THE NEWSLETTERS

1. William Bishop to John Bennett, 4/14 December 1621

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 72, pp. 247–248*]

Very much respected and worthy s*i*r,

We long to heare of yo*u*r safe arrivall at Rome,[1] w*hi*ch I hope we shall do ere th[ese] come to your handes. I will first tell you what letters I have already addres[sed] towards you, then what I have now to say. I sent you the nuncios[2] letters to Card[inal] Lodovicy,[3] the popes nephew, by the meanes of the Spanish ambassadors[4] secretary. The packet was endorsed unto Padre Maestro[5] at the Spanish amb[assador's] house in Rome. Afterward I sent you one of mine, with another out of England to M^r^ Franks,[6] by M^r^ Wainmans[7] means. It was addressed unto Monsig*no*r Cursino, the agent in Rome, at Cursino House hard by S^t^ Lewes Church. Item, the nuncio himself being at Toulouse with the king[8] did, upon the receit of that l[etter] w*hi*ch you sent him from o*u*r brethren in England, write a second letter unto Card[inal] Lodovicio in your favour, w*hi*ch he addressed unto the rector[9] of the Engli[sh] college in Rome to be deliv*er*ed unto you at yo*u*r arrivall

[1]John Bennett, the recently appointed agent of the English secular clergy, had arrived in Rome on 11/21 November 1621: TD, V, p. ccxxxii.

[2]Ottavio Corsini, archbishop of Tarsus and papal nuncio in France.

[3]Luigi Ludovisi, nephew of Pope Gregory XV.

[4]Francisco de la Cueva, duke of Alburquerque, Spanish ambassador in Rome.

[5]Diego de Lafuente OP, chaplain to Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, count of Gondomar. He had been dispatched to Rome to obtain a papal dispensation for the proposed marriage of Prince Charles to the infanta Maria. See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 158; CRS, 68, pp. 144, 148–151; AAW, B 25, no. 17. On 18/28 July 1622, William Bishop had requested Gondomar that Lafuente should be appointed 'great almoner' to the infanta, in part because of 'the credit that he hath gotten already with our king', and that Lafuente might 'be made a byshope aswell': AAW, A XVI, no. 124, p. 501.

[6]Identity uncertain.

[7]Probably a reference to Thomas Wenman. A letter from William Bishop to John Bennett in October 1622 mentioned that Wenman was with Bennett in Rome: AAW, A XVI, no. 168, p. 633. Wenman, with William Seton and John Browne, signed a letter to Urban VIII in September 1624 in favour of the proposed Anglo-French dynastic marriage treaty: AAW, B 26, no. 146.

[8]Louis XIII.

[9]Thomas Fitzherbert SJ. See Anstr., I, p. 117. Fitzherbert was on bad terms with some of the English Catholic secular clergy. In December 1623, Thomas Rant claimed that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at Rome. The last weeke I writt to M^r^ Mailer[10] another about you and our affaires, thinking him to send [it] ere this come to Rome, but I p*er*ceive sence that they are yet at Florence and p*er*haps will not come to Rome of [*sic*] one moneth, for w*hi*ch I am sorie, for that he and his going by shipe would have assisted you to the uttermost of their powers. There is, within his, a letter of father prior[11] of the Benedictines to there agent, who went up with you, which I hope he will sent [*sic for* send] him. Thus much of that w*hi*ch is past. Now to the present. The Lord Digbie, at his returne from the emperour,[12] did bring downe into the Lower Palatinate Count Mansfild, with 14,000 souldiers, who at h[is] arrivall did raise the siege of Frankenvale; w*hi*ch was evill taken of the Spaniard[s]; and the Lord Digbie therefore much denied in Flanders as one that p*re*tended love to the Spaniards and yet underhand did maligne them.[13] But, having better judgment, that can hardly be gathered out of Mansfild['s] fact. For o*ur* king hath alwaies p*re*tended to defend the Palatinate, and to gett it for some one of his grandchildren, either by intreaty or by strong hand. Therefore his agents can be no more accused for seeking to defend that, than thothers be for endevoring to take it. Wherefore, it being at liberty to ech p*ar*ty alike either to gett it, or to kepe it, neither can be justly offended with [each] other for doeing their best both in their kinds. That he[a]ringe of the L[ord] Digbie was very gratefull to his king and state,[14] whereupon he hath ~~called~~ <caused> the parlement to [be] held at the 20 of their November, albeit he had before put it of[f] unto February, that he may uppon so good an occasion gett some more subsides to maintaine the said count in the Lower Palatinate.[15] Before the beginning of the parlement the lay Catholikes in prison were sett

Fitzherbert had told John Bennett that 'hee woulde gett him putt out of Rome', and 'Ben[nett] replyed, yow are a cokscombe': AAW, B 25, no. 102.

[10] Henry Mayler. See Anstr., I, pp. 223–224; *NCC*, p. 98.

[11] This is presumably a reference to Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB, the prior of St Edmund's in Paris, since Henry Mayler was still in Paris before setting out for Rome, where he arrived by mid-March 1622: D. Lunn, *The English Benedictines, 1540–1688* (London, 1980), p. 233; AAW, B 25, no. 54.

[12] Ferdinand II.

[13] For Count Ernst von Mansfelt's contribution to the raising of the siege of Frankenthal, see *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 159, and for John Digby, 1st Baron Digby's part in this enterprise, see *ibid.*, pp. 161–162; McClure, *LJC*, p. 401; Adams, PC, pp. 319–320; *CCE*, p. 47. Henry Clifford commented on 25 January/4 February 1622 that Digby had 'effected litle by his' recent failed 'ambassage to the emperour' and 'had brought downe the C[ount] Mansfyelde to annoy the contrary part what he coulde', which 'deprived himselfe of good giftes that were ordayned for him': AAW, A XVI, no. 96, p. 409.

[14] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 161.

[15] For the 1621 parliament's second sitting, see Russell, *PEP*, pp. 124–144; Adams, PC, p. 320; and for Digby's address delivered there concerning the Palatinate, see Russell, *PEP*, pp. 125–126; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 167, 174; McClure, *LJC*, p. 410.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at liberties [*sic*] on their own bands.[16] And M^r^ Colleton[17] hath leave to choose what house he will to remaine in, as I have heard other men say, but not from our agent or himself.[18] And other priests at libertie write that the times are very calme. Yet I for my p*ar*t do feare thend of the parlement, for the Houses be both against us and have passed terrible lawes, but I hope the king will not confirme them.[19] The false archbishope[20] hath greased the favorite[21] in the fist, and made his peace, though I hold him for ever disgraced;[22] and the disgraces given to thothers[23] at thend of the last session may happ to make them all more moderate. Thus much of England. Here ~~one~~ M^r^ [*name illegible*], one of our companie,[24] without our knowledge, went to Orleans and there proceeded doctor in both lawes, w*hi*ch we tooke verie ill at his handes because it is against the popes breve.[25] And [we] do not to this day salute <him> by the name of doctor, nor meane not to do untill the nuncio hath seen the breve (w*hi*ch we have to shew him) and have passed his judgment thereupon. This I thought good to advertise you of, that if [*MS torn:* any (?)] imputation should be laid upon our

[16]See *Letter 6*; PRO, SP 14/123/116; *CGB*, I, p. 46.

[17]John Colleton.

[18]By September 1622, Colleton had left London and had 'gone to the Bathes': AAW, A XVI, no. 135, p. 539.

[19]For the anti-Catholic draft legislation of the first sitting of the 1621 parliament, see *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 54–55; CRS, 68, p. 150; McClure, *LJC*, p. 379.

[20]George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury.

[21]George Villiers, 1st marquis of Buckingham, later 1st duke of Buckingham.

[22]In July 1621, Archbishop Abbot had accidently shot a gamekeeper, Peter Hawkins, on the Hampshire estate of Lord Zouch. For the commission which dealt with Abbot's case, and for James's decision to exonerate him, see McClure, *LJC*, pp. 394, 395, 399–400, 406; Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 67–68. A copy of the royal dispensation which cleared Abbot was sent to Rome: AAW, B 25, no. 43; *CSPD, 1619–1623*, p. 311. John Hacket pointed out that 'our hierarchy was much quarrel'd with and opposed by our own fugitives to the Church of Rome, who would fasten upon this scandal, and upon it pretend against our constant succession'. Hacket said that the lord keeper, John Williams, made the same point in his letter (to Buckingham) in which he refused consecration by Abbot: Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 65, 66; cf. *NCC*, p. 226; PRO, SP 14/123/107. For the damage to Abbot's reputation, see PRO, SP 14/122/97; PRO, SP 14/123/5; McClure, *LJC*, p. 406. (William Whiteway heard a rumour that Abbot had been 'remooved fom his place, and in his steed came' Bishop Lancelot Andrewes: Whiteway, *Diary*, p. 40.)

[23]Bishop refers to the proceedings against the regime's critics during the first sitting of the 1621 parliament, primarily those who were subsequently imprisoned: the earl of Southampton, the earl of Oxford, John Selden, and Sir Edwin Sandys. See Russell, *PEP*, pp. 122–123; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 384–385, 388; Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 68–69; *Cabala*, pp. 57–59, 61.

[24]i.e. one of the members of the English secular clergy's writers' institute, the Collège d'Arras in Paris, for which see *NAGB*, p. 8.

[25]For the papal breve governing the award of higher degrees to the English secular clergy, see *NAGB*, pp. 8, 259; L. Hicks (ed.), *Letters of Thomas Fitzherbert, 1608–1610*, CRS, 41 (London, 1948), pp. 52–53.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

companie for his audacious fact you may excuse us as altogether cleare ~~for all~~ <from any> consenting or approving of it.

Father Leander[26] writ[t]e unto Doctor Cicill[27] a letter wherin he did, undiscreetly in my judgment, say that it were meet, ere bishops were granted us, that it should be p*ro*posed both to religious men and lay gentlemen to heare their advises therein; he not being ignorant, as I thinke, that all those gentlemen who affect the Jesuites would be against the having of them.[28] And, as for religious, if they will not be under them, what should they have to do with the choise of them more than we do meddle with the [*MS damaged:* [mak]ing (?)] of their superiors, ours being the ordinary rulers in Gods Church, theirs being extraordinary father vicars and viceprovinciall[s]? This letter was sent to F[ather] Fitzherbert and may happ to be p*ro*duced [*p. 248*] against us. I will cause him to be spoken withall that he may declare their opinion categorically by their agent there, w*hi*ch is that they mislike not bishops but rather thinke them convenient for England now, p*ro*vided that they may enjoy their accustomed priviledges and exemptions. This they have often said, wherefore some doubt may bee made of that letter.

I heard even now that o*ur* king of England should of late demand of some <of his> bishops and chaplaines whether they thought that the papists did committ idolatry in that worshipping of images w*hi*ch they used, and willed them to consult of it seriously and to returne him their answer, <who>, after deliberation among themselves, answered that they thought the papists did not committ idolatry therein. Which answer he liked and, shortly after, gave order that his chappell at Whitehall[29] should be of new decked up and all the images that had been there this hundreth yeare[s] should be decently painted and sett in the places accustomed. This chappell will agree well with their Lutheran Masse in a cope with candels and crucifix, of w*hi*ch you heard before, with elevation and adoration of the sacrament w*hi*ch was said by <D[octor]> Andre[w]s, bishop of Winchester, by the kings order as it is commonly thought.[30]

[26]John (Leander) Jones OSB, prior of St Gregory's, Douai.

[27]John Cecil.

[28]John Bennett had informed Matthew Kellison in late November 1621 that 'the Jesuits here are making catalogues of lay people's names, who forsooth would have no bishops; and this, as a great weapon, they purpose to use': TD, V, p. ccxxxii. In the same month, the Jesuit general, Muzio Vitelleschi, promised Richard Blount SJ that he would do his best to frustrate Bennett's agitation in Rome: ARSJ, Anglia MS 1, fo. 148r.

[29]The old chapel royal at the east end of Whitehall Palace. See B. Schofield (ed.), *The Knyvett Letters (1620–1644)* (London, 1949), p. 56, citing J.E. Sheppard, *The Old Royal Palace of Whitehall* (London, 1902), p. 65.

[30]See above, p. 12; AAW, B 25, no. 39; BL, Harleian MS 1583, fo. 294r. Thomas Knyvett had remarked, on 9 October 1621, that 'the kings chappell at Whithall is curiously painted

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

When M^r^ Mailer shall come to Rome you may by his meanes most conveniently sent [*sic for* send] yo*u*r letters to me, for the Spanish ambassador[31] is often abroad with the king, and p*er*haps will not so willinglie send unto us yo*u*r letters as the others agent will.

I will add here this my observation of o*u*r kings p*ro*ceeding of late w*hi*ch gave me hope that he meanes we[ll]. First he hath disgraced them that were hottest against us: Canterbury,[32] <another bishop puritan>,[33] Nanton,[34] Southampton,[35] etc.

Secondly he hath provided to the chief offices men better affected to o*u*r religion, the L[ord] Tresurer <Cranfild>,[36] the L[ord] Keeper Williams,[37] the great secretaries [*sic*].[38]

Thirdly he did countenance Winchester seeming to say Masse, and hath given order that his owne chappell be dressed up ~~after~~ with pictures after th*e* old maner, and hath bespoken a crucifix of gold to be sett in it.

and all the images newe made and a silver crusifix amaking to hange therin, against the Spanish ladys coming': Schofield, *The Knyvett Letters*, p. 56; see also PRO, SP 14/123/27; N. Tyacke, 'Lancelot Andrewes and the myth of Anglicanism', in P. Lake and M. Questier (eds.), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560–1660* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 31–32.

[31]Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, count of Gondomar.

[32]George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury.

[33]Thomas Morton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield: see *ODNB*, *sub* 'Morton, Thomas' (article by Brian Quintrell).

[34]Sir Robert Naunton. The elector palatine's representatives at the English court had recently put forward proposals for an Anglo-French marriage in order to forestall the projected Anglo-Spanish treaty. Initially, it appears, James exploited this as a bargaining counter with the Spaniards. The marquis of Cadenet, brother to the duke of Luynes, Louis XIII's favourite, visited the English court in late December 1620: Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 35–36; *CSPV, 1619–1621*, pp. 534–535, 572; Tillières, *ME*, pp. 30–49. But, in late January 1621, Gondomar persuaded James against such a proposal. This led to Naunton's dismissal: *CSPV, 1619–1621*, pp. 548, 553; R.E. Schreiber, *The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton 1589–1635* (London, 1981), pp. 68–84.

[35]Henry Wriothesley, 3rd earl of Southampton.

[36]For the recent appointment of Sir Lionel Cranfield as lord treasurer, see McClure, *LJC*, p. 403.

[37]John Williams, bishop of Lincoln (consecrated on 11 November 1621).

[38]Sir George Calvert, a crypto-Catholic, had been appointed secretary of state in February 1619, in succession to Sir Thomas Lake. In March 1621, Chamberlain had remarked that among the competitors for the other secretaryship, after the disgrace of Sir Robert Naunton (who technically retained his post at this time, although he was suspended from it), was 'Master Gage (Tobie Mathewes deare frend) though most say he is rather reserved for that place about the infanta when she comes': McClure, *LJC*, p. 339. In late July, Chamberlain could write that 'all this last weeke, Sir Richard Weston was secretarie (as far as common fame could make him) insomuch that yt was saide not to be in dooing, but don, but now the report cooles again': *ibid.*, p. 392. In mid-October there were rumours (again) that Sir John Suckling would be appointed to the post: *ibid.*, p. 399, cf. p. 339; Adams, PC, p. 322. (It was even claimed, in January 1622, that Tobias Mathew had been appointed to the secretaryship: *Letter 3*.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Fourthly he hath sett at liberty all <lay Catholikes> that were in prison, and M^r^ Colleton. Other priestes imprisoned hath also such liberty that they be absent a moneth, as I heare, and go out, whosoever will go, over the seas.

It is also com*m*only voiced that the Lord Digbie is very shortly to returne into Spaine to make an end of the match.[39] He hath 15 daies since sent thither an extraordinary post to prepare his way.

It is here greatly feared lest Cou[n]t Mansfild wil, by Lorrayne, passe into France to aid the Hugonots. Some say that he <is> already entred into Lorraine.

Thus with my very harty commendac[i]ons unto you both,[40] desiring you to remember my harty good affection unto Padre Maestro, I rest.

The 14 of December, 1621.

Yo*u*rs most assured,

W*illia*m Bishope

If you can find any better means of directing o*u*r letters to you, I pray you advertise us. M^r^ D[octor] Smith[41] com*m*ends himself to you.

Addressed: Admodu*m* r*everen*do viro d*omi*no Johanni Bennetto, sacerdoti Anglo.
Romae.

Endorsed: 14 Decembe*r* 1621.

2. Edward Brown [Bennett] to John Bennett, 19 December 1621

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 75, pp. 253–256*]

Good syr,

Yo*u*rs of the 7 of November from Millayn I have receaved, being very glad that you soe well passed the difficulties of those mountayns w*hi*ch I allwayes conceaved to be soe daungerous. Boath my frendes[42] give

[39] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 162, 166.

[40] i.e. to John Bennett and also to William Harewell, who had travelled to Rome with Bennett: TD, V, p. ccxxxii.

[41] Richard Smith.

[42] Presumably a reference to Lady Elizabeth Dormer (widow of the 1st Baron Dormer, and cousin, by marriage, of the duke of Feria, whose mother was Jane, the daughter of Sir William Dormer and Mary Sidney) and to her grandson Robert Dormer, 2nd Baron Dormer.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

you many thankes for your frendly discourses of this familye[43] to the governour,[44] who as yeat hath not written to the ould lady,[45] but when he dothe she will give hym humble thankes for the many favours he showed yo*u*.[46] To the embassadour[47] he hathe written how that he will write to the king of Spayn and desyer his letters to o*u*r king abowte the younge lord[48] and so intreat hyme to followe the bussines.

My younge lady liketh well of the cowrse but is desirous that for this haulf yeere it should not be sett a foote, while that[49] there be more certaintye of the Spanish match. For, if that should breake of[f], this is not like to succeed. Withall my L[ord] of Mongymry,[50] havinge notice of such a cowrse to have been undertaken for the younge lordes travaile, it would move hime, it may be, to deale hardlier with the younge ladye, as supposing all this to be plotted to defeate him of what he most desirethe, and soe labour not only to have the younge lord into his p*ro*tection, but alsoe restrayne hyme, that she should not have the comforte of hime as she desireth.[51] Therefor yo*u* are intreated to give the duke thankes, withall to showe hyme that as yeat it is not thought convenient his excellency should move the kinge <of Spain> till he heer further from the embassadour who will, and can, best informe his excellency of the tyme most fittinge for such a p*ro*ject.[52]

Heere[53] we have been this 4 days, wher at o*u*r first cominge we fownd all thinges uncertayne, the parlement men having drawen such

[43]i.e. the Dormer family of Wing in Buckinghamshire, whom Edward Bennett served as a chaplain.

[44]Gomez Saurez de Figueroa, duke of Feria and governor of Milan.

[45]Lady Elizabeth Dormer.

[46]On 16/26 November, John Bennett had assured Matthew Kellison that he had made representations to Feria at Milan concerning the finances of the secular clergy's college at Douai: TD, V, p. ccxxxii. On 1/11 January 1622, Kellison wrote to Bennett to thank him for his 'carefull remembraunce of our affaires with the duke of Feria', who had 'promised my Ladie Dormer once before' to write to the king of Spain on behalf of the college at Douai in order to secure the payment of its Spanish royal pension. Kellison hoped that the duke would now write to the Spanish court to procure that the pension might be paid either at Milan or at Antwerp: AAW, A XVI, no. 92, p. 399. See also *Letter 4*.

[47]Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, count of Gondomar.

[48]Robert Dormer, 2nd Baron Dormer.

[49]i.e. 'until'.

[50]Philip Herbert, 1st earl of Montgomery.

[51]Sir William Dormer, the 1st Baron Dormer's heir, had died in October 1616. The first baron himself died soon afterwards and the earl of Montgomery was granted the wardship of Sir William Dormer's son: McClure, *LJC*, pp. 30, 39, 41; PRO, SP 14/89/55. For the marriage, in 1625, of the 2nd Baron Dormer and Montgomery's daughter, Anna Sophia Herbert, see *Letter 75*.

[52]For the formal request to Feria to deliver the young Lord Dormer from the perils in which he found himself (in other words, the danger of apostasy while he remained under the control of the earl of Montgomery), see AAW, A XVII, no. 77, pp. 239–240. I am grateful to Caroline Bowden for assistance with this point.

[53]i.e. in London.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

positions against recusantes[54] that, if his Ma*jes*ty had given way unto them, it had not been morally possible for them to have given any releefe for the maintenaunce of any good people.[55] But he checkt them withe a shorte letter, wherof my nephew[56] saieth he hath sent you a coppye.[57] Since, they have replied.[58] But he soe catechised them with a letter of 3 sheetes of pap*er* that they all held down there heades. In the same he willed them not to medle with his p*re*rogatives and misteries of estate, nor yeat w*i*th the matching of his sonne, or direct hyme how to make his warres; that he would match w*i*th Spayn if the kinge of Spayn would keepe all conditions agreed upon; that they had too long a peace under hyme w*hi*ch made <them> soe desirous of alterations; that bellum was dulce inexp*er*tis w*i*th many other thinges.[59] The coppy bye the next post it may be I shall send yo*u*. Soe that heer be good hopes all will goe well.

The Jesswetes give owt that the dispensation is grawnted,[60] withall that M^r^ Gage[61] hath made a speech to Gregory[62] against the having of b*ishop*s w*hi*ch heer is litle regarded.[63]

[54]In addition to the unsuccessful recent draft recusancy legislation (see *Letter 1*), it was proposed in the subsidy bill that recusants (and those with recusant wives, children, or servants) should pay double the ordinary rate, 'and be counted as aliens', as Chamberlain remarked on 1 December, observing that this was all that the Commons could 'do to shew the apprehension and dislike of the incredible increase of that faction': McClure, *LJC*, p. 412; see also AAW, A XVI, no. 92, p. 401.

[55]i.e. Catholic clergy.

[56]Joseph Haynes.

[57]Matthew Kellison forwarded the copy, sent by Haynes, to John Bennett (AAW, A XVI, no. 71, pp. 243–245) of James's letter of 3 December 1621 to the speaker of the Commons (commanding 'fierie and popular spirittes' there to desist from debating 'matters farre beyond their reache and capacitye'), and also of the remonstrance which the Commons had drawn up on 3 December to be sent to James and had been forced to withdraw, AAW, A XVI, no. 92, p. 399 (printed in TD, V, pp. cclxxxviii–ccxc; J.P. Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution* (London, 1966), pp. 43–47); Russell, *PEP*, p. 135; B. Pursell, 'War or peace? Jacobean politics and the parliament of 1621', in C. Kyle (ed.), *Parliaments, Politics and Elections, 1604–1648*, Camden Society, 5th series, 17 (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 174–175.

[58]For the petition taken to the king on 11 December, see Kenyon, *Stuart Constitution*, p. 29.

[59]See *ibid.*, p. 29; McClure, *LJC*, p. 414.

[60]For the papal commission (comprising the cardinals Millini, Bandini, Cobelluzio, and Sacrati) appointed to deal with the issue of the dispensation for the proposed marriage of Prince Charles and the infanta Maria, see *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 158; PRO, SP 77/14, fo. 500v. From Rome, on 1/11 September 1621, George Gage had notified Lord Digby that the Roman curia had 'no aversion from this busines' of the Spanish match. Bandini in particular was well affected towards King James and 'as affectionat to England as can be wished': PRO, SP 94/24, fo. 292r.

[61]George Gage, secular priest, son of Edward Gage of Bentley, East Sussex. See Anstr., II, pp. 120–121; P. Revill and F. Steer, 'George Gage I and George Gage II', *BIHR*, 31 (1958), pp. 141–158.

[62]Pope Gregory XV.

[63]For George Gage's audiences with the pope in July and August 1621 concerning the dispensation for the Spanish match, see CRS, 68, pp. 149–150. Gage had argued to Digby

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[*p. 254*] Of yo*u*r last from Millayne I sent a coppye to yo*u*r frend[64] by Jenkyn who since 10 dayes <agoe> was withe me. She is very well, God be thancked. As we came from the cuntrey I writt unto her againe by M^r^ Bowes who is gon to keepe Chrismas with her.

M^r^ Collington[65] comendeth hime self to yo*u*. He would have written but that he hath nothing to saye, w*hi*ch p*er*chaunce yo*u* will think impossible for sup*er*iors who have dew care of the comon. But, to deale plainly w*i*th you, I think he hath nothing to write.

Withe the embassadour[66] I have been, who used me after his maner. He showed me yo*u*r letter from Millain, and hopeth shortly to heer from you.[67]

Ther is a book latly come fowrth called the P*ro*testants Plea,[68] directed to the parlament. The autor as [*sic*] is sayed (w*hi*ch I alsoe beleeve) to be hime who writ[t]e those letters for p*re*eminence of place.[69] Many marvaile it came owt at this tyme, but he saieth M^r^ Archpreest[70] left it hyme for a legacye to sett it fowrth.[71]

I pray reme*m*ber me to Pater Maister (who they say heer is bushop) and to M^r^ Franckes. John Meredith is like to fall to some truble as

that Spanish diplomatic assurances in Rome (that Spain was persuaded and satisfied that James would grant toleration to his Catholic subjects after the match was concluded) would secure the dispensation; but here Gage interpreted toleration as, essentially, no more than the liberty to worship in private according to conscience: PRO, SP 94/24, fos 291v–293v. Many secular priests believed, by contrast, that the success of the Spanish match ought to lead to a grant of episcopal authority to one of their number, and that this would be an essential component of a more comprehensive and far-reaching toleration: AAW, A XVI, no. 95, p. 407. For the long-standing enmity between George Gage and some of the secular clergy, see AAW, A XIV, no. 142, p. 445; TD, V, p. 90; *NCC*, pp. 80, 144–145.

[64]Lady Elizabeth Dormer.

[65]John Colleton.

[66]Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, count of Gondomar.

[67]Gondomar had written to John Bennett in early October 1621: AAW, A XVI, no. 64, p. 225.

[68]Richard Broughton, *English Protestants Plea, and Petition, for English Preists and Papists, to the Present Court of Parlament* (Saint-Omer, 1621). The book is an answer to the sermon preached at St Margaret's, Westminster by Archbishop James Ussher at the opening of the 1621 parliament on 18 February: ARCR, II, no. 80; P. Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age* (London, 1978), no. 682; James Ussher, *The Substance of that which was Delivered before the Commons House . . .* (London, 1621); McClure, *LJC*, p. 347; J. Shami, *John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 61–62. Ussher's sermon condemned idolatry, remonstrated against toleration of Catholics for reasons of state, and demanded the enforcement of the recusancy statutes.

[69]For the authorship of *English Protestants Plea*, see ARCR, II, no. 80; *Letter 13*.

[70]William Harrison.

[71]See Broughton, *English Protestants Plea*, p. 3, where the author claims that William Harrison 'bequeathed as a legacie to mee unworthie this chardge: to write and publish to the world this [. . .] treatise'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

alsoe his brother about beating of a minister at Abergeyney who complayned of them to the parlament.[72] Mr Smith remembreth hym self unto yo*u*, as also to Mr Franckes.

The owld frend,[73] young frend[74] and M*istr*es Fr:[75] most lovinglye salute yo*u*. My Lady St Johns is maried to Mr W*illia*m Arundell by whom I have been very kindly intertayned.[76] Josephe[77] liketh hyme well.

Even as I write this, I heer the parlament is p*ro*rowged to the 8 of Februarye, his Ma*jes*tye being this night expected to the town. Sig*no*r Licentiato saluteth yo*u* and Mr Franckes kindlye. This

[72]In late 1621, the House of Commons received a deposition from Eleazar Jackson, 'a public preacher in Abergavenny', who claimed to enjoy 'the popularity and approbation of the inhabitants of that town'. He alleged that two of the town's numerous recusants had assaulted him at night in his own chamber and had inflicted serious injuries upon him. Because of the local magistrates' sympathy for the recusants, and because of further threats to his life, he was constrained to leave Abergavenny. They had 'sought to deterre and drive me from my place', he said, 'by scandalous aspersions, hereby labouringe to perswade the common sorte of people to entertaine a dislike of my doctrine'. Finally 'when they sawe their menacing would nott prevaile, two noted recusants (one of them suspected to be a seminarie priest) came upon mee in myne own chamber, intending to murther mee, which if they had effected they had a horse of one John Meridith redie sadled att a recusants doore neare unto my lodginge, where hee, the said John Meridith, stood at a windowe in an upper chamber to see the event, butt by Gods providence att that tyme I escaped from them'. After dark on 14 October 1621, another two convicted recusants forced their way into his room and demanded 'a quarrell by way of disputation, viz concerning Purgatorie and the blessed virgin Marie'; but soon they 'reprehended mee for handling matters of controversie in the pulpitt and further charged mee with the procuring of a warrant of the peace against one Roger Howell, one of the recusants which first attempted to murther mee'. Then they resorted to violence, 'beating and sore wounding mee in the head with a dagger and a candlesticke, besides a dangerous stabb in the forehead'; and they warned Jackson 'to leave the contrie forthwith'. His opponents said that 'if they had a king which would favoure theire religion they would putt us all to the fire and faggott, styling us obstinate and damnable heretiques': M.S. Giuseppi *et al.* (eds), *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury*, 24 vols (HMC, 1888–1976), XXIV, pp. 242–243; see also PRO, SP 14/124/58; W. Notestein, F.H. Relf, and H. Simpson (eds), *Commons Debates 1621*, 7 vols (New Haven, CT, 1935), II, pp. 544–545, V, pp. 245–246.

[73]Lady Elizabeth Dormer.

[74]Robert Dormer, 2nd Baron Dormer.

[75]Identity uncertain.

[76]Matthew Kellison remarked in January 1622 on the recent marriage between the 2nd Viscount Montague's widowed daughter, Mary, Lady St John (whom Kellison referred to as Joseph Haynes's 'landladie', i.e. patron) and William Arundell, the second son of Sir Thomas Arundell, 1st Baron Arundell of Wardour. He regarded it as 'an unequal match [...] and prejudicious to her [...] reputation'. Lord Arundell, however, emerged as one of the most vociferous supporters of the secular clergy leadership and their proposals to reform the English Catholic community: AAW, A XVI, no. 92, p. 400; see also Questier, *C&C*, pp. 388–389 and *passim*; McClure, *LJC*, p. 396.

[77]Joseph Haynes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is all that occurreth. Soe, with my best wishes to you boath, I cease.

Your very assured,

Ed[ward] Brown

December 19, 1621 our stile.

[*on p. 256*]

Addressed: Admodum reverendo domino, D[omino] Joanni Bennetto.

No endorsement.

3. Joseph Hervey [Haynes] to John Bennett, 20 January 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 94, pp. 405–406*]

My good uncle,

Wee are much comforted to heare that you are safely come to your jornies eand. I have letters from you but they are not dated, at which your brother[78] is much troubled. That to your best freind[79] I sent immediately to her. She is well, as also the rest of our freinds, God be thanked. This weeke we received a letter from F[ather] M[aste]r[80] to the archpriest[81] and [his] assistents wher, acknowledging the receipt of our letter to him, he desireth to be excused in the busines we intreated him. I hope it is but a modest refusall. You can advise whether it be necessary for us to renew our request unto him or no.[82] He speaketh very comfortably of you in his letter. As yet we are not quite out of feare whether some of your letters which should have mett you there have miscaried in the way or no. All things here goe well; only informers are busy and, as I am for certaine told, some 40 writts are taken out of the crowne office against Catholiques. But it is very like they will be stopped. The puritans out of a hatred and feare they have of it doe ordinarily report that papistry is setting up againe. Here is a gentelman called Mr Tobias Mathew in greate request and is, as I am

[78] Edward Bennett.
[79] Lady Elizabeth Dormer.
[80] Diego de Lafuente OP.
[81] William Harrison, who had died on 11 May 1621.
[82] William Bishop had written to Diego de Lafuente on 25 December 1621/4 January 1622: AAW, A XVI, no. 91, pp. 397–398.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tould, made secretary of state in S*i*r [Robert] Nantons place, w*hi*ch is thought a very strainge thing, being that he is com*m*only reputed both a preist and Jesuite.[83] The parlament you here is quite dissolved and the L[ord] Cooke[84] in the Tower, and some others of them. It is sayed that we shal shortly have another parlament. Ther is a report that an Inglish regement of souldiers[85] shal goe into the Low Countries on the archeduk[e]s side and the gentelman[86] who married my lady is amongest others named to be coronell and then your nephew[87] is to be capelliano major. Your brother and his company went forth of [the] towne the last weeke. He was here very sick, and in some dainger, w*hi*ch hath renewed their resolution to come here no more. I have at this p*re*sent no other newes. By the last the Carmelite[88] did write a letter for you and we are now talking of writing a com*m*on letter for the busines of bushops. My lady remembers her love to you and to M[r] Franks to whome I also desire to be kindly remembred and so doth M[r] Pecker when you have well dispatched your busines. I wish I were w*i*th you to accompany you home. Be carefull of your health, w*hi*ch I forgett not dayly to remember. W*i*th my service and best love, I leave you to the p*ro*tection of our Saviour, and will ever be your nephew, to be com*m*aunded,

Joseph Hervey

20 of Jan[uary].

[*on p. 406*]

Addressed: Admodum r*everendo* domino, D*omino* Johanni Bennetto. Roma.

No endorsement.

[83]John Chamberlain noted Tobias Mathew's arrival from Paris, and also that he was politically tainted because of his association with the disgraced lord chancellor, Sir Francis Bacon: McClure, *LJC*, p. 419; PRO, SP 14/124/82, 84. Mathew had been secretly ordained, with George Gage, by Cardinal Bellarmine in May 1614:, Anstr., II, p. 120; *NCC*, p. 50.

[84]Sir Edward Coke.

[85]See *Letter 5*.

[86]Haynes appears to refer here to William Arundell (see *Letter 2*), but Edward Vaux, 4th Baron Vaux was the colonel of the English regiment which went to Flanders.

[87]i.e. Joseph Haynes himself.

[88]This may be a reference to the Carmelite friar Thomas Dawson (Simon Stock), a friend of the secular clergy: see *NCC*, p. 12. In June 1624, Carlos Coloma, the Spanish ambassador, took Dawson as his chaplain: TD, V, p. cclx.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. Anthony Champney to John Bennett, 1/11 May 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 108, pp. 449–452*]

Worship*ful*l and r*everen*d si*r*,

In my last I signifyed M[r] P*re*sident[89] his sicknesse w*hi*ch I doubt not maketh you longe to heare of his recoverie.[90] His fever hath quitt him and he only nowe expecteth to recover his strength. Here past yesterday S*i*r Rich[ard] Weston, embassatour for Ingland, to meete w*i*th other embassatoures of Spayn, France and the emperoures at Bruxelles to treat of accom*mo*da*ti*ng matters in these partes of Christendom.[91] The Lord Hayes[92] is in France; Lord Digbie in Spayne.[93] The governoure of Cambray[94] is gon for Ingland[95] whence the count of Gondomar departethe about the 10 of their May ~~March~~.[96]

[89]Matthew Kellison, president of the English College at Douai.

[90]See *Letter 5*.

[91]On 10/20 April, Champney had recorded that 'Sir Richard Weston and, as some say, the earle of Rutland ar expected here about the Palatinate'; the imperial ambassador, Count Georg Ludwig von Schwarzenberg, had also arrived in Brussels following an embassy to the court in London where he had 'commission to propose a match betwixt a daughter of the emperour and the [. . .] p[a]latin his sonn upon condition that he be brought up with the emperour whereupon will folowe the restoring of the Palatinat at least to the sonn': AAW, A XVI, no. 107, p. 447; see also *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 294, 325; Birch, *CTJI*, II, p. 303; PRO, SP 77/15, fos 85v, 92r, 94v; *CGB*, I, pp. 151, 178, 193; BL, Additional MS 72254, fo. 101r; *The Oration or Substance of that which was Delivered before his Majestie of Great Brittaine, by the Emperours Embassador. . .* (London, 1622, *Revised Short-title Catalogue*, nos 21828.5, 21829); Pursell, *WK*, pp. 170–171. For Weston's embassy in May, and his return, empty-handed, in late September 1622, the purpose of which journey had been, in part, to prevent the elector palatine joining Mansfelt and encouraging him, as he did, to refuse a peace accord, see Adams, PC, p. 329; Alexander, *CLT*, pp. 24–28; R. Lockyer, *Buckingham: the life and political career of George Villiers, first duke of Buckingham 1592–1628* (London, 1981), p. 126; W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 311–312; Inner Temple Library, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 48, no. 3; PRO, SP 77/15, fos 221r, 296r–306r; *CCE*, p. 78; *CGB*, I, pp. 166, 169, 179, 180, 188, 193, 202, 233; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 200r–v.

[92]Sir James Hay, 1st Viscount Doncaster and future 1st earl of Carlisle. See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 276; Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 39–47.

[93]See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 323, 326, 329; *CCE*, p. 66.

[94]Carlos Coloma.

[95]See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 320; *CCE*, pp. 66, 89.

[96]For Gondomar's departure from London, on 16 May, see Redworth, *PI*, p. 45. Champney mentioned to John Bennett, in a letter of 22 May/1 June 1622, that Lady Elizabeth Dormer had come 'to London expressly to take leave of the co[u]nt of Gondomare and to be acquaynted with his successour' and that 'shee would commend unto him ernestly the cause of <the> [secular] clergie'. Edward Bennett, her chaplain, had said that Gondomar 'telleth him that all things goe well and he hopeth they will goe better and that he liketh nothing the padri', i.e. the Jesuits: AAW, A XVI, no. 112, p. 463. Several commentators noted how Gondomar was socializing with the prominent Catholic peer and nephew of Lady Dormer, the 2nd Viscount Montague. Simonds D'Ewes was told that Gondomar had been

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The governoure afore men*n*tioned, passing this way, did us the honoure to come to our colledge,[97] heard Mass in our church and accepted of a fewe verses, Greeke and Latin, and promised all good offices possible. M^r^ P*re*sident, by me, p*re*sented him the names of divers of our bretheren w*i*th whome he might deale co*n*fidently: M^r^ Colleton, y*ou*r brother,[98] M^r^ Harvey,[99] M^r^ Musket[100] and M^r^ Bretain.[101] M^r^ John Loe his brother[102] is gon [as] <his> chaplayne. He would not visit the colledge of S^t^ Omers though he was invited. M^r^ Colleton hath his absolute libertie and hath taken a howse nere Clerkenwell. M^r^ Blackloe his brother[103] writeth to his brother[104] her[e] that they live in greate peace for the p*re*sent and in hope of better; that they expect a generall pardon from the king of all penalties of ~~co*n*fiscatione~~ co*n*victions w*hi*ch he saythe they long to see effected.[105] He addeth that the earle of Oxford[106] was sent to the Towre [*word deleted*] two dayes before the date of his letter w*hi*ch was the 2 of the p*re*sent

at Godalming with Montague, and they 'strove soe long to give each other the best inn, ther being but two good ones in the towne'. Gondomar 'tooke upp an alehowse and the viscount a clothiers howse and ther men jovialised in the two best inns'. Then Gondomar went down to Cowdray 'wher desiring to see Chichester church, hee was at first kept out and I thinke altogether by a poor sexton whoe shutt the doores against him'. Afterwards Gondomar, it was said, went to visit the Cotton family at Warblington in Hampshire, after which he departed for Portsmouth: *DSSD*, p. 79; *Letter 5*; PRO, SP 14/130/85; cf. Questier, *C&C*, pp. 392, 399–400. The Venetian ambassador, Alvise Valaresso, noted in early September 1622 that Gondomar had had differences with the Jesuits, while his successor, Coloma (who, the count of Tillières claimed in May 1623, referred to Gondomar as a liar and a charletan), was on much better terms with the Society: *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 403; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 205v. Subsequently, however, as it appears from a letter from Coloma to Cardinal Millini in 1624, Coloma changed his opinions somewhat: TD, V, pp. cclx–cclxii. On 10/20 August 1622, the Jesuit general, Muzio Vitelleschi, wrote to Richard Blount SJ that the English secular clergy were trying to alienate Gondomar from the Society: ARSJ, Anglia MS 1, fo. 161v.

[97]The Collège d'Arras.

[98]Edward Bennett.

[99]Joseph Haynes.

[100]George Fisher. Fisher had been ordered into exile by the privy council in February 1621 but had not left the country, and had subsequently taken part in a debate with George Abbot's chaplain, Daniel Featley: Anstr., II, p. 103.

[101]Matthew Britton.

[102]William Law. See TD, V, p. cclxi; *NAGB*, p. 97; Anstr., II, p. 204.

[103]Presumably a reference to Richard White, brother of Thomas White, alias Blacklo. See *NCC*, pp. 7, 128.

[104]i.e. Thomas White.

[105]Champney reported on 22 May/1 June 1622 that Catholics in England 'speake still of a pardon to come forth for all convictions, and that there is a commission granted to 8 of the counsell to determin upon the deliverie of all prisoners as well preistes as others', but nothing, apparently, had been done to effect this: AAW, A XVI, no. 112, pp. 463–464; cf. *Letter 6*.

[106]Henry de Vere, 18th earl of Oxford.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[month].[107] The palatin[108] is for certayn in the Palatinate where he and Mandsfeild will doe what mischeife they ca*n*.[109] I know not whether the expedition of his p*ro*ceedinges may not hinder the good course of things aswell in Ingland as els where. But all must be referred to Gods holy disposition. You heard of the king of France his happy successe agaynst his rebelles wherein if he goe forward, w*hi*ch we are to pray for, will bring them under his obedience.[110] Our bretheren in Ingland co*m*playne much of the Jesuites p*ro*ceedinges agaynst M^r^ Newma*n*[111] in Lisboa, whereof I suppose you are informed by M^r^ Newman him self.[112] For M^r^ Messenden[113] in <his> last wrote [*p. 450*] that he hadd a large paquet to send to Rome from him. They use the p*ro*tectoures[114] letters and authoritie to putt M^r^ Newma*n* out of his residence. I pray you have a*n* eye to his affayres and assist him all you ca*n* according to the informations you shall receave from him self. You see howe occasions fall out for our countries servise to hold you there longer than you expected. And certaynly thence you must <not> part till you have a successoure, howsoever your mayne busines goeth for this p*re*sent. The p*re*sident of the Benedictaynes,[115] haveinge beene lately at Parise, hath p*ro*mised them there to write to their p*ro*cter there at <Rome> to joyne w*i*th you in the matter of b*ishop*s, w*hi*ch, if they doe, will help salte*m* removendo p*ro*hibens. They can*n*ot yet jumpe together amongst them selves w*hi*ch doth them harme.[116] Even nowe was there heare a doctour of the Dominicanes to bidd farewell to M^r^ P*re*sident and to com*m*end him self unto the prayers of the howse, he being sent into Denmarke to preach. God graunt them good successe. He sayth that he is sent by the nu*n*cio[117] by his Holiness his

[107] See McClure, *LJC*, p. 433; PRO, SP 14/129/50; *DSSD*, p. 75; BL, Additional MS 48166, fo 142v; PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fo. 32r; G.P.V. Akrigg (ed.), *Letters of King James VI & I* (London, 1984), pp. 409–410.

[108] Frederick V, elector palatine.

[109] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 267, 324, 326; *CCE*, p. 73; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 160r.

[110] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 294, 317.

[111] William Newman.

[112] For Thomas More's account, dated 8/18 March 1622, of the conflict in Lisbon over the semimary founded there through the beneficence of Pedro Coutinho, see AAW, A XVI, no. 102, pp. 427–429; see also TD, IV, pp. cclviii, cclx, cclxv; J. Kirk and W. Croft, *Historical Account of Lisbon College* (Barnet, 1902); *NCC*, p. 258.

[113] Edward Maddison. He had been sent to Madrid in November 1619 as agent for the English College at Douai. See Anstr., II, p. 207.

[114] Edouardo Farnese, cardinal protector of the English nation. See Questier, *C&C*, pp. 326, 327, 345; *NAGB*, *passim*.

[115] William (Rudesind) Barlow OSB.

[116] According to John Ducket, writing on 1/11 May 1622, the Benedictines at Paris were saying that 'there will be bishop[s] if the match hould, otherwise not': AAW, A XVI, no. 109, p. 453.

[117] Giovanni Francesco Guido del Bagno, archbishop of Patras.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

order.[118] We have your acquittance of the 23 of March, as I remember, for 35 crownes, receaved of our agent[119] there. I pray you keepe an accompt of that [which] you receive, that our accompts may be entire with him. Noe more nowe but my love and best wishes to your self and Mr Farrare,[120] telling you both that all your freinds could willingly complayne of your seldom writing. God ever keepe you both.

Doway, this 11 of May 1622.

Yours ever,

Champney

If the match goe forward it would be convenient we hadd some honest frend nere the queene. For which purpose we have thought of Mr Clifford[121] of Antwerpe who, as you knowe, by your and your freinds meanes was preferred to the duches of Feria[122] and quitt himselfe well.[123] I wrote hereof to your brother and <he> liketh verie well both of the thing and of the man. The duke of Feria wilbe both able and willing to sett <it> forward if you can convenien[t]ly dispose the business that we be not prevented therein; if the thing fall out you shall do well. Here is a speech that Mrs Ward[124] has put her self in the Inquisition.[125] We knowe not in what sense it may be true. The Lord Digbie is, by this, in Spayn with his wife and eldest sonn and daughter.[126]

[118]The nuncio reported to Propaganda Fide on 8/18 June 1622 that he had appointed the Dominicans Jacques de Brouwer and Nicolas Janssens 'pour faire une enquête au Danemark et en Norvège': *CGB*, I, pp. 212, 261–262, see also *ibid.*, p. 296.

[119]Giovanni Battista Scanarolio, the agent in Rome for the English College at Douai. See *CGB*, I, p. 54. For Scanarolio's letter to John Bennett of 19/29 June 1622, see AAW, A XVI, no. 115, p. 471. For letters to Scanarolio from English secular priests, see PRO, PRO 31/9/90, *passim*.

[120]William Harewell. Harewell had left Rome on 28 April/8 May 1622: CRS, 10, p. 191.

[121]Henry Clifford.

[122]Jane Dormer, duchess of Feria.

[123]On 23 April 1623, William Trumbull provided Henry Clifford with a letter of recommendation to Sir George Calvert, describing Clifford as 'a very sufficient and honest gentleman', who had attended on the duchess of Feria until her death, and subsequently resided in Flanders but wanted briefly to return to England 'to followe his particuler affaires': PRO, SP 77/16, fo. 145r–v.

[124]Mary Ward.

[125]For Mary Ward's arrival in Rome in 1622, and her interview with Gregory XV, see M. Chambers, ed. H.J. Coleridge, *The Life of Mary Ward (1585–1645)*, 2 vols (London, 1885), II, pp. 2–3; *CGB*, I, pp. 69, 136. For the discussion during 1622 of Ward's institute by the congregation of bishops and regulars, headed by Cardinal Bandini, see M.M. Littlehales, *Mary Ward* (London, 1998), pp. 110, 114; Chambers, *Life*, II, p. 59; Dirmeier, *MW*, I, pp. 661–662, 684–685, 698–699, and *passim*.

[126]McClure, *LJC*, p. 432.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[*on p. 452*]

Addressed: Perillustra et admodu*m* rev*erend*o dom*in*o, D[omino] Johanni Benetto, cleri Anglicani in curia Romana procuratori. Romae.

Endorsed: D. Champ[ney]. Maii xi°.

5. Anthony Champney to John Bennett, 20/30 May 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 113, pp. 465–466*]

R*everen*d and respected s*ir*,

M^r^ P*re*sident[127] had y*ou*rs of the last of Aprill and 7 of May. We are sorie of yo*ur* solitude but <glad> of [your] co*n*stancie and corage. God, I hope, will <give> effect to all yo*ur* good endevores. M^r^ P*re*sident doth still co*n*tinue ill. God graunt we may see him one [*i.e.* on] his feete agayne, for w*hi*ch I beseech you pray in those holy places.[128] Yesternight came one hither who was in London the Su*n*day before and brought a message from my Lord Vaux that he did rely upon M^r^ P*re*sident for a chaplayn major of his regiment.[129] For he will not have anie of the Jesuites p*ro*viding.[130] He brought newes of the count of Gondemoors his being at Plimmouth in his way to Spain, likewise of the countess of Buckinghams being Catholike for w*hi*ch the king, he sayth, is angrie. But I pray God her religione be sincere.[131] He telleth also of a booke[132] writen in Latin in France of the co*n*veniencie of the match <which> ~~with~~ Canterburie[133] p*re*sented to the kinge, thinking to p*ro*cure his dislike thereof, but it fell owt quite co*n*trarie. For he liked it so well that he hath caused it to be printed in Inglishe. The

[127]Matthew Kellison.

[128]William Bishop reported Kellison's recovery on 18/28 July 1622: AAW, A XVI, no. 124, p. 501. John Bennett understood on 24 September/4 October 1622 that Kellison had 'fallen backe into his ague': AAW, A XVI, no. 151, p. 587. But cf. *Letters 13*, *15*.

[129]Emerging out of the marriage negotiations with the Spaniards was a concession that Lord Vaux (with another Catholic peer, the earl of Argyll) could raise troops for service in Flanders: see Cogswell, *BR*, p. 20; McClure, *LJC*, p. 428; PRO, SP 94/30, fo. 64r; *CGB*, I, p. 312; see also above, pp. 27–28, 51–52.

[130]The Vaux family tended, however, to function as a patron of the Society of Jesus. See also *Letter 13*.

[131]The count of Tillières recorded that the countess of Buckingham had converted to Catholicism at Easter 1622: PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fo. 44v. See *Letter 14*.

[132]Michel Du Val, *Hispani-Anglica seu Malum Punicum Angl'Hispanicum* (Paris, 1622, translated and published in London in the same year). See Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 39, 41–42, 46, 48, 50.

[133]George Abbot.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

warrant for the deliverie of the lay prisoners was under the broad seale some dayes before his departure from London and, as he sayd, was p*re*sently to be put in execution.[134] He sayd further that the Jesuites hadd made a*n* assembly in London about y*o*ur business to co*n*sult what they showld answer to the reasons for b*ishop*s, whereby I gather that your business is not so nere a*n* end. For I imagin they will p*ro*cure delay till these mens answers come to Rome. They have showed a great deale of violence agaynst M^r^ Newman in Lisboa whereof I doubt not that [you] have heard. You must in the behaulf of all the clergie, who is [*sic*] wronged in him, defend him agaynst their violence.[135]

[*p. 466*] M^r^ More[136] is upon his way hither, and then for Ingland to set forward that house of Lisboa.[137] M^r^ Farrare,[138] when he cometh, shalbe most hartely welcome. It is pitie such mynds or sowles showld not be in better bodies, sed ipse fecit nos ut [*word illegible*: no*n* (?)] ipsi nos. When you were here my leysure was small but, nowe M^r^ P*re*sident is sick, I ame quit[e] opprest. God will either give strength or help, to whose holy grace I committ you this 9 of June 1622.

Yours ever,

Champney

Addressed: Admodu*m* r*everen*do d*omi*no, D[omino] Johan*n*i Benetto cleri Anglicani procuratori in curia Romana. Roma.

No endorsement.

6. John Hazell[139] to Diego de Lafuente, [after 25 July] 1622

[*AAW, OB I/i, no. 64, fos 125r–126v*]

Very r*everen*d s*i*r,

Bycause I have intreated yo*u*r favo*u*r and [*MS damaged*] I will geve yo*u* a true accompt of what I have undertaken and p*er*formed.

[134]See *Letter 6*.
[135]See *Letter 4*.
[136]Thomas More.
[137]Anstr., I, p. 234.
[138]William Harewell.
[139]See H. Bowler (ed.), *London Sessions Records, 1605–1685*, CRS, 34 (London, 1934), pp. 105, 106, 386.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The embassador of Poland,[140] having [*MS damaged*: obtained from our (?)] kinges Majestie the liberty of the lay Catholique prisoners, commended the procuring of [*MS damaged*] to Count Gondomar and Sir Arthure Aston.[141]

But bycause there wanted a solli[citor] [*MS damaged*] was neglected, whereuppon the Catholiques of the New Prison earnestly intreated me to [*MS damaged*] whereunto I gave consent apprehending it to be a busines of small labor and lesse charge.

Thereupon I went to the embasador of Spayne[142] in their name to intreat his assurance aswell bycau[se] the busines concerned the Catholique cause, as also because the embassador of Poland had left [?] it recommended to his lordshipp and he [accord]ingly promised his best helpes, and for a beginning sent one of his follow[ers] with me to M^r^ Secretary Calvert[143] to make me knowne unto him. And withall to lett him understand that I was the man appointed to sollicytt the busynes for the Catholiques.

M^r^ Secretary then promised he wold moove the king and bad[e] me attend at Hampton Court, which I did for the space of foure or fyve dayes, but could gett none other answere than that he had no tyme oportune to moove the king.

This was before Michaelmas. And those dilatory answeres I receaved dyvers other tymes, twice or thrice a week for a month or fyve weekes together. At last, upon a lettre from his Majesty concerning this busynes, he answered his graunt was to be understood by way of banishment.

[140]Jerzy Ossolinski, count of Teczyn. See *Oratie van . . . Georgius Ossolinsky Grave Palatijn van Tenizijn ende Sendomyria . . . ende Ambassadeur aende Koninckl̈ijcke Majesteyt van Groot-Brittaignien . . . den 11 Martij, 1621* (The Hague, 1621); *A True Copy of the Latine Oration of the Excellent Lord George Ossolinsky* (1621). For the ideological significance and objectives of the Polish court's soliciting of military aid from James – namely the possibility of a 'crusade against the Infidel', something which James welcomed and which could be construed, at this point, as part of 'the public critique of the Protestant cause' – see S. Pincus, 'From holy cause to economic interest and the invention of the state', in A. Houston and S. Pincus (eds), *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 281–282, for which reference I am grateful to Paul Stevens.

[141]See Sir W. Fraser *et al.* (eds), *Reports on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Eglinton* (HMC, London, 1885), p. 118. For Gondomar's involvement in the securing of this concession for imprisoned Catholics, see CRS, 68, p. 152; *CGB*, I, p. 46. Sir Arthur Aston co-operated with the Polish ambassador in raising Irish troops for Polish military purposes. A formal complaint against Aston was lodged by the Russian ambassador in June 1622: PRO, SP 14/120/38, 107; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 352, 353, 388; *APC, 1621–1623*, pp. 32, 246; C.W. Russell and J.P. Prendergast (eds), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, 1615–1625* (London, 1880), pp. 334–335; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 164r–v; see also *CGB*, I, pp. 100–101. For Aston's royalism during the civil war, see P.R. Newman, *Royalist Officers in England and Wales, 1642–1660* (London, 1981), p. 10.

[142]Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, count of Gondomar.

[143]Sir George Calvert.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But this answere gave soe small contentment to my lord embassador that he took that graunt rather for a punishm*en*t than a grace, and for his p*ar*t wold not accept of it whereupon, at his Ma*jes*t[i]es next com*m*ing to towne, he renued the suit againe to his Ma*jes*ty and obtayned a promise of their lib*er*tyes upon bonds.

Afterwards, diligently solliciting p*er*formance of this p*ro*mise from tyme to tyme, my answere still was that they were devising a course to doe it in some sufficyent legall manner, for w*hi*ch it was necessarie to consult w*i*th my l[ord] chief justice,[144] the other justices and the attorney generall,[145] and theire opynions to be delivered to his Ma*jes*ty. Soe difficult a matter it was made that in those consultaci[ons] there were fyve months spent, though I did followe it most importunelye from daye to daye, attendi[ng] oftentymes whole dayes w*i*thout audyence or speeche.

At last, upon Easter Monday, M^{r} Secretary tolde me there was nowe a course resolv[ed] [up]on w*hi*ch [h]e had not com*m*ission to declare unto me, but badd me come to him the next daye, and th[en he to]ld mee I was to attend upon my l[ord] keep*er*[146] who wold acquaint me w*i*th the course, w*hi*ch was that all [*MS damaged*] of othe[r] prisons w*i*thin the kingdome should be by wrytts of habeas corpus remooved to the kin[g's bench], and thence deliv*er*ed by the justices of that benche upon their bonds as aforesaid by vertu[e of a w]rytt unde[r] the great seale, devised for this speciall purpose, w*hi*ch onely wrytt my l[ord] keep*er* told me wold cost them iii^{li} a peece besides the charge of the habeas corpus w*i*th other charges belonging thereunto and besides all other fees aswell of keep*er*s as officers.

This charge being considered to be verie great and such as a great p*ar*t could not undergoe, I enformed my l[ord] embassado*ur* thereof, and mooved him that the wrytt might be gotten gratis, which accordinglie he p*ro*cured for the poorer sorte. But this difference betwene poore and rich being likely to breed p*er*plexitie and confusion, we made further suit to p*ro*cure this favo*ur* for all, w*hi*ch also was obtained; onely my l[ord] keeper badd me paye the clarks for wryting.

The wrytt being made, it concerned onelie such as were in prison for refusing the othe w*hi*ch, though it were a principall matter, yet manie being prisoners for other matters, though lesse offensive, we had reason to doubt that these wold not be suffred to have the benefitt of the wrytt, where upon we were forced to make suite that the wrytt might be enlarged and renewed to comprehend all other cases concerning

[144] Sir James Ley.
[145] Sir Thomas Coventry.
[146] John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

recusancye, w*hi*ch was at last graunted, but there were still excepted all other cases, as printing, selling of books, speeches against ministers and the like.

This newe wrytt being made, I p*ro*cured habeas corpus for them of the Newe Prison. But, bycause their remoove from that prison to the kings bench wold have bene both troblesome and chargeable, I p*ro*cured that they might be onlie brought to the kings bench barr where, being presented w*i*th their causes, 2 dayes they were turned back, some p*re*tence of impedyments being still found, whereupon I was still dryven to goe to the secondary of the crowne office and to other officers and to promise them recompence of their fees w*hi*ch were taken awaye, a gratuity for their favo*ur* and furtherance and soe the next tyme of their apparance they were discharged.

Afterwards I proceeded to p*ro*cure the lib*er*tyes and discharge of other prisoners, and soe in those two termes of Easter and Trynitye 1622, w*i*th much importunitie and labor, there were released 4 or 5 and thirtye, for div*er*[s] of w*hi*ch number I was dryven to p*ro*cure from my l[ord] keep*er* speciall warrants, ether bycause there was no cause [*fo. 125v*] of their com[mittal] specified in the Mitt[imus or by]cause some other cause of the aforesaid was added to the cause of their refusin[g the] oathe or recusancye.[147]

The busines in towne [*MS damaged*] it remayned that a course should be taken for such as were prisoners in the contrye [*MS damaged*] [re]moove by habeas corpus may easily appeare to be [a] matter of much trouble and more charge. Therefore I petitioned my l[ord] keep*er* to take [in] to his consideraci*on* the difficultyes of it, especially that many of the Catholique prisoners were not able to beare the charge of their jorney to London, and some through sicknes and age not able to to travell at all. For those that were able to travell it was first graunted by my lord keep*er* that they should be brought up at the kings charge. And soe, to husband the matter well for the kings purse, my lord keep*er* sent to my l[ord] chief justice to drawe a l*ett*re that might be sent w*i*th the wrytts, com*m*aunding that none should be brought up but such as were capable of the kings grace, whereupon my l[ord] chief justice, consulting w*i*th my l[ord] treasorer concerning this l*ett*re, he opposed this course as chargeable for his Ma*jes*ty, notw*i*thstanding

[147] For those Catholics released from prison in 1622–1623, see CRS, 68, pp. 152–154; PRO, C 181/3, fos 70v–71v (lists contained in the docquet books of the crown office in chancery). For the writs in late June and the first week of July 1622 directed to the judges of king's bench 'to take baile' of large numbers of Catholic prisoners for recusancy and for refusing the oath of allegiance, see PRO, C 231/4, fos 141r, 143r. Further writs of this kind (and pardons to Catholic clergy) were issued in late November 1622 and (to judges on circuit as well as in London) from mid-February 1623 onwards: *ibid.*, fos 146r, 146v, 153r, 157r, 157v, 158r, 174r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it was concluded that the king should beare the charge of the poorer sort and th*at* the richer should beare their owne.

But finding in this course dyvers difficultyes w*hi*ch may easily appeare to any mans understanding, aswell for the troble as the charge,[148] I p*ro*posed to my l[ord] keep*er* another w*hi*ch was that the wrytts might be dyrected to the judges of the assizes, to enlarge in their sev*er*all circuit[s] such Catholique prisoners as the wrytts concerned, w*hi*ch course my lord allowing for his part (especially bycause it saved the kings purse) promised to moove the kings Ma*jes*ty in it, w*hi*ch he accordingly did. And soe his Ma*jes*ty com*m*aunded that that course should be taken.[149]

But whereas at first the wrytt was retornable cr*astin*o a*nim*ar*um*, the retorne being soe short, I sollicited anewe for a longer retorne and soe it was graunted to be quindena pasche. I further p*ro*cured my l[ord] keep*er*s l*ett*re unto the judges to declare more expresly and fully his Ma*jes*ti[e]s intencyon that no occasion might be left to interprett the wrytt otherwise than according to the meaninge of that letter.

Moreover, the graunt being made to the embassador of Poland, it was onely understood <onely> [*sic*] of such as were prisoners then, to wytt at the tyme of the grace obtayned, w*hi*ch was about the [f]irst of August 1621, soe that all such as were com*m*itted afterwards were decreed incapable [t]hereof. And therefore, that they also might receave the benefitt of it, we were dryven to make the execuc*i*on of the graunt w*hi*ch was about the first of July 1622.

Thus difficult, troblesome and tedyous a busynes it prooved, and indeed, if it be well considered, it wilbe found a matter of great consequence not onelie for the benefytt that many poore Catholique prisoners enjoyed thereby a legall course, being newly and for this sole purpose devised to bayle those that were condempned in praemunire, but for the countenance it gave to religion, and it did incredibly moderate the passion and malice of the especiall enemyes thereof aswell officers of all quallety as others.

[148]John Hacket memorialized and celebrated the 'mazes wherein' Williams 'led the Spanish embassador, with whom he shifted so cunningly that they could obtain nothing for the toleration of popish recusants but delays and expectations from time to time': Hacket, *SR*, part II, p. 6.

[149]An order from the king to the lord keeper, dated 25 July 1622, admitted that the directions which had been issued concerning the release of imprisoned Catholic separatists on bail 'before the king's bench' were 'very chargeable' to the 'poorer sort of recusants'. Assize judges were empowered to free them 'on the sureties and conditions before ordered': *CSPD, 1619–1623*, p. 429; PRO, SP 14/132/57, fo. 92r; BL, Additional MS 48166, fo. 154r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Besides this I sollicited and brought to p*er*fection an other matter of great consequence w*hi*ch was that after the wrytts of *ad melius inquirendum* were sent and deliv*er*ed to the sheriffs of all the countyes of Wales, I procured a sup*er*sedeas to stay all p*ro*ceedings and messingers at the kings charge to carry them downe. In recompence whereof I receaved bare thanks from one onely man.

Lastly I have now labored in the matter of the informers, no man els willing to shewe himself in it, much lesse to take any great paynes therein or to be at anye charge. I may well saye that nothing had bene done in the generall had I not undertaken it.

Besides I rann hazard of incurring the displeasure of the state, in following with soe much importunitye a busines soe lyttle grateful and pleasing to them. And de facto the bishopp of Durham,[150] w*i*th the judges of that circuit, made great complaints of me to his Ma*jes*tye for my earnestnes and forwardnes in the cause.

I may well add that, to prosecute this, I neglected my owne pryvate affayres as also dyvers good occasions of preferments, as in p*ar*ticuler in any course wherein my l[ord] embassador [*fo. 126r*] Gondomar could have furthered me, w*hi*ch he voluntarilie [*MS obscured*] to doe in any course I should undertake, aswell for the paynes he knewe I took in the [*MS damaged*] busynes as also for some speciall service I had done his l*ordshi*pp.

Seing therefore, r*everen*d good s*i*r, I have taken soe long and great paynes w*i*th so much hindrance and hazard to my self, seing I have disbursed so much moneyes, and ingaged my credytt for much more to gratefie officers and others whose labo*u*r and helpe I used in the busynes, I humbly intreat your charytable furtherance that in recompence of all my labo*u*rs I may not be too much p*re*judiced both in my credytt and state, and I shall ever remayne,

Y*ou*r poore frend and servant [to] be com*m*aunded,

John Hasell

S*i*r, th*a*t yo*w* may the better understand the benefytt I did the Catholiq*ue* prisoners and what charge I saved them, aswell in the fees of the sheriffs as in their remoove from their severall prisons to the kings bench, I thinck good to lett yo*u* knowe that it cost one David East, being a poore man, remooved but from S^{t} Albans to the kings bench, and therat bayled, himself alone six pounds and upwards, and yet the fees of the wrytt was [*sic*] forgeven him.[151] According to which proportyon let it be judged what it wold have cost such as had

[150] Richard Neile.

[151] For the writ in early May 1622 to release David East from the king's bench prison, see PRO, C 231/4, fo. 134v, which also records others (Sir John Webb, William Matthews,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

come from the remote parts, brought up by sheriffs and officers, their charges and all their fees reckoned.

[*on fo. 126v*]

Addressed: R*everendissi*mo in Christo patri D[omino] Didaco de Fuentes espiscopo Madriti.

Endorsed: Mary Q[ueen] Mother.
John Hasel his account about his soliciting for Catho[lics].
Com*m*on Cathol[ics].
Artis intoriatus sive tabelliorum libri duo spirum.

7. William Bishop to John Bennett, 15/25 August 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 133, pp. 533–534*]

Very deare s*i*r and as much respected,

Being to send the inclosed I thought good to add these first to let you understand that M[r] Gage dined with us yesterday, with whom we had much talke for he taried with us 2 howers before and three howers after dinner.[152] For other matters we found him indifferent, but he thought it not expedient that we should have any bishope before his imbassy were passed. He is very confident that he shall p*er*swade his Ma*jes*tie to condescend to all that he hath p*ro*mised in the favour of Catholiques and so to worke that the mariage shalbe presently concluded. He would not have the newes of a bishop to be bussed into the puritans eares before all were concluded, for feare lest they should thereupon cause a new cry against the mariage and so trouble the king. We replied that their malice was rather against Spaniards than o*u*r having of bishops, and that therefore it should be better to ha[ve] bishops before the match, that they might not be hated more for the match and <the> Spaniards sake than for their owne. And that if his Ma*jes*tie would, for ~~the~~ <o*u*r> having of bishops, breake with the king of Spaine, then it were better he should breake with him before the match were made than after, when it should ly in his hands to afflict also the infanta, maried, at his pleasure, when they were better to kepe out of his power, if for any so necessary

William Martin, Barnardine Peppey, Margaret Field, and Grace Cooper) freed by the same means a few days later.

[152] See Questier, *C&C*, p. 397.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a point of o*ur* religion he would be so much moved. Diverse other reasons passed to and fro, he sometimes, between, p*ro*testing that he had not done any evill offices that way. To say the truth he is like to find our king in very good disposition, for he hath promised the Spanish ambassadour[153] that he will take away all penall lawes against recusants, and de facto hath commanded the judges of assise not to meddle with any recusants in this summers circuit. All lay Catholikes be deliv*er*ed on their bondes out of prison.[154] And all priests in prison do walk and rid[e] too, abroad, as M*r* Hewes[155] assured me, at their pleasure. But no assurance from his Ma*jes*t[i]e of any continuance.[156] That must be wrought by his Holines or the king of Spaine. For the co[u]ntenance of Catholik[es] and continuance of their ease it wilbe necessary that his Holines do add to his conditions that three or four Catholike lords may be sworne on the privy councell where all <such> matters are <soe> principally handled.[157] Item, that we may have in ev*er*y shire some two or three justices of peace, either Catholike or Catholikely affected, to defend the country Catholikes in ev*er*y shire.[158] To w*hi*ch end the old oath of <the kings> supremacy and new [oath] of false fidelity must be suppressed in all Catholikes

[153]Carlos Coloma.

[154]On 2 August 1622, Lord Keeper Williams had issued an official instruction to the judges: AAW, A XVI, no. 127, p. 509; AAW, OB I/i, no. 80; TD, V, pp. ccxcv–ccxcvi; PRO, SP 14/132/84. Williams cited reason of state for the king's command to him to pass two writs under the great seal to release imprisoned Catholics. The judges were to comply in the cases of those imprisoned for recusancy, for refusing the oath of supremacy, for having or dispersing popish books, for hearing Mass or 'any other parte of recusancy which doth concerne religion only and not of state, which shall appeare unto you to be totally civill and politicall': AAW, A XVI, no. 127, p. 509; see also above, pp. 30–37.

[155]This appears to be a reference to the writer ('E. Hew[es]') of AAW, A XVI, no. 165, pp. 625–626, whom Matthew Kellison seems to cite as the agent in England for the English College at Douai: AAW, B 26, no. 139; see also AAW, B 27, no. 3; cf. Anstr., I, p. 178, II, pp. 164–165.

[156]Simonds D'Ewes recorded on 4 August 1622 that one of the judges at the Winchester assizes had said that 'the king disliked a rumour of toleration, and was sorrye for his peoples feares, and that hee himselfe was farr from poperye': *DSSD*, p. 89.

[157]In an undated missive (AAW, B 25, no. 82) which was dispatched to Gondomar in Madrid (though written in English) after the count's return there, and which commented on the marriage articles of December 1622 (see Redworth, *PI*, p. 177; Gardiner, *NSMT*, p. 332), William Bishop advised that it should be arranged, 'if it may bee, that two noblemen at the least be made 2 of the kings privy councell, that they may there deale for Catholikes'. The 'fittest' men, according to Bishop, were 'the Lord William Howard, the Lord [Thomas] Arundell of Warder, the Lord Harbert [Henry Somerset], the Lord Ewers [William Eure] and Sir Thomas Savage', and also 'the Lord Clenrichard [Richard Burke]'; Bishop added that the first two were 'the wisest, the gravest and fittest men'. (This modifies Questier, *C&C*, p. 389.)

[158]William Bishop argued that such men might 'winne credit so that, when a parlement is called, they may be chosen knightes of the shire': AAW, B 25, no. 82.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cases. For these, and some such like, it were very expedient that either o*u*r bishope were established, to take order for these orders, or that some of us were deputed by his Holines to go in and treat about them, leave being gotten by his Holines or the Spaniards meanes of the king for our safe entry. M[r] Gage doth make us to feare, albeit you have many hopeful wordes given you, ~~yf~~ <lest> you shall not gett the bishop named before they are fully accorded, w*hi*ch is like to be about or before All Saints as he verily thinketh. If you be forced to stay so long, or otherwise [are] willing enough to have about for the Roman college [*sic*],[159] certify them in England so much and you shall not want either comission or instructions to compass it, as I verily hope. Other newes there is none worth the writing w*hi*ch you shall not heare of Mons*ieu*r d'Aire,[160] for some say that the Cardinal de Rets[161] is dead, a great losse to France but, may be, a plaice to Mons*ieu*r de Lusons cardinalate, w*hi*ch Mons*ieu*r d'Aire greatly desireth, to whom I pray you com*m*end me hartely. And so with my best wishes to yo*u*rself, I do rest.

Yo*u*rs alwaies assured,

W*illia*m Bishope

I do hold it most expedient that you daily make instance for o*u*r bishope, albeit I wish it should be holden as secret as may bee among o*u*r selves for, within a month or two after you have obtained it, his bulles will not be dispatched, and order in p*ar*ticular sett with all due circumstances for his consecration. I thinke it wilbe best cheape in Paris even for D[octor] Chelison[162] or any that come out of England. For here we never want the presence of three bishops, w*hi*ch wilbe hard to find in any p*ar*t of Flanders.

The 25 of August 1622.

[*on p. 534*]

Addressed: A monsieur, Monsieur Bennett, agent du cleargy d'Ingleterre ches Monsig*no*r l'evesq*ue* d'Aire auprès le Mont de la Trinité. A Rome.

No endorsement.

[159] The English College in Rome.
[160] Sébastien Bouthillier, bishop of Aire.
[161] Henri Gondi, cardinal de Retz, who had died on 2/12 August 1622.
[162] Matthew Kellison.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

8. Eaton [Edward Bennett] to John Bennett, 31 August 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 134, pp. 535–538; printed in TD, V, pp. ccxlviii–ccl*][163]

Sir,

Wee receave greate content of your industrious negotiation in the matter of b*ishop*s, ~~but~~ and the happie success thereof.[164] Neverthelesse, our adversaries, who have not bene able to prevayle againste you there, have not omitted to stirre up coales here and, as is very p*ro*bablie thought, have stirred up the kinge and state to oppose in the businesse. The lord keeper[165] hath bene lately w*i*th the Spanish embassadour,[166] complaininge, as from the kinge, that the pope went about to sett up b*ishop*s in his kingdome againste his will, w*hi*ch in former ages was not wonte to bee done but by the princes nomination; and w*i*thall signified that he understood they should be created w*i*th titles of Canterburie, Lincolne etc., w*hi*ch must neede cause great exasperation in the state and would by noe meanes bee

[163]Only the postscript of this letter is in the hand of Edward Bennett.

[164]In reply to a previous letter sent by Edward Bennett on 4 August, John Bennett notified him on 30 September/10 October 1622 that, 'for our suite of bishops', the secular clergy leadership's opponents 'leave nothing untryed to hinder it; and, having bene foyled here (for we have a decree before his Hol[iness] for it), they fly to his Majesty of England for help, and here give out that his Majesty is offended with the motion; and all to delaye'. John Bennett advised that 'you must helpe there, that from thence we be not hindred. They oppose themselves to his Majestyes designes what they can, and yet will make him by art serve their turne. There is no meanes to assure his Majesty against there slightes but to bring in bishops whome his Hol[iness] will charge soe to governe his people that it be without offence to his Majesty. And, if bishops had governed hertofore, his Majesty had not bene troubled w*i*th such plotts as have bene discovered to the hazard of his Majesty and the ignominy of Catholicke relligion. I praye putt that in exequution which in my last I did soe earnestly desire and gett, if you can procure it, a testimoniall from the Spanish embassad[or] for the present want of bishops and send it to me'. John Bennett instructed his brother to 'forgett not alsoe to drawe reasons to satisfy his Majesty. 1. We seeke but one bishop. 2. Titular in partibus infidelium, not in England, soe as there wilbe no cause of emulation with them at home. 3. His jurisdiction will not be larger than that of the archpriest. 4. It wilbe limited and knowne. 5. It will serve to keep our opposites in order. 6. It will oblige the superior to accounte of his owne and his subjectes actions and consequently [p]reserve his Majesty and estate from all trouble that way': AAW, A XVI, no. 156, p. 605. He further instructed him to warn James that 'if he should be against ordinary jurisdiction, without which Catholick relligion cannot stande, they here presently will take heed therof and bring his Hol[iness] into jeleousy that his Majesty meaneth not well towardes Catholickes and that all is but a shewe; and soe make him doubtefful to proceede in the matter of dispensation; specially, his Majesty suffering soe many bishops in Ireland and that without inconvenience': *ibid*; see also Questier, *C&C*, pp. 399–400.

[165]John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.

[166]Carlos Coloma.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suffered.[167] The embassadour answered he had not bene informed concerninge the state of this bussinesse and therefore could, for the present, give him noe full answere. Only this, he sayd, hee had heard, that the clergie p*re*tended bishops but not w*i*th any such titles as he spoke of, but only w*i*th episcopall authori[ti]e to minister the sacrament of ~~extreame u~~[~~nction~~] confirmation and performe other things pertaininge to such a function. Neverthelesse he promissed to informe himselfe better concerninge the whole matter and afterwards give the kinge and his lordship ~~better~~ a fuller answer. Upon this the embassadour hath writ[t]e to the Spanish embassadour[168] there w*i*th you to knowe in what termes ~~that~~ the matter stands.[169] Some

[167]Williams, said Hacket, was inspired by 'so great [. . .] disaffections to that corrupt and unsound Church' that he 'watched' the Catholic clergy 'more narrowly than any other counsellor'. He intervened when they petitioned Buckingham 'to assist them for the erection of titulary popish prelates in this kingdom'. Buckingham consulted Williams, and Williams advised that it 'would set all the kingdom on fire and make his Majesty unable to continue those favours and conveniences to peaceable recusants'; and that it would take away 'from his Majesty an hereditary branch of the crown', namely 'the investitures of bishops'; and furthermore it would be worse than an 'absolute toleration'. For whereas, in France, toleration 'doth so divide and distinguish towns and parishes that no place makes above one payment to their church-men [. . .] this invisible consistory shall be confusedly diffused over all the kingdom'. The result would be that 'many of the subjects shall, to the intolerable exhausting of the wealth of the realm, pay double tithes, double offerings and double fees'. This was one reason, in fact, why the Irish nation was so impoverished. Also, 'if the princes match should go on, this new erected consistory will put the ensuinge parliament into such a jealousie and suspition that it is to be feared that they will shew themselves very untractable upon all propositions'. Finally, it was against 'the fundamental law of the land' for 'the pope to place a bishop in this kingdom'. Hacket claims that James ordered Williams to put these arguments 'with his best skill to the Spanish embassador', and that Williams pretended to Coloma that he 'was startled at a heady notion that came from Savoy, as he thought', concerning Catholic bishops. Williams urged Coloma 'to send for the Savoyan [ambassador] and to wish him to throw aside his advice for titulary bishops lest it should hinder the king of Spain's desire in accommodating the Catholics with those courtesies which had been granted': Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 94. James had heard, remarked Alvise Valaresso, of a petition to the curia to appoint four bishops, and that the pope would grant two, one of them being Diego de Lafuente. The king was infuriated at the proposal to give those who were appointed 'the title of the bishoprics of this realm': *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 403. William Bishop, however, argued that Williams had 'a good affection to our religion', and that the fault lay with Coloma: AAW, A XVI, no. 164, p. 623.

[168]Francisco de la Cueva, duke of Alburquerque, Spanish ambassador in Rome.

[169]Lord Keeper Williams had told Buckingham on 23 August 1622 that Coloma 'took the alarum very speedily of the titulary Romish bishop, and before my departure from his house at Islington [. . .] did write both to Rome and Spain to prevent it'. Williams said that the regime's information about the suit for bishops with the titles of established sees had in fact come from Tobias Mathew. Williams observed that Mathew would 'prove but an apocryphal and no canonical intelligencer, acquainting the state with this project for the Jesuites rather than for Jesus['s] sake': *Cabala*, p. 70; BL, Harleian MS 7000, fo. 98r; see also *Letter 23*. Mathew had revealed the project initially to his friend Sir Francis Bacon: TD, V, p. 90. In a letter to Buckingham of 29 September 1622, Mathew denounced 'those indiscreet

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of ours, who live about this towne, have bene too negligent in not preoccup[y]inge the embassadour[170] *wi*th the substance of our designes, and stayinge his hand from intermedlinge, to the p*re*judice [*p. 536*] of our affayres in a businesse alreadie determined by the sea apostolike. But, neverthelesse, wee hope all will goe well. For althoughe he bee much addicted to the Jesuits, as he himselfe confesseth, yet he seemeth a noble and honeste minded man and hath promised to favour us in all juste pretensions, and w*i*thall to informe our kinge and his ministers what we pretende, to see if we canne gaine the state by fayre meanes w*hi*ch, if wee cannott, we shall [*word deleted*] have his helping hand to further our designe however, w*hi*ch is all wee doe desire. This wee have, from his owne mouth, this morninge, M*r* Broughton, who is nowe very forward for b*ishop*s,[171] M*r* Harvie,[172] M*r* Barker[173] and my selfe haveinge bene w*i*th him to treate about this businesse. The newes of the Spanish embassadour interposinge himselfe in this affayre after such a maner troubled us all. But the greatest feare is paste and wee have not spared to speake playnely and signifie unto him expressly that the Jesuits are the only men that oppose us and therefore have desired him he give noe eare unto them in our matters, to our prejudice, w*hi*ch he hath promised he will not, w*i*thout our knowledge. And soe wee departed from him w*i*th greate contentement and satisfaction.[174] Afterwards, I went to the

English Catholicques which I declared to your lordship heertofore to have drawn a purpose from the pope to consecrate and send hither some English Catholicque bushops', for they had 'proceeded so farr as to name the men', namely Matthew Kellison, William Bishop, Richard Smith, John Bosvile, Cuthbert Trollop, and Edward Bennett. Mathew claimed that 'the Jesuits have had no part in this negotiation' but that, 'if the business proceed, some one or more of them will also gett to be made bushops heer': BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 82r.

[170] Carlos Coloma.

[171] On 22 August/1 September 1622, William Bishop reported from Paris that Richard Broughton 'hath even now written unto the nuncio of France and among <other> things doth tell him that matters amend apace in England and that now it wilbe no danger to have bishops if it so please his Holines. He estemeth Doctors Kellison, Bishope, Smith and Champeney to be very gratefull to the cleargy and that any of them wilbe acceptable': AAW, A XVI, no. 136, p. 541. In a letter of 23 October 1622, Broughton explained to John Bennett that 'I was never against bishops but onely I wished yt had beene stayed a little longer before begunne'. Broughton added that, 'since our first beeing with' Coloma, he (Broughton) had 'beene there agayne to putt hym in mynde to bee and continue our frend'. John Colleton, with Cuthbert Trollop and Roger Strickland, had also been to visit Coloma: AAW, A XVI, no. 167, p. 631.

[172] Joseph Haynes.

[173] Oliver Almond. Elsewhere his alias is given as Parker: Anstr., I, p. 7.

[174] William Bishop sent word on 26 September/6 October 1622 that Coloma had dropped his objections: AAW, A XVI, no. 153, p. 595. On 29 September, Edward Bennett commented to his brother that the king had shown Coloma 'a letter written by Secretary Calvert in the name of the king to show the kings dislik as before. Now we know that there is a Jesswet [a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dutch embassadour,[175] acquaintinge him *w*ith what the l[ord] keeper had delivered to the embassadour, and desireinge him, in occasions, to signifie to the kinge and his ministers that wee pretend noe more but what the Spanishe embassadour hath alreadie signified to the lord [*p. 537*] keeper, that is, to have a b[ishop] ~~who may~~ or b*ishop*s, w*i*th some forraine title, who may exercise amongst us the function of episcopall authoritie, who hath promised all favour.[176] Wee are upon p*re*sent departure; and soe, in haste, I end.

London, this 31 of Auguste, 1622.

Yours,

Eaton

I use another hand because I am soe busye. It is two a clock, and am to goe 27 miles this night. All this morninge I was w*i*the these embassadours and, [I] hope, [they have] don us som good.

[*on p. 538*]

Addressed: Admodu*m* r[everendo] d[omino], D[omino] Joanni Bennetto cleri Anglicani apud sedem apostolicam agenti. Romam.

