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INTRODUCTION

I The Life and Work of Sir John Cheke

Biography

John Cheke was born in the parish of St. Mary the Great in Cambridge, 16 June 1514. In that same year Erasmus was completing his lectures in Greek at the new college of St. John's which Cheke was to make famous as a center of learning in the first half of the sixteenth century in England. Three years prior to Cheke's birth, in 1511, those forces which were to determine the course of several centuries of western thought, and no less the life of Cheke himself—religion, politics, and classical learning—combined to bring about a small but incalculably significant change on the English scene. In that year Bishop John Fisher, then President of Queens' College, Cambridge, and later a Catholic martyr, was instrumental in bringing Eras-

1 Charles Henry and Thompson Cooper, Athenae Cantabri-gienses, I (Cambridge, 1859), 166. Cf. John and J. A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses Part I: From the Earliest Times to 1751, I (Cambridge, 1922), 328; John Gough Nichols, "Some Additions to the Biographies of Sir John Cheke and Sir Thomas Smith," Archaeologia, XXXVIII (1860), 114. For elaborated lives of John Cheke, see John Strype, The Life of the Learned John Cheke, Kt . . . , first published in 1705 (corrected edition Oxford, 1821), and Walter Nathan, Sir John Cheke und der englische Humanismus (Bonn, 1926). Strype's life is a valuable but inadequate account, utilizing some materials no longer available and giving a generally religious slant to the facts as Strype knew them. Nathan's biography, the most thorough modern presentation of biographical and critical data, is at this time out-dated by recent scholarship, particularly relating to The hurt of sedition. All references to Strype's Cheke are to the corrected edition, 1821.
mus to Cambridge as the university's first Greek reader. In that year too, Fisher realized another ambition for Cambridge. Urged by the bishop, Lady Margaret Beaufort, mother of the first reigning Tudor, had before her death in 1509 provided for the establishment of St. John's College. In 1511 St. John's was activated, and its statutes laid down an obligation to provide classical teaching. In a review of Cheke's life the disparate aspects of sixteenth-century English life represented by these facts may be brought to focus, revealing in the account of John Cheke a portrait of the English Renaissance humanist and explaining the production, from such a man, of the treatise for civil obedience, *The hurt of sedition.*

Sixteenth-century records have little to reveal of the early life of John Cheke in what must have been the highly stimulating atmosphere of life in the small university town. Some of the most important minds of the English Reformation were being trained in Cambridge in the years of Cheke's boyhood: Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, Parker, Coverdale. Cambridge was beginning to take the lead in Greek scholarship in England. While at the turn of the century Oxford led the way in humanistic studies, including Greek, 3

reactionary factions at Oxford had hindered the progress of Greek learning there. Thus in 1519 Cambridge was able to claim a formal Greek reader to the university—Richard Croke, who had been appointed Greek instructor to King Henry VIII about 1517—while Oxford could not make the same claim until 1520.\(^4\) So rich was the intellectual mine at Cambridge that Cardinal Wolsey sought there in 1525 for experienced men to fill important positions in his new Cardinal's College (now Christ Church) at Oxford.\(^5\) Undoubtedly, as the son of Peter Cheke, a processional official of the university,\(^6\) John Cheke was, if only indirectly, exposed to the activity of the schools. He is reputed to have had a grammatical education under one John Morgan, M.A.,\(^7\) and in 1529, at the age of fifteen, was admitted to St. John's College.\(^8\)

Apparently Cheke's aptness for learning attracted the attention of George Day, Master of St. John's in 1537\(^9\) and Bishop of Chichester in 1543. Day, with such men as Richard Croke and later Cheke himself and Ascham, had be-

\(^7\) Ath. Cant., I, 166.
\(^9\) Baker, Hist., I, 105.
come a fellow of the university under Nicholas Metcalfe, who was Master of St. John's from 1516 to 1537, personal chap­lain to Bishop Fisher, and himself a patron of classical learning. According to Cheke's own testimony, Day was his "bringer-upp," and at his hands he "gat an entrie to some skill in learning." It may well have been Day, then, who initiated Cheke's classical studies. Cheke proceeded B. A. 1529/30 and commenced M. A. 1533. Sometime in these early years he came under the patronage of Dr. William Butts who, in 1524, took a lease on St. Mary's hostel in the parish of Cheke's youth. In the year of Cheke's entrance at St. John's, Butts became a member of the College of Physicians and in the same year was made physician to Henry VIII. About this same time Cheke's father died, and in subsequent years Cheke referred to Butts as "him whom I had here on earth in the stead of a father," his "chief patron," and signed a letter to Butts: "Tuus animo filius." Perhaps it

10 Tilley, p. 438.
13 Ath. Cant., I, 87.
was Butts, as has been suggested, who brought Cheke to the notice of the king, who chose Cheke and Thomas Smith of Queen's College to be his scholars.

In his years at St. John's, from his fifteenth to his thirtieth year, Cheke made many significant friendships, among which the acquaintance with Thomas Smith was one of the most productive. Smith describes the relationship:

"That equality of age and conditions, the same course of studies, and the royal bounty equally exhibited to us, and the continual vying with one another, and emulation of our parts and wits, which in others is wont to kindle envy and dissension, hitherto hath united us closely, and tied us both together in love as brothers."

In 1533 Smith, then twenty years of age, was appointed to read the Greek lecture for the university, and it must have been about this same time that Cheke began to "reade priuatly in his chambré, all Homer, Sophocles, and Euripides, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Isocrates and Plato . . . .", as Roger Ascham reports. Ascham himself, just one year younger than Cheke, came to St. John's about the time Cheke

---

16 Strype, Cheke, p. 6.
17 Cheke to Henry VIII, prefatory letter to Cheke's translation of St. John Chrysostom Homilies, 1543 (STC 14634, title given in Greek); partial English version in Strype, Cheke, p. 9. Cf. reference to Cheke as "king's scholar" in LtF, XIX, part 1 (1903), 374, #610, grant 35.
19 Ath. Cant., I, 369; Strype, Smith, p. 10.
did, but was apparently not so well prepared as Cheke and was tutored by Cheke for several years before Ascham proceeded B. A. in 1533/34.\textsuperscript{21} Ascham refers to Cheke as "my dearest frend, and teacher of all the litle poore learning I haue."\textsuperscript{22} In Ascham's writing we have the best account of those years prior to Cheke's departure from Cambridge to Court. From his statements we are able to glean information not only of Cheke's associations but of the impress which he left upon his college and upon learning generally in England. Ascham writes:

Cambridge, at my first comming thither, but not at my going away, committed this fault in reading the preceptes of Aristotle without the examples of other Authors: But herein, in my time thies men of worthie memorie, M. Redman, M. Cheke, M. Smith, M. Haddon, M. Watson, put so to their helping handes, as that vniuersitie, and all studentes there, as long as learning shall last, shall be bounde vnto them, if that trade in studie be trewlie followed, which those men left behinde them there.\textsuperscript{23}

All of the men named with Cheke were his friends and fellow classical scholars.\textsuperscript{24} According to another remark of Ascham's, however, Cheke himself was chiefly responsible for bringing about the improvement in the state of classical learning, particularly Greek, in his college. Writing to

\textsuperscript{21} Ath. Cant., I, 263.
\textsuperscript{22} Ascham, Scholemaster, in English Works, p. 283. Cf. pp. 178-79.
\textsuperscript{23} Scholemaster, p. 278.
\textsuperscript{24} Cf. Ath. Cant., vol. I.
an absent friend, Ascham says:

Sophocles and Euripides are now more familiar to us than Plautus was when you were here. Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon are more read now than Livy was then. They talk now as much of Demosthenes, as they did of Cicero at that time. There are more copies of Isocrates to be met with now than there were of Terence then. Yet we do not treat the Latin writers with contempt, but we cherish the best of them who flourished in the golden age of their literature.

It was Cheke who gave the first impulse towards bringing about this state of things: he twice read through Homer, Sophocles, Euripides, and Herodotus, at a public lecture and that too without taking any fee. He meant to do the same for all the Greek poets, historians, orators, and philosophers, if ill luck had not stood in the way of such a great advancement of learning.  

The "ill luck" refers to a controversy over the correct pronunciation of Greek which Cheke's enthusiasm for the learned languages was eventually to involve him in.  

From his early days at St. John's this same enthusiasm made him an inspired and inspiring teacher and earned him the respect of his Cambridge contemporaries, so that Ascham could not only say that Cheke "laid the very foundations of learning in that college," but could acclaim him as a great encourager of his students and fellows:

...when I consider howe manye men he succoured with his helpe, & hys ayde to abyde here for learninge, and howe all men

26 See below, pp. 68-70.  
27 Lat. let.: Ascham to Cheke, [1547], in Giles, I, 148-49; translated in part by Strype, Cheke, p. 7.
were prouoked and styrrred vp, by his counsell
and daylye example, howe they shulde come to
learning, surely I perceyue that sentence of
Plato to be true, which sayeth that there is
nothyng better in any common wealthe, than
that there shoulde be alwayes one or other,
extcellent passyng man, whose lyfe and vertue,
shoulde plucke forwarde the will, diligence,
laboure and hope of all other, that folowyng
his footesteppes, they myght come to the
same ende, wherevnto labour, lerning & vertue,
had cōueied him before.28

Happily, Ascham has left us, along with the record of
Cheke's influence, a description of the mind of this man
who made, in his twenties, an indelible impression upon his
contemporaries and his college. Writing as a teacher him­
self many years later, Ascham recalls the qualities of mind
which had inspired him and others:

... though I, in all this discourse, seem
plainlie to prefer, hard and roughe wittes,
before quicke and light wittes, both for
learnynge and maners, yet am I not ignorant
that som quicknes of witte, is a singuler
gifte of God, and so most rare emonges men,
and namelie such a witte, as is quicke with­
out lightenes, sharpe without brittlenes, de­
sirous of good thinges without newfanglenes,
diligēt in painfull thinges without weri­
sommes, and constant in good will to do all
thinges well, as I know was in Syr John Cheke
... .29

Thus it was the personality and mind of the man, as much
as his scholarship, that impressed and stimulated his con­
temporaries.

Of this academic period of Cheke's life, greatly

28 Toxophilus, p. 45.
29 Scholemaster, p. 192.
significant for the future of English letters, the records have relatively little to offer, and one must largely speculate about the answers to questions regarding the day-to-day life of the vital intellect and vigorous teacher whom Ascham describes. A letter written in 1535 by Cheke to Matthew Parker, then chaplain to Queen Anne Boleyn, asking Parker to use his influence with the queen to secure financial aid for William Bill, an indigent student at St. John's, supports Ascham's statement about Cheke's readiness to assist the cause of learning. According to another report, we can infer that by 1536, at the age of twenty-two, Cheke's stature among his fellows was considerable, for in that year he is reputed to have appeared as a college proxy, with Nicholas Metcalfe and George Day, then past and present Masters of St. John's, "before the king's commissioners in the matter of the oaths of the succession and supremacy . . . ." This incident suggests another important aspect of Cheke's career—his involvement in the activities of the Reformation, an involvement which eventually determined his fate. Metcalfe, a papist, was relieved of the headship of St. John's at the fall of Bishop Fisher of Rochester in 1535, and one Cambridge historian charges Cheke and Day with ingratitude toward the former master, who was unseated par-

30 Lat. let.: Cheke to Matthew Parker, [1535], in Giles, I, 1-2.
31 Baker, Hist., I, 104.
tially because of the university fellows' rebellion in 1534 against him as too rigidly orthodox and Romish. Thomas Fuller, however, in his history of the university, is confident that "neither Master Cheek nor Master Ascham, then Fellows of the College, had any hand against him . . . ." And Ascham's respectful praise of Metcalfe, in which he says he is echoing the feelings of John Cheke, would seem to indicate that Fuller's confidence is well founded. Cheke's sympathies by this time, if not earlier, were undoubtedly with the "new learning" of the Reformation; most of the men with whom he associated closely had "protestant" inclinations. On the other hand, one of the young men who seems to have been a close friend of Cheke and Ascham, Thomas

32 Baker, Hist., I, 105.
34 Scholemaster, p. 279.
35 While I am aware of the extensive misuse of the term "protestant" by historians of the sixteenth century (cf. the relevant discussion by J. W. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century [London, 1928; reprinted London: Methuen, 1957], pp. 1-7), I use the term in application to Cheke on the authority of Ascham's use of it in speaking of the "new learning" sympathizers as opposed to "papists"; Scholemaster, p. 279: "He [Nicholas Metcalfe] was a Papist in deede, but would to God, amonges all vs Protestats I might once see but one, that would winne like praise, in doing like good, for the aduancement of learning and vertue. And yet, though he were a Papist, if any young man, gave to new learning (as they termed it) went beyond his fellowes, in witte, labor, and towardnes, euyn the same, neyther lacked, open praise to encourage him, nor priuate ex­hibition to mainteyne hym, as worthy Syr I. Cheke, if he were aliuie would beare good witnes and so can many mo."
Watson, was a life-long Roman Catholic. Cheke's zeal for the "true religion" did not at this time, evidently, keep him from some rewarding intellectual relationships with his more religiously conservative contemporaries.

Other formal college duties were performed by Cheke. In 1539 he appears to have been the last "master of the glomery," i.e., "master of the grammery," the precise sixteenth-century functions of which office antiquaries have been unable to determine. In the following year, upon the foundation by Henry VIII of the first public or regius professorships at Cambridge, Cheke was nominated to the Greek chair, at a salary of forty pounds, and he held the position until 1547. But this last honor, in his twenty-sixth year, was merely the public recognition of an office which Cheke had been informally fulfilling, in public as well as privately, for approximately five years. And it was in the offices which he proffered gratuitously to his fellows and students that he appears first to have been so vitally responsible for the growth of humanist learning in England. The great admiration for Cheke which Ascham long cherished grew out of those early years, when Ascham,

36 Scholemaster, p. 284.
39 Mullinger, Univ. of Camb., I, 340-41.
40 "Cheke," DNB, p. 179.
William Cecil, later Lord Burghley,\textsuperscript{41} Thomas Watson, and others gathered about Cheke to hear the considered judgments of the youthful and vigorous teacher. In those years of enthusiastic learning there was little time for much else than teaching and study. To those modern critics who have condemned the humanists following More and Fisher for their few contributions to early "scholarship," the answer has been given by Douglas Bush, who explains the dearth of scholarly production from men like Cheke by reference to their overwhelming teaching burden and, more importantly:

\begin{quote}
The main impulse of Tudor humanism, and of the best continental humanism, was not that life should be given up to classical learning, but that classical learning should be an aid to the active Christian life.\textsuperscript{42}
\end{quote}

Thus it is that Cheke's devotion to classical learning as a means to the good life makes the task of his biographers the more difficult, for as another modern critic has said:

\begin{quote}
... he is one of those men whose greatness is the harder to recapture now because he taught more than he wrote, and left behind him men rather than books. It is, however, one of the natural compensations of life that such men produce pupils who are both willing and able to pay tribute to their masters, and hand down to posterity materials from
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{42} Douglas Bush, "Tudor Humanism and Henry VIII," University of Toronto Quarterly, VII (1938), 175.
which it is not hard to reconstruct their teaching . . . .43

Although Cheke left behind him no personally written record of those years at Cambridge44 and no original work to mark that period, Ascham has served Cheke and posterity well. Indeed, one suspects that Ascham held Cheke to be, in many ways, the prototype of the ideal schoolmaster which he set out in his book on that subject. He specifically refers to Cheke's "example of excellency in learnyng, of godlynes in liuyng, of diligēcie in studying, of councell in exhorting, of good order in all thyng," qualities which "did breed vp, so many learned men, in that one College of S. Iohns, at one time, as I beleue, the whole Vniuersitie of Louaine, in many yeares, was neuer able to affourd."45 As we shall see in the subsequent analysis of Cheke's critical theories, many of the important attitudes and judgments in The Scholemaster are avowedly Cheke's, and in reporting them, Ascham lights still other facets of the man--his perceptiveness as a

44 Save for the three Latin letters to Stephen Gardiner regarding the Greek pronunciation controversy which were printed in Ioannis Cheki Angli De Pronuntiatione Graecae potissimum linguæ disputationes cum Stephano Vuintoshensi Episcope, septem contrarijs epistolis comprehensae, magna quadam & elegantia & eruditione refertae (Basle, 1555), pp. 22-162, 218-325, 339-45. The Newberry Library has a copy of this book which I have examined.
reader, his discrimination as a teacher and critic of literature, and the precepts which were his legacy to English pedagogy and criticism. Then too, when we consider the leadership of St. John’s College in the renaissance of classical learning in England in the sixteenth century and Cheke’s responsibility for that leadership, we may see him as one of the foremost English representatives of modern humanistic study and his opinions as sometimes pioneering and always prophetic of later trends in sixteenth-century English humanism. Most importantly for this study, we shall see how the theories and values of these early years could become the frame and spirit of Cheke’s most important English work, *The hurt of sedition*.

The central conceptions which concerned Cheke—the study of the classics for wisdom, for stylistic models, for an appreciation of literature, and the emphasis upon simplicity and naturalness in writing and speech, whether classical or vernacular—these were his preoccupation in the years at Cambridge, from 1529 to 1544, and these constitute the legacy he left, with the inspiration of his teaching, to his followers there. By his thirtieth year Cheke had succeeded in cultivating and bringing into productivity the seeds of humanism planted in England by


47 See below, pp. 63-80, for a discussion of Cheke’s contributions as a humanist to English criticism and pedagogy.
earlier humanists, such as Grocyn, Colet, Linacre, Erasmus, More, and Bishop Fisher. His good husbandry did not go un­rewarded. Sometime about the beginning of 1544 he was elected public orator of the university, and on 6 May 1544 "John Cheke, the King's scholar," was awarded from the court a grant of the canonry and prebend in "King Henry the Eight his college in Oxford."

These recognitions from university and court were, however, only foreshadowings of the far greater recognition which was soon to come. They mark, in Cheke's history, the end of an academic era italic with success and the beginning of a period of involvement in public life which, if fraught with ambiguity, nonetheless saw the production of Cheke's major English work. In early July of 1544 the regency (established by King Henry to rule at home during his ab­sence in France) under Queen Catherine Parr, an ardent re­former, announced the appointment of John Cheke to the tutorship of Prince Edward. The event was noted by lead­ing Reformation thinkers abroad, and at Cambridge there

49 L&P, XIX, part 1, 537, #374, grant 35; i.e., King's College, now Christ Church.
50 L&P, XIX, part 1, 537, #864. Printed in extenso in State Papers Published under the Authority of His Majesty's Commission, I ([London?], 1830), 764. According to infor­mation from Cheke printed by Jerome Cardan (De Geniturs [1558], p. 37) and reprinted by J. G. Nichols in "Some Additions . . .," p. 114, Cheke actually became the prince's tutor on 10 June 1544.
was at once grieving and celebration:

The great hinderance of learning, in lackinge
thy man greatly I shulde lament, if this dis-
cómmoditie & welth, of ye hole realme, for which
purpose, our noble king full of wysedome hath
called yp this excellent man full of learnynge,
to teache noble prince Edwarde, an office ful
of hope, conforte & solace to al true hertes
of England: For whom al England dayly doth
praye, yt he passing his Tutour in learnyng &
knowledge, folowyng his father in wisedome &
felicitie . . . maye bring to his own glory,
immortal fame & memorie, to this realme, welthe,
honour & felicitie, to true and vnfayned
religion perpetuall peace, concorde and
vnitie.52

Within three months of Cheke's departure from Cambridge
Ascham was lamenting to Cheke the decay in civility and
learning at St. John's which had resulted:

. . . .things are now brought to such a pass that
I know not what good can any longer be expected
from that consent of good men, for the advance­
ment of letters, and to check the turbulence and
intolerance of some amongst us, which, although
much supported by the goodness of the cause, was
nevertheless kept up [i.e., regulated] in a
great measure by your prudent management.53

Several months later he was to repeat this lament to Arch-
bishop Cranmer.54 But Ascham and others at Cambridge were
not unaware of the good fortune they had in having such a
friend as Cheke at court, and in the years following, such
a man as Walter Haddon, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge in
1549-1550, as well as Ascham, was not slow to remind him of

52 Toxophilus, pp. 45-46.
53 Lat. let.: Ascham to Cheke, in Giles, I, 53-57; trans­
lated xli-xlili, as quoted.
54 Lat. let.: Ascham to Cranmer, in Giles, I, 63-70.
his ties to the university, of its debt to him, and of the influence which he now might wield for the state of learning at Cambridge. When Ascham asserted to Cheke that "being

55 Strype prints the following pertinent translated excerpts from Latin letters written to Cheke from Cambridge. The first, from Ascham (Strype, Cheke, pp. 33-34; Latin original in Giles, I, 109-11), is undated, but was apparently written before the death of Henry VIII in January 1547, since it contains a reference to "Prince Edward":

"Of all that number of very eminent men, most eminent Cheke, that ever went forth from this University into the commonwealth, you alone are the man, whom she, above all others, loved being present, and being absent admired: which you also in recompense had adorned more than all the rest, when you were present, and now being absent afford your help unto. For being present, you delivered such rules of learning for all instruction, and propounded such examples of ingenuity to all imitation, as when every one followed for their greatest benefit, none perfectly and completely attained. There is none indeed among us all, either so ignorant as knows not, or so envious as to deny it, that these most fortunate fountains of our studies, which many with great industry, pains, and hope, have drunk at, have flown from your wit, tuition, example, and counsel. And the perpetual preservation of your memory, is consecrated to those monuments of your humanity, parts, and learning. But being gone, you have heaped upon us greater assistance, and surer defence, than ourselves expect. For whilst a King, instructed by your precepts, becomes such a patron of learning by your counsel, we are not ignorant what the rest either will, or at least ought to contribute to our University. We have drawn this our hope, and this discipline out of your Plato, to Dionysius, a very bad king; yet we have had experience lately of the fruit and use of it, by your aid in our best Prince Edward. Therefore, since so many mutual offices, so many pious close-nesses and ties are between you and the University, that in fetching back the remembrance of it from your very cradle, to the honour in which you now are, there is no benefit of nature, or fruit of industry, or praise of wit, or defence of fortune, or ornament of honour to be found in you, whereunto our University either hath not contributed for your use, or whereof it hath not partaken to her glory: we do not doubt, but the University may hope and receive from you this fruit of the ornaments she hath conferred on you; that whatever interest and power your honourable place and station may hereafter put into your hands, you will employ it all in preserving the dignity of the University,
gone, you have heaped upon us greater assistance, and surer
defence, than either the rest of our friends could ever
think, or we ourselves expect," or that "a King, instructed
by your precepts, becomes such a patron of learning by your
counsel," it is clear that Cheke did not forget the uni-
versity or the cause of learning, but rather was intent upon
utilizing the highest teaching office in the land not only
for the good training of a governor but for the advancement
of learning generally.

We do not comment any one, but all our causes to you, wherein
we hope you will take such pains, as either you ought to
bestow upon us, or we to expect from you."

A second letter, this from Haddon (Strype, Cheke, pp.
23-24) and also undated, was probably written about the same
time as Ascham's very similar letter above, i.e., 1544-1547;
I quote again from Strype's translation:
"My condition is harder than the rest. They saw how
you excelled in parts and learning; I not only well knew
this too, but was throughly [sic] acquainted with your more
interior ornaments, which diffused themselves through all
the parts of your life. Which when I then duly weighed,
how great they were in you, I do so much the more want them
now, and so much the less am able to bear the trifles, the
levities, and the ignorances of many of our men. But be­
cause this was owing either to your happiness, that you
should especially be there, where your diligence might flow
abroad most extensively into the commonwealth; or to our
unhappiness, that we should undergo the loss of your divine
mouth, the loud trumpet, as one may call it, of all good
discipline, our trouble ought to be abated, lest if we ap­
pear over-much disquieted, we may seem either not to love
the commonwealth enough, or ourselves too much. It was a
very good thought of your Plato, that some changes of com­
monwealths are natural, that when there happens an altera­
tion in the state of our affairs, we should not be much
moved. And although your body be snatched from us, yet
your obliging behaviour, your wit, your study, your elo­
quence, and learning, is present in all our schools, and
in each of our private thoughts." Cf. additional Latin
56 See preceding note, quotation: Ascham to Cheke.
The honor and position which Cheke received with his appointment to the tutorship did not come uninvited. In 1543 Cheke had dedicated to Henry VIII a Latin translation of two Greek homilies of St. John Chrysostom, the first work of the young scholar to appear in print, and reputedly the first book to be printed using Greek type in England. About the same time, he was at work on a Latin translation of Leo V's Greek books on "the sleyghtes and pollicies of warre," similarly dedicated to the king, as was his translation, again from the Greek to Latin, of Plutarch's "On Superstition." Then too, Henry could not have been unaware of the high reputation of his scholar at Cambridge, and the rewarding of the Oxford canonry to Cheke is indication of the growing favor in which the king held him. Cheke never lost this good grace while Henry VIII lived, and his retention as Edward's tutor at the accession of the young

---


59 Toxophilus, p. 44. Printed as Leonis Imperatoris de bellico apparatu liber, e Greco in Latinum conversas, J. Checo ... interp. (Basle, 1554). B. M. 1397. s. 6.

60 No sixteenth-century edition of this book appears to be extant. Parts of it were preserved in MS fragments and were translated and printed in Strype's Cheke, pp. 183-218.
prince in January, 1547, is indication that the avidly Protestant Seymour protectorate approved of Cheke's influence upon the new king.

Something of Cheke's attitude toward his responsibility and of his philosophy of the education of governors is revealed in his only extant writing to Edward VI. In a letter written by Cheke when he thought himself to be dying of a serious illness, he warns the young king to listen to true and plain-spoken counsellors, to reward them for their good service, and to distrust advisers who always assure him that "all is well"; he charges him to temper all of his actions and words with the fear of God, for his own glory and for the glory of God. In addition, Cheke advises him to

61 Eng. let.: Cheke to Edward VI, Nug. Ant. (1769), pp. 71-74; (1801*), I, 17-22. This letter is dated 1547 in Park's edition of the Nug. Ant. (1804) although he does not account for this date (I, 17). The manuscript copy of the letter, in B. M. Add. MS 46367, fols. 5v-6v, gives no date. I assume Park is mistaken and that the letter was written in 1552. In the dates printed by Jerome Cardan, the great European mathematician, physicist, physician, and pseudo scientist (see Nichols, "Some Additions . . .," p. 114), serious illnesses were listed by Cheke as having occurred in 1540 and 1552, but none is listed for 1547. Since the dates were given to Cardan for the construction of a horoscope, and since Cheke saw fit to mention these illnesses as important, it seems likely that he would have mentioned an illness of 1547 had there been one. In addition, the content of the letter, i.e., Cheke's reference to a son and to himself as head of a college at Cambridge (Cheke was married in May of 1547 and became provost of King's in 1548), indicates a later date, as does the material regarding the king's studies which suggest the king to be more advanced in his scholarship than he probably was in 1547 at ten years of age and with only three years of Cheke's tutelage.
continue his reading of the precepts of good government, particularly the chapters of Aristotle's *Politics* which describe the means of preserving kingship and recommend moderation in all behavior; for his "divinitie" Cheke prescribes the New Testament, with *Sapientia*, *Ecclesiasticus*, and the *Proverbs*. The recommendations are not unusual, coming as they do from a Christian humanist; indeed Erasmus had included these books in his list of recommended readings for the Christian prince. But it is interesting to note what Cheke, who thought himself to be dying, should single out for the special attention of the young king. The chapters from Aristotle, the New Testament, and the books of ancient Hebrew wisdom focus philosophically upon moderation, humility, charity, the responsibilities of the righteous man, and upon the overall burden of the virtuous man who will, however, find ultimate rewards. The supreme value of wisdom, attained through the grace of God, is the "final" lesson for the young English Renaissance monarch. Cheke's deepest convictions are revealed in this emphasis upon the blending of classical and Christian virtues.

63 Thomas W. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke*, I (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944), 208, although such use of Biblical books was not a Renaissance innovation.
64 For a detailed study of Edward's schooling in Cheke's association, see the above work, especially I, 200-56. Ascham, writing to John Sturm, 14 December 1550, says of the young king's relationship with Cheke: "... Our King's
With the advancement of years the progress of Cheke's fortune as Edward's tutor indicates clearly enough that Cheke was accepted by king and counsellors alike. The fragmentary records of Cheke's activities in those years are adequate enough to suggest that Cheke occupied an increasingly powerful and consequently hazardous position. The pertinent records begin with May of 1547 when he married Margaret Hill, daughter of Richard Hill, who had been ser-
ability equals his fortune, and his goodness surpasses both . . . . In scarce any other particular do I esteem him more fortunate than that he obtained John Cheke as the instructor of his youth in sound learning and true religion . . . . On the day before I left England, when conversing in London with sir John Cheke, I inquired of him how it was that the King should read the Ethic of Aristotle rather than the Cyropaedia of Xenophon, and he answered with the greatest wisdom and learning, (as he is always wont), 'In order that his mind, first instructed in all those infinite examinations and dissections of virtues and vices, may bring a sound judgment to each of those examples of character and conduct, that everywhere present themselves in history: and because it is scarcely possible that his natural perceptions, amused and led away by the pleasantness of history, should at once form such conclusions as are of an abstruse and recondite nature, although highly necessary to confirm the judgment. Still my endeavor is to give him no precept unaccompanied by some remarkable example.' How fortunate (adds Ascham) is England, my Sturmius, that the youth of its prince, for he has but recently entered his fourteenth year, is reared under this excellent training . . . ." (Lat. text printed in Giles, I, 224-29; translated in Lit. Remains, I, cli-clii, from which I quote). Cf. Jerome Cardan's report that Edward, at fifteen, "was a pretty good logician; he understood natural philosophy . . . . He had begun to favour learning before he was a great scholar himself, and to be acquainted with it before he could make use of it . . . ." (In Horace Walpole, Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors of England, Scotland, and Ireland . . . enlarged and continued by Thomas Park, I (London, 1806), 59-60; quoting from Cardan, De Geniturs). See also J. G. Nichols' reference to a quadrant supposedly given Edward by Cheke, Lit. Remains, I, xxb-xxc.
geant of the wine-cellar to Henry VIII. After the death of Hill, his widow married Sir John Mason, who thus became Cheke's step-father-in-law. In October of 1547 Cheke sat in the House of Commons for the Borough of Blechingly, Surrey. In the same month he is found utilizing his position of influence and his friendship with William Cecil, then custos brevium in the Court of Common Pleas, to secure Cecil's assistance for a stranger bishop, needy and unknown, who wished to speak with the protector. In January of 1548 Ascham was urging Cecil to promote the cause of the new learning by recommending Cheke as a candidate for the provostship of King's College, Cambridge, "for the good of the whole University."


68 Calendar of Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath, Preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire, II (Dublin, 1907), 11. This note, perhaps as a custom between Cheke and his former pupil, is written in Greek. Cf. reference by Strype, Cheke, p. 176, to similar note which predates the death of Cheke's sister Mary, Cecil's wife, 22 February 1542. Cf. also MSS of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bath, At Longleat, Co. Wilts, Historical Manuscripts Commission: Third Report (1872), App., p. 195, for another brief note in Greek from Cheke to Cecil, 23 August 1551.

69 Lat. let.: Ascham to Cecil, in Giles, I, 156-58; translated I, lvi-lvii, from which I quote. All dates from 1 January to 25 March are given according to modern usage, i.e., January 1547/48 is given as 1548.
asking him to do what he could to secure for Ascham the tut­
orship of Princess Elizabeth, a position made vacant by the
death of Ascham's former pupil, William Grindal,70 who was
allegedly brought to court by Cheke,71 and whose death Cheke
commemorated with a poem.72 In April of 1548 Cheke's former
teacher George Day was deprived, for religious reasons, of
the provostship of King's College, and Cheke succeeded him
in that position by the authority of a royal mandamus.73 In
June Cheke was writing Matthew Parker, assuring him that he
would do what he could for Parker at court, this in return
for some valuable advice reportedly given Cheke by Parker
regarding the properties of the dissolved college of St.John
Baptist at Stoke, next Clare, Suffolk, the use of which
Cheke was interested in securing.74 Before the end of the
year this property was awarded "the king's servant John
Cheke" on payment of "ready money"; the payment of more than
950 pounds, as stipulated by the official grant of 21 Octo-
ber 1548, indicates that Cheke had achieved some affluence.75

70 Lat. let.: Ascham to Cheke, in Giles, I, 160-62; trans-
lated in part, I, lvi-lvii.
71 Strype, Cheke, p. 9.
72 Unpublished manuscript poem in Arundel MS, fol. 206v.
See Ruth Hughey, "The Harington Manuscript at Arundel Castle
73 Alumni Etonienses; or, a Catalogue of the Provosts &
Fellows of Eton College & King's College, Cambridge. . .,
74 Strype, Cheke, pp. 37-38.
75 Calendar of Patent Rolls . . . Edward VI, I (London,
ed. John Roche Dasent, New Series, II (London, 1890), 225,
for exchange of "sale money." Cf. John Strype, Ecclesiasti-
In July Cheke was again in communication with Cecil regarding a suit to the protector for some benefice. Cheke's efforts to aid his fellow Protestants indicate his growing involvement in religious matters, an involvement which is further reflected by Edmund Gest's dedicating to him an outspokenly Protestant exposition, *Treatise against the preve masse...*, 1548. Evidence of Cheke's increasing importance in public matters may be found in the lists of official commissions, where his name begins to appear rather frequently. In November of 1548 he was one of seven dignitaries serving on a commission to visit Eton College and Cambridge University and to execute certain instructions and appoint separate colleges at Cambridge for the study of civil law and medicine.

The circumstances of Cheke's life from January of 1549 until his death in 1557 cannot be divorced from the political unrest and upheaval in England during the last four and one half years of Edward's reign and following the accession of Mary. The records give relatively little attention. Memorials, relating chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of it... II (Oxford, 1822), part 2, 402, for citation from Edw. VI's "Book of Sales."

76 Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edw. VI, Mary, Elizabeth: 1547-1580...; ed. Robert Lemon, Edw. VI, IV (London, 1857), 8, #24. The original is reported to be much mutilated and unclear.

77 Nathan, pp. 56-57; i.e., STC 11802.

78 Cal. Pat. Rolls Edw. VI, 1, 369, and Cal. SP Dom.: Edw. VI, V, II, #13. Among others on the commission were Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of Rochester, Sir William Paget, Thomas Smith, then the king's secretary, and William Maye, the king's doctor.
tention to Cheke's activities in these years, but the implications for him and his work in the occurrences of the times are rather clear, and the bare facts are greatly elaborated when set against the background of the religious, economic, and political strife of the period. Cheke's life became complicated with politics at least as early as 1547, when his political involvement was reflected in his representing the protectorate in Commons by sitting for Blechingly in the first Edwardian Parliament. From 1549 on, Cheke lived uneasily with crisis and public success. Life at Court proved a far different thing from life at Cambridge, and if his higher position in public service was more prominent, it was also more dangerous.

The year 1549 was for Cheke one of crisis and ultimate success. Apparently the year began well enough, with Cheke among the favored whose servants were given New Year's rewards by the king. But January 1549 was to be a time which held many fates in the balance, and Cheke's among them. According to Cheke's own statement, the eleventh of January was a day of disgrace and near loss of office. He gives no reasons, but in that same month the protector's brother, Thomas Seymour, the Lord High Admiral, Baron Sey-

81 Nichols, "Some Additions . . .," pp. 100-01, 114.
mour of Sudeley, was imprisoned for dishonesty and recalcitrance, having attempted, among other alleged crimes against the realm, to influence the young king for his personal gain and power. In subsequent testimony against Admiral Seymour, Cheke was many times mentioned as having been considered by Seymour a ready way to Edward's affections.®² Seymour himself is reported to have admitted trying to purchase influence in the royal household by means of gifts, including one to Cheke, who was loath to take it.®³ Cheke, in a declaration of 20 February 1549, reported that the Lord Admiral had indeed tried to persuade him to use his influence with the king in order to procure some power for Seymour from the House of Lords.®⁴ Cheke refused to co-operate, and according to Edward's testimony against Seymour, Cheke implied that the king too did right not to be influenced by Seymour.®⁵ In addition to the suspicion cast upon him by Seymour's machinations, Cheke had, apparently, other problems at court at this time. In a letter to the fractious wife of

---

the protector, the Duchess of Somerset, Cheke asks that this lady forgive his wife for some offence she had given the Duchess at court; he apologizes for his wife's misdemeanor, explaining that she is pregnant and not well, and asks for leniency and mercy for his wife. 86

Which of these incidents, if either, led to Cheke's temporary disgrace and withdrawal from court it is impossible to say from the available evidence. Perhaps the two difficulties together forced him to leave the court at this time. To be sure, his involvements with Admiral Seymour, who was beheaded on 20 March 1549, did not make the court a comfortable place for Cheke. In any event, it is certain that he had suffered a severe disillusionment and that he retired for a time to Cambridge, from which he wrote to his friend Peter Osborne, Keeper of the Privy Purse:

I fele the caulme of quietnes, being tost afore with storms, and have felt ambition's bitter gal, poisoned with hope of hap. And therefore I can be meri on the bankes side without dangring miself on the sea. Yo'r sight is ful of gai thinges abrode, which I desire not, as thinges sufficientli known and valewd. 0 what pleasure is it to lacke pleasures, and how honorable is it to fli from honor's throws. Among other lacks I lack buckram to lai betwene ye

86 The Earl of Surrey's poem, "Each beast can choose his fere," which is presumably addressed to the Duchess, reveals her bad manners. Eng. let.: Cheke to the Duchess of Somerset, in Strype, Cheke, pp. 44-45. The letter is dated "From Westminster, the xxvii. of January, 1549. 2 Edw." Strype takes this date to be 1549/50. But "2 Edw." indicates that the dating is according to Julian calendar and that the letter was therefore written in the same January as that of Seymour's disgrace (3 Edw. began 28 January 1548/49).
bookes and bordes in mi studi, which I now have trimd. I have mede of xxx yards. Chuse you the color. I prai you bi me a reme of paper at London. Fare ye wel. . . .From Cambridge the xxx. of Mai 1549, 3 Ed. 6. Yo'rs known, Joan' Cheke87

This letter is of interest not only for the information it gives regarding Cheke's disgrace and his subsequent whereabouts, but also for its tone of stoicism, the revelation of his character and his gained wisdom. Perhaps also about this same time, May of 1549, and again apparently from Cambridge, Cheke wrote a worried letter to the Duke of Somerset, revealing his anxiety about the king's education in his absence.88 It is Cheke's great concern that the protector will take watchful care of Edward, overseeing his education, giving him the benefit of his wisdom and experience, keeping him from pride and arrogance, and cautioning him always to be open to experienced men's counsel. Cheke's fears are, he says, prompted by no other cause than love; yet surely the tone of this letter implies a caution based on past experience at court. It is, I think, clearly a letter of genuine concern for the young king and not one motivated by mere expediency, as the circumstances of the preceding January might betray one into believing. While the tone is res-

87 Eng. let.: Cheke to Peter Osborne, in Lit. Remains, I,1, and Strype, Cheke, p. 39.
88 Eng. let.: Cheke to the Duke of Somerset, in Nug. Ant. (1769), pp. 66-70; (1804), I, 41-47. Nichols prints the letter (Lit. Remains, I, ccxlv-ccxlvii) and dates it, from the internal evidence, May, 1549, the time of the visitation to Cambridge mentioned in the letter.
pectful toward the protector, it is also frankly concerned about potential difficulties, and the advice given by Cheke is directed as much to Somerset as to Edward.

In June of 1549 came the first of the serious popular protests against the protectorate governmental policies. Insurrections began in Devon and Cornwall and spread from the southwest to the northeast of England, the common people rising first for religious and then for economic reasons. The political situation by mid-summer was indeed grave, and John Cheke, probably from Cambridge, was provoked by the occasion to write The hurt of sedition, his vernacular plea to the common people for order. In the subsequent analysis of the substance and form of this treatise we shall examine the relationship of the circumstances of the rebellion and the rhetorical attack which Cheke launched against it. For the moment it may be said that while it is unlikely that the treatise was in any way instrumental in halting the rebellion, it did play an immediate part in Cheke's own situation. We know that Cheke was at Cambridge on 20 June 1549 at which time, at least partially back in good grace, he served as one of the king’s commissioners in a religious disputation concerning transubstantiation, for which Nicholas Ridley delivered the judgment. In addi-

89 See below, pp. 81ff.
tion, his letter to Peter Osborne suggests plans for a prolonged stay in Cambridge, and there is no evidence that he planned to leave, nor any evidence that he did leave there soon after that. It is, therefore, quite possible that he wrote the treatise while at Cambridge, barely fifty miles, along the London to Norwich pike, from the center of the northern rebellion. Indeed, Cheke may have been stimulated to write his treatise by a first-hand account of the rebellion from his Cambridge friend Matthew Parker, a native of Norwich who, in the midst of the insurrection, had preached a sermon against rebellion to the rebels in Norwich, had been threatened by them, and had returned in haste to Cambridge. Since the tract was written for the emergency, the shorter of the two 1549 texts may well have been sent from Cambridge to John Day's shop in London and hastily set up to be sent to the rebelling commoners. The second 1549 edition, with an elaborated and far cleaner text, was very possibly overseen by Cheke himself, from Cambridge or perhaps, by that time, from London. There is no record of Cheke's whereabouts or other activities before January, 1550, but it is not unlikely that the publication

92 In 1549 there was no active press in Cambridge. John Siberch, the first Cambridge printer, stopped printing in 1522 or 1523, and no attempt was made to put a press to work in Cambridge until 1588. See Goldschmidt, The First Cambridge Press ..., p. 18.
of his treatise, if it were written in Cambridge, would have brought him back to London, perhaps before September of 1549. Indeed, it is possible that if Cheke wrote the treatise purely from personal conviction, or if there was the additional motive of doing the state a service which might be considered adequate to reinstate him at court, he may well have been called back to London at the request of the same powers he had earlier offended. On the other hand, he may have been commissioned from the beginning to write the treatise, or urged by friends at court, such as Cranmer, to employ his rhetorical abilities to present the argument of the "true subject," the case against rebellion. The treatise represented the philosophy of civil obedience which was embraced by the most prominent religious and political thinkers of Cheke's day, and whether or not it was officially commissioned, it functioned as propaganda for the crown.

That the contribution to the cause of peace which Cheke made in *The hurt of sedition* was instrumental in reinstating him at court cannot be asserted. The significance of the rebellions to the state of English politics is clear enough, however, and Cheke's fortunes were implicitly involved in the attitudes and activities of the vying powers behind the English throne. The main political result of

---

the rebellions of 1549 was to discredit Somerset and to exalt John Dudley, Earl of Warwick. The protector was largely in sympathy with the commons, who suffered under the oppression of the enclosure system. He backed measures to check the encroachments of the nobility, and after the rebellions had begun, he openly declared that the gentlemen had given the people occasion to rise. And although he was compelled to issue a proclamation for the suppression of violent action against enclosure, his principal secretary of state, Sir Thomas Smith, complained that this being only a general exhortation, there was no particular authorization to carry it out. In addition, Somerset treated some of the rebel prisoners with great leniency. His general policy had been to court popularity by encouraging "liberty" among the commons, and thus the rebellions, supposedly an outgrowth of this liberty, were laid at his feet by Warwick who, eager to create an authoritarian government exercised by himself in the name of Edward, championed order. Indeed Warwick be-

97 It is interesting to note, in connection with Warwick's authoritarian views, that he was the son of Edmund Dudley, who wrote an important and outspoken plea for social hierarchy in his Tree of Commonwealth. See Christopher Morris, Political Thought in England: Tyndale to Hooker (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), pp. 15-17.
came the hero of the victory over the rebels in August of 1549, and Somerset the villain. The nobility preferred to overlook the real cause of the disturbances. "In the midst of the convulsion, the Council bethought itself of saving its face and its pockets by attributing the condition of England not to the original malady but to the remedies that Somerset had prescribed. It prepared to remove not the disease but the physician." In October the protector was deposed by a grand coup captained by Warwick.

In the records of this political upset Cheke's name does not appear, but succeeding circumstances clearly ally him with Warwick's faction. Sir Thomas Smith, his former Cambridge associate, was imprisoned with the protector and others who were Somerset's open political allies, but Cheke was clearly not considered one of these. While it is true that in The hurt of sedition Cheke's attitude is strongly conservative, this in no way necessarily commits

---

him to sympathy with Warwick. The conservatism of the treatise made it representative both of unscrupulous anti-liberals, such as Warwick, and of thoughtful men of moderation, such as Cranmer, who felt that no good could come of waste, bloodshed, and violence of any kind. However, that Warwick's party could use to their selfish political ends the less selfish convictions of men such as Cheke and Cranmer is only too apparent. What is additionally probable is that Cheke may well have been duped by Warwick's pose as a zealous reformer of religion, to the end that Cheke, with other politically naïve theologians, may have in 1549 publicly allied himself with Warwick, believing him to be the man whose decisive action would establish quickly the "true religion" in England. Ironically, it was Somerset's own religious conservatism which probably led men such as Cheke to turn from him to Warwick who, if he believed in anything, believed in the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, but who for political expedience protested great zeal for reform.  

101 So successful was Warwick's pose that he was hailed by leading reformation thinkers as "the most faithful and intrepid soldier of Christ," "a most holy and fearless instrument of the word of God."  

was similarly blinded to Warwick's hypocrisy; the events which followed the rebellions of 1549 support this inference.

In the incidents of the next twenty-four months--from Somerset's overthrow in October, 1549, through his four month imprisonment in the Tower, his release and uneasy return in February to power shared with Warwick--Cheke became increasingly concerned with ecclesiastical reforms, but the political overtones of his government-directed activities are clear. In October of 1549 he was named one of thirty-two commissioners to examine old ecclesiastical laws and to suggest revisions, according to an act of Parliament in that year. Cheke is listed among the "divines" appointed to the commission which was headed by Cranmer, and at the renewal of the commission in February of 1552, he is again listed among the divines.\footnote{Cal. Pat. Rolls: Edw. VI, IV (1926), 354.} Apparently Cheke had taken orders sometime prior to the composition of the first commission. In January of 1550, while Somerset was in the Tower, Cheke was named to a commission, with such divines as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Ponet, to investigate heresies throughout the king's dominions; the commission was to arrest heretics who proved obstinate, and to punish persons who opposed the Book of Common Prayer.\footnote{Cal. Pat. Rolls: Edw. VI, III (1925), 347.} Cheke was a fast friend of foreign reformers recently established in England, such as Martin Bucer, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.
in 1549, and Peter Martyr, Divinity Professor at Oxford in 1548. In May of 1550 he was writing to the ailing Bucer, promising to do what he could to assist a friend of Bucer's. Cheke acted as an intermediary between Bucer and John Young, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1555, in a religious disputation in which Bishop Ridley had an interest. Ridley had succeeded the more Catholic Edmund Bonner, who was deprived as Bishop of London after a trial in 1549, in which Cheke testified against him, as he was to do in 1551 against the conservative Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. Ridley, like Bucer, found Cheke a strong friend of reform, and appealed to him in several instances for the aid of his influence at court, once referring to Cheke as "one of Christ's special advocates, and one of his principal proctors." Cranmer too had a consistently high opinion of Cheke's learning and religious convictions, and when the Archbishop appointed Bucer and Martyr as consultants in the revision of the Prayer Book, Cheke was assigned to do a Latin translation of the Book.
for Martyr, who did not understand English.\textsuperscript{110}

Additional indication that Cheke had regained the
good favor of the court is found in the successive grants
received from Edward VI: a large property grant in January,
1549, "for diligence in the instruction of the king and
other causes moving the king's liberality";\textsuperscript{111} in April a
household license to retain fifty persons over and above
his household and those under him in his offices;\textsuperscript{112} in May
additional property, including several manors and accompa-
nying rents.\textsuperscript{113} Sometime before July of 1550 Cheke was made
one of the gentlemen of the king's Privy Chamber. He is
addressed in these terms by Thomas Nicolls in the dedicatory
epistle to Cheke which prefaces Nicolls' translation of
Thucydides' history of the Peloponnesian wars.\textsuperscript{114} Clearly
by this time Cheke was in the favor of Warwick. Late in
1550 he represented the city of Cambridge as well as Cam-
bridgeshire on a commission to collect a relief granted by
Parliament.\textsuperscript{115} At Bucer's death, early in 1551, Cheke
edited a collection of written memorials of Bucer, \textit{De obitu
doctissimi doctoris M. Buceri: Epistolae duae}, including
letters from Cheke to Peter Martyr and Walter Haddon con-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{110} Strype, Cheke, p. 54.
\item \textsuperscript{111} Cal. Pat. Rolls: Edw. VI, III, 113.
\item \textsuperscript{112} Cal. Pat. Rolls: Edw. VI, III, 327.
\item \textsuperscript{113} Cal. Pat. Rolls: Edw. VI, III, 187.
\item \textsuperscript{114} Thomas Nicolls, The hystory writtone by Thucidides the
Athenyan . . . (London, 1550), sig. A\textsuperscript{III}.
\item \textsuperscript{115} Cal. Pat. Rolls: Edw. VI, V (1926), 351, 362.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
cerning Bucer as a great Protestant thinker. At the same
time he made an effort to secure the library of the dead
theologian for the king's collection. In May of 1551 his
work on the king's behalf was still further rewarded with
very extensive grants in Suffolk, Essex, Norfolk, and Lin-
colnshire. In other contemporary records Cheke's name
occurs in relation to a minor court quarrel, reformation
activities abroad, and further activity of the ecclesias-
tical commission established to reform the canon law. The
involvements and rewards of the year were climaxed, however,
on 11 October 1551, for on that day Cheke was knighted.

