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Abstract of Thesis

Robert Beale (c.1541-1601) was one of the foremost (and certainly the best documented) of the 'second-rank' figures that inhabited the inner rings of the Elizabethan polity, and who in many senses characterised the politics of the age. Beale was educated first at Coventry and then abroad during the Marian exile. Here he imbibed of the cosmopolitan Protestantism that was to characterise and also control his subsequent years of service to Queen, Country and commonwealth. His academic, linguistic and legal training also formed the basis of his secretarial and administrative skills that provided the backbone to his public political life.

Beale became an integral figure in mid-Elizabethan political society first through his connections with Cecil, Leicester and Walsingham and then through his service as a diplomatic specialist and as a Clerk of the Privy Council. His entire public political life was motivated and controlled by a complex matrix of conceptions of service. First, service to Walsingham in Paris as a secretary and familiar; second, service to Cecil and Leicester and other Privy Councillors as an administrator and a source of counsel, and third service to Elizabeth as Queen and figurehead of the nation. The final controlling ideological impulse for Beale was his service to the more intangible concepts of a distinctly protestant English commonwealth, combined at the same time with a more widespread notion of a pan-European community of reformed protestants.

Beale’s public political life provides an exceptionally well-documented microcosm of many of the concerns that motivated his contemporaries and of the arenas in which these concerns were acted out. As such, the clearer and more detailed picture of Beale that emerges also adds considerably to our understanding of mid-Elizabethan political society.
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Introduction. Robert Beale and the Elizabethan Polity

‘If I examine my prejudice, I find that it is not against biography itself, which in any case we must have, and which can be as exacting and searching a discipline as most types of history: It is against young people writing of life before they have gathered sufficient experience to interpret it.’ Sir John Neale 1958.1

Robert Beale was born in around 1541, son of a London mercer Robert Beale and of Amy Morison, sister to the Henrician scholar and diplomat Richard Morison.2 Beale was then educated under the care of John Hales in Coventry and by his Uncle Richard Morison in Frankfurt during the Marian exile. Beale’s return to England in the early 1560s flung him headlong into the debate over the succession to Elizabeth, and he remained at the epicentre of the Elizabethan polity through his service as a diplomatic specialist and as a Clerk of the Privy Council from the early 1570s till his death in 1601. During these later years of political maturity Beale was moving in the same political circles as the Queen and her chief Privy Councillors, but always as a creature of the second rank, conscious of his own relative position below these figures, and of his duty to advise, counsel and serve their wishes and desires as much as his own. Though not then of the ‘first flight’, Beale became virtually ubiquitous in so many aspects of contemporary political society that his historical presence can hardly be ignored. Beale’s political ubiquity is then reinforced in the eyes of the aspiring historian by the remarkable facts of archival survival concerning him. His wide and varied political and intellectual interests were also allied to fingers that bits of paper seemed to have had a habit of sticking to. This considerable archive of personal working papers assembled over Beale’s lifetime has then fortunately survived the many possible

deprivations of the intervening centuries and is now safe and sound in the care of the new British Library at St. Pancras, London.

These then are the bare historical and archival facts around which the biographical ‘life’ of Beale could be constructed and written up, and this combination of Beale’s wide political experience and the fortunate survival of his papers should constitute in itself sufficient justification for attempting the study of Robert Beale that follows. Furthermore, the existing historical literature touching on Beale is, apart from the brief entries in the standard biographical sources, at first glance perplexedly scanty, amounting to a couple of articles dealing primarily with his archive rather than with his political life.³ This comparative historiographical neglect of Beale is rooted paradoxically in the very survival of Beale’s lovingly gathered and then fortuitously preserved personal working archive, a lasting legacy of primary material contained now in nearly a hundred manuscript volumes. This very fullness of Beale’s surviving archive of manuscript papers forms a veritable embarrassment of riches, and imposes on the prospective biographer the daunting dilemma of how to encompass the many different details, facets and strands of Beale’s busy political life and still produce a study that maintains conceptual unity and some sort of narrative sense.

Partly because of this, the following study of Robert Beale is not a conventional narrative political biography of Beale (rest again, Professor Neale), nor even an unconventional one at that, as it is by no means a complete history of the politics, diplomacy and administration of England during the years of Beale’s political maturity from c.1564 to his death in 1601. A complete biographical endeavour in this form would also involve researching and writing explanatory accounts of areas of Elizabethan history which are still poorly served by existing historiography and for

³ The journal articles concerning Beale and his archive are Schofield, B. ‘The Yelverton Manuscripts’, *BMQ* 19 (1954), pp. 3-9; Basing, P. ‘Robert Beale and the Queen of Scots’, *Brit Lib J* 20 (1994), pp. 65-82. Aspects of Beale’s career have been examined in a recent PhD by Patricia Brewerton submitted in 1999 at Queen Mary and Westfield, London University.
which extensive primary source material certainly survives. The prospective biographer of Beale who had done his archival research thoroughly would potentially be placed in the shoes of John Leland, a man who has been seen as the father of the flowering of British history in the early Sixteenth Century, and who amassed such a vast amount of material in his travels and researches that he was eventually unable to publish in any form. This is an uncomfortable thought. 'We all know what happened to Leland,' mused Daniel Woolf in 1990, 'and it is worth remembering that his Elizabethan disciples knew it, too: the problem of putting his vast store of data into a rhetorically satisfactory form drove him insane.'

The existing traditional narrative political biographies of the various principal and not-quite first-rank figures of the Elizabethan period (such as Sir Ralph Sadler, Sir William Petre, Sir William Paget, Sir Henry Killigrew, Sir Walter Mildmay, Horatio Palavicino, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Nicholas Bacon and Sir Michael Hickes) are therefore useful but not entirely natural companions or comparisons to the study that follows. Nor are the more recent but perhaps less biographically conventional studies dealing with the often interchangeable roles of the intellectual, the secretary, the writer and the politician in Elizabethan England. Beale was by no means a literary figure in the same bracket as Sir Philip Sidney, Gabriel Harvey or Edmund Spenser, and Beale produced no lasting testament to his poetic imagination or mastery of the English language as he probably (quite rightly) laid claim to neither. Beale was a hybrid creature to modern eyes, one of

the most prominent of the busy intellectual servants who inhabited the second-tier of political society and who in many senses characterized the politics of the age. Beale thought of himself, and was also thought of by contemporaries who were in a position to know, as a learned and educated man. He read and wrote six or seven languages, collected an impressive array of manuscript treatises and tracts, was one of the founding member of the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries, and corresponded with some of the most learned men of his day. These early modern intellectual figures like Beale, Sidney, Thomas Norton, Gabriel Harvey or John Dee, were, with their libraries, their contacts and their learning, continually eager to provide intellectual services to the leading political figures of the time, or, as was the case with Beale, Sidney and Norton, simply were the leading political figures of their time.7

The relative absence of historiographical material exclusively concerning Beale and the related absence of any one direct model for the form of this study virtually guarantees that what follows below is not explicitly driven by any one current historiographical debate or argument. Each chapter attempts to engage with the relevant modern literature where necessary or useful, but no single historiographical work, tradition or debate provides a focus or a structure for many of the following discussions and arguments. It is partly for these reasons that the two aspects of Beale’s career for which he is perhaps best served by modern historiography - his involvement in the ecclesiastical politics of the 1580s and 90s, and his often associated role as a ‘man of business’ in the Elizabethan House of Commons - are passed over in relative silence. Beale’s role as one of the many Elizabethan Members of Parliament, described within the two volumes of Professor J. E. Neale’s study of the Elizabethan House of Commons published in the 1950s, was the first proper historiographical treatment of any of Beale’s multifarious political activities. Following on from Neale, Patrick Collinson’s portrayal of the

'puritan' Beale and his struggles both in and out of Parliament with Archbishop John Whitgift and Bishop John Aylmer over the heart and soul of the Elizabethan church in the 1580s and 90s has effectively remained the 'classic' characterisation by which Beale has been subsequently understood.\footnote{Neale, J. E. Elizabeth I and her parliaments 1559-1601 2 Vols Jonathan Cape, London 1953, 57; Collinson, P. The Elizabethan Puritan Movement Jonathan Cape, London 1967.}


Graves's work on Norton was a conscious revision of the radical puritan agitator presented by Neale, and formed a part of the continuing criticism of Neale's work on the Elizabethan parliaments at the hands of the so-called 'revisionists', led principally by Geoffrey Elton.\footnote{Elton, G. R. 'Parliament in the Sixteenth Century: Functions and Fortunes', \textit{Historical Journal} 22 (1979), pp 255-78; \textit{The Parliaments of England 1559-1581} CUP Cambridge 1986.} Studies by a new generation of historians such as Norman Jones, Ian Archer, David Dean and others have since considerably clarified and expanded the
understanding of the mechanisms and procedures at work in the Elizabethan Parliaments.\textsuperscript{11} This process of ‘revision’ has effectively served, although not always intentionally, to push politics into the background as far as the Elizabethan parliaments are concerned. Simply put, Neale’s view of the Elizabethan Commons defined by political conflict and opposition has been replaced by one in which Conciliar management, procedural correctness, commercial interests and legislative efficiency controlled events within the lower house.

A relatively lonely and isolated voice in reply to the ‘revisionists’ has been that raised by Patrick Collinson, who has sought to re-politicize the Elizabethan House of Commons through the re-politicization, albeit in a more subtle manner than that of Neale, of the ‘men-of-business’ like Beale and Norton.\textsuperscript{12} Collinson and also Simon Adams have since also pointed out that any attempt to categorize the putative men of business according to whether they were lawyers, civic officials, or royal servants is an essentially futile endeavour and one that partly misses the point in the process.\textsuperscript{13} Men like Norton and Beale did indeed share many of the same concerns and many of the arenas in which they articulated these concerns, but at the end of it all each was his own


man and any attempt to stifle the differences between them by a blanket categorization such as 'man of business' for the sake of historiographical neatness would be misplaced. Another relevant criticism of the terms of the 'man of business' debate within the process of revision of Neale's work is that the well of primary material had pretty much run dry. In one of the most important of the recent evaluations of Elizabethan Parliaments, Collinson was straightforwardly honest that although he had 'moved the furniture around the room', few new pieces had been offered for consideration either by him or by Neale's recent critics. Others have perhaps been less honest and their arguments descended accordingly in ever-decreasing circles of self-reference. What follows does not pretend to offer much new material directly relating to Beale's role in the Elizabethan House of Commons, but many of the issues involved are covered elsewhere in what follows in greater depth; issues of service and duty, and the varieties of ideological and religious loyalties manifested by Beale and men like him to Queen and Privy Council.

If this brief survey of the historiographical background shows then what the following study of Robert Beale is not, then what is it that we have left? Pressures of time, money and of ability (rather than a more straightforward fear of mirroring Leland's bouts of insanity) have instead conspired to produce the more limited study that follows. If not a biography, then the rhetorical form adopted for what follows consists of a more episodic and conceptual analysis of Beale's political life centred around the concept of service in early modern society. The following eight chapters in the main bulk of the PhD and the three associated appendices can be broken down for convenience into three separate sections. The first section deals with Beale's archive and papers, the second with his service as a secretary, diplomat and clerk of the Privy Council during his political maturity from c.1570 to his death in 1601, and the third with his extended involvement in the issues surrounding the succession to Elizabeth and then with Mary Queen of Scots, which culminated in his central role in the execution of the Scottish Queen at Fotheringay in February 1587. There is little or no consideration therefore in
what follows of certain areas of Beale’s political life for which there are significant archival sources and which undoubtedly deserve prolonged and proper investigation. For these reasons, Beale’s role as an expert on the Hanse merchants and their base in London at the Steelyard, as a councillor of estate in the Netherlands expedition in 1587, as a Secretary to the Council of the North, and his many days and nights spent searching out and interrogating suspected Catholics in London are not treated in detail below. It is hoped that the aspects of Beale’s career which are considered in more depth below offer significant parallels and similarities for his role in areas such as these that might partially compensate for these deficits.

The first section concentrates on the simple facts of archival survival that should underpin any study of Beale, whether past, present or future and whatever its adopted rhetorical form. Beale’s collected manuscript papers are now mostly in the Yelverton Papers in the British Library and represent an enormously rich and varied source of primary material in their own right. Because of Beale’s seeming ubiquity in so many areas of Elizabethan government, his papers contain something relevant on virtually every aspect of Elizabethan history, whether categorized as political, diplomatic or ecclesiastical. It is partly then because of the survival of so much rich and varied source material that Beale’s own political life has remained relatively untouched, as generations of potential or prospective historians have been discouraged by this forbidding mass of what was for so long inadequately catalogued manuscript material. This absence of a satisfactory catalogue was the main hurdle to any attempt to write anything meaningful on Beale himself, and this hurdle was only satisfactorily removed with the publication of the British Library Catalogue of the Yelverton Papers in 1994.¹⁴ The first section of the PhD consisting of Chapter 1 and Appendix 1 is concerned with this extensive personal archive: how Beale produced and collected it, the process by which it was organized and bound, its care and history in the intervening centuries with

the Yelverton family and their descendants, and its present location in the British Library and elsewhere. Much of this first section is based on the 1994 British Library Catalogue, but much also is new, especially concerning the volumes of Beale’s papers that were dispersed at some time or another after his death and are no longer found with the main bulk of the Yelverton papers now catalogued as British Library Additional MSS 48000-196. The research for this section of the Ph.D is underlain by various concepts concerning the use of distinctive paper stocks by individuals in the processes by which archives like Beale’s were constructed. The basis for these conclusions is presented in Appendix 1, which outlines the criteria for judging what are termed as ‘Beale-related’ and ‘Beale-originated’ papers based partly in the concept of watermarks and papers stocks. Two examples of the possible fruits of this line of research are then given in detail at the end of Appendix 1: the dating of a manuscript copy of George Buchanan’s *De jure regni apud Scotos*, and a schedule showing the extensive survival of the papers of Thomas Norton within Beale’s archive.