Endorsed: M^r^ Faringt[on].[177] Aug[ust] 31.
I had in mine that the lord keeper sayd we went about to make an archbishope of Canterburry and of Yorke and, when the ambassadour told him that they p*re*tended [*three words illegible*] onely to [*word illegible*] and to kepe order among priestes, he was appeased.

reference, presumably, to Mathew] who is well acquainted with the sayed secretary, whom we vehemently suspect in this bussines. It is certayn if [. . .] [Gondomar] had been heer, he had soe satisfied the king as that a bushop might have come in withowt any notice of the estate taken of hym'. The way was now clear for the pope to appoint a bishop, and 'it must not be in the estate['s] liking or disliking whether we have bushops or no. If it were soe, we should have no goverment at all heere': AAW, B 47, no. 30; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 403.

[175]Jean-Baptiste van Male. For van Male, see C.H. Carter, *The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598–1625* (London, 1964), ch. 11.

[176]Van Male promised Edward Bennett that he would speak to the lord keeper to 'shew him how litle cause they have to except against the priestes for seeking for bishops': AAW, A XVI, no. 147, p. 567.

[177]The name Farrington was one of the aliases used by Edward Bennett.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

9. Caesar Clement[178] to [John Bennett], 31 August/ 10 September 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 137, pp. 543–544*]

Verry wor*shipfu*ll syr,

W*i*th the occasion of directinge unto yow th*is* l*ett*re, I lett yow knowe t*hat* I sent an answer to y*o*u th*e* 28 of Aug[ust] and t*hat* here be many discourses uppon whose head th*e* mytre off th*e* graunted b[ishop] shall lyght, amonge whome su*m* would make to believe that yow labour onlie for y*ou*r brother,[179] and t*hat* th*e* ende off this business is to seeke y*ou*r selves, and t*hat* itt hathe not th*e* com*m*on consent. I do as a frende warne yow what is sayde, even by su*m* verry grave men off th*e* clergie. We hope itt is otherwyse, thowgh th*e* hydinge off th*e* parson[s] from us th*at* ar interessated in itt, and th*e* pretendinge to have an anomalu*m* com*m*ended by th*is* nuncio,[180] maketh th*e* mattre not a little suspect. Iff yow go thus to worcke yow will marr all and make th*e* m*att*re of b*ishop*s odious agayne. Yow be discrete ynowgh to looke well abowtt yow t*hat* yow be not founde partiall in th*e* carriage off so waightie a busines. Th*e* best were th*e* election wer as neare canonicall as o*u*r state will permitt, t*hat* nott onlie th*e* assistents butt others allso off respect t*hat* ar abrode wer harde theyr opinion in individuo, t*hat* he myght be a parson pleasinge and off partes requisite. For iff yow make him amonge y*ou*r selves onlie, yow must allso looke t*hat* he shall stande by himself when yow shall need concell and helpe off those who hetherto have assisted yow. Wee knowe who be uppon th*e* liste and who ar borne in hand t*hat* ar not. To doo well, itt showlde go by the voyces off th*e* gravest and off most respect, w*hi*ch his Holl[iness] and protect*o*r can easilye have iff itt wer so propounded. Remembre th*e* sturres past, because they instituted an archpriest[181] in th*e* begin*n*inge w*i*thowtt hearinge th*e* clergie, w*hi*ch clergie yow must not thincke is

[178] Caesar Clement was, at this point, vicar-general of the Spanish army in Flanders, as well as dean of the church of St Gudule in Brussels: *CGB*, I, pp. 8, 120–121.

[179] Edward Bennett.

[180] For the unwillingness of the Flanders nuncio (Giovanni Francesco Guido del Bagno, archbishop of Patras) to become involved in the process of nomination for an English bishop, and his opinion that it was primarily the concern of the Paris nuncio (the 'ordinarie of England'), see AAW, A XVI, no. 144, pp. 561–562; TD, V, pp. 88, 89. The Flanders nuncio was, from time to time, tacitly sympathetic towards the vicar apostolic in Holland, Philip Rovenius, whom the English secular clergy regarded as a friend, principally because of his hostility to some of the religious orders; on the other hand, the nuncio was not (in general) a critic of the Jesuits and was also an enthusiastic supporter of Mary Ward: *CGB*, I, pp. 68–69, 107, 136, 162, 245, 251, cf. p. 514.

[181] George Blackwell.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in Inglande onlye, w*hi*ch opinion wer a grounde off division to th*e* wronge off many, w*hi*ch therfore I have laboured w*i*th M^r^ D*oct*or Kellison to take awaye all we cowlde to bringe in true correspondence between those at huome [*sic*] and abrode, t*ha*t so th*e* com*m*on cause myght have more poise, and speed th*e* better, w*hi*ch I wowlde had so ben observed in this off b*ishop*s. Off w*hi*ch no more, w*i*th my kyndest com*m*end*ation*s.

From Brussels, the 10 off Sept[ember] 1622.

Y*ou*r unfayned frende,

C[aesar] Clement

No address or endorsement.

10. Oliver Almond to John Strong [Matthew Kellison], 31 August/10 September 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 138, pp. 545–546*]

R[ight] worthie sir,

I am right glad of your recoverie, and the 3 lynes you wryt did co*m*fort me much, beinge a tooken of some amendme*n*t. I have thought good to lett you understand in respect my name is used in Rome (as appeareth by a l*ett*er written by Don Anselmo[182] unto M^r^ Presto*n*[183]) co*n*cerning some speaches had betweene the sayd M^r^ Presto*n* and myselfe[184] of the death of D[octor] Kinge, b[ishop] of Londo*n*.[185] I reme*m*ber I related [*word omitted:* them] unto the r[ight] r[everend] archpriest, D[octor] Harreson deceased. And the truth was, as I can nowe call to mynd, th*a*t M^r^ Presto*n* never co*n*fessed unto me but denyed th*a*t ever he reco*n*ciled or in th*a*t kynd dealt w*i*th the b[ishop] of Londo*n*.[186]

[182]Robert (Anselm) Beech OSB.

[183]Roland (Thomas) Preston OSB.

[184]In November 1613, Anthony Champney had suspected Almond of being in agreement with Preston's opinions concerning the 1606 oath of allegiance: *NAGB*, p. 117.

[185]For the circulation of the rumour of Preston's involvement in the alleged conversion of Bishop John King, see D. Lunn, *The English Benedictines, 1540–1688* (London, 1980), pp. 51–52; *Letter 13*. John Gee claimed that he had asked among the London Catholic clergy which priest had reconciled the bishop and 'they named to me F[ather] Preston': T.H.B.M. Harmsen (ed.), *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare (1624)* (Nijmegen, 1992), pp. 143, 91.

[186]In May 1621, John Chamberlain had commented that the reason for the story was that Bishop King had 'out of charitie (both before and in his sicknes) [. . .] relieved some priests that were in prison'; a correspondent of William Trumbull said that Preston was one of them: McClure, *LJC*, p. 376; Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare*, p. 91.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But he sayed th*a*t he thought t*ha*t he myght be prayed for, yf at his death he required a priest and were co*n*trite. But I doe not know th*a*t eyther he sayed Masse for him or caused others to doe it. I moved a doubt yf he were not reco*n*ciled nor absolved ab excommunicatione, havinge binn a notorius percussor clericoru*m*, and as it were no*m*inatis exco*mmun*icatis p*er* bulla*m* coenae, th*a*t we could not offerre sacrificiu*m* pro [?] a*nim*a eius but only praye privatly for his soule and reme*m*ber him in o*ur* meme*n*to. This was the passage of those busines[ses] at th*a*t tyme, so fare as I reme*m*ber. I have credibl[i]e h[e]ard, but I did not see it, th*a*t in March last, or end of Februarie, there was a booke uppo*n* the presse, or prynted, intituled the Bishop of Londons Legacie, wherein was p*ro*bablie proved t*ha*t the b[ishop] recanted his errors and dyed a Catho[lic]; but it was suppressed and came not publickly to lyght although some have privatly seen it.[187]

For the sermon, preached on 25 November 1621 by Henry King, which refuted the rumour of the conversion, see *DSSD*, p. 58; Henry King, *A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse* (London, 1621).

[187] For George Fisher's *The Bishop of London his Legacy* (Saint-Omer, 1623), see ARCR, II, no. 557; A. Davidson, 'The conversion of Bishop King: a question of evidence', *RH*, 9 (1968), pp. 245–246; *Letter 13*. Antony Allison and David Rogers (ARCR, II, no. 557) attribute the tract to Fisher, although cf. *Letter 23*, which perhaps implies that Richard Broughton (who had cited the alleged conversion in his *English Protestants Plea*, p. 19) may have been the author or have had a hand in it. For Broughton's defence of the book, see AAW, A XVII, no. 3, pp. 9–10; *Letter 13*. Broughton wrote to Thomas Rant on 28 April 1624 that 'I thinke you have h[e]ard' that, during John Bennett's agency in Rome, 'the author of the booke to the last parlament' (i.e. Broughton himself) 'was complayned of in the consistory for writeinge [that] D[octor] Kinge, Protestant bishop of London, dyed a Catholick'. (Rant believed that the complaint came from Thomas Preston.) However, Broughton successfully 'justified himself', and now 'the Jesuits at S. Omers have published that b[ishop] his book of the authors of his chaunge in religion. Yt came publick hither about Christmas last but with a new preface; for, in the first which came forth in the beginning of March was 2 yeares and then was in the archb[ishop] of Canterburyes hands, it sayd the booke was delyvered to the publisher by the b[ishop] of London to bee published after his death; in the second, onely they say constantly that hee dyed a Catholicke, not affirming the other': AAW, B 26, no. 45. For the second edition of *The Bishop of London his Legacy*, see ARCR, II, no. 558; *Letter 20*.

The book was printed on the Saint-Omer Jesuit college press. However, some Jesuits may have been dismissive of it. According to John Gee, the Jesuit Lawrence Anderton believed that it was too obviously a forgery: 'he was sorrie that ever any such booke should be suffered to come forth: for it would doe them more hurt than any booke they ever wrote': Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare*, p. 144; cf. Thomas Scott, *Boanerges: or the humble supplication of the ministers of Scotland, to the High Court of Parliament in England* (Edinburgh [false imprint; *vere* London], 1624), p. 24. Nevertheless, the book appears to have been exploited by the secular clergy in order to argue at Rome that the Protestant episcopate in England was no longer as resolutely anti-Catholic as it had once been. William Bishop, in a letter to John Bennett, enclosing the volume, assumed that it could be used in this way: *Letter 23*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The k[ing's] M*aje*stie sent the l[ord] keeper[188] of the great seale of England unto the Spanish embassador[189] (as I think, misenformed) th*a*t they [*sic for* the] priests sought to have manie b*ishop*s w*i*th Englishe titles, as it were to affront the b*ishop*s of England. The embassador hath wrytten to Rome to be enformed of this matter.[190] It is thought co*n*venient, yea necessarie, th*a*t we have on[e] b[ishop] (intituled of Hippo or Alexandria, it is no matter where), in place of the archp[riest][191] deceased, to be a sup*erio*u*r* and governe eccl*esiastic*es more s*ecundum* cannones eccl*esi*ae, and lett not o*u*r suyte in any case surcease in this kynd, but pursue the grant and gett the man no*min*ated. Thus mu[ch], yf you think good, you maye signifie to M[r] Ben[nett] or send him this my l*ett*er. And so w*i*th all good wishes, especially the recoverie of your streng[t]h and health, I tak[e] my leave.

London, this 10*th* of Sept[ember] 1622.

Yours ever to use,

Ol[iver] A[lmond] or J. Bark[er]

[*In hand of Anthony Champney*] S*i*r, this letter coming so fitly and the author desiring it should be sent to you, we would not omitt to send it. Here w*i*th it is M[r] Oliver Almond[s] letter, alias Jo[hn] Barker. We have not leasure to copie it; therefore reserve the leter.

[*on p. 546*]

Addressed: To his worthie good frend M[r] John Stronge at Dowe.

Endorsed: [*on p. 545*] Oliver Almond, assistant, who amongst many of his worthy labours converted the Lord Stafford[192] and lived with him till his death.[193]
[*on p. 546*] M[r] Barker. Septemb[er] 10[th].

[188] John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.
[189] Carlos Coloma.
[190] See *Letter 8*.
[191] William Harrison.
[192] Edward Stafford, 4th Baron Stafford. See *NCC*, p. 193.
[193] Oliver Almond died before June 1625: Anstr., I, p. 7. Lord Stafford died in September 1625: Cokayne, *CP*, XII/i, p. 186. In mid-1621, Stafford's sister Dorothy, following her unfortunate marriage to a lawyer from Lincoln's Inn, was in Spain and seeking to 'gett entertaynment under the Lady Doña Maria [. . .] and so to rayse a fortune if happily the match shold succeed with England': PRO, SP 94/24, fo. 176r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

11. William Farrar [Harewell] to [John Bennett], 4/14 September 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 139, pp. 547–548*]

Very reverend and respected sir,

It is now a moneth since M^r President[194] had any letter from you. In my last[195] I advertised you that the king had given a charge unto all ministers in England not to speake in their sermons any thinge against the pope or Catholickes. This was writt us from England. Since, we have receaved a copie of the directions given by the kings appointement in this behalfe unto the ministers,[196] which I send you hereinclosed, whereby you shall see whereuppon that report rose and how farre it is verified. All the lay Catholickes throughout the realme are now sett at libertie. There arrived heere 3 dayes agoe a scholler out of the North, who affirmes it for those partes;[197] by whome also I understood of a peece of busines <happened lately in that countrie> w*hi*ch I thought good to give you notice of, and therefore have caused him to sett it downe in writing, w*hi*ch I send you togeather w*i*th this. He reportes also that some moneths agoe the bishop of Durrham,[198] accom*m*odating the quire of the <cathedrall> church, tooke up a stone w*hi*ch bare the inscription of a bishop (whose name was Shirley[199]) buried under the same some 200 and odde yeeres agoe. The workemen digging under that stone light uppon the bishops bodie, w*hi*ch was found entire lapt up in lead, the intirenesse whereof one of the workemen trying w*i*th his finger found it firme and solid flesh. The bodie was buryed againe in the same place and the matter silenced as much as they could.

[194] Matthew Kellison.

[195] This letter does not appear to have survived.

[196] For King James's directions concerning preaching, see K. Fincham (ed.), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, 2 vols (Woodbridge, 1994, 1998), I, pp. 211–213; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 32–35, 37; Shami, *John Donne*; McClure, *LJC*, p. 449. Simonds D'Ewes remarked with sarcasm that Richard Sheldon, in his provocative anti-popish sermon of 1 September 1622, concluded (as did 'allsoe all our ministers') that 'the late articles the king had sett foorth, especiallye that of preaching in the afternoone upon the points of the catechisme, would bee of [. . .] good use for the beating downe of poperye': *DSSD*, p. 95.

[197] For the virtual cessation in September 1622 of the proceedings of the high commission at York against Catholics, see Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, High Commission Act Book, 16, fos 300r–322v.

[198] Richard Neile.

[199] Walter Skirlaw, bishop of Durham (d. 24 March 1406). He was buried in a chantry tomb at the altar of St Blaise and St John of Beverley: *ODNB*, *sub* 'Skirlaw, Walter' (article by M.G. Snape).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Their is some variance and hart burning in England amongst some (you know whome <M^r [*name deleted*], M^r Rouse[200] et[c].>) about the settling of the affaire of b*ishop*s.[201] Heere also some have averted D*oct*or Clement[202] from the same by wronge information. But this day M^r President hath writt to him at large to make all straight againe.[203] M^r President salutes you and desires you againe to remember his indulgences, agnus Deis, medals <pardon for S*i*r Charles [*name obscured*]> etc. M^r D*oct*or Champney also remembers himselfe unto you. The post is ready to goe and I have no more time, having all this day been troubled partely w*i*th M^r President[s] letter to D*oct*or Clement, partely w*i*th other encombrances. So, w*i*thout more ceremonie, I take my leave.

Y*ou*rs ever,

W[illiam] Far[rar]

Doway, 14 Sept[ember] 1622.

No address.

[*on p. 548*]

Endorsed: M^r Farrar. Septemb[er] 14^th.
Matheus.

12. Eaton [Edward Bennett] to John Bennett, 14 September 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 140, pp. 549–552; printed in part in TD, V, pp. 124–125*]

Syr,

I was glad to see y*ou*rs to o*ur* good frend M^r D[octor] Bushop, of the 15 of August, and that you are soe well in healthe. The last weeke I writt unto yo*u* from London. Now I am to awnswer this <of yo*ur*s>

[200] Richard Broughton.

[201] See *Letter 8*.

[202] See *Letter 9*.

[203] On 14/24 September 1622, William Harewell advised John Bennett that Caesar Clement (who, Harewell noted in a letter four days later, was 'of great authoritie with the nuncio, and in that court, and one who must be respected, els our cause is like to fare the worse': AAW, A XVI, no. 147, p. 567; cf. *CGB*, I, p. 32) was 'no friend of the Theatins', i.e. Jesuits, 'though <ordinariely> he be moderate in his speeches as houlding that a point of wisdome'. He had spoken 'roundly of them' to the Flanders nuncio: AAW, A XVI, no. 144, p. 562; see also AAW, A XVI, no. 161, pp. 617–618.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unto D[octor] Bushop. Yo*u*r paynes not only hath deserved much at the handes of the clergy but alsoe hath drawen them to acknowledge a great obligation unto yo*u*. For Gods sake come not away before all be dispatched, especially about b*ishop*s. The confirmation you have gotten of the colledge of Lysbon doth much comfort us. Benedictus Deus. We long to heer of the nomination but, as yo*u* say, we hope it will come in good tyme. I pray God those Jessuetresses[204] have no way given to their cowrses. All indifferent good men wonder they are not clean dissolved. The Jesswetes give owt that either they must dissolve or [*word omitted:* go] to clausure.[205] And M^r^ Young[206] the Jesswete <tould me> that the Jesswetes since the beginning of there order had not beene so much wronged in ~~there~~ any thing as in the seeming dependanc[e] the Jessw[e]trices had upon them.[207]

M^r^ Georg[e] Gage is <com> six weekes a goe. At first they gave owt he came with the dispensation; now that he had only the coppye of it w*hi*ch, having showed the king, he disliketh two pointes: that his Holl[iness] setteth down for motives inducing hym to dispence viz the Catholicke education of children hoped for; 2^l[y]^ tolleration of religion to English Catholicke[s] with some security for the same. And that Georg[e] Gage is to goe to Rome abowt it. This the Jesswetes give owt. If he doe come, I suppose he shall have no letters of creditt from the king or estate, and that hym self is the first mover of the jorney. He must p*ro*cure his comendations from the Spannishe embassadour.[208] In my last[209] I towld you what conferenc[e] I had w*i*th hym [*in margin:* the sayd embassador], having in my company M^r^ Broughton (who now is sure for us), M^r^ Barker[210] and my nephew.[211] Now I send yo*u*

[204]The members of Mary Ward's institute.

[205]See Littlehales, *Mary Ward*, p. 114; Dirmeier, *MW*, I, pp. 713–714, 716, II, pp. 77–8.

[206]Francis (or John) Young SJ. See CRS, 75, p. 342.

[207]The Jesuit general, Muzio Vitelleschi, tried very hard to prevent John Gerard SJ assisting Mary Ward: ARSJ, Anglia MS 1, *passim*; Dirmeier, *MW*, I, II, *passim*. In June 1621, Vitelleschi had ordered that a book written by John Price SJ in favour of Mary Ward's institute should be neither printed nor circulated in manuscript: ARSJ, Anglia MS 1, fo. 141r; Dirmeier, *MW*, pp. 544–547; H. Peters, *Mary Ward* (Leominster, 1994), p. 289. For the general's directive in early 1620 to Richard Blount SJ to ensure that no member of the Society should be 'mixed with their direction or government', see Chambers, *Life*, II, pp. 13–14; for Blount's orders to this effect which were issued on 19 July 1623, see Dirmeier, *MW*, II, pp. 3–4. For English Jesuits, such as Roger Lee and Andrew White, who were noted supporters of the institute, see Chambers, *Life*, II, pp. 50–51, 53–57; Dirmeier, *MW*, *passim*; *Letter 29*.

[208]Carlos Coloma.

[209]*Letter 8*.

[210]Oliver Almond.

[211]Joseph Haynes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a coppye of the good archdeacons <of Cambrayes>[212] letters to me, concerninge the embassadours liking of what had past between us. [*Four words deleted.*] <Withe these I write unto hym> secretly to deale with embassadors that he give Gage no letters of creditt in any thinge to deale in the affayers of the clergye. But I can not beleeve he will come to Rome <about the dispensation>, that matter belonging only to the Count Gundemar, Pater Maistro and your self <in the name of the clergy>. Upon his arivall <heer> my nephew spoke with hyme. He seemeth to comend your payns and, talking of bishops, he sayed the pop[e] was a good man but did not understand res transalpinas.[213] See the arrogancy of this fellow in censuring the cheef pastor. You must be carefull to keepe this relation of the archdecon secrett. Heer be letters caried up and down which his Hollines should write to the archduches[214] in the behaulf of the Jessuitre[sse]s wherof they bragg much but many beleeve them not.[215]

I have not seene M^r^ Whitnal.[216] My nephewe telleth me he speaketh wonderfull much good of you and is desirous to see me.

That relation. [*sic*] How, after your first audience, his Hollines should send for you and tell you that he had h[e]ard [of] you as a man sent from the body of the clergy. Now, as a private man, he comaunded you to tell hym your opinion of the king, and that you should awnswere he was not to be trusted, [and] withall advise his Holl[iness] to warn the Catholick kinge not to goe forward with our king without such assurance as he could not be deceaved. This Doctor Bosvile[217] towld me, having h[e]ard it from [*p. 550*] a very worthye gentleman [*in margin on p. 549:* M^r^ Baker], seeming to deliver it as come from the Jesswetes. I can not send it you with any other testimony than this. You know

[212] François de Carondelet, archdeacon of Cambrai, who came to London in late 1622 to assist with Carlos Coloma's embassy: CRS, 68, p. 158.

[213] See also AAW, A XVI, no. 153, p. 595 (William Bishop to John Bennett, 26 September/6 October 1622); AAW, B 47, no. 30 (Edward Bennett to John Bennett, 29 September 1622).

[214] Isabella Clara Eugenia, the infanta-archduchess of Austria, and ruler of the Netherlands.

[215] For Isabella's patronage of Mary Ward's institute, see Littlehales, *Mary Ward*, pp. 106–113; Chambers, *Life*, II, p. 92; Dirmeier, *MW*, *passim*.

[216] On 22 August/1 September 1622, William Bishop noted Mr Whetenhall's arrival in London: AAW, A XVI, no. 136, p. 541. A pass was issued to one Thomas Whetenhall in February 1623, permitting him to travel abroad for three years (he had previously, in April 1622, been issued with a licence to stay abroad); this Whetenhall took the oath of allegiance: *APC, 1621–1623*, pp. 192, 427. Thomas Rant recorded in late 1623 'the storye how the Jesuitts would have putt M^r^ Whitnal (bycause hee was camerado to M^r^ [John] Bennet) into the Inquisition; but Card[inal] S[anta] Susanna, who knewe him, hindred yt': AAW, B 25, no. 102.

[217] John Bosvile.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that they vent owt ther infection by thear followers soe that, fale it owt as it list, they will escape shott free. [*In margin:* Noat.]

Within these 4 dayes Jenkyn was heer. He called as he came from London. Your cosen is very well with all her family. I have written unto her such newes as I had from you. All thinges goe heere very well, wherof in my last I made particular mention. It should seeme you have latly written some letters to me which I have not receaved. All frendes be well and salute you. I pray remember my best frend[218] and my self to Pater Maistro. I have written to the counte de Gwndemar and acquainted hym with my lord keepers[219] beinge withe the Spannish embassadour about bishops, [and] informed [him] of what hath hapned, intreating his helpe. God keepe you.

Ever yours,

Eaton

Edward Bennett[220]

Sept[ember] 14.

As I was writing these my frend came to me and sayd, comend <me> most kindly to my cosen, tell hym that he <doe> lack nothinge. The party that moved hyme to the jorney will not see hym want. God blesse her. As world <the> [*sic, for* the world] hath gon with us hetherto, we would not have stood withowt her. She is a Mellania[221] unto us. [*In margin*: My old Lady Dormer.]

It is highe tyme our superiour be named. Heer is no order taken to helpe any thing that is owt of order nor any body in deed to sett any thing in order. I wonder with what conscience our opposites labour to hynder superiority amongest <us>, being soe necessary that withowt it all will [come] to ruine and perdition. You must tell his Hollines (wherof I could write many particulars unto you if I thought they came saffly unto your handes) it is heer the comon opinion amongest the clergye that we have no adversaries but the Jesswetes, who in nothing seeke our good. Therfor thinck [*sic*] that his Hollines can not in conscience suffer them to have goverment in any thing that belongeth to the clergye. And, surely, if the cowrse of ther proceedinges be not soone and much altered from what it is, the whoale clergy of England wilbe constrayned to protest to the sea apostolick against them as overthrowers of the cleargy, and soe seek

[218] Lady Elizabeth Dormer.
[219] John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.
[220] In the hand of Thomas Rant.
[221] St Melania (the younger): see D. Atwater, *The Penguin Dictionary of Saints* (Harmondsworth, 1965), p. 242.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

means [*words omitted:* to prevent us (?)] from having any thing to doe w*i*th <them> in matter of goverment belonging unto us. Beleve me, it will come to these extremityes if that ther be no order taken w*i*th them, and ordinary jurisdiction [*words omitted:* be not] planted amongest us.

[*p. 551*] It is much marveled heer how M^r^ Gage came to the coppy of the dispe*n*sation w*hi*ch he showed the kinge and what autority he had to publishe it. For it is imagined that the counte de Gwndemar and Patre Maistro w*i*th yo*ur* self should have had the p*ro*mulgating of it.

No address.

[*on p. 552*]

Endorsed: M^r^ Faringt[on]. Septemb[er] 14^th^.

13. William Farrar [Harewell] to [John Bennett], 20/30 September 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 148, pp. 569–570*]

Very reverend and respected sir,

I writt unto you on Satturday last[222] from Brussels, and againe on Wednesday last[223] from hence being then newly come home. What successe I had in that busines you recom*m*ended to me there, I writt at large before, and therefore it <is> needeles to repeate it heere, the shortenes of the time also affording me no laisure thereunto. Since my last <w*hi*ch was but two dayes agoe>, wherein I sent you ~~a copie of~~ a letter[224] ~~from~~ of M^r^ Broughtons <writt hither> and a copie or two more of other matters, there is another letter come to M^r^ D*oct*or Champ[ney] from him, wherein he writes that he heares it reported the king is not well pleased w*i*th the forme of the dispensation, the copie w*hi*ch M^r^ G[eorge] Gage brought him setting downe as motives the education of the children (hoped for by this marriadge) in the Catholick faith, and toleration of religion for Catholickes w*i*th some

[222] AAW, A XVI, no. 144, pp. 561–562.
[223] AAW, A XVI, no. 147, pp. 567–568.
[224] In the margin, Harewell writes: 'by that letter you shall understand that M^r^ Broughton doth now professe to joyne in the sute of bishops'. For Richard Broughton's letter (AAW, A XVI, no. 135, pp. 539–540), see *Letter 8*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

securitie thereof.[225] This is secretly talked of, and that his Ma*jes*tie is secrettely <also> thereat discontent[ed][226] but doth not outwardly shew it, w*hi*ch (sayth M^r^ Broughton) is to be well liked, if true. It is sayed that M^r^ Gage shall presently returne to Rome about this matter though others thinke there is some other pretence therein. M^r^ Broughton writes he was tould by one that had ~~him~~ it from M^r^ Gage himselfe that he was to returne.

Cardinal Mellino <in the name of the cardinals of the Inquisition> writt a letter to M^r^ President[227] to know who was the author of a booke entituled *English Protestants Plea* etc., whereunto the saied M^r^ President gave his approbation.[228] ~~Whereunto~~ To this letter M^r^ President returned present answer, the same day he receaved <it> [*three words deleted*], informing him and the congregation that the author thereof was one M^r^ Broughton, an assistant.[229] In regard of the notice he had from you by y*our* last of certaine exceptions, w*hi*ch some there seme to take against the booke, it was wished heere that M^r^ President had enlarged himselfe a litle more in his answer, and added a word or two that there was nothing contained therein w*hi*ch might justely be excepted against. I will deale w*i*th him, if I can, to write a second letter to Mel[lino] to that effect so that (if you thinke it good) you may stay that w*hi*ch comes to you in my <last> packett of the 28^th^ of the present. I suppose there is no such hast therein. I thought good to send you the booke it selfe of M^r^ Broughton heere enclosed, that you may see what it is that is excepted [*p. 570*] against. The places are underlined according to the copie w*hi*ch the Jesuits scored as matters of great note and reprehension. It is no marvell they are displeased

[225]For George Gage's return to England with the terms of the dispensation, see PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 199v; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 122v; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 412; McClure, *LJC*, p. 452; *Letter 12*.

[226]For James's objections to the terms of the dispensation, see *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 418.

[227]Matthew Kellison.

[228]Richard Broughton wrote to John Bennett on 23 October 1622 that he had heard that Cardinal Giovanni Garzia Millini 'desireth information of the b[ishop] of Londons death'. Nevertheless 'hee that wrote the Protestants Plea had many reasons, as hee thought, to write as hee did'. In particular, he had heard 'for creditt' that John King 'had testified with his owne hand his reconciliation, as many thinke yt was convenient hee should': AAW, A XVI, no. 167, p. 631; see also *Letter 10*. On 24 September/4 October 1622, John Bennett noted that, in 'the last weekes congregacion before the cardinalls', he had been 'called in and amongst other thinges they inquired much concerning the maner of death of King, bishop of London'. Thomas Preston OSB had alleged that he knew nothing of the matter. But he mentioned Broughton's *English Protestants Plea*, which Matthew Kellison 'should approve for the printe, and <sayth> it were needfull the truth were knowne with the author'. Bennett defended Kellison's approbation of the book on the grounds that it related only 'to faith or good maners'; but his interrogators asked 'might we not by him know what the author were, that the truth of the story may be knowne?': AAW, A XVI, no. 151, pp. 588–589.

[229]i.e. an assistant to the former archpriest, William Harrison.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

therew*i*th. They would have no mens creditt rise, none talked of but themselves. The monkes have also carped thereat no lesse than the others because he preferres the labours of the clergie before those of the religious.[230] Heere is a letter of procuration come from M[r] Colleton w*i*th the handes and seales of the rest of the assistants thereunto, giving power to M[r] Newman to accept in their names the donation of Don Pedro,[231] and to oblige the clergie to the performance of all conditions required by the founder. It is made in the Portugall tongue and writt in partchment. <It goes away for Spaine this day.> The newes at Brussels before I came thence was <current> that Heidleberg was taken by Count Tillie[232] <by assalt> and all putt to the sword.[233] W*i*th what blood it will breed in England is doubtefull. I thinke I forgott to write heereof in my last. My L[ord] Vaux came not this way,[234] being (as we are informed) averted from that purpose by the Jes[uits] at St Omers, whither he came w*i*th a full resolution to have taken this place in his way and to <have> seen M[r] President. Heere was some provision made for him. His entertainement at S. Omers by the Jes[uits] is reported to <have> been very great and so did a friend of ours also write thence. M[r] President and M[r] D*octo*r Champ[ney] salute you. The next weeke you shall have some lines from M[r] Pres[ident] himselfe, for so he promises, whereby you shall see that (God be thanked) he is now prettily recovered and almost himselfe againe. In hast w*i*th my service to y*ou*r selfe and my freindes w*i*th you, I rest. Doway 30 Sept[ember] 1622.

Yours ever,

W[illiam] Farrar

When I was making up my letter, I was tould that presently uppon the coming forth of this booke of M[r] Broughton, w*hi*ch was printed

[230] For one instance of Broughton's tract's abrasive attitude to the regulars, see Broughton, *English Protestants Plea*, pp. 5–6. Broughton had, however, at the time of the appellant controversy, issued publications which were sympathetic to the Society of Jesus. See, e.g., his *An Apologicall Epistle* (Antwerp [false imprint; printed secretly in England], 1601), p. 46; and his *First Part of the Resolution of Religion* (Antwerp [false imprint; printed secretly in England], 1603), pp. 53–54.

[231] Pedro Coutinho.

[232] Jean 't Serclaes, count of Tilly.

[233] For the taking of the elector palatine's capital of Heidelberg, with conventional plunder but not the massacre indicated here, see Cogswell, *BR*, p. 20; Pursell, *WK*, p. 184; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 467, 469; *DSSD*, pp. 97–98; *HMCMK*, p. 137.

[234] On 18/28 September 1622, William Harewell reported that Lord Vaux had 'newly come over' and that the secular clergy at Douai expected 'him heere this night'. There were 'saied to be come with him (besides some 2,000 come before) 800 soldiers and some 80 gentlemen of note that accompanie him, all very gallant': AAW, A XVI, no. 147, p. 567.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by Heigha*m*[235] at St Omers, the Jesuits made complaint of the printing thereof unto the bishop there, who thereuppon sent the book underlined in the places you shall see to M^r President w*i*th a letter unto him advertizing him what exceptions were taken thereat, and desiring to be informed thereof. M^r President returnes the whole passage in every place of exception, in Latin, w*hi*ch, when the bishop sawe, his censure of that book was that he sawe nothing in <it> that any should take offence at, but that the author spoke honorably of all persons, giving every one their due respect etc. This was the bishop of S. Omers verdict, wherew*i*th the Jesuits, not being satisfied, they threatened to send the book to the nuncio, and it is like they sent <it> up to the cardinals of the Inquisition. And this is the comedie thay have acted.

No address.

Endorsed: M. Ferar. Septemb[er] 3[o].

14. William Bishop to John Bennett, 23 September/ 3 October 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 150, pp. 585–586; part printed in TD, V, pp. ccxlvi–ccxlvii*]

Very worthy s*i*r,

I held my handes the last weeke, hoping that you would have dispatched, and have been ready to come downe with Monsieur d'Aire[236] who, I fear mee, will not stay long there, now he hath obtained Mons*ieu*r Lusons[237] red capp; for that he is wholly his. I begin to feare now lest M^r Gage will proove a cold p*ro*phet, who told us, as I advertised you, howsoever you were faire p*ro*mised, ye[t] that <the> byshop should not be chosen and dispatched till all the covenants about the match were th[o]rough[ly] agreed upon. Yet it may be otherwise, and that they stay onely to heare what their nuncios will report, w*hi*ch, assure yourself, will be in our favour; this nuncio[238] for us here; he[239] in Flanders for D[octor] Kellison. Ere this, I hope you have <received> the commendations, w*hi*ch diverse here, of the greatest ~~great~~ <credit> (considering the absence of the nuncio, and the death of the card[inal] of Retz, byshop of Paris), did very willingly give us, and that in very ample maner; w*hi*ch being joined to the <two>

[235] John Heigham.
[236] Sébastien Bouthillier, bishop of Aire.
[237] Armand-Jean Du Plessis, bishop of Luçon, and now Cardinal Richelieu.
[238] Ottavio Corsini, archbishop of Tarsus.
[239] Giovanni Francesco Guido del Bagno, archbishop of Patras.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cardinals[240] that have been here nuncio, and Bentivolio,[241] 7 yea[rs] before in Flanders (who, besides, doth exceedingly affect D[octor] Kellison), and the archbyshope of Armach,[242] and [the] byshop of Aire, will serve abondantly. And I think that Mons[ieur] Bartin[243] will, if need be, be very foreward for ~~for~~ mee, more much [*sic*] than I am worthy. Besides, one of the chiefest of o*u*r faculties, <the> theolog[ic]all of O*u*r Ladies, and now allso, during the vacation of the byshope, one of the vicar generalls, tels me that he, hearing of the matter, hath written very affectionately in my behalfe to the cardinal of S^{t} Susanna who esteemeth him much.[244] All this I tell you for yo*u*r satisfaction; protesting that I do not, in any case, desire that most weighty burden to light on my shoulders but that the court may not rest misinformed of our simple qualities. Father Archange[245] resalutes you very hartly, and is of opinion <with whom I agree> that it is best that you <to> [*sic*] come down, assoone as you have gotten yo*u*r dispatch for one bishope, that you, wee and they of Doway may conferr togither about the p*ro*ceeding of o*u*r bishop for his officers and of all his affaires; and afterward you may, if you please, returne, if we cannot find a fitt man to send in yo*u*r place; w*hi*ch I feare verely we shall not do. M^{r} Gage, as some suspect, hath put it into the lord kepers[246] head <at least he seemes so conceited> that, if we have bishops, it will be to put them out of their places. But o*u*r byshop shall p*re*tend no more to their bishoprickes than our priests do to their benefices, or religious men to their religious houses. And no question but, when he shalbe

[240] Roberto Ubaldini and his successor as nuncio in Paris, Guido Bentivoglio.

[241] In late 1623, Bentivoglio promised Thomas Rant assistance with the secular clergy's suits in Rome: AAW, B 25, no. 102.

[242] Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh, who resided in Rome, was a supporter of the secular clergy leadership's agency at Rome. See A. Macinnes, 'Regal union for Britain, 1603–38', in G. Burgess (ed.), *The New British History: founding a modern state 1603–1715* (London, 1999), p. 34; J.J. Silke, 'Primate Peter Lombard and Hugh O'Neill', *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 22 (1955), pp. 15–30; *NAGB*, p. 79. Though he had formerly supported the rebel earl of Tyrone, Lombard had, by the time of Tyrone's death, come to 'favour a rapprochement with the English crown in the hope of achieving some measure of toleration': H. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 110–111. Thomas Rant recorded how, in Rome, Lombard discoursed about how much 'the Jesuitts' had 'wrong[e]d the kings title in writinge Dolman', i.e. the *Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Ingland*: AAW, B 25, no. 102; H. Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion* (Woodbridge, 1993), pp. 4–5, 182. In September 1622, Lombard had added his voice to those who were trying to persuade the Roman curia that the regime in England would genuinely try to get a toleration through a packed parliament: Gardiner, *NSMT*, p. 177.

[243] Claude Bertin, superior of the French Oratory in Rome.

[244] For Cardinal Scipione Cobelluzio, see Chambers, *Life*, II, p. 140.

[245] William (Archangel) Barlow, a member of the Paris community of the Capuchins. See Allison, RS, p. 183.

[246] John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

well informed <of> o*ur* manner of p*ro*ceeding, he and his Ma*jes*tie both will rest better conten[t] to have a bishop among us than to let the priests and Catholikes to be swaied by the Jesuits, whom they take for busy bodies and enemies to their p*er*sons and state. And you may promis, if need bee, when our bishop is here consecrated, he shall not enter into England till the Spanish ambassador hath made his way to the said lord keper, yea, and to his Ma*jes*tie also. Catholikes be daily better and better used in England. And S*ir* Edward Cooke being out of the Tower for threatning, as it were, the king that we [*sic for* he] would repent him of shewing to[o] much favour to Catholikes, was by his Ma*jes*tie send [*sic for* sent] back to the Tower, there to lodg[e] till he had learned more witt. Concerning M^r^ Father Percies conference,[247] it is writen that the lady[248] afterward went to church,[249] and there being two daies conference in the former he was by many reported to have had the better, though many also say the contrary, but in the Saterday he was reported to have had the worse. I have seen the former daies conference set out by himselfe with many additions, what he thought to have said, and yet, I assure [*p. 586*] you, in <my> poore judgment <and in D[octor] Smiths> is [*sic, for* it] was a slight peece of worke, not worthy [of] such an audience wherefor [*word illegible*] inferred [?] very prudently. Were it for nothing els, we have great need of a learned bishop who is able to stand in confractione, or at least that is able to call forth some of the best learned among us to defend Gods truth.[250] Thus much in answer to

[247] For the series of debates held over three days (24–26 May 1622) between the Jesuit John Percy (who had converted the countess of Buckingham to Rome) and leading Protestant divines, as well as the king, see above, pp. 13, 30. For Richard Blount SJ's account (of 8 October 1622) of the disputation between John Percy and Francis White, see AAW, A XVI, no. 154, pp. 597–598; ARSJ, Anglia MS 1, fo. 163r.

[248] Mary Villiers, countess of Buckingham.

[249] The countess's reward from the king for announcing that she was returning to the Church of England was reported to be £2,000. On 22 June 1622, John Chamberlain noted that, on the previous Sunday, she had received communion in the chapel royal 'with both her daughters (though they had receved the weeke before)'. By September, Chamberlain, like others, understood that she had 'relapsed into poperie and makes open profession, wherupon she is sent from court and (as is said) confined to her house at Dalbie in Lecestershire': McClure, *LJC*, pp. 439, 441, 451; see also *Letter 16*. A long letter of October 1622 from Sir George Paul urged her to renounce the Church of Rome: BL, Harleian MS 1581, fos 244r–246v. Rumours and libels circulated about her, including, as Simonds D'Ewes recorded on 10 January 1623, 'a booke [. . .] called "the Chast Matron", in which was discovered all the villanis, witchcrafts and lasciviousnes' of the countess: *DSSD*, p. 113; see also McClure, *LJC*, p. 457; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 137–138; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 88.

[250] On 18/28 July 1622, Bishop had observed in a letter to Bennett that, 'among the questions which our king is said to have [asked] the Jesuits to be resolved, the chief is whether the pope [can] depose kings. To which, as the report goes, they meane to answer that F[ather] Generall hath forbidden them to treat of that question, which will not satisfy

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

your letters. I will add this one observation, hoping that you shall have o*ur* bishope, that his buls must passe sure, because that is already granted to all the Irish, as my l[ord] of Armach can tell you, <yet> some 50 crownes or thereabout[s] will neverthelesse be layd out for officers sees. [*In margin:* This is privilegi*um* pauperem.] Thus with my very harty salutations, I rest.

Yo*ur*s alwaies assured,

W*illia*m Byshope

The third of October 1622.

I, fearing Mons*ieu*r d'Aires absence, will write to you hereafter by Monsieur Bertin of the Oratory.

On Michaelmas day F[ather] Sillesden,[251] accompanied with F[ather] Talbot,[252] passed ~~out of England~~ <by this towne> towards Rome. What newes they cary, we heard not, saving that here they gave out that the lay Catholikes were not deliv*er*ed out of prison according to the kings letters patents, w*hi*ch to speake absolutely was false, for that the most of them be out. If some one man in some remote shire be not, that is nothing to the purpose.[253] Their meeting of 45 in one house in London was knowen afterward to the king and very evill taken, enough to have made him fallen out with us all. They excused it and say it was to chuse the said Sillesdon to goe to Rome to be present at a councell of their elect and to be the agent for the English Jesuits there.

Some Protestants of the best intelligence in this towne do report that they saw of late a comission under the kings <broad> seal and under the princes seal passe thorow this town to the Lord Digbie in Spaine, who now is earle of Bristow, to conclude the points of the mariage.[254] I send you a copy of the kings comandement and the bishop of Canterburies exemtion [*sic*] thereof for the framing of preachers

the king. And againe some thinke that his Holines will not take it well that they should be silent in that important point being by a king questioned about it': AAW, A XVI, no. 124, p. 501.

[251] Henry Bedingfield SJ. See CRS, 75, p. 294.

[252] Thomas Talbot SJ. Talbot served as a chaplain to Lord Vaux: ARSJ, Anglia MS 1, fo. 164v.

[253] See *Letter 15*.

[254] John Bennett had been told in March 1622 that Digby's title (he was created earl of Bristol on 15 September 1622, although his promotion was rumoured as early as January of that year) was not to be announced until he arrived in Spain: AAW, A XVI, no. 105, p. 439; see also McClure, *LJC*, p. 422. The count of Tillières ascribed Digby's promotion to Gondomar: PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fo. 39r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not to speake against the match nor against Catholikes.[255] I further add that the Catholikes have paid nothing for their recusancy [in] the last halfe yeare. [*In margin:* This with M^r [Ir]elands letters by Mons*ieu*r Bernard, my l[ord] of Rhemes[256] chaplaine.]

Addressed: A monsieur, Monsieur Bartin, père de la congrégation de l'Oratoire logé a St Louis.
Pour estre donné (si luy plaist) à Mons*ieu*r Bennet, agent pour le cleargé d'Angleterre à Rome.

Endorsed: Suarum de fide disp. 19 19 sect 2^a^ n. 21 propositiones non [*two words illegible*] mentem censura*m* [?] heresis [*word illegible*].
M^r^ D[octor] Bishop. Octob[er] 3.

15. William Farrar [Harewell] to John Bennett, 25 September/5 October 1622 (with postscript by Matthew Kellison)

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 152, pp. 591–594; printed nearly entire in TD, V, p. 122*]

Right worthy and respected sir,

Since my last,[257] w*hi*ch I writt unto you the last weeke by the way of Paris, having but a few daies before sent by the way of Brussels from Paris, we understand that there passed by there of late a coople of Jesuites, by name F[ather] Talbot and F[ather] Silesdon,[258] that are making to Rome.[259] In that place they gave out that the lay Catholickes are not yet released in England. It is not to be doubted but they who, so neere home, and amongst those who are like to know the trueth of matters, are not ashamed to report so manifest untruethes, will, further of[f], be more bould in their relations and reportes. You may, therefore, know this for certaine trueth that (as I have heeretofore writt unto you) all the lay Catholickes that were, in any place in all the kingdome of England, imprisoned meerely for religion are dismissed, freed and sett at libertie by vertue of the king his speciall letters under his broad seale

[255] For the royal directions concerning preaching, see *Letter 11*; and for George Abbot's letter accompanying them and qualifying them, see Shami, *John Donne*, pp. 75, n. 1, 105–106; K. Fincham (ed.), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church*, 2 vols (Woodbridge, 1994, 1998), I, pp. 213–214; George Abbot, *The Coppie of a Letter sent from my Lords Grace of Canterburie* (Oxford, 1622).

[256] William Gifford, archbishop of Rheims. See Anstr., I, p. 133.

[257] *Letter 13*.

[258] Henry Bedingfield SJ.

[259] See *Letter 14*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to that effect. This we have for certaine, not onely of such Catholickes are [*sic for* as] were imprisoned for the Catholicke religion in London but even of those in the North, in Lancashire, Herefordshire and, in a word, in all other places and partes of the realme, from whence we had both speciall letters advertizing us thereof; and also divers scholars lately come from those severall partes, who affirme the same; insomuch that they report there be some released in the castle of Yorke who <for their conscience> had suffered 38 yeeres continual imprisonment <there>, others 26, others more ~~for their conscience~~. And although some heere and elsewhere thinke they be not freely and absolutely released, w*i*th[out] any manner of restriction etc, but onely uppon bale, as the com*m*on course of releasement is, yet you know that that manner of releasing uppon bale is, in a sort, equivalent to a free and absolute releasement. And, seeing they are released by the kinges special grant, they cannot be recalled again but by the kinges special com*m*and, and under his or a number of the privie counsell their handes. True it is that we heare there be yet some detained in Lancaster who were com*m*itted heeretofore for printing <of Catholicke bookes> to whom the judges [*p. 592*] (more strict heerein than perhaps they can well justifie) will not permitt this priviledge and favoure of his Ma*jes*tie to be extended, they being com*m*itted <(as they say)> not for matters of religion but for printing, the w*hi*ch is, by a special lawe of <the> realme, prohibited to all (of what religion soever they be) save such as be publickely licensed, w*i*thin the cittie of London onely and the two universities, out of w*hi*ch places, you know, there is no printing permitted or allowed in all England.[260] W*i*thall, we understand at Durrham the bishop[261] of that place, uppon the releasement of the rest of the Catholickes, on his owne authoritie kept still in prison a Catholicke woeman possessed and another in whose house the saied possessed woman had been, at severall times, exercised; w*hi*ch yet was more than he could doe. But it seemes he ought [*sic for* owed] the divell a spight and so ment to keepe him in prison for it.[262] These

[260] William Bishop wrote to John Bennett (in a letter dated either 30 September/10 October 1622 or 10/20 October 1622, but probably the former) that 'the last newes out of England is that all Catholike prisoners are delivered all England over except four printers in Lancaster gayle who are said to be detained under colour of medling in matter of state, though the printers prisoners in London were delivered as well as others', and that 'all priests about London aswell Jesuites as others are out of prison under one pretence or other, saving some fewe in the Clinck who, as it seemes, will not go out': AAW, A XVI, no. 157, p. 609.

[261] Richard Neile.

[262] It is possible that Bishop Richard Neile (who had been involved in suppressing the puritan exorcist John Darrell) was reacting to the circulating reports of the recent attempted exorcism, by Catholic clergy in the Coventry and Lichfield diocese, of William Perry, the 'boy of Bilson'. See Richard Baddeley, *The Boy of Bilson* (London, 1622); A.W. Foster, 'A biography of Archbishop Richard Neile (1562–1640)' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1978), p. 21.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

two presidents are all that I can heare ~~can~~ <likely to> be alleadged against the generall releasement of all Catholickes, w*hi*ch I thought good to give you notice of, to the end you might be provided against such shameles untruethes and lies as will, perhaps, be given out there in this matter. M^r^ Gage his emploiements are much talked of in England. They say the king and he spend whole howers, sometimes 3 or 4 togeather, in private conference. He gives out he is presently to return in all post hast to Rome.[263]

The king, uppon the newes of the taking of Heydleberg, sent the marques of Buckingha*m* to the Spanish embassadour[264] to expostulate w*i*th him thereabout, betwixt whome there passed a terrible conflict of huge and mightie wordes insomuch that they say they were so loude, in the heate of their reasoning the matter, that they were heard many roomes of[f]. Yet the skirmish ended in peace, and the marques <before he departed> supped with the embassadour.[265]

We are informed that ~~the~~ Tobie Matthew gives out [that] some have raised sinister reportes of him because he will not be drawne to be a slave to the clergie.[266] It seemes some take notice of his Jesuites weedes and his priesthood, w*hi*ch he would gladly conceale, if he could, thereby to carrie matters more smoothely than otherwise he is like, but, I thinke, in vain. Besides other good proofes heereof there ~~be some~~ <is one> in these partes whose ~~parentes have~~ <mother, a

[263]See Gardiner, *NSMT*, pp. 178, 182; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 485, 490.

[264]Carlos Coloma.

[265]The official Spanish line was that Heidelberg had been taken 'onely to drive those wicked souldiers out of the countrey who lived on the spoile and would not suffer the countrey <men> to till the ground, with reservation of it to the king of England to dispose of for his daughter': AAW, A XVI, no. 157, p. 609. William Harewell reported on 16/26 October 1622 that (as he was informed by William Law, now serving as chaplain to Carlos Coloma) James 'does [. . .] offer Manheim and Frankendale to have Heidleberg delivered againe, which hitherunto he would never offer', although Mannheim (defended, like the other towns, by English troops under Sir Horace Vere) was on the verge of surrender, and fell on 18/28 October: AAW, A XVI, no. 171, pp. 663–664; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 470, 505; PRO, SP 14/134/13, 14, 15; *DSSD*, pp. 102, 105, 106; Redworth, *PI*, p. 57; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 171, 185–186. For Bristol's unsuccessful diplomatic attempts to save Mannheim from the count of Tilly's forces, see Patterson, *King James VI and I*, pp. 320–321. In Madrid, in February 1623, Bristol offered to the Spanish court that Frankenthal should be put into the archduchess Isabella's hands in return for the abandonment of the siege, with provision to restore it 'si la paix avec l'empereur n'était pas conclue': *CCE*, pp. 117–118. For the treaty signed by James concerning Frankenthal, surrendering it in mid-April 1623 for a specific period to the archduchess (though the government in Brussels decided in April 1624 that this agreement was abrogated by the breach of the Anglo-Spanish marriage treaty), see *CSPD, 1619–1623*, pp. 502, 504, 511, 516, 519, 526, 529, 531, 532, 550, 567; *APC, 1621–1623*, p. 446; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 159r; PRO, C 115/107/8485; *CCE*, p. 125; *CGB*, I, pp. xxi, 293, 300, 304, 312, 456, 492, 495, 508, 509, 528, 534, 543, 547, 555–556. See also *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 296, and *passim*; Redworth, *PI*, p. 73; Pursell, ESP, pp. 707, 708; *CCE*, p. 184; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 458, 465, 468, 470, 476, 481, 485.

[266]i.e. the secular clergy.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lady of good note,> told him that yong Tobie had saied Masse in her house.[267] And yet these men persuade themselves they can walke invisibly. Enough [*p. 593*] of this. In what case M^r President[268] is I leave to his owne relation, and the testimonie you shall have thereof from the subscription beneath. M^r D[octor] Champney salutes you most kindely. In my last, I writt what passed with the Spanish embassadour in our sute for bishops, which I hope will come short.[269] If otherwise, you may know he writt uppon mistaking, and now he is of another judgement. God keepe you in health. You are by all our friendes heere and elsewhere most earnestely entreated not to stirre thence till all thinges be fully settled and (if it be possible) another come to supply your place. In your absence you know how all matters are like to goe.[270] No more at this present but my service to your selfe, P[adre] Maistro, M^r Seton.[271] Adieu.

Yours ever in all service,

W[illiam] Farrar

Doway 5 Octob[er] 1622.

[267]For Mathew's secret ordination, though he was not a Jesuit, see *Letter 3*.

[268]Matthew Kellison.

[269]Joseph Haynes remarked on 12 October 1622 that, the night before, Coloma had told him that the rumour that a bishop had been appointed for England was untrue, because Cardinal Millini had recently written to him 'for to nominate some on[e] whom he thought most fitt to be our archpreist', although Coloma had replied to the cardinal that the English secular clergy were determined to secure an episcopal appointment: AAW, A XVI, no. 158, p. 611.

[270]On 24 September/4 October 1622, John Bennett reported to William Bishop that 'the delay of nomination yet houldeth me; whereof, being weary, I repayred to his Hol[iness] and complayned bitterly, and soe to the cardinals. Some answer his Hol[iness] made at first, as if the danger were not great for a small tyme; to which I replyed that we spent noe daye or weeke in this delay without losse of soules. Wheruppon I insisted very earnestly; soe as his Hol[iness] promised I should forthwith be dispatched. My memoriall was noe lesse earnest than my wordes; which, by comandment from our f[ather], was the next congregacion before himself, within two dayes, readd, and a resolution made, as they conffesse, that I should have speedy satisfaction; but the particulers I cannot yet lerne'. Bennett insisted, however, that the secular clergy would be satisfied only with 'a superior of our owne choice'. In the mean time the secular clergy's adversaries at Rome 'fayne a hundreth chymeras in there owne braynes nothing at all to the matter, and then publish there own fictiones for truth; as, for example, that they here expecte the event of the dispensation before any thing be in this determined. But they knowe litle of the estate of e[i]ther. For our sute dependeth not <at> all of the maraidge; and, I assure you, we had our graunte when here they were doubteffull whether the maraidge would hould or noe': AAW, A XVI, no. 151, pp. 587–588.

[271]William Seton, of Meldrum in Aberdeenshire, a friend of the English secular clergy in Rome. He was attached to the household of Cardinal Scipione Cobelluzio: D. Shanahan, 'The descendants of St. Thomas More: Reverend Thomas More IV, 1565–1625', *London Recusant*, 3 (1973), p. 89. William Bishop pointed out in late December 1623, after the election

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[*In Matthew Kellison's hand*]

Deare Sir,

Seing that my recoverie is so deare unto you, these lynes shal serve to shew unto you that I ame living, and not onlie living but (thankes bee to God, his mother, his saintes, and my freinds prayers) soe recovered as I walk abroad about the howse and garden. I congratulate yo*u*r good successe and better hopes of yo*u*r negotiation which, if it should not succeed, yet our countrie and clergie should be never th*e* lesse <bound> to you, yea having used al[l] zeale, industrie and dexteritie and having made matters more known than ever and brought them to <a> better passe than ever before, so that you have at least opened th*e* way for another tyme, and (as we hope) for this tyme. I com*m*end my selfe to yo*u*r prayers there.

Yours own ever,

Matth[ew] Kellison

No address.

[*on p. 594*]

Endorsed: M[r] Ferrar. Octob[er] 5[th].

16. William Farrar [Harewell] to [John Bennett], 4/14 October 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 159, pp. 613–614*]

Very reverend and respected sir,

M[r] D[octor] Champney hath y*ou*r last of the 12[th] of September. Y*ou*r desire for the satisfying of the nuncio[272] heere, and the labouring of his furtherance of y*ou*r affaires, is in such sort accomplished as I was able

of Maffeo Barberini as Urban VIII, that the new pontiff had been cardinal protector of the Scottish nation, 'and therefore M[r] Seton is like to be well knowen to him': AAW, A XVII, no. 63, p. 204. Thomas More understood that Seton was, like George Con, 'knowne to his Majestie'. This was because Seton was 'nere of kinn to the late chanceler of Scottland' (Alexander Seton, 1st earl of Dunfermline) and 'most gratfull unto him'. He had 'lyved some yeares in this court wher he hath gott good experience and great frends and acquantance': AAW, A XVIII, no. 55, p. 337. Seton was no friend to the Jesuits. He told Thomas Rant that 'within theis 6 yeeres, ther have byn 2 Jesuitts dyed in the Inquisition for revealinge of confessions', and although 'one of them indeede was gott out to the Jesu, a day before hee dyed [. . .] bycause his sicknes was in the Inquisition, and his neernes to death ther, wee may say hee dyed ther': AAW, B 25, no. 102.

[272] Giovanni Francesco Guido del Bagno, archbishop of Patras.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to doe it, whereof I presume yo*u* have ere this understood by two of mine. I feare the Jesuites have possessed the eares of that nuncio, or els the Spanish embassadour[273] his letters against y*our* sute (whereof I have already writt unto you once or twice) have made him could [*i.e.* cold] in that affaire. Yet, as I informed you at large, I persuaded my selfe that I left him well satisfied (as also D*oct*or Clement, who is a great man w*i*th him) though I did not finde him desirous to have any dealing w*i*th us in that kinde, save uppon occasion that his sentence and judgement were authentically required by some in ~~there~~ <authoritie in that court> in w*hi*ch case onely he promised his helping hand. But, for that I have writt of this matter and of the manner of my negotiation w*i*th him sufficiently heeretofore, I spare to make a needeles repetition thereof now againe.

It is noe marvell the good fathers make such triumph <there> for the vict[or]ie F[ather] Fisher[274] gott against D*oct*or White. Even in these partes they <gave> out no lesse. But those who are not ashamed of trueth ringe anoth[er] tune. What I writt to you of that matter came from M^r^ Broug[h]ton and M^r^ Nelson[275] under their owne handes, and we heard it from divers that came from England as a thing commonly talked of to the litle creditt of the good father. I can not certainely informe you whether the lady[276] was reconciled againe or no.[277] But certaine it is uppon that disputation she went to the church. [*In margin:* my lady of Buckingham.]

D*oct*or Worthington[278] is this day setting forward from hence towardes England. He returned five dayes agoe from Brussels where he lay (and thereabouts) the space of 5 or 6 weekes expecting answer from Rome concerning his congregation, not omitting in the meanewhile to labour the nuntio there in that behalfe. He gives out now to some heere w*i*th whome he is most confident that he hath lately receaved licence from the cardinals to p*ro*ceed w*i*th his congregation untill such time as a superior be appointed <in England> (w*hi*ch he hopes will not be in haste) to whome then it shall belonge to judge of the conveniency of it, and whether it shall be allowed of or no. His designe is to repaire to London w*i*th the best speed he can and from thence to direct his letters to such as have heeretofore given up their names unto him to meet him there, w*i*th whome he hopes to prevaile so farre as also w*i*th others (for to creditt his congregation the more he hath both [*p. 614*] the cardinals letters to shewe and w*i*thall his rules in print) that

[273]Carlos Coloma.
[274]John Percy SJ.
[275]John Jackson.
[276]Mary Villiers, countess of Buckingham.
[277]See *Letter 14*.
[278]Thomas Worthington.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

w*i*thin a short time he will so multiplie his companie that the superior who comes heereafter shall not be able to dissolve them though he would.[279] This day I write to M^r^ Sara[280] to give him advertisement heereof and I have promised M^r^ D*octo*r Champney to write to M^r^ Colleton to the same effect. It will not perhaps be amisse for you to shew y*ou*rselfe <there> in this point according to the directions you have in y*ou*r instructions. For though there be no great cause to feare that the doctor will be able to bring any great matter to passe in this kinde, yet prevention hurtes nothing.

I send you heereinclosed a peece of Monsieur Carondelett, the archdeacon of Cambray, his letter to M^r^ Provost,[281] word for word in French as it was writt by him, save that for brevities sake I contracted the last paragraffe. The summe of it is this, in English, that he hath, since his coming into England, solicited and brought to ~~passe~~ good issue so many favours w*hi*ch the embassadour[282] hath procured of the king and the honor whereof he may challenge to himselfe, that at this day there is not one prisoner [*in margin:* intellige lay-Catholick] for religion in all England. And that he does now negotiate the same for Scotland; that the king hath recalled the charges and com*m*andes heeretofore given to the judges of the circuit for informing against Catholicks. That the chancelour (bishop of Lincolne),[283] of whome depend all graces and affaires next after the king, hath done him the honour as to favour

[279]On 8/18 October 1622, Caesar Clement wrote to William Harewell that Thomas Worthington had been with him the day before and had told him that 'he wowlde go to Rome for two thinges, the one to informe his Hollines better off this matter of bishops, wherin he <sayed he> was much abused by summe that sowght butt themselves'. His other purpose was 'to sett forwarde the congregation by him begunne, or sodallitie tendinge to reformation'. Clement thought that 'itt were good he wer prevented by givinge warninge' to John Bennett in Rome: AAW, A XVI, no. 161, pp. 617–618. For Worthington's account, written in late August 1624, concerning his quarrel with William Bishop over Worthington's sodality and his refusal to serve as an archdeacon under the authority of Richard Broughton and John Bosvile, see AAW, B 26, no. 111 (modern transcription of AAW, B 26, no. 112); AAW, B 27, no. 42. The hostility of leading secular priests to Worthington dated back to his time as president of the English College at Douai, where he was regarded as a favourer of the Jesuits: *NAGB*, *passim*. It was also thought that he intended to appropriate quasi-episcopal authority to himself in England. In January 1616, Anthony Champney had complained to Thomas More that 'it was given out all over in England' that Thomas Worthington had been created archpriest in place of William Harrison: TD, V, p. clxxxvi. In April 1616, William Rayner remarked from Paris that 'yt hath been here reported that Monsignor Worthington confirmeth people in England', and this rumour was the result 'of soom speaches that D[octor] Worthington himself used to a French bushop that came out of Italie with him to whom he sayd soomthinge about his extraordinarie facultie': AAW, A XV, no. 65, p. 173.

[280]Edward Bennett.

[281]Thomas Harlay, provost of the church of St Gagericus (St Gery) at Cambrai. See CRS, 10, pp. 218, 219.

[282]Carlos Coloma.

[283]John Williams.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and creditt him so much that he saies he (the chancelour) will treate with no other than himselfe (the archdeacon) in matter appertaining to religion, and in effect grantes him all the favours he demandes of him, etc; that there resort to the embassadours chappell 1,500 or 1,600 Catholicks (at a time, or in a day) to heare Masse.

M[r] President[284] writt yesterday both in his owne and the clergies name unto the chapter of Cambray for Monsieur Carondelett his longer stay in England, who without licence of the chapter must of necessitie repaire home. He gave them to understand how necessarie M[r] Carondelett his presence is in those partes in the behalfe of Cath[olic] religion; and hopes uppon that and other considerations they will condescend to lett him stay longer, for the embassadour himselfe writt to the infanta[285] heere that she would direct her letters to the chapter for the same effect, which she hath done.

F[ather] Rudesind[286] tould me yesterday that the Jesuites write to him from Rome that there is no more done in your sute of bishops than was the first day you came to Rome; and withall that nothing is like to be done therein, how confident soever you jest of that matter; but we know their trickes.[287] This is all, for the present, but my service and best wishes, whereof I rest.

Yours ever,

W[illiam] Far[rar]

Doway 14 Octob[er] 1622.

No address or endorsement.

17. William Farrar [Harewell] to John Bennett, 11/21 October 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 166, pp. 627–630*]

Very reverend and right worthy sir,

Of the receipt of your last, which bare date the 12[th] of Sept[ember], I writt the last weeke by the way of Paris, according to your direction, which as oft as I write I shall heereafter observe. We cannot heere

[284] Matthew Kellison.

[285] Isabella Clara Eugenia, archduchess of Austria.

[286] William (Rudesind) Barlow OSB.

[287] On 14/24 September 1622, William Harewell had informed John Bennett that Rudesind Barlow and the Benedictines were prepared to give their nomination for Matthew Kellison and Richard Smith, but not for William Bishop, for he was, they thought, too 'boisterous': AAW, A XVI, no. 144, p. 562.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

understand what this nuncio[288] does in y*ou*r affaires either one way or another. What was like to be expected of him I have already at severall times sufficiently advertised you since the time I was w*i*th him.

From Paris, M^r^ Ir[eland][289] writes to D*oct*or Champney that F[ather] Ar[changel][290] tould him his brethren from Rome give him notice that, besides the 6 w*hi*ch the clergie hath recom*m*ended and nominated, there be 6 others presented and recommended by those who except against the clergies nomination; and that some have recom*m*ended himselfe (F[ather] Arch[angel]) w*hi*ch he will not heare of. How these thinges goe there, I doubt not but you knowe far better than we heere. Yet I thought it not amisse to let you understand what reportes passe in these partes concerning those affaires. Sig*no*re Chrysogono[291] writt the last week unto M^r^ President[292] to have an information of the state of o*u*r college,[293] <v*i*z> the number of o*u*r schollers, o*u*r institute, the end and fruite of the seminarie, the foundation etc. W*i*thall that he would give him in like sort a particular relation of the other seminaries, colleges and monasteries, both of men and woemen of our <and the Irish and Scotish> nation, resident in the Low Countries, w*hi*ch M^r^ President hath done and is now readie to send him it. We conceave, and not w*i*thout good ground, that the congregation de Propaganda Fide hath writt to the nuncio of these partes to be informed of <all> the seminaries and religious houses of these nations residing w*i*thin his nunciature.[294] And for this cause this information is demanded of M^r^ President not onely of his owne but also of all the rest of these 3 nations. We understand that the like order is come to the superior of the Irish colledge in this towne and that thereuppon they seemed to be inquisitive of the state of o*u*r colledge. Whereby it is gathered that every colledge is to relate not onely of their owne estate and conversation but w*i*thall <of the condition> of all the rest, to the end ~~they~~ superiors be not tyed onely to the relation w*hi*ch each colledge or monasterie shall give of it selfe w*hi*ch might be partiall and too much in it[s] owne favour, but what others also do testifie thereof. That part <of M^r^ Presidents relation>[295] ~~thereof~~ w*hi*ch concernes the Jesuitesses

[288] Giovanni Francesco Guido del Bagno, archbishop of Patras.

[289] Richard Ireland.

[290] William (Archangel) Barlow.

[291] Chrysogono Flacci, secretary to Giovanni Francesco Guido del Bagno. See *CGB*, I, pp. x, 36, and *passim*.

[292] Matthew Kellison.

[293] The English College at Douai.

[294] See AAW, A XVI, no. 169, pp. 635–644, no. 170, pp. 645–662; CRS, 10, pp. 195–206, 390–399.

[295] See Littlehales, *Mary Ward*, p. 112; Chambers, *Life*, II, pp. 50–52; Dirmeier, *MW*, I, pp. 726, 727–729; AAW, A XVI, no. 170, pp. 645–662.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I send you heerinclosed, w*hi*ch I caused to be coppied out in hast whilst I was writing this.

From England we heare there is great trouble about the taking of Heydelberg. The king was at great wordes w*i*th the Spanish embass[ador][296] about it, insomuch that some feared a new storme would have rose against Catholickes. But by such as be newly come out of England (since the generall report there of the taking of Heydelberg) all thinges are quiett, and Catholickes in good peace, w*hi*ch God continue.[297]

[*p. 628*] There is, and that not uncertaine, newes that the palsgrave[298] (who since his flight from the Palatinate till now hath lurked at Sedan w*i*th the duke of Bullion) some ten dayes agoe imbarked himselfe at Calaies.[299] Whither his course was, it is yet [*word omitted:* not (?)] knowne. Some feare he either is [*word omitted:* in], or will (so soone as he can) make for, England. But his entertainement there is like to be but could [*i.e.* cold] by the king and prince.[300]

Out of Spaine there is a fleete coming of 150 saile to keepe the Hollanders in, and to cutt off all their trafficke, the meanes to undoe them quite.[301] Some 60 saile of them were come before Plimmoth (where it is sayd they desired to take in fresh water but could not be permitted). The rest are comming after.[302] Yesterday, we heard that at St Omers there is order taken for provision to furnish the fleete withall. One butcher there hath already killed 500 beeves and poudered them. One baker hath com*m*and to provide 6,000 biskett, another 4,000, besides others etc. But these particulars we had of one

[296] Carlos Coloma.

[297] See *Letter 15*; see also AAW, B 47, no. 30.

[298] Frederick V, elector palatine.

[299] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 481. In early July 1622, Frederick had dispensed with the services of Mansfelt and Christian of Brunswick, and had withdrawn to Sedan to reside with his uncle, Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, duke of Bouillon, though Mansfelt and Brunswick had joined him there in August, before leaving for the siege of Bergen-op-Zoom: Pursell, *WK*, pp. 181–185.

[300] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 414, 440, 462, 487–488.

[301] See *ibid.*, pp. 476, 478, 479, 480, 483, 485, 495; McClure, *LJC*, p. 455; *CCE*, p. 111.

[302] On 16/26 October, William Harewell had recorded, for John Bennett's benefit, the news sent by Caesar Clement to Matthew Kellison, which he had recently received from William Law, concerning the Spanish fleet. This, combined with the 'newes of the taking of Heydleberg', greatly disconcerted the king, who 'presently called for his councell to know what the meaning heere of should be, and whether they were able to bringe the kingdome in danger'; but the fleet, 'passing on her journey, went forward, with a very prosperous winde, till it arrived uppon our coastes and so 28 ships are arrived at Dunkerk, the rest at Callis'. This was an encouragement to those, such as Harewell, who had been downcast by 'the Marques Spinola his raising of his [si]ege before Bergen op Zome', and it 'opened our eyes to see that surely [a]ll the marques['s] hope laye uppon the coming of this armada', which would 'divert the enemie from Berghen': see AAW, A XVI, no. 171, p. 663; *CGB*, I, p. 261.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

who knew the parties and heard it of them, to whome this order was given. I have <not> heard from o*u*r friendes in England now a good space. I expect M[r] Duckett[303] now every day, uppon whose coming I thinke to provide my self forethw*i*th thitherwards unless Al[mighty] God dispose otherwise of me, w*hi*ch yet I know not. I desire nothing but to fulfill his holy will.

M[r] President and M[r] D*oct*or Champney salute you. Let me crave y*ou*r remembrance of me in y*ou*r holy sacrifices, as I forgett you not in mine, remaining yours ever in all service.

W[illiam] Farrar

Doway 21 Octob[er] 1622.

[*on p. 630*]

Addressed: Al molto illustre et rev*eren*do sig*no*re, il Sig*no*re Giovanni Benetto, agente del clero di Ingle[t]erra en Roma.

Endorsed: M[r] Ferrar. Octob[er] 21[th].

18. William Bishop to John Bennett, 21/31 October 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 172, pp. 667–668*]

Very wor*shipfu*ll s*i*r,

Yours of October the 10[th] came speedely to my handes, for the 29 of the same I send [*sic, for* sent] into England the inclosed. I have both earnestly intreated yo*u*r good brother[304] to importune the Spanish ambass[ador],[305] who is both for his letter to Rome and promise to them double bound, to remoove that block out of our way, w*hi*ch he hath cast in it, and, if he find him cold, to seeke unto the l[ord] keeper[306] by some effectual meanes, and to informe him well, and then no doubt but he will rather favour us than our opposites, specially considering that we are for the mariage, and they against it, we all speaking as much honour of his Ma*jes*tie as wee can do, they calumniating his actions, etc.

[303]John Ducket, procurator for the English College at Douai. See Anstr., II, pp. 89–90; AAW, A XVI, no. 109, p. 453.
[304]Edward Bennett.
[305]Carlos Coloma.
[306]John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I feare lest F[ather] Archangell[307] can do litle with the Frenc[h]e ambassadour[308] in England, who is turned about for the Jesuit[s], I know not by what words, if it be not that they now do leave the Spanish p*ar*ty and fly to the Frenc[h]e, w*hi*ch alone should move the Spanish ambass[ador] to favour them in p*re*judice of them that are their affectionate welwillers. F[ather] Arch[angel] and we may be able to do somwhat with the Cardinall de Surdis[309] if he come hither, as his mother doth looke for him shortly, and some other p*re*lates may then be drawen in to joyne w*i*th him. I meane to sound some of the Sorbon to see if it be fitt to gett our faculties of divinity to write to [his] Holines or the Cardinall Bandini in our cause. I am glad o*u*r testimonies cam[e] safely to yo*u*r hands. God send they may serve to his honour and service in time and place. I do vehemently suspect M^{r} Gage to have suggested to the lord keeper or [the] king himself those calumnies of o*u*r p*re*tensions to the archbishoprickes of Canterbury and Yorke, whereat his Holines was as much touched as we that he would go about to doe such a thing without our kings privity, w*hi*ch questionles he would never have done. That is my first note against M^{r} G[age]. My second [is] that he is credibly reported to <have> sayd to some of o*u*r great ones [?] that the pope was a good man but knew litle of matters on this side of the Alpes.[310] My third I gather out of this w*hi*ch D[octor] Cicill (who holds good intelligence with them) told me that the king and court were indigne, that is, verie offended with some disdaine, with the conditions inserted into the dispensation.[311] This he told me verbatim but did tell me nothing that M^{r} Gage should say for the same, w*hi*ch is to me a good conjecture [*words obliterated*] he is in England. He is for the king rather than for the pope in that matter [*words obliterated*] [of the dispe]nsation and being in deed evill affected to the match lets any thing passe that [*words obliterated:* might serve (?)] to break it of[f]. The like p*ar*t he is like to play in that court. And as I have advised yo[u] [*words obliterated*] tell the Spanish amb[assador], if he beare any good will to the match, let him take heed ho[w] he imploy any such holow harted men in that busines. All this to your self, to make use of as occasion shall serve. I heare that the king and court did mislike that it was put among the motives of the dispensation that their children should be brought up Catholikely till they were seaven yeare old, w*hi*ch is, in my judgment, a very good point, yet rather to be wished than stood

[307] William (Archangel) Barlow.
[308] Tanneguy Leveneur, count of Tillières.
[309] François d'Escoubleau, cardinal de Sourdis.
[310] See *Letter 12*.
[311] See *ibid.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stifly upon, because when children be past three yeares old they go out of their mothers education and charge, so that she is not bound to see them brought up in her religion, though she be bound to do her best endevour, both by counsell with them and by intreaty with her husband.[312] This, I say, by the way. But if M^r^ Gage returne to Rome to have these points amended <as it is reported he shall> you may lett him alone with it unlesse you shall chance to be requested, for [?] o*u*r king, to assist him, because that wilbe displeasing to that court, and no wise man doth of his own accord thrust himself into other mens busines that is like to p*ro*cure enmity. To worke o*u*r king to say that he likes of a byshop for us may be a hard matter and require more time than it is expedient that o*u*r busines do hang in suspense, for feare God should call his Holines, wherefore do your best to have the man nominated and consecrated, though it be under condition that he not go into England till a faire way be made for him. The Jesuits have their superiour, the Benedictins their[s], so have the recollects. Why should not the cleargy, the noblest portion of the ecclesiasticall state, have theirs? The king cannot justly be offended when the bishope shall neither be intitled to any bishoprick to w*hi*ch he chalengeth right to p*re*sent, nor so much as come into his countrey without his leave; but then, say they, why would we have <one> if he do not go into England. I answer first wee have great hope that we shall gett the king to like it ere it be long. Secondly in the meane season he, with the advise of o*u*r best and wisest men, may continue the best maner of p*ro*ceeding in his goverment and appoint some vicar generals under him, ~~by~~ <among> whom he may devide the goverment of the whole realme, who in his absence may see priests to do their dutie and take heed that no scandall be given neither by priest nor lay Catholikes w*hi*ch, if God grant us liberty, wilbe more necessary to looke unto, quia licentia sumus omnes deteriores. You look for newes but there is litle stirring, albeit o*u*r king was much displeased with the takin[g] of Heidelberge, the chiefe towne in the Palatinate, yet he doth not in any thing lesse [*word obscured*] towards Catholikes. He complained of [*p. 668*] it to the infanta.[313] She exclused [*sic*] herself for that they were enforced, upon the coming downe of Mansfelt into Flanders, to call her forces out of the Palatinate so that she could not [*word omitted:* prevent (?)] the duke of Braviers [*sic*] forces to do what they thought good. O*u*r king hath also send [*sic for* sent] a post into Spaine about

[312]For the negotiation of the clause of the treaty which dealt with this issue, see Gardiner, *NSMT*, p. 338; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 490.

[313]Isabella Clara Eugenia, archduchess of Austria.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same. God knows whether they will not give the like answer.[314] Yet some Jesuits that came lately from thence thinke that the mariage wilbe shortly concluded, though they be no friends thereunto. Here they say that the king <is in Montpellier and> hath made peace with his rebels. Yet we have no certenty of it, wherefore I referr that to the next.[315] I will in my next com*m*end that to yo*u*r camerado and M^r^ President[316] w*hi*ch you desire about the booke written for the Jesuitrices. Thus with my very harty com*m*end[ations], I rest ~~yours~~.

Yo*u*rs alwayes assured

W*illia*m Byshope

The last of October 1622.

M^r^ Gage when he passed by us would not communicate to us anything because the secrecy of the Inquisition was upon them, but it seemes he observed not that secrecy in the court of England for, as I before noted, they did know the p*ar*ticulars of the dispensation.

The reduction of Montpellier and peace made was this day cried upon [*sic*] and downe the streetes.

Addressed: Au révérend père, le Père Bartin prestre de la congrégation de l'Oratoire demeurant à S^t^ Louis.
Donne le si vous plait à Mons*ieu*r Bennet, agent du cleargy d'Angleterre.
A Rome.

Endorsed: M^r^ D[octor] Bishop.
Octob[er] the last.

[314]In Madrid, the Spaniards offered exactly the same excuse to the earl of Bristol, namely that Mansfelt had caused the withdrawal of Spanish forces from the Palatinate in order to defend Flanders, and that the 'seige of Heidleberge was no way by the consent or knowledge' of Philip IV. On 13/23 October, said Bristol, the Spanish court 'dispatched away letters to the infanta to stopp the emperours and duke of Bavarias proceedings': PRO, SP 94/25, fos 265r, 266r; see also *HMCMK*, pp. 137, 138; *CCE*, pp. 91, 92.

[315]For the peace agreed at Montpellier, see Adams, PC, p. 332; Lockyer, *Buckingham* pp. 229–230; C.J. Burckhardt, *Richelieu and his Age*, 3 vols (London, 1967), I, p. 151. On 10/20 October 1622, William Bishop had observed in a letter to Bennett that Louis XIII was 'said to have made a peace with his rebels which, though most zealous men do dislike, yet it seemes not so bad as some would make it. The townes that held out do yeelde to have their new fortifications beaten downe and do receive Catholike garrison[s] and governour[s]': AAW, A XVI, no. 164, p. 623.

[316]Matthew Kellison.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

19. William Farrar [Harewell] to John Bennett, 23 October/2 November 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 173, pp. 669–670*]

Very r*everen*d and respected sir,

The last weeke I writt unto you,[317] both by the way of Brussels and Paris, and sent you the coppie of a letter[318] writt unto me from D[octor] Clement. Three days ago M[r] President[319] receaved a long letter from y*ou*r brother,[320] relating at large all their proceedinges w*ith* the emb[assador],[321] whereof I have given you advertisement longe agoe. Therew*ith* he also sent the coppie of a letter w*hi*ch Mons*ieu*r Carondelett had writt unto him concerning his <after> dealing with the emb[assador] in the behalfe of the clergie, the w*hi*ch, though I suppose your brother will be carefull to send you, yet for more surenesse sake I thought it not amisse to enclose heerein. D*octo*r Worthington is safely arrived in England, yet passed not w*ith*out suspition. He went in all alone at Dover where the old fox Jones[322] began presently to smell him and tould one M[r] Cape,[323] a Catholicke knowne to him, who chanced at that time to be come to Dover to provide shipping for my L[ord] Montague his sonne,[324] that ~~there was~~ some of <his> companie ~~who~~ suspected the old man for what he was and therefore wished him to deale w*ith* him etc. The conclusion was [that] D*octo*r Worthington gave Jones an angell and went his way cleere. My L[ord] Montague his sonne arrived heere on Friday last w*ith* a Benedictin monke[325] his tutor and fower men in his companie. He is going for Spaine, there to spend some time and a great deale of money. He stayed one day heere in towne, not having any com*m*oditie to depart sooner, for his tutor makes as much haste as he can in respect of the season of the yeere.[326] He and his father had been at Wing[327] the latter end of this summer. For now their is great league betwixt both those houses.

[317] AAW, A XVI, no. 171, pp. 663–666 (16/26 October 1622).
[318] AAW, A XVI, no. 161, pp. 617–618.
[319] Matthew Kellison.
[320] Edward Bennett.
[321] Carlos Coloma.
[322] A reference, presumably, to William Jones, clerk of the passage: *CSPD, 1619–1623*, pp. 16, 374, 378, 395, 406, 420, 460, 462.
[323] William Cape. See Questier, *C&C*, p. 392.
[324] Francis Browne, the son of Anthony Maria Browne, 2nd Viscount Montague.
[325] Edward Smith. See Lunn, *The English Benedictines*, p. 229; PRO, SP 16/178/43; Anstr., II, p. 299.
[326] See Questier, *C&C*, p. 392.
[327] The residence of the Dormer family in Buckinghamshire.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The last night M^r George German returned out of England. He left his friendes well and M^r Colleton with them in the countrie. They looke longe for you as also y*ou*r hostesse M^rs Smith, who is very well, as he sayeth. She hath heard of my returne w*hi*ch was not my fault. M^r Gage is now uppon his way towards Spaine, and from thence to Rome as the report goes. Yet some say his way is straight to Rome.[328] He passed at Dover some 2 or 3 dayes before M^r German. He had 500^li for his viaticum.[329] Much speech there is of his employement. Howsoever, whilst he was in England, he was extraordinarely gallant, and still at court, yet had w*i*th him not above one or two men neither in England nor now in his <great> embassie. My conceipt is he is rather for Rome than Spaine because not above 12 dayes agoe there was one Endymion (I know not whether I should putt a Sir before it or no) Porter dispatched from the king for Spaine,[330] a man by the favour of Buckingham raised from small meanes[331] and (if I be not mistaken) M^rs Porter[332] (the Jesuitresse) her sonne. And, now I speake of Jesuitresses, M^r German telles that that broode encreases apace in England, insomuch that in one house in Shoe Lane at London there live 14 of them.[333] They make themselves as sure of the confirmation of their order as if they had it in their pockett.