The circumstances surrounding Cheke's advancement to
the knighthood further implicate him with the political

117 Lat. [?] let.: Cheke to Matthew Parker, in Strype,
Cheke, pp. 61-62; John Cheke, The Gospel according to St.
Matthew. . . Also vii. original letters, ed. James Goodwin
119 Cal. SP Dom.: Edw. VI, XIII, 35, #51: a brief letter to
Cecil from an ecclesiastical commissioner, Richard Goodrick,
complaining of an unkindness from Cheke.
120 Calendar of Manuscripts of the Most. Hon. the Marquis
of Salisbury . . . Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire,
I (1883),87-88: letter from John Abell, a friend of Cheke's
brother-in-law Richard Hillis, to Cecil, asking Cecil to
give Cheke a message regarding a forthcoming book of Peter
Martyr.
122 Cal. SP Dom.: Edw. VI, XIII, 35, #56. Cf. Wriothesley,
II, 56; Two London Chronicles, p. 24; Diary of Henry Machyn,
Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, from A.D. 1550 - A.D.
1563, ed. J. G. Nichols (London: Camden Society, vol. XLIII,
1848), p. 10; Lit. Remains, II, 352; in A Booke of the Trav­
aille and Lief of Mr. Thomas Hoby, ed. Edgar Powell, in Cam­
IV, 1902), p. 74, the date is erroneously given as August.
clique headed by Warwick. In a move to overthrow Somerset once for all, Warwick found it expedient to remove courtiers sympathetic with the protector’s policies and to surround himself with empowered friends. To this end he raised his political tools—relatives and friends—to knighthood and peerage, and he himself, without a valid claim to the title, was made Duke of Northumberland. Among the friends knighted that day were William Cecil and John Cheke, and it is difficult not to conclude that the rise of these men, coincident as it is with the fall of their first patron, suggests timeserving. The case against the politically astute Cecil seems more damning than that against Cheke, whose religious zeal and convictions about reformation had apparently blinded him to Dudley’s hypocrisy. But it is not easy to overlook the fact that on the very day that Cheke was knighted, the party with whom he was now clearly associated began an investigation into Somerset’s activities and five days later arrested him, railroaded his trial, and on 22 January 1552 saw to his execution in the face of strong popular feeling against it.\textsuperscript{123} At the same time, it is difficult to assume that Cheke was fully aware of Dudley’s selfishness and treachery and that he acted knowingly as Dudley’s tool in the hope for some personal satisfaction of

ambition. In extant records Cheke's integrity is not questioned by his contemporaries; quite to the contrary, it is lauded. For example, in Holinshed's *Chronicles* Cheke is described as

... a gentleman everie waie in complet sort satisfieng the report blazed abroad of him. For if there were no more testimonies extant in the world, but this onelie treatise [*The hurt of sedition*] discoursing Kets rebellion; it were enough to warrant no lesse true, than in common speech and writing is left witnessed of him. And suerlie it appeareth, that as in this gentleman there was an extraordinarie heape of laudable gifts; so was there also in him the right vse of them all.124

His great learning and wisdom are never qualified by the suggestion of duplicity or selfish expediency. But Cheke's earlier experience had taught him that to displease the powers behind the throne could earn him exile and separation from his royal pupil. And if Cheke's commitment to the young king and to his duty to him was a genuine one, as the 1549 letter to Somerset indicates, he may well have felt that his first loyalty was to Edward and that he was obliged to do whatever the party in power demanded of him in order to retain his proximity with the king. The treacheries of Dudley, which he would then have had to approve, would have been rationalized by Cheke in terms of both his religion and his humanist duty to the state. It seems necessary to conclude that the great teacher and scholar was at least partially blinded to reality by his own convic-

tions—that Cheke was politically naïve, an idealist who assumed others were as honest as he.

But that Cheke was convinced that the cause of the New Learning was a high one cannot be doubted. He was an unceasing toiler in the labors of reform. He participated in two important disputations, regarding the nature of the sacrament, with John Feckenham, later private chaplain and confessor to Queen Mary, as the principal defender of the Roman Catholic position. Cheke's zeal for Protestantism led Richard Morison, Ambassador to Germany, to suggest that Cheke be elected to write a state letter for the king to John Frederick, Duke of Saxony, for Cheke would have "a will to write a Protestant, and . . . [would not] do it only because he is commanded." Immediately after he received his knighthood Cheke resigned his Greek chair at Cambridge, an honor which he had retained throughout his absence from the university. But apparently he did not at any time lose contact with the activities at his college, and he constantly used his influence to place his friends there or to bring them from Cambridge to court. For instance, among other offices done his friends, Cheke obtained a posi-

125 The two disputations took place at the homes first of William Cecil (25 November 1551) and then that of Richard Morison (3 December 1551). See Strype, Cheke, pp. 69-86.
128 Strype, Cheke, pp. 68-69.
tion for Ascham with Richard Morison in Germany. He was equally concerned about the king's academic environment and secured for the king's library the vast collections made by John Leland, who had been charged by King Henry VIII to gather the manuscript riches of the dissolved monasteries. In early May of 1552 Cheke was appointed to a commission sent to Eton to investigate "what things are to be reformed or corrected there . . . ." At this same time he became very seriously ill with "peripneumonia," and he remained near death for some weeks. By late May Bishop Ridley was able to write, in a letter to Cecil, "If Mr. Cheke is almost recouvr'd, God be blessed." By 12 July 1552 Roger Ascham reported that he had news of Cheke's "most happlie recovery":

129 Strype, Cheke, p. 48. See Cal. SP For. Edw. VI, p. 175, #450, and p. 219, #558, for friendly references to Cheke by Morison in communications with William Cecil.
130 Strype, Cheke, p. 87.
132 "Some Additions . . . ." p. 114. Thomas Fuller, in The Church History of Britain (1st ed. 1655), ed. J. S. Brewer, IV (Oxford, 1845), 117-18, prints the following anecdote: "When crowned king, his [Edward VI's] goodness increased with his greatness; constant in his private devotions, and as successful as fervent therein, witness this particular: Sir John Cheke, his schoolmaster, fell desperately sick; of whose condition the king carefully inquired every day. At last his physicians told him that there was no hope of his life, being given over by them for a dead man. 'No,' said King Edward, 'he will not die at this time; for this morning I begged his life from God in my prayers, and obtained it.' Which accordingly came to pass, and he soon after, against all expectation, wonderfully recovered . . . ."
133 Lit. Remains, II, clxi.
... but I am thus firmely persuaded that God wist and wold we wold be thankfull, and therefor bestowed this benifite upon us. Gods wroth, I trust, is satisfied in punishing diverse Orders of the realme for their misordre ... But if Learning, Counsell, Nobilitie, Courte, and Cambridge, shold have bene all punished at ones, by taking away Mr. Cheeke to, then I wold have thought owre mischeef had ben so moche as did crye to God, for a generall plague, in taking away such a general and onely man, as Mr Cheeke is.134

On 20 August Cheke was awarded a comprehensive license to hunt on his properties, this as a special dispensation from the king to his tutor, freeing Cheke of the general prohibition against hunting.135 On 26 August 1552 Cheke became one of the Chamberlains of the Exchequer.136 About this same time Archbishop Cranmer enlisted the aid of Cheke and Cecil in drawing up revisions of the English confession of faith.137 Probably it was at this time too that Cheke was at work translating into Latin two of Cranmer's religious treatises, Defensio verae et catholicae doctrinae de sacramento, which was published the next year, and Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum, on which he collaborated with

135 Cal. Pat. Rolls: Edw. VI, IV, 260-61. This patent provides a revealing catalogue of mid-sixteenth-century weapons, hunting customs, and animal (especially bird) life.
Shortly after this, Cheke took part in a commission to investigate heresies, and he was asked by the Privy Council to arbitrate a religious controversy between John Hooper, Bishop of Worcester, and his canons. In November he was awarded additional extensive grants of property and rents in Suffolk and London, as well as the custody of one of the former heirs of the property involved. Early in 1553 he again sat in the House of Commons for Blechingly Borough, Surrey, and in late May he was awarded still further grants of vast properties enlarging his earlier holdings in Clare, Suffolk. But these activities and rewards were again preliminary to the granting of a higher honor: on 2 June 1553, "Sir John Cheke, knight, was sworne and admitted to be one of the kinges Majesties Principall Secretaries." As in the instance of Cheke's advancement to the

---


141 Cal. Pat. Rolls: Edw. VI, IV, 266, and V, 267. The heir in question was one Thomas Barnardeston, apparently son to the first of four sixteenth-century Sir Thomas Barnardestons. If such is the case, he was educated in Geneva during the reign of Mary.

142 Brit. Sessional Papers, LXII, part 1, 381.


knighthood, his appointment to the secretariat is involved in Dudley's political intrigues. As early as October of 1551, the time of the second coup against Somerset, which included the knighting of Cheke, Dudley was thought to have designs upon the throne. Although Edward VI was a minor and had no real control, Dudley's power depended at least superficially upon Edward and the king's acquiescence to his ideas, but in 1553 Edward was slowly dying before his eyes. Dudley was forced to take conspicuous action if his ambitions were to be realized. His first major move was to marry his son Guilford to Lady Jane Grey (21 May 1553), who was the daughter of Frances Brandon and Henry Grey, Third Marquis of Dorset and Duke of Suffolk, as well as granddaughter to Henry VIII and second cousin to Edward VI. Next, arguing for the cause of Protestantism, he persuaded the dying Edward to make a device which named Lady Jane's heirs male to succeed to the throne; this was subsequently changed, perhaps by Dudley, to read "Lady Jane and her heirs male." These directions for the succession contradicted those of Henry VIII's will, which named the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth as Edward's successors. Both of these ladies had been formerly declared by Henry to be illegitimate, but if this earlier decision were accepted and the final will overlooked, not Lady Jane but her mother was next in line to succeed Edward VI. Nonetheless, Edward and Dudley insisted upon the device naming Lady Jane, and to the men around the
king the dilemma was hopeless; it was treason to do what Dudley wished, but if he won, it would be treason to have refused. Cecil absented himself from the council, sick with anxiety, and "the guileless Cheke was sworn secretary. Cecil was not dismissed, but the hint was broad enough and Cecil returned to his duties on June 11." The council succumbed to Dudley's pressure and agreed to a policy. On 12 June lawyers were called to draw up Edward's will on the lines of his device; they argued against the legality of such a move, but Edward insisted. They resisted further after consideration of the treasonous aspects of the action. Dudley accused them of treachery, and finally the lawyers were coerced into "agreement," reflecting that it could not be treason to obey a king in his lifetime and that if they did nothing against Mary after Edward's death, she could not lawfully condemn them. This must have been the reasoning of the coerced counsellors as well, for on 21 June the letters patent for the limitation of the crown were completed and signed by over a hundred persons-- privy coun-

146 Pollard, Hist.: Edw.-Eliz., p. 85.
147 Acts of the Privy Council: 1552-1554, p. 285. On 7 June Cheke wrote to Henry Bullinger of the king's health and of his goodness, but no notice was given to these activities at court. See Cheke to Bullinger, in Orig. Letters ... Reformation, I, 140.
sellers, peers, archbishops, bishops, judges, aldermen, and sheriffs. Among them was Cheke.\footnote{149}

On 6 July Edward died and the news was kept secret for three days in order to give the council time to complete the plan, and if possible, to capture the forewarned and escaped Mary. On the tenth a declaration was made to the effect that Lady Jane Dudley was the new queen of England and that Lady Mary and Lady Elizabeth were illegitimate.\footnote{150}

The Bishop of London, Nicholas Ridley, was assigned to preach upon this same theme, and his audience did not receive it kindly.\footnote{151} But to zealous Protestants like Cheke and Ridley, any means were acceptable for preventing a return to Catholicism and papal rule as Mary's accession clearly meant. For them even treason was justified in order to defeat the antichrist and make Protestantism victorious in England.

On 11 July Mary's challenge arrived, requiring the


\footnote{151} Grey Friars, p. 78; Wriothesley, II, 88; Two London Chron., pp. 26-27. Cf. Pollard, Hist.: Edw.-Eliz., p. 89; Pollard is led to date the sermon 9 June, according to the phrasing of the Grey Friars text, but other contemporary reports explicitly date the same text and reception 16 June.
council to proclaim her title to the throne; they replied with defiance, the answer reputedly drafted by Cheke. But throughout the kingdom antagonism against Dudley grew and Mary was fast winning support. Within a week Dudley was undone by rebellion against him and, from all sides, desertion of his cause. Dudley himself, who had been persuaded by the council that only he, the hero of the rebellions of 1549, could meet no opposition, rode out to meet Mary's army and was unable to raise more than the skeleton of a force. From all sides were curses for him and cheers for Mary. On 19 July, Mary was proclaimed queen in the presence of court dignitaries, including Cheke. London responded with delirious celebrations, and although Dudley affected joy when finally he was told that all England had risen for the Tudor heir, he was returned to London a prisoner. On 28 July, his property already

153 John Stow, The Annales of England... (London, 1592), p. 1032. On 19 July the council made a last desperate attempt to hold things together, issuing an order to Lord Rich to remain faithful to Queen Jane in spite of the defection of the Earl of Oxford to Lady Mary; the document was written by John Cheke. See Strype, Cranmer, app. #LXIX, in II, 913, for a reprint of this document.
154 Stow, Annales, p. 1034. For an outspoken contemporary condemnation of John Dudley's behavior throughout this month, see Historical Narration of certain Events that took place in the Kingdom of Great Britain in the month of July, in the year of our Lord 1553. Written by P. V. [possibly Peter Vermigli, i.e., Peter Martyr]. Now first reprinted from the Latin (London, 1865).
155 Chron. Queen Jane, p. 12; Stow, Annales, p. 1035.
156 The contemporary accounts of the reception of Mary are numerous and detailed: cf. Wriothesley, II, 88-90; Grey Friars, pp. 80-81; Two London Chron., pp. 27-28; Chron. Queen Jane, pp. 11-12; Stow, Annales, p. 1035.
being inventoried and his servants removed, Sir John Cheke followed Dudley to the Tower.

Thus was Cheke's political career in England ended. Ironically enough, the man who had written an outspoken denunciation of rebellion ended his service to the state legally guilty of treason. To what extent his complicity in Dudley's intrigues was informed, intentional, or the result of coercion and guilelessness, it is impossible to say. Cecil later testified that when first the conspiracy was disclosed to him it was Cheke who, referring him to the example of Socrates, had persuaded him not to flee the realm.

It would seem clear that Cheke, in comparing their situation to that of Socrates in the Crito, had taken the position that the righteous man must stand fast, even though this might mean defeat and loss of freedom. That such religious conviction was largely the cause of Cheke's predicament is reinforced by testimony from Cranmer, who on 14 August wrote to Cecil:

> Yester nyght I harde reported that Mr. Cheke is indited .... I had grete trust that he sholde be one of them that sholde fele the Queenes grete mercie and pardon, as one who hath been none of the grete doers in this matier agaynst her, and my trust is not yet gone, excepte it be for his earnestness in religion, for the which, if he suffre, blessed is he of God,

---

158 Machyn Diary, p. 38; Two London Chron., p. 28; Wriothesley, II, 91; Chron. Queen Jane, p. 13.
159 From BM Lans. MSS, 2, 102, as quoted by Martin Hume in The Great Lord Burghley (New York, 1898), p. 42.
that suffreth for his sake, how so ever the world's judge of hym. For what ought we to care for the judgment of the world when God absolveth us. But alas, if any means cowde be made for hym, or for my lordge Russel, it were not to be omitted nor in any wise neglected, but I am utterly destitute bothe of counsell in this matier and of power, beinge in the same condemnation that they be. But that one only thynge which I can do, I shal not ceasse to do, and that is only to pray for theym, and for my selfe, with al other that be now in adversitie. When I saw you at the Courte, I wolde fayne have talked with you, but I durst not, nevertheless if you cowde fynde a tyme to come over to me, I wolde gladly commun with you...

This letter is not only revealing of the situations of Cranmer, Cheke, and Cecil, but provides an ironic illumination of the subsequent fates of these three: of Cranmer, who eventually found the strength to be careless of the world's judgment; of Cecil, who was too much the political realist to depend exclusively upon prayer; and of Cheke, whose "earnestness in religion" proved first to be too great and finally not great enough.

The events of Cheke's life from the accession of Mary until his death in 1557 are obscured by a dearth of document and a plethora of speculation. After a two-month imprisonment he was released, and on 13 September 1553 the queen provided him with a gift of one hundred pounds. There was apparently no extreme pressure upon him at this time to renounce his reformation inclinations. Indeed the

161 Chron. Queen Jane, p. 27.
queen and her government in these first two months were quite lenient. Fortunately for Cheke he was not retained in the Tower much beyond this time, for Mary's popularity rapidly declined and her reaction was to become unbendingly single-minded against her religious and political opponents. The subsequent Wyatt rebellion in January of 1554 was a manifestation of the widening discontent with the queen's determination to restore Roman church practices and to marry a foreigner. The zealous Cheke, however, was to keep clean of this intrigue. Perhaps Dudley's final hypocrisy, the attempt to save himself from execution by recanting to Catholicism, had stunned him into a new awareness and caution. And after the rebellion there was the silent and bitter lesson of reality to be learned from the execution of the innocent Guilford Dudley and the sixteen-year-old Lady Jane.

For whatever cause, Cheke was freed from prison and apparently avoided suspect involvements. He was allowed to retire to his manor of Stoke, next Clare, Suffolk, from which, in a letter dated 23 December 1553, he implored the kindness of Lord William Paget. Formerly the constant supporter of Somerset, Paget had been removed from power by Dudley only to be reinstated by Mary, eventually becoming one of her privy counsellors. Paget, perhaps out of com-

164 Eng. let.: Cheke to Paget, Nug. Ant. (1769), pp. 175-76; (1804), I, 47-49.
passion for Cheke's "undone state," was instrumental in obtaining travel privileges for him, and may have helped to secure the official pardon of 28 April 1554, \textsuperscript{165} for in a letter dated 14 April 1554 from Calais, Cheke acknowledged his debt to this gentleman. \textsuperscript{166} Cheke's reasons for leaving England are clear enough. Not only was it hardly safe for him to remain in proximity with the increasingly intolerant queen, but abroad he could be active with the reformers there. Although his wife was "sick in bodie, tormented in minde," \textsuperscript{167} Cheke felt that his family could gain nothing by his remaining in England, and that he "had as leeve grow aged a-broad with experience, as ruste at home with ydle-nessse ... ." Thus he wrote from Calais, 4 April 1554, to his wife's step-father, Sir John Mason, to whom he pleaded his relative innocence in the events of the preceding year, and of whom he asked kindness and care for his wife and children. \textsuperscript{168} On the same date he made a similar request of John Harington the Elder of Stepney, whose previous good will to him he acknowledged. \textsuperscript{169} He remained in Calais at

\textsuperscript{166} Eng. let.: Cheke to Paget, Nug. Ant. (1769), pp. 169-70; (1804), I, 53-56.
\textsuperscript{167} Nug. Ant. (1769), p. 176; (1804), I, 48.
\textsuperscript{169} Eng. let.: Cheke to John Harington the Elder, Nug. Ant. (1769), pp. 171-72; (1804), I, 51-53. Harington was the husband of the natural daughter of Henry VIII, later father
least about a fortnight; from there he again wrote Paget, thanking him for favors done, and asking that the misfortunes and debts of his wife and children be diminished by the generosity of this gentlemen, whose earlier misfortunes Cheke had helped to alleviate. 170

Cheke's movements in Europe after his stay in Calais have been broadly speculated upon, but the extent of his involvements is not clear. 171 On 10 July 1554, he was in Padua, 172 to which he had come from Basle, 173 one of the refuges of Marian "exiles" abroad. 174 In a letter to Sir John Mason, written 12 July 1554 from Padua, he reported his arrival in that city on 10 July and announced his plans to learn the Italian tongue and to study civil law, "not seeking perfection, which requires a man's life, but avoiding the extremity of ignorance, and learning to give aim like a stander by, where he is not in game like a shooter." 175

171 Christina H. Garrett, in The Marian Exiles (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), pp. 114-117, sets out a suggestive but inadequately documented theory that Cheke, from February to March of 1556, directed the intensive anti-Marian propaganda campaign which centered in Emden, Germany. Strype suggests that Cheke's translation of Cranmer's Defensio was printed in Emden (Strype, Cranmer, I, 374), but additional research in continental documents is necessary to validate these suggestions.
173 Garrett, p. 115.
174 Garrett, p. 47 ff.
175 Eng. let.: Cheke to Sir John Mason, enclosed in a let-
In this same letter he again pleaded with Mason to watch over his burdened wife and children (who may have been with Mason in Brussels at this time) and to send him word of their welfare. In addition, Cheke revealed to Mason his intentions to remain in Europe, perhaps even beyond his license to travel, because there he would be of more use to his family and to God. On 22 July 1554 he wrote from Padua to Secretary William Petre, sharply criticizing Italy and Italians:

Courtesans in honour, haunting of evil houses noble; breaking of marriage a sport; murder, in a gentleman, magnanimity; robbery, finesse if it be clean conveyed,— for the spying is judged the fault and not the stealing; religion, to be best that best agreeth with Aristotle de anima; the common tenant, though not in kind of tenancy, marvellously kept bare, the gentleman nevertheless, yet bare that keepeth him so; in speech cautious, in deed scarce; more liking in asking than in giving. 176

Thomas Hoby reported finding Cheke in Padua with other Englishmen when he arrived there 23 August 1554. 177 On 21 October Cheke, with others from the Padua group, journeyed to Mantua, returning to Padua 29 October. 178 In a letter to Bishop Stephen Gardiner dated "From P. the kalends of December, 1554," Cheke asked anew for leniency...
and assistance for his family in England. About this time Cheke's properties in England were divided among new tenants, and it is quite possibly for this reason that he asked Gardiner for leniency and that he wrote Queen Mary, asking that he might have restored to him certain grants awarded him by her father. There is no indication that the queen responded affirmatively, but Cheke was apparently not interested in returning to England to attempt a more direct plea, reformers having more and more become anathema to Mary. Instead Cheke remained among English friends in Italy; perhaps it was about this time that he lectured so inspiringly on Demosthenes in the presence of Thomas Wilson at the University of Padua. In the spring of 1555, however, apparently after a serious illness, perhaps the result of the plague in the south, Cheke determined to go north to Caldero before the pestilence increased again, and there he joined Hoby once more, with whom he continued his northward journey. By October 1555 he had arrived in

183 In a letter to Sir John Mason, dated from Padua 6 June 1555, Sir Thomas Hoby implies Cheke has been ill: Cal. SP For. Mary, #383, p. 174.
184 Hoby, Book of Travails, p. 120.
Strasbourg, a city second only to Geneva as a stronghold of Protestantism on the continent, from which he wrote to John Calvin concerning the trials of the times and the church. Four months later, in February 1556, he was again writing from Strasbourg, this time to William Cecil in England, to whom he spoke of his ill health as reason for being rarely in communication with friends at home; he urged Cecil to be steadfast for the reformed religion, commended certain of Cecil's firmer stands against Roman practices, but also obliquely criticized Cecil's temporizing, reminding him that in "thisbritil staat of lyf... everie good examiner of his lyf hath, to content God quietlie, & to satisfie an unhardened conscience... ." Cheke, however, was to find that between the conception and the act falls the shadow. On 12 March 1556 he was still (or again) in Strasbourg. But within the week, according to the famous report of Cheke's friend John Ponet, Cheke had been betrayed into a trap, kidnapped, and returned to England and the Tower, where his struggle "to content God quietlie" ended in defeat. Ponet reports:

185 Lat.[?] let.: Cheke to Calvin, in Orig. Letters... Reformation, I, 142.
186 Eng. let.: Cheke to Cecil, in Strype, Cheke, pp. 99-101. Strype (p.99) says "transcribed from the original, exactly word for word," but does not indicate the location of the original.
187 A Latin letter from Cheke to Henry Bullinger (Orig. Letters... Reformation, translated I, 145-47) was written from Strasbourg on this date.
Paget and Mason albeit they have not one father and mother yet be they sworn brethren; and albeit they be of sondry universities, yet be they both of one studie. What so ever Mason worketh, Paget uttereth; that thone Inventeth, the other practiceth. By Masons working, and Pagettes devising, Sir Petre Carowe went into Flanders, Mason pleging for his sauagearde king Philippes fidelitie, ad his owne honestie. Afterwarde he and Sir Iohan Cheke being enticed both to come to Brusselles to see the Quenes Embassadours, and hauing brought Paget on his waie towards Engelande, be in their returme taken by the Prouost Marshall, spiled of their horses, and clapped in to a carte, their legges, armes and bodies tied with halters to the body of the carte, and so caried to the sea side, and from thence in to the towre of Lond. And before Paget came to Calesse, Sir Petres man coming out of England meteth him, and asketh for his maister. Paget smyleth and saitheth nothing, but his maister was in health.188

Ponet attributes the plot to Paget's desire to prove himself to the queen in order to attain advancement. Cheke, whether because of his anti-Marian activities in Europe or simply because of his leading stature among reformers, seemed a likely prize.189 Carew was prepared by Paget, set the trap, and for the sake of appearances, allowed himself to be imprisoned with Cheke, knowing he would be well provided for and rewarded for his part of the coup.190 From Paget and Mason, to whom Cheke had written earlier for consideration

188 John Ponet, A Shorte Treatise of politike power, and of the true Obedience which subjectes owe to Kynges and other ciuile Gouernours, with an Exhortacion to all true naturall Englishe men, sig.[I 6v-7v], reprinted in facsimile by Winthrop S. Hudson, John Ponet (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1942), pp. 140-42.
189 Garrett, pp. 116-17.
190 Ponet, sig. [I7]; Garrett, pp. 105-07.
of his plight and his family, Cheke found, finally, little kindness.

Indeed Cheke found little in his final year to make "this brtil staat of lyf" in any way easier. From all sides came accusations. Under the pressure to recant he began to break. Hearing this news on the continent, his friend Ponet wrote to Bullinger from Strasbourg, June 1556:

I wish that what you wrote to me concerning sir John Cheke may not prove prophetic. I doubt not but that he will seal his testimony to the gospel with his blood. What will not Pharaoh attempt against Israel, especially on his return from exile?191

Cheke's testimony, to the contrary, ended in compromise with the enemy rather than martyrdom for the cause. On 1 July his wife was allowed to visit him in the Tower;192 perhaps about this same time Cardinal Pole had begun his interviews with Cheke, and Feckenham, the Dean of St. Paul's, had under way his attempts to bring Cheke back into the Roman fold.193 Apparently Cheke's alternative to recanting was the heretic's punishment by death at the stake.194 Perhaps Cheke had already recanted when his wife was permitted to see him, or perhaps, influenced by her step-father, Sir John Mason, she pleaded with Cheke to recant for the sake of

191 Ponet to Bullinger, in Orig. Letters ... Reformation, I, 117-18.
193 Hist. MSS Comm.: Third Report, p. 239.
194 Strype, Cheke, p. 110.
his family. By 15 July he had been won. On that day he
made a written statement of his belief in the carnal pres-
ence in the sacrament, and accompanied it with a plea
that this should stand as adequate indication that he had
complied. At the same time he wrote to Queen Mary, assuring
her that he had declared his mind in matters of religion to
the Dean of St. Paul's, trusting that she would accept his
statement, and swearing obedience to her laws and orders of
religion. He was not removed from the Tower immediately,
however, but was kept there into September, perhaps until
early October, writing and rewriting his recantation until
it embraced all of the materials which Pole and Feckenham
and the queen demanded it contain, including admissions
that his most grievous offense was in teaching his erroneous
views to King Edward and other youth. Indeed Cardinal Pole
himself is alleged to have written the version of the recan-
tation which Cheke was made to read at court on 4 October
1556. This public recantation was prefaced by an oration

195 Strype, Ecc. Mem., III, part 2, 414-16, prints this re-
cantation, with the accompanying Lat. let.: Cheke to Pole,
pp. 416-17.
196 Lat. let.: Cheke to Queen Mary, in Giles, I, 448-49;
cf. Strype, Cheke, p. 112. English version, evidently by
Cheke, printed by Strype, Ecc. Mem., III, part 2, 417. The
original occurs in Manuscripts of Sir Alexander Malet,
Bart., at Queensbury Place, Kensington, Hist. MSS Comm.:
197 Hist. MSS Comm.: Third Report, p. 239.
198 Strype prints Cheke's own recantation (Cheke, pp.115-17)
and excerpts from that written for him by Pole (Cheke, pp.
117-27), the original of which occurs in Petyt MSS: Inner
Temple #538, vol. XLVI, fo. 391, Hist. MSS Comm.: Report II
(London, 1874), App., p. 155.
by Feckenham, which added the final touch to the production which was being made of Cheke's submission. The fruits of this strategy were evidently abundant; by 2 November "well nigh 30 persons who were in prison in danger of being burned, [have] . . . by the grace of God and through the efficacy of his [Cheke's] language been converted." In Europe the news of Cheke's capitulation was sobering: "However it may be, we may learn this, that it is vain to place our confidence in man." And as some wise reader of Cheke's recantation, perhaps Matthew Parker, observed in a marginal notation: "Homines sumus."

But little of the man was left. His vast properties had been gradually granted to others, and in return he was given, to be shared with his friend Peter Osborne, some land in Somersetshire and an out-of-the-way manor in Devon. Perhaps it was hoped he would leave London for the remote West country where he would be safely out of

200 Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in other Libraries of Northern Italy, 1556-1557, ed. by Rawdon Brown, VI, part 2, (London, 1881), 769, #690: Giovanni Michiel to the Doge and Senate.
202 Strype, Cheke, p. 128.
touch with those sympathetic with reform. Cheke did not
oblige any such hope. Indeed there is a suggestion that he
was able to get word to his friends on the continent that
his faith was bent but not broken.\footnote{205} He remained in Lon-
don, residing in his house in Woodstreet,\footnote{206} from which he
wrote his famous letter to Hoby on 16 July 1557. Two months
later in this same house, on 13 September 1557, John Cheke
died at the age of forty-three, having found life too brit-
tle.\footnote{207} He was buried in St. Alban's church there, in the
north chapel of the choir, and his grave was marked with
verses by his old Cambridge associate, Dr. Walter Haddon:

\begin{quote}
Doctrinae lumen Cheous vitaeque magister,  
Aurea naturae fabrica, morte jacet.  
Non erat e multis unus, sed praestitit unus  
Omnibus et patriae flos erat ille suae.  
Gemma Britanna fuit, tam magnum nulla tulerunt  
Tempora thesaurum, tempora nulla ferent.\footnote{208}
\end{quote}

Whether or not Haddon wrote with intentional ambi-
guity, the sixteenth century would not, nor can we overlook
the irony of Cheke's history. Learning, religion, and
politics-- the forces that had in the decade of his birth

\footnote{205} Strype, Cheke, p. 130.  
\footnote{206} Eng. let.: Cheke to Hoby, in Castiglione, The Book of the Courtier (London: Everyman Library, 1948), p. 8; this house is usually referred to as that of Peter Osborne, but since Cheke and Osborne shared the West country property, perhaps they also shared this house in London.  
\footnote{207} Machyn, p. 151.  
\footnote{208} Strype, Cheke, p. 131. Strype also prints an epitaph by Thomas Challoner:

\begin{quote}
Tu nunc exuvias liquisti corporis hujus,  
CHEKE, Deo vivens, lux nova juncto polo.  
Fulisisti inter nos lumen radiantius; et nunc  
Astra tuo exortu languidiora micant.
\end{quote}
combined to produce in Cambridge the renascence of classical learning of which Cheke himself was to become the acknowledged leader, combined as well to determine his fate. Ironically, the portion of immortality Cheke finally achieved was the result not of his official and public activities in the years at court, but rather of the impact of his teaching and personality in those earlier days at St. John's College. Thus Milton in his eleventh sonnet apostrophized Cheke the humanist teacher:

Thy age, like ours, O Soul of Sir John Cheek,
Hated not Learning worse than Toad or Asp;
When thou taught'st Cambridge, and King
Edward Greek. 209

It is especially significant that Milton should thus immortalize Cheke, because as a humanist teacher drafted into the service of the king, Cheke was himself an exemplification of the Ciceronian ideal so much esteemed by Renaissance humanists from More to Milton. Indeed, throughout Cheke's career are indications that he may well have consciously attempted to embody those qualities which Cicero said were essential to the orator or public servant.

Criticism

In addition to his own active life, Cheke left behind him a small but important legacy of ideas, together with inspired disciples to perpetuate his intellectual
estate. As we know them, the main conceptions that concerned Cheke were a handful of simple, closely related ideas with broad implications for the young men who heard him expound them. As E. J. Sweeting has noted, these men were to move in many areas of Tudor activity as statesmen, educationalists, translators, tutors to the royal family and to the aristocracy, and friends of the most energetic men in England and on the continent. In particular, the formation of habits of mind under Cheke's guidance was to play an important part in the evolution of Tudor criticism.210

Most fundamental to the complex of Cheke's thinking was his notion of the hard core of learning which all men should possess. Ascham says:

Yea, I haue heard worthie M. Cheke many tymes say: I would haue a good student passe and iorney through all Authors both Greke and Latin: but he that will dwell in these few bookees onelie: first, in Gods holie Bible, and then ioyne with it, Tullie in Latin, Plato, Aristotle: Xenophon: Isocrates: and Demosthenes in Greke: must nedes proue an excellent man.211

Clearly, these seven recommendations were not made to encourage the learning of a single philosophy or writing style; the writers were chosen primarily for their wisdom,

for the private and public virtues which they implicitly and explicitly extol. This is the humanist training for the good life, a Christian existence bolstered by the wisdom of antiquity. At the same time, the list is richly diverse, providing variations and reinforcements of philosophical themes, precepts together with examples, and a variety of types of eloquence. These are the materials which will contribute to the making of "an excellent man." But Cheke had, additionally, very definite views regarding how these materials should be used, ideas as to how the most good could be got from these "great books," and the remaining concepts which he taught deal largely with methods.

Of Cheke's theories concerning techniques, perhaps the most famous is that of imitation, the details of which are set out completely by Ascham, who acknowledges his debt to Cheke for this idea which forms the core of the teaching philosophy in Book II of The Scholemaster. As J. W. H. Atkins has noted, the doctrine of imitation itself was nothing new. From Isocrates on, the importance of an example or model for acquiring skill in writing had been a much-vexed question. What is new in Cheke's view of the problem, as Ascham presents that view, is not which models or how many should be followed; that, as Ascham notes, has been too much the preoccupation. The new emphasis is on

213 Scholemaster, p. 276.
method: by analyzing parallel or imitating passages found
in the classics the student may induce the creative prin-
ciples from which a great classical writer worked and then
may be guided by these principles in writing well himself,
whether in a learned language or in his native tongue. As-
cham sets out six steps which the student may use in an ap-
proach to true imitation— to the appreciation of style:

### Additional Excerpt:

> if a man would take this paine... when he hath layd two places, of Homer and Vir-
gill, or of Demosthenes and Tullie togither, to teach plainlie withall, after this sort.

1. **Tullie retayneth thus moch of the matter, thies sentences, thies wordes:**
2. This and that he leaueth out, which he doth wittelie to this end and purpose.
3. This he addeth here.
4. This he diminisheth there.
5. This he ordereth thus, with placing that here, not there.
6. This he altereth and changeth, either, in propertie of wordes, in forme of sentence, in substance of the matter, or in one, or other conuenient circumstance of the authors present purpose.

Then Ascham notes the sources of these ideas:

> In thies fewe rude English wordes, are wrapt vp all the necessarie tooles and instrumentes, wherewith trewe Imitation is rightlie wrought withall in any tonge. Which tooles, I openlie confesse, be not of myne owne forging, but partlie left vnto me by the cunningest Master, and one of the worthiest Ientlemen that euer England bred, Syr John Cheke; partlie borrowed by me out of the shoppe of the dearest frende I haue out of England, Io. St.

---

214 Scholemaster, pp. 267-68. As Donald L. Clark, John Milton at St. Paul's School (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), p. 172, has noted, the idea was also set out by Luis Vives in 1531 and had a classical source in Pliny the Younger, to whom Ascham also refers, Scholemaster, pp. 244-45.
It is interesting that Atkins says only that Ascham acknowledges his debt to John Sturm,\textsuperscript{215} whose writing on imitation was available to Ascham in manuscript.\textsuperscript{216} But Ascham's first acknowledgment is to Cheke, and a statement by William Cecil, another of Cheke's former students, confirms the method as Cheke's; in a letter to John Harington the Younger of Kelston, Cecil advises:

\begin{quote}
In wrytinge, to seeke varietie of invention, to make choise of words and phrases, to vse apte examples, and good imitacyon, I knowe be verie good thinges; but if you follow the trade of Sir John Cheke (who was one of the sweetest flowers that hath coomen in my tyme out of the garden you growe in [Cambridge]) you can not doe better. One manner of his, amongst dyvers excellent, was this, to appoint those that weare under hym, and that he desired shoulde moste profytt, to take a peecce of Tullie, and to translate it into Englishe, and after, layinge theire bookes asyde, to translate the same againe into Latine, and then to compare them with the booke, and to consider whiche weare don aptelie, or vnproperlie; and howe neare Tullies phrase was followed in the Latine, and the moste sweete and sensyble wrytinge in Englishe; con-tynewinge with this kinde of excercise once or twice in a weeke, for two or three yeres, you shall come to write (as he dyd) singularlie in bothe tongues, which is most necessarie and most comendable.\textsuperscript{217}
\end{quote}

Repeatedly Ascham speaks of Cheke in his discussion of

\textsuperscript{215} Atkins, p. 91.
\textsuperscript{216} The material was later printed in Sturm's De imitatione, 1574. In the last years of Ascham's life, when he was at work on The Scholemaster, he wrote at length to Sturm concerning their mutual ideas concerning imitation (see Giles, II, 174-91). But Ascham repeatedly attributes to Cheke and the early discussions in the years at St. John's the impulse for his major critical notions.
\textsuperscript{217} Nug. Ant. (1775), pp. 239-40; the letter is dated 1578.
other aspects of imitation. One of the most important of those aspects was, to Cheke, the comparison of precepts and examples; for the end of imitation was not merely the cultivation of a writing style, but the understanding and appreciation of the literature itself:

Whan M. Watson in S. Iohns College at Cambrige wrote his excellent Tragedie of Absalon, M. Cheke, he and I, for that part of trew Imitation, had many pleasant talkes together, in comparing the preceptes of Aristotle and Horace de Arte Poetica, with the examples of Euripides, Sophocles, and Seneca.218

Ascham was later to quote Cheke as saying that it was always his endeavor to give no precept unaccompanied by some remarkable example.219

These attitudes are inseparable from still another point about which Cheke apparently felt very strongly. This concerns the necessity of developing an "ear" for language by hearing it read properly and by becoming skilled in the correct pronunciation of it. We have already noted Cheke's practice of reading aloud from the Greek classics, and it was a practice which he valued and continued throughout his life.220 It was out of this concern for developing a sensitivity to and an appreciation of a writer's manner as well as matter that he became involved in the controversy over the correct pronunciation of Greek at Cambridge in 1542.

219 See above, note 64: Ascham to Sturm.
Ascham has left us an outline of the controversy:

... when Cheke wished to enlarge his course of usefulness in the cause of learning by bringing back the true and ancient pronunciation of Greek, lo, the right reverend the bishop of Winchester [Stephen Gardiner], yielding to the requests of certain envious men, issued a decree to forbid the use of this new mode, and thus not only stopped the new pronunciation in spite of the remonstrances of almost all the university, but almost wholly extinguished all the zeal for learning which had been kindled up among us. Do you think this a slight hinderance to learning Greek?

He continues, defending Cheke's views:

Every one is aware that all knowledge comes to us through our senses: if then we are thus deprived of the use of our ears, how can we distinguish between one word and another unless we keep our eyes constantly fixed upon a book? The Greek vowels are now all pronounced so thin and slender, so closely allied to the letter iota that you can distinguish nothing but the piping of a sparrow, or the hissing of a snake .... Some letters have passed between his lordship and Cheke on this matter .... No one can defend the old barbarous pronunciation better than his lordship of Winchester: but this I will say; he has the strongest, we the best side of the argument.

The technical details of the argument, set out in the correspondence between Cheke and Gardiner, are of no great pertinence here. Although Cheke was stopped in his

221 Lat. 1st.: Ascham to Brandesby, [1542/43], in Giles, I, 25-27; translated, I, xxxvii-xxxviii.
222 This Latin correspondence was printed in De Pronuntia-Graecae. . . (Basle, 1555), and the original letters occur in L&P, XVII (1900), dated from 15 May-2 October 1542: #327 (two letters), #482, #483, #742, #891, #892, together with Gardiner's edict of 15 May, #327. Cf. Thomas Smith's part of the controversy in Strype, Smith, pp. 22-26. Smith's correspondence with Gardiner was printed in De recta et emendata Linguae Graecae Pronuntiatione . . . (Paris, 1568). Cf. also Ascham correspondence with Hubert, Giles, I, 344-
reformation of the English pronunciation of Greek, his method ultimately prevailed and is that now used by modern English scholars of Greek, a fact which affirms his judgment.\textsuperscript{223} More importantly, the position taken by Cheke reveals his great concern for stylistic awareness leading to a comprehension of the works generally. Cheke labored to remove all barriers between the student and fuller understanding.

It was not merely for the appreciation of the classical languages but for English and English writing style that Cheke emphasized these aspects of imitation, defined types of eloquence, and recommended models.\textsuperscript{224} Undoubtedly Ascham speaks for Cheke when he says:

\begin{quote}
\ldots all languages, both learned and mother tongue, be gotten, and gotten onelie by imitation. For as ye vse to heare, so ye learne to speake: if ye heare no other, ye speake not your selfe: and whom ye onelie heare, of them ye onelie learne.

And therefore, if ye would speake as the best and wisest do, ye must be conuersant, where the best and wisest are: but if yow be borne or brought vp in a rude contrie, ye shall not chose but speake rudelie: the rudest man of all knoweth this to be trew \ldots \ldots They be not wise, therefore that say, what care I for a mans wordes and utterance, if his matter and reasons be good. Soch men, say so, not so much of ignorance, as eyther of some singular pride in themselues, or some speciall malice or other, or for some
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{49, 373-77. S. Havercamp, in Sylloge Altera Scriptorum (1740) prints from Erasmus, Cheke, Gardiner, and Smith regarding Greek pronunciation. Nathan, Cheke und der eng. Hum., summarizes this material but presents nothing new. 223 "Cheke," DNB, p. 179. 224 Cf. Scholaemaster, pp. 283, 286, 289.}
private & perciall matter, either in Religion or other kinde of learning. For good and choice meates, be no more requisite for helthie bodies, than proper and apte wordes be for good matters, and also plaine and sensible utterance for the best and depest reasons: in which two pointes standeth perfit eloquence, one of the fairest and rarest giftes that God doth geue to man.

Ye know not, what hurt ye do to learning, that care not for wordes, but for matter, and so make a deuorse betwixt the tong and the hart.225

Cheke was, of course, insistent upon a sound understanding of a language in order that content would not be distorted; to this end he was to plead that translators print the original text with their translations, so that the author himself could be an interpreter of the translator.226 But it was his constant concern to teach a proper sensitivity to language: kinds of rhetoric, levels of eloquence, appropriateness of vocabulary; and this concern led him to the formulation of his most distinguished and original conceptions regarding literary appreciation, ideas which are particularly relevant to the subsequent study of his major contribution to English literature, The hurt of sedition.

The first of these observations, preserved in the Scholemaster, is Cheke's famous judgment of Sallust. Ascham says:

Salust, is a wise and worthy writer: but he requireth a learned Reader, and a right considerer of him. My dearest frend, and best master that euer I had or heard in learning, Syr I.