The second section comprising of Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 is the largest in terms of wordcount and forms the heart of the thesis. This seeks to explore a number of conceptual themes that have been structured in a loose chronological arrangement around Beale’s developing career as secretary, bureaucrat and diplomat during the 1570s, 1580s and 1590s. Many of these themes revolve broadly around the concept of secretarial service in early modern society, whether within the personal households of ‘great men’, or as diplomats, administrators, clerks and as office holders in the royal bureaucracy. This section begins in Chapter 2 with a treatment of Beale’s early years and education in the 1550s and 1560s. During this formative period of Beale’s upbringing in Coventry and during the Marian exile in the 1550s, Beale came under the care of his uncle Sir Richard Morison and of John Hales, the man termed below as Beale’s ‘foster-father’. Beale’s own later career and diplomatic specialisation contained uncanny echoes of that of his ‘uncle Morison’, and his political and religious ideology came to mirror closely that of the committed and cosmopolitan protestantism of John
Hales. Beale then returned from the continent to England at Hales’s behest in the early 1560s to join the pressure group attempting to try to validate the marriage of Catherine Grey to the Earl of Hertford and to get the Suffolk claim to the succession to Elizabeth ratified in Parliament. Beale’s service to Hales and Hertford in these affairs in the mid-1560s, although ultimately frustrated and unsuccessful, brought his name to the notice of the Privy Council and the men at the heart of political society for the first time.

Chapter 3 then concentrates on the first service of real political note that Beale performed, when he accompanied Francis Walsingham, the newly appointed resident English ambassador, to France between 1571 and 1573. Beale was ten years younger than Walsingham but their political lives were to be completely intertwined. Their paths had possibly crossed during their time on the continent during the Marian exile, and they had then become brothers-in-law through their respective marriages in the mid-1560s to the sisters Edith and Ursula St. Barbe. As well as their marriage vows to the St. Barbe sisters, Beale and Walsingham shared together enduring commitments to Elizabeth as Queen, to their commonwealth and country, and to the reformed Protestant faith, mixed then in equal measure with a visceral hatred of Catholicism. Beale’s relationship with Walsingham and his role within the ambassador’s household were both characterized and controlled more by Beale’s intellectual qualities and his ideological and religious motivations than by his administrative capabilities. Beale’s relationship with and service to Walsingham as a secretary in Paris cannot therefore be defined merely in terms of a secretarial assistant or as an amanuensis, where his utility might be measured by the number of letters he penned, endorsed or filed. Instead, Beale served more as a household familiar, a trusted associate and confidant as defined within contemporary concepts of service central to Early Modern administration, government and politics. These two roles of amanuensis and confidant could, however, overlap in certain circumstances and with certain individuals. How this happened in practice is shown through an examination of the roles of the different individual secretaries and servants in the households of all the English ambassadors resident in Paris, beginning
with Sir Thomas Hoby in 1566 and culminating with Walsingham himself in 1571-73. This prosopographical survey of ambassadorial secretaries and their various roles is then complemented by an analysis of the proportion of Walsingham’s correspondence during the calendar year of 1571 that was penned either in his own autograph hand or by an amanuensis on his behalf. This survey is then concluded by an analysis of how Walsingham and others controlled the flow of information to the Queen and Privy Council through the intermediation of Sir William Cecil as Principal Secretary.

Beale left France and returned again to England in 1572, and was appointed as one of the Clerks of the Privy Council in July of the same year. This was the office and position at Court that was to define the nature of his involvement in the Elizabethan polity over the following three decades. As one of the Clerks of the Council, Beale’s duties and service were centred around his relationship with the Privy Council in general and with the Principal Secretary in particular, an office that was soon to be filled by Beale’s trusted brother-in-law Francis Walsingham in December 1573. The subject of Chapter 4 is formed by the often complex and intertwined administrative relationships that existed between the three key (and often-overlapping) political nodes that were so distinctive of the mid-Elizabethan polity: the rough triangle formed on the one side by Elizabeth as Queen, on the other by Sir William Cecil and the other serving Principal Secretaries, and then by the Privy Council as an administrative and executive body.

The Principal Secretary was the administrative mainstay of the later Tudor state and the fulcrum around which lesser crown servants like Beale and the other Clerks of the Council revolved. The administrative procedures of the Privy Council during the time of Beale’s service as Clerk were characterized by the peculiarly mid-Elizabethan arrangement where the serving Principal Secretaries Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Francis Walsingham and Sir Thomas Wilson worked hand in hand with the ongoing administrative omniscience of Sir William Cecil. The model of bureaucratic
practice inherited by Walsingham and the other serving mid-Elizabethan Principal Secretaries had been handed down from Thomas Cromwell’s time by a succession of Principal Secretaries and their servants. The Principal Secretary’s own household clerks or 'secretariat' were fundamental to this model of bureaucratic practice, and a model for this too was passed on pretty much intact from Cromwell to Cecil to Walsingham. The internal structure of Walsingham’s secretariat during the 1570s and 80s is analyzed here in order to trace the relative roles of Walsingham’s household secretaries and of Beale, as both one of the Clerks of the Council and as a personal intimate, within the administrative processes of government.

The role and responsibilities of Beale as one of the serving Clerks of the Privy Council from 1572 to c.1588 is then described in greater detail in Chapter 5. The chief responsibilities of Beale and his fellow Clerks were the preparation, drafting and penning of Council letters and then the efficient recording of these in the Privy Council Register. These tasks are examined here using specific examples of the paper record produced by all the various secretaries and clerks involved. Beale learnt his trade in the Privy Council chamber in the early 1570s, and by the beginning of the 1580s was acting as the senior serving Clerk, and also as a temporary Principal Secretary himself during Walsingham’s occasional absences. During this time, Beale’s involvement in the ecclesiastical politics of the early 1580s and his clashes with Archbishop John Whitgift show his position and influence at the heart of the polity. Whitgift may well have had the last laugh in the struggle for the heart and soul of the Elizabethan church, but Beale’s involvement was not insignificant and provides an instructive exemplar of how men like Beale operated within the Elizabethan political system. Beale’s service as a Clerk of the Council is also described here against the historiographical background of Privy Council administrative history. Since the early Twentieth Century, the Tudor Privy Council as an administrative body has come under intense scrutiny. In comparison, the Clerks of the Privy Council have been under-served by modern historiography, and even something as apparently simple as the identification of some
of the various Clerks serving at certain times has proved problematic. Partly in order to address this imbalance, and partly in order to locate Beale’s service as one of the Clerks in its proper context, a chronological list of the Clerks of the Privy Council from c.1538 to 1600 is given in Appendix 3, detailing where possible the dates of appointment and times of attendance for each individual clerk.

Beale combined his service as a Clerk of the Council between 1572 and his death in 1601 with his continuing involvement in diplomatic affairs, whether acting in person abroad or as a specialist technical advisor back in England. The forms of service that a man like Beale was expected to do as a diplomatic specialist are described in more detail in Chapter 6, using the particular examples of his 1576 mission to the Netherlands and some of the many treatises, ‘white papers’ and general surveys either proposed by Beale himself or specially commissioned by others. During these years Beale acted partly as an executive instrument and partly as a source of advice, counsel and information. Beale was qualified for this role as a diplomatic specialist through the intellectual and practical amalgam of his education, his linguistic and legal training, his extensive personal experience of the continent and his more general administrative and secretarial experience. The extensive correspondence Beale maintained with comparable continental figures - diplomats, secretaries and intellectuals - functioned as a private source of political information and European news directly comparable to the networks maintained by Cecil and Walsingham as Principal Secretaries. Beale’s diplomatic service was primarily controlled by the need to satisfy the three principal but not always complementary interests of England’s defence, ideology and trade: defence from a feared Catholic invasion, the maintenance of the protestant reformation at home and abroad, and the provision of a political framework that was conducive to England’s mercantile interests. The ideological drive behind the more neutral linguistic and administrative skills was provided by Beale’s own more personal ideological and religious commitments, which consistently served to underlay and align his attitude towards the often bewildering circumstances of continental European politics.
Beale's return to England at the behest of Beale's foster-father John Hales in the mid-1560s plunged him headlong into the issues surrounding the possible succession to Elizabeth that was in many ways to define a greater part of his political life. The third and final section of the PhD comprising of Chapters 7 and 8 is concerned with Beale's ongoing involvement in these issues. Beale's early support of the Suffolk claim to the succession on the basis of a selective interpretation of Henry VIII's will and the designation of Catherine Grey in Parliament was transformed after Mary Stuart's flight into England in 1568 and the radical realignment of European politics along more strictly confessional lines in the late 1560s. How Beale redirected his energies thereafter in a more straightforward belief in the practical efficacy of Mary's death is discussed in Chapter 7. Beale's conviction of the political necessity of Mary's death was underpinned by the frustration felt by Beale and many others in the face of Elizabeth's own intransigence and refusal to sanction the execution of the Scottish Queen. This conviction was increasingly sharpened in Beale's case by his reading during the 1570s of the Scottish and continental literature on the justification of civil rebellion and tyrannicide thrown up by the contemporary European political situation of the 1560s and 1570s.

When Mary Stuart was finally executed at Fotheringay in February 1587, Beale was able to breathe a sigh of relief on many counts, but even he could probably never have predicted how central his own individual role in actually bringing this about was to be. Ever since this time, both Beale and Beale's colleague Principal Secretary William Davison have been almost exclusively associated with the death of Mary Queen of Scots.¹⁵ Chapter 8 is based around the circumstances of the meeting of the Privy Council in William Cecil's private chambers at the Court in Greenwich on 3 February

¹⁵ In the words of Davison's only biographer up to now: 'The connection of William Davison, one of the Secretaries..., with the fate of Mary Queen of Scots, has obtained from him the notice both of Historians and Biographers, and he is in a great degree identified with that event.' Nicolas, N. Harris Life of William Davison Secretary of State and Privy Counsellor to Queen Elizabeth London 1823: preface, A2.
1587. In this covert Privy Council meeting the warrant for Mary’s execution was
danded over into Beale’s hands, and he was then instructed by Cecil and the other
councillors to ride north to Fotheringay in all haste and secrecy and proceed with the
execution. Both Beale’s role as a Clerk of the Privy Council and that of William
Davison as Principal Secretary within the political framework of the mid-Elizabethan
Privy Council is nowhere more clearly or well documented as in this single most
pivotaly important of occasions. The circumstances behind the signing of the warrant
by Elizabeth and the subsequent scapegoating of William Davison in Star Chamber in
March 1587 are investigated in detail here in order to attempt to show how the
processes of conciliary government that had matured in the middle decades of
Elizabeth’s reign reached their apogee with the Council meeting that despatched Beale,
and then how the wrath of Elizabeth was sufficient to rend asunder the conciliary
political will that had been assembled over the years in the face of Elizabeth’s
reluctance to put Mary to death.

The political fallout of these events also brought out into the open some of the themes
of service and duty that have underpinned this thesis. In the face of the wrath of
Elizabeth, servants such as Beale, whether they had sworn an oath of loyalty to
Elizabeth as a royal servant or not, were forced into an uncomfortable process of
introspection, and pressed into articulating the motivations and loyalties that had
impelled them to carry out the deed that they had just committed in her name. Here the
multi-layered basis for the service of men like Beale to varying conceptions of Queen,
Council, and a distinctly protestant Commonwealth were effectively laid bare. These
various ideological and religious forms of personal and public motivation were often
over-lapping, consensual and complementary: they might also become, when placed
under severe stress as generated by situations as the execution of Mary, less and less
harmonious and more and more contradictory.
A good part of this second section, and of the study of Beale and his political life in general, relies on the production of a proper context of similar clerks, secretaries and servants to judge him by. In each of the preceding chapters dealing with the various aspects of Beale’s political career, whether as part of the household of Walsingham in Paris, as one of the Clerks of the Privy Council or as a diplomatic representative, Beale can only be properly judged by comparing him with others, like with like. With Walsingham in Paris this involves comparing him with men like Ralph Warcop and Lisle Cave, as a Clerk of the Privy Council during the 1570s and 80s with men like Edmund Tremayne and Thomas Wilkes, and as a diplomatic representative during the same decades with men like Daniel Rogers and William Davison. The source material for this investigation (as with so much else in early modern history) consists almost exclusively of hand-written correspondence. In order to trace and map out the service of a particular individual, and also the associated structure of secretariats in which they worked, it has been necessary to rely heavily on the ability to identify the autograph handwriting of all the various individuals involved. The methodology and the principles upon which this research has been carried out are treated at length in Appendix 2. A brief survey of the history of the collection of autograph writing over the preceding four centuries introduces a consideration of the utility of applying the methodology and principles of forensic document analysis into sixteenth-century archives. This also incorporates a discussion of the cultural significance of autograph handwriting in Elizabethan England. This is then followed by a list of verified sample or comparison documents in the autograph handwriting of as many of the individuals who feature in this thesis as has been possible to track down.

In a study of such a varied and well-documented figure such as Beale there should hopefully be something for everyone in the following pages. An imaginary ‘pik’n’mix’ reading-guide organized according to possible interest groups would be as follows: bibliographers, archivists, paper historians (and potential biographers of Thomas Norton) should begin at the beginning with Chapter 1 and its associated Appendix 1.
Those professing a more general interest in Beale himself and the other diplomats, clerks and secretaries like him, together with the various concepts of personal and ideological service that motivated them should read Chapters 2 through 6. These five chapters at the heart of the thesis can be read either as a whole or selectively as required. Those readers interested in the mid-Elizabethan Privy Council and its clerks in particular should read Chapters 4 and 5 and the associated Appendix 3 listing the clerks of the Privy Council c.1540-1600. Palaeographers and forensic document analysts should read Chapter 3 and Appendix 2. Historians of political thought and those interested in the vexed question of the Elizabethan succession or exclusion crisis should read Chapter 7. Anyone interested in the circumstances surrounding the execution of Mary Stuart in February and March of 1587 should read Chapter 8, which, it is argued, has something to say about everything else too. Should anyone ever attempt to read it all then it is hoped that there is enough connecting material to link it all together satisfactorily.