[*p. 670*] In one of my last[334] I writt we had newes that there <were> 6,000 men levying about London to goe for Holland under the conduct of Colonell Gray[335] but those that came late out of England heare no such matter. All thinges goe in a peaceable course in England. I writt unto you longe since[336] that all the lay Catholicks were for certaine at libertie and that at Yorke some there <were> ~~amongst these~~ that had been prisoners 36 yeeres, some 28 etc. M^r

[328] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 485, 490; Gardiner, *NSMT*, pp. 182, 183. For the reasons for Gage's journey via Madrid, see PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fo. 134v.

[329] On 23 September 1622, a warrant was passed to pay George Gage £500 for his employment in the king's service abroad: *CSPD, 1619–1623*, p. 449.

[330] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 469, 479; *CSPD, 1619–1623*, p. 451.

[331] Cf. *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 439. Porter, a relative of Buckingham, had been appointed a groom of the prince of Wales's bedchamber: Redworth, *PI*, p. 43. For his mission to Spain, see Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 129, 132, 133–134; J.H. Elliott, *The Count-Duke of Olivares* (London, 1986), pp. 205–206.

[332] Angela Porter. See Dirmeier, *MW*, I, p. 731. There is no evidence that she was a member of Mary Ward's institute. I am grateful to Caroline Bowden and to the Bar Convent at York for information on this point.

[333] There is no record of a residence set up by Mary Ward's institute here, and it is unlikely to have existed, certainly not for the numbers of women alleged. Again, I am grateful to Dr Bowden and the Bar Convent for this information.

[334] AAW, A XVI, no. 171, pp. 663–666.

[335] Sir Andrew Gray.

[336] *Letter 15*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Parrie telles me his father had been prisoner in Flint full 40 yeeres, a longe time of confession of his faith, and therefore worthie the libertie he now enjoyes *wi*th the rest. D*octo*r Bishop solicittes M^r^ D*octo*r Champney to helpe you *wi*th some advertisements concerning the abuse of the Jesuites goverment of that colledge there that you might fall on bord *wi*th them. But D*octo*r Champney is of opinion that it is not yet time for that matter, and wishes you would not by any meanes medle *wi*th it. Other affaires of importance must be first setled and then that will more easely followe whereas, if you begin now, you will both encomber *you*rselfe in a troublesome businesse and thereby hinder *you*r other designes. And *wi*thall, ~~if~~ <though> you should prevaile against them so far as to dispossesse them of that place, <~~yet~~> thinges as yet stand in such sort *wi*th us <as they doe> that there would not be men found to undertake their roomes <and so would [*word illegible*] proove peiora prioribus>. Yet <shall> you [*word deleted*] do well <in [?] the meane[time]> to provide *you*rselfe <full> of [*word deleted*] <all manner of> instructions belonging to that point that, when time shall serve, there want no matter whereon to worke etc. There is not any thing els worth the writing. M^r^ President comes now to the refectorie. Both he and M^r^ D*octo*r Champney salute you most kindely. I expect M^r^ Duckett heere *wi*thin less than ~~these~~ 10 dayes, uppon whose arrivall I shall provide my <selfe> for[th]*wi*th for England, having no occasion to stay heere any longer. In the meane and ever, I rest.

Y*ou*rs to be com*m*anded,

W*illi*am Farrar

2 Novemb[er] 1622.

No address.

Endorsed: M^r^ Ferrar the 2 of Novemb[er].

20. William Farrar [Harewell] to John Bennett, 30 October/9 November 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 174, pp. 671–674*]

Very reverend and respected sir,

In my last,[337] w*hi*ch was the weeke past, by the way of Brussels, I sent you all the occurrences then worth the writing, togeather *wi*th the

[337] *Letter 19*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

coppie of a letter of Mons*ieu*r Carondelett to y*ou*r brother[338] w*hi*ch y*ou*r brother sent M^r^ President.[339] Since, there occurres no new matter save that M^r^ D*octo*r Bishop writes from Paris that M^r^ Gage, passing that way, tould them the king was highely offended at the clergies sute for bishops and that the Spanish embassadour[340] in Engl[and] had writt to the king of Spaine to hinder the same w*i*th the pope in regard of the k[ing] of Engl[and] his so hainousely taking of that matter. This troubles us heere. But first we know by whose sinistrous and pestiferous suggestion this matter hath been breathed into the kinges eare, to witt the Jesuites darlings. Secondly for that the king is persuaded the clergie seekes to supplant those that at this present possesse the bishoprickes in England; and especially that by this meanes the authoritie w*hi*ch both <he> and his predecessors, even in Catholicke times, have enjoyed in the nomination of bishops and bestowing the bishoprickes independent of the sea apostolicke shall be lost, if not from himselfe, yet from his successors; w*hi*ch is a point whereat the Catholicke princes of England have in former times not a litle stood; and therefore may <now> much more be stood uppon by him. And this ground you may use for the furtherance of y*ou*r sute, giving his Holines to understand that it will be a matter of ~~great~~ <extraordinarie> importance <even> to the sea apostolicke <it selfe> to settle bishops in England now at this present, thereby to regaine that authoritie of bestowing the bishoprickes in England from the kinges who lay claime thereunto. For the popes practice now (w*hi*ch the king certainely will never gainesay for feare of hindering greater matters) will serve for a plea heereafter and the authoritie he hath in this behalfe once taken to himselfe may, without contention or quarrell, be easely continued in aftertimes, for every thing is sooner stopped or hindered at the first, tha[n] <afterwards recalled> when ~~it is~~ by course and practize it is confirmed.

Thirdely it is supposed that the kinges stomacking this matter was but a suddaine passion w*hi*ch afterwardes would passe away w*i*thout leaving any impression in his mind behind it. For what cares the king if the clergie have bishops, so that he receave no prejudice thereby? A wonder lastes but for nine dayes, and surely that fitt of the king (if yet it be true that the k[ing] was really offended at the newes) was of lesse continuance. For even the taking of Heidleberg (uppon the newes whereof the k[ing] fell into an extraordinarie passion of wrath and discontent) stucke uppon his stomacke not above a weeke, as we heare

[338]Edward Bennett.
[339]Matthew Kellison.
[340]Carlos Coloma.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for certaine.[341] And yet <had> the [*p. 672*] kinge great cause to be highely offended and discontented thereat if the circumstance of that businesse be considered. Uppon this rumor of the k[ing's] displeasure with the clergie, the Jesuites seeme very jolly and cockesure there will be no bishops, insomuch that there was a Jesuite in a certaine place in England who, hearing some talking of bishops which the <clergie> was shortely like to have, used these wordes in plaine termes: they shall have no bishops. We heare also that many other religious in England do so carrie themselfes in this businesse as that they plainely discover they are no friends of b*ishop*s. But this is not to be spoken of. Your brother writt to M[r] President that there was a Jesuit[342] knowne to have had three howers privat conference w*i*th Secretarie Calvert, a point worth y*our* notice.[343] The Spanish fleete, of w*hi*ch I writt unto you in my last and others before,[344] is vanished away. It never came further, as we heare, than the coast of England about Plimmoth where, having notice they came too late for the service w*hi*ch was intended, they returned, or were (as it is sayed) by speciall order recalled, and com*m*anded backe againe. It is thought they were sent to doe some exploit uppon the Hollanders whilst Spinola should give the onsett uppon Berghen, who being enforced to raise his seege before their comming, all that plott was marr*e*d.[345]

M[r] President salutes you, and so doth M[r] D*oct*or Champney.

I know not what will become of me, for I am not a litle importuned both by M[r] President, D*oct*or Champney and others to stay heere still. But nemo potest duobus dominis servire, and againe in all places I am but servus inutilis, w*hi*ch others will not be persuaded, but I my selfe know it too well. When M[r] Duckett comes, whome we expect heere every day, I shall be at some certainetie. Whatsoever become of me, I am y*our*s ever in all service.

W[illiam] Farrar

Douay 9 Novem[ber] 1622.

Sir, since the making up of my letter, D*oct*or Champney shewed me a letter of M[r] Rouses[346] <216 [*sic*] newly arrived> wherein he writes at large concerning a booke published in Januarie last containinge the

[341] See *Letters 17*, *18*.

[342] Francis (or John) Young SJ. See CRS, 75, p. 342.

[343] See *Letter 25*.

[344] The Spanish fleet was mentioned in William Harewell's letter of 16/26 October (AAW, A XVI, no. 171, pp. 663–666), rather than that of 23 October/2 November (*Letter 19*), and also in his letter of 11/21 October (*Letter 17*).

[345] For the raising of the siege of Bergen-op-Zoom, see J. Israel, *The Dutch Republic* (Oxford, 1995), p. 483; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 472, 480, 486, 488, 548; *CGB*, I, p. 256.

[346] Richard Broughton.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

motives of the bishop of London his dying Catholicke.[347] The poste is readie to depart and I have not time to coppie out his letter or the parcells of the saied booke of motives, w*hi*ch M[r] Rouse gott the sight of and hath sent D*octo*r Champney in his owne hand writing. On Friday next I will send you them both by way of Paris, God willing. In the meane [time], take the title of the foresaid booke, w*hi*ch is this: *The Bishop of London his Legacie, or Certaine motives of D. King late Bishop of London for the change of Religion and dying in the Catholick and Roman Church: penned by himselfe and delivered over to a friend in his life time, with a Conclusion to his Brethren the LL. Bishops of England.*

No address.

[*on p. 674*]

Endorsed: Ferar. Novemb[er] 9[th].

21. William Bishop to John Bennett, 5/15 November 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 175, pp. 675–676*]

Very much respected s*i*r,

These are to acknowledg[e] yo*u*rs of October 24[th] and to give you great thankes for the care you have of the common cause and to praise God for your diligence and patience. God forgive those o*u*r bretherne who, having done litle or nothing in this matter of byshops (w*hi*ch doth most import us), yet cannot but murmur and backbite them who have most furthered it. Well, let us not be weary of well doeing, and they shall have shame enough of their opinions. Yo*u*r camerado did satisfy M. D*octo*r Clement.[348] They that so malitiously informed him and sought to do others <must> sit downe by the losse. Well, to other matters. We are glad of your placing with Monsig*no*r Vives.[349] He will help you, though

[347] See *Letter 10*. In fact, Richard Broughton's letter of 23 October 1622 (AAW, A XVI, no. 167, p. 631) dealt with his own book, *English Protestants Plea*, rather than with George Fisher's *The Bishop of London his Legacy*. For Broughton's defence of the latter book, see AAW, A XVII, no. 3, pp. 9–10 (cited in *Letter 10*).

[348] See *Letter 11*.

[349] Juan Bautista Vives, envoy in Rome for the archduchess Isabella: see Shanahan, 'The descendants of St. Thomas More', p. 91; *CGB*, I, p. 30. Richard Smith wrote to John Bennett on 10/20 October 1622, 'I know him well and, as I think, he wil remember me if you tel him that I was the agent' for the English secular clergy in 1609 and went often, with Thomas More, to visit him, 'and he gave me at my departure a book, De Missione ad Infideles, written by a discalced Carmelite, and hath written to [me] since I came to Paris': AAW, A

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not so fervorously as did the bishop of Aire,[350] to whom we will render, at his first arrivall here, all the thanks we can. There is so great reason to p*er*suade his Ma*jes*tie to be favorable to us that I am in very good hope he will be made ours. I have written unto le conde de Gundomar both to yeeld him o*ur* raisons for a byshope and humbly to intreat him that he will write unto our kings Ma*jes*tie in our behalfe, w*hi*ch I pray you to sownd <[*two words obscured*]> and to gett Padre Maestro (to whom I pray you remember my harty comend[ations]) to do the same. Don Balthazar de Zuniga being dep*ar*ted,[351] the conde is like to succeed him in that most honorable place w*hi*ch, if he do, his letters unto the Spanish ambassadour in England[352] (who [?] is over much affected to the Jesuites) will cause him to be more indifferent; howsoever they in Spaine, [*sic*] being now upon the point of conclusion for the match, <the> conde may be requested to put in that for a speciall favour to Catholikes, that his Ma*jes*tie do not resist o*ur* having of bishops, for otherwise how can he be taken to grant us the use of o*ur* religion w*hi*ch cannot be kept in order and peace without our ordinary pastors; w*hi*ch point I have already touched in mine to him. Conde Gundomar is o*ur* patron. He hath been the principall instrument under God to p*ro*cure us that libertie which we already enjoy, wherefore we must fly to him to make it p*er*fect. This point being well recommended to him by you and Padre Maestro cannot but encourage him much to p*ro*ceed in it with ardour. And he principally can effect what we desire both with the Lord Digby (who is now created earle of Bristow) and with our kings Ma*jes*tie. Your brother[353] I know will do in England what he can. And he, accompanied with those his bretherne (unto whom the Sp[anish] ambassador p*ro*mised to repaire what damage soever should come of [*word omitted:* his] letter), pressing the [*word illegible*] to p*er*forme the same, will I hope obtaine it at his handes, he no doubt standing in some awe of Gondomars displeasure, whom he knowes to favour us even in this cause.[354] I am glad that the bishop of Holland[355] comes up to justify his <cause> against the Jesuites for they gave out in Flanders that his evill cariage was made an instance

XVI, no. 163, p. 621. See also *NAGB*, *passim*; AAW, B 26, no. 40A. In December 1623, Vives promised that he would assist Thomas Rant with the secular clergy's current business in Rome: AAW, B 25, no. 102.

[350] Sébastien Bouthillier.

[351] For Zuñiga's recent death, see *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 483, 502.

[352] Carlos Coloma.

[353] Edward Bennett.

[354] For Coloma's second letter to the Spanish ambassador in Rome, withdrawing his objection to the secular clergy's suit for the appointment of a bishop, see AAW, A XVI, no. 177, p. 679; TD, V, p. 91.

[355] Philip Rovenius, vicar apostolic of Holland since 1614, and created archbishop of Philippi in 1620: *CGB*, I, p. 45.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

against our havinge bishops as though, for the evill behaviour of one (if it were true), the ordinary institution of Christ and practise of the whole Church should be abrogated and, if you could proove clearly that they had said that they would be gone out of England if we had bishops there, it were alone sufficient to discredit them in all matter of goverment. For, if they cannot endure to live where bishops do governe Gods people, what make they in the Christian world where bishops and none but bishops do governe?[356]

Touching the Jesuitrices, some in Flanders give out that you have ben checked for saying something against them w*hi*ch you could not proove. Whether it be soe or noe, be alwaies wary what you say even against the Jesuite[s] the*m*selves, for that you saw how in the congregation de P*ro*paganda Fide they gott men to speake against a knowen truth; <how> much more would they urge even against a truth that were not well prooved?[357] I have written both to Doway and St Omers to get M[aster] Wilsons booke in their defence and shall send you the principall propositions in it so soone as it comes to my hand[s].[358] A Benedictine of very good credit reported here the last sommer that one of those Jesuitrices (a Benedictine and the

[356]Catholic jurisdictional structures in the Netherlands were problematical in ways rather similar to those in England. The secular clergy who worked in rebel-controlled areas were governed by a vicar apostolic, at this date Rovenius, who was also provisionally bishop of Utrecht, whereas (after 1612) the Jesuits were responsible to the nuncio. As Paul Arblaster explains, 'further confusion was added by the existence of areas under Dutch control which were part of dioceses still largely in loyal territory', in which priests were, of course, governed by diocesan bishops: P. Arblaster, *Antwerp & the World: Richard Verstegan and the international culture of Catholic reformation* (Louvain, 2004), p. 119. On 24 September/4 October 1622, John Bennett had reported that 'here is also in the congregacion de Propaganda Fide informaciones given by the Jesuites against the bishop of Holland', Rovenius, who had recently set out from Flanders for Rome, 'and they would <have> him taken away and noe bishop there. But he hath answered them home. I have seene the objectiones and answeres. The nexte congregacion determineth that matter and I thinke litle for the Jesuites there advantage. They are subjectes to that bishop in many important pointes and he curbeth there insolency.' Also 'there are 200 prestes' whereas the Jesuits numbered only 'some xx^{ti}, yet would have all in theere owne handes': AAW, A XVI, no. 151, p. 589; *CGB*, I, pp. xxxii, 268–269. For Rovenius, see also *NCC*, pp. 89, 94, 243; Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, pp. 377f. and esp. pp. 381–384; *CGB*, I, pp. xxxi–xxxii, 94 (Rovenius's defence of his actions, offered to Giovanni Francesco Guido del Bagno); AAW, A XVI, no. 180, p. 688.

[357]In a letter of 30 September/10 October 1622, John Bennett had reported to his brother Edward that 'you wrote unto me of a letter published in England as written by his Hol[iness] in approbation of the Jesuitrices', and had asked for a copy of the letter if it could be proved that the Jesuits were publicizing it. John Bennett argued that the pope 'noe way favoureth them but much misliketh them and there institute and <soe> doe all the best of this courte. Yet they will not putt them out of Rome albeit, of late, they were in some danger.' The institute's members 'begge upp and downe here, and that very impudently, to there owne shame and disgrace of there countrey': AAW, A XVI, no. 156, p. 606.

[358]John Wilson, at Saint-Omer, had (said Joseph Haynes) 'written a booke wherin he defendeth them and censureth the spirites that favour them not'. This is a reference, in fact,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

priest of the house <in England> being present) did, after Masse, sett her selfe downe in a chaire before the alter and there made them an exhortation; whereas a woman by S[aint] Paules rule should not speake in the congregation. Item M^r^ Harlay, provost of St Gery in Cambrai writt to mee this last weeke that 13 of those women are gathered [*word illegible*] in London into one house[359] and do p*r*ofesse to teach yo[u]ng children. Is not this to irritate the magistrate against all Catholikes? I have written to M^r^ Colleton to take true information of it and to send it to you or me with what speed he can.

M^r^ Biron shalbe for your and his friends sake very welcome to us.[360] The newes of this co[u]ntry is that Montauban [*p. 676*] hath rendred it self to the kings order, is content that all her new fortifications be beaten downe and that all Catholikes be restored to their livings and they must also have the free use of their religion. Rochell will not yeeld to the kings order. The duke of Guise about 12 daies since did give the Rochelers a great overthrow by sea.[361] Out of England no great matter. There is a rumour that M^r^ Mathewe shalbe sworne secretarie unto the prince,[362] who is said also to labour for a parlement to take away the laws against Catholiks because the infanta hath sent him word that she will not come in to have her head stroke of[f], w*hi*ch may be by those wicked lawes enacted against recusantes. Thus with my very harty comend[ations], I rest.

Yo*u*rs alwaies assured,

W*illia*m Bishope

The 15th of November 1622.
Concerning the Benedictins, I once said that it were the better way if they would joyne with us in having of bishops, and that they should

to Richard Gibbons SJ's translation entitled *An Abridgement of Meditations of the Life, Passion, Death & Resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Iesus Christ* (Saint-Omer, 1614); the abridgement in question, by François Solier SJ, is a version of a work by Vicenzo Bruno SJ: see ARCR, II, no. 344; Dirmeier, *MW*, I, pp. 216–218. The book was dedicated by Wilson 'to the vertuous and religious gentlewomen Mistresse Mary Warde and the rest of her devout company in S. Omers'. John Bennett asked for a copy in order to demonstrate Wilson's 'foolery and knavery': Dirmeier, *MW*, I, pp. 216–218; AAW, A XVI, no. 156, p. 606. (Of John Wilson's *The Treasury of Devotion*, which was published at Saint-Omer in 1622, Richard Smith complained to Rome in 1626 that part of this collection had been printed without the proper authorization: ARCR, II, no. 811.) I am very grateful to Caroline Bowden for assistance with this point.

[359] See *Letter 19*.

[360] On 30 September/10 October 1622, John Bennett had sent word of Biron's impending return from Italy: AAW, A XVI, no. 156, p. 607.

[361] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 519; cf. *HMCMK*, p. 148.

[362] See also AAW, A XVI, no. 165, p. 625 (a letter to John Bennett from E. Hewes, of 20 October 1622, mentioning the same rumour, which Hewes did not believe).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be as well chosen and have voices [?] to cho[o]se as wee, if they [?] would be under them. If that did not like them, that we would leave them to the full [*word obscured*] of their puritaynes and only request them to further us in the suite. This hath been repeated over and over to them since, now ten times, and do they yet grudg[e] at it? God amend them.

Addressed: Au révérend père, le Père Bartin prestre de la congrégation de l'Oratoire à St Louis.
Donne le (si vous plait) à Mons*ieu*r Bennet agent du cleargy d'Angleterre.
A Rome.

Endorsed: M^r^ D[octor] Bishop. Novemb[er] 15^th^.

22. William Bishop to John Bennett, 5/15 November 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 176, pp. 677–678; postscript to AAW, A XVI, no. 175*]

Since I sealed up my packett, M^r^ Gage came to visite us who [w]as at his first coming to the king (as he saieth) not much respected because he brought, <as> condition of the dispensation, something that liked them not, yet afterward he was in credit, they meaning to use him for that purpose of mollifying those conditions. And, whereas he was to have been sent straight to Rome, now he is to passe by Spaine[363] and there to see the conclusion of the match and to bring their helpes for o*u*r king with him. He saies that he findes o*u*r king wholy bent to go thorow with the match, and therein to do the Catholikes all the favour that can be reasonably demanded of him. Whereas, if it should not succeed, he must needes deale by way of parlement, that wilbe by the puritans, and so he shalbe driven to condescent [*sic for* condescend] to worse and worse lawes against recusants, otherwise the puritans will do nothing for him. Wherefore, as we love our owne good, we must labour that the match be not hindered. All this is well, and I would his father Jesuits were all of the same mind. He seemes to be much engaged to the king, and very foreward to speake for him, and that the king is not to be pressed to too hard conditions; and, to say the truth, so thinke I too, yet under that faire p*re*tence in generall we must looke to the Catholikes p*ar*ticular present benefitt, as to have some of the Catholike nobility sworne on the privy councell; and that <some> hostages be given for the assurance of p*er*forming,

[363]See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 485, 490; PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 301v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

w*hi*ch M^r^ Gage thinkes are not to be stood upon. The former point the king must eas[i]ly do with [*sic for* without (*?*)] any lett; the second seemes to require their pac[i]ens [*sic for* pacient] consent and therefore more difficult. Well, lett wiser heads than mee thinke well on those and such like points. There was much adoe at the court at the taking of Heidelberge, and for ten daies M^r^ Gage durst scarce speake to any body. Great talke there was of making a great army and of warr with Spaine as false dissemblers. The king let them alone but, when the heat was blowne over, he staid in his former resolution to linck himself with Spaine and to suppresse the puritans if that commotion were setled. God hold him in that mind. Yea M^r^ Gage stikes not to say that, if the match go not foreward, he will lay all the fault on the Spaniard (o*u*r king is so reasonable); yea that he never meant it from the beginning. But M^r^ Cottington, who hath [*word omitted:* been] agent in Spaine this seaven yeares, returning of late into England, assured the king that the Spaniard is as willing to goe foreward as he, so that it is, God willing, moste like to be very shortly concluded.[364] Thus much of M^r^ Gage.

I heare that the fals[e] byshop of Meath[365] in Ireland, having in his sermon inveighed against the popes Holines, he was told from the d[ep]uty [?] that his Ma*jes*tie [*p. 678*] of Great Britayne had forbidden all preachers to inveigh against the pope. Well then, said he, I will do so no more, and went, as they say, to excuse him[self] to some principall of his auditors therefore.[366] So easy is it <for the kinge> to incline most of [*word deleted*] <his [?]> cleargy not [to] be enemies to o*u*r religion. Yea M^r^ Gage saith that many of the puritans, seing him to be much made [*sic*] of by the king, seemed to respect him much. One of o*u*r doctors, whom M^r^ Seton knoweth, told me that the card[inal] of Susanna doth favour o*u*r suite for bishops but would not have it spoken of.[367]

[364]For Francis Cottington's arrival from Spain and his being sworn secretary to Prince Charles, see Redworth, *PI*, p. 44; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 113; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 336, 485, 490. Digby assured Calvert that Cottington's report of the negotiations in Spain would give 'great satisfaction, notwithstanding any jealousies or doubts which may be raised by the comming of Mr Gage into England with the popes unreasonable demandes': PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 223r. In disgust, Simonds D'Ewes remarked that Cottington 'was newlye come over and had satisfied the king' concerning the Spaniards' intentions, and so 'all the good hopes at court weere dasht': *DSSD*, pp. 102, 101.

[365]James Ussher.

[366]This is, apparently, a reference to Ussher's controversial words in his sermon preached at the swearing in of the new lord deputy, Henry Cary, 1st Viscount Falkland, on 8 September 1622: see Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, p. 112; *ODNB*, *sub* 'Ussher, James' (article by Alan Ford).

[367]Cf. *Letter 52*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The palsgrave[368] that was, is now by the Hollanders p*ro*moted to the bishoprick of Utrick, ~~the~~ to live upon that. And the lady princesse[369] doth by herselfe and [her] folowers seeke to draw wh[at] English or Scottish gentelmen they can to folow her, w*hi*ch [?] breadeth in o*u*r king and prince a great distruste that she p*re*tends to o*u*r crowne before her time, w*hi*ch is no smale motive to them to unite themselves to the Spaniard that by his [*words obliterated*] need be they may withstand both puritans at home and Hollanders abroad.

F[ather] Archang[el][370] will do his best to gett the Frenc[h] ambassadour[371] in England to write to the Fr[ench] ambassadour in Rome[372] to speake for us in that matter of byshops w*hi*ch, if he do, wee will get him to speake much to the purpose for us. It now cometh to my mind, and it may be supposed with some p*ro*bability, that the Jesuits fautors [?] should put into the kings head that great wrong was offered to his regall authoritie to have any man named to be a bishop in his realme without his leave and consent <for> [*three words deleted*] F[ather] Forcer[373] [?] <did> tell M^r^ Missindin[374] that the king had written to my L[ord] Digbie, who is now earle of Bristow, against o*u*r having of bishops without his licence.

O*u*r prince hath sent some token to the y[o]ung [?] infanta, requesting her to come speedely or els he shall <forsooth> languish away with love, as the poets faine.

M^r^ Newman did by the help of law make good his place till F[ather] Kensington,[375] who follows the suit against him, is vanished quite out of sight.[376] Yo*u*r help hath stood him in great stead. We hear [?] even now that all the Rochelers ships to the number of threescore are either sunke or taken or spoiled by the duke of Guyse.[377] This is some recompense for the bad peace [?] w*hi*ch they say is made much to the Hugonots advantage.

[368] Frederick V, elector palatine.

[369] Princess Elizabeth, wife of the elector palatine.

[370] William (Archangel) Barlow.

[371] Tanneguy Leveneur, count of Tillières.

[372] Denis Simon de Marquemont, archbishop of Lyons. See J. Bergin, *The Making of the French Episcopate 1589–1661* (London, 1996), p. 665; D.L.M. Avenel (ed.), *Lettres, Instructions Diplomatiques et Papiers d'état du Cardinal de Richelieu*, 8 vols (Paris, 1853–1877), II, pp. 16–17.

[373] Francis Forcer SJ.

[374] Edward Maddison.

[375] John Laithwait SJ.

[376] For William Newman's report, on 31 July/10 August 1624, of Laithwait's death, see AAW, B 26, no. 99.

[377] See *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 519; *Letter 21*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[*At top of p. 678*] The third of November, when it began to sheet in snow [?].

There is a great fleet of ships come out of Spaine for Flanders w*hi*ch, if they had come a moneth so[o]ner, Spinola had not lost the siege to [*word illegible*] the Spaniards fault.[378]

23. William Bishop to John Bennett, 8/18 November 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 178, pp. 681–682; printed in part in TD, V, p. 91*]

Very wor*shipfu*ll s*ir*,

Albeit I did write unto you[379] within these three daies, yet this copy[380] of the legacy of the late <false> bishope of London being sent me from Doway to send unto you, that you may <have> the first presentation of it to the cardinalls that desire it, I do send it away in hast. I like the thing well, yet, because M^r^ Broughton seemes over fearfull of the publication of it, you may use what moderation you think best in the presentation of it. I have sent yours into England and joyned my owne with them, giving them the best advice I can, specially that they make friends to the prince (who seemes hartely affected to the match) and to give him to understand that whosoever brought that newes unto the kings Ma*jes*tie that his Holines would send him in an archbishop of Canterbury and another of Yorke is no friend to that match but desires the breach of it, but, casting such a bone as that between the popes Holines and his Ma*jes*tie, he must needes be p*re*sumed to make them fall out the one with thother: his Holines with the king, if he should not be willing to p*er*mitt <in his kingdome> the ordinary pastors and pillars of o*u*r religion; and, againe, <to make> the king offended with his Holines for that he should intitle men to the archbishoprikes of England without his privity. If M^r^ Gage did this prety peece of service (as it seemes he did, for that it was done about his first arrivall to the court and not before) he deserves to be greatly blamed both of the one and of thother: of his Holines, for giving his Ma*jes*tie falsely to understand his <most> modest manner of p*ro*ceeding; and of the king, for that his resisting of bishops may be a just cause of witholding the dispensatio*n* without w*hi*ch the Catholike

[378] See *Letter 20*.

[379] See *Letter 22*.

[380] In the secular clergy agent's papers there is a manuscript copy of the preface of *The Bishop of London his Legacy*, with a part thereof translated into Latin. See AAW, A XVI, no. 85, pp. 303–314, no. 86, pp. 315–318.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

king will not proceed in the mariage. If they can beat this well into our princes head they will marr M[r] Gages negotiation. And I think that, <if> Cardinal Bandini do but suspect Gage to be such an [*sic*] misinformer of their good meanings to the kings M*aje*stie, they will not hereafter use him. But what marvell though a Jesuited man (if not a Jesuite) do use such trickes to breake of[f] the match cunningly w*hi*ch they utterly dislike and have opposed underhand what they could. Truly, to imploy a man that affects not the busines he goeth about is the next way to undoe it. For having <the> credit to be trusted in it, he may eas[i]ly spy out how it is to be marred.

Wherefore <lett> wise men see how they imploy any Jesuited p*er*son in that matter of the match. I am the longer in this point because I have nothing els now to write, wherefore com*m*ending you and our important causes unto the p*ro*tection of our blessed Saviour, I rest.

Yo*ur*s alwaies assured,

W*illia*m Byshope

The 18[th] of November 1622.

[*on p. 682*]

Addressed: Au révérend père, le Père Bartin, prestre de la congrégation de l'Oratoire à S[t] Louis.
Donne le si vous plait à Mons*ieu*r Bennet agent du cleargé d'Angleterre. A Rome.

Endorsed: M[r] D[octor] Bishop. Novem[ber] 18[th].

24. Joseph Haynes's relation of his conference with John Williams, bishop of Lincoln, 25 November 1622

[*AAW, A XVI, no. 179, p. 683; printed in TD, V, p. cclv*]

With warrant from superiors and a letter from the Spanish embassador,[381] I went to the l[ord] keeper[382] and, after acknowledgment of former acquaintance, I made knowne unto him my bussinesse, the substance whereof was sett downe in a letter I had from M[r] Benett[383] at Rome, w*hi*ch I did reade unto him. Hee seemed well pleased at it and did not, by his discourse, shewe any dislike of our haveinge

[381] Carlos Coloma.
[382] John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.
[383] John Bennett.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a b[ishop]. He told mee that his Ma*jes*tie was offended w*i*th those b*ishop*s in Ireland ~~for that~~ for that they had sett up a consistorie, and wiped the people there of theire mony; the Protestant b*ishop*s having first fleeced them, the other[s] went closer.[384] I answered that it was not mony w*hi*ch the secular clergie aymed at but goverment, good dis*ci*pline and order amongst them, w*hi*ch could not bee without a b[ishop]. He sayd he would deale effectually w*i*th his Majesty and desired a copie of the sayd letter. <This was the> 25 November 1622.

Jo[seph] Heynes

Endorsed: My nephew his conference w*i*th my l[ord] keeper.

25. Richard Sara [Edward Bennett] to John Bennett, 15 January 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 1, pp. 1–4*]

Good syr,

Immediatly befor Chrismas I sent yo*u* the embassadours[385] letters to Cardinall Melino, to whome also the good archdecon[386] writt wherof I sent yo*u*, in [the] Chrismas hollidaies, <a coppy>,[387] soe that now we hope all impedimentes be removed. I pray write to the good archdecon to whom we are infinitlye bownd. Now they have sett <on> the kinge to take exceptions against D[octor] Kellisons booke of the p*re*late and the prince,[388] because they would hinder his p*ro*motion sed frustra.[389]

[384]See also Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 94; *Letter 8*.

[385]Carlos Coloma.

[386]François de Carondelet.

[387]AAW, A XVI, no. 181, pp. 689–692 (Carondelet to Cardinal Millini, 27 December 1622, printed in TD, V, pp. cclv–cclx).

[388]Matthew Kellison, *The Right and Iurisdiction of the Prelate, and the Prince. Or, a treatise of ecclesiasticall, and regall authoritie* (Douai, 1617). A second edition had appeared in 1621. In 1624, John Colleton wrote a letter of assurance to King James concerning Kellison's tract. Colleton declared that the 'second impression' of the book (i.e. the second edition) was drawn from the author only 'by reason of certaine exceptions taken' by Thomas Preston (in *A New-Yeares Gift for English Catholikes* (London, 1620)) against the first edition: AAW, A XVIII, no. 104, p. 559.

[389]Kellison was the first choice of those secular clergy who were canvassed for their opinion about those suitable to have episcopal authority conferred on them. This anonymous denunciation of Kellison to the Jacobean regime persuaded Rome to appoint William Bishop instead: Allison, RS, pp. 154–155, 176–177.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The king sent to M^r^ Colleton a gentleman to wish hyme to enquire the autor of the p*re*late and prince wherin the autor showld write that it was lawfull to kill King James by name. His Ma*jes*ty had not seen the book, owt of w*hi*ch 10 articles were drawen owt, wherof this was on[e]. His Ma*jes*ty alsoe sent to the embassadour by my lord of Buckingham <to complain of his porter who had sould this book>, but the booke being examined ther is nothing fownd in it but the ordinary doctrin of Godes Church de dominio indirecto sum*ma* pontificis over kinges.[390] Soe that all thinges be well pacified; and Doctor Kellison wished [*sic*] to writ to his Ma*jes*ty to give hime account of the argument of the booke and occasions of writing of it. The true autors of this stratagem we knowe not. Great suspition there is the Theatins[391] have had a finger in setting of it forward ~~by th~~[e] because ther frendes have been busy in it, as Cottington by name, who w*i*th <Secret[ary]> Colvert have opposed them selfes to b*ishop*s and would have made the embassadour[392] beleeve the king would hang any b*ishop*s that came in. But, being sent unto and tould that it will be ill taken they should oppose Gundemar his designes, they excuse them selfes and will no more medle in that bussines. No dowbt his Ma*jes*ty hath ben wrought by Jessuit[i]call means to oppose hyme self but, since he hath been informed by yo*ur* letter, a gentleman tould me from his own mouth that he should say it was necessary the priestes should have bushops ells all would [be] owt of order. These Jesswetes have been soe busye w*i*th the embassadour that he hath no conceit of them. Of this matter of Doctor Kellison I desired M^r^ Smith to writ some p*ar*ticulars w*hi*ch yo*u* shall receave. They ar much trubled because it is a comon report that ther hath been a Jesswete w*i*th Secretary Calvert, M^r^ Younge by name, to sett forward this opposition.[393]

All thinges goe heer w*i*th great contentment to his Ma*jes*ty. Syr Endimion Porter is retorned.[394] Boath kinges have agreed upon the

[390] See Kellison, *The Right and Iurisdiction of the Prelate, and the Prince*, esp. chs 7, 8, 9, 10. In early January, Alvise Valaresso reported the news of James's complaint, delivered via Buckingham, to Coloma, concerning the sale, by a porter in his household, of Kellison's book: *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 538. John Chamberlain believed it had actually been printed there: McClure, *LJC*, p. 471. According to Chamberlain, the porter was an Englishman. He may, in fact, have been Coloma's chaplain, William Law.

[391] i.e. Jesuits.

[392] Carlos Coloma.

[393] See *Letter 20*.

[394] Porter arrived in London on 2 January 1623: Redworth, *PI*, p. 49; *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 545, 548; *DSSD*, p. 119. His advice that the Spanish match might be successfully concluded, and a settlement achieved in the Palatinate, persuaded Buckingham that he and Prince Charles should travel to Madrid: Adams, PC, p. 333.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

conditions of the marraidge.[395] Ther is nothing desyred but the dispe*n*sation. The Jesswetes and ther followers give owt that Gage is gon to Rome abowt that and he will effect all.[396] The priestes and ther followers say that it is Pater Maestro that must effect it, and that Gage doth but intrud[e] hyme self by the countenaunce of Jesswetes, being able to doe nothinge. All indifferent wise men wonder that <the Count> Gwndemar and Pater Maestro will give way to this intruder to have any hand in this bussines knowinge he is an instrument of the Jesswetes boath now and hereafter to truble and make faction for them. It were good [*p. 2*] Pater Maestro did looke into this bussines lest that while they, for manner sake, give way to his forwardnes, he will sett that footinge hereafter for his setters on, that they <will> wish they had never opposed hyme at first. Capite vulpeculas etc. All this Christmas his Ma*jes*ty hath been in this town and no dowbt ~~he~~ hath beene delt w*i*th to showe discontent ~~abowt~~ <against b*ishop*s>, espetially in this rwfflinge abowt Doct[or] Kellisons booke. Yeat ~~she~~ he gave not the least sign of ~~discontent~~ any. Every body crye[s] owt that his Hollines would be pleased p*re*sently to end this good work of b*ishop*s before the ~~dispensation~~ marraidge be concluded as a thinge not dependinge upon it. The lord keep*er*[397] hath beene no back frend to o*u*r bussines because the Jesswetes have no hand w*i*th hyme. But M*r* Secretary Colvert and M*r* Cottington, who hath a Jesswette to his brother,[398] have beene very forward against us.

In my letters before Chrismas I sent yo*u* newes of M*r* W*illia*m Floyer['s][399] good end, w*i*th a letter of George to yo*u*. I looke for hyme every day. His Ma*jes*ty hath been sick of the gowt this Chrismas, as is sayed, but nowe, God be thancked, [is] reasonable well. I pray God

[395]For the contents of and agreement on the marriage articles of December 1622 (concerning the infanta's household and chapel, her servants and the arrangements made for the education of her children, and the legal status of and protection for English Catholics), endorsed by James in January 1623, see Redworth, *PI*, pp. 49, 174–183. On 12/22 February 1623, William Harewell reported to John Bennett that 'it is saied the k[ing] of England at his signing and putting his hand unto the conditions of marriadge concerning religion <seemed to make a pause and> bad[e] the noble men that stood by [to] beare witnesse that he signed those conditions against his conscience. Kings have more fetches than ordinarie men.' Harewell understood also that 'the palatine shall be restored to what the Spaniards possesse of his, and perhaps the rest, but with condition that his children be brought up in the emperours court': AAW, A XVII, no. 6, p. 22.

[396]For puritan ire at rumours spread by Catholics about the dispensation, see *DSSD*, p. 132.

[397]John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.

[398]Sir Francis Cottington's brother, Edward, had entered the Jesuit novitiate in late 1602, although he died shortly afterwards: CRS, 74, p. 148. See also CRS, 54, pp. 63–66; M.J. Havran, *Caroline Courtier* (London, 1973), pp. 3, 13.

[399]Or 'Floyde'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he have longe life. Ther is a comaund sent to all judges not to medle with recusantes.

My frend[400] with all myn[e] [?] salute you. We are all behowldinge unto her. I pray remember my frend and my service to Pater Maistro. She hopeth you will come boath together. God keepe you.

Yours,

Rich[ard] Sara

January 15 1622.

It is written unto us that the Jesswetes mean to sett up a seminary at Lysbon in those howses that doe belonge to us and soe sett an altar against ~~the~~ an altar. We doe not desyre they should make up such buildinges for it is to serve them selfes and to oppose us. Lett those howses be joyned to Don Pedro[401] his colledge. If you informe not of this they will breed us truble. Good lord, they thincke upon nothinge but tumultes and scandall. If the sea apostolick takes no order with them, our cuntrey wilbe undon. You must gett this matter of bishops sett forward before the maiche be concluded.

[*on p. 4*]

Addressed: To the worshipfull my loving frend M^r^ John Bennett.

[*on p. 2*]

Endorsed: M^r^ Clifton.

26. John Bennett to Sir George Villiers, marquis of Buckingham, 24 February/6 March 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 8, pp. 27–30; part printed in TD, V, pp. ccxciii–ccxcv*]

Most excellent and my very good lord,

As to this weighty ~~and importante~~ affayre, soe long dependinge in this courte, I could bringe no other furtherance ~~but~~ <than> such as weake endevoures, ~~issuing out of~~ <accompanied with> an earnest desire of thincrease of Godes honor, ~~accompanied with~~ <and> the service of our prince and countrey, ~~could~~ <~~might~~> <could> affoorde, soe truly could I be very well contente to have lapped upp the memory therof, and joyed in the happy issue, as the effecte

[400] Lady Elizabeth Dormer.
[401] Pedro Coutinho.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the diligence and industry of others. ~~But I could not be suffered soe to lurk, those poore laboures <must> by busy tonges be brought to lighte and branded I knowe not with what aspersiones of not only unprofitable <for> which I~~ [*deleted:* ~~should~~] <[*deleted:* ~~had~~]> ~~<should not complayne>~~ [~~but~~] ~~easily have passed over, but hurtefull also to the cause I pretended to advance. And albeit my conscience tould me I sewed noe badd seede and founde the blade incombred with cockle of misreporte~~. [*In margin:* But lurke I might not. I must undergo the ce*n*sures of medling wittes; and, howsoever my co*n*science tould me I had sowed noe bad seed, I found cockle of misreporte cast in.] Yet ayminge, for my parte, at noe private interestes, I resolved to suffre both to growe, in Godes name, knowinge well our supreme and all-seeinge judge would, tyme ynoughe, severe them, thon for his barne, thother for the fyer. ~~But perceaving that myndes guyded whether with mistakinge, misaffection or an overflowing humor of overactive medlinge, I will not judge, had spred this noyse even to the eares of his Majesty~~ [*In margin:* But p*er*ceaving that, by overactive diligence, this noyse had bene spread even to the eares of his Ma*jes*ty (whose vassall, though unp*ro*fitable, yet loyall, I am)] and your Ex*cellen*cy, the memory of whose honorable travailes our posterity will blesse, I held [it] my duty to give accountes ~~furst to his Majesty, then to your Excellency~~ <to both>, such as if it cannot recomende much deserte, yet I hope will free my actiones and intentions from all suspecte of cryme. Thus then it fell out.

When furst I arrived here, of his Hol[iness] his power to dispence in our case I found noe doubte made: only, it was aggreed amongst devines [*p. 28*] that to warrant the doinge, as voyd of synne, there must be ~~just~~ <good> cause, inferring special advantage for God his honor, justly hoped, ~~and~~ yea, well assured therby: ells could not ~~his Hol~~[~~iness~~] he lawfully enervate an ecclesiastical decree established for publick good, sith that were an abuse of his authority, graunted [*word deleted*] non ad destructionem, sed ad aedificationem. At my furst audience, his Hol[iness] demaunded what in this behalf we could allege. Soe did the card*ina*ls [*word deleted*]. To satisfy, I pressed by word, and exhibited in writing, the reasones w*hi*ch I send herew*i*th. But this busynesse never wanting stiff and secrete opposition, it was insisted that thoughe ~~it could not be denyed~~ the causes alledged were sufficient, yet what assurance could be had that his Ma*jes*ty would mak[e] good such thinges as therin should be promised? To aunswere this, I added the appendix, w*hi*ch goethe also ~~herewith~~ <w*i*th these>. That, in forcinge and urginge these reasones, we should be importunate: our duty to our prince, our present advantage, our former distresses, were causes pregnant, warranted specially w*i*th the right we had to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

require remedy from the sea apostolick when, in peaceable maner, and <with> content of all partys, it might be yelded. ~~As~~ If our speeches were feelinge, as issuing from the harte, ~~soe in truth~~ <truly they> were ~~they~~ h[e]ard w*i*th feeling by his Hol[iness] and our hon[ourable] judges, <who> ever showed an ernest desire to give his Ma*jes*ty all satisfaction, and us the releef w*hi*ch <we> soe justly required.

All this <we did, or could, doe> induceth no bond, chalengeth no thankes ~~from us~~. It is due. But P*adr*e Maestro his his [*sic*] faithfull diligence, sollicitude and incessant laboures in this ~~behalf~~ affayre, discovered that affectionat regard of his Ma*jes*ty his service and sincere love to our nation, that many strangers (for all in this matter are not of our judgment) ~~thought it an~~ <deemed it an> excesse, yea blamed it in him. His answere ever was that, thoughe by nation he were not English, yet his harte was English; [*in margin:* and [he] soe much p*rev*ayled that, w*i*th his prudence and efficacy, he swayed myndes, if not in affection averted, yet assuredly in judgment opposite]. I ~~protest unto~~ assure yo*ur* Ex*cellen*cy I increase nothing, nor can deliver thon half of what I many tymes h[e]ard and saw. [*p. 29*] Gratitude and honesty bynd us to acknowledge that w*hi*ch, if we did deny or could secrete, this whole court ~~ringeth of~~ <would wittnesse>.

When this important busynesse was brought to the issue w*hi*ch here for the tyme would be expected, I was called uppon by o*ur* Catholicke cleargy of England to supplicate for a sup*eri*or, w*hi*ch nowe they they [*sic*] have wanted above xx^{ty} monthes,[402] and is needffull to preserve peace, discipline and order amongst us. Why they desired that the delegate unknowne, insuficient and never heard of authority of an archprest should should [*sic*] be changed to the caracter, kn[o]wne [?] and receaved jurisdiction of a bishop, and this, w*hi*ch they had xx^{ty} yeres sued for, the enclosed writing will give yo*ur* Exc*ellency* a brief accounte only. I add that, if ever severe discipline were useffull amongst us at this tyme, it is most needeffull to restrayne the overpotent sway of some stirring spirits impatient of limits and boundes, but alsoe w*i*th authority to guyde the zeale of other Catholickes whoe in this calme maye runne into excesses and increase his Ma*jes*ty his difficultyes to there owne harme and hurte of there comon cause. If herin should be neglecte, and therby disorders happen, his Ma*jes*ty hath present remedy, calling the sup*eri*or to accounte, w*hi*ch he cannot avoyd by pretence he wanteth power and meanes of redresse w*hi*ch an archpreest may justly doe. [*In margin:* And this I say <to satisfy such as> [*three words deleted*] ~~reported~~ decried and blamed that [*sic*] ~~though~~ this o*ur* suite <as> unseazonable or out of tyme.]

[402] i.e. since the death of the third of the archpriests, William Harrison.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sithence we receaved the joyffull newes of the late dispatch in Spayne, his Hol[iness] increased o*u*r congregation w*i*th accesse of two card*ina*ls in place of Card*ina*l Sacrati[403] whoe is absent. These are Ubaldini[404] and Barberini,[405] worthy personages, and [they] shewe greate zeale in this affayer. Two dayes agoe, I had audience w*i*th his Hol[iness], to wytt, the 4th of this p*re*sent. I fynde him the same that [he] allwayes [was]. Having sayd what I purposed, I exhibited the memorial inclosed. But here are greater and more powerffull endevoures w*hi*ch will, I hope, bring this whole treaty on to a speedy conclusion; which God, of his goodnesse, graunt. If I have beene ~~tire~~ tediouse, I conceaved a bonde and necessity. What issueth out of dutiffull affection y*ou*r Ex*cellen*cy will easily p*ar*done. Soe, wishing yo*u*r Ex*cellency* all increase of hon[our] and happinesse, here and hearafter, I rest.

[*on p. 30*]

Endorsed: Mr Bennett to the d[uke] of Buckingham.

27. William Farrar [Harewell] to John Bennett, 5/15 March 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 10, pp. 33–36*]

Very reverend and most worthy sir,

The last weeke I gave you notice of o*u*r friend Mons*ieu*r Carondelet his visiting M^{r} President[406] heere and the entertainement he had of us w*i*th the content and satisfaction he receaved therein.[407] The w*hi*ch he hath since very well certified; for at his departure from Cambray towards England, w*hi*ch was w*i*thin three dayes after he went from us, he sent the colledge, for a present, a faire <guilt> cuppe w*i*th a cover in like sort guilt w*hi*ch is valued to be worth some 9 or 10^{l} sterl[ing]. It seemes to be of English worke, and given him by some friends there.

[403] Francesco Sacrati.
[404] Roberto Ubaldini.
[405] Francesco Barberini.
[406] Matthew Kellison.
[407] On 12/22 February 1623, William Harewell had notified John Bennett that he had been sent to Brussels by Matthew Kellison to meet with François de Carondelet. Carondelet had recently arrived from England 'to treate with the infanta uppon speciall affaires in the behalfe as well of the k[ing] of England as the k[ing] of Spaine'. Harewell saw 'the passe' Carondelet 'had from the k[ing] of England' and said that he had 'done extraordinarie great offices for the clergie of Eng[land] with the infanta' and others, and had defended Kellison against the 'aspersion which was cast uppon him for his booke' (*The Right and Iurisdiction of the Prelate, and the Prince*): AAW, A XVII, no. 6, p. 21; see also *Letter 25*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I enformed you also by my last, and by my other also of the weeke before, of the licence the chapter hath given him to be absent untill midsomer next and of my being at Cambray to deale w*i*th some of the canons therein. Withall I writt that we had newes out of England that the bishop of Canterburie[408] would resigne his place to the bishop of Lincolne, lord keeper.[409] But it was writt onely as a report, not for <a> certainetie, though it be very probable there is some such matter.

On Satturday last we had di[s]astrous newes from Brussels, w*hi*ch went there for currant, and was verily beleeved of most of our nation in that cittie, to witt that the prince of Wales should be murdered by one of his pages, and the king <surprized and> putt in prison. This newes came from Holland to Brussels, and presently ranne through all these countries. But by Munday we heard that the prince was gone privately out of England disguised into Spaine. This report gave us some hope that the former was false, yet could we not beleeve it, having no greate ground for the same, but ~~the~~ a breeve that the infantas agent[410] in England had writt so much to the governor of St Omers, and he to the abbot of Arras.[411] Yesternight, being Tuesday, we had this most certainely confirmed from Paris by D*octo*r Bishop (our monkes heere receaved as much from theirs there), who writt that the <prince> passed that way the first Sunday in Lent, from whome, for that I presume you will have the same newes particularly, I omitt to adde any more of what comes from him. Over and above w*hi*ch, <Don Carlos>[412] the Spanish emb[assador's] wife residing in Cambray had a letter from her husband in England on Munday morning to the same effect, who moreover writes that the prince his going into Spaine was kept so secrett that he was not made privie thereunto till he was gone; and that he sent a post after him to prevent his coming to Madrid, if it were possible. This newes I doubt not will be the comfortablest unto you that came a long time, as it is to all of us heere. The puritans in England, as the same emb[assador] writes, [*p. 34*] doe mightily storme hereat.[413] But many take this to be one of the greatest pointes of pollicie that the king hath yet shewed for the securing of himselfe and his sonne.

[408] George Abbot.

[409] John Williams.

[410] Jean-Baptiste van Male. Another representative of the infanta, Ferdinand Boischot, had recently arrived in order to negotiate the proposed armistice in the Palatinate: *CSPV, 1621–1623*, p. 577; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fos 189r–v, 208r–209r.

[411] Philippe de Caverel, OSB, abbot of St Vaast at Arras. See *NAGB*, p. 182; Allison, RSGB, II, pp. 255–256.

[412] Carlos Coloma.

[413] See, e.g., *DSSD*, pp. 121–122.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Newes heareof we expect to heare out of England from o*ur* friends there, from whome we have not now heard any thing these three weekes or thereaboutes. The last we receaved from you were 15 dayes agoe and bore date the 21 and 28 of Januarie. D*oct*o*r* Bishop writes he had one from you of the 14th of Februarie wherein you advertized him you intended to be shortely downe, w*hi*ch we shall be glad to see. I am now, and shall heereafter be, the more sparing in my writing for that I am in doubt my letters will not find you there. M*r* President[414] is well and salutes you most kindely. He sung Masse and evensong on St Gregories day.[415] D*oct*o*r* Champ[ney] and the rest do also remember themselves respective unto you. My self kisse y*ou*r hands, and rest.

Y*ou*rs ever in all service,

W*illia*m Farrar

Douay 15 Martii 1623.

I writt unto you in my former letteres of a search w*hi*ch was of late (21 Jan[uary]) in the New Prison at London by com*m*ission from the b[ishop] of Canterburie. The cause thereof (as M*r* Nelson[416] writt) was given by the Jesuites who were saied to have printed an answer to the articles or propositions (the last summer given them by the king)[417] against the kinges liking and prohibition, and secretly to have divulged divers copies thereof. What was taken from them, v*iz* their ordinarie bookes, churchestuffe etc., the king promised should be restored unto them againe; and, at that time that notice heereof came unto us, it was also writt that one of the Jesuites there in prison had his chalice and some other of his thinges de facto restored, and expected restitution of the rest.[418]

No address.

[*on p. 36*]

Endorsed: Perused.

[414] Matthew Kellison.
[415] 12 March.
[416] John Jackson.
[417] See *Letter 14*.
[418] On 20 February/2 March 1623, William Bishop had written to John Bennett that, 'upon suspition of some writings, F[ather] Fishers [John Percy's] lodging was searched in the New Prison, but he', with the prison keeper's connivance, was with 'the countes[s] of Buckingham in Leicestershire', as Bishop had been informed by Richard Broughton, who was resident with the Manners family at Belvoir: AAW, A XVII, no. 7, p. 25; *Letter 29*. Alvise Valaresso noted the confiscation of Percy's books and 'sacred implements' by 'the king's special command', but also, a week later, the restoration to him of 'everything taken from him': *CSPV, 1621–1623*, pp. 573, 578; see also Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 116; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 177v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

28. William Farrar [Harewell] to John Bennett, 12/22 March 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 11, pp. 37–40*]

Very reverend and right worthy sir,

Since my last of the weeke past,[419] wherein I writt of the prince of Wales his journey into Spaine and the report of the bishop of Canterburie his surrendering his place, we have not receaved any fresh newes from England. All these countries ringe with the applause of our most noble prince his resolution and adventure for Spaine, and it is the onely subject now of every ones discourse. Much speech there is of his carriadge in Paris, which perhaps you have in part heard from thence. Now we heare that he is safely arrived in Spaine, which we hope is certaine, though we doubt whether any certaine newes could be brought hither from Spaine since his arrivall there, for that is not above 18 dayes since he parted from Paris. It is certaine that the marques of Buckingham, <with> Sir Francis Cottington and M^r^ Endymion Porter, went along with him,[420] and (as we are credibly informed) not above two more or three at the most.

We have receaved letters from Lou[v]aine of great newes reported there come fresh from Rome; in which letter [*sic*] the partie writes that the day of the date of his saied letter, which was 15 Martii, he sawe a letter from Rome in which was written that M^r^ Gage was arrived at Rome with other gentlemen coming from England to procure the dispensation, and the partie that shewed him this letter added that he thought that that matter would be sett forward apace (although there had been nothing done in it all this while). And, after, he writes that another partie the same day tould him that M^r^ Gage had procured the dispensation, and that it would be at the court in Spaine by Midlent Sunday. God be thanked M^r^ Gage is so great a man in those mens mouthes. Withall the same partie from Lou[v]aine writes that one (who had the newes from the fathers there) tould him lately that we had now a bishop made, and that the man was M^r^ Benett, but which (sayeth he) I knowe not. And, a few dayes <after>, the same partie tould him againe that now he had for certaine that the clergie had no bishop, nor should have any, because the king (of England) himselfe had written unto the pope against it.[421] These men would faine doe, or at least say, something, but that they falter in both. It is writt from

[419] *Letter 27*.

[420] See *DSSD*, p. 119; Redworth, *PI*, pp. 77–79.

[421] William Bishop had been appointed as bishop of Chalcedon (i.e. as a titular bishop *in partibus infidelium*) in February 1623. The breve for his consecration was issued on 13/23

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same place out of letters from England that Dr Dunne hath of late preached [*p. 38*] at Pauls Crosse by the kinges command,[422] and in his sermon declared publickely that the kinges will was that all persecution of Catholickes should from thence forth cease throughout the realme.

The Jesuites begin now to shew themselves the onely men for the match; though some of them in these parts have not doubted, and that very lately, to say that thinges did not goe in England in that sort, nor so well, as men abroad did thinke and that, if Gondomar did not returne into England this spring, Jordanio converteret*ur* retrorsum. But the prince his going into Spaine hath turned the winde and filled their sailes full for the other course. We have had none from you these three postes. M^r^ President[423] and the rest salute you, and now longe to see you, praying hartely for y*our* safe returne. I have no more worth the writing. And so, kissing y*our* hands and the handes of Padre Maistro and M^r^ Seton, I rest.

Y*our*s ever to serve you,

W*illia*m Farrar

Douay 22 Martii 1623.

[*on p. 40*]

Addressed: Al molto illustre et rev*eren*do sig*no*re, il Sig*no*re Giovanni Benetto, agente del clero di Ingleterra en Roma.

No endorsement.

29. William Farrar [Harewell] to John Bennett, 26 March/5 April 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 19, pp. 71–72*]

Very reverend and respected good sir,

Since the last poste, when I writt[424] at large of all occurrences, there hath not arrived any newes heere worth advertising. There have some come to us since then out of England but they bring no more w*i*th

March 1623. The consecration took place in Paris on 25 May/4 June 1623: Anstr., I, p. 37; AAW, A XVII, no. 12, p. 41; TD, V, p. cclxxiii.

[422] See M. Maclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534–1642* (Toronto, 1958), p. 245.

[423] Matthew Kellison.

[424] *Letter 28*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

them than we had before, and w*hi*ch you have also had from mee. This onely particular we heare above what I have hitherto writt unto you concerning the search that was made in the New Prison, in F[ather] Fisher[425] his chamber, w*hi*ch was (as formerly I have ~~formerly~~ advertized you) to finde out certaine printed bookes privately sett forth by him about the disputation he had w*i*th D*octo*r White, contrarie unto the kinges expresse command given <him> in that behalfe, and for certaine other papers and letters whereof he was suspected.[426] Above this I say we have heard that the saied F[ather] Fisher not being <found> in prison when the saied search was made, but abroad in the countrie by the keepers p*er*mission, the keeper in default of him was com*m*itted prisoner untill the others coming in, w*hi*ch happening a fewe dayes after, F[ather] Fisher, so soone as he was returned to prison, was com*m*itted to close guard, w*hi*ch argued that the state had some pretence against him, otherwise they would not have made shew of such severitie as the times goe now.

The Jesuitesses doe [*word deleted*] swarme in London and other places of England.[427] I writt the last weeke how their mother provinciall, by

[425]John Percy SJ.

[426]See *Letters 14*, *27*.

[427]For a copy of the allegations made during this month (March 1623) against Mary Ward by Mary Alcock, see AAW, A XVII, no. 17, pp. 59–62; Dirmeier, *MW*, I, pp. 762–765; Littlehales, *Mary Ward*, pp. 88, 91, 111–112. Alcock's accusations were similar to those presented at Rome by both the secular clergy and others, such as the Benedictine Robert Sherwood: Littlehales, *Mary Ward*, pp. 111–112. Alcock claimed that Mary Ward 'came licke a dutches to visite the Ignatian prisoners att Wisbitche in [a] coache attended with two pages ridinge with her in the sayde coache and two or three attendantes of her owne sexe and was so bowntifulll or rather prodigall that she gave to eache keeper (who wished more suche guests) an angell a peece'. She and her company 'lived att Hungerford Howse in the Strand verye riotouse, with excessive charge bothe for coastlye garments and daintie fare, nott omittinge to dress herselfe and the rest in the newest and most phantasticall maner then (and yeat) used by that companie, videlicet as ieolowe ruffes etc.' In this, they took after Anne Turner, who had been executed (with dramatic shows of repentance) for her part in the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury: 'they seeme to imitate M^ris^ Turnors institution (a sainte latlie hanged att Tiburne for notoriouse crimes, and canonised by my late Lord Cooke), rather than the institution of S^t^ Ignatius latelye canonized by Pope Gregorie'. At Hungerford House they 'weare esteemed curtisans and suspected for hoores', as Ward's 'owne brother [William] (nowe called M^r^ Inglebie) with others will testifie'. Furthermore, 'in imitation of the boyes at S^t^ Omers they have playes called actions, manye times, through the helpe of Father [John] Willsons procurement, whearat theire creditors repine, wishing they wowld refraine suche chargable toies and paye theire depts'. Some of the Jesuits urged them on: 'the Ignatians (and namlye Father [Richard] Gibbons, Father [William] Flacke, and Father John Lhoyd [i.e. Floyd] with others before and since the death of Father [Roger] Lea) encoraged and exhorted the sayde companie by sermons and otherwise to dilate and extend themselves though they were butt twoo in a howse'. Mary Ward 'woulde <often> affirme and saye shee was sure, when her order was confirmed, whiche shee kneawe would be shortlye, that manye of her companie by reson of theire worthynes and perfection showld

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

name N. Bapthrope,[428] passed this way to S^{t} Omers with two other of her societie with her, and a yong man her servant. They give out that their mother generall is in great grace in the court of Rome and that <her> suite goes on very well, with expectation shortely to have a good dispatch thereof. In England the puritans are at their wittes endes, having all their common wealth putt out of joynt by the prince his suddaine departure for Spaine. They talke greate wordes, and (as we heare), with bills sett uppon the Sp[anish] emb[assador][429] his gates, threaten somewhat before May. But they are [*word illegible*]. The princes servantes are gone after him to the number of 80 of his household. Other noblemen have overtaken him by this, whose names I writt you in my last. It is thought he will be backe by the end of May. The marques of Buckingham (as he writt to his wife) is to returne before him, to witt, so soone as the marriadge is past in Spaine. On Sunday next, being Palme Sunday, we hould the quarant howers <of praier> in our colledge for the good successe heereof in the behalfe of Godes Church and our countrie.

Heerewith I send you some papers from M^{r} Broughton. M^{r} President[430] and the rest salute you. We have not heard from you now these 3 weekes, and Doctor Bishop [*p. 72*] (as yesterday he writt) not this moneth; which makes us thinke we shall see you shortly, supposing you differ your writing untill you write that good newes we expect, which is that you have your long desired dispatch of all businesses, and are setting forward towards us. I write the more sparingly for that I feare my letters will not finde you there. God send you a happie journey downe. We pray daiely for you. So kissing your handes and the hands of Padre Maistro and M^{r} Seton, I rest.

Yours ever to serve you,

William Farrar

Douay 5 April 1623.

No address or endorsement.

be imploy[e]d by his Holines['s] comande and placed in diverse monasteries to reforme other religiouse orders. Therfore it behoved them to take corage and shew themselves more than woemen': AAW, A XVII, no. 17, pp. 59–62; Birch, *CTJI*, I, p. 377; cf. Peters, *Mary Ward*, pp. 354–355; T.J. Dandelet, *Spanish Rome 1500–1700* (London, 2001), p. 180.

[428] Barbara Babthorpe.

[429] Carlos Coloma.

[430] Matthew Kellison.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

30. William Bishop to Thomas Rant,[431] 14 September 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 40, pp. 141–142*]

Very reverend father,

It falles out so that I cannot, I feare mee, dispatch all my letters of recommendation for you, with all other writings necessary for yo*u*r journey this weeke, unles I, being now out of London, do happely meet with a messenger that goes ~~hence~~ <thither> two daies henc[e] wherefore I do send you inclosed, within F[ather] Bartins letter, one of mine to his Holines in congratulation,[432] and another in thankes giving to Card[inal] Bandini[433] w*hi*ch I pray you send away with the first [op]portunity to the said good father, desiring him to present them at his first leisure. M^r^ Colleton, with ~~the~~ many other of the better sort of o*u*r cleargy, will send you the like in their own names unto both his Holines and the same cardinall, w*hi*ch, if they come with mine, send them also, I pray you, in yo*u*rs inclosed unto Father Bartin, desiring him in o*u*r names to deliver both togither both to the one and thother. Otherwise send mine away alone I pray <you>, for that they will come rather to[o] late than otherwise. Wee all pray you very hartely to make yo*u*r self ready for the next weeke. You must p*ro*cure for your self the nuncios[434] comendations unto the popes nephew,[435] for we have not yet heard what he is called, and therefore could not write to him. Take your generals[436] comendac*i*ons

[431] For the appointment of Thomas Rant as William Bishop's agent in Rome, see AAW, A XVII, no. 35, pp. 129–130. John Bennett had returned from Rome in the summer of 1623, and accompanied Bishop to Douai in July 1623, on Bishop's journey to England. Bennett came back to England via Brussels in early August 1623 but died almost immediately after he arrived: Anstr., I, pp. 32, 37. For Rant's instructions, as Bishop's agent, see AAW, A XVII, no. 36, p. 131. On 7 November 1623, Arthur Pitts informed Rant that Bishop had dealt with the French ambassador in London, so that letters to Rant might 'passe in his packet' to the French ambassador in Rome, and that Rant should send his letters to London by the same means: AAW, A XVII, no. 50, p. 167.

[432] AAW, A XVII, no. 41, pp. 143–144 (15 September 1623). Bishop's officials had written on 10 September 1623 to congratulate the new pope, Urban VIII (Maffeo Barberini), who had been elected on 27 July/6 August 1623: AAW, A XVII, no. 37, pp. 135–136. See also *Letter 34*. For the Francophile Barberini papacy, see Dandelet, *Spanish Rome*, pp. 188–190.

[433] For William Bishop's letter of 16 September 1623 to Cardinal Bandini, see AAW, A XVII, no. 42, pp. 145–146. Bishop's vicars-general and archdeacons also wrote to Bandini, on 18 September: AAW, A XVII, no. 45, pp. 153–154.

[434] Ottavio Corsini, archbishop of Tarsus.

[435] Cardinal Francesco Barberini, nephew of Urban VIII.

[436] Pierre de Bérulle, the founder and general of the French Oratory. On 17 September 1623, William Bishop wrote to Bérulle concerning Rant's agency in Rome on behalf of the English secular clergy: AAW, A XVII, no. 43, pp. 147–148. See also John Gee, *New Shreds of*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unto the Frenc[h]e ambassador[437] at Rome and to whom els he shall thinke fittest to further your negotiation in our behalfe.

The cardinall of Richelieu['s] comendacions also will do us much good, wherefor I send unto D[octor] Smith to write to him first. Touching your charges I will write to Monsieur de Gamaches[438] that he deliver you one hundreth Frenc[h]e crownes out of that bagg which I gave him to keepe for M[r] D[octor] Champeney. I do now send you my letter to him, and did the last weeke write to M[r] D[octor] Champeney to write to the said doctor to the same effect. You must have a man to waite upon you. Wherefore you may <stand in> need of such mony at Paris. When you come to Rome you must take up of the college of Dowaies mony for to serve your turne. We will see them paid againe and, albeit I did the last weeke write to D[octor] Champeney to that purpose, yet do you call upon him for a warrant to receive the same mony of their factor at Rome.

It is now a common rumour that our prince is come home unmaried and unbetrothed,[439] as our king saith, on his commandement, yet without any meaning to breake of[f] the match, which he desires now more than before, as he hath told the Spanish ambassadors[440] in great earnesnes [*sic*] and caused them so to write into Spaine. The fault is laid on the pope's nuncio in Spaine[441] who, having the dispensation in his handes, would not deliver it till he had received order from his Holines that now is so to do.[442] The king fears lest the Spanish ambassadors here should have certified some thing of the delaies of performaunce of such favours as he pleased to promise to the Catholikes, and that thereupon they in Spaine did make delaies of the mariage. This I pray you tell the nuncio. Notwithstanding <the rumour of> our princes returne, his Majestie hath given order as we heare <from the Sp[anish] ambassadors house> unto the lord keeper[443] to dispatch presently the pardons for all Catholikes that please to take it, and to sett all prisoners at liberty, with the suspension of all penall lawes <for time to come and to give> ~~and~~ order to judges and

the Old Snare (London, 1624), pp. 51–54, for the copy of a letter, dated 14 September 1623, from John Colleton, Richard Smith, Richard Broughton, and Edward Bennett to Bérulle requesting that Rant might serve as William Bishop's agent. For the probable means of Gee's acquisition of this letter, see Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare*, pp. 109, 161–162; BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 101v.

[437] Noël Brûlart.

[438] Philippe de Gamaches, a professor of theology at the Sorbonne. See *Letter 31*.

[439] Prince Charles arrived back in England on 5 October 1623.

[440] Carlos Coloma and Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa.

[441] Innocenzio de Massimi, bishop of Bertinoro.

[442] See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 26, 40; Redworth, *PI*, pp. 102–104.

[443] John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

justices not to execute them.[444] In my next you shall heare whether this be so presently p*er*formed as it is comanded. Thus with my very harty comendac*i*ons <to your self and> [*two words deleted*] unto all my good friends, I rest.

Yo*ur*s assuredly,

W*illia*m Chalcedon

The 14 of o*ur* September 1623.

[*on p. 142*]

Addressed: Au révérend père, le Père Thomas Rant, prestre de la congrégatione de l'Oratoire auprès l'église de S^{t} Honoré a Paris.

[*on p. 141*]

Endorsed: Written: Sept[ember] 14 1623.
Received: Octob[er] 24 1623.
Answered: Nov[ember] 1.

[444]See above, p. 63; Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 155–159; *Cabala*, pp. 79–80; PRO, SP 14/152/46, 46.i (for Williams's dealing with the Spanish ambassadors over the pardons, and his attempt to mislead them as to the cause of the delay, i.e. to gain time until Prince Charles returned from Spain). Williams informed Conway on 10 October that, on his own initiative, he had delayed sending out orders to suspend the penal laws against Catholic separatists because of the extent of popular opposition. This was a course which, on 11 October, Conway noted that the king had approved: PRO, SP 14/153/38, 39.

Calvert had written to Conway on 18 August that 'further direction' was needed for the grant of toleration to Catholics. This was because, in the present form of the articles, there was no provision for dispensing Catholics from the oaths of supremacy and allegiance and from 'their coming to church'. On the same day, Calvert was forced to admit that the Spanish ambassadors were so annoyed at the delays to the toleration grant that Inojosa threatened to write to the court in Spain to 'unsay all he hath sayd in his last letters'. The Spaniards also insisted that Lord Zouch should be compelled to take his oath to observe the treaty conditions in order to 'prevent many complaints, which otherwise would come from the Cinque ports, of people landing there to whom the oath of allegiance is administered': PRO, SP 14/151/5, fo. 6r; PRO, SP 14/151/6, fo. 8r–v. The following day, Conway replied that, in spite of James's ire at the Spaniards' demands, clauses concerning the dispensation from the oaths and ecclesiastical conformity would be dealt with, as would Lord Zouch's taking of the oath: *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 60; BL, Additional MS 35832, fo. 124r; see also PRO, SP 14/151/27, 43, 60, 61, 62, 63, 79. For the dispensation for Catholics, see PRO, SP 14/151/76, 77; PRO, SP 14/152/4; *CSPD, 1623–1625*, pp. 70, 76; McClure, *LJC*, p. 513. On 7 October, Conway ordered Williams 'to prepare and put in immediate execution the order for enlarging priests', and to inform the Spanish ambassadors thereof: *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 89.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

31. William Bishop to Thomas Rant, 25 September 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 47, pp. 157–160; part printed in TD, IV, pp. cclxxxii–cclxxxiv*]

Very reverend father,

I have at length made ready all that I thought requisite to furnish you in that long and painful journey to Rome. First <you> shall receive a hundreth Frenc[h]e crownes of Mons*ieu*r de Gamaches, one of o*u*r doctors of [the] Sorbon (with whom I left that and more) by this letter w*hi*ch I do write unto him to that effect. If that will not serve, you may take more. Salute also I pray you in my name Mons*ieu*r du Val[445] [and] Mons*ieu*r Filsac[446] my great friend. You may tell them that I have been very joyfully received of all o*u*r cleargy and laity aswell nobles as of the meaner sort; [and] that I have been very busy to reduce the Catholike cleargy <and laity> unto the ordinary goverment of the canons, as neare as I can, without offense of the state. Desire Monsieur Filsac['s] letters of commendation unto the cardinall of S*anta* Susanna who doth very much esteeme them. Concerning yo*u*r negotiation, the point w*hi*ch may be questioned is my creation of deane and chapter.[447] As for vicar generals and archdeacons, every one teacheth that it lieth in the bishops power to make them; for that he cannot, without their helpe, governe one diocese, much lesse a whole kingdome. Yet these archdeaconries be so cast that the ministers cannot be justly offended with them. For they be not distributed by bishoprics, as theirs are, but by shires; and ours have authority over Catholikes onely, who will not be governed by their archdeacons, and not over any P*ro*testants who be of their flocke. Wherefore the state it self cannot blame us who seeke to order them onely who will not be ordered by their new ~~canons~~ <injunctions> and disorderly ministers. Yea, they must confess that we do them a pleasure, to bring them to live orderly, whom they cannot rule.

Now, concerning deane and chapter, they are in all Catholike country[es] holden for the principall men of the cleargy,

[445] André du Val, a professor of theology at the Sorbonne.

[446] For Jean Filesac (Edmond Richer's successor as syndic of the Sorbonne), see Allison, RSGB, I, pp. 333–334; *NCC*, pp. 174, 241.

[447] For William Bishop's appointment of episcopal officials and his creation of a chapter, see Allison, RS, pp. 149–150.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ordained as to serve God howerly, so to assist the byshope with their counsell and to be an example unto the rest of the cleargy. Wherefore to want them is to want ~~the~~ a principall p*ar*t of the cleargy. Whereupon it followeth that his Holines, giving me the ordinary power and authority of a bishope, doth consequently give me power to institute <a> deane and chapter, as a society of grave learned men, without whom neither the bishope himself, nor the rest of the cleargy, can well consist. Neither is it materiall that I have no cathedrall church to give them residents [*sic*] in, nor revenues to maintaine them; of both w*hi*ch, God be thanked, they can provide for themselves. For it is not the place or maintenance that makes the men fitt for that calling, but the qualit[i]es and giftes w*hi*ch be in the men, w*hi*ch will in time, as we hope, draw the rest after them. The <ancient> byshops in the primitive Church, during the time of p*er*secution, had, no doubt, such worthy men about them as might well have been named a deane and chapter, but it sufficed them to have the matter it self, though not under those tearmes, w*hi*ch were very conveniently brought in afterward. So we do request that we may name the like qualified men by the name of deane and chapter, w*hi*ch are now usuall names all Catholike countries over, yea, and in ours also. Besides, a cathedrall church is so called because the bishop doth make his ordinary residence there, and setteth, as it were, his chaire in that place; for cathedrale doth come of cathedra, the bishops chaire. And what cathedrall church is there without deane and chapter? Finally, the deane and chapter have many priviledges by the canons of the church and, among the rest, one that we do chiefly ayme at w*hi*ch is that episcopall jurisdiction doth remaine among them untill a new bishop be chosen and consecrated. We have but one byshop. If God should call him, then were all piscopall jurisdiction lost in our country unles there be deane and chapter to conserve it. Wherefore, labour, I pray you, very carefully, to obtain of his Holines that he wilbe pleased to confirme and establish our deane and chapter, with power in the chapter, if our bishope should be dead (otherwaies to remaine in the bishop), [*two words deleted*] to cho[o]se a new deane if he that is now chosen by me should hap to dye. [*p. 158*] For this get the popes breve <holding it to be one of the chiefest matters that you <have> now to do>. To give you a brief for yo*ur* own instruction of the manner of <our> new established goverment, thus it is: over all England I have appointed five vicars generals [*sic*], one over the East, M*r* Colleton; the second over the South, M*r* D[octor] Smith; the third over Wales and the West, M*r* Edward

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Benet;[448] the fourth over the North w*hi*ch is M[r] Broughton. <To> the fift I leave the middest of the country, who may be either M[aster] D[octo]r Boswell or M[r] Arthur Pits, if he come as he promised. There be 20 archdeacons who have, ech one, two shires apeece, saving M[r] Nelson,[449] who hath the charge of six, and so have <the> two archdeacons of Wales, ech of them, six. Under ~~the~~ every archdeacon are two ~~deacon~~ deanes of the country, decani rurales, in ech shire [who] are to hearken after all the disorders of Catholikes in those shires, and to advertise the archdeacon thereof, that they may be amended. Besides, there shalbe in every shire a notary, to record what the archdeacon there concludeth, and to gather together such thinges as have happened, or shall happen, in the same, concerning <the> Catholike cause.

The deane and chapter are to assist the bishop with their counsell, and to p*re*serve episcopall authority if the bishop should happ to dy.

I desire you to obtaine of his Holines that such of our countrymen as have livinges abroad in other countries may be dispensed withall for their residence there for three years; so that they leave in their places sufficient men to discharge that duty w*hi*ch they were to p*er*forme; ~~and allow~~ <allowing> unto them a sufficient p*or*sion to maintaine them honestly. And, by name, I would request that favour for M[r] Arthur Pittes, chanon of Remeremont in Lorrayne, who is able to do o*ur* country much good, and [is] willing to labour here, so he may draw some reliefe from his chanonry and not be put out of it for his absence.

I do also send you hereinclosed a copy of faculties granted to the Jesuites at their going into Ireland at the request of Cardinall Arigonio,[450] desiring you to get Cardinal Bandino, or some other of o*ur* friends, to procure me the same, with that last line <set downe in it>, and this only addition that, <what> facultie soever any religious man in o*ur* country hath, I may enjoy and practise the same. This is all that now comes to my mind, w*hi*ch I recom*m*end unto yo*ur* care and diligence. I will not, at the first, find fault with any of the religious mens extraordinary facultates, and how they do communicate the same to ev*er*y meane member of their body. This I leave for hereafter. Thus

[448] William Harewell, in July 1624, described Edward Bennett as 'most about my lord [William Bishop] the time he was heere, and [the] cheefest of his counsell': AAW, B 26, no. 82.

[449] John Jackson.

[450] Cardinal Pompeo Arrigoni. See *NAGB*, pp. 119, 148, 157, 160, 214.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with my very harty com*m*endac*i*ons, praying o*u*r blessed Saviour to send you a happy journey, I rest.

Yo*u*r affectionate friend,

W*illia*m Byshop of Chalcedon

You must go up to Italy by Lyons lest you be suspected to come from Paris and so put [?] to make you[r] quaranteene.[451] But go first to Lorraine and stay there some few daies that you may take a testimoniall of the city that you go from thence, and so to Basill and Lucerne, where you may have yo*u*r passe signed to testify that you passed along that way.

I do send you <a> copy of all my letters constitutive, of vicars generals [*sic*], of archdeacons, of deane and chapter,[452] that you p*e*ruse them, and be more ready to defend them if any do impugne them, and a copy also of the instructions w*hi*ch I gave to the archdeacons.[453] All the letters in your comendations are so sealed that you may open them.

M^r^ Doctor Seton followeth the Cardinal de S*anta* Susanna at whose pallace you shall heare of him.[454] He did very greatly help M^r^ Bennet, for he is very expert in all the affaires of that court and mervellous well affected to o*u*r cleargy, wherefore make high account of his friendship.

[*p. 159*] This I give you as a secret instruction, when you have a convenient audience after your first, to let his Holines understand that o*u*r cleargy had no knowledge of Card[inal] Millino['s] election to be o*u*r protector and have since, both in o*u*r sute for byshops and about the college of Lisbo[n], found him to deale against us and so in others [*sic*] matters.[455] Wherefore o*u*r most humble sute unto his Holines is that he wilbe pleased to appoint some other cardinall for

[451] For Thomas Rant's journey to Rome, see *Letter 34*.

[452] AAW, A XVII, no. 30, pp. 117–118, no. 31, pp. 119–120, no. 32, pp. 121–124.

[453] AAW, A XVII, no. 67, pp. 211–212 (1623), 'Instructiones pro archdiaconis maxime cum visitant suas provincias', defining the archdeacon's functions when on visitation. Significantly, the thirteenth article to be observed and implemented reads as follows: 'tam sacerdotes quam laicos exitent ad Deum sancte colendum, et ad debitam regi obedientiam praestandam, pro cujus salute et tranquillo ac prospero regno divinam majestatem quotidie orent, nec non pro Carolo principe et infanta Maria'.

[454] See *Letter 34*.

[455] For the secular clergy leadership's long-standing antagonism towards Giovanni Garzia Millini, cardinal viceprotector of the English nation, see *NAGB*, pp. 13, 158. William Bishop, in a letter to Rant of early January 1624, repeated these accusations and stated that Millini had appointed, at the Jesuits' direction, a visitor of the English College in Rome in September 1623 'who, to gratify the cardinall and the fathers, made no bones to dismisse the scholers', i.e. the anti-Jesuit students ejected from the college (for whom see *Letters 33*, *34*): AAW, A XVII, no. 78, p. 249; TD, V, p. cclxxi.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

us that will indeed favour and protect us.[456] The like we may truly say of o*u*r colleges, whom the fathers will thrust out, [if] they can p*re*sently get his furtherance. We had therefore as much need to p*ro*cure those poore scholers a true p*ro*tector. If his Holines demand whom we desire, Card[inal] Bandini is the man to whom we be most bound, and in whom we have the greatest confidence, or whosoever els that is not to[o] much caried by the Jesuites.

[*on p. 160*]

Addressed: A monsieur, Monsieur Thomas Rant à Paris.

Endorsed: [*on p. 157*] Written: Septemb[er] 25 1623.
Received: Octob[er] 24 1623.
Answ[ered]: Nov[ember] 1.
[*on p. 158*] Theis letters bee w*i*thout date. But they came to my hands October 24 or therabouts, anno 1623. They were written Sept[ember] 25. For M^{r} Collintons letters and th*em* [?] came togeather. And th*ey* were of that date.

32. William Parker [Bishop] to Thomas Rant, 25 November 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 53, pp. 173–176*]

Very reverend and deare s*i*r,

These I send to congratulate yo*u*r arrivall at the holy city where I hope you are by this time, or wilbe very shortly. I have been in some shires over to visit and to give the sacr[ament] of confirmation,[457] where I was very welcome even to the hostes where the fathers of the companie[458]

[456]In March 1624, Bishop again insisted that Millini must be removed, and thought 'it most convenient to request to have Cardinall [Francesco] Barbarino the popes nephew, who is already protector of Scotland', since 'England and Scotland' were 'now made all one kingdome', and William Bishop was himself bishop 'aswell of Scotland as of England': AAW, A XVII, no. 101, p. 327. On 12 March 1624, Bishop's officials set their hands to a formal petition for Millini's replacement by Barberini: AAW, A XVII, no. 105, pp. 341–342; see also AAW, A XVII, no. 110, pp. 355–356, no. 114, pp. 363–364.

