

THE RECUSANCY OF SIR THOMAS CORNWALLIS

By PATRICK McGRATH AND JOY ROWE

The formidable code of penal laws against Roman Catholics which was gradually built up during the reign of Elizabeth I would, if fully implemented, have destroyed Roman Catholicism in this country and have reduced to poverty all who refused to conform to the new religious settlement. In fact, the penal laws were enforced in a somewhat haphazard manner, and as far as Catholic laymen were concerned, what happened to them depended on a great many variable factors, including the number of friends they had at court and the strings they could pull in high places, the zeal of the local magistrates and the diocesan bishops, the international situation at any particular moment, and their own reputation for loyalty or disloyalty in the eyes of the authorities. Although the threat of the penal laws could never be ignored, a considerable number of known Catholics lived their lives with comparatively little direct interference from the government, while others felt the full vigour of the penal code, and paid the price of their attachment to the old religion with fines, imprisonment and death.¹

A great deal of local research has still to be done before we can have anything like a satisfactory picture of the Catholic community under Elizabeth I.² This article is concerned mainly with the fortunes of one Catholic gentleman in Suffolk in these difficult years and with the way in which he faced the problems which to a greater or lesser degree affected all his contemporaries. For a number of reasons, his case was by no means typical, and it would be wrong to generalise from his career about the Catholic squirarchy

¹ For a detailed study of the operation of the laws in a neighbouring county, see Michael O'Dwyer, 'Catholic Recusants in Essex, c. 1580 to c. 1600', unpublished London M.A. thesis, 1960. Fr. O'Dwyer reached the conclusion that only one man in Essex regularly paid the fine of £20 a month, and that some substantial recusants paid nothing. For the impact of the Recusancy Laws on another Suffolk family, see G. H. Ryan and Lilian J. Redstone, *Timberley of Hintlesham*, 1931.

² There is, of course, a wealth of material in the publications of the Catholic Record Society, and a journal devoted to Recusant History is published by the Arundel Press, Bognor. Details of publications and work in progress in this field are given in *A Register and Newsletter for Students of Recusant History*, published annually by T. A. Birrell, Van Nispenstraat 19, Nijmegen, The Netherlands. The Essex Recusant Society publishes a journal three times a year.



(From the portrait at Audley End; by permission of the Hon. Robin Neville)

Sir Thomas Cornwallis in 1590, aged 71.

as a whole. Nevertheless, in some measure his story illustrates the varied patterns which made up the history of Elizabethan Catholicism and helps to explain how it managed to survive in spite of the determined efforts made to destroy it.

Sir Thomas Cornwallis of Brome in Suffolk was born in 1519 and died in 1604. He was descended from Thomas Cornwallis, a London vintner, who had been sheriff and alderman of London and who had died in 1384, leaving an heir, John, who became a country gentleman. John married Philippa, daughter and coheir of Robert Bucton of Brome. John's son, Thomas (1420-1484) married an Essex heiress and was knight of the shire for Suffolk in 1449-50. Three of Thomas's elder sons died without issue, and the estates eventually passed to his fourth son, William, who, when he died in 1519, was a substantial landowner attached to the Dukes of Norfolk. William's heir, Sir John Cornwallis, distinguished himself in the Earl of Surrey's expedition to Morlaix in 1521, and it was presumably through the influence of the Howards that he eventually entered the royal service in 1538 as Steward of the Household of the young Prince Edward. Sir Thomas was 19 at the time his father took up this official appointment and twenty-seven when he succeeded to the family estates on his father's death in 1546.³ His father's close personal contact with the young heir to the throne and with Edward's half-sister Elizabeth were probably helpful to Sir Thomas when he got into difficulties later.⁴

Very little is known about the education and early religious development of Sir Thomas. He had been born in 1519 and he grew to manhood in the critical decade of the fifteen-thirties when Henry VIII broke with Rome. Presumably the breach presented no problem of conscience to the members of the Cornwallis family. They accepted the new arrangements, as did most of their contemporaries, and the fact that Sir John was given an appointment in Prince Edward's household suggests that he was in every way reliable from the King's point of view.

Sir Thomas succeeded in 1546 to family estates the income from which had been substantially increased by his father. The radical religious changes of Edward VI's reign did not, as far as we know, produce any reaction from him. He was knighted at

³ There is a good deal of material relating to the Cornwallis family in W. A. Copinger, *Manors of Suffolk*, 7 vols., 1905-1911. The bulk of the family papers are now in the possession of the Earl of Iveagh, K.G., K.C.M.G., and we should like to express our thanks to him for his kindness in allowing us to examine and make use of the material. The Colston Research Society of the University of Bristol generously agreed to pay part of the cost of our research.

⁴ Details of Sir John's connection with Mary and Elizabeth are given in his *Notebook of Personal Expenses*, 30-34 Henry VIII, now in the Ipswich Record Office.

Westminster on 1 December 1548, and when Ket's rebellion broke out in 1549 he went with the Marquis of Northampton, Lord Sheffield and other gentlemen to try to crush it. They took Norwich, but it was subsequently retaken by the rebels, and Sir Thomas was captured. He did not regain his liberty until Warwick defeated the rebel force.⁵

What Sir Thomas thought of the drastic religious changes from 1547 to 1553, we do not know, but he was evidently regarded as reliable. He was one of the commissioners appointed to collect the subsidy in 1551⁶ and to see that the proclamation was enforced for supplying the markets with victuals at reasonable prices.⁷ He was also one of the nine commissioners for Suffolk appointed to make an inventory of plate, jewels, vestments, bells and other ornaments of churches, chapels, brotherhoods, guilds and fraternities. The commissioners were to take a full view of such goods, to compare it with inventories previously made, and to search for what had been embezzled.⁸ It would be dangerous to read too much into this. Sir Thomas may have been put on the commission simply as a prominent Suffolk landowner, but his participation suggests that he was not over-squeamish about looted ecclesiastical property.⁹ Further evidence that he was well thought of by the government is the fact that he was appointed sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk in the last months of the reign.¹⁰ He was thus in 1553 in a key position in the crisis produced by the king's death.

When Edward died, the Princess Mary was at Kenninghall, a confiscated residence of the imprisoned Duke of Norfolk. She crossed the border into Suffolk to the comparative security of Framlingham Castle, and the Suffolk gentry flocked in to support her. The Council, headed by the Duke of Northumberland, who was trying to seize the throne for his daughter-in-law Lady Jane Grey, no doubt hoped that Sir Thomas Cornwallis as sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk would proclaim Lady Jane as queen, but Sir Thomas, with that loyalty to the direct Tudor line which charac-

⁵ W. A. Copinger, *op. cit.*, III, 235.

⁶ *Cal. Patent Rolls, Edward VI*, v, 358.

⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, 141.

⁸ *Cal. Patent Rolls, Edward VI*, IV, 393-395, and subsequent commission of 3 March 1553, *ibid.*, v, 415.

⁹ Sir Thomas's father had acquired an interest in some of the lands of Coxford Priory (F. Blomefield, *Norfolk*, 1805, I, 544), and in the manor of Tivetshall which had belonged to Bury St. Edmunds (*Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, XVII, 322). Sir Thomas himself had an interest in Thorpe Abbots, formerly the property of Thetford Priory (Essex Record Office: D/DBY E.36 and *Cal. Patent Rolls, Edward VI*, 1547-48, I, 228).

¹⁰ *Cal. Patent Rolls, Edward VI*, v, 387.

terised the whole of his life, was one of the first to support Princess Mary, and he thus earned a gratitude that launched him on what looked like being a very successful career in the royal service. He became a member of Mary's Privy Council, and his wife, Anne Jernegan, was one of the Queen's Ladies of the Bedchamber.¹¹ Sir Thomas was employed with Sir Robert Bowes to negotiate the Treaty of Edinburgh with the Scots in 1553, and he was one of those sent to treat with the rebel, Sir Thomas Wyatt, in 1554. He showed his courage and his loyalty in this crisis which nearly brought the Queen down, and in the same year he was appointed Treasurer of Calais, a post he retained until two months before the town fell to the French. Although there was some kind of rumour that he had made a lot of money out of his Treasurership and that he had a measure of responsibility for the loss of Calais, the government evidently did not consider him in anyway to blame, and in December 1557 he was appointed Comptroller of the Queen's Household.

We know little of Sir Thomas's religious views during these years. He was certainly regarded very favourably by the Queen, but the only evidence we have connecting him in any way with the policy of religious persecution is in a letter from the Council to Cornwallis and Sir Nicholas Hare instructing them to examine William Flower, alias Branch, who had seriously wounded a priest in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, while the priest was administering the Sacrament. They were to enquire from Flower whether he had any associates and what he meant by wearing a placard about his neck with the words *Deum time, idolum fuge*. They were to speak to the Bishop of Winchester to proceed against him for heresy and to the Justices of the Peace of Middlesex to proceed in the like manner for shedding blood in church. If Flower persisted in his heresy, he was to be put to death, and his right hand was to be struck off on the day before his execution.¹²

That Sir Thomas Cornwallis took his religion seriously at this time may be inferred from a letter he sent from Calais to Sir William Petre on 6 March 1555. He said that in his haste to get to Calais he had forgotten to ask the Queen for a preacher to be sent there. He considered that Doctor Serles, the present incumbent, was 'a man so rude, unlearned, and barbarous, as the like was never heard in the place of a preacher'. He thought that 'for the advancement of God's glory, the Queen's proceedings, the estimation of learning, and the people's conversion, it had been better her

¹¹ *Cal. Patent Rolls, Philip and Mary*, II, 67.

¹² *Acts of the Privy Council 1554-6*, p. 115, 15 April 1555; John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, Oxford, 1822, vol. III, Part I, 337; John Foxe, *Ecclesiastical Historie*, 1641, III, 241 ff.

Majesty had spent 300 l. than such an unlearned man should have come among this people'. Sir Thomas had apparently been shocked at the bad sermon which he had heard, and he asked that Archdeacon Harpsfield or 'some other grave learned man' should with speed be sent thither 'to repair this man's hurt'.¹³

Two points of interest may be noted about this period of Sir Thomas's life for they may well have had considerable effect on his subsequent fortunes. They concern his relations with the two people who were going to dominate England for the next forty years—the Princess Elizabeth and William Cecil. In February 1554, Sir Thomas Cornwallis had been sent with William, Lord Howard and Sir Edward Hastings to bring Elizabeth from Ashridge in Hertfordshire to London. The princess was either ill or pretending to be ill, but she was nevertheless compelled to make the journey by slow stages to London and the Tower. It can perhaps be assumed that Sir Thomas, who had known the princess under happier circumstances, behaved with consideration and courtesy during this difficult mission. Elizabeth does not seem to have borne any grudge.¹⁴ In addition, he seems to have played an important part in protecting her interests by opposing in the Council the plan to imprison her in the Tower and by maintaining that she could perfectly well be confined elsewhere.¹⁵ He was no doubt influenced by the fact that he had known Elizabeth when she was a child,¹⁶ and it is probable, too, that he was not enthusiastic about the Spanish alliance. There are one to two indications that the Spaniards were not particularly pleased with him. Count Feria, for example, wrote to Philip on 1 May 1558 mentioning Cornwallis as one of the most influential men in the government but adding that he always made difficulties about everything.¹⁷ It may well be that Sir Thomas, like Elizabeth, was proud to be 'mere English'.¹⁸

¹³ *Cal. State Papers Foreign*, 1553–8, pp. 157–158.

¹⁴ It appears from Lord Howard's report to the Queen that this delicate mission was carried out in a tactful and friendly manner. See P.R.O., S.P. 11/3, no. 21.

¹⁵ *Cal. State Papers Spanish*, xii, pp. 166–167, 22 March 1554. According to W. A. Copinger, *Manors of Suffolk*, iii, 176, Sir Thomas opposed in the Council a plan to send Elizabeth out of the country with a view to excluding her from the succession 'allegging that the people of England would take it very ill, nay, would not at all endure that the next heir to the crown should be conveyed out of the land'.

¹⁶ *Infra*, Appendix II, p. 262.

¹⁷ *Cal. State Papers Spanish*, xiii, p. 379. See also Philip to Feria, 22 or 23 January 1558, *ibid.*, p. 343; J. A. Froude, *History of England*, vi, 192. Sir Thomas had been included in the list of those to whom Philip was to give presents and was to receive a gold chain worth 200 crowns. (*Cal. State Papers Spanish*, xii, 315, ? July 1554).

¹⁸ For Sir Thomas's reference to 'the plane olde Inglishsh manner', see *infra*, p. 232, n. 21.

An even more valuable relationship was established with William Cecil. When the two first became acquainted, we do not know. The earliest evidence of their friendship comes in Mary's reign, but they probably knew each other before that. Although Cecil was in eclipse under Mary, he was still a useful man to know, and a couple of letters among the Cecil papers for March and April 1557 show him performing various services for Sir Thomas.¹⁹ This friendship was to last all their lives, and the Cecils were to be of considerable assistance to Sir Thomas and his sons. As will be seen later, Sir Thomas corresponded with Cecil on numerous occasions, and a relationship by marriage between the two families was established in 1570 when Sir Thomas's son, William, married Lucy Nevil, one of Lord Latimer's daughters and coheireses. Her eldest sister had married in 1564 William Cecil's eldest son, Thomas. This extremely valuable contact did not mean that Sir Thomas would be unmolested in the difficult years that lay ahead after 1558, but it did ensure that he would get a sympathetic hearing from those in high places and that he would be dealt with much more leniently than many of his fellow recusants.