Beale has been an interesting companion over the past few years, and his papers and political career have certainly introduced me to virtually every aspect of Elizabethan history imaginable. This study of Beale has also demanded the acquisition of the full range of technical tools and research skills that a prospective research student is required to hold in order to make any kind of sense of it all. Virtually all of what follows is grounded on independent archival research conducted mostly in the British Library and the PRO over the previous four years. This research has therefore a distinct bias to primary sources, and in particular (as my discussions below of the uses of paper evidence and of forensic handwriting analysis testify) to handwritten correspondence on handmade paper. Partly because of this, I have tried to stay away where possible from the numerous printed editions and calendars of records and correspondence. Whilst not quite amounting to an unthinking fetishisation of manuscript material, this bias reveals itself also in a tendency to quote at length from these original sources. What follows may therefore be likened to something hewn from the coal-face (so to
speak) of Elizabethan history, and may potentially cause a bit of unnecessary coughing and spluttering because of this. It would be admitted that this approach has led in places to a lack of proper historical perspective and perhaps a tendency to confuse the wood for the trees. What is lost in clarity or breadth of vision will be compensated, I hope, by a sense of authenticity and by the vitality of the original sources.

If the reader is provoked to wonder to why there is no more personal assessment of Beale in the pages below, it is because I simply don’t have one. Almost every one of the ‘traditional’ biographies of Elizabethan political figures referred to earlier in this introduction includes an apology for their inability to consider any aspect of what we would term in our modern/post-modern age their subject’s ‘personal’ life. No single letter or note that we would label as ‘personal’ survives even within Beale’s copious archive assembled so assiduously and then preserved so fortuitously over the centuries. It might be considered a poor return for the years spent studying a single individual to offer a couple of references to a toothache he suffered in the summer of 1576 when in the Netherlands, or that when in the Low Countries a decade later Beale sent back to his wife a gift of two lanterns and four pairs of bellows.16 When Beale had something personal to say to his wife Edith or to his friends and colleagues such as Daniel Rogers, Sir Henry Killigrew or Francis Walsingham, then either he said it in person or he did not deem the paper it was written on as worth the keeping.

On the often vexed question of religion, I must attempt to persuade the reader that I have no particular axe to grind. Beale grew up to be a bigoted and fanatical protestant, who was personally involved in the racking of Catholic missionaries and conspirators, who canvassed openly for the death of Mary Stuart, and who then played an instrumental part in her final downfall. I have nothing to say on the rights and wrongs

16 BL Egerton MS 1693 f 18 Thomas Castleyn to Beale 4 June 1576; ‘Mistress Beale told me that you were troubled with the toathe ache but I trust you are longe since amended thereof...’; Add MS 48014 Beale's Journal from the Netherlands 1587, f 171b ‘I wrote to my wife by a man of Mr Briant & sent to lanterns & four par of belows.’
(whether legal, moral, or doctrinal) involved in all this. Many other people in similar positions to Beale who shared his religious convictions thought the same way, and with the education Beale received and a foster-father like John Hales, it is not surprising that Beale did too. Beale did what he did and thought what he thought for his own good reasons, and I will have done at least part of my job properly if I manage to explain the how and why of all this in the pages below, and I am content to leave it to the reader to make any judgement, whether moral or religious, according to their own views and consciences if they feel it necessary. I have also tried to avoid the use of value-laden adjectives in describing what Beale was up to and what he thought, although not, I would maintain, from any naïve belief in my own irreproachable objectivity. On the other hand, readers can judge for themselves if they feel that my own historiographical debts to Professors Collinson and Guy have skewed my interpretation or outlook, for I would be the first to suggest that they most certainly have influenced and guided me in not only what I have discussed but the way in which I have done so. That, I would most definitely maintain, is what the teaching process is all about. Neither of these two teachers has ever sought to poke or prod either my continuing historical education or this thesis in a direction that they did not want to go, for that would have been too crude. The influence of both has always been of a more indirect, less hands-on character that I hope has paid dividends, and it is for they themselves and for the informed reader familiar with their work to judge accordingly.
Chapter 1. Robert Beale’s Collection of Manuscript Papers

‘After the sale of a few lots of the Yelverton MSS the sale was stopped. ... To know where the remainder are now preserved would be useful information. They were all given by Lord Sussex to Lord Calthorpe... and at his death had not been opened, nor perhaps since.’ Richard Gough, antiquary, 1812.¹

It is ironic that the relative historiographical neglect that Beale has suffered from over the centuries is due almost entirely to the survival virtually en bloc of his collection of manuscript papers, a peculiar blessing of archival survival that makes Beale virtually unique amongst his Elizabethan peers. In total, ninety-five manuscript volumes containing papers relating to Beale’s original collection survive. The bulk of these volumes, eighty five to be precise, are to be found amongst the ‘Yelverton papers’ bought by the British Museum from Brigadier Richard Hamilton Anstruther-Gough-Calthorpe in 1953, a descendant of the Yelverton family, and which are now catalogued as British Library Additional Manuscripts 48000-196.² In addition to these 85 volumes still contained within the ‘Yelverton Papers’, there are also another eight volumes containing papers that were originally part of Beale’s collection scattered around the rest of the British Library collections, and two volumes that have strayed a little further afield: one now in Aberdeen University Library and the other in Brigham Young University Library, in Provo, Utah. Three further volumes which were part of the Yelverton library in the Seventeenth Century and then disappeared sometime in the

² The British Library Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts: the Yelverton Manuscripts Additional Manuscripts 48000-48196, British Library London 1994: ‘Introduction’ Part I by Michael Borrie, pp ix-xvii, and Part II by Patricia Basing pp xix-xxxv. This was invaluable as the basis for my own work in Beale’s papers; I would also like to thank Ms. Basing for the help and friendly advice she offered me during the course of my studies on Beale and the Yelverton Papers.
Eighteenth Century were almost certainly composed entirely of Beale’s papers, and these have since unfortunately failed to resurface.³

The present location of many of Beale’s papers in the bound volumes of the Yelverton collection and elsewhere bears little relation to their contemporary organization during Beale’s own lifetime. The model of organization in Beale’s mind would not have been the shelves of bound volumes of the manuscript library familiar to historians from Robert Cotton’s library so assiduously collected and organized in the 1620s and 1630s.⁴ Beale was first and foremost a secretary, diplomat and Clerk of the Council, whose working environment was a chamber or study with odd shelves and chests, not that of the institutional library with regular cases of shelves containing neatly bound manuscript books. Beale himself had been brought up in the bureaucratic tradition of the Principal Secretary’s Office under Walsingham, and his model for the organisation of his own papers was something akin to that of Walsingham himself, recorded in an inventory made of Walsingham’s papers in 1588 by one of his secretaries Thomas Lake. Walsingham’s papers were collected and organized first under subject matter - whether by a particular sovereign or country - under titles such as ‘France’, ‘the Scottish Quene’, ‘Germany’ etc. - or by domestic categories and the various ‘Books of Home matters’ such as ‘Musters’ and ‘Naval matters’. Within these subject headings, papers were then subdivided according to year, issue or some other relevant category and then wrapped into bundles or packets that were only then given an alphabetical letter and number on the verso of the outer sheet. Only two places of storage were

³ The 8 volumes now in the other British Library collections are Add MSS 14028, 14029, 32100; Egerton MSS 1693, 1694; Stowe MSS 163, 571, 572. The two other volumes are Aberdeen University Library MSS 1009/1-2 and Brigham Young University Library Vaults MS 457. The three missing volumes that appear by their contents to have been entirely Beale-related were numbered Yelverton MSS 41, 56 and 97; three further possible Beale-related volumes were Yelverton MSS 83, 113, and 124. All these will be dealt with separately below.
mentioned in Lake’s 1588 inventory - either ‘in the study at London’ in chests or shelves, or ‘remayning at the Courte on the shelf’. Papers kept like this in bundles and wrappers that had not been bound into volumes were more easily extracted for consultation, circulation and copying, and were also more portable in the days when the Principal Secretary’s office travelled with him in the still itinerant Court. The same preference for storage of personal papers as ‘packets’ or ‘bundles’ that were then located on shelves or in chests was repeated elsewhere by many of Beale’s contemporaries involved in similar pursuits. In 1619 the then keeper of the Public Records Thomas Wilson obtained a Privy Council warrant to confiscate from the hands of Ralph Starkey the ‘sackfull of papers to the number of 45 paquetts’ that had once belonged to Beale’s colleague William Davison. The example of Thomas Norton’s papers considered at length in Appendix 1 also confirms the practice of keeping items separate and loosely wrapped in bundles rather than in bound volumes. However, this very convenience and flexibility prized by contemporaries also meant that the subsequent survival of these papers for posterity was prejudiced in many ways; bound volumes, as was proved countless times over the centuries to come, are infinitely more secure and easier to keep track of than bundles of loose papers.

Nor would it have been Beale’s intention to collect and organize his various bundles and packets of papers in a manner akin to Sir Robert Cotton’s convenient chronological


5 Lake’s 1588 list of Walsingham’s papers is now Stowe MS 162; the storage of items at Walsingham’s house in Barn Elms is mentioned in Walsingham’s Memorial Book for 1583-85, now Harleian MS 6035; eg. f 36b ‘To sorte such wryttinges as I will carry with me to Barne Elmes’. These two volumes are discussed more extensively in Chapter 4 below.

6 Harleian MS 286 ff 286-87; dated 14 August 1619. The papers referring to the English captivity of Mary Queen of Scots (now PRO SP 53) were arranged originally in bundles of letters to and from the Scottish Queen, subdivided by chronological time periods; eg. SP 53/21/43 ‘A note of papers concerning the Queene of Scotland’; ‘A: A great bundle containing 92 letters written to the Queene of Scotland from April 1584 untill January 1586 by these persons following viz. ...B: A bundle of letters from the Queene of Scotland containing 56 letters from July 1584 till March 1586 & some elder written to these persones following viz....’.
format utilised for his state papers series. Beale was a member of the Society of Antiquaries in the 1590s, but he was not quite a ‘collector’ and putative historian in the same mould as Cotton. The two men were separated significantly by a generation and the intellectual influence of the figures of the historians Jacques Auguste de Thou and William Camden. Cotton’s ‘State Paper’ series (obtained from a variety of sources including papers originally belonging to William Cecil and Francis Walsingham) amounted to nearly 200 bound volumes, and is one of the few early modern British archives to surpass that of Beale in size and depth. Cotton’s motivation for acquiring these papers seems to have been the production of an annalistic-style history of the British Isles, following the modish fascination for Tacitean annalistic history and the example of Cotton’s chief mentor Camden in his account of Elizabeth’s reign contained in his *Annales*. In comparison, Beale’s papers were composed primarily of material he had either produced or collected himself for his own particular political activities and intellectual interests, and the emphasis in Beale’s case is definitely tilted towards the direction of practical political and diplomatic utility rather than towards the furnishing of raw material for the writing of annalistic histories.

There was no official State Paper Office until near the end of Elizabeth’s reign, and papers were not segregated along the lines of modern categories of ‘public’ and ‘private’ until well into the following century. Manuscript papers which would now be considered as ‘Public Records’ tended to remain in the hands of private men who had collected them, and thereafter in the possession of their family descendants or even

---

with the various secretaries and clerks who served under them and their own respective
descendants.\(^9\) Beale's own collection of papers was almost entirely 'public' in character
when viewed from a modern perspective: it is perhaps surprising therefore to read
Beale's advice in his *Treatise on the Office of Principal Secretary* written in 1592 that
'in the Collectio[n] of things I would wish a distinccion used betweene that which is
publicke and that which is private - that is, a separacion betweene those things which
are her Maties Recorde[s] and appertaines unto her and those which a Secretary getteh
by his private industrie and charge.' Beale's complaint here stemmed from his concern
that the whole-scale confiscation of all of Walsingham's papers after the death of the
Principal Secretary in 1590 had left a situation 'wherby no meanes are left to see what
was donne before or to give anie light of service to yonge beginners'.\(^10\) Beale's working
distinction between 'public' and 'private' was here not therefore based upon the subject
or import of the papers in question, but on the means and 'industrie' which had lain
behind their creation or collection. What Beale implied was that the papers such as the
'digests', 'journals' and 'memorial' books (considered in more detail in Chapter 4
below) were 'private' on account of the means of their production, although their
subject matter may have been considered 'public' by any other criteria. As such many
papers in Beale's own collection would perhaps be more 'private' than at first sight to
modern eyes.\(^11\)

---


\(^10\) Beale, Robert 'A Treatise of the Office of a Councillor and Principall Secretarie to her Majestie', BL Additional MS 48149 ff 1-9 is an early seventeenth-century copy, printed in Read, C. *Mr Secretary Walsingham and Queen Elizabeth 3 Vols London* 1925, Vol I Appendix pp. 423-43; p 431.

\(^11\) The seizure of Thomas Norton's 'state papers' in 1584 described in Appendix 1 and of Walsingham's own in 1590 reinforces the impression that the distinction between 'public' and 'private' papers was drifting towards definition by the subject matter of the papers rather than simply by the means or 'industry' of their original production.
Beale himself died quietly in his bed in 1601 and his papers, containing many items which concerned extremely sensitive 'public' issues and causes, were transferred into private family hands, contrary perhaps to this gradual change in contemporary sensibilities towards potentially sensitive 'public' material.\textsuperscript{12} Beale died intestate, and no list, description or inventory of his goods, books or manuscript papers made at the time of his death has come to light. Beale's eldest daughter Margaret married Sir Henry Yelverton, a member of a prominent Northamptonshire family whose father Sir Christopher had been a colleague of Beale's in many of the Elizabethan parliaments.\textsuperscript{13} All (or almost all) of Beale's manuscript papers that were in his possession at his death passed through Margaret or Beale's anonymous second personal clerk (termed below as 'Clerk B', who began his service with Beale in 1593 and then continued to work in the Yelverton library after Beale's death) into the hands of the Yelverton family and their descendants. Without a will or any other evidence we can only guess at why the papers passed to his daughter Margaret or Beale's Clerk B in particular, as Beale was also survived by his wife Edith St. Barbe and by a number of his other children.\textsuperscript{14}

When the antiquarian John Bridges visited Easton Maudit in the 1720s whilst compiling his history of Northamptonshire, he noted contemporary reports of how the Yelverton library was begun by Henry Yelverton 'in King James's time'.\textsuperscript{15} The arrival of Beale's papers at Easton Maudit in the early Seventeenth Century was almost certainly the catalyst for this expansion and reorganization of what then became known

\textsuperscript{12} Lyons, Rev. D. ed. \textit{The Environ of London} London 1792, Vol I, p 12; 'Robert Beale, counsellor of the north, and clerk of the privy council, departed out of this life, on Monday, at eight of the clock of night, being the 25 May, and is buried in London, 1601.'