225 Scholemaster, pp. 264-65.
226 Lat. let.: Cheke to Henry Bullinger, 1556, in Orig. Letters... Reformation, translated I, 145-47.
Cheke, such a man, as if I should liue to see
England breed the like againe, I feare, I should
liue ouer long, did once giue me a lesson for
Salust, which, as I shall neuer forget my selffe,
so is it worthy to be remembred of all those,
that would cum to perfite judgement of the Latin
tong. He said, that Salust was not verie fitte
for yong men, to leerne out of him, the puritie
of the Latin tong: because, he was not the purest
in proprietie of wordes, nor choiest in aptnes
of phases, nor the best in framing of sentences:
and therefore is his writing, sayd he neyther
plaine for the matter, nor sensible for mens un-
derstanding. And what is the cause thereof, Syr,
quoth I. Verilie said he, bicause in Salust
writing, is more Arte than nature, and more labor
than Arte: and in his labor also, to moch toyle,
as it were, with an vncontented care to write
better than he could, a fault common to very many
men. And therefore he doth not expresse the mat­
ter liuely and naturally with common speach as
ye see Xenophon doth in Greeke, but it is caried
and driuen forth artificiallie, after to learned
a sorte, as Thucydides doth in his orations. And
how cummeth it to passe, sayd I, that Caesar and
Ciceroes talke, is so naturall & plaine, and
Salust writing so artificiall and darke, whan all
they three liued in one tyme? I will freelie
tell you my fansie herein, said he: surely,
Caesar and Cicero, beside a singular prerogatiue
of naturall eloquence geuen vnto them by God,
both two, by vse of life, were daylie orators
emonges the common people, and greatest coun­
cellers in the Senate house: and therefore gaue
themselves to vse soch speach as the meanest
should well vnderstand, and the wisest best al­
low: folowing carefullie that good counsell of
Aristotle, loquendum vt multi, sapiendum vt
pauci.227

Sallust's fault, unnaturalness, Cheke goes on to explain, is
the result of his having been "absent from his contrie, and
not inured with the common talke of Rome, but [he] shut vp
in his studie, and bent wholy to reading, did write the
storie of the Romanes."228 Cheke's emphasis upon simple

227 Scholemaster, pp. 297-98.
228 Scholemaster, p. 298.
and natural language is, of course, nothing new. Cicero, perhaps most importantly, had insisted upon the rhetori-
cian's use of a vocabulary formed of words of daily use and conversation:

... the vocabulary of conversation is the same as that of formal oratory, and we do not choose one class of words for daily use and another for full-dress public occasions, but we pick them up from common life as they lie at our disposal, and then shape them and mould them at our discretion, like the softest wax.229

But as J. W. H. Atkins has observed, "what distinguishes the criticism . . . is that attempt at explaining the facts psychologically by an analysis of the historical causes . . . something new in literary judgment."230 Cheke's judgment is the result of a complex sensitivity, one geared not merely to accepting uncritically all classical writing or to reading a work divorced from the circumstances which influenced its composition. The historical appreciation manifest in his opinion is evidence of the new humanist concern for history and its implications for modern man.231 But, more fundamentally, it is evidence of the inquiring energetic mind which made St. John's College the "nursery of humanism"232 and Cheke "the germinal mind" of mid-six-

230 Atkins, p. 95.
231 Atkins, pp. 51-52.
Cheke's realization that only "natural" language could produce vitality and endurance in writing undoubtedly led him to his position in favor of "pure" English for which he is perhaps best known today. The attitude was recorded thirteen years after Cheke left Cambridge, in a letter to Thomas Hoby, subsequently printed with Hoby's edition of Castiglione's *Courtier* in 1561. But throughout Ascham's discussion of imitation, based so largely on Cheke's attitudes, one finds adequate proof that in those early days as well, Cheke was concerned with the problems of vernacular writing. To be sure, most of the earlier humanists found the vernaculars no fit instruments for literary expression, recognizing Latin as the one universal medium. Ascham's remarks in the preface to Toxophilus, justifying his own use of English, clearly reveal the traditional preference for Latin among English scholars: "... to haue vvritten this boke either in latin or Greke ... had bene more easier & fit for mi trade in study ... " And indeed, Cheke's own scholarly writing was done exclusively in Latin, enabling it to reach a wider, frequently continental, scholarly audience. He was at the same time, one can be sure, aware of the necessity to strengthen the

---

233 Sweeting, p. 61.
234 See especially Ascham quotations above, pp. 70-72.
235 Atkins, p. 53.
236 Tox., p. x.
fabric of vernacular writing. He was, after all, dedicated to teaching Englishmen. And, as E. J. Sweeting has observed, his influence "would have been far less productive and of less importance to the development of critical consciousness in England had it been confined to the domain of purely classical scholarship." Cheke's use of "natural" language and his own skill in writing English prose will be demonstrated in the subsequent analysis of his only extensive English writing, The hurt of sedition. For the moment it may be noted that his personal correspondence in English manifests a great natural ability with English prose rhythms. Thomas Wilson was to praise highly Cheke's use of the vernacular: "... better skill he had in our English speach to judge of the Phrases and properties of wordes, and to diuide sentences: than anye else had that I haue knowne." Further evidence of his concern for good English prose style is reported by Wilson when he quotes Cheke as saying that he valued Demosthenes above all classical writers because he had applied himself "to the sense and understanding of the common people," and that "none euer was

237 Sweeting, p. 95.
238 For a discussion of Cheke's colloquial diction, see below, pp. 157-60.
239 See, for instance, the letter to Edward VI (printed in Nug. Ant.: 1769, 1792, and 1804), written under the stress of great illness, or that to Penelope Pie (printed in Nug. Ant.: 1775, 1792, and 1804), a similarly "didactic" letter, advisory in tone, exhorting-- in the manner of the Senecan essay-- the recently orphaned young woman to a life of virtue.
240 Wilson to Cecil, in Demosthenes, Three Orations, sig.i r.
more fitt to make an English man tell his tale praise worthily in any open hearing, either in Parliament or in Pulpit, or otherwise, than this onely Orator was.²⁴¹

It would seem, therefore, that the position in favor of "pure" English was probably the result of years of concern for vernacular expression. It is concisely expressed in the letter to Hoby:

I am of this opinion that our own tung shold be written cleane and pure, unmixt and unmangeled with borowing of other tungs, wherein if we take not heed by tijm, ever borowing and never payeng, she shall be fain to keep her house as bankrupt. For then doth our tung naturallie and praisable utter her meaning, when she bouroweth no counterfeitness of other tungs to attire her self withall, but useth plainlie her own, with such shift, as nature, craft, experiens and folowing of other excellent doth lead her unto, and if she want at ani tijm (as being unperfight she must) yet let her borow with suche bashfulnes, that it mai appeer, that if either the mould of our own tung could serve us to fascion a woord of our own, or if the old denisoned wordes could content and ease this neede, we wold not boldly venture of un­known wordes.²⁴²

In the rising battle between the various sixteenth-century theories for enriching the English language, Cheke's stand was outspokenly for English "unmixt and unmangeled" and for (when absolutely unavoidable) a judicious borrowing from other languages, but against the conscious effort to introduce foreign coin, such as was made by Thomas Elyot in his

²⁴¹ Wilson to Cecil, sig. i-iV.
²⁴² Eng. let.: Cheke to Hoby, in The Courtier, pp. 7-8.
Boke named the Gouernour in 1531. Regarding Cheke's stand, one modern critic has written:

It is . . . Cheke's great and incontestable achievement that he lent the whole weight of his immense influence and authority at this critical moment to English as a language fit to stand on its own feet. . . . From him springs that attitude which runs through the minds of all who spoke of "inkhorn terms," and to him we owe it in no small measure that English did not indulge in such an orgy of borrowing that it would now be little more than a bastard Romance language. 243

One of the most important echoes of Cheke's attitude against extensive borrowing is found, greatly elaborated, in Wilson's Arte of Rhetorique, first published in 1553 and later enlarged in an edition of 1560. 244 It is quite likely that Cheke influenced Wilson in this matter. Cheke's position was very probably current at Cambridge before he left the university, and Wilson may well have heard it there in the 1540's. Then too, at about this same time, Cheke had further indicated his stand regarding the fitness and adequacy of the vernacular for "parliament, pulpit, or otherwise" by starting a translation of the New Testament in "pure" English, completing the Gospel according to Matthew and a portion of the Gospel according to Mark, and Wilson may well have been aware of this project. 245 Although

244 Arte of Rhet., pp. 162ff.
245 See Nathan's argument favoring the attribution to Cheke of the preface to The New Testament in English after the Greeke translation annexed with the translation of Erasmus in Latin . . . In officina Thomae Gaultier, pro J. C.
the fragment was not published until 1843, it is interesting as an example of Cheke's attempt to enrich English, not from foreign sources, but, as he suggests, from "the mould of our own tung [which] could serve us to fascion a word of our own," as well as "old denisoned wordes." His theory led him to what Strype has generously termed an "over-laboured" translation. Terms such as "out-peopling" and "crosst" are substituted for "carrying away" and crucified; the substitutions are not always clearly in line with Cheke's theory, and many Latin-derived words are used, apparently for the want of better. The attempted translation cannot be considered one of Cheke's successes, but its existence reinforces our knowledge of Cheke's very real hopes for vernacular usage. Similarly incidental to Cheke's stature as a theorist, but also contributing some-

Pridie kalend. Decem. (1550), STC 2821, in Nathan, p. 48. While the MS fragment of the New Testament translation is undated, Nathan is sympathetic to the notion that Cheke's hand can be seen in this preface, written prior to the first edition of Wilson's Arte (1553). In any event, there is enough evidence of Cheke's early concern for a plain and clear natural usage to attribute some of Wilson's attitude to Cheke. In addition to Wilson's studying at Cambridge at the time of Cheke's greatest fame there, he met and studied with Cheke in Padua in about 1555 and acknowledges his debt of learning to Cheke in the dedicatory epistle to Cecil which prefaces the translation of Demosthenes' Orations.

Strype used the MS of the translation which he found in the library of Benet (now Corpus Christi) College, Cambridge (Strype, Cheke, pp. 163-64). The only extant edition is that by James Goodwin, The Gospel according to St. Matthew and part of the first chapter of the Gospel according to St. Mark . . . (London, 1843).

Strype, Cheke, p. 164.
thing to our view of him as a reformer is the fact that the
translation is written in a reformed English orthography
which Cheke devised in an attempt to standardize the then
chaotic state of English spelling.248 These attempts at
reform in English usage and orthography have led several
modern critics to label Cheke as a "crotcheteer"249 and
"something of a crank,"250 thereby overlooking the much
more significant and far-reaching effect of his teaching
and influence generally. It is this sort of injudicious
criticism that has kept many modern students blind to
Cheke's less sensational but vastly greater accomplish­
ments. His influence upon his fellows and students is in-
calculable. As men such as Ascham and Wilson testify in
their acknowledgment of their debts to Cheke and in their
own production, Cheke lives, not in his particular experi­
ments with orthography and vernacular vocabulary, but
rather in "the mental outlook of others."251

Thus it is true that Cheke, in the tradition of the
greatest teachers, left behind him men rather than books.
But in addition to the men and his own active life, he left
one English book which was the creation of those productive

248 Strype, Cheke, pp. 161-62. Strype also asserts that
Cheke introduced a system of quantitative spelling for
249 George Saintsbury, The Earlier Renaissance (Edinburgh
250 C. S. Lewis, English Literature in the Sixteenth Cen­
251 Sweeting, p. 91.
and sometimes divisive forces in his life: The hurt of sedition is Cheke's testimony for the Renaissance and Reformation in sixteenth-century England. It is a rhetorical monument to an age which had at once Olympic visions and human frailties; as such it is a monument to its author, John Cheke.
II The hurt of sedition

The hurt of sedition howe greueous it is to a Com-
mune welth appeared in 1549 and was subtitled by its author, "The true subiecte to the Rebell."252 As the subtitle im-
plies, the treatise was designed as an address, but as such it was never delivered, nor was it, as a published tract, instrumental in producing immediate results, so far as is known. It provided Cheke's successors, however, with a rhetorical model in which traditional arguments for rea-
sonable and peaceful political action were meaningfully and cogently applied. Old and new themes-- from the Great Chain of Being and Moderation to Civil Obedience and Protestantism-- are met in Cheke's vernacular prose tract. In the examination of the treatise which follows, the relevance of The hurt of sedition to sixteenth-century political and religious theory has been considered. Most specifically, however, the attempt has been to elaborate a single assertion about the treatise: that in it Cheke has successfully employed the formal classical oration in a popular plea for the godly order of quiet. An explanation of this statement, while it will not reveal all of the com-
plexity involved, will focus upon what are perhaps the major aspects of this fine Tudor prose work.

252 For a discussion of the specific dating of the edi-
tions of 1549, see below, pp. 88-89.
Historical Occasion

In June of 1549 came the first serious manifestation of protests against the protectorate governmental policy. In the session of Parliament which lasted from 24 November 1548 to 14 March 1549, authority was given to Archbishop Cranmer's new order of church service, the first English Book of Common Prayer—Cranmer's attempt to provide a compromise between Catholic and reforming Englishmen, A. L. Rowse pertinently says:

It is difficult for anyone without a knowledge of anthropology to appreciate fully the astonishing audacity, the profound disturbance to the unconscious levels upon which a society lives its life, of such an action as the substitution of an English liturgy for the age-long Latin rite of Western Christendom in which Englishmen had been swaddled time out of mind. No doubt there were factors that aided such a daring breach with the timeless past, notably the gradual introduction of English services, such as the singing of the Litany, in Henry's reign; and, perhaps most important, the increasing national self-consciousness, a most powerful psychological current of the time. All the same, nothing

253 The fullest contemporary accounts of the political disruptions of the summer of 1549 are the eye-witness report of the Exeter historian John Hooker in Holinshed's Chronicles of 1587, III, 1014-1041, and that of Alexander Neville, Norfolkes furies: or, a view of Ketts camp, first printed in Latin in 1575, in English (somewhat epitomized) in Holinshed in 1587 and separately in 1615. Both Hooker's and Neville's accounts are printed by Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain . . . , ed. J. S. Brewer, IV (Oxford, 1845), 40-49. Other valuable contemporary accounts are cited in succeeding notes. Strype, Ecc. Mem., II, part 1, 259-92, summarizes the events of the rebellion; in II, part 2, he prints related documents concerning enclosure acts, martial law, enclosure commissions, etc.
can detract from the revolutionary audacity of such an interference with the customary, the subconscious, the ritual element in life.\textsuperscript{254}

The new liturgy was to be put into use at Pentecost, i.e., Whitsunday (9 June 1549). About that time, men of the West Country, of Devonshire, Cornwall, and Somerset, to whom the vernacular and simplified rites seemed ungodly, rose in protest against its use and called for a return to traditional usage.\textsuperscript{255} A year earlier in Cornwall there had been a slight rising, and just prior to the Whitsunday rising, in May there had been, in Somersetshire and Lincolnshire, "a commotion of the commons ... concerning a proclamation for enclosures, and they broke downe certaine parkes ... .\textsuperscript{256}"

The protests against religious innovations were added to the unrest which stemmed from the increased enclosing of common


lands by wealthy landowners, and the result was rebellion. 257 The rebels formed camps and besieged Exeter, Devonshire, which was bravely defended. John Russell, high steward of the Duchy of Cornwall and in 1550 the first Earl of Bedford, was sent into the West to drive off the attackers from Exeter and to execute the leaders of the rebellion. Meanwhile the commons of Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire, and Bedfordshire took actions against two landowners, throwing down fences and killing stock. The Marquis of Dorset, Henry Grey, was sent against these offenders. 258

But rebellion was in the air. In a letter from London, 25 June 1549, the reformer John Hooper, then chaplain to Protector Somerset, wrote to his friend abroad, Henry Bullinger:

... through the instigation of the devil and wickedness of man there has lately arisen in my part of the country [i.e., Gloucestershire, adjacent Somersetshire] a commotion of the people against the government, not unattended with danger, and as yet hardly composed. Tumults of this kind are taking place not only in the country, but almost throughout the whole king-

---


dom. The people are sorely oppressed by the marvellous tyranny of the nobility. Let us pray that all occasions of discord may be piously removed, and that the people may be kept in order to the glory of God's name.

The state of our country is indeed most deplorable...

The state of England was to become even more deplorable before peace was again restored. Along the great road leading from London through Cambridge to Wymondham and Norwich the news and the excitement of the western and southern risings spread. On 10 July trouble was felt in Cambridge, and on that same day, following protests against enclosures, a group of insurgents in Norfolk found a leader in Robert Ket, a well-to-do tanner, who led his followers north of Norwich to Mousehold Heath. There he took possession of Mount Surrey, which Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, had been building before his imprisonment in 1547. At this site Ket maintained headquarters for six weeks. His numbers swelled to thousands within days, and about this time Ket's rebels drew up their economic complaints. In London fears mounted. On 18 July terms were sent north from London to Norwich, announcing pardons for those who submitted and execution for the traitors who persisted in rebellion, and in

---

259 John Hooper to Henry Bullinger, in Orig. Letters...
Reformation, I, 66.
261 S. T. Bindoff, Ket's Rebellion 1549 (London: George Philip [for the Historical Association], 1949), p. 4; Russell, pp. 48-56, prints these undated complaints. See below, p. 114, for Cheke's handling of the economic complaints.
the city martial law was declared and the gates and walls were armed. On 21 July "the byshoppe of Caunterbery came sodenly to Powles, and there shoyd and made a narracyon of thoys that dyd ryssse in dyvers places within the realme ..." On 22 July two rebels from Kent and Essex were brought to London and hanged. When Ket and his followers received the offer of pardon, most of them refused it, saying they had done nothing which called for pardon. Norwich was thrown into a state of defence, and the rebels began a strong attack. The government's answer to the seizure of Norwich, the second city in the kingdom, was to despatch an expeditionary force under William Parr, Marquis of Northampton. The defence failed; on 1 August the rebels took over Norwich in a bloody battle in which, among others, Edmund, First Baron Sheffield, was killed. The debacle ended in Northampton's withdrawal.

Meanwhile in Exeter Lord Russell had better success, and on 5 August victoriously besieged the city, taking four thousand prisoners and hanging other rebels on the spot.

262 Wriothesley, II, 15-16; Grey Friars, pp. 59-61
264 Wriothesley, II, 18-19.
265 Bindoff, Ket's Rebellion, p. 5.
266 Two London Chron., p. 18; Grey Friars, p. 61; Wriothesley, II, 19; Bindoff, Ket's Rebellion, p. 5.
267 Wriothesley, II, 19; Grey Friars, p. 61.
Within a week more rebels were hanged in London and still more condemned to death. The Exeter victory, however, did not allay the fears in London, and the quarters of rebels who had been hanged, drawn, and quartered were placed as warnings over many London gates. The city government sent out a proclamation against wrestling, perhaps in fear of crowds gathering, surely to emphasize the alarm felt by all officials at the civil disruption in the realm. To make the matter worse, on 8 August France presented a defiance to the protector and provoked war by attacking English fortresses at Boulogne. In addition, the Norfolk crisis drew strength from the Scottish borders, where England was carrying on skirmishes with the Scots.

The king's government took swift action to recapture Norwich. Originally the protector himself was to have led an army against Ket, but for unknown reasons, before 17 August he was replaced by John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and Somerset's rival for power. Warwick acted decisively and with speed. He moved by Cambridge, Thetford, and Wymondham to Intwood, three miles from Norwich, where he arrived on

270 Bindoff, Ket's Rebellion, p. 5. Pollard, Eng. under Prot. Som., pp. 240-42, attributes the replacement to Somerset's conscience; he could not take command against Norwich without alienating the popular support which his domestic policy (i.e., sympathy with protests against enclosures, investigation of enclosures, etc.) had brought him.
23 August. He was joined there by other troops. A new pardon was offered to all but Ket, but it too was refused. On 24 August the battle for Norwich began and by 27 August Warwick was victorious, after a final pardon had been offered and again refused. Ket himself fled the field but was captured and eventually removed to London. Five thousand rebels were reported slain, and many more were executed subsequently in Norwich. Others were imprisoned and later pardoned. Robert Ket and his brother William were tried and condemned for treason in London on 26 November 1549 and were returned to Norwich and Wymondham where they were hanged from public steeples.

Sometime after the first serious rising in June of 1549, and before the defeat of the northern rebels on 27 August, John Cheke set himself to address to the rebels a treatise against sedition and rebellion, *The hurt of sedition howe greuous it is to a Commune welth*. Cheke wrote here for the first time in his career to the commons of England rather than to her scholars and theologians. He employed the vernacular in a carefully constructed plea for civil obedience in which he could muster all his Christian humanist talents and convictions, providing, as it were, an elaboration of the official proclamation sent from London.

The result was, as will be shown, a remarkable representation of mid-sixteenth-century views on politics, religion, economics, and rhetorical prose style. How large a part The hurt of sedition played in putting down the rebellion it is impossible to say. Although the composing of the treatise may have began as early as June, it was not completed until after 1 August, since the treatise contains a reference to the death of the Marquis of Sheffield, who was killed on that day at Norwich. Two editions were printed in 1549. At least the first edition appeared before the rebellion was put down in late August since Cheke addresses the still rebelling commons. The second edition may have followed very soon after: Cheke strengthened his argument against rebellion by means of a single change in his text, an elaboration added to the early sections of the second edition; the presence of this interpolation suggests that he felt the need of a more vigorous attack on the still undefeated rebels. 274 There is, in addition, textual indication that the second 1549 edition was hastily printed. 275 Both editions were imprinted at London by John Day and William Seres, both bear on their title pages the border-design of the Tudor crown and shield, 276 and both were printed anonymously. The two

274 The interpolation occurs at B3V, 17- B5V, 6.
275 For a discussion of the two 1549 editions, see below, pp. 318-24.
1549 editions may indicate that the treatise enjoyed a certain popularity at its publication among more literate and sympathetic readers who felt it was a just statement of the occasion. The anonymity of the piece gave it the appearance that it spoke for all men of Right Reason and loyalty and for the king as well. The royal arms on the title page gave it the ring of the highest authority, an authority which would be considerably greater than that suggested by a single man's name. Indeed, the presence of the arms indicates that the work was written on the request of the protector and the king and that it was quite surely issued with authority. But it is unlikely that the tract was in any way instrumental in halting the rebellion. Its influence was to reach beyond the occasion of its composition, and its importance lies, as will be demonstrated, not in its occasional nature, but in the larger implications of its philosophy and prose style.

Authorship

That Cheke was the author of the treatise there is no reason to doubt. The only lifetime editions, those of 1549, were printed anonymously for good reasons, as we have seen. By 1557, however, the work was publicly attributed to Cheke: John Bale, in Scriptorum Illustriu maioris Brütannie, the enlarged edition of his Illustrium Maioris Britanniae (1548), recorded among Cheke's works Damna ex Seditione. Bale gives, in Latin, the first line of this
work, which identifies it as The hurt of sedition.277 The first posthumous edition, 1569, was published as Cheke's, and in that year there were men living, such as William Cecil, who might have disputed the attribution had it been incorrect. As far as I know, the only reference made to the treatise during Cheke's lifetime is that of Thomas Wilson.278 He found it rhetorically excellent enough to quote from, as we shall see, attributing it to "a most worthy man."279 Writing this no more than four years after the rebellion, Wilson may well have left the writer nameless in respect for the author who had not seen fit to publish the treatise under his name. Other Renaissance writers such as Gabriel Harvey and Ben Jonson, scholars of no little repute, attribute The hurt of sedition to Cheke.281 Moreover, all editions after 1549 were published as Cheke's. The most convincing testimony for Cheke's authorship, although paradoxically the least valid as evidence, may be found in the treatise itself which in its rhetorical persuasiveness would seem clearly to be the work of the foremost Demosthenic

277 John Bale, Scriptorum Illustriü maioris Brytannie, I (Basle, [1557]), 699.
278 Ascham makes no reference to the treatise, but there is no particular reason why he should refer to it; he does not mention a great many other pertinent events in Cheke's life.
280 The quotation from The hurt of sedition occurs on a page following a reference to "our soueraigne . . . that now is: King Edward" (p. 201), indicating that this section was written before July of 1553.
281 See below, pp. 164-68.
scholar of the time.

Doctrinal Background

In The hurt of sedition Cheke argues against rebellion from two fundamental positions— that rebellion is unlawful and that it is harmful. Cheke, in arguing against rebellion as unlawful, assumes the traditional position that there are in nature clearly discernible divinely established relationships from which man may infer God's intention for all His creatures:

If the servaunt be bounde to obey his maister in the familie, is not every subjecte bound to serue the kinge in his realme? The chyld is bounde to the priviate father, and bee we not al bound to the comune wealthes father?

(B4, lff.)

This view of "correspondences" is, of course, part and parcel of the doctrine of order which was given its first important sixteenth-century English expression\(^\text{282}\) in Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Boke named the Gouernour* in 1531. Elyot speaks of

... the discrepancy of degrees, wherof proceeded order: whiche in thinges as wel naturall as supernaturall hath euuer had suche a pre-eminence, that thereby the incomprehensible maiestie of god, as it were by a bright leme of a torche or candel, is declared to the blynde inhabitants of this worlde. More ouer take

\(^{282}\) Of course, this view of order can be traced back to Plato's *Timaeus* and before: see A. O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942), pp. 24-68. E. M. W. Tillyard, in *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1956; first published 1944), pp. 3-70, gives the best concise treatment and examples of this world view in its English setting.
away ordre from all thynges what shulde than remayne? Certes nothyng finally, except some man wolde imagine estsones Chaos: whiche of some is expounde a confuse mixture. . . . Hath nat he [God] set degrees and astates in all his gloricous warkes? . . . Beholde also the ordre that god hath put generally in al his creature, begynnyng at the moste inferiour or base, and assendynge upworde: he made not only herbes to garnisshe the erthe, but also trees of a more eminent stature than herbes, and yet in the one and the other be degrees of qualities; some pleasant to beholde, some delicate or good in taste, other holysome and medicinable, some commodious and necessary. Semblably in byrdes, bestis, and fisses, some be good for the sustinance of man, some beare thynges profitable to sondry uses, other be apte to occupation and labour; in diuerse is strength and commoditie; some other serve for pleasure; none of them hath all these qualities; fewe haue the more part or many, specially beautie, strength, and profite. But where any is founde that hath many of the said propreties, he is more set by than all the other, and by that estimation the ordre of his place and degree euidently apperethe; so that in every thyng is ordre, and without ordre may be nothing stable or permanent; and it may nat be called ordre, excepte it do contayne in it degrees, high and base, accordynge to the merite or estimation of the thyng that is ordred.

In 1537 the official English statement of this doctrine appeared in The Institution of a Christen man, commonly called "The Bishops' Book." The exposition of the Fifth Commandment which is presented here for the use of the clergy in the instruction of "the people commytted to theyr spirituall charge" sets out for popular use an interpretation of the commandment to obedience based upon the doctrine of order:

---

... by this word, Father, is understood here, not only the natural father and mother, which dyd carnally begete vs, & brought vs vp: but also the spirituall father, by whom we be spiritually regenerated & nourished in Christ: and all other gouernours & rulers, vnder whom we be nourished and brought vp, or ordered and guyded. ...

And by this comandement also subiectes be bounde, not to withdrawe theyr sayd faualitie, trouth, loue, & obedience towards theyr prince, for any cause what so euer it be. Ne for any cause they may conspire agaynst his persone, ne do any thynge towards the hynderaunce, or hurte therof, nor of his estate.

And furthermore, by this comandement they be bound also to obey all the lawes, proclama­tions, preceptes, and comandementes, made by their princis and gouernours: excepte they be agaynst the comandementes of god. And lyke wyse they be bounde to obey all suche as be in au­toritie vnder theyr prince, as farre as he woll haue them obeyed. 284

Ten years later, in 1547, an even more popularly in­fluential expression of the doctrine of order and its corol­lary doctrine of obedience is that found in The First Book of Homilies, first published two years before Cheke addressed himself to the problem of rebellion. The Tenth Homily, en­titled "An Exhortation Concerning Good Order and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates," was read in all English churches at regular intervals throughout the year, and the doctrine of order was given general currency in this form:

Almighty God hath created and appointed all things, in heaven, earth, and waters, in a most excellent and perfect order. In heaven he hath appointed distinct (or several) orders and states of archangels and angels. In earth he hath assigned and appointed kings and princes, with other governors under them, all in good and necessary order. The water above is kept, and raineth down in due time and season. The sun, moon, stars, rainbow, thunder, lightning, clouds, and all birds of the air, do keep their order. The earth, trees, seeds, plants, herbs, corn, grass, and all manner of beasts, keep themselves in their order. All the parts of the whole year, as winter, summer, months, nights, and days, continue in their order. All kinds of fishes in the sea, rivers and waters, with all fountains and springs, yea, the seas themselves keep their comely course and order. And man himself also hath all his parts both within and without, as soul, heart, mind, memory, understanding, reason, speech, with all and singular corporal members of his body, in a profitable, necessary, and pleasant order. Every degree of people, in their vocation, calling, and office, hath appointed to them their duty and order. Some are in high degree, some in low; some kings and princes, some inferiors and subjects; priests, and laymen, masters and servants, fathers and children, husbands and wives, rich and poor; and every one have need of other. So that in all things is to be lauded and praised the goodly order of God: without the which no house, no city, no commonwealth can continue and endure (or last); for, where there is no right order, there reigneth all abuse, carnal liberty, enormity, sin, and Babylonical confusion. Take away kings, princes, rulers, magistrates, judges, and such estates of God's order, no man shall ride or go by the highway unrobbed; no man shall sleep in his own house or bed unkill'd; no man shall keep his wife, children and possessions in quietness; all things shall be common; and there must needs follow all mischief and utter destruction both of souls, bodies, goods, and commonwealths.
E. M. W. Tillyard has noted how closely Shakespeare's most famous use of the doctrine of order in Ulysses' speech from Troilus and Cressida parallels this passage from the homily. But whether or not the homily, in this early form or in the revised form of The Second Book of Homilies (1571), was the primary means by which the doctrine achieved the stature of the "world view" of Elizabethan Tudors, such other famous expressions of it as were given by Richard Hooker in Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity and by Edmund Spenser in Book Five of The Faerie Queene clearly indicate that the doctrine of order was a Renaissance commonplace. Thus when Cheke employed it in The hurt of sedition, he had made use of a tradition which lay at the center of sixteenth-century thought.

In addition to the doctrine of order, that is, the argument from unwritten universal law, Cheke employs arguments from the written law of God in his assertion of the illegality of rebellion. Here again he is following earlier writers on the subject of obedience who had made abundant use of scriptural authority. As we have just noted, The Institution of the Christen man clearly relates civil obedience to Mosaic law. Moreover, the homily exhorting obedience, after its initial statement of the doc-

286 Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays, p. 19.
287 See below, pp. 171, 174-75.
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trine of order, argues for civil obedience exclusively from Biblical reference. The most powerful of the scriptural texts against rebellion is the Pauline exhortation in the thirteenth chapter of Romans beginning:

Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment.

Cheke's use of such arguments from scriptural authority, however, is relatively modest, as we shall see.289

In his second fundamental position against rebellion—that it is harmful—Cheke does not follow in a well defined tradition of usage, but departs from the dominant practice of keeping strictly to arguments from authority, either unwritten or written expressions of it, and argues rather from utility. In so doing, he is quite in keeping with Aristotelian precepts of rhetoric, as I shall demonstrate,290 although he is establishing something of a tradition in English writing against rebellion.291 As far as I am aware, none of Cheke's predecessors argued to any extent from the rationale of utility, although as J.W. Allen in The History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century has noted, it was a rationale familiar enough in

---

289 See rhetorical analysis below, pp. 110-53.
290 See below, p. 122.
291 For a discussion of the influence of The hurt of sedition in subsequent writing, see below, pp. 171-74.
Tudor policy making. The Tudors had inherited chaos from the fifteenth century, and chaos was clearly hurtful. So Elyot had named it:

... where there is any lacke of ordre nedes must be perpetuall conflicte and in thynges subiecte to Nature nothyng of hym selfe onely may be norisshed; but whan he hath distroyed that where with he dothe participate by the ordre of his creation, he hym selfe of neces-site muste than perisshe, wherof ensueth universall dissolution.

But although this line of argument had not been largely utilized before Cheke's writing, there is the suggestion of it in the official arguments for obedience at the time of the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536. Sir Richard Morison, writing as the propagandist for Henry VIII, had briefly outlined the harmful aspects of rebellion in *A Remedy for Sedition* and had suggested the potentialities of this line of argument in a companion tract, *A lamentation in whiche is shewed what Ruyne and destruction cometh of seditious rebellyon.*

---

292 Allen, pp. 121-33.
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But although Morison argues in part from inutility as well as from illegality, his assertions of rebellion's harmfulness are explicitly related to rebellion's offense against written and unwritten law: "But the most hurt of all is, that we lerne to set god and his lawes at naughte." It remained for Cheke, undoubtedly familiar with these official writings against rebellion, to focus upon and elaborate the rationale of utility and to combine with it arguments from the doctrine of order and scriptural authority, producing the fullest and, I believe, the strongest case against rebellion in Tudor England.

Before proceeding to an analysis of Cheke's rhetorical implementation of these traditional positions against rebellion, we must examine briefly one aspect of the doctrine of civil obedience which has implications for Cheke and the subsequent history of his treatise. The doctrine of obedience, as it is clearly presented in the interpretation of the Fifth Commandment in The Institution of the Christen man, calls for the obedience of the subject to the prince and his laws in all cases "excepte they be agaynst the commandements of god." The homily of 1547 elaborated this position:

296 See explanatory notes for doctrinal and verbal echoes of Morison in The mart of sedition.
297 For Cheke's use of the arguments, see the rhetorical analysis below, pp. 110-53.
298 See above, p. 94.
Yet let us believe undoubtedly, good Christian people, that we may not obey kings, magistrates, or any other, though they be our own fathers, if they would command us to do any thing contrary to God's commandments. In such a case we ought to say with the Apostles. We must rather obey God than man. But nevertheless in that case we may not in any wise withstand violently or rebel against rulers, or make any insurrection, sedition, or tumults, either by force of arms or other ways, against the anointed of the Lord or any of his appointed officers; but we must in such case patiently suffer all wrongs and injuries, referring the judgment of our cause only to God.299

This qualification of the doctrine of obedience, because it allows for disobedience but prohibits resistance, has been termed the doctrine of non-resistance,300 and theoretically this is an accurate description of the Tudor position. But as the heads of the English church, Henry VIII and his successors were themselves the interpreters of the commandments of God, and if one were arguing from the position of the crown, the qualification was, for all practical purposes, nonexistent. In 1549, as a propagandist for the crown and a zealous defender of the crown's Protestantism, Cheke argued

for obedience to the king, even on religious questions. Edward's religion was, for Cheke, the true religion, and a Protestant monarch's laws would not be "agaynst the cōmande-mētes of god." But when during the Catholic Marian reign convinced Protestants found themselves subject to laws which they interpreted as ungodly, they could, within the limitations of the doctrine of non-resistance, choose to disobey Mary's laws and, as the homily instructed, quietly suffer the consequences for righteousness' sake. In the coup to prevent Mary's accession, however, men like Cheke and Cranmer went farther than the doctrine allowed, since in supporting Jane Dudley they actively resisted their lawful ruler. That the doctrine of non-resistance had "strict reference to immediate expediency," as J. W. Allen has asserted, is evidenced by the swiftness with which men like Cheke who had employed it for the strength of their own cause abandoned it when it could be implemented against them: "Not by accident did the mid-century witness the first attempts . . . to draw a distinction between 'kinds of obedience'-- a subject which was to occupy more and more attention during the reign of Elizabeth and on into the seventeenth century." Those for whom the doctrine of non-resistance was no longer tenable, such as the Protestant

301 Allen, p. 132.
Marian exiles, sought a rationale which would justify not merely disobedience but resistance to an "ungodly" ruler. The most important of the early attempts at such a justification was made by Cheke's friend and fellow exile John Ponet, perhaps even with Cheke's assistance. Nonetheless, the doctrine of qualified obedience or non-resistance remained the official Tudor position. Clear evidence of this may be found in the Elizabethan elaboration of the 1547 homily against rebellion, the homily of 1570 entitled "An Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion," and, more important here, in the successive Elizabethan editions of The Hurt of Sedition under the Tudor aegis. Of particular significance is the edition of 1569 which, published on the occasion of the Northern Rebellion, once more bore the royal seal and represented the philosophy of the most powerful political forces in England. But by 1641, the year of the sixth edition, Cheke's condemnation of rebellion was antagonistic to increasingly popular liberal attitudes; in that year, although it still represented the government in power, the treatise voiced the minority opinion of the Royalists and was employed by them in their attacks upon the

303 A Short Treatise of politike power, and of the true Obedience which subjectes owe to Kynges and other ciuile Governours, with an Exhortacion to all true naturall Englishmen, 1556, is reprinted in facsimile by Winthrop S. Hudson in his study John Ponet (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1942). Regarding Cheke's acquaintance with Ponet, see Ponet references above, pp. 57-58.

304 See below, pp. 175-76.
At the writing of *The hurt of sedition*, however, the doctrine of virtually unqualified civil obedience was the dominant English political rationale. To describe the theory as expedient is in no way to disparage it or the men who employed it to the good of the body politic. It was not, after all, a narrowly personal excuse for action; on the other hand, it had very real personal meaning for many of the individuals who were subjects of the commonwealth it strengthened. The Duke of Somerset is reputed to have accepted with equanimity his condemnation to death, pronouncing from the gallows: "But I am condemned by a law whereunto I am subject; and as we all; and therefore to shew obedience I am content to die . . . ." The issue was not as clear-cut to Cheke after the accession of Mary, but that he was convinced of the soundness of the doctrine of civil obedience in 1549 there can be no doubt. His position in *The hurt of sedition* could hardly be plainer. The title itself asserted the proposition which the treatise was designed to sell: that sedition is hurtful, and grievous to the commonwealth. To this thesis was added the strength of religious authority by means of a woodcut, on the verso of the titlepage, which is equally clear in mean-

---

305 See Gerard Langbain's preface to the edition of 1641.
ing: it contains an illustration of Absalom being torn violently from his horse by an over-hanging bough and simultaneously run through by pursuers from the rear; beneath the illustration are the words "The rewarde of Absalon the Rebel." And if the title or the woodcut were not sufficiently clear, the subtitle heading the text could have left no doubt as to the point of view of the writer; here was the case of the "true subiecte to the rebell."

Rhetorical Analysis

Cheke sought to accomplish his purpose by means of ideas and persuasive devices presented in the traditional rhetorical form of a deliberative oration specifically concerned with the inexpediency of the policy pursued by the rebelling commons. As in all orations of this type, it deals with future consequences as shown by past experience. Cheke has attempted, as Plato prescribes, to enchant the mind by arguments.\footnote{Plato, 
Phaedrus, in The Dialogues of Plato, ed. Benjamin Jowett, I (New York: Random House, n.d.), 264.} Following Aristotle, he has observed in the situation at hand "the available means of persuasion" to be used in an oration designed to prove what ought or ought not to be.\footnote{Aristotle, Rhetoric, in Basic Works, I, ii, 1329.} Logical, pathetic, ethical, and non-artistic proofs are utilized with masterful subtlety, and one feels that each word has been carefully calculated to have its effect. The appropriateness of the premeditated
periodic construction becomes clear as the reader senses that he is being propelled along toward an inevitable end. Cheke's dedicated purpose is to persuade, and all other matter which might in passing delight or teach is subordinated to the present goal. This is not to suggest, however, that Cheke was unaware of the value of delight as a means, nor that he was not ultimately concerned that the reader profit from the tract. Indeed, the persistent value of the piece lies in its didactic thesis and the artistic elaboration of it. The *hurt of sedition* is as much an instructive sermon as it is a persuasive speech.

As a rhetorical plea, *The hurt of sedition* follows closely the design of the classical oration as it is described in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. That Cheke was extremely familiar with the *Rhetoric* we have adequate evidence from the education of Edward VI;\(^309\) Roger Ascham makes a specific reference to this work as being in Cheke's curriculum for the king.\(^310\) The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Quintilian's *De Institutione Oratoria* were equally familiar,\(^311\) but Cheke does not follow as closely the more detailed pattern for the oration recommended in these works, a pattern which was later set forth in Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhet-


\(^{310}\) Lat. let.: Ascham to Sturm, 1550, in Giles, I, 224-29; translated in part in Lit. *Remains*, I, cli-cliii.

orique and exemplified in Sidney's *Defense of Poesie*. The following outlines of the plea indicate the structural divisions of *The hurt of sedition*, first according to the more general Aristotelian plan, then according to the more particular divisions as they are found in the *Arte of Rhetorique*:

I INTRODUCTION (A2-A3, 12) Entrance (A2-A3,12)

All right-minded men must abhor rebellion; even rebels, if they consider their action with some light of understanding, will see the hainousness of their actions.

II PROPOSITION (A3,12-A4;2) II Narration (A3,12-elaboration A4,3-A4V,5) A4V,5)

Contrary to God's will and the godly order of quiet, disobedient men have seditiously and hurtfully taken justice into their own hands for the reformation of pretensed injuries.

III Proposition (none)

IV Division (A3V,4-A4,2)

A) "fyrst ..."

B) "next ..."

C) "thyrdly ..."

III DISCUSSION (A4V,5-H1,24) VI Confutation (A4V, 5-B3,9 [begins oblique A3V,12])

A Confutation:

1 Of religious grievances

(A4V,5-A6V,10)

2 Of social grievances

(A6V,11-B3,9)

B Confirmation: 

1 Rebellion is wicked and horrible to God, and the usurping of God-given authority will be punished by God. (B3,9-B3v,17)

2 Rebellion offends unnaturally the sovereign lord, the king. (B3v,17-D3,19)
   a) Rebellion breaks the stated law of God regarding obedience to kings. (B3v,21ff.)
   b) Rebellion breaks the established natural law of God regarding the hierarchical position of the king. (B4,1-B9,14)
   c) Rebellion breaks specific laws of the king regarding:
      i- false orders (B9,15ff.)
      ii- robbery (B10v,5ff.)
      iii-imprisoning of king's servants (C2,19ff.)
      iv- murder (C4,16ff.)
      v- pillage of cities (C7,22ff.)

[Transitional summary and exhortation to repentance: D2v,1-D3,18]

3 Rebellion troubles miserably the whole commonwealth (D3,19-H1,24)
   a) Rebellion produces major evils:
      i- dearth (D3,19ff.)
      ii- death (D8v,13ff.)
      iii-destruction (E2v,17ff.)
      iv- idleness (E4,20ff.)
      v- disorder (E6,22ff.)
   b) Rebellion hinders or harms good things presently possessed:
      i- justice (E8,21ff.)
      ii- friends and loved ones (F2v,8ff.)
      iii-reformation of religion (F3,16ff.)
      iv- freedom and good will (F4,9ff.)
      v- reputation abroad (F8,16ff.)
If the seven-fold division is accepted, the Proposition, according to Wilson's definition of it as a short pithy sentence, is nonexistent. In addition, the confirmation does not precede the confutation, as Wilson would have it, but rather Cheke follows here Aristotle's recommendation for an answering orator, placing the major confutation of the piece before the elaborated confirmation, while minor confutations appear within the separate confirmations at the discretion of the orator. Thus while the seven-fold division can be made, the arrangement of The hurt of sedition does not follow that pattern as neatly as does Sidney's Defense of Poesie, but rather conforms more readily to the simpler Aristotelian plan. In the discussion of proofs which follows, I shall indicate how very thoroughly Cheke adheres not only to the broader Aristotelian outline, but also to the numerous particular recommendations made by Aristotle for the deliberative oration.
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Before proceeding, however, two noticeable structural "faults" in *The hurt of sedition* must be noted. Cheke has failed to make all of his subdivisions small enough to be readily grasped as units of attention, and this same weakness is reflected in some of his smaller thought units. Periodic constructions are, at times, so extended that the reader, when the sentence is completed, has lost the original line of thought. Cheke is less likely to err in this way when he is moved by righteous anger to use interrogatives, or when he employs metaphorical expression, than when he is attempting straightforward exposition. The nature of his case and of his audience prevents him from erring too frequently on the side of extensive intellectualizing or unadorned factual exposition; and within the larger units of the oration, the movement of the discussion is agile, if not always fastidiously logical.

The second fault in *The hurt of sedition* is an overlapping of ideas from one contention to another which, on superficial study, might lead the reader to accuse Cheke of merely reiterating, rather than progressing from point to point. But there is a clear-cut and highly significant progression, and the overlapping is, it would seem, a venial sin, since although in a logical analysis of the piece one cannot always make neat divisions, yet the premature or repeated suggestions of contentions act as psychological interlocks. Aristotle clearly endorses rhetorical procedures
which "assume an audience of untrained thinkers" and are designed for "the hearing of persons who cannot take in at a glance a complicated argument, or follow a long chain of reasoning."\(^{316}\) As we shall see, it is more important to Cheke that the reader is carried along psychologically than that he can reduce the tract to a flawless logical outline. "The wiseman," Wilson asserts, "that hath good experience in these affaires, . . . will not be bound to any precise rules, nor keep any one order, but such onely as by reason he shall thinke best to vse, being master ouer arte, rather then arte should be maister ouer him, rather making arte by wit, then confounding wit by arte."\(^{317}\) In addition, this kind of "disregard" for the logical rules increases the dramatic reality of the speech, makes it, in fact, more speech-like, more immediate, spontaneous, and intimate than it might be had Cheke written in the bare and perfectly logical manner of, say, Aristotle. That Cheke was not unaware of the value of speech verisimilitude in his tract would seem to be shown by the frequent use of direct address, imperatives, and interrogatives, all of which add perceptively to the dramatic atmosphere of the spoken oration. A careful study of his interpolation of such phrases adds to one's conviction that Cheke was not without a large portion of the showman's sense of timing. Never is merely analytical or

\(^{316}\) Rhet., I, ii, 1331.

\(^{317}\) Arte of Rhet., p. 159.
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logical arrangement valued before climax. If the right psychological emphasis demands that he break into his arrangement, he does not hesitate to disregard the formal order he has been pursuing in favor of the immediate gain in emphasis he might make. Rhetoric, as Aristotle asserts and Cheke practices it here, is not a science but a faculty. 318

With this view of the oration as a whole, we may now proceed to an examination of the kinds of detail which Cheke employs in the presentation of his plea. Again one notes that Aristotelian devices are represented. Thus the modes of persuasion or proofs may be analyzed as follows: Those which belong to the art of rhetoric (i.e., requiring the rhetorician's art) are 1) logical; 2) pathetic; 3) ethical. Those which do not require invention but are already at hand may be classed as non-artistic, e.g., authorities, laws, witnesses. Since Aristotle only grudgingly admits ethical and pathetic proofs to be used with logical proof, it is of particular significance that Cheke employs these secondary types in a very primary way; the significance of the emphasis Cheke places upon them will be seen more clearly after the several types have been defined and illustrated.

Logical proof is the result of the rhetorician's power of proving "a truth or an apparent truth by means of

318 Rhet., I, iii, 1337.
the persuasive arguments suitable to the case in ques-
tion." Cheke gives each of his three main contentions a
slightly different logical treatment. The first, that re-
bellion is an offence against God and will be punished by
God, is presented obliquely during the twelve-page confutation which follows the elaboration of the proposition. Af-
ter setting out the charge (i.e., Aristotelian Proposition)
against the rebels ("Ye which be boudb by gods word ... haue cötrari to gods holy wyl ... and cötrari to y godly order
of quietness ..." A3, 12ff.) and enumerating the contentions
to be examined ("fyrst ..., next ..., thyrdly ..." A3V, 4ff.), Cheke "elaborates" the charge. What is actually his
intention here, however, is to slip into the matters to be
confuted without alerting the listener (even at this point
the atmosphere of the forum has been achieved). In this
way, with a swift maneuver he can finish off the points to
be confuted, i.e., the weapons of his opponents, before the
opponents realize they are being attacked. It is a force-
ful-- and I think victorious-- strategy, for it almost com-
pletely does away with whatever advantage the opponents
might have gained in having presented their charges first,

319 Rhet., I, ii, 1330. For use and definition of proofs,
cf. I, ii, xv, and passim.
320 As far as I can discover, neither the religious com-
plaints of the western rebels nor the economic complaints of
Ket's rebels were printed in an itemized form in the six-
teenth century, although John Fox's account of the western rebellion included a generalized statement of the religious complaints (Holinshed, Chronicles, III, 1009). There are two
and leaves the field open to Cheke's chosen artillery, his three major contentions against rebellion. The action is swift indeed; after the division of the contentions he does not even pause to begin a new sentence, but moves rapidly into the introduction to the confutation: "... and yet ye pretend that partelye for goddes cause, and partely for the commune welthes sake, ye do a ryse ..." (A3V, 12ff.). Then, apparently pausing to elaborate the proposition (note the new paragraph: A4,3), he again catches his opponent unawares. In a series of staccato interrogatives he approaches the first of the pretended causes of the rebellion: "Ye rise for religion. What religion taught you ?" (A4V,5ff.), and he continues to move rapidly from one religious "reason" to another by means of questions to the rebels, the answers to which, given by the speaker, provide arguments against the rebels' contentions. Each of the four religion-related de-

Other extant versions of the religious complaints, one in Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of Roman Jurisdiction, 3rd edition, III (London, 1902), 57, and another is printed by Nicholas Pocock from Royal MS. 18 B. xi, fol. 1-40, in Troubles Connected with the Prayer Book of 1549, pp. 141-93. Answers were drafted by Nicholas Udall, "Answer to the Commoners of Devonshire and Cornwall," first printed by Pocock in Troubles, pp. 141-93, and by Thomas Cranmer, "Answers to the Fifteen Articles of the Rebels, Devon ...," (printed in Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, pp. 163-87). Cranmer's answer, like Udall's, was not published at the time. Both writers invoke scriptural authority in these brief responses to demands for the restoration of Catholic usage. See explanatory notes for texts of complaints pertinent to Cheke's argument. The economic complaints of Ket's rebels were apparently not printed until Russell, Kett's Rebellion, where they are printed from MS Harleian 304, fo. 75.
mands which Cheke chooses to address ("ye wyll haue the old," "Ye wyll haue that the Cannons do estabyleshe," "You wold haue the bibles in agayne," "Ye thyncke it is not learnedlye done") is met with scriptural authority (A4v-A6), and by anticipating the rebels' objections to his own points, he is in the position of the fair-minded judge who is nonetheless unable to avoid pronouncing the inevitable and just conclusion: for all their complaints for religion's sake, the rebels really do not know the obvious answers which religion itself gives back to them: "Lerne, learne, to knowe this one pointe of religion, that God wylbe worshipped, as he hath prescribed, & not as we haue deuised . . ." (A6, 21ff.).