If Mary had lived longer, Sir Thomas Cornwallis might have enjoyed a long and distinguished career in the government's service, but he was much too closely identified with the old order for there to be any hope of his continuing in power when Elizabeth I succeeded to the throne on 17 November 1558. He was dropped from the Privy Council and he retired to his estates in Suffolk. There was a certain amount of tidying-up to do in connection with his retirement, and on 30 November 1558 we find Sir Thomas and Edward, Lord Hastings of Loughborough writing to Cecil, the new Secretary, soliciting a reward for Ludovicus Nonnius, a physician sent over from Spain to attend the late queen.²⁰ A year later, Sir Thomas wrote again to Cecil thanking him for his letters and sending him 22 partridges some of which were to be presented to Lord Robert Dudley. He asked Cecil to tell Dudley 'that I have of late by advertisement from my frendes understand of his L[ordship's] good respect and favorable opynyon of me, and that he spares not to utter the same in a right good presence'. He added: 'How so ever I have deserved, my L[ord] shieweth hymself like a noble man to whome for this and former freindship shewen in my late adversitie, I doe yeld myself bound unto hym to doe

¹⁹ Hist. MSS. Comm: *Cecil I*, 139-140. See also *ibid.*, 138, for a letter from Thomas Lord Wentworth to Cecil, 16 January 1557, in which Lord Wentworth asked Cecil to furnish his cousin, Sir Thomas Cornwallis, with a note of a house standing near the Thames, built by the Duke of Somerset.

²⁰ *Cal. State Papers Domestic*, 1547-1580, p. 115.

hym any service or pleasure during my lyfe. And this I meane (beleve me) after the plane olde Inglishsh manner . . .'.²¹

Another of Sir Thomas's friends at court was Francis Yaxley, clerk of the signet, to whom he wrote on 16 February 1560 telling him that he 'should not be unmyndfull of thold advise that I have given unto you [of] bestowing some care to profitt yourself when opportunitie may shoue'. He said he understood Yaxley was 'moch attendant upon my L[ord] Robert who being a gentlemen of verie good nature, and in place to doo them good that honor and serve hym well, will willingly (I assure myself) preferr any convenient sute that you shall attempte'. He asked Yaxley to give his 'humble and harty commendacons' to Lord Robert, and said that he had agreed to Yaxley's request for some partridges, even though his game had almost been destroyed in his absence. He did so 'because I do gesse on whome you meane to bestow them', and he added: 'However you do a synfull deed to breake love, now when every partriche hath chosen hyr mate'.²²

Although he thus maintained contacts with the court, Sir Thomas Cornwallis no doubt knew very well that there was no future for him in public life. In July 1560 he wrote to Yaxley asking to be excused from attendance on the Prince of Sweden who was proposing to visit England. He wished Yaxley to prevent his appointment.²³ Retirement meant the loss of the profits of office,²⁴ and it would be a blow to a man who liked public employment, but Sir Thomas was now over forty years of age, and it may be that he was not unwilling to devote himself to the development of his estates, to the establishment of his children, and to various building projects at Brome and in Norwich.

In the fifteen-sixties, Sir Thomas was busily engaged in rebuilding his house at Brome. Work went on there from 1562 until 1569 and cost about £1,000. Like many of his contemporaries, Sir Thomas was a great builder, and he must have been kept fully occupied in supervising operations, managing his considerable estates and delighting in the pleasures of a country

²¹ P.R.O., S.P. 11/7, no. 33. From Brome, 6 November 1559. He also stated that Cecil in his last letters had mentioned that the Lord Treasurer sent his good wishes, and he asked Cecil to return the compliment.

²² P.R.O., S.P. 11/11, no. 15, 16 February 1560. At this time Yaxley was closely attached to Cecil, but later he got into trouble and went into the service of Mary Stuart. He was drowned in 1565 while on his way from Spain to Scotland.

²³ *Cal. State Papers Domestic* 1547-1580, p. 157, 22 July and 30 July 1560, (nos. 9 and 15).

²⁴ The income and expenditure of Sir Thomas Cornwallis have been examined by Dr. Alan Simpson in a chapter in his forthcoming book *East Anglian Studies*. The writers of this article are also engaged in work on the Cornwallis estate papers in connection with their proposed biography of Sir Thomas Cornwallis.

gentleman.²⁵ That he continued to enjoy the friendship of Sir William Cecil is clear from a letter he wrote to him in 1566 thanking him for 'the favourable order and expedition as I have received in my private causes, depending of late before you'. He stated that he had heard 'by the report of my singular good Lord the Duke of Norfolk his grace, your loving and friendly disposition towards me' and he asked Cecil to continue 'your good opinion and assured friendship towards me'. He said he knew that innocence did not always keep men out of trouble but that he would think his poor estate sure and safe enough as long as he had Cecil's friendship. He could express his thanks only in words but he would do so by deeds if he could.²⁶

Sir Thomas does not seem to have taken any part in local government during the fifteen-sixties, and this is rather surprising since his patron, the Duke of Norfolk, was all powerful in Norfolk and Suffolk in these years and was quite capable of getting his supporters put on the bench, even though they were known to be Catholic in sympathy.²⁷ It may well be that Sir Thomas wanted to keep clear of local as well as of national politics, but his connection with the Duke of Norfolk, which no doubt helped him through the first decade of Elizabeth I's reign, was to prove very dangerous when the Duke became involved in trouble over his proposed marriage with Mary, Queen of Scots.

Whether Sir Thomas conformed and went to the parish church from time to time in the fifteen-sixties, we do not know. He may well have done so, as did many other Catholics, but it nevertheless seems fairly clear that when trouble came in 1569 he was suspected of being opposed to the new religion. Norfolk was sent to the Tower on 11 October 1569. The government was already investigating those who had been associated with him when he fled from court to his estates in East Anglia. These included Sir Thomas Cornwallis and his son-in-law Thomas Kitson. They were summoned before the Council at Windsor and were required to answer a long series of questions. The first part of the examination was designed to find out whether they were in any way implicated in the Duke's political activities. They were asked when they came to him, how long they stayed with him, who was there, what talk took place about his sudden departure from Court or about his proposed marriage with Mary, Queen of Scots, and why

²⁵ *Cal. State Papers Domestic* 1547-1580, p. 157, 31 July 1560. Sir William Cordell (Master of the Rolls) to Francis Yaxley. Sir Thomas Cornwallis, the Countess of Bath, Lord Windsor and his wife have been with him, making merry.

²⁶ B.M. *Lansdowne MSS.* 9, fo. 3.

²⁷ See Alfred Hassall Smith, 'The Elizabethan Gentry of Norfolk', unpublished London Ph.D. thesis, 1959.

they remained with him when they knew the reason for his departure from Court. This was followed by a number of questions about religion—whether they went to their parish church, whether they received communion yearly, whether they delivered up any unlawful books to the bishop as they were required to do by proclamation, and if so, what the books were. Sir Thomas Cornwallis was also asked about the part he had played in the settlement of certain lands belonging to the Duke of Norfolk and what speech the Duke had had with him at any time about the proposed marriage with the Queen of Scots.²⁸

The questions relating to his political activities probably presented no difficulty to Sir Thomas. It is true that he was a friend of the Duke of Norfolk, but it is unlikely that he was in any way implicated in his political schemes. Sir Thomas maintained that he had met the Duke by chance as he came from London. He had been hunting near Diss. He stated that after the Duke's last coming to Kenninghall, he had spoken of the proposed marriage to Dru Drury and Sir Thomas, who had already been informed of the Queen's displeasure with the Duke and the reason for it. Cornwallis remarked that he thought the Duke had not been of that mind twelve months ago, and the Duke replied that he had not been of that mind at Christmas last. Cornwallis informed the Council of the names of those who had been present at this time and of the reason why he had acted as feoffee with regard to some of the Duke's lands. It must have been quite clear to the Council that Sir Thomas was not involved politically and that in attending on the Duke he had merely been carrying out the normal duty of one of the gentry who enjoyed the patronage of the Howards.²⁹

The questions concerning religion must have been much more alarming. Unfortunately Sir Thomas's answers have not been preserved, but it is significant that Sir Thomas's son-in-law, Thomas Kitson, replied that he himself had not received communion for four or five years past. Presumably in an attempt to placate the Council, he added that he sometimes went to sermons with the Lord Chief Justice—a reference, no doubt, to the sermon preached at the beginning of each assize.³⁰ Sir Thomas's replies on the question of religion must have been even more unsatisfactory, and

²⁸ Hist. MSS. Comm: *Cecil I*, 439, 22 October 1569.

²⁹ Hist. MSS. Comm: *Cecil I*, 438, 22 October 1569. The Examination of Sir Thomas Cornwallis taken at Windsor. In November 1569, William, Lord Eure reported to Cecil on the number of papists in Cumberland with estates near the sea and so, presumably, dangerous if an invasion were attempted. He mentioned Sir Thomas Cornwallis's estate at Wilton, near Gisborough (*Cal. State Papers Domestic, Addenda*, 1566–1579, pp. 100 and 101).

³⁰ Hist. MSS. Comm: *Cecil I*, 439. Examination of Thomas Kitson at Windsor, 27 October 1569.

he was not set at liberty until nearly a year later. This first imprisonment of Sir Thomas is thus recorded in the summary of accounts kept by his steward: 'the Charges and thepences of Sir Thomas Cornwallys Knight For one whole yere begynnyng the Fyrste of Octobre Anno Domini 1569 And Endyng the laste of Septembre Anno Domini 1570 In the wyche tyme the sayd Sir Thomas Cornewales was committid by the Lordes of Councell . . . as a Prysoner for matier of religion'.³¹ During the greater part of this time, Sir Thomas was confined to the care of Bishop Jewel, and he even went on a visitation with him. Presumably the government hoped that conversation with the foremost Anglican apologist of the day might persuade Sir Thomas to conform.

Some very interesting details of Sir Thomas's imprisonment are given in a separate account of expenses incurred during this period, and this is printed in full in an appendix.³² He was clearly not treated with any harshness, and he was allowed to maintain contact with his family and friends, but nevertheless he was deprived of his liberty, and this may well have been irksome to a man who was very much concerned with his domestic affairs. Part of the time he was ill and he may have had trouble with his teeth.³³ In addition, the future must have seemed extremely uncertain, and at one time he was expecting to be sent to the Tower.³⁴

Sir Thomas was back in London on 5 June 1570, and on 12 June he was engaged in a formal disputation with a number of Anglican divines. We have some account of this disputation from Gabriel Goodman, Dean of Westminster, who wrote to Cecil about it, and we also have Sir Thomas's letter to Cecil and his submission to the Queen. It seems worth while printing these three documents in full as an appendix to this article because they throw a good deal of light on the character and ability of Sir Thomas and because they illustrate the arguments and the pressures brought to bear on an Elizabethan gentleman who found himself at variance with the government's religious policy.³⁵

³¹ Iveagh Collection: *Cornwallis MSS.* 1/2. This is *The Brief Collection of Expenses* which contains the General Receiver's annual accounts of all monies passing through his hands. Each summary is prefaced by a head note in which the outstanding personal events of the year are recorded. The accounts run without a break from 1558 to 1597.

³² *Infra*, pp. 264-271.

³³ He was 'sick of a murr and reume', and he made a payment for 'certene gold wier for teeth'. *Infra*, pp. 267, 270.

³⁴ See p. 270. Payment of £19 11s. 9d. for 'Certeine napery and kychen vessells providid when he sholde have gone to the Tower'.

³⁵ *Infra*, pp. 259-264. The documents are calendared in *Cal. State Papers Domestic* 1547-1580, p. 293. Goodman's letter is calendared as of 21 June 1567 and is so dated by Goodman, but Goodman clearly made a slip. The endorsement is 1570, and the letter obviously relates to the disputation which we know from the other documents took place in 1570.

The tone of Dean Goodman's letter suggests that Goodman was far from satisfied with the way in which the disputation had been handled by the Anglican apologists, and it seems that Sir Thomas had not been convinced by the arguments advanced by his opponents. Nevertheless, Goodman thought there was still great hope of winning him over to the establishment. Sir Thomas approved of much of the new form of worship, including the use of the vernacular, but he wanted all this to be confirmed by 'General Authority'. Here, presumably, lay the appeal to the whole Catholic Church which St. Thomas More had made earlier and Edmund Campion was to make later. He was critical, as any intelligent Catholic must have been, of many things in the Church of Rome, and he wished them reformed in accordance with the practice of the early church. He explicitly repudiated the temporal claims of the Pope—a very important point at the time when the Papal Bull of Excommunication with all its stark, uncompromising terms had put the Catholic laity in an extremely awkward situation. He appears to have posed the question to his opponents of why they accepted the early General Councils but doubted the decisions of the later ones. It is clear that both Sir Thomas and Dean Goodman took Sir Thomas's conscience very seriously, and that Goodman had a very high opinion of Sir Thomas's ability. 'I have seldom knowen', he writes, 'any of that syde so wyse and so conveniently learned, more reasonable in Conference, or more nearour to conformity'. He thought Sir Thomas would follow the truth when he saw it, and he advised treating him gently for the time being over those matters which his conscience could not as yet accept. He urged Cecil to use his influence to persuade him, since Sir Thomas thought very highly of Cecil. He added that Sir Thomas had not been well for the last three days.

It seems likely that Cecil was already using his powers of persuasion on his friend, for Sir Thomas's letter to him, dated 21 June 1570, is in answer to a letter of Cecil's which has not survived. In this Sir Thomas referred to Cecil's friendship in terms which show that it was no mere conventional acknowledgment. He indicated that he was facing the greatest crisis of his life 'havyng now matter in hande, that towchythe me nearest of all that I ever hade sythe I was borne'. He regretted that Cecil was angry with him over the management of the debate with the Anglican divines, but pointed out that he was not responsible for the arrangements and was perfectly willing to co-operate with the plans for the discussion. He said that he would not now go into the points raised by Cecil, but that they did not meet his particular difficulties. It is clear that Cecil had pointed out the sorrow he would bring to his wife and family if he remained obstinate, and Sir Thomas

admitted that 'the care and sorow off my lovyng wyffe, the crye and lamentyng of my poore chyldren and servantes . . . are off force to move a manne of more constancye than I have'. He believed that the anger of the Prince and the danger that it involved were terrible, but he affirmed that 'the danger toffende Almyghtye God ys, or owghte to be, more Weyghed then all the perylls in the Worlde besydes', and he maintained that it was this alone which had kept him from conforming, whatever anyone else might say.