\textsuperscript{13} The inscription on the tomb of Henry and Margaret Yelverton is printed in Bridges, J. \textit{The History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire} ed. P. Whalley, 1791 Volume II p 166.

\textsuperscript{14} Beale's wife Edith St. Barbe died in 1628 and was buried at Eastington, Gloucester; see Walsingham's will dated 12 Dec 1590 printed in \textit{Wills from Doctors Commons: A Selection from the Wills of Eminent Persons proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury 1495-1695} eds. J. G. Nichols and J. Bruce Camden Society 1863.

as the ‘Yelverton library’ itself. These oral reports are confirmed by the evidence examined below for the organisation and binding of many of Beale’s papers only after they had arrived at Easton Maudit. The subsequent history of Beale’s papers lay in the hands of the Yelverton family at Easton Maudit till 1785, when their survival as a coherent archive was seriously endangered for the first and only time due to the financial excesses of their then guardian the 3rd Earl of Sussex. Their eventual safety for posterity was ensured when they were transferred inside two large chests to the London residence of the Calthorpes (collateral descendants of the Yelverton family), where they stayed, under-researched but at least under lock and key, safe from further dispersal and decay till their arrival at the British Museum in 1953.

Beale’s collection or library of printed books, although probably originally comparable in size and depth to his surviving manuscript papers, did not weather the intervening centuries anywhere near as well. Beale’s intellectual interests were wide and varied and he felt a certain pride in his attainments: he studied Canon law almost all his adult life, read at least six or seven languages, compiled a large folio selection of historical material relating to Spain, and once told Archbishop Whitgift that he had read as much divinity as any of his chaplains. Odd sheets of autograph notes taken from printed books survive in his manuscript papers, and he frequently alludes to his printed books either in his correspondence or makes reference to printed editions in his treatises and polemics. We also have the anecdotal evidence of two well-informed contemporaries: Daniel Rogers and Andre Wechel. Roger’s autograph ‘Book of Epigrams’ includes eight poems addressed to Beale; in one of these Rogers admonished Beale to make as much use of his extensive library as he can.16 Wechel, in his preface to his printed edition of Spanish chronicles and histories Rerum hispanicarum scriptores of 1577, thanked Beale for his industry and learning in compiling the library from which the

16 Huntington Library MS 31188 (British Library Microfilm RP 363) f 104a.
collection was printed.\textsuperscript{17} We may therefore justly conclude that Beale’s library of printed books was large and varied, but unfortunately we do not know if any of Beale’s printed books were passed on to the Yelverton library along with his manuscript papers. A catalogue of the Yelverton library of printed books was undertaken in 1694, and this catalogue, subsequently bought by Sir Francis Hargrave, is now British Library Hargrave MS 107.\textsuperscript{18} It contains entries for over 3000 printed books, listed under categories such as ‘Theologia’, ‘Historia’ etc. Although it is perfectly possible that Beale’s library of printed books accompanied his manuscript papers to Easton Maudit, it is impossible (beyond conjecturing by title and subject matter) to determine from the catalogue titles and publication dates in Hargrave MS 107 which books may or may not have been Beale’s within the Yelverton collection. Furthermore, whilst most of the the manuscript volumes of the Yelverton library eventually found what was to be a safe home at the Calthorpe residence in Grosvenor Square, the Yelverton library of printed books did not, and it was dispersed in the 1780s.\textsuperscript{19} No Sales Catalogue for this dispersal has come to light, and with the intervening two centuries of dispersal, the Yelverton library of printed books cannot be satisfactorily reconstituted to be inspected for possible marks of identification as to their possible original provenance with Beale or not.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Rerum hispiancarvm scriptores aliquot, quorum nomina versa pagina indicabit ex bibliotheca clarissimi viri dn. roberti beli angli...} Frankfurt, Andre Wechel 1577-81; Sig. iii a.

\textsuperscript{18} Basing ‘Introduction’ p xxix lists also 14 specifically legal MSS from the Yelverton collection that were also purchased by Hargrave. None of these 14 (or any others as far as I can tell) contain any items related to Beale.

\textsuperscript{19} Four volumes bearing the Longueville (the title of the Yelverton descendants) book-stamp were purchased from London booksellers between 1785 and 1838; see Clough, C. H. ‘A Presentation Volume for Henry VIII’, \textit{Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute} 44 (1981), pp 199-202. Richard Gough, in his 1788 ‘Progress of selling books by Catalogues’, printed in Nichols, J. ed. \textit{Literary Anecdotes} iii, 1812, notes that the ‘Yelverton Library and MSS’ were offered for sale in 1784; I have been unable to find any Sale Catalogues for either the Library or the MSS: see Pollard, A. W. \textit{List of Catalogues of English Book Sales 1676-1900 now in British Museum} London 1915; Munby, A. N. L. and Coral, L. eds. \textit{British Book Sale Catalogues 1676-1800: A Union List} Mansell 1977; Sotheby Parke Burnet \textit{Catalogues of Sales} Xerox University Microfilms 1973 (British Library SCS 16 (3); Pt. 1 Reel 7).

\textsuperscript{20} Sir Francis Hargrave purchased some items from the Yelverton collection, and Hargrave’s library of printed books was bought \textit{en bloc} by the British Museum in the early Nineteenth Century: there might exist therefore the possibility of a tenuous channel whereby some of Beale’s
The manuscript papers that were taken to Easton Maudit seem to have comprised (with
the possible exceptions noted below) the entirety of Beale’s collection, which were then
mixed with those of Sir Henry Yelverton and his father Sir Christopher in the Yelverton
family library. We do not know for sure as the earliest inventory, list or catalogue of
any of the manuscript papers at Easton Maudit was made only in c.1648. This first
catalogue (or a contemporary copy of it) is now Add MS 48195, which describes the
187 MS volumes then within the Yelverton library and under the care of Sir
Christopher Yelverton, son of Margaret Beale and Sir Henry Yelverton.\footnote{See Basing ‘Introduction’, pp xxv-xxvii. A quarto catalogue titled ‘Manuscripts belonging to
Sir Chr. Yelverton Bart. Anno 1648’ was lot 4254 in Richard Gough’s sale, 4 April etc. 1810.
This was bought first by Richard Heber, and then from the Heber sale in 1836 by Thomas
Thorpe, when it was subsequently lost. Two folio catalogues of the Yelverton Library dated 1694
are Bodleian Library MS Add. C. 223 (\textit{Sum. Cat.} 29433) and Brussels Bibl. Roy. MS. 14005.
Add MS 48195 was begun ff 1-3 and indexed ff 94-176 in the hand of the ‘Italian’ active in the
Yelverton library in the mid seventeenth-century.}
This manuscript catalogue formed the basis (with very few alterations) of the first printed
catalogue of the Yelverton collection included in the great Oxford survey undertaken by
Edward Bernard and others printed as \textit{Catalogi... manuscriptorum Angliae} (hereafter
\textit{CMA}) in 1697.\footnote{\textit{Catalogni librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae in unum collecti...} ed. Bernard, E.
sive potius Actorum & Genealogiarum Nobilium Thesaurus. Continens Codices CLXXXVII’.
The \textit{CMA} descriptions were taken literally (more or less) from either Add MS 48195 or a copy of
it - see Basing ‘Introduction’ p xxvii. For MSS on which \textit{CMA} was based see, \textit{SC (Summary
The 62 pages of descriptions of the Yelverton manuscripts in \textit{CMA}
are relatively full and accurate, but by the end of the Twentieth Century they had
perhaps outlived their usefulness to the demands of modern historical scholarship. The
printed books might have reached the modern-day British Library. However, no record of
ownership linking any books at the British Library to Beale appears in Alston, R. C. \textit{Books with
CMA descriptions dating effectively from the mid-Seventeenth Century were finally superseded only with the publication of the more modern and comprehensive catalogue gradually produced by a team of fourteen members of staff (with the co-operation of many other scholars) at the British Library between 1954 and 1994. It was this delay in publication of a modern catalogue that had effectively stalled the study of Beale as a whole rather than as a sum of his many parts: no single person could have been expected to do the job of tackling Beale properly without also undertaking the vast and laborious task of cataloguing his papers. This modern catalogue was the sine qua non of any study of Beale’s multi-faceted political life, and because of the richness and variety of Beale’s collection, it is also an immeasurable improvement for students of Tudor history in general and of Elizabeth’s reign in particular.

The reliance of scholars since 1697 on CMA as the working catalogue had understandably led to the characterisation of the Yelverton papers as a ‘lucky-dip’, a bin-full of papers that had a pleasant habit of throwing up archival surprises, and over the years many a speculative hand had pulled out an unexpected jewel. The more important volumes of papers, such as the two volumes containing papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots now Add MSS 48027 and 48049, had been examined fairly thoroughly, but even here (as is shown in Chapters 7 and 8 below) there still remained room for further research. As implied by the antiquary Richard Gough quoted above at the beginning of this chapter, it is clear that many of the volumes had hardly been touched in one form or another since their journey to Easton Maudit early in the Seventeenth Century. The 1994 British Library catalogue has at last satisfactorily described the items of Beale’s collection spread around the Yelverton papers, but until the right eye is cast over a particular description, an item’s true significance may well remain obscured. Since the availability of the new catalogue, more historians than ever

---

23 HMC Second Report, 1871 "The Manuscripts of the Right Honourable Lord Calthorpe,
before have taken advantage of the greater transparency of Beale’s collection and have
published work based almost completely on new archival discoveries found within.
Beale’s papers have long provided the odd indication that the ‘dark continent’ theory of
historical research is alive and well, and they may well continue to do so for a few years
yet.\(^{24}\)

The first catalogue of the Yelverton papers made in c.1648 forms the benchmark from
which any of the subsequent losses from the Yelverton library can be measured. The
total original number of 187 Yelverton MSS bound and numbered in the first half of the
Seventeenth Century had dropped by only one in c.1648 to 186 volumes (this included
the 4 vols. in 2 pts, vols. 7, 161, 183, 187), and the contents of this one lost volume
(vol. 113, labelled simply ‘desideratur’) will therefore forever remain a mystery.\(^{25}\)
Thereafter, the comings and goings of the Yelverton library volumes present a fairly
contorted story. We know that one MS volume was lent out to Lord Hatton at some
time in the Seventeenth Century and was then returned.\(^ {26}\) The next indication of any
missing volumes is a note dating from 1755, when a total of 14 volumes were listed as
missing, 3 of which were definitely returned at a later date and 11 of which are still

\(^{24}\) Add MS 48126 ff 6-17b, printed in Malkiewicz, A. J. A. ‘An eye-witness account of the Coup
d’état of October 1549’, \textit{EHR} 70 (1955), pp. 600-09; Add MS 48040 ff. 13-104b, a collection for
the reformation of ecclesiastical laws, printed in F. Donald Logan ‘The Henrician Canon’, \textit{BIHR}
47 (1974), pp 99-103; Add MS 48093 \textit{Vita mariae angliae reginae} is edited and printed by D.
MacCulloch in \textit{Camden Misc.}, xxviii, 1984, pp 181-301; Add MS 48152 ff 185-92, an account of
the Cadiz expedition, used in Hamer, P. ‘New Light on the Cadiz Expedition of 1596’, \textit{Historical
Research} 70 (1997), pp 182-202; 6 letters from Mary Queen of Scots are printed in
written by the government to the rebels in 1549 are printed from Beale’s second formulary book,
Add MS 48018, in Shagan, E. ‘Protector Somerset and the 1549 Rebellions: New Sources and

\(^{25}\) This total of 186 volumes is corroborated by the late-seventeenth-century list of shelf-marks in
Harg. MS 107 f 42; this lists 35 vols in all not placed (inc. vol. 113), and 152 volumes placed.

\(^{26}\) Add MS 48195 f vi a: ‘Lo Hatton a Manuscript folio ye title, tractatus Danici, Germanici,
Lusitanici, Guernsey, etc. priviledges granted to Merchants....’. This is almost certainly Add MS
48001.
missing today. A total of 17 volumes were missing in 1809; those that went missing in between 1755 and 1809 were Yelverton vols. 15, 22, 23, 28, 94 and 167. Three of these (vol. 15, 28, 167) are still missing today and another 3 (vols. 22, 23, and 94) were subsequently bought by the British Museum and reside now in other British Library collections. Some of these losses sustained by the collection before 1809 were only partly due to theft or a lack or care: before the MSS were transferred to the Calthorpes, the Yelverton heir Lord Sussex had attempted to recoup some of his debts by disposing of them for cash. Eight volumes of a total 187 were listed as missing when Lord Sussex first offered the collection up for sale as a whole to the British Museum in 1781. Three years later in 1784 the whole collection was again offered for public sale at auction. Four lots were sold and 182 returned as, according to the antiquary Richard Gough, ‘they were so lotted it was impossible to have proceeded’.