Then, having conclusively dealt with the religious causes, he moves confidently to the pretended social causes of the rebellion. The very specific economic complaints of the Norfolk rebels against property owners' practices are not taken up by Cheke, who chooses rather to address himself to the broader social issues. By means of the same method of rapid-fire questions and answers he probes the underlying questions of rule and social order, of wealth and equality, questioning in turn the motives and the logic of the rebels'


322 See above, p. 85, n. 261.
objections to rule and riches, and ending in a triumph of argument reductio ad absurdum: "If one be wiser the an oth-
er, wil ye banishe him because ye entēd ā equaliti of al thīges? . . . If one haue better vtteraunce then an other,
wyll ye pul out his tonge to saue your equalitie?" (Bl,
21ff.). He ends the section of confutation with another
reference to biblical authority: "He sayeth humble your
selues . . . and ye set vp your selues aboue the magistrates.
. . ." (B2, 12-B3,8).

Thus it is that when Cheke arrives at the end of his
confutation of the rebels' arguments and is ready to give
special confirmation to his first major contention-- that
rebellion is an offense against God and will be punished by
Him-- he is able to dispose of it in scarcely more than a
page, again briefly invoking scriptural authority. Since
all objections to the assertion have already been answered
(and usually by the same recourse to authority), the formal
presentation of the first point is effected by means of a
mere summary which acts simultaneously as a transition to
his second major point-- that rebellion is an unnatural of-
fense against the king. Three subpoints are to be made
here, each one linked to its predecessor as each of the
major contentions follows logically out of each other. The
first subpoint-- that rebellion breaks the stated law of
God regarding obedience to kings-- is a corollary to the
first main contention, and thus scriptural authority is
again invoked. But out of this follows a broader corollary to the first major contention: rebellion breaks the established natural (and unstated) law of God regarding universal order, i.e., hierarchy. Cheke seizes the occasion for a thorough-going amplification of the contention, here again employing a form of questioning, enhanced now with examples. As Aristotle describes the example, and as Cheke uses it, it is a "rhetorical induction," more convincing and clear than the Enthymeme (or "rhetorical syllogism"), "more readily learnt by the use of the senses,... applicable to the mass of men," and most appropriate to political oratory. Cheke most frequently employs what Wilson calls the "vne gall example," i.e., when the weaker is brought against the stronger. Aristotle specifically deals with the logical uses to which discussions of "relative utility" can be put, and in Cheke's employment of the unequal example, there is implicit what Aristotle terms "arguments about the Greatness and Smallness of things." Thus, in developing the notion of obligation to the written law, he draws the further conclusion of obligation to the unwritten natural law in an extended series of examples, all of which

323 Rhet., I, ii, 1330; i.e., Wilson's "Rogatio" (Arte of Rhet., p. 183).
324 Aristotle, Topics, in Basic Works, I, xii, 198.
325 Rhet., III, xvii, 1445.
326 Rhet., I, vii.
327 Rhet. II, xix, 1411-12.
reflect sound sixteenth-century doctrine. For instance: "If the members of our naturall bodie all folowe the head, shall not the members of the politicall bodie all obey the kynge? If good maners be cotent to giue place, the lower to the higher, shall not religion teache vs alway to geue place to the highest?" (B4, 17ff.). It is important to notice that this passage containing the two subpoints concerning written and unwritten law did not appear in the first 1549 edition, but was added to the second 1549 text, suggesting that Cheke considered the second-edition interpolation a rhetorically significant addition. It is the only change of any consequence in the later 1549 text.

The psychological power which the use of unequal examples lends the contention that rebellion is an unnatural offense against the king is reinforced with traditional assumptions and rhetorical conception to produce what is one of the most effective passages in the tract. The passage is richly humanistic, and it is important to consider here two uses which Cheke makes of the humanist's conception of Right Reason. By establishing himself not only as a man of reason but as an exponent of Reason, Cheke clearly appeals to the notion which individual men cherish of themselves, that they are right-thinking men, and he places the rebels in a position of self-condemnation:

329 See above, pp. 88-89; below pp. 318-21.
Who can persuade where treason is above reason, and might ruleth ryght, and it is had for lawful whatsoever is lustful, and comotioners be better than commissioners, and commune wo is named commune wealth. (B4V, 14ff.)

How unreasonable is it, he says, "to seeke against lawes to order lawes . . ., [to] thinke more libertie in wilfulnes, then wisedome in dutiefulnessse, and so runne headlonge not to the mischiefe of other, but to the destruction of your selues . . ." (B5, 3 ff.). To this he adds a catalogue of descriptive words which point the finger of unreasonableness at men who purport to be making a "reasonable" claim to the king: the rebels are lustful, unthrifty, wicked, unnatural, sturdy, wild, prideful. If reason and logic would prevail, "if authoritie woulde serue vnder a kynge, . . . if wisedome and grauitie might take place, . . . if knowledge of the commune wealthe could helpe, . . . yet [neither authority nor gravity nor knowledge] . . . can moue ye other to kepe you in the dutie ye ought to do, or to aduoide this great disorder wherin ye be" (B5V, 7ff.). Disorder equals illogical behavior:

... who is wisest be withstanded, the disobedientest obeid, the highe in authority not waied, y vskilfullest made chief captaines, to the noblest most hurte entended, the braggingest brawler to be moste safe. (B6, 8ff.)

Then in a flurry of metaphorical conceptions, Cheke overwhelms the "reasonable" opposition with graphic delineation of its unreasonable nature: the rebels' "mad rages" have led
them to "forsaking and brusting of quietnes"; their camps are like "bile in the bodie, naye lyke a synke in a towne"; the outrageous thirst of rebellion cannot be quenched except with the blood of true subjects; the rebels intend to "broile the comune wealth with the flame of theyr treason."

Finally, in an attempt to make his point felt in the most familiar terms, he combines the devices of unequal example, question, metaphor, and highly charged descriptive words in a vividly presented comparison of the rebels with madmen and beasts:

He that is miscontented & thinges that happeneth, & because he can not beare the miserie of them, renteth his hear, & teareth his skin, and mangleth his face which easeth not his sorrowe, but encreaseth his miserie, may he not be iustly called mad & phatastical, & worthy whose wisedome should be suspected, and what shall we saye of thē, who being in cōmune welth, feeling a sore gneuous vnto them, and easy to have ben amēded, sought not the remedie, but hathe increased the grief, & like franticke beastes raging against their head, doth teare and deface asmuch as lieth in thē, his whole authoritie in gouernment ....

(B7, 5ff.)

Cheke takes a rather dangerous chance here; he dares to suggest, if ever so passingly, that perhaps the rebels have some small degree of justice in their cause. His reason for introducing this fraction of recognition is clear; the suggestion of sympathy, slight though it is, wins greater attention from his audience. Then, at the moment when his listeners are convinced of his reasonableness, he turns that conviction to his positive gain by pursuing his comparison ("like franticke beastes raging against their
head \ldots") to show how a reasonable man must inevitably view rebellion: "And who sayling wel the heuines of the faute, may not iustlie saye and hold, them to be worse here-in the ani kinde of brute beastes" (B8, Iff.). Even you who may be sympathetic with this rebellion, Cheke is implying, must grant my logic. Having won this degree of sympathy from his antipathetic audience, it is the speaker's task to ensure the victory of his argument on this point by capitalizing upon the advantage gained. Cheke does this by pursuing the man-beast-madness comparison. In an extended unequal example which has reference to the everyday experience of the commoners he is addressing, he demonstrates the more-than-bestial madness of rebels who will not obey even as beasts: "You being not striken of your head, but fauored, not kept downe, but socoured, & remedied by lawe, haue vio­lētly againste lawe not only barked like beastes, but also bitten like hellhōūdes" (B8, I8ff.). The emotional impact of the entire passage is climaxed with the evocation of the very powers of hell.

The logical development of Cheke's second major contention is continued along lines similar to those just discussed as Cheke proceeds to his third subpoint— that rebellion offends the king by breaking specific laws of the commonwealth against the issuing of orders, robbery, imprisonment of the king's servants, murdie, pillage of cities. Questions, unequal examples, appeals to logic, and metaphor-
ical language are again used effectively: "If a vagabonde wolde do what him lust & cal him self your seruaüt, & execute such offices of trust, whether ye would or no, ... what wolde euery one of you saye or do herein?" (B9v,21dd.); "If ye tolde a priuate message in an other mans name, ca it be but a false lie I prai ye? And to tel a fained message to y commun weth, & that frō y king, ca it be honest thinke ye?" (B10, 12ff.); "how ca you otherwise iudge of it ...? (B10, 22ff.); the body "is the true vessel of the mynd ..." (C3, 3ff.). Once more Cheke takes the opportunity to amplify a point along humanistic lines of thought (C2v,1-C4,11), indeed making a digression on liberty which again woos the rebels' sympathies only to force them into a position of self-condemnation. This section contains a second digression (what Wilson calls swerving from the matter to serve the purpose), this to praise "faithful" cities, and thus censurse "white lyuerid" ones, taking the occasion also to declare the virtues of a dead hero in order to heighten the heinousness of the living villains (C8v,18-D2, 23). The effect of both digressions is to make more immediate and personally felt the grievous and hurtful nature of sedition, providing a subtle transitional device to the third and most important major contention.

There is considerable indication that Cheke's final contention-- that rebellion troubles miserably the whole

330 Arte of Rhet., p. 181.
commonwealth-- is for the treatise the crucial argument. It is given focal attention by its length (half the treatise) and by its final position. Cheke's general practice is to proceed from points of lesser to greater importance, thereby leaving the reader with the most powerful and persuasive arguments ringing in his ears. In addition, this argument is prefaced by a brief summary of the points so far covered and by an exhortation to repentance and restoration of peace. In this regard it is important to note Aristotle's assertion that "all advice to do things or not to do them is concerned with happiness and with things that make for or against it." As a political orator Cheke's obligation is to deal with the expediency of a measure in terms of happiness; the hurtfulness of sedition must be his primary focus. Thus the title of the treatise, rather than focusing upon the wickedness or illegality of sedition, clearly emphasizes its hurtfulness. A great variety of support is introduced to establish this final contention. As in the former arguments, Cheke's favorite devices of question and example predominate. But while the other arguments had been purposed to show that rebellion is counter to authority and law (essentially abstract "goods"), his final effort is to demonstrate how rebellion is counter to self-interest (very familiar and tangible "goods"). While Cheke has previously appealed to reason and logic, the strength of the earlier
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arguments is chiefly in his use of authority and suggestions of traditional doctrinal premises. Now he bases the argument itself upon common sense, and he appeals almost entirely, in his logical proof, to pragmatic tests of values.

The logical proof for the third and last major contention is made up of two assertions about the inexpediency of rebellion: Rebellion troubles miserably the whole commonwealth first by producing major evils and secondly by hindering or harming good things presently possessed. Here again the logical process of the rhetoric reflects Aristotle's suggestion that the discussion of utility include the complementary questions of the acquisition of bad and the removal of good. But underlying these assertions is a political "logic" which is the key to The hurt of sedition and to Cheke's essentially pragmatic political position. Nowhere does he systematically set out a political philosophy, but throughout the treatise and particularly in the development of his third argument against rebellion, Cheke's assertions provide a substance from which his pragmatist's logic can be inferred. Paraphrased that logic is this: Non-destructive means to individual well-being are to be sought by all men. But individual well-being is impossible without political well-being, and political well-being is possible only through order. Therefore, order is the means to individual well-being, and should be sought. In other
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There is no individual well-being without political well-being and there is no political well-being without order; therefore the individual must seek well-being through order. Rebellion produces political chaos and cannot therefore produce individual well-being. Rebellion is to be avoided, in fact, because out of the political chaos which it brings about come innumerable evils to the individual. Thus it is that Cheke's third argument against rebellion is based on an appeal to self-interest, at the level of survival, however, rather than cupidity.

It is essential to note, before proceeding to a discussion of specific proofs, that in Cheke's underlying logic, order is not an end in itself but a means to an end. He can thus take a liberal position regarding the traditional concept of a fixed social hierarchy and yet remain firmly conservative regarding the necessity of order for political well-being. He can implicitly disavow the notion of an inflexible social order and at the same time insist upon the maintenance of political order. In behalf of the latter position he employs the traditional metaphor of the "body politic" (E6V, 20ff.) which clearly demonstrates the mutual dependence for survival of all the parts. However, Cheke's use of the metaphor does not presuppose a static or inflexible order. There is room within Cheke's concept of order for the advancement of the hard-working, godly individual who is not satisfied with his low lot. True it is that
poverty and wealth are divinely ordained, but God also provides for change. As God chooses some men to rule and some to obey (A7, 19ff.), He chooses some to be rich and some to be poor (A8V, 14ff.). But God's reasons are mysterious (A8V, 18ff.) and wealth does not necessarily mean God is smiling on a man; God gives wealth to the wicked "for the heapyng vp of their dānācīon" (A8V, 20). Nor does the possession of wealth indicate that a man is to have it permanently; God may "pluckle downe the riche, to this state of pouertie, to shew his power, as he disposeth to order them" (B1, 9ff.). Poverty is likewise assigned to men by God's wisdom (B1, 5ff.) and God may, at will, change the material estate of poor men "and set thē aloft whē he listeth, for such cause as to him semeth" (B1, 7ff.). Thus, although all is as God planned and may not be forcibly changed by man, if God wills it, a man may by labor rise to a materially higher estate.

Labor maintains the commonwealth (A8V, 2ff.), Cheke asserts. The hope of advancement is the incentive to labor (A8, 18ff.; A8V, 4ff.), and it is not an empty hope since through labor "many meane mēs childrē cōmēth vp" (A8V, 7ff.). If a man has wearied of poverty, he need not be resigned, for there is this readily available and godly way to rise (B2, 4ff.). But it is the way of labor and humility, not rebelliousness (B2, 4ff.). Rebellion, inherently offensive to God, can never provide the means to a better life. But, God granting it, labor and humility, orderly and God-approved means, may
result in coming "honestly vp," may "rightly" bring an aspiring man to his desire for enrichment. If this is ever to be, however, if indeed the commonwealth is to survive, cooperation from all sides is necessary. The lesson regarding the importance of order and brotherly dependence, although in this instance it is taught to the commoners, is applicable to all sides (F6V, 4ff.). Similarly was the Fifth Commandment interpreted in The Institution of the Christen man:

> And although this commandement make express mention onely of the chyldren or inferyours to their parentes and superiours; yet in the same is also understood & comprised the office and dutie of the parentes & superiours agayne vnto theyr chyldren and inferiours.333

Excess of selfishness on any side must be controlled (E6V, 24ff.).

With Cheke's underlying logic before us, we may proceed to an examination of the logical proofs of his third and last major contention-- that rebellion troubles miserably the whole commonwealth, first by producing major evils and secondly by hindering or harming presently possessed goods. The first subpoint is divided into separate discussions of the five major evils produced by rebellion; in order of increasing evilness and necessary causal relationship: dearth, death, destruction, idleness, disorder. The discussion is kept simple and always in terms of experience immediately significant to the audience. Sentences are fre-
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quently short; maxims and earthy philosophy, detailed description and metaphor are employed to advantage. Thus he asserts: "Barnes be poore mens storehouses, wherein lieth a greate parte of euerie mans owne liuing . . ." (D4V, lff.);
"Haye is gone, corne is wasted, strawe is spoiled, what rekeninge of herueste canne ye make, other for thaid of others, or for the relief of your selues?" (D5V, 7ff.);
"the storme of famine, where of ye most lickely must haue the greatest parte" (D6V, 7ff.); "Experience teacheth vs that after a greate dearthe coeth a greate death . . ." (D6V, l1ff.); "Worke is vndone at home, and loiterers linge in stretes, lurk in ale houses, range in highwaies, valiaunte beggers play in tounes . . ." (E5, l1ff.); "What is a loyteror, a sucker of honie, a spoyler of corne, a destroyer of fruite? Nay a waster of money, a spoyler of vitaile, a sucker of bloud, a breaker of orders, a seeker of brekes, a queller of life, a basiliske of the comune wealthe, whiche by companie and syght doth poyson the whole contrey, and staineth honeste mindes with the infection of his venime . . ." (E5V, 6ff.); "Do we not euidently know, that a man mai better kepe his arme or his legge frome breaking or fallynge out of ioynt, afore hurt come to it, then after e y hurt it may safely & quietely be healed, and restored to e y former strength & health again" (E7V, 4ff.).

The second subpoint of the final contention is a corollary to the first: not only is the commonwealth
troubled miserably by the major evils produced by rebellion, but those good things previously possessed by the commonwealth are hindered or manifestly harmed. Here again Cheke appeals to the individual right-thinking man; implicit again is the suggestion that the rebels are, under their garb of error, honest men who value justice, friends, truth, freedom, and their good names; and moreover they are potentially loyal Englishmen who would, if their reason were not disturbed, value for the commonwealth's sake order at home and prestige and power abroad. The effect once more is to gain the sympathy and attention of the audience before turning the logic of the argument against it, to the destruction of its pretended claims. He addresses himself to "those commodities, whiche ye thought to haue holpen your selues and others by" (E8, 17ff.) which by means of rebellion "be not onely hindered, but also hurt ther by" (E8, 19ff.). The first of the commodities to be dealt with is justice, which in this case involves the amelioration of social conditions. Thus again he risks tacit acknowledgment of a degree of justice in the rebels' ends, in order to condemn categorically, and in terms of their own values, the means which they have chosen to achieve what they consider "good" for themselves and the commonwealth. "The Kynges maiestie by thaduise, et. cet. entended a iuste reformation of all suche thynges as poore men coulde truely shewe them selues oppressed with, thinking equalitie of justice, to be the diademe of his
kingdome, and the safegard of his comunes" (E8, 21ff.). The rebels acted "leste wicked men should be wealthy, and they whose hartes be not truly bent to obedience, shoulde obteine at the Kinges hand that thei deserued not in a comune wealth . . ." (E8v, 24ff.). They have rebelled in order to heal a social sore. The metaphor of the bad surgeon who heals only superficially while the deep wound festers and grows (F2, 7ff.) is the central figure in this passage dealing with social amelioration, and it is revealingly symbolic of Cheke's double vision toward the problem--his understanding of the commoners' predicament and his profound belief in the impracticability of rebellion as a solution. Cheke did not choose to address directly any of the specific economic complaints voiced by the northern rebels, but there is, among articles concerned with rents, taxes, and common lands, one which is remarkable, not as a particular request but as the fundamental human plea at the heart of the civil strife: "We pray thatt all bonde men may be made ffre for god made all ffre wt his precious blode sheddyng."334 Re­belling and unrebelling commoners, and I think Cheke no less, must have responded to that "iron string." The bad surgeon-deep wound-ill remedy metaphor is the symbolic core of The hurt of sedition, and in his employment of this figure Cheke gives significant expression to what he recognizes

334 Article #16, "Complaints of the Northern Rebels," in Russell, p. 51.
as the very real complexity of the rebellion. 335

But although the sore may indeed exist, although the men against whom the rebellion was directed might indeed be evil, the rebellion is even more evil and a worse sore (F4v, 13ff.), and while individuals may have broken the king's laws by, for instance, illegally enclosing common land, it is not for private men to take into their own hands the enforcement of the law and the punishment of the offenders.

335 Hugh Latimer similarly saw the problem of rebellion as no simple one-sided issue, and in a sermon before Edward VI he placed a great part of the cause of rebellion squarely on the covetousness of the gentlemen: "Covetousness was the cause of rebellion this last summer [1549]; and both parties had covetousness, as well the gentlemen as the commons .... The commons thought they had a right to the things that they inordinately sought to have. But what then? They must not come to it that way. Now on the other side, the gentlemen had a desire to keep that they had, and so they rebelled too against the king's commandment, and against such good order as he and his council would have set in the realm. And thus both parties had covetousness, and both parties did rebel. I heard say that there were godly ordinances devised for the redress of it. But the giants [gentlemen] would none of it in no sauce. I remember mine ownself a certain giant, a great man, who sat in commission about such matters; and when the townsmen should bring in what had been inclosed, he frowned and chafed, and so near looked, and threatened the poor men, that they durst not ask their right .... They in Christ are equal with you. Peers of the realm must needs be. The poorest ploughman is in Christ equal with the greatest prince that is. Let them, therefore, have sufficient to maintain them, and to find them their necessaries .... Therefore, for God's love, restore their sufficient unto them, and search no more what is the cause of rebellion. But see and 'beware of covetousness'; for covetousness is the cause of rebellion" (from "The Last Sermon Preached before King Edward the Sixth ... 1550," in Sermons by Hugh Latimer, with introduction by Canon Beaching [London: Everyman Library, 1906], pp. 213-15). See, in addition, Allen Chester, Hugh Latimer: Apostle of the English (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1954), pp. 164-74.
The question is, as Aristotle suggests, one of relative utility. The rebels, as self-appointed law enforcers, do not ameliorate social conditions, but rather add immeasurably to the chaos they seek to remedy. Illegal and hurtful means can in no way be justified by virtuous ends. And when high aims are sought to the accompaniment not only of false and unlawful measures but with the destruction of present goods as well, only madmen could continue to pursue the tainted goal. Thus Cheke may refer with impunity to the seed of justice at the heart of the rebels' cause because he can turn their plea for justice against them. He does not hesitate to make several passing references to "the Kinges maiestie's promised reformation" (that is, the measures taken by Somerset's government to investigate enclosures), implying that had the rebels not taken the law into their own hands, their grievances would have been liberally and swiftly attended to by beneficent magistrates. The destructiveness of rebellion serves well to draw attention away from the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of the governmental measures. Cheke agilely turns the best of his antagonists' defense to his own purpose. But in this regard it is of the greatest significance that he does not once presume to discuss explicitly the fundamental justice of the rebels' claims against the enclosing aristocracy, what his fellow-Protestant theologian John Hooper referred to as "the
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marvellous tyranny of the nobility." Cheke carefully avoids overt discussion of a provocation which he might well find impossible to defend. He is supported in his avoidance by Aristotle's assertion that "the political or deliberative orator's aim is utility: deliberation seeks to determine not ends but the means to ends, i.e. what is most useful to do." Thus he chooses in his treatise to focus upon the hurtfulness of the means taken, subordinating, as Aristotle earlier recommends, the question of the justice of ends which he could not altogether disclaim. It is the more tribute to his consummate skill as orator that he could deftly turn to his own advantage the most appealing of the rebels' positions.

The second commodity which the rebels' bad timing and wrong doing have harmed is friendship, or more correctly, the body of friends. Here Cheke briefly but openly refers to enclosures: "In eueri quarter some men whom ye set by wil be loste, whiche euerye one of you if ye haue loue in ye, would rather haue lacked the profite of your enclosures, then

337 See Hooper quotation above, pp. 84-85. Cf. William Thomas' discourse for the king's use, "Whether it is better for the commonwealth, that the power be in the nobility or in the community," in Ecc. Mem., II, part 2, 372-77, especially Thomas' remark that "it hath been often seen by experience, that through the covetousness of the nobility the commons have been oppressed; so that for disordinate appetites of the few, the multitude hath suffered . . ." (p.375). Cf. Latimer's sermon above, p. 130, n. 335; Thomas Lever, Sermons 1550, ed. Edward Arbor (London: English Reprints, 1895), p. 32.
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cause suche destruction of them, as is lyke by reason and
judgement necessarily to folowe" (F2V, llff.). Again he
uses the image of the wound and the evil remedy (F3, 2ff.).
Again he refers to the "entended reformation," now adding
to the list of hindered commodities the true reformation of
religion: "The kinges maiestie, &c. hath godly reformed an
uncleane parte of religion, & hath brought it to true
forme of the first churche that folowed Christe, thinking
that to be the trueste, not what later mens phansies hath
of them selues deuised, but what thapostles and their fel­
owes had at Christes hande receiued, and willeth the same
to be knowne and set abrode to al his people" (F3, 15ff.).
The Protestant reformation zeal of Cheke and the government
with which he is associated is obvious here.

Once more
the problem of means and ends is addressed: "Nay thoughhe
the thinge were very godlie that were done, yet the person
must nedes do yl that enterpriseth it, because he doth a
good thing after an il sort, and loketh but on a little
parte of dutie considering the thinge, & leaueth a great
parte vnaduised . . ." (F3V, 5ff.). But in this rebellion
not only means and ends are twisted with evil, but occa­sion,
cause, and agent as well (F3, 19ff.), and thus is true
religious reformation hindered, increasing the pernicious­
ness of rebellion. This point is dealt with briefly here,
for it is to be reiterated in stronger terms at the conclusion of the discussion of the third and last major contention, with which we are presently concerned, i.e., the hurtfulness of sedition to the commonwealth.

The next hindered commodities which Cheke discusses are freedom and good will. The rebels, in seeking a "better" existence by means of rebellion, have not enhanced their lives with more liberty, but brought upon themselves and other restrictions of what freedom they already possessed.

Cheke conceived of bodily freedom as prized possession: "what be goodes in comparison of helth, libertie, & strēgthe, which be al settled and fastened in the body" (C3, 10ff.). Repeatedly he asserts his attitude toward the body as a precious thing: "Mens bodies oughte to be free from all mens bondage and crueltie" (C2V, 14ff.); the body is "euery liuyng mans treasure" (C3, 1) which is "the true vessell of the mynd to be measurably kept of euery man, for al exercises and services of the minde" (C3, 3ff.). Of all earthly things, there is none more precious than bodily well being—"helth, libertie, & strēgthe." Thus the rebels, having brought down the martial law upon themselves and others through their disorder, have lost one of their most dear possessions, bodily freedom, without which they cannot hope peaceably to pursue a good or better life.

Thus it is that Cheke can point to rebellion as a hindrance to freedom and be assured that he is again striking
at one of the most honored virtues in the rebels' scheme of things, indeed at the heart of that scheme ("pray that all bonde men may be made ffre ... "). And good will is a means with which freedom is achieved; it is a commodity which is as important to the common man as is money, for it too can make opportunity for advancement: "And seinge ye be lesse able by money & liberalitie, to deserue good wil then other be, & your only kinde of deserts is to shew good wil, which honest mē do wel accepthe asemuch worth as money, haue ye not much hindred & hurt your selfe hereI, losing τ kinde of humanitie which ye haue only left & turning it in to cruelti, which ye ought moost to abhorre ..." (F7, 5ff.). Cheke uses this discussion of the value of good behavior as a means to good favor as another opportunity to set forth his view of vertical progress within the social order. The rebels, seeking to throw off a yoke of bondage, have secured further yokes by provoking the government to the use of martial law, but more importantly by losing the good will of their ruler and by making the gentlemen seem more trust-worthy "because the comunes be vntrustye" (F5V, 9ff.). Had the commons been wise, they would have attempted to implement to their own good the force of the social order: if "the kingses best kind of gouernmēt is so to rule his sub- iectes, as a father ordreth his children, and beste life of obedient subiectes is one to behaue hismēlfe to an other,

See above, p. 129.
as though they were brethren under the kynge their father" (F6, 23ff.), then the wise younger members of the family will seek not only the favor of the father but of the elder members as well who, after the father, are most able to assist less powerful or less important individuals: "To seeke them both with honestie is wisdome, to lose them both by sellennes is madnes" (F7, 7ff.). "But and we being wery of pouertie, would seke to enriche our selues, we should go a far other way to work the this ..." (B2, 4ff.). The right way to advancement is not rebellion, but humility before God and good will toward man (B2, 8ff.).

Thus Cheke proceeds with his logical argument regarding the "inward griefs" which rebellion brings upon the commonwealth. Before concluding this section treating generally with the grievous nature of rebellion, Cheke turns to the "outward griefs" produced by sedition, dealing first with the loss of English prestige abroad as foreign powers see the English king and council disregarded by the commons, and then with the loss of opportunity abroad, the sapping by civil disruption of military strength necessary both for aggression and defence against foreign nations. The appeal here is clearly to nationalistic feelings which, throughout, Cheke assumes the rebels to possess. But it is not now mixed with an appeal to the particular personal pride and value which had hitherto been made; rather now he draws almost entirely upon the unconscious and unnamed social com-
mitment, "the most powerful psychological current of the time," as A. L. Rowse has described it.\footnote{342 See Rowse quotation above, pp. 82-83.} That this evaluation is accurate is, I think, confirmed by Cheke's placing of his appeal to national pride. The whole of the concluding section of this third and last argument is designed to call up nationalistic responses, not only in political but in religious matters as well. The logical argument is premised upon the assumption that sedition (and at this crucial point Cheke defines it) "is the sickenes of a comune wealthe, which is febled and fainted with breach of dissentio, not able to weld her wealthe by breakyng of her limmes, & easelyste takē when it is miserablieste sicke" (G5, 21ff.). Thus at the heart of the grievousness of rebellion is the weakening of national strength. The loss of prestige and opportunity abroad is worsened by the state of vulnerability into which the country is thrown by civil disorder. And not only foreign powers eager for merely political gain, such as France in this instance, are aided by the rebels' action, but even more importantly the domestic strife plays into the hands of Rome and the Pope, who would dominate the spiritual as well as the material life of England. Cheke continues to use such logical devices as inductive examples: "If thei which lie like spials, & herkē after liklihodes of thinges to come, because they declare opportunitie of tymes to thenemie, are to be iudged comune enemies
of the contrei, what shall we reasonably thinke of you, who
do not secretly bewraie $^5$ counsels of other, but openly be-
traie the comune wealth with your owne deedes, and haue as
muche as lieth in you, sought the ouerthrowe of it at home
..." (G6, 1ff.). But such logical development of the con-
tention that rebellion is grievous to the commonwealth by
hindering national progress and strength serves as a frame
for the more important emotional appeals which give the
final force to the treatise. Thus, as we shall see, he
loads this section with highly charged words appealing to
national pride while he introduces the logical examples of
France, Scotland, and Rome to illustrate the political in-
expediency of rebellion. Then too, in treating specifically
the religious losses incurred by the commonwealth, he ac-
companies examples from biblical and church history with
evocative references to the devil himself.

Thus Cheke presents logically his three major argu-
ments. He proceeds to his conclusion, employing logical
proof as he now more fully defines sedition by contrasting
it with concord and with other hurts: "For even as concord
is not only $^9$ health, but also the strength of the realme,
so is sedition not only the weaknes, but also thaposteme of
the realme .... For it is not in sedition as in other
fautes which being mischeuous of them selues, have some
notable hurt alwaies fast adioyned to them, but in this one
is there a whole hel of fautes . . ." (H1v, 10ff.). Then,
after presenting a catalogue of the "whole hel of fautes,"
which serves here as a partial recapitulation of the hurts
of sedition, he specifically "compares" rebellion with war:

As for warre although it be miserable, yet one part getteth somewhat, & rejoyseth in the spoile, and so goeth lustier away, and other encreaseth his contrey with riches, or enhaunseth him self w glori, but in seditio both the partes loseth, the ouercômed can not flie, the ouercômer can not spoile, more the winner winneth, the more he loseth, the more that escape, the more infamous men lyue, al that is gained is scasely saued, the winning is losse, the losse is destruction, bothe waste themselves, & the whole most wasted, the strêghthening of them selues, the descale of the contrey, the striuing for the victorie, is a praye to thenimie, and shortly to saye, hellishe turmoile of sedition, so far passeth comune miserie of war, as to sleye himselfe is more heinous then to be slaine of an other. (H2, 21ff.)

The use of unequal examples here, climaxed with a comparison with analogous unequal examples, is a triumph of logical proof for rhetorical effect. To this Cheke adds a persuasive pièce de résistance in the form of an apostrophe to Peace which is an overwhelming condemnation of disorder, making the understanding of the hurt of rebellion more painful by praising the virtues of a lost state of bliss:

O noble peace, what wealth bringest in, how doth all thinges florishe in feld and in towne, what forwardnes of religion, what encrease of learninge, what grauitie in counsell, what deuise of witte, what order of maners, what obedience of lawes, what reuerence of states, what suagearde of houses, what quietnes of life, what honor of contrys, what frendship of mindes, what honestie of pleasure, haste thou alwaies mainteined, whose happines we knewe not while now we feele the lacke, and shall learne by misery, to understond plentie, and so to auoide
If persuasive argument is the essence of logical proof, this apostrophe is the climax of Cheke's entire logical attack.

Aristotle states that the orator, in his epilogue, must accomplish four things: he must make his audience well disposed to himself and ill-disposed to the opponent, magnify the leading facts, excite the required state of emotion in the hearers, and refresh their memories. Thus the condemnation of rebellion and the praise of peace psychologically aligns the audience with the speaker, as well as excites in the hearers an emotional state ripe for a plea for reform. Having gained these points, Cheke swiftly recapitulates his arguments and musters the leading facts which damn the rebels (H3V, Iff.). The emotional appeal reinforces the logical reiteration to the end: the rehearsal of the devastations of rebellion is followed fast by a plea to pity and reasonability (H3V, 19ff.), and this in turn is followed by the ominous concluding statement appealing to fear by reminding the rebels that they have not only made God, king, and countrymen angry with them, but that the forces of good are assembled to bring about the destruction of all seditious men (H4, 20ff.).

This, then, is Cheke's logical treatment of the trea-

---
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tise's proposition that contrary to God's will and the godly order of quiet, disobedient men have seditiously and hurtfully taken justice into their own hands for the reformation of pretended injuries. His three major arguments, as we have seen, develop specific contentions and assert successively that rebellion is wicked, illegal, and destructive. The thesis of the treatise--that rebellion is hurtful, as past experience shows, and ought not to be pursued in the future--is first given oblique logical presentation in the confutation, and next in the subsequent confirmation of the first two major arguments; then Cheke turns the full strength of his logical powers to an explicit treatment of inexpediency to which he devotes the latter half of his treatise. The nature of Cheke's method makes it impossible, as we have seen, neatly to separate logical proofs from other devices available to the rhetorician. An examination of Cheke's pathetic proofs--those which stir the emotions of his hearers--may be continued now from the suggestions already made that Cheke is constantly aware of psychological effect; in addition, many of the illustrations above have suggested the kinds of appeals which Cheke repeatedly makes to win his audience to his cause.

In his exordium Cheke's first sentences set the emotional tone and attitude to be taken toward order and, by implication, toward disorder, i.e., gratitude to God and aloofness from the contaminating influence of rebels, who
should in their turn feel deep shame, isolation, and fear. On the side of virtue are such concepts as liberality, grace, benefit, quiet, joy, mercy, justice, thankfulness, learning, truth, faithfulness, honesty, duty, with several allusions to brotherly love, national fellow-feeling, and national obligation; on the rebels' side are misery, disorder, conspiracy, beastliness, vice, wickedness, filth, abhorrence, lamentation, overthrow, hurt, mischief, rage, heinousness, grievousness, horribleness. Then he appeals to reason, to Christian duty and conscience, to fear of punishment, to recognition of the godly order of quiet. Most noteworthy here is the pathetic proof with which Cheke envelopes the charge against the rebels (italics of charged words are mine):

In the whyche doynge, ye haue fyrst fauted greuously agaynst God, next offeded unnaturally our Souereigne Lorde, thyrdly troubled miserably the hole commune wealth, vndone cruelly many an honest mä, and broughte in an vttre misere both to vs the kynes Subiectes, & to youre selues beynge false rebelles, and yet ye pretende that partelye for goddes cause, and partely for the commune welthes sake, ye do a ryse, when as your selues cannot deny, but ye that seke in word goddes cause, do breake in dede goddes cammaide-ment, and ye that seke the commune welth, haue destroyed the commune welth, and so ye marre, that ye woulde make, and breake that ye would amend, because ye neyther seke anye thynge ryghtly, nor woulde amende anye thynge orderly.  
(A3v, 4ff.)

Love of God, king, commonwealth; rectitude, naturalness, decency, honesty, shame, honor, pride-- all of these emotions are appealed to here. Note too that the reiteration of the
notion of pretended injuries and wrong-headedness in the careful juxtaposition of phrases in this passage: "seke in word," "breake in dede"; "seke," "destroyed"; "marre," "woulde make"; "breake," "would amend"; "neyther seke ... ryghtly," "nor woulde amende ... orderly."

An examination of almost any passage of the tract will support the assertion that Cheke found in pathetic proof a most powerful weapon and, in addition, the perfect vehicle for his pedagogical bent with an audience not easy to instruct. Aristotle taught that logical argument should be based on facts and "received opinions"; in his logical presentation Cheke could count heavily upon traditional assumptions regarding order, obedience, unwritten law, and even national obligations. But inseparable from the "factual" status of such opinions was their emotional force, and Cheke employed them for both logical and pathetic effect, as we have seen. Again, Aristotle had noted that "argument based on knowledge implies instruction, and there are people whom one cannot instruct. Here, then, we must use, as our modes of persuasion and argument, notions possessed by everybody ... ." To such notions-- concepts of honor, justice, friendship, duty, freedom, i.e., the good life-- Cheke could make subtle pathetic appeals. And finally there were, again as Aristotle described them, the fundamental
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human emotions such as fear, pity, and shame to which the orator could turn for his most assured emotional responses. It is interesting to note, however, that this last and baser source is least frequently tapped by Cheke, and that his appeals are predominantly to the higher emotional involvements and commitments such as love of country, peace, fellowman, justice, freedom, order. Cheke's discretion in this regard reveals in him that highest of the good orator's virtues, about which Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero are unanimous: the good orator is, finally, the good man, motivated to speech by high moral principle which not only commits him to a high cause, but directs "with integrity and supreme wisdom," as Tully said, his verbal power to enchant the soul. 347

Everywhere in The hurt of sedition pathetic proofs abound. Point after point is couched in highly charged connotative language which is clearly calculated to move for Cheke and against his rebellious adversaries. We have only to review some of Cheke's positions to understand the importance of pathetic proofs in his arguments: He plays upon the commoners' desire to be thought of as reasonable and just men, dutiful servants and ambitious laborers, responsible family men, and loving friends. He appeals to their belief in Biblical and English law and to the emotions of

347 Cf. Plato, Phaedrus, pp. 276-77; Aristotle, Rhet., I, i, 1328; Cicero, De Oratore, II, 45.
fear and shame at having misused both. He calls upon them as lovers of justice and independence and appeals to their hatred of overweeningness and irresponsibility in other men. Reminding the rebels of their loss of good will, he appeals to class jealousy; invoking the threat of legal and spiritual punishment, he appeals to fear; pointing to the sufferings of innocents, he appeals to pity; and placing the whole burden of the waste and pain of rebellion upon their shoulders, he appeals to shame. "Received opinions" such as the belief in hierarchical order or scriptural revelation serve, as has been suggested, as props to logic, but they carry as well a substantial emotional load which Cheke directs in behalf of his position. As we have seen, he tacitly concedes all element of justice in the rebels' cause; it is their method that he chiefly condemns. Similarly he lauds liberty, and decries the rebels' infringements of it. He never goes far in his logical argument without reiterating the relationship of rebellion to the powers of hell-- to irrationality, the Pope, indeed Satan himself-- to all things anti-Reformation, anti-English, or against quiet and order.

Thus Cheke appeals to a belief that is most unshakably fixed in the mind of his audience-- the belief in order for the sake of the good life. But Cheke's readers, like many who believe in a principle, while they insist on its unqualified application to the lives of others, nonetheless exempt themselves from those restrictions which would
obstruct their own activities. It is Cheke's task, there­fore, to identify so thoroughly the good of the commons with the good of the commonwealth, that the rebels will be ob­liged to acknowledge the evil of rebellion. Indeed, he must implicitly identify the good of the commons with all good, with all national virtues and favors, and ultimately with God. Thus shot through the entire treatise, including the first two contentions which deal explicitly with the wicked and illegal nature of rebellion, are appeals to the self­interests of his audience. The mad rages that offend God and the king plague most of all the rebels' own good. Thus he seeks to show that not only does rebellion break God's law, but it alienates God's love (E2V, 9ff.); not only does it break the law of the commonwealth, it hinders the prog­ress of the law for the good of the commons and loses the king's good will (E8, 21ff.; F5V, 8ff.). As we have seen, the ills which have befallen the commonwealth are placed as a burden upon the rebels' conscience, but they are shown also to be a blight to the rebels' interests. Who can be so unconscious of his own good as to deny that rebellion has hindered that good? Who finally cannot praise and de­sire that richness and abundance provided only by "noble Peace"?

Cheke concludes his treatise with a summary recapit­ulation of pathetic proofs. Specifically, he appeals to pity: "Wherfore for gods sake haue pitie on your selues ... ,
& if for desperatenes, ye care not for your selues, yet re-
membre your wyves, your children, your contrey ... (H3V, 19ff.; italics mine). He then calls upon the rebels' sense
of duty: "with humble submission, acknoweledge your fautes,
and tary not thextremitie of the kinges swerde, leaue of repentaunce & turne to your duties, aske God forseuenes,
submitte ye to your kyng ... (H4, 2ff.). He appeals to
their pride and its shame with a generously proferred ex-
cuse: "declare your doinges to procede of no stubburnes, but al this mischiefe to growe out of ignoraunce" (H4, 13ff.).
Then, having made his final appeal to the rebels' best sense
of themselves, he evokes their fears of God, king, and com-
monwealth in the concluding threat, significantly climaxing
the treatise on a note of self-interest: "the shame of your mischiefe to blemishe ye for euer" (H4V, 9ff.).

The third and last kind of artistic proof—ethical
proof which is the result of the speaker's power of evincing
a personal character which will make his speech credible—Cheke uses quite consciously, though less conspicuously than pathetic proof. Aristotle says that the speaker's charac-
ter, as it is revealed in his speech, "may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion." It is Cheke's
constant endeavor to impress himself favorably upon his au-
dience so that, in turn, his plea will be accepted as part of his own ethical personality. Thus he identifies himself
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with some of the fundamental beliefs held by those whom he is seeking to persuade. We have noted in Cheke's selection of pathetic proof the beliefs and emotions which he can be assured are those of his audience. Thus, as we have seen, he indicates in the argument that his emotions are not infrequently one with the rebels: love of justice and truth; hatred of men pleasers, irresponsibility, and sloth; belief in the honor of labor and in labor as a means to opportunity; commitment to the interests of the commonwealth and to God's commands. At the same time he explicitly dissociates himself from lawlessness, rashness, and vulgar reasoning.

To the contrary, in his introductory remarks, he thoroughly establishes himself as a spokesman for law and order: "we haue by hys grace, kepte vs quiet from rebellion . . . we see suche miseries, hange ouer thole state of commune welth, thoroughe the great misorder of youre sedition, that it maketh vs muche to rejoyce, that we haue been, nother partners to youre doynges, nor conspirers of your coun-celles . . . . God lyke a merciful father, stayed vs frō your wyckednes. . . we myghte iustly for offīce, abhorre you like rebelles, whom elles by nature, we loue lyke Englishe men. And so for oure selues, we haue greate cause to thank God . . ." etc. (A2-A3,12; italics mine). He associates himself with all God-loving, God-fearing men; with men of conscience, loyalty, and duty. The title-page decoration implies an official royal endorsement of the speaker, and
the title itself asserts his commitment to the commonwealth's cause. Through numerous references to English law and Biblical authority, he shows himself to be learned, and knowledgeable in those areas which the rebels have chosen to contest. He condemns irrationality and aligns himself with all men of Right Reason; his logical argument speaks for his wit and wisdom, and its tone of righteous indignation reinforces his explicit alliance with all right-thinking men. At the same time he can also be assured of winning the ear and favor of his audience by an appearance of modesty: he shows himself humble before God, a servant of God and king, indeed of Reason. He does not flaunt his authority or his learning, although it should be clear to his audience that he could. His simple language presents him as a plain-spoken man. He may gain as well the rebels' respect by indicating his understanding of economic and political reality, and he would surely win their sympathy by his familiarity with the commonplaces of the common man's existence—with crops, weather, animals, sickness, etc. And most importantly, he demonstrates throughout the treatise that it is the good of the commonwealth that he has in mind, that his entire effort is for the sake of the rebels' salvation, their return to reason and prosperity.

The non-artistic proofs that Cheke employs—i.e., a proof that is not invented by the rhetorician and does not
strictly belong to the art of rhetoric— are laws and witnesses or authorities. As we have seen, Cheke's logical presentation of his first two major contentions is achieved by means of extensive reference to particular and universal law, laws of the commonwealth and of God. The references to national and Biblical laws are very general, Cheke undoubtedly assuming in his audience a spontaneous emotional response to the mere authoritative reference to these traditions. Perhaps in addition he could assume among the more intelligent rebels a passing if haphazard acquaintance with those traditions. On the other hand, Cheke employs a number of specific witnesses or authorities in addition to the general appeals to institutions in variations of the argumentum ad verecundiam which have already been noted. Cheke's authorities are almost exclusively Biblical, although in his introduction he alludes to the history of Sparta, which, except for a metaphorical use of a mythical allusion, is the classical scholar's only specific employment of his erudition. The Biblical authorities which he names are St. Paul, Jeremiah, Christ, "the Psalmist," St. Peter, Moses, Aaron, the Apostles, and there are, in addition, general references to Biblical authority and church history. In employing such authorities as these,
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350 Rhet., I, xiii, 1370ff. Fuller information on Cheke's specific references may be found in the explanatory notes.
351 See explanatory note to G8, 18-21.
Cheke is calling up Biblical witnesses at least somewhat familiar to the rebels through their exposure to the 1547 homily exhorting obedience. Those witnesses, not from past but rather from present events, include the heroic defenders of Exeter, as well as the traitors of Norwich. He alludes to noblemen involved in the military effort against the rebels, most importantly to Edmund Sheffield, First Baron Sheffield, killed in the bloody defense of Norwich, and upon whose virtues he digresses in order to present in a heroic figure a human symbol of the great good which rebellion destroys. In praising Sheffield, Cheke is following Aristotle's recommendation: all those qualities which the audience fundamentally esteems are attributed to the hero, and that which is esteemed is represented as noble. He presents in detail the dead hero's greatness and vividly describes the rebels' slaughter of him, employing the passage to heighten the effect of his logical conquest of the rebels, climaxing it with an extended accusation of murder. Thus pathetic, logical, and non-artistic proof combine here with ethical assertion. Cheke similarly twice utilizes the personal appeal of Edward VI (Dl, 10ff.; F8v, 7ff.), establishing the youthful king as an innocent in whom there is great promise, prematurely betrayed and defamed by the disorder of his people. "Traitor Ket" and the Pope are witnesses on the side of the damned, and Cheke spends no time

352 Rhet., I, ix, 1356.
elaborating their evil; this is indicated tacitly by the
disparaging contexts in which he employs their names.
Cheke's use of such witnesses further illustrates his un­
derstanding of and skill with the devices of classical ora­
tion.