[457]For William Bishop's account, of 5 December 1623, of his tours during which he dispensed the sacrament of confirmation, see AAW, A XVII, no. 55, p. 181. On 25 December 1623, Joseph Haynes reported to Rant that Bishop was received 'by al sortes of well meaninge good Catholiques', including the 2nd Viscount Montague. Haynes enclosed a copy of Montague's letter of 1 August 1623 to Bishop 'at his first comminge': AAW, A XVII, no. 29, pp. 115–116. Haynes noted that Montague 'sent for him afterwards to his house where 500 were confirmed with wonderfull joyfull harts to have a Chatholique byshop amongest them': AAW, A XVII, no. 59, p. 191; see also Questier, *C&C*, p. 402.

[458]i.e. Jesuits.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reside. In a word, <from> the greatest of the Catholike nobles unto the meanest of the laity, there was common and great joy for that dignity bestowed on us by his Holines. And whereas some did mutter out [?] that it would be cause of contention <among Catholikes> and much trouble from the state, it prooves, God be thanked, much contrary. For it pleaseth his Ma*jes*tie to winke at it, and all orders of relig[ion] have sent me congratulation by their superiours, either coming to me in presence, as the p*ro*vincials of the Benedictins and of the Society did, and some others by letters very submissively written.[459] So that, o*ur* Saviour be praised, all goes very fairely on. And ~~all the~~ <four> Spa[nish] <extraordinarie> ambassadors[460] and the ordinary of France[461] do applaude o*ur* peacible and orderly p*ro*ceeding, and do much like that I have given no occasion of speech of me in the court. To speake the truth, I do much feare that I shall not be able to give satisfaction to all the shires in England nor be able to visit them in three or four yeares, wherefore I do hartely desire that one more b*ishop* at the least might be chosen for the north country. And the fittest man in my slender judgment wilbe M[r] D[octor] Champeny, who is a most honest vertuous man, of great zeale, learning and discretion, and not to[o] old, as I take some to bee who were otherwise to be p*re*ferred. He is also that country man.[462] Upon him also I desire that the charge of Scotland may be laid, unles his Holines thinke fitter as I and many other do, to give to the Scottes a bishop of their owne nation.[463] For they will not willingly be under any other. And none of ours doth desire to

[459]On 5/15 June 1623, Rudesind Barlow OSB had written to William Bishop from St Gregory's, Douai, promising obedience to him: AAW, A XVII, no. 21, pp. 81–82; TD, V, pp. cclxxv–cclxxvi.

[460]Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa had arrived in England in June 1623: *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 51. For the other Spanish ambassadors at this time (Diego de Mendoza (who landed in October 1623) and Diego de Messia (who arrived, as ambassador from the archduchess Isabella in Flanders, in November 1623)), see PRO, SP 14/153/41, 47; *CCE*, p. 110; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 150; *APC, 1623–1625*, p. 116; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 516, 522; PRO, SP 77/16, fo. 333r. The fourth ambassador (though not 'extraordinary') was, of course, Carlos Coloma: PRO, SP 14/154/27.

[461]Tanneguy Leveneur, count of Tillières.

[462]Anthony Champney came from the North Riding of Yorkshire.

[463]See Allison, RS, pp. 152, 189. Both William Bishop and his successor, Richard Smith, received jurisdictional authority over Scotland as well as England. Despite Bishop's reluctance to accept this responsibility, and despite Scottish Catholics' requests for Scottish prelates, 'no action was taken by Rome until 1653 when a local prefect was appointed for the Scottish mission': Allison, QJ, p. 140. See also AAW, A XVIII, no. 29, pp. 247–248; TD, V, pp. cclxiii–cclxv (a memorandum from David Chambers in 1624 requesting that the bishop of Chalcedon should be relieved of his jurisdiction over Scotland), pp. cclxii–cclxiii (a memorandum by Thomas Rant of 20/30 May 1624, similarly urging that Bishop should not have responsibility for the Scottish Catholics); but cf. AAW, B 26, no. 75 (Matthew Kellison to Thomas Rant, 15/25 June 1624, saying that he was 'not sorie that Scotland is excepted from our b[ishop's] jurisdiction'). Subsequently, in 1626, it was thought that a Scot, John

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be troubled with that charge, w*hi*ch will not be well taken of the nation. This point I do not desire that you do yet urge, but to insinuate onely, till I send you full comission from the best of o*u*r cleargy to deale in it wherefore, though you plainly declare that <I> do humbly desire <it> for the good of o*u*r country, yet because more voices may be required to it, do not expresse M. Doctor Champeney by name, that there be no collections made against him. If his Holines please to rely on my credit and yo*u*rs with F[ather] Bartins,[464] Card[inal] Ubaldinall [*sic*], Card[inal] Bentivolio and such others as may be there gotten, then it would bee a fitt season to send him as soone as the infanta shalbe come in, for this sending in one a good while after another is most likely to passe w*i*thout offending o*u*r state. M^r^ Thomas Sac[kville][465] talkes somwhat idly, as I take it, of having six b*ishop*s and a card[inal]. I would we might [*word omitted:* have] three. Among other yo*u*r charges you must have a speciall care that o*u*r cleargy [*words omitted:* do not] have bishops thrust upon [them] by any trickes of the religious, but that, when it shall please his Hol*in*es to grant us one or two more, that [*sic*] then he will vouchsafe to heare the desires and suffrages of o*u*r cleargy, that no unwelcome <man> be sett over them.

For newes, there came with o*u*r prince out of Spaine an extraordinary ambass[ador], Don Diego de Mendosa,[466] who have [*sic*] been very r[o]ially intertained and is returned.[467] Another [came] from the infanta in Flanders, wonderfully well accompanied, who was also very honorably received.[468] They two and Don Carolo[469] were of late blanquetted [*sic*] by the duke of Buckingham where, the king and prince being p*re*sent, the prince with the kings leave did drinke a health to the infanta of Spaine his mistris, and the king, as they say,

Trumbull, had been appointed to exercise episcopal jurisdiction in Scotland: Questier, *C&C*, p. 429. For Trumbull's arrest and interrogation in August 1626, see AAW, A XX, no. 22, p. 83. Trumbull had a licence from the papal nuncio in Paris 'to administer the sacraments of baptism, penance, the eucharist, extreme unction, and matrimony, throughout Ireland and Scotland' and, with the licence of the bishop of Chalcedon, in England as well: *CSPD, 1625–1626*, pp. 320–321. See also PRO, SP 16/21/71; PRO, SP 16/32/116; PRO, SP 16/36/44; PRO, SP 16/38/15; PRO, SP 16/44/84; PRO, SP 16/525/85. By October 1626, however, Archbishop Abbot was convinced that Trumbull was an impostor. The archbishop claimed to know, 'by certaine intelligence, that their purpose at Rome lately was to make one Muskett [i.e. George Fisher] to bee a bishop in Scotland': AAW A XX, no. 28, p. 101; see also PRO, SP 16/80/10; PRO, SP 16/529/93.

[464]Claude Bertin, superior of the French Oratory in Rome.

[465]The fourth son of Thomas Sackville, 1st earl of Dorset.

[466]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 150.

[467]Mendoza had departed on 21 November 1623: PRO, SP 14/154/67.

[468]Diego de Messia. The 'ordinary agent of Brussels', Jean-Baptiste van Male, came back to England at the same time: *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 150.

[469]Carlos Coloma.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wished all them hanged, and the devill to take them, that were against the match.[470] [*p. 174*] So that the common opinion now is that it is throughly agreed upon and will assuredly hold. Our prince obtained that recusantes should not pay in their halfe yeares rent at this season. And all priests were sett out of prison at his returne home.[471] The lord of Canterb[urie][472] would faine be medling with mee, as some report, and to give an occasion to the Spaniards to breake the match, but it seemes that his Ma*jes*tie will not p*er*mitt it.

Let me heare, I pray you, where you remaine there and what you are like to spend, that I may take order with them at Doway for the discharge of it. I do adventure this letter by the Frenc[h]e ambassad[or] but will shortlie find out the best course, I hope, of sending. [In the] meane season, o*ur* blessed Saviour protect and direct you in all the affaires of this poore Church of England. All yo*ur* friends do salute you and desire to be remembered by you in those holy places.

Yo*ur*s alwaies assured,

W*illia*m Parker al*ia*s Chalcedon (so do you write to mee)

The 25 of November stilo veteri.

[*on p. 176*]

Addressed: Au très révérend père, le Père Bartin, prestre de l'Oratoire et supérieur de S^{t} Louis, pour le Père Th[omas] Rant. A Rome.

Endorsed: [*on p. 173*] Written: 25 Novemb[er] 1623.
Received: Jan[uary] 16 1624.
Answ[e]r[ed]: [*sic*].
[*on p. 174*] Received by the hands of Père Bertin, but by the pacquett of France, th*e* 16 Januarii <1624> stilo novo.

This was the first letter I received from my lord since I came to Italye but not the first w*hi*ch hee writt unto mee. For yt appeeres by a letter w*hi*ch M^{r} Arthur Pitts sente unto mee, dated the 7 of November, that my l*or*d had sente mee a letter dated the 31 of October, and that I never received.

[470]This news was translated into Latin by Thomas Rant to be exhibited to the curia in Rome: AAW, A XVII, no. 55, p. 181.
[471]See PRO, SP 14/153/38.
[472]Archbishop George Abbot.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

33. Anthony Champney to Thomas Rant, 3/13 and 5/15 December 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 57, pp. 185–188*]

R*everen*d good father,

I have <not> writen unto you since those[473] I wrote after your departure from Paris. These I suppose will find you at yo*u*r journeys end. If our frends in Ingland have beene as slowe in writing to you as to us here, you have heard nothing from them since your departure from Parise. If you have not heard it alreadie, you may understand that upon the 5 of 9^{ber}, being Su*n*day, a certayn father of the co*m*panie <called Drewerie>[474] preaching at the French embassatours in London and a great co*m*panie being invited thither, mo[r]e by manie than could enter into the roome ~~about~~, about the middest of the sermon the flore of the chamber, being overcharged, brake and caried w*i*th it the flore of the chamber under it, so that the preacher him self, together w*i*th two other Jesuites and above 90 more, were crushed to death, besides divers that were hurt and brused, of w*hi*ch accident we, haveing notice, sung Mass for the dead and all our prestes sayd Mass for them.[475] Besides one Ladie Webbe,[476] daughter to S*i*r Thomas Treshame, w*i*th one sonn and a daughter, we heare not of anie of note <that were kild>. Of this accident M^{r} Ireland[477] (who is ill w*i*th a quartayn ague) writeth that they (<the fathers>) are blamed for two causes: thon for that they were warned before of the weakness of the howse, in so much that the landlord had charged them not to lay so much as anie nu*m*ber of faggotts;[478] thother because they made so great an assembly at this tyme, whereat the king was offended not a litle, blaming the over bowldness of Catholikes in this begining of his con*n*ivence towards them. Another grave preist writeth that it is

[473] AAW, A XVII, no. 48, pp. 161–162 (3/13 October), no. 51, pp. 169–170 (31 October/10 November).

[474] Robert Drury SJ.

[475] For the 'fatal vespers' in the gatehouse of the French embassy in Blackfriars on 26 October 1623, see above, pp. 64–65. Those Catholics who were opposed to the Society of Jesus did not go so far as to agree with Protestant commentators that the structural failure of the building was an act of providence. But several, like Champney, were clearly unsympathetic. In early January 1624, William Harewell remarked that he hoped the short Latin account (recently sent to Rome) of William Bishop's episcopate in England would, with other documents, 'being well pressed [. . .] lie heavie uppon our adversaries, and crack the master-beame of their creditt': AAW, B 47, no. 89.

[476] Catherine Webb, second wife of Sir John Webb of Odstock and Canford.

[477] Richard Ireland.

[478] According to William Sterrell, the warning was delivered to John Percy SJ: CRS, 68, p. 162.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

observed that this father was sent for expressly into Ingland to drawe the world unto them by his preaching, whereunto he is sayd to have hadd a good facultie. And this was his verie first sermon after his arrivall; 2^{ly} that this happened upon the 5 of 9^{ber} according to the French accompt, w*i*thin whose liberties it happened, w*hi*ch was the day of the powder plott, but after another accompt[479] [*sic*]. 3. That there being a preist, a monk and a frier p*re*sent, none of them were hurt but only the Jesuites kild. 4. There was a great ladie, to wit the Ladie Walingford,[480] who was desireous that a monk showld have preached there that day, but shee was p*er*suaded that he would be out of the towne; nevertheless [she was] towld that, if shee desired to heare it, there would be a good sermon. She ~~can*not*~~ <came not> but the monk [*in margin:* M^{r} Hilton[481]] whome she was made belive would be out of towne came and escaped. Thes[e] be <the> comentaries and glosses made of that dolefull accident, w*hi*ch I write not that I ame of the same opinion but that you may knowe what the world sayth, and use the knowledge thereof as you shall have occasion. M^{r} President[482] is upon urgent occasions of the howse[483] gone into Ingland, not to returne before the spring or somer. These inclosed letters are from two of our p*ro*fessours to the minister of the colledge there, to whom I pray you deliver them and demand answer of them and urg[e] the matter so farr as you [*p. 186*] shall think co*n*venient <and desire to speak your self with Peter Fitton[484] about this matter>. They p*re*tend to have good right <to> the things they demand and do not tak[e] it well they should be put of[f] w*i*th tergiversations. Here is a certayn bruite for the p*re*sent that the match w*i*th Spayn is broken, w*hi*ch we canot belive, for we had letters of the 23 of 9^{ber} that the prince hadd sett embrotterers one [*sic for* on] worke to make apparell for the infanta, and that the money w*hi*ch Catholikes were accustomed to pay into the excheker was refused and differed till our ladie day, the infanta being thought will [*sic*] come shortly after. I pray you deliver this inclosed to our agent[485] and com*m*end me most kindly to Father Bertin and, w*i*th my love to yo*u*r self, desiring some ~~memorie~~ remembrance <in your

[479]i.e. 5 November, according to New Style dating.

[480]Elizabeth Knollys (daughter of Thomas Howard, 1st earl of Suffolk), wife of William Knollys, 1st Viscount Wallingford, who was created 1st earl of Banbury in August 1626. He died in May 1632, allowing her to marry Edward Vaux, 4th Baron Vaux: *NCC*, pp. 80–81. In 1628, she was listed as a patron of William Harewell, who was, by then, serving as secretary to Bishop Richard Smith: PRO, SP 16/529/94, fo. 146v.

[481]Thomas (Placid) Hilton OSB.

[482]Matthew Kellison.

[483]The English College at Douai.

[484]Peter Biddulph.

[485]Giovanni Battista Scanarolio.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prayers> when you visit the holy places, I comitt you to Gods holy grace, this 13 of ~~9~~[ber] 10[ber] 1623.

Yo*u*rs ever,

Champney

After I had writen these, I received from M[r] Ceton[486] letters signifying a great deale of trouble amongst the scholers in that colledge and the dismission of divers,[487] whereof it seemeth foure or five are yet in Rome, expecting some better issue of theyre business, whoe, because they are gentlemen and farr from their freinds, and may be in great want of money or meanes as they have modestly signifyed to my lord[488] and as I suppose to their owne freinds, also I hope I may p*re*sume so much of their freinds will and disposition herein as to wish you to take of S*ign*ore Scanaroglio, our agent there, as for your owne use, so much as may keepe them out of extremitie till we may heare from my lord or theyre owne friends, or that some other order be taken for them there. I knowe not what com*m*ission my lord hath given you co*n*cerning the colledge but, such as you have, use it to the co*m*forth of th*e* dismissed w*i*th the advise of M[r] Ceton and other freinds. You must not be afrayd to shew your self agent or p*ro*curator for the clergie where the interest thereof is in question. For so shall you p*re*judice the same and give your adversaries courage to oppose them selves more bitterly agaynst you. M[r] Bennett[489] did ever fynd M[r] Ceton a true freind and so he sheweth him self still to be your man. Therefore be bowld w*i*th him in that w*hi*ch may appertayn to our clergies affayres. I have here writen to him w*hi*ch you will please to deliver him and so once more I com*m*end you to Gods holy grace. [*Four words deleted in margin.*] You <may> signify to M[r] Fitton and his felowes that their letters to my lord, to M[r] President and their owne freinds are in my hands and shall, God willing, be w*i*th <the> first comoditie sent [*p. 187*] unto them. [*In margin:* They are alreadie sent.]

Comend me to them and advise them to carie them selves modestly and so as they may be thought to desire nothing but that w*hi*ch is

[486]William Seton.

[487]For the students of the English College in Rome who had been expelled for sedition in the 'Fitton rebellion', see above, pp. 55–57. Peter Biddulph, Thomas Harper, John Faulkner, Anthony Shelley, and Francis Haynes were ejected from the college on 15/25 October 1623. Richard Perkins and Thomas Longueville were thrown out in November: CRS, 37, pp. 185–186, 190–192, 194. For the (undated) letter of appeal, signed by the first five, to William Bishop, see AAW, A XVII, no. 60, pp. 195–198; and for Bishop's answer (of 29 December 1623), see AAW, A XVII, no. 61, pp. 199–200; TD, V, pp. cclxx–cclxxi. See also AAW, A XVII, no. 24, pp. 87–90; TD, V, pp. cclxv–cclxviii.

[488]William Bishop.

[489]John Bennett.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

laudable for them to desire. They are not the first that have suffered wrong by such as should have beene their best freinds, and that even in that place. I my self ame wittness of a great deale of such like dealing w*i*th others there, and ame hartely sorie that they are not yet wearie of such woful p*ro*ceeding agaynst their owne children and bretheren. It may be Gods will to p*er*mitt these things to reduce that howse to their government to whom it belongeth. It is writen to us from Paris that they heare out of Ingland that the mariage is co*n*tracted in Spayn de p*rae*senti by such order as our prince left there for that purpose. And this is co*n*firmed by letters out of Spayn to our Benedictaynes here. This I pray impart w*i*th M^r^ Ceton who in his letter to M^r^ President seemed to be somewhat doubtfull of the issue of that matter be [*sic*] reason of the princes sodayn departure out of Spayn. This 15 of 10^ber^ 1623.

Yo*ur*s as before,

Champney

[*on p. 188*]

Addressed: To the r*everen*d Father Thomas Rant.

Endorsed: [*on p. 185*] Written: Decemb[er] 15.
Received: January 23.
Answered: [*sic*].
[*on p. 187*] Received this the 23 of Januarye 1624 by Père Bertin or by Scannarolio, I knowe not well w*hi*ch.
[*on p. 188*] Seal the letter that is open. This other that is sealed for the same partie is of like business.

34. Thomas Rant to William Bishop, 13/23 December 1623

[*AAW, B 25, no. 103*]

Right hon*ora*ble,

Wearyed with the leangth and fowlnes of the way, uppon St Lucyes daye,[490] I came to Rome, safe and in good healthe, blessed be God. In the whole cours of my journye I rested but one daye, and that was at Thurin, wher the coache for Millan parted not till the second day after my arrivall at Novalese. The passage was open a weeke before I

[490] 13 December.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

came, so no quarantene was requisite. When I writt from Paris how I accounted to bee heere by the 21 of November, I was then in the mynde to have gone a good parte of the way by post but, consultinge better with my purse, I founde it necessarye to change advice and to goe common journyes, which are verrye litle ones, in the depth of durte, height of rivers and shortnes of the dayes. And the expence for horshier, coach-hyer, halfe as much more as in sommer tyme, in regarde they imploye halfe as much more tyme and charges than in sommer; for example, from Florence to Rome is but 4 dayes journye in sommer tyme, now they aske six dayes; and that chargeth the passinger with expence for his dyett and lodginge for that surplusage. And this proportion fell out in divers other places.

The first mann I wente to see, after Father Bertin (who exceedinglye healpeth mee) was M^r^ Doctor Seaton, who I fownde so ill that hee kept his bedd but now, thanke God, is upp and able to goe abroade. This indisposition hee is thought to have fallen into by overtravellinge for thos[e] schollars which the Inglishe Colledge put a trick uppon to expell them as seditious.[491] But wee hope [for] their restauration, and wee are now in deliberation what cource to take to that purpose. My onlye comminge to towne this wynter gave new life to them, for they were borne in hande [that] no bodye would bee heere for the clargye till after Esther. All our freinds, which, thanke God, are not fewe nor of the leaste power, sayde <to mee> opportune ad modum venisti.

The next I went to was Card[inal] Bandino who received mee noblye and affectionatlye with embrasments, and asked particularlye of the comminge into England, freinds, ennemyes, place of aboad, episcopall function and [epis]copall habbit, and was joyed that one was sente hither to looke to the clargy[es] affaires.

Cardinal St Susanna was much plesed with the letters hee received, assuringe his best healpe in any of our busines in this courte.[492] Hee reflected uppon my beeinge one of the Oratorye; and asked mee whether I lodged ther. I answered no, for I was an Inglishman, and the number of our fathers is limmited to six, which they are alreadye. Yow say true, quoth hee; I remember such an agreement. I am glad yow are of that companye. When I told this to Father Bertin, hee

[491] John Bennett had secured a papal visitation of the college, but the death of Gregory XV in July 1623 intervened and the commission for visiting the seminary was terminated. With the accession of Maffeo Barberini (Urban VIII), a new commission was drawn up, and the new visitor was more favourable to the Jesuit administrators of the seminary. This resulted in the expulsion of the rebel students: TD, V, pp. 100–104; M.E. Williams, *The Venerable English College, Rome* (London, 1979), pp. 29–30.

[492] Rant had visited Cardinal Scipione Cobelluzio on 8/18 December 1623, and the cardinal asked whether 'the Jesuitts and regulars agree well with the bishop': AAW, B 25, no. 102. For Bishop's letter of 13 September 1623 to the cardinal, see AAW, A XVII, no. 39, pp. 139–140.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was much satisfied, alledginge how contrarye an effect my agency will woorke in Rome to that they immagined in France it would. For it cleeres a pointe wherin divers heere did secretlye dowbt that wee are not religious, since one of o*u*r order deales for the secular clargye.

Card[inal] Barbarino, his Holynes[']s nephew, received mee w*i*th much curtesye, and bad[e] mee repaire to him in my occations, and I should well see hee was not onlye a wellwiller but tender of o*u*r cause and exceedinge desirous to healpe it to a good issue.[493] Then I beseecht his l*ordshi*p to gett mee audience of his Holynes. Forthwith hee called to Sig*no*r Georgio Clony,[494] a Scotch gentlemann that follow[s] him, and is in greate favore, to accompanye mee to his Holynes lodgings to see if the tyme weare fitt to kiss his feete. But greater personns and officers, waightinge for audience, made mee come a second tyme. Uppon St Thomas th*e* Apostells day,[495] about two a clock after noon, I was admitted to heeringe, and fownde so favorable and gratious usage that, whil[e] I live, I must remember yt w*i*th all thankfull acknowledgm*en*t. Hee spake w*i*th mee, aboave a full halfe hower, of divers subjects; but principallye of his desire to see that country, w*hi*ch have [*sic*] brought forth so manye glorious martirs, to retorne to the faithe of their forefathers. His verry woords weare: pro salute spirituali gentis vestrae, non pigebit sanguinem proprium effu*n*dere, immo cum apostolo, cupio anathema esse. Next, hee wittnessed a soverain esteeme of o*u*r soveraign, sayinge: cum cardinalitia dignitate constitutus <essem>, et in congregatione de Propaganda Fide, sententiam meam dicturus eram, ubi agebatur de futuris nuptiis, inter filium regis vestri et sororem regis Catholici, quantum possibilie fuit, steti a parte nuptiarum, nec jam per me stabit, quod optatum finem <non> assequantur; quod potero pro rege Angliae faciam. I proteste before God, I make the matter no better, nor no worse, than his Holynes made yt. In substance thus yt was, though perhaps the woords may have some like difference.[496]

[493]Thomas Rant recorded that Cardinal Barberini had asked him, on 10/20 December 1623, whether the duke of Buckingham and the earls of Rutland and Arundel were Catholics: AAW, B 25, no. 102.

[494]George Con. See Albion, *CI*, *passim*. For correspondence between Rant and Con in the summer of 1625, and Con's promise of assistance for the Collège d'Arras, see AAW, B 47, no. 123.

[495]11/21 December.

[496]Elsewhere Thomas Rant recorded that on 'St Thomas[']s daye after dinner I had audience of his Holines', to whom he presented letters from William Bishop. The pope asked him what liberties Catholics enjoyed in England, and Rant replied that they could hear Mass in private houses. If the Spanish match were to proceed, however, Mass would be heard in public. The pope asked about Bishop's arrival in England, and whether the king knew of it. Rant said that without doubt he did, since he knew of his consecration (the place, persons, and time) and the joy which Catholics had shown in seeing a bishop whom they

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Touchinge y*ou*r l*ordshi*ps letters, hee sayd, gratissimae sunt nobis episcopi Chalcedonensis litterae, et ipsi respondebo per litteras; w*hi*ch is no smale favore. In the farewell hee bad[e] mee, in all my occations [to] come to him freelye. I should finde him such as I desired for our business. Monsig*no*r Vives is still him selfe, that is, a noble sinceare prelate, affectionate as much as is possible to o*ur* clargie. Wee owe him honore and prayers for the good offices paste and presente. Hee lamented the deathe of M^r^ Bennet, and so doe 3 or 4 of the cheefe cardinalls, sayinge hee was a worthy personage.

Sig*no*r Ingoli[497] shewd mee y*ou*r l*ordshi*ps letters, w*hi*ch hee sayes are to bee redd publiq*ue*ly in th*e* congregation de Propaganda Fide. Hee is vostrissimo, and of a sweete disposition, courtious, openn, affectionate.[498]

No letters are yet come to my handes, ether from y*ou*r l*ordshi*p or from any other, since I left Paris, yet yow promised I should finde some ready heere to wellcome mee. I have neede of weeklye letters to give accounte of such particularityes as they will aske mee of, concerninge th*e* kinges favoringe or disfavoringe Catholiq*ue*s, concerning the graces or disgraces done to y*ou*r l*ordshi*ps persone [and] concerninge y*ou*r actions, imployments, functions, healthe, stay or residence, unitye or dissension with others and particularlye of th*e* Jesuitts. In a woorde, all varietye of information, and thos[e] as particular as cann bee and as frequente as cann bee, not omittinge thos[e] w*hi*ch are com*m*on ther, for they bee not common heere.

Yf supplye of monyes come not quicklye, I shall sone bee at a non plus. Of the 100 crownes I receiv*e*d at Paris, when I came to Rome, I had left but 15; and 50 more I receiv*e*d heere at Rome, w*hi*ch I tooke upp of a gentlemann of my acquaintance at Paris, payinge 6 crownes for th*e* transporte. I am to repay that heere at Candlemas. A long cloake and sotane coste mee 24 crownes of my 50. A rydinge shorte cloake and rydinge suite cost mee 30 crownes of my hundred. The rest in charges. And now my mann healpes to spende the monye faster.

Commendinge my selfe and my busines to y*ou*r holye prayers, without farder ceremonye, I humblye take leave, <cravinge your

had not seen for many years. Rant argued that James must have allowed Bishop's arrival in the realm, since there was no sign of any official displeasure towards him: AAW, B 25, no. 102.

[497] Francesco Ingoli, secretary to the congregation de Propaganda Fide. See *NCC*, pp. 39, 153, 156.

[498] Rant wrote that Ingoli advised him to be 'moderate in speakinge of the Jesuitts', unlike John Bennett who had a tendency to be 'transported': AAW, B 25, no. 102.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

blessinge and> remayninge y*ou*r l*ordshi*ps humble servante to his best power.

Thomas Rant

Rome 23 Dec[ember].

I beseeche y*ou*r l*ordshi*p consider quicklye on[e] that I write to M^r^ Irlande and, yf hee bee not in towne, ther is no danger to breake upp his letter. I would bee glad to knowe wher y*ou*r l*ordshi*p stay[s] for the most parte.

Addressed: To the right hon*ora*ble [m]y lord bishop of Chalcedon theis.

Endorsed: 23 Decemb[er] 1623.
Of M^r^ Rants first arrivall at Rome.

35. William Bishop to Thomas Rant, 18 December 1623

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 58, pp. 189–190*]

Very reverend and much respected father,

About 3 weekes past I did certify you of the occurrents of that time w*hi*ch were very good. But now I must acquaint you with a great alteration, for it pleased his Ma*jes*tie, upon what grownd I know not, to send a post or two into Spaine and there to recall or make stay of the proxy w*hi*ch was left in the Lord Digbies hands to have been deliv*er*ed the day folowing to the king of Spaine to have maried his sister in the name of o*u*r Prince Charles, w*hi*ch recall or stay could not but greatly perplex and trouble the Catholike king and his peeres who had published the same before and p*re*pared extraordinarie solemnit[i]es for the accomplishing of it. We say for o*u*r excuse here that [it] is worthely done because they differred the prince and put him of[f] often when he was there present. Also for that the Cath[olic] king will not promise to restore the Palatinate.[499] They answer that this matter of the Palatinate was never comprehended within the articles of agreement, and to have it thrust in now on the sudden was a signe that we meant not to stand to o*u*r former agreement; besides, all the Palatinate was not in there handes, wherefore they could not restore it if they would; yet ever promised to do their endevour to gett it restored, w*hi*ch they still would do, but could not make it an ingredience of their articles, but would labour that it might be a consequence of it. To thother point of the delay of the marriage whiles o*u*r prince was

[499]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 185, 188, 194.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in Spaine, they answer that, assoone as the dispensation was come, they were ready to have finished but staid to heare that o*u*r king had p*er*formed those favours to recusants w*hi*ch in the same dispensation were required. In the meane season his Holines[500] died, and then would not the nuncio deliv*er* the dispensation before he knew the next popes pleasure therein. Nor [*word omitted:* did] the Spaniards accomplish the mariage before they had the dispensation in their handes, w*hi*ch o*u*r prince tooke evill, saying that it was sufficient that they knew the dispensation to be come. Hitherto their reasons, as farr as I can learne. But it is thought by diverse that the duke of Buckingham, o*u*r k[ing's] favorite, falling out with Cou[n]t Olivares, the Spanish kinges favorite, did sollicite o*u*r king to hasten his sonne thence, p*er*suading him that, before they would suffer him to go unmaried, they would not stay for any other confirmatio*n* of the dispensation, w*hi*ch fell out otherwise, and sence their arrivall here the favorite is said to have done both with the king and prince what he can to breake of[f] that mariage and to have prevailed therein. This is the more common opinion, though there be some that thinke it wilbe peeced up againe, one way or other, because it is holden in reason of estate so convenient both for the one king and thother. Buckingham and the Lord Hayes[501] have been with the F[rench] ambassadour, and had long conference with him about matching o*u*r prince in France as many do p*re*sume, thought [*sic for* though] there be no constat of it. Thus much of that unhappy matter.

Touching o*u*r own busines, I am entered into covenant with the Benedictins of the English congregation to hold good correspondence one with another. The Calmelites and Cappucins do promise the like, and the Jesuites a farr of[f] have made some meanes for the same w*hi*ch, if [*word omitted:* it] will come of[f] honestly, we shall p*er*forme.[502] There is not yet any new p*er*secution, but continuance of

[500] Gregory XV.

[501] James Hay, 1st Viscount Doncaster, who had been created earl of Carlisle in September 1622.

[502] For the 'Canones ecclesiastici ad pacem et disciplinam inter clerum saecularem et monachos Benedictinos conservandam a reverendissimo in Christo patre ac domino, D[omino] Gulielmo Episcopo Calcedonensi propositi', see AAW, A XVII, no. 54, pp. 177–180 (an authenticated copy sent to Claude Bertin, superior of the French Oratory in Rome). On 25 December 1623, Joseph Haynes had remarked that 'now we beginne to be much better united than formerly, both preists amongest our selves and religious with us'; via 'spetiall articles [. . .] in this holy league are we al conjoyned; except only the Jesuits, who have not yet refused, nor yet as we heare doe seeke it, but stand aloofe harkninge what others doe': AAW, A XVII, no. 59, p. 191. On 6 February 1624, William Bishop described how, in the previous year, he had 'made good correspondence with the Benedictins'. He had also received 'letters from the superior of the Franciscans', while the 'Dominicans, Calmelites and Cappucins have congratulated my election and tendred me their obedience and concurrence'. Richard Blount, the Jesuit provincial, had visited him, 'desiring that we

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

o*u*r p*ro*vident liberty, God continue it.[503] I certified you that you returne me answer by means of the Frenc[h]e [amba]ssadour in R[ome][504] in the Frenc[h]e ambass[ador] Mons[ieur] de Tillieres['s] packet, [*p. 190*] addressing them to Mons*ieu*r Chamberlaine,[505] his English chaplaine, to be delivered to mee.[506] The Jesuites here bragg that four or five of the English scholers be thrust out of the college for having spoken with M[r] Benett o*u*r agent there w*hi*ch, if it be true, cannot but be very grievously taken of all o*u*r body.[507] What, may not they who are bred to serve o*u*r clergy speake with the agent of the same cleargy?[508] But, say they, he gave them counsell to breake the rules of the college. What rules, I pray you lerne? I answere you shall find none. If the rulers may

might live like good friends together'. Bishop suggested that past antagonisms might be forgotten, but remarked that the secular clergy were 'much offended for the misgovernment of our colleges'. Blount answered 'that he had nothing to do with those goverments but they were under the fathers of the Society who lived in the same country'; he would, however, 'write to them to govern well'. But this 'tooke so small effect that, shortly after, the scholers were thrust out of the college in Rome': AAW, A XVII, no. 96, p. 314; TD, V, p. cclxxv. During the summer and autumn of 1623, the Jesuit general, Muzio Vitelleschi, had voiced extreme suspicion of William Bishop. In August, Vitelleschi warned of the factionalization of the English Catholic community in favour of either Spain or France. In September, he noted how the danger represented by Bishop was increased by Bishop's opportunity to communicate with the king: ARSJ, Anglia MS 1, fos 179r, 181r, 181v, 190v. In January 1624, Vitelleschi congratulated Blount for extricating himself from a meeting with William Bishop and his officials. He advised him that, if English Catholics thought the bishop of Chalcedon's proceedings were unacceptable, they should petition Rome against him. In particular, Vitelleschi rejected what he termed the 'calumnies' spread by Bishop's secretary, William Harewell, about the English College in Rome: *ibid.*, fos 190v, 191r; and in February 1624 he positively instructed Blount to refuse obedience to Bishop: *ibid.*, fo. 191v.

[503]On 25 December 1623, Joseph Haynes remarked that 'it is [. . .] reported that the bitesheepes', i.e. Protestant bishops, 'here, upon the newes of the matches breaking of[f], came to the king for his leave to send abrode the pursevants, but his answer was that he now grew olde and would not persecute any more for religion. If they did otherwaies offend, lett them be punished, so that it is verily thought, whether the match goe forward or no, we shal not be troubled for religion so longe as the kinge liveth, which I wish may be many yeers': AAW, A XVII, no. 59, p. 192.

[504]Noël Brûlart.

[505]John Varder. See Anstr., II, p. 327. In mid-November 1620, Tillières had secured Varder's release from the New Prison (though on condition that Varder would immediately take himself abroad): *APC, 1619–1621*, p. 314.

[506]In March 1624, Bishop remarked that this mode of sending letters was 'the safest and most speedy [. . .] albeit the Frenc[h]e do not affect the match with Spaine as we do, yet we have in the matter of our hierarchie found more help of Frenc[h]e than of Spanish, and so do remaine indebted unto both': AAW, A XVII, no. 101, p. 327.

[507]See *Letters 33, 34*.

[508]Anthony Shelley asked how the expelled students, returning to England, were supposed to behave towards the bishop and his officers when they were taught in Rome to question his authority: TD, V, p. 103.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

upon such generall accusations expell when they list, yea them that desire to observe most the true end of that college, what murmur will <not> raise in all true <members> of our body, and that deservedly? Wherefore I pray you to speake boldly to his Holines, in all o*u*r names, that he wilbe pleased to have an eye to that stone [?] of offence and to provide that none may be expelled thence on envy or such generall slanders, but that he will give you leave to looke into that disorder that you may informe his Holines of the truth of such matters, for that we send you thither to p*ro*cure remedy thereof as much as for any other matter.[509] Thus, with my very harty com*m*endac*i*ons [*word deleted*] to the reverend Father Bartin and yo*u*r self, with M^{r} Seton and the rest <of> o*u*r friends, I desire you to remember me in those holy places. The 18th of o*u*r December 1623.

Yo*u*r very loving friend,

W*illia*m Byshope of Chalcedon

Addressed: Au très révérend père, le Père Bartin supérieur de S^{t} Louis.

Pour estre donné au Père Thomas Rant.

A Rome.

Endorsed: [*on p. 189*] Written: Decemb[er] 18 1623.
Received: Febru[ary] 1 1624.

[509]For Bishop's letter to Rant of 29 December 1623, advising the students to stay in Rome until the spring, and telling Rant to petition that their case should be heard by Propaganda Fide, see AAW, A XVII, no. 63, pp. 203–204; TD, V, pp. cclxviii–cclxx; see also *Letter 36*. In a letter of 6 February 1624, Bishop described to Rant how he had recently written, on 15 January, to the pope (AAW, A XVII, no. 81, pp. 267–268; part printed in TD, V, pp. cclxxii–cclxxiii) to request that 'the visit of the college may proceed which his predecessor of happy memory did, motu proprio, begin, and that it may passe by the same <worthy> persons of the congregation de Propaganda Fide whom he appointed'. Other leading secular clergy had done the like (AAW, A XVII, no. 95, pp. 309–312); and Bishop offered his advice as to how Rant should secure their aims and objectives so that the 'notable abuses' in the college might be corrected: AAW, A XVII, no. 96, p. 313; TD, V, pp. 101, cclxxiv. In March 1624, the issue was referred by the pope to Propaganda Fide. The congregation decreed that the expelled students should be sent to Douai and that their expenses should be defrayed by the college in Rome: Anstr., II, p. 291; AAW, B 47, no. 51; AAW, A XVII, no. 122, pp. 389–390; see also *CGB*, I, p. 461. A new college oath was drawn up in August 1624. It was ordered to be published on 11/21 February 1625: AAW, A XVIII, no. 37, pp. 273–274; TD, V, p. cclxxx. For a further petition, of 27 May/6 June 1625, by Thomas Rant that scholars of the English College should not enter the Society, see AAW, B 48, no. 54, fo. 126r–v. A decree was promulgated that a papal licence would henceforth be required by any seminarist who intended to enter a religious order: TD, V, pp. 109, 112–113, cclxxix; AAW, B 26, nos 74, 75; AAW, A XVII, no. 123, pp. 391–392; AAW, A XIX, no. 68, pp. 205–208.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[*on p. 190*] Received by Père Bertin uppon the first daye of Februarye 1624.

36. William Bishop to Thomas Rant, 17/27 January 1624

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 86, pp. 281–282*]

Reverend father,

Though I have not as yet received any from you, I cess not to write as occasion requireth. I do now write unto his Holines humbly requesting him to deale with the king Catholike for the rendring of the Palatinate, at leste so much as is in his royall hands, unto o*ur* king for one of the palatins sonnes that may be brought up Catholikely in the emperours court.[510] We heare now that the Catholike king will condescend thereunto, and I have heard that his Ma*jes*tie of Great Britaine would be content that the said sonne should be brought up in the emperours court and to mar[r]y one of his daughters.[511] This later point is of very great consequence, not onely for continuing the Catholike faith in the Palatinate where it now begins but for us also in England, he being as it were the second and next [to] the prince and his mother. Wherefore his Holines is to be put in mind of it, p*ar*ticularly that he may take order to have it treated of, if it be not already mentioned. The favourite[512] here is mightely against the match, and was like to drave his Ma*jes*tie and the prince from it. The beginning of the p*ar*lement is put of[f] till the twentieth of February.[513]

[510]For William Bishop's letter of 31 January 1624 to Urban VIII urging his assistance in procuring the restitution of the Rhineland Palatinate in order to secure the Anglo-Spanish dynastic treaty, see AAW, A XVII, no. 88, pp. 285–286. A similar letter had been dispatched by Bishop to the king of Spain on 30 January: AAW, A XVII, no. 87, pp. 283–284.

[511]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 144, 158–159; see also above, p. 68.

[512]George Villiers, 1st duke of Buckingham.

[513]On 6 February 1624, William Bishop commented that 'at this parlement' it was likely that 'we shall all of us be by proclamation commanded to depart the realm'. He continued that 'all priests and Jesuits' were already 'by proclamation banished out of Ireland and the Catholike bishops also, but the prince is said to excuse it, that it is done by the deputie onely without any warrant from our king': AAW, A XVII, no. 96, pp. 314, 315; TD, V, p. cclxxvi; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 218–219. This proclamation was dated 21 January 1624 and was brought by Irish Catholics to London to show, in translation, to the marquis of Inojosa, who took it to Prince Charles in order to complain. In Spain, an official protest was made in March to Sir Walter Aston concerning it; and William Trumbull recorded on 19/29 February how a complaint had come from the Spanish ambassadors in London to the authorities in Brussels against the 'newe persecution [. . .] so they are pleased to style it': PRO, SP 94/30, fo. 127r; PRO, SP 77/17, fo. 39r; see also AAW, B 26, no. 10; *CGB*, I, p. 431. A month after it was issued, the Irish proclamation was withdrawn: A. Ford,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The archbishop of Canter[bury],[514] with some others, are in hand already to give comission to pursuivants, but diverse of <the> better sort of the privy counsell do oppose against it and have yet staid it. The good successe against Gabor[515] and Mansfield doth much trouble them that would have the match broken. We begin to feare againe. God Almighty p*ro*tect us.

M^r^ Harpur[516] is at last arrived here, who hat[h] informed us how all things passed there against the five scholers. We cannot write more p*er*tinently than we [have] done to reduce the visitation unto [the] congregat[ion] de Propaganda Fide who were first charged with it by Pope Greg[ory] the fifteenth of hap[p]y memory.[517] I desire you very hartely to folowe that matter most diligently with all the help of Fa[ther] Bertin and M^r^ Seton, who hath already dealt in it most kindly, for w*hi*ch I pray you to thank him hartely from me and all our cleargy. Thus, desiring you to remember [*word omitted:* me] in those holy places, I rest.

Yo*u*rs most assuredly,

W*illia*m Bishop of Chalcedon

27 of January <1624> stilo novo.

[*on p. 282*]

Addressed: Au très révérend père, le Père Thomas Rant. Soit donnée au très révérend père, le Père Bartin, supérieur de S^t^ Louis a Rome.

[*on p. 281*]

Endorsed: Written: January 27.
Received: March 25.
Received: 25 March [*sic*].
Delivered his Hol*in*es letter 27 March.

The Protestant Reformation in Ireland 1590–1641 (Dublin, 1997), p. 206; C.W. Russell and J.P. Prendergast (eds), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, 1615–1625* (London, 1880), pp. 458f, 464; *HMCMK*, p. 192; AAW, B 26, no. 58.

[514]George Abbot.

[515]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 209, 223. For Bethlen Gábor, who had allied himself with the Bohemian rebels against Ferdinand, see G. Parker, *Europe in Crisis* (Brighton, 1980), p. 162; Pursell, *WK*, *passim*.

[516]Thomas Harper, one of the rebel students at the English College in Rome.

[517]See *Letter 34*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

37. Anthony Champney to Thomas Rant, 5/15 February 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 12*]

Verie r*everen*d and loving s*i*r,

Yo*u*rs of the 10 of Jan[uary] to M^r President,[518] in his absence, came to my hands by the way of Paris. I ame gladd you have received assurance for your money whereof I pray you keepe just accompt. I send you here letters from my lord[519] w*hi*ch yesterday I received. I suppose he hath given you both comission and direction for that matter of the colledge[520] w*hi*ch, as I sayd before <in other letters>, I would have so dealt in as that the dore may not be shut to the clergie frome demanding the colledge to be restored to the clergie when they shall find oportunitie to p*ro*pose that sute. The reasons thereof <I mean of clearing the colledge> you may expect from them for I knowe they are in drawing.

Co*n*cerning the match w*i*th Spayn, whereof no doubt there is as great expectation there as els where, you may knowe that though, since Christmas, it hath beene howlden <as> broken, yet nowe it is generally esteemed to be in more forwardness than before. The difficultie did arise about the Palatinat w*hi*ch the king of Spayne p*ro*miseth to doe what he can for the restitution thereof, w*hi*ch giveth our king good co*n*tentment.[521] The infanta of late hath writen to our prince. The Lord Digbie is stayed in Spayn who <before> was called [*word deleted*] <thence>. Not only the Catholikes do hope well but the heretikes doe feare more than before.[522] Of 12 of the councell, onely three are averted from it, and one of them cometh in.[523] The

[518] Matthew Kellison.

[519] William Bishop.

[520] The English College in Rome.

[521] See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 201, 207, 208.

[522] Simonds D'Ewes commented, in his diary for 13 February, 'wee had ill newes spread abroad by the papists that the Spanish match should yett proceede': *DSSD*, p. 180.

[523] Anthony Champney likewise recorded, on 20 February/1 March 1624, that (on the basis of a report enclosed in a letter from Kellison) only three of the privy council opposed the Spanish match, and that even Londoners were now in favour of it: AAW, B 26, no. 15. On 31 January, John Chamberlain had observed that 'the junta for forrain affaires sat hard all that weeke' and that it was rumoured that 'they were devided into three parts, five for the Spanish match, viz: lords keper [Williams], treasurer [Middlesex], marshall [Arundel], Weston and Calvert, fowre newters that wold not declare themselves, the duke of Richmond, Hamilton, chamberlain [Pembroke] and Belfast; three directly against yt [. . .] Buckingham [. . .] Carlile and Conway', though the prince was now averse to the match as well, and this was what had broken the deadlock. Pembroke was arguing for the match in order to spite

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

parlement that was apoynted for the 12 of Febru[ary] is adjorned till the 20 of the same. Cooke and S*i*r Edwin Sandes are sent into Ireland to be occupied there in tyme of parlement.[524] There is a marchant that cometh from London to Parise who sayth that the embassatour[525] hath 80 embrotterers in his howse (but p*er*adventure he exceedeth the nu*m*ber) w*hi*ch argueth p*re*paration for some extraordinarie solemnitie. This is all I can say for the present, but w*i*th my best wishes to yo*ur* self and my love to Father Bertin, I rest this 14 of Feb[ruary] 1624.

I long to heare of the receipt of my letters sent by their <meanes> [*word deleted*] of the Oratorie at Paris w*hi*ch course I will use no more. I pray you deliver this inclosed to the direction [*word omitted:* of], and com*m*end <me> ever most kindly to, M[r] Doct[or] Seton and the youthes out of the colledge.

Y*ou*rs ever, Champney

Tell, I pray you, M[r] Browne that I have now writen agayn to our agent, S*ign*ore Scanarolio, to pay him 25[li] everie half yeare.[526]

I have taken notice to our agent of his courtesie towardes you and in M[r] President his name have given him thankes.

Addressed: R*everen*do admodu*m* pr*estr*e [?] ac d*omi*no, D[omino] Thomae Ranto cleri Anglicani in curia Romana procuratori. Romam.

Endorsed: Written: Feb[ruary] 14.
Received: March 25.
Answer[e]d: [*sic*].

Buckingham: McClure, *LJC*, pp. 541–542; Schreiber, *FC*, pp. 56–57; Ruigh, *1624*, p. 41; cf., for Pembroke's position, Adams, FP, p. 156.

[524]See AAW, A XVII, no. 78, p. 249; TD, V, p. cclxxii.

[525]Carlos Coloma.

[526]On 21/31 January 1624, Anthony Champney had written to inform Thomas Rant that 'there is in Rome a young gentleman called M[r] John Browne to whome I pray you comend me and tell him that nowe I have writen to our agent to pay him everie six monethes 100 crownes haveing receaved order from his mother for it': AAW, B 26, no. 8. Browne was a cousin of Thomas Roper: *Letter 77*. He appears to have been the individual listed by Thomas Rant as a mourner at Thomas More's funeral in April 1625 (clearly distinguished from Francis Browne, son of the 2nd Viscount Montague, who was also present): D. Shanahan, 'The death of Thomas More, secular priest, great-grandson of St. Thomas More', *RH*, 7 (1963–1964), p. 26; *Letter 85*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

38. William Bishop to Thomas Rant, 22 February 1624

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 100, pp. 325–326*]

Deare father,

I have your third [letter] of January the 10th, and do not a litle muse that my first was not come to your hands then. I have written my self to you about six. God send you good dispatch for the deane and chapter because that wilbe as a continuation of episcopall jurisdiction if we cannot gett any more bish[ops], w*hi*ch I trust in God we shall do, ere it be long, by your good aid; and if that chapter were setled and our college visited and reformed by expulsion of them who have robbed us of many fine wits, and the college (as is supposed) of many thousand pounds,[527] then loe we should all joyntly [*two words illegible*] b[ishops].

We daily pray for you and all those good cardinals our patrons. Do not you [forge]tt us in those holy places. I have already written to Card[inal] Farnesio and Barberini[528] and to Monsig[nor] Vives. I will gett [*two words obscured*] to make some faire insinuation to him in [your] [b]ehalfe. I think that [*word obscured*] M^r^ Setons would place <you> there. He is so hospita[ble]. Now I do write to Card[inal] Ludovisio.[529] If F[ather] Rector[530] should not be some what cholerike he had lost himself; but you <are> wise enough to kepe outward peace with [h]im and yet fol[low] your busines <close> and assist the injured scholers[531] in the best manner you can. Those wandring sisters[532] want not some to magnify their endevoures and to report that they are enlarged to Naples. The scholers letter came in good time and was delivered to his father here in London. I am right glad that P[ère] Bertin is in good health. I pray you thanke him hartely for his kind letter and all the courtesies he hath shewed to our cleargy and mee. Do the like unto Card[inal] Bentivolio both for all former benefits and for his courteous letter to me at this time. Thus much in answer

[527] See AAW, A XVII, no. 96, pp. 313–316; TD, V, pp. cclxxiv–cclxxvi (Bishop's account of the maladministration of the English College at Rome).

[528] For William Bishop's letters of 12 February 1624 to Cardinal Francesco Barberini and 22 February 1624 to Cardinal Edouardo Farnese, see AAW, A XVII, no. 93, pp. 303–304, no. 99, pp. 323–324.

[529] For William Bishop's letter of 19 February 1624 to Cardinal Luigi Ludovisi, see AAW, A XVII, no. 97, pp. 317–318. Ludovisi wrote in reply to Bishop on 6/16 March: AAW, A XVII, no. 108, pp. 351–352.

[530] Thomas Fitzherbert SJ.

[531] i.e. the rebel students at the English College in Rome.

[532] i.e. the members of Mary Ward's institute.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to yo*u*rs. Now to o*u*r newes. Yesterday being the 19th of o*u*r Feb[ruary] the parlement was begun by o*u*r kings Ma*jes*tie. It was <first> put to the 16th, but the duke of Lenoux,[533] dying suddenly that morning in his bed <at Whithall>, thrust it of[f] to the 19th.[534] The duke is lamented of most men as a quiet orderly nobleman who did not wrong any body, and was held for a friend to the Spanish match.[535] His Ma*jes*tie['s] speech was in generall tearmes faire to the par[l]ementary men.[536] He and they be as man and wife. They must not be jaylors of him. He ~~had~~ <did> treated [*sic*] to match his sonne in Spaine, but his beloved Buckingham and his secretarie should acquaint them with their p*ro*ceding therein. He had given the papists more liberty than [here]tofore; yet like a wary horsman, who doth not alwaies use the spurs, but lettes the bridle some times in the horses neck, yet kepes the reins in his own handes. He desired them to see what were best to be done in both those cases and in any other [*word obscured:* matter (?)], yet so as they do remember <alwaies> his prerogatives. This <is> the summe of all I heare as yet. Shortly wee shall have all in print. A constant report is of both Protestants and Catholikes that Co[u]nt Henry de Berge, taking the opportunity of the great frost, is gotten over and encamped nere unto Utrick in Holland, and hath above 20,000 me*n* with him and is like to endanger all that co[a]st.[537] Some speech there is also that another, assisted with the prince of Frizeland,[538] is doeing there and hath already gotten one towne, that

[533]Ludovic Stuart, 1st duke of Richmond and 2nd duke of Lennox.

[534]McClure, *LJC*, p. 545; *DSSD*, p. 181; Thompson, *RD*, p. 1; Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 173; PRO, SP 14/159/63.

[535]The duke of Lennox was, in fact, generally regarded as a stalwart of the Bohemian faction: Adams, PC, p. 306; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 103. However, Ludovic, the youngest son (born 14 October 1619) of Esmé Stuart, who succeeded to the title as 3rd duke of Lennox, was ordained as a Catholic priest by Richard Smith in 1652 and became almoner to Catherine of Braganza in 1661: Anstr., II, pp. 312–313.

[536]PRO, SP 14/159/55, 56, 57, 58; Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 91; *LJ*, III, pp. 209–210; *Letter 39*; ED, fos 11–4r; Lambeth Palace Library, MS 930, no. 81. For the copy of James's speech dispatched to Thomas Rant, see AAW, A XVII, no. 98, pp. 319–322.

[537]Berg's manoeuvre was part of a defensive strategy designed to counter the assembly of Dutch cavalry near Breda under Henry of Nassau: *CGB*, I, pp. xix, 43, 428, 432. On 12/22 February 1624, William Trumbull noted that Berg, 'lieutenant generall of our cavalry (joyned with Don Goncales de Cordova, and 12,000 men, certaine peeces of cannon, and a good quantity of munitions)', had 'already passed the Rheyne and other ryvers', in order to 'make a strong impression into the country of Freezland': PRO, SP 77/17, fos 33r, 39r; see also Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, pp. 386–387; *CCE*, pp. 76, 141, 148.

[538]Enno III, count of East Friesland.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Harberstade,[539] now duke of Brunswike, by the death of his brother,[540] to witt that he was taken and caried to the [e]mperour, is now recalled. They say onely that <he> doth sue to the emperour for his p*ar*don and wilbecome his servant if he please to accept of his submission.[541]

Tobie Mathew, now knighted for his good service in Spaine,[542] declares himself openly to be for the duke of Buckingh[am] and saith that he hath reason to do as he doth, that is, to be against the Spanish match, and that o*u*r prince was not well used there, and that Cou[n]t d'Olivares is a darke and dull felow. I hope he [*MS torn*] not be for his dealing against Catholikes too. Time will reveale more [*MS torn*]. [Wi]th my very harty comend[ations] I rest.

Your loving friend,

W*illia*m Chalcedon

22 February.

Addressed: Au très révérent père, le Père Bertin supérieur de S[t] Louis, pour le r*évéren*d Père Thomas.
A Rome.

[*on p. 325*]

Endorsed: Written: 22 Feb[ruary].
Received: 10 June.

[539]Christian of Brunswick, administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt. For his employment by the Dutch, see Israel, *Dutch Republic*, p. 483. He had been one of Princess Elizabeth's daughter's godfathers, and was also a cousin of the Stuarts via the marriage of Anne of Denmark's sister Elizabeth: BL, Harleian MS 1581, fos 236r, 436r; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 239–240; Patterson, *King James VI and I*, p. 29; Pursell, *WK*, p. 148. After getting the better of a skirmish against the count of Tilly in July 1623, Brunswick's army had been destroyed at Stadtlohn by Tilly in August: BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 292v; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 80; M. Lee (ed.), *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 1603–1624* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1972), p. 301; J.V. Polisensky, *The Thirty Years War* (London, 1974), p. 169; Israel, *Dutch Republic*, p. 483.

[540]Friedrich-Ulrich, duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (d. 1634). See *CGB*, I, pp. 371, 379.

[541]See also AAW, A XVII, no. 94, p. 307.

[542]Back in mid-April 1623, Calvert had written to Buckingham that, in view of the rumoured 'aversenesse' of some of the Roman curia towards the marriage, James had decided that Mathew, 'of whose loyalty and faithfulnesse to his service his Majestie rests very well assured, should instantly make his repayre' to Spain. James believed that, 'by the creditt and reputation which he hath with that party in respect of his profession in religion', Mathew might, in Spain, 'endevor to remove all rubbs arising that way and to satisfy needelesse doubts and jealousies if there bee any'. Mathew would 'bee many other wayes usefull' to the prince there. He had been ordered 'to depend' solely on Buckingham and to take his direction from him 'in all things': BL, Harleian MS 1580, fo. 184r. For the count of Tillières's report of Mathew's purpose in going to Spain ('essayer d'ouvrir les yeux' of Prince Charles 'affin qu'il puisse cognoistre la vérité de nostre religion', and, failing that, to break the match altogether), see PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 204v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This was the last letter I received.[543]

[*on p. 326*]

Endorsed: Written 22 Feb[ruary], received the 10 of Jun[e] by the phisitian of M*ons*i[eu]r l'ambassadeur de France, M*ons*i[eu]r de Betun.[544] Father Archangel delivered yt to him to bring to Rome.

W[illiam] Chalcedon Feb[ruary] 1624.

39. Thomas More to Thomas Rant, 28 February 1624[545]

[*AAW, B 26, no. 14*]

Right wor*shipfu*ll,

It hath pleased our r[ight] hon[ourable] and r*everen*d [lord] to ease me of the care of ordinarie correspondence with you because of my remove from London, and [he] chardgeth me onlie with our affairs in Spayne, which I shall seeke to dischardg[e] as I may.[546] With you alsoe I will not omitt to com*m*unicate as occasion is offered, if I perceave my lines [are] anie thing acceptable to you or avayleable for the com*m*on cause. I know others will have a care to satisfye you in all occurrantes. For my part, though, I am ~~not~~ obliged by your letters to me, yet I wold insinuate unto you that the fearfull parlam*en*t, called principallie to advise with the nobilitie and com*m*ons about the match with Spayne, began upon Thursday the xixth of this present. It was putt of[f] twice, once from Thursday the xiith of this present to Monday next following, because of the hard frost and deep snowe which contynued three weekes. The second adjourne was from Monday to Thursday when it began. And this was in reguard of the unfortunate and sodaine death of the duke of Richmond, who was a noble man of such worthie disposition that he carryed with him generallie the hartes <of all>, and particulerly the Catholickes, because of his good affection and furtherance of the match with Spayne.[547] The king tooke these unexpected tydinges of the dukes death wonderfullie to hart, it being brought him when he was readie to have sett forward towards the

[543]In fact, as Rant noted in his endorsement of *Letter 42*, Bishop's missive to him of 2 April 1624 was the last letter which came to him from Bishop.

[544]Philippe de Béthune, count of Sully.

[545]The letter concludes with a separate note, in Latin, from More, concerning his cousin Thomas Roper.

[546]See Anstr., I, p. 234.

[547]See *Letter 38*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

parlam*en*t. For the duke, lodging in the court at Whithall, went very well to bed on Sonday night. On Monday morning he complayned of his head and backe, and seeking to take some small repose was sone after fownd dead, to the dismayall of the whole realme. His Ma*jes*tie made a pithie speech to the parlam*en*t of half an howre long,[548] signifying unto his audience the cause of this present assemblie, which was according to the tenour of the writtes dyrected into every shire to advise with his loyall subjects upon certein necessarie pointes and principallie touching the match of his dearest sonne the prince, and the good of his grandchildren, praying the present parlament as they were the representative bodie of the realme, and consequentlie his dear spowse, to sett aside all jealousies and to love him as their spowse, omitting now, because the time of their deliberation was but short, all necessarie questions and brabbles, and seriouslie to attend what may be for the generall peace of Christendome and the peace and tranquillitie of this realme. As for their priviledges, they might be assured he wold never infringe them that be lawfull. Onlie he wold not now have them stand upon anie such unnecessarie delaies and trifleing away of time, but advise him in this important businesse and then he wold doe as he saw cause. He putt them in minde how two or three parlaments had miscarried, and wished them to have more care in [?] this. As for the imputation laid upon him that he meant to suppresse the religion professed, he made his protestation that he never intended alteration of religion, or to digg or root it upp, though he had connyved for a tyme with papist[s] and not proceeded with such rigour as formerlie; yet itt was with that prudence that as a skilfull ryder he had still his hand upon the raines to drawe backe or give head as he thought it best. This was in effect his Ma*jes*ties speech, which the l*or*d keaper, l*or*d of Lincolne,[549] applauded without anie addition,[550] saying onlie that who soe[ver] had heard his Ma*jes*tie needed not to hear a croaking chancelor, as the Lacedemonian who was invited to heare one that co[u]ld represent the tune of a nightingall answered αυτοσ ηκουσα: I ~~have~~ have heard nightingalls them selves; and said his speeches wold be aureo annulo ferreas stallas,[551] to enamell a gold ring with rustie yron. Seeing his Ma*jes*tie had leaft in them τον κεντρον, a pricke and stinge, and soe he concluded that, as Nerva dyed havinge adopted Trajan, least this his mortall deed shold be depraved by anie mortall fact insuing, soe he wold not, by his addinge, seeme to diminish the

[548] See *ibid.*
[549] John Williams.
[550] For Williams's speech, see PRO, SP 14/159/59; ED, fo. 5r–v.
[551] 'Annulum aureum ferreis stellis ferruminare': Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 175.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

im*m*ortall glorie of so dyvine a speech. The speaker of the parlam*en*t is a hott professor, one S*i*r Thomas Crew, a serjeant at law.[552] In his oration after his acceptance by his Ma*jes*tie he made a most bitter and sharpe invective against Catholickes, wishing an exact execution of the penal lawes against them, with the banishment of all preistes and religiouse, of which speech it is sayd that the l*or*d keaper gave his opinion that it was nether charitable nor according to lawe, nor befitting the present times, nor good for our cowntrie. For charitie wold have us to seeke the conversion, not subversion of our erring neighbours, and that papist[s] shold be wonn by reason and good persuasion and by good examples, and not with terrors and threates made to counterfeit and dissemble. And that the lawes did not require such courses but as were for the peace and tranquillitie of the realme. And that the tymes were now such that we had neede to be at unitie amongst our selves, and the good of our cowntrie wold have frendship manteyned withall seeing that, though we breake with Spayne, yet with whom soever we joyne it is especially with such as professe the same religion with papistes.[553] And one moderate man of the parlam*en*t answered another that wished all Catholickes banished this realme,[554] answered [*sic*] that he saw noe reason in such a project because, suppose all were banished, they might repair to the Palatinate and ther procure the landes and lyvinges of the Protestantes ther [*sic*], and send them hither, w*hi*ch wold not be soe convenient for the realme. Sure it is that the lower howse is marvelouslie bent against religion, and two b*ishop*s made two speeches against my l*or*d of Ch[alcedon][555] in p*artic*uler,

[552]See McClure, *LJC*, p. 546; PRO, SP 14/159/60, 64.

[553]See ED, fos 5v–6r, 6r–9v, 9v–13r; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 234–236, 236–238; cf. Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 176, 177–179; PRO, SP 14/159/65, 66, 67; *LJ*, III, pp. 211–213. According to Sir Walter Earle, Williams declared that James had 'never spared the execution of any law but for a greater law, salus reipublicae', and that 'all the laws are yet in force', and there was 'no connivence but for propagation of true religion': ED, fos 11v–12r. Simonds D'Ewes thought that Williams, following Crew, spoke equally boldly against 'the papists', and that previously he had been 'of the popish faction, but now, after the princes returne out of Spaine and the breach of that match, this upstart turned the note of his tune another way': *DSSD*, p. 181.

[554]On 25 February, Sir Thomas Jermyn had 'mooved to intimate to the Lords' what the Commons 'had resolved concerning recusants', *inter alia* 'bannishing the priests out of the kingdom'. Jermyn and other MPs had also suggested barring Catholic recusants from London: Thompson, *HA*, pp. 5, 6.

[555]William Bishop. Thomas More may have meant two MPs in the lower House rather than two bishops. For Richard Dyott's speech in the Commons on 25 February concerning William Bishop's tour through Staffordshire 'with his crosiers, myters and 6 chaplayns' and his confirming 'at one tym 400 in the Roman faith', see Thompson, *HA*, p. 5; *idem*, *RD*, p. 13; ED, fo. 29r; *Letter 42*; for Dyott, see also N. Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 67, 140–143. Another MP, Christopher Brooke, argued that 'it is treason by the law for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the president of Doway[556] who is yett hear, procuring some healp towardes the dischardg[e] of the debtes of his house, procured by the backward paym*en*t of the k[ing] of Sp[ain's] pension. And generallie all Catholickes live in daylie fears and dare skantlie keap their owne howses, expecting searches and all extreamities.[557] One M^r^ Harry More, a gentleman of [the] Bishopricke,[558] who had bene somtime prisoner in Yorke upon the statute of persuasion,[559] was sent up prisoner to the Fleet for certeine words disgracefull to the religion professed, v*iz*, that Qu[een] Marie of Scotland was a martyre and the trew hiere [*sic*] to this crowne; that Queene Eliz[abeth] was a bastard, and wrongfullie witheld the right from Qu[een] Mary and her issue; and, lastlie, that the religion now professed here came out of K[ing] Henry the eighth his codpeece. This last point was urged most against him as disgracefull to one that was soe worthie a prince and the fowndation of this religion now professed. In conclusion, his judgment in the starr chamber before the parlam*en*t was to loose both ears, to stand two daies upon the pillorie, one in Cheapside, the other at Westminster; to have his nose slitt, to ride through London with his face to the horstaile, to pay, I thinke, ten thowsand powndes fine, and to be prisoner perpetuall. This was executed upon the poor gentleman accordinglie, notwithstanding he alleadged for him self that he had said noe more but what was exstant

seminaries made beyond seas to cum into Engl[and] [. . .] or for any to harbour suche, to avoyd which law this bishopp instituted suche heer': Thompson, *HA*, p. 5; *idem*, *RD*, p. 13.

[556]Matthew Kellison.

[557]William Bishop reported on 5 March that 'they made of late a search all London over upon the second of our March in the night after three persons principally' (Bishop himself, Richard Blount SJ, and Matthew Kellison) but 'found neither them nor any other priest': AAW, A XVII, no. 101, pp. 327–328; see also *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 249; PRO, PRO 31/3/58, fo. 49r. In his diary for 2 March, D'Ewes said that 'search was made heere in this cittie, in manye popish howses, for armor': *DSSD*, p. 184. The king, said Bishop, had been told that 'some Catholikes in London had made great provision of muskets and powder, a most gross ly' and all part of the parliament's attempt to break the match with Spain: AAW, A XVII, no. 101, p. 328. (Simonds D'Ewes's diary for 25 February had previously narrated that, following the proposals by MPs in the Commons for 'new lawes', the 'bishopp of London [George Montaigne] alsoe, upon ther instigation, sent about to manye severall howses to have enquirie madde what papists were residing in and about London': *DSSD*, p. 182.) Anthony Champney recorded on 31 March/10 April 1624 that Kellison returned from England in haste, 'upon Good Fryday [. . .] because the lower Howse tooke notice of his being there and there was a search for two nights together thorowe all London by the order of the parliament'. Although 'neither anie one [was] taken nor trobled, nor yet was the search anie way exact but verie sleight [. . .] yet his freinds were of opinione that he showld depart': AAW, B 26, no. 27; Questier, *C&C*, p. 409.

[558]County Durham.

[559]13 Elizabeth c. 2 ('An Acte agaynste the bringing in and putting in execution of Bulls and other Instruments from the Sea of Rome').

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in print in their statute lawes and such other books as were sett forth by publicke authoritie and approbation.[560] Ther was a preist taken two daies since by a bookbinder in London upon occasion that the preist, enterteyning him self upon occasion with the reading of a pamphlett that lay upon the stall intituled A Gag for the Pope,[561] and, being to depart, the bookbinder asked him how he liked the booke. He answered it was a foolish booke and full of lies. Wherupon the bookbinder fetcht the constable and, following him to a Catholicke scriveners shopp, ther apprehended him, carrying [him] first before the l*or*d cheef justice.[562] But, seeing he wold not intermeddle in the businesse, they sayd they must now make somthing of the businesse and soe, carrying him to D*oct*or Montaigne, b[ishop] of London, he is committed, as the report goeth, but it is not knowne to what prison. It is alsoe said that ther is a Jesuit taken at Warwicke whom my l*or*d of Shrewsbury[563] challengeth for his servant. The pr[iest's] name is M[r] Hurlston, who hath a brother a Bened[ictine].[564] My l*or*d[565] keapeth marvelouse close. Few knowe wher he is.[566] But I am sure he will not forgett you. I have writt certen reasons whie the government of the colledges shold be given to the clergie and whie the Jesuites are noe fitt [*word obliterated*], which I have sent to my l*or*d to have his approbation and wold have them sent to you to see wh[ether th]er may be made anie use of them, and to be advised from you and our frendes ther wherin they [are] defectuouse and how they may be perfected. I can not yett gett a procuration drawne though [I ha]ve sent, and spoken alsoe with M[r] Farrar[567] theraboutes. Onlie I would desire you to informe yourself of the state of thinges and how every thing standeth in the colledge, I mean whether they acknowledg[e] such thinges as I pretend they have. And, if you co[u]ld send me the forme of a procura[tion] drawne by anie notarie, I wold sett my hand ~~therto~~ with M[r] Farrars testimonie and others therto. Which I thinke

[560]John Chamberlain commented that Henry More 'laughed all the while' that sentence was being executed in Cheapside: McClure, *LJC*, p. 545. More had also said that Anne Boleyn 'was a whore': *DSSD*, p. 180; see also Whiteway, *Diary*, p. 59; BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 117v. For the proceedings in the star chamber against More, see PRO, STAC 8/32/20. I am grateful to David Cressy for this reference.

[561]*A Gagge for the Pope, and the Iesuits: or the arraignement, and execution of Antichrist* (London, 1624).

[562]Sir James Ley.

[563]George Talbot, 9th earl of Shrewsbury.

[564]The Benedictine may have been Richard Huddlestone: Anstr., II, p. 164; the identity of the priest is uncertain.

[565]William Bishop.

[566]Alvise Valaresso said on 12/22 March that Bishop had gone to the Spanish embassy: *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 249.

[567]William Harewell.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

wold be noe bad course, though it will require much time. We all long for an end of this terrible parlam*en*t, and in the mean time keap close, com*m*ending our cause to God and all good men, hoping well that, as the Catholicke cause prospereth in other cowntries, soe it will doe in this. The Hollanders have sent their embass[adors][568] hither, who arryved at London three dayes since, to treat with the king and estate for ayde against the Spanierd.[569] Ther was a report, that is not yett quite laid downe, that Henry van Berge was retyred backe to Brussells from Utreich, wher he had made a passage ~~of~~ over the ryver Isel, with the losse of three thowsand, but the last newes is that he hath fortifyed and secured his passage with two strong bulwarkes that he will not easelie be beaten away, but that at least he will block up Utrech that it shall not be able to range far that way.[570] And it is thought that the Spanierd will hardlie besett Hollend this summer, the emp*er*ors forces comming alsoe to annoy them in Freezland. This newes is said to troble the parlam*en*t very much and, if anie thing make them calme, this will, though ther want not manie that give projectes how to impoverish Spayne and to weaken the force of that kingdome. Howsoever it be trew or false, what is reported of the king of France, it is a wonderfull encoradgment to poor Catholickes to hear that he hath putt all Hugonotts from his cowncell, and in p*articu*ler the chanceler M^r^ Seller,[571] with his sonn,[572] and that he hath answered the Vycownt Kensington[573] how if Ingland deal ther for a match they must not expect to finde them more backward in religion than the Spanyerds but that they must exact, if not the same, yet as good conditions for Catholickes. Manie ~~deed~~ deeme, as they faine wold have it, that his Ma*jes*tie, the prince, yea and the duke[574] alsoe, are absolutlie resolved for to match with Spaine, and that, whatsoever the duke or prince doth, it is onlie to drawe the parlam*en*t to yeild consent therto, without which the conditions agreed upon by both kingdomes can not be valide and of force; and the king of Spayne seemeth to condescend to whatsoever is demanded of him, as was declared by a letter he sent which was read in the parlament. For the prince, duke and secretaries of estate, by the kinges order, were

[568] François Aerssens and Albertus Joachimi. See Adams, PC, pp. 337–338.

[569] See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 233; Adams, PC, p. 337. James received the Dutch ambassadors on 29 February: see *DSSD*, p. 183. For the treaty with the Dutch, see *Letter 47*.

[570] See Lee, *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain*, pp. 314–315; BL, Additional MS 72255, fos 120r, 122r; *HMCMK*, p. 194; PRO, SP 17/77, fos 41r, 53r.

[571] Nicolas Brûlart de Sillery, chancellor of France.

[572] Pierre Brûlart, vicomte de Puisieux, secretary of state. See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 212, 218; Burckhardt, *Richelieu and his Age*, I, p. 155.

[573] Henry Rich, 1st Baron Kensington, later 1st earl of Holland.

[574] George Villiers, 1st duke of Buckingham.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to impart to the parlament what hath passed hetherto in the matter of the match. Onlie the duke, to curry favour, sayd that whatsoever the k[ing] of Sp[ain] promised, it was never intended sincerlie, but was a fetch to gaine time and to worke his owne ends.[575] We shall, err [*sic for* ere] longe, see what matters will come unto because the king expecteth the parlamentes resolution within this fortnight, it is said before the twelfe of our March. The duke alsoe said that P*a*dre Maestro his comming was alsoe for noe other purpose but to win time. P*a*dre Maestro is not yett come, though he be upon the way, as a post that sett out a day after him from Madrid affirmethe, but it is not known wher he is for the present. Some suppose him to be in Paris.[576] The marquesse of Enojosa expecteth his dispatch by the waye of Flanders, and to be gone hence soe sone as newes com*m*eth that my l*or*d of Bristow is departed from Madrid, who intended to begin his journey upon the first of your March.[577] Noe more but hartie wishes

[575]For Buckingham's speech to members of parliament at Whitehall in the afternoon of 24 February 1624, see PRO, SP 14/159/72–79; Thompson, *HA*, pp. 3–4; *idem*, *RD*, pp. 5–11; ED, fos 16r–26r; *DSSD*, p. 182; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 180–181; T. Cogswell, 'The people's love: the duke of Buckingham and popularity', in T. Cogswell, R. Cust, and P. Lake (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 216–219.

[576]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 242; *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 169. For the dispatch in March of a royal safe conduct to Diego de Lafuente via a messenger of the chamber, see PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 6or. At Dover, Matthew Kellison, on his way out of the country, met Lafuente, who, while 'passing thorowe France nere unto Abbeville', had been 'overtaken by 6 horsmen who tooke from him all his letters and instructions. But he sayd the instructions were so favorable for Ingland that he cared not though they were printed, and the miss of them for the present he hopeth will quickly be supplyed by a dooble out of Spayn': AAW, B 26, no. 27; McClure, *LJC*, p. 552; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 198. The Flanders nuncio, Giovanni-Francesco Guido del Bagno, said the incident had taken place at Calais, and that Lafuente was stopped by four men posing as customs officials: *CGB*, I, p. 451. Sir Francis Nethersole heard that some people believed the story of the loss of his papers was a charade in order to 'avoyd the skorne of entering into any negocyation at this time of the day which the ambassadors see is too late': PRO, SP 14/161/36, fo. 56r. See also PRO, SP 14/152/13 (for Lafuente's belief that those who had taken his papers were Englishmen); PRO, PRO, 31/3/58, fo. 67v; PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 113v (for Sir Edward Herbert's note, on 1/11 April 1624, that 'it is told mee from divers that Padre Maestro was robb[e]d of his papers by such as had order afterwards to show them to this king', i.e. Louis XIII); BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 132r. According to the earl of Kellie on 5 April, the word was that the seizure of the letters was 'bye one of his Majesties embassadours lyeing their', either Kensington or Herbert himself, and that James was incensed: *HMCMK*, p. 197. Sir Edward Conway reported on 30 March that, at a recent audience with James, 'Padre Maestro [. . .] pleaded not the losse of his papers' and 'said he had many good thinges to open, but found the estate of affaires so changed as had rendered those propositions frutelesse': PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 83r. For Lafuente's arrival, see PRO, SP 14/160/58. Del Bagno said that Lafuente's principal objective was to assure 'la securité du comte de Bristol': *CGB*, I, p. 444, 452, 456.

[577]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 209, 211; *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 169.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of your health and happinesse, commendations, and dutie to all good frendes, and M^r^ Nelsons[578] remembrance to you and soe farewell.

London, February 28, 1624.

Y*our*s ever,

Thomas More

Addressed: Al m*olt*o r*everend*o sig*nor*e et patron mio osservan*issim*o il Sig*nor*e Tomasso Rant, Inglese, agente del clero Cath[olico] Inglat*erra*.
Roma.

Endorsed: Written: Feb[ruary] 28.
Received: May 16.
Answered: June 4.
Received th*e* 16 of May by the French poste. Card[inal] de La Valette sente it.

40. William Bishop to Thomas Rant, 12 March 1624

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 104, pp. 339–340*]

Very reverend and deare sir,

I did write unto <you> the last weeke[579] how the parlement with full consent of both Houses did request the kings Ma*jes*tie to breake of[f] the match with Spaine and treaty for the Palatinate, <to> help the Hollenders and to p*re*pare his navy for the seas, to see his owne havens and other sea coasts well fenced and to looke unto Ireland.[580] His Ma*jes*tie[s] answer was very grave and like a king of greate wisdome and long experience.[581] Albeit he desireth to folow their counsell [*two words deleted*] in all important matters, yet he must see <first> how he should be able to undergo and hold warr against so great a power as was the kings [*sic*] of Spaine, lest, seeing himself to[o] weake, he might onely shewe them his tooth and not be able to bite them. It was now to be considered that the united princes of Germany were brought very lowe, that the Hollenders [were] scarse able to hold out longer without his helpe, w*hi*ch they did even now crave by their ambassadours,[582] [so] that, if warr were once begun, all his imposts

[578] John Jackson.
[579] AAW, A XVII, no. 101, pp. 327–328 (5 March 1624).
[580] See PRO, SP 14/160/33; Thompson, *HA*, pp. 21–23.
[581] For James's speech, delivered at Theobalds on 5 March and reported in parliament on 8 March, see PRO, SP 14/160/30; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 250–251; Thompson, *HA*, p. 25; *DSSD*, p. 185; *LJ*, III, pp. 246–247, 250–251.
[582] See *Letter 39*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(w*hi*ch was the best part of his revenues) would p*re*sently decay. That he was already farr in debt to his brother of Denmark and unto others (some say to the summe of sixteen hundreth <thousand> pound[s] sterling) w*hi*ch mony he had imploi[e]d to p*re*serve the Palatinate, to furnish his daughter and her children, and about the princes journey into Spaine, all w*hi*ch they were to repay, as being imploied for the honor of England. Besides, to furnish his navy [and] to set an army a foote would cost a huge summe of money; to repaire his ports and other dangerous sea coasts and to send a garrison into Ireland would not be done [*word deleted*] with smale expences. Let them shew him how these matters might be p*ro*vided for and he would hearken to their counsell for the beginning of warr and, being once entred into it, would not make peace without their advise. They should also have the managing of the money, w*hi*ch they should collect, to se[e] it so imploied as they desired. He gave them this weeke to consider of it. But in fine, as I heare, they will not tell his Ma*jes*tie what mony they will gather, or how, before he hath broke off the mariage. But let him do that <first> and then trust to them for the rest. I do not thinke that his Ma*jes*tie will like of that answer, but will have them, as it is meet, shew him first how the warr shalbe mantained and then yeeld them his answer. Thus stands the matter at this instant. The next weeke will shew more. The lower House is highly offended against on[e] M^{r} Gerrard that he, being a recusant, crept into the lower House. But he hides <his> head and hath sent to the borow to cho[o]se another burghesse, saying himself to be sick. He was no converted recusant, and so the borow [was] blameles in their choise.[583] It is told me that an English ship carying fifty cast peeces out of Sussex for Flussing was mett by the Dunkerkers and led thither. They wanted

[583]Sir Thomas Gerard, MP for Liverpool, had declined to take the required oaths and had also refused to take communion: Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 89, 259–260; ED, fo. 47v. Holles's diary records that 'complaint was made against Sir Tho[mas] Gerard, chosen burgess for Lerpoole [*sic*] in Lancashire, that he had been long in town', and 'came not to the hows for he would neither swear, nor receave, beeing an obstinate recusant': Thompson, *HA*, p. 18. On 8 March, Gerard 'petitioned to be discharg[e]d, fayning sickness', a manoeuvre which got short shrift from Sir Robert Phelips and Sir Peter Hayman: *ibid.*, p. 25; ED, fos 56v–57r. On 9 March, a sergeant-at-arms was dispatched to find Gerard. Three MPs were appointed to determine whether he was a convicted recusant, and whose names were on his 'writt of election': Thompson, *HA*, pp. 27–28; ED, fos 62v–63r. On 13 March, Sir Arthur Ingram 'mooved that a bill of praemunire' should 'be drawn against' Gerard, though Sir Thomas Hoby was compelled to report 'of the search whether Sir Thomas Gerard were a convict recusant' that 'it could not be found to be so': Thompson, *HA*, p. 34; ED, fo. 81v. Six days later, it was known that he had taken refuge with the Spanish ambassador. On 3 April, MPs were still trying to proceed against Gerard: Thompson, *HA*, p. 60. Subsequently, in October 1625, Gerard was alleged to have used 'traiterous speeches', and was imprisoned in the Tower: *APC, 1625–1626*, pp. 205, 206, 239; PRO, SP 16/7/37, 69, 10, 42, 42.i–iv; PRO, SP 16/11/42.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

six peeces and <would> pay honestly for them.[584] Some report that there be above twenty Jesuites fled for savegard unto the Spanish ambassadors house. The Frenc[h]e ambassador doth <shelter and> borow some of ours, wherefore you must not thinke much that wee do keepe within <with him>, albeit we must alwaies joyne with them whom our king most respecteth; which some now imagine to be rather the Frenc[h]e than the Spanish, at least the duke of Buckingham so doth, who can do most with the prince and his Majestie. Wherefore feare not to send your letters to him by the Fr[ench] amb[assador] of Rome;[585] yea, you <may> very truly and lawfully say and tell even the popes Holines that Monsieur le Count du Tilliers is a very honest and zealous <Catholike>, and favoreth recusants <and priest[s] so> [*word deleted*] <farr forth> as he may, and is very ready to assist us all.[586] I do now write to second you in that pointe of the remove, if it may be, of our comprotector Car[dinal] Melino,[587] and for our deane and chapter. I hope the vicar generall will write the next weeke to the same effect. Thus, with my very harty commend[ations], I rest.

Yours,

William Chalcedon

12 of our March 1624.

[*on p. 340*]

Addressed: Au très révérend père, le Père Bertin, supérieur de S[t] Louys, pour le P[ère] Thomas. A Rome.

Endorsed: [*on p. 339*] Written: March 12.
Received: April 25.
[*on p. 340*] Received the 25 Aprill by the bishop of Lyons[588] his servante. Yt came in the pacquett from England. Monsieur de Lion does the affaires of France at Rome and is as [*sic*] ambassador.

[584]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 250; PRO, SP 14/160/70.