The small numbers of missing volumes from 1781 (8 vols) and 1784 (1 volume of 187 total) are hard to explain if the 11 volumes missing both in the lists of 1755 and 1809 and still missing today were in all likelihood not present in the Yelverton library in the early 1780s. It is possible but unlikely that some of the 11 volumes missing in 1755 were returned to the library in time to be offered up for sale in 1781, and that these very same volumes then subsequently disappeared again. However, 3 Yelverton volumes that definitely went missing between 1755 and 1809 have subsequently appeared in

---

27 The 1755 list is Add MS 48196C f 61. This gives as missing Vols. 18, 41, 56, 60, 71, 83, 97, 112, 113, 114, 124, 126, 127, 156. Of these, 56, 60, 71, 156 all crossed through, of which 60, 71, and 156 were definitely returned to the library, and vol. 56 either still missing or missing again in 1809. Possible pre-1755 then 11 vols missing 18, 41, 71 (48065), 83, 97, 112, 113, 114, 124, 126, 127. It is hard to tell at what date these vols. went missing: of these 14 missing vols., vols. 18, 41, 71, 97, 112, 113, 114, 124, 126, 127, 156 were without a definite placing in Hargrave MS 107 f 42 - hence, Vols 56, 60, 83 did have a placing and were definitely there in the late Seventeenth Century.

28 Add MS 48195 f ii; this gives 17 volumes missing: 15, 18, 22, 23 (now Stowe MS 570, 571), 28, 41, 56, 83, 94 (now Add MS 14029), 97, 112, 113, 114, 124, 126, 127, 167.

29 i.e., Vol 113 and 7 more; see Basing, P., ‘Introduction’ 1994, p xxxiii.

30 Nichols, J., ed. Literary Anecdotes iii, 1812, p 622.

31 The 14 volumes missing today are 15, 18, 28, 41, 56, 83, 97, 112, 113 (still), 114, 124, 126, 127 and 167.
other collections; vols. 22 and 23 in the Stowe MSS and vol. 94 in the collection of George Chalmers bought by bookseller Thomas Rodd in the mid-Nineteenth Century and then sold on to the British Museum. It is more likely that these 3 volumes and one other were the 4 lots sold in 1784. A possible candidate for the fourth lot of this aborted sale of 1784 is the other volume that Chalmers bought, a volume of Beale’s correspondence now British Library Add MS 14028.\textsuperscript{32} The problem here is that Add MS 14028 was never catalogued and given a number as part of the Yelverton collection, and without a Sale Catalogue from the aborted sale of 1784 we do not know for certain. It is possible instead that the means by which the number of missing volumes in the Yelverton library was ‘made up’ was by the inclusion for sale of a number of the unbound and uncatalogued loose bundles of Beale’s correspondence that had also been passed on to the Yelverton family. Five volumes of these loose papers have since appeared, and it is necessary to investigate the provenance of each volume separately to try and clarify these issues.

The link of these 5 volumes of loose Beale-related papers to the Yelverton library appears tenuous at first, testified only by the existence of copies of some of the items from each volume in a quarto notebook in the Yelverton collection that is now Add MS 48149. Add MS 48149 is a somewhat untypical Yelverton volume: numbered ‘161’ on the spine, it is not included in the c.1648 catalogue Add MS 48195 or in CMA, although two of the hands used in its construction date the volume to the mid- to late-Seventeenth Century.\textsuperscript{33} The rest of Add MS 48149 consists of copies of Beale’s correspondence, mainly relating to the Netherlands 1576-87, taken from at least 5 non-

\textsuperscript{32} BL Add MSS 14028-30 were bought by Rodd in Chalmers sale ‘lot 1880’ in 1844, and sold in the following year to the BM. In 1797 George Chalmers returns two MSS Yelv. vols. 17 and 27 (48017, 48024) Lord Henry Calthorpe tells Chalmers that ‘about twenty’ vols. missing?

\textsuperscript{33} The first article copied into the notebook is a copy of Beale’s treatise on the office of Principal Secretary, presumably copied from Yelverton MS 97 ‘Notes fit to be considered by one that shall be a Principal Secretary, by R. B. for Sir Edw. Wotton, f. 52.’; this first article is written in
Yelverton MSS containing Beale’s papers. Of these 68 items in the rest of Add MS 48149, 17 are copies from what is now BYU MS 457, 1 from Egerton MS 1693, 3 from Egerton MS 1694, 9 from Stowe MS 163, 9 from Add MS 14028, with the remaining 23 from uncertain provenance (none of these were copied from items now in Aberdeen MS 1009).\textsuperscript{34} Add MS 48149 acts therefore as a link between the Yelverton library and these 5 volumes of Beale’s papers that were never catalogued as belonging to Easton Maudit. There are two hypothetical explanations for this link: either these 5 volumes of unbound papers were dispersed at sometime between Beale’s death and before the cataloguing of the main bulk of the Yelverton papers in 1648 onwards, or they remained in the Yelverton library unbound and uncatalogued till they were dispersed at some later date, possibly in the aborted sale of 1784.

The available evidence for the separate provenances of these 5 volumes does not unfortunately add very much more to this hypothesis. Add MSS 14028 was one of three ex-Yelverton volumes purchased by the British Museum from the bookseller Thomas Rodd in 1843; Rodd had purchased these three volumes in 1842 as lot 1880 ‘Miscellaneous Old Manuscript Papers’ in the sale of the antiquary George Chalmers.\textsuperscript{35} Add MS 14028 consists exclusively of Beale-related papers but has no correlation to any of the missing numbered Yelverton MSS. Two of these 5 volumes, Egerton MSS 1693-94, were acquired by the British Museum at auction in 1856. These are described in the relevant catalogue of Additional Manuscripts as formerly belonging to George A. F. Rawdon-Hastings, 2nd Marquess of Hastings, who had died in 1844 and who had married Barbara Yelverton, Baroness Grey de Ruthyn. No doubt these two volumes

\textsuperscript{34} British Library 1994 catalogue lists 63 items; I have listed the 7 letters from Wilkes 1586-87 now Artt. 2 as separate items as the originals in BYU MS 457 are loose items.

\textsuperscript{35} Basing, P., ‘Introduction’ 1994, p xxxiii; the other two volumes purchased off Rodd are now Add MS 14029 and 14030: Add MS 14029 is almost certainly Yelverton MS 94 reported missing
were descended through his wife, but no details survive to clarify their provenance any further. The fifth of these volumes is now Stowe MS 163, the first half of which (ff 1-49) consists of original papers relating to Beale’s mission to the Netherlands in 1576 and then Leicester’s expeditions in 1585-87. None of these items are catalogued in Add MS 48195 or CMA, and the volume arrived into the Stowe library at some time between the compilation of the 1818 catalogue and the 1849 sale.\(^{36}\) Once again, there appears to be no means of ascertaining the provenance of this volume before its re-appearance in the early Nineteenth Century.

The two volumes of papers originally belonging to Beale that have since strayed the furthest in terms of distance present further problems. Brigham Young University MS 457 contains 51 separate loose items of Beale-related papers that had previously formed part of what had been Phillipps MS 12115, a collection of 104 items relating to Sixteenth Century and Seventeenth Century history, purchased whole by Thomas Phillipps as lot 174 at the sale of William Upcott’s MSS in 1846.\(^{37}\) The other 53 non-Beale related items that went to make up Phillips MS 12115 were a mixed collection covering sixteenth- and seventeenth-century history, including some Leicester papers obtained (through fair means or foul) by Upcott from the Evelyn residence at Wotton in Bedfordshire.\(^{38}\) The provenance of the 51 Beale-related items that are now BYU MS

\(^{36}\) Yelverton MSS 22 and 23 now Stowe MS 570 and 571, were at Stowe when the collection was catalogued in 1818; see Rev. Charles O’Conor Bibliotheca MS. Stowensis. A Descriptive Catalogue of the MSS. in the Stowe Library 2 vols. London 1818-19; vol ii, p 348 nos. 123, 124. Stowe MS 163 was not included in the 1818 catalogue; it was lot 99 in the 1849 sale. It may well have been part of the Bridgewater library pre-1849; the latest item by date is f 226, a letter from Rev. Henry Todd to John Egerton, Earl of Bridgewater 14 Feb 1807.

\(^{37}\) BYU MS 457 was sold as lots 563-84 at the Sotheby’s Sale of Monday 26 June 1967; Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliotheca D. Thomaes Phillips, Bart. Middle Hill 1837-52; MS 12115 is listed on p 212; ‘Ex Bibl. Wmi. Upcot, 1846... Letters (104) of various Persons to Walsingham, Burgheigh, &c., from 1553 to 1620. folio. ch. 1/2 russ. s. xvi, xvii.’

457 before Upcott's ownership is uncertain, and no record of any of the items appears in Add MS 48195 or CMA.

Aberdeen University MS 1009 presents a further anomaly compared to all other volumes of Beale's papers, as no copies of any of its 97 loose Beale-related items occur in Add MS 48149, and therefore no record of its existence, whether at Easton Maudit or elsewhere, appears to exist before its donation in 1732 to Aberdeen.\textsuperscript{39} One further volume now in the British Library (Add MS 32100) consists of extracts made by Beale or at his behest between 1587-94 concerning monastic lands and rents for land for the Priory at Coventry, and other ecclesiastical lands, which was purchased at Sotheby's from the Towneley sale in 1883. This volume does not match any of the descriptions of lost Yelverton MSS and no record of its earlier provenance has survived.\textsuperscript{40} Finally, British Library Add MS 5935 is a volume of copies of sixteenth-century papers, consisting of either copies of letters or of instructions for Ambassadors in a late seventeenth-century hand. Most of the letters copied are addressed to Walsingham and concern relations with the Netherlands 1576-87 and Beale's involvement with Mary Queen of Scots in the 1580s; the exceptions are 5 letters addressed to Beale, and one from him. Many of the letters to Walsingham are either from Beale himself or are items (such as the correspondence from Thomas Wilkes 1586-87) that either Beale later acquired or could possibly have obtained copies of himself. The originals of the 5 items addressed to Beale do not survive elsewhere. The 'Instructions to Ambassadors' in the second half of the volume span the whole of the Sixteenth Century and are common

\textsuperscript{39} Aberdeen MS 1009/1 and 1009/2; The first part contains 44 loose items all relating to Beale, the second 54, of which 53 relate to Beale. It was donated to the library in 1732 by James Frazer; see Henderson, J. M. 'Some Elizabethan MSS. in the University Library', Aberdeen University Review 14 (1926-7), pp. 202-6.

\textsuperscript{40} British Library Catalogue of Additional Manuscripts British Library 1889, p79: 'Extracts from chartularies and other monastic records, made for Beale, Clerk to the Privy Council, c. 1580-90: with notes in his own hand.' Purchased at Sotheby's, Towneley Sale, lot 179, 27-28 June 1883.
enough exemplars; these might have been copied from either Beale’s papers or other ‘State Papers’.41

Beale’s papers patently formed the bulk of the Yelverton library MSS, but the exact proportion and their distribution within the collection had until the publication of the British Library 1994 catalogue never been satisfactorily established. Patricia Basing’s indispensable ‘Introduction’ to this 1994 catalogue was the first attempt made to distinguish in detail the different provenances of the various Yelverton MSS from the respective papers of Beale and the different generations of the Yelverton family. The task was complicated because of the relatively few volumes that bear positive evidence of having been organized and bound up in their present state during Beale’s lifetime. Some (but by no means all) of the bound Yelverton volumes that exclusively contain Beale’s papers bear lettered labels, lettering or traces of these on the cover or in the binding material. From this, Basing argued that at some stage during his lifetime, Beale had allocated some of the bound volumes he owned an alphabetical letter: each letter allocated was not exclusive to a particular volume, some single letters being allocated to 2 or 3 different volumes. This attribution of the label as ‘an archive mark of Beale’s own’ is based on this retrospective inference as only volumes entirely consisting of Beale’s papers still show the coloured labels, letters or traces of labels. In total, 34 volumes still in the Yelverton library (and also one stray Yelverton volume also now in the British Library) still bear these labels, lettering or traces of these.42

41 The 5 items addressed to Beale are Add MS 5935 f 48 Castelnau to Beale from London 6 September 1583; f 49 <Laurence Tomson> to <Beale> from Greenwich 28 May 1576; f 50 Nau to Beale from Sheffield 8 April 1582; f 64 Monsieur Pezines to <Beale> 20 September <1569>; ff 69-70 Thierry Badonere to Beale 20 August 1577.
42 Basing ‘Introduction’ pp. xix-xx. The twenty three MSS still bearing labels are Add MSS 48000, 48003, 48006, 48007, 48010, 48012, 48017, 48018, 48019, 48020, 48022, 48024, 48025, 48030, 48031A, 48032, 48034, 48036, 48037, 48043, 48047, 48082, 48125. The 11 Yelverton Add MSS bearing traces of labels are 48009, 48014, 48026, 48027, 48029, 48038, 48040, 48042, 48080, 48150, 48151. Yelverton MS 23 now Stowe MS 570 also bears a letter. Two Yelverton MSS re-use labelled covers: Add MS 48013 consists entirely of Beale-related papers, and this is included below; Add MS 48153 contains no Beale-related papers.
The evidence presented by Basing for the organization of Beale’s papers during his own lifetime depends entirely on this extant physical evidence of the original bindings and the labels and lettering attached to these. Further positive evidence for the conscious organization and binding of his papers by Beale from the contents lists, foliation, endorsements and other binding materials is limited to a few volumes. We have already discussed how the model of organization most prominent in Beale’s own mind was that of the working study familiar to him during his years of service to Walsingham. The only manuscripts that were bound during Beale’s lifetime were the ‘books’ made up for a particular purpose: these were either pre-bound paper books that were then copied into - for instance his Genealogical collection of English nobility now Add MS 48042, or his second formulary book for his work as Clerk of the Privy Council now Add MSS 48018 - or the volumes made up from different items (both original and newly copied up) for specific diplomatic purposes - for instance what is now Add MS 48128 for his extensive dealings with the Hanse, or what is now Add MS 48129 for his review in 1595 with Henry Killigrew and Arthur Atye of the debt owed to the United Provinces in 1595. Another good example of a volume made up for a specific purpose is Add MS 48000; this contains treaties between England, Spain and the Empire which was constructed purposely for the Boulogne conference of 1600. A loose leaf has been inserted addressed to Beale at Boulogne, which Beale has then annotated with notes from the volume.33.