All this might lead one to expect that Sir Thomas was explaining why he could not do what was asked of him, but in fact he was leading up to a statement that he was now prepared to submit. He wished to clear himself of any suspicion of infidelity to the Queen, and he was moved, he said, more by her clemency 'wyche I certeynly know to have procedyd ffrome hyr owne person' than he would have been by any threats or loss of goods. He said he wished the queen knew all the thoughts of his heart and of his love for her 'ffrom the tyme I knew hyr fyrst as a childe in the prynce my master hys house untill the daye beyng now my leage ladye . . .'. He would apply himself to obey her laws in matters of religion 'as Almyghtye God wyll gyve me grace to be further persuadyd' and he would defend her against all foreign princes. He said he was not well in mind or body, and he begged Cecil to see that 'at the Fyrst I be drawne no Further then to cumyng to Chyrche wheare I wyll use my self (by Godes grace) to want offence to eny menne and not by devyse to be pressyd further, wyche myght make me eyther an hypocryte or desperate, but sufferyd without offence to eny good manne, for a tyme to forbear the rest, vntyll Almyghtye God (If that be his holly will) shall suffer me to [be] more fully persuadyd off the rest'.

In this letter to Cecil, Sir Thomas enclosed his humble submission to the Queen. He again made the point that hitherto it had been his conscience alone that had prevented him from conforming to the Queen's laws, and 'thus longe wythdrawne me from the cumminyng to Chyrche', but now 'upon better consyderation off the matyer and therwythe weyghinge how mercyfullye yt lykyth your hyghnes to deale, in seekyng no further to serche or examyn my consyence, then wythe the shew off mysellfe to be an humble and obedyent subiect vnto your maiestie in frequentyng the Chyrche and servyce therein now vysd', he begged the Queen to extend to him her accustomed favour and to restore him to his former liberty.

These documents concerning Sir Thomas's submission are of considerable interest since they illustrate the kind of mental struggle that must have gone on in the minds of many Catholics. Like so many sixteenth century gentlemen, Sir Thomas had a tradition of

loyalty to the crown which made him very reluctant to disobey the law, and there was in his case a personal attachment to the Queen. It seems almost certain that Sir Thomas's expression of loyalty and fidelity to Elizabeth was more than a mere convention.

The question arises whether in making this submission he was doing something which he believed to be wrong. It is very difficult to answer this question, and we should like to have much fuller evidence than has in fact been preserved. From what we have, it can, we think, be argued that Sir Thomas had very serious scruples about what he was doing. It is true that many Catholics conformed for the sake of avoiding trouble, even though they did not give interior consent to what went on at the services they attended in the parish church. Many of them, at least until the coming of the seminary priests, thought they could do so with a good conscience, but it is not absolutely clear that Sir Thomas was in this position. He had held out from October 1569 until June 1570, and it rather looks as though he now conformed only under pressure. There is clearly a measure of reservation in his submission. He will go to church, but no more is to be asked of him until he is more fully persuaded. He was an intelligent man who thought a good deal about his religious position, and it seems likely that he was very uneasy about the step he was now taking. His mind may well have been disturbed by the controversies in which he had been engaged and by the obvious advantages of doing what he was asked to do. In this uncertainty, he at length yielded, and with a man of less sensitive conscience and less determination, this first step would have led—as it did with many hundreds of his contemporaries—to full acceptance of the established church.

It must have been with mixed feelings that Sir Thomas rejoined his family in London and returned with them to Brome in August 1570. He was a free man, but he had obtained his freedom only after a submission which had been the result of a considerable interior struggle. No doubt his family were glad to welcome him, and his sons, at least, must have congratulated him on behaving so sensibly. Neither William, the newly married heir, nor Charles his second son, ever caused the government any serious anxiety over matters of religion. They apparently accepted the Church of England without much difficulty.³⁶ On the other hand, Sir

³⁶ It is something of a problem why neither William nor Charles ever showed the slightest inclination to follow their father's religion. In 1609, Sir Charles Cornwallis, then English ambassador in Madrid, told Robert Cecil of an argument he had had about religion with a Carmelite friar who had said 'that he and many others of the greatest of this Court could not beleeve, that I, that had disceded from such Parentes, whatsoever showe I make in regard of myne Employment and Respect to him I serve, could be inwardly of that Opyinion

continued on next page.

Thomas's second daughter Elizabeth, who married Thomas Kitson of Hengrave, was certainly a recusant later,³⁷ and some of Sir Thomas's recusant friends among the Suffolk squires must have regretted his failure to stand firm.

Some indication of the state of Sir Thomas's mind is given in a letter which he wrote to his son-in-law, Thomas Kitson, in January 1572. He said: 'The time is such in which we now live as it would comber a wiser head than I have now to give you advice which way to proceed and therefore can do but humbly pray God to direct you to take such course as may tend to the preservation of your credit and reputation and the best safety of your person'.³⁸

Meanwhile Sir Thomas apparently conformed and attended the parish church. Nevertheless he did his best to help his kinsman, Mr. Hare, who would not conform and who was cited to appear before the Bishop's Chancellor in February 1572. The bishop was under pressure from the Council to take steps against recusants and was unable to oblige Sir Thomas. He wrote to him explaining that he could not accept Mr. Hare's request to put the business off until the weather was better. He said that his conscience, his duty to the Queen and 'the sharp rebuking letters' which he had received from men in authority required him to take action. If he was informed that Mr. Hare and the other recusants frequented the church and common prayer and received the Sacrament, that would be the end of the matter. Otherwise they must take the consequences. It was more than time to deal with such disobedient subjects as 'the examples of the late rebellion and traitorous conspiracies of papistry, even against her majesty's most royal person, were most apparent witnesses'. He added that Mr. Hare would do better to follow Sir Thomas's good example, in resorting to church, hearing sermons and otherwise conforming himself.³⁹

³⁶ *continued.*

I profess'd . . .'. (*Memorials of Affairs of State . . . from the Original Papers of Sir Ralph Winwood*, 1725, III, 31). We do not know when the boys were born, but the accounts for 1555-7 (Iveagh Collection: *Cornwallis MSS.* 1/2) mention payments to Charles's nurse and for William's board. The children probably grew up in Elizabeth's reign, and Sir Thomas may have allowed them to conform instead of bringing them up as strict Catholics. But of this we cannot be sure. See, however, p. 245, n. 68.

³⁷ *Infra*, p. 254, n. 89.

³⁸ Cambridge University Library: *Hengrave MSS.* 88 (2) No. 65, dated January 1571/2. Kitson had been put under arrest at the same time as his father-in-law and eventually made a more unqualified submission than did Sir Thomas. See John Gage, *The History and Antiquities of Hengrave, Suffolk*, 1822, p. 178 ff.

³⁹ *MSS.* Joh. Episc. nuper Elien, quoted in J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, vol. II Part I, p. 164, dated 25 February 1571 [1571/2]. Both William and Michael Hare were prominent Suffolk recusants (see G. H. Ryan and Lilian J. Redstone, *Timperley of Hintlesham*, p. 43 ff.).

Although he went to the Anglican church in the fifteen-seventies, it is nevertheless clear that Sir Thomas was regarded as a Catholic. When the Duke of Norfolk wrote his last letters to his son Philip Howard, he urged him to make use of Sir Thomas but at the same time to 'beware of him and of all other that be papists'.⁴⁰ Again, Sir Thomas's name appears as a Catholic in a list of 'influential persons' which was apparently prepared in the interests of Mary, Queen of Scots.⁴¹ At what date Sir Thomas ceased to conform, we do not know, but in the later fifteen-seventies there are indications that he was once more under suspicion in the matter of religion, and this may well be connected with the general stiffening of the Catholic resistance as a result of the activities of the seminary priests. This suspicion is shown in the series of questions put to Charles Ratcliffe concerning the activities of Mountford Scott—'a Jesuit or mass priest'. Ratcliffe was asked in relation to Scott whether he knew or had heard to what gentlemen's houses in Norfolk and Suffolk he had resorted within the last two or three years, and by what means Ratcliffe and Sutton had been bailed from imprisonment which they suffered 'for Rheims testaments'. Another question was:

'Item, did not Sir Thomas Cornwallis wright anie letters or vse anie meanes on your behalfe for that purpose and to whom did he wright the same'. The interrogation continued as follows: 'Item, do you not take the said Sir Thomas Cornwallis to be a Catholique and have assumed him so to be. Item, have you heard the said Sir Thomas saie that he would come no more at church. When and where did he so tell you. Item, did not you speake with Sir Thomas Cornwalleyes a little before or as you came up to London the last tearme and had he not speche with you then concerning going to the church. Declare what speche yt was. Item, what letters do you know of that he hath wrytten to anie person in your behalfe synce the begynnyng of your troubles for Rheims testaments'.⁴²

Unfortunately, Charles Ratcliffe's replies to the part of the questionnaire concerning Sir Thomas have not survived, but it is clear that Sir Thomas was suspect, although there was presumably insufficient evidence to justify any action against him.

⁴⁰ See *The Venerable Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel 1557-1595*, edit. J. H. Pollen and William MacMahon, Catholic Record Society, vol. xxi, p. 6.

⁴¹ Catholic Record Society, vol. xiii, p. 90.

⁴² P.R.O. S.P. 12/113, no. 28. Calendared under May 1577.

The attempt to link Sir Thomas with the missionary activities of Fr. Mountford Scott is of considerable interest, since Fr. Scott belonged to a family of Suffolk gentry.⁴³ He was far advanced in his studies when he left England for Douai in 1574. He was ordained priest in 1575 and returned as a missionary priest to England in 1577.⁴⁴ Later, at any rate, he had many contacts with the Suffolk gentry.⁴⁵

Another piece of evidence relating to Sir Thomas's religious position in the later fifteen-seventies is found in the accusations brought by the Puritans against Bishop Freke of Norwich. This is not the place to examine the details of the quarrel between Freke and his enemies,⁴⁶ but some brief comment is necessary in order to explain how Sir Thomas came to be involved. Bishop Freke was translated from Rochester to Norwich in 1575 on the death of Bishop Parkhurst. Norwich was a disturbed diocese from the religious point of view with a strong Puritan faction, which included some very influential supporters among the Justices of the Peace. There was, too, a quite strong Catholic group which was also represented on the bench.⁴⁷ Bishop Freke, who was apparently a rather weak man dominated by an overbearing wife, became involved in a series of very fierce disputes with the Puritans, including the Puritan justices, and in the course of one of these there were brought against him a whole series of charges, some of which relate to Sir Thomas Cornwallis.⁴⁸ The bishop's Puritan opponents

⁴³ *Unpublished Documents relating to the English Martyrs*, edit. J. H. Pollen, 1908, Catholic Record Society, vol. v, pp. 71-74, 291.

⁴⁴ Challoner, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, 1741, Part I, p. 258. He was executed in 1591.

⁴⁵ See Catholic Record Society, vol. v, 71 ff. for the confession of Richard Lacey of Brockdish in Norfolk, 1583. Lacey gave away a great deal of information about Suffolk Catholics, including his own brother who, he alleged, left certain Catholic books brought from beyond the seas at Anthony Bourne's house in Brome. He further alleged that the Suffolk Catholics 'do saye that they knowe whatt is done against them in the Court, and thatt they have theire secrett frindes there thatt give them knowledge thereof presently . . .'. Richard Lacey added that about five years earlier when Fr. Scott was staying with Edward Sulliard, he tried to persuade Lacey to become a Catholic. It is interesting that Sir Thomas's mother was a Sulyard. Lacey also stated that Miles Yare, the parson of Stuston, 'sayeth masse commonly in his parloure chamber . . . and . . . thatt in the said chamber ar all thinges necessary perteyning therto'. Stuston was one of the livings in the presentation of Sir Thomas.

⁴⁶ For detailed examination of the dispute, see A. Hassall Smith, 'The Elizabethan Gentry of Norfolk', and P. Collinson, 'The Puritan Classical Movement in the Reign of Elizabeth I', unpublished London Ph.D. thesis, 1957.

⁴⁷ Dr. Hassall Smith points out that if the recusant returns for 1577 and 1588 can be regarded as a guide to the distribution of gentry with Catholic sympathies, there were more in the diocese of Norwich than in any other, except perhaps London.

⁴⁸ There were 36 charges involving Sir Thomas. They are to be found in P.R.O. S.P. 15/25, no. 19, fos. 272-274, November 1579.

claimed that many recusants who before trembled at his name for their suspected religion now came to his table.⁴⁹ They alleged that one Downes, an obstinate papist, had told a friend ‘tush, tush, let the protestants prate and talke what they will, I am sure we have the Bishop on our side’.⁵⁰ They maintained that Sir Thomas Cornwallis had great influence with the bishop’s officials and that he had taken steps to place a chancellor with the bishop who would serve his (Sir Thomas’s) purpose.⁵¹ They alleged further that ‘when other papists fynd faults with him for resortinge somtymes to church and sermons, it ys credibly avowched he aunswareth thus, If a man sate at dynner and heare a foule prate, shall he rise and goe away and not be counted himself a more foole. This is notorious, all service tyme when others on their knees are at praiers, he will sett contemptuously reading on a boke (most likely some Lady psalter or portasse which have been found in his pue)’. In addition, Sir Thomas was said to have boasted about his former secretary Lawrence who was now a monk in the Charterhouse at Brussels,⁵² and to have bestowed benefices in his gift on papist priests, non-residents and unlearned men. Another charge relates to a conversation between Cooke of Ipswich and Sir Thomas when Cooke asked Sir Thomas for his good word in a suit to the Bishop’s Chancellor. ‘Whereto Sir Thomas answered—nay the Chancelor is a foole. I will not deale with him of all men but I can doe enough with the B[ishop] I warrante you and somewhat also with my lords of the Counsaill though some think nay, to whom Cooke replied—that may well appeare by your worshipp’s quick dispatch out of your great troubles. Sir Thomas Cornwallis answered—“yea, marry, Cooke are thou advised of that?”’.⁵³

The bishop’s enemies painted a picture of the bishop hand in glove with the papists. They gave an account of a dinner at Ludham in 1578 at which the bishop entertained Sir Thomas

⁴⁹ Hassall Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, quoting P.R.O. S.P. 15/25, fo. 279.