[585]On 16 February 1624, Sir Edward Herbert had reported that the embassy in Rome of Noël Brûlart was 'revoked' and that Philippe de Béthune, count of Sully was appointed in his stead. On 24 April, Herbert noted that Béthune had 'charge to disavow all that' Brûlart 'hath done for the accommodating of the busines of Valtelina and to hold the Spaniard to the Treaty of Madrid': PRO, SP 78/72, fos 36v, 164r; Avenel, *Lettres*, I, p. 725; for the Valtelline, see *Letter 76*.

[586]In early March 1624, Tillières described how he had recently lobbied James at Hampton Court on behalf of English Catholics: PRO, PRO 31/3/58, fo. 44v.

[587]See *Letter 31*.

[588]Denis Simon de Marquemont, archbishop of Lyons.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

41. Arthur Pitts to Thomas Rant, 19 March 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 19*]

R[everend] f[ather],

I wrote unto you a note howe to co*n*vey safely your l*ett*res to M[r] Parker.[589] He since hath satisfyed your doubt. We have a parlemen*t*, violent and of the hotest, for warre, and against us. By the wisdome of our kinge all wilbe for the best. He makes them see their weeke strength in warfare so that, retourni*n*ge home to their residences [and] beinge pressed to geve reason to the hoote spurres of their humeurs [and] why they co*n*cluded not to their expectation of warre and p*er*secutions, they gevinge just reasons, all is lyke to tourne to a greater calme, and the matter of the mariage w*i*th Spayne shall appeare necessary. The kinge his M*ajes*ty gave at the begin*n*inge[590] divers reasons of peace, first that he hath and doeth desire to dye as he hath lived, w*i*th the title of the peacable kinge. Agayne that he would be loth to dye in debt to his brother of Denmarke and others, and, sith warres will bring him further in debt, those must be first payed; that his grand children have not bred but fro*m* him; that his frendes in Germany be downe the wynd and can*n*ot helpe him; that the Hollanders can*n*ot stande unlesse he p*re*sently ayde them (at w*hi*ch his speach in parlemen*t* they storme, though when the m*aste*r of the ceremonies wold have treated them as ambassadors, they sayd we come not nowe in that quality, but as humble petitioners); that subsidies and fiveteenes wilbe longe a leveinge, and for warre that he must have p*re*sent mony; that his enemies we[re] never so potent as nowe; that the cheefe revenu[e] of his estate is the impostes w*hi*ch by warre must cease. All w*hi*ch reasons notw*i*thstandinge, they p*er*sistinge to breake w*i*th Spayne, three dayes since, he sent to them in writinge that his warre can*n*ot be just but against the emperour; for his son*n*e in lawe the others medled not but as collaterals to gayne the estate of Bo[h]emia taken fro*m* him; that before he enter in warre he must trie and solicite others his confederats and fre[n]des. The parlemen*t* this daye are to advise of the meanes for mony.[591] He gave them a caveat not to charge [the]

[589] William Bishop.

[590] See *Letter 40*.

[591] For the tax debates on 19 and 20 March 1624, following James's demand on 14 March for revenue for the waging of war, see Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 203–215; Alexander, *CLT*, pp. 56–58; Thompson, *HA*, pp. 39–49; ED, fos 92v–100r; *LJ*, III, pp. 265–266; *DSSD*, p. 186. Anthony Champney commented on 31 March/10 April 1624 that MPs had, at their meeting with the king at Whitehall on 14 March, urged him to 'brake with Spayn, and offered him to that purpose their goods, lands and lives', but James replied that 'to pay his debts <first>

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

com*m*ons, and my L[ord] Scroope, p*re*sident of the North, telleth them that they are so needy there that they must be relieved, and not able to paye. When they urge the goodes of the Catholickes, he scorned yt sayinge, when I am engaged in warre they will goe to church and so fayle me; and that yt will geve occasion to ruyne those of there religion abrode. Yea, the embassador of Venize[592] is sayd to have adv*er*tised o*ur* kinge to co*n*sider that the hard usage of Catholickes here wilbe distastful to their republique. Here hath byne a privat man fro*m* Bavaria[593] to offer the Palatinate to [the] palsgraves eldest son*n*e w*i*th a most advantageouse mariage, who had private co*n*ference as well and dep*ar*ted unknowen.[594] Don Francesco[595] hath byne privatly w*i*th the kinge very often,[596] wherat the duke of Buckingam stormed against the L[ord] Clinton,[597] who answered as resolutely, as one redy w*i*thout his leve to bringe in any that the kinge should cal for. Marvaile not that we write litle newes for ev*er*y day the waves be up and downe. God hath given us a kinge to keepe us as God will have us to stande, inter spem et metu*m*. Expedit eni*m*. Thus in hast, the 19 of March, by o*ur* accompt here. There were some searches in London, but no violence, nor losse, or i*m*prisonemen*t*, I heard this day fro*m* M[r] Parker.

Addressed: A mons*ieu*r, Monsieur Bertin, supérieur de S[t] Luys. A Rome.

Endorsed: Written: March 19.
Received: Aprill 30.
Answered: June.
This not subscribed letter is written by M[r] Arthur Pitts. I received yt Aprill 30 or therabouts.
Answered: June 14 or 15.

they must give him 5 subsidies and 10 feefteens, and everie yeare, whilst the warrs lasted, 2 subsidies [*sic*] and 5 feefteenes, at which demand they went their wayes, astonished and wondering': AAW, B 26, no. 27. For the subsidies demanded, see PRO, SP 14/160/89; PRO, SP 14/161/19, 30; Thompson, *HA*, p. 36; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 198; Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 210–211.

[592] Alvise Valaresso.

[593] Francesco della Rota. See Cogswell, *BR*, p. 133; Pursell, *WK*, pp. 208, 218; PRO, SP 77/17, fo. 1v; *CGB*, I, p. 504; BL, Additional MS 72255, fos 94v, 96v.

[594] For Bavaria's diplomatic proposals, see *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 154, 176, 179, 193, 198–200, 203, 204, 208, 209, 212, 215, 216, 218; PRO, PRO 31/3/57, fo. 284r; BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 101r–v.

[595] François de Carondelet.

[596] See PRO, SP 14/160/15, 16; *HMCMK*, pp. 199–200; *CGB*, I, pp. 449, 452–453, 462.

[597] Pitts intended to refer to Thomas Erskine, 1st earl of Kellie, rather than to Theophilus Clinton, 4th earl of Lincoln. See A. Courtney, 'Court politics and the kingship of James VI & I, c. 1615–c. 1621' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2008), pp. 240–241. I am grateful to Alexander Courtney for advice on this point.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

42. William Bishop to Thomas Rant, 2 April 1624

[*AAW, A XVII, no. 115, pp. 365–366*]

Very rev*eren*d father,

Albeit I have not <received> any of yo*ur*s of late yet, the state of o*ur* affaires beginning to alter, I would not omitt to certify you of it. Though our king do yet give faire words to the Spanish ambassadors, nevertheless the common voice goeth that he will breake with Spaine and trait with France about the mariage of the prince. Yea, they say that the Lord Hayes[598] hath already a commission granted him for that purpose[599] and that the Lord Kenchington,[600] captaine of the kings guard, is joyned in commiss[ion] with him, who hath been in France this moneth or more to sound the affection of the Fr[ench] king and his councell concerning the acceptance of that mariage. It then being so p*ro*bable that the match will fall out there, we must seeke to benefite the poore Catholikes by the help of the Frenc[h]e, as we did before by the Spaniards. Wee will write and send to sollicite the principall p*er*sons, dealers in it, that they will not do lesse for the Catholikes their neighbours than Spaine would have done if the match had holden with them.[601] You, o*ur* agent, must also supply[602] to his Holines in all o*ur* names that he will deale with the king of France, the queene mother,[603] Cardinall Richlieu, Mons*ieur*

[598]James Hay, 1st earl of Carlisle.

[599]See *HMCMK*, p. 197; PRO, PRO 31/3/58, fos 63r, 70v (Carlisle had received 'deux commissions, l'une pour une ligue, et l'autre pour le mariage').

[600]Henry Rich, 1st Baron Kensington, later 1st earl of Holland.

[601]A week before, Bishop had already reported that 'the most probable opinion is that' James would 'deale with France for his sonne', and there was 'no doubt but that he and his will do their best endevour to draw in France to assist him in warr for the Palatinate'. Bishop instructed Rant to lobby 'the cardinals our friends' to intervene with the French court to obtain as favourable conditions for Catholics in the treaty as the Spaniards had demanded. In Bishop's opinion, 'they may in deed request more favour for us than did the Spaniard in regard that they do graunt greater favours to their Hugonots than we dare demand': AAW, A XVII, no. 110, p. 355. (This was the line which the French secretary of state, Henri-Auguste de Loménie, seigneur de Villeauxclercs, eventually took over the extent of the toleration to be allowed to English Catholics as part of the Anglo-French marriage treaty: Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 214.) Bishop believed that, before any dispensation was issued for the marriage, the papacy would demand proof that Catholics had been granted toleration. The count of Tillières, 'a most sound Catholike and a very noble and wise ambassadour, hath very well informed himself of the former conditions' offered to the Spanish court, 'and is able in particular to relate them'. If necessary, the secular clergy would 'provide most honest and sufficient gentlemen to cary them into France and <to> procure his Christian Majestie to effect them'. Bishop was concerned, however, that 'some Frenc[h]e wilbe to[o] precipitate in the busines and suffer them selves to be gulled by some of the Scottish faire promises': AAW, A XVII, no. 110, p. 355.

[602]i.e. supplicate.

[603]Marie de Médicis.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

de Guise[604] and Monsieur d'Epernon[605] that they stand stoutly for our Catholikes and suffer not them selves to be deceived by faire words, but send sound Catholikes, witty and trusty men, unto our king to see all thinges promised to the Spaniards in favour of Catholikes to be performed by o*u*r king and councell before the fiances be made. We will assist them with true informations and the best directions we can devise. If p*er*formance go not before of such things that may be done, p*er*haps we shall not obtaine them afterward. For more clearnes: if o*u*r king and the lords of his counsell, if all the bishops and judges, do not bind themselves by oath to see that there shalbe no execution of any penall lawes enacted against Catholike Romans after the match made, and that there shall not <be> any other lawe made afterward against them, matters are not like to go well for us. We shall have faire p*ro*mises and litle p*er*formance. Wherefore it is not amisse to informe his Holines so much, and to request that the dispensation, w*hi*ch must be had for them as well as <it was> for the Spaniard, may stay in the nuncios[606] handes till he heare assuredly from us that that oath especially be taken and cessation of inflicting penalties be published. This much of that matter. Now to the occurrents. The duke of Buckingham caries all before him. His Ma*jes*tie favours him excedinglie and so doth the prince. At an ordinary in Milford Lane, where the greatest lords do often meet, on Saturday the 20th of o*u*r March, there were many of them. The Lord Dorsett[607] began a health to the ruine of Spaine and their folowers, w*hi*ch passed without exception. But ere that day senight his health was impaired and on Easter day, being the 28 of the same, he died.[608] At the same table the earle of Oxford[609] dranke a health to the confusion of papists; or conversion, said some. Divers others said they could not pledg[e] him, for I have many friends papists, said the Lord Scrope. <Nor I, said the e[a]rle of> Essex;[610] my mother and sister are papistes.[611] Nor I, said the earle of Northampton,[612] for my sister[613] is one. And so some others. The said earle of Oxford, on Wenesday

[604]Charles de Lorraine, duke of Guise.

[605]Jean-Louis de Nogaret de La Valette, duke of Epernon.

[606]Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

[607]Richard Sackville, 3rd earl of Dorset.

[608]On 22 April 1624, John Jackson recounted Dorset's death to Rant and stressed that he 'was noe frend of ours': AAW, B 26, no. 40A.

[609]Henry de Vere, 18th earl of Oxford.

[610]Robert Devereux, 3rd earl of Essex.

[611]See P. Little, '"Blood and friendship": the earl of Essex's protection of the earl of Clanricarde's interests, 1641–6', *English Historical Review*, 112 (1997), pp. 927–941. Essex's mother was Frances Walsingham, countess of Essex and countess of Clanricarde, and his sister was Dorothy Sherley: *NCC*, p. 209.

[612]William Compton, 1st earl of Northampton.

[613]Margaret Compton, wife of Henry Mordaunt, 4th Baron Mordaunt.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

folowing, did runne at the tilt and was cast by his horse, w*hi*ch also fell on him and broke his arme so short atwoo that ~~done~~ <some> yet say he is in danger of death. The admirall Buckingham hath been at the kings ship[s] by Rochester and is about the furnishing of them. He hath made a motion to the parlement to gather up a great summe of mony to victuall them p*re*sently, p*ro*mising to see them paid when the first subsidy shalbe paid in; w*hi*ch they take in evill p*ar*t.[614] The parlement hath p*ro*mised three subsid[i]es and three fifteenes, all to be paid within on[e] yeare, w*hi*ch wilbe a very hard matter for the poorer sort who already are not able to pay their rents.[615] Thus, with my very harty comendac*i*ons, I rest.

Yo*u*rs,

William Chalcedon

2^{o} Aprilis 1624.

[*on p. 366*]

Addressed: Au très révérend père, le Père Bartin, supérieur de S^{t} Louis. Pour le r[évérend] Père Th[omas] Rant. A Rome.

Endorsed: [*on p. 365*] Written: Aprill 2.
Received: May 28.
This was the last letter hee writt mee.[616]
[*on p. 366*] Received by the French poste who sent yt to S^{t} Leuys th*e* 28 of May, directed in a cover to Père Bertin by the name of Père Bertram. It came nether from M^{r} Lockwood[617] nor from th*e* Oratorye nor by M*onsieu*r Marchand;[618] yet it came from Paris; but I knowe not how. So, beeinge too long uppon the way, I cannot tell who to blame.

[614]See PRO, SP 14/162/4, 12.

[615]See McClure, *LJC*, p. 550; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 215.

[616]William Bishop died on 13 April 1624. For the accounts of his ministry, compiled for dispatch to Rome, see AAW, A XVII, no. 113, pp. 361–362, no. 116, pp. 367–374. John Jackson, on 22 April, observed of Bishop that 'the k[ing] and state never spake against him' and that when the lawyer and vehement anti-puritan Richard Dyott 'did in the parlement lower Howse speak of his going from place to place the last summer in Staffordshire, and confirming hundreds [. . .] the same man within a while after was put owt of the parlament by the rest of the same howse as one falsly elected': AAW, B 26, no. 40A; Ruigh, *1624*, p. 169; Allison, QJ, p. 141; Russell, *PEP*, pp. 153–154; History of Parliament Trust, forthcoming biography of Richard Dyott (article by Andrew Thrush).

[617]John Lockwood.

[618]See AAW, B 26, no. 11.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

43. Nelson [John Jackson] to Thomas Rant, 16 April 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 34*]

Very r*everen*d and noe less revere*n*ced and beloved sir,

I was not unkinde (as yow write of M^r^ Ire[land] and mee) in being soe long silent, but I omitted or rather differred t*hat* office upon such grounds as I held for good. For I understood t*hat* one was by appointment to keep weekly correspondence, w*hi*ch made me the less forward, hoping he wold enforme of all p*ar*ticulers; 2^ly^, M^r^ M[ore] [?] told me himselfe did write and in one of him yow have seen my hande.[619] 3. I was owt of the towne when I shold have written if I had been here, in regard of some perticulers w*hi*ch, after my returne, I thought would be stale before they co[u]ld come unto yow. I co[u]ld alleage diverse others but it is needles to yow to whom I have ever borne soe much faithfull love and respect. This great loss[620] and cross wee have receyved will be noe less bemoaned there than with us, as I think, in regard he was soe worthy a prelate of Gods Church, at th*e* sterne wherof they sit.

Owr parliam*en*t co*n*tinueth as yet. The lawes have passed both th*e* howses.[621] The k[ing] promiseth there shall be noe execution of them or th*e* rest. Whether he will passe them or noe is uncertaine, thowgh it

[619] i.e. AAW, B 26, no. 10 (Thomas More to Thomas Rant, 30 January/9 February 1624, with postscript by John Jackson).

[620] i.e. the death of William Bishop.

[621] This is a reference to the 1624 parliament's draft legislation against recusants ('An Act for the Explanation of a Branch of the Statute made in the third Year of the King's Majesty's Reign, intituled, An Act for the better discovering and repressing of popish Recusants'). For its introduction, and the debates over its format, see Thompson, *HA*, pp. 24, 57, 59, 62; *LJ*, III, pp. 248, 249, 252, 278; Thompson, *RD*, pp. 5, 12–13; ED, fo. 170r. On 18/28 June, Thomas More described its contents: 'they provided to disannull all trusts that had bene formerlie used in behalf of Catholickes, laying extreame penalties upon such as did not, w[i]thin a certein time, bring in and discoover the said trust, and then procured all grawntes even under the broad seale to be of noe effect, being for benefitt of recusantes, for that everyone shold be, in the tearms of former times, in their monthlie paymentes ether of xx^l^ or two partes of their lyvings. Againe they provided that the king shold take into his handes all the lands and goods of such recusantes as payd two partes and allow the sayd parties a third part out of the exchequer. Further, Catholickes wifes shold alsoe be paid for, and their children above eight years shold be taken from ther parentes and be brought up in some Protestant howses at their parentes chardges. These were some part of their lawes, and I thinke they had dyverse others because, after the former were passed, and the whole companie had supplicated against the recusantes to his Majestie and had procured him to make a bitter speache against Catholickes and to protest his hatred against them, they had xii more pointes to urge against them, but what they were I never heard.' James would not give his assent, of course, but had 'given order, as some say, for the execution of former penall lawes': AAW, B 26, no. 77.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is generally feared he will. I am told that there [is] comaundment given that all the prince his servants doe receyve on Sunday next. The penaltie I knowe not, unles it be the losse of his service. Yet I was also told that he said to Padre Maestro, commend me to the infanta and tell her I will keep my first and last promise to her that there shall be noe persecution.[622] I wish there were not. But, durante parl[i]amento, there is noe hope of helpe. I was also told in secret that, when the imbassadors of Sp[ain][623] alleaged to owr k[ing] that he had declared that he wold break the treaties, his Majestie answer[e]d that the howse understood not his [*word illegible*]. For I mean (said he) to break them because they are not in a right forme, and I will againe renue them in a perfecter maner.[624] Yet the lo[rd] of Kensington is in France, dealing for a match there. And it is dayly expected that the e[arl] of Carlile shall goe with commission.[625] I was enformed from a good hand that Kensington did motion the matter to the q[ueen] mother[626] who sent him to one that is greatest with the king. He asked the baron if he had commission. He said noe other than himselfe, for being captaine of the guard he was a commission. That is noething to us (said the other) but bring a commission and wee will deall with yow. Yet I will tell yow beforehand that yow must make account of 2 things. 1. that our k[ing] will doe noething without the popes consent. 2[ly], wee expect as good conditions for religion as Spaine shold have had. Why, said Baron Kensington, we brake with Spaine upon that point. And without that, said the other, expect noe treatie with us. The lower House is very violent against Cath[olics] and wold, besides the lawes, have all preists presently banished, and Catholicks also banished 10

[622]See Gardiner, *NSMT*, p. 253.

[623]Carlos Coloma and Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa.

[624]For the anxiety caused by James's response, on 15 March 1624, to a delegation on the previous day from the Lords and the Commons, headed by Archbishop Abbot, concerning the breach of the treaties with Spain (despite Charles's and Buckingham's reinterpretation of James's words), see PRO, SP 14/160/77, 89; *DSSD*, p. 186. However, on 23 March, Abbot delivered the petition of both Houses to break the treaties with Spain, to which James assented: PRO, SP 14/161/19–30, 36; Thompson, *HA*, p. 52; ED, fos 100r–107v; *DSSD*, p. 187. On 16/26 April, Anthony Champney wrote to Thomas Rant that the king had assured the parliament that he would not now treat with Spain any further for any match, and, as for the Palatinate, he would recover it by military means, for which they must provide financially. As for the manner of waging war, however, 'when, and agaynst whome, to wit whether <agaynst> the emperour or duke of Bavier, belonged only to him and his sonn, and therefore he would have no further conference with them thereof'. The wild celebrations in London 'as if the Palatinat had bene alreadie gotten [. . .] did not please the king, and his dislike did as little please the parliament': AAW, B 26, no. 44.

[625]For the formal instructions issued to Carlisle and Kensington on 17 May 1624, see PRO, SP 78/72, fos 214r–220r.

[626]Marie de Médicis.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

myles from Londo*n* and th*e* court.[627] Yet we hope well, and th*at* th*e* k[ing] will not persecute generally. The French imb[assador][628] is a zealous and worthy nobleman. His brother th*e* count I suppose is w*i*th yow, and Monsig*no*r de Lescale w*i*th him, to who*m* I praye present my respect[s] in th*e* best maner, and also to yo*u*r worthy freind Monsig*no*r Bertine. I mean the next week to send yow th*e* kings 2^{d} speech w*hi*ch I did intend a fortnight since to send yow.[629] Yo*u*r nephew is placed w*i*th an other by M^{r} Yelverto*n*, whom I co[u]ld never see since yow went, thowgh M^{r} Ireland promised to intreat him.[630] God graunt th*at* the deane and chapter be co*n*firmed by his Hol[iness], w*hi*ch will be most needfull in persecutio*n*, if any happen, as many fear. It was instituted upo*n* good warrant, yet, to shew o*u*r duties, his lo*rdshi*p[631] referred it to his Hol[iness] w*i*th hu*m*ble request he wold co*n*firme th*e* same. I hope one shall be sent to yow shortly, eyther th*e* b[ishop] his secretary[632] or M^{r} More.[633] And soe I rest, whose hart and hand you know. 16 Apr[il]. I pray present my respect to th*at* worthy Monsig*no*r Vives. If yow wold have us write to any, send their names, place, stile etc. What is Sig*no*r Defendente,[634] a marchant or a cleargy man? In hast, w*i*th a 1,000 best wishes and as many intreaties of yo*u*r prayers.

Nelson

Addressed: All molto r*everen*do pre[te], il Sig*no*re Thomaso Rant, agente dell clero Inglese. A Roma. S^{t} Luis.

Endorsed: Written: Aprill 15 [*sic*] 1624.
Receaved: June 5.
Answered: June 15.

[627]See ED, fo. 113v.

[628]Tanneguy Leveneur, count of Tillières.

[629]See PRO, SP 14/161/24; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 215–216.

[630]By a letter of 20/30 April 1624, Francis Smith informed Rant that a letter was coming to him from Richard Ireland, 'wherein he certified you of placing your nephewe by order from your sister who requested one M^{r} Yelverton to end that business with the consent of M^{r} Ireland. The youth likes his master well whoes [*sic*] name is Peter Windor, a taylor in Holburne and a Cath[olic]': AAW, B 26, no. 48; see also Anstr., II, p. 167; *NCC*, pp. 174, 212.

[631]William Bishop.

[632]William Harewell.

[633]Thomas More was, on 28 May 1624, appointed by the episcopal chapter to serve, jointly with Thomas Rant, as the secular clergy's agent in Rome: AAW, A XVII, no. 140, pp. 439–442.

[634]This individual was mentioned to Rant by John Jackson in a letter of 22 April 1624: AAW, B 26, no. 40A.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

44. John Smith [Colleton] to Thomas Rant, 29 April 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 47*]

My very deere sir,

I wrot the last weeke unto yo*u*. The occurrantes since: upon o*u*r Saint Markes daie,[635] o*u*r king, intending to give satisfaction to the parlement men, caused them to appeare before him at Whitehall, where he gave them heartie thankes for the petition they exhibited, both for execution of the lawes against Catholike recusants as also for setting fourth a proclamation for the banishing of all priestes, religious and seculars.[636] And his Highnes granted the one and the other unto them in ample maner w*ith* invective wordes against recusants to the great content and applause of the <saide> auditorie.[637] And, according to the kinges speaches and graunt, we every daie since expected the com*m*inge foarth of the p*ro*clamation.[638] But this daye it is bruted that his Ma*jes*tie, for reasons of state, hath deferred the setting forth of the p*ro*clamatio*n* for thirtie daies or, as others will have it, for fortie. What wilbe the end, O*u*r Lord knowes. But the Catholicke partie is much dismaied, and feareth least his Ma*jes*tie also will let passe and ratifie the newe lawes made against papists w*hi*ch are above measure severe, as intitling the king to all recusants lands and goods of what cauling soever, allowing onlie the third part for there maintenance,

[635] 25 April. In fact, James's reply to the petition against recusants, to which Colleton refers, was delivered at Whitehall on 23 April: PRO, SP 14/163/34; ED, fos 159v–161v (it was reported in the Commons on 24 April). For the petition, itself dated 23 April, see PRO, SP 14/163/32, 33; Ruigh, *1624*, p. 250; McClure, *LJC*, p. 553.

[636] See *Letter 45*. For Sir Robert Phelips's motion on 1 April for a proclamation against recusants, see Thompson, *HA*, p. 57; see also *LJ*, III, pp. 287, 289–290, 291–292, 297–298, 304. For the arguments in the Commons on 6, 7, and 10 April over the formulation of the petition (the Lords and the Commons both produced a draft) concerning the enforcement of the laws against Catholics, and whether it should be done via a proclamation, see Thompson, *HA*, pp. 62, 63–65, 74; PRO, SP 14/162/9–11; see also PRO, SP 14/163/1, 2.

[637] 'Some of the wisest', wrote John Jackson to Thomas More on 22 April, 'think that this satisfaction must eyther bee to graunt but not to execute it (for wee hope there wyll be noe execution therof), or els to tell them that he is to treat with Fra[nce] for his sonne and with Venice and others for <getting> the Palatinate which he cannot doe if he persecute Catholicks; and soe, on Saterday, get the subsidie bill twice read, if it can bee, and shortly after make an end of the parl[iament]. In secret, it is said he enterteyneth yet the matter with Spa[in], and also with Bavaria, and some <wise men> think that, if ever the prince mar[r]y, it will be with Spa[in], thowgh some of France are of an other expectation': AAW, B 26, no. 40A.

[638] See *Letter 45*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and this to be paid out of the exchecker unto them.[639] Two dayes since, a post came from Spaine and brought warrant for the ambassadours departure,[640] the marquesse, so soone as he could provide him selfe and Don Coloma upon the arrivall of the next intended ambassadour, to witt Mendosa, the noble man that attended our prince in his returne from Spaine, who is apointed leige.[641] Pater Maestro is heere, and hath grace with our king and staieth till the comming of Mendosa, but howe long after is not spoken of. Heer is great adoe and fearefull reports. The lower House have censured foure noblemen as unworthie to beare office,[642] namelie the earle of Rutland, lieutenant of the sh[ir]e,[643] the earle of Worchester, lord privie seale, the earle of Northampton, president of Wales, the Lord Croope [*sic*], president of the Northe.[644]

[639]One week before, on 22 April 1624, Colleton had written that James was resisting the parliament's calls for the newly drawn-up legislation to receive royal assent. The Catholic 'ambassadours protest unto us that his Majestie hath promised them most constantlie that dureing his life there shalbe no more persecution'. James had said that, if the subsidies were to be granted only on condition of oppression of Catholics, he would rather refuse the money: AAW, B 26, no. 42; see also *Letter 43*. On 5 April 1624, Thomas Locke had written to Carleton that 'the recusants (and not the meanest amongst them) give out that the Spanish ambassadors were humble suitors to the king for some mitigation towards recusants, and that the king should promise it in tyme convenient': PRO, SP 14/162/16, fo. 34v.

[640]For Inojosa's departure, see *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 373; *CGB*, I, p. 500; and for Coloma's eventual parting, see *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 463; PRO, C 115/107/8487; *Letter 57*. According to Sir Balthazar Gerbier (writing much later), the customary royal gifts to the Spanish ambassadors, when they left, allowed some 'malitious tongues' to say that James still credited their accusations against Buckingham: BL, Lansdowne MS 4181, fos 40v–41r.

[641]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 366, 377, 413. Diego de Mendoza, Gondomar's nephew, had come from Spain with Prince Charles and had arrived in October 1623, though he had left again in November: *Letter 32*; PRO, SP 14/154/38, 67; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 165; McClure, *LJC*, p. 529.

[642]On 1 April 1624, Sir Edward Coke had moved that the seventh branch of the statute of 1605 (3 James I, c. 5) should be 'revyved [. . .] that no recusant, or [one] that hath a recusant to his wyfe shall beare office': Thompson, *HA*, p. 57. Two days later, Thomas Lovell, elected for Bletchingley, was proceeded against for corruption in the electoral process, and also because he was noncommunicant and his 'mother, his daughter and sunn' were recusants. On the same day it was ordered that 'all knights and burgesses should deliver in wryting the names of all thei knew that boare office in their counties and were recusants, or had wyves so, and children': *ibid.*, pp. 60, 61, see also *ibid.*, p. 83. For proceedings concerning popish and suspected office holders, see ED, fos 163r–164v, 180v–181r; PRO, SP 14/164/46, fos 76v–77r; PRO, SP 14/164/86; PRO, SP 14/165/34, fo. 66v; PRO, SP 14/165/48; TD, V, pp. 152–153; *LJ*, III, pp. 394–396.

[643]Francis Manners, 6th earl of Rutland, was lord lieutenant of Lincolnshire: *LJ*, III, 394.

[644]An undated letter from Sir Henry Constable, 1st Viscount Dunbar to John Kirton, his servant at Burton Constable, noted that the Commons committee 'fell foule upon my lord of Rutland as an absolute papiste' but 'had a query agaynst our presidente [Scrope] for favoringe papistes and not communicatinge, and labors with all violence to have him put from his place': BL, Additional MS 38856, fo. 4r. Rutland had been the only dissenter in the upper House when, at a conference between Lords and Commons on 22 March, a declaration was drawn up to be presented to James on policy towards Spain. Charles had

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Count Mansfild was heare of late, had co*n*ference w*i*th his Ma*jes*tie and [was] chieflie intertained by o*u*r prince. His staie was som ten or twelve daies.[645] Some think the parlement will breake up shortlie, other[s] that his Ma*jes*tie will dissolve it, as he did the last. Happie for Catholickes if it so prove. M^r^ Doctor Boswell and M^r^ Thomas More <both of the chapter> were not p*re*sent at the last meeting[646] and, com*m*ing since to towne, have given there voices, as yo*u* see by the scroles inclosed,[647] w*hi*ch you maie add to the former. We looke earnestlie for letters from yo*u*, nor have we received any this moneth or more. Fare yo*u* well.

29 of Aprill.

Yo*u*rs in all,

J[ohn] Smith

Addressed: Admodum r*everen*do d[omino], D[omino] Thomae Ranto, cleri Anglicani agenti. Romam.

Endorsed: Written: Aprill 29.
Received: June 26 by Card[inal] de La Valette his pacquett.
Answered: Julye 1.

45. Richard Smith to Thomas Rant, 23 May/2 June 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 64*]

My very good father,

I am comen to my Cardinal Richeleu for to request him for to help us to get an other bishop in steed of o*u*r late deceased,[648] and to obtaine as

laboured to make Rutland change his mind, although Buckingham (Rutland's son-in-law) had defended him: PRO, SP 14/161/30, 36; Ruigh, *1624*, p. 228. For Scrope's occasional conformity, see J.T. Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry* (London, 1969), pp. 174, 200, 202; James Howell, *Epistolae* (London, 1678), part I, section 5, p. 200. Richard Broughton wrote to Rant on 28 April 1624 about the '4 great peeres' and commented that 'all of them' were 'in good grace with our king, our best frend': AAW, B 26, no. 45.

[645]John Jackson reported on 22 April 1624 that Mansfelt, four days previously, had been to 'Tibballs to the k[ing], and came back this evening with the prince' and lodged at 'St James in the <princes quarters>, [in the] next chamber to the prince <in the same chamber which was provided for the infanta>'. Diego de Lafuente had used the opportunity of his interview with James, also at Theobalds, to tell the king 'how daungerous [Mansfelt] may prove to the kingdom': AAW, B 26, no. 40A; see also McClure, *LJC*, p. 556; *DSSD*, p. 192; PRO, SP 14/163/1, 16, 48; PRO, SP 78/72, fos 144r, 146r.

[646]See *Letter 43*.

[647]AAW, B 26, no. 46.

[648]William Bishop. John Colleton had written to Thomas Rant on 22 April 1624 that eleven of the members of the chapter had met and 'we all held it necessarie to petition to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

good conditions for Catholiks in case o*u*r prince marie here in France as the Spaniards had obtained.[649] And he telleth me that he had, befor my coming, p*ro*cured that his king had written to his embassadour[650] in Rome for to deale earnestly with his Holines for to give us an other bishop; and that he wold doe what he co[u]ld for the other. Wherfor I pray you visit the French embassador there and set him forward al you can, and if you need any more help from here whiles I am here I wil doe whatsoever lieth in me. And this I can assure you, that o*u*r back freinds are resolved ether to hinder or to differ [*i.e.* defer] as long as they can that we have no more bishops, and therfor we need follow this matter as hotely as we can, for if it be differred [*i.e.* deferred] it is half denied.[651] Our embassadour, my lord of Carlil, cometh hither to this courte within thes[e] twoe dayes,[652] and both the king and queene mother[653] saye they wil never agree to the mach unles they obtayne

his Hol[iness] for three bishopes at least': AAW, B 26, no. 42; see also AAW, B 26, no. 46; *Letter 44*. However, by 3 June, Colleton had changed his mind. He recommended to Rant that he should solicit the making of two bishops, one of whom should be Matthew Kellison (with the intention that he would eventually reside in the English College in Rome, and become the rector there): AAW, B 26, no. 65. On 7 September 1624, referring to his letter of 3 June and one of the same date addressed to the pope (making the same request), Colleton wrote again to Rant and noted that he had urged that the newly appointed bishops should 'staie, the one in the colledge of Rome, the other in Paris or in the colledge of Douaie, and to governe heere by there under officers till it should please God to calme the storme then violentlie blastering, or mitigate the aversion of his Majestie from the Catholick highe function'. Colleton 'did not name Rome, Paris or Douaie for the places where the bishopes' should live, and used only 'the wordes in partibus transmarinis, but the suite had been easie after his Hol[iness] had yelded to the request' and agreed that those chosen 'might make there staie the one in Rome at the colledge, the other in Paris at the Englishe residence', i.e. the Collège d'Arras, 'or in Douaie', until the time was right for them to go to England. Rant, however, had strongly disagreed, and had not presented Colleton's suit. Colleton had also suggested that the pope should appoint a vicar-general with the powers which the archpriest had enjoyed, but again Rant had vetoed the suggestion: AAW, B 26, no. 118.

[649]Smith, who had been in London, returned to France in May 1624, traversing the Channel at the same time as James Hay, 1st earl of Carlisle, and hurried to the court at Compiègne in advance of Carlisle's arrival there: Allison, RS, p. 170.

[650]Philippe de Béthune, count of Sully.

[651]William Harewell had explained to Thomas Rant in early May 1624 that 'a Catholique of speciall note and qualitie in this land' had written to the pope, immediately after William Bishop's death, to ask for 'religious men to [be] our bishops'. Harewell thought that 'if way should be given to such motions and conceipts of particular persons, and those lay people too', the effect would be to 'have the Church governed not by ecclesiasticall prelates or clergie men but by the laytie [. . .]. Withall, as one moves for one religious order, so will another move and sue for another order and a third person for a third order etc.', and the secular clergy, 'the maine pillar and the very bodie of Gods Church', would be 'cast aside'. Elections of bishops should be governed by canon law, not by 'lay mens privat plottes and projects, not aiming at bonum totius but partis, and their owne privat ends': AAW, B 26, no. 50.

[652]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 332, 335, 339; Allison, RS, p. 170.

[653]Marie de Médicis.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as good conditions for Catholikes as Spaine hath obtayned, and I pray you request his Holines to continew them in this good mynd. For otherwise Catholikes in England were undone.[654] I doubt not but befor this you have heard of the proclamation against priest[s] which was published in England the 8 [*sic*] of their May, and is extreme severe against them and their harbourers.[655] God graunt them patience, and yet, to tell you mine [*sic*] opinion, I rather hope than feare, for the king did clearly shew that he wold never have made this proclamation if he co[u]ld otherwise have gotten the parlament to graunt him subsidies, which yet their clergie did without any condition at all.[656] And yet the lower House wold not even [*word omitted*] with this but endevoureth to draw the k[ing] to harder lawes against Catholikes. This much I thought to certifie you of, and if herafter there fall out any thing worth your notice I shal not omit to let you know it.

2 of June from Compeigne.

Yours assured,

R[ichard] Smith

The Jesuites have dealt with the marquis of S. Germain,[657] embass[ador] in England, for to oppose against bishops which, if he doe, you may certifie his Holines that he is no freind to the clergie,

[654]Cf. *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 363 (concerning Carlisle's instructions about toleration for Catholics in England).

[655]James had acceded to the demand, in the parliamentary petition of 23 April, for a royal proclamation dealing with Catholic clergy. Though John Colleton had expected, on 29 April, that it would be deferred for a month or more (*Letter 44*) and John Chamberlain claimed on 30 April that the process of securing the measure had stuck, nevertheless Secretary Conway announced in the Commons on 1 May that James had instructed the attorney-general to draw up the proclamation, which was issued on 6 May: ED, fo. 166r. The proclamation stated that, since the Catholic clergy, 'now harboured within this realme', 'by their boldnesse and insolencie', had seduced and withdrawn 'his Majesties subjects, not onely from the religion here established, but also from their obedience and allegiance to his Majestie', James had seen fit to 'charge and command' all of them to take themselves out of his dominions by 14 June 'with the first opportunitie of winde and weather [. . .] and never after to returne into this realme'. All other such clergy were forbidden to enter the country. The utmost severity of the law would be inflicted on any priests who disobeyed, or any who harboured them: *SRP*, I, no. 252. Alvise Valaresso observed that the proclamation 'was posted up to the sound of trumpets and drums, and a great crowd collected at the Spanish embassy as a sign of contempt for the ambassadors': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 318. Thomas Locke had believed, in early April, that if the law were to be properly enforced there would soon be an exodus abroad of many papists: PRO, SP 14/162/16. But Sir Francis Nethersole thought, on 15 May, that 'the papistes [. . .] laugh at the proclamation agaynst their priestes, now they are sure the parliament will be ended before their day come[s]': PRO, SP 14/164/86, fo. 142v.

[656]See also Ruigh, *1624*, pp. 248–256; AAW, B 26, no. 71; *Letter 46*.

[657]Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and that he most shamfully reviled our good bishop when he first came to visit him,[658] but that he shold rather give eare to the other embassadors. The Benedictins offer to doe whatsoever they can to p*ro*cure an other bishop, and so doth Fa[ther] Archangel.[659] Agayne, my good father, farewel, in great haste. And I praye you com*m*end me to F[ather] Bertin.

Addressed: Au révérend père, D. Thomas Rant, prestre del Oratoir en S. Luis. A Rome.

Endorsed: Written: June 2.
Received: June 24.

46. John Smith [Colleton] to Thomas Rant, 30 May 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 63*]

Right worthie sir,

Yesterdaie, being the 29 of o*u*r Maie, the parlement broke up and is adjourned [?] till the second of Nove*m*ber. His Ma*jes*tie refused to co*n*firme any of the bills or <newe lawes> that were made against recusants, w*hi*ch were many and, beyond belief, severe.[660] What will become of the p*ro*clamation is yet uncertaine. Som hope that before the expiration of the dayes apointed there wilbe published a kind of mitigation or revocation; others thinke that nothing wilbe don, but it shall stand stand [*sic*] still in full force.[661] Our king, talking of late w*i*th the Franche ambassadour,[662] told him that the p*re*sent pope was a marvailous good prelate, wise, myld and judicious, w*i*th other large wordes in his Hol[iness's] com*m*endation. I writ thes[e] by Douaie [*word illegible*] desier to adv*er*tise yo*u* w*i*th the [*word illegible*] of the good newse. On Fridaie I writ by the usuall waie, the Franche ambassadour. I have yo*u*rs of the 12 of yo*u*r Maie, and shall send answere to the pointes thereof, God willing, on Fridaie as I have said. We shall nowe expect weeklie to heare of the former letters addressed upon o*u*r bishopes death. The chapter not co*n*firmed here is no jurisdiction or

[658]In late 1623, Alvise Valaresso had reported that William Bishop's appointment of his officials had provoked the anger of the privy council, but Inojosa intervened and 'himself reproved the bishop': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 165.

[659]William (Archangel) Barlow.

[660]See PRO, SP 14/165/61, fos 141v–143v; ED, fos 204r–207r; PRO, SP 14/167/10; *LJ*, III, p. 424.

[661]See *Letter 45*.

[662]Tanneguy Leveneur, count of Tillières.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

superioritie at all: a want that must be supplied w*i*t*h* speede unlesse havock of discipline be unregarded.

May the 30.

Jo[hn] Smith

Addressed: To M[r] Thomas Rant, at Rome.

Endorsed: Written: May 30.
Received: August 4.
Answered: August 10.

47. John Smith [Colleton] to Thomas Rant, 18 June 1624 (with postscript of 25 June 1624)

[*AAW, B 26, no. 68*]

Very deere sir,

It is [a] for[t]night since I wrot,[663] and the cause of my silence was the uncertentie howe things would end. In my last, I advertised that his Ma*jes*tie refused to co*n*firme any of the lawes w*hi*ch the parlement had agreed on against Catholikes. And, where as it was hoped that his Highnes would have reversed or suspended the proclemation for the banishing of priests, the event proved quite co*n*trarie. For, the daie befor the expiration of the time assigned for priests to depart the land, his Ma*jes*tie cauled all the judges before him and straitlie com*m*aunded them to execute w*i*t*h* rigour all the <old> lawes made against recusantes.[664] This he did on Sundaie last, the 13 of this moneth, and the 14 was the last of the daies w*hi*ch were allowed to priests to prepare themselves. I thinke some eight or neene [*i.e.* nine] seculer and religious accepted of the banishment. On Thursdaie following, the 17 of this p*re*sent, old Father Davis[665] was seased on by the co*n*stable[s] and caried by two porters before the recorder of London.[666] I saie caried by two porters because he could not goe, being above fourescore and almost blind. The recorder com*m*itted him to Newegate, where he lies. On the same daie the Franche ambassadors chaplaine,[667] going in the streetes upon busines, a cu*m*panie of the vulgar cried out and said here is a

[663]AAW, B 26, no. 65 (3 June 1624).

[664]As the count of Tillières noted, this excluded 'celle qui regarde la vie': PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fo. 139v.

[665]William Davies. See *Letter 49*; CRS, 68, p. 171; Anstr., II, pp. 82–83.

[666]Sir Heneage Finch.

[667]It is not clear which individual is referred to here. John Varder was serving as the count of Tillières's English chaplain (*Letter 35*) and, on 22 June 1624, at the insistence of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

priest, a Jesuit, and staied him till he told them that he was a Franche man, and no subject of the kings. Yo*u* see by thes[e] two p*ar*ticulers howe furious the multitude stand, and what extremitie is like to followe.

The king sendeth sixe thowsand men to support the Hollanders.[668] The aerle [*sic*] of Oxford, Southampton, w*ith* fower more, are coronels, and a Scottishe noble man[669] generall, w*hi*ch discont[ent]eth the mightie.[670]

The duke of Buckingham is well recove[re]d and is nowe at courte in no lesse favour both w*ith* the prince and his father than heretofore.[671]

It is nowe more than <9 neene [*sic*]> weekes since I adv*er*tised the death of o*ur* bishoppe,[672] and howe destitute we were left of jurisdiction and authoritie. We expect yo*ur* letters dailie in that point, and shall not a litle marvell if we receive none shortlie from yo*u*, our distresses co*n*sidered. I was tolde this very after noone that the bishoppe of Canterburie,[673] being sued unto by pursivants for making them warrants, answered that they could have none. Good newes, if true, for Catholickes, nowe marvelouslie afraid, would quicklie take heart of grace [?] if pursivantes were suppressed and not againe admitted to ~~authoritie~~ search and ransacke. [*In margin:* The informant[s] are above beliefe busie. There are mo[re] than 250 writ[t]es gone out [?] alreadie.] My next will informe yo*u* the certentie. Doctour Richard Smith hath left us and is in Paris w*ith* his old lord the cardinall.[674] He said before his going he would staie but sixe weekes at most, but I thinke he will not make good that word.

Our Lord be yo*ur* guid[e] in the businesses. Fare yo*u* well.

Yo*ur*s,

Jo[hn] Smith

18 of June 1624.

Tillières, he received a warrant guaranteeing him freedom from molestation, despite the recent proclamation: PRO, SP 14/168/22.

[668]See Alexander, *CLT*, p. 58; Ruigh, *1624*, p. 249; Adams, FP, p. 170; *idem*, PC, p. 349; PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 83v; PRO, SP 94/30, fo. 274r; PRO, SP 94/31, fo. 71v.

[669]William Douglas, 7th earl of Morton. See McClure, *LJC*, p. 562; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 333; *HMCMK*, p. 202.

[670]For the appointment of regimental officers, see McClure, *LJC*, pp. 562, 565; PRO, SP 14/164/92; PRO, SP 14/165/12; Adams, PC, p. 349; and, for the disputes over precedence among those appointed to lead the new force, see Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 276–277.

[671]See PRO, SP 14/168/17, 48.

[672]William Bishop.

[673]George Abbot.

[674]Cardinal Richelieu. For Richard Smith's recent journey to Paris, see *Letter 45*; and for his patronage relationship with Richelieu, see Allison, RS, esp. pp. 168–169; Questier, *C&C*, pp. 212, 378–379, 418, 420, 421, 423, 425.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This letter should have gone the last weeke, but my ill chanch[e] hindered it. The pursevantes have yet no warrants and it is thought they shall have none in respect of the p*re*sent treaty w*ith* France for a matche w*hi*ch wilbe, as most thinke, co*n*cluded eare long, yea very shortlie. The <leiger> ambassadour[675] of France is cauled home by his king very sodenlie and beginneth his journey in post for France tomorowe next.[676] Thes[e] five weekes we have had no letter from yo*u*, w*hi*ch astonisheth and driveth us to feare false dealing some where. Fare yo*u* well, and God blesse yo*ur* doings. June 25. Freindes do all well.

Addressed: Admodum r*everen*do patri, D[omino] Thomae Ranto cleri Anglicani agenti.
Romam.

Endorsed: Written: June 25.
Received: August 7.
Ans[wered]: Aug[ust] 10.

48. John Lockwood to Thomas Rant, 24 June/4 July 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 79*]

Rev*eren*d [sir],

I receved yours dated the 4 of June, w*ith* th*e* others inclosed <by Mo*n*s[ieur] Granett>,[677] all w*hi*ch I delivered unto M[r] Do*ct*or Champenie who is yett heere w*i*th us in Arras College. They are sent to Doway, and soe for England. The trouble co*n*cerning our college is now before the nu*n*tio[678] heere, who hath imbraced this businesse and is in hoope too mak[e] a good therof [*sic*]. Bothe

[675]Tanneguy Leveneur, count of Tillières. Colleton, recorded Anthony Champney, had 'taken his lodgeinge' in Tillières's residence. Tillières's 'family' temporarily remained there following his departure: AAW, B 26, no. 89.

[676]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 373; McClure, *LJC*, p. 568. Champney in Paris remarked to Thomas Rant, in a letter of 8/18 July 1624, that 'the count de Tillers is come hither discontented', and the marquis of Effiat went 'in his place, by whose meanes I knowe not, but for our hurt doubtless'. Tillières had informed Champney of the arrest of the priest William Davies on the day before he (Tillières) left the country: AAW, B 26, no. 89; *Letter 49*. For Amerigo Salvetti's surprise at Tillières's recall, see PRO, C 115/107/8486. Dudley Carleton believed that Tillières was 'suddainly revoked for haveing' used 'certaine punctillious language here' about the marriage, 'for which he had no order nor instruction': PRO, SP 14/168/48, fos 67v–68r.

[677]John Lockwood described Granett as 'the banquier of St Benets cloister': AAW, B 26, no. 11.

[678]Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

M^r^ Do*ct*or Champenie and M^r^ Do*ct*or Reinard ar sworne too stand too his definitive sentence.[679] They have 2 howers appoynted them every day to have ther cause harde before him, w*hi*ch is 7 a clock in the morning and one in the afternoone. Soe sowne as it shall bee ended yow shall understand therof. Ther came to us some 15 days agoe <thos> 4 schollars w*hi*ch were expulsed the English College w*i*th yow. They sta[y]ed 2 or 3 days to refresh them selves, and soe were sent for Doway.[680] Do*ct*or Smith hath bene some moneth['s] space att Co*m*pien w*i*th his cardinal[681] to help all he can to procure by his cardinals meanes, who is one and the cheife (as I heare) of the com*m*issioners appoynted for the intreatie of the macth [*sic*] of England, some good co*n*ditions for the Catholiques of England. It is geven fourth that France will stand very resolutly for the good of the Catholiques of England, and that itt is alredie granted that the daughter of France shall have her chappell as large and amplie furnished w*i*th clergie men as the infanta of Spayne should have had.[682] My Lo*r*[d] Kinsinton is gone for England to have (as they say) a more ample com*m*ission to intreat of the macth [*sic*] heere.[683] This mach is fered will prove a co*m*bynation agaynst Spayne (although itt is thought ther will bee no service this yeare), yett notw*ith*standing the k[ing] of France hath sent for 6 or 7 thowsand Switzers to fortifie his frounter [*sic*] townes in the meane tyme, both towardes Savoy, Lauraine and Picardie. The newes is here that ther shall bee sent 2,500 me*n* into Irland to strenthen that island,[684] and that for the space of 2 days the drum*m*e strok[e] upp to levvye 6,000 me*n* for Holland, but, att th*e* end of thes[e] 2 days, word came to London that the Hollanders in the Indies had hunge upp a dozen of our men, wherupon the drum*m*e was laide downe,

[679]On 20/30 August 1624, John Lockwood wrote to Thomas Rant, from Paris, that the nuncio had been dealing with the Collège d'Arras for over a month. However, he had left them in the state in which he found them, so that William Rayner 'stayeth still emongst us, wherfore the two younge men that came hether frome Doway this last winter to perfecte ther studies here were redie to be gonne agayne rather than to live in companie with him [. . .] seing that his impatient course (if itt did continew still as itt did before) would bee noe small hinderance to ther intended course': AAW, B 26, no. 115. For the problems which had been caused in the college by Rayner (Richard Smith's cousin), see *NAGB*, pp. 178, 180–181, 231, 232; *Letters 59*, *68*; Questier, *C&C*, p. 401.

[680]For the arrival at Douai of John Faulkner, Anthony Shelley, and Richard Perkins (on 15/25 June 1624), and Francis Harris (on 6/16 July), see CRS, 10, pp. 229, 230. See also AAW, B 26, no. 91 (Anthony Shelley to Thomas Rant, 13/23 July 1624).

[681]Cardinal Richelieu.

[682]For the arrangements which had been made for the infanta's chapel, see above, pp. 46–47.

[683]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 373; *Letter 43*.

[684]Cf. AAW, B 26, no. 85, where Colleton repeated, in his letter to Rant of 16 July 1624, a rumour that 6,000 troops would be sent to Ireland; see also *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 291, 302, 333.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and what this soddayne newes will breede we can not yett tell.[685] We heere that the proclamation for the banishing of all Jesu[i]stes out of England was to tak[e] effect the 14 of June.[686] It is reported that the prince of England ~~hath~~ is much averted from Spayne and that he will be revenged of them. Oould [*sic*] Dr Roger Smith[687] is deed of late. I herd frome M^r^ Irland of late. He is well and I think that wee shall have him here agayne, if so be wee could gett this Do*ct*or Reynard gone. Thus recom*men*ding too your good prayers in that holy place, I remayne.

Yours always,

Jo[hn] Lo[ckwood]

Paris 4 of July.

Addressed: Au rév*éren*d p[ère], Père Thomas Rante. A Rome.

Endorsed: Written: Julye 4.
Received: Julye 21.
Answered: [*sic*].

49. Richard Smith to Thomas Rant, 22 July/1 August 1624

[*AAW, A XVIII, no. 35, pp. 269–270*]

Very reveren[d] father,

I have *your*s of the 2 of Julie, w*hi*ch though I answered [it] briefly by M^r^ More who dep*ar*ted hence towards you ten dayes agoe,[688] yet, becaus[e] this wil come to y*our* hands more spedily, I wil answere it agayne. As for b[ishops], if the asking of manie wold be any delay of the matter,

[685]For the Amboyna massacre, which briefly delayed the signing of the treaty with the Dutch, see Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 274, 275; *Letter 75*.

[686]See *Letter 47*. On 15/25 June 1624, Kellison had written to Rant that James had finally taken 'courage and refused to give way to the exequution of lawes against Catholikes and now Catholikes are again as free as ever and in as great troupes flocke publiquelie to the ambassadors howses': AAW, B 26, no. 75. Thomas Locke had sulked to Carleton on 16 June 1624 that 'the Jesuits make no great hast to be gone, though their tyme be out', and that they intended to rely on royal favour: PRO, SP 14/167/70, fo. 109r. Thomas More thought that very few priests had seen fit to obey the proclamation which ordered them into exile: AAW, B 26, no. 77. On 15/25 June, in Paris, Anthony Champney commented that, although the proclamation had been 'fixed upon the Spanishe embassatoures dore', nevertheless Richard Smith had reported that the new French ambassador, the marquis of Effiat, had written to Louis XIII to prevent the execution of the proclamation: AAW, B 26, no. 74.

[687]See *NAGB*, p. 180.

[688]See *CGB*, I, p. 498.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I co[u]ld wish you insisted but upon one, for in time he wil obtayne more. And of the same opinion was Conde Tillier in England that now we were to ask but one. This good conde is called out of England and albeit M^r^ Colleton and others have written to the k[ing and] q[ueen] m[other] and to others, and I have done al I can, yet I feare he wil not be sent back.[689] The new French embass[ador][690] there hath written hither that o*u*r king hath granted to [*sic*] all that the French demanded, excepting the English Catholiks going to the princesse[']s chapel, w*hi*ch yet he wil not forbid. And in substance the same points are granted to the French for Cath[olics] w*hi*ch were granted to the Spaniards, but not in that forme and maner.[691] My L[ord] Kensinton is not yet returned w[i]th thos[e] articles, w*hi*ch maketh manie here to muse. This day or to morowe [*MS torn*] is looked from England. If the ladie[692] goe to England I think she sha[ll] have divers of y*ou*r congregation.[693] My card[inal][694] promised me to write [*MS torn:* to Cardinal de La] Valette[695] in favour of b*ishop*s, but he is now out of the towne so that I a[m] [*MS torn:* not (?)] sure that he wil remember it this poste, but as soone as I see him I [*MS torn:* shall] get a letter of him. I dare not ask a letter from the k[ing] lest it might be [*MS torn:* thought (?)] offensive to the k[ing] of England.

In any case, demand of his Holines a copie of such informations as wil be given against such as are named for b*ishop*s, w*hi*ch M^r^ Benet[696] did and obtained, and therby th[e] informers tooke out their informations, confessing that they had bene falsly informed.

[689]For Tillières's recall and departure, see *Letter 47*.

[690]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat. For his arrival, see PRO, SP 14/169/2, 14; McClure, *LJC*, p. 568; PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fos 157r–158r. Amerigo Salvetti commented that Effiat was 'unexperienced both of countrie and affaire[s]', though, by the second week of July 1624, Salvetti was calling him a 'brave Frenchman': PRO, C 115/107/8486, 8487.

[691]On 13/23 July 1624, Richard Smith had announced that 'the summe for Catholiks is that they shal not be persecuted for practise of their religion in privat'. Buckingham would not agree to more 'lest he shold offend the puritans, of whome he hath made him self head. But if Catholiks carie them selv[e]s moderatly, more in time wilbe graunted': AAW, B 26, no. 90. On 10/20 August, Smith observed that Richelieu 'laboureth al he can to get good conditions for us and hopeth to obtaine' them. The minister La Vieuville had been 'put downe [. . .] cheefly for having so litle care of the Catholiks of England when he delt for the mach': AAW, B 26, no. 106; see also AAW, B 26, nos 102, 104; Avenel, *Lettres*, II, pp. 20–26; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 443. Carlisle noted how, as a result, 'those who have now the sole managing of the busines will labour all they can' to improve 'the conditions of the treaty to the advantage of this state and Rome': PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 11–v. See also above, p. 90.

[692]Henrietta Maria.

[693]i.e. the Oratory.

[694]Cardinal Richelieu.

[695]Cardinal Louis Nogaret de La Valette.

[696]John Bennett.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Otherwise by their secret informations they wil stayne any mans credit. A good old priest called M^r^ N Davis, almost 80 yeares old and almost blind and deafe through age and labors in Gods vinyard, was co*n*demned lately at Newgate, but not executed.[697] Much terror there is, but hope that it is but for a time to content puritans. Six thousand men [a]re to goe to Holland under my L[ords] Southampton, Oxford, Essex and Willougbie.[698] And the prince wil not let my L[ord] Vaux returne to his charge.[699]

Here some give out that o*u*r b[ishop][700] in England was like to have bene [the] cause of a great schisme. But I know that he was [the] cause of greate unitie. For, first, al the laitie were united in him, glad of him, and divers wept for his death, and [*word obliterated*] remitted their temporal debates to his judgment. 2. Al the preists were glad of him, and had now no grudge at the Jes[uits] for hindering the*m* from their natural sup*eri*or. 3. Al the Benedictins joyned hands with him and drew articles [*word obliterated:* for (?)] to avoid al dissentions, and the like was expected of the other religious.[701] 4. The sup*eri*or of the Jes[uits] came to o*u*r b[ishop] w*hi*ch before they wold not doe,[702] and some of the*m* honorably used him in their houses, and others preached of the

[697]William Davies was reprieved on the way to Tyburn where, according to John Colleton, 'about a 1,000 people went [. . .] to expect his execution': AAW, B 26, no. 95. Alvise Valaresso claimed that the count of Tillières's intervention (as well as 'the king's good disposition') secured Davies's reprieve, although Tillières was on the verge of leaving the country: *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 384; see also PRO, SP 14/168/59, 60, 64. Anthony Shelley narrated, on 13/23 July 1624, that 'the holy man was exceeding sorry, and weppe [*sic*] bitterly' at his reprieve, 'sayinge that this was the second time thay had served him soe; for hee had been condemn[e]d once for the same reason, longe before, and delivered. Hee sayd it was his onworthynes whoe did not deserve soe glorius a crowne, and with his constancy and good example did aedify the people exceedingly. When hee was condemned ther was on[e] only man in the roome that cryed God save the kinge, which shoed but litle content that the people tooke at his condemnation': AAW, B 26, no. 91. Sir Francis Nethersole commented, however, that the reprieve of a 'Jesuiste' would 'encourage his fellowes to stay here still and to bring backe those that run away for feare of the proclamation': PRO, SP 14/169/14, fo. 19r. For Davies's own account of the proceedings against him in 1624 (written for Propaganda Fide and attested by two Catholics imprisoned in Newgate), see PRO, 31/9/90, pp. 145–147; for John Colleton's account, see *ibid.*, pp. 157–158.

[698]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 333, 353; McClure, *LJC*, p. 567; *Letters 47*, *48*.

[699]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 363; PRO, SP 14/168/40. On 2/12 July 1624, William Trumbull recorded that news had arrived in Brussels of 'Lord Vaux his resolution to staye in England, and not to returne any more to the commande of his English regiment'; and the infanta, on the advice of Inojosa, Coloma, and van Male, had 'given the command of that regiment to Sir Edward Parham': PRO, SP 77/17, fos 231r, 238r. Subsequent missives from Trumbull noted that the English and Scottish forces commanded by Parham and the earl of Argyll were in decline: *ibid.*, fos 353r, 411v–412r, 438r.

[700]William Bishop.

[701]See *Letter 35*.

[702]See *ibid.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

necessitie and com*m*oditie of a b[ishop] and appointed their people to pray for him. And more was hoped for. Nether can any name any word or deed of o*u*r bishop w*hi*ch was like to cause schisme in England. Thes[e] effects I know did rise of having a b[ishop]. Here is also said that preists in England goe from house to house desiring [*word obliterated:* them] to put away Jes[uits] as enemies to the state, but I doubt not but that is a slan[der]. F[ather] Archangel[703] is not in towne, but as soone as he cometh I wil get him to write to the popes brother.[704]

After I had written thus far, I receaved a letter from M^r^ Ed[ward] Benet of the 7 of their Julie, wherin he saieth that they have no news, w*hi*ch signifieth that p*er*secution is ceased.[705] And that Don Carlos Colombe[706] hath written a marvelous good letter for the clergie to Card[inal] Melino.[707] Trie if he wil shew it to you. I pray you do my

[703]William (Archangel) Barlow.

[704]Cardinal Antonio Barberini, a Capuchin, and brother of Pope Urban VIII. See Allison, RS, pp. 182, 183; *NCC*, p. 107; *Letter 54*.

[705]On 20 June 1624, John Colleton had written to Rant that 'two thousand writ[t]es are alreadie gone out, procured by the promoters, which swarme'; and writs 'ad melius inquirendum' were dispatched 'to sease on the two partes of the landes of Catholikes, to the kings use, and spoile them of all there goods. And thes[e] writs goe within thes[e] two daies into all the shires of the realme, unlesse staie happen to be made by the mediation of the Frenche ambassadour, where of there appeares litle hope': AAW, B 26, no. 72; see also McClure, *LJC*, p. 568; AAW, B 26, no. 83 (Colleton to Rant, 13 July 1624, reporting that the exchequer writs were still 'in readinesse' and emphasizing how severe the judges had been, on their circuits, towards recusants). From Paris, however, on 22 July/1 August, the earl of Carlisle expressed surprise that 'the state of the recusants in England hath been (by some bodie's letters from thence) represented heer under a bitter persecution'. He thought it 'strange' that such claims should even be credible 'while we are in parlie with France': PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 361v. On the same day, he had secured an audience with Louis XIII. Louis had, despite Carlisle's denials, and evidently somewhat tongue in cheek, showed concern at the news of the 'great persecution against the Catholiques in England', and claimed that it was an affront to his honour, especially since the Spanish match negotiations had seen far greater, even if temporary, lenience extended to James's Catholic subjects: PRO, SP 78/72, fos 365v–366r. Carlisle alleged that, even if such rumours were true, James was trying to ensure that any dispensation from statute law against Catholics did not appear to be the result of French pressure, though Louis lamented the internal political disruption caused in France by the rumours of persecution in England: *ibid.*, fo. 366r–v. On 10/20 August, Richard Smith noted that, although by 'the 2 of August, the persecution was not ceased in England', in spite of the king's instructions, 'by this time it is hoped that it is ceased, for bothe the k[ing] and my card[inal] have written effectually to the French embass[ador] there, and he useth diligence therin': AAW, B 26, no. 106.

[706]Carlos Coloma.

[707]On 16 July 1624, John Jackson had reported that Coloma 'liveth solitary; he goeth to none, nor none goe to him'. Also, 'his chappel was robbed 4 or 5 dayes since, but not above x^li^ worth taken. The custodia [*i.e.* tabernacle] was turned upside downe but not opened, which I think was a speciall providence of Our Lord, who was within the same. A silver lamp and other things [were] taken': AAW, B 26, no. 84.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dutie to my good l[ord] of Armach[708] and my kind com*m*endations to F[ather] Berti[n]. Thus with my hartiest to y*ou*r self, I alwaies rest.

Y*ou*rs most assured,

R[ichard] Smith

1 Augusti.

Addressed: For M^r^ Rant.

Endorsed: Written: August 1.
Received: August 19.
Answered: August 26.

50. John Nelson [Jackson] to Thomas Rant, 4 August 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 98*]

My reverend good sir,

I have receyved 2 l*ett*res fro*m* yo*w*, as I hope yo*w* have done from me, thowgh [you] me*n*tion but one. I did also write a 3^d^, wherin I had taken exact paynes to enforme yo*w* of many private and speciall points, but finding the same a fortnight after at th*e* Fr[ench] imb[assador's] I did, after a second addition therunto, upo*n* fear of miscariage, tear all. Neyther was my mynde at rest till it was torne, thowgh to this howre I co[u]ld have wished it in yo*u*r hands, and wold have been at th*e* charge of sending w*i*th probable safety. The last newes is th*a*t a speciall post is come fro*m* owr imb[assador][709] in France who, they say, writes th*a*t his Hol[iness] hath willed th*e* k[ing] of Fr[ance] th*a*t he be not hastie in th*a*t match because he cannot as yet receyve any full satisfaction of the breach w*i*th Spayne. Since the k[ing] began his progress he was ill and purged both wayes and, in the fit, I hear, said he died a Romane Cath[olic]. I co[u]ld make [*sic*] lawgh hartely if I durst, thowgh verely the tymes shold rather make me sory. At th*e* last sessio*n*s 2 were comitted to Newg[ate], who refused the oath. At th*e* sessio*n*s before, old Fa[ther] Davise, a sec[ular] pr[iest], [was] co*n*demned, as yow have heard.[710] At th*e* assizes at York 2 gentlewoem*e*n [were] co*n*demned to die for helping a pr[iest] to escape[711] and, upon

[708] Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh.
[709] James Hay, 1st earl of Carlisle.
[710] See *Letters 47, 49*.
[711] Ursula and Jane Tankard, of Brampton, Kirkby Ravensworth, co. York, were granted a pardon for harbouring the priest Basil Norton (who was supposed to have gone into exile

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it, one of the judges (Denham)[712] fell sick. The other went the rest of the circuite aloan. Judge Chamberlane[713] in Berkshire, at Redding as I take it, chalenged one that he was a papist. He denyed it, saing I goe to church. That shall not serve, quoth the judge, and made him in his sight receyve the comunion, [and] after that tendred him both the oaths, which fear made him take. All this served not. He caused him to swear that from his hart he held the rel[igion] of Ing[land] right etcetera. This partie, going homeward, fell from his horse and brake his arme in 3 parts, and now is eyther dead or at the mercy of God. Inditements and presentments were never soe many. Comissions are gone owt and, thowgh it was bruited that there was a stay comaunded, yet I hear it prooves otherwise. Informers are very buisie in vexing Cath[olics]. The spite of the people [was] never soe great, noe not in Q[ueen] Eliz[abeth's] tyme. As Catholicks goe along the streets they crye owt, a papist, a papist, and use other reproaches and molestations against them. Gee the minister (I suppose yow know by report who he is, as well as he hath set yow in print),[714] this Gee espied one M[r] Coale[715] 2 dayes since the 2[d] of Aug[ust] in Holburne, and presently cryed out a Masspreist, which was enough to rayse the street, and they hayled him before my lo[rd] mayor[716] who tendred him the oath of supr[emacy] and, upon refusall, comitted him to Newg[ate].[717] He had but 12[d] in his purse when they tooke him. Many of those whom the Jes[uits] gave up as converted by them are fallen back. There arived, 4 or 5 dayes

in July 1618): Anstr., II, p. 233; CRS, 68, p. 172; PRO, C 231/4, fo. 174r; *APC, 1618–1619*, pp. 202–203; J.C.H. Aveling, *Northern Catholics* (London, 1966), p. 246; see also AAW, B 26, nos 96, 121, 132. The pardon was drawn up for them in late December 1624 as part of the package of toleration measures agreed with the French: PRO, SP 14/177/22.

[712] Sir John Denham, a baron of the exchequer.

[713] Sir Thomas Chamberlain, a justice of the king's bench.

[714] For John Gee, see Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare*. On 20 June 1624, John Colleton instructed Thomas Rant that he should personally write out petitions and memoranda directed to curial officials in Rome, and sign them on behalf of the leading secular clergy in England, because, 'if we sholde pen them here, they maie miscarie, as others that our bishope wrot have done, as now is apparant to the world in Gee his newe booke [i.e. *New Shreds of the Old Snare*], where in the copies of diverse letters are set downe'. Colleton was referring primarily to a letter from William Bishop's vicars-general to Pierre de Bérulle concerning Rant's appointment as the agent of the secular clergy in Rome: AAW, B 26, no. 72; Gee, *New Shreds of the Old Snare*, pp. 51–52; *Letter 30*.

[715] Thomas Cole. See Anstr., II, p. 68.

[716] Sir Martin Lumley.

[717] On Gee's own account, in his Paul's Cross sermon of 31 October 1624, 'not above three moneths since, when I passed along the open street in this citie [. . .] I was set upon by one of that Jesuitical brood, well knowne to mee', with 'a stilletto'. But Gee 'evaded' Cole's (alleged) attack, 'and for his commitment, I had the ayd of the justice of this honourable citie, by the authoritie of [. . .] the lord maior': John Gee, *Hold Fast* (London, 1624), p. 51.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

since, one M^r Mors[e][718] from R[ome] who desired to speak with me, and at our first meeting I asked whether he were in the sturrs.[719] He presently told me he was for the Jes[uits] and began to defend them and accuse the schollers. I grew a litle warme therat, having by good chance seen some of your relations. A freind of the Jes[uits] gave owt that I had animated them by letters. Informe us of the Jesuitrisses and take heed they prevaile not to the overthrow of the cleargy. They got of late from a gentlewoman 2 of her daughters by mear importunitie. What a disgrace (said they) will it be to us if it be knowne that wee can not prevaile with yow, etcetera. She, because she wold not discontent them, against her mynde suffers them to have 2 litle daughters. They report strange things of their being sent for to Naples and entertayned with procession etcetera. The Jesuits freinds give owt that we shall not obtayne b[ishops]. There is a block layed in the way, thowgh all others say that, the sooner it is graunted, the less will be the exception, being the continuing of the succession and of what was formerly done. Sir Tobie Mathew gives owt that the ladie of France[720] is to come to R. agaynst Christmas next and that the k[ing] and q[ueen] accompeny her to Massils.[721] I did write to Doctor Smith and desired him to enforme yow of all. The Fr[ench] imb[assador][722] here said to Mayerne[723] the phisition, as they were sitting downe to the table, that he browght noe Jes[uit] because they medle in state, nor sec[ular] pr[iest] for they wold eyther be drunk in tavernes or lye at the brothel howses, but [only] that good Capucin[724] who then said grace. These be calumnious against all the clergy of Christendome, but that of France especially, who only were in election. They were soe much the more injuriouse because he was a Hugonote to whom they were spoken, and, at that

[718] Henry Morse, who had left the English College in Rome on 9/19 June 1624. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1625: CRS, 37, p. 190; CRS, 75, p. 139.

[719] i.e. the recent disputes in the English College in Rome.

[720] Henrietta Maria.

[721] A reference, perhaps, to Marseille-en-Beauvaisis, east of Rouen.

[722] Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[723] Sir Theodore Turquet de Mayerne.

[724] Ange de Raconis (Angelo Rafaele da Raconiggi) was president and superior of the Capuchin mission in England: AAW, B 26, no. 130. In July 1622, Raconis had informed John Bennett that, while in London, he had dealt with John Jackson, whom he regarded as one of the most learned and judicious among the secular priests: AAW, A XVI, no. 122, p. 496. On 31 August/10 September 1622, Matthew Kellison remarked that Raconis, 'being returned from London, sayd that our k[ing] told him he liked secular priests but not Jesuites': AAW, B 26, no. 120. For Raconis's report from London, dated 29 September 1622, to Propaganda Fide, see PRO, 31/9/90, pp. 124–129.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tyme, Moulins[725] did lye at his howse, to whom in all likelihood he wold relate them when he came home, in infamia*m* religionis.

I suppose yo*w* dare not write us th*e* newes of Spalat.[726] The ballets sing and picture him as burnt.[727] Yea some statesme*n* reported as much. The l[ord] of Kensingto*n*, who*m* some call earle of Holla*n*d,[728] went on Friday last for France.[729] O*u*r soldiers th*a*t goe for the Lowe Countries finde warrs, or at least wounds, in Ingl[and]. At Gravesend they fowght one w*i*th an other, and one having his hand cut and, seeing one of his finger[s] hang by th*e* skin, pull*e*d it of[f] and threw it a way, etc*etera*. An other here slew a captaine to shew his valo*u*r. I hear there is a prophecie th*a*t, in th*e* jubilee year, Ing[land] shall be co*n*ver*t*ed. Thus yow see how I roam up and downe, as matters come to mynde. But I suppose, living soe farr of[f], and having others th*a*t write serious matters, these will serve to recreate yo*u*r spirits. M*r* More, if he be come, will excuse me, having in this writte*n* soe much as at this tyme I can. And here, w*i*th my best love and respect, I rest.

Yo*u*rs most assured,

J[ohn] N[elson]

4 Aug[ust].

Some give owt in France th*a*t, if the b[ishop] of Chal[cedon] had lived, there wold have been a schisme in Ingl[and].[730] P*e*rhaps they say as much there, and add th*a*t fowle slander th*a*t pr[iests] goe fro*m* howse to howse to forbid me*n* to entertaine Jes[uits], breing [*sic*] traito*u*rs, and th*e* fact treason. Card[inal] Mel*i*no hath written a poore, sleight Italia*n* l*ett*re to M*r* Coll[eton], stiling him dean of the Ingl[ish] cleargy,[731] and tells him th*a*t the p[ope] caus*e*d 2 of his l*ett*res to be read, of th*e* 15

[725]Pierre du Moulin, for whom see A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge, 1995), *passim*; Adams, PC, pp. 289–290; Cogswell, *BR*, p. 40.

[726]For Marc'Antonio de Dominis, archbishop of Spalato, see N. Malcolm, *De Dominis (1560–1624)* (London, 1984); see also above, pp. 28–30.

[727]De Dominis did not die until 30 August/9 September 1624. For the posthumous sentence formally passed on him by the Inquisition, on 11/21 December 1624, see *A Relation Sent from Rome, of the Processe, Sentence, and Execution Done upon the Body, Picture, and Bookes of Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalata, after his death* (London, 1624); Malcolm, *De Dominis*, pp. 79, 137.

[728]Henry Rich, 1st Baron Kensington, was created earl of Holland on 24 September 1624.

[729]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 412.

[730]See *Letter 49*.

[731]See AAW, A XVIII, no. 31, pp. 253–254 (Cardinal Millini to John Colleton, 26 June/6 July 1624). Colleton wrote to Rant on 2 August 1624 that he had received this letter, which arrived in England on 22 July, via the nuncio in Flanders. The cardinal, said Colleton, 'stiled me decanus cleri Anglicani, and wrot that it was his Hol[iness's] pleasure to bestowe that nomination and office upon me till an other were apointed, but gave no one facultie or jurisdiction at all, save onlie authoritie to comfort my brethren and encourage them by my good example': AAW, B 26, no. 96.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and 22 of June, and give[s] him facultie to doe as he doth, that is to exhort the clergy a mantenerse nella fede. Yow shall have a copie of it sent yow. My conjecture is that the p[ope] in congreg[ation] de P[ropaganda] F[ide] ordain[e]d that the d[ean] and chap[ter] shold continew donec etc, and gave him order to signifie soe much, which owt of the abundance of his love he hath thus qualified. I am angry at my selfe that I doe not write both to him and to the congre[gation] that he may reflect on himselfe, and they understand the indignitie.

Yours,

J[ohn] N[elson]

Addressed: All molto reverendo signore, il Signore Tomaso Rant, agenti dell clero Inglese.
A Roma.

Endorsed: Written: August 4.
Received: Septemb[er] 21.
Answered: Sept[ember] 28.

51. John Nelson [Jackson] to Thomas Rant and Thomas More, 27 August 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 109*][732]

V[ery] r[everend sirs],

On Saterday the 21 of Aug[ust] I went to the marquess imb[assador] of France[733] and told him I was come in the behalfe of the dean[734] and cleargy: 1. to present our respects. 2. to signifie the causes why he heard not of us sooner, which were 2: owr absence upon owr imployments, and that some came purposely to London to wait on him, and found him gone [on] the progress. He replyed freindly to these. I went on and told him that we tooke notice of his care of religion, and were thankfull for it, and desired that he wold take the cleargy also into his favour and protection, and, if we co[u]ld serve him in any thing, he shold finde us ready. To this he curteously replyed, but knew not what the dean was or any thing of the cleargy till I told him. Then I told him that I had heard that one was sent from the k[ing] of France (Monsieur Berule) to

[732]This letter is discussed in Questier, *C&C*, pp. 415–416.

[733]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat. Effiat, in his letter of 21 August to the secretary of state, Henri-Auguste de Loménie, seigneur de Villeauxclercs, related that 'le chancellier Brouck m'a amené un prestre seculier qui faict l'office de grand achidiacre' (i.e. Jackson): PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fo. 210v. Fulke Greville, 1st Baron Brooke, had lost the chancellorship of the exchequer to Sir Richard Weston in late 1621.

[734]John Colleton.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

R[ome] to procure a dispensation[735] and, if he pleased, wee wold send to our age*n*t[736] to co*n*curr w*i*th him therin. He asked me if I spake this of my owne private motio*n* or fro*m* the dean etc*etera*. To th*a*t I answered th*a*t I came lately fro*m* the dean and was intreated by him to doe these duties. He seemed to take the offer in extraordinarie kinde maner and promised me severall tymes he wold write to his maister of it and of us, and th*a*t now he did see we were not Spaniards etc*etera*. I added also th*a*t we had understood th*a*t the marq[uis] imb[assador][737] of Spaine had done us ill offices at R[ome] by his l*ett*res against the having of b*ishop*s,[738] and th*a*t the k[ing] of Fra[nce] his l*ett*res came about the same tyme com*m*aunding his imb[assador][739] at R[ome] to deall w*i*th his Hol[iness] effectually about b*ishop*s, w*hi*ch did us a great pleasure, and we desired his Ma*jes*tie shold know o*u*r thankfulnes. He did not understand any thing, eyther th*a*t we had had [*word deleted*] <a bishop or> any other circu[m]sta*n*ces of those points, but gave willing ear to all and promised much kindness and caused a writing to be shewed unto me concerning th*e* good of Cath[olics], w*hi*ch he purposed to procure th*e* k[ing] to subscribe to, being th*e* next day to goe towards Woodstock to meet him; and, after I had read it and liked it, <he> gave me anew many good words and soe dismissed me. I will labo*u*r th*a*t, at his

[735]Richard Smith had written to Thomas More, on 10/20 August, informing him of the departure for Rome of Pierre de Bérulle ('who is my freind and with whome you may deale confidently') in order to secure the dispensation, 'which office the Jes[uits] looked to have had': AAW, B 26, no. 106. For the dispatch of Bérulle to Rome to assist Philippe de Béthune, count of Sully in obtaining the dispensation for the Anglo-French marriage, see Allison, RS, pp. 180–181; Avenel, *Lettres*, II, pp. 18–19; also above, p. 102. On 1 September 1624, John Colleton wrote to Bérulle offering Rant's assistance: AAW, A XVIII, no. 53, pp. 333–334. A letter of the same date to Urban VIII expressed the English Catholics' hope that a dispensation would be granted, and that the pope would remember their Church 'ubi nullus [. . .] pastor episcopus praesidet, sed omnis jurisdictio et regimen jacet hoc tempore': AAW, A XVIII, no. 54, p. 335. This letter, Gordon Albion comments, was dispatched on the advice of Effiat himself: Albion, *CI*, p. 59. Matthew Kellison had written to the same effect on 16/26 August: AAW, A XVIII, no. 49, pp. 325–326; see also AAW, A XVIII, no. 62, pp. 357–358 (Colleton to Urban VIII, 22 September 1624); and above, pp. 102–103. Significantly, George Fisher opined in late October 1624 that, 'if I may creditt report, the French ar very desirous of the match and will, if they can, conclude it uppon any termes, even without a dispensation, if it may <not> be obtained spero tamen meliora': AAW, B 47, no. 156; see also Fisher's letter of 26 November 1624 (*Letter 63*). John Lockwood retailed, on 30 September/10 October 1624, a rumour that Bérulle, on his way to Rome, had all his letters taken from him, allegedly by the 'Spanyereds [. . .] in his hye way towardes Rome, as Padre Maistro was here in Fraunce when he went last for England': AAW, B 27, no. 13; see also *Letter 39*.

[736]i.e. in Rome.

[737]Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa.

[738]See *Letter 45*.

[739]Philippe de Béthune, count of Sully.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

returne, others may also goe unto him. I understand that, when it was perceaved that France stood upon condicions for Cath[olics], the k[ing] shold say to the prince, yow see to what pass yow have brought this business. There are discontentments between the d[uke][740] and p[rince] which I doe gather by some words that the d[uke] spake of the p[rince]. The d[uke] said to a freind of myne that wee papists were strange people that co[u]ld not be content to suffer a while that, after, we might be quiet. It seems they desire an other sessions [*sic*] of parlament, therby to get money for the payment of the kings debts, and they fear the purit[ans] will not graunt any new subsidies unles the goods and liberties of Cath[olics] be offred as a sacrifice to appease their malice, and therfore, if the sessions hold, I expect litle cessation till that be past, if then; which I ad[d] because the purit[ans] doe smell as much and will doe their worst to lay a ground for continuing of persec[ution]. When some of them were told what was done against Cath[olics], they answer[e]d: this is not to hurt yow, but to content us. It is thowght that the match with France will hardly [*word deleted*] <goe on>. I am told that the imb[assador] hath found that by following the Jesuits advise in some point he hath comitted a great errour, and therupon is owt with them, and desires to conferr (now) with the principall of the cleargie.[741] Some have named unto him M^r^ Coll[eton] and M^r^ Ben[nett]. M^r^ Pitts will be one of the fittest, in regard of his language, when he cometh to towne. M^r^ Blunt, the provinciall, was often with the imb[assador], and others of them also. And M^r^ Anderson[742] the Scotish Jes[uit] was in the progress, as his chaplein, after the Capucin[743] went for France,[744] whose returne was expected within 15 dayes. Fa[ther] Blunt, the provinciall, went to the Spa[nish] imb[assador][745] and told

[740] George Villiers, 1st duke of Buckingham.

[741] See also AAW, B 26, no. 120; Albion, *CI*, pp. 56, 59.

[742] For Patrick Anderson SJ (who died on 24 September 1624), see W. Forbes-Leith (ed.), *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI* (London, 1889), pp. 291, 317–347; ARSJ, Anglia MS 1, fos 191r, 201v; AAW, B 26, nos 129, 137 (Thomas Roper's report, of 24 September 1624, that Anderson 'lyethe very dangerously sicke' at the French embassy).

[743] Ange de Raconis. Later, on 14 February 1625, John Jackson wrote to Rant that Patrick Anderson had taken Raconis's place by a 'pretty wile': *Letter 72*.

[744] Alvise Valaresso said he had been assured that Raconis's recall by Richelieu was 'because of some error committed by him, in certain letters, through excess of zeal or lack of judgment': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 424; CRS, 68, p. 169. On 13/23 July 1624, the earl of Carlisle had reported that Raconis had gone to England with the intention of converting the king 'and the whole state [. . .] to the Romish faith'. Carlisle had learned this 'from a great minister of state, who feares it may occasion scandall there, and yet is not approved heer' in France. Carlisle hoped that Raconis would be recalled as soon as possible 'because publique notice is taken of the man heer', and also because it was believed that he had 'composed a booke of controversies for his Majesties satisfaction': PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 347r. For the damning report on Raconis, written by Effiat to Louis XIII, see PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fos 186v–192r.