The evidence from the binding materials alone for the date of either organisation or binding is often contradictory and inconclusive, as can be demonstrated by comparing the two groups of MSS that use identical binding materials. Four of the Yelverton MSS are bound in leaves from a fifteenth-century English Antiphoner which all still bear
labels, and were probably bound at the same time in the 1590s under Beale’s direction. Two of these (now Add MSS 48024 and 48043) use the same fourteenth-century canonistic treatise for binding strips; both MSS also include leaves from the same paper stock as front-papers. Both these MSS also have contents lists written in the hand of Clerk B which include autograph additions by Beale. A third volume now Add MS 48037 has a contents list partly in the hand of Clerk B and partly in a later hand, written on paper watermarked with a pot dating from c.1580. The final volume now Add MS 48150 is Beale’s first formulary for a Clerk of the Privy Council, dated in Beale’s own hand ‘1572’ on the front cover, though this was probably written in at a later date. In comparison, the 13 Yelverton volumes bound in vellum leaves from an early sixteenth-century Antiphoner printed in Paris present a less than homogenous case: 5 of these volumes bear labels or traces of them, one of which (Add 48153) has been reused to bind a volume with no Beale-related material. Two more (Add MSS 48013 and 48117) are also re-used covers, with Add MSS 48013 bearing a trace of a label on the inside of the cover; two volumes containing Beale-related material (Add MSS 48116 and 48117) also include early seventeenth-century material. The random selection of sheets from the original antiphoner ‘supports the suggestion that the MSS were bound at intervals over a period of time’. Six of these 13 volumes bound in the antiphoner exclusively contain contemporary Beale-related material with latest dating items from 1581 - 1599. These six volumes also do not contain any items or binding material dating after 1601, suggesting that Beale was only organizing and binding selected items of his papers in the 1590s and not before.

---

43 Add MS 48000 f xliv loose leaf; reused paper add ‘To the right worshipfull Mr Robert Beale one of her Maties commissioners At Bullen’, with notes of treaties and years by Beale.
44 Add MS 48024 ff 227-238; 239-250 end papers and Add MS 48043 ff iv-xv front papers on same paper watermarked with a pot 50mm high with a thin horizontal band in body with no letters and a fleur-de-lis on top; Add MS 48024 f vii contents list in hand of Clerk B, with Beale autograph on f xivb; Add MS 48043 f v a contents list in hand of Clerk B and Beale.
That Beale himself was only binding selected volumes of his collection is clear as the thirty-five volumes bearing labels or traces of labels and lettering do not represent even half of the Beale-related material originally deposited in the Yelverton collection. In the Yelverton papers now in the sequence Add MSS 48000-196, in addition to the thirty-five labelled volumes described above, there are another thirty-eight volumes entirely containing what are termed below as ‘Beale-related’ papers that never bore a label.45 There are also a further two ex-Yelverton MSS in the other British Library collections entirely consisting of Beale-related material.46 In addition to this total of seventy-five volumes which entirely consist of Beale-related material (whether organized at Beale’s behest or not), there are in the Yelverton papers a further three composite MSS which predominantly contain Beale-related material, and nine more that contain the odd items relating to Beale.48 Working from the basis of the Add MS 48195 catalogue that leaves us with a grand total of eighty-seven MS volumes of the survivors of the original 187 Yelverton volumes that can in some form or another instruct us on Beale’s political and cultural life and that were definitely part of the Yelverton papers in the Seventeenth Century. Five more British Library MSS and the Aberdeen and Brigham Young MSS

46 These thirty-eight MSS volumes are Add MSS 48001, 48002, 48004, 48005, 48011, 48013, 48015, 48022, 48028, 48033, 48035, 48039, 48048, 48049, 48050, 48064 (traces of label on spine?), 48066, 48078, 48081 (?Beale?), 48083 (traces of label on spine?), 48084, 48085, 48086, 48088 (a pre-bound book that contains two seventeenth-century items copied in later), 48090, 48092, 48093, 48094, 48096, 48098, 48100, 48115, 48117, 48126, 48127, 48128, 48129, 48182? For the reasons outlined above, this list of exclusively Beale-related MSS differs from that produced by Basing ‘Introduction’, p xxi.
47 The three entirely Beale-related Yelverton MSS which went missing in the Eighteenth Century and are now located in other British Library collections are now Stowe MSS 571 (still with label and included above) and 572, and Add MS 14029.
48 The three composite MSS with predominately Beale-related material are Add MSS 48023 (art. 31 possibly non-Beale related), 48116 (artt. 5 possibly, 18-19, 21-23 non-Beale related), 48152 (artt. 28, 34 non-Beale related). Conversely, the nine composite MSS with only odd Beale-related material are Add MSS 48044 (artt. 1-3, 13 Beale-related; artt. 10-11, 19, 22 are later seventeenth-century copies of possible Beale-related material), 48062 (artt. 4, 19, 22-26 Beale-related), 48063 (artt. 1-2, 4-6, 11, 19-20 (and possibly 10) Beale-related), 48101 (artt. 5-6, 12-13, 16-19, 21-25 Beale-related), 48102 (art. 11 Beale-related), 48114 (artt. 27, 3-4 Beale-related), 48118 (artt. 9-16 Beale-related), 48161 (possibly art. 1 Beale-related), 48196C (artt. 1, 3-6 Beale-related); 48099 is a seventeenth-century copy of the Digges treatise possible Beale-related; Add MS 48191 is a copy of an English translation of Cicero’s De Petitione Consulatus written in the hand of Clerk B.
which were all never catalogued as part of the Yelverton papers at Easton Maudit are
entirely composed of Beale-related material (with one exception); the provenance of
these has been examined in more detail above.\textsuperscript{49}

Some Beale-related material has also been lost, perhaps irretrievably. Three of the total
of fourteen volumes of Yelverton papers listed in Add MS 48195 and in CMA
(Yelverton Vols. 41, 56, and 97) that have since disappeared without trace probably
consisted wholly of Beale-related papers. None of these three volumes contained any
item that definitely post-dated Beale. Volume 41 (missing in 1755) consisted of 69
miscellaneous items relating to a variety of subjects such as the organisation of the
Royal household, the history of Parliament, and to the English claim to sovereignty
over the Scots. Volume 56 (missing in 1809) contained 39 separate items, almost all
concerned with the succession debates of the 1563 and 1566 Parliaments, and then with
the arraignment and trial of the Duke of Norfolk and the attempt to execute Mary
Queen of Scots in the 1572 parliament. Many of these items were originally from the
papers of Thomas Norton and probably some from those of John Hales as well (see
Appendix 1). Vol. 97 (missing in 1755) contained diplomatic material relating to the
English claim to the French throne, and also two treatises of Beale’s from the 1590s.
However great a shame the loss of these three Beale-related Yelverton MSS volumes is
(especially perhaps for the history of the 1560s Parliaments), ninety five from a
probable total of ninety eight volumes containing Beale-related material is not a bad
survival rate. Historians of Tudor England in general (and of Robert Beale in particular)
should be thankful for the remarkable integrity of the Yelverton collection over the
centuries. It is a testimony to the safe hands of the Calthorpes that even during the
hectic antiquarian trading of the Nineteenth Century no further losses were sustained

\textsuperscript{49} The five British Library MSS not hitherto included are Add MS 14028, 32100; Egerton MS
1693, 1694 and Stowe MS 163 ff 1-49. The two further ‘strays’ are Aberdeen University MS 1009 and Brigham Young Vaults MS 457.
and the collection remained admirably intact. However much money Brigadier Richard Hamilton Anstruther-Gough-Calthorpe was paid by the British Museum in 1953, as far as all historians of Tudor England were concerned, it was certainly a price worth paying.

The survival of this amount of material collected by and concerning a figure of the second tier of political society is unique for the Elizabethan period. The true extent of this material is only comprehensible when we look around for suitable comparisons. Only the papers of the three pre-eminent Privy Councillors Sir William Cecil, Sir Francis Walsingham and Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester, could have surpassed Beale’s collection, and each of these collections has been variously dispersed, split and dissipated over the centuries. These Privy Councillors would not have been the natural comparisons by which contemporaries would have measured Beale and his papers. Beale’s peers were the courtiers, diplomats and secretaries of the second tier of political society, many of whose names we encountered briefly by way of comparison with Beale in the Introduction to this thesis. Sir Henry Killigrew and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton are two slightly older figures who combined public diplomatic and domestic service in a form comparable to Beale. Both have little in terms of archival survival to show for their efforts compared to Beale. Only a few volumes of Throckmorton’s papers have survived, and it is partly for this reason that Throckmorton is notoriously ill-served by historians and has remained a relatively shadowy figure.30

Sir Ralph Sadler, another diplomat who rose to become joint Principal Secretary in the 1540s and who then served as a Privy Councillor under Elizabeth, has similarly left us only a few volumes-worth of papers.31 The papers of the country squire and gentleman

30 Some of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton’s papers from 1559-1564 are now BL Add MSS 35830-32; these volumes were Hardwicke Papers Vols 482-484 used and printed by P. Forbes in A Full View of the Public Transaction in the reign of Qu. Elizabeth London 1741.
31 Sadler’s correspondence is now BL Add MSS 33591-95; see Slavin, A. J. Politics and Profit: A Study of Sir Ralph Sadler 1507-1547 CUP Cambridge 1966. Cf. The private papers of Sir
Sir William More of Loseley in Surrey are comparable to those of Beale in their extent and in their individual coherence, but not in their breadth of involvement in contemporary politics. More was a country gentleman with connections at court but, unlike Beale, did not spend his public life at the centre of the polity. Of the 1447 separately-listed Loseley items from Elizabeth’s reign in the HMC catalogue, only a handful relate to issues of national rather than county importance, and the various political tracts and treatises that circulated and informed the ‘political nation’ that are so conspicuous in Beale’s collection are notable only by their absence.\(^{52}\)

Other Elizabethan clerks and diplomats operating in similar circles to that of Beale such as Thomas Wilkes, Thomas Randolph and Daniel Rogers have been the subject of some historical research but their papers did not survive intact.\(^{53}\) Daniel Rogers shared much of his public life with Beale in the 1570s and 80s as a diplomatic envoy and as a Clerk of the Privy Council. Rogers also shared with Beale his ideological commitment to a pan-European Calvinism and many of the intellectual interests in literature, history and politics. However, compared to the riches of Beale’s collection, posterity has not been so kind to him, and beyond the odd item in the SP foreign series, and the odd volume of a personal or literary nature there is little surviving source material to help us know more about Rogers.\(^{54}\) Others like them such as Valentine Dale and William Waad have been the subject of no historical research at all.

William Petre, Sadler’s partner as joint Principal Secretary in the 1540s, were deposited in Essex County Record Office from Ingatestone Hall in 1939: see Emmison, F. G. William Petre, Tudor Secretary Longmans, London 1961.

\(^{52}\) HMC 7th Report ‘The Manuscripts of William More Molyneux, Esq. of Loseley Park, Guildford, Co. Surrey’, Appendix pp. 597-681 by J. C. Jeafferson; what I take to be ‘political treatises’ are listed for example on p 623 ‘A Discourse touchyng the pretendyd matehe betwene the Duke of Northefolke and the Queen of Scottes, 1570. 28 pages’.


Sir Thomas Smith, the archetype of ‘the Tudor intellectual in office’, has left us with something: his papers in Essex County Record Office relate to family affairs and his estate matters, and those in the PRO and British Library collections are concerned with the administrative fare of the Principal Secretary’s office - valuable in themselves but not comparable to the density of Beale’s collection. The surviving papers of William Davison are now split between the PRO in SP 12 and 15 and a few volumes of the Harleian collection. Davison was a busy diplomat who rose to become second Principal Secretary under Walsingham, and was as close to Beale as humanly possible in terms of political function as well as their personal and professional relationship. His many diplomatic missions concerning Scotland and the Netherlands would undoubtedly have generated more papers than those that have survived, and these relatively few examples do not alas merit comparison to the extent of Beale’s archive. Some part at least of Davison’s papers apparently descended after his death in 1608 through one of his two daughters to the ‘Duncombe’ who sold papers to Ralph Starkey, who, as we have seen already, was then relieved of the care of some of them by Thomas Wilson at the order of the Privy Council in 1619. The Davison papers that Starkey managed to hold onto

---


Smith’s intellectual protégé Gabriel Harvey remembered some years later that Smith’s manuscripts were dispersed at his death in 1577: Harvey was bequeathed some volumes that Andrew Perne had also coveted and the two exchanged some interesting words at Smith’s funeral. Smith’s library of printed books bequeathed to Queen’s College, Cambridge still await a thorough survey: see Dewar, M. Sir Thomas Smith: A Tudor Intellectual in Office University of London The Athlone Press 1964; Collinson, P. ‘Andrew Perne and his times’, Andrew Perne Cambridge Quatercentenary Studies Cambridge CUP 1989; Grafton and Jardine 1990, p 60 n. 96 lists R. Simpson Sir Thomas Smith’s Booklists, 1566 and 1576 Warburg Institute Surveys and Texts 15, forthcoming.