Thus Cheke follows the general prescriptions for the
classical oration as Aristotle presents them in his Rheto­
ric. We have seen as well that in numerous specific ways
Cheke agrees in practice with Aristotle's particular dicta
regarding rhetorical techniques, so that one may assume, I
think, that Cheke consciously attempted to employ many of
the recommendations of the Rhetoric in his treatise. This
is surely not to say that Cheke allowed himself to be bound
too strictly to the letter, but rather that he found in the
letter some highly useful methods for achieving the spirit
of his master. Cheke, as Aristotle insists, is not merely
determined to succeed in persuading, but, as a good orator,
is intent upon discovering "the means of coming as near such
success as the circumstances of each particular case al­
low." Cheke's use of Aristotle's Rhetoric has a further
significance. As P. O. Kristeller has noted, the Rhetoric,
"which in the Middle Ages had been neglected by the profes­sional rhetoricians and treated by the scholastic philos­ophers as an appendix to the Ethics and Politics, became
during the sixteenth century an important text for the hu­

\[\text{Rhet.}, I, 1, 1328.\]
manist rhetoricians." In The hurt of sedition is reflected an influential humanist's judgment that the Rhetorica is an worthy guide to the art of successful persuasion. It remains to indicate one rather significant debt Cheke's oratory owes to classical tradition. As Aristotle was the classical theorist whose precepts Cheke chose to follow, so Demosthenes was the classical orator whose practice Cheke extolled. Thomas Wilson, asserting that Cheke was "famous for his learning throughout Europe" and a "match with anye . . . for his knowledge of the Greek tongue," reported of Cheke's esteem for and knowledge of Demosthenes:

... if any might haue bene most bolde to haue taken vpon him [the most difficult task of making Demosthenes' Greek "speak Englishe"], Sir John Cheeke was the man, of all that euer I knew, or doe yet know in Englelade. Such acquaintance had he with this notable Orator, so gladly did he reade him, and so often: that I thinke there was noyer olde Priest more perfite in his Porteise, nor supersticious Monke in our Ladies Psalter as they call it, nor yet good Preacher in the Bible or testament, than this man was in Demosthenes. And great cause moved him so to be, for that he sawe him to be the perfittest Orator that euer wrote for these two thousand yeares almost by past (for so long it is since he was) and also for that he perceyued him to haue before his eyes in all his Orations the advancement of vertue as a thing chiefly to be sought for, together with the honor and welfare of his countrie. Besides this, master Cheeke's judgement was great in translating out of one tongue into an other, and better skill he had in our English speach to judge of the Phrases and properties of wordes, and to diuide

355 Wilson to Cecil, in Demosthenes' Orations, [‡v (preceding #j)].
sentences: than anye else had that I haue knowne. And often he woulde englyshe his matters out of the latine or Greeke vpon the sodeyne, by looking of the booke onely without reading or construing any thing at all: An vsage right worthie and verie profitable for all men, aswell for the aptnesse of framing the Authors meaning, and bettering thereby their judgement, and therewithal perfiting their tongue and utterance of speach. Moreover he was moued greatly to like Demosthenes aboue all others, for that he sawe him so familiarly applying himselfe to the sense and understanding of the common people, that he sticked not to say, that none euer was more fitte to make an English man tell his tale praise worthily in any open hearing, either in Parliament or in Pulpit, or otherwise, than this onely Orator was.356

Cheke's esteem for Demosthenes is thus due significantly to two specific characteristics of the great classical orator; first, his noble cause, that is, "he perceyued him to haue before his eyes in all his Orationes the advancement of vertue as a thing chiefly to be sought for, togethier with the honor and welfare of his countrie"; secondly, his "simple" style, that is, "he sawe him so familiarly applying himselfe to the sense and understanding of the common people."

Such rhetorical virtues made Demosthenes the fittest prac-

356 Wilson to Cecil, sig. *j*-*j*. Wilson echoes Cheke when, in the Preface to this translation of Demosthenes, he says: "Demosthenes hath more matter couched in a small roume, than Tullie hath in a large discourse, and that Demosthenes writing is more binding, more fast, firme, and more agreable to our common maner of speach, than Tullies Orations are" [sig. *iiiiV]. Cf. Scholemaster, p. 285, for reference to Cheke's view of Demosthenes as the orator who succeeded on all three levels of oratory, i.e., low, medium, and high. Ascham's slight treatment of Demosthenes may be explained by the incomplete state of Book II or perhaps by Ascham's own preference for Cicero (Scholemaster, p. 293).
tical teacher and his oratory the best model for imitation: "none euer was more fitte to make an English man tell his tale praise worthily in any open hearing, either in Parliament or in Pulpit, or otherwise, than this onely Orator was."

Taking such a position Cheke would surely be expected to strive to achieve, in his own oratory, the virtues of his practical master. As the preceding rhetorical analysis of The hurt of sedition indicates, Cheke does not disappoint such expectations; the cause he pleads and the means he takes to present that plea to his audience are consonant with Demosthenes' practice as Cheke saw it. In many specific ways as well, Cheke's treatise is distinguished by significant qualities which mark the oratory of his master. For instance: the argumentative versatility and flexibility which typify Demosthenes' orations we have already noted in Cheke's handling of his proofs. Cheke follows his master in his use of the facts of history and tradition. Like Demosthenes he is more intent upon pressing his logical point than upon extensive narration or description, although both orators employ brief narrative which is constantly subordinated to the issue. Regarding

357 For an illuminating and scholarly critical study of Demosthenes' oratory, see Charles Darwin Adams, Demosthenes and his Influence (New York, 1927), especially pp. 57-86 for an examination of Demosthenes' distinguishing characteristics.
pathetic proofs, Cheke, like Demosthenes, stirs chiefly the
great emotions of patriotism and love of personal honor and
uses restraint in employing the weaker emotions of pity and
fear. In the use of general maxims neither Demosthenes nor
Cheke is lavish, but when the issue demands such support,
it is given with increased force. In addition, Cheke em-
loys the sharp nervous rhetorical question to arouse his
hearers, as does Demosthenes; often, as we have seen, ques-
tion and answer fly back and forth between Cheke and his
supposed objector. Metaphorical language, most often in a
single word or short phrase, is typical of both orators,
neither using the fully expanded simile with much frequen-
cy. And Cheke, like his master, uses some of the Gorgian
rhetorical devices of sound and echo, but, like Demos-
thenes, he avoids excessive use which would detract from
the naturalness of his presentation. When he uses, for
instance, a punning play on sound, he usually reserves it
for a sarcastic attack or ridicule: "to chaunge youre o-
bedience from a kynge to a ket," i.e., carrion and the
rebels' leader Robert Ket are equated in a damning pun. In
one significant way Cheke does not closely follow his
teacher: Demosthenes' extensive use of invective is not
reflected in The hurt of sedition; to be sure, Cheke does
employ ridicule, but it is more subtle than are Demos-
thenes' harangues which appeal "to the universal enjoyment
which a mob finds in seeing a man pilloried with . . . in-
His temperament, perhaps even more than his artistic standards, undoubtedly explains this difference.

Two very important stylistic parallels need elaboration. Cheke's style, it seems to me, is particularly distinguished by its blend of conversational and formal techniques. Of the conversational devices, the question and answer technique derives, as we have just noted, from Demosthenes. To this Cheke adds the use of direct address (he speaks of the rebels as "you" throughout the treatise) and an occasional imperative ("Lerne, learne, to knowe this one pointe of religion . . ." [A6, 21ff.]). But most importantly, Cheke, like Demosthenes, presents his insight into the political situation "in speech so simple and clear that the common man must see the point at issue, and feel the urgency of the case." In his famous judgment of Sallust, Cheke makes clear his standards of the best diction; Nature, rather than Art, must be the writer's ultimate guide, and he who would write well must "expresse the matter lively and naturally with common speach" and not be "caried and druen forth artificiallie, after to learned a sorte." The greatest of the classical orators, Cheke continues, used "soch speach as the meanest should well vnderstand, and the wisest best allow." Only "naturall & plaine" dic-

358 Adams, p. 59.
360 For Cheke's judgment of Sallust and its implications, see above, pp. 71-72.
tion can produce matter which will be "sensible for mens understanding." Thus Cheke "was moued greatly to like Demosthenes above all others, for that he sawe him so familiarly applying himselfe to the sense and understanding of the common people . . . ."361

Cheke's own diction in The hurt of sedition clearly complements these critical judgments. The language of the entire treatise is simple, indeed plain, in that Cheke avoids the use of learned terminology. This is nothing more than we would expect from an admirer of Demosthenes' simplicity and a man who subsequently outspokenly criticized inkhorn terms or pretentious borrowings.362 But Cheke does not merely avoid learned language, he quite consciously chooses to use colloquial diction and purposely selects not ornate or classical but homely and natural images. Thus we have such images of the body as the "commonwealth's sore," diction and metaphor which would be meaningful to the simplest country man. Indeed, such use of concrete language and metaphor which uses the simplest level of pain and pleasure to describe bad and good can be found throughout the treatise. Perhaps the most apparent use of pain to represent bad can be found in the title itself: the hurt of sedition. The metaphor of bodily hurt can also be found in the most extended image in the treatise, the image of the

361 See Wilson quotation above, pp. 153-54.
362 See Cheke's letter to Hoby, above, p. 76.
wound and the bad surgeon. Language and image such as this would be vivid and meaningful to the simplest rural man who had no understanding of the intricacies of political or economic theory. But such graphic diction is not simply the result of Cheke's awareness of his audience's limitations. Throughout the treatise the use of simple, familiar, and direct expressions gives a plain-spoken, common sense voice to the dominant common sense appeal. Thus he speaks of "me pleasers," "stifneckednes," "stomaking," "the braggingest brawler," "your vpstirres," "pickers, or hid theues, nay more then theues, day theues, herd stelers, shire spoilers," "brainlesse rebels," "choppyng of chyldren," "white lyuerid Cities," "harebrained vnrulelines," "brainsicke heads," "the sharpnes of staruing"; the rebels are "hongerbitten," "nipte with egerunes of famine," "blered"; their camps are "stinking" and compared to "a bile in a bodie, naye lyke a synke in a towne"; the commonwealth is "clogged," "plucked down," "tossed" by rebellion. In addition, there are the forceful expanded images such as the central "hurt" figure or the secondary metaphors of rebellion as a "sink" or "a whole hel of fautes." Passages such as the following description of vagabonds illustrate Cheke's blending of colloquial diction and graphic image:

... after warres it is communelye sene, that a great number of those which wente out honest, returne home againe like roisters & as though thei were burnt to the warres botome, they haue all their lyfe after an vnsauery smacke thereof,
and smel stil towarde daillespers, purspeikers, highwaiw robbers, quarelmakers, ye & bloud-sheders to. (E4v, 9ff.)

The colloquial vigor of such language as this reinforces the forthright and reasonable ethical personality evinced by the presentation of the arguments and in a way which is completely appropriate to Cheke's audience of commoners.

In addition to these natural or conversational qualities in Cheke's style, there are, finally, those aspects which are learned and formal and which lend dignity of tone and rhetorical effectiveness. Cheke, again like Demosthenes, owes much of the force and distinction of his oratory to his command of the periodic style. The roundness and compactness of the premeditated, organically conceived period has at its heart, it seems to me, a paradox which is the very essence of rhetoric as, for instance, Aristotle and Cicero taught it and Demosthenes and Cheke practiced it.

If rhetoric, as Aristotle asserts, \textsuperscript{363} is distinguished from dialectic by supra-rational appeals, if it seeks to persuade by any available means rather than merely to discuss logically, then the apparently reasonable though actually emotional periodic sentence is the best suited to the orator's intention. I say "apparently reasonable" because the symmetry of the periodic construction implies balance, reasonableness, logic; and this appearance of reason appeals to and convinces the reason of the audience. But at the same

\textsuperscript{363} Rhet., passim, but see, for instance, I, ii, 1330.
time the impact of its symmetry moves the senses, the heap­ing form makes it a vehicle for overwhelming the emotions, the suspended construction produces emotional suspense which in its completion the sentence relieves, to the posi­tive advantage of the orator. In other words, the orator who is the master of the periodic construction is the mas­ter of the reason and emotion of his audience.

Cheke like Demosthenes is equally at home with vari­ous forms of periodic construction: with the shorter, sharper antithetic period ("If the seruaunt be bounde to e­bey his maister in the familie, is not subiecte bound to serue the kinge in his realme?" [B4, lff.]); or the larger symmetrical group of parallel clauses ("Who can perswade where treason is aboue reason, and might ruleth ryght, and it is had for lawful whatsoeuer is lustful, and cōmotioners be better then commissioners, and cōmune wo is named com­mune wealth" [B4V, l4ff.]); or in that strongest form in which by the presentation first of the subordinate thoughts the hearer's mind is held in intense expectation of that final clause which will give force and meaning to the whole ("Oh with what cruell spyte, was violentlye sondered so noble a bodye frome so godlye a mynde, whose deathe muste rather bee reuenged then lamented, whose death was no lacke to hym self, but to his countrey, whose death might every way been better born thē at a rebels hand, violence is in al things hurtful, but in life horrible" [C6, l2ff.]).
Such examples could be many times multiplied. Almost every page of *The hurt of sedition* develops logically and emotionally in terms of such constructions. Where Cheke employs non-periodic constructions he is almost always appealing to understanding rather than feeling. But frequently the ultimate effect of a series of non-periodic constructions is that of an extended period, the senses and understanding suspended, for instance by a series of questions and answers, until the last interrogative is resolved. One final point regarding Cheke's use of periodic sentence forms must be made: In the discussion of the faults of *The hurt of sedition* I called attention to the difficulty which extended periodic constructions might cause the reader;\(^364\) I noted as well that this problem was not apparent where the presentation was highly charged with emotion. The explanation lies in Cheke's knowledge of human emotions, of how to excite a feeling which does carry on, even while we forget the individual statements. The audience surrenders itself to the rising feeling, is simultaneously hypnotized by the appearance of logical progression, and is persuaded with a conviction that is virtually subconscious. In this last most important way, Cheke is the successful disciple and imitator of Demosthenes.

Plato, Aristotle, Cicero— all insist that the orator must understand human beings and be able to suit his

\(^{364}\) See above, pp. 109-11.
words, his arguments, and his style to the audience and the occasion. Like Sidney and Milton after him Cheke succeeded in writing an oration which can be submitted to the classical standards and not be found wanting. Like his Renaissance successors he fulfills these traditional requirements in a pioneer attempt to utilize classical form and prescriptions in a popular treatise. That he employed the frame and dicta in a vital way, after Demosthenes, in real arguments to the ecclesia, the popular court of hundreds of commoners, and not simply to other scholars, is additionally significant when one realizes that here are not merely the dry bones of formal rhetoric, but the blood of successful persuasion as well. Cheke's success, as I have tried to demonstrate it, makes The hurt of sedition no little triumph in the Renaissance revival of the classical art of oratory.

Reputation and Influence

The reputation of the humanist teacher and orator in the century following the writing of the treatise was in no small way the result of the stature of The hurt of sedition. That Cheke's style commanded, before his death, the respect of his contemporaries is evidenced in Wilson's assertion that "better skill he had in our English speach to iudge of the Phrases and properties of wordes, and to diuide sentences: than anye else had that I haue known"365; or again

365 See Wilson quote above, pp. 153-54.
in Walter Haddon's comment upon Cheke's translation of Chrysostom's *De Fato*:

... the voice in this disputation seemed not to be so much Chrysostom's as Cheke's own. So plentiful was the volume of most noble sentences concerning God, so handsome the placing them, words so well suited to the matter, such elegant translations, so familiar and delightful narrations, so great a contexture of arguments, such agreement of the whole oration with the cause. Which were all properly Cheke's own virtues, partly natural, and partly obtained by study and knowledge.

When, in the *Arte of Rhetorique*, Wilson discusses the colors and ornaments which "commend and set forth an Oration," he illustrates with a direct quotation from *The hurt of sedition* (C6, 10ff.):

Then the sentences are said to end like, when those wordes doe ende in like sillables which do lacke cases ... . The rebels of Northfolke (quoth a most worthie man that made an inuictive against them) through slauerie, shewe [error for slew] nobilitie: in deede miserably, in fashion cruelly, in cause deuillishly.

Cheke's reputation as a master of English prose style is further seen in Thomas Nashe's reference to "the Exchequer of eloquence Sir Iohn Cheeke, a man of men, supernaturally traded in al tongues," and again in the remarks of Cheke's most outspoken admirer in the latter part of the sixteenth century, Gabriel Harvey, who lauded Cheke's style

---

366 Lat. let.: Walter Haddon to Cheke, translated in Strype, *Cheke*, p. 51, from which I quote.
as "the hony-bee of Plato." In his criticism of Inkhornists and undisciplined stylists, Harvey offers Cheke, with Ascham, as an example of a diligent prose stylist who will "stand leuilling of Colons, or squaring of Periods, by measure and number." He complains of the dearth of art and wit in English letters, in spite of the revival of classical learning, and again points to Cheke with other notable exceptions:

But even since that flourishing transplantation . . . Arte did but springe in such as Sir Iohn Cheeke and M. Ascham, & witt budd in such as Sir Phillip Sidney & M. Spencer . . .

Most importantly, he has specific praise for The hurt of sedition: in a letter to a friend, Harvey comments:

... I dout not I, but you have ere this suf­ficiently perusid or rather thurroughly red over thos tragical pamflets of the Quen of Scots, as you did not long ago that pretti elegant treatis of M. Chek against sedition: and verry lately good part of the Mirrur for Magistrates, three books iwis in mi judgment wurth the reading over and over, both for the stile and the matter.


Sir Iohn Cheek.
Who can persuade, where treson is
Cheke's "pretti elegant treatis" is similarly praised by Ben Jonson who, in The English Grammar, refers to The hurt of sedition as "that excellent oration of Sir John Cheek against the rebels, whereof before we have made so often mention ... ." He illustrates English prose practices with passages from Cheke, as well as from such acknowledged masters of English prose as Chaucer, Lydgate, Lord Berners, Thomas More, Roger Ascham, John Foxe, and Bishop Jewel, and he indicates his admiration for Cheke's prose style by closing the grammar with a quotation from The hurt of sedition, asserting that practices such as Cheke's not only agree with nature, but also come "nearest to the ancient stays of sentences among the Romans and the Grecians." Echoing Jonson's sentiments, Richard Carew called Cheke the English Demosthenes, and found in The hurt of sedition "all the figures of Rhetorick." Finally, Cheke's early eighteenth-century biographer, John Strype, in his Ecclesiastical Memorials,

above reason; and Might ruleth right;
and it is had for lawful, whatsoever
is lustful: and commotioners is better,
then Commissioners, and common Wo is
nam'd Common Welth.

Gabriel Harvey

Harvey is, of course, applying Cheke's own statement (B4V, 14ff.) as a description of Cheke himself.


said of the treatise that it "carried an admirable strain of rhetoric and persuasion, and was close and piercing, like an oration of Demosthenes, with whom Cheke was very conversant, and of whom he was master."^376

Praise such as this, especially from such style-conscious critics as Harvey and Jonson, could not help but perpetuate in the century following the composition of the treatise the recognition accorded *The hurt of sedition* as a masterful piece of Tudor prose. In the analysis of the treatise I dealt with those larger aspects of prose rhetoric with which Cheke was chiefly concerned in his attempt to present convincingly his plea for order. The distinction of the piece lies in Cheke's mastery of Aristotle's concept of rhetoric, with its correlative dicta, and in his successful imitation of his practical master, especially his skillful employment of the periodic construction. That he was similarly a master of the particular grammatical techniques available to the Renaissance prose writer, what Wilson calls the colors and ornaments of rhetoric, is clear, not only from the assertions of Wilson, Jonson, and Carew, but to be sure from almost any sentence of his text. But of the figures he employs, the commonest are those which by means of parallelism of form reinforce a parallelism in thought. Thus parallelism of length (isocolon) and syntactical parallelism (parison) are used to buttress logical structures and

[^376]: Ecc. Mem., II, part 1, 305.
to provide that symmetry of construction which woos emotion as well as reason. As I indicated above, Cheke avoids excessive use of the more apparent Gorgian techniques of jingle and word play, and thus only occasionally does one find in Cheke's text examples of sound parallelism in its various forms (paronomia). Cheke's discretion in the use of the less subtle rhetorical figures is further evidence, it would seem, of his preference for the more natural devices of oratory, and it is clear from the remarks of Wilson, Harvey, Jonson, and Carew, that these critics found Cheke's prose to be adequately ornamented.

It is impossible to estimate the influence exerted by Cheke upon the development of English prose style. The hurt of sedition is, as compared with other contemporary prose of the third quarter of the sixteenth century, remarkable for its unaffected manifestations of the rhetorical arts, its decorous display of learning, and its conversational tone. Moreover, Cheke's diction, although common as we have indicated, is exceptionally pure. While he does not by any means avoid using the "foreign coin" about which he was to warn Hoby, his predilection for "old denisoned wordes" might lead one to expect in The hurt of sedition an inordinate number of archaic terms. Not so, however; in one hundred and twenty-four pages there are few words which present a vocabulary problem to the modern reader. In ad-

377 See above, p. 76.
diction, Cheke is never guilty of writing such an awkward prose, as say, Thomas Wilson in his dedicatory epistle to William Cecil, quoted above.\textsuperscript{378} The modern reader, once he has overcome the handicaps of time which change in punctuation usage creates, finds the treatise eminently readable. That Cheke was, even in haste, a conscientious stylist there can be no serious doubt. It must be repeatedly asserted, however, that style and form were to Cheke means to an end, and that persuasion was the goal for which formal requirements could without hesitation be modified. This philosophy was undoubtedly a part of his legacy to succeeding students of rhetoric, and \textit{The hurt of sedition} must have been looked to by others than Harvey and Jonson as a model for style and technique. The rhetoric of such eminent Englishmen as Roger Ascham and William Cecil, both students of Cheke's and admirers of his prose,\textsuperscript{379} might be expected to reflect qualities of their teacher's style. And to be sure, Ascham's prose style in \textit{The Scholemaster} is distinguished by those same conversational and periodic elements that distinguish \textit{The hurt of sedition}. More than this cannot be asserted from present evidence, but the ramifications of Cheke's far-flung intellectual influence provoke speculations about the perhaps similarly extensive effect of the style of his treatise upon English prose.

\textsuperscript{378} See above, pp. 153-54.
\textsuperscript{379} See Cecil quotation above, p. 67.
Harvey recommended to his correspondent not only the style but the content of Cheke's vernacular treatise, and it is perhaps an even more difficult matter to judge the importance of The hurt of sedition in the intellectual history of the sixteenth century than it is to evaluate its effect upon literary style. Most of the ideas employed by Cheke to bolster his argument against sedition were Renaissance and Reformation commonplaces, traditional thinking which was not original with him. Assertions regarding hierarchy, vested power, authority of the scriptures, nationalism, and civil obedience were part and parcel of the intellectual climate of England from the time of Henry VIII's break with the Church of Rome (and before, in some instances) to the end of the century and beyond. Indeed, from 1547, these assertions were repeatedly presented to all Englishmen in the form of homilies read as a regular part of church services throughout the land.\footnote{380 See above, pp. 94-96.} Moreover, arguments specifically against rebellion were manifest in numerous more or less popular tracts from the time of the Pilgrimage of Grace, in 1536, onward, especially following the Northern Rebellion in 1569.\footnote{381 See James K. Lowers, Mirrors for Rebels: A Study of Polemical Literature Relating to the Northern Rebellion (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1953).} Cheke's treatise helped to perpetuate these intellectual commonplaces; in it "one sees a very practical application of the theories [of hierarchy and submission]...."
to the issues of the moment in the religious, the social, and the political field. It was ... the outgrowth of a long and sustained process of reflection and definition, the expression of what is an established tradition."382 For the propagandists who followed Cheke The hurt of sedition "revived salient arguments against civil disobedience."383 To be sure, the availability of Cheke's treatise in Holinshed's Chronicles from 1587 may well mean that Shakespeare, Spenser, Hooker, and other later writers on order and rebellion read Cheke there, and that their considerations of these subjects were directly influenced by him. Cheke's iterations against sedition may well have contributed to Shakespeare's conclusion: "Thus ever did rebellion find rebuke" (Henry IV, Part 1: V, v, 1). But while there is no conclusive evidence to support a claim that Cheke had direct influence upon such writers as these, it can be demonstrated, I think, that The hurt of sedition did indeed influence directly what was undoubtedly the most influential writing against rebellion in the sixteenth century, "An Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion" which appeared separately in 1570 and in 1571 was included in the Second Book of Homilies.384 It is an enlarged version of the Tenth Homily in the 1547 First

384 Two Books of Homilies, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.
Book of Homilies, "An Exhortation Concerning Good Order and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates," which, as J. W. Allen has noted, "reads rather like a rough draft" of the homily of 1570. The later homily is four times the length of the earlier, its examples are more selective, expanded, and better focused, and its prose is a great deal more polished. For the most part it relies upon Biblical and other historical examples and authority for its arguments, but in its Third Part, which contains some of the most stirring passages of the homily, a significantly different approach has been used. I should like to suggest that part of this difference may be the result of the unknown homilist's acquaintance with The hurt of sedition.

As we have noted, Cheke in The hurt of sedition employs the non-artistic device of authority very rarely, and his chief persuasive recourse is to those proofs of rhetoric approved by Aristotle as proper for the orator. In Part III of the "Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion" there is a marked shift away from the almost exclusive use of arguments from Biblical example and authority (the method which dominates most of this homily, as well as the one employed generally in the homilies and in other treatises of this type in the period); one finds instead more rhetorically acceptable logical proofs, the most important of which, for our purposes, is the argument that rebellion is inex-

385 Allen, p. 128, n. 1.
pedient. But even more significantly, one notes that the au-
thor argues in terms of those evil effects of rebellion--
dearth, death, and waste--which Cheke had earlier employed.
Cheke’s arguments are greatly telescoped, but such matters
as famine-caused disease, unwholesome camps, the waste of
good husbandry, and the rotting of crops which Cheke dis-
cusses are similarly discussed in the homily.\textsuperscript{386} Moreover,
Cheke’s assertion and demonstration that rebellion exceeds
war in its horribleness (Hlv, 19ff.) is paralleled in the
homily.\textsuperscript{387} There is as well a passing reference contrasting
rebellion and peace which echoes Cheke’s contrast and apos-
trophe to Peace.\textsuperscript{388} Several other verbal echoes occur in
the earlier sections of the homily when the homilist refers
to rebellion as “an unfit and unwholesome medicine, to re-
form any small lacks in a prince, or to cure any little
grievs in government; such lewd remedies being far worse
than any other maladies and disorders that can be in the
body of a commonwealth.”\textsuperscript{389} Or again, like Cheke the hom-
plist refers to rebels as “hellhounds.”\textsuperscript{390} But most impor-
tantly, in Part III there is, in addition to the major par-
allel cited above, another revealing passage, this one par-

\textsuperscript{386} In the homily as printed in Two Books of Homilies,
pages 272-73 roughly parallel a much longer passage in The
\textsuperscript{387} See explanatory note to Hlv, 19ff.
\textsuperscript{388} See explanatory note to H2v, 18ff.
\textsuperscript{389} Two Books of Homilies, p. 555; cf. Cheke, F2, 7ff.
\textsuperscript{390} Two Books of Homilies, p. 566; cf. Cheke, B8v, 23.
alleling Cheke's discussion of rebellion as a conglomerate of all sins ("So many greuous faultes meting together in one sinke ..." [C7, lOff.]):

For he that nameth rebellion nameth not a singular or one only sin, as is theft, robbery, murder, and such like; but he nameth the whole puddle and sink of all sins against God and man; against his prince, his country, his countrymen, his parents, his children, his kinsfolks, his friends, and against all men universally; all sins, I say, against God and all men heaped together nameth he that nameth rebellion.391

J. W. Allen calls this passage the finest in the homily.392 Here not only Cheke's assertion but even his figure of the sink is echoed by the homilist.

These examples would seem to provide telling evidence that the author of "An Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion" was acquainted with Cheke's treatise and indeed, familiar enough with it to carry over into his homily persuasive arguments and rhetorical echoes. It cannot be reiterated too often nor too emphatically just how great was the impact of the church homilies exhorting obedience and order. Although such important Renaissance scholars as E. M. W. Tillyard, Lily B. Campbell, and Alfred Hart393 have

391 Two Books of Homilies, p. 569.
392 Allen, p. 132.
asserted and reasserted the influence of the homilies upon the thinking of the Elizabethans, most importantly upon Shakespeare, it does not seem to be generally realized that from 1547, every man, woman, and child in the English commonwealth was aurally exposed, from six to ten times yearly, to one or the other version of the homily concerning order. In the instance of William Shakespeare this would mean that in the twenty years between his seventh year and his twenty-seventh, or about the time of the writing of the first political plays, Shakespeare would have heard from one to two hundred times a sermon against civil disruption. If, then, as I have attempted to demonstrate, Cheke influenced the substance and rhetoric of that sermon, we may well claim for him a share of the sermon's impact. The subsequent influence attributable to Cheke is indirect and not conspicuous, but in the intellectual climate that nourished Spenser and Shakespeare, it was pervasive.

A final inference about the possible influence of Cheke's treatise upon subsequent writers may be gleaned from the fact that The hurt of sedition appeared, after its first two editions in 1549, in several significant new editions. Of these the third edition, brought out on the occasion of the Northern Rebellion of 1569, had perhaps the greatest immediate influence. Indeed, the author of the 1570 homily may have been attracted to Cheke's treatise in

394 See above, p. 102.
this new edition, and others of the writers of polemical materials following the 1569 rebellion may have looked to Cheke's freshly edited treatise for arguments. Interest in the Northern Rebellion persisted well after the rebellion itself had been subdued, kept alive in successive editions of the chronicle histories. Perhaps for this reason a fourth edition of Cheke's treatise was published in 1576. But none of these earlier editions had such opportunity to be influential as did the edition of 1587 which was included in the third volume of Holinshed's Chronicles of that year. The inclusion in Holinshed may well have been provoked by the Babington plot to put Mary Stuart on the throne, and by Mary's subsequent sentence to death. With its inclusion in the Chronicles, prefaced by eye-witness accounts of the rebellions of 1549, The hurt of sedition was ensured of a continued existence and, perhaps, readers who could see in it the perpetual argument of order-loving men. Such a man was Gerard Langbain, the editor of the last Renaissance edition, which was published on the eve of the Civil War. Langbain, in the preface to his edition of 1641, observed:

For upon this common Stage of the world though the Actors change daily, & have their last Exits after which they return no more; yet there is a

\footnote{According to the colophon of the third volume of the Chronicles (see Bibliographical Descriptions below), the volume was completed in January 1587 (modern dating) and thus prior to Mary's execution, 8 February 1587; she was found guilty of treason, and execution was demanded by Parliament, 12 November 1586.}
continual recurrence of the same Pageants, parts and humours to be represented by other persons.396

And in an age not unlike the Renaissance, with its intellectual ferment and underlying social revolution, the twentieth-century reader is unable to overlook the parallel of Cheke's arguments with those of modern voices for "government of law, not men," for here is the eternal appeal for order and peace and reasonability, to the "godly order of quiet."

In this edition I have attempted to present the modern reader with an authoritative text of Cheke's treatise, to make available a significant manifestation of Renaissance intellectual traditions. But most importantly, I have tried to indicate, in the rhetorical analysis, that the persistent value of The hurt of sedition lies not merely in its didactic thesis, but in the vital, artistic elaboration of that thesis in the form of a classical oration.
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v1
The rewarde of Abora
lon the Rebel.
The true subject to the
Rebell.

Monge so many & notable benifites, 
where w God 
hath already liberally, and 
plentifully en 
dued vs, there 
is nothing more beneficial, then, that 
we haue by his grace, kepte vs qui-
et from rebellion at this time. For we 
see suche miseries, hange ouer thole 
state of commune welth, thoroughge 
the great misorder of youre sedition, 
that it maketh vs muche to reioyce, 
that we haue bene, nother partners 
of youre doynges, nor conspirers of 
your councelles. For euen as the La-
cedemonians for the a\uc\ocyan\g\ of 
Dronckennes, dyd cause theyr son- 

A.ii. 

nes
The true subject
nes to beholde their seruauntes whē
they were Drōcke, that by beholding
theyr bestlynes, they mighte advoide
the lyke vyce, euen so hath God lyke
a merciful father, stayed vs frō your
wyckednes, that by beholdeinge the
filth of youre faute, we myghte iust-
ly for office, abhore you like rebelles,
whome elles by nature, we loue lyke
Englishe men. And so for oure selues
we haue greate cause to thanke God,
by whose religion and holy word day-
ly taughte vs, we learne not onely to
feare him truely, but also to obey our
kinge fayethfully, and to serue in our
own vocacion lyke subjectes honest-
lye. And as for you we haue suerlye
iust cause to lament you as brethren,
and yet iuster cause to ryse agaynite
you as enemyes, and moste iust cause
to overthowe you as rebelles. For
what hurt could be done, other to vs
privatly, or to the hole cōmune welth
generallye, that is now ¦ mischife so

[A.ii.\(v\)] brought
to the rebell.

brought in by you, triumphant as we see now the flame of your rage, so shall we necessarily be consumed hereafter to the misery of the same. Wherefore consider your selues with some light of understanding, & marke this grievous & horrible faute, which ye haue thus vily committed, howe hainous it muste nesstably appere to you, if ye will reasonably consider which for my dutyes sake, and my hole countrys cause, I wil at this preset declare vnto you. Ye which be bound by gods word, not to obeye for feare, like men pleasers, but for conscience sake like christians, haue contrari to gods holy wyl, whose office is everlastinge death, & contrari to y godly order of quietnes, set out to vs in y Kings Maiesties lawes, y breach wherof is not vnknowe to you, take in had vn-called of god, vnsent by men, vnfit by reason, to cast away your bound duties of obedience, & to put on you agaynst A.iii. the
The true subject
the magistrates, goddes office committed to the magistrates, for the re-
formaciō of your pretensed iniuries.

In the whyche doynge, ye haue
fyrst fauted greuously agaynst God, 
next offed done unnaturally our Soue-
reigne Lorde, thyråly troubled misere-
rably the hole commune wealth, vn-
done cruelly many an honest mā, and 
broughte in an utter miserye both to
vs the kynges Subjectes, & to youre
selues beynge false rebelles, and yet
ye pretende that partelye for goddes
cause, and partely for the commune
welthes sake, ye do a ryse, when as
your selues cannot deny, but ye that
seke in word goddes cause, do breake
in dde goddes cammaūdement, and
ye that seke the commune welth, haue 
destroyed the commune welth, and so
ye marre, that ye woulde make, and
breake that ye would amend, because
ye neyther seke anye thynge ryghtly,
184

to the rebell.
nor woulde amende anye thynge or-
derly.

# He that fauteth, fauteth agaynste
goddes ordinaunce, who hath forbid-
den all fautes, and therefore ought a-
gaine to be punished by goddes ordi-
aunce, who is the reformer of fautes.
For he sayeth, leaue the punishmente
to me, and I wyl reuenge them. But
the magistrate is the ordinaunce of
god, appoynted by him w the swerde
of punishmente, to loke strayghtlye
to all euil doers. And therefore, that,
that is done by y magistrate, is done
by God, whom the scripture often ty-
mes doeth call God, because he hath
the execution of Goddes offyce. How
then do you take in hand to reforme?
Be ye Kynges? by what authoritye,
or by what succession? Be ye the
Kynges offycers? by what commy-
sion? be ye called of God? by what to
kens declare ye that? Goddes worde

A.iii. teacheth
The true subject
teacheth vs, no man should take in
hand anye office, but he is called of
God lyke Aaron. What Moyses I
praye you called you? what gods mi-
mister bad you rise? Ye rise for religi-
on. What religion taught you? If
ye were offered persecucio for religio,
ye ought to flie, so christ teacheth you
& yet you intèd to fight. If ye would
stand in the trueth, ye ought to suffer
lyke marters, and you woulde sleye
lyke tyrauntes. Thus for religion ye
kepe no religion, and nother wol fol-
lowe the councell of Christe, nor the
constàcy of martyrs. Why rise ye for
religion? Haue ye any thing contrary
to goddes boke? Yea haue ye not all
thynges agreable to goddes worde?
But the newe is differente from the
olde, & therefore ye wyll haue the old.

If ye measure the olde by trueth, ye
haue y eldest, if ye measure the old by
phansy, then it is hard bycause mens
phansies chaungeth to geue that is
to the rebell.

old. Ye wyll haue tholde stil. Wyl ye haue anye older then that as Christe lefte, and hys Appostles taught, and the fyrste Churche after Christe dyd vse? Ye wyll haue that the Cannons do estabylsheth. Why, that is a greate deale yonger then that ye haue, of latter tyme, & nulier inuented. Yet that is it that ye desier. Why, the ye desier not the oldest. And do you prefer the Byshoppes of Rome a fore Christe, mens inuentions a fore goddes law, the newer forte of worshyp before the elder? Ye seke no religion, ye be deceuyed, ye seke traditions. They that teach you blynd you, that so instructe you. If ye seke what the old doctours saye, yet looke what Christe the oldest of al sayeth. For he sayeth before Abrahaam was made I am. If ye seke the truest waye, he is the very trueth, if ye seke the rediest waye, he is the verye waye, if ye seke euerlastinge lyfe, [A.v.] he
The true subject
he is the very lyfe. What religion, would ye haue other nowe, then hys religiō? You wold haue the bibles in agayne. It is no marueil, your blynd guides would leade you blynde stil. Why, be ye Houllates & backes, that ye cannot looke on the lyght? Christe sayeth to euery one, serche ye the scriptures, for thei beare wytnes of christ. You say pul in the scriptures, for we wyl haue no knowledge of Christe.

The Appostles of Christ, wyl vs to be so readye, that we maye be hable to geue every man an accompt of our fayth. Ye wyl vs not ones to reade the scriptures, for feare of knowyng of our fayeth. Sayncte Paule prayeth that euerye man maye encrease in knowledge, ye desire that our knowledge might decay agayne. A true religion, ye seke by lyke, and worthy to be fought for. For without the swerd in dede nothynge can helpe it, nother

[A.v. v] Christ
to the rebell.

Christ, nor trueth, nor age can main-
tayne it. But why should ye not lyke
\[\frac{\text{\textsuperscript{1}}}{\text{\textsuperscript{2}}}\] whiche Gods word establisheth, the
primatiue churche hath authorised,
the gretest learned men of this realme
hath drawen, the hole consente of the
parliament hath confirmed, the kyn-
ges Maiestie hath set forth? Is it
not truely set out? Can ye devise any
truer, then Christes Apostles vsed?
Ye thyncke it is not learnedlye done.
Dare ye commons, take vpon you
more learnynge, then the chosen By-
shoppes and Clearkes of this realme
haue? Thynke ye folly in it? Ye were
wont to iudge your parliamente wy-
sest, and nowe wyll ye sodenly excell
them in wysdome? Or can ye thincke
it lacketh authoritye, whych the king,
the parliament, the learned, the wyse,
haue iustly approued? Lerne, learne,
to knowe this one pointe of religion,
that God wylbe worshipped, as he

\[\text{A.vi.}\] hath
The true subject

hath prescribed, & not as we haue de-

vised, & that his wyl is wholy in hys

scriptures, whych be full of gods spi-

rite, & profitable to teach the truth, to

reprooue lies, to amend fautes, to bring

one vp in righteousnes, he that is a

gods man maye be perfecte, & redy to

al good worckes. What can be more

required to serue God wyth all? And

thus much for religion rebelles.

# The other rabble of Norfolke rebel-

des, ye pretende a commune welth.

How a mende ye it, by kylynynge of

Gentilmen, by spoylynge of Gentyl-

menne, by enprisonynge of Gentyl-

men? A maruelous tanned common

welth. Whi shuld ye thus hate them,

for theyr ryches, or for their rule? Rule

they neuer toke so much in hande, as

ye do nowe. They neuer resisted the

kyng, neuer wyth stode his consaile,

be fayethfull at this daye, when ye be

faythles, not only to the King, whose

[10]

[20]

[A.vi. V] sub-
to the rebell.

subjectes ye be, but also to your lords whose tennauites ye be. Is thys your true dutie in sume of homage, in most of fealtie, in all of alegeans, to leaue your duties, go backe from your promises, faull from your fayeth, and contrary to lawe and trueth, to make vn lawfull assemblies, vngodlye compa-
yyes, wycked and detestable campes, to disobey your betters, and to obeye youre tanners, to chaunge youre obe-
dience from a kynge to a ket, to sub-
myt youre selues to traitours, and breake youre fayth to your true king and lorde? Thei rule but by law, if o ther wyse: the law, the Counsayle, the King, breaketh their rule. Ye haue or derly sought no redres, but ye haue in tyme foūd it. In contries some must rule, some must obey, euerie man may not beare lyke stroke, for euerie man is not lyke wyse. And they that haue sene moste, and beste habyll to beare

[A.vii.]     it,
The true subject it, and of iust dealyng besyde, be most fit, to rule. It is an other matter to understand a mans owne gryfe, and to knowe the cōmune welthes sore, & therefore, not they that knowe theyr owne case, as euyer man doeth, but they that understand the commune welthes state, oughte to haue in contreyes, the prefermente of rulyng. If ye felte theayne that is ioyned with gouernaunce, as ye se and like the honoure, ye woulde not hurte otheirs to rule the, but rather take greate pains to be ruled of theym. If ye had rule of the Kynges Maiestye committed vnto you, it were wel done ye had ruled the gentilmen, but now ye haue it not, and cannot beare there rule, it is to thinke the Kynges Maiestye fo- lyshe, and vniust, that hath gyuen cer teyne rule to theym. And seynge by the scripture, ye oughte not to speke euil of any Magistrate of the people,
to the rebell.

why shouled ye not only speake euyl
of them whom the kynges Maiestye
hath put in office, but also judge euil
of the kyng him selfe, and thus sedici
ouslye in felde to stande wyth your eu-
sweardes drawen agaynst hym.
#

If ryches offend you, because ye
would haue the like, then thinke that
to be no cōmune welth, but enuie to
the cōmune welth. Enuye it is to ap-
paire an other mans estate, wythoute
the amendement of your own. And to
haue no gentilme, bycause ye be none
yourselues, is to brynge downe an
estate, and to mende none. Would ye
haue al a lyke rich? That is the ouer
thorowe of laboure, and vtter decaye
of worke in this realme. For who wil
laboure more, if when he hath go-
ten more, the idell, shal by luste wyth-
out ryghte, take what hym lust from
hym, vnder pretence of equalitie with
hym. Thys is the bringinge in of I-

[A.viii.] dlenes
The true subject
dilenes, whyche destroiyeth the commone
welth, and not the amendement of la-
bour, that maytayneth the commune
welth. If there should be such equa-
litie, then ye take all hope away from
yours, to come to anye better estate,
then you nowe leue them. And as ma-
y meane mes childe cometh honest-
ly vp, & is greate succour to all their
stocke, so shoulde none be hereafter
holpen by you, but because ye seke e-
qualitie, whereby all cannot be riche,
ye woulde that by lyke, whereby eue-
rye man should be poore. And thinke
bsyde that ryches and inheritaunce
be goddes prouidence, and gyuen to
whom of hys wysdome he thyncketh
good. To the honeste for the encrease
of theyr godlynes, to the wycked for
the heapyng vp of their danacion, to
the simple for a recompence of other
lackes, to the wise for the greater set-
ting out of gods goodnes. Why wil
[A.viii.v] your
To the rebell
your wisedome nowe stoppe goddes
wisdom, and prouide by your lawes
that god shal not enrich them, whom
he hath by prouidence appointed as
him liketh. God hath made the poore,
and hath made them to be poore, that
he myght shew his might, and set the
aloft whē he listeth, for such cause as
to him semeth, and plucke downe the
riche, to this state of pouertie, to shew
his power, as he disposeth to order
them. Why do not we the being pore
bere it wisely, rather then by lust seke
ryches vniustly, and shewe our sel-
ues contented with gods ordinaunce
which we must other willingly obey,
and then we be wyse, or els we muste
vnprofitably striue withal, and then
wee be mad.

But what meane ye by this equa-
litie in cömune welth? If one be wi-
srer thē an other, wil ye banishe him be
cause ye entēd a equaliti of al thīges?

B.i. If
To the rebell.

If one be stronger then an other, wil ye sley hym because ye seke an equalitie of all thinges? If one be wel fawnder then an other, wyll ye punishe him because ye looke for an equalitie of all thynges? If one haue better utteraunce then an other, wyll ye pul out his tonge to saue your equalitie? And if one be richer then an other, wyll ye spoyle hym to maintaine an equalitie? If one be elder then an other, wyl ye kyll him for this equalities sake? Howe iniurious are ye to god himselfe, who entendeth to bestowe his giftes as he himself listeth, and ye seeke bi wicked insurrections, to make him geue them oðmunely a-like to al men, as your vaine phansie liketh. Why would ye haue an equalitie in ryches, and in other gyftes of god there is no meane sought. Other by ambition ye seke lordlines, muche vnfitte for you, or by couetousnes ye [B.i.\textsuperscript{v}] bee
To the rebell

be vsatiable, a thing likely inoughe in ye, or els by folie ye be not content wyth your estate, a phâsy to be plucked out of you. But and we being we ry of pouertie, would seke to enriche our selues, we should go a fur other way to worke thē this, and so should we rightly come to our âsire. Doth not Saincte Peter teache vs afor god a ryght waye to honour, to ryches, to all necessarie and profitable thynges for vs? He sayeth humble your selues, that God mighte exalte you, and caste all your care on hym, for he careth for you. He teacheth the waye to all good things, at goddes hande is, to be humble and you exalte your selues. Ye seke things after suche a sorte, as if the seruaunte should anger his maister, when he se-keth to have a good turne on hym. Ye would haue riches, I thinke at Godâes hand, who geueth al riches, B.ii. and
To the rebell.

and yet ye take the way cleane contrary to riches. Know ye not he that exalteth him self, god wil throw downe? Howe can ye get it then, by thus setting out your selues? Ye should submit ye by humilitie one to an other, & ye set vp your selues aboue the magistrates. Se herein howe much ye offended god. Remembre ye not, that if ye come nighe to God, he wyll come nigh vnto you? If thē ye go frō god, he wyl go frome you. Doeth not the Psalme saie, he is holy with the holy, and the wicked mā he is froward. Euen as he is ordred of men he wyll ordre thē againe. If ye wold folowe his wyl, & obey his comauementes, ye should eate the fruites of y earth saith y prophet, if not the sword shall devoure you. Ye might haue eate the fruites of this seasonable yere, if ye had not by disobedience rebelled against god. Nowe not only ye can not
To the rebel.
eate $\frac{h}{f}$ which your selues did first sow
bi labour, & now destroie bi sedition,
but also if $\frac{h}{f}$ kinges maisties sworde
came not against you, as iust policie
requireth, yet $\frac{h}{f}$ iust vegeance of god
wold light among you, as his worde
promiseth, and your cruell wicked-
nes deserueth.
#
For what soeuer $\frac{f}{f}$ causes be that
hath moued your wild affectiōs here
in, as thei be vniust causes & encrease
your fautes muche, the thing it selfe,
$\frac{h}{f}$ risinge I meane, must nedes be wic-
ked and horrible afore god, & the v-
surping of authoritie, and taking in
hande of rule, which is the sitting in
gods seate of iustice, & a proude cli-
minge vp in to goddes highe throne,
must nedes be not only cursed newly
by him, but hath also bene often pu-
nished afore of him. And that which
is done to gods officer, god accōpteth
it done to him, for thei despise not the
B.iii. minister
The true Subject

minister as he sayth himselfe but thei
despise him, and that presumption
of challenginge goddes seate, dothe
shewe you to haue bene Lucifers,
and sheweth vs that God wyll pun-
nyshe you lyke Lucifers. Wherfore
rightly looke as ye duey haue deser-
ued, other great vengeaunce for your
abominable transgression, or els ear
nestly repent, with vnfained mindes,
your wicked dōinges, and other with
example of deathe be contente to de-
horte other, or els by faithfulnes of o
bedience declare howe great a service
it is to God, to obey your magistra-
tes faithfully, & to serue in subiection
trulye. Well if ye had not thus gre-
uously offēaed god, whome ye ought
to worship, what can ye reasonablye
thinke it to be no faute again ẽ king,
whome ye ought to reuerence? Ye be
bound by gods worde to obeye your
kinge, & is it no breake of dutie to ẽ
[10]

[B.iii. v]

stande
To the rebel.

stande your kinge? If the seruaunt be
bounde to obey his maister in the fa-
milie, is not $y$ subiecte bound to servy
the kinge in his realme? The chyld is
bounde to the priuate father, and bae
we not al bound to the comune weal-
thes father? If we ought to bee sub-
iecte to the kinge for Goddes cause,
ought we not I pray you to be faith
fully subiecte to the kinge? If wee
ought dutifullly to shewe al obedience
to heathen kinges, shall we not wyl-
lingly and trulye be subiecte to chi-
sten kinges? If one ought to submit
him selfe by humilitie to an other,
ought we not all by dutie to be sub-
iecte to our kynge? If the members
of our naturall bodie all folowe the
head, shall not the members of the po
liticall bodie all obey the kynge? If
good maners be cõtent to giue place,
the lower to the higher, shall not re-
ligion teache vs alway to geue place

B.iii. to
The true Subject
to the highest? If true subjectes wyll
die gladly in ye kings service, should
not al subjectes thinke it dutie to obei
the kyng with iust service. But you
have not onlye disobeyd like ill sub­
jectes, but also taken stoutlie rule v­
on you like wicked magistrates. Ye
have ben called to obedience, by coun­
cell of priuate men, by thaduise of the
kinges maiesties councel, by the kin­
ges maiesties free pardon, but what
councel taketh place, where sturdines
is lawe, & churlishe answers be coun­
ted wysedome. Who can perswade
where treason is aboue reason, and
might ruleth ryght, and it is had for
lawful whatsoeuer is lustful, and co­
motioners be better then commissio­
ners, and comune wo is named com­
mune wealth. Haue ye not broke his
lawes, disobeyed his counsel, rebelled
against him? And what is co­mun­
wealth worth, when the lawe whiche

[B.iii.ii.v] is
To the rebell
is indifferent for all men, shall be wilfully and spitefully broken of headstrong men, and seeke against lawes to order lawes, that those may take place not what the consente of wyse men hathe appointed, but what the luste of rebelles hathe determined. What vnthriftines is in yll seruaun tes, wyckednes in vnmaturall chyl-
dren, sturdines in vnrulye subjectes, crueltie in fierce enemies, wyldnes in beastlie minde, pride in disdainfull hartes, that floweth nowe in you, which haue fled from housed conspiracies, to encamped robries, and are better conteted to suffer famine, cold, traualle, to glutte your lustes, then to lyue in quietnes, to saue the commune wealth, and thinke more liber-
tie in wilfulnes, then wisedome in dutiefulnessse, and so runne headlonge not to the mischiefe of other, but to the destruction of your selues, and

B.v. vndo
The tue Subject

vndo by folye that ye entende by mis
chiefe, nother seyinge howe to remedie
that ye iudge fautie, nor wyllinge to
saue your selues from miserie, which
stifneckednes can not do, but honesty
of obedience must frame.