[745] Carlos Coloma.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

him th*a*t such a one, describing ~~Mr Nelson~~ <me>, had been w*i*th th*e* imb[assador] of France and spoken against Spaine.[746] I, understa*n*ding of it, sent Fa[ther] Blu*n*t a message th*a*t ~~he~~ <I> found myselfe agreiv*e*d at th*e* wrong he had done me and, if he gave me not the better satisfactio*n*, I wold right myselfe soe as the other shold learne to be better advised and more charitable hereafter.[747] What his answer will be, I knowe not. Perhaps the French imb[assador] shall be aquainted herw*i*th that he may see how they curry favo*u*r w*i*th all sides.

A gentleman of note <and one th*a*t was present whe*n* I was w*i*th th*e* Fr[ench] imb[assador]> and a frend to th*e* Jes[uits], hearing of Father Blu*n*ts dealing, was sory and said th*a*t, if the Span[ish] imb[assador] had knowne th*e* necessitie by my going and what I sayd, he wold have advised the same. Other matters I must leave till an other time and, w*i*th my best respect to yo*w* both, rest.

Yo*u*rs,

Jo[hn] N[elson]

The 27 of Aug[ust].

Addressed: For M^r^ More and M^r^ Rant.

Endorsed: Written: August 27.
Received: October 5.
Answered: Octob[er] 21.

52. Thomas More to John Nelson [Jackson], 28 August/7 September 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 117*]

Right wor*shipfu*ll,

Yours of Julie 16^o^ were most welcome unto me, and I must crave pardon for being soe boysterouse with you, for the want of such

[746]Richard Blount SJ had recently sent a letter of gratitude to Louis XIII: *ibid.*, fo. 181v. On 23 August 1624, however, Effiat complained that 'les lettres du Père Blond me sont non plus de mon goust et particullièrement celle du nonce qui me semble n'est pas asses ample pour venir à la fin desirée'. Effiat had told him bluntly that 'ses affections n'avoient pas rapport à ses promesses': PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 213v. On 1/11 September, Effiat recorded that he and Blount had dined together and 'nous sommes séparés grands amis': *ibid.*, fo. 228v. But, for John Macbreck SJ's report of 31 December 1624 that Effiat was on bad terms with Blount, see ABSJ, Stonyhurst Anglia MS A II, 3, no. 15; ABSJ, Stonyhurst Anglia MS A IV, no. 26, p. 19.

[747]On 15 November 1624, John Jackson complained to Thomas More of Richard Blount SJ's 'wrongful abusing' of him to the 'Spa[nish] imb[assador]': AAW, B 27, no. 47.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

necessarie healpes as I wished stay[e]d me long err I co[u]ld take my journey, and I thought all blameworthie in this kinde that did not enquire what was done, and urged not forward the execution of what was resolved upon. You perhaps know not that my commission is limited to one sole matter, and therfore, though I wold, I co[u]ld not follow your affairs in this place for want of your authoritie. And now I am in good hope, his Ho[liness] giving us soe favourable audience as he did, and testifying with tears his tender affection to our cowntrie. I see not but that we shall sone dispatch that principall matter, and soe may returne with expedition. His H[oliness] wished I had had order from you to deal in the matter of dispensation [*in margin:* procure us the like commission] and not onlie from you but alsoe from his Ma*jes*tie and the prince and the lay Catholickes. It wold have bene a dischardg[e] of his conscience if it had bene generallie sued for from thence as it is by France. We expect howrelie F[ather] Berul who writt hither from Turyne upon the 29 of August. He will favour us all he maye and attendeth onlie to the procuring of the dispensation. We are exceedinglie bownd to the French embass[ador] Mons*ieu*r Betune who was our cleargies patrone in their first brunt in time of Clement VIII.[748] I went to visit him with M[r] Rant, and ther he discoursed with us above an howre and an half. He it is that in his kinges name furdereth our suite more than we ever co[u]ld, although we finde his Ho[liness] verie readie to give us all satisfaction. To him must we shew our selves gratfull, as alsoe to others in France that favour us. Card[inal] Bandino and the Card[inal] Barbarino be our especiall patrones, and by their means I hope we shall finde singuler comfort in all just demands.[749] Card[inal] S[anta] Susanna is our good frend but he seemeth to be much altered since M[r] Jhon Benettes being gone, and inclineth to the favoring of the Jesuites. And soe doth Sig*no*r Ingoli in whom we reposed so great confidence. I have not bene at the colledg[e][750] and the rector[751] telleth M[r] Weynman that their is noe place for me. They faine fearfulnesse of our agentes conversation in their colledges because therbie the schollers are moved

[748]i.e. during the 1602 appeal to Rome against the archpriest George Blackwell, when the French diplomatic service, in the person of Philippe de Béthune, assisted the secular clergy who led the appeal. See J. Bossy, 'Henri IV, the appellants and the Jesuits', *RH*, 8 (1965), pp. 80–112; Allison, RS, pp. 170, 180–181.

[749]Anthony Champney requested subsequently, in a letter to Rant of 8/18 December 1624, 'I pray you lett me [know] whether either Card[inal] Barbarino or anie other sayd to you at anie tyme that capitulum cleri Anglicani est chimera. It is tould us Card[inal] Barbarino towld you so, which we would gladly knowe': AAW, B 27, no. 81. Rant tried to set Champney's mind at rest in a letter of 18/28 January 1625: AAW, B 47, no. 49.

[750]The English College in Rome.

[751]Thomas Fitzherbert SJ.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to sedition and tumultes, which is a divelish calumnie to lay their faultes in their government upon our cleargie. Upon Twesday next, one of our schollers, a convictor, defendeth philosophie in the Jesuites schooles and dedicateth his conclusions to Card[inal] Barbarino, the popes nephew. Their will be great solempnitie, and the cost bestowed upon his conclusions is thought will amount to one hundred poundes. He is a convictor and is reputed to have his resolution to be a Jesuite. For such schollers are not comprehended within the prohibition that noe schollers shall enter into religion without his Ho[liness's] especiall licence. For the Jesuitresses they live obscurelie, and in great necessitie in this place, and wold for mear want be driven away, but that the Jesuites underhand mantaine them, I fear me, of our colledge rentes, which is extreamelie in debt. But externallie they wold be accompted their enemies. It is not yett published what they are to doe. C[ardinal] Millino, ther onlie frend, told us when we were with him that he had alwaies bene against that institute. And his Ho[liness] hath said resolutlie aut includantur, aut dissolvantur.[752] And we expect daylie when this shallbe intimated unto them. It is trew what they say, that they have three howses, one here, the other not 4 miles but 40 miles hence, to wit at Perugia, wher the last weeke their cheef patron the bishop[753] dyed, and in what ease he hath leaft them I hear not; the third is at Naples, whereof I hear nothing.[754] Shortlie you will hear more. One prelate in this cittie told me that we shold see some of them err long great bellyed; and when I sayd it co[u]ld not be in these beginnings, because they wold have an especiall care now of their creditt, he said noe more but putt his finger upon his mouth as though he wished us to say nothing but expect the end. But, for their vowes and processional receaving, I take it for a fable as Card[inal] Bandino did alsoe, to whom he signifyed what was reported ther.[755] And everyone wondreth that they can make anie believe what is soe fond and ridiculouse. They have altered ther habit, as it is said, for I have not seen them, and insteed of great hattes they have got the Spanish woemens habit.[756] I thanke you for your newes, and request you to

[752] See Dirmeier, *MW*, II, pp. 77–78.

[753] Napoleone Comitoli, who died on 20/30 August 1624. See Littlehales, *Mary Ward*, pp. 127–128; Dirmeier, *MW*, II, p. 74; Chambers, *Life*, II, pp. 102–103.

[754] See Littlehales, *Mary Ward*, pp. 125–130; Dirmeier, *MW*, II, p. 47.

[755] On 16 July 1624, John Jackson, in London, alerted Thomas More that Mary Ward's institute's members in the capital 'give owt [. . .] that they have 3 howses there, one in R[ome] and [an] other 4 myle[s] on this side [of] Rome, and one at Naples, and they were sent for and intreated thither and enterteyned with a procession and ringing of bells etcetera, or els that the like was done at Rome and that before the popes face they tooke their [vo]wes in great solemnitie': AAW, B 26, no. 84.

[756] Cf. Chambers, *Life*, II, pp. 6–7; Dirmeier, *MW*, I, p. 606.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

write often and in perticuler what occurreth. I presume M^r^ Muskett[757] can send weeklie, to whom committ your letters for me. And soe with my dutie to your right hon[ourable],[758] gyving her and you most humble thankes for the favour shewed to my neece Grace,[759] I take my leave, not forgetting M^r^ Rantes most kinde remembrance, who fealt no smale greife at the miscarriadge of the letter you intended him. He complayneth extraordinarilie of the slacknesse of correspondence, and indeed ther can not be a greater impediment in our negociationes. Farewell. R[ome].

Sept[ember] 7^o^ 1624.

Yours ever most assuredlie,

Th[omas] M*o*re

Addressed: To the right wor*shipfu*ll M^r^ Jhon Nelson give these. London.

Endorsed: 1624.

53. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 2/12 September 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 122*]

Right worship*fu*l and deere syr,

Some three weekes agoe I wrote unto you, hoping that that letter shold welcome you to Rome, and now I long to heare of yo*u*r safe arrival and good health w*hi*ch I pray God long continew. On the vigil of O*u*r Ladies nativitie,[760] the mariage betweene o*u*r prince and madame of France was concluded, and signed by both p*ar*ties and with good conditions for Catholiks and in some points better than thos[e] of Spayne. Wherfore I pray you joyne earnestly with Mons*ieu*r Berul (as M^r^ Benet[761] did with P[adre] Maestro) to p*ro*cure the dispensation in the

[757] George Fisher.

[758] A reference, presumably, to Anne Philipson, second wife of Thomas Arundell, 1st Baron Arundell.

[759] For Thomas More's niece, Grace, see D. Shanahan, 'The family of St. Thomas More in Essex, 1581–1640', *Essex Recusant*, 1 (1959), p. 64. Grace More was professed OSB at Cambrai (she took Agnes as her name in religion) on 22 December 1624/1 January 1625: *Letter 61*; AAW, B 47, no. 75; see also B. Weldon, *Chronological Notes containing the Rise, Growth, and Present State of the English Congregation of the Order of St. Benedict* (Stanbrook, 1881), appendix, p. 28.

[760] 29 August/8 September.

[761] John Bennett.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

name of the clergie.[762] M^r^ Benet[763] desireth it and I have written to M^r^ Colleton and M^r^ President[764] to authorize you al they can, ~~but I think~~ though I think that not needful, but, becaus[e] it is better and my card[inal][765] desired it, I have written to the*m*. We are much beholden to the said card[inal], not only for thes[e] conditions of the mach but also for his forwardnes to get us a b[ishop]. For he hath earnestly com*m*ended the matter to M*onsieu*r Berul and to the nuntio[766] here, and, seing the mach is concluded, I hope that o*u*r suite of b[ishops] wil not be denied, albeit some of the Jes[uits'] freinds in England give out that such order is taken as we shal have no more in haste, but others of this traine here say we shal have 2 or 3 of whome they hope to get one for the*m*. I wrote to you in my last that I suspected they ment to p*re*fer M^r^ Jhonson if they could. And what exceptions there are to be made against him both for incontinencie and frailtie in matter of the oathe [*sic*].[767] Deale co*n*fidently with M*onsieu*r Berul, for he is o*u*r freind, and maligned by o*u*r adversaries as wel as we. Co[u]nte Tillier is to be cheefe of [*MS torn:* the] princesse her house and, as I heare, his wife[768] is to be her cheef woman.[769] Wh[o is] to be her confessor, I yet know not. Her b[ishop][770] is a freind of oures and a kinsman of my card*in*al.[771] I need not say how expedient it were that o*u*r b[ishop] were

[762]See AAW, A XVIII, no. 99, pp. 549–550 (draft of a petition to the pope, in More's hand, for the grant of the dispensation).

[763]Edward Bennett.

[764]Matthew Kellison.

[765]Cardinal Richelieu.

[766]Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

[767]On 10/20 August, Smith had recorded that 'the Jes[uits] wold have M^r^ [Cuthbert] Jhonson to be b[ishop], for here is made inquiries of him. Twoe Catholiks told me of his incontinencie with a married woman as a thing certaine and knowne. And he tooke some oathe, for which he escaped death. For which causes my l[ord] of Calcedon [*i.e.* William Bishop] wold not give any office unto him': AAW, B 26, no. 106. For the version of the oath of allegiance which Cuthbert Johnson (serving as chaplain to Margaret Dormer, wife of Sir Henry Constable, the future Viscount Dunbar) had offered to King James in 1610, see *NAGB*, pp. 77, 79, 82. For the rumoured nomination, see Allison, RS, pp. 158–159; and above, p. 86.

[768]Catherine Leveneur (née Bassompierre), countess of Tillières.

[769]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 507.

[770]Daniel Du Plessis de la Mothe-Houdancourt, bishop of Mende and nephew of Cardinal Richelieu. See C. Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria and the transition from princess to queen', *The Court Historian*, 5 (2000), p. 23.

[771]On 19/29 September 1624, Carlisle and Kensington alerted Conway that there had been a 'vehement contestation' between Richelieu and Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld, 'as they sate in council, about the nomination of the bishop that should attend Madame into England', with Richelieu 'commending a young, learned and moderate man, the bishop of Mente', and La Rochefoucauld 'as strongly opposing him under pretence that he is an heretique'. The English ambassadors interpreted this as a factional manoeuvre by La Rochefoucauld to secure the appointment of Claude Caylar de Saint-Bonnet de Toiras, bishop of Nîmes and brother of one of the royal favourites, Marshal Toiras, who had

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in England before the princesse come, both for respect of Cath[olics] and Protestants, and therfore I pray you urge al you can the naming of him as soone as may be. Because o*u*r former b[ishop] is diversley calum[n]iated I send with this a note of divers good things done by him in his short time. The man who calumniated me to the nuntio, as I wrote in my last,[772] is, as I heare now, Tobie Mathew, who <in Englande> threatened to kil me if I were not a preist, becaus[e] I once said that one reported that he was a priest,[773] so haughtie that ministers sonne and neophite is becomen. And it is very likely that such letters are sent to R[o]me wherfore get, if you [*word omitted:* can] (as M[r] Benet[774] did), a copie of the accusations that are made against thos[e] that are named. From England they wrote of much p*er*secution, but the k[ing] p*ro*mised the Fre[n]ch embas[sador][775] that there shal be no more after the 5 of their August,[776] and here is comen M[r] White of Essex,[777] who intendeth to goe to Rome, who knew not of much stirre

petitioned the English to secure the appointment for his brother: PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 144r. For the rivalry between the two cardinals over ecclesiastical appointments, see also Bergin, *The Making of the French Episcopate*, pp. 454–455.

[772]Smith's letter of 10/20 August to More had stated that 'lately hither was a letter written out of England to the nuntio' by 'a nameles fellow [Sir Tobias Mathew] wherin he chargeth me that I am pr[a]eceps, ira fervidus and acerrimus, promotor factionis, contra Jesuitas', and that Smith would, if promoted to episcopal dignity, 'raise a tempest of sedition': AAW, B 26, no. 106. Mathew allegedly also claimed that Smith 'cooperated to the calling out of Co[u]nte Tillieres out of England', which Smith denied: AAW, B 26, no. 105 (Smith to Rant, 8/18 August 1624). Mathew also denounced Richelieu (for insufficient zeal in the cause of English Catholics during the Anglo-French marriage negotiations) in a letter sent to Cardinal Barberini in October 1624: Albion, *CI*, p. 56.

[773]For Mathew's secret ordination, see *Letter 3*; and for the exploitation of this fact by Smith, see Anstr., II, p. 120; Questier, *C&C*, p. 470.

[774]John Bennett. See AAW, B 27, no. 31 (cited in *Letter 58*).

[775]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[776]On 2/12 September 1624, John Lockwood reported that Louis XIII, 'understanding that the k[ing] of England ment to macth [*sic*] with him, tould him that unlesse hee did discontinew his persecution hee would in no ways entre into conditions of mariag[e] with him, to whom the k[ing] of England replied, requesting him to have patience but untill the 5 of August, which was the day he much solemnized for his delivery <out> of the handes of Go[w]ry, att which tyme he purposed of cessation of persecution': AAW, B 26, no. 121; see also *Letter 54* and above, pp. 98–102. In Sir Richard Weston's account of 23 August, Effiat had insisted on the 'revocacion of the commissions issued out of the exchequer' against Catholics. Weston had replied that this 'could not be don without perticular lettres to every county, which would rayse more bruit and noyse and give more scandall to his Majesties subjects and the parlament than any thing that was don in the treaty with Spayne'. Nevertheless, when the commissions were returned to the exchequer, the king could 'use what grace he pleased', and would intervene in cases where undue rigour had been applied. With this statement Effiat 'seemed to rest satisfied': PRO, SP 14/171/68, fo. 107r. On 1 September, Sir Edward Conway passed to the attorney-general a list of Catholic clergy and laity (among whom were the priests William Davies and Thomas Cole) 'for whom the French ambassador mediates': *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 333; PRO, SP 14/172/1.i, fo. 2r.

[777]Richard White. See *Letter 4*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that daye. If M^r White come to you, use him kindly, for I hope he is sure to the clergie, and therby <hee> may help you. M^r Rant hath written downe that the Benedictins request a b[ishop] of their order, but F[ather] Bernard[778] here denieth it.[779] You may know the truth by F[ather] Sebert[780] when he cometh. When occasion serveth, urge how Clement 8 testifieth in his bul[781] that the occasion of dissension betwene the p[riests] and Jes[uits] riseth of their medling in o*ur* matters and that the*m* selves think it expedient that o*ur* supe*ri*or shold have nothing to doe with the*m* in governing us. If his Holines wold do the like, al the quarels wold be ended, and otherwise I feare they wilbe endles. After I had written this, talking with M^r White, he seemed unwilling to be knowne to any Englishman in Rome, but to deal by a Frenchman called Mons*ieu*r de Scala who had bene some times in England with Co[u]nte Tillier. I pray you do my dutie to the good primate of Ireland.[782] And thus, with my hartiest to y*ou*r self, I leave you to the p*ro*tection of o*ur* sweet Saviour.

12 of 7^ber^.

Y*ou*rs ever and ever,

R[ichard] Smith

Addressed: A monsieur, Monsieur Thomas More, prestre Anglois. Rome.

Endorsed: Written: Sept[ember] 12.
Received: Sept[ember] ult[imo].
Answered: October.

[778]John (Bernard) Berington OSB. See Lunn, *The English Benedictines* p. 233; Weldon, *Chronological Notes*, pp. 135–136.

[779]Smith's letter of 16/26 September 1624 to Thomas Rant recorded that the English Benedictines in Rome were ready to support the secular clergy's petition for a bishop, and that Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB would 'further our suite what he co[u]ld': AAW, B 26, no. 141. Subsequently, in a letter of 2/12 December 1624, William (Rudesind) Barlow, president of the English congregation of the Benedictines, who had been lobbied by Anthony Champney for his support, wrote to the cardinals of Propaganda Fide, declaring his order's assent to the appointment of another bishop. He commended, in particular, Smith himself and Matthew Kellison: AAW, A XVIII, no. 83, pp. 413–414; AAW, B 26, no. 141.

[780]Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB. See *Letter 54*. On 17/27 August 1624, Champney had noted Bagshaw's departure for Rome: AAW, B 26, no. 110; and, on 6/16 September, John (Bernard) Berington OSB wrote to Thomas Rant recommending Bagshaw to him: AAW, B 26, no. 126. Bagshaw was one of those who signed a request, dated 17/27 September 1624, to the pope for the issue of the dispensation for the Anglo-French dynastic treaty, though this petition was never delivered: AAW, B 26, no. 146.

[781]The breve of Clement VIII dated 25 September/5 October 1602. See *NAGB*, p. 5.

[782]Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1624 Septemb*er* 12.
D[r] Smith. Recea[ved] Septemb*er* 30. Answ[ered] Octob*er* 7.
By Fr[ance].
Minae Tobiae Mathei.

54. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 16/26 September 1624

[*AAW, B 26, no. 142*][783]

Right worship*ful* and deere syr,

I have y*our*s of the 26 of August, written from Rome. Y*our* other written from [*word illegible*] I never yet saw. I am most glad th*at* you are safely comen to Rome and in health, w*hi*ch I pray God to continew, and y*our* self to have great care of. I have written unto you twoe or 3 letters, and in my last[784] certified you that the mach betwene England and France was co*n*cluded and signed by the com*m*itties of both p*ar*ties but, the articles being sent to o*ur* king, he hath not yet app*ro*ved them. When notice cometh of his app*ro*bation, Mons*ieu*r Villoclare,[785] one of the French secretaries, is to goe into England to take his oathe.[786] M[r] Cape writeth to me from London of the 24 of their August that the p*er*secution for enditing, p*re*senting, convicting and informing was never worse and yet our k[ing] had p*ro*mised the French embass[ador][787] there that there shold be no more p*er*secution after the 5 of their August.[788] Yet Catholiks goe to the embassadours chappells as befor and I heare not of anie searches of houses. But a while agoe M[r] Cole, a p[riest], was taken by Gee,[789] and Crosse[790]

[783]This letter is discussed in Allison, RS, pp. 182–183.

[784]*Letter 53*.

[785]Henri-Auguste de Loménie, seigneur de Villeauxclercs. For his appointment, following the dismissal of Puisieux and Sillery, see PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 19r.

[786]On 12/22 September, Carlisle had observed how confident the French were that the match would go forward. He noted that Richelieu 'sent immediately' to the secular clergy's Collège d'Arras 'to invite them to rejoyceing [*sic*] and to blesse that day and to pray for him, for the favour which was then, and by his meanes, procured unto them': PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 163r.

[787]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[788]See *Letter 53*.

[789]See *Letter 50*. In October 1624, Thomas Cole wrote to Sir Edward Conway that, although Conway had ordered his release from Newgate, the recorder of London refused to accept 'such bayle' as Cole was 'able to procure', since the 'sufficient housholders' who provided it were 'unknowen' to the recorder, and they were also 'Roman Catholiques': PRO, SP 14/173/119, fo. 148r.

[790]Humphrey Cross. See *NAGB*, pp. 43, 77, 89, 218–219; *NCC*, pp. 3, 256, 257.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tooke divers woemen and youthes in their jorney to Dover for to goe over. I heare there hath bene a publik disputation in the French embass[ador's] house, and yet I heare nothing of the successe, w*hi*ch maketh me doubt that it was no better than the former[791] w*hi*ch [the] Jes[uits] had and p*er*haps wold with this recover their honor. More of England I know not, for seldom I have anie letters from thence.

As for the doubtfulnes of his Hol[iness] about making b*ishop*s, I hope that wilbe removed by means of my card[inal],[792] who telleth me that he hath lately written therabout to his Hol[iness] and also to Mons*ieu*r Bethun, and biddeth me not doubt but that he wil obtaine our suite. I have sent you here a letter from F[ather] Archangel[793] to their procurer g*ene*ral,[794] and an other from F[ather] Raconis to the popes brother,[795] and Co[u]nte Tillier hath p*ro*mised me an other to his Holines in oure behalf in this matter and I hope that Mons*ieu*r Bethun and Berul wil overcome al d*ifficu*lties, with whome I pray you be co*n*fident in this matter, and help them al you can in p*ro*cureing the dispensation, about w*hi*ch, if much d*ifficu*ltie be made, p*er*haps I shal be sent to Rome, for my card[inal] told me that p*er*haps I might be sent thither, but this to y*ou*r self. As for subscribing my name, I give you ful power, except it be in things w*hi*ch may be to my owne com*m*endation or p*re*ferment. I <have> written to M^r^ Colleton to send you the seale w*hi*ch you desire. God in heaven speed y*our* labours. I have spoken with D[octor] Mailer about that place of Mons*ieu*r Vives, and at the first motion he liked wel of it, but desired some time to consider of it, and saieth that he wil write to you his ful mynd, but as yet he hath not brought me his letter.[796] M^r^ White[797] and his co*m*panie p*ar*ted from here 8 dayes agoe. He told me th*a*t he wold p*ro*mote our suite for b[ishops] al he co[u]ld.

[791] A reference, perhaps, to John Percy SJ's disputation in May 1622 with the king and leading Church of England divines; see *Letters 14*, *16*. Alternatively, Smith may be alluding to Percy's and John Sweet's more recent disputations, in 1623, with Daniel Featley and Francis White, for which see McClure, *LJC*, p. 507.

[792] Cardinal Richelieu.

[793] William (Archangel) Barlow.

[794] For Barlow's letter, see AAW, A XVIII, no. 59, pp. 349–352 (7/17 September 1624).

[795] Cardinal Antonio Barberini.

[796] On 17 May 1624, Sir Walter Aston had reported to Secretary Conway that, 'at the princes being in this court, it pleased [. . .] Buckingham to have many conferences with one Doctor [Henry] Maylard'. Prince Charles also would 'admitte him sometymes into his presence' because they found 'him [. . .] a person of very good abilityes, and one that gave extraordinary satisfaction of his affection' in the service of his king and prince, and in particular 'to give light' to the prince concerning the Spaniards' 'unworthy proceedings'. Mayler stayed in Madrid so that 'whylst the business of the match was in any suspence hee might bee ready to assist in any thing that might have required his service'. He had left Madrid (without receiving from the Spanish court 'any kynde of gratuity') on 24 March 1624: PRO, SP 94/30, fo. 264v.

[797] Richard White. See *Letter 53*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

He hath a letter in his com*m*endation to Card[inal] Barberino from o*u*r nonce.[798] Here they looke for news of M*onsieu*r Beruls negotiation for the dispense, and it is said that, as soone as that cometh, my L[ord] Carleil wil goe to England. Mansfeild is dep*ar*ted hence towards Calis, some say for England, others for Holland.[799] The French verily looke th*a*t our prince wil come hither if the mach take effect, and p*er*haps our k[ing] expects news from R[ome] of the dispense befor he wil subscribe to the articles. I pray you do my humble dutie to my l[ord] primate,[800] Mons*ieu*r Vives, Mons*ieu*r Berul, and my hartie com*m*endations to M^r^ Seaton, though unknowne, and to my old acquaintance F[ather] [*word illegible*] if he be alive, and to F[ather] Sebert[801] and al acquaintance. M^r^ Rant writeth to me of a visit[802] w*hi*ch he thinketh is to be befor C*hri*stmas, but I know [*word omitted:* not (?)] what visit that shal be. I pray you let me know by y*ou*r next. M^r^ Ireland, who is now with us, told me th*a*t Enejosa,[803] being in England, said openly th*a*t if the clergie named me for a b[ishop] he wold oppose becaus of my card[inal]. I pray God he oppose not against the matter. Some suspect th*a*t my L[ord] Maxwel there helpeth to make a stay for b*ishop*s as M^r^ Gage was sent for th*a*t purpose whiles M^r^ Benet was there.[804] This letter to the p[ope] is from Co[u]nte Tillier. Now I heare th*a*t there is comen a courier from England. P*er*haps he bringeth the kings allowance of the articles. The Jesuite th*a*t disputed in the F[rench] embass[ador's] house is Patrick Anderson, a Scot.[805] M^r^ Rant misunderstood me as if simply I wold have him to sue for one b[ishop], wheras I wish that onely if the striving for many wold delay the suite. This letter to the p[ope] is from Co[u]nte Tillier for b*ishop*s. He sent it sealed and so I know no p*ar*ticulers of it. This letter of M^r^ Nelson[806] wil give you light of matters in England. I have long time cried upon o*u*r brethren to goe to the F[rench] embass[ador] and I am glad that now at last they have gone to him.[807] It is now 8 dayes th*a*t I heare nothing of D[octor] Mailer, and p*er*haps he wil doe nothing. M^r^ Blacklow[808] wilbe

[798] Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.
[799] See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 438; PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 162r.
[800] Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh.
[801] Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB.
[802] i.e. an official visitation of the English College in Rome.
[803] Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa.
[804] For Robert Maxwell, 1st earl of Nithsdale's mission to Rome (to assist in the procurement of the dispensation for the Anglo-French marriage), see *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 433, 439, 447, 476; Birch, *CTCI*, I, p. 78; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 232.
[805] See *Letter 51*.
[806] *Ibid.*
[807] See *ibid.*
[808] Richard White. See *Letter 53*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at Rome before C*hris*tmas, so that you may deale with him y*our* self. Mansfeild is gone from here to Calis, some say for England, others for Holland. Co[u]nte Morris hath taken Clevis.[809] One comen lately out of England to the monks in Doway saieth he never knew things so il, and that the archb[ishop] of York[810] his pursivant seaseth both upon Catholiks and so affected. Thus having no more to write, with my hartiest love, I leave you to the p*ro*tection of o*ur* sweet Saviour.

26 of 7^{ber}.

Y*our*s ever as his owne,

R[ichard] Smi[th]

Addressed: To M^{r} More.

Endorsed: 1624. D[octor] Smith.
Septem*b*er 26.
Recea[ved]: October 15. Answ[ered]: October 21. By Fr[ance].

55. George Musket [Fisher] to Thomas More, 23 September 1624

[*AAW, A XVIII, no. 65, pp. 363–366*]

Right r*everen*d s*i*r,

I perceive by your letters dated the 24 and the last of August that our cheife <busines> is yet in the budd and not come to that ripenes and perfection we desire, but we hope shortly to see the fruit of your laborius jorney and to obtaine that wich we all most earnestly desire. Some rumors ar spread abroad that D*oct*or Smith is already designed to that dignity but your letters baring so late date and not intimating any such thing maketh me thinke that thes[e] ar but false reports.[811] If the[y] prove <true> we shall all rejoice and esteeme <it> as a great blessing of Almighty God. The course of the time here is so uneven and uncertaine that we know not our selves in what state we stand. Our feares and hopes ar in equall ballance. In the remote parts of the land, Catholiques suffer great persecution. Ther lands and goods ar

[809]Cf. Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, p. 484.
[810]Tobias Mathew.
[811]For the appointment of Richard Smith to succeed William Bishop as bishop of Chalcedon, see Allison, RS.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seised, 12[d] for every Sunday[812] rigorously exacted, besides many other aggreevances by promoters in every place.[813] Only we ar free from pursivants wich is some comfort amidst thes[e] troubles. The French ambassador[814] hath labored much with the king for some mitigation of thes[e] extremities and hath received many faire promises but as yet there is no effectuall course taken for the redresse of thes[e] miseries.[815] Yet generally it is reported that the match with France is in great forwardnes, some say concluded, but I cannot beleive this. Certaine it is that the duke is preparing to goe to France. His trunckes ar already at the custome house. The 11[th] of this moneth ther arrived here a secretary from Spaine.[816] I heard some whispering as though he brought good tidings from thence but I cannot learne what his particular errand is. He is to have audience shortly,[817] wich if it be favorable some say we may expect shortly a great ambassador from thence. Don Carlos[818] will be gone within this fortnight at the farthest. Mansfield arrived here some few daies before the secretary came and

[812]The statutory penalty, under the Elizabethan act of uniformity (1 Elizabeth, c. 2), for absence from church on Sundays and holy days.

[813]See AAW, A XVIII, no. 58, pp. 347–348 (an order for the reporting of recusants at the general sessions at Spittle in Lincolnshire); AAW, A XIX, no. 4, pp. 9–12 ('Complaintes of extremities and wronges done unto the Catholickes in the parishe of Botsworthe in the county of Lincolne by the churche wardens of the sayed parishe by vertue of Sir Nicholas Sanderson his warrantes by worde and writinge'); AAW, A XVIII, no. 64, pp. 361–362 (Robert Turbott [?] to Richard Forster, 23 September 1624, concerning the course taken by Sir Thomas Hoby and Sir David Foulis at Stokesley against Catholics); AAW, A XVIII, no. 75, pp. 395–398. For other letters addresed to Forster, describing sanctions against Catholics in the autumn of 1624, see AAW, A XVIII, no. 66, pp. 367–368, no. 69, pp. 375–376, no. 70, pp. 377–378; see also Questier, *C&C*, p. 422.

[814]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[815]On 15/25 September 1624, Matthew Kellison recorded that William Lane had written to him (on 3/13 September) that Effiat 'of late, by the mediation of the d[uke] of Buck[ingham], hath gotten some lettres to the lord keeper, the attorney generall and to the chancelor of the exchequer for the suppression of al writtes and commissions sent into the countrie against recusantes. He told the k[ing] plainlie that, if he did <continew> persequution against Catholikes in Ingl[and], then the Fr[ench] k[ing] his master wold persequute in like manner the Hugonotts in France': AAW, B 26, no. 139. The agent for the English College at Douai reported, at the same time, that Effiat had also secured restraints on 'the promotors, informers and pursuivants, soe it is thought the matche will goe forward': AAW, B 26, no. 139. Cf. *Letter 56*.

[816]On 8/18 September 1624, William Trumbull sent news that 'on Tewsday last', Jacques Bruneau, 'secretary of the counsell of Flanders at Madrid [. . .] passed this way towards England, with the quality of agent for the king of Spaine', in order 'to releive Don Carlos Coloma', and that he would stay there 'untill the comming of another Spanish ambassador': PRO, SP 77/17, fo. 330v; see also *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 451; *CGB*, II, p. 657; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 581, 584; PRO, SP 94/31, fo. 168r.

[817]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 454, 474.

[818]Carlos Coloma.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hath bin with the king.[819] What his busines is I cannot understand. Some say that he desireth imploiment at sea. The prince lately, as he was hunting, fell from his horse and brused himselfe sorely but, thankes be to God, he is in no danger.[820] M^r^ Missenden[821] wrighteth from Spaine that the king hath give[n] order that the pension wich was paid yearely by him to the colledge of Doway shall be now paied <by the infanta[822]> by 2,000 escudos per an*num*, and that the arrerages shall be paied by a thousand duckets per an*num* or more as she pleaseth. Before I end, I must <intreat> a favor at your <hands> wich is that you will be pleased to goe to the fathers at Minerva, I meane those of St Dominickes order, by whom I was received into the cheife sodality of Our Lady and to intreat them to give [*p. 364*] me autority to receive into that sodality such as shall desire it at my hands. I might have had <this> favor at my coming from thence but I forgot to aske it. I pray you solicite earnestly in my behalfe. I was admitted into that sodality 17, 18 or 19 yeares agoe by the name of George Fisher or George Ashton, I know not well. If you please to take the paines I doubt not but you will find my name and obtaine this favor for me.[823] Those of the Society have autority to admit into the society or sodality of the conception, and this the[y] chaleng[e] as peculiar to that society, by wich the[y] draw many to them selves, that they must depend only of them. For I have heard they will not admit them unles the[y] promise to depend of them and ther direction.[824] Take this to your consideration and think how this inco*n*venience may be prevented and whether the like priviledge may not be obtained for the clergy. I have solicited M^r^ Smith[825] many times for such letters as you desire, and he telleth me he hath fully satisfied your expectation. Since the writing of this I understand by me*n* of the best intelligence that the king is pleased at the instance of the French ambassador to compassionate the poore afflicted state of Catholikes and that the order is now drawing up for the staiing of this present persecution, and that such as have had ther goods seased and sold shall have the price of them [re]stored backe. We expect the publication of this order within thes[e] 7 or 8 daies. This mitigation will be some present comfort. Yet I see not any solide foundatio*n* of future hope, but feare that the ensuing

[819]See *Letter 54*.
[820]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 445.
[821]Edward Maddison.
[822]Isabella Clara Eugenia, archduchess of Austria.
[823]See also AAW, B 26, no. 56 (Fisher to Thomas Rant, 12 May 1625).
[824]For Richard Smith's complaints to Rome in 1626 concerning the Society of Jesus's sodality of the Immaculate Conception, see AAW, B 27, no. 100; AAW, A XXVI, no. 81, pp. 225–226; *NCC*, pp. 47, 72.
[825]Identity uncertain.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

parlament will raise the tempest againe to the increase of our miseries. Writts ar allready out for the sum*m*oning of the parliament. I have no more to impart but my best love wich is allwaies yours. Com*m*end me I pray you in most harty manner to M^r^ Rant and incourage <him> all you can to <goe> forward and to perfect the good worke he hath begun. He shall have our best petitions to Almighty God for this good successe. I rest.

Yours ever assuredly,

G[eorge] M[usket]

Septemb[er] 23.

Addressed: To his wo*rshipfu*ll and very worthy freind M^r^ Thomas More. Rome.

[*on p. 366*]

Endorsed: 1624. Septemb*er* 23. Musket.
Recea[ved]: Nov*emb*er 8. Answ[ered]: Nov*emb*er 9. By Fr[ance].

56. George Musket [Fisher] to Thomas More, 1 October 1624

[*AAW, A XVIII, no. 68, pp. 371–374*]

Right r*everen*d si*r*,

I wrote unto you the last weeke[826] and gave you some hope that the king would take order for the redresse of such <miseries> as Catholiques <suffer> by the extremity of this present persecution, and it was certainly reported that the order was drawing <up> and should be published within [a] few daies, but I see now we ar feed with an empty spoone and that the French ambassador either can doe nothing or will doe nothing, for the persecution daily increaseth and beginneth now to draw neere London and is greater than I have knowne it thes[e] many yeares. Catholiques goods ar seased uppo*n* in most places and sold before their faces. Ther barne dores ar shutt upp and ther corne seased to the king. Petifull complaints come from all parts, and at least <60> petitions have bin preferred by distressed Catholikes to the French ambassador, but he effecteth nothing for them.[827] Besides

[826] *Letter 55*.

[827] On 2 October 1624, Edward Bennett insisted that 'in all places, the justices are busye in making enquiries upon the goodes and landes of recusants': AAW, B 27, no. 2. Eight days

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I am crediblely [*sic*] informed that, notwithstanding this extremity of persecution, letters have bin forged by our adversaries (for I know not how it can be otherwise) and generally, in the name of all Catholiques, sent to the French cardinall,[828] president of the councell, to testifie that the[y] suffer no persecution but that Catholiques injoy ther liberty without any molestation[.][829] This proceeding maketh me thinke that ther is juggling in the world and that the French ar deluded with faire words and false reports. For beleive it, s*ir*, if you did but heare the complaints and lamentations of Catholikes, and see the miseries they suffer, it would pitty your hart. Neither doe I see any care had of them nor any course taken for ther releife. Only the king giveth faire words. Meane time we ar scourged and vexed intollerably and the promoters ar our cheife persecutors, but, to cover this persecution and give some color of clemency, the pursivants have no warrants; neither ar priests much persecuted nor any imprisoned since M[r] Coole who was apprehended by Gee and comitted to Newgate. Under this

before, in Antwerp, Henry Clifford believed that the Anglo-French match was doubtful because of the continuing measures against Catholics 'in the remoter parts'. The French ambassador was 'perplexed', but 'Cardinal Richlieu from France wrote a very courteous and frindly lettre assuering our Catholicks in the behalfe of his most Christian Majestie and the queene mother all assistance for their peace and benefite', a reference to Richelieu's formal letter of 15/25 August 1624 to James's Catholic subjects: AAW, B 27, no. 8; Avenel, *Lettres*, II, pp. 29–30. On 10/20 October 1624, Matthew Kellison noted that he had received reports of 300 Catholics proceeded against in Yorkshire, and 700 in Hampshire. On 17 October, Thomas Roper sent word (backed up by Colleton four days later) that, despite rumours of a 'stay of proceedinges' against Catholics, none had yet been released from Newgate. London's lord mayor was seizing Catholics' property. The French ambassador had again been petitioned to intervene (AAW, B 27, nos 20, 25, 23), while, ten days later, John Jackson sent in similar reports from Lincolnshire: AAW, B 27, nos 25, 23, 47; see also *Letter 55*. The French ambassador, wrote Anthony Champney on 18/28 October, had received sixty petitions, and '2,000 are sayd to be falne in the North, partly by the extremitie <of persecution>'. 'Promoters swarm' and 'take <men> in the street by arrest for debt' to the crown: AAW, B 27, no. 31. On 29 October 1624, Thomas Roper, in London, reported that the lord mayor 'seased here uppon many mens goodes, and solde them under' the French ambassador's 'nose, who hathe hetherto prevayled in nothinge for our good' and scarcely had 'patience to heare our complayntes, to which he freely tellethe us that he dothe not geave us any creditte, thoughe our troubles be so appairent', choosing, rather, to rely on the word of the king that there 'shall be no persequution'. Roper added that, 'in the meane tyme, many a hundred have bein utterly undonne, and many [. . .] more are in apparent danger of legall proceedings in the courte of Westminst[er]. There is some stay till Feb[ruary] but 12[d] a Sunday, indightements and seasures are putt in exequution': AAW, B 27, no. 32; see also *Letter 58*.

[828]Cardinal Richelieu.

[829]John Jackson commented on 15 November 1624 that 'I hear that the Fr[ench] imb[assador] craveth of the Catholicks to informe into France that they think it not convenient to press the k[ing] here to[o] stricktly to points of religion': AAW, B 27, no. 47.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

specious pretence of clemency ~~the color~~ towards priests they color ther proceedings and make the world beleive that ther is no persecution at all, wheras those that should entertain and maintaine priests ar spoiled of ther goods and brought to penury.[830] I thought good to intimate thus much least my former informations and such other false reports grounded uppon false hope should make [*p. 372*] you conceive amisse of the present state of things. I wish I could send you better newes, but withall it is fitt you understand <the truth>. The Spanish ambassador Don Carolo[831] is to depart uppon the feast of S^t^ Francis,[832] if he hold his apointment wich I thinke he will, for all his carriage is allready gone.[833] The secretary[834] wich came lately out of Spaine hath take*n* a house in the Spitle. To morrow we departe fro*m* Ely House,[835] for it hath pleased him to graunt me also a cha*m*ber at the Spitle. He hath had audience of the king 6 or 7 daies since, and was curteously <intertayned> [*interlineated word obscured*] but Don Carolo departeth without audience bycause he tooke part with the marquez.[836] The duke[837] is not yet gone into France, neither can I heare certainly when he will goe. In hast, [I] comend my selfe to your love and to good M^r^ Rant, and desire to heare how matters goe with you. I rest.

Yours assuredly,

G[eorge] Muscott

Octob[er] 1^o^.

[830]See *Letter 50*. The cynical Francophobe Henry Clifford remarked on 22 October/1 November that 'in England, for the present, there is caulme and, on the sodaine, informers are suppressed, and it is thought such priests and Catholicks as be prisoners shall be released out of hand, and the l[ord] keeper hath order to stay all execution against recusantes'. But, Clifford thought, 'this is to entertaine more plausibly the secretarie of France [*i.e.* Villeauxclercs] who is dayly expected, and it is probable this caulme will endure to February next', when Clifford expected that parliament would assemble, and 'then againe a storme is expected'. The English Catholics' only 'hope is that his Holinesse will not lett things passe without solide meanes setled for our good and peace', for 'the French are sodaine and credulous when the important busines toucheth not themselves directly': AAW, B 27, no. 33.

[831]Carlos Coloma.

[832]4 October.

[833]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 436, 455, 463.

[834]Jacques Bruneau.

[835]The Spanish embassy in London.

[836]Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa. See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 455.

[837]George Villiers, 1st duke of Buckingham.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[*on p. 374*]

Addressed: All' ill*ust*re sig*nor*e, il Sig*nor*[e] Thomasso Moro Inglese. Roma.

Endorsed: 1624. Octob*er* 1. Musk*et*. Recea[ved]: Novemb*er* 15. Answ[ered]: Novemb*er* 16. By Fr[ance].

57. Thomas Roper to Thomas More, 8 October 1624

[*AAW, B 27, no. 10*]

Good cosen,

Yours of the 7th and 14th of Sept[ember] came to my handes at one tyme, our post being gon hence the day before. Otherwise you would have had an answeare a weeke sooner. They came to my handes as I was sitting downe to dinner. I opened them, and that for Sir Francis Cotting[ton][838] I sent presently by my man unto him, for if I had carried it after dinner, as I did intende it, I had missed him, he beinge ready <to sette foote in stiroppe and> to goe to Tibolls[839] where the courte was, as my man delivered him your letter w*hi*ch he readde w*i*th great attention, and thoughe my man told him that I would attende on him my selfe when he retorned, he would notwithstandinge know my lodginge. I was this morninge at his house but yet he is not retorned.[840]

M[r] Warde desirethe a ~~forme~~ <coppy> of <a> letter of procura [*sic*] from you, otherwise he feareth if it be made here he shall erre in the manner <and forme>. Yet my [*sic for* me] thinkes, w*i*th a testimony of his life, the old procura should serve w*hi*ch was made to you and me. I thinke it be yet extant.

I doe not heare any suche thinge here as you write concerninge ~~the~~ my cosen George Gag[e][841] who hathe lived this quarter of [a] yeare in Wayles w*i*th his sister Stradlinge,[842] and here amonge us is very litle spoken of, and that w*hi*ch is w*i*th you reported is not beleeved here by any. The lady is in the Low Countreys, and I thinke you will see hir

[838] Thomas More's letter of 28 August/7 September 1624 to Sir Francis Cottington thanked him for his 'singular cowrtesies', and asked him, in effect, whether King James desired English Catholic assistance in obtaining the dispensation: AAW, A XVIII, no. 55, p. 337.

[839] Theobalds.

[840] On 14 October 1624, Thomas Roper further noted that he had gone 'once or twice unto Sir Francis Cotting[ton], but it was not my good fortune to meete with him' because he had gone to the court at Royston, but Cottington knew how to contact Roper if need be: AAW, B 27, no. 15.

[841] See Anstr., II, pp. 120–124; Revill and Steer, 'George Gage I and George Gage II', pp. 141–158.

[842] Elizabeth Gage, wife of Sir John Stradling. For the link between the Gage and the Stradling families, see Questier, *C&C*, p. 80.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

shortely where you are, so you see they are very farre distant one from the other. There was in deede a great speeche of a likinge betweene him and my cosen Thatchers[843] widdowe, w*hi*ch was Treshamme,[844] but that would be no great fortune to him.

I am hartely sorry to heare that you can have no tidinges of your ringe and two peeces of golde, and the more it troubleth me that I should be the occasion of your losse. My memory never fayled me in any thinge so muche as it did in this, and there never happened suche a like chanche unto me thoughe I have had often chardge of thinges of great valew, and if Fath[er] Seberte[845] can not helpe my memory I know not what to say or [*sic for* of] my cairelensensesse [*sic*]. If these thinges remayned w*i*th me I feare I might have putte them in a ~~drawer~~ cabinette I had w*i*th severall drawers and some secrette devices, w*hi*ch cabinette I sold at my comminge from Rome to the Jewes, and these thinges taking little place might remayne in some of the sayed drawers, and be forgotten by me, and yet all this is but a surmise and a bare conjecture of myne.

I desire to heare whether you have had satisfaction for your luoghi de monti,[846] and likewise to heare how it passethe w*i*th M^rs^ Warde.

My Lord Windesor[847] takethe his journey this day for Italy. There goeth w*i*th him M^r^ Clayton.[848]

My Lord Montague hathe receaved a warrante from the councell for to recaule his sonne from Spayne.[849]

Commende me to my uncle Philippe[850] and lette him know that my Lady Tressam dyed this day seavenight, being some two dayes after M*ichaelm*as. I am beholdinge to my uncle for he hathe sette me out here amonge his acquaintance to be a great opposite to the padri,[851] and in that kinde <he> is the most passionat man that ever I knew.

Atkinson betaketh himselfe unto his olde trade, and some few dayes a goe touke one of the padri cauled Bonner (alias Juens)[852] that lived in my neigheboured [*sic*] and released him for ten or eleven pounde.

[843]William Thatcher, son of James Thatcher and Mary Gage.

[844]Anne Tresham, daughter of Sir Thomas Tresham.

[845]Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB.

[846]See *Letter 75*.

[847]Thomas Windsor, 6th Baron Windsor.

[848]This is a reference, apparently, to James Clayton. See AAW, A XIV, no. 112, pp. 353. He told Thomas Rant in late 1623 that Cardinal 'Bandino sayde to my Lord Windsor' that 'hee could lay downe reasons of state why the kinge of England should bee Catholike', and 'a great kinge', and that it would be possible for the court of Rome to 'recompence his spirituall jurisdiction': AAW, B 25, no. 102.

[849]See Questier, *C&C*, pp. 331, 392–393.

[850]Philip Roper.

[851]i.e. the Jesuits.

[852]John Alexander Evison SJ, whose usual alias was Bonham. See CRS, 74, pp. 163–164; *NCC*, pp. 148, 171, 252.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I heare he had money of one or two before, yet he hathe no warrante to apprehend any.[853]

Some reporte that Sir Alberte Morton shall goe leadger into France at the intercession of my Lady Elizab[eth's] grace, whose servante formerly he was.[854]

There came over a Frenche monsieur[855] some weeke ago, who lodgeth w*i*th the amb[assador],[856] but is no man of note. Only he is a courtier and favoured by that kinge, and goethe gallante. There is preparations made for to receave one other, who is comminge, and sayed to be one of the cheife secretarys of Fra*n*ce.[857] In our cause they doe us very little [*word deleted*] or no good at all, for we are more oppressed now than we have bein this great while, and none escape. Twelve pence the Sunday is commonly exacted. Presentementes and indightementes goe forwarde. Mens goodes are seased on and sold and the monyes returned into the exchequer, and all the [*word deleted*] <favor> the ambassador hathe obtayned is that there is a commission granted <lately> unto the chancelour of the exchequer[858] to this effecte, that suche moneys as are allready leav[i]ed shall be returned into the exchequer. Suche goodes as shall be hereafter seased ar to be redelivered uppon the partyes complainte, geaving his owne bonde for so muche debte unto the kinge as the goodes are prised at.[859] There is noe ease at all but in the pursevantes, who yet have no warrantes.[860] What shall we expecte when the matche is effected if, now it is in treaty, we faire so ill? They say it is done only to content the parlement w*hi*ch now is proroged againe untill the 16 of February.[861] The pretence

[853]Stories about the notorious renegade William Atkinson's ties to the Society of Jesus had circulated ever since the appellant controversy. See Anthony Copley, *Another Letter of M^r. A. C. to his Dis-Iesuited Kinseman, concerning the Appeale, State, Iesuites* (London, 1602), p. 26; Anstr., I, p. 13; see also AAW, B 26, no. 40A.

[854]Morton had served as secretary to Princess Elizabeth, electress palatine.

[855]Guillaume de Bautru. See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 456.

[856]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat. See Tillières, *ME*, pp. 84–85.

[857]Henri-Auguste de Loménie, seigneur de Villeauxclercs.

[858]Sir Richard Weston.

[859]See PRO, SP 14/172/54 (formal letter of the king to Weston, 24 September 1624, concerning the property of recusant Catholics); see also AAW, A XVIII, no. 73, pp. 385–388.

[860]On 28 October/7 November 1624, Richard Ireland commented that, whereas he had written to Thomas Rant about a month earlier concerning the cessation of the persecution 'upon the relation of letters' received from England, 'it seemeth nowe the relation was grounded upon good words that the French emb[assador] had for the revocation of all writs out of the exchequer against Catholiques. But, since, we doe heare such lamentable complaints both by [. . .] letters, and <by> some gentlemen [. . .] that there is extreme persecution in all parts': AAW, B 27, no. 38.

[861]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 456, 462.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is by reason of the rifenesse of the sicknesse,[862] w*hi*ch now the colde weather hath diminished, for wheras there dyed 400 and odd a weeke, this last weeke there dyed but 300 and odd.[863]

It is sayed Sir Roberte Nanton shall be master of the wardes,[864] and Sir Roberte Lee cheife justice treasurer of Engl[and].[865]

Mansefeilde departed hence some two dayes agoe, it is sayed. He is gone for Hollande in one of the kinges shippes. On Satterday last in the night there arrose a very great winde, and so great a storme there was that many shippes were cast a way in the Downes, and one of the kinges was very shridly shaken.[866] Some say that one of the Dunkerkers that lay ther did putte to sea, and was followed by five Hollanders. We heare not yet any thinge of them.[867]

Don Carlos[868] departe[d] hence on Monday last w*i*thout audience.[869] Mansefeildes negotiation was thought to be about a leag[u]e against the House of Austria. It is sayed he shall have from us 9,000 men and 3,000 out of Scottland, and twenty thousande pounde a monthe, as muche from France, and from Venice, Savoy, Holland, Swedland twenty thousand pound more, so in all threescore thousand pounde a monthe.[870]

[862]The plague.

[863]Cf. McClure, *LJC*, p. 588.

[864]See *ibid.*, pp. 580, 582. Naunton had been appointed to the mastership of the court of wards on 30 September 1624: E.B. Fryde, D.E. Greenway, S. Porter, and I. Roy (eds), *Handbook of British Chronology* (London, 1986), p. 112; Schreiber, *The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton*, pp. 95–96; PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 226r.

[865]See McClure, *LJC*, pp. 583, 585, 587. James, Baron Ley was appointed lord treasurer on 11 December 1624: Fryde *et al.*, *Handbook of British Chronology*, p. 108.

[866]See PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 226r.

[867]See McClure, *LJC*, p. 582.

[868]Carlos Coloma.

[869]See *Letter 56*.

[870]George Fisher recorded on 14 October that 'the councell hath taken order, as I heare for certaine, for the pressing of 1,200 men for Mansfield, who is now at the Hage, but everye day expected in England': AAW, A XVIII, no. 73, p. 386. On the same day, Thomas Roper observed that 'there is a secrette order gon downe <in to the countrey> to the deputy lieutenantes for to use their best endevor and industry towardes the raysinge of souldiers for Mansefeilde' and there were 'some sixteene shippes in readinesse' which some believed would be used as transports: AAW, B 27, no. 15. Also, on 14/24 October, John Lockwood in Paris recorded that Mansfelt, in England, would 'have some say 10, others say 12 or 15, thousand men to helpe to remove, as many conjecture, the seige that is before Breda', which 'doth yett hould out, but by the opinion of most men itt will bee taken [. . .] before itt bee longe': AAW, B 27, no. 28. Five days earlier, Chamberlain believed that Mansfelt would have '8,000 English and 4,000 Scotts under sixe regiments': McClure, *LJC*, p. 582. For James's orders, reported by Conway on 5 October 1624, that Mansfelt should receive £15,000 'in assistance of his charge and arminge of his troope', and £20,000 every month 'soe longe as the accion shall last', and a levy of 12,000 men to be transported at royal expense to France, see PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 225r.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Some say my lord of Somersette shall be permitted to bringe a writte of error against his attaynder whereby the title that my Lord Digby hathe to Sherborne shall be overthrowne.[871]

There is some sixteene shippes preparinge for to sette out. Some conceave they shall goe with the Hollanders to the Ind[i]es. The prince remaynethe at Ritchemonde and is not very well disposed. He complaynethe somewhat of his faule.[872]

Thus with my kinde remembrance unto your selfe, M[r] Rant, M[r] Seton, Signor Giov[anni] Battista Portinari,[873] in haste I end.

The 8[th] of October 1624.

Your assured lovinge cosen,

Th[omas] R[oper]

Addressed: All' illustre signore, il Signore Tomasso Moro, Inglese. Roma.

Endorsed: Ingl[and]. 1624 Flanders.
Octob[er] 8.
R[eceived]: Novemb[er] 22.
Ans[wered]: Novemb[er] 23.

58. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 14/24 October 1624

[*AAW, B 27, no. 29*]

Right worshipful and most deer syr,

I have yours of the 23 of 7[ber] and am hartely glad of the recoverie of your health which I pray you looke unto above al other busines. As for the suite of bishops, I hope in God by your industrie and good praiers you wil overcome at last, for it is Gods cause and Christs legacie to his Church, and therfor I doubt not but you wil have a good end. Here D[octor] Cecil confesseth that he wrote against me, and yet told me

[871]On 14 October 1624, George Fisher informed Thomas More that 'ther is some whispering [. . .] that' Robert Ker, earl of Somerset 'is creeping againe into favor wich maketh some suspect that the other [*i.e.* the duke of Buckingham] is declining': AAW, A XVIII, no. 73, p. 385. On 21 October, John Colleton observed that Somerset was pardoned and restored to his honours: AAW, B 27, no. 25; McClure, *LJC*, p. 582 (for Somerset's 'promise not to looke toward the court').

[872]See *Letter 55*.

[873]Giovanni Battista Portenari. Thomas More described him as 'somtime secretarie' to Cardinal Francesco Maria Monti and 'afterward' to Cardinal Luigi Capponi: AAW, A XVII, no. 44, p. 149.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

th*a*t he thought me and M[r] Benet[874] fit men for such a place.[875] Now he forbeareth to come to o*u*r house. Persons accused him for an espie to the Inquis[ition].[876] P*er*haps some thing there might be found against him. M[r] Benet spake to the pope him self for to have a copie of the accusations, and obtained it, and otherwise it were impo*ssi*ble to see them, and me thinkes it were <reason> that that shold be graunted, els honest me*n* may be slaundered irremediably. I am told for certaine that the French nonce[877] hath written for me, and that he earnestly moved the suite of b*ishop*s.

As for England, very lately came over M[r] Warner,[878] governor to my L[ord] Peters sonnes[879] who now live at Florence, who assureth me that the F[rench] embass[ador],[880] befor his comming, had obtained a letter of the k[ing] to the chancelour of the exchequer[881] to cease al writts against Catholiks, and that the chancelor had sent writtes into al shires for to stay the p*er*secution of goodes, and that the embas[sador] had p*ro*cured the goodes of 60 or 80 Catholiks to be restored to them. And since his comming we have certaine newes that the parlament

[874]A reference, presumably, to Edward Bennett.

[875]Thomas More had informed Edward Bennett that the calumnies against Matthew Kellison and Richard Smith (and also against William Bishop) were sent to Rome by John Cecil as well as by Sir Tobias Mathew: AAW, B 27, no. 19. (Thomas More reported to John Jackson, from Rome on 30 October/9 November 1624, that Thomas Worthington, in a letter to Thomas Rant, had been the source of the claim that William Bishop, had he lived, would have caused factional division within the English Catholic community: AAW, B 27, no. 42.) These briefings against the leading secular clergy candidates to succeed William Bishop elicited a storm of protest. Anthony Champney, for example, argued in October 1624 that the secular clergy's agents in Rome should demand to be informed of the details of the accusations, 'for it cannot stand with anie right that the accuser be heard and the accused be not permitted to answer for him self. And, though the stile of the Holy Office be not peradventure to produce the reasons, yet the accusation must be knowne <to the accused>, unless they will condemn a man without heareing him, which is agaynst the lawe both <of> God and nature, unless it be in notoriis'. Champney remembered that John Bennett, 'when he was there, demanded the same and obtayned the graunt which, beinge knowne, the accusations were recalled as grownded upon false information': AAW, B 27, no. 31. For an account of the accusations against Smith, see also AAW, B 27, no. 63 (Champney to More and Rant, 17/27 November 1624). For Smith's eliciting of the accusations against himself, see *Letter 59*; Allison, RS, pp. 184–185. For judicial procedure in the inquisition at Rome, see G. Crosignani, 'Richard Smith *versus* Robert Persons SJ: a double denunciation at the Holy Office of *The Judgment of a Catholicke English Man*' (forthcoming in *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*).

[876]For Robert Persons SJ's relationship with John Cecil, see Anstr., I, pp. 64–68.

[877]Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

[878]Christopher Walpole SJ. I am very grateful to James Kelly for identifying Walpole, who had been sent to England on 9/19 June 1624: CRS, 37, p. 187; CRS, 75, p. 326.

[879]Edward Petre and Thomas Petre, respectively the fourth and sixth sons of William Petre, 2nd Baron Petre. Again, I am grateful to James Kelly for this reference.

[880]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[881]Sir Richard Weston. See *Letter 57*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is p*ro*roged til the 2 of Febr[uary]. A litle befor, Catholiks had bene much trobled, as we understood by letters, and p*er*haps yet are in the north p*ar*tes more remote from London.[882] Don Carlos[883] is comen over and, as some say, without audience of the k[ing].[884] M[r] Messinden[885] writeth from Spayne that certainly Gondemar is to come to England,[886] where now as agent is the secretarie of Flanders,[887] who, as they say, offereth restitution of the Palatinate for to have the mariage,[888] w*hi*ch p*er*haps maketh the stay in the French mariage, for now o*u*r king demandeth of them assistance for recoverie of the Palatinate. And yet, as F[ather] Archangel[889] saieth, both [the] queene mother[890] and some other great councelors say the French mariage wil take place.[891] I have written long since into England for to get you com*m*ission to sue for the dispensation, but they are sloe in writing, becaus[e] their means of sending hither is not good. If there be a visit of the English colledg[e],[892] I pray you move that al Engl[ish] Jes[uits] may be removed becaus[e] they be nourished in faction and breed the like in the

[882]George Fisher's report of 27 October 1624 to Thomas Rant confirmed that the lord keeper had caused a stay in proceedings against Catholics, though 'how long this mitigation will last I know not, but a stopp is made untill the beginning of the parliament wich is in February'. Fisher feared, however, that 'this is but a preparation to the coming of the secretary of France, whom we expect shortly, who finding a calme here will report to the world the good effects of this treaty and the clemency of our king', and that, since 'policy so raigneth', and 'religion hath allmost no place', in the end, 'howsoever the French bragg of the good conditions, I feare the kings word will be all the security they shall have': AAW, B 47, no. 156; cf. *Letter 57*.

[883]Carlos Coloma.

[884]See *Letter 56*.

[885]Edward Maddison.

[886]On 24 September/4 October 1624, Sir Walter Aston (who had, a month previously, mentioned the rumour of Gondomar's return) reported that, two days before, Gondomar had been instructed to lead another embassy to James. But, by mid-December, Aston was saying that Gondomar would not, in any event, leave until after Christmas. On 24 December/4 January, Aston knew that Gondomar had no desire to go and that his unwillingness had resulted in a serious quarrel with Olivares: PRO, SP 94/31, fos 199r, 233v; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fos 58v, 60r, 65r–v.

[887]Jacques Bruneau.

[888]See *Letter 55*. Bruneau offered that the elector palatine would be restored at a meeting of the imperial electors: *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 465–466.

[889]William (Archangel) Barlow.

[890]Marie de Médicis.

[891]John Lockwood, in Paris, recorded on 14/24 October 1624 that 'now of late ther are new articles proposed on both sydes' by the English and French negotiators, and the match was 'yett no more advanced att this present than itt was when itt was first mentioned'. The reason was, it was reported in Paris, that James had commanded the earl of Carlisle to delay. He had also 'proroged the parlament untill the 2 of Februarie next to come'. All of this was done '(as itt is thoughte) too gaine tyme untill hee heare frome Spayne', in other words anticipating Gondomar's return and a peaceful solution to the problem of the Palatinate: AAW, B 27, no. 28.

[892]The English College in Rome.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholers.[893] But, if there were speedie hope of a b[ishop], it were good it were differred [*i.e.* deferred] til he were heard, who might speak with more authoritie. The Jes[uits] desired to have P. Arnou[894] sent in F[ather] Beruls place but could not obtayne it. I never saw D[octor] Mailer since I made the p*ro*position to him. Perhaps the offer of a good turne hath turned him from us.[895] I pray you do my dutie to my l[ord] of Armach[896] and Monsig*no*r Vives, and thus with my hartiest to y*ou*r self I com*m*it you to the p*ro*tection of o*u*r sweet savior.

24 of 8^{ber}.

Y*ou*rs ever as you know,

R[ichard] Smith

Addressed: To the right worship*ful* M^{r} Thomas More.

Endorsed: Oct[ober] 24.
1624 Octob*er* 24.
Smith. Rece[ived]: Nov*em*b[er] 12.
Answ[ered]: Nov*em*b[er] 18.
Fr*an*ce.

59. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 28 October/7 November 1624

[*AAW, B 27, no. 40*][897]

Right worship*ful* and deere syr,

I have yo*u*rs of the 7 of 8^{ber}, wherby I p*er*ceave both what paines you take in y*ou*r sute and how fertil our adversaries are in slanders. The

[893]On 11/21 November 1624, Richard Smith rejoiced at the news of the impending visitation of the college. He had heard from his cousin William Rayner that the pope would visit the college 'in flagello, as it wel deserveth, for, as M^{r} Fitton saieth, the Hospital [*i.e.* the original foundation] is quite suppressed'. Furthermore, the college was in debt to the tune of 9,000 crowns, and 'yet not half the number' of students 'appointed by Greg[ory] 13['s] bul (which is fiftie)' were accommodated there. Smith argued that 'the alumni shold be repetitors, as it was in our time'. In addition, the 'colledge alone shold not herafter choose our protectors or viceprotectors'. They should not seek to put all Jesuits out of the college, for that would be 'against Greg[ory] 13 his bull'; they should try only to exclude English Jesuits: AAW, B 27, no. 53.

[894]Jean Arnoux SJ, confessor to Louis XIII. See Bergin, *The Making of the French Episcopate*, pp. 437, 438, 440.

[895]Smith noted, on 11/21 November 1624, that Henry Mayler was now 'setled with the bishop of Metz', Henri de Bourbon-Verneuil, 'the king his bastard brother': AAW, B 27, no. 53; Bergin, *The Making of the French Episcopate*, p. 190.

[896]Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh.

[897]This letter is discussed in Allison, RS, pp. 184–185.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nonce[898] hath told me (but name him to none) that that w*hi*ch is newly objected against me is that I shold say that the p[ope] can not dare facult*at*es regularibus invitis ordinariis, w*hi*ch, as I p*ro*tested to him, I never thought nor (that I know) ever spoke of anie such matter, w*hi*ch also D[octor] Rainer and M^r^ Ireland testified under their hands in a writing w*hi*ch I gave to him, with w*hi*ch he seemed satisfied, and in truth I think he favoureth me, and withal he told me that he merveiled at this objection becaus[e] some Jes[uits] had certified [h]im that they liked me the best of al thos[e] that are p*ro*posed. My cardinal[899] [*MS torn:* told (?)] me (but this also to y*ou*r self) that they made me an heretik, and yet [*MS torn*] that the F[rench] embass[ador][900] had written to him that the matter wold be effected a[nd] that Card[inal] de Valette was appointed com*m*issarie for it.[901] God, I hope, who hath raised him to favour this his cause, will bring this matter about in due time. For I feare that this wil not be the last slander. But my comfort is mendacia no*n* diu fall*er*unt. I pray you repaire as often as conveniently you can to the F[rench] embass[ador] and to Card[inal] Valette, and let them know how much the clergie hertofore was beholden to the F[rench] nation for p*ro*curing o*ur* first b[ishop],[902] and p*ar*t[icul]erly to Mons*ieu*r Bethune for his help to the appellants.[903] It were not amisse to suggest how F[ather] Fit[zh]erbert was one of the accusers of my booke against Bel to the Inquis[ition], and how falsly they accused that and yet continew that course.[904] I pray you hartely thank my l[ord] primate[905] and al thos[e] who have given their testimonie of me to the Holie Office, and p*ro*cure, if you can, that Card[inal] Valette make Mons*ieu*r Berul be examined about me becaus[e], as I heare, he is not willing other waies to medle in this matter. My card[inal] is at this p*re*sent very ill at ease and therfor I can not troble him in this matter. I am forced

[898] Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

[899] Cardinal Richelieu.

[900] Philippe de Béthune, count of Sully.

[901] For the pope's appointment, at Béthune's insistence, of Cardinal Louis Nogaret de La Valette to oversee Smith's case in the Holy Office, rather than of the Holy Office's permanent commissary, Desiderio Scaglia, see Allison, RS, pp. 185–186.

[902] William Bishop.

[903] See *Letter 52*.

[904] For the accusations made against Smith concerning his book *An Answer to Thomas Bels late Challeng* (Douai, 1605), see Crosignani, 'Richard Smith *versus* Robert Persons SJ'; *NAGB*, pp. 8, 140. Edward Bennett had recorded on 31 July 1624 that 'it is heer reported that [. . .] Fa[ther Thomas] Fitzharbert', who had been associated with Robert Persons in the denunciation of Smith's *Answer*, 'opposeth hym self to bushops, and that he giveth owt my lord of Chalcedon favored the oath. For the first they breake promise with me, for F[ather] Blunt promised me that there society would no way oppose our sute for a successor; and for the second they deserve the Inquisition': AAW, B 26, no. 94.

[905] Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thus to seek to cleare my self becaus[e] the Jes[uits], as it seemeth, espetially seek to deprive [me of] my good name. Otherwise they shold do me a good turne. That w*hi*ch I feare most is the continuance of their p*er*secution, w*hi*ch is very sore for goods, as three who lately come from England do testifie, and M^r^ Cape, of the 27 of their 7^ber^, saieth never was [it] <so> sore for informers since he hath bene Catholik. Nevertheles, the marriage is here thought to be sure, and my card[inal] told me th*a*t his Hol[iness] findeth the conditions for Catholiks as good as they were with Spaine.[906] Both he and the nonce wold have had me to have come up to you as in the name of the clergie for to sue for the dispense if the time of the year had not beene too far spent. M^r^ Fouler[907] and his companions are now arrived at Lions, and in their way hither, but M^r^ Foscue[908] cam hither the last weeke. My cousin D[octor] Rainer was glad of y*ou*r salutation and that you hoped that he was not the man that joyned with D[octor] Cecil to oppose. If you please, you may let the cardinals know how F[ather] Persons accused D[octor] Cecil for a spie to the Inquis[ition],[909] and there they may find how he escaped, w*hi*ch I think was but fowly and therfor followeth the Jes[uits] least they shold publish his good tricks. F[ather] Sebert[910] may do you some help and I hope he wil doe it willingly.

After I had writt this, came letters out of England of the 2 of 8^ber^ w*hi*ch reporte extreme p*er*secution for goods. God comfort the*m* for my cardinal can not help the*m*. I sent, to M^r^ Rant, D[octor] Rainer['s] and M^r^ Irelands testimonie that I never taught that w*hi*ch is imputed upon me. Paper faileth me, and therfor no more at this present but O*u*r Lord Jesus be alwaies with you.

7 of 9^ber^.

Y*ou*rs ever,

R[ichard] Smith

[906]Cf. McClure, *LJC*, p. 589.

[907]A reference, apparently, to Ralph Fowler, a cousin of Peter Biddulph, who had left the English College in Rome on 15/25 February 1624: CRS, 37, p. 202. He took minor orders at Douai on 12/22 February 1625: CRS, 10, p. 234. Nine days earlier, Richard Ireland had recorded receipt of a letter from Anthony Champney 'wherby I understand that M^r^ Fowler is entered among the Benedictins, and soe begineth his novitiatship there': AAW, B 47, no. 120; see also AAW, B 47, no. 49. Fowler also considered entering the Oratory: AAW, B 47, no. 115. But, as Champney pointed out to Thomas More in a letter of 9/19 March 1625, Fowler 'had <made> us belive here he would be a [secular] preist': AAW, B 47, no. 54.

[908]This may be a reference to George Fortescue. See *NCC*, pp. 292, 314.

[909]See *Letter 58*.

[910]Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Addressed: To the right worship*ful* his assured freind Thomas More.

Endorsed: Nov[ember] 7.
France. 1624.
Novemb*er* 7. D[r] Smith. Recea[ved]: Novemb*er* 25. Answ[ered]: Dec*em*b*er* 2.

60. John Nelson [Jackson] to Thomas More and Thomas Rant, 5 November 1624

[*AAW, B 27, no. 35*]

My very r*everen*d and revere*n*ced sirs,

I presume yo*ur* loves both to one another and mee also will take in good part th*a*t I write but one l*ett*re to yow both. I am farr fro*m* London and knowe not how this one will be conveighed. I have written fro*m* tyme to tyme to o*u*r freinds beyond, th*a*t yow might fro*m* them be enformed of all occurre*n*ces. I have also written to M[r] Coll[eton] earnestly th*a*t he wold eyther himself, or by his secretarye, write every weeke (as I wold doe, were I in his case) and I hear th*a*t others about Londo*n* hold correspo*n*dence w*hi*ch makes mee, being absent, forbear to troble yow so oft as I am willing to doe. In my last informatio*n* of Fa[ther] Blu*n*t his trecherous dealing, I omitted to let yow know that he came in at my back when I suspected nothing, having agreed before that I would eyther have private audience or none. I did not then know it was he.[911] But I came after to knowe it. Wee doe wonder here how matters are caried th*a*t in France and, as it seems, in R[ome], the p*er*secutio*n* is not beleived. I did write to D[octor] Smith and receyved a l*ett*re fro*m* him th*a*t we shold hear noe more of th*a*t point. Yet, at the same tyme, I receyved one fro*m* M[r] Coll[eton] th*a*t Cath[olics] had not been soe p*er*secuted these 60 years.[912] There came forth a proclamatio*n* com*m*aunding persons of qualitie to reside in their countryes, dated th*e* 19[th] of O*cto*ber 1624.[913] One writes to me from Londo*n* th*a*t, except the yeare of the battell at Prage,[914] he never knew so p*er*ilous a tyme as this is like to be. And, thowgh there be some small stay of proceedings, yet it is uncertaine and, in th*e* country, litle or noe notice is taken therof. He writes also th*a*t some think th*e* Fr[ench] match is dowbtfull,

[911] See *Letter 51*.

[912] John Colleton's letter of 8 October to More and Rant had claimed that the 'persecution holdes still in some degree, thoughe the extremitie be abaited of that it was, worse than at any time for thes[e] threescore yeares, bloud excepted': AAW, B 27, no. 9bb.

[913] *SRP*, I, no. 259.

[914] 1620.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thowgh it is said that our k[ing] is now contented that the mariage shall precede the league rather than fayle of both and that, upon Mansfeilds comming over, who was this last week expected, there shold be 12,000 men pressed and transported with speed, some say by the end of 9ber. But because there shold be 8,000 maintained by the French, <for the pay> wherof there is yet noe certenty, perhaps they will not be sent soe soone.[915] Others will write unto yow of the French archb[ishop],[916] who came hither from the k[ing] by consent of his Hol[iness] as it is said, who was at Oxford and with the k[ing].[917] Yow know I love France but I can not but greive to think that they soe joyne with enemies to religion,

[915] See *Letter 63*.

[916] Guillaume d'Hugues, Franciscan archbishop of Embrun.

[917] On 29 October, Thomas Roper had reported that 'the archebishoppe of Ambrune is lately comme from our universities. He dothe not seeme to meddle in affaires but rather to observe the courses of thinges': AAW, B 27, no. 32. On 27 October 1624, however, George Fisher had given it as his opinion that 'the archbishoppe of Ambrone (who was sometimes generall of the Fratte Minore) [. . .] hath bin with the king', and James complained to him that 'his Catholique subjects ar too much addicted to the Spaniard, wich discourse pleaseth the French': AAW, B 47, no. 156; Bergin, *The Making of the French Episcopate*, p. 641. For Embrun's fact-finding mission to England, see also *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 479, 480, 486, 493; McClure, *LJC*, p. 586; *CGB*, II, p. 579; PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fos 79r–90r (Embrun's own account, dated March 1635, of the origins and progress of his visit, undertaken in the first instance at the instigation of a Scottish Franciscan but with the backing of Louis XIII). He took part in ceremonies of sacramental confirmation, which disquieted some English Catholics, though John Colleton, it appears, approved. Embrun dispatched an apologia to Rome for his proceedings in England. It replied to the complaints which had been made about him, and which were amplified by the Spaniards in Rome, especially the claim that he had dispensed the sacrament of confirmation without licence. He described his confirming of English Catholics both in their houses in and around London and in the French embassy (where he stayed, for part of his time in the country, with Effiat, even though he initially came as a private individual). He claimed that Colleton had furnished 'les ornaments et aultres choses nécessaires qui luy estoient restés entre les mains par la mort de leur [. . .] évêque'; and 'la chose feult portée aux oreilles du roy par certains puritains principaux': PRO, PRO 31/9/90, p. 201; *Letters 61*, *63*, *68*; PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fos 79v, 89r; Tillières, *ME*, p. 85. Embrun was alleged to have visited both Mansfelt and George Abbot, though Fisher subsequently denied it, as did Embrun in his apology sent to Rome: Tillières, *ME*, p. 85; *Letter 63*; AAW, A XVIII, no. 93, p. 449; PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fo. 89r. On his own account, Embrun made contact with leading Catholics, including the countess of Buckingham and the earl of Rutland. While he was in England, it was rumoured in France that he was labouring to convert King James: PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fos 80v, 81r. On 7 December 1624, Edward Bennett noted that, although Embrun, who had now departed, had 'confirmed heer at least 2,000' ('with what autority we know not'), nevertheless 'by this his Holl[iness] may see what neede heer is of a b[ishop] or rather bushops', and 'the arch[bishop] promised to informe his Holl[iness] of it': AAW, B 27, no. 73. Smith put a different gloss on the archbishop's visit. On 11/21 November, he wrote to More that 'there was in England a French bishop, greatly Jesuited', and that 'perhaps the Jes[uits] wil get that F[rench] bishop to confirme thos[e] noble men or woemen of theirs whome they wold not have to receave that sacrament of our b[ishop]': AAW, B 27, no. 53. Embrun claimed, though, that some Hispanophile English Catholics disliked what he did: PRO, PRO 31/9/90, p. 201. Smith had, in fact, received a letter from Colleton, dated

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and in prejudice to religion, for all the victories which those get with whom they joyne hurt the cause of Gods Church. There be 2 tollerated by our state to enforme the French imb[assador]: one Mr Foster[918] of Yorkshire (who hath a brother a Jesuite[919]) and one Mr Minshaw a lawyer,[920] both Jesuited, and I think the Jes[uits] joyne with the duke upon the hopes they have by his mother,[921] and soe will enforme as shall stand with theire ends. God amend all. There hath been a scandalous report of one Fa[ther] Bartlet a Jesuite in Somersetshire.[922] One Kate Bussy went to the b[ishop] of Bathe[923] etcetera and told him what his cariage was towards her. It seems he grew acquainted with her, and eyther made her Cath[olic] or pretended it and, if she were, she is taken and told all. Yet his superiours doe not take him owt of the country.[924] Doctor Champ[ney] did write the 9th of Aug[ust] from Par[is] to Mr Coll[eton] that I or Mr Pitts shold procure an answer of these 2 points from the founder of our residence at Parise:[925] 1. Whether he hath testified to any that he wold not have Mr Reyner remooved above all the rest. 2dly whether he hath made a revocation of his gift because his will is not observed; which 2 points Fa[ther] Blunt <vice> provinciall of the Jes[uits] had written thither, and therby hindred the proceeding of the howse. I got that honorable gentleman, the founder, to my lodging, when Mr Coll[eton] was present, and read that part

18 November, stating that 'the archb[ishop] of Embrun, who is in England, assureth them that our king wil have no cessation of penal laws til the mariage be consumate'. But Colleton 'addeth withal that the forsaid archb[ishop] saieth that after the mariage we shal have more than we can expect': AAW, B 27, no. 82. For Embrun's advice in November 1624 to Buckingham concerning the link between toleration for James's Catholic subjects and the issue of the dispensation, see BL, Harleian MS 1583, fo. 238v; and for his applause, in a letter of 15/25 January 1625 to Prince Charles, for James's concessions to Catholics, see *ibid.*, fo. 246v.

[918] Richard Forster (knighted in 1649). See *NCC*, p. 121; M. Foster, 'Sir Richard Forster (?1585–1661)', *RH*, 14 (1978), pp. 163–174. Foster speculates that Forster was introduced into royal service by Sir George Calvert: Foster, 'Sir Richard Forster', p. 165.

[919] Thomas (or Seth) Forster SJ. See CRS, 74, p. 176.

[920] For a warrant of November 1624 delivered to 'Richard Minshull and Richard Forster' to carry out unspecified services for the marquis of Effiat, PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 331r. The reference to Minshull may, in fact, indicate the Catholic John Middlemore: see PRO, SP 14/177/37. Thomas Roper explained that Middlemore and Forster would 'be authorised by my lord keeper and the ambass[ador] [. . .] to see the stay of proceedinges, and to repayre uppon occasion to the judges with messadges from them': AAW, B 27, no. 32.

[921] Mary Villiers, countess of Buckingham.

[922] Richard Bartlett SJ. See Anstr., II, p. 18.

[923] Arthur Lake, bishop of Bath and Wells.

[924] In mid-November 1624, Jackson reiterated that he hoped the 'accusation of the Jes[uit] to the b[ishop] of Bath and Wells' was 'undeserved', but 'usually there is noe smoak without some fire': AAW, B 27, no. 47; see also *Letter 72*. Thomas More, in his letter of 15/25 January 1625 to Jackson, asked for further news about this incident: AAW, A XIX, no. 2, p. 3.

[925] i.e. Thomas Sackville, the patron of the Collège d'Arras.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the letter. To the first point he answer[e]d he never testified or spake any such matter, nor any thing belonging to it. To the 2d he answered, absolutely noe. He had not revoked it. This I testified under Mr Colletons hand and my owne, wherby Fa[ther] Blunt is convinced to be a false informer, an unworthy office for a religious superior.[926] Yow may speak this as a testified truth, as also his informing the Sp[anish] imb[assador][927] of my audience.[928] A gentleman, hearing these 3, said that I had got <such> an advantage against the Jes[uits] as he had not formerly heard of, because they did <soe cuningly> cary their buisinesses as thowgh we had ground to suspect their bad dealing, yet he co[u]ld never see any proofe before against them, which now he did. I receyved your lettre (Mr Rant) of the 28 of 7ber on the 1 of 9ber and I receyved one from yow (Mr More) since I came into the country. I make the best use of your lettres I can. I shew them where they may doe good, and acquaint as many as I can with the contents. But I am not acquainted with what yow write to others, unles [I] sometyme get a sight of Mr Colletons [*sic*] his lettres. Yet I hear yow inform Mr Musket.[929] There was a rumour of Gondomar his returne, but without ground as I hear,[930] and some rather think that the agent[931] who is here will ~~rather~~ depart, at the least if the press of 12,000 [*in margin:* whereof Mansfeild is to be generall] goe on, and I had it from a good hand that before the end of 8ber it had passed the hands of the l[ords] of the councell and wanted but the kings hand. Yow have made me long (Mr Rant) for that justification of the archb[ishop] of Philippi[932] his bookes, as they in Doway have made me of the booke.[933] [*In margin:* Send it him.] And yow are in the right that such wares are

[926]Matthew Kellison had alerted Thomas Rant, on 15/25 September 1624, that Colleton and Jackson had confirmed Sackville's answers about the Collège d'Arras; and yet Richard Blount SJ had declared the exact opposite to John Cecil and George Latham SJ: AAW, B 26, no. 139.

[927]Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa.

[928]Presumably John Jackson refers to his audience with the French ambassador, the marquis of Effiat, on 21 August 1624 (see *Letter 51*).

[929]George Fisher.

[930]See *Letter 58*.

[931]Jacques Bruneau.

[932]Philip Rovenius.