56 SP 15/27/65 Henry Killigrew to William Davison December 29 1580 at London; ‘If you see Mons. Villiers, commend me to him, and also to Mr Beale, at his coming thither. I was present and prayed when his image was dedicated to God by the congregation, Mr Secretary being Godfather, and Mrs. Barrett godmother,...'.
were then bought by Sir Simonds D'Ewes', and were eventually bound up by Humfrey Wanley for the Harleian library.\textsuperscript{57}

Our final comparison is also the most instructive for a number of reasons. Thomas Norton, lionised by Michael Graves as the parliamentary ‘man of business’ \textit{par excellence}, led a busy political life in the service of the City of London and of his country, his Queen and Sir William Cecil in particular. He became recognized as a parliamentary manager without peer during the 1560s and 1570s, and was, according to Graves, used as such by the Privy Council until Norton’s fall from grace in the winter of 1581/82 for talking of affairs that he should have left alone. Norton’s multifarious activities are amply chronicled by Graves; as a searcher-out and persecutor of Catholics and sedition (synonomous to the fiercely Protestant Norton), as an agent for the City of London, and as a drafter of bills and manager of Parliamentary business at the behest of Cecil, Walsingham and the Privy Council. Norton was also a man with widespread intellectual interests who co-composed the first blank-verse drama written in English with Thomas Sackville, translated Calvin’s \textit{Institutes} into English and paraphrased the first Psalm. He obviously had the interests, opportunity and inclination to amass a considerable amount of MS material relevant to his public and private lives. Norton’s papers stored in his study were seized by Thomas Wilkes on Privy Council orders at Norton’s death in 1584, and an inventory of 74 items survives. These 74 items give a good indication of Norton’s interests and activities, but, if packed up together and bound up in the same style as Beale’s own MSS papers, would by comparison fill perhaps only 3 or 4 volumes. This comparison is not entirely conjectural, as Norton’s papers seized in 1584 do survive almost in their entirety in the bound volumes of the

\textsuperscript{57} Harleian MS 286 f 286; Davison’s will PCC 29 Dorset of 1608 is printed in Nicolas, N. Harris \textit{Life of William Davison Secretary of State and Privy Counsellor to Queen Elizabeth} London 1823; D’Ewes bought the papers that Wilson had missed from sale of Ralph Starkey’s papers in 1628; see Watson, A. G. \textit{The Library of Sir Simonds D’Ewes} London, British Museum 1966 pp. 24-26, which were then bound up by Humfrey Wanley in what is now the Harleian MSS.
Yelverton library as part of Beale’s papers. In terms of archival survival alone, Beale is a unique figure for the Elizabethan polity.
Chapter 2. Robert Beale in the 1550s and 60s: the formative years

‘Touchinge my studies, I have by the space of xxvj yeres and upwards bene a student of the civill lawes, and long sith could have taken Degree, if I had thought, (as some doe) that the substaunce of Learninge consisteth more in Forme and title, then Matter: ... In Divinitie, I think, I haue redde as much as anye Chapleyne your Lordship hathe.’ Beale to Archbishop John Whitgift 1584.¹

Despite the remarkable size and depth of Beale’s archive, the surviving documents dealing with his own upbringing and early life during the 1550s and 60s do not allow a detailed first-hand reconstruction of what was a challenging and intense formative period for the young man. Until Beale’s appointment as a Clerk of the Privy Council in 1572, the survival of autobiographical material within his own papers is fragmented and eclectic, and any papers referring to his upbringing that have survived seem to have been collected or preserved more through chance or personal ties rather than through the bureaucratic habits he acquired later on in his life. For these early years no single man, nor even his archive in this case, is an island, and we must turn also to two relatively well-known mid-Tudor figures, Sir Richard Morison and John Hales, who both had a commanding influence on Beale’s early life. Beale was born in 1541 or 1542 to Robert Beale, a London mercer, and Amy Morison, sister to the scholar and diplomat Richard Morison, though it was his mother’s relationship with her brother that evidently decided the future of the young Robert. Beale’s father died in 1548 and the responsibility for Beale’s upbringing was passed through the intervention of his uncle Richard (although no evidence to say as much survives) to John Hales. It is only through Morison and Hales that we can trace the geographical locations of Beale’s

¹ Add MS 48039 ff 42-45 annotated by Beale ‘My letter to the L. Archbishop of Cant. 7. Maij 1584’; f 44a.
early education in England and on the Continent, and through them also appreciate the roots and form of his early ideological and religious beliefs.

Beale later referred to his early upbringing in a letter to Christopher Hatton written in 1589 to ask for the release from the Fleet prison of a certain John Hales of Coventry, who was at the time under suspicion of having harboured the Marprelate press. Beale explained his interest on the grounds that he had once held the wardship of this John Hales, and that he did ‘favor’ him ‘for that I thinck him to be an honest gent, and for that I was sometime brought upp by his uncle’.2 The eponymous uncle was of course the elder John Hales, described by Sir Anthony Denny to Henry VIII as ‘a very good Scholar, and a lover of learning and learned men’, who had amassed influence and money enough to purchase the Carmelite Whitefriars monastery in Coventry, part of which was then made into a residence that became known as ‘Hales place’, and had then also helped to erect what became the ‘Free School’ of Coventry.3 Beale later remembered, in another letter written to Whitgift of 1590, how, ‘ffowertye yeres and upwrades I was brought upp a scholler in the Citie of Coventree’, perhaps in the very school that Hales founded. ‘Sith that time’, Beale continued, ‘I have borne a certaine affection unto the towne, for that beinge a well wyller of learninge, it was the place where it pleased god to geue me the beginninge of my understandinge.’4

The involvement of John Hales in Beale’s education and life from such an early stage must have been due to Hales’s obviously close family, ideological and financial links to Beale’s Uncle Morison. Hales was born in 1516 and had then entered the service of Thomas Cromwell in the mid-1530s, where he assiduously built up his political

---

2 Add MS 48039 ff 63-70 Beale to Sir Christopher Hatton 25 November 1589 draft in hand of Clerk A, endd. by Beale, f 63a.
3 Lamond, E. A Discourse of the Commonweal of the Realm of England Cambridge 1893, ‘Introduction’ p xviii n. 8: ‘Not long after this Mr Hales came to settle at the White Friars (to which he gave the name of Hales-place) and in the Choir of the Church thereunto belonging, maintained a School at his own expense, allowing to Mr Sherwyn, the chief-master, £30 a year...’.
4 Lambeth Palace Library Uncatalogued Fairhurst Papers lot 44, Beale to Whitgift dated 22 August 1590 in hand of Clerk A; a draft is Add MS 48039 ff 74-75b.
connections and his personal fortune. Hales’s first recorded dealings with Richard Morison are when he bought the priory of St. Mary’s-without-Bishopsgate off him in 1541, and the ongoing relationship of Hales and Morison was to control the first twenty or so years of Beale’s life. Morison’s daughter Mary married a Bartholomew Hales - perhaps the younger brother mentioned in John Hales’s will - and another of Hales’s brothers Stephen was also married to one of Morison’s sisters. It is unclear whether these links between Hales and Morison stemmed from their own upbringings and education or from their common service to Cromwell and Henry VIII in the 1530s. Morison was then a special ambassador to the Hanse towns and to Denmark in 1546-47, and was Edward VI’s resident ambassador to the Emperor Charles V from July 1550 until his replacement after Mary’s accession by Sir Philip Hoby in August 1553. Morison’s will of 1550, made before he was appointed ambassador to the Emperor, appointed John Hales as joint executor with Morison’s wife, and Catherine Willoughby, Duchess of Suffolk as overseer. Morison then returned to England briefly, but thereafter soon sought sanctuary abroad: in 1555 Morison, Sir John Cheke and Anthony Cooke were all in Strasbourg, where Morison died on 17 March 1556. Morison bequeathed Hales his library on his death in 1556, and it was Hales who wrote to Cecil to inform him of Morison’s decease.

The elder John Hales emerged to his own independent historical notoriety through his involvement in the commissions for enclosure under Protector Somerset in 1549, and after the autumn coup orchestrated by Northumberland, Hales found himself in trouble and also in the Tower. Soon after Hales left England for the continent in the spring of

---

1551, and passed by his friend Richard Morison then employed as English ambassador to the Emperor. Hales already had wide contacts amongst the international protestant intelligentsia; his elder brother Christopher had studied in Strasbourg with the German reformer Martin Bucer in the late 1540s, and Thomas Cranmer mentioned a letter of Bucer’s to John Hales describing Bucer’s difficulties in Strasbourg in his invitation to the reformer to come to England in October 1548. Hales was also well known to the renowned protestant humanist pedagogue Johannes Sturm in Strasbourg, whose friendship he shared with Roger Ascham. Hales was in regular correspondence with William Cecil after he had left for the continent in 1551, which provides some information on his travels and contacts during these years, and also begins to document the relationship between Hales and the rising star of Tudor politics who was to wield such influence under Elizabeth. Hales’s wanderings between the various mid-century continental reformers are also documented in correspondence that survives in the volume of Beale’s papers now in Aberdeen. On one of his numerous journeys Hales carried a letter of recommendation written by the Polish reformer John à Lasco at his home in London to Spitconius Jordanus in Poland dated 16 December 1552, describing Hales as a ‘uir, & pietate, & eruditione, & generis Nobilitate, insignis.’ On his return journey to England, Hales carried a letter from Georgius Maior at Wittenberg dated March 1553 back to John à Lasco in London. Hales’s track record during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI would have marked him out too distinctly for him to remain long in England under Mary, and in 1553 Hales left again for the continent. Sir Thomas

---


Hoby's account of his travels during the 1550s mentions that both John and Christopher Hales had settled in Frankfurt in 1555, where they had a house with servants and property assessed by the city authorities at the 'not inconsiderable sum of 5500 florins'. When the Marian agent John Brett passed through Frankfurt in the summer of 1556 he was on the receiving end of Hales's 'hotte wordes' as Hales enforced his 'threates' to kick Brett out of his house.\(^{11}\) This was not the first or, as we shall see, the last time that John Hales let his temper and his protestant self-righteousness get the better of good diplomatic judgement.

Beale himself is not commonly associated with the thousand or so Marian exiles who left England for the reformed cities in Germany and Switzerland, and his name is not amongst the 300-odd biographies in Christina Garrett's *Marian Exiles*; nor is he listed amongst the numerous English dissidents who fled instead to cities like Padua and Venice in Italy.\(^{12}\) Beale was, however, an exile, one of the younger hangers-on, too young indeed to figure in either any of the later accounts of the events in the reformed cities where the English exiles made their temporary homes, and too young to pay taxes or have his name listed by the local authorities in their cities on any official document. Beale presumably left England either with Hales in the early 1550s or with Morison in 1554, and he had definitely settled at Morison's house in Strasbourg at some time before Morison's death in 1556. More later reminiscences by Beale, this time to

---


Burghley in July 1584 to complain of his treatment by the then Bishop of London, John Aylmer, fill in the details here:

"The Bishopp was sometyme my scholemen; he was for a while in the tyne of Q. Marye at Strasbourgh lodged in myne uncle morisons house, and after I remayned with him in the house of John Abell, and frequented the common scholes and lectures of Peter Martyr and Sturmius. When he departed from thence uppon some causes, which I haue heard were reported unto your L. by Sr Anthonye Cooke: I went with him to Zurick and continewed there about a yere: I serued him as much as anye servant could, and yet were all my charges borne by my frendes... Sith I was xiiiij or xv yeres olde he hathe had nothinge to doe with me..."  

John Aylmer was another provocative figure from the Marian exile who was to influence Beale’s upbringing and outlook, but not necessarily in the benign manner of Hales and Morison. In the early 1570s Beale felt comfortable in recommending his old teacher Aylmer to Cecil as someone suitable to be sent into Germany to negotiate with the Protestant Princes, but in Beale’s increasingly bitter struggles with the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the 1580s and 90s Aylmer became his own personal ‘bête noire’ and avowed enemy. It is through the mutual contempt between Beale and Aylmer that developed later that the lie is given to the famous picture of Aylmer included by Roger Ascham in his _Scholemaster_. Ascham portrayed Aylmer as a tutor (to Lady Jane Grey) who preferred sweet words to the birch to encourage his pupils. According to Ascham, Lady Jane was so grateful to god for her tutor Aylmer, ‘who teacheth me so ientlie, so pleasantlie, with soch faire allurementes to learning,’ that when she was away from her desk, she fell to ‘weeping, because, what soeuer I do els, but learning, is ful of grieve, trouble, feare, and whole misliking unto me.’ It is clear that Beale felt differently about the matter and would perhaps have argued with Ascham if he had ever been given

---

13 Add MS 48039 f 48b, from ff 48-56 in hand of Clerk A again ‘The answer of Robert Beale concerning such things as haue passed betwene the L. Archbishop of Canterbury and him.’ Dated ‘Primo Julij 1584 For my L. Threr.’ on f 48a.

14 Add MS 48049 f 356a; Collinson *Elizabethan Puritan Movement* 1967.

the chance. In his letter to Burghley in July 1584 Beale indignantly recalled that during a disputation over the status of 'indifferent things' in the church, 'the Bishopp of London burst out, that I was once his scholler, and wished that he had as muche power to beate me now as ever he had, ffor then he would teache me another lesson'. Beale was understandably indignant, 'and it greaueth me hauinge receyved so little from him as I did beinge now two & fowerty yeres olde; to be threatened with whippes, as [I] though I were an A.B. Jack still.'

Despite this later animosity, Beale's education under Aylmer was not all whips and birch. Beale also remembered in this same letter that, 'whilst I was his scholler he red to me and others certayne orations of Demosthenes and some tragedies of Euripides: and reputed the Logick and Rhetorick which we had learned in the scholes.' Beale's exposure to a reformed humanist education utilising such fashionable classical texts as Demosthenes's orations to the citizens of Athens reverberates through his later political life. This humanist education founded on rigorous Latinity and a strict training in the science of rhetoric provided the intellectual framework that would remain within men like Beale for the rest of their intellectual and political lives. Recent work in the field of early modern intellectual history and political thought has emphasised the importance of the classical rhetorical training that the intellectuals, administrators and politicians of the mid-Sixteenth Century began to receive at the hands of their humanist teachers. From academics like Gabriel Harvey and philosophers like Thomas Hobbes to the apparently more mundane politicians such as Sir William Cecil, scholars are waking up to the practical consequences of the form of the humanist education contemporaries received, and also to the direct correlations these contemporaries perceived between the

---

16 Add MS 48039, f 48a.
17 Add MS 48039, f 48b.
classical world described in their Latin and Greek texts and the world they inhabited in the Sixteenth Century. Beale was of course no different, and over the course of this study it will become clear how his intellectual training and his various ideological motivations interacted with his perceptions of the practical political world he saw around him.