# If authoritie woulde serue un-
der a kynge, the counsayl haue grea-
teste authoritie, if wisedome and gra
uitie might take place, thei be of most
experience, if knowledge of the com-
mune wealthe could helpe, they must
bi dayly cōference of matters vnder-
stand it best, yet nother y authoritie
that the kinges maiestie haue geuen
the, nor the grauitie which you know
to be in the, nor the knowledge which
with great travaile thei haue gotten,
can moue ye other to kepe you in the
dutie ye ought to do, or to aduoiide
this great disorder wherin ye be. For
where disobedience is thought stou-
tnes, and sullennes is counted man-

[B.v."v"] hood
To the rebel.

hood, and stomaking is corage, and
prating is judged wisedome, and the
eluishest is moste mete to rule, howe
can other iustc authoritie be obeid or
sad counsel be fol owed, or good know
ledge of matters be heard, or vōmaun
dementes of counsellours cosidered?
And howe is the kynge obeid, who
is wisest be withstood, the disobedi
test obeid, the highe in authoritie
not waied, vyskilfullest made chief
capitaines, to the noblest most hurte
entended, the braggingest brawler to
be moste safe. And euen as the viler
partes of the bodie, would contende
in knowledge & gouernmêt with the
fiue wittes, so doth the lower partes
of the commune wealth, enterprise as
high a matter, to striue against their
duty of obedience to the counsaile.

But what talke I of disobedience so
quietly, hath not such mad rages run
in your heades, that forsaking and

[B.vi.] brusting
The true subject
brusting the quietnes of the common peace, ye haue hainouslie and traitorouslie encamped your selfe in fielde, and there lyke a bile in a bodie, naye lyke a synke in a towne, haue gathered together all the nastie vagabonds, and idle loysterers, to beare ar moure against him, with whome all godlye and good subjectes wyll lyue and dye wyth all. If it be a faulte when two fight together, and the kinges peace broken, and punyshement to be sought therfore, can it be but an outrageous & a detestable mischief, when so manye rebelles in number, malitious in minde, mischeuous in enterprise, fight not amonge the selues, but against al the kings trew and obedient subjectes, & seke to prowe whe ther rebellion may beate doune hone sty, & wickednes may overcome truth or no? If it bee treason to speake hay nousli of the Kynges maistie, who is not
To the rebel,

not hurt therby, and the infamie returneth to the speaker againe, what kynde of outrageous and horrible treason is it, to assemble in campe an armie against him, and so not onlye entende an ouerthrowe to him, & also to his commune wealth, but also to cast him into an infamie through all outwarde and straunge nations, and perswade them that he is hated of his people, whome he can not rule, and that they be no better then vyllaines, which wyll not with good orders be ruled. What death can be devised cruel inough for those rebelles, who with trouble seeketh death, and ca not queche the thirst of their rebellion, but with the bloud of true subiectes, & hateth the kings mercifull pardó, when thei miserably haue trasgressed, & in suche an outrage of mischief, wyl not by stubburnes acknow ledge themselues to haue fauted, but

[B.vii.] enten-
The true Subject

entèdeth to broile the comune wealth

with the flame of theyr treason, & as-
muche as lyeth in them, not only to a

noy them selues, but to destroie all o-

ther. He that is miscontented w thin
ges that happeneth, & because he can

not beare the miserie of them, renteth

his hear, & teareth his skin, and man-
gleth his face which easeth not his so

rowe, but encreaseth his miserie, may

he not be iustly called mad & phàstasti-
cal, & worthy whose wisedome should

be suspected, and what shall we saye

dothe, who being in ñ comune welth,

feling a sore greuous vnto them, and

easy to haue ben amèded, sought not

the remedie, but hathe increased the

grief, & like franticke beastes raging

against their head, doth teare and de-

face asmuch as lieth in thè, his whole

authoritie in gounement & violètly

taketh to thè sèlues that rule on thè,

whiche he by pollicie hath graunted

[B.vii.\(^{v}\)] vnto
To the rebel.

unto other. And who waiyng wel the heuines of the faute, may not iustlie saye and hold, them to be worse herein the an kinde of brute beastes. For we se that the shepe wyl obey the shep heard, & the nete be ruled by the nete-heard, & the horse wyl knowe his kep- per, & the dogge wyl be in awe of his master, & eueri one of them fede there, and of that, as his keper & ruler doth appointe him, & goeth from thence, & that, as he is forbiddē by his ruler. And yet we haue not hard of, that a- ny heard or companie of these hath ri sen against their heardman or gouernoure, but be alwaies contented not only to obey them, but also to suffer them to take profite of thē. And we se furthermore that al heardes & al sors- tes, be more egre in fierenes against all kynde of straungers, then they be againe their owne rulers, and wyl easier offende him who hath not hurt

[B.viii.] them
The true Subject

them, then touche their ruler who see-keth profite on them. But ye that ought to be gouerned by your magis-trate, as the heardes bi the heardma, and ought to be lyke sheepe to your kyng, who ought to be lyke a shep-hearde vnto you, euen in tymé whē your profite was sought, & better redresse was entended, the your vpstir-res & vnquietnes could optain, haue beyond y crueltie of al beastes foulie risen against your ruler, and shewed your selues worthy to be ordred lyke beasts, who in kinde of obediece wil fall frome the state of men. A dogge stoupeth when he is beate of his ma-ster, not for lacke of stomacke, but for natural obedience. You being not stri-ken of your head, but fauored, not kept downe, but socoured, & remedied by lawe, haue violetly againste lawe not only barked like beastes, but al-so bitten like hellhoudes. What? is the [B.viii.5] mischife
mischief of sedition, other not knowē
unto you, or not feared? Hauē not ex-
amples afore times both told thende
of rebels, & the wickednes of rebellio
itself? But as for olde examples, let
the passe for a while, as things well
to be considerē, but at this presēt one
thing more to be waied. Loke vpon
your seluēs, after ye haue wickedlye
stept into this horrible kinde of trea-
son, do ye not se howe may botōles
whirlpoles of mischief ye be golpht
with all, & what lothsome kindes of
rebellio ye be faine to wade thorowe?
Ye haue sent out in y kinges name, a
gainst the kinges wil, preceptes of al
kindes, and without cómaundement,
cómaundēd his subiectes, & vnruilily
haue ruled, wher ye listed to cómaūd,
thinkinge your owne phansies, the
kinges cómaundemōtes, and rebelles
lustes in thinges to be right gouern-
mente of thinges, not lokinge what
shoulde
The true subject should follow by reason, but what your
selues follow by affection. And is it not
a daungerous & a cruel kinde of trea
so, so to geue out preceptes to the kin
ges people? Ther ca be no iust execu-
tion of lawes, reformation of fautes,
geuing out of commaundementes, but
frō ſe kinge. For in the king only is ſe
right hereof, & the authoritie of him
deriued by his appointmente to his
ministers. Ye hauing no authoritie
of the king, but taking it of your sel-
ues what thinke ye your selues to be?
Ministers ye be none, except ye be the
deuils ministers, for he is the author
of seditiſ. The kinges maiestie enten
deth to maintain peace, & to oppresse
warre, ye stirre vp vprores of people,
hurliburlies of vagabondes, routes
of robbers, is this any parte of the
kinges ministerie? If a vagabonde
wolde do what him lust & cal him self
your seruaūt, & execute such offices of
[B. ix. v] truste
The tru subject
trust, whether ye would or no, as ye
haue cōmitted to an other mans cre-
dit, what wolde euerti one of you saye
or do herein? Would ye suffer it? Ye
wāder out of houses, ye make everye
day newe matters as it pleaseth you,
ye take in hande y execution of those
thinges, god bi his word forbidding
the same, which god hathe put ma-
gistrates in trust withal. What cā ye
sai to this? Is it sufferable thinke ye?
If ye tolde a priuate message in an o-
ther mans name, cā it be but a false lie
I prai ye? And to tel a fained message
to cūmune Welth, & that frō king,
cā it be honest thinke ye? To cōmand,
is more thē to speake, what is it then
to cōmaund so traiterous a lie? This
thē which is in word a deceitfull lye,
& in dede a traiterous facte, noisome
to Welth, vnhonorable to king, mischeuous in you, how cā you
otherwise iudge of it, but to be an vn
[20]
[B.x.] hard
The true subject

harde of, and notable disobedience to
the kyng, and therfore by notable ex
ample to be punished, and not wyth
gentlenes of pardon to be forgesuen.
Ye haue robbed euery honeste house,
and spoiled them vniustly, and peti-
ously wronge pore men beinge no of-
ferers, to their vfter vndoinge, & yet
ye thinke ye haue not broken the kin-
ges lawes. The kings maiesties law
and his commaundement is, that e-
euerie man shoulde safegyue kepe his
owne, and vse it reasonably to an ho-
neste gaine of his liuinge. Ye vio-
lently take and carie away from men
without cause, all thinges whereby
they should maintaine, not onlie the-
selues but also theyr familye, and
leave them so naked, that they shall
feele the smarte of your cursed enter-
prise, longer then your owne vnnatu-
rall, and vngodly stomackes woulde
well vouchsafe. By iustice ye should

[213]

[B.x.v] neyther
nether hurte, nor wrong man, & your pretensed cause, of this monstrous sturre, is to encreace mens welth. And yet how many, and say trueth, haue ye decayed and vndone, by spoilyng and takyng away their goodes? Howe should honest men liue quietly in the common welth at any tyme, yf theyr goodes, other gotte by their owne la­bour, or left to them by their frendes, shall unlawfully and vnorderly, to the fedyng of a sorte of rebels, be spoi­led and wasted, and utterly scattered abroade. The thyng ye take, is not your right, it is an other mans owne. The maner of taking against his wil, is unlawfull, and against the order of euery good common welth. The cause why ye take it, is mischeuous and hor­rible, to fatte vp your sedicion: ye that take it, wicked traiters, and common enemies of all good order. If he that desireth an other mans goodes, or ca­
The true subject
tel do faute, what doth he, thinke you,
whose desire takyng foloweth, and is
led to and fro, by lust, as his wycked
dansie void of reason doth guide him.
He that vseth not his owne, wel and
charitably, hath muche to aunswere
for, and shall they be thought not vn
iuste, who not onely taketh awaye o-
ther mens, but also misuseth, and wa-
steth the same vngodlye? They that
take thynges priuily away, and steale
secretely, and couertlye, other mennes
gooddes, be by lawe iudged worthye
deathe. And shall they that withoute
shame spoyle thynges openly, and be
not afearde by impudence to professe
theyr spoyle, shall they be thought ei-
ther honest creatures to god, or fayth-
ful subjectes to their king, or natural
men to their countrey? If nothynge
had moued you but the exaumple of
mischief, & the fowle practise of other
moued by the same, ye should yet haue
[O.i.V] abstayned
to the rebell.
abstayed from so licencious & so villanous a shewe of robbery, considering howe many honester there be that beynge loth their wickednes shoulde be biased abrode, yet be found out by providence, and haged for desart. What shall we the thinke or say of you? Shall we call you pickers, or hid theues, nay more then theues, day theues, herd stealers, shire spoilers, and utter destroyers of all kindes of families, both among the poore, and also among the rich. Let vs yet further see, is there no mo thynges wherein ye haue brok the kings lawes, and so vylie disobayed hym, contrary to your bounden dutie. Ye haue not onely spoyled the kings true subjects of their goodes, but also ye haue imprisoned their bodies, whiche should be at liberty vnder yr king, & restrained the of their service, which by dutie they owe the kyng, & apaired both strength & helthe, wherwith they liue and serue the kyng.

C.ii. Is
The true subject

Is there any honest thing more desired than liberty, ye have shamefully spoiled them thereof. Is there any thing more dutyfull, then to serve theyr Lorde and mayster? But as that was deserved of the one parte, so was it hyndered and stopped on your parte. For neyther can the Kyng be serued, nor famylies kepte, nor the common wealthe looked vnto, where freedome of libertie is stopped, and diligence of service is hindered, and the helpe of strength and healthe abated. Mens bodies oughte to be free from all mens bondage and crueltie, and onely in this realme be subiect in publike punishment, to our publique gouernour, & neyther be touched of hed les captains, nor holden of brainlesse rebels. For the gouernement of so precious a thyng, ought to belong vnto the most noble ruler, and not iustly to be in euery mans power, which is iust
to the rebell.

ly every living mans treasure. For what goodes be so dere to every man as his own body is, which is the true vessell of the mynd to be measurably kept of every man, for al exercises and servises of the minde. If ye maye not of your owne authoritie, meddle with mens goodes, much lesse you maye of your own authoritie take order with mens bodies: For what be goodes in comparison of helth, libertie, & strēgthe, which be al settled and fastened in the body. Thei that strike other, do gretly offed & be iustly punishable. And shal they that cruelly and wrongfully torment mens bodies with yrons, & imprisonmentes, bee thoughte, not of other, but of theyselues honeste and playne, and true dealyng men? What shall we saye by them, who in a pryuate busynes wyll let a manne to goe his iourneye in the kinges high way? do they not, thinke ye, playne wrong?
The true subject

Then in a common cause not only to hynder them, but also to deale cruelly with them, and shutte them from doing their service to the kyng, & their duty to the common welthe, is it not both disobedeyence, crueltye, and mischief thynke ye? What an hynder-raunce is it to haue a good garmente hurte, any iowell appayred, or any esteemed thyng to be decayed? And seeing no earthly thyng a manne hathe more preciouse then his body, to cause it to be cruelly tormented with yrons, febled with colde, weakned with ordering, cā it be thought any other thing but wrong to the sufferer, crueltye in the doer, and great disobedience and transgression to the kynge? Howe then be ye hable to defende, but seeing ye so vnpitifully vexe men, caste them in prison, lade them with yrons, pyne them with famine, contrarye to the rule of nature, contrarye to the kynges
to the rebell.
kynges maesties lawes, contrary to
godes holye ordinaunces, hauynge
no matter, but pretensed and fayned
gloses: Ye be not only disobediente to
the kyng lyke rebelles, but withstan-
dyng the lawe of nature lyke beastes,
and so worthy to dye lyke dogges, ex-
cept the kynges maiestie, without res-
ppect of your deseruyng, do mercifully
graunt you of his goodnes, that as
you cannot escape by iustice.

Yet ye beynge not contente with
this, as small thynges enterpryse
greater matters, and as though ye
could not satisfy your self, if ye should
leaue any myschief vndone, haue
sought bloud with crueltie, and haue
slayne of the kynges true subjectes
many, thynkyng their mirdre to be
youre defens, when as ye haue en-
creased the faulce of your vyle re-
bellion with the horroure of bloud-
shed, and so haue burdened mischyefe

C.iii. with
The true subject
with mischief while it come to an importable weight of mischief. What could we do more in ye horriblest kind of faultes, to the greatest transgressors & offenders of god & men? then to loke straightly on them by death, & so to rid them out of the common welth by seuer punishment, whō ye thought vnworthy to liue among men for their doings. And those who hath not offended the kynge, but defended his realme, and by odedyence of service sought to punish the disobedient, and for safegard of euery man put thēselvēs vnder dutie of lawe, those haue ye miserably and cruelly slayne and bathed you in their bloude, whose doinges ye shoulde haue folowed, and so haue appayred the common wealth, both by distruction of good men & also by encrease of rebels. And how can that common wealth by any meanes endure, wherein euery man without
to the rebell.

authoritie, maye unpunysshed, slea whom he lyste, and that in suche case as those who bee slayne shewe themselfes mooste noble of courage, and mooste ready to serue the kynge and the common welthe, and those as doe slea, be moost villanouse and trayterouse rebels, that any common welthe dyd euer susteine. For a Citie and a province be not the faire howses, and the strong walles, nor the defence of any engine, but the liuyng bodyes of men, beyng hable in nombre & streghth to maintaine themselfes by good order of iustice, and to serue for al necessary and behoueable vses in the common welth. And when as mans body beyng a parte of the whole common welthe, is wrongfullye touched any way, and specially by death, then suffereth the common welth great iniurie, and that alway so muche the more

C.v. howe
The true subject
howe honester and nobler he is, who
is injuryously murdered. How was
the Lorde Sheffield handeled among
you, a noble gentilman and of good
service, both fitte for counsel in peace,
and for conduite in warre. Considering
other the grauitie of his wysdome, or
the authoritie of his personne, or his
service to the commune wealth, or the
hope that all men had in hym, or the
neeede that England had of suche, or
or among many notablie good, his singuler excellencie, or that fauour of all
men toward hym, being loued of euer
er ye man, and hated of no man. Con sidered ye, who should by dutie be the
Kynges subjectes, other howe ye
should not haue offended the kyng, or
after offence haue required the kynges pardon, or not to haue refused his
goodines offered, or at length to haue
yelded to his mercie, or not to haue
slaine those who came for his service,
to the rebell.

or to haue spared those, who in dāger offered raunsom. But al these things forgotten by rage of rebelliō, because one madnes cannot be without infinite vices, ye slewe hym cruelly, who offered hymself manfully, nor would not spare for raunsome, who was worthy for noblenes to haue had honour, and hewed hym bare, whom ye coulde not hurt armed, and by slauery slew nobilitie, in dede miserably, in fashion cruelly, in cause deuelishlye. Oh with what cruell spyte, was violentlye sondered so noble a bodye frome so godlye a mynde, whose death muste rather bee reuenged then lamented, whose death was no lacke to hym self, but to his countrey, whose death might euery way been better born the at a rebels hand, violence is in al thin ges hurtful, but in life horrible. What should I speake of others in the same case,
The true subject case, divers and notable, whose death for manhood and service, can want no worthie praise, so long as these roughly styrers of rebellion can be had in mynde. God hath hym selfe ioyned mans bodye and his soule together, not to be departed a sonder, afoire he eyther disseuer them hym self, or cause theim to be disseuered by his minister. And shall rebels and hedles campes, being armed against God, and in feld agaynst ther king, thinke no faute to sheed bloude of true subiectes, having neyther office of God, nor appointement of ministers nor iust cause of rebellion? He that steleth any parte of a mans substauce is worthy to lose his lyfe. What shall we thinke of them? who spoyle men of ther lyues, for the mayntenaunce wherof, not onely substauence and ritches be sought for, but also al commune wealthes be devised. Nowe then, youre owne consiences [C.vi.V] shoulde
to the rebell.

should be made your iudges, & none
other sett to geue sentence agaynst ye.
Seing ye haue bene suche bloode she-
ders, so heynouse manquellers, so hor-
ryble murderers, coulde ye do any o-
there then playnely confesse youre
foule and wycked rebellion to be gre-
uouse agaynst God, and trayterouse to
the king, and hurtfull to the com-
mone wealth. So many greucose
faultes meting together in one sinke,
might not onely haue discouraged,
but also dryuen to desperacion, any o-
ther honest or indeferent mynde. But
what feele they, whose hartes so depe
myschiefe hath hardened, and by ve-
hement of affection be made vnsham-
fast, and stoppe al discourse of reason,
to let at large the full scoupe of theyr
vnmesurable madnes. Private mens
gooddes semith lytle to your vnsatia-
ble desires, ye haue waxed greedy
nowe vpon Cities, and haue attemp-

[C.vii.] ted
The true subject

ted mightie spoiles to glutte vp and
ye could your wastyng hunger. Oh
how muche haue they nede of, that wil
neuer be contented, and what rychesse
can suffise any that will attempt high
enterprlces aboue their estate. Ye could
not maintain your campes with your
priuate goodes, with your neybours
porcion, but ye must also attempt Ci-
ties, because ye soughte great spoyles
with other mens losses, and had for­
gotten how ye liued at home honestly
with your owne, and thought the wor-
thy death that woulde disquiet ye in
your house, & plucke away that which
ye by right of law thought to be your
owne. Herein see what ye would haue
done, spoiled the kingses maiesties sub-
jectes, weakened the kings strength,
ouerthrowe his tounes, také awai his
municiP, drawé his subjectes to like re-
bellio, ye & as it is among forein ene-
mies in sackyng of cities, no doubte

[C.vii. V] thereof
to the rebell.

therof ye would haue fallen to slaugh-
ter of men, rauiishing of wifes, deflow-
ryng of maidens, choppyng of chyl-
dren, firing of houses, betyng doun of
stretes, ouerthrowing of all together.

For what measure haue mē in the en-
crease of madnes, whē they cānot at ē
beginnyng stay thēselues frō falllyng
into it. And if ē besetting of one hous
to rob it, be iustly demed worthy deth,
what shall we thinke of them that be-
sege whol cities for desire of spoil. We
liue vnder a king to serue him at al ti-
mes whē he shal nede our strēght, and
shal ye thē not only wdraw yourselfs
which ought as much to be obedīt as
we be, but also violently plucke other
awai to, fro ſ dutie vnto the which by
goddes comaundemē al subjectes be
straightly bōūd, & by all lawes every
nacion is naturally led? The townes
be not only the ornament of ſ realme,
but also the seate of Marchauntes,
the place of handycraftes, that men

[C.viii] scatte-
The true subject
skattered in wyllages, and neding di-
uers thinges, maye in littell rome
knows where to fynde ther lacke. To
ouer throwe them then, is nothing els
but to wast your owne commodites so
that when ye wolde by a necessarye
thyng for money, ye could not tell
where to fynde it. Municion serueth
the king, not only for the defence of
hys owne, but also for thinuasion of
his enemye. And if ye wyll then, so
straightlie deale with him, that ye wil
not let him so much as defende his
owne, ye offer him double iniurie, both
that ye let him from doing anye nota-
ble facte abrode, and also that ye suf-
fer not him quietlye to enjoy his owne at
home. But herein hath notably appe-
red, what cities hath faithfully serued
and suffered extreme danger, not one-
ly of goodes, but also of famyne and
death, rather then to suffer the kings
enemyes to enter, and what white ly-
[C.viii.v]  uered
To the rebell
uerid Cities hath not onely not with
stāde them but also with shame fauo
red them, & with mischiefe ayded the.
And I would I might praise herein
all cities alike, whiche I woulde do,
if all were lyke worthye, for then I
might shew more fayth in subiectes,
then strēgth in rebels, & testify to mē
to come, what a generall faith euerie
citie bare to y kinges maiesty, whose
age although it were not fit to rule,
yet his subiectes heartes were wyl-
linge to obeie, thinking not onely of
his hope, which al men conceiue here
after to be in him, but also of the iust
kynd of gouernement, which in his
minoritie his cousail doth vse amōg
them. And here, how muche and how
worthely may Exceter be cōmended,
which being in y middest of rebelles,
vnuitailed, vnfurnished, vnpredared
for so longe a siege, did noblie holde
out the continuall & daungerous as-
sault of the rebell. For they susteined
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the violence of the rebel, not onely
when they had plenty enough of vi-
taile, but also xi. or xii. daies after ye ex-
treme famine came on them, and li-
uing without bread were in courage
so manful, and in duty so constante,
that they thought it yet much better
to die the extreme death of hōger, shewing truth to their kyng, and loue to
their country, than to give any place to the rebell, and fauoure him with aide, although they might have done it with their lesse danger. Whose ex-
ample if Norwhich had folowed, and had not rather given place to traitor Ket, then to keepe their duty, and had not sought more safegarde then honesty, and private hope more then commune quietnes, they had ended their rebellion sooner, and escaped the selues better, and saued the losse of the worthy Lorde Sheffilde, in who was more true service for his lyfe
[D.i.v] then
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then in them for theyr goodes. And although thys can not be spoken a-
gainste certeine honeste that were a-
mongest them, whose prayse was the greater because they were so fewe, yet the greate noumber was suche that they not onely obeyed the rebell for feare, but also followed him for loue, and did so traiterously ordre the kin-
ges bāde vnder my Lord Marques, [10] that they suffered more dammage oute of their houses by the townes-
men, then they dyd abroade by the rebelles. Whose faute as the kyn-
ges maiestie maye pardon, so I wold ether the example might be forgottē, that no Citie might hereafter folow the lyke, or the dede so abhorred, that other hereafter woulde aucyde the lyke shame, and learne to be noble by Exceter, whose truth doth not onely deserve longe prayses, but also great rewarde.

D.ii. Who
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Who then that would willingly defend ye, can saye any thinge for ye, which have so diverselie faulted, so trayterously offended, not onely agaynst private men severally, but also generally against whole tounes, and that after suche a sorte, as outewarde enemies full of deadlie foode, could not more cruelly invade the. And thus the Kingses majesty dishonored, his counsel disobeied, the goodes of the pore spoyled, the houses of the wealthy sacked, honest mens bodies enprisoned, worthy mens personages slaine, cities besieged & threatened, and all kinde of thinges disorde red, can ye without teares and repentance here spoke of, which without honestie and godlines ye practised, a not finde in your hartes nowe to retoure to dutie, which by witchcraft of sedicion, were drowned in disordre. Haue ye not in disordre first greuous lie offended God, nexte trayterouslie
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risen against your Kinge, and so no-
ther worthy everlasting life, as long
as ye so remaine, nor yet ciuile lyfe,
being in suche a breache of commune
quietnes. If euery one of these can-
not by themselues, plucke you backe
from this your leude & outragious
enterprises, yet let all together stirre
ye, or at leaste be a fearfull example
to other, to beware by your vnmeasu-
rible foly, howe they do so farre pro-
uoke God, or offend man, and finde
by your mistemper to be them selues
better ordred, and learne styl to obey
because they woulde not repente, and
so to lyue with honesty, t they would
noter willingly offend Gods lawe,
nor disobey mans.

# But and ye were so mucche blered
that you dyd thinke impossible thin-
ges, & your reason gaue ye againste
all reason, that ye noter displeased
God herein, nor offended the Kynge,
yet ye be so blynde that ye vnndersta

D.iii. not
The true Subject not your owne case, nor your neighbours miserye, nor the ruine of the whole commune welthe, which doth evidently folowe, your so foule & detestable sedition. Do ye not see howe for the maintenaunce, of theseungodly rablementes, not only Cities and villages, but also Shieres and contres be utterly destroyed. Is not their corne wasted, their cattell fet a waye, their houses rifled, their goodes spoiled, and all to feede your vprisinge without reason, and to maintein this tumulte of rebellion inuented of the Deuill, continued by you, and to be overthrown by the power of Gods mightie hande. And while should not so hurtfull wasting and heering of contreies, be iustelye punished with greate seueritie, seinge robbinge of howses, and taking of purses, do by lawe deserue thextremitie of death. Howe manie suffer injurie when one hundred of a Shiere is spoiled, and [D.iii.V] what
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what injurie thinke ye is done when not only whole Shieres be destroyed, but also euerie quarter of the Realme touched. Haue ye not brought vpon vs all pouertie, weakenes, and hatered within the Realme, and discouragement, shame, and dammage without the Realme? If ye miserably entended not onelye to vndo other, but also to destroie your selues, and to overthrowe the whole Realme, coulde ye haue taken a redier waye to your owne ruine then this is? And firste if ye be any thinge reasonable, lifte vp your reason, and weie by wisedome, if not all thinges, yet your owne cases, and learne in the beginninge of matters to forsee the ende, & so iudge advisedly, or ye enter into any thinge hastelye. See ye not this yeare the losse of herueste? And thinke ye, ye can growe to wealthe that yere when ye loose youre thryfte and profite?

D.iii. Barnes
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Barnes be poore mens storehouses, wherin lieth a greate parte of euerie mans owne liuing, his wives & hys childrēs liuing, wherwith men main taine their families, pay their rentes, and therfore bee alwayes thoughte most ryche when they haue best crop pes. And nowe when there is nother plentie of hai, nor sufficient of straw, nor corne inough, & that through the great disorder of your wycked rebel-liō, can ye thinke ye to do wel, whē ye vndo your selues, and iudge it a com-mune wealth, when the comunes is destroyed, & seake your hap by vn-happines, & esteme your owne losse to bee your owne forwardnes, and by thys iudgement shew yourselves howe litle ye understand other mens matters, whē ye can scasely consider the wayghtiest of your owne. Hathe not the haye this yere, as it rose fro the ground, so rotted to the grounde agayne, and where it was wonte by

[D.iii.5] mens
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Mens seasonable laboure to be taken in due tyme, and the serue for main-tenaunce of horse and cattel, where-with we lyue, nowe by your disorde-red myschief, hath ben by mens idel-nes and vndutifulnes, let alone untouched, & so neyther seruith the pore to make money of, nor any cattell to liue with. The corne was sowne w la bour, & the ground tilled for it with labour, & loked to be brought home againe with labour, & for lacke of honest labourers is lost on the ground, the owners being loiterers, & seking other mens haue lost their owne, and hoping for mountaines, lacked their present thrift, neither obteining that they sought nor seking they ought. And howe shall men lyue when the mayntenaunce of theyr provision is lacking? For laboring and theyr old store is wasted by wildnes of seditio, and so neyther spare tholde, nor saue the newe. Howe can menne be fed thē

[D. v.] or
The true Subject
or beasts liue, when as suche wastefully negligence is miserably vsed, & mispending the time of their profite, in shameful disorde of inobedience, care not greatly what becomes of their owne, because they entende to liue by other mennes. Haye is gone, corne is wasted, strawe is spoiled, what rekeninge of herueste canne ye make, other for thaid of others, or for the relief of your selues? And thus haue ye brought in one kinde of miserie, which if ye sawe before, as ye bee lyke to feel after, although ye had hated the comune wealth, yet for loue of youre selues ye woulde haue avoided your great enormitie ther-of, into the whiche ye wilfully nowe haue caste in your selues.

# An other no lesse is, that suche ple-
tie of vitaile, as was abundauntly in everye quarter for the reliefe of vs all, is nowe al wastfully and vnthrift fully spente, in maintaining you
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lawfull rebelles, and so wyth disor-
der all is consumed, whiche wyth
good husbondrie, might longe haue
endured. For so muche as woulde
haue servd a whole yere at home,
wyth diligente and skilfull heede of
husbandrye, that is wylfully wasted
in a moneth in the campe, through
the rauening spoyle of villainie. For
what is vnordred plentie, but a wast
full spoyle, wherof thinconuenience
is so greate, as ye be worthy to feele,
and bringeth in more hardenesse of
liuinge, greater dearte of al thing, &
occaisioneth mani causes of diseases.
The price of thinges must nedes en
crease muche, whē the number of thin
ges waxeth lesse, and by scartsie be
enhaunsed, & cōpelleth men to abate
their liberalitie in house, both to their
owne, and also to straungers. And
where ȳ riche wāteth, what can ȳ po-
re fynd, who in a comune scartsie, ly-
ueth most scarsely, & feleth quicliest
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the sharpnes of staruing, when euer-
rye man for lacke is hongerbitten, which if ye had wel remembred before, as ye nowe maye after perceyue, ye would not I thinke so stifneckedlie haue resisted, and endaungered your selfe in the storme of famine, where of ye most lickely must haue the greatest parte, whiche most stubburnly resisted, to your owne shame and confusion. Experience teacheth vs that after a greate dearthe cōmeth a greate death, for that when men in greate want of meate eateth much ill meat, they fyll theyr bodies wyth ill humors, & casteth them from theyr state of health into a subiectiō of sicknes, bycause the good bloud in the bodie is not able to keepe his temper, for y multitude of the yll humors that cor rupteth the same. And so growe great & deadly plages, and destroie greate noumbres of all sortes, spa­ring no kinde that they light on, no­
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ther respecting the pore with mer-
cie, nor the riche with fauour. Can ye
erfore thinke herein, when ye se de-
caye of vitails, the ryche pinche, the
poore famishe, the folowinge of dis-
eases, the greatenes of deathe, the
mourning of widowes, ey pitefulnes
of the fatherles, and all this miserie
to come thorowe your unnaturall
misbehauceour, that ye haue not dan-
gerously hurt ey comunes of your co-
trei with a doleful and an uncurable
wounde?

These thinges being once felte in
the comune wealth, as they must ne-
des be, every man seith by & by what
foloweth, a great diminishmēt of the
strength of the realme, when the due
nomber that the realme doeth main-
taine is made lesse, and therby we be
made rather a pray for our enemies,
then a safetie for our selfe. And howe
can there be but a great decay of peo-
ple at the length, when some be ouer-
thrown
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thrown in warre, some suffer for pu-
nyshemente, some pine for famine,
some die wyth the campes diet, some
be consumed wyth sickenesse. For al-
though ye thinke your selues able to
matche wyth a fewe vnp repared gen-
tlemen, and put them from theyr hou-
ses, that ye myght gaine the spoyle,
dooye iudge therefore youre selues
stronge inoughe, not onely to with-
stande a kynges power, but also to
ouerthrowe it? Is it possible that ye
shoulde haue so madde a phrensye in
your head, that ye should thinke the
nomber ye se so stronge, that all ye see
not, should not be able to preuaile to
the contrarys? Wyth what rea-
son coulde ye thinke that if ye bode
the hoate brunte of battayle, but ye
must needes feele the smarte, special-
ly the kynges power comminge a-
gaynst you, which if ye feare not, be-
lyke ye knowe not the force thereof.

[D.vii.v] And
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And so muche the greater number is lost in the realme, that both the overcommer and the overcommed be partes, although vnlyke of one realme, and what losse is not onely of either syde, but of boeth, that dothe playlye redoune to the whole. Then where so great and so horrible a faute is committed, as worse can not bee mentioned of frome the beginninge, and bringeth in withall suche penuerie, suche weaknes, suche disordre in the comune wealth, as no mischiefe besyde coulde do the like, can any mā thynke with iustē reason that al shal escape vnpunished, that shall escape the sweard, and not mani for terrour, and examples sake should be looked vnto, who hath bene other great doers in suche a disordred villainie, or greate counsellors to suche an outegrown mischiefe? Seinge thonly remedie of redressing wilfull fautes is a iust & a seuere punishment of suche
The tru subiect
whose naughtie deede good menne
oughte to abhorre for duties sake, &
il men maye dreade for lyke ponish-
mentes sake, and a free licence to do
mischiefe vnpunished is so daunge-
rous that the sufferaunce of one, is
tho\-casion of the faule of a great no-
ber, and womannishe pitie to one, is
a deceitful crueltie to the whole, en-
tising them to their owne destruction
bi sufferauce, which wold haue auoi-
ded the daunger by forponyshmet.

And in such a barenes of vitaile,
as muste needes come after so raue
ning a spoile, it must nedes be $^\frac{1}{2}$ some
thoughfe fewe, shall be so nipte with
egerne of famine, that they shal not
recouer againe them selues out of so
freatinge a daunger. So in a gene-
rall weakenes, where all shall be fe-
bled, some must nedes dye and so di-
minishe the nomber and abate suche
strength as the Realme defended it
self withal afore. Whiche occasi\o of
[D.viii. v] suer
To the rebell
so fewe coming of so great a cause
if ye should make iuste amendes for,
not of recopence which ye could not,
but of punishment which ye ought,
howe manie, howe diuerse, and howe
cruell deathes ought every one of ye
often to suffer? Howe manie came to
the campes from longe labour to so-
daune ease, and frome meane fare to
stroiyng of vitaile, and so fel in a ma
ner vnwares to suche a contrarye
chaunge, that nature herselue abiding
neuer great & sodaine chaunges, can
not beare it without some groundes
entred of disseases to come, whiche
uncircumspecte men shall soner feele
the thinke of & then wil scasely judge
the cause, when they shall be vexed
with the effecte. It is litle marueile
that idlenes & meat of an other man-
nes charge wyl sone feeede vp and fat
lykely men, but it is greate meruaile
if idlenes and other mens meate do
not abate the same bi sicknes againe,
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and specially comming from the one
and goinge to the other contrary in
those, who violently seeke to turne in
a moment thole realme to the contra
ry. For while their minde chaungeth
from obedience to vnrulines, and tur
neth it selfe from honesty to wildnes,
and their bodies go frome labour to
idlenes, from smale fare to spoile of
vitaile, and from beddes in the night
to cabins, from swete houses to stink­
ing campes, it muste nedes bee by
chaunging of affections which alter
the body, & by vsinge of rest \frac{1}{2} filleth
the body, and gluttinge of meates
which weakeneth the bodie, and with
colde in the nightes which acraseth
the bodie, & wyth corrupt ayer which
infeceth the bodie, that there folowe
some greuous tempest, not onli of con
tagious sickenes, but also of present
dethe to the bodie. The greateste
plucke of all, is that vehemence of
plage, which naturally foloweth the
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dinte of honger, whiche when it entreth once amonge men, what dartes
of panges, what throwes of painses, what shoutes of death doeth it caste
oute, howe manie fall, not astoni-ed wyth the syckenes, but freated
with the paine, how beateth it doune not onli smale townes but also great
contreis. This when ye se lyght first on your beastes, which lacketh fod-
der, and after fall on men, whose bo-
dies gapeth for it, and see the scarce-
nesse of men to be, by this your foule
enterprise, and not only other menne
touched with plages, but also your
owne house stonge with death, and
the plage also raysed of your risinge
to fyre your selues, can ye thinke to
be ani other but mäquellers of other,
and murderers of your selues, and
the principalles of thouerthrowe of
so greate a nomber, as shall other by
sweed or pomyshent, famine or some

E.i.i. plage
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plage or pestilence, be consumed and
wasted out of the commune wealth.
And seinge he that decayseth the num-
ber of cottages, or plowes in a toune,
semeth to be an enemie to the commune
wealth, shall we not compte him, not
onely an enemie but also a murderer
of his contrey, who by harebrained
vnrulines causeth the utter ruine, &
pestilent destructiō of so mani thou-
sande men. Graunte this foly then &
ouersyght, to be suche as worthely ye
may compt it, and I shall go further
in declaring of other greate incomue
niences, whiche your daangerouse &
furiose misbehauencoure, hath hurte-
fully brought in. Seing diverse ho-
nest and true dealing men, whose ly-
uing is bi their owne provision, hath
come so aforehande by tyme, that
they haue bene able well, to liue ho-
nestly in their houses, and paye be-
sides the rentes of their farmes truli
haue by your crueltie and abhorred
To the rebel.

Insurrections lost their goodes, their cattail, their heruest, which they had gotten before, and wherwith they entended to liue hereafter, thei be brought to this extremitie, that thei be neither able to liue as they were wonte at home afore, nor to paie their accustomable rente at their due time. Wherby they be brought into trouoble & vnquietnes, not only musinge what they haue lost by you, but also cursing you by whome they haue lost it, and also in daunger of losing their holdes at their Lordes handes, excepte by pitie they shewe moore mercye then the ryghte of the lawe wyll graunt by iustice. And what a griefe is it to an honest man, to labour, true lye in youth, and to gaine painfully by labour, wherewith to liue honestli in age, and to haue this gotten in longe time to be sodainlye raught awaye by the violence of seditio, whiche name he oughte to abborre bi it.

E.iii. selfe
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selfe althoughhe no miserie of losse followed to him therbi. But what greater grievre ought seditious rebelles to haue them selues, who if they be not stricken with punishment, yet ought to pyne in conscience and melte away with the grievre of their owne fautes, when they se innocētes & men of true service hindered & burdened with the hurte of theyr rebellion, and who in a good comune wealth should for honestyes sake prospere, they by these rebelles onelie meanes be caste so behinde y hand, as thei can not recover easely agayne by theyr owne truth, that as they haue loste by those traytours mischief. And if vniuste men ought not so to bee handled at anye mannes handes but onely stande to the order of a lawe, how muche more should true and faithfull subiectes, who deserue prayse feele no vnqui- etnes, nor be vexed with seditio, who be obedientlye in subiection, but ra-
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ther seeke iuste amendes at false rebelles handes, and by lawe obtaine that they loat by disorde, and so constraine you to thuttermoste, to paye the recompence of wrongfull losses, because ye were the authors of these wrongfull spoyles. Then woulde ye sone perceiue & commune wealthes hurte, not when other felte it who deserued it not, but when you smarted who caused it, & stode not and looked upon other mennes losses, whiche ye might pitie, but tormeted with your owne which ye would lamente. Now I am past this mischief, which ye wil not hereafter deny, whẽ ye shal praise other mens foresight, rather the your wicked doinges, in bewailing thende of your furye in whose beginning ye now reinyse. What say ye to of vagabodes & loitrõ beggers whiche after ouerthrow of your cape & scatering of this seditious nõbre, wil swarme in eueri corner of the realme,
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and not only lie lying vnder hedges, but also stande sturdely in cities,
and begge boldly at euery dore, leaving labour which they like not, and
followe idlenes which they should not. For euery man is easely and na-
turally brought, from labor to ease, frome the better to the worse, frome
diligence to slouthfulnes, and after warres it is communely sene, that a
great nomber of those which wente out honest, returne home againe like
rollers & as though thei were burnt to the warres botome, they haue all
their lyfe after an unsauery smacke thereof, and smel stil towarde daieslep-
ers, pursepikers, highwaie robbers, quarelmakers, ye & bloudsheders to.
Do we not see commonly in thende of warres more robbing, more begging,
more murdering then before, & those to stand in the high wai to aske their
almes whom ye be afraied to say nai vnto honestly, lest they take it awaie
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frome you violently, and haue more
cause to suspecte their strength, then
pitie their nede. Is it not then daily
hearde, howe men be not only pursu­
ed, but utterly spoiled, and fewe mai
ride safe by the kings waie, excepte
they ryde stronge, not so muche for
feare of their goodes, which menne
esteme lesse, but also for daunger of
their life whiche every man loueth.
[10]Worke is vndone at home, and loite
rers linger in stretes, lurk in ale hou
ses, range in highwaies, valiaunte
beggars play in tounes, and yet com
plaine of neede, whose staffe if it be
once hoat in their hande, or sluggish­
nes bred in their bosome, thei wil ne­
uer be allured to labour againe, con­
tenting them selues better with idle
beggary, then with honest and profi
table labour. And what more noisom
beastes be in a comune wealth? Dra­
nes in hius sucke oute the honie, a
smal matter, but yet to be loked on bi
[20][E.v.] good
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good houesbôdes, caterpillers destroy
the fruite, an hurtefull thynge and
well shyfted for, by a diligente ouer-
seer. Diuerse vermine destroye corne,
kyll polleine, enginnes and snares
be made for the. But what is a loytey
ror, a sucker of honie, a spoyler of
corne, a destroyer of fruite? Naye a
waster of money, a spoyler of vitaile,
a sucker of bloud, a breker of orders,
a seeker of brekes, a queller of life, a
basiliske of the comune wealthe, whi-
che by companie and syght doth poy
son the whole contrey, and staineth
honeste mindes with the infection
of his venime, and so draweth the
commune wealthe to deathe and de-
structiō. Such is the fruites of your
labour, and travaile for your preten-
sed commune wealthe, which iustice
wolde no mā should tast of but your
selues, that ye myght truelye iudge
of your owne mischiefe, and fraye o-
ther by example frome presumynge

[E.v.V] the
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the lyke. When we see a great number of flyes in a yere, we naturallye judge lyke to bee a greate plage, and hauing so great a swarming of loytering vagabondes, readie to begge and braule at euyry mannes doore, which declare a greater infection, can wee not looke for a greuouser and perilouser daunger then the plage is? Who can threfore otherwyse deame, but thys one deadlye hurte, where­with the comune wealthe of oure na­tion is wounded, besyde all other is so pestilent, that there can be no more hurtefull thinge, in a well gouerned state, nor more thrown in to all kind of vyce, and vnrulinesse, and threfore this your sedition not only most odious, but also moste horrible, that haue spotted the whole contrey, with suche a staine of idelnes.

# There can be none end of fautes, if a ma rehearse al fautes, t y do necessa­rilye folowe this vnruly sturdines.

[E.vi.] For
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For not only vagabūdes wandring
and scatering the selues for mischief,
shall runne in a mans eies, but also
disorder of euerie degre, shall entre in
into a mans minde, and shal behold
hereby the commune wealth miserably
defaced by you, who should asmoche
as other haue kept your selues in or
der in it. Nother is the maiestrates
duely obeied, nor the lawes iustly fea
red, nor degrees of men considered,
nor maysters wel serued, nor parētes
truly reuerenced, nor Lordes remem-
bred of their tennautes, nor yet other
naturall, or Ciuile Lawe muche re­
garded. And it is plainly vnpossible
that that contrey shall well stande
in guernemet, and the people grow
to wealth, where order in euery state,
is not fitly observered, and that bodie
can not bee with out muche grieve of
inflammation, where any least parte is
oute of ioynte, or not duely set in his
owne natural place. Wherfore order

[E.vi.V] muste
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must be kept in the commune wealth
lyke health in the bodye, and al the
drift of pollicie loketh to this ende,
howe this temper mai be safely main
tained, without any excess of vnmea-
surablenes, other of thone syde or of
thother. And easye inough it is to
kepe the same, whē it is once brought
in to the meane, and to holde it in y
staye it is founde in, but when it bur
steth out once with a vehemence, and
hath gotten into an vnrule disorder,
it spredeth so fast, and ouerfloweth al
honeste mens resistinge so violently,
that it will be harde to recouer the
breche of longe time againe, excepte
with greate and wise counsell (which
no doubte shal be in season vsed) ther
be wonderful remedies sought there-
fore. And euen as a man fallinge is
easier holden vp by staye, then when
he is fallen doune he is able to ryse a
gaine, so is the commune wealth slipp-
inge, by the foresight of wisedome,
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better kepte frome ruine, then when
it is once fallen in to any kinde of mi
sery the same may be called againe to
the olde and former state. Do we not
evidently know, that a man mai bet­
ter kepe his arme or his legge frome
breaking or fallynge out of icynt, a­
fore hurt come to it, then after it
may safely & quietely be healed, and
restored to former strength & health
again. And nowe thorow your sediti­
tous meanes, things y were afore qui­
ete & in good order, lawes feared & o
beied, subjectes ruled & kept in dueti,
be al now in a great disorder, & like if
it be not holpe to growe to wildnes, &
a beastlines, seinge neither comune
dutie cā be kept, which nature prescri­
beth, nor comune law cā be regarded
which pollicie requireth. How can ye
kepe your owne if ye kepe no order,
your wife & childrē how cā they be de­
fended from other mens violence, if
ye wil in other thinges breake al or­
der
To the rebell.

To the rebell, by what reason, would ye be obeyed of yours as seruauntes, if ye will not obey the king as subjectes, how woulde ye haue others deale orderly with you, if ye will use disorder against all others. Seinge then there is suche a confusion now of things, such a turmoile of men, suche a disorder of fashions, who can loke to liue quietly a great whyle, who cō thinke but ɔ ye haue miserably tossed ɔ commune wealth, & so vexed al men ɔ disorder, ɔ thincōuenience herof, can not only nip others, but also touch you.