⁵¹ A reference to Dr. William Masters. It was claimed that ‘in the old B[ishops] daies’ Sir Thomas had taken care to settle such a one as Chancellor of Norwich ‘as beinge at his devotion, might follow his direction’. Dr. Masters had studied at Rome and Orleans from 1565–8, his mother Anne Tibenham was a recusant, and he himself came under suspicion. His patent was revoked in 1575 and John Becon, a puritan, was appointed in his place. It was alleged that Sir Thomas ‘practised . . . to . . . buy . . . [Becon’s] offyce for Dr. Masters, offringe any ready downe money very frankly’. Becon refused but after a long and fierce dispute with the bishop, he was moved to Chichester, and Dr. Masters was re-appointed—a triumph for the Catholic group. See Hassall Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 172 ff.

⁵² In a Book of Evidences compiled for Sir Thomas, after the calendaring of a deed for 1566 there is a note in a new hand: ‘Thus much by Thomas Lawrence before his departure beyond the sea’. Essex Record Office: D/DBY E.36, f. 70.

⁵³ P.R.O. S.P. 15/25, no. 19 [charge no. 36].

Cornwallis, William Paston, Martin Barney, Miles Corbett and others. The bishop complained of the poverty of his see and talked about getting translated to Worcester. 'Sir Thomas answered, nay that shall you not, my L[ord], we will rather contribute somewhat, and so Sir Thomas offringe ten poundes yearly, the residue promised severally tenne poundes in the like sorte'.⁵⁴ Another allegation was that 'aboute the same tyme Sir Thomas Cornwalleis his servantes and the B[ishop]s solompnly feasted one thother in the City of Norwich, wherto my L[ord] and Mrs. Freake were contributarie that some reeled home in the streets well tyled to the offence of all good people . . .'.⁵⁵ As Dr. Hassall Smith says, 'This portrayal of the Bishop as a man dominated by a pro-Catholic clique is almost certainly an exaggeration',⁵⁶ and Dr. Collinson is no doubt right when he suggests that the bishop's associates against the puritans consisted of 'an alliance of Catholics, conformist Anglicans and the merely irreligious who resented both the preachers and the power of the justices who maintained them'.⁵⁷ The real point behind the allegations was that the bishop had been taking measures against the puritans, and in the week after the dinner at Ludham he had said 'I will tary here in despite of them all, to plague the whole generation of them'.⁵⁸ But even allowing for puritan exaggeration, the fact remains that Sir Thomas was on good terms with the bishop, and there is a ring of truth in the words attributed to him. It is clear where Sir Thomas's sympathies lay even though he was still to some extent conforming.⁵⁹ It is also clear that Bishop Freke treated the Catholics as gently as he could since he needed support against the puritans.⁶⁰

⁵⁴ P.R.O. S.P. 15/25, no. 19, fo. 273 [charge no. 20].

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, charge no. 22.

⁵⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 172.

⁵⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 881.

⁵⁸ S.P. 15/25, no. 19, fo. 274, charge no. 21. He was supposed to have said this in some rage 'strikinge the bord with his fiste very angerly'.

⁵⁹ Sir Thomas's claim to have influence at Court ties up with Ratcliffe's allegations, *supra* p. 240. His alleged boasting about his secretary's going abroad to become a monk is not improbable (*supra*, p. 242, n. 52).

⁶⁰ See Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 174 for Freke's letter to the recusant Ferdinando Paris saying that he had 'of late received verie sharpe reprehension from my Lordes of the Counsaile for my lenitie extended towards you and the rest in question for religion in these partes'. The puritans complained that Freke 'could spie out from the furthest of his dyocesse some mynysters of the ghospell for omyttinge the leaste dutie and yet could not spye out any one masse of so many in Norfolk and Norwich'. Support to the charge was given by the fact that Freke's butler and his lawyer were indicted at Quarter Sessions for going to mass [Hassall Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 186]. Again, Dr. Hassall Smith notes that of the ten justices described by Bishop Scambler in 1587 as 'backwardes in religion' no less than seven were appointed during Freke's struggle with the puritans [p. 188].

The fifteen-eighties were to be a very difficult period for Sir Thomas, and it was fortunate for him that he could still count on the friendship of William Cecil. He wrote to him on 18 August 1581: 'I understande by my sonne Cornwaleys (the bearer hereof) how honorablye and frendly it pleased your L[ordship] in the greatest prisens, to annswere for my poore credit and honestie and that to A greate personage'.⁶¹ Such friendship was invaluable since Sir Thomas was coming increasingly under suspicion because of his religious views. It was evidently necessary to pull as many strings as possible, and Sir Thomas's daughter, Lady Kitson, the mistress of Hengrave Hall, also used her influence in high places. In reply to her request for help, Sir Philip Sydney wrote from Court on 28 March 1582:

'Madam, I have, according to your L[adyshi]ps comandment by lettre and by my cousin Grivel, delivered unto me, dealt with Mr. Secretarie [Walsingham, Sidney's father-in-law] for his favour toward Sir Thomas Cornwallies. Truly, Madam, hitherunto I can obtain no furdre than this, that there is a present intention of a general mitigation, to be used in respect of recusants; so as he may not, he saith, prevent her Majesties dealing therein, in any particular case, and would not put himself in subjection to the tonges of such kind of men with whom he should deal, but assures me that there is ment a speedy easing of the greatnes of your burden. I assure you, Madam, upon my faithe, I dealt carefully and earnestlie, owing a particular dutie unto Sir Thomas, which I will never fail to shewe to my uttermost . . .'.⁶²

Fulke Greville also wrote on the same day saying that he had solicited the help of the Secretary.⁶³

No action was in fact taken against Sir Thomas at this time, but the government was keeping its eye on him. His name appears in a list of recusants apparently compiled by an informer in the early

⁶¹ B.M.: *Harleian MSS.* 33, no. 80. At this time Sir Thomas and his son William had fallen foul of the Earl of Leicester. Sir Thomas's youngest daughter Mary had made a clandestine marriage with the Earl of Bath. The Earl subsequently repudiated the marriage, and when Sir Thomas took action to establish its validity, the Earl of Bath secured Leicester's support. (Hist. MSS. Comm: *Cecil XI*, 223).

⁶² The letter is printed in full in John Gage, *The History and Antiquities of Hengrave, Suffolk*, 1822, pp. 182-3.

⁶³ Cambridge University Library: *Hengrave MSS.* 88 (2), no. 67.

fifteen-eighties,⁶⁴ and in 1583 Fr. Hugh Hall was questioned concerning his knowledge of Sir Thomas and his son-in-law Sir Thomas Kitson. Hugh Hall was chaplain to John Somerville and his wife Margaret, who was related to Francis Throckmorton. The three of them, as well as Somerville's father-in-law, Edward Arden of Park Hall, Cudworth, Warwickshire, were arrested in October 1583 when the government was rounding up those suspected of being implicated in Throckmorton's plot.⁶⁵ Hugh Hall was apparently a Marian priest who had resided in various Catholic houses, and his statement throws some interesting light on Sir Thomas Cornwallis.⁶⁶ Hall said he knew Sir Thomas only slightly and had seen him only twice in his life. The first occasion was about eighteen years earlier at Mr. Hare's house at Bruisyard, Suffolk, 'when Sir Thomas did but take him by the hand, and, as he thinketh, Sir Thomas knew what he was'. The other occasion was in the summer of 1582 about harvest time at Mr. Ralph Sheldon's house in Worcestershire.⁶⁷ He said that 'they had no conference of any mater of state, but only of religion, and Sir Thomas asked him among other things whether he were so fully in the chirch as he might do the office of a prest. He answered that he knew not his owne state, and he yet douteth whether he stand excommunicate or no, for that he hath omitted the doinges of prestly office. Sir Thomas then moved him to say masse there, but he refused, sayeng he knew not how Sir Thomas stood . . .'. Hall said he met Cornwallis and Kitson again within the next three days at Holmby (Northants.) 'but they had no conference with him of anything but of gardens and orchards'. Since then, about three-quarters of a year ago, he had received a letter from Sir Thomas Cornwallis 'touching the alteracion of his purpose in making of a garden'. He denied that he had ever been present at 'any marriage with a masse . . . sollicitd by Sir Thomas Cornwallis or Sir Thomas Kitson or William Cornwallis', and he said he did not know William Cornwallis.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ S.P. 12/157, no. 88, calendared under ? 1582. The list is headed 'The names and places of habitacion of those whom presentlye I can advertyse'. It is endorsed 'The names of the places of habetation of certayne recusants'. The following entry appears under Norfolk: 'At Brome halle, syr Thomas Cornwales, his Ladye, mr. Wyllyam his sonne, and Mr Jacksone preiste'.

⁶⁵ For Hugh Hall, see Catholic Record Society, vol. II, p. 238; vol. XIII, pp. 97, 99; vol. XXXIX, pp. 188-9, 196.

⁶⁶ P.R.O. S.P. 12/164, no. 77. 31 December 1583.

⁶⁷ We know that in this year, Sir Thomas Cornwallis and Sir Thomas Kitson went on a visit to Devonshire. They intended to return via Derbyshire where they meant to visit the Countess of Shrewsbury. While they were at Mr. Sheldon's house, they received news of the death of Lady Cavendish, Kitson's daughter. (Iveagh Collection: *Cornwallis MSS.* 1/2). Possibly Sir Thomas Cornwallis wanted Fr. Hall to say Mass for the repose of her soul.

⁶⁸ It is not clear what is behind this reference to a 'marriage with a mass'. The reference to William Cornwallis is surprising. There is nothing associating him with recusancy, apart from this and the informer's list referred to in n. 64.

In 1584, the position worsened. The bishop of Norwich was instructed by the government to inquire into Sir Thomas's religion. Sir Thomas was prepared to assert his loyalty to the Queen, and he did in fact sign the Instrument of Association solemnly binding him to defend her against all her enemies and to persecute to the death those who endeavoured to overthrow her.⁶⁹ But he was not prepared to go to the Anglican church. He stated his position in a letter to the bishop, which has not survived, and, fearing the consequences when this letter was forwarded to the government, in July 1584 he wrote to Lord Burghley as follows:

'Although your speech used to my brother Henry did much astonish me, yet I will not be discouraged from hope of your favour; and your lordship, remembering the whole course of my life so directed since her Majesty's reign, as no action of mine hath discovered a disobedient or unquiet thought towards her; but indeed much unquietness bred in myself to satisfy her Majesty, sithence the last time of my being called in question for this matter, I hope you will clear me of all factious fantasies whereunto in my youth, I thank God, I was never forward. I would to God none of mine had been more of late, wherein (as himself knoweth best) he hath walked alone for me, and shall therefore carry the burden without me. I have ever taught him not to be free of the Marchant adventures.⁷⁰ My Lord Bishop, at his last return from Court, signifieth unto me her Majesty's commandment to him to inquire of my coming to Church, or if I did not, the cause of my leaving it of late; whereunto I have yielded such answer as appeareth in the copy of my letter to the Bishop here inclosed;⁷¹ whereof I perceive he will presently advertise her Majesty, which is the cause of my speedy sending up to your lordship at this time, humbly beseeching your good opinion of me, and favourable report to her Majesty of my forebearing the Church; whereunto if I thought in my heart I might resort without offence to Almighty God, He is my witness, and shall condemn me if I feign devotion or use it for faction, I would willingly please her Majesty, whom I must confesse I have hitherto found gracious unto me. My lord, I have not long to live, neither do I desire or hope for any fortune of the world (God is my judge), nor other happiness, than with a quiet conscience

⁶⁹ B.M.: *Harleian MSS*, 6994, no. 81.

⁷⁰ Evidently one of Sir Thomas's relations was in trouble, but it is not clear to whom this refers.

⁷¹ The enclosure has not been preserved.

to end the rest of my days in mine own house, if I might by her gracious disposition, and your lordship's favour, obtain so much; where I would live so privately, as my behaviour nor example should offend or hurt anybody. My lord, if ever my service and poor friendship unto you in times past did deserve praise, or my prayers for you can hereafter, judge me and my meaning right, and let me taste the fruit of your favour and credit; which with all my heart for your sake and for the realms, I heartily pray God may long continue.⁷²

This letter is the first definite evidence that Sir Thomas was no longer prepared to attend the Anglican Church, although he must have refrained from doing so for some time before he wrote it. He was now sixty-five years of age, anxious only to live the rest of his days in peace at Brome. This makes his courage in the following years all the more remarkable.