[933]Jackson seems to be referring to Rovenius's controversial *Tractatus de Missionibus ad Propagandam Fidem, et Conversionem Infidelium et Haereticorum Instituendis* (Louvain, 1624). On 27 October/6 November 1624, Matthew Kellison had recorded that the religious orders were combining together in an attack on Rovenius's recently published book (which Kellison had in his possession). Kellison expressed the hope that he might 'visit this bishop of Holland, who is in a monasterie not above an Inglish mile from Bruxelles': AAW, B 27, nos 23, 37. For Rovenius's book, see *CGB*, I, pp. xxxii, 525. For the agreement between Rovenius and his critics, worked out initially by Propaganda Fide in May 1623 (dated 5/15 October 1624, and finally confirmed by

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

very gratefull. But I co[u]ld never get that booke, which the Jes[uits] set forth in Parise, which as I have heard was not much in favour of the sea apostolick. Well, I think the Church of God had need to looke to these good fathers fingers ere it be too late. I hope (Mr Mo[re]) yow have your treatise against their government of seminaries,[934] and I intend by the next to send yow a very good information which aloan were sufficient in my opinion to remoove them from our colleges. I hope yow will be carefull that the publishing of the jubilee here may be sent to the cleargy.[935] But we hope yow will send us an other Chalced[onensis] ep[iscopus], ere that tyme, which we have soe much want of, as I can not but mervayle that any opposition shold hinder it. Owr Lord Jesus prosper your labours and send us a joyfull meeting.

My freinds take your remembrances as they well deserve, in very kind maner, and here, with my best respects to yow both, I rest, this fifth of 9ber 1624.

Yours in the maner yow knowe,

J[ohn] N[elson]

When Don Carlos Coloma arrived at Calis, caryed in the kings ship, Don Francesco[936] met him with intention to accompany him to Bruxells, but at the same tyme there came a pacquet from the infanta,[937] telling [him] that the order was come from Spaine that he must neyther goe to Bruxells nor Cambray but remaine at Gant as the marques del Enojosa is detayned a journey short also of Madrid, upon a motion of our imb[assador] or agent in Spayne that they had spoken to the k[ing] against the prince and duke, but I think that of the prince will not proove soe.[938] However it shewes the k[ing] of Sp[ain] his desire

Propaganda in August 1625), see *CGB*, I, pp. xxxii, 326, 338, 510–511, 575, II, p. 625; AAW, A XVIII, no. 74, pp. 389–394; AAW, A XIX, no. 67, pp. 201–204.

[934]It is not clear which document is indicated here. John Jackson may be referring to one of the manuscript accounts of the governance of the English College in Rome, retained in the secular clergy's agent's papers in Rome, e.g. AAW, A XVIII, nos 25, 94, 95, 97.

[935]For the jubilee, see AAW, B 26, no. 98; AAW, B 27, nos 47, 107; cf. *CGB*, I, p. 566, II, p. 608.

[936]François de Carondelet.

[937]Isabella Clara Eugenia, archduchess of Austria.

[938]For claims that Inojosa was in disgrace at the Spanish court for his attempt to bring down Buckingham, see AAW, B 27, nos 10b, 14; PRO, SP 14/173/23; see also above, pp. 78–79. For a contrary report, see PRO, SP 14/175/33. On 17/27 July 1624, Sir Walter Aston observed that Inojosa could rely upon Olivares, since Inojosa was 'allied both to the conde and his lady'. Aston, on Conway's orders to secure 'some exemplary justice against the marquis' and, he implied, Coloma as well, did his best to 'negotiate' at Madrid against both ambassadors. Aston assured James that he would 'find that the markes of his 'distasts are seconded with publike demonstrations' of Philip IV's 'displeasure towards them': PRO, SP 94/31, fos 115r, 197r, 205r. For Aston's accusations, see *CSPV, 1623–1625*,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to give o*u*r k[ing] all possible satisfactio*n* w*hi*ch gives him th*e* greater adva*n*tage if there shold be any breach, w*hi*ch God forbid. Da pace*m*, d*omi*ne, in diebus n*ost*ris.

Addressed: To the right worship*ful*l my very worthy freinds M^r^ Tho[mas] More and M^r^ Rant, or eyther of them. At Rome.

Endorsed: Written: Novemb[er] 5.
Received: Decemb[er] 17.
Answered: January 1 1625.

61. Thomas Roper to Thomas More, 12 November 1624

[*AAW, B 27, no. 43*]

Good cosen,

M^r^ Muskette[939] did receave one this weeke from you but had no time to answeare it. My company is well. Only your neece is troubled w*i*th a colde. Mansfeilde is here w*i*th us, but lodgethe now at the seigne of the palsgrave in Lombarde Streite. Since his comminge, there hathe bein 3 or 4 severall presses of men in London, and they have raysed some 1,500 or 2,000 men and they have sent into other countreys to levye the rest, w*hi*ch in all must be twelve thousande. It is muche wondered uppon what service they shall goe this winter tyme under such a commander. We have 4 or 5 Catholicke shrifes chosen, whereof some are convicted: M^r^ Perkins in Barkesheire,[940] M^r^ Stanforde[941] in Staffordsheire, <and> Sir Henry Sherley in Lestersheire.[942]

There is a rumor that there is order geaven for the restrainte of proceedinges against recusantes but nothinge is don therein, for the persequution is heavy, and never ~~allmost~~ greater if you consider the generality. God comforte us all. And yet some labour to possesse forreners that it is not so, who conceave it is not so great as we make

pp. 412, 413; *CCE*, pp. 177–178. Initially, Aston seemed to get results, for on 24 September/4 October he could report that both ambassadors were forbidden to return to the court in Madrid: PRO, SP 94/31, fos 232r, 255r. For the temporary disgrace (if at all) of Inojosa and Coloma because of their attempted coup against Buckingham earlier in the year, see also *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 300, 301, 303, 309, 395, 449, 463, 472, 484; AAW, B 27, no. 18; PRO, SP 14/173/23; PRO, SP 14/175/33; *CCE*, p. 186; *CGB*, I, p. 539. On 22 October/1 November, Philip officially informed the Flanders administration that Inojosa and Coloma were completely cleared, and that Coloma could resume his duties at Cambrai: *CCE*, p. 187.

[939] George Fisher.

[940] The sheriff of Berkshire, appointed in late 1624, was, in fact, Sir John Blagrave.

[941] Edward Stanford.

[942] For Sir Henry Shirley, see R. Cust, 'Catholicism, antiquarianism and gentry honour: the writings of Sir Thomas Shirley', *Midland History*, 23 (1998), pp. 45, 65; *NCC*, p. 209.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it because there is so great concurse unto the ambass[ador][943] for to receave the sacrament of confirmation w*hi*ch the archeb[ishop][944] there dothe administer,[945] and I thinke is more tollerate[d] to blinde strangers. It is sayed the duke of Buckingh[am] shall ~~have~~ be prince palatine of Munster and lieutennant generall of Ireland.[946] In hast I end.

12 of 9^{ber} 1624.

Yours,

Th[omas] R[oper]

No address.

Endorsed: Ingl[and]. 1624 Nov*em*b*er* 2.
Rece[ived] [and] answ[ered]: December 21.

62. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 25 November/5 December 1624

[*AAW, B 27, no. 70*]

Right worship*ful*l and deere syr,

Albeit I wrote unto you by the last ordinarie[947] and also by an extraordinarie since,[948] nor have at this time anie great matter to write, yet wold I not omit to send by this ordinarie to let you know what here wee have. Since, therfor, my last, the mach betwene England and France hath bene published by fires of joy and shooting of artillerie, and the secretarie Villoclare is gone into England to take our kings oathe to keepe the articles.[949] The English Jesuits

[943] Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.
[944] Guillaume d'Hugues, Franciscan archbishop of Embrun.
[945] See *Letters 60*, *63*, *68*.
[946] See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 499.
[947] AAW, B 27, no. 53 (11/21 November 1624).
[948] AAW, B 27, no. 60 (16/26 November 1624).
[949] On 7 December 1624, Edward Bennett reported that 'a day agoe the French secretary', Henri-Auguste de Loménie, seigneur de Villeauxclercs, 'arived and was mett by the erle of Dorsett': AAW, B 27, no. 73; see also PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 304r. Henry Clifford understood that, when Villeauxclercs reached Dover, he learned of '3 Catholicks' who had been arrested 'passing [. . .] for England, and there [were] imprisoned and their bookes, beades and other things [had been] taken from them'. Villeauxclercs 'woulde not part thence till these 3 persons were delivered and all their goods restored': AAW, B 27, no. 84. Bennett recorded that 'this day we goe to hime to present our service. Within two dayes he goeth to meete the king at Cambridge where the embassadour is to take his oath abowt the conditions agreed upon. What they be we know not': AAW, B 27, no. 73; see also *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 510, 515; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 589, 591; PRO, SP 14/176/16, 53. For the audience of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

agent[950] is gone with him as his chaplen and, as some say, also D[octor] Cecil, for he vanished out of the towne at the same time. The last news of al from M[r] Cape were of the begining of the last moneth w*hi*ch told of a fresh renewing of the p*er*secution. But now I hope that is ceased. I can heare nothing fro*m* o*u*r brethren in London. We shal have a good b[ishop][951] ~~from~~ <for> grand almoner to o*u*r princess, and divers English preists for her chaplens, amongst ~~*whi*ch~~ <whome> I have named you, if you please to accept of it when you returne. The Jesuits give out that they shal have the place of the confes[sor],[952] but that is not certaine, and some report that o*u*r English embass[adors] say they shall passe over their bellies befor that be. It is said that Co[u]nte Carlil is shortly to goe to England, and one Syr [Albert] Morton is to come as leiger here.[953] Out of England is written that the k[ing] had com*m*anded to raise 12 thousand out of hand for to rescue Breda, and yet that Gondamar was dayly expected in England.[954] Thus much for other matters. As for o*u*r owne cause, there is a bul of Greg[ory] 14, made [in] 1591, extant in propi ep*iscop*ali procesii, w*hi*ch forbiddeth anie to make information of thos[e] that are p*ro*posed to be b*ishop*s, besides such [as] are deputed therto by his Holines, and p*ar*ticulerly forbiddeth [*word illegible*] inimicos and aemulos. And yet o*u*r Jes[uits] being both inimici and aemuli, nor being deputed by his Holines, take upon them this office. P*er*haps if you read the bul you may pick thence some thing to y*ou*r purpose. The other day passed herby a young scholler of that colledg[e] called Hastings,[955] who saieth he came downe for his health, and goeth to Liege to studie. P*er*haps he is sent downe to devide the new order setled in that colledg[e], and therfor it were wel to know whether he was an alumne of the colledg[e] or no, and after to doe as you see convenient.[956] If you heare any thing

Bennett and other leading secular clergymen (including John Colleton, Joseph Haynes, and William Shelley) with Villeauxclercs, in order to acknowledge their obligation to Louis XIII, see AAW, B 27, no. 74. Villeauxclercs promised them that the French court would ensure that the Stuart court delivered on its promises of toleration made in the course of the treaty negotiations. For the confirmation of concessions over religion, secured by Villeauxclercs during his audience with the king at Cambridge, see PRO, PRO 31/3/60, fo. 305v *et seq*; also above, p. 108.

[950] A reference, apparently, to George Latham SJ. See *Letter 69*.

[951] Daniel Du Plessis de la Mothe-Houdancourt, bishop of Mende.

[952] See AAW, A XVIII, no. 86, pp. 419–420 (John Colleton's letter to a cardinal in Rome, 13 December 1624: 'Quare non expedit ut confessarius reginae sit Jesuita').

[953] See *CSPD, 1623–1625*, pp. 207, 212, 314, 327, 330.

[954] For the progress of Spinola's siege of Breda, see AAW, B 27, nos 72, 88; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, *passim*; see also above, pp. 108–109.

[955] Edmund Hastings, alias Manners, son of Sir Henry Hastings, had left the English College in Rome on 1/11 October 1624: CRS, 37, p. 202; CRS, 55, p. 372.

[956] On the same day that Smith wrote this letter, Richard Ireland noted that Edmund Hastings had recently arrived in Paris and had 'gone hence to Liege'. He was 'much

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of a letter sent thither by Jes[uits] w*hi*ch, they say, was written by a preist,[957] and sent fro*m* house to house to p*er*swade to put out Jes[uits], I pray you make it to be brought out and the place named and p*er*son of whome they had it, for I fear it is forged by them. But F[ather] Leander[958] telleth that, whiles he was in England, he knew 12 preists put out of their places in one moneth by one Jesuit, who asked their patrons whether the preist co[u]ld catechize or preach or give the sp*irit*ual exercises, and, if they co[u]ld [*word omitted:* not], he p*ro*vided them a Jes[uit]. M^r^ Bennet[959] writeth to me that we shold p*ro*cure that o*ur* b[ishop], when God shal give us one, be made vicar to the pope. I think he is made made [*sic*] delegate to him in [*word obscured:* main *or* manie] cases by the co[un]cel of Trent. I pray you confer therof with y*our* freinds. And thus with my hartiest com*m*endations I com*m*it you to the p*ro*tection of o*ur* sweet savior.

5 of 10^ber^.

Y*our*s owne [*sic*],

R[ichard] Smith

Addressed: To the right worship*ful*l M^r^ Thomas More.

Endorsed: 5 Decemb[er].
Paris. 1624. D*oct*or Smith.
Decemb*er* 5. Recea[ved]: Decemb*er* 27. Answ[ered]: Decemb*er* 30.
De Vicario Apostolico.

63. George Musket [Fisher] to Thomas More, 26 November 1624

[*AAW, A XVIII, no. 80, pp. 407–408*]

R*everen*d and very worthy s*ir*,

I cannot persuade my selfe that you have <so> much cause to complaine of our slackenes in writing as you intimate in your last

disappoynted for some meanes, having missed to find Fa[ther] George [Latham] heere': AAW, B 27, no. 69.

[957] See *Letter 71*.

[958] John (Leander) Jones OSB.

[959] Edward Bennett.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the 2 of Octob[er], for although your extraordinary diligence may be some condemnation of our negligence, yet we should be to[o] much to blame and forgetful of our selves if we should not hold correspondency at this time, especially when it so much concerneth us. I have urged M[r] Coll[eton] very earnestly and he telleth me that he hath written unto you every weeke since this intercourse began and given full information of the state of all matters here and, for my part, I have written so many times. True it is I have omitted to wrighte thes[e] last tow weekes, being otherwise imploied abroad. The letters you [have] written [?] to me I have comunicated to M[r] Colleton and others, as occasions served, and I hope before this you have received our informations concerning the persecution here wich hath bin very great. And, although now they proceed more moderately, yet we cannot presume of peace but rather feare persecution bycause as yet we cannot perceive that any thing is done effectually by the French in our behalfe, no course taken for the staiing <the execution> of the penall statutes or abolishing the 2 oaths of supremacy and allegiance. What is intended I know not. The tow priests in Newgate who have long expected ther inlargement by mediation of the French ar still in prison. All the ease we find is that we are not molested by pursivants and promotors as formerly we have bin. The French complaine that we fill yours [*sic*] eares with rumors of persecution, but I pray God we have not greater cause to complaine of them for concealing the truth and persuading the world that all persecution is ceased, wheras the matter is farr otherwise. I perceive they earnestly desire this match and, if I be not deceived, they will conclude it uppon any conditions rather than faile, wich whether it will be to the good of our country I leave to your prudent consideration. They condemne us [*word deleted*] also for not sending an agent as we did in the time of the treaty with Spaine to sollicite a dispensation. But you know how to answere this complaint, having fuller comission to deale in this busines.[960] The 21

[960]Thomas Roper added his voice to Fisher's, in a letter written on the previous day (25 November). Roper thought that 'the pressinge of us by the Frenche ambass[ador] (and some say allso the archebish[op] of Ambrune joynethe with him that we are all Sp[a]niardes) turnethe muche to our prejudice, and it is a kinde of justifiinge of the persequution against us. If we might from France receave the like ease we did from Spayne we should as soone be Frenche as Spaniardes; but truly, since the Frenche treaty hathe bein, we have had nothing but a heavy persequution, and yet they labour us <as I am credebly told> to write letters and to certify bothe to Paris and Rome that there is no persequution and to assure his Holinesse that our kinge intendethe well to Catholickes and Catholike religion, wich <in diverse respectes and> in pointe of state <allso> we cannot doe, seinge his Majesty in all his <publicque> speeches and discourses which he maketh <dothe endevor> to make the contrary appeare unto his subjectes; and to sette downe in writinge under our handes the contrary is very dangerous and not fittinge for us to doe. Likewise we are laboured by the ambass[ador] to sollicite and hasten the dispensation': AAW, B 27, no. 58.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of this moneth, bonefiers were at every dore in London in token of joy for the agreement made betwine the tow kings concerning this treaty, and now every houre we expect an extraordinary ambassador fro*m* France. The archb[ishop] of Ambrune departed hence this last weeke furnished with the best informations we could give him and accordingly I suppose he will informe the king of France and those ther that ar to deale in this busines.[961] He confirmed many here at severall times, wich was not so well liked by some.[962] But I suppose he did no more than he might well doe. Many here could wish he had come in another fashion and kept the port of a bishoppe, for his being here as a private ma*n* in secular habit did somewhat derogate from the dignity of an archb[ishop] and made him lesse esteemed by Catholiques. Also his going to visit Mansfield and Canterbury caused some to mutter. Mansfield hath bin here this fortnight and more, expecting souldiers. At his coming over he was in great danger by sea. The kings shippe wich was to waift him over was cast away by violence of the tempest, in wich were divers English gentlemen and some of Mansfields souldiers to the nu*m*ber of 16[0] all cast away, with some treasure of Mansfields.[963] How much we cannot certainly learne. Since his coming hither, ther arrived uppo*n* the coast of Kent 16 saile, as is reported. In thes[e] shipps ther ar 6,000 Almans or more, as some say.[964] Our souldiers to the nu*m*ber of 1,200 ar, if reportes be true, to joine <with the*m*>. Marry, what enterprize they have in hand no ma*n* ca*n* imagine. Only the king hath promised the Spanish secretary here that he intendeth no hurt to the king of Spaine nor his dominions. Much muttering [*p. 408*] ther is about thes[e] forraine souldiers, and the more for that wee heare that Brunswike[965] is to be here shortly.

[961] Roper commented that, 'thoughe otherwayes a good man', Embrun 'dothe discover muche passion against Spayne, which makethe him and the discreter sorte of Frenche men to forgette God Allmighties cause, and to say what our state here sayethe and urgethe against us'. Furthermore, at his departure, he was taking with him 'M^r^ [William] Atkinson the apostata': AAW, B 27, no. 58.

[962] See Tillières, *ME*, p. 85; *Letters 60*, *61*. Zuane Pesaro had commented on 19 November 1624 that Embrun had finished his business in England, 'glorying in having publicly performed sacramental functions, a thing that no one has accomplished since the change of religion in these realms', despite complaints from both 'Jesuits and certain Catholics' that he had 'ventured to officiate in another's jurisdiction'. He 'particularly prayed the Catholics' and the religious orders, 'as Béthune requested, to send petitions to Rome to hasten on the dispensation', but the Jesuits had been unwilling to comply: *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 501.

[963] On 19/29 November, Henry Clifford reported to Thomas More that Mansfelt escaped with his page and lieutenant, although 100 of his company were drowned: AAW, B 27, no. 64; cf. McClure, *LJC*, p. 586; Whiteway, *Diary*, p. 66.

[964] For the recruiting of these German soldiers, see Whiteway, *Diary*, p. 67; *HMCMK*, p. 219.

[965] Christian of Brunswick, administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt. He had, two months before, approached the English ambassadors in Paris in order to 'sollicit' their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mansfield was desirous to land thes[e] souldiers in Kent but the king would not heare of that. Onely he hath given his leave to land 200 at a time, unarmed, to aire themselves. Southampton and his sonne ar both lately dead in the Low Countries.[966] Some rumors ar spread also of Grave Maurice his death, but the[y] ar yet uncertaine. I have no more to impart at this present but my best love to your selfe and good M[r] Rant.

Yours ever assuredly,

G[eorge] Mus[ket]

Novemb[er] 26.

Addressed: To the w*orshipfu*ll his very worthy freind M[r] Thomas More.

Endorsed: Ingl*an*d. 1624. Musk[e]t.
Novemb[er] 26. Recea[ved] [and] answ[ered]: January 11 1625.

64. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 23 December 1624/2 January 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 21*]

Right worshipful and deere syr,

I have y*ou*rs of the 2 of 10[ber]. And now at the last are the bulls come for to make me b[ishop] of Calcedon, but no jurisdiction at al for England.[967] And therfor I have intreated my cardinal[968] and the nonce[969] to write that I may have the same auth*orit*y w*hi*ch my p*re*dec*ess*or had, w*hi*ch was to be ordinarius of England,[970] with the same extrordinarie faculties that the archepriests had, and that in case of necessitie I may confirme sine ornamentis pontificalibus cu*m* solis sacerdotalibus,

'mediation for some employment for him, who otherwise must be forced to accept of the emperours offer of pardon and to serve under him in the contrary quarrel': PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 193r.

[966] Henry Wriothesley, 3rd earl of Southampton, died at Bergen-op-Zoom on 10/20 November 1624, and his son James four days before him, at Rosendal. See Lee, *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain*, p. 317.

[967] See AAW, A XIX, no. 5, pp. 13–16 (attested copy of the breve of Urban VIII to Richard Smith, bishop elect of Chalcedon, 25 January/4 February 1625; printed in Dodd, *CH*, III, pp. 7–8).

[968] Cardinal Richelieu.

[969] Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

[970] i.e. to have ordinary jurisdiction as a bishop in England.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

becaus[e] I can not have the other in some places and occasions.[971] I hope to be consecrated the 6 of this moneth by the nonce and to be gone to England as soone after as I can, and as soone by the next poste I wil send you a com*m*ission in blank, sealed and subscribed by me, for you to put in what you think fit. But in anie case, take no notice as from me that I am the [*MS torn*], his Holines wil have the matter to be as secret as may be, that I may be in England befor o*u*r king know[s] therof. But harken, I pray you, if faculties be already sent to me or no. For p*er*haps they were sent with the bulls, but miscarried by some chance, or it may be thay be sent by this next poste w*hi*ch cometh hither within thes[e] three dayes, and p*er*haps there is some stay for the modification of them. And, if they be modified, doe, I pray you, al you can that I be made ordinarius Angliae, without w*hi*ch my auth*orit*y wilbe nothing.[972]

For England the news is here that, at the coming of Secretarie Villoclare, the Catholik prisoners were set at libertie and al p*er*secution ceased; that our k[ing] hath signed the articles, and given to Villocleere a diamant of 20 thousand crownes, and the prince an other of 10 thousand. Twoe Catholik English say that the p*er*secution is ceased, and one of the*m* addeth that the inquirie was great and general, but not the taking away of goods, and that there are at this p*re*sent foure highe sherives that are recusants.[973] The other, who was one of M[r] Gage his men, and goe[th] to Rome now, saieth that Mansfeld hath betwene 12 and 15 thousand English souldiors readie to embark and that he is in Dover.[974] The Low Countries are much afraid of him and p*ro*vide wel for him. The duke of Buckingham is made prince of Tiperary in Ireland.[975] From Flanders they write that they hope to have Breda shortly, and that the towne beginneth already to parole [?]. Here is great number of souldiors and much sending of armes and munition towards Calis and some speak that the Hugenots begin to sturre. The good b[ishop] of Ayre[976] hath bene like to die but, God be thanked, now there is hope that he is out of danger. I pray you remember him in y*ou*r devotions.

[971] For Smith's appointment, and the limits imposed by Rome on his jurisdiction, see Allison, RS; Allison, QJ.

[972] In a letter to Thomas Rant of 3/13 February 1625, Smith played down the extent of the authority which he sought, and insisted that he would want to exercise his episcopal judicial authority only in first instance, with a right of appeal allowed to the nuncio in Paris: AAW, B 47, no. 13.

[973] Cf. *Letter 61*.

[974] On 17/27 December 1624, Henry Clifford observed that 'many souldiers of Mansfielde runne away as soone as they have libertie, and one runne [*sic*] into the river and was drowned because he would not be pressed to serve him': AAW, B 27, no. 88. For a similar account by John Chamberlain, see McClure, *LJC*, p. 593.

[975] See *Letter 61*.

[976] Sébastien Bouthillier.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We have a good clergie man[977] apointed to be b[ishop] to Madam[978] in England, and with him shal goe divers good clergie men. The F[rench] k[ing] hath apointed a F[rench] Jesuit for her confessarius, but p*er*haps he wil not hold the place, for the earle of Carlil saieth it wil never be permitted, and is earnest against it.[979] I pray you let this letter be com*m*on to good F[ather] Rant whome I pray to excuse me being so busie for my consecration within thes[e] 3 dayes, and desire him to deale with F[ather] Berul about my faculties aforesaid, but as not knowing any thing of me more than is necessarie. For I know not how his Holines wold take it if it were discovered, and therfor this secresie I com*m*end to you and him above al matters. And by the next I hope I may write to you more plainly. The bulls were here delivered with so litle secresie as I feare they are more knowne than his Holines wold [*sic*], but that was no fault of mine. Thus, with a thousand com*m*endations to you both, I commit you to God. This 2 of Jan[uary] 1625.

Y*ou*rs ever and ever,

R[ichard] Smith

Addressed: Au r*évéren*d père, P[ère] Claude Bertin Supérieur du S^{t} Louis. Pour Mons*ieu*r Thomas More Anglois.
Rome.

Endorsed: Paris. 1625. Chalc[e]don.
January. 2. Receav[ed]: January 26. Answ[ered]: January 28.

65. Thomas Roper to Thomas More, 29 December 1624

[*AAW, B 47, no. 183*]

Good cosen,

This inclosed of M^{r} Farring[ton][980] can not take notice of your two letters unto him of the 29th of 9^{ber} and of 7 Decemb[er] for that they

[977] Daniel Du Plessis de la Mothe-Houdancourt, bishop of Mende.
[978] Henrietta Maria.
[979] On 29 November/9 December 1624, Marc'Antonio Moresini, Venetian ambassador in France, had reported that 'they have agreed upon twenty-eight priests, whom Madame will take with her to celebrate the offices in her church, and a bishop'. There were disagreements about her confessor. The nuncio 'overcame opposition, the queen mother so wishing', and a Jesuit, Barthélemy Jacquinot, was appointed, though his appointment was soon revoked, in part at the insistence of King James: *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 507; PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fos 89v–90r; Fraser, *Reports on the Manuscripts of the Earl of Eglinton*, p. 110; see also *Letter 68*.
[980] Edward Bennett.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were yet in my handes when this letter came from him, but, since, I have sent them unto him.

Halberstate,[981] since his coming, is made knight of the Garter and hathe a pension of 2,000[l] graunted him out of the excheq[uer]. It is sayed there shall be raysed another army for him of 15,000, and talke there is of a new presse, but it is not as yet beleeved.[982]

It is thought that Mansef[elt] will remayne yet in Kent these 2 monthes. His shouldiers in passinge throughe the countrey unto him committe many disorders. People shutte uppe their houses and stirre not abroade, no markettes are kepte, nor is there any commerce, and everyone for the present live[s] uppon suche provision ~~and~~ <as> they have in their houses.[983]

Villocleere hathe stayed here a weeke longer than he intended, only to see those thinges perfected w*hi*ch it pleased our kinge to graunte him in favor of his Catholicke subjectes. There was brought him by M[r] Secretary Conway a writinge seigned w*i*th the kinges privat signate w*hi*ch contayned the particulars of his Ma*jes*ties graunte. Uppon perusall thereof the ambass[ador] expressed muche discontentednesse for that he sayed his Ma*jes*ties officers had <not> penned it accordinge unto the kinges graunte. First he excepted maynely against the preamble w*hi*ch seemed to have bein coppied out of some of Queene El[i]zab[eth's] proclamations. The tenor of it was this, vid[elicet], whereas diverse preistes, Jesuites and suche like personnes ~~have~~ for their disloyalty to their ~~prince and~~ soveragne and for many treacherous actiones have bein imprisoned e[t]c*etera*, it is notwithestandinge his Ma*jes*tie[s] pleasure at the entreaty of the ambass[ador] and in contemplation of the matche that they shall be fourtheworthe [*sic for* forthwith] sette at liberty and banished the realme.[984] He disliked that all preistes e[t]c*etera* should be taxed for <suche> heigneous offences and for disloyalty, beinge [*sic for* seeing], as he sayed, no religion thought more obedience to their soveraigne than the Cathol[ic]. And, for banisshement, that was no favor but a great penalty, and his Ma*jes*ties graunte was for their liberty.

[981] Christian of Brunswick, administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt.

[982] See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 514, 526, 530; McClure, *LJC*, p. 595; PRO, PRO 31/3/59, fo. 196r.

[983] Thomas Roper had recorded with dismay on Christmas Eve 1624 that Mansfelt's recruits, travelling to their assembly points, caused 'many disorders as they passed'; for example, 'in Hartefortesheere they came to one Sir John Lukes house who, beinge a deputy lieutenant of that sheere, did reprehend them for their insolency. Thereuppon they brake his pate and shrodly beate his men that came to rescue him': AAW, B 27, no. 85. See also *Letter 67*; AAW, B 47, no. 75.

[984] See *Letter 62*; PRO, SP 14/177/11.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hereuppon Villocleere made his complainte unto the duke. Since, there have bein severall [*word deleted*] <wayes thought on> for to geave him content, and now he hathe a letter under the kinges privat seignat directed to Secretary Conway who hathe order to signifie the kinges pleasure unto my lord keeper,[985] my lord treasurer,[986] M^r^ Attorney[987] and the judges concerninge the present cessation of all proceedinges against recusantes and, <by vertue of> this letter, Secretary Conway gave him severall letters to the sayed officers. It is expected that all prisoners shall be fourthe with delivered.[988]

This day, beinge New Yeares Eve, he tooke his journey for France, havinge leafte behinde a good opinion amonge the Cathol[ics] for his zeale in their cause. And (as some say), if Monsieur Fiats[989] persuasions had taken place, he had not so muche insisted for the performance now of those thinges as he did, ~~but~~ the parlament beinge so nighe at hand. He hathe bein told by some of ~~the~~ our state that they [*sic for* the] papistes have sette him on purposely to breake the matche, w*hi*ch they have great reason to furder, beinge w*i*th a Catholi[c] princesse. The Catholickes desire no more fiats to comme amonge them, but would be gladd to heare of factum est, and be acquainted w*i*th him.

The Dutche agent[990] and the Spanishe agent[991] had joyntly togeather their audience these hollydayes and seemed to have good satisfaction geaven them, none being present at their audience.

Commende me to M^r^ Clayton, who I thinke is arrived ere this at ~~his~~ his journeys ende. Entreate him when he retornethe that he will brinke [*sic for* bring] w*i*th him for me an silver forke for to use at the table, w*hi*ch I desire may be tridens. Here they know not well how to

[985] John Williams, bishop of Lincoln.

[986] Sir James Ley.

[987] Sir Thomas Coventry.

[988] According to George Fisher, 'it was long before the ambassador obtained this order in such forme as he desired, insomuch as he rejected tow severall orders sent him under the broad seale, but the third, suting to his expectation, he accepted': AAW, B 47, no. 151. For Zuane Pesaro's account of this confrontation, see *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 539. See also PRO, SP 14/177/22 (a memorandum for King James, *inter alia*, to issue letters to both archbishops (for which see PRO, SP 14/177/25–28) to halt high commission proceedings against Catholic recusants and to order a warrant to prevent all process against Catholics); PRO, SP 14/177/23 (a request from the marquis of Effiat that recusants should be released from all pecuniary penalties, be reimbursed for fines levied since the previous Trinity term, and be immune from action against them by secular and ecclesiastical courts); PRO, SP 14/177/36–40 (the warrants to grant Effiat's request); PRO, SP 14/177/29 (James's order, of 26 December, to Lord Keeper Williams to issue writs for the release of imprisoned Catholic clergy); *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 551; see also PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 368r; PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 49v.

[989] Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[990] Presumably Roper intends to refer to Jean-Baptiste van Male, the agent of the archduchess Isabella.

[991] Jacques Bruneau.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

make them. Likewise una scatula di balle bolognese. I will, when he commethe, retorne him <his> monys with many thankes.

Commende me to M^r^ Rant, Don Anselmo,[992] Don Seberto[993] and the rest of my good freindes.

Yours,

T[homas] R[oper]

Lette my name be hereafter Tho[mas] Browne when you write unto me.

The 29^th^ of Dec[ember] 1624.

Addressed: All' ill*ust*re sig*no*re, il Sig*no*r Tomasso Moro, Inglese. Roma.

Endorsed: Ingl[an]d. 1624. T[homas] R[oper]. Decemb[er] 29. Recea[ved] [and] answ[ered]: Febr[uary] 21 [and] 22.

66. Richard Sara [Edward Bennett] to Thomas More, 1 January 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 194*]

Right wo*rshipfu*ll and worthy syr,

Having last week written unto you, this day I receaved two from you, thon of the 23 of November, thother of the 30 of the same. I am glad the commission is come to yo*u*r handes, but you tell me not whether it be the com*m*ission for the dispensation, or thother for yo*u*r self. Yo*u* alsoe acknowledge the receit of the breviculus[994] and the canons,[995] whereof, me thinkes, you might make some benefitt at least with the congregation de P*ro*paganda Fide. The secretary[996] that came last out of Fraunce maketh us beleeve that the articles be very good and that we shall have a generall cessation from all p*er*secution. I suppose upon

[992] Robert (Anselm) Beech OSB.

[993] Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB.

[994] This is a reference to a Latin account of William Bishop's episcopate in England, sent to Rome by William Harewell in early July 1624. Another copy was dispatched subsequently: AAW, B 27, nos 9, 87; AAW, B 47, no. 89.

[995] i.e. 'Canones ecclesiastici ad pacem et disciplinam inter clerum saecularem et monachos Benedictinos conservandam a reverendissimo in Christo patre ac domino, D[omino] Gulielmo Episcopo Calcedonensi propositi', for which see AAW, A XVII, no. 54, pp. 177–180; *Letter 35*.

[996] Henri-Auguste de Loménie, seigneur de Villeauxclercs.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his return (w*hi*ch I am written unto wilbe within two dayes) they wilbe sent to his Ho[liness] and you shall better know ther the p*ar*ticulars than we heer, soe secrett they be kept. Yo*u* must beare w*i*th me that yo*u* heare not soe soone all occurrantes from me for, beinge in the cuntrey, it is a fortnight sometymes before I doe hear what hapneth [?] in the cowrte, and abowte London, whereof o*u*r frendes, abiding ther, might easily and soone informe yo*u*. I cry unto them to give M^{r} Rant and yo*u*r self correspondence but they still sleepe. This negligence hath undon o*u*r cause. As for assuraunce, I doe think his Ho[liness] doth well not to stand to[o] much upon it but to take the kinge of Fraunce his roiall word. If that we showld break w*i*th Fraunce, and the prince marry som P*ro*testant, we will wish we had some Catholick lady withowt either condition or p*ro*mise. I dowbt not but that many ill suggestions be made ther against our kinge, but surely I can <not> allow of ther information. We take comfort in the insinuation you make that o*u*r b[ishop] is chosen. But we are exceedingly trubled that boath o*u*r agentes (whom we have sent of purpose to deale in that affayer) showld be made such straingers to what is don, and howld you boath, as alsoe the whoale clergye, much dishonored by it. Not that we desyre to knowe it before it is befittinge, but because we all [*word omitted:* are] soe litle regarded that, in o*u*r own affayers, we have not the respect in that cowrte to have o*u*r agent ~~(in o*u*r own affayers)~~ trusted. I p*ro*test unto yo*u* boath, if I were where yo*u* are, I showld informe his Ho[liness] and alsoe the congregation de P*ro*paganda Fide how much greved the clergye be at the litle regard [that] is had of them. Againe it breedeth a great inconvenience unto us, this dependance of princes, w*hi*ch his Ho[liness], makinge o*u*r b[ishop] at o*u*r own sute, might redresse. For if the French make hym, as now they doe, the Spaniard will howld hym for there enimye, and soe consequently favour no request he shall make in the behaulf of those colledges we have in ther cuntry. If the Spaniard had made hyme, then the French <lady> (if she become o*u*r princes[s]) would have frowned, and then we had suffered of that syde. All w*hi*ch I say might and may allwayes heereafter be prevented if his Holl[iness] would be pleased to make o*u*r sup*er*iors upon o*u*r own sutes, and not of any princes whatsoever. For then boath sup*er*ior and his clergy showld be held for indifferent to all, and soe w*i*th confidence might intreate the helpe and assistance of all.[997] An exception (p*re*sently upon the

[997] On 1 January 1625, William Harewell also regretted that neither Thomas More nor Thomas Rant had been informed directly of Smith's appointment (even though they were the secular clergy's accredited agents in Rome). Harewell expressed concern at the political implications of the way in which Smith had been appointed: AAW, B 47, no. 89. Edward

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b[ishop's][998] death) was made to me by <the> Spanish embassadours against Doct[or] Smith that he was of the French faction. Therefor they sayd they would oppose hyme. [*In margin:* The marquez[999] sayd, if we p*ro*pose him, he would withstand bishops.] And I had much a doe to cleer it. I beseeche you to thinck of this bussines w*hi*ch, beinge <well> vexed in that cowrte, may (it may be) heareafter <move them> to deale better w*i*th us. If I were w*i*th you, I showld say more. I beleeve if Doct[or] Smith be o*u*r b[ishop], and writ in the behalf either of the colledge of Doway or Portingall to Spayn or the Low Cuntres, he wilbe litle regarded, and this because he is made by the French. And soe much of this.

You speake of a restraint feared in his jurisd[ict]ion. I can not imagyn they will restrayn what the canons giveth hyme. As for my L[ord] Mount[ague] his practise, we doe not admire it, although it may seeme strainge, a monk being his sonnes tutor,[1000] he showld seeke to the Jesswetes.[1001] I doe not dowbt but that, er[e] this, yo*u* have fownd my L[ord] Winsor but litle to like them. He p*ro*mised me he would deale confidently w*i*th you boath.[1002] I cowld wishe that such letters as come from us, either to his Ho[liness] or to any of the cardinals, were delivered by yo*u*r self or M[r] Rant and not by second p*er*sons, because then you showld have good occasion to urge what in the letters is treated. We hope his Ho[liness] will take order w*i*th these defamers and ~~the~~ not suffer the dead and livinge to be wronged. Me thinges [*sic for* thinkes] they showld either give yo*u* such articles as be given up to awnswer or show there dislik[e] of the defamers by disgracinge of them. I like well of yo*u*r dictamen that the religious who live heer ~~amongst us~~ showld heareafter be examined of the carraidges of bussines amongest us; as also that all o*u*r affayers showld be drawen owt of the Inquisition and handeled in the congregation de P*ro*paganda Fide, being p*ar*ticularly ordayned for these hereticall cuntreis.

Heer is as great sturringe for warrs as ther talk amongest you of it. Brunswick,[1003] Count Mansfeld, as alsoe Towers[1004] be heere.[1005] Great

Bennett lodged another protest about the same matter in a letter of 7 March 1625 to Rant: AAW, B 47, no. 121.

[998]i.e. William Bishop.

[999]Juan Hurtado de Mendoza, marquis of Inojosa.

[1000]See *Letter 19*.

[1001]For the 2nd Viscount Montague's patronage of the Society of Jesus, see Questier, *C&C*, pp. 333, 444–446.

[1002]For Lord Windsor's extant letters to Thomas Rant (one in February 1625, two in June 1625, and one in August 1625), see AAW, B 47, nos 200–203.

[1003]Christian of Brunswick, administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt.

[1004]Frédéric Maurice de la Tour d'Auvergne, duke of Bouillon, who had succeeded his father, the prominent Huguenot leader, in March 1623: *HMCMK*, p. 162.

[1005]See AAW, B 47, no. 157.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mustering, but whither they goe is unknowen. My frend[1006] giveth you many thankes for yo*u*r remembraunce of her, and most hartely saluteth yo*u* agayn. I pray reme*m*ber my most kynd respect to good M^r^ Rant, intreating these may serve you boathe, this being all I have to saye owt of this sollitary cuntry. It may be o*u*r frendes at London will tell yo*u* more. O*u*r brethren heer with me salute you boathe. O*u*r Lord keepe yo*u*.

Ever yo*u*rs most assured,

Richard Sarra

1^o^ Januarii 1624.

Addressed: For M^r^ More.

Endorsed: Ingl*an*d. 1625. Sarrha.
January 1^o^. Recea[ved] [and] answ[ered]: February 21 [and] 22.

67. George Musket [Fisher] to Thomas More, 6 January 1625

[*AAW, B 27, no. 91*]

Right w*orshipfu*ll,

I expected to heare from you by the last post, but it is now a fortnight and more, and yet I heare nothing. The last week matters were so doubtfull that I knew not what to wright. Now we have the period of our expectation, for our prisoners ar released and the king hath given order that ther shall be no proceedings in any court against Catholikes for meere matter of religion. This favour we have by the mediatio*n* of the French ambas[sador][1007] who would not depart untill he obtained it under the broad seale. Presently, uppo*n* the dispatch of this order, he departed for France uppo*n* our New Yeares Eve. Brunswicke[1008] hath had very gratious entertainme*n*t here of late. The last weeke he was created knight of the Garter and had a pension of 2,000 per an*nu*m graunted him by his Ma*jes*tie.[1009] He departed hence uppo*n* New Yeares Day. Mansfield is still uppo*n* the plaines of Dover, training his souldiers, and it is not certaine when he will depart thence. Some report they shall not goe untill the States give security for him that he shall <not> hurt the king of Spaine or any of his

[1006]Lady Elizabeth Dormer.
[1007]Henri-Auguste de Loménie, seigneur de Villeauxclercs.
[1008]Christian of Brunswick, administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt.
[1009]See *Letter 65*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

territories. In the meane <time> they comitt many outrages, and it is confidently reported that amongst other of ther villanies they have ravished a ladye and her tow daughters. Comission is gone from the king to execute martiall law uppon them, and, as I heare, some of them ar hanged. How many I cannot certainly learne.[1010] Now it is confidently reported here that the earle of Gondomar is coming for England. I cann hardly beleive this, although I heare it reported by those that have reason to know it.[1011] The next weeke, if any post come from Spaine, you shall know the certainty. I pray you, send up some comfortable news concerning our manie suites. For we heare nothing at all as yet but what we heare from you. As touching the hospitall,[1012] I suppose Mr Collet[on] will send you his opinion. For my part I thinke it fitt his Hol[iness] should be acquainted with it now in the beginning least hereafter they plead prescription. Thus, with offer of my love to your selfe and Mr Rant, I rest.

Yours assuredly,

G[eorge] M[usket]

Janu[ary] 6.

Addressed: To the right w*orshipfu*ll Mr Thomas More.

Endorsed: Ingla[nd]. 1625.
Musk*e*t. January 6. Recea[ved]: February 21 [and] answ[ered]: [February] 22.

[1010]See *ibid*. On 14 January 1625, George Fisher wrote that Mansfelt's recruits had 'committed in the country many insolencies but that of the ravishing of the lady and her daughters, wich was here for many daies confidently reported, is now as confidently contradicted': AAW, B 47, no. 151. On 5 January 1625, Thomas Roper had complained that 'our cuntrey of Kent sufferethe muche by Mansefeildes shouldiers who have committed many disorders. Some 12 of them brake into my fathers house at Cant[erbury] and some 20 more were brought into the house by the constable and there they remayne and are lodged. Marshall law is now proclamed and, since that, it is sayed some halfe a score have bein hanged. There hathe bein a fleete expected from the East for to transporte them, which now is sayed to be comme to the Downes, being of 80 sayle': AAW, B 47, no. 179. See also McClure, *LJC*, p. 593; PRO, SP 14/176/66. On December 26, Sir John Hippisley, lieutenant of Dover Castle, had told the council that the soldiers committed every kind of outrage, plundering and pillaging their way through the local population: PRO, SP 14/177/18. With the Kentish authorities, Hippisley also reported on 31 December that the officers were failing to enforce discipline: PRO, SP 14/177/48. For similar reports by John Chamberlain, Francis Wilford, and William Jones, see McClure, *LJC*, p. 596; PRO, SP 14/177/33, 34. For the commission for exercising martial law, dispatched subsequently to Hippisley, see PRO, SP 14/181/10, 11; see also PRO, SP 14/181/26, 37. On 13 January 1625, Sir John Ogle and Sir William St Leger assured Conway that the soldiers at Canterbury were now well ordered: PRO, SP 14/181/51.

[1011]See *Letters 58*, *73*.

[1012]See *Letter 58*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

68. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 7/17 January 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 12*]

Right worship*ful* and deer syr,

I have y*our*s of the 16 of 10[ber] and, by this, I hope you have my last in w*hi*ch I certified you how that I then had receaved my bulls for to be made b[ishop] of Calcedon but yet had no auth*orit*y or jurisdiction for England. Since, I have bene consecrated the 12 of this p*re*sent by the nonce[1013] who did it with much affection and honor to me and invited both me and his twoe assistants[1014] to a very great dinner. He is willing that I shold stay here til my faculties come, and other my freinds counsel me the same, and so I purpose now to doe that I may the better replie if the faculties be not suffi*ci*ent, w*hi*ch I onely desire shold be ordinarius Ang[liae] with the same faculties w*hi*ch the archpreists had, and that I may confirme sine pontificalibus cum sacerdotalibus ornamentis in case of necessitie.[1015] My cardinal[1016] hath written by the last for thes[e] faculties and also, as I think, the nonce who p*ar*ticulerly favoureth me. I had hoped that my consecration shold have bene secret and for that end it was done in the chapel of the nonces [*sic*] his house, but one of his men told it to Griffin Floyd and he spreadeth it al about.[1017] My Lord Carlil hath defeated the Jesuit of being confessarius[1018] to our princesse,[1019] and there shalbe ether a doctor of Sorbon or some such other. [*MS obscured:* It] is said our king wil have no religious about her becaus[e] they make vows to strangers. Secretarie Villoclare is dayly looked for here, and it is said the day before his departure from London he went to the prisons and set al Catholiks at libertie.[1020] The d[uke] of Buckingham, now prince of Tiperary, counte palatin of Munster and leiutenant of Ireland,[1021] is making great p*ro*vision for to come hither to espouse the princesse. Don Tomas, sonne to the d[uke] of Savoy, hath married Co[u]nte Soissons sister.[1022] The Hugenots in Poitou are rebelled and have taken twoe

[1013]Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta. See Allison, RS, p. 189.
[1014]Cardinal Richelieu and Claude de Rueil, bishop of Bayonne. See *ibid.*
[1015]See *Letter 64*.
[1016]Cardinal Richelieu.
[1017]For Griffin Floyd, see *NAGB*, pp. 151, 275–276.
[1018]See *Letter 64*.
[1019]Henrietta Maria.
[1020]Thomas Roper informed Thomas More, in his letter of 5 January 1625, that, on 'that day that Villocleere (to whome the recusantes are beholding for his caire <of them>) went a way, the prisoners of Newgate in the morninge came to him to render him thankes': AAW, B 47, no. 179.
[1021]See Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 215–216.
[1022]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 519; PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 192v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ilands[1023] before Ro[chelle], twoe litle citties, but the k[ing] sweareth that he wil be revenged of them. As soone as I have faculties I wil send you commission to deale in my name and as soone as I come to England I wil consult with my brethren how to help that colledg[e].[1024] You wold not think what want we are like to have of men, for I feare much [*word omitted:* for (?)] even this litle house[1025] after my leaving it, men are so unwilling to live with my coosin,[1026] and he so hard to be removed, and yet I hope that this house wold be much increased in means if we had suffi*ci*ent men that wold live in it. You write that the b[ishop] of Embrun hath confirmed 200 [*sic*] and here is reported [*MS damaged*] that he co*n*firmed 10 thousande.[1027] The French much com*m*end his cariage there. My brethren have written nothing to me of his doings. Now I heare that the reporte of the Hugenots rebellion is doubtful if not true. I pray you inclose this letter to his Holines in a cover and deliver it as soone as you can, I make no mention of you in it becaus[e], as I said, I have my self as yet no com*m*ission for England, and, if he be offended that my consecration be knowne, I pray you tel him that it came not out by my fault. Breda stands as it did. Coloma is to be about Namours with 20 thousand.[1028] Mansfeld is not yet comen out of England and as is said the ports are stopt til he be departed. I pray you let this letter be com*m*on to M[r] Rant, for I gladly use the libertie which he giveth me to write to you both in one. I pray you com*m*end me most respectively to F[ather] Berul and to al freinds, and thus, with my hartiest to you both, I com*m*it you to the protection of o*u*r sweet Savior. I pray you, by yo*u*r next, let me know how much wold be necessarie to mantaine one honestly at Rome. And, when you

[1023]Rhé and Oléron: see *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 562.

[1024]The English College in Rome.

[1025]The Collège d'Arras.

[1026]William Rayner. On 11/21 February 1625, Anthony Champney suggested to Smith that, as a last resort, Smith 'co[u]ld procure' Rayner 'the place of chapleine' with Henrietta Maria 'that at least he might live securely without molestation': AAW, B 27, no. 93. On 3/13 March, Smith informed More that he had 'now good hope to remove my coosin' from the college 'with his owne liking, and at a reas[onable] rate, for so he agreed yesterday with me, if his freinds in the towne doe not disswade him from it:, AAW, B 47, no. 15. However, on 19/29 June, Henry Holden reported to Smith that Rayner was 'threatening perpetuall aboad': AAW, A XIX, no. 61, p. 181.

[1027]Cf. *Letters 60*, *61*, *63*. Embrun himself claimed that he had been permitted to administer the sacrament of confirmation in London, 'où durant le séjour que j'y fis, plus de dix mille Anglois reçeuvent ce sacrament de ma main': PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fo. 81v.

[1028]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 580. On 3/13 February 1625, Richard Ireland noted that Coloma 'wayteth on' Mansfelt with the troops 'lately levyed in the Lowe Countryes': AAW, B 47, no. 118. For the raising of these troops and for the appointment of Coloma to lead both these soldiers and other imperial troops against Mansfelt, see *CCE*, pp. 197, 204–205; *CGB*, I, p. 576, II, p. 593; PRO, SP 77/17, fo. 18r–v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

may, write to M^r Newman to see what hope there is of a colledge at Lisbon. Farewel a thousand thousand times.

17 of Jan[uary] 1625.

Yo*ur* servant in Christ Jesus,

R[ichard] Chalcedon

Addressed: A monsieur, Mons*ieu*r Thomas More chez le r*évéren*d père, P[ère] Claude Bertin, supérieur de St Louis à Rome.

Endorsed: Paris. 1625. Chal[cedon].
January 17. Recea[ved]: Febru[ary] 6.
Answ[ered]: Febru[ary] 10.

69. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 20/30 January 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 11*]

Right worship*ful* and deere syr,

I have y*our*s of the 30 of 10^ber^ and befor this I hope you know that I am appointed succ*ess*or to my l[ord] of Calcedon,[1029] for now they write it from thence to D[octor] Cecil who after such authentical notice, as he said, did take the paines to come to visit me,[1030] as also did F[ather] George[1031] who is now returned out of England with Mons*ieu*r Villoclare, the F[rench] kings secretarie, who hath obtained of o*ur* king that al payments or bonds and such like made by Cath[olics] into the exchequer since the treatie of this mariage should be repaied, that al prisoners be set at liberties, 12^d^ on Sunday remitted, informers put downe and al penal lawes against Cath[olics] ceased, and this our k[ing] hath printed, signed and sealed; and besid[es] he hath sworne that he wil nether directly nor indirectly draw the princesse[1032] from her religion nor hinder her or her trayne in the execution therof, or in the bringing up of her children in her religion. The d[uke]

[1029] William Bishop.

[1030] Smith observed, about three weeks later (on 16/26 February), that John Cecil 'professeth him self a great clergie man, defieth al that say he ever was against the having of b[ishops], and offereth to goe to Rome upon his owne charges for the good of the clergie': AAW, B 47, no. 18.

[1031] George Latham SJ. On 20/30 January, Richard Ireland commented that 'Fa[ther] George Latham hath bene in England' with Villeauxclercs 'and is nowe returned. He hath bene heere to congratulat my l[ord] of Ch[alcedon] [...] and sayth that the king hath promised toleration to Catholiques': AAW, B 47, no. 117; see also *Letter 70*. According to Edward Bennett, Latham, while in England, 'walketh in his habitt': AAW, B 27, no. 74.

[1032] Henrietta Maria.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Buckingham is looked for here within this moneth or six weeks for to espouse the ladie. And, finally, Mons*ieu*r Villoclare is much com*m*ended for his dealing in England, but not so Fiat.[1033] I am glad that you have so good correspondence fro*m* England, for I had never worse. I feare that both their and my letters are intercepted. Touching the confessor, I have done what I can, and once it was surely held that it should not be a companion[1034] by procurement of my l[ord] of Carlil,[1035] but now they are in hope agayne and, as it seemeth, they hope to worke it by Bucking[ham] his mother,[1036] that from England they shal not be hindered and, if they be not fro*m* thence, it wil not be fro*m* hence. I moved P[ère] Berul himself for that place but he seemed not willing, and I spake to the nonce[1037] and others for him, who liked the notion very wel. What the event wil be God knoweth. Here I see that many feare the Jes[uits] and wil not incurre their hatred for to doe others good. I have heard nothing of that sermon made in England, but F[ather] Persons long since made the like in our colledg[e] at Rome.[1038] If I could learne of it I wold endeavour [*sic*], but as I tel you I can heare nothing from England. M^r^ Rant writeth to me that P[ère] Berul sent him to Card[inal] Valette with a copie of my pre[de]cessor[1039] his faculties w*hi*ch putteth me in hope that I shal soone have mine. I was desirous to have gone to England and expected them there but both the nonce and my cardinal[1040] are of an other opinion w*hi*ch I wil follow. I pray you doe what diligence you can to hasten them and to p*ro*cure that I be ordinarius Ang[liae]. Some Scots wold have me also to have jurisd*ict*ion over their countrie, but that I desire not.[1041] The nonce is ordinarius of both, yet being desired of a Scot to give leave to take orders, he refused becaus[e], as he said, his Holines had forbidden him to practise that auth*orit*y til he had ended some matters w*hi*ch then were consulted in Rome. I pray you also to send me word what i[t] wold cost yearly for to mantayne

[1033] Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[1034] i.e. a Jesuit.

[1035] See *Letter 68*.

[1036] Mary Villiers, countess of Buckingham.

[1037] Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

[1038] The identity of Robert Persons's sermon is unclear, but he had (in April 1597) delivered a long speech at Rome to the students of the English college there, condemning those whom he regarded as responsible for the dissensions among English Catholics, and rehearsing many of the arguments which he subsequently deployed during the appellant controversy: P.J. Holmes, '*An Epistle of Pious Grief*: an anti-appellant tract by Robert Persons', *RH*, 15 (1981), pp. 328–335; ABSJ, Collectanea N II, pp. 125–159.

[1039] William Bishop.

[1040] Cardinal Richelieu.

[1041] Cf. *Letter 32*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one in Rome, for as soone as I come to England I purpose to seek out one who may be instructed by you and assist you in y*our* paynes and save you fro*m* visits that are not necessarie, and succeed you when you shal think fit and not otherwise. You wold not think what d*ifficu*ltie I am like to find to get men to keepe up this house,[1042] p*ar*tely upon av*er*sion from my coosin[1043] and p*ar*tely of other humors and want of wil to distaste the*m* selves for the com*m*on good. Ghesse you what we shold doe if that colledg[e][1044] were put into o*ur* hands, how we shold be able to furnish it continually. Now I heare that F[ather] Berul is p*ar*ted fro*m* Rome and wilbe here within this fortnight. God give him a good jorney. I hope he bringeth my faculties. I heare also that the good b[ishop] of Ayre[1045] who so much assisted M^r^ Benet and our clergies cause is dead. I pray you earnestly com*m*end his good soule to God. I pray you imparte the contents herof to M^r^ Rant, for I am willing to use the priviledge which you both graunt me to write to you both in one letter, especially sith M^r^ Ireland writeth to him, so that if ether of us forget any thing the other may supplie it. Com*m*end me I pray you very kindly to [the] l[ord] primate,[1046] M^r^ Browne, F[ather] Anselme,[1047] M^r^ White[1048] (whose letter to his brother[1049] is sent) and to al freinds. Thus, with my hartiest to you both, I com*m*it you to the p*ro*tection of o*ur* sweet Saviour.

Paris. 30 of Jan[uary].

Y*our* servant in Christ Jesus,

R[ichard] Chalcedon

Addressed: Au r*évéren*d père, P[ère] Claude Bertin, supérieur de S^t^ Louis.
Pour Mons*ieu*r Thomas More agent des Anglois à Rome.

Endorsed: Paris. 1625. Chal[ce]don.
January 30 Recea[ved]: February 21. Answ[ered]: [February] 24.

[1042]The Collège d'Arras.
[1043]William Rayner.
[1044]The English College in Rome.
[1045]Sébastien Bouthillier.
[1046]Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh.
[1047]Robert (Anselm) Beech OSB.
[1048]Richard White.
[1049]Thomas White.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

70. Thomas Browne [Roper] to Thomas More, 28 January 1625

[AAW, B 47, no. 184]

Good cosen,

I have receaved yours of the 28 of Dec[ember] with some others which have bein disposed of accordinge unto their severall directions.

I have written unto you formerly of Villocleere who hath stoode our good freind. Whilest he was here, there came hether with him Fath[er] George[1050] but not Doct[or] Cicell. Where he is I know not, but some rather thinke he is gon towardes your partes.

The dukes journey is stayed for a tyme, which makethe us thinke all is not ripe and that the dispens[ation] is not yet comme to France. Yet they say the duke will sett forwarde to be in France against their Easter. Yet all ~~be~~ <is> but conjectures. His brother the lord of Purbeckes wife[1051] is lately brought to bedd of a sonne which the lord dothe not acknowledge to be his, and the generall opinion is that it is M[r] Rob[ert] Howardes, a younger sonne to the lord of Suffolke.[1052] The lady is restrained to hir lodginges and hath bein examined by the lord keeper about it and about hir communication with Lambe,[1053] a famous sorserer, whome formerly my Lord Windesor did prosequute, and had hanged him had he not had extraordinary good freindes who saved his life.[1054] This yonge sonne is to inherite the dukes honnors, I

[1050] George Latham SJ. On 2/12 April 1625, Anthony Champney sent news to Thomas Rant of Christian of Brunswick's sojourn in England, and that 'Father George Lathame, who went with Villoclere as his chaplayn, sayd Mass wittingly before' Brunswick 'in the embassatours presence which, had one of us done [it], would be no less than exco[mmu]nication'. That he 'who gloried to call him self flagellum sacerdotum' should be 'admitted to Mass is either to[o] much indulgence or to[o] much neglect of Gods divin[e] mysteries. That he did this <is> no fable, for we have <it> from one to whom he him self towld <it> and another who served him to Mass, and upon his comman[d] brought a chaire in for' him 'who, askeing Father George whether he was Catholike, answered yea, a sorie one': AAW, B 47, no. 47.

[1051] Frances Villiers, wife of John Villiers, 1st Viscount Purbeck, and daughter of Sir Edward Coke.

[1052] See McClure, *LJC*, pp. 599, 601.

[1053] John Lambe.

[1054] John Chamberlain commented (on 26 February 1625) that Lambe, 'a notorious old rascall' was 'condemned the last sommer at the kings bench for a rape' (of Joan Seger) and was arraigned previously 'at Worcester for bewitching my Lord Windsors ymplement': McClure, *LJC*, p. 601. An account published after Lambe's murder in 1628 recited an indictment against him in 1608 which alleged that he used 'devilish and execrable arts to disable, make infirme and consume the body and strength' of Lord Windsor: *A Briefe Description of the Notorious Life of Iohn Lambe* (Amsterdam, 1628), p. 4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

meane his earledome and baronny and his estate, if he have no isshew mayle himselfe, and therefore the duke stirreth in it as a businesse w*hi*ch concernethe him neere.

On your purification day, in the afternoone, there was some insolency offered to van Male whilest he was at evensonge.[1055] Some unruly people made great noyse at his gate, ringinge often the bell and would not, beinge warned, desiste. Hereuppon some of <his> people issh[e]wed out and some scuffeling there was, w*hi*ch noyse van Male hearinge, came downe himselfe and, as some say, bestirred himselfe and gotte into his house the constable who was one of the most forwardest and did beate <him>. In the meane tyme some of the officers of the parisshe came and so appeased the strife.

Mansfeildes shouldiers are yet on our co[a]st, and lye at ancer in the Downes. He himselfe hathe lately bein at Calais, treatinge to lande his shouldiers thereaboutes, but whither he intendes is not yet knowen.[1056] His shouldiers suffer muche a shippeboarde, especially those Germaines that came to him, who have layen longe at sea, and many of them dye. There is a new presse for 2,000 more to supply the nu*m*ber of the sicke and of those that are runne away.

We say here that his Holinesse is tutto Francese, and that he is entered into league w*i*th other princes who are to assiste him for the recovery of Naples, and that there is a general conspiracy of all the potentates of Europe for to pull downe the House of Austria, w*hi*ch consequently will weaken Catho[lic] rel[igion]. They reporte here likewise that there is a garrison of 2,000 shouldiers in Rome, lodged about Strada Julia[1057] for the better defence of the citty against the Spaniards, who are commanded out of Rome, and that his Holinesse is fortifiinge of the Burgo. None of all this I heare from you, w*hi*ch maketh me hope it is otherwise, neither is this answearable to the devotion of this yeare.

[1055]It had been remarked by Alvise Valaresso, back in November 1623, that the residence which van Male had taken was unsuitable because it was 'in a very frequented place', and 'the people coming from his Mass incurred some danger': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 150. However, in the Commons in early April 1624, John Holles complained that there was still 'great resort' of papists to the ambassadors' houses and that 'oure last Lady Day ther was three or 4,000 at Vanmales hows': Thompson, *HA*, p. 55.

[1056]On 19 January 1625, Sir John Ogle and Sir William St Leger had sent word that Mansfelt had received a 'direct prohibition', signed by Louis XIII, against landing his troops in France (primarily to avoid antagonizing Spain) but advising him to 'stand towards the Estates dominions': PRO, SP 14/182/15, fo. 23r; see also *CSPD, 1623–1625*, pp. 454, 457–462; PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 51r; *CGB*, II, pp. 586, 591; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, pp. 224, 227; *Letter 71*.

[1057]The Via Julia, near to the English College.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

About London we enjoye a kinde of calme, and yet promoters have some in chaise who rather compounde with them than stande out with them, knowinge not what the tymes hereafter will be. In remote partes they are busye in all kinde, and it is feared if the Frenche will be satisfied with what Sir George Goringe is to deliver them[1058] that then there will ensue a present persequution against the parlam[ent] which is proroged untill the 15 of Marche.

Our cosen the doctor[1059] goethe with the duke, and is makinge ritch clothes of pluche and velvette with many gardes of satten lace. M[r] Sackvell[1060] is muche reformed and goethe moderatly. I saw him yesterday in a suite garded with goulded twiste.

John [*name illegible*] was but to[o] well dealt withall by me, for after he had spent a yeare in Engl[and] he seemed desirous to retorne, and so I gave [him] 15[l] or 16[l] in his purse, which he tooke and spent and went not, but putte himselfe in to other services where he continued not longe, havinge gotten to[o] good an opinion of himselfe and, after he was from me, he borrowed money which yet he owethe me.

In hast I take leave, the 28[th] of Jan[uary] 1625.

Yours,

Th[omas] Browne

Addressed: All' illustre et molto reverendo signore, il Signore Tomasso Moro.
Roma.

Endorsed: 28 Jan[uary] 1625.

[1058]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 568; *Letter 71*.

[1059]Dr John More, the duke of Buckingham's physician. On 20 May 1625, he stood as godparent to Thomas Roper's second son, Thomas. See Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the Snare*, p. 294; McClure, *LJC*, p. 326; A. Hamilton (ed.), *The Chronicle of the English Augustinian Canonesses Regular of the Lateran, at St Monica's in Louvain*, 2 vols (London, 1904–1906), II, pedigree of Roper. He had, allegedly, been involved in the raising of money for the imperial cause against the elector palatine: *CSPV, 1619–1621*, p. 479. Sir Robert Harley had complained, in the Commons on 2 April 1624, that 'ther is a certayn thing in the town call[e]d a popishe physitian, lett him be restrayn[e]d to his hows, and go to no patient; but lett them that can take phisick of no boddy else go to him if they will (meaning [. . .] D[r] Moore)': Thompson, *HA*, p. 59. On 24 September 1624, Roper had instructed Thomas More that, if he should write to Sir Francis Cottington, John More would deliver the letter: see AAW, B 26, no. 137.

[1060]Identity uncertain.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

71. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 3/13 February 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 10*]

Right worshipful and deere syr,

I have y*our*s of the 13 of Jan[uary], and I assure my self that ere this you know that I was consecrated above a moneth agoe b[ishop] of Chalcedon and have al this while expected my faculties w*hi*ch are not yet comen. M[r] Berul is arrived and I was at his house to see him, but he was gone forth. If I could have spoken with him, I shold have written some thing to you touching my faculties more than I can doe now. But, for my self, I shal be contented if I have such as my predec*es*sor[1061] had,[1062] and that his Hol[iness] be content that I observe the Councel of Trent, w*hi*ch my cousin Rainer wil not have to bind in England,[1063] nor me to observe, and p*er*haps he speaketh not of himself but of others who wold have no lawes to bind them. Wherfor I pray you know what his Hol[iness's] pleasure is therin, but not as fro*m* y*ou*r self if you can by other means. I pray you get if you can thos[e] articles betwene the b[ishop] of Holland[1064] and the Jes[uits]. M[r] Ed[ward] Benet hath certaine articles betwixt them. I know not whether they be thos[e] wherof you write; as also I pray you let me know what that letter of M[r] Prat[1065] conteineth and to what purpose it is used. My good cosin[1066] here made great blusterings about it, but

[1061] William Bishop.

[1062] On 3/13 March, Smith wrote to More that his recently arrived faculties were 'sparing ynough, for they are ad beneplacitum sedis Ap[osto]licae, and subordinate to the nonce in France, but I hope they wil serve for the time': AAW, B 47, no. 15.

[1063] Subsequently, this was a position concerning the decrees of the Council of Trent which tended to be associated with the Jesuits: *NCC*, p. 56.

[1064] Philip Rovenius.

[1065] James Pratt. See *Letters 62*, *74*. Back in the third week of November 1624, this manuscript letter was known to be in circulation. It alleged that the Jesuits were being evicted from their gentry residences by the seculars: see AAW, B 27, no. 53. More notified John Jackson on 15/25 January 1625 that 'it was my chance to see the coppie of a letter, subscribed by James Pratt, writt to a nobleman whose father keapt in his house a Jesuit who is said to have made an oration to the k[ing] of Spayne in Vallad[olid] Colledg[e], afferming in the name of all the Cath[olics] in Ingland obedience to the said k[ing]'. However, 'this letter seemeth to caste the Jes[uits] as dangerouse men and suspected of the estate and therefore wisheth the nobleman to take order in that matter and not to endanger him self with such parsons. I wold request you to inquire wher you can of such a man as James Pratt', for, More thought, 'the letter is counterfeit and onlie shewed to draw some imputation upon our companie as seeking the displacing of Jesuites and the undoing of such parsons'. More believed that 'it can not be gathered by the letter that the writer was a preist, noe nor soe much as a Cath[olic], which maketh mee suspect false dealing': AAW, A XIX, no. 2, pp. 3–4; see also AAW, A XIX, no. 7, pp. 19–20.

[1066] William Rayner.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the nonce[1067] wold not be knowne to have seene any such. D[octor] Cecil much urged a meeting of some pr[iests] and Jes[uits] before the nonce, and he was inclined therto but, finding that Jes[uits] must be co[mman]ded therto, he is now not so forward. As I think I have written to you already, that [*sic*] I suppose M^r^ Townly[1068] hath repaid the 8^l^ which I lent him becaus[e] so much is given to the man in London to whome I appointed him to pay it. M^r^ Dorington[1069] and M^r^ Hall[1070] are not yet arrived here.[1071] When they come we shal do them what pleasure we can. Thus much touching the contents of y*our* letter. Hither are sent from o*ur* prince to Madam[1072] great p*re*sents w*hi*ch some French men value at a million of crownes, others at 800 thousands. The k[ing] is not thought to come so soone as was expected. Mansfeild is p*ar*ted withe his men from England, but as yet we heare not where he is landed. The speech is that he is to land about Bergen up Zome.[1073] F[ather] Barnes hath put forth his booke [*illegible note in margin*] De Equivoc*ation*e, w*hi*ch was condemned in the Indice P*ro*hibitorum befor it came forth, w*hi*ch p*er*haps hath made him take out that p*ar*te of the title (Contra Lessiu*m*).[1074] Here the Jesuit wil goe for confessarius whatsoever become of it, though he be sent back agayne,

[1067]Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

[1068]This may be Richard Townley of Norton in Lincolnshire. See AAW, A XIX, no. 109, pp. 387–388, no. 110, pp. 389–390.

[1069]A reference, perhaps, to either Francis or Robert Dorrington. See *NCC*, p. 118.

[1070]On 24 September 1624, Thomas Roper had written to inform More that 'there is gone uppe towardes you one M^r^ George Hall that was your sister Burdes neighbour': AAW, B 26, no. 137. For the return of Dorrington and Hall via Paris (reported by Richard Ireland on 15/25 February 1625), Rheims, and Flanders, see AAW, B 47, no. 124.

[1071]On 30 October/9 November 1624, More had informed John Jackson that 'manie of our cowntrie are come up' to Rome, including Richard White, who 'came with a young Cotton', i.e. a member of the Cotton family of Warblington in Hampshire. The 'Henslowes alsoe come some month after from Florence', while 'from Doway came' not only George Hall but also 'M^r^ North, M^r^ [Richard] Charnock, M^r^ Griffin, M^r^ Shirburne, Damport and others': AAW, B 27, no. 42; see CRS, 10, p. 230.

[1072]Henrietta Maria.

[1073]For Mansfelt's attempt to disembark his infantry, while his cavalry was being marshalled by Christian of Brunswick at Calais, see Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 228; *CCE*, p. 204; *CGB*, II, pp. 604, 608, 609.

[1074]John Barnes's *Dissertatio contra Aequivocationes* (Paris, 1625) received approbation from the Sorbonne, though publication was delayed because (as the earl of Carlisle related), after half of the book was printed, the Jesuits informed the papal nuncio, Spada, who complained to the king. A temporary halt was secured to the printing of it, while Spada demanded that the book should be sent to Rome for perusal there. Nevertheless it was available by early 1625, even though it had been censured by the Inquisition on 14/24 December 1624: Allison, RSGB, I, pp. 365–366; ARCR, I, nos 65–67; PRO, SP 78/72, fos 348r, 362r; PRO, SP 78/73, fo. 163v. Smith recorded on 16/26 February that the book was condemned in Rome. But it was 'approved here' both by the Sorbonne and the parlement of Paris, and was 'much esteemed, and surely it decifreth the equivocators and sheweth them to be impostors': Allison, RSGB, I, p. 366. Barnes's book attacked Jesuit attitudes to mental

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

so they are resolved to put our k[ing] to it, and to hazard the whole matter rather than they shold misse of that office, and yet p*er*haps they may misse of their purpose, but here none wil directly oppose again[s]t them, though it be for the com*m*on good. Besid[es], the ladie, as I heare, liketh not the man who is appointed her confessor.[1075] There is one executed in Roan, for matters touching the k[ing] his person, who hath accused twoe Jes[uits], for w*hi*ch they are in prison and what the event wilbe I know not. A pri*ncip*al Jes[uit] went hence thither for to help them, and an other here in his sermon touched [*sic*] that an order ought not to be worse thought of for the fault of one or twoe.[1076] We heare no more of the rebellion of Soubize, so that it is like that al that matter is [*word illegible*].[1077] I pray you, by y*our* next, confer with M^r^ Rant and send me such a copie of com*m*ission as you think fit, for by that time I hope I shal have my faculties and have com*m*unicated with my brethren in England. Of late, M^r^ Colleton, M^r^ Blunt and the provincial of [the] Bened[ictines] have met and agreed that no newse of the estate of Catho[lics] in England shal be beleved here unles they al write. For hitherto it was a shame how contrarie relations were sent hither. F[ather] George[1078] saieth that F[ather] Rudesind[1079] told him that they were drawne to the articles betwixt my prede*cess*or and them ad redimenda*m* vexatione*m*,[1080] w*hi*ch I beleve not, yet I write that you may know what is said therof. I pray you acquaint M^r^ Rant with this and read his for I have written d*iff*erent things to you. I pray com*m*end me most respectively to my l[ord] primat,[1081] and also to M^r^ Browne and M^r^ White. And thus with my hartiest to y*our* [*word omitted:* self], I com*m*it you to the p*ro*tection of o*ur* sweet Savior.

reservation. Carlisle praised the book's vindication of the 'lives of kings from the fraude of equivocations': PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 362r. For Barnes's dispute with other members of his order over their recently united English congregation, see Lunn, *The English Benedictines*, pp. 108–109.

[1075]See *Letters 64*, *68*.

[1076]A report in the foreign state papers describes how 'a priest at Rouen' was 'broken upon the wheele for having a purpose to kill the king because he ayded heretiques in the Valtelin and Germany'. The two Jesuits accused by him had been brought to Paris, 'but it is thought the thing wilbe smothered, and they brought to no farther question'. The writer believed that the alleged plot 'was partly cause that Mansfield was not suffred to land in France': PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 83r.

[1077]For Benjamin de Rohan, baron of Soubise's rebellion in January 1625, see *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 562, 563, 567, 582, 588; M.P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562–1629* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 185–186; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 230; Elliott, *The Count-Duke of Olivares*, pp. 223, 227; PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 96r; *Letter 72*.

[1078]George Latham SJ.

[1079]William (Rudesind) Barlow OSB.

[1080]See *Letter 35*.

[1081]Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

13 of Febr[uary].

Your servant in Christ Jesus,

R[ichard] Chalcedon

Addressed: To the right worship*ful* M[r] Thomas More.

Endorsed: Paris. 1625. February 13. Lord Chalch[edon]. Recea[ved]: March 6. Answ[ered]: [March] 10.

72. [John Jackson] to Thomas Rant, 14 February 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 162*]

V[ery] r[everend] sir,

I will not be long in your debt. This day I receyved yours of which my h[onourable] f[riend],[1082] by whom yow are kindly remembred, said that it was short and sweet. Neyther M[r] M[ore] nor your selfe take notice of two former of myne nor of the relation concerning Fa[ther] Blunt and me.[1083] I suspect it is intercepted. Yow must expect no great newes. I have not been in London since 7[ber]. Concerning matters of religion, they are handled after the wonted maner. Fayre promises, now and then some ease, and by that tyme the fame therof cometh to that place, and some desired proceedings therupon, the stream runneth as it did before. The pursuivants range and rage in Yorkshire,[1084] thowgh his Majestie did write a lettre to the b[ishop][1085] (at the Fr[ench] imbassadors motion) to the contrary.[1086] M[r] Metcalfe, a

[1082] A reference, perhaps, to Thomas Arundell, 1st Baron Arundell.

[1083] See *Letter 51*.

[1084] See AAW, A XIX, no. 4, p. 12 (concerning the enforcement of 'a new commission [. . .] for searching' which had been issued on 23 January 1625 by the 'highe commission to the Blanshardes', for whom see Richard Cholmeley, 'The memorandum book of Richard Cholmeley of Brandsby 1602–1623', *North Yorkshire County Record Office Publications*, 44 (1988), pp. 143, 175, 193, 202, 218, 228).

[1085] Archbishop Tobias Mathew.

[1086] For the king's letter to the archbishop of York, dated 26 December 1624, ordering the suspension of proceedings in the high commission court, see PRO, SP 14/177/27; *Letter 65*. An undated memorandum noted that this letter – and an identical missive to the archbishop of Canterbury – did not extend to the episcopal courts, and so the archbishops should intervene to prevent all process against Catholics there: PRO, SP 14/177/28. Thomas Roper had observed, on 21 January 1625, that the English Catholics were indebted to Villeauxclercs but, 'since his departure, thinges have not bein accordingely performed and, whereas there was a letter written unto the bissh[op] of Yorke by the kinge for a cessation, it was recauled before it was sent, with a promise of more ample satisfaction in another kinde': AAW, B 47, no. 186. (John Hacket implied, in his biography of Lord Keeper Williams, that Williams had

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

preist, is there co*n*demned since Christmas at a gaole delivery.[1087] The oath [is] tendred at th*e* ports. The informers at Londo*n* served process, as they did of late on th*e* La[dy] Carill and the La[dy] Mulleneux her daughter.[1088] M^r^ Penny w*i*th his nephew M^r^ Mathewes were here of late, and then yow can not doubt of ~~yo*u*r~~ o*u*r often speech of yo*u*r selfe. I excus*e*d yow what I co[u]ld, for both himselfe and his sister mervailed as much they heard not fro*m* yow as yow of his silence. We hear th*a*t his Hol[iness] hath writte*n* to th*e* k[ing] of France to know whether he will avow the proceeding of his generall w*i*th th*e* Grisons; and, if he doe, he must declare himselfe against him. Or, if he had noe com*m*ission, th*a*t he will punish him. The k[ing] hath returned a delatory answer th*a*t, if he have done soe much, he hath exceeded his com*m*ission, but he will not co*n*demne him untill he hear him speak; and soe desires forbearance. O*u*r soldiers th*a*t went w*i*th Mansf[elt] are on th*e* coast of Holla*n*d or [Zeal]a*n*d, but in th*eir* shipps. It is thought to be doone by appointme*n*t that the [*sic*] 2,000 of the French may joyne w*i*th them, [and] that France and Ingl[and] both may equally countenance and avow the action. It is said th*a*t Subize hath taken an other fort call[e]d Bl[a]vet in Britany.[1089] I suppose yow have long since heard of his

managed to persuade Villeauxclercs to moderate his determination to procure concessions for English Catholics: Hacket, *SR*, part I, pp. 213–222, part II, p. 6.)

On 13 February, Williams promised Conway that he would use Conway's warrant to summon 'any of the archbyshopp of Yorke his officers or any one imployed in that highe comission [. . .] upon whom complaint shalbe made for eagernes of proseqution against the Roman Catholiques in this time', and to 'signifie unto them, privatelye and yeat as pressingelye as the occasion shall require, his Majestyes just pleasure for theyr discreet behaviour in the execution of that part of theyre offices in this considerable time of his Majestyes most weightye negociation'. Nevertheless, Williams advised that, if the king wanted to command the judges and JPs 'to be moderate [. . .] in the enquiringe out of Roman Catholiques either by the statute of 12^d^ a Sundaye or by enditements in the quarter sessions', this would require a specific letter from the king telling Williams to issue the necessary order: PRO, SP 14/183/54, fo. 85r. The marquis of Effiat expressed misgivings, and diplomatic protests followed: PRO, SP 78/74, fos 68r–69r, 74r. For the attempt to give assurances to Villeauxclercs concerning the orders directed to Archbishop Mathew, see PRO, SP 14/184/8; PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 80r–v. For Williams's justification, in mid-March, of the regime's proceedings concerning recusants, see *Cabala*, pp. 105–106. On 17 March, Williams remarked to Buckingham that 'you are informed' that copies of the letters to the two archbishops 'are spread abroad in Staffordshire to his Majestyes disadvantage (for soe it is)'. Williams hoped that Effiat might 'thereby [. . .] perceive the bent of the Englishe Catholiques, which is not to procure ease and quietnes to themselves but scandals to their neighbourhinge Protestants and discontentments against the kinge and state': BL, Harleian MS 7000, fo. 174v.

[1087]Brian Metcalf was sentenced on 23 January 1625: Anstr., II, p. 218; AAW, A XIX, no. 4, p. 12; PRO, SP 14/185/54, fo. 84v.

[1088]Mary, the daughter of Sir Thomas Caryll and his wife, Mary (Tufton) of Shipley in Sussex, had married Sir Richard Molyneux of Sefton in Lancashire: Cokayne, *CP*, IX, p. 45. I am grateful to Gabriel Glickman for assistance with this reference.

[1089]See Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 230; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 567, 582; Avenel, *Lettres*, II, pp. 65–66.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

taking of the isle by Rochell.[1090] They write that the e[arl] of Carlile, now knight of the Garter, cometh over to hasten the mariage, and that the d[uke] shall goe to Calis to fetch the la[die]. Sir Wa[l]ter Aston is sent for owt of Spaine, some say for writing to our k[ing] a project about the Palatinate for which the prince is displeased.[1091] Your relation of that good b[ishop] is gratefull. I praye excuse me with all respect to M[r] More at this tyme. I know this shall be common to both, and the next week, God willing, I will write to him. It seems our b[ishop][1092] was consecrated before yow knew he had his bulls. M[r] Penny told me he mervelled that M[r] Bartled the Jes[uit] was suffred to stay in that country, there goe so many speeches of him.[1093] The widowe <M[rs]> Hauker (said he) telleth scurvy and fowl things <of him>; and ther daughters, who are fallen, doe the like. He shold have been at a howse of note this Christmas and a <lay> gentleman, who bare some stroak there, said that if he came, himselfe wold depart. Thus reformed are the Jes[uits] in Ing[land]. There is a Scotish Jesuite[1094] with Monsignor Fiat the imb[assador], who in likelyhood got the Capuchines[1095] place by a pretty wile, which I shall write in some other lettre. Now I take my leave of yow both in hartiest maner, and rest.

Yours assured.

Your lettre bears date the 4[th] of Jan[uary], and I write this the 14[th] of Feb[ruary]. We had newes 14 dayes since that the Archd[uke] Charles was dead at Madrid,[1096] and the k[ing] sick. And now it is said in the country that he is also dead. But we have it by noe letter from London.

Addressed: To the right worshipfull my worthy freind M[r] Rant, at Rome.

Endorsed: Received: 11 Aprill.