But now see howe that not onely these vnloked for mischiefs haue heauly growė on ye, but also those commodities, whiche ye thought to haue hōpen your selues and others by, be not onely hindered, but also hurt ther by. The Kynges maiestie by thad-uisė. et cet. entended a iuste reformation of all suche thynges as poore men coulde truely shewe them selues

pressed
The true subject

oppressed with, thinking equalitie of justice, to be the diadem of his king
dome, and the safeguard of his communes. Which was not only intended by
wisdom, but also set on with speed, and so entered into a due considering
of all states, that none should have just cause to grudge against the other,
when as every thinge rightfully had, nothings could be but unrightfullie
grudged at. And this would have been done, not onely with your glad &
willing assente, but also been done by this daye almoste thorow out the
whole realme, so that quietly it had bene obtained without inconuenience,
and spedeli, without delay. And what soeuer had been done by the kinges
maiesties authoritie, that would by right haue remained for euer, & so ta
taken in lawe, that the contrary partie, neither could by iustice, neither wold
bi boldnes, haue enterprised breake thereof. But leste wicked men should

\[E.viii.v\]
To the rebell
be wealthy, and they whose hartes be not truly bent to obedience, shoulde obteine at the Kings hand that thei deserued not in a comune wealth, ye haue merueilously and wortheli hurt your selues, & graciousli prouided, except the Kings goodnes be more vn to you then your owne desertes can claime, y ye be not so muche worthye as to bee benefited in ani kinde, as ye be worthy to lose that ye haue on eue rie side. Ye haue thought good to be your owne reformers by lyke, not on ly vnnaturally mistrusting the Kin­ ges iustice, but also cruelly and vn­ ciuilely dealing w your owne neigh­ boures. Wherin I wolde as ye haue hurte the whole realme, so ye had not enterprised a thinge mooste daunge­ rous to your selues, and mooste con­ trary to the thinge ye entended. If ye had let thinges alone, thought good by your selues to be redressed, and du tifuly loked for the perfourmaunce F.i. of
The true subject of the Kinges maiestie promised reformation, they should not haue bene undone at this tyme, as in a great sort of honest places thei be, nor those contreis who for their quietnes bee moste worthi to be loked on, shoulde haue ben vnprouided for at this dai. But this comoditie hath happened by the way that it is euidently known, by your mischief, and others duty, who be most true to the kinge, & most worthye to be done for, and who bee most pernitious & traiterous rebels. And it is not to be doubted, but they shal be considered with thankes, and fynde iuste redresse, without deserued misery, and you punished like rebels, who might haue had both praise and proftie like subjectes. For that as ye haue valiauntly done of your selues, thinke ye it wyll stande any longer, then men feare your rage, whiche can not endure longe, and that ye shall not then byde the rigor of the lawe.
To the rebell
for your priuate injuries, as ye vsed
the furye of your braynes in other
mens oppressions. Wyll men suffer
wronge at your handes whe law can
redresse and the right of the comune
wealth wyll maintayne it, and good
order in contres wyll beare it? Ye a-
mende fautes as yll surgions heale
soores, which when they seme to bee
whole aboue thei rankle at the botome
and so be faine continualli to be sore,
or else be meded by new breaking of
the skynne. Your redresse semeth to
you perfite and good, ye haue pulled
doune suche thinges as ye would, ye
thinke now all is well, ye cosider no
farther, ye seke not the botome, ye se not
the sore, ye haue done it by no lawe,
ye haue redressed it by no order, what
the? If it be none otherwaies serched
the bi you, it wil not tary log so, other
it wil be after continually as it was a-
fore your comming, or els it must be
whé all is done améded by the king.

F.ii. Thus
The tru subiect
Thus haue ye both lacked in y time,
and miste in the doing, & yet besides
that ye haue done whiche is by your
doynge to no purpose, ye haue done y
things with suche incouueniences as
hath bene bothe before rehearsed and
shall bee after declared, that better
it had bene for you neuer to enjoy
the comoditie if there be any, then to
suffer the griefes y will ensue, which
be very mani. In eueri quarter some
men whom ye set by wil be loste, whi­
che euerye one of you if ye haue loue
in ye, would rather haue lacked the
profit of your enclosures, then cause
suche destruction of them, as is lyke
by reason and judgement necessarily
to folowe. What comune wealth is
then, to do suche abhominable enter­
prises after so vile a sorte that ye hin
der that good ye woulde do, & bringe
in that hurte ye woulde not, and so
finde that ye seke not, and folow that
ye loose, and destroye your selfes by

[F.ii.V] follye
To the rebel.

folly, rather then ye would be ordred by reason, and so haue not so muche amended your olde sores, as brought in newe plages, which ye your selues that deserue them wil lament, & wee which haue not deserued them maye curse you for. For although the Kin­
ges maistie, &c. entended for your profites a reformatiō in his comune wealth, yet his pleasure was not, nor no reason gaue it, that euerie subject shoulde busilye intermedle with it of their owne head, but onlie those who his counsel thought moste mete men for suche an honest purpose. The kin­
ges maistie, &c. hath godly reformed an vncleane parte of religion, & hath brought it to y true forme of the first churche that folowed Christe, think­
ing that to be the trueste, not what later mens phansies hath of them sel ues devised, but what thapostles and their felowes had at Cristhes hande receiued, and willeth the same to be

F.iii. knowen
The true Subject

knowen and set abrode to al his peo-
ple. Shal euery man now that listeth,
& phansieth the same take in hand vn
called to be a minister, and to set forth
the same hauing no authoritie? Nay
though the thinges were very godlie
that were done, yet the person must ne
des do yl that enterpriseth it, because
he doth a good thing after an il sort,
and loketh but on a little part of du-
tie considering the thinges, & leaueth
a great parte vnaduised, not consid-
ring the person, whē as in a wel and
justly done matter, not onlie those. ii.
thinges ought well to be weied, but
also good occasion of time, and reaso
nable cause of the doinge ought also
much to be set afore euery doers eies.
Nowe in this youre deede the ma-
ner is vngodlye, the thinge vnsuffer-
able, the cause wicked, the person se-
ditious, the tyme trayterous, and can
ye possibly by any honeste defence of
reason, or any good conscience reli-
[F.iii.v] giously
To the rebel.

giously grounded denie that this ma-
litious & horrible faute, so wickedly
set on is not only sinfull afore god, &
traiterous to the King, but also dead-
ly and pestilent to the whole comune
wealth of our contrey, & so not only o-
uerflow vs with the miserie, but also o-
erwhelme you with the rage therof.

Yet further se, and ye be not wery
with the multitude of miseries whi-
che ye haue meruelouslye moued,
what a yooke ye wilfully do bringe
on your selues, in stirring vp this de-
testable sedition, and so bringe your
selues in to a further slauery, if ye vse
your selues often thus inobediently.

When commune order of the lawe
can take no place in vnruyl and diso-
bedient subiectes, and all men wyl of
wylfulnessse resiste wyth rage, and
thynke theyr owne violence to be the
beste iustice, then be wyse magistra-
tes compelled by necessitie, to seke an
extreme remedie, where means salues

F.iii. helpe
The true Subject helpe not, and bringe in the Martial lawe, where none other lawe seruith. Then muste ye be contented to byde punishment without processe, conde­nation without witnesse, suspition is then taken for judgement, and dis­pleasure may be iust cause of your ex­ecution, and so withoute fauoure ye finde straitenes, which without rule seeke violence. Ye thinke it a harde lawe and an vnsufferable. It is so in deede, but yet good for a medicine. Desperat sicknesses in phisicke must haue desperate remedies, for meane medicines, wyll neuer helpe greate griefs. So if ye caste your selues in­to suche sharpe diseases, ye must nee­des loke for sharpe medicines againe at your phisions handes. And wor­thy ye be to suffer thextremitie in a co­mune wealth, which seeke to do thex­tremitie, and by reason, muste receiue the lyke ye offer, and so be contented to byde the ende willingly, which set [F.iii.i] on
To the rebel.

on the begininge wilfullye. For no greater shame can come to y comune wealth, then that those subjectes, whiche should be obedient euene without a lawe, can not be contented to be or- dred by the lawe, and by no meanes kept within their dutie, which should euery way offend rather then in their dutie. It is a tokē that the subjectes lacke reason, when they forsake lawe, and thinke other by their multitude to finde pardon, which can not iustly stretch to al, or els bi strēgth to beare the strokke, which can not prospere a gainst a kinge. They must nedes li- ttle considre them selues, who bringe in this necessitie, rather to stande to the pleasure of a mans will, then to a byde the reason of the lawe, and to be endaungered more whē an other mā lysteth, then when himselfe offendeth. And this muste necessarily folowe if your rebellion thus continue, & while ye seeke to throwe downe the yoke

[F.v.] which
The true Subject

which ye phansie your selues burdenned withal, ye bringe your selues in a greater bondage, leauing safetie & folowinge daunger, and puttinge your selues vnder the iustice of them whose fauoure ye might easelye haue kept, if ye would willingly & dutifully haue serued. Now gentlemen be more in trust because the comunes be vntrusty, & thei gat by seruice which ye lose bi stobburnes, & therymore must nedes if ye thus continue, haue more authoritie from the kyng, because ye would be in lesse subjictio to ye king, and ye as ye wil not do of your selues ye muste be cœpelled to do by others, and ye refuse to do willingly, think ye must be drawen to do same constrainedly. Which when it cœmeth to passe, as wisedome seeth in your fautes it must nedes, what gain ye the, or what profite cœ arise to you by ry-sing, which might haue found ease in sitting stil, & what shal ye be at length
To the rebel.

the better for this turmoile, which be side divers other incomodities rehearsed, shall be thus clogged with the unsufferable burde of ye Martial lawe.

Yet is there one thinge behind which me thinketh yourselves shuld not forget, seing ye haue given ye cause, ye should duly loke for theeffect. Ye haue spoiled, enprisoned, & threatened gentlemen to death, & that with such hated of minde, as may not well be borne, ye cause therof I speke not on,

which tried wil happeli be not so great, but se thinge, set murder a syde whiche is ye heinosest faute to a private man. What could more spitefulli haue ben done again the the ye haue used w crueltie? Can this do any othe but breed in their stomakes gret grudge of displeasure toward you, & engedge suche an hated as the wea- ter & the sufferer, muste nedes beare ye smart therof. The kings best kind of gouvernmet is so to rule his subiects, as a father ordreth his children, [F.vi.]
The true Subject

and beste life of obedient subiectes is one to behaue himselfe to an other, as though they were brethern vnder the kynge their father. For loue is not the knotte onely of the commune wealth, wherby diverse partes be perfitely ioyned to gether in one pollitike body, but also the strength, and mighte of the same, gathering togethér in to a small rome with order, whiche scatered woulde elles breede confusion and debate. Dissention we see in smal houses, and therby maye take example to great commune wealthes, howe it not onlie decaith them from wealth, but also abateth them from strength. Thinke small examples to take place in greate matters, and the lyke though not so greate to followe in the both, and therby learne to iudge of greate thinges unknowen, by smal thinges perceiued. When brethren agree not in a house, goeth not the weakest to the wall, and w[10]

[F.vi.\textsuperscript{v}] whom
To the rebell.

whom the father taketh part withal,
is not he likest to preuaile? Is it not
wisedome for the yonger brother, af­
ter the good wyl of the parentes, to
seeke his eldest brothers fauour, who
vnder the is most able to do for him?
To seeke them both with honestie is
wisdom, to lose them both by sullen­
nes is madnes. Hathe there not bene
daily benefites frome the gentlemen
to you, in some more, & in some lesse,
but in none:considered, which thei haue
more friandy offered, then you haue
gently requited. This must ye lose,
when ye wyll not be thankefull, and
learne to gaine new good wyll by de­serte, when ye forsake tholde frende­ship vprouoked. And ye must think
that liuing in a comune wealth to ge­ther, one kinde hath need of an other,
and yet a great sort of you more need
of one gentleman, then one gentle­man of a greate sorte of you, and though
all be partes of one comune wealth,
The true subiect
yet all be not lyke worthy partes, but
all being vnder obedience, some kinde
in more subjection one wai, and some
kinde in more service a nother waye.
And seinge ye be lesse able by money
& liberalitie, to desire good wil then
other be, & your only kinde of deserte
is to shew good wil, which honest me
do wel accepte asmuch worth as mo-
ney, haue ye not much hindred & hurt
your selfe herei, losing t one kinde of
humanitie which ye haue only left &
turnig it in to cruelti, which ye ought
moost to abhorre, not only because it
is wicked of it selfe, but also most no
some to you. I can therefore for my
part thinke no lesse herin, but ye must
finde some inconuenience herein, if ye
folowe your stifnes stil, & must nedes
judge t ye haue wilfully brought on
your selues suche plages as the lyke
coulde not haue fallen on you, but
by your selues. Seing then thus ma
ny wayes ye haue hurte the comune

[F.vii.v] wealth
To the rebell.

wealth of this whole contrei within,
by destructiō of shieres, losyng of her useet, wasting of vitaile, decaiyng of manrode, vndoing of fammers, encre sing of vagabondes, maintaining of disorder, hindring of redresses, bring­ing in of Martial lawe, & bredinge continuall hatered amonges diuers states, what thinke ye I praye you, iudge ye not ye haue cōmitted an o dious & a detestable crime againste thole comune wealthe, whose furde raunce ye ought to haue tendred by duti, & not to haue sought hurt ther of with your owne dāmage.

† Besides al these inward griefes, which eueri one seueralli must nedes fele w miserie, there happeneth so mani outward mischaūces amog strau gers to vs w disdaine, if ther were nothing in the realme which we should feel, yet shame which doth touch vs frō other cōtreis should not ōli moue but also cōpel you harteli to forthinke this your rebellious sedicio. 

[F,viii.]
The true subject

For what shall strangers think,
when they shall hear of the great mis-
order, which is in this Realm with
such a confusion, that no order of lawe
can keep you under, but must be fain
to be beaten down with a king's pow-
er. Shall they not first think the
King's majesty, in whose mind God
hath so much hope for a
child, as we may look for gifts in a
man, other for his age to be little set
by, or for lack of qualities not to be
regarded, or for defect of love to be
resisted, and no notable grace of God
in him considered, nor the worthiness
of his office looked upon, nor natural
obedience due to him remembered.
Shall they not next suppose small esti-
matio to be given to the rulers, to whom
under the King we owe due obedience,
that can not in just & lawful matters
be hard, nor men to have that right
judgment of their wisdom, as their
justice in rule, and foresight in coun-
[V. viii. v] sell
To the rebel.

\(\text{cel requireth, but rather prefer their owne phæsies to others experience, &}
\)
deame their owne reaso\text{-}n to be comune wealth, & other mës wisdom to be but
dreaming. Shal thei not truly saye, the subiectes to be more vnfaithfull in disobedience, then other subiectes worse ordred be, and licence of liber-
tie to make wylde heades withoute order, and that they neither haue rea-
son that understand not the mischief of sedition, nor duetie which folowe
their beastlines, nor loue in the which so litle remembre the comune wealth,
nor natural affection which wyldelie seeke their owne destruction. Thus
the whole contrey lackinge the good opinion of other nations is caste in
to great shame by your vnrulines, &
the procedinges of the contrey be they neuer so godly shal be yl spo-
ken of, as vnfitte to be brought into vse, and good thinges hereby that de
serueth prayse, shall byde the rebuke

G.1. of
The true Subject
of them that lyste to speke yll, and yll
things vntouched shall be boldlyer
maintained, nothing may with praise
be redressed, where things be mea-
red by chaunsable disorder, rather the
by necessary use, and that is thought
most pollitike, that men wyl be beste
contented to do, and not that whiche
men should be brought vnto bi duty.
And w what duty or vertue in ye, can
ye quech out of mens memories this
foule enterprise, or gather a good re-
port againe to this realme, who hath
so vilely with reproche sclaudred the
same, and diuerslye discredited it a-
monge others, and abated the good o
pinion which was had of the iust go-
vernment and ruled order, vsed here-
toefore in this noble realme, which is
now most greuous bicause it is now
most without cause. If this outward
opinion, without further inconueni-
ence were al, yet it might wel be borne
and woulde with ease decaie, that it
To the rebel.
grew, but it hath not only hurte vs with voice, but endaungered vs in deede, and caste vs a greate deale behinde the hande where els we might haue had a ioylie fordeale. For that opportunitie of time, whiche seldome chauceth, & is alwaies to be take, hath bene by your frowarde meanes lost this yere, & so vainly spente at home for bringinge downe of you, whiche should els profitably haue ben other wise bestowed, t it hath bene almoaste as great a losse to vs abrode to lacke that we myghte haue opteined, as it was cobraunce at home, to go about the ouerthrow of you, whose sedition is to bee abhorred. And we mighte both couenientli haue inuaded some, if they wold not reasonably haue grow en to some kinde of frēdship, & also de fēded other, which wolde beside pro­mise for times sake, vniustli set vpon vs, & easly haue made this stormi ti­me a faire yere vnto vs, if our mē had
The true Subject

bene so happy at home as our likely-hode abrod was fortunat. But what

is it I pray you, other to let slyp such

an occasiō by negligence, or to stop it

by stubburnes which once past away

can bee by no meanes recovered, no

not thoughge with diligence ye go a-

bout, to renforse the same againe.

# Was there not I pray you, great

hope in the parties, and much likely-

hode in the thinge, that the Scottes

who hath both troubled vs, & destroi-
ed himself to escape that happines of

t perpetual vnitie, y shuld for both our

welthes haue euermore ēdured, wold

haue reasonably cōdescōded to some

good point of frēdship, had not your

busye and brainsicke heads come in

to such a dusines of reason, y for a tri-

fle which ye ought not to haue done,

ye stopped y which ye cā neuer amēd.

And what had bene more agreable &
cōuenient for vs both, thē as nature

hath made vs one & enclosed vs from

[G.ii.v] all
To the rebell
al other, so we might by agrement be
one, and be made severall frome o-
other mens rulinge. For while they
seke the helpe of other contreis, they
decayse them selues, & bringe them sel-
ues in to a straunge subjicte, rather
then they would byde an equalitie w
vs, which when they lay their affecti-
ons a part, & loke on their owne state
with true reason, thei will then iudge
what it is bothe to haue alway theyr
neighbour an enemie, & their bought
frende a ruler. But they can not al-
ways cōtinue in this blind hatered,
and if they wil not forsee it by reason,
they must after feele it by experience,
and so peraduenture know it to late,
when al those occasions, which tyme
bringeth, and god ordeineth, be take-
away and can not so conueniently be
brought to passe, beinge daunted, as
thei might afore beinge offred. Ther
hathe lacked nothings hitherto but
their good wylles, to be englishe, to
G.iii. be
The tru subject
be equal ĭ al benefits of this realme,
to bee gourned wyth one ruler and
with one lawe, to haue ioyned ourse
selfes in aliaunce of bloud, in equalite
of fredship, in benefite of one comune
wealth. The lacke of their partie is
cause of cōtinual debate, endles war,
infinite dissention, commune hindere-
raunce to vs both, which who soeuer
fealeth the greater smarte, we muste
bothe acknowledge and finde faute
with the miseri, howe soeuer we wyll
amend the cause. Al this had ben wel
brought to passe nowe if your wicked
enterprises had not muche hindred
their furderaunce, and caused thē to
breth against their owne profite, and
doute much to fall into an agrement
with vs, who can not well nor ciuile
agree amongst ourse selues. For howe
should they thinke them selues to en-
ter into a good state of comune weal-
the where there is nothing, but diso-
bedience of subjectes, rebelliō againe
[G.iii.7] magi-
To the rebell
magistrates, none order of duti, & vn
rulines so confuse of y comunes, that
the lyke may perchaunce be foude, in
loking ouer course of histories, but
the lyke can not be sene, in remēbring
thorowe the length of al your times.
But seing thei in cōsideratiō of y best,
sawe y hurte to be longe in lege with
their hired frendes, & the daunger to
stande in cotinuall warre w their e-
nemies, thought it good counsell to
ioine w their neighbors in some nigh
sort of frōdship, both for thaduoiding
of thoppressiō of y french, which they
forsaw necessarily to folow, & also for
redeming quietnes, which was to be
gottē at no bodies hāde but at oures.
This hope had, & the likelihod grow
ing to a certeintie, & that quietnes ob
tained that both we should wisely de
syre, what cōmoditie had sprong ther
of, what wealth would haue risen to
bothe the parties, what euerlastinge
frōdship wold haue ben knit for euer,
The tru subject
what happines had blessed euen the
most miserable, theexperience of fewe
daies, would plainly haue declared,
& profe of wise heads wolde shortlye
haue cōcluded. But al this, this al is
dashed, & the great towardnes cleane
taken awaye, not by their meanes,
who sawe what they shoulde do, and
knew what they feared, but by you,
by your deuilishe enterprises, ᴾhor-
rible vbices whereof did muche more
wythdrawe men from agrement, then
your obedience and duty would haue
entised to frendship. Wherfore ye
haue done more hurte, thē ye cā make
amendes, seing your duti can not re-
couer, that your misorder hath broke
and haue loste others quietnes with
your owne sturres, & haue marred co-
mune matters, with priuat factions
and so by lacke of wisedome & great-
nes of mischief haue brought in losse
of hap, & prolonging of trouble.

What saye ye to the frenche, who

# G.iii. v
To the rebell.

promising peace & continuance of
his leage, dothe contrarye to pro-
mise, make much of occasions, and se-
ing our weaknes, thinketh it is time,
not loking howe true a gentlemans
faithe shoulde bee, but sekinge honor
of victory, against honor of fidelitie.
And if we had bene strong this yere
with quietnes, not broken with discé-
tion, euem the stoutest men wold haue
ben lohest of trouble, not so hastie to
gue the onset, where they had know
en al to haue ben fensed, & nothing to
be wanting. But what honor is got
ten to fight with a sicke man, or what
manly praise is it to beate doune the
lame, chiefly to the valiaunt, who en-
tende by force without suttelty, and
by manhoode withoute treason, to
get honor in fielde and the fame of
victorie. Sedition is the sickenes
of a comune wealthe, which is febled
and fainted with breach of dissenti5,
not able to weld her wealthe by brea-

[20]

[G.v.] kyng
The true subject

kyng of her limmes, & easelyste take
when it is miserabliest sicke. But
what soeuer occasiō he taketh for ad
uantage loke who it is at home that
giueth it, and the more losse commeth
by the warre, the more thinke your
faute to be greuous of it selfe, and o-
dious to other. Ye can not do suche a
foule treason at home, but outward
nations shal ringe of it, and by wise-
dome iudge vs in discention feble,
whome in agremente thei haue felte
stronge, and therbi sake where e time
of the doinge serueth, althoughhe the
tyme of the doer serue nothing at al.
By this meanes ye see the leages of
peace broken, opē warre proclaimed,
the Kynges contries imuaded, what
thende wil be, you must nedes iudge,
if ye thinke of the time at home, howe
ye do not only trouble it, but also al-
most wholy betraye it. If ye woulde
with wickednes, haue forsaken your
faith to your naturall contrei & haue
To the rebell.
sought crafti means to haue vtterli' betraied it to oure comune enemies, could ye haue had any other spedier waie then this is, bothe to makeoure streght weak, & their weaknes strōg. If ye wold haue sought to haue spi­
ted your cōtrey, & to haue plesed your enemie, & folowe their counsel for our hinīrauce, could ye haue had devised of thē, any thing more shamefull for vs & icyful to them. If thei which lie like spials, & herke after liklihoodēs of things to come, because they declare oportunitie of tymes to thenemie, are to be iudged comune enemie of the contrei, what shall we resonably thinke of you, who do not secretly be­wraiē counsels of other, but openly betraiē the comune wealth with your owne deedes, and haue as muche as lieth in you, sought the ouerthrowe of it at home, whiche if ye had obte­ned at Goddes hande, as he neuer alloweth soo horrible an enterpyse,
The true subject

howe could ye haue defended it fro
the overthrow of other abrod? For is
your vnderstandyng of thynges so
small, that although ye se your selues
not vnfit to get the vpper hand of a
fewe gentlemen, ye be able to beate
doune afore ye the kings power, ye
and by chaunce ye were able to do,
would ye iudge your selues by stren­
gth mighti inough to resiste the pow­
er of outward nations that for praise
sake woulde inuade ye? Naye thinke
truly with your selues, that if ye do o
uercome, ye be vnsure both bi strēgth
abrode, and displeasure of honest mē
at home, and by the punishmēt of the
god abouve, and how ye haue not yet
gotten in dede, that your vaine hope
looketh for by phansie, thinke howe
certainly ye haue wounded comune
wealth w a sore stroke, in procuring
the frenche by our weakenes to seeke
victorie, & by our outward misery to
seke outward glorie, & inward disho

\[G.vi.v] \quad \text{nor,}\]
To the rebel.

nor, which whatsoever they get think it to belong of you, which have offered the victorie, afore they began war, because ye wold declare to men hereafter bylyke, how daungerous it is to make sturres at home, whě they do not only make our selues weake, but also our enemies strong.

Beside these ther is another sort of mě, desirous of advauntege, & disdain ful of our wealth, whose grief is most our greatest hap, and be offeded with religion, because they be drowned in superstitiō, mě zealed toward god, but not fit to iudge, meaning better with out knowledge, thě thei iudge bi their meaninge, worthier whose ignorauce should be take awaie, then their wyl should be folowed, whom we shoulde more rebuke for their stubburnes, thě despise for their ignoraunce. These se-inge superstitiō beaten downe, & reli-gion set vp, gods worde taking place, traditions kept in their kind, differēce

[G.vii.] made
The true Subiect
made betwene gods cōmaundemōtes
and mans learning, the truth of thin
ges sought out according to christes
institution, examples taken of the
primitiue churches vse, not at e Bi-
shop of Romes ordinauce, & true wor
ship taught & wil worship refused, do
by blindnes rebuke y as bi truth thei
should folowe, & by affection follow y
as bi knowledge they shuld abhorre,
thinkinge vsage to be truthe & scrip-
ture to be errour, not waiynge bi the
worde, but miscōstruing by costume.
And nowe thinges be chaïged to the
better, & religió trullier apointed, thei
se matters go awrie, which hurteth y
whole realme, & they rejoyse in this
mischief, as a thing worthely happe-
ned, mistaking the cause, & slaūdring
religiō, as though ther were no cause[20]
whi god might haue punished, if their
vsed professiō might styll haue taken
place. Thei se not ȝ where gods glo-
rice is truliest set forth, there ȝ deuil is
[G.vii.V]  
moste
To the rebel.

most busie for his part, & laboreth to corrupt bi lewdnes, \( t \) as is gotte out bi the truth, thinking \( t \) if it were not blemished at the first, \( t \) residue of his falsehead should after lesse preuaile.

So he troubleth bi biwaies he cā not plainly withstāde, & vseth subtiltye of sophistry, where plaine reasō fayleth, and perswadeth simple men \( t \) to be a cause, which in dede cā not be tried & takeō for a cause. So he causeth religi- gion which teacheth obedience, to be judged \( t \) cause of sedition, & the doc- trine of loue, \( t \) sede of discentio, mistaking \( t \) thinge, but perswading mens mindes, & abusing \( t \) plaine meaning of \( t \) honest, to a wicked ende of religi ons overthow. The husbande man had not so sone throwen seede in his grounde, but steppeth vp thenemie & he soweth coole to, and maketh men doute, whether the good housebande had done well or no, and whether he had sown there good seede or bad.

[G.viii.] The
The true Subject

The phasiful Jewes in Egipt wold not beleue Ieremie, but thought their plage & their miserie to come by his meanes, and leauing of Idolatrie, to be the cause of penurie, wherfore by wilful advise they enteded to forsake the Prophets counsell, & thought to serue god most truly, by their roted & accustomed Idolatrie. When chri- sten men were persecuted in the primitie church, and daili suffered mar tyrdome for christes profession, suche faire season of wether was for iii. or iiiii. yere together, t heathen iud- ged ther vpon god to be delighted with their crueltie, and so were perswaded with the bloud of the martyrs, thei pleased god highly. Suche phansies lighted nowe in papistes & irreligiose mens heades, and icyne things bi chaunce happening togeth- er, and conclueth the one to be the cause of the other, and the delighteth in true worshippers hurte, because [G.viii.v] they
To the rebell

thei judge cursedly ý good to be bad,
and therefore reýyseth in the punish-
ment of ý godly. For they being flesh-
lie, judge by outward thinges, & per-
ceiue not ý inward, for ý thei lacke ý
sprite, and so iudge amis, not under-
standing god, what diuersitie he suffe-
reoth, to blind stil the wilful, & thorow
al daungers, he saueth his forchosen.
Thus haue ye geuen a large occasiō,
to stubburne papistes both to iudge
amis, & also to reioyse in this wicked
chaunce, contented with our mischief,
not liking our religion, & thinkinge
God dothe punyshe for this better
chaunge, and haue therby an ýl opi-
nion of gods holy truth cōfirmed
in them by no sure scripture, but by
folowing of mischaunce, which they
oughte to thinke to comme for the
pride and stubburnes of the people,
who doth not accepte gods glorie in
good parte, nor geue no due praise to
their lorde and maker. What should

H.i. I
The tru subiect

I sayse more? ye hurte euerie waie, the
daungers be so great, & the periles so
many, which do daylie follow your de
uelyshe enterprise, t¥ the more I seke
in the matter, the more I cõtinually
see to say. And what wordes can wor-
thely declare this miserable beastli-
nes of yours, whiche haue entended
to deuide ¥ realme, and arme the one
part, for the killing of the other? For
euen as concord is not only ¥ health,
but also the strength of the realme, so
is sedition not only the weaknes, but
also thaposteme of the realme, which
when it breaketh inwardlie, putteth
the state in great daunger of recoue-
rie, & corrupteth the whole comune
wealth ¥ the rotte furie that it hath
longe putrified with. For it is not in
sedition as in other fautes which be-
ing mischeuous of them selues, haue
some notable hurt alwaies fast adjoy
ned to them, but in this one is there a
whole hel of fautes, not seuerally sca-
[20]
[H.i.v] tered,
To the rebel.

tered, but clustered on a lumpe, together & coming on so thick, it is impossible for a region armed with all kinds of wisedome & strength therto, to auoide the daungers y issueth out thereof. When sedition once breaketh out, se ye not the lawes ouerthrown, the magistrates despised, spoyling of houses, murdering of men, wastinge of contreis, encrease of disorder, diminishing of the realmes strength, swarming of vagabondes, scarsitie of laborers, & those mischiefes all plenteously brought in, which god is wont to scorge seuerely w al, warre, dearth, pestilence? And seinge ye haue thefte and murder, plague & famine, confusion and idlenes lynked to gether, can ye looke for anye more mischiefe in one shameful enterprise, then ye euidently see, to growe herein? As for warre although it be miserable, yet y one part getteth somewhat, & red'sytheth in the spoile, and so goeth lustier away, and
The true Subject

other encreaseth his contrey with riches, or enhaunseth him self glori, but in seditio both the partes loseth, the ouercômed can not flie, the ouercômer can not spoile, more the win­ner winneth, the more he loseth, the more that escape, the more infamous men lyue, al that is gained is scasely saued, the winning is losse, the losse is destruction, bothe waste themselues, & the whole most wasted, the strægthe ning of them selues, the decaie of the contrey, the struying for the victorie, is a praye to thenimie, and shortly to saye, hellishe turmoile of sedition, so far passeth comune miserie of war, as to slye himselfe is more heinous then to be slaine of an other. O noble peace, what wealth bringest y in, how doth all thinges florishe in felde and in towne, what forwardnes of religi on, what encrease of learninge, what grauitie in councell, what deuise of witte, what order of maners, what o

[H.ii. v] bedience
To the rebel.

bedience of lawes, what reuereence of states, what sauegarde of houses, what quietnes of life, what honor of contreis, what frendship of mindes, what honestie of pleasure, haste thou alwaies mainteined, whose happines we knewe not while now we feele the lacke, and shall learne by misery, to understand plentie, and so to auoide mischief, bi the hurte that it bringeth, & learne to serue better where rebellion is once knowne, and so to liue trulie, and kepe the kinges peace. What good state were ye in afore ye began, not pricked with pouertie, but stirred with mischief, to seeke your destruction, hauinge waies to redresse al that was amisse, magistrates most readie to tender all iustice, and pitiful in hearing ye poore mens causes, whiche soughte to amende matters more then you can devise, and readie to redresse them, better then ye coulde imagine, and yet for a headines ye

H.iii. coulde
The true Subiect
could not be contented, but in despite of god, who commandeth obedience & contempt of the kynge, whose lawes seeketh your wealth, & overthrow of your contrey, whiche naturally we should love, ye would proudly rise, and do ye wot not what, & amend things bi rebellio to your utter vndoing. What state leaue ye vs in nowe, beseeched with enemies, deuided at home, made pore with spoile & losse of our heruest, vnordred & caste doone, with slaughter and hatered, hindred from amend mentes, by our owne deuelyshe haste, endaungered with sickenesses, bi reason of disorder, layed open to mens pleasures, for breaking of the lawes, and feebled to suche faintenes, that scasely it wyl be recovered. Wherfore for gods sake haue pitie on your selues, consider howe miserably ye haue spoyled and destroied and wasted vs all, & if for desperatenes, ye care not for your selues, yet remembre your

[H.iii.v] wiues
To the rebell.

wyues, your children, your contrey, and forsake this rebellion, with humble submission, acknowledge your fautes, and tary not thextremitie of the kinges swerde, leaue of w repen-
taunce & turne to your duties, aske God forgeuenes, submitte ye to your kyng, be cõtented for a comune weal the one or two to die, & ye captains for the residue sacrifice your selues, ye shall so best attaine e kinges gra-
tious pardon, saue the assemble, and helpe the comune wealth, & declare your doinges to procede of mo stub-
burnes, but al this mischief to growe out of ignoraunce, which seing e miserie would redresse the faute, and so recouer best the blot of your disorder, and staye e great miseries which bee lyke to folowe. Thus if ye do not, thinke truly with your selues, e god is angrie with you for your rebellio, the kinges sweard drawne to defend his contrey, e crie of the poore to god
The true subject
against ye, the redines of the honeste
in armor to vâquishe ye, your death
to be at hand, which ye cā not escape,
hauing god against ye, as he promi-
seth in worde, the kinges power to o-
uerthrowe ye gathered in the feld,
the comune wealthe to beate ye
downe, w stripes & with cur
ses, the shame of your mis
chiefe to blemishe ye
# for euer. #
#(···)#
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[H.iii.iv]
EXPLANATORY NOTES

Alv. While the appropriateness of the woodcut to the subject of the treatise is obvious, Cheke had indicated an earlier interest in the story of Absalom. Cf. Ascham, Scholemaster, p. 284. But cf. also a reference to Absalom as a Biblical example of the rebel in the Tenth Homily of the First Book of Homilies ("An Exhortation Concerning Good Order ..."), in Two Books of Homilies, p. 113.

A2 18-A2V 4. For ... vyce: this allusion to Spartan discipline is Cheke's only overt reference to antiquity. There is a Senecan echo here; cf.: "And so, in the case of good men the gods follow the same rule that teachers follow with their pupils; they require most effort from those of whom they have the surest hopes. Do you imagine that the Lacedaemonians hate their children when they test their mettle by lashing them in public? Their own fathers call upon them to endure bravely the blows of the whip, and ask them, though mangled and half-dead, to keep offering their wounded bodies to further wounds. Why, then, is it strange if God tries noble spirits with severity? No proof of virtue is ever mild" (Seneca, "On Providence," in Moral Essays, trans. John W. Basore, I [London: Loeb Classical Library, 302
1928], 31).


A4 v 5-6. Ye...religion: the religious grievances which Cheke is answering here are those of the Devon and Cornwall rebels whose complaints, unlike those of the Norfolk rebels, were almost all of a religious nature. Cf. "Sixteen Articles of the Rebels of Devon and Cornwall," in Nicholas Udall's "Answer to the Commoners of Devonshire and Cornwall," in Troubles Connected with the Prayer Book of 1549, pp. 141-93.

A4 v 6-8. If...you: Matthew 10:23.


A4 v 20: ye wyll haue the old: the Devon and Cornwall rebels asked generally for the reestablishment of traditional practices. For example: "...we will have all the general Councils and holy decrees of our fore-
fathers observed, kept and performed..." ("Sixteen Articles," p. 148).

A5 5-6. Ye...establish: i.e., canon law as set out by the Roman Catholic Church in Corpus Juris Canonici.

A5 19-20. For...am: John 8:58.

A5V 3-4: You...agayne: Article 10 ("Sixteen Articles," p. 175): "Item, we will have the Bible and all other books of Scripture in English to be called in again..."


A5V 6. Houllates & backes: i.e., owlettes and bats.


A5V 12-15. The...fayth: 1 Peter 3:15.


A6 11. Ye...done: The sixteen articles of the rebels of Cornwall and Devon are directives, and not mere petitions, to the king. They presume to have superior wisdom to the authorities, and in Article 15 the rebels suggest that the king be advised on commonwealth matters by their representatives.

A6V 11-12. The...welth: i.e., the other rable, those of Norfolk, have economic grievances. Their complaints
are predominantly against economic injustice resulting from ineffectual local administrators and tyrannical landowners. Their twenty-nine complaints occur in MS. Harleian 304, fo. 75, and are printed by Frederic W. Russell, *Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk*, pp. 48-56.

A6v 16. *tanned*: i.e., disciplined. This is a punning allusion to the leader of the Norfolk rebels, Robert Ket (or Kett), a well-to-do tanner and landowner, who with his brother William led the commoners of Norfolk in their attempt to attain economic justice. The ensuing rebellion, for which he was held responsible and for which he was hanged, has taken its name from him. Cf. Frederic W. Russell, *Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk*, and S. T. Bindoff, *Ket's Rebellion*, for the fullest accounts of his life and his involvement in the uprising.


A7 12. *ket*: i.e., carrion, another punning allusion to Ket.

A7 19-22. *In . . . wyse*: Romans 12:6-9, is a New Testament authority for this Renaissance commonplace. See, for instance, Thomas Elyot, *The Boke named the Gouernour*, II, 209: "The inferior persone or subiecte aught to consider, that all be it (as I haue spoken) he in the substaunce of soule and body be equall with his supe­rior, yet for als moche as the powars and qualities of
the soule and body, with the disposition of reason, be nat in every man equall, therefore god ordained a diversitie or preeminence in degrees to be amonge men for the necessary drection and preseruation of them in conformitie or lyuinge."


A8 4-6. thus... hym: see note for A3 18-19.

A8 10-11. appaire: i.e., impair.

A8 15-A8v 14. Would... poore: Sir Thomas More, in Utopia, would agree with Cheke that labor maintains the commonwealth, but he would argue that economic equality does not destroy the incentive to labor. In Utopia, it is not the pursuit of degree but of mutual security and happiness that makes the Utopians want to cooperate in the labor system. But cf. Richard Morison, A Remedy for Sedition, p. 12: "I pray you for a season, let it be as we desire, let us imagine, we be all ryche, doth it not streight folow, I as good as he, why gothe he before, I behynde? I as ryche as he, what nedeth me to labour? The mayde as prowde as her dame, who mylketh the cowe?"

comunes must be comunes, euery man acceptynge his degre, euerye man contente to haue that, that he lawfully maye come by. We must, if we purpose euer to come to welthe, which we ofte lese in wronge sekyng for it, all agree, that the lawes haue theyrr place."


B2 19. if: i.e., when.


B2v 16-20. If ... you: Job 36:11-12.


B3v 2-6. that ... Lucifers: Lucifer had presumptuously challenged godhead and thus disrupted God's order. He was therefore expelled from heaven and punished with hell. The point of the comparison is that the disruption of order will provoke God's most extreme wrath.

B3v 12-13. dehorte: i.e., dissuade.

B3v 21-23. Ye ... kinge: Proverbs 24:21; but see, in addition, references for the following note.

B4 10-14. If ... kingses: Romans 13:1ff.; 1 Peter 2:13; Titus 3:1. Cf. the Tenth Homily of the First Book of
Homilies, in Two Books of Homilies, pp. 105-17.

B4V 4-7. But . . . magistrates: One of the first acts of Ket's organized rebels was to issue a "warrant" for provisions as "king's friends & deputies" (Holinshed, Chronicles, III, 1030).

B4V 7-11. Ye . . . pardon: the first pardon was offered 21 July 1549 (see introduction, p. 86); it was generally refused by the rebels, who asserted that they had done nothing which demanded pardon. After a further attempt to be heard, the king's herald withdrew (Bindoff, Ket's Rebellion, p. 5). Two other offers of pardon were made later (23 August and 27 August) in the final days of the rebellion. Cheke is probably referring here to the early offer (see above, pp. 88-89, regarding the dating of Cheke's composition of the treatise).

B4V 14-20. Who . . . wealth: the rhetoric of this passage parallels that of Morison in two brief passages from A Remedy for Sedition: "Honestie can not abyde, there where myght sytteth aboue right, where wyll is skyll, where treason standeth for reason" (p. 9); "We loue to be disceyued, we ymagyne a certayne commune welth in worde and in outwarde apparance, whiche if we baptysye righte, and not nycke name it, we must nedes call a como wo" (p. 12). Gabriel Harvey used these lines from The hurt of sedition to describe Cheke; see in-
troduction, note 372.

B5 1. **indifferent**: i.e., equally applicable.

B6 5. **sad**: i.e., mature, serious.

B6 8. **obeid, who**: i.e., obeyed when who.

B6V 1. **brusting**: i.e., bursting, breaking; brust was standard sixteenth-century form, and brusting should not be considered the result of the compositor's error.

B7 22-23. **wyl . . . fauted**: Ket and the bulk of his following rejected the king's pardon, saying that they had done nothing which called for pardon; cf. explanatory note to B4V 7-11.

B7V 8. **hear**: i.e., hair.

B9 15-21. **Ye . . . cōmaundemētes**: in addition to the initial warrant (see explanatory note to B4V 4-7, Ket's rebels "interpreted" the royal enclosure commission rulings and presented these interpretations as the king's law (see Holinshed, Chronicles, III, 1031).

B10V 10-14. **The . . . liuinge**: this is apparently an allusion to the "commonplace of English law that full ownership of land is possible for no person save the King"; right use of property thus becomes a right by gift and an obligation (William Geldart, William
Holds worth, and H. G. Hanbury, Elements of English Law

C2 8. pickers: i.e., plunderers, robbers.

C2v 16-18. onely . . . gouernour: i.e., in this realm be subject to the governor only.

C2v 18-19. hedles: i.e., heedless.

C5v 3. Lorde Sheffield: Edmund Sheffield, First Baron Sheffield (1521-1549). Killed at Norwich 1 August 1549. He was the author of lost sonnets and his death was commemorated by Barnaby Googe, Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonnetes, 1563.

D1 11. age . . . rule: Edward VI was eleven years of age at the time of the rebellion.


D1 19-D1v 13. Execeter . . . daunger: Exeter stood a siege of six weeks before John Russell, reinforced with German and Italian mercenaries, effected its relief, 6 August 1549. See introduction, pp. 83-84.

D1v 13-20. Whose . . . soner: according to F. W. Russell, Kett's Rebellion . . ., there is no contemporary evidence to support Cheke's unqualified accusation that
the citizens of Norwich collaborated with the rebels. To the contrary, there is evidence that sturdy towns-
men defended the king's law heroically, although unsuc-
cessfully. The truth, as Russell suggests, probably lies somewhere between the two attributions.

D2 3. *honeste*: i.e., honest men.

D2 10. *my Lord Marques*: William Parr (1513-1571), Marquis of Northampton, Earl of Essex, and Baron Parr; brother to Queen Katharine Parr, supporter of Somerset, and later of Northumberland and the *coup* for Lady Jane Grey.

D3v 18. *heeriing*: i.e., harrying.

D5v 1. *naughtie*: i.e., without good; evil.

E1 10. *stroiyng*: i.e., destroying.

E1v 17. *acraseth*: i.e., weakens, impairs.

E8 21-E8 24. *The . . . thereof*: Protector Somerset had es-
   tablished a commission to investigate enclosures, 1 June 1548, but contrary to Cheke's protests (see intro-
   duction, pp. 131-32), the efforts of the commission did not ameliorate the agrarian problem. For a detailed dis-
   cussion, see Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 147-341; Pollard, *Hist. of Eng.*:
Edw. VI-Eliz., pp. 31-34. The best contemporary view of the enclosure problem is to be found in *A Discourse of the Common Weal of this Realm of England*. First printed in 1581 and commonly attributed to W. S., ed. Elizabeth Lamond (Cambridge, 1893); see especially pp. xxxix-xli, regarding the commission, and pp. xi-xiv, regarding the ensuing rebellion.

F2 7-F4v 19. *Ye... handes*: the extended metaphor of the sore-ill remedy may have been suggested to Cheke by Richard Morison's briefer use of the same image, not only in the title of his work *A Remedy for Sedition*, but also from "It is but an easy remedy, that maketh the sore greater" (p. 22) and its brief elaboration, pp. 33-34.

F3v 14-15. *those. ii. thinges*: i.e., the action and the agent.

F6v 4-12. *For... debate*: cf. Morison, *A Remedy for Sedition*, p. 26: "God wylle not the bondes of nature to be broken, the charitie and loue, that shoulde be betwene all men, moche rather betwene theym that are of one countrey, one shire, one citie, one house, one parentage."

G2v 9-G5v 22. *Was there not... betraye it*: Contrary to Cheke's suggestions, English-Scots relations were far
from hopeful in 1549. In September of 1547 Somerset had moved aggressively against Scotland in a renewed claim of the hand of Mary Stuart for Edward VI, a marriage contracted for by treaty 1 July 1543, but lost by the belligerence of Henry VIII in his subsequent claim of suzerainty over Scotland. Somerset's methods were equally resented by the Scots, who in July of 1548 betrothed Mary Stuart to the French Dauphin. Somerset renewed the claim of suzerainty, and in June of 1549 hostilities were raging between England and Scotland. Anglo-French relations were no better. Henry II of France was ambitious to regain Boulogne from the English, and, if possible, to expel them from Calais, in spite of the peace his father Francis I had made with Henry VIII in June 1546. French raids were made on Boulogne from December 1547, and the English involvement in Scotland provided the occasion for open war, declared by France at the height of the Ket rebellion, 8 August 1549 (Mackie, pp. 407-08, 483-85; Conyers Read, The Tudors: Personalities and Practical Politics in Sixteenth Century England [New York: Henry Holt, 1937], pp. 97ff.).

This passage was omitted from the edition of 1569, an edition provoked by the political agitation in the North which ended in the Northern Rebellion, November 1569. The passage was inimical to Elizabeth's attempts
to keep the peace with both France and Scotland. Franco-English relations were strained to the point of the French ambassador's presentation in London of a list of grievances (March, 1569), accompanied by Charles IX's demand of Elizabeth whether it was to be peace or war. As to Scotland, Elizabeth could not afford to alienate the anti-Marian Scottish regency while pro-Marian forces were rebelling against her in the North (J. B. Black, The Reign of Elizabeth 1558-1603 [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936], pp. 78-112).

G5v 17. opē warre proclaimed: i.e., by France, 8 August 1549 (see preceding note).

G7v 7. wil: i.e., wandering, wild, lost, perplexed.

G8 18-21: The ... thenemie: the allusion may be to Cadmus' sowing of the dragon's teeth at the founding of Thebes or to Jason's sowing of dragon's teeth at the bidding of Aeëtes, king of Colchis and father of Medea.

G8 21. he: i.e., the Devil.

G8v 1-9. The ... Idolatrie: Jeremiah 44.

H1v 11-12. concord ... realme: this reference to concord, with its elaboration at H2v, 18ff., may be compared to Richard Morison, A Remedy for Sedition, pp. 59-60; "Lette vs agree, lette vs agree, let vs se, what
good concorde amonges men doth. Concord brought them together that wandering without places, euer in fere one of thother. Concord made lawes, concord builded cities . . .," etc.