After Beale had served and studied with Aylmer in Zurich until 1557, teacher and student then parted company for the time being. Aylmer hurried home to England after the accession of the Protestant Elizabeth in 1558 to begin to climb the ladder of ecclesiastical preferment, whereas Beale, like many other Protestant Englishmen, did not leave his continental exile immediately. Beale prolonged his stay on the continent to study Civil and Canon law, and whilst he therefore received a higher education, he took no formal degrees, as he himself informed Archbishop Whitgift in the letter quoted above. The printer Andre Wechel referred in 1577 to Beale’s earlier education amongst the ‘schools of Germany, France and Italy’ in his preface written for his edition of Spanish histories taken from Beale’s library. In Germany we already have Beale’s testimony to his education at the houses of Richard Morison and of John Abell in Strasbourg and then in Zurich with Aylmer again. The only record of Beale’s further education in Germany is his enrollment at the University of Wittenberg in May 1560. Beale’s incentive for studying here may well have been the contact of John Hales with George Majer during the 1550s alluded to by the letters of recommendation for Hales that survive in Beale’s papers. Here in Wittenberg he met and befriended Hubert Languet, who was to fulfil in the coming decades the role of intellectual and spiritual

20 Rerum hispanicarum scriptores aliquot...ex bibliotheca clarissimi viri dn. roberti beli angl. nunc accuratis emendatiusque recusi, & in duos tomos digesti, ...francofurti, ex officina typographica andreae wecheli, mdxxix-mdxxxii; Sig. iiiia.
mentor to Beale that Morison and Hales fulfilled for the 1550’s and 60s. Further clues as to exactly where Beale went and when are not forthcoming; the usual sources for enrollment or matriculation at European Universities do not list his name, and the fact that by his own admission he took no degrees means that his name would not have cropped up on graduation lists. It is likely that the Italian school Wechel referred to was Padua, famous for its Civil law and also with strong English connections during the Sixteenth Century. Beale’s slightly elder contemporary Thomas Wilson later remembered his own time in Padua during the Marian exile in his translation made in 1570 of The Three Orations of Demosthenes, recalling in his dedication to Cecil the fame and example of Sir John Cheke, and the ‘care that he had ouer all the Englishe men there’ in 1555 and 1556. Beale’s future brother in law Francis Walsingham was of course the consularius of the English nation in Padua in 1555, and Walsingham then matriculated the following year at Basle with three of his Denny cousins, Anthony Gilby and Lawrence Humphrey. Beale was still in Strasbourg and Zurich during Cheke’s time at Padua, but there remains the possibility that he passed through Padua in the early 1560s. Beale was also to spend much of the later 1560s in Paris, but no record of his formal attendance at the newly formed Faculté du Droit survives.

John Hales patently wielded an overwhelming influence on the young Beale. He was crucial in first educating him in Coventry, and then in conjunction with Morison in

---

23 Wilson, Thomas The three Orations of Demosthenes chiefe Orator among the Grecians, in fauour of the Olynythians, ... with those his fower Orations titled expressly & by name against King Philip of Macedonie: most nedefull to be redde in these daungerous dayses, of all them that loue their Countries libertie, and ... Englished out of the Greeke by Thomas Wyson Doctor of the ciuil lawes.. Henry Denham 1570, ‘Dedication’ dated 10 June 1570, sig * a; See Bartlett’s work in note 6 above; Andrich, G. A. De Natione Anglica et Scotia iuristarum universitatis Patavinae ab anno MCCXXXII ad annum MDCCXXVIII Padua 1892; Mitchell, R. J. ‘English Studies at Padua 1460-1475’, TRHS 4th ser. 19 (1936), pp. 101-17.
bringing Beale abroad under Mary. Here Beale was exposed to a continuing education that was based on the twin pillars of the reformed Protestant faith and a humanistic training that distinguishes so many of the exiles who were later to become prominent under Elizabeth. Hales’s movements during these years are linked directly to Beale in a variety of ways. Beale may well have accompanied him physically in some of his travels, but more importantly the mantle of the contacts and friendships that Hales was to make during these years was then assumed by the younger Beale as he grew up in the 1560s. As we will see later, Beale sent regular letters back to Hales in England during his residence in Paris in the late 1560s, and it was Hales’s connections with Cecil and Leicester that were to be instrumental in assuring that Beale made the next crucial step up the career ladder to become a Clerk of the Council in 1572. Hales was lampooned as ‘Hales the Hottest’ in the ‘Jewd Pasquil’ of the 1566 parliament, and he was undoubtedly a difficult character to those that crossed him or offended his sense of protestant propriety, as the Marian agent John Brett had found out to his cost. But Hales must have had a softer side hidden away somewhere, as Beale, for one, held Hales in some sort of paternal affection for the rest of his life. John Hales died in bed in Coventry on 26 December 1572; Beale then acted as overseer for Hales’s will in early 1573, and was granted the wardship of John Hales junior, son of Christopher Hales and the nephew and heir of John Hales, in May 1573. Beale then took responsibility for the younger John Hales’s education in the hands of the German humanist Jacobus Regius in London, much as the elder John had taken care of him. Beale’s intervention on behalf of John Hales junior to Sir Christopher Hatton in 1589 quoted above shows that this affection persisted long after the death of John Hales senior in 1572. Beale also preserved many of Hales’s papers within his own considerable archive, and he annotated the brief note ‘Mr John Hales his hand’ on the single surviving item amongst

---

his papers that was in Hales’s autograph, a personal memorandum of sorts of the identity of the man who was his to all intents his surrogate father.  

Beale’s links to these two prominent Henrician reformers and humanists, Richard Morison and John Hales, helped form the deeply felt protestantism and pathological anti-catholicism he manifested in later years. Morison’s own diplomatic career and specialities in Northern European affairs are also an uncanny premonition of many of the aspects of Beale’s later political life. Beale mastered Latin and French, and this dual expertise, in languages and in civil and canon law, proved the educational background for his later diplomatic career. Futhermore, Hales’s own preoccupation with the succession question after the accession of Elizabeth was to have a more immediate influence on Beale’s early life. Beale’s eventual return journey to England in 1563 was made at John Hales’s bequest in order to help in Hales’s attempt to push the Suffolk claim to the throne as the answer to the still undecided succession to Elizabeth, and to validate the clandestine marriage of the Earl of Hertford to Catherine Grey. This secret marriage between Hertford and Catherine Grey had caused an uproar due to Catherine’s relevance to the succession, through her descent from Mary Tudor, the younger surviving daughter of Henry VII. Catherine Grey was in 1560 the eldest surviving grandchild (Lady Jane Grey had been her elder sister) of Mary Tudor through her marriage to Charles Brandon, the notoriously much-married Duke of Suffolk. The marriage between Catherine and Hertford, alledgedly made in secret over Christmas 1560 with one witness and conducted by a priest who had both subsequently died, was discovered in August 1561, and Catherine, already pregnant with child, was locked up

27 Add MS 48043 f 72a.
in the tower, where Hertford soon joined her. Catherine’s son, called Edward after his father, was born on 21 September 1561.\(^{30}\)

In March 1563 the official report of the Commission of Inquiry under Archbishop Parker unsurprisingly found the marriage invalid, and therefore disabled any resulting children from consideration in the succession to Elizabeth. In August 1563 Hertford and Catherine Grey were finally released from the Tower, but the adherents to the Suffolk claim were still anxious to validate the marriage. A manuscript treatise titled *A Declaration of the Succession of the Crown Imperial of England*, written by a certain John Hales, was circulated in the autumn of 1563, and was then publicly ‘discovered’ in the spring of 1564.\(^{31}\) The ensuing investigation showed how Hales was at the centre of a network of protestant adherents to the Suffolk claim who thought that the designation of Catherine Grey was the most practical solution to the disputed succession to Elizabeth. The complex manoeuvring between Court, Parliament and Privy Council over the autumn of 1563 did not bring about the required agreement of Elizabeth, and the proposers of the Suffolk claim had sought different ways, such as the circulation of Hales’s treatise, to influence political opinion.

Hales had also sought another intellectual plank to support his argument by providing juristic arguments for the legitimacy of Catherine Grey and her children to the succession to Elizabeth. To this end he had either despatched or written to his young understudy Beale to undertake a tour of European universities, in ironic imitation of Cranmer’s visit to the continent at the end of the 1520’s to seek out canonistic opinion.

---

\(^{30}\) Cecil to Sussex 12 August 1561 printed in Wright, T. (ed.) *Queen Elizabeth and her Times* London 1838, pp. 68-69. Another son Thomas was born 10 February 1563.

\(^{31}\) Hatfield MSS CP 154 f 60 ‘The forthe examination of the said Jhon Hales, the xxvij of Aprile’ by D. Dale, D. Wyson is endd. by Burghley 26 April 1564. CP 154 f 61 is headed ‘The examination of J. hales taken the xxvij of Aprile’; see also *The Right of Succession to the Crown of England, in the Family of the Stuarts, exclusive of Mary Queen of Scots, learnedly asserted and defended by Sir Nicholas Bacon ... against Sir A. Brown ... Faithfully published from the original manuscript, by Nathaniel Boothe, etc. (A Discourse upon certain points touching the inheritance of the Crown: conceived by Sir A. Browne.* In fact, written by John Hales* London 1723.*
on the invalidity of Henry VIII’s marriage to Catherine of Aragon. Beale later told
Burghley of his ‘8. yeres or more’ of service to Hertford ‘with danger and charge to
defende as much as might be his pretended mariage’, and how then he had been
‘uncourteously [contrarye to] and without cause cast of’ contrary to Hertford’s signed
declaration to pay Beale £40 a year.32 Beale’s training in civil law and his continental
experience were used as he sought out the opinions of continental jurists on the three
debated matters associated with the Suffolk claim to the throne through Catherine Grey.
The first debated question was the validity of the clandestine marriage of Catherine
Grey to Hertford in 1560; the second the status of the earlier contract of marriage made
between Catherine Grey and Henry Lord Herbert in May 1553; and finally the third
concerned the legitimacy of Catherine’s descent from the marriage of Catherine’s
grandfather Charles Brandon with Henry VII’s younger daughter Mary. The fruits of
Beale’s labours are contained in two MSS now to be found in Cambridge University,
passed on into the Library from Bishop John Moore’s library in the Seventeenth
Century.33 Beale had himself first written a long treatise outlining the case and
validating the marriage of Catherine Grey to Hertford, and had then shown this treatise
to the jurists for comment on the details and arguments within. In the style of a
contested decision, he had set out the facts of the case with ‘Sempronius’ and ‘Seia’ as
the protagonists Hertford and Catherine together with the associated legal questions,
and had then recounted the subsequent judgement of the official enquiry under Parker,
published on March 12 1563. Beale obtained two positive replies to this first case of the
validity of the marriage of Grey and Hertford within Canon law from the jurists
Chilianus Sinapius, Marcus Ludovicus Ziegler, Georgius Bruner and Johannes Michaell
of the Imperial city of Spires, and another from ‘the doctors of Parys’. Beale also wrote
a second treatise on the question of the validity of the marriage of ‘Charles, Duke of
Suffolk with the Lady Marye, the Kinges’ sister’, and thereby the legitimacy of ‘Lady

32 Add MS 48039 ff 48a/b, from ff 48-56 in hand of Clerk A again ‘The answer of Robert Beale concerninge such thinges as haue passed betwene the L. Archbishop of Canterbury and
him.’ Dated ‘Primo Julij 1584 For my L. Threr.’ on f 48a.
33 CMA in ‘Librorum manuscriptorum ... Joannis Mori Episcopi Norvicensis..’, Vol II, Pars I, pp.
. 361-384, no. 9412, 226.
Fraunces, daughter of the said Charles, Duke and the Quene’, mother of Catherine Grey. Beale obtained three positive replies to this second treatise from Johannes Oldendorpian and Jacobus Omphilius and from the four doctors of Spire.34

Hales was examined on the orders of the Privy Council by the civilian Doctors (and Beale’s future colleagues in diplomatic and secretarial service) Valentine Dale and Thomas Wilson in the spring of 1564.35 During this investigation, the involvement of Beale in procuring the legal advice of continental jurists was uncovered. One of the interrogatories put to Hales concerned the ‘answer made by the lemned men of padua to the case by Robt Beale’, and another on who had formed ‘the case that was sent ‘by Robert Beale’ to oldendorpian’. Hertford’s step-father Francis Newdigate was also asked at the same time ‘how many wer pryuee to the bookes or wrytings that wer sent from beyond the seas by beale.’ 36 The success of Beale’s trip was of course limited in that the marriage was never validated, but whereas Elizabeth may well have made her own mind up, her judgement was not necessarily shared as final by the rest of the political nation, and the remote possibility of all this becoming relevant again remained in the back of many men’s minds. Ten years later Archbishop Parker commented to Cecil that he had thought to himself, ‘but uttered it to nobody living’, that ‘some man might work to have the case opened again, with such reasons as the Earl hath gotten (as he saith) since, for that he sent Beale over the seas, to have the judgement of learned men in that cause’, and the children of the marriage of Hertford and Catherine Grey pronounced legitimate.37

34 Cambridge University Library MS li.5.3, ff 18-44; Cecil (Salisbury) MS I, p 272 no. 880; Cambridge University Library MS li.5.3, ff 45-76; ff 82-96; Cambridge University Library MS Dd.3.85, Art. 18, 19ff; Cambridge University Library MS li.5.3, ff 1-3a, 3a-6b, 8b-15b.
35 Among these men mentioned by Catherine Grey in her testimony was Richard Bertie, the last husband of the Duchess of Suffolk. Beale may also have had some connection to Bertie, evidenced by his possession of an MS treatises written by Bertie in 1559 to support Elizabeth in answer to Knox’s infamous treatise: now Add MS 48043 ff 1-9b, endorsed on f xvb in Beale’s hand ‘These answers were mad by mr Rychard Bartye, husband to the lady Catharine Duchess of Suff: against the book of John Knox: 1558’.
36 Hatfield MSS CP 154 f 65a; Hatfield MSS CP 154 f 62a; in Cecil’s hand. I have so far found no evidence of a