Although he had been called in question for religion in 1584, no drastic action was taken against him at this time. It may be that Lord Burghley was quite sure of his loyalty to the queen and exercised his influence on behalf of his old friend. In 1585 when recusants were asked to contribute to the cost of forming a troop of 'light horse', Sir Thomas's name heads a list of thirteen Suffolk gentry who were willing to co-operate. He was prepared to give £50, as were William Yaxley and Roger Martin.⁷³

Nevertheless Sir Thomas was not left alone for very long. In the crisis arising from the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, and the preparations for the despatch of the Armada, it is possible that Lord Burghley was not prepared to take any risks, even with an old and trusted friend. In 1587, Sir Thomas was evidently being pressed over the matter of recusancy fines, and he went off to London to state his case to the Council. What happened then is related in an extract from his account book:

' . . . about the beginnunge of July he made a voiage to London to obteyne favor in payment of the Mulct, A penall

⁷² P.R.O. S.P. 12/172, no. 17, printed in Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 1877, vi, 208-209. Foley states that it was written by an amanuensis and that it bears an autograph signature 'in an aged and tremulous hand'. He ventured the opinion that Sir Thomas was allowed to end his days unmolested, but this was not in fact so.

⁷³ P.R.O. S.P. 12/184, no. 61. Ten others, including Edward Sulyard and Michael Hare, were willing to give £25 each. Those contributing were apparently to be given immunity from prosecution under the penal statutes in return for a yearly contribution. See *Cal. State Papers Domestic 1581-1590*, pp. 318, 319, 322.

statute imposeth upon Recusantes. But the same Sir Thomas his case beyng commytted to the order of the Lord Tresurer and Mr. Secretarie, and not sortynge to such speedie ende as was hoped of, the said Sir Thomas returned to his house in Brome 7th September, and haveynge disposed of his houshold affayres, made an other iorney to London in the ende of October for fynishinge his said suyte, but the same still procedynge A verie slowe corse and the said Sir Thomas makeynge his abode at Mr. Taylors house in Wode strete, he was with other Catholikes by direction from the Lords of her Maiesties privie Counsell convented before the Archbishop of Canterbury and other commissioners for matters ecclesisticall and on St. Andrewes even commytted to the custodie of the Bishopp of London, wher remayninge onlie one day and two nyghtes he was by favor of my Lord Tresurer upon suyt to him made, removed to the house of Mr. Blague in Lambith'.⁷⁴

Further information about this episode is found in Sir Thomas's letters to Lord Burghley. On 16 July 1587 he wrote to him from Highgate⁷⁵ as follows:

'The advertysment I receyved frome you and Mr Secretarye did not a lytell astonyshe me, beyng of a sharper case than any I receyved from her hyghnes in all my lyfe. I rekone yt a punnyshement for my synnes to gode, for ageynst hyr majesty (I take hym to recorde) I had never wyll, nor meanyng of offence, other than in the matter, which hathe put my poor minde in suche dystresse, as I must offende hym or hyr. I was now determynd tanswer the penaltie of the lawe, and never ageyne to sue for remyssion or favor, nor yet presumed to sue for to hyr majesty had I not bene encouraged by suche advyse as your Lordship knowythe I receyvyed from my sone. Besydes hyr Majesty's displeasure, nothing dothe more trubble me, than that the contrarietye in conscyence shulde be jugid faction, a thyng (I thanke God) farre frome my nature, yonge and oulde, and yf I nedyd wytnesses, truly I would appeale to your Lordship who hath longest knowne me in all fortunes of eny now lyvyng in that place'.

He said that he was not really concerned about his reputation, as he would have been when younger, since he was now in his sixty-

⁷⁴ Iveagh Collection: *Cornwallis MSS.* 1/2.

⁷⁵ Sir Thomas's son and heir William had a house in Highgate.

seventh year and various illnesses in the last four years had reminded him how near he was to his end, but he added:

'I confesse your repulse more greavyth me in respect of reputation, than anythyng happening to me meny yeres, that boathe my enemyes and frends shalbe in ther opinions deceyvyd, who have holden that hyr hyghness was my gratius ladye . . . and that your Lordships honorable friendship towards me was such, as myghte have credit suffycient to preserve me in this case'. He continued as follows: 'As for payment of the Mulct, I have no other way (consydering my small lvyng) than a way I confesse as contrarye to my nature as to my custome for 45 yeres holden, which is the breakyng up of my howse, to sojourne with one of my chyldren'.

He thought that if he did this, he might save from the money he spent on hospitality enough 'to satysfye the lawe' and still have something over each year, and he went on

' . . . had I, my Lord, (as latly I wrote to your Lordship) when I dyd serve a most lyberall prynce, bene as carefull to provyde for meselfe, as I was to do hyr honest and profytable servyce, I shulde not now in my age be enforcid to abandon myne owne howse, for enhablyng me to pay the penaltye of the law'.

He had been advised by the Secretary to write to the Queen, and he asked Burghley's advice and support.⁷⁶

It is clear from this letter to Burghley that Sir Thomas did not want to pay the fines. He stressed his inability to carry on the running of his household and made the point (which Burghley would, no doubt, appreciate) that if he had lined his own pocket when he was in office under Mary, he would now be in a much stronger financial position. But, it may be suggested, what really moved him to protest so strongly was indignation that his loyalty had been called in question when his only reason for not conforming was that his conscience would not allow him to do so. He had evidently been given a hint that a personal appearance would lead to mitigation. He might perhaps have done better to keep quiet,

⁷⁶ B.M.: *Harleian MSS.* 6994, fo. 493. It seems from this letter that Sir Thomas was being asked to pay a substantial sum—possibly the fine of £20 a month under the Act of 1581 which, calculated on the basis of thirteen months to the year, would have come to £260 per annum. It is interesting to note that in 1587 his expenditure on provisions for his household came to over £270, apart from numerous other payments connected with the running of his houses at Brome and in Norwich (see Iveagh Collection: *Cornwallis MSS.* 1/2, 1587).

since; as it turned out, he was putting his head into the lion's den. Even so, one cannot but admire the courage of the old man in coming up to London in circumstances which he must have known would be dangerous for a recusant at such a time.

That Burghley was moved by his friend's appeal seems clear from a letter of 23 July 1587 in which Sir Thomas relates to him how he waited on the Secretary of State (Walsingham) who offered to take Sir Thomas's petition to the Queen. He writes:

'Mr. Secretary used me very honourably and friendly, for which I must account myself indebted to your lordship, I being both a stranger to him, and never deserved it by any service or pleasure that ever I did him . . . In the end, it pleased him to remember that I had done many favours to divers needing it in time when I was in place, and therefore I was worthy to receive the like for myself. He entered into few particularities, but of my love and duty to the Queen's Highness before her coming to the Crown . . .'

He goes on to say that on his way home he had received Burghley's letters informing him of

'the aptest time to satisfy my desire to see Theobalds, wherein it also pleased you to wish that my coming might be as well accepted of her Majesty as I should be of you'. He adds: 'My good Lord, as I have enjoyed the one to my great comfort, I humbly thank you for it, so if by your lordship's means and favour I attain the other, you shall send me home a contented merry man, and I shall lay up this amongst many other assured demonstrations of your love and friendship showed me in this change of time . . .'.⁷⁷

Before he was finally committed to prison in November 1587 Sir Thomas made one more attempt to satisfy the government. He wrote to Burghley on 29 October with reference to a report that Lord Vaux and other recusants called before the Council had subscribed to certain articles and had been dismissed. He said he would like to know the substance of these articles. It was rumoured that they consisted of an acknowledgment that the Queen was the lawful ruler, notwithstanding any proceedings of the Pope, and that they also included a protestation about defending her against all her enemies and persecuting to the death anyone who attempted anything against her person. He said he had

⁷⁷ Hist. MSS. Comm: *Cecil III*, 269.

himself already subscribed as much on a number of occasions, as was clear from his submission at the time when the Duke of Norfolk was arrested in 1570, from his letter to the bishop of Norwich in 1584, from his signature to the Instrument of Association, from various letters he had written to Mr. Secretary and to Burghley, and finally from the letters he had recently written to the Queen 'protestynge before Al[mighty] God and all the world, that in these poyntes I was never of other mynde in all my life synce I was of discretion to decerne what my Religion towards God and my dutie towards my prynce did meane'. He hoped he had done enough, but he would do anything further that Burghley required. He would subscribe to the articles again if necessary, but he hoped he would not 'be cawlyd in place publyke but do the same before your L[ordship] or tharchbyshop of Cantyrbury at such tyme as I shalbe by you apoyntyd'.⁷⁸

Further details of Sir Thomas's confinement are contained in his steward's accounts for 1588 and 1589. The account for the year 1588 records that during this time Sir Thomas remained 'at commandement by order from the Lords of her Maiesties Counsell for matter of Religion at Mr. Blague's⁷⁹ house in Lambeth and fallyng ther verie sick, was (in Februarie) by favor obteyned of the said Lords licensed to remove to Sir Thomas Kitson's house in London, wher he remaynde till the beginninge of September, when he had licens to be at the house of Mr. Taylor in Wodestreete, with libertie to be about the citie as farr as Higate'. The story is continued in the 1589 account which states that he remained 'at commandement' at Mr. Taylor's house 'with libertie of ffyve myles compass about London, untill the beginninge of May when he obteyned favor of the Lords of Counsell to go downe to his house in Brome for three moneths, before the expiracon wherof he had further favor to make his abode wher he should best like, until he should agayne be called for'.⁸⁰

The troubles which had begun in June 1587 came to an end in October 1589 with a letter sent by the Privy Council to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It stated that Sir Thomas was included among the recusants who were required by their bonds to appear shortly in London but that since he was 'a very olde man, and one that besides the matter of his Religion hathe not bene knownen to have intermeddled in causes of the State', they had 'for that reason and for other good considerations thought meet that he be suffered

⁷⁸ B.M.: *Harleian MSS.* 6994, no. 81.

⁷⁹ Thomas Blague was an Anglican divine who became Dean of Rochester in 1591. He was one of the Queen's chaplains.

⁸⁰ Iveagh Collection: *Cornwallis MSS.* 1/2, 1588 and 1589.

to continue in the country where he now is'. The Archbishop was to give order accordingly so that he be not troubled in respect of his bond.⁸¹

Thus did Sir Thomas Cornwallis face the second great religious crisis of his long life, and this time he had stood firm. He had not in fact had to suffer a great deal at the government's hands, and only limited restrictions had been placed upon him, but the worry and the excitement may well have contributed to his illness. He had not been called upon to display heroic virtue, but he had faced the challenge with quiet courage, and had been prepared to take the consequences. Fortunately Cecil's friendship and the fact that the Council was apparently convinced of Sir Thomas's loyalty, combined with the fact that he was an old man, ensured that he was permitted to spend the remainder of his life undisturbed.

Contrary to what might have been expected, Sir Thomas still had fifteen years of life left to him, and during this time the protection of the Cecils appears to have continued. On 11 July 1593 one William Goldsmyth reported to Sir Robert Cecil a conversation he had had with Philip Woodward,⁸² a priest attendant on Cardinal Allen at Rome. Goldsmyth protested to Fr. Woodward, whom he had known at Grammar School, that he was no spy, and got him to talk about affairs in England. Fr. Woodward asked if the ancient nobility and gentry were not weary of the Lord Keeper, Sir Nathaniel Bacon, the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Treasurer and others, and then said that Sir Thomas Cornwallis and his sons were happy in that 'they suck honey from spiders'.⁸³

There were at least two more occasions when friendship with spiders was useful to Sir Thomas. In December 1598 the Council wrote to the High Sheriff and Commissioners for the Musters in Suffolk stating that although of late, upon intelligence of some dangerous attempt by the enemy, order had been given to remove the horses of all recusants so that they could not assist the enemy, nevertheless this order was not to apply to Sir Thomas Cornwallis 'Forasmuch as he hathe byn and so contynneth ann auntyent and true servaunt unto her Majestic, and notwithstandinge his differences of religion hath never byn touched with any suspicion of dysloyalty or yll affection to her Majestic and the State, but hath alwayes caryed himself as a dutyfull and faithfull subject'. He was to be left the use of his horses 'according to the good opinion that is conceived of him'.⁸⁴

⁸¹ *Acts of the Privy Council*, 1589-90, p. 170. 6 October 1589.

⁸² Philip Woodward's name appears in a list of priests known in Suffolk in 1588. Catholic Record Society, vol. xxii, p. 127.

⁸³ Hist. MSS. Comm: *Cecil IV*, 335.

⁸⁴ *Acts of the Privy Council*, 1596-97, p. 375.

Sir Thomas's contacts and known loyalty also proved useful in securing the eventual release from prison of his younger brother, William, who was a Catholic priest ordained beyond the seas. An undated note in Sir Thomas's *Book of Evidences* states that William was born in 1523 or 1524 and that he 'continueth still unmarried and is at this present a Catholic priest made at Swessyon [Soissons] in France and by an Act of Parliament made 23 November [23] Elizabeth [gap in MS] this realm to live in perpetual banishment'.⁸⁵ He apparently returned to England and was arrested. An undated letter from Elizabeth Kitson to Elizabeth Cecil asked her to use her influence to help 'a poore unkle I have William Cornwaleys latly come from beyonde the seas and put in to such a hold as non of his friends can releave him with nessarye clothes and fode but they becom in like danger to himself'. Elizabeth Kitson asked that he might be removed to some public prison 'wher we that be so neare him may exercise the libertye the lawe giveth havynge a regarde to frendshipe Kyndred and Charitye'. She says, rather surprisingly, 'The cause why he returned was extreme want and did therfor rather chose to subiecht himself to the lawe heer, than to become more miserable ther'.⁸⁶ When he was examined in prison in 1593, William stated that his age was 66 and that he had been made a priest by the bishop of Soissons by authority from the bishop of Rome. The famous 'bloody question' was apparently put to him, and he replied 'that he thinketh that the pope, by his catholic authority . . . may not proceed to excommunicate or accurse our sovereign lady, and thereupon pronounce her subjects to be freed and discharged of their obedience to her And that if the pope should send an army into this realm, to establish the catholic Romish religion, he would in that case fight against such an army to the uttermost of his power, on her majesty's side'.⁸⁷ But although he gave what the government must have considered a very satisfactory answer to the 'bloody question', William nevertheless remained in prison until 1600 when the Council wrote to Sir Thomas stating that in view of the age and infirmity of his brother William, now a prisoner in the Clink, and in view of Sir Thomas's discretion, an order had been given to release William who was to be confined to Sir Thomas's house 'wherein wee doubt not but in regard of the favour which ys shewed him he will have care to carry him selfe in such a dutyfull sort as there be no occasion of scandall'.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ Essex Record Office: D/DBY E.36.

⁸⁶ Cambridge University Library: *Hengrave MSS.* 88 (2), no. 99.

⁸⁷ J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, Oxford, 1824, iv, 261, printing a document entitled 'A note of the evidence of all the prisoners for popery in the severall counties; as the lord Keeper Puckring collected and writ it down . . . endorsed by his own hand, anno 1593'.

⁸⁸ *Acts of the Privy Council*, 1599-1600, p. 62, 10 February 1600. Sir Thomas had for many years been paying William an annuity. It was increased from £11 to £12 3s 4d in 1579 and to £13 6s 8d in 1583. Cornwallis MSS. 1/8.

The Council also exercised its influence on behalf of Sir Thomas's daughter, Lady Kitson. She was listed as a recusant in 1588, and was indicted for recusancy at Bury Assizes in 1599. As a result of intervention by one of the members of the Council, the Attorney General was instructed to remove the case by writ of *certiorare* to King's Bench, but Lady Kitson took a long time over preparing her defence, and 'some hard neighbour' procured a writ of *procedendo* to get the case taken back to the Assizes in Bury. The Lord Chamberlain, on behalf of the Council, instructed the Attorney General to remove the matter once again to King's Bench where Lady Kitson had undertaken to sue for trial next term. He stated that all the witnesses who would prove her repair to church were in London, and added 'we are fully resolved that she is no recusant at all, neither intends to be'.⁸⁹

Yet another member of Sir Thomas's family who profited from the Cecil connection was Lady Anne Cornwallis who wrote to Sir Robert Cecil on 15 April 1602 saying

'I understand by my son Cornwaleys (the bearer), who, upon the first intelligence of my being indicted at these last assizes in Suffolk, attended upon you, your honourable offer of means to free me. I was moved, first, to think myself bound to God, whose pleasure it has been to prolong my life beyond my lord your father, my friend and old acquaintance, for such succour and courtesy in the son. By what occasion this fell now upon me, which by her Majesty's favour and direction to your father and Mr. Secretary Walsingham was ordered to be withholden, my son will signify now to you. From my house in Brome, 15 April 1602'.⁹⁰

Sir Thomas's brother Henry was reconciled to the Church of Rome before his death in 1598. The evidence for this is the statement made by Henry's son, Richard, when he was admitted to the English College in Rome in 1598. Richard said that he was thirty years of age and that his father 'was not long since, by the goodness of God, reconciled to the Catholic Church'. He added

⁸⁹ John Gage, *The History and Antiquities of Hengrave, Suffolk*, London, 1822, p. 183; Catholic Record Society, vol. xiii, p. 97 note 87. It is difficult to understand why there was all this fuss if Lady Kitson was not in fact a recusant. Possibly she was playing London off against Bury. Her husband was listed as a recusant in 1588. Catholic Record Society, vol. xxii, p. 120.

⁹⁰ The writer of this letter appears to be Anne, the second wife of Sir Charles Cornwallis. She does not give her full Christian name but signs 'A Lady Cornwaleys'. She was the daughter of Thomas Barrow of Newton, Suffolk, and widow of Sir Ralph Shelton.

that his mother was Anne Calibut and that he had two half-brothers by the same mother, one of whom was a priest in England. He had been a heretic until three years ago when he had been reconciled to the Church by his half-brother and by Fr. Gerard.⁹¹ Richard was ordained priest in 1599 and was sent to England in 1601, and so it is possible that he visited his uncle in his last years. He died in Spain in 1606 in the house of his cousin Sir Charles Cornwallis, Sir Thomas's son, who was then English ambassador in Madrid.⁹²

An interesting glimpse of Sir Thomas in his declining years is provided by Fr. Charles Yelverton, son of Humphrey Yelverton of Bawsey in Norfolk. Charles Yelverton was admitted to the English College in Rome in October 1601. He stated that he was 23 years of age, that he had spent 6 years at Cambridge,⁹³ that three or four years after taking his degree he lived with his uncle Charles Yelverton, and that then 'by reason of the persecution' he stayed first with Anthony Bedingfield and then at a doctor's house in Winston in Suffolk. After that, he went to Mr. John Bedingfield of Ridgfield where he stayed a year. His narrative continues: 'and when I saw that all the clouds had dispersed and all cause of alarm had gone, I appeared in public again. Then Sir Thomas Cornwallis, knight, sent for me and invited me to stay with him, and there for three or four months I repeated the breviary with him, to whome at my first arrival I told my intentions and whither I wished to go'.⁹⁴

Sir Thomas's reading in the last years of his life was by no means confined to the breviary, and a little group of letters written by him to John Hobart reflect his interest in books and in the world in which he lived.⁹⁵

'If you will send me that French apology for the Jesuits', he wrote in May 1592, 'though I not readily understand that language, I shall make shift to pick out the meaning. I have bought two fair maps to furnish my gallery and am also devising to purchase the globe of the earth and the heavens for though I be going out of the world yet am I

⁹¹ Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, vol. 1, 1st series, 1877, p. 182; *Liber Ruber of the English College, Rome, 1579-1630*, edit. Wilfred Kelly, Catholic Record Society, xxxvii, 1940, p. 342; A. Jessopp, *One Generation of a Norfolk House*, Norwich, 1878, p. 182 ff.

⁹² *Memorials of the Affairs of State in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I . . . from the original papers of . . . Sir Ralph Winwood*, London, 1725, II, 260, 278.

⁹³ He took his degree in 1593/4. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*.

⁹⁴ Henry Foley, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

⁹⁵ Bodleian Library: *Tanner MS.* 285, nos. 3, 10, 27, 30, 33, 34, 36. John Hobart, the brother of the Jacobean Chief Justice, was son of Thomas Hobart of Plumstead, Norfolk, and Audrey, daughter of William Hare of Beeston, Norfolk.

desiring before I leave it to have some further acquaintance and knowledge therof, and that for this respect (which the learned Jesuit Josephus Acosta in his *India Discoursa* reciteth) because there is nothing that doth more raise and lift a man's heart and mind to the love and admiration of his creator than the contemplation of the frame and constitution of the heaven and earth'.⁹⁶

A little earlier he instructed Hobart to purchase *Vincentius Lirinensis contra Hereses*, adding,

'My desire is, because the book is very little, to have it bound up with some other of the like arguments, or else some matter of devotion. I would have it of some new edition, with a fair letter, if it may be, for this which I have is an old letter, and false in many places; printed at Colone, 1554 . . . likewise buy for me Bishop Fisher's Psalms which you may buy in quires and bind up with Vincentius, if the volumes fit together . . . get it so bound that it would lie open, for I like not Cawoods binding . . . If you have the catalogue of such books as are comen over from the Neaht. [Netherlands] I pray you send me their names and prices'.⁹⁷

On another occasion, he wrote:

'There is a little packet lately come over, printed at Gullen, wherin are those treatises compiled together into one volume *Meditationes, Soliloquia et manuale Sancti Augustini*. I pray you buy it for me . . . If there be any new volume of Lipsius come over since his *Machina Bellica* send it to me . . . If some of the Church History be come forth I pray enquire the price and how many years it containeth'.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ *Tanner MS.* 285, no. 36. 24 May 1592.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 31. n.d. The book in question is by St. Vincent of Lerins: *The golden treatise of the auncient and learned father Vincentius Lirinensis. For the antiquitie, and universalitie, of the Catholicke religion: against the prophane novelties of all heresies: newly translated into English by A.P.* 1596-7. (Printed secretly in England). See A. F. Allison and D. M. Rogers, *A Catalogue of Catholic Books in English printed abroad or secretly in England 1558-1640*, Biographical Studies, vol. III, no. 4, Bognor, 1956, p. 163.

⁹⁸ *Tanner MS.* 285, no. 30. n.d. Justus Lipsius (1547-1606) who is referred to in this letter, was Professor of History in the University of Leyden from 1579-1590. He then returned to the religion in which he had been brought up and became Professor of Latin at Louvain. He had a great reputation as a classical scholar and was considered the leading authority on Tacitus and Seneca. His published works include *De militia Romana*, 1595.

Elsewhere he wrote: 'The book of comparaisou between Mahomet and Calvin should be very welcome unto me: I have spoken to one Mr. Dereham (whom I think you well know) to procure it for me'.⁹⁹

Sir Thomas evidently appreciated the news-letters he received from John Hobart. '... though I now be an old man and ready to leave the world', he wrote, 'yet doth not age example me from that old rule *Est natura hominis novitatis avida* but that we still desire to know the world's affairs'. He said he had been given by Sir John Fortescue a 'Calendar or Concordantia Religionis et jure (*sic*) in a book of last year's impression set out by M. Laurentius Riseberginus of the abridgement of the Turkish histories'. He noted that there was a reference on page 193 to another concordance, and he asked Hobart to get this or anything else he could find on the same subject.¹⁰⁰

On one occasion Sir Thomas's reading led to a rather surprising development. He told Hobart with reference to the *Saturnalia* of Lipsius:

'in the latter end of the book you shall find divers figures of the players in Rome both on horseback and on foot. Amongst the which (I think it be the IVth or Vth figure) you shall see a coach with two wheels and two horses to draw it with . . . I cannot conjecture how it is holden up. I would gladly have such a one to ride about my park, but the workmen here cannot discern with what device it is carried. I pray you therefore repair to Mr. Cavendish (who made a coach for her majesty to go as well on water as land) and take his opinion in it . . . if you can get me a model made of it, I doubt not but our workmen here can do it according to the pattern'.¹⁰¹

There is an interesting postscript in one of the letters which reflects what must have been the attitude of many Catholics in England to those abroad who were endeavouring by political action to bring about a change in the religious position in this country. Referring to a letter which he had received from John Hobart, Sir Thomas wrote: 'I am very sorry and so (I am sure) be all good Catholics of those lewd libels. It will but exasperate matters. In nos cudetur faba. They be out of the way themselves and therefore do not regard what we endure'.¹⁰² This was

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 33.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 34.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, no. 27. 8 June 1592.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, no. 27. See Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, III, 382.

written on 8 June 1592 and would seem to refer to a reply, published at Lyons in 1592, to the queen's proclamation of 1591 attacking the missionary priests. The book in question was entitled *Elizabethae Angliae Reginae saevissimum in Catholicos sui regni edictum . . . Cum responsione ad singula capita . . . per D. Andriam Philopatrum presbyterum*. It was written by Fr. Robert Persons and was a fierce attack on the government. Sir Thomas evidently felt that English Catholics, who were in the firing line, would suffer from the political activities of men who were themselves out of the government's reach.

In his will, dated 26 March 1604, Sir Thomas committed his soul to God 'and to his deerlie beloved sonne Jhesus Christe my Redeemer and Savioure by whose bitter death and passion I truste to have remission and forgiveness of all my Synnes And to oure blessed Ladie St. Marye the Virgin and to all the holye companye of heaven'. On 6 November he made a codicil with various additional bequests including an annuity 'to Robert Cornwaleys whoe hath verye diligently and paynefully attended uppon me all the tyme of my sicknes',¹⁰³ and before the year was over, he died. He was buried in Brome parish church where the monument which he had erected in his lifetime shows him lying side by side with his wife, their feet resting on a stag and their hands clasped in prayer.

Sir Thomas Cornwallis had not been called upon to die for his faith, and, unlike some of his fellow recusants, he had not even been required to pay very heavily for the privilege of retaining it. To what extent he was able to practise it, must remain in some doubt. It is probable that he behaved with great caution and that he did not go out of his way to make his home a centre for seminary priests or Jesuits, even though he was no doubt able from time to time to go to Mass and the Sacraments in the numerous Catholic houses of Suffolk. But if, as seems probable, he behaved with such discretion at a time when many of his fellow recusants were taking tremendous risks for their faith, it must be remembered that he had a passionate determination not only to be loyal to the Queen but to convince the government of his loyalty. In his letters to Burghley in the fifteen-eighties one sees a note of anger and of exasperation that his fidelity should be questioned. He was the queen's good servant, but loyalty to God and his church came first. In the crisis of 1569-70 he hesitated and weakened. In the second crisis, he stood firm and faced the consequences. As it happened they were not, by the standard of the martyrs, very severe. There are many things about him which we do not know, but all the evidence points to an intelligent, conscientious man

¹⁰³ Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House: 11 *Hayes* (1605).

who followed the light that was within him and who was ready to do what he believed to be right. He had been born at a time when religious fervour was at a low ebb in England, and he conformed without apparent difficulty during all the changes of the Henrican and Edwardian Reformations. One feels that he was no zealot and that the enthusiasm of the counter-reformation had only a limited effect upon him, yet in an age of conflicting loyalties, he did his duty as best he could to God and the Queen and, unlike many of his contemporaries, he was not concerned only with the things of this world.

APPENDIX

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE IMPRISONMENT OF SIR THOMAS CORNWALLIS 1569-70

I *The Dean of Westminster to Sir William Cecil.*

P.R.O., S.P. 12/43 no. 9. Dated 21 June 1567 and calendared under 1567 in *Cal. S.P. Dom.* but referring in fact to the events of 1570.

Sir, my Duty humbly remembred. I am sure youe have harde att the full, of the conference hadd betweene Sir Thomas Cornwalles, Mr. Provost, and Mr. Harpsfeld. Sory I was, that hit hadd no better successe, considering how willing Sir Thomas was to be resolved, so hit might have ben with his conscience. I was not att the conference the same day, by reason hit was an ordinary chapter day, and I and the company hadd as then very necessary business to doo for the howse. I hadd thought that for the fyrst tyme, that they would have bene devising of a more reasonable state of the Question, and one of more probabilitie, then that which was proposed, the same being in dede altogether Improbable, and Impleying in hitselfe contradiction. Sir Thomas delivered the Question the day befor, and semed to be willing to the altering of the state of the Question vpon conference. The order of proceading was, that Sir Thomas moved certayne doubts whearvnto (the Question being so layd) they agreed in Answer.

But, sir, yff I may be bowlld to say what I think, the case off Sir Thomas is farr other ways, then was presupposed in the Question, and he is nearour degree, to that which he is required to doo. He dooth allow of the prayours and administracion for the tonge and matter, and only dooth wyshe the same to be approved by Generall

Authoritye; he dooth mislike of many thinges in the church of Rome (which is pretendid catholick) in respect of maners and the discipline and [? some thinges] in respect of the doctrine, he could wyshe to be altered to the better, and to the order of the primitive church. The primacy of the Bishopp of Rome, as he dooth clayme hit over princes in matters temporall, he dooth utterly mislyke of. And so of many thinges presupposed catholick he dooth wyshe noe reformacion, and several thinges altered by order in the church of Englande, he could well like of, so theare weare assent thereunto of generall [? council].

And for my parte, who am of small Judgment (yff I may under correction speake hit) I have seldom knowen any of that syde so wyse and so conveniently learned, more reasonable in Conference, or more nearour to conformity. His only stay of all is (as I have sayd) Generall Councell, whose determinacions in somme thinges whene he shall fynde to differe from the sentence of scriptures, the use of the primitive church and Judgment of the Annciantt fathers, and that the latter Generall Councells be not of that puryty with the Annciantt weare of, but are more subiect to affection and to the corruption of tyme. I doubt not but as his conscience shalbe persuaded therin, so he will yelde to further truth without respecte of parson or tyme. Thear semeth just cause of bearing with hym in somme thinges for a tyme, in respecte of his conscience being thearin not fully persuaded, and good cause of favour for that wherin he is resolved, therin he wylle yeld most willingly to truth, and follow with all obedience. I hope God will reveale the reast to so good meaninge a conscience, and to so well willing a mynde. I beseke you whom booth in credit and frendshipp he dooth so much esteme, according to your wysdom so to deale with him that you may gayne to God and yourself the Treasure of a perfect frende. Thus craving pardon for my overbowlldness in these causes, and troubling of you, I humbly take my leave. From Westminster Colledge the 21 of June 1567.

Sir Thomas hath bene somewhat disquieted and troubled in health these three days. I hope he wyl proceed fourth hymself agayn yff hit may please youe to scend hym a comfortable messadge.

Yours as he is Bound to commannde in Christ
Gabiell Goodman

II *Sir Thomas Cornwallis to Sir William Cecil.*

P.R.O., S.P. 12/43, no. 10.

Sir, although I know how much I have bene bounde vnto yow always sythe our fyrste aquayntance, yete verly I have found

a more syngulare testimonye of the same in these my late troubles then in all my lyffe before. A true and perfect frende ys tryed in adversytye. I know yow looke not for meny wordes of offyce but wyll pardone them tyll tyme off more quiet, havyng now matter in hande, that towchythe me nearest of all that ever I hade sythe I was borne. It ys not well with me when I shall gyve yow cause to be angrye with me or sorye for me. And when yow wryghte that yow are angrye with me for the question as yt was propounded to mr. provoste: the wyche as I wyll not in all poyntes defende, so by your flavor, yt dyfferythe not mucche ffrome that was conceyvyd at Wyndesore, whereunto my Lord off Dureham and mr. provost made the same Resolution that now ageyne was agreyde vpon: whereoff I put yow and other my Lords off Councell in remembrance at my laste beyng before yow: at wyche tyme also was vsyd to me suche speache by some (whom I ame suer yow remember) as I hade cause to Iuge the case to be off that same as I now dyd delyver it. But, Sir, the trowthe ys thys, I made mr. provoste acquayntyd with the question 5 or 6 dayes before owr conferece. I gave hym a cople in wryghtyng wone daye before. I offeryd consent to reforme yt, yff he woulde shew cause of myslykyng. And further I tould hym that I thoughte the fyrst tyme off owr metyng shulde be beste spent in the well conceyvyng and formyng off the question, wyche in dede for myn owne parte I lokyd for and deseryd. That thys ys very true, I referre myselffe to the reporte off mr. deane of Westmynster, who in thys case can saye more for my declaration then I wyll wryghte. The question fframyd in your letter, I meane not to dyssallowe, nor now texamen the partes therof, in the wyche nevertheles (savyng your reformation) ys not conteynyd thesspeccyall poynete that I doubtyd off. The rest of your leter movythe me as to suche persusyons as be vehement wyse and ffrendely. True ys yt, the care and sorow off my lovyng wyffe, the crye and lamentyng of my poore chyldren and servantes ar pytifull and off force to move a manne off more constancye then I have. The Indyngnation off the prynce, with the consyderation off the peryll that thretynethe to every subiect, ys terryble, but yete the danger toffende Almyghtye God ys, or owghte to be, more Weyghed then all the perylls in the Worlde besydes, the feare of wych (I do proteste) hathe bene the cause off my stey to yelde to what have bene demandyd off me hytherto. Iff some others have Iugyd otherwyse off me, suerly they have therin done me the more wronge. But, Sir, I am now, by Godes sufferance, advysyd to dwell no longer in the susspycion off my prynce for my fydelytye towardes hyr majestie, nor to abuse the greate clemencye and mercye wyche I certeynly know to have procedyd ffrome hyr owne person to me, the wyche before gode, I confesse, hathe wroughte mervelus effect in me, such as (I beleve) all other losses

temporall in the worlde nor other Rygor coulde have done. For some demonstration wheroff, yow sawe my folly (but yete unfeynyd, God is my Iuge) when I awaytyd upon yow at Westmynster thys day fortnyghte.

I do therefor now most enterely beseache yow, goode master Secretary, to present hyr hyghness with my humble submyssyon, wyche I make prostrate at hyr majesties foote, most humblye cravyng hyr mercye and pardon for myn offence to hyr hyghnes, for the wyche I am hartely sorye, and do feythfullye promyse from hensfurthe to apple my selfe (as Almyghtye God wyll gyve me grace to be further persuadyd) to the contentation off hyr majestie in obeying hyr lawes establyshed for Relygion, and besydes ffeythfullye to serve and defende hyr with my bodye, landes and goodes, ageynss all foreyn prynces and potentantes that be in the Worlde. And thys I do playnly and truly meane, as I desyer God and hyr hyg[h]nes to be mercyfull to me at my most neade.

On my feythe, mr. secretary, I wysshe hyr majestie knew all the thoughts off my hartes, for my love and affection to hyr, ffrome the tyme I knew hyr fyrst a chylde in the prynce my master hys howse untill the daye beyng now my leage ladye and Soverayngne, and then I know hyr goode and mylde nature woulde not myslyke off hyr greate ffavor and mercy now Imployde vpon me.

Sir, I pray yow beare wythe me for suche Imperfecttions as yow shall fynde in my handelyng off thys matter, whyche mysellffe conceyve to be many, but yet at thys tyme beyng neyther well dysposed in bodye nor mynde I can not amende yt at thys present as I woulde, but I humblye pray yow supplye these wantes by yowr ffrendly reporte off my submyssyon and conformytye as to yowr dysscretion shall seme best. Most earnestly besechyng yow so to temper my ends in thys matter, that at the ffyrste I be drawne no ffurther then to cumyng to Chyrche wheare I wyll use my self (by Godes grace) to want offence to eny menne and not by devyse to be pressyd further, wyche myght make me eyther an hypocryte or desperate, but sufferyd without offence to eny good manne, for a tyme to forbear the rest, vntyll Almyghtye God (If that be his holly wyll) shall suffer me to [be] fully more persuadyd off the rest.

I have long trublyd yow with thys vnpleasante letter. I do acknowleg my selffe bownde vnto yow for my selfe and my Sonne. I pray God Rewarde you seyng power servythe not save to recompence the leaste parte of that. And so with my humble commadationes I take my leave off yow. At Westminster the 21 off June

yowr most bonnden duryng lyffe to be commandyde
T. Cornwaleys

III *Sir Thomas Cornwallis to the Queen.*

P.R.O., S.P. 12/43, no. 10 (i).

To the Queenes most excellent maiestie

In most [hu]mble wyse I, Sir Thomas Cornwaleys Knyght, yowr maiesties [most] humble and dutyfull subiect, do with all reverence and lowlynes off mynde prostrate at your hyghnes ffeete, submytte my sellffe to yowr most excellent majestie, acknowlegyng myn offence to yowr hyghnes and yowr lawes, beyng readye to make suche amendes for the same, as (wythe yowr gracious acceptation theroff) may enduce yowr greate goodnes to pardon and forgett wherin heretofore I have offendyd yow: beyng determynyd (by godes sufferance) never to offende yowr maiestie ageyn in the same. I most humblye therfor beseche yowr maiestie to restore me ageyne in to yowr favor, beyng redye to serve yowr hyghnes in eny maner that yt shall please yow to dyrect and comande me, wherbye I truste to make yt manyfest to the hole Realme, how humble and loyall a subiect yowr majestie hathe off me.

I humbly also upon my knees beseche yow, my goode and gracious leage lady, not to Iuge or thynke that eny obstynacye, vaynglorye, malyce or the want of dutye, love or due allegiance to yowr hyghnes have thus longe wythdrawne me from the cummyng to Chyrche (according to yowr maiesties lawes sett forth and establsheed in that behallffe) but the scruple I have heretofore conceyved therbye to offende Almyghtye God, hathe bene thonlye cause wyche movyd me herunto, the feare wheroff (wyche ys more to be weyde then all ye perylls in the Worlde) as I do protest before Almyghtye God and yowr hyghness, hathe bene the very occasyon off myn offence: So now upon better consyderation off the matyer and therwythe weyghing how mercyfullye yt lykythe yowr hyghnes to deale, in seekyng no further to serche or examyn my consyence, then wythe the shew off my sellffe to be an humble and obedyent subiect vnto yowr maiestie in frequentyng the Chyrche and servyce therin now usyd: I do not only confesse my falte towardes yowr hyghnes hytherto in not performing the same and therbye to have incurryd the danger off the lawes, but also do acknowleg mysellffe so much bounde to yowr excellent maiestie for thys yowr mylde and most mercyfull clemencye, as for the same I shalbe redye to Imploye my bodye, landes and goodes to serve yowr hyghnes ageynst all foreyn prynces, potentates or persons in the worlde, thowghe ther were no other bonde off Allegiance to bynde me therunto then thys yowr maiesties most mercyfull and gracious consyderation off me. I thus having (vnder yowr hyghnes favor) declaryd myn offence and repentance, wythe thassurance of my

loyaltye to lyve and dye yowr true and feythfull subiect, I do now most humblye upon my knees beseche yowr maiestie to extende yowr accustomed favor vpon me, that by the same I may be now restoryd to former lybertye, wherbye I may apere vnto the worlde yowr true and feythfull subiect, and so that I be bounde duryng my lyffe tacknowledge yowr hyghnes my most mercyfull and gracyus soverayne ladye, and shall dayly pray vnto Almyghtye God for the preservation of yowr maiestie, that you may longe lyve and Reyagne in most prosperous and happye estate over us.

IV *Sir Thomas Cornwallis's Private Account 1569-70.*

Iveagh Collection: Cornwallis MSS. 1/3.

[It is impossible to reproduce the account precisely in the form in which it is set out in the original but all the details are included, except some of the intermediate totals. Arabic numerals have been substituted for Roman numerals in the various items of expenditure].

Thacompte of Thomas Laughter servannte to Sir Thomas Cornwaleys Knighte as well of all suche sommes [of money] as he hath received to thuse of his seide master from the Xth of Octobre 1569 until the firste of Auguste 1570 as of the issueing the [same to the] saide master of his use In whiche tyme the saide Sir Thomas Cornwaleys was absent from his house at Brome in Suffolk, being first [summoned] to the court at Windsor before the Lordes of Counsell, to be examynid upon some article touching the Duke of Norfolk at that [time] committid to the Tower, And the saide Sir Thomas beinge therupon found not to be any weye touchid with any disloyalty towardes [his] Prince: He then was examynid upon matier of religion, and beinge found to embrace the Catholique faithe nowe termed papistical and refusinge to come to the churche to communicate in prayer accordinge to the religion and lawes sett forth and establishid in this realm on that behalf, He was by the saide Lordes of Counsell committid as prisoner to the Places and persons heirafter menconed [and] ther contynuid in maner and fourme expressid in this said Accompte, duringe whiche tyme the Lady Cornwaleys his wife [was] Comaundid to kepe and contynue her house and Familie at Brome aforesaid.

The said Thomas Laughter ys charged with severall sommes of money by him receivid within the tyme of this his Accompte by the Delivery of his said Master as aperith by diverse particulars hereupon Tryed and examynid Amountinge in all to the some of £305 1s 2½d.

Whereof:

WYNSORE

RIDING CHARGES TO THE CORT

At his repare to the Courte at Windsore setting Fourthe from Brome the Xth of octobre above saide and aryvinge at Windsore the XIIth of the same beinge attendid with VI men and VII horses and accompanid to Newemercat with Mr. William Cornwaleys his eldest sonne and Mr. Mulcastre sometyme his servaunte. At Newemercat: Horsemeate 14s; Victualles 7s 4d. At Baldocke, Horsemeate 12s 6d; Victualles 8s 10d. At St. Albones, Horsemeate 10d; victualles, 7s 3d.

VICTUALLES AND HORSEMEAT THER

The charges of his diet and for his horses with VI men in his aboad ther from the XIII of Octobre untill the 11nd Novembre at Mr. Stutfieldes, with 11s 3d for riding charges for Thos. Laurens, Christopher Bullmer, Hamond Noloth and Robt Widoe being then sent home, as aperith by particular bills therof that is to say: Victualles £9 9s 9d, Horsemeate, £6 4s 9d.

The charges of his diet ther in the hous of Mr Parcker a prieste from the 3 of November untill the 28 of the same beinge all that tyme close prisoner attendid with 2 of his own servauntes and one of the Gard named Laurence Manley. That is to say: Victualles, £5 19s; Fuell, 26s 8d; Chambre rome, 30s; Washing, 2s 10d.

IN SEVERALL PAYMENTES IN THE TITLES, VIZ

For Phisicke: to Mr. Doctor Atsloe a phisicion for his advise in ministringe a purgacon 10s.

Forain Paymentes

In severall payementes with 3s put into his purse to playe; 18d for a coller and lyme; 2d for a uryvall; 20s for Miles the taylor in discharge of a debit to him due from Mr. Wm. Cornwaleis sone of the said Sir Thomas

Almes

In Almes to sondrie poor persones in the Towne in that space 9s

Apparaile

A longe side cloake of violett cloth lyned with purple baze, £4 13s 5d
A pair of plaine sloppid hosts of black caisty, 14s 3d
A doublet of blacke silke mocado, 27s 1d

A Felt hatt with narow verg and highe crowne, 6s 8d
 A paier of shoes, 16d.
 Mendinge a paier of hosts, 2d.

Giftes and Rewardes

To Mr. Wm. Cornwalyes at Newmercat, 40s.
 To Mr. Mulcastre ther, 40s.
 To Mr. Tho. Jernagan at the Corte, 20s.
 To Laurence Bedingfield on of the said Sir Tho. his men, 20s.
 To Hamond Noloth one other of his servauntes, 20s.
 To diverse severall persons bringing presentes and taking paynes any way for the said Sir Thomas Cornwaleys during his abode ther, 48s.

[Total of expenses at Windsor, £46 2s 7d]

AT SARISBURY

RYDING CHARGES FROM THE CORTE TO SARUM

At his repaire from Windsore the 29th of Novembre towards Sarisburye to Mr. Jewell then Bushoppe ther to be framid to his secte wher he contynued untill the Vth of June attendid thither with ii yeoman of the garde, ii of his owne servauntes and a horsekeeper of Mr. Norris of the Corte, viz: Hartlerowe,¹⁰⁴ victualles, 8s; Horsemeate, 4s 8d. Andevor, victualles, 10s 10d; Horsemeate, 6s 8d. Sarum at the signe of the George, victualles iii meales, 16s 6d; Fewell, 2s 4d; Horsemeate, 8s 6d.

DIET THER IN THE CLOSE

The charges of his diet ther lienge in the close and keepinge house from the XXVIIIth of Novembre 1569 untill the Vth of June 1570 attendid with ii of his owne servauntes and one Whityarde a pore scholler for victualles, washinge and fewell onely as aperith by particular bookes hereupon tried and examinid £40 3s 2½d

This Accomptant allowid for severall somes of money by him paide at the commanndement of [his] said Master as doth hereafter appere in severall Titles: that is to saye, In severall paements under these Titles:

Phisick

The charges of phisicke as well for the said Sir Thomas Cornwaleys as this Accomptant in tyme

¹⁰⁴ Hartley Wintney

of ther sicknesses duringe ther aboade ther, the said Sir Thomas being sick of a murr and reume and this accomptant of ague, 42s 1d

Forain Charge

In severalle foraine paymentes viz for conveyance of aparaile and other necessarice from Brome unto him at Sarum, for cariage of lettres and sondrie like occasions in this time, with 39s in ready money to him delivered at several tymes to put into his purse, 70s 6d

Almes

In Almes to dyverse and sondrye persons in the Towne at that tyme duringe the aboade of the said Sir Thomas ther, 44s 8d

Aparayle

A payer of bootes, 8s. For Shooes ther, 10s 1d. For Mending hoses and other aparaile, 8d. For 1 doz. of pointes, 8d. For a pair of flannel stockes and ther making, 22d. A doz of silk buttons, 4d. For threde and silke, 22d. For a Jewell lace, 6d. For a pair of plaine hoses, 9s 1d. A lace for a pair of knyves, 2d. For makeinge and mendinge of a douplet, 8s 8d. A pair of oxforde gloaves, 8d. For mending a douplet, 12d. For iiij paires of sockes, 22d. For iiiij paires of Knyves, 4s. A dozen of longe buttons, 3s. For makeinge a mockadoe gowne, 4s 8d. A scarfe of tawny purple sarcenet, 8s. Two Jemewe ringes, 8s 4d. Two Coyves [?], 3s 4d. Lynen boothest a paier, 2s 8d. Vernishing a pair of Spurres, 2d. A Black Satynne Douplet, 58s.

Necessaries

For diverse necessaries bought in this tyme by the said accomptante. Urynalles 2, 4d. Paper, vi quaer, 2s. A stryner for the Cook, 4d. Syste of Waxe, 12d. A boutelle and Streyner for the Cook, 4d. To a Joigner to set upp a bed, 16d. For a writinge deske, 12d. Rushes, 2s. Canvas for shetes and table cloathes, 14s. Ofen brigges, 12d.

Gyftes and Rewardes as particulerlie ensueth viz

To my Lord Bushoppe of Sarum xii yardes of satyn, £7 4s.
To his Lordshippe a ringe of gold sett with a very fayer turqueis price £13 6s 8d.
To Mr. Bolde his chapleyne iii yardes of taffata, price 40s.

To Laurence Manley a yeoman of the gard that attendid
 the said Sir Thomas at Windsor and to Sarum at his departure 66s 8d
 To Richard Longworth one other of the gard that assisted him, 20s.
 To Mr Norris horsekeeper attending to Sarum, 6s 8d
 To them to bear ther charges in retourne to Windsor 20s.

In the Bushop of Sarum his house at severall tymes amonge
 his servantes, viz at Newe yere tyme, 38s 8d
 At his sending for to apere in hillyar terme and after
 countermandid 39s 10d.

At his departure Sarum 20s.

To the vicars of the church at that tyme, 20s.

To Mr. Powell, 30s. Oldfield 10s. Davy the horsekeeper the
 Bishops men attending the said Sir Thomas to London 45s.
 At his remove from his first lodgings in the close to
 Robertson Keeper of the house and his servants there, 55s.

In his progress with the Bushoppe when he road on
 visitacion into North Wiltshire. At Mr. Ernlice at
 Camyons, 3s. At the Lady Stumper at Bromham, 20s. At
 Mr. Beyntons at Rowden, 33s 4d. At Mr. Sheringtone at
 Laycock 10s 6d. At Mr. Pickerings at Mounke Farley,
 3s 4d. At Sestone a fermer 2s 6d.

To certeyne his kinsfolkes and servauntes that visited
 him: Henry Aldham his servaunte, 20s. Mr. J. Cornwallys
 his nephwe, 40s. Mr. Henry Singleton his kinsman, 20s

To divers his friendes and alies that came likewise to
 visit him for ther horsemeat during ther aboad, viz.
 for the horsemeate of Mr. Plator, 5s 4d. Mr. Tilor,
 2s 6d. The Lady Catherine Cornwaleis, 27s 9d. Mr. J.
 Cornwaleis, 4s 6d $\frac{1}{2}$. Mr. Bolton, 2s 8d. Mr. Barwick of
 Westhorpe, 8s. Wm. Hancocke, 4s. In his progress with
 the Bushopp 13s 10d.

To diverse and soundrye persons bringinge presentes to
 the said Sir Thomas as well in Newe Yeaere Daye. As before
 and after duringe his aboad ther as by a particular booke
 apeerith.

[Total expenses at Salisbury, £115 16s 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d]

AT LONDON

RYDINGE CHARGES TO LONDON AND DIET THER VIZ

At his retourne from Sarum to London the Vth of June
 1570 where he remaynid at Mistress Clastes house untill
 the XIIth of the same and thence was comittid to Mr. G.

Goodman deane of Westminster until the XXIth of Julye next followinge beinge attendid upon to London from Sarum with iiii of the Bishop of Sarum his servauntes and twoo of his owne men. Basingstoke, Victualles 8s; Horsemeat 9s 2d. Steanes, victualles 15s 4d; Horsemeate, 4s 7d. London At Mrs Clastye, Victualles £5 3 11d. At Mr. Deane, Victualls £8 9s 1d. London, Horsemeate, 14s 4d.

RYDINGE CHARGES OF SERVAUNTES ETC

The charges of the said Sir Thomas his elder sonne and other his servauntes in all the tyme of his trouble as well in travellinge to weight upon himself at Sarum touchinge diverse his business as in Corte and London as by the particulars therof it doth and may apere over and besides stable charges payementes for horses and such like ridinge charges viz
Mr. Wm Cornwaleys and Edward Goldinge with their servauntes attendunte £12 6s 2d
Thomas Laurans iiii several journies and continuall aboard at London severall tymes lx daies £7 5s 11d
Robert Glaundfield with 33s 4d to him allowid for a hors. £6 19s 8d.
Christopher Bullmer, Richard Shawe, Henry Laurance
Henry Aldham and this Accomptant 67s 8d

RYDINGE CHARGES HOMEWARDE TO BROME WITH RESTITUCON OF LIBERTY

The Charges of the said Sir Thomas beinge restorid to the Quene her Maiesties favor and his former libertye beinge accompanied with his eldest sonne and his wife, Mr. Kitson and his wife with XX men and XXX horses and lieng at ther freindes houses in ther iourney Homewarde againe to Brome wher they aryvid the 2nd of August 1570
At London after his restoare to Lyberty:
His owne diet at Mr Aleine 66s.
Boarde wages for XI men 53s 10d
Horsemeat at Liverye £3 2s
Homeward by wey of Rewarde at Mrs Ailofes 35s
Mr. Daveice, 5s, Mr. Tylneis, 4s 8d.

STABLE CHARGES

For twoe geldinges bought in Wiltshire, Thone of Mr. Bennet, thother of Mr. Chafyne £18
For a gray somer nagg which was molten by Mr. Wm. Cornwaleyes 60s
For a buff sadle 40s
For bridells bittes pastorns reans and stiropes as aperith by particule bills therof 69s 9d

GIFTES AND REWARDES

To Mr Argall servaunt to the La. Latymer 40s
 To Dorset that should have servid thesaid Sir Thomas 30s
 For ii cheans of bugle gevin for tokens 24s
 To Alexander Mr. Groomporters rider 20s
 To his fellows in the gromeporters lodg. 9s 6d
 To the officers and servauntes in the Deane of
 Westminster his house 57s 6d
 To diverse other that brought presents and came
 on message to the said Sir Thomas in his aboard
 ther 70s 1d

IN SEVERALL OTHER PAYMENTS UNDR E THESE TITLES

Wages and Rewardes

To this Accomptante for his wages for iii qrs endid
 at Midsomer 1570 with 39s 6d to him pardonid
 upon the determinacoin of his Accompt 79s 6d
 To Richard Shawe for the like space at 53s 4d per ann. 40s.

Necessaries viz

Pewter Vessell 27s 4d Paper 2s.
 Drinking glasses 12d. Certeine napery and
 Kychen vesells provided when he sholde have
 gone to the Tower £9 11s 9d
 A case of dagges, 45s. certene gold wier for teeth
 3s 6d. A Truncke, 8s. Cordinge lyne 2d.
 A Botle with gargreis, 2s 6d

FORAYN CHARGES

Boate hire and barge hire 23s
 For cariages to the Caremen 19s 6d.
 To put in his purse to play at tables 2s

APARAYLL AT HIS BEINGE AT LONDON

A Taphata duoplet besides makinge 21s.
 A canvas duoplet, 16s 10d. A jewell lace, 10d.
 A cloak of purple stammell laid with lace and lynid
 with murrey baize, £4 9s 3d
 A Taphata hat, 10s. A vellet capp, 10s.
 A clothe capp, 3s. Blacke satyn 1 yard, 16s.
 A canvas duoplet besides making 10s 7d
 A Spanish leather jerkin laid with lace and taphata 49s 7d
 A car and tassell for a dagger 8d.
 Spanish shoes, 2s 5d. A shirt with whit perles, 16s.

A dutch cloake of puk lynid with unshonne vellet, £6 9s
 Twoe dozen pointes, 3s. A Bagg of Russet sylk ingrained,
 14s 6d.

A wast girdle, 6d.

To the tailor for making certeyne aparaille, 65s 6d.

To the hosier for lik occasion, 21s.

ALMES THER

Given in Almes to diverse pore persons ther 6s 11d

[Total expenses at London, £143 2s 6d]

SUMMA ALLOCACIONIS VIZ

Summ totall of all the paymentes above mensionid
 collected into titles here under mencionid viz

Rydinge Charge and dyett	£127 14s 10½d
Forayne Charges	£ 7 4s
Necessaryes	£ 15 4s 7d
Apparaille	£ 37 19s 4d
Stable charges	£ 26 9s 9d
Allmes	£ 3 0s 7d
Phisicke	£ 2 12s 1d
Gyftes and Rewardes	£ 84 16s 0d
	<hr/>
	£305 1s 2½

And so this Accomptant oweth - nul. And therefore quietus est.