Hlv 11-19. concord . . . with: peace and sedition are similarly contrasted in "An Homily Against Disobedience . . ." (1570): "universally, instead of all quietness, joy, and felicity, (which do follow blessed peace and due obedience,) to bring in all trouble, sorrow, disquietness of minds and bodies . . ." etc. (Two Books of Homilies, p. 574; for the context of this quotation, see following note).

Hlv 19-H2v 18. For . . . other: sedition is similarly contrasted with other calamities, such as war, in "An Homily Against Disobedience . . ." (1570):

. . . now, as I have shewed before that pestilence and famine, so is it yet more evident that all the calamities, miseries, and mischiefs of war, be more grievous and do more follow rebellion than any other war, as being far worse than all other wars. For not only those ordinary and usual mischiefs and miseries of other wars do follow rebellion, as, corn and other things necessary to man's use be spoiled; houses, villages, towns, cities to be taken, sacked, burned, and destroyed; not only many wealthy men, but whole countries, to be impoverished and utterly beggared; many thousands of men to be slain and murdered; women and maids to be violated and deflowered; which things, when they are done by foreign enemies, we do much mourn, (as we have great causes,) yet are all these miseries without any wickedness wrought by any our [sic] countrymen. But, when these mischiefs are wrought in rebellion by them that should be friends, by countrymen, by kinsmen, by those that
should defend their country and countrymen from such miseries, the misery is nothing so great as is the mischief and wickedness; when the subjects unnaturally do rebel against their prince, whose honour and life they should defend, though it were with loss of their own lives; countrymen to disturb the public peace and quietness of their country, for defence of whose quietness they should spend their lives; the brother to seek and often to work the death of his brother, the son of the father; the father to seek or to procure the death of his sons, being at man's age; and by their faults to disherit [sic] their innocent children and kinsmen their heirs for ever, for whom they might purchase livings and lands, as natural parents do take care and pains and be at great costs and charges; and universally, instead of all quietness, joy, and felicity, (which do follow blessed peace and due obedience,) to bring in all trouble, sorrow, disquietness of minds and bodies, and all mischief and calamities; to turn all good order upside down; to bring all good laws in contempt, and to tread them under feet; to oppress all virtue and honesty and all virtuous and honest persons, and to set all vice and wickedness and all vicious and wicked men at liberty to work their wicked wills, which were before bridled by wholesome laws; to weaken, to overthrow, and to consume the strength of the realm, their natural country, as well by the spending and wasting of the money and treasure of the prince and realm, as by murdering of the people of the same, their own countrymen, who should defend the honour of their prince and liberty of their country against the invasion of foreign enemies; and so finally to make their country, thus by their mischief weakened, ready to be a prey and spoil to all outward enemies that will invade it, to the utter and perpetual captivity, slavery, and destruction of all their countrymen, their children, their friends, their kinsfolks left alive, whom by their wicked rebellion they procure to be delivered into the hands of foreign enemies, as much as in them doth lie" (Two Books of Homilies, pp. 573-74).

Note that this passage reads throughout like a précis of Cheke's third major assertion, i.e., that rebellion is hurtful to the commonwealth.
Key
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AF (copy text): The hurt of sedition howe greueous it is to a Commune welth (London, 1549).
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A Note on the Text of the Present Edition

The present edition of The hurt of sedition is based upon an hitherto unidentified and undescribed edition which I propose to show is the second of two 1549 editions of the treatise and the last one to be printed during Cheke's lifetime. A unique copy of this edition is located in the Folger Shakespeare Library.

In 1549, the year in which the treatise was first published, two editions appeared, both of which were printed by John Day and William Seres. The collations of these editions, STC 5109 (A) and STC 5109.2 (AF), are the same with the exception of an addition of two leaves in the B signature of AF, comprising material which elaborates the argument of the preceding pages. The texts of the two editions are parallel in substance, line for line and page for page, to B3\(^v\) where the additional material of AF occurs, enlarging the AF text by two leaves. If the AF text had been the first to appear, one would assume that its gatherings would have been in eights throughout the first six gatherings, and the final gathering run to six leaves. This, however, is not the case. The fact that the printer accommodated this addition by adding two leaves to the B signature rather than by increasing the final signature by two leaves suggests that the AF text is later than the A text. This unusual

1 See above, p. 117.
accommodation would suggest that the printer wished to duplicate as closely as possible the format of the earlier edition. The line for line parallel of the AF text with the A text reinforces this suggestion and, in addition, indicates that the AF text was set up from a corrected copy of A. With the exception of the long interpolation, the AF text follows the substance of A, but most of the typographical errors and awkward accidentals which occur in A have been emended by the editor of AF. AF follows A line for line (though not letter for letter) from [Alr] to A4v and from D1r to [H4v] (except for a minor omission in AF which results in an eight-line discrepancy from [G6v, 24] to [G7r, 9]). Even catchword and signature errors are repeated: e.g., the incorrect signing of H3 for E3. Paragraphing in AF occasionally varies from A, and generally the punctuation has been corrected and improved. This evidence combines to show that AF is a corrected and enlarged second edition of *The hurt of sedition*, and suggests that the additional material of AF was written by Cheke, although too late for inclusion in the first edition.

The text of AF provides, moreover, evidence to support the suggestion that it, like the first 1549 edition, was published before the end of the Ket rebellion in late August of 1549.² There is textual indication that AF was hurried into book form, suggesting that a certain urgency

² See above, pp. 88-89.
accompanied its publication. Sheets of this edition were folded and gathered while the ink was still wet. Clear evidence of this is found in the Folger Library copy, B gathering, especially on B, where the print from the bottom of B5 appears in reverse.

The Folger Shakespeare Library copy of the second edition appears to be unique. Communication with the bibliographers of the three libraries holding copies of A (British Museum, Cambridge University Library, and Huntington Library) has revealed that the collations of these copies are identical. What was assumed by bibliographers to be another copy of this edition, the Folger volume, was thought to have some minor variants. However, I was advised by Dr. James B. McManaway of the Folger Shakespeare Library that he did not know in what way the Folger copy was a variant. But, as we have seen, the Folger Shakespeare Library volume represents a second 1549 edition, and no other copies of this edition are known.

The identification of a second lifetime edition of Cheke's treatise solves a major textual riddle for the editor. The first posthumous edition, STC 5110 (B), appeared in 1569 and until now has been considered the second edition of the book. This edition of 1569 is distinguished by several considerable variants, the authority of which to this time could not be ascertained since they occurred in a text appearing twelve years after Cheke's death. My colla-
tion of the three subsequent Tudor and Stuart texts reveals that they fairly consistently follow the 1569 edition. The newly-identified 1549 edition provides, however, an explanation of most of the 1569 substantive and accidental variants. Moreover, my study of the variants from the first six editions of the treatise indicates the essential genealogical relationship of the texts. Two major variants occur: in the AF we find the interpolated passage (i) discussed above; in the B text we find a section omitted (o) which had occurred originally in A. From these variants together with numerous shorter ones the following relationship may be established:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{A (o)}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{B (i)}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C (i & o)}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D (i)}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{AF (i & o)}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{E (i)}
\end{array}
\]

The B text follows the substance of AF, with the exception of the omission and such minor substantive variants as would appear attributable to the hand of an editor attempting, by the rare addition of a word or phrase, to clarify the sense of a passage made unclear in A or AF by the compositor's omissions. Consistent spelling variants (murder B for murther A & AF, doth B for doeth A & AF) would
seem to be the result of the B editor's wish to "modernize" his text.

The C text (1576) incorporates both (i) and (o), and its accidental variants indicate that it was produced from B and A rather than AF. The C text is the fullest posthumous text.

The D text (1587 Holinshed) essentially follows the substance of B, including its interpolation from AF and omitting the passage from A and AF. Some of its minor corrections seem to have been made with reference to A and C. The Holinshed editors have exercised the most license with their text, since one finds in the D text innumerable small variants, especially in paragraphing, which do not occur in other earlier texts. Since the D text occurs in the double-columned folio pages of the Chronicles, the arbitrary paragraphing would seem to be the result of the editor or compositor's desire to produce a more readable looking page, the paragraph breaks being far more regular in this text than in others.

The E text (1641) follows, with minor exceptions, the B text. Occasional reference to the D text is indicated by minor variants.

Although the black-letter type in which the 1549 AF edition is printed has not been reproduced or indicated (including long s and r), I have presented the text line for line and page for page, including title page and title-page
verso, in order to provide a partial facsimile text and to make the general apparatus of notes and variants more usable. Line numbering and signatures (where they do not appear in AF) have been added.

The punctuation and spelling of my edition follow that of my copy text except where obvious printing errors, superfluous punctuation, or omissions necessitate emendation. In some cases, for instance, where the compositor has been crowded for space on his line, he has omitted end and internal punctuation. I have emended the punctuation of the text where such omissions produce misreading and ambiguity, making my corrections in the light of context, capitalization, general punctuation habits, and catchwords. Where substantive emendations or spelling corrections have been necessary, AF text spelling practices have been my standard. All such emendations, with the resultant AF variants, have been noted in the table of variants. Where the compositor has omitted spaces between words which obviously were intended to be printed separately, I have silently spaced the words. In other instances, where misreading is not a danger, and where it is not clear that the compounded words are products of crowding, the compounded words are printed here as they appear in AF.

For the printer's symbol Æ (and) in the AF text, I have substituted & which, in addition to Æ, appears in A for and. For the pointing-hand symbol used in the AF text
to mark most paragraph indentations, I have substituted #.

All errors in running title, catchword, or signature have been retained, since they in no way affect the sense of the text and are of value in identifying the second 1549 edition and in relating it to the first edition.

In the table of variants I have attempted to record all substantive variants and all accidental variants which essentially change the syntax and/or emphasis of the substance. Thus all paragraph, period, question or exclamation mark, and parenthesis variants are recorded, but only such comma, colon, semicolon, capitalization, and abbreviation variants as affect the primary sense of the reading or present some ambiguity of that sense. While in the A & AF texts one encounters repeatedly such abbreviations as ę, ę, ę, ą, and &, in addition to Roman numerals and elisions such as thende, thole, etc. for the ende, the whole, etc., in the B text these are rare or unused, as they are in all succeeding texts. Since the abandonment of abbreviations in the later texts does not in any way change the meaning of the substance, and since in no case does one text consistently reprint the accidentals of an earlier text, there is no advantage gained in recording these accidentals. Capitalization is noted per se when it implies omitted or incorrect preceding punctuation, but capitalization practices with proper nouns vary greatly from text to text; the resultant variants are not recorded, nor are those from the D text.
which indicate the first word of direct quotation: He saith, Humble your selues. Hyphenation, like spelling and punctuation generally in the earlier texts, is arbitrary, depending upon the amount of space the compositor had in his line. When a collated word has end-line hyphenation, I have not recorded that hyphenation.

The following variants have been considered spelling rather than substantive variants and are not recorded: ye: you; bilike: by like; afore: before; by cause: bi cause: because; fait: fault; nother: neither, neyther; other: either: eyther; happeneth: happen; doeth, doth, etc.; furdermore: furthermore; murtherer: murderer; then: than. In each of the above instances, the first spelling is typical of the A and AF texts, the latter spellings typical of the later texts.
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A2 19-20 aduoydynge of Dronckennes,] aduoydyng 
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iniuries. \[♀] In A pretenced 
iiniuries. In CD

A3\(^\text{v}\) 7  Lorde, thyrdly] Lorde, Thirdly A

A3\(^\text{v}\) 12  rebelles, and] rebels. And D

A3\(^\text{v}\) 15  a ryse, when] a ryse. When A arise, 
when \[♀] \[♀] \[♀] rise, when E

A3\(^\text{v}\) 18  commandements; D

A4 9  the. But] them. \[♀] But C

A4 13  doers. And] doers, and A
A4 14-15 is done by God,] is done by the ordinaunce
of God, BCDE

A4 17 offyce. How] offyce. [?] Howe AC


A4 19-20 authoritye, or] authoritie? or BCE
authoritye? Or D

A4 20 succession] occasion D

A4 21 offycers? by] officers? By BCDE

A4 21-22 commyssion? be] commission? Be BCDE


A4v 4 you? what] you? What CDE

A4v 4-5 minister] ministers C

A4v 5-6 you rise? Ye rise for religion. What]
you ryse? ye rise for religiο, what A
you rise? [?] Yee rise for religion. What BCDE

A4v 6 you y?] you, that? A

A4v 8 flie, so] flie. So A flee, so C
fight. If] fight, if A
and] aud AF
martyrs. Why] martyrs, why A
religion? Haue] religion? haue A
boke? Yea] boke? yea, A
old. If] olde, if A olde. [?] If C
still, wyll A
that as] that wch E
that A
nulier inuented. Yet] nulyer inueted, yet A
desier. Why, the] desier, why then A
desire. Why? the C
oldest. And] oldest, and A : prefer]
refer C
Chryste, mens] Cstryste, mens AF Christe?
mens AC
inventions] invention

law, the] law? The

elder? Ye] elder? ye

blynd you, that so instructe you. If

blynde you, that so instruct you If

deceiue you. If

sayeth before] saith; Before

made I am. If] made I am, if

What religion] What other religion

ye haue other nowe] ye haue now

religio? You] religion? [?] You

guides would] guides, would

Why, be] Why? be AC why be

backes] Bats

lyght? Christe] light? [?] Christe

in] iu AF : scriptures] scriptnres
Christ. The] Christe. [-scenes] The

hable] able BCDE

Sayncte Paule] S. Paule C

agayne. A] againe A E

fought for. For] fought for, for A

establisheth, the] establisheth, the A

churche hath] churche, hath AFA

authorised] authorysed A

forth? Is] forth. Is A

set out? Can] set out? can A

vsed? Ye] vsed? ye A

king, the] king the AFA

is a gods man] is gods man B

worckes. What] worckes, what A

rebelles. [scenes] The] rebelles. The A

welt, Howe] welt, howe A

it, by] it? by A it? By D
Gentilmen, by] Gentilmen? by A

Gentilmenne, by] Gentilmen? by A

Gentylmen? A] Gentilmen? a A

common welth. Whi] common welth, why A

them, for] them? for A them? For D

Rule] rule AF

and contrary] and and contrary C

lordes? Thei] lordes. Thei A

law, if other wyse: the] law, if other wyse the A

King, breaketh their rule. Ye] King, breaketh their rule, ye A King, taketh awaye their rule. Ye BCDE

found it. In] found it, in A

lyke wyse. And] lyke wyse, and A

and beste habyll] and be best able BCDE

scripture, ye] Scripture, that yee E
A7V 23 euil of any] euil to any A euil of a C
A8 1 why shoulde ye] why do ye BCDE
A8 5 in felde to stande] in feldde, stande BCDE
A8 6-7 hym. [¶] If] hym. [space / ¶ not indented] If A him? [¶] If DE
A8 7-8 ye would haue the] yee wish the D
A8 9 comune] cōmuns AF
A8 10 comune] cōmuns AF
A8 12 own. And ] owne, & A
A8 13 gentilme] geneilme AF
A8 16 rich? That is] riche? that is A rich? That is, C
A8 21 hym lust] him list C
A8V 3 maytayneth] maytayneth AF
A8V 4 welth. If] welthes, if A
A8V 5 take all hope away] take awaie all hope D
A3V 7-8  many meane mens] many mens A
A3V 9  chyldre cometh] children doo come D
A3V 12-13  riche, ye] rich. Ye D
A3V 13  by lyke] belike BCE (belieke) D
A3V 14  poore. And] poore, and AD
A3V 18  good. To] good: to D
A3V 23  goodnes. Why] goodnes, why A
Bl 1  wisedome nowe stoppe] wisdome stop C
Bl 4  prouidence] prudence A
Bl 5  liketh. God] lyketh? God BCDE
Bl 10  to this state] to hys state A
Bl 10-11  pouertie, to shew his] pouertie by his D
Bl 14  vniustly, and] vniustly? And A
Bl 15  contented] content D
Bl 17  then we be wyse] then the wyse A
Bl 18  then] theu AF
Bl 19-20 mad. [!] But] madde. But BCE
mad? [!] But D

BlV 12-13 this equalities] his equalities E

BlV 13 are ye] be ye A

BlV 15 himself] him self A


BlV 21 god there] God? there C God? There D

B2 4-5 you. But] you. [!] But AD :
But and] But if D

B2 9 Saincte Peter] S. Peter ACD

B2 17 to be humble] to humble A

B2 22 would] would AF : I thinke] (I thinke) D

B2V 3 throw downe] throwe him downe ABCDE

B2V 7 your selues aboue the magistrates.] your
selues by arrogancie aboue the
magistrastes BCDE

B2V 9 Remembre] Remebre A
froward. Euen, froward? Euen

god. Nowe, god, nowe

affection

ting AF

selfe, risinge I meane, must] self
(the risinge I meane) must

afore god, & the] afore God, the

in to goddes] in goddes

cursed newly by him, but hath also]
cursed newly by him, but also hath

him, for] him. For

minister as he sayth himselfe but]
minister (as he saieth him self) but

as ye duely haue] as ye haue duely

other great vengeaunce for] other for
greate vengaunce, for
B3v 13 other] others E

B3v 16-17 subiection truluye. Well if ye] subiection truly. [¶] If authoritie A
subiection truely. [¶] Well if ye
BCDE

B3v 17-B5v 6 Well if ye had not . . . obedience must
frame.] omitted in A

B3v 20 again the] against BCDE

B3v 23 breake] breach D

B4 2 bounde to obey] bound to serue C

B4 9 not I] not then I BCDE


B4v 7 magistrates. Ye] magistrates. [¶] Ye D

B4v 11 pardon, but] pardon. But D


B4v 18 be better] is better BC are better DE
commune wealth. Haue) commonwealth?
Haue DE

and seeke] that seeke BCDE

what the consent] what consent D

determined. What] determined? [m]
What C determined? What D

seruantes, wickednes] servants?
wickednes C

chylde, sturdines] Children? sturdines C

subjectes, crueltie] subjects? crueltie C

enemies, wildnes] enemies? wildenes C

mindes, pride] mindes? pride C

cold, trauaile, to] colde & trauail to C

dutifulnesse, and] dutifulnesse? and C

frame.] frame? C

authoritie, if] authoritie. If C
experience, if] experience. If C

best, yet] best. Yet C

the dutie ye] that dutye, ye A

this great] the great BCDE

disobedience is thought stoutnes, and
    sullenes is] disobediences is, thoughse,
    stoutnes, and sullenes is A

courage, and prating] courage, prating C

counsellours considered? And] counsaillers
    considered. And A counsaillours
    bee considered? And BCDE

who is wisest] whose wyseste, ABCDE

disobedientest obeyed, the high]
    disobedientes obeyed, he hyghe A

safe? And] safe? And D

commune wealth] comunswelth, A

counsaile. But] counsaile. [¶] But BCDE
quietly, hath quietly? hath CE
quietlie? Haue D

comune peace,] communs peace, A

haue] ahue B

selfe in] selues in CD

him, with whome] him, whome D

wyth all. If] withall? [?] If C
withall? If E

& a detestable] & detestable C

entende] enteude AF

perswade] 'perswade turned letter AF

ruled. What] ruled? What C ruled?
[?] What D

queche the thirst] quence the thrust A

the comune wealth] that commune wethth A

other. He] others? He D

miscontented] miscoted A
suspected, and] suspected? And ABCDE

cómune welth] cômunes welth A

rule on] rule vpon D

other. And] other? [□] And D

beastes. For] beasts? For CD

is forbidde] his forbidde AF is robrydden A

ruler. And] ruler, and A

the. And] the. [□] And C

kyndes] kyndes A

againe] against DE

them. But] them. [□] But D

magistrate] magistrates ABCDE

lyke sheepe] lyke a shepe A

t y tyme] the time BCDE
th*s your] them youre A

shewed] shewe A

stoupeth] stoppeth A

for lacks] for the lack C

obedience. You] obedience, you AF ABC

obedience: you DE

tawe not only barked] law, not only not

barked C

helhoudes. What? is] helhoudes. What is

AF BCE helhoundes, what? is A

helhounds. What? Is D

considerd, but] considered. But D

waied. Loke] weied. [¶] Looke D

thorowe? [¶] Ye] thorowe? Ye AF

BCD thorowe. [¶] Ye A

out in y kinges name, against the kinges

wil, preceptes] out (in the Kings

name, against the Kings wil) precepts C
B9\textsuperscript{v} 4 treas\textbar, so to] treason, to D

B9\textsuperscript{v} 13-14 be? Ministers] be? [\textit{Q}] Ministers C

B9\textsuperscript{v} 16 seditio. The] sedition. [\textit{Q}] The D

B9\textsuperscript{v} 18 war\textbar, ye] war. Ye A

B9\textsuperscript{v} 20 robbers, is] robbers. Is AD

B9\textsuperscript{v} 22 him lust & call] hym list, call A

he lust, and call D

B10 2 comitted to] committed vnto D

B10 3 eueri one of] every one of A

B10 8-9 things, god bi his word forbidding the same, which] things (God by his word forbidding the same) which C

B10 14 ye? And] ye, and A

B10 18 traiterous] traiterons AF

B10 18-20 lye? This th\textbar which is in word a deceitfull lye, & in dede a traiterous facte, noisome] lye? Thys th\textbar which is in worde a deceitfull lye, and in
dede a trayterous faute, noysome
lie, & in deede a trayterous facte,
noysome

**Bo 21** unhonorable] dishonorable A

**Bo v 3** to be punished] to punished A

Yee D

**Bo v 6** vuiustly] vuiustly AF

**Bo v 6-7** petiously] pittifully E

**Bo v 14** liuing. Ye] liuing: ye D living:
Yee E

**Bo v 14-15** violently] violenly A

**Bo v 20-21** entercryse] entercryse AF

**C 3** welth. And] wealth: and E

**C 6** goods?] gods? A

**C 13-14** scattered abroades.] snatched awaye. A scattered abrode? BDE
Cl 14 thyng ye] thing that ye D

Cl 15 mans own. The] mans own, the A

Cl 18 welth. The] welth, the A

Cl 20 fatte vp your] fat your D : sedicion:

Cl 21 it, wicked] it be wicked BCDE :

Cl 22 enemies of all] enemies to all A :

Cl 5-6 guide him. He] guide him? He BCDE

Cl 9 misuseth] misueth A

Cl 14 deaths. And] death, and ADE

Cl 17 spoyle, shall they be thought] spoile,

be thought ABCDE
the example] th' example
& so villanous] & villanous
you? Shal] you? shall
theues, nay] theues? nay
destroyers of] destroyers ers of
kindes] kinde
see, is] see. Be
vylie disobayed hym] vilelie disobeie?
bounden dutie. Ye] bounden dutie. []
of their goodes] of the goddes
the Kyng. [Is] the Kyng. Is
lybertie, ye] libertie? ye
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C2V 6 desuered] desiered AD : the one] th' one C

C3 6 minde. If] minde? If CD

C3 10 bodies: For] bodies. For BCE bodies. [?] For D

C3 13 body. Thei] bodie? They D

C3 14 offed] ffende A : punishable. And] punishable, And AF punishable, & ACD

C3 15 wrongfully] wronfully A

C3 16-17 imprisonmentes] imprisonmente AC

C3 17-18 other] others D

C3 18-19 honeste and playne] honest, plain C


C3V 6 disobedyence, crueltie,] disobedience, and crueltie, AC

C3V 10 decayed? And] decaied, and A decayed? and C
C3V 11-12 hathe more] hath is more D

C3V 12-13 cause it to be] cause it be C

C3V 19 defende, but] defende it? But BDE

C4 2 goddes] God D

C4 4 gloses: Ye] gloses, ye ABCDE

C4 10-11 that as you] which ye CDE

C4 13 this, as] these as AC

C4 13-14 enterpyse greatter matters] enterprise great matters BDE

C4 15 self, if] selues, if D

C4 18-19 slayne of the kynges true subiectes many, thynkyng] slayne of the kynges true subiectes many thynkyng AF A slain many of the Kings true Subjects, thinking C

C4V 1 with mischiefe] whiche mischiefe AF

C4V 2 mischief. What] mischief, What A
could we] could ye C
faultes, to] faults, vnto D
men? then] me, then BCDE
straightly] strictlie D
doinges. And] doniges, And AF doynges,
And A dooinges? And CD
and so haue] & not to haue D
can that common wealth] can the common
welth C
suche case] such cases C
mooste noble] moste notable C
those as doe] those which do C
susteine. For] susteine, For A sustain? [?] For CD
the defence] the dead defence C
engine] Engins C
warre. Considered ye other the] warre.
Considering other AF warre, considering other the BDE war? Consider ye either the C

C5V 10 had in hym] had of him C

C5V 13 that fauour] the fauoure ABCDE

C5V 14 men toward] men bare towarde BDE


Considered ye D

C5V 18 kyng,] K. D

C6 3 of rebellio] of bellion A

C6 6-7 not spare for raunsome,] not so much as spare him for ransome, D

C6 13 violentlye] violently A

C6 15 mynde, whose] mynde, Whose AF mynde?

Whose ABCDE

C6 17-18 lamented, whose] lamented, Whose AF

C6 19 countrey, whose] countrey, Whose AF
C6  20 way been] way be C : hand, violence] hand. Violence BCDE

C6  3-4 as these ougly] as the ougley C

C6  5 mynde. God] mynde, God AF A minde? God C

C6  5-6 hym selfe ioyned] hym selfe wined AF A

C6  7 departed] parted E

C6  9 to be disseuered] to disseuered A

C6  9-10 minister. And] minister. [D] And D

C6 10 and] aud A : hedles] heedlesse D headlesse E

C6 12 thinke no faute] think it no fault BDE

C6 13 shed bloude] shed y blood C : subiectes, hauing] subiectes hauing AF A

C6 15-16 rebellion? He] rebellion? If he C

C6 v 18-19 them? who] them, who BCDE

C6 v 22-23 deuised. Nowe] deuised Nowe A
deuised. Now BE deuised? Now CD

C6 v 23 then, youre] then if your C

C7 2-3 ye. Seing] ye, seing AF B ye seinge A

C7 3-4 suche bloode shaders] suche great blood-shedders C

C7 9 hurtfull] hurtfull AF

C7 9-10 commone] commuue A

C7 10 wealth. So] welth? So BDE welth?

C7 13 desperacion] deperacion A

C7 14 indeferent] indifferent BCDF :
mynde. But] mind. [∀] But D

C7 16-17 vehement of affection] vehimencie of affection BDE vehemētaes of affection C
C7 18 discourse] discouere A : reason] reason A


C7 21-22 vnsatiable] vnsatiable blurred "ble" A

C7 23 vpon] blurred in A

C7 v 1-2 vp and ye could your] vp (and ye could) your CE vp, if you could, your F

C7 v 4 contented, and] contented? and CE

C7 v 6 estate? Ye] estate, ye AF

C7 v 17 owne. Herein] owne. [♀] Herein C

C7 v 18 done, spoyled the kinges] done. Spoyled the kynges "y" in "spoyled" and "kynges" broken A

C8 3 maidens] maides AC

C8 5-6 all together. For] altogither. [♀] For D
into it. And into it? And

spoil? We spoil. We AF

selfs which ought as much to be obedient as we be, but selues, which ought as much to be obedient as we be, but

selues (which ought as much to be obedient as we be) but C

to, fro t] to, fro the BD to fro the C
too, from the E

subjectes] sujectes A

straightly] strictlie D

wylages] villages BCDE

ther lacke. To] ther lacke, To A
the lacke. To D

money] moneys A

fynde it. Municion] find the same. [a]
Munition D
enemye. And] enemye, And AF

straightlie] strictlie D

notablej notatable A

not him quietlye] not quietlye AF A

deathj dearth E

withstandej withstood DE

alike, whichej alike! which D

worthye, forj worthie. for BCDE

heartes were wyllingsj harts willing C

his hope,] the hope, D

them. And] them. [?] And C

comended, which] commended? which E

continuall] continuall AF

onelie when they] onlie they D

vitaile] vittels D

theyr] rheyr AF
against the certain honest sort.

A greater number of these were so abhorred.

Other than these, such praises were given. [Who] Who

Trayerously and feudo

Spoke of, which without honestie and godlinesse ye practised, and spoken of (which without honestie and godlines be practised) and
D2 22-23 disordre. Haue\] disorder? Haue BCDE

D3 5 quietnes. If\] quietnes? If UD

D3 7 this your\] these your E

D3 8 let all together\] let them altogether D

D3 10 other\] others D

D3 24 yet ye be so\] yet be ye so BCDE

D3V 5 sedition. Do\] sedition? Doe BCDE

D3V 9 destroied. Is\] destroyed? Is BCDE

D3V 10 fet\] fetcht UE

D3V 17 hande. And\] hand? And BCDE

D3V 18 heerlieng\] heering B herying C harrieng D herrying F

D3V 22-23 death. howe\] death? Howe BCDE

D3V 24 spoiled, and\] spoyled? & CE spoiled? And D

D4 4 touched. Haue\] touched? Haue BCDE
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D4 6 realme, and] Realme? and E

D4 10 also to] also to "so" blurred A

D4 13 is? And] is? [♀] And BDE.

D4 13 & so judge] and judge D

D4 19 or] yer D ere E : enter] enter AF

D4 21-22 thynke ye, ye can} thinke ye can D

D4V 11-12 wicked rebellio] lewd rebellion D

D4V 14 is] are E

D4V 17 forwardnes] frowardnesse G

D4V 20 scasely] scarcely BCDE


D4V 22 fro] from CDE

D4V 24 agayne, and] again? and CE

D5 13 labourers is] laborers it is D

D5 18-19 ought. And] ought. [♀] And D

D5V 2 vse] vsed? And D
inobedience, care] inobedience, they
care BDE inobedience? They care C

mennes. haye] mens? Hay BDE

others,) other. C

caste in your] cast your D : selues.)

vitaile] vittels D

nowe al wastfully] now wastfullie D

vnthriftfully] vnthriffully AF

diligente] diligence D

vnordred plentie, but] vnordered but C

spoyle, wherof thinconuenience] spoyle?

wherof the inconuenience BDE

thing,) things DE

disseases. The] diseases? The D

wherej were AF

fynd, whoj finde? who CE
hungerbitten, which hungerbitten.

Which D

not I think so C

selfe D

confusion. Experience D

Experience BCDE

that when men C

no\[\] nother A

wounde? C These C wounde? These BCDE

the common C

followeth; even a D

selfe. And C selues C And BCDE

punyshement C punyshemeute A

sickenesse. For C sicknes? For UD

stronge C gronc A
D7 V 23-28 l thereof. And thereof? And BCDE

D8 3-4 be partes, although vnlyke of] be parties, although unlike, of BDE be parties (although unlike) of C

D8 7 whole. Thenj whole. ["] Then D

D8 14 besyde] besides D

D8 18 examples] example E

D8 22 mischiefe? Seinge] mischief, seeing BCDE

D8 V 4 sake, and] sake. ["] For C

D8 V 8-9 one, is a] one, is is a AF

D8 V 12-13 by forponyshmet. ["] And] before punishment. And C

D8 V 13 vitaile] vittels D

D8 V 16 thoughhe fewe,] (though few) D

D8 V 24-El 1 of so fewe] catchword on AF and A D8 V- "euer"; not printed on El of neuer so few, BCDE
often to suffer?

vitaile, and vitaile? And and

effecte. It effect? [?] It

lykely] like

the other] th' other

it selfe] it felse

vitaile] vittels, 

cabins, from] cabins, and from

and glutting] and by glutting

bodie. The] body. [?] The

vehemence] vehemencie

oute, howe] out? how out? How

paine, how] paine? How

contreis. This] contreis? This 
countries? [?] This
thinke you to be
ponyshment
wealthe. And wealthe? And BCE wealth?
causeth the utter] causeth utter
in. Seing] in, seing BDE
men, whose lyuing is bi their owne provision, hath] men (whose liuing is by their owne provision) hath C
besides] beside
the rentes] their rents E
truli haue] truli, haue & truely, & nowe haue BCDE
hereafter, thei be] hereafter, and now be BCDE
wonte] wuut
justice. And] justice. [F] And D

raught] caught D

seditio, whiche] sedition? which E

selues, who . . . fautes, when] selues (who . . . faults) when C

that as] that which DE

mischief. And] mischeef? And CD

thuttermoste,] the uttermost, BDE th' uttermost C

spoyles. Then] spoiles. [F] Then D

other felte] others felt UF

lamente. now] lament. [F] Now BCE

not. for] not? For D

robbers, quarelmakers,] robbers quarelmakers, AF

to. do] too. [F] Doo D
begging, more] begging more AF
kinges waie,] kings highwaie, D
bosome] bosomes E
laboure. And] laboure. [Π] And C
beastes be] beasts to be E
housbodes, caterpillers] husbandes. caterpillers BCDE
an hurtefull] a hurtful C
thē. But] them. [Π] But D
loyteror, aj] loyteror? A BCDE
destroyer] stroier D : fruite?
Naye aj fruite, naye a BCE fruit, a D
vitaile,] vittels, D
destruction. [Π] Suche C
E6  3  iudge lyke] iudge it like  BCDE
E6 16  state,] estate,  D
E6 17  vnruilinesse, and] vnruylynes? and  C
E6 18  sedition not only] sedition is not
       onely  BCDE
E6 21-22  idlenes. [?] There] Idlenes.
         There  C
E6 22  none end] no end  E
E6 23-24  necessarilye] necessary  E
E6 24-E6V 1  sturdines. For] sturdines, For  A
E6V  9  Nother is the] Nother be the  BCDE
E6V 22  any] ony  AF
E6V 24  place. Wherfore] place. [?]  Wherfore  CD
E7  6  thone] the one  BDE th' one  C
E7 11  vehemence] vehemencie  D
E7 16  of longe time] of a longe time  A
counsell (which no doubt shall be in season vsed) ther] counsaile which no doubt shall be in season vsed, there BDE

former strength & health again. And] former strength and health againes? And BDE former helth again?

in a great disorder] in great disorder C

like if it be not holpe,] like (if it be not holpen) D

order, your] order? your C order? Your D

wife] wiues D

order, by] order? by C order? By D

subjects, how] Subjects? how C subjects? How D
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ES 6 others?] others. AF

ES 10 whyle, who] while? who C

ES 14 you. [¶] But] you? [¶] But CD

ESv 1 with, thinking] with thinking AF A

ESv 15 quietly it had] quietly if it had C

ESv 23 breake] breach CD

ESv 24 thereof. But] thereof. [¶] But D

Fl 6 graciously] greeuouslie D

Fl 6-9 prouided, except ... claime,]

prouided (except ... claime) D

Fl 19 daungereus] dangerously E

Fl 22 alone, thought ... redressed, and]

alone thought ... redressed, and

AF A alone (thought ... redressed)
& C

Flv 1 of the Kinges] of that, the Kingses

BCDE : promised] promising D
those] whole D

subjectes. For] subjects. [W]

For D

oppressions. Wyll] oppressions?

Wll BCDE

redresse and] redresse it, & D

be when ... done amended] be

(when ... doone) amended D :

kinge. Thus] king. [W] Thus

BDE

purpose, ye] purpose. Yee D

incouenienees] incouenientes A

to enioy] to enjoyed AF A to haue enjoyed BCDE

men whom ... by will] men (whom ... by) will D

you if ... ye, would] you (if ... ye) would D

is] if AF
F2v 18 folowe. What] followe. [†] What C

F2v 18-19 wealth is then,] welth is it then, BCDE

F3 7 for. For] for? For CD

F3 15 purpose. The] purpose, The A
   purpose. [†] The CD

F3v 14 those] these BCDE

F4 2 faute, so wickedly] fault so so
   wickedly C

F4 3 on is not] on, is it not C

F4 3-4 god, & traiterous] god, traiterous A

F4 8-9 therof. [†] Yet] thereof? [†]
   Yet BDE thereof? Yet C

F4 16 selues often] selues into a further
   slauerie, if ye vse yourselues often D

F4 24 salues] waies D

F4v 9 straitenes] strictnesse D
and an unsufferable.] and unsufferable.

BCDE

medicine. Desperat] medicine. [ açıklık]

Desperate D

sicknesses] sickness BCE

pardon, which can not justly stretch
to al, or] pardō (which . . . al)
or C

king. They] king. [ açıklık] They D

selues] felues A

gat] get D got E

nedes if ye thus continue, haue] needs
(if . . . continue) haue C

stil, &] stil? And CD


thinge, set murder a syde whiche is thlg
heinosest] thing, set murder a side,
it is the heynousest BDE thlg
(set murder aside) it is y hainousest C

F6 22 sufferer] fufferer AF

F6 23 thereof. The] therof? The C thereof. [♀] The D

F6v 2 selfe to] self vnto C

F6v 6-8 wealth, wherby . . . body, but] welth (wherby . . . body) but C

F6v 9 same, gathering] same gatheryng A

F6v 22 perceiued. When] perceiued. [♀] When C

F6v 24 walles, and] walls? and E

F7 2 he likest] he the likest CE

F7 3 the yonger] a yonger E

F7 4 parentes, to] parentes to AF A

F7 9 madnes. Haue] madnesse. [♀] Haue D
F7 11-12 lesse, but in none cosidered, which

lesse (but . . . cosidered) which

F7 14 requited. This] requited? Thus C
requited? This D

F7 17 forsake] forfake AF

F7 23 you, and] you. And D

F7V 1 partes] parties A

F7V 9 do wel accepte] doo wil accept C

F7V 11 selfe] selues CD

F7V 16 you. I] you? I C you. [τ]

I D

F7V 17-18 herin, but ye must finde some inconvenience
herein, if ye] herein, if ye D

F8 3 vitaile] vittels D

F8 4 manrode] manhood D

F8 6 disorder] disorders D

F8 9 states] estates C
you, iudge? you? iudge C you?

Judge D

& a detestable] and detestable BCDE

damage. [T] Besides] damage? [T]

Besides CD

of the great] of greate A

suche a confusion] such confusion D

power. Shall] power? Shal GDE

to be resisted, and no notable grace of god in him considered, nor the worthines] to be reconsidered, nor the worthynesse B

remembred. Shal] remembred? Shal AC remembered? [T] Shall D

phāsies to others] fansies before others BCDE

dreaming. Shal] dreaminge? Shall BCDE

wealth] weolth AF
Gl 15 wyldele] will daylie BCDE

Gl 16 destruction. Thus] destruction?
   Thus BCE destruction? [?] Thus D

Gl 19-20 & the] & and the AF

GlV 3 maintained, nothing] mainteyned.
   Nothing BCDE

GlV 5 chaunsable] changeable D

GlV 11 of mens memories] of memorie D

GlV 21 cause. If] cause. [?] If BDE
   cause? If C

GlV 22-23 without further inconuenience] (without further inconuenience) D

GlV 23 al, yet] al yet AF

GlV 24 decaie, that it] decaie as it D

G2 4 might] wight AF

G2 6-7 time, whiche ... be take, hath]
   time (which ... betaken) hath C
that we] that which wee E

other,] others D

fortunat. But] fortunate. [V] But D

I pray you,) I pray, you AF (I pray you) D

renforce] inforce C reinforce DE :

againe.) againe? D

Was there not I pray you ... almost wholly betraye it.] omitted in BDE

pray] yray AF

himself] the\-self A them selues C

am\-ed. And] amend And A

vs one, &] vs and C

rulinge. For] ruling. [W] For C

decaye] deceiu C

with] with "t" broken AF
G3 15 and] aud AF

G3V 4 selfes] felfes A

G3V 24 subjectes, rebellio againe] subjectes rebellio, againe AF subjectes rebellio againe A

G4 6-7 times. But] times? But C

G4 7 thei in cōsideratiō . . . best, sawe] thei incōsideratiō . . . best sawe A they (in cōsideration . . . best) saw C

G4 22 wealth] weathl AF

G4V 2 theexperience] th' experience C

G4V 9-10 but by you, by your deuilishe] but by your, by your deuilyshe AF A but by your deuilish C


G5 7 fidelitie. And] fidelitie? And C

G5 15 man, or] mā? or C
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G6 11 them. If] them? If BCDE

G6 14 thenemie,) enemies C

G6 23-G6v 1 hande, as . . . enterpryse, howe] hande, as . . . enterpryse, Howe AF A hand (as . . . enterprise) how C


G6v 7 afore ye the] afore the D : power, ye] power? yea CE

G6v 16-17 of the god] of God D

G6v 17 aboue, and] aboue. And BDE

G6v 21-22 procuring the frenche by] procuring our enimies by BCDE
dishonor, which howsoever 

think it to be long of

offered the victory

bylyke, (belike)
daungerous

make]

our enemies]

wil worship]

as]

costume. And]

G6v 24-G7 1 dishonor which whatsoever] dishonor, which howsoever BCE dishonor. Which howsoever D

G7 1 think it to be long of} thinke it to be long of AF

G7 2 you, which] you, who BCDE offered the victorie} offered the victory A

G7 4 bylyke,} (belike) D

G7 5 daungcr] daungerons A

G7 6 make] blurred AF

G7 7 our enemies] blurred AF

G7v 7 wil worship] will worship BC will-worship DE

G7v 8 as bi] that which by E

G7v 9-10 as bi] that which by E

G7v 13 costume. And] custome. [Æ] And D
that which is_E
falsehood CDE
bi biwaies he cã not] by biwayes, he cannot BDE by waies that he cannot C
plainly] plainey A
cause. So] cause. [A] So C
to a wicked] to wycked A
whether he] whether be E
leaving of] leaving off E
Prophets] blurred AF
serue] s erue A
Idolatrie. When] Idolatrie. [A]
When C
G8v 14  iiiii. yere] fower yeare BCE four yeares D

Hl 3  godly. For] godly. [♀] For C

Hl 7-8  suffereth, to blind] suffereth, blinde B

Hl 8  & thorow] and how thorowe BCDE

Hl 9-10  forechosen. Thus] forechosen. [♀] And thus D

Hl 13-14  mischief, not] mischief not AF A

Hl 16-17  an yl opinion] an euill opinion D

Hl 17-18  cofirmed in them] cofirmed in in them AF

Hl 23  nor geue no due] nor yet giue due C


HlV 1  more? ye] more? Ye BCDE

HlV 3  folow] poor imprint AF

HlV 10  other? For] other? [♀] For C
H1v 18 that it hath] that he hath C that it hath bene D

H1v 19 with. For] withall. For D

H2 3 for a region] for & region A

H2 4 kinds] kinds D


H2 13-14 plenteously] plenteously AF


H2 21 As for] "As" blurred AF

H2v 3 both the partes] both parts D

H2v 4 ouercômed] ouercommer D

H2v 4-5 ouercômer] ouercommen D

H2v 18 other. O] other [א] O C other. [א] 0 D

H2v 19 peace, what] peace! what E :
H2\textsuperscript{v} 21 towns, what? town? what C town!
what E

H2\textsuperscript{v} 21-22 religion, what? Religion? what C

H2\textsuperscript{v} 22 learninge, what? learning? what C

H2\textsuperscript{v} 23 councell, what? Council? what C

H2\textsuperscript{v} 24 witte, what? wit? what C :
maners, what? manners? what C

H2\textsuperscript{v} 24-H3 1 what obedience? what of obedience AF

H3 1 lawes, what? lawes? what C

H3 2 states, what? states? what C

H3 2-3 houses, what? houses? what C


H3 4 contreis, what? countries? what C

H3 4-5 mindes, what? mindes? what C

H3 6 mainteined, whose? maintained! whose E
H3 7-8 the lacke] thy lacke D


H3 14 began, not] began? not E

H3 18 amisse, magistrates] amisse? Magistrats D

H3 22 and readie] and were readie BCDE

H3 24 imagine, and] imagin? and C

H3v 2-3 & contempt] and in contempt BCDE

H3v 3-4 kynge, whose lawes seketh your wealth,
&] king (whose . . . welth) and C
king, whose lawes doo seeke your
wealth, and D

H3v 4-5 & ouerthrow of your contrey] and to
ouerthrow the Countrie BCDE

H3v 8 vndoing. What] vndoing. [?] What C

H3v 9 nowe, beseeged] nowe? beseeged AE

H3v 15 sicknesses,] sickenesse D
Wherefore B E recovered? Wherefore C covered. [W] Wherefore D

Spoyle and destroied and] spoyle, destroyed, & ECDE

Rebellion, with] rebellion. With D

Leaue of with] leave off with DE

Die, &] die. And D

Selues, ye] selves. yee E

& declare] & to declare D

And so recouer] & to recouer D

Followe. Thus] followe. [W] Thus C

In worde] in his word DE

Colophon variants from AF and A (for colophon variants of other editions, see bibliographical descriptions):

2] Iohn] John A

3] at] ouer A
Cum gratia et Priuilegio] Cum
privategio A
WORKS OF SIR JOHN CHEKE


English poems in manuscript: Although I am not citing other unpublished works of Cheke, four English poems, the only ones attributed to Cheke and of particular interest for that reason, exist in two manuscripts, Arundel MS. (Harington Poetry II), fol. 206v, and BM Add. MS. 36529, fol. 80-81. The following first lines of the poems are from the Arundel MS. as transcribed by Miss Ruth Hughey, to whom I am indebted for the material:

"What natures worke is this, in one wightes Corps to hyde"
"I praye to god whoe weldithe aye, the starrye heavens"
"The fainted shade <--> of life painted with natures hand"
"Uncertaine certaine deathethe free grindall hath thee caught"

The hurt of sedition howe greueous it is to a Commune welth.
London, 1549. [For other Renaissance editions of this treatise, see bibliographical descriptions above.]


Translation (Greek to Latin): John Chrysostom. [Two Homilies]. 1543. STC 14634.


Translation (Greek to Latin): Leo VI. Leonis Imperatoris de bellico apparatu liber, e Greco in Latinum conversus, J. Checo ... interprete. Basil, 1554.

Translation (Greek to Latin): Plutarch. On Superstition. English translation by William Elstob printed by

Letters are found in the following collections:


Havercamp, S. *Sylloge Altera Scriptorum*. [?], 1740.
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Adams, Charles D. Demosthenes and his Influence. New York, 1927.


Burghley, William Cecil, Lord. A Collection of State Papers relating to Affairs in the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth, From


Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Mary, 1553-1558, Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office. Ed.


from the Abolition of Roman Jurisdiction. Third ed.

Dunning, William A. A History of Political Theories from
Luther to Montesquieu. New York, 1927.

Edward VI. Literary Remains of Edward the Sixth... Ed.


Elyot, Thomas. The Boke named the Gouernour. Ed. Henry

Figgis, John Neville. Studies in Political Thought from
Gerson to Grotius. Cambridge, 1907.

Figgis, John Neville. The Theory of the Divine Right of
Kings. Cambridge, 1896; second, enlarged ed. Cambridge,
1914.

Foxe, John. The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe. London:
[The Church Historians of England], 1853-1868. 8 vols.

Froude, James A. History of England from the Fall of Wolsey
to the Death of Elizabeth. New York, 1890. 2 vols.

Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain... First


Historical Manuscripts Commission: *Calendars, Reports, and Papers*. London, 1870-.

Historical Narration of certain Events that took place in the Kingdom of Great Britain in the month of July, in the year of our Lord 1553. Written by P. V. Now first reprinted from the Latin. London, 1865.


Hughey, Ruth. "The Harington Manuscript at Arundel Castle

The *Institution of a Christen man*, conteynynge the exposition of the comune Crede, of the seuen sacramentes, of the x. comandementes, & of the Pater noster, and the Aue Maria, Justification and purgatorie. London [1537] misdated 1534.


[Ponet, John]. *A Short treatise of politike pouer, and of the true Obedience which subjectes owe to kynges and other ciuile Gouernours, with an Exhortation to all true naturall Englishe men*. 1556. Rep. in facsimile in Hudson, John Ponet.


*State Papers Published under the Authority of His Majesty's Commission.* [London?], 1830-1836. 4 vols.


Strype, John. *The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith, Kt*

... First ed. 1698; corrected ed. Oxford, 1820.


Society, vol. LXVII, 1857; LXXXIV, 1863; CV, 1872.
3 vols.
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