[1090] See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 562.
[1091] Cf. *ibid*., pp. 569, 590, 591.
[1092] Richard Smith.
[1093] See *Letter 60*.
[1094] A letter written on 31 December 1624 by the Scottish Jesuit John Macbreck to Muzio Vitelleschi claimed that the writer had been summoned from Scotland by the marquis of Effiat to take Patrick Anderson SJ's place and to serve as Effiat's confessor: ABSJ, Stonyhurst Anglia A II, 3, no. 15; ABSJ Stonyhurst Anglia A IV, no. 26, pp. 19–20; Forbes-Leith, *Narratives of Scottish Catholics*, p. 314; Foley, VII, p. 483. See also *Letter 75*.
[1095] Ange de Raconis.
[1096] For the death of the archduke (the emperor's brother) at Madrid on 18/28 December 1624, see AAW, B 47, no. 76; *Cabala*, p. 167; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 62r. For the purpose of his recent journey to Spain, see PRO, SP 78/72, fo. 362v; Elliott, *The Count-Duke of Olivares*, p. 218.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

73. Paul Overton [Peter Snod][1097] to Thomas Rant, 15 February 1625

[*AAW, B 26, no. 13*]

R*igh*t r*everen*d worthy sir,

I have not hetherto tooke uppon <mee> to write unto you, beinge unacquainted, and knowinge the determination of a setled correspondence to bee kept betweene M^r^ More and M^r^ Muskett.[1098] But M^r^ Coleton intimates unto mee that you are desirous more often to bee informed than he can performe, for many imployments. And this is the cause principall that I beginne nowe to intrude my selfe into a correspondence w*i*th you. To beginne with o*u*r generall estate of Catholikes: ~~it~~ you p*er*adventure heare that wee are in security, but it is not soe. Writs are daylie served by informers, excommunications pronounced in publike church by ministers; noe order is given to the judges nowe goinge theire circuits, noe restrainte of exactinge 12^d^ a weeke, and the promise of repayment out of the exchequer is driven of[f] from p*er*formance w*i*th faire words, ut verbo dicam. Spes alit agricolas. Yet is the French amb[assador][1099] daylie, and earnestly, though frustra, solicited.[1100] The present generall opinion of the duke [of] Buckinghams goeinge for the lady of France is that he sets forward a fortnight or three weekes hence. It is only opinion, yet of good probabilitie. It is conjectured most hast wilbe made least Gondomar, whoe is saide to come hethereward, should trouble the streame. The Viscountes Purbecke hath lately beene in question about

[1097]See Anstr., II, p. 302. Snod had become secretary to the secular clergy's episcopal chapter in 1624.

[1098]George Fisher.

[1099]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[1100]On 12 March 1625, Secretary Conway sent the attorney-general a list of Catholics presented by Effiat, and asked advice on how 'the king's grace may be most conveniently bestowed, but not in the public way they desire': *CSPD, 1623–1625*, p. 496. On the same day, Archbishop Abbot complained to Conway that Effiat had been told on numerous occasions that a named individual, John Tapper, for whom the French ambassador had evidently interceded, was not in prison for his religion: PRO, SP 14/185/47; see also *CSPD, 1623–1625*, pp. 494, 504; PRO, SP 14/185/95. For the attorney-general's advice concerning the London prisoners whose cases the French ambassador had taken up, see PRO, SP 14/185/54. He argued that each case should be separately investigated, and he advised that presentments and convictions of recusants should not cease but that forfeitures as a result of conviction should be prevented: *ibid.* Williams gave the same advice, in effect, to Buckingham on 13 March: *Cabala*, pp. 105–106.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a man childe of hers nowe come to light, thoughe into the world a yeare since, and ~~that~~ certaine images of waxe, as the dukes and some others, are reported to bee found in her cabinet, uppon w*hi*ch Lambe, the sorcerer formerly condemned in the kings bench for a rape and a murther, is nowe againe close prisoner in the kings bench, and the twoe gentlewomen of the viscountesse in the Gatehouse.[1101] The starre chamber will hereafter discover more of this matter, where it is thought this whole cause shall come to triall. O*u*r parliament is put of[f] till March, and is thought will then be adjourned to Michaelmas. This is the p*re*sent face of ~~o*u*r~~ times. Touchinge o*u*rselves, M^r^ Coleton and the rest desire that the motion, alreddy on foote, for fower more b*ishop*s bee followed, and that earnest sute bee made to settle faculties and jurisdiction of goverment uppon some office and the parson bearinge it for the time beeinge, [so] that, if God take away o*u*r b[ishop],[1102] as he did the former,[1103] wee bee not left destitute of order in goverment. Thus, w*i*th my best respect to yo*u*r selfe and M^r^ More, I rest.

Yo*u*rs alwaies to command,

Paule Overton

15 Feb[ruary] 1624.

The inclosed I desire you to deliver if you can, and in most courteous manner commend mee to M^r^ Browne. His mother is in health, redeemed from Jesuitesses.

Addressed: To his much respected good freinde M^r^ Thomas Rante, these. Rome.

Endorsed: Letters sent to M^r^ Rant and M^r^ More. 1624, 1625. XV. No. XV.

74. George Musket [Fisher] to Thomas Rant, 18 February 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 155*]

Right w*orshipf*ull,

I have yours of the 18 of Janu[ary] in wich you certifie that the dispensatio*n* is graunted, but no speach <yet> of the coming of the

[1101] See *Letter 70*.
[1102] Richard Smith.
[1103] William Bishop.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lady, although many be of opinion that the match will goe forward, and the duke[1104] still maketh great preparation for that jorney, yet it is uncertaine when he will goe. But that wich most troubleth us is that no effectuall course is taken for the redresse of our miseries. Many still complaine, especially in the North, and Lancaster goale [*sic*] is furnished at this present with 15 prisoners, 2 pr[iests] and 13 lay men,[1105] and no course taken for the[ir] release, nor for the stay of persecution ther, so that they expect daily more prisoners. And the justices ther ar so forward that they urge the paiment of 12[d] for every Sonday and call poore people before them and tender the oath. And upon refusall they comitt, insomuch that an honest [?] gentleman of that country told me that he thought he knewe above on[e] hundred wich were fallen away for feare of this danger. Neither must you thinke that they alone ar persecuted, for others in all parts have ther share in thes[e] miseries and know not how to helpe themselves. It is thought the parliament will be put of[f] untill May, but as yet it is not certainly concluded. Uncertaine rumors ar spread of Mansfield and his forces, some say, and this is more credible that he is not yet landed, and that many of his soldiars ar dead with hunger and cold, and that this expedition will come to nothing in the end. Ricardus Calcedonensis[1106] is not yet come, but we expect him daily, and hope shortly to injoy him. I know not what to say to that letter of James Pratt.[1107] It is like, as you say, that it was the ground of those scandalous reports you mention, and I [see] no reason why, <for> the passion of on[e] man, they should lay an imputation upon all priests, as though they terrified Catholikes for keeping of Jesuits if they keepe themselves within ther bounds. I hope we shall live in peace with them. The French ambas[sador][1108] still remaineth <here> and now ther is no speach of his remove, but, to speake truth, he doeth us litle or no good so farr as I can perceive, for wich cause he is not so much respected as others his predecessors have bin.[1109] We ar not yet certaine of the coming of the earle of Gondomar,

[1104]George Villiers, 1st duke of Buckingham.

[1105]On 4 March, Fisher claimed that there were two priests and fifteen lay Catholics imprisoned there: AAW, B 47, no. 159.

[1106]Richard Smith.

[1107]See *Letter 71*.

[1108]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[1109]Thomas Roper reported to Thomas More, on 12 March 1625, that he had recently 'sent [. . .] some particulars of what had passed in Yorkeshire and Linconsheere about which some <came> uppe hether to seeke remedy, and with much difficulty they obtayned a letter of his Majesties to the justices for their forbearance to proceede furder in suche businesses without expresse leave of his Majestie, to which' the marquis of Effiat 'gave no assistance, beinge much displeased with the recusantes whome he sayed, with their letters, had don him ill offices in France and R[ome] and therefor he would have nothinge to doe with them': AAW, B 47, no. 178.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

although some ar of opinion that certainly he will come this spring. If you heare any thing of Ormus[1110] or Brasile, let us be partakers. I have no more to impart but my best love wich is allwaies yours, so I rest.

Yours assuredly,

M[usket] G[eorge]

Febr[uary] 18 1624 co*m*poto Anglicano.

Addressed: To the right wo*rshipfu*ll M[r] Thomas More.

Endorsed: Feb[ruary] 18. Received: 5 Aprill.

75. Thomas Roper to Thomas More, 24 February 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 181*]

Good cosen,

Your last is of the 25 of Jan[uary]. You will perceave, by this relation I send you, how many suffer for their recusancy, though I presume you are made beleeve otherw[a]ys.

M[r] Bisshoppes name is James, and not Bernaby, that is to be employed into your partes.[1111] We say here that ~~the dis~~ thoughe the dispensation be comme to Paris, yet it is directed to the nuntio[1112] and to remayne in his handes untill the two kinges be agreed, and that it is clogged with some conditions w*hi*ch are not pleasinge unto us, withall that the Frenche kinge insistethe to have the same freedome for his Ma*jes*ties subjectes that are Romaine Catholi[cs] that the Frenche Protestants have in France.[1113] The coppy of the dispensation was brought the last weeke by M[r] Carey[1114] and one Seton,[1115] but it geavethe us no content.

[1110]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 286; PRO, SP 94/25, fo. 348r.

[1111]Six days previously, Roper had written to More that 'it is reported that Barneby Bisshoppe, nephew to our last prelate [*i.e.* William Bishop], shall be employed to your course by his Majestie. He is a humaniste but very unfitte for any negotiation': AAW, A XIX, no. 7, p. 19. See also AAW, B 47, no. 77.

[1112]Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

[1113]On 4 March 1625, George Fisher had observed that 'the king of France standeth much <as I heare> uppon conditions for religion and <for> as much toleration as he graunteth his Hugonots in France'. Fisher thought that this would cause James 'to pause at least untill the parliament be ended, wich beginneth the 15 of this moneth, for as yet I cannot heare of any prorogation': AAW, B 47, no. 159; see also Hacket, *SR*, part I, p. 214.

[1114]A reference, presumably, to Thomas Carey.

[1115]Captain John Seton. See *CSPD, 1623–1625*, pp. 249, 486; PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 60v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There was the last weeke some conference after dinner at the Frenche amb[assador's][1116] betwene Monsieur Molines, the famous minister of France, and one Kelly, a Scottishe man, before the ambass[ador], who allso did argue in defence of our religion. The mannor of the conference was related unto me by one of the padri[1117] who was present with Father Fissher[1118] (who alwayes is one), yet he ~~hathe~~ <sayed> they were bothe of them there by accident. Yet some are otherwayes persuaded. Monsieur Molines dined with the ambass[ador] and after dinner the ambass[ador] gave occasion of discourse of matters of religion unto Monsieur Molines who entred into a long discourse, sermon like, runninge throughe many pointes of controversy and was severall tymes interrupted by M[r] Kelly who required him to pause a while, that he might make some answeare to some one or two pointes of his discourse on which he would insiste, beinge [*sic*] it would be to[o] tedious to answere all he had sayed. And so, after some importunity, they insisted uppon some two heads, whereof marriadge of preistes was one, and so tooke occasion to expounde some generall conseiles. Father Fisher made some one argument or two in forme to which Molines made answeare, and the most of the conference was with Kelly whome the padri commended to have don well, and to be very readdy in controversies, havinge a good Frenche and Latin tongue. As they were arguinge, Molines sonne was allso arguinge in the same roome with others, but after some houres or mores discourse they all ended abruptely, for the conference was confused, every one speakinge without order, and no judge appointed. At the partinge, the ambass[ador] told Molines that he thought he could have sayed more for his religion, and that he should never persuade him, and so caused him to be accompanyed to his coache.

The Easte India company caused one Greeneberry ~~to~~, a painter, to drawe them a picture wherein they did expresse the great cruelties with al the Holl[anders] had used against our Ingleshe at Amboina, and this picture they did intende to sette in their haule. The Hollenders complayned to our counsell, who sent for Greeneberry who, understandinge <the cause> thereof, went accompayned [*sic*] with ten of the committe[e] of the company, who did affirme unto the lords that they had sett him a worke. The counseile have forbidden the picture to be exposed to the vew of the vulgar.[1119]

[1116]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[1117]i.e. Jesuits.

[1118]John Percy SJ.

[1119]For the Amboyna incident of February 1623 (reported in England in mid-1624), see *Letter 48*; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 274–275; McClure, *LJC*, pp. 562–563; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 343,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

None of those particulars that were granted to Villocleere are yet performed.

My yonge Lord Dormer[1120] is on Monday next to be married to my lord of Montgomeries daughter[1121] *w*ith little contentment to his freindes.[1122]

One Taylour,[1123] secretary to Conte de Gondemar, arrived here some two dayes agoe, and is gon *w*ith the Spanishe agent[1124] to courte. The reporte is that he hathe written unto the kinge that his M*aje*stie will be pleased to send one of his shippes to the Groina for him, he not beinge well able to travell by land.

Sir G[eorge] Colverte, I am tolde, is rectus in C. R.,[1125] and it <is> sayed he intendes to goe <a viaggio> to the New Founde Land where he hathe a share in that plantation.[1126]

I have written two lines ~~to~~ in Italian about your writinge of your luoghi de m*on*ti w*hi*ch <you say> is in the procurer of the colledges

359; PRO, SP 14/168/48; PRO, SP 94/31, fo. 233v. The East India Company wanted the incident made the subject of a stage play, but the Dutch appealed to the privy council to have this prevented: PRO, SP 14/184/22; McClure, *LJC*, p. 602.

[1120]Robert Dormer, 2nd Baron Dormer.

[1121]Anna Sophia, daughter of Philip Herbert, 1st earl of Montgomery.

[1122]See McClure, *LJC*, p. 605. One of Joseph Mead's correspondents observed how John Prideaux, vice-chancellor of Oxford, had 'at the earl of Montgomery's lodging [. . .] bestowed three days in catechizing the young Lord Dormer and the Lady Anne Herbert, and the last Sunday administered the Lord's supper unto them', and then 'married them by special licence of the archbishops; of which young lord much good is conceived, though his mother be an absolute recusant': Birch, *CTJI*, II, p. 503.

[1123]Henry Taylor: see Anstr., II, p. 314; *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 610, 616, 621; AAW, B 47, no. 159. On 10 March, Fisher understood that, following Henry Taylor's return to Spain, Gondomar would travel to England, 'wich I hope will be about Easter or soone after': AAW, B 47, no. 154.

[1124]Jacques Bruneau.

[1125]i.e. the Church of Rome.

[1126]See J.D. Krugler, *English and Catholic: the Lords Baltimore in the seventeenth century* (Baltimore, MD, 2004), ch. 3. On 3/13 February, Richard Ireland believed that Calvert had been imprisoned in the Tower: AAW, B 47, nos 120, 129. For the conferment of Calvert's Irish peerage (Baltimore), noted by John Jackson on 21 February, 'that the world shold not conceyve he was put from his secretariship in disgrace', see AAW, B 47, no. 163; Krugler, *English and Catholic*, p. 74. Calvert had made provision in May 1624 to resign his office to Sir Dudley Carleton, though Secretary Conway suspected him of double dealing and thought that he 'intended to bring the king to take notice that he is excluded from business and therefore desires to be rid of his place', and then James would 'set all again where it was two years since': PRO, SP 14/164/7; Ruigh, *1624*, p. 288, n. 37. In fact, he surrendered his office to Sir Albert Morton: Krugler, *English and Catholic*, p. 68; BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 165r. On 26 February 1625, Chamberlain noted that Calvert 'is gon into the North with Sir Tobie Mathew which confirmes the opinion that he is a bird of that feather': McClure, *LJC*, p. 603; see also BL, Additional MS 72255, fo. 166v. Calvert was offered the option of remaining a privy councillor if he would take the oath of allegiance, but he refused: McClure, *LJC*, p. 609; *Letter 81*; Krugler, *English and Catholic*, p. 73.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

handes. I am confident it was never delivered unto him by me, but if I had it I did deliver it to fath[er] rector who then was Fath[er] Owen,[1127] he beinge dead.[1128] This rector[1129] turnethe you to this Carlo.[1130]

I doe make a question whether these few lines of myne will doe you any good for, if they be disposed to caville, they will stande to have it more authenticall. If M[r] Heines had bein in towne, I would have <had> it don by him as protonario apost[olico].

If M[r] Clayton be *wi*th you, I pray you tell him that my Lady Appleton[1131] dyed this last night. The 24 Feb[ruary] 1625.

Yours,

T[homas] R[oper]

No address.

Endorsed: Writt[en]: 24 Febr[uary].
Receaved: 11 Aprill.
Answ[ered]: 19 Aprill.

76. Henry Clifford to Thomas More, 25 February/7 March 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 70*]

Wor*shipfu*ll and r*everen*d s*i*r,

I have yo*u*rs of the 15 February, and have dispatched the inclosed for England, from whence the last weekes post brought you no l*ett*res, and he of this weeke is not yet come. M[r] Tho[mas] Roper is very busie in an intricate busines betwene his father and hime, w*hi*ch is com*m*itted to arbitrement, and the last weeke they were all busie abowt it. In England promoters are busie, and the worlde beginns to doubt of the match w*i*th France; upon what grownds I knowe not, for great jewells have bene sent.[1132] Messengers goe up and downe. The earle of Carlile remaines still in France and, by the procuration of the queene mother,[1133] is named knight of Garter. And these assistants of

[1127]Thomas Owen SJ. See *NAGB*, p. 9.
[1128]See PRO, SP 77/13, fo. 145r; see also AAW, B 27, no. 58.
[1129]Thomas Fitzherbert SJ.
[1130]Carlo, as named by Roper, was the procurator in question: AAW, B 27, no. 75.
[1131]Joan Sheldon, wife of Sir Henry Appleton, 2nd baronet, of South Benfleet, Essex. Margaret Roper, sister of William Roper of Eltham (d. 1577), had married Henry Appleton of Dartford.
[1132]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 615–619.
[1133]Marie de Médicis.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mansfielde hath bene jointly from both kings, the one furnishing him with foot, and the other with horse, and both with mony. And it likely that the course [*i.e.* cause] of the delay is to see the effects of this project of Mansfielde. He is by Gertembergh[1134] with his English expecting his horse from France, who all the last weeke were embarked at Calais.[1135] No <man> suffered to stay on the key while they were shipped. But on Sunday night, 23 February, there was so terrible a north-west winde that it drowned in that haven 3 shipps of the French kings (whereof one was the viceadmirall), a shipp of warre of the Hollanders, and Lambert the commaunder was forced to cutt downe the main mast of his owne shipp, and much spoile did it upon lesser botes. So it was Thursday following before Halberstate[1136] could begin to shipp his horse.[1137] At Flushing also this tempest did much spoile, and cast away a shippe wherein was our English souldiers. At Amsterdame it drowned divers vessells, whereof some were shipps of warre bound for the West Indies. Mansfeeld can not be readie yet these 15 dayes, but our soldiers expect him with great desire, of whom the countrey is full, sufferinge by them greate spoile and miserie.

I had yesternight a lettre from the leaguer from Captaine Bentley,[1138] who writes that their streangth and new supply would gladly have Mansfielde come nearer. He can doo them no harme, nor in any probable discourse releeve Breda, except God Almightie punish us by this meanes for our sinns, which I hope his mercye will preserve and assist us against the enemies of his truth.[1139]

Both the fleetes of Spaine are now gone for Brasill, and are to meete at Capo Verde. God speede them well.[1140]

Here is a relation of horrible sacrileges, execrable barba[r]ismes and such impiouse insolencies that the French have committed upon Catholicks and their churches and aultars in the Valteline, as no Turke nor profane beast coulde doo more. O greate miserie that such

[1134]Geertruidenberg. See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 603; *CCE*, p. 206; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 228.

[1135]See *Letter 71*; *CCE*, p. 204.

[1136]Christian of Brunswick, administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt.

[1137]See *HMCMK*, p. 220.

[1138]A reference, presumably, to Frederick Bentley, who was a cousin of the archpriest William Harrison, and whose father, Edward, had married Catherine, the daughter of Sir William Roper of Eltham and Canterbury. Frederick Bentley fought for the Habsburgs in Flanders: see AAW, B 25, no. 38; Anstr., II, p. 23; Hamilton, *Chronicle of the English Augustinian Canonesses Regular*, II, pedigree of Roper.

[1139]See *CCE*, p. 213.

[1140]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, pp. 512, 544, 573; *Cabala*, pp. 166–167. On 4/14 March 1625, Clifford expressed the hope that 'the armadas that be gone to Brasill will remoove the Hollander, and ruine him there, being the nation that pester[s] the worlde': AAW, B 47, no. 77.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

monsters doo fight and serve under him that hath the name of the most Christian king.[1141]

Breda, no question, is in great affliction, but confideth that Mansfielde will helpe. But the marques[1142] hath sent them word if, at the surrendering of the towne, he finde not a months provision he will leave them to the spoile of the souldiers.

Your brother[1143] is very well and recommends his love. So are his, as farre as we heare. My wife thanks you for your charitable remembrance, and we both commend us to your good prayers. Wishing you good health and happines.

Andwarp 7° Martii.

Your servant assuered,

Henry Clifford

[1141]On 31 December 1624/10 January 1625, Clifford had commented to More that, in Antwerp, 'they talke that his Ho[liness] is partiall in the Valtelene, and suffers theise forts to be taken by the French without great resistance of his souldiers that keepe them', though on 4 February Thomas Roper informed More that 'here we say that his Hollinesse is offended with the Frenche for their forwardnesse in the Voltolina, and that their generall, the marquise of Cuever, is threatened to be excommunicated'. In Roper's mind, this was connected with a fear that 'the Frenche will bring us into broyles and then leave us, and that they will not be firme to us in the league, which league must needes in effecte turne to the great prejudice of Catho[lic] religion', and so he hoped that 'his Holinesse will nether directly nor indirectly concurre to it': AAW, B 47, nos 83, 182. For the confrontation in the Valtelline, see *CSPV, 1623–1625, passim*; J.V. Polisensky, *The Thirty Years War* (London, 1974), p. 163. Since the 'Spanish Road' had, following the duke of Savoy's offensive alliance with the French in 1610, become unavailable as a secure land route for the Habsburg military establishment, the Valtelline was strategically crucial to the Spaniards. It had been taken by the duke of Feria for Spain in November 1620, after the revolt in July of that year by the Catholic inhabitants of the region against the Grisons who ruled over both the Engadine and the Valtelline – the valleys which provided routes between Lombardy and the Tyrol, i.e. northern Italy and Switzerland. In 1593, the Catholics there had made an agreement with the Spaniards to permit the movement of troops across their region. See R. Bonney, *The European Dynastic States, 1494–1660* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 206–208; G. Parker, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567–1659* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 70, 73; Cogswell, *BR*, pp. 67, 70; Albion, *CI*, pp. 3–5; PRO, SP 94/24, fo. 37r. The French made clear their determination to see the Valtelline restored to its former state and, following the unsuccessful Treaty of Madrid in April 1621, to ensure the rejection of the articles offered to the Grisons during 1621 and forced on them by Feria in 1622: PRO, SP 78/69, fos 38r, 71v. As Sir Henry Wotton wrote on 8/18 December 1621, the Spaniards, having so successfully taken it, could 'walk (while they keep a foot in the Lower Palatinat) from Milan to Dunkercke upon their own inheritances and purchases, a connexion of terrible moment': L.P. Smith (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1907), II, p. 221. In February 1623, the League of Lyons, between Louis XIII, Savoy, and the Venetians compelled the Spaniards to put the area into the hands of the papacy: Bonney, *The European Dynastic States*, pp. 207–208; Albion, *CI*, pp. 4–5; Pursell, *WK*, p. 196; PRO, SP 78/71, fos 18r, 22v, 50r, 85r; PRO, C 115/107/8495; BL, Harleian MS 1581, fo. 60r–v.

[1142]Ambrogio Spinola, marquis of Los Balbases.

[1143]Cresacre More.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Addressed: Al molto illustre signore, sig*no*re mio oss*ervanissi*mo, il r*everen*do sig*no*re, D[omino] Tomaso Moro sacerdote Inglese nella casa de Mons*ieu*r Vives a la Trinita Monte in Roma.

No endorsement.

77. Thomas Roper to Thomas More, 4 March 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 185*]

Good cosen,

I receaved lately two of yours, the one of the first and the other of the 8 of Feb[ruary].

I am gladd you geave me advertisement in your letters of my cosen Browne. His father understandethe thereof, who is well pleased and sendethe unto me kinde remembrances for lettinge him know from tyme to tyme what you write, I meane as muche as concernethe his sonnes well doinge.

My Lord Maxwell came hither some ten dayes agoe[1144] and hathe often bein with our duke,[1145] whose journey into France seemethe to be at some staye, and that [*i.e.* because] there is some rubbe in our Frenche treaty. It is sayed that there is a shippe and a pinnace appointed to be sent to the Groina for Gondemar. But I doe not affirme it for certayne. But whosoever [*sic*], I doe not presume that Gondemars journey will be about any matche, but only to continue an amety betwene us and Spayne, to entertayne some reconsiliation or treatys [*sic*] of agreement with the House of Austria and to hinder this great navy which is preparinge for the West India.

The marquis Hamleton[1146] dyed on Tweuseday last[1147] at his lodginges at Whitehall of a purple fever,[1148] and ended his dayes as befitted a good Christian to doe, for soe am I more than credebly informed, and

[1144]See *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 558.

[1145]George Villiers, 1st duke of Buckingham.

[1146]James Hamilton, 2nd marquis of Hamilton.

[1147]Cf. *HMCMK*, p. 222 (Hamilton died early in the morning on Ash Wednesday).

[1148]On 11 March, the Venetian ambassador, Zuane Pesaro, reported that 'it is said that the marquis of Hamilton died a Catholic, but with suspicion of poison, and when alive he rather took sides against the marriage articles, probably not on religious grounds but from opposition to the favourite': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 617; see also McClure, *LJC*, p. 604. The attorney-general dealt on 22 March 1625 with the case of Stephen Plunkett who (though he was not, as had been thought, a 'papist') had been repeating rumours that the marquis had been 'poysoned twelve moneths synce', in 1624: PRO, SP 14/185/95, fo. 171r; A. Fox, 'Rumour, news and popular political opinion in Elizabethan and early Stuart England', *HJ*, 40 (1997), p. 604.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

therefore I doe pray for him.[1149] One of the padri cauled Wood[1150] did the deede.[1151] The drumme is at this present beaten in severall partes of the towne for voluntarie shouldiers for to supply my Lord Willobyes[1152] regiment, but our men are utterly discouraged from goinge, havinge bein very coursely used by the Holl[anders], and now Mansefeilds

[1149]John Chamberlain commented that 'the papists will needs have' Hamilton as 'one of theirs, which neither appeared in his life nor in his death that we can any way learne, but yt is no new thing with them to raise such scandalls and slanders': McClure, *LJC*, p. 605. In late March 1622, the earl of Kellie had remarked that Hamilton's making of 'a matche soe farr as it can be' of his daughter with 'the Lord Digbye his sone' had made many 'think that he is more Spanishe than he was': *HMCMK*, p. 116. The count of Tillières, in mid-May 1622, believed that Hamilton had been 'maltraité de la France, depuis sept ou huit mois' and he was 'presque entièrement retiré et approché de l'Espagne', even though he was accounted 'de la faction puritaine' and a friend of Spain's opponents; and, in mid-June, Tillières hoped that Hamilton could be separated from his 'puritan' friends: PRO, PRO 31/3/56, fos 40r, 58v. Simonds D'Ewes, however, recorded in his diary for early July 1623 that Hamilton had spoken strongly against toleration for Catholics: *DSSD*, p. 146. Tillières recorded the same sentiment from Hamilton in late March 1624, though Hamilton told Tillières that he spoke thus out of deference to Buckingham: PRO, PRO, 31/3/58, fos 65v–66r. On 29 February/10 March 1625, the marquis of Effiat thought that Hamilton 'estoit Catholique en son âme et mort Huguenot': PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fo. 59r. Nine days later, Kellie observed that there were rumours both that Hamilton was 'poysened' and that 'he shuld have dyed a papiste', but 'that is as fals as the uther'. A week later, the rumour was still circulating that Hamilton had 'dyed a papiste and that he had a priste with him and reconcealed himselfe to the pope of Roome'. However, Kellie still did not believe it, for Hamilton was 'more subjecte to his pleasours and the companye of wemen than to preests', and though there was a 'preest with him sume two days before he dyed [. . .] yet I think his besines was more weemens besines than preests affairs'. The rumour was credited because it was spread by Hamilton's Catholic physician, George Eglisham (who subsequently accused Buckingham of poisoning King James): *HMCMK*, pp. 223, 225; R. Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626–1628* (Oxford, 1987), p. 183.

[1150]The identity of this Jesuit is uncertain, but John Gee mentions a Jesuit associate of the evangelist John Percy SJ whom he names as 'M[r] Wainman, alias M[r] Wrightman, alias M[r] Wood' (with various other aliases including that of Baker): Gee, *New Shreds of the Old Snare*, pp. 21–22. It is not clear whether this individual should be identified with the Jesuit Alexander Baker (as depicted it seems, under his alias of Wood, in Thomas Scott, *The Second Part of Vox Populi* (np, 1624), p. 54), since Baker was apparently in prison at this point (see Anstr., II, pp. 12–13); but he was obviously not the secular priest Christopher Wainman (*ibid.*, p. 375). Thomas McCoog has suggested that the Jesuit in question might be John Wood (a son, or brother, of James Wood, laird of Boniton), who entered the Society in 1600 but about whom little else is known: ARSJ, Rom. 169, fo. 22v, Rom. 172, fo. 37r. I am very grateful to Dr McCoog for this information.

[1151]In a letter of 18 March, Pesaro said that 'the king spoke wrathfully against the Jesuit who administered extreme unction to the marquis of Hamilton and against the physician who assisted there, but was soon mollified': *CSPV, 1623–1625*, p. 621; see also *CSPV, 1625–1626*, pp. 6–7, for Pesaro's report of 30 March that Archbishop Abbot wanted to take action against 'those concerned in the conversion' but the French ambassador prevented it and so Abbot had 'decided to publish a book praising the marquis as a Protestant'.

[1152]Robert Bertie, 14th Baron Willoughby, later 1st earl of Lindsey.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

usadge is farre worse. It is sayed his 12 thousand is comme to 7 thousande. We shall shortely understande what he doethe, for that Brunsewicke[1153] is now gon to him with his horse from Calais which are sayed to be 1,200 or 1,400.[1154]

The kinge on Satterday last seigned a warrante for the restitution of the bondes which were taken of recusantes since the 5th of Aug[ust] and for the monys which were payed since that tyme into the excheq[uer], but my lord treasurer[1155] sayethe that there is no money in the excheq[uer] so that neither the one nor the other is yet performed.

My awnt Mallory, thankes be to God, is pretty well amended. And so I pray you lette my uncle[1156] know, with my best remembrance unto him, hopinge he dothe remember me and myne. My wife[1157] ~~will neede~~ <desirethe> to be remembred in his devotions. She drawethe neere hir tyme which will be about the end of Aprill or beginninge of May.

This day came out a proclamation for adjorninge the parla[ment] untill the 20 of Aprill.[1158]

Thus, with my kinde remembrance unto your selfe, Mr Rant, D[on] Seb[ert],[1159] D[on] Anselmo,[1160] Gio[vanni] Condeno,[1161] Mr Seton and the rest, I end.

Yours,

Th[omas] R[oper]

The 4th Marche 1625.

Addressed: All' illustre signore, il Signore Thomasso Moro, Inglese. Roma.

Endorsed: Tho[mas] More.
Writt[en]: 4 March. Received: 1 May, by Venice post.
Answered: 3 May.

[1153] Christian of Brunswick, administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt.
[1154] See also AAW, B 47, no. 46; *CCE*, pp. 207–208, 212.
[1155] Sir James Ley.
[1156] Philip Roper.
[1157] Susan, daughter of John Winchcombe of Henwick, Berkshire.
[1158] *SRP*, I, no. 266 (3 March 1625).
[1159] Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB.
[1160] Robert (Anselm) Beech OSB.
[1161] John Condon. He was one of the mourners at Thomas More's funeral in April 1625: Shanahan, 'The death of Thomas More', p. 26.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

78. Richard Smith to Thomas More, 15/25 March 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 17*]

Right wor*shipfu*ll and deere syr,

I had y*ou*rs of the 24 of Febr[uary] which brought very glad tidings of his Holines['s] desire to uphold the clergie[1162] by declaring that the seminaries are to manteyne that [*i.e.* them], and not instituted for to furnish religious companies, and by his purpose to make al such alumnes for to sweare that they shal not enter into any religion without expresse licence of the sea ap[osto]lik.[1163] If this order be put in practise, our Theatins[1164] wil not be so desirous of o*u*r seminaries where they shal have much paine and no great p*ro*fite, and o*u*r clergie wil soone florish; wherfor God grant that his Hol[iness] put this in execution. My faculties came the last poste but one, and I wold gladly be gone hence, but my cardinal[1165] wisheth me to stay yet a litle, and I doubt not but it is both for my owne, and the com*m*on good, though he tell me not wherin. Of late the mach was like to have broken upon conditions as [*words omitted:* it is] said, w*hi*ch his Hol[iness] had put into the dispensation, w*hi*ch o*u*r king wold not admit,[1166] and I feare that some of o*u*r Theatins seeke under some such good p*re*text to breake al, as is thought they did in the Spanish mach, and may be gathered by thos[e] words of D[octor] Cecil w*hi*ch I have written to you hertofor.[1167] But now, God be thanked, al points are agreed upon and o*u*r duke[1168] expected here within this moneth. I wold M*r* Benet[1169] had written to me what faculties thos[e] are w*hi*ch he wold have me to have, for by my cardinal his means I hope to obtayne whatsoever is requisite. You wrote to me as archb[ishop] of Chalcedon and so did some to my p*re*dec*ess*or, and indeed Chalcedon was made a metropolitan see

[1162]i.e. the secular clergy.

[1163]See *Letter 35*.

[1164]i.e. Jesuits.

[1165]Cardinal Richelieu.

[1166]See above, p. 110; *Letter 75*; see also AAW, B 47, no. 78.

[1167]On 3/13 March 1625, Smith had informed More that 'D[octor] Cecil tould me that if there be faith in men our Jes[uits] were against the Spanish mach', and 'God grant they be not also against this, and stil dreame of their conquest and booke of reformation', i.e. Robert Persons's notorious discourse about reform of the English Church and state, which had circulated only in manuscript during this period and was eventually published by Edward Gee as *The Jesuit's Memorial for the Intended Reformation of England* (London, 1690), AAW, B 47, no. 15.

[1168]George Villiers, 1st duke of Buckingham.

[1169]Edward Bennett.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by the g*ener*al counsel held there, and it were for the honor of o*ur* clergie and countrie that I were such, espetially sith Holland hath an archb[ishop] of Philippi.[1170] But in my bul I am named bishop. I pray you see what you can learne of this matter. I rather expect a copie of the comission w*hi*ch you desire than send you a blanc, least as I wrote befor it might fall into enemies hands.[1171] I hope to send you a letter to the F[rench] embass[ador][1172] by this poste, and other letters to the cardinalls I wil send by the next. I am to goe out of this cittie with my card[inal] for thes[e] holie dayes, where I hope p*er*fectly to understand the state of o*ur* matters. M[r] White his brother[1173] is here with us, and I much wish that he wold come to you, but D[octor] Champney saieth he p*ro*mised them to returne to them after twoe years, and it seem[eth] he expecteth his brother for to make his resolution.[1174] If God send good times in Eng[land] I have great hope to p*ro*cure more b*ishop*s by means of my card[inal] who p*ro*miseth to doe for us al he can, espetially seing, as you write, his Hol[iness] is not averted fro*m* it. I pray you doe my most kind and respective com*m*endations to my L[ord] Winsor, though as yet unknowne to M[r] Browne, M[r] Seaton, M[r] Clinton, D. Anselme,[1175] D. Sebert[1176] and al freinds and acquaintance with you. And thus with my hartiest to y*ou*r self I leave you to the tuition of o*ur* sweet Savior.

25 of March.

Y*ou*r servant in Christ Jesus,

R[ichard] Chalcedon

Addressed: To the right worship*ful*l M[r] Thomas More.

Endorsed: Writt[en]: 25 March.
Received: 16 Aprill.
Answered: 21 Aprill.

[1170] Philip Rovenius.

[1171] See AAW, B 47, no. 15 (Smith to More, 3/13 March 1625).

[1172] Philippe de Béthune, count of Sully.

[1173] Thomas White, brother of Richard White.

[1174] Subsequently, on 3/13 August 1625, Richard Ireland wrote that Thomas White 'is readye to come' to Rome 'if my l[ord] [*i.e.* Smith] send him. My l[ord] (as it seemed by his last) expected the consent of his mother and bro[ther] which he had not when he wrote his last': AAW, B 47, no. 113. Thomas White, who had been studying canon law in Paris since April 1624, succeeded More in early 1626 as the secular clergy's agent in Rome: Anstr., II, p. 349.

[1175] Robert (Anselm) Beech OSB.

[1176] Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

79. Anthony Champney to Thomas Rant, 4/14 May 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 52*]

R*everen*d and beloved s*i*r,

Yours of the 19 of Aprill to M^r President[1177] mentioneth one of the weeke before to my self w*hi*ch is not come, for the miscareing whereof I ame sorie. If <you> would please to send us a copie of M^r Mores will, signed w*i*th your owne hand, that we may see howe we stand w*i*th him and whether he hath left anie thing to this howse, you shall specially oblige us.[1178] If either his brother[1179] or we our selves, or anie other, shall desire a*n* authenticall copie it may be p*ro*cured hereafter as it shall be desired. We like well and com*m*end your indifferencie betwixt this howse and the body of the clergy, and do not wishe you to incurr anie displeasure for your affection to us. I doubt not <but> everie one wilbe well co*n*tent w*i*th that order w*hi*ch our speciall frend hath sett downe, whose sowle God bring to eternall repose. I pray you certefy M^r More at Anwarpe of his brothers will co*n*cerning the payment of the 40 crownes bequeathed to our Franciscanes in like maner as you have sett it downe here, that he may not think that burthen put upon him, nor yet the religiouse me*n* hindered of their legacie.[1180] We thank you hartely ~~for the~~ for the printed decree[1181] you sent us, w*hi*ch

[1177] Matthew Kellison.

[1178] For Thomas More's death and the text of his will, see AAW, A XIX, no. 30, pp. 99–100 (Cresacre More to Thomas Rant, 29 April/9 May 1625); Shanahan, 'The death of Thomas More'.

[1179] Cresacre More.

[1180] Henry Clifford had informed Rant on 22 April/2 May 1625 that Cresacre More would write to him but, in the meantime, 'the watch he requesteth you to accept as a token from him, and what els you like that may by any title descend to him that he had about him. There is alreadye order for the 10^li for the church of our English Franciscans in Doway and to other religious frends we have sent to pray for him': AAW, A XIX, no. 28, p. 93.

[1181] AAW, A XIX, no. 9, p. 25 (a decree issued by the Holy Office on the cultus of saints, 3/13 March 1625). George Fisher remarked, on 12 May 1625, that he had received a copy from Rant: AAW, B 26, no. 56. The clergy agent's papers contain a memorandum (never delivered, though shown by Rant to Francesco Ingoli and the secretary of Cardinal Magalotti), dated 10/20 September 1625, against the growing cult of Henry Garnet SJ. The memorandum stated that Garnet died for treason, not for faith, and that his cult would damage the cause of English Catholics. Rant recorded that Ingoli told him not to submit it, and Magalotti's secretary advised that he should present it as a private man, not as agent of the secular clergy: AAW, A XIX, no. 77, p. 235. Rant recorded that, in the previous April, he had made a complaint to the Society in Rome about an inscription under 'Garnets picture in the grand Jesus gallerye' which, referring to Garnet's execution, read 'prop[ter] fidem Catholicam'. It was changed so that it read 'onlye ab haereticis occisus 1606'. Rant remarked that the famous wheatstraw, the relic of Garnet's death and witness to his martyrdom, was still there but was now 'transposed to the right hande, which is the less perspicuous parte of the allye': AAW, B 25, no. 102.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

though we must <as we think> thereby be forced to remove some pictures of our martires out of our church, w*hi*ch some hadd bestowed for the ornament thereof, yet are we well co*n*tent therewith. They are the pourtraictes of severall preistes executed in Ingland in this late p*er*secution, set upon the side walles of the church, w*i*thout anie other crownes or glories but only the maner of their execution w*i*th a palme in their hands, w*hi*ch we desire to understand from you whether they are co*m*prised in the decree. We would also knowe what they doe in th*e* colledge there, w*i*th the paynting of their church for so much as p*er*tayneth to the later tymes of persecution. I will send a copie thereof to M^r^ Messendin[1182] by M^r^ Ireland that, if he will, he may take [a] copie of it. The copie also of the articles betwixt the bishop of Holland[1183] and the Jesuites was verie welcome and will give my lord[1184] great light howe to p*ro*ceede in his affayres.[1185] But, because this copie is unperfect, <we> intend to send it to the bishop him self to have it p*er*fected and also to entreat him for a copie of the decree of the co*n*gregation,[1186] whereupon these articles are grownded. We <have> hitherto omitted to seeke acquaintance w*i*th him, but, God willinge, we <will> endevour to co*m*pose it, being, as you observe well, verie co*n*venient for us. M^r^ Blacloe his brother[1187] is come to Parise, so that he may <nowe> resolve w*i*th him self to come to you, if he himself will. For albeit we have great use of him here, and therefore desire much his p*re*sence, according to his p*ro*mise, yet seeing he shall there be imployed for the com*m*on, w*hi*ch we chiefly ayme at, I think we shall resolve to remitt his p*ro*mise, upon co*n*dition he will undertake that charge w*hi*ch truly I doubt not but wilbe for his honour and our countries good. But in the meane while we must entreat your co*n*tinuation, hoping that God will strengthen your corporall forces, according to the desire of your will; that, as by Gods help you have brought our matters to good estate, so you may deliver them to yo*u*r successour who may, by the like help of God, better them dayly. Your judgement of our pension there, and the maner of taking it up, doth jump w*i*th our desires, but the importunitie of freinds will not license us to practice it, w*hi*ch notw*i*thstanding, God willing, we will hereafter observe more strictly. For hitherto, whilst we desire to pleasure freinds, we hurt our selves and troble our agent more than needes. My lord is

[1182]Edward Maddison.
[1183]Philip Rovenius.
[1184]Richard Smith.
[1185]On 12 May 1625, George Fisher wrote to thank Rant for a copy of the articles, and said that he had sent them to Smith: AAW, B 26, no. 56.
[1186]De Propaganda Fide.
[1187]Thomas White, brother of Richard White. See *Letter 78*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at last gone for Ingland.[1188] God speed him well. Since his departure, came letters to Parise that Mons*ieu*r de Fiat,[1189] ordinarie leger for France in London, is informed, that he hath done him verie ill offices in Parise, and therby is highly displeased w*i*th him. These be the good offices of some back freinds which I doubt not will light upon their owne heades. But they are so co*n*fident in their owne streng[t]h that they think nothing ca*n* hurt them. His back I hope is stronger in Parise than that it ca*n* be swayed with such forgeries. This nu*n*cio[1190] of Bruxelles is gone to Parise to meete there the legate[1191] who, at the writing of our last from Parise, was arrived at Orleance, and the match or marriage was appointed to be solemnised upon Su*n*day last, the 11 of May. Hence I can write you noe newes, nor out of Ingland have we anie; but that our Catholique nobilitie are in difficultie howe to carie them selves at the solemnitie of the coronation, when they are to sweare upon the crowne of S[t] Edward their alleageance to the king; w*hi*ch nowe is done in their service tyme. This case hath beene co*n*sulted at Parise, and the nu*n*cio[1192] will say nothing to it till he heare from Rome w*hi*ch wilbe to[o] long to expect.

M[r] Cooper or Charnock[1193] w*i*th one out of the colledge there, called Ann,[1194] arrived well here upon the 12 of this month. Their other two co*m*panions they left at Parise. The lat[t]er of these went next day towards Ingland. M[r] Charnock acknowledgeth the debt of 20 crownes to M[r] More. M[r] President yesterday tooke phisike, and this day hath beene busied, so that you must accept this as his answer w*i*th his love and myn [*word obscured:* owne] to yo*u*r self, and both our hartie com*m*endacions to M[r] D[octor] Seton w*i*th myn owne to Père Claud Bertin, and so I com*m*itt you to Gods holy p*ro*tection and grace, this 14 of May 1625.

Y*ou*rs ever,

Champney

[1188]See *Letter 80*.

[1189]Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[1190]Giovanni Francesco Guido del Bagno, archbishop of Patras. See PRO, SP 78/75, fo. 85r.

[1191]Cardinal Francesco Barberini. For Barberini's embassy to Paris, see *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 44; Hibbard, 'Henrietta Maria', p. 17; PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 96r; PRO, SP 78/75, fos 85v, 300v–301r.

[1192]Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

[1193]Richard Charnock. See CRS, 10, p. 236; *Letter 71*. On 7 December 1624, Edward Bennett had asked Thomas More to 'show M[r] Charnock (whose friends I know well) what friendship you can': AAW, B 27, no. 74.

[1194]John Anne. See CRS, 55, pp. 374–375; CRS, 37, p. 203.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Addressed: For M^r^ Rant.

Endorsed: Writt[en]: 14 May.
Received: 7 Juine.
Answered: 7 Juine.

80. Richard Smith to Thomas Rant, 12 May 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 20*]

Very reverend and deere syr,

God be thanked, and good praiers, I came safely to England the 8 of this moneth after y*ou*r account and found matters in good termes for Catholiks. For Mon*sieu*r de Fiat,[1195] soone after my coming, obtained of the king letters to the treasurer, chancelor and archb*ishop*s for to surcease al p*er*secution of Catholiks and to set at libertie al prisoners, and restore al moneys taken since Trinitie terme last.[1196] And both he and Conte de Trem received very good words of his Majestie in behalf of Catholiks, and assurance that he wold p*er*forme what he had p*ro*mised.[1197] Nevertheles, becaus[e] as yet the warrants are not published yesterday, some Catholiks were arrested for the 20^l^ a moneth and some others cited to appeare befor the comission,[1198] but this I hope wil not continew. The d[uke] of Buckingham is privatly gone to France to meete o*ur* queene who is in her way hither and, as they say, o*ur* king goeth to meete her within thes[e] 2 or 3 dayes. I have written letters to his Holines, to the congreg*ati*on de P*ro*paganda Fide and others, and wil send the*m* as soone as I can by Paris, but this way I take by chance, and am glad to write to you though in haste. If I can I wil send you a com*m*ission now, or els as soone as I can by Paris. I have bene here this forthnight and I heare not that the state taketh any notice of me; yea Mons*ieu*r Fiat offered me divers times to p*re*sent me to his Majestie and the duke, if I wold, but I stay that til the coming of o*ur* queene. F[ather] Blunt hath bene divers times with me, but wil not send any of his for to debate o*ur* matters befor the nonce[1199]

[1195] Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[1196] For Charles I's 'indulgence' of 1 May 1625 in favour of his Roman Catholic subjects, a document of which Lord Keeper Williams was very critical, see Hacket, *SR*, part II, pp. 6–7; PRO, SP 16/2/1–6; PRO, SP 78/75, fo. 117r–v; and for the imprisoned Catholics whose release was promised to Effiat on 28 May 1625 conditionally, i.e. on proof that their imprisonment was solely for religion, see PRO, SP 78/75, fos 39r–v, 116r; see also AAW, A XIX, nos 36, 37.

[1197] For the embassy of Réné Potier, count of Tremes, see PRO, PRO 31/3/61, fos 99r–102r, 103r–v; *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 51; Avenel, *Lettres*, II, p. 73.

[1198] i.e. the high commission.

[1199] Bernardino Spada, archbishop of Damietta.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at Paris, but telleth me that al things are wel, and such g*ener*al good termes. I have given order ~~for al~~ that al the preists in England say 3 Masses for the soule of good M[r] More, in whose place I hope to send an other soone after the heats, and then wil expect y*our* returne hither wher you shalbe most welcome to me, and enjoye the co*m*panie of y*our* good general[1200] and others of y*our* brethren for whome his Majestie p*ro*videth a chapel and good lodgings in S. James. In the meane time, com*m*ending my self most hartely to y*our* good praiers, I com*m*it you to the p*ro*tection of our sweet Savior.

12 of May.

Y*our* servant in Christ Jesus,

R[ichard] Chalcedon

Becaus[e] this com*m*ission is drawne in haste, shew it not unles you have need, for by Paris I wil send you one more formal.

Addressed: Admodum reverendo d*omi*no, D[omino] Thoma Rant, congregationis Oratorii presbitero.
Roma.

Endorsed: Written: May 12.
Received: June 19.
Answered: June 21.

81. Richard Ireland to Thomas Rant, 26 May/5 June 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 122*]

R*everen*d and good father,

I have <not> receaved any letter from you by this last post. The banquer[1201] hath not receaved his packett wher[a]s all men that I knowe have receaved theirs. He seemeth to be much troubled, and sayth that it is greatly to his disadvantage.

I have sent your former packets into England where my l[ord] of Ch[alcedon] is well arrived, as you may see by these enclosed packets. He writeth to me th*at* he hath sent to you directly from England. M[r] Black[lo's] brother[1202] maketh great difficultye for th*e* sending of his

[1200] Pierre de Bérulle.
[1201] This appears to be a reference to 'Mons[ieur] Granett' (cited in *Letter 48*).
[1202] Richard White.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bro[ther],[1203] doubting that it may be much to his mothers prejudice and his. My l[ord] hath sent these letters unsealed which I suppose he hath done of purpose that you may understand well the contents of them. I dare not saye that my l[ord] is too credulous for the amendment of our afflicted state. God send all well. But if I had bene of his counsell (thoughe I [*word obscured:* wish (?)] he had farre better counsell than I can give in such a case) under his correction, and likewise of better judgements, he should not have wrote as yet [*word illegible*] hopefully as he doth. If you did heare what the generall opinion is heere to the contrary, and what [*word illegible*] signes there are which bode us noe great good, I doe thinke your [?] feare wold be greater than your hope. Let us commend all, trust God and resigne our selves to His holy will. [*In margin:* Amen.]

Our queene went hence for England on Monday. God speed her well. The duke of Buckingham came sodainly and secretly hether a fewe dayes before her departure.[1204] The duke is heere as yet, and Sir Albert Morton, secretary of state, whoe came with him. They are to goe hence this daye after the queene.

Your old freind Sir Geo[rge] Calvert profesed himselfe openly a Catholique before the councell and, as my l[ord] of C[halcedon] writeth to me, had continued in the councell if he wold have taken the oath of allegiance which is tendered to Catho[lics].[1205]

Ther is great doubt of some extraordinary schisme in England for it is thought that preists and Cath[olics] which will take that oath the[re] have great favour; the other must expect nothing but the rigour of the lawe. This is certaine, that Fa[ther] John Barnes hath bene courted heere by the duke, and <hee> was presented to him by the embassadours <of Englande>. Ther ar others, as is sayd, M[r] D[octor] Potter,[1206] and Don Michael,[1207] an Italian monke. Some are

[1203]Thomas White.

[1204]See *CSPV, 1625–1626*, pp. 59, 63, 68, 77.

[1205]See McClure, *LJC*, p. 609.

[1206]A reference, presumably, to Jerome Porter OSB. Sir George Goring had recorded on 11/21 March 1625 that 'Docter Potter and Doctor Barnes, both priests [. . .] have bin severall times with me to intreate my mediation for theyre' return to England. They said that, if permission were granted them to return, they would 'doe such service as when his Majesty shall understand the designe thereof and how many of this French Catholique Churche will joyne with them in the publication of such exceptions as they justly have against the popes usurpation', they doubted not but that the king would 'think they doe God and him good service'. They dared not openly voice such sentiments in France, and 'the other night one of them scaped narrowly of being murthered by some of the Jesuits schollers': PRO, SP 78/74, fo. 107v.

[1207]Arthur (Michael) Godfrey OSB. See Lunn, *The English Benedictines*, p. 123; Birch, *CTCI*, I, p. 122.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of opinion that these men shall be putt in place about the queene,[1208] and [the] Oratorians [will be] shortly sent home againe. Sed nolo amplius movere hanc cama[r]inam.[1209]

Mr Price came not this waye, but I receaved a letter from him from Dowaye. Heere was an auncient man called Mr Browne whoe came to me, in your name, to have my helpe and direction for his journey to Antwerpe and thence to England. He seemeth to be a very kind, honest man and was most thankefull for the litle kindnes I did him.

Mr D[octor] Cecilles [*word obscured:* goes (?)] into England as ausmonier to the duchese of Chevreux,[1210] and he purposeth to returne with her againe within 2 moneths. I hope you never forgett my respectfull and kind comendation to Mr Doctor Seton. And I alwayes include Fa[ther] Sebert[1211] among my freinds notw[i]t[h]standing your differences, which I hope are quickly ended betweene you.

I am heere not tyed as a beare to the stake but sometymes I have cause to thinke that I am tyed with a beare.[1212] I will doe my best to endure for a tyme thoughe it be very irkesome to me.

Mr Lockwood is gone hence to live at Chells, having more profitt and more contentment happily there than he had heere. We are but foure and I wold willingly (unlesse we may be eased of a burden unsupportable) give over my place againe to any honest young man. Heere was one that belonged to my L[ord] Castlehaven in England, whoe desyred me to remember his love and service to you. His name is Mr Walgrave,[1213] a gentleman of a good family, and was sometimes

[1208]On 25 May/4 June 1625, Anthony Champney had reported that 'Father John Barnes [. . .] being in Parise, saith he is sent for <into> England by our king with promise not only of securitie but also preferment, and saith the king resolveth to make a difference betwixt Catholiques that [. . .] howld opinions favorable to the state, as is that of the oath of alleageance, and others. The first he will favour, thothers contrarie. Doctor Potter is also [. . .] sent for and is to goe in with our queen, who I thinke might better be spared than there imployed. Father Barnes saith he will not goe till he have printed another booke which some thinke wilbe [. . .] in defence or favour of Widdringtons [*i.e.* Thomas Preston's] doctrin, which the parliament of Parise will patronise. It were much to be wished that these men would imploy their wittes and learning for the edification of Gods Church and not for the disquieting thereof': AAW, B 47, no. 48. John Pory claimed, on 1 July 1626, that Porter and Godfrey had 'taken the oath of allegiance, some say of supremacy also': Birch, *CTCI*, I, p. 122.

[1209]A reference to Camarina, a town on the south coast of Sicily. For the proverb to which Richard Ireland refers, see W. Smith, *A New Classical Dictionary* (London, 1853), p. 141.

[1210]Marie de Rohan, duchess of Chevreuse. For her appointment to accompany Henrietta Maria to England, see Archives des Affaires Etrangères, Paris, Correspondance Politique Angleterre, 32, fos 176r–178r. I am grateful to Michelle Howell for this reference.

[1211]Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB.

[1212]Richard Ireland refers here to the conflict among the clergy in the Collège d'Arras.

[1213]Charles Waldegrave. George Fisher described him, in October 1624, as 'second sonne to Mr Walgrave of Stanningale in Norfolcke and brother to Sir Edw[ard] Walgrave'. Charles had been Fisher's 'schoolefellow in Rome' and was 'on[e] of the prime witts of the colledge'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholler of our colledge at Rome. It seemeth he loveth and respecteth you well.

Farewell good father, and remember me as I doe you for, in your love and such remembrances, I doe m[u]ch comfort my self, assuring you that I am as I have found you <the same> [*word illegible*] to me [*two interlineated words illegible*] beyond my meritt in all hartye affection.

Yours to be commanded,

R[ichard] I[reland]

Junii 5to 1625.

Paris.

Addressed: Au r*évéren*d p[ère], P[ère] Thomas Rant, d[e]m[euran]t [?] à S^{t} Louis, à Rome.

Endorsed: Written: June 5.
Received: Julye 22.
Answered: Julye 28.
And with this, letters to his Holines and card[inals] de Prop[aganda] Fide, dated 26 Maii.[1214]

82. Henry Clifford to Thomas Rant, 3/13 June 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 82*]

R*everen*d s*ir*,

By the last post I did not write to you, expecting l*ett*res from England, and none came for you then, but now this supply[e]s that defect. I thanke you for yo*ur*s of the 24 of the last, as for the former of the 17 May. Mine have shewed you th*at* M^{r} More[1215] is gone to Cambray where he is like to reside the moste p*ar*t of this sum*m*er. Yesterday I wrote to him how he was beholding to the love and respect you beare ~~his fam~~ him and his familye, w*hi*ch he will and doth acknowledge,

He was 'a man of extraordinary repute in his county. He came from Rome for his health, and was for some yeares somewhat crasy. For the space of 5 or 6 yeares he followed the court and was in great esteeme with the lord of Northampton [Henry Howard], while he lived. He is lately married and his father hath given him an estate of 300^{l} per annum': AAW, A XVIII, no. 73, pp. 386–387; CRS, 54, pp. 89–90; CRS, 37, p. 121; *NCC*, pp. 266–267.

[1214] AAW, A XIX, no. 33, pp. 107–108 (John Colleton and the vicars-general of Richard Smith to the cardinals of Propaganda Fide, 26 May 1625); AAW, A XIX, no. 34, pp. 109–110 (Colleton and the vicars-general to a recipient (probably a cardinal) in Rome, 26 May 1625); AAW, A XIX, no. 35, pp. 111–112 (Colleton and the vicars-general to Urban VIII, 26 May 1625).

[1215] Cresacre More.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and therefore you have greate reason to keepe th*a*t watch and what els it pleaseth you of his brothers, being likewise a pawne of his love and respect to you.[1216] I thanke you for the p*ro*phesie w*hi*ch I wish you had interpreted all. For what is constered, I shoulde have guessed w*i*thout a com*m*entarie, but com*m*only such matters are fathered on antiquitie, when subtillye they are divulged by moderne witts who, by the concurrence of accidents, conjecture what is likeliest to followe. But this we plainly see th*a*t the maine defender and entire mantainer of the Church and the Catholicke fayth is his Cath[olic] Majestie.[1217] [*In margin:* Nego.] On Thursday 5^to^ Junii the Holland forces went out of Breda, [*in margin:* Thank God] and the marques['s][1218] forces entred. They had honorable conditions and marched w*i*th flying colours very gallant and, wholy armed, carried w*i*th them ~~tow~~ <4> peeces of artillerie and two morter peeces. On Tuesday the infanta[1219] came to this towne,[1220] magnificently entertayned. Generally [there] were made bonefires and other feasts of joy for the recoverie of Breda,[1221] whither yesterday morning her hig[h]nes went accomp[anied by] 40 companies of horse and other forces and divers others that went to see the towne and fashion of the leaguer. She carried w*i*th her good store of mony to gratifie the souldiers.[1222] The earle of Oxford is dead at the Hague, sickning upon a fall he had when our English made that rash and unfortunate attempt upon the leaguer of the marques.[1223] Mansfielde is gone w*i*th his forces towards Germanie;[1224] and the Duke Saxe and the Baron Anholt[1225] w*i*th the emperours forces sent by the marques to attend him.

This day our queene is to be in England, for all the gentleman [*sic*] of Kent were com*m*aunded to be at the Downe by Dover to waite upon

[1216]See *Letter 79*.

[1217]In his letter to Thomas More of 31 December 1624/10 January 1625, Clifford had opined that 'it seemes the only protector of the Catholicke Church, under God Almightie and the prayers of the just, is the king of Spaine and howse of Austria': AAW, B 47, no. 83. In another letter to More, six weeks earlier, Clifford had warned that the intentions of the French were good, but 'when they fynde any difficultyes to overcome [. . .] I feare me the execution of their intended good will come short of their wishes, and wee shall fynde but few of them such as worthy Gundemar was, who [. . .] prosecuteth the Catholick cause with his whole heart': AAW, B 27, no. 49.

[1218]Ambrogio Spinola, marquis of Los Balbases.

[1219]Isabella Clara Eugenia, archduchess of Austria.

[1220]Antwerp.

[1221]See *CSPV, 1625–1626*, pp. 69, 71, 72, 78, 80, 83, 101, 111.

[1222]See *CGB*, II, pp. 646, 648.

[1223]See *CSPV, 1625–1626*, pp. 46, 69, 73.

[1224]See Adams, PC, p. 355; Lockyer, *Buckingham*, p. 250; *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 46; *CGB*, II, p. 643.

[1225]Johann-Jakob, baron of Bronckhorst and Anholt. See *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 122; Lee, *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain*, p. 293.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

her. Divers ladies went over to Bulleine to attend her, among whom were the Ladye St Johns[1226] and the Lady Savage.[1227] Yet promoters are still busie, and vexe all knowen recusants nor doe, or at least will not, the officers take any notice of the kings promise, w*hi*ch the French assueredly affirme.[1228]

The p*ar*lament is differred [*i.e.* deferred] to our 23 [*sic*] June.[1229] And they still presse w*i*th rigour to supply the great navie w*hi*ch is providing.[1230] In July ambassadours are expected from Spain to condole and congratulate. El Conde Gondamar comes to Paris to treate w*i*th that king abowt the French proceedings.[1231] The Hollanders have had losse at sea by the Spaniards. I bessech you send the enclosed to Fa[ther] Sebert[1232] for it imports [*sic*]. I have ha[d] the 22^{li} M^{r} Evans[1233] was to make good to M^{r} President[1234] at Dou[ai]. [O]ur Lord Jhe*sus* keepe you and so I humbly com*m*end me.

Yo*u*rs,

Henry Clifford

Andw[arp] 13 June 1625.

No address.

Endorsed: Writt[en]: June 13.
Received: July 3.
Answered: Julye 5.

[1226] Jane Savage.

[1227] Elizabeth Darcy, wife of Sir Thomas Savage, the future 1st Viscount Savage. In December 1622, Jane Savage, their daughter, had married John Paulet, the future 5th marquis of Winchester: Cokayne, *CP*, XII, p. 767; PRO, C 115/107/8485; Redworth, *PI*, p. 43.

[1228] Thomas Roper had noted, on 14 May 1625, that 'promotors are very busye, and this day, in Westminster Hall, did serve Sir Francis Inglefeilde with a writte for his wifes recusancy and some five or six more were so served at the same tyme'. Also 'an attorney was served with a writte for defendinge the causes of six recusantes convicted, the penaltye beinge a 100^{l} for eache', which was 'a new strayne in the law not formerly looked into': AAW, B 47, no. 187.

[1229] Following James's death, and because of the determination to secure the Anglo-French marriage treaty, there was a succession of prorogations from 17 May until 18 June: Russell, *PEP*, p. 204.

[1230] See C. Thompson, 'Court politics and parliamentary conflict in 1625', in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (London, 1989), p. 177.

[1231] See *CSPV, 1625–1626*, pp. 41, 47, 48, 100, 109, 117; PRO, SP 78/75, fo. 85v.

[1232] Robert (Sigebert) Bagshaw OSB.

[1233] William Evans: see AAW, B 47, no. 87 (Evans to Thomas Rant, 3/13 July 1625).

[1234] Matthew Kellison.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

83. Anthony Champney to Thomas Rant, 8/18 June 1625 (with postscript by Matthew Kellison)

[*AAW, B 47, no. 55*]

R*everen*d and verie loveing s*ir*,

M^r President,[1235] being at this p*re*sent otherwayes occupied, gave me charge to return you answer to yo*ur*s of the 24 of May. D[octor] Cecilles is not like to see you there in hast for he is gone into Ingland w*i*th Madame de Chevereux as her chapleine where, if he fynd footeing to his co*n*tentme*n*t, he is like enough to stay. There hath beene here and at Parise also divers reportes of our younge kings death. What policie there may be in the authores of such fictions, I knowe not. We have not yet seene anie copie of M^r Mores will. His brother[1236] is nowe at Cambray and, ere he turn back, we shall desire a sight of that [which] you sent to him. S*ign*ore Scanarolio must not expect his accomptes returned this weeke because we have not p*er*used them further than that [which] I wrote the last weeke. Agnes Fowler is not anie Jesuitess but a good Catholike and descreet woma*n* who com*m*ethe thither upon vowe w*i*th much devotion and resolution, and so you will fynd if I be not deceived. The rate of our scholers, if it be brought under 23^li, we shall be at overmuch loss by them. Therefore though M^r President, to shewe him self not obstinat or peremptorie, did remitt something to the prudence of the judges, yet we hope they <will> consider the matter in some p*ro*portion as it is and not so to favour one part that they may overmuch oppress or wrong thother. M^r Fitton[1237] his returne is not yet heard of.[1238]

How matters will goe w*i*th Catholiques <in Inglande> doth not yet appeare, but more feare than hope. P*ro*moters are verie busie and divers troubled, w*hi*ch the embassatoure[1239] sayth shall all be amended by the queenes com*m*ing. The king is between London and Dover, expecting the arrivall of his queene. The countess of Buckinghame w*i*th divers ladies are [*sic*] passed over to Bologne, where by this day the queene is thought to be arrived. Some say that the ceremonies of mariage must be reiterated agayn at Canterburie. God grant as much constancie in the French Catholikes as our heretikes embassatoures shewed in Parise, who caused the ceremonies to be

[1235] Matthew Kellison.

[1236] Cresacre More.

[1237] Peter Biddulph.

[1238] On 2/12 April 1625, Champney had informed Rant that 'M^r Fitton is thinking of going into Ingland to deale with his father and mother and to informe them of the truth, if they will understand it, and so to return': AAW, B 47, no. 49; see also AAW, B 47, nos 46, 90.

[1239] Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

celebrated [w]*i*thout the church that they might assist thereat, w*hi*ch done they w*i*thdrewe them selves till Mass was done. We heare that matters goe hard w*i*th the French both in the Valtelin, where they dye for famin, and in Savoy where Prince Thomaso hath had a shrewde shock[1240] and ~~an~~ [*words omitted:* there is (?)] a constant report that the constable[1241] is dead; and that the Hugenotes are insolent in Poitou and Dauphenie; the Spaniards verie strong, so that it is thought that the duke of Savoy may come to blowes in the end.

Gondomare, who was upon his voyage for Ingland, is now come extraordinarie into France[1242] where, if some good end be not made, this is like to proove a troublesome yeare. In Ingland there was never such pressing of men, as well for sea as land, but to what end is not known, whether for offence or defence. The French marchandes from divers places have sent to the king co*m*playning of the loss they sustayn by the arrest of their shippes in all the king of Spayns countries for the money the duke of Guise tooke going to Genova. What wilbe the issu is not yet seene. Yesterday I had one from M[r] Messindin[1243] of the 21 of May wherein he writeth as received from Newma*n* at Lisboa that M[r] Francis Tregean, a most constant co*n*fessour, in whose howse M[r] Cuthbert Mayn, our first martir, was taken, haveing been buried in Lisboa (for in King James his tyme, fynding no remedie of his wronges, he left Ingland and went into Spayn) [in] the yeare 1608, in the church of the casa p*ro*fessa of the Jesuites, upon S[t] Marcs day last, by occasion of having another in the same place, was fownd his bodie <so> entiere and incorrupt that it seemed nothing <was> wanting therein but only life, his fleshe soft and rysing after it was pressed downe and his joyntes limber and plying. And, being buried in S[t] Francis his habit, the habit was wholly co*n*sumed, saveing only so much as covered his secret partes w*hi*ch remayned whole, a spann broad or more.[1244] This it hath pleased God for his owne glorie and the

[1240] For the Spaniards' defeat of Prince Thomas of Savoy, near Asti, see *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 42.

[1241] François de Bonne, duke of Lesdiguières, constable of France.

[1242] See *Letter 82*.

[1243] Edward Maddison.

[1244] William Newman had written from Lisbon on 30 April/10 May 1625 that 'a certeyne hermandad or congregation, goeinge to burry one of their brethren in the casa professa of the Jesuittes in this citty of Lisboa, they opened the grave where M[r] Francis Trugian (who dyed in this towne) was burryed' in September 1608. The body was said to be incorrupt. On the following day, Newman gained admittance to the church and described what he saw, though he was not certain that the body really was incorrupt. On the Monday following, some of the English Catholics in Lisbon went, at the behest of the Jesuits, to the archbishop to beseech him to set up a commission to see whether all this was natural or 'beyond nature'. The archbishop instructed that a 'junta of physitions and surgeons should be chosen' to deal with this. Newman hoped that this would 'redound to the augmentinge of the glory of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

com*m*forth of those that suffer for him to shewe in our days. God grant all may take com*m*forth and example thereby to whose holy grace and p*ro*tection I ever com*m*itt and com*m*end you, and so doth M[r] President whose lines you may imagin these to be.

Doway this 18 of June 1625.

Y*ou*rs ever,

Champney

The infanta[1245] is gone to Antwerpe and so to Breda w*i*th good store of money and giftes as well for ordinarie pay as for extraordinarie giftes and presentes.[1246] Howe this whole armye will hereafter be imployed is not yet knowne.

[*Postscript by Matthew Kellison*][1247]

Good Sir, I being otherwise busied, and D[octor] Champney having answered your l*ett*re for mee and imparted al y*ou*r newes, I hope you

the renowned protomartyr of our semynaries, M[r] Cuthbert Mayne, that was taken in M[r] Trugian his house and (may piously be beleeved) gave such doctrine in his lyfe, such example by his death and such assistance with his prayers ever after, as brought this great confessor [*i.e.* Tregian] to such perfeccion', when his body lay incorrupt even after seventeen years in a 'common and ordinary grave', in which there were another five bodies which decomposed in the ordinary way: AAW, A XIX, no. 31, pp. 102–103. See also Anstr., I, pp. 224–226. For Ignatius Stafford SJ's account, of 16/26 April 1625, describing Tregian's exhumation and claiming that his body was found 'incorrupt and entire, without corruption in any part', see J. Morris (ed.), *The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, 3 vols (London, 1872–1877), I, pp. 61–63.

[1245]Isabella Clara Eugenia, archduchess of Austria.

[1246]In a letter of 18/28 June to Thomas Rant, Richard Wariner described the infanta's triumphal entry into Breda, for which see also *Letter 82*. Wariner narrated how 'some knavish wittes have sett owt a leafe of paper printed, very conseitedly. The[y] have putt Breda in a coffin and covered it with a moorning clothe. Before goeth Count Morice, who caryeth the crosse (for indeede yt is one of his townes, and therfor he most of all haith lost in this affayre). On eache side of the beere, is of the one, the king of England with a torche in his hand weeping' and on 'the other side is the king of France, then followeth Count Palatin upon an asse, and his wife upon a mule, after whom do follow his 7 children with theyre hattes in their handes like lacquais. After them the estates of Holand on one side, pitifully weeping; on the other the Venetians. All the foresayd personages do complaigne one to another': AAW, B 47, no. 197.

[1247]On 6/16 June 1625, Kellison had written to Thomas Rant a short note to recommend the two bearers of this letter. One of them, he said, was 'sonne to the bishop of Hereford', Francis Godwin. Godwin's son, 'being made a Catholique on this side, hath been oftentymes sent for by his father and mother, and especially his mother who hath written hime persuasive lettres and hath offered him much to return, saying that otherwise he will be [the] cause of her death. And yet, the yong gentleman, fearing least he should be importuned or for[ced] to doe against his conscience, he being now a Catholique, chose rather to live poorelie in this town and to frequent our lessons.' A pension or other subsidy from the English college or from the curia in Rome, said Kellison, would help to sustain his faith: AAW, B 47, no. 133.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

will excuse mee. One writeth to mee th*a*t a Theatin[1248] sayd that he that was a principal agent to procure th*e* decree for th*e* new oath did him selfe p*re*sentlie after make sute to be a Theatin. I pray you, good sir, desire Sig*n*or Scanarolio to make th*e* sute of a resignation of a benefice over oure pensions, th*e* which sute I sent to him long since. It is for a frend of myne. M[ris] Fowler is a verie honest gentlewoman, noe Jesuitesse. Th*e* yong man that confessed to the pope is now heer labouring as he sayth to be [a] Capucin. I bad him to [*word illegible:* dinner (?)]. M[r] Fitton is not yet returned, w*hi*ch is a sign that he hath much trouble. I pray you comend me to good D[octor] Seaton.

Your own ever,

Mat[thew] Kellison

I wrote to F[ather] Fitzherbert for money, about an 100[l], w*hi*ch M[r] Banes gave us, and I desired Sig*n*or Scanarolio to demand it. The next weeke our procurator will send th*e* accountes.

Addressed: Admodum rever*en*do domino, D*omi*no Thomae Ranto, cleri Anglicani in curia Romana agenti dig*niss*imo.

Endorsed: Writt[en]: June 18.
Received: Julye 19.
Answered: Julye 19.

84. Thomas Roper to Thomas Rant, 17 June 1625

[*AAW, B 47, no. 189*]

Sir,

The letter for David Camerario[1249] is from M[r] Willson or Tompeson,[1250] one of his countreymen that livethe amonge us here who, hearinge of his unworthy carriadge towardes our nation and clergy, hathe written him a letter of reprehension <and> of advise, and <w*i*thall> geavethe him some freindly admonitions. He was importunat w*i*th me to send it, and assurethe me he namethe no boddy in his letter, thoughe perchance it may doe ~~but little~~ small good and worke little w*i*th him.

[1248] i.e. a Jesuit.

[1249] David Chambers. See *NCC*, p. 58. In June 1625, William Webster described Chambers as 'a Scottes priest, a very honest man who lyved with M[r] [Thomas] Moore' and others in Juan-Bautista Vives's house in Rome ('a la Trinita de Monte', in the Piazza di Spagna): AAW, A XIX, no. 56, p. 165; AAW, B 27, no. 8; Shanahan, 'The descendants of St. Thomas More', p. 91.

[1250] William Thompson OFM. See *NAGB*, pp. 163, 198; *NCC*, p. 23.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Yet, to satisfye his desire, I wisshe he had it, and by suche meanes as you shall thincke fittinge.

Our queene (after some dayes of expectance) landed on Sonday last, being our 12 of June, at Dover, and that night lay at the castle.[1251] The next day in the afternoone our kinge went from Canterb[ury] unto hir. She, havinge notice of our kinges arrivall, mette him ~~in~~ comminge into the castle uppon a paire of stares and offered to prostrate hir selfe at his feete, but the kinge hindred hir. Then she offered to kisse his hand w*hi*ch he likewise would not suffer hir to doe but, imbracinge hir, kissed hir two or three tymes togeather, and so walked into a roome and passed some howre w*i*th hir in discourse, and then tooke coache and went w*i*th hir that night to Canterb[ury] w*hi*ch was your midsommer eve, and the supper was all flesse. She being advertised by one of hir chapelines of the day, forbore eatinge, and the cause beinge knowen, some whitmeates were presently made readdy for hir, and that night the king and she bedded togeather, and much a doe there was to gett out of the roome an old matrone who attended on the queene, she alleaginge that she had engaged hir promise to [the] queene mother[1252] not to leave hir.[1253] They rested togeather in Canterb[ury] the next day, and the day following went to Cobbam Hall, and yesternight they came to Whitehall by barge, the river beinge full of shippes w*hi*ch discharged their ordinance as hir barge passed by. Of hir trayne there were only 3 persons of note: the duke of Cheverous,[1254] Conte Tilly[1255] and Villocleere.

This day is the first day of the terme and the last, for it is adjourned untill M*ichaelm*as by reason of the ~~sicknesse~~ <plague> of w*hi*ch there dyed this weeke 165, and 31 parishes are infected. Tomorrowe the parlament beginnethe, w*hi*ch it is thought will hold by reason of the kinges occasions of money, especially for his great fleete w*hi*ch is in a manner now in readinesse, and the kinge will be at the parl[iament] himselfe, but goethe privately thether. We have rayne in great abundance and have had [it] bothe before our queenes landinge and since.

Yours,

T[homas] R[oper]

[1251] See *CSPV, 1625–1626*, p. 87; for the allegedly disastrous reception of Henrietta Maria at Dover, see Tillières, *ME*, pp. 89–91.

[1252] Marie de Médicis.

[1253] See *ibid.*, p. 91.

[1254] Claude de Lorraine, duke of Chevreuse.

[1255] Tanneguy Leveneur, count of Tillières.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Indightementes <and> convictions goe forwarde, and penaltyes are imposed uppon recusantes notwithstandinge the matche. At Canterb[ury] some of my kinsefolk and freindes paye yet 12^{d} a Sonday for not going to churche. We cannot but hope that some grace will be shewed them for the queene[s] sake.

[*In margin*]

Some thinke Fiat[1256] will remayne here ledger w*hi*ch pleaseth not your freindes nor others but our state <only>, w*hi*ch will endevor the more to have him here because he is opposed, and for his former service he hathe the order of the Spirito Sancto bestowed on him.[1257]

Addressed: All' ill*ust*re sig*no*re, il Sig*no*re Tomasso Rante, Inglese. Roma.

Endorsed: Written: June 17.
Received: Julye 24.
Answered: Julye 26.

85. George Musket [Fisher] to Thomas Rant, 24 June 1625

[*AAW, B 48, no. 35, fo. 98r*]

Very worthy s*i*r,

Your last of the 7 of June hath given me good satisfactio*n* concerning the secrecy used in our cheife busines. I was too sensible of your disgrace and could not conceive the*n* that it was for our good, but now I am satisfied my selfe <and> I will endeavor to satisfie others. You have deciphered M^{r} Phil[ip] R[oper] sufficiently,[1258] and given M^{r} Browne such a character as we shall easily know him when he cometh.[1259] Notwithstanding M^{r} Philip R[oper's] conceit of those priests[1260] that were sent in with the queene, they have hitherto demeaned themselves so religiously that they have the applause eve*n* of those that stand most affected to the Jesuits and I hope ther exa*m*ple will doe much good.

[1256] Antoine Coiffier de Ruzé, marquis of Effiat.

[1257] See *CSPV, 1625–1626*, pp. 25, 29.

[1258] In a letter of 18 March 1625, Thomas Roper had asked Thomas More to 'commende me to my uncle Philippe who is good company untell he fauleth in to discourse of the padri' (i.e. the Jesuits): AAW, B 47, no. 176.

[1259] Browne had attended the funeral of Thomas More in Rome in April 1625: Shanahan, 'The death of Thomas More', p. 26.

[1260] i.e. Oratorians.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

F[ather] Berule especially hath wonn much credit and is esteemed, as he deserveth, a man of great zeale, but all matters ar yet so unsetled that we know <not> what the issue will be. The parliament, those especially of the lower House, urge eagerly the execution of the penall lawes against the recusants and the confirmation of such lawes as were made against <them> in the last parlament, but not confirmed by his M*ajes*tie, also the banishment of priests.[1261] You know it is but ther wonted proceeding. But ~~the~~ we hope the king will be gratious and rather ease us of our former burden than impose any new inflictions uppon us. Thes[e] parlamentary busines[ses] are but yet in the budd, and it is hard to conjecture what fruit will insue. All of the parliament house have taken the oath of supremacy and the lower House hath ~~to~~ urged to have a generall fast for the cessation of the plague and good successe of ther busines. But the lords spirituall of the higher <House> opposed this motion, and answered that it apertained to them and not to the parliament to apoint fasts. But they condescended to joine with them in praier for those purposes and to shew that both Houses were in charity notwithstanding some differences betwixt the[m]. They consented all to receive the comunion the next day. I heard also that the lower House moved to have the king open his prerogative that they might know how farr it extended it selfe.[1262] What answere was given I cannot learne. God send good successe to his glory and our countries good. The French will labor what they can to ease our afflictions but how farr they will prevaile is yet uncertaine. During the parliament I suppose they will be able to doe litle. Great part of this weeke hath bin spent in feasting the French and such court complements. Thus abruptly, with offer of my love, I rest.

Yours unfainedly,

G[eorge] M[usket]

June 24.

[1261]Thomas Roper, on 23 June, described the meeting of the parliament on 18 June and narrated that 'in the end of his speeche, his Majestie made a profession of his faithe, assuringe them he would not change nor alter any thinge, but continew in it as his father had don'. But, 'some 2 dayes after', on 20 June, 'Sir Thom[as] Crew, speaker of the lower House, made a speeche and invayed bitterly against recusantes, and thereuppon the lower House did propose unto his Majestie that the penall lawes might be putte in execution against them, to which his Majestie answeared that he would doe what was fittinge, but tolde them withall that was not the businesse for which they were cauled': AAW, A XIX, no. 56, p. 166; see also McClure, *LJC*, pp. 625–626.

[1262]See Thompson, 'Court politics', pp. 172, 174–176. Writing on 25 June 1625, Thomas Roper described the arguments over the proposed fast, the communion, and the royal prerogative, and concluded that 'the common wealthe is sicke and muche distempered': AAW, B 47, no. 190.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Addressed: To his very worthy freind M^r^ Thomas Rant.

Endorsed: Writt[en]: June 24.
Received: Julye 31.
Answered: Aug[ust] 2.

86. Henry Clifford to Thomas Rant, 12/22 August 1625

[*AAW, A XIX, no. 70, pp. 211–212*]

R*everen*d good s*i*r,

I am, thanks be to God, after two months returned home, where I finde many kinde l*ett*res of yo*u*rs but, newly arrived, have not yet time to p*er*use them. I left our countrey exceedingly infected, but cheifly London wherein these last weekes dyed, as the note was brought this day, 4,557 and moste, yea all, this number of the plague. For Westminster and Stepney are not counted in this reckning.[1263] Notw*i*thstanding this greate contagion, the parlament is continued at Oxford, to assist the king w*i*th mony, who wants it by meanes of the greate expences for the late helps of Holland w*i*thout any benefite, and the setting forth of this greate armada, w*hi*ch from England hath 120 shipps and from Holland 30. So in al 150, w*hi*ch makes the king of Spaine to be about him. Yet divers are of opinion th*a*t this navie will not goe forth, although it be in a manner readie at Plimmouth, p*ar*tly as I say for wants of mony, p*ar*tly for the late victories of the Spaniard here upon Breda, at Genoa upon the French, and at Brasile upon the Hollander, whose fleete being victorious is much encoraged against any enemie.[1264] And w*i*thall the greate pestilence in England will be a hinderance to putt the souldiers and marriners togeather w*i*thout infection, some of the shipps being alreadie infected. The queene remaines very Catholicke, and the bishop and Mons*ieu*r Berule, her confessour, doe their duties very well, being still about her, although at my com*m*ing away the rest of the Oratorie remained at S^t^ James, much discontented. There is no other chappell than private chambers.

[1263]On 26 July/5 August 1625, George Fisher had sent Thomas Rant a graphic account of the plague, and said that he was in London 'to attend the sicke and cheifly to releive the necessity of the poore' and that 'we ar called uppon daily, the number of the sicke is so greate'. The count of Tillières interpreted the plague as a providential judgment on the English for continuing to persecute Catholics, contrary to the treaty made with the French: Tillières, *ME*, p. 92.

[1264]See *CSPV, 1625–1626*, pp. 122–123, 138. The Dutch had occupied Bahía, the capital of Brazil, but the Spaniards had recently recovered some of their losses: see G. Parker, *Spain and the Netherlands, 1559–1659* (London, 1979), p. 55; Elliott, *The Count-Duke of Olivares*, pp. 215, 236; *CCE*, pp. 176–177, 222; *CGB*, II, p. 653.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Buckingham doth all, for the king w*i*thout him will doe nothing. The p*ar*lament is very busie to heape more burdens and afflictions uppon Catholicks. The duke of Chevre[use] they say hath doone good offices w*i*th the king to stay these violences, brought to it upon the honour to keepe promises and for reason of state than of any inclination in himselfe. I coulde doe no busines in England because all fri[e]nds were so farre disp*er*sed by meanes of the sicknes. [*In margin:* This towne hath also many howses infected.] I sent yo*ur* l*ett*res for England yesterday w*hi*ch were many, w*hi*ch shoulde be of the 2 of this. God Almightie keepe you.

Andwarpe, 22 April.

Yours,

Henry Clifford

No address.

Endorsed: Written: Aug[ust] 22.
Received: Sept[ember] 11.
Answered: Sep[tember] 13.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960116309003352 Published online by Cambridge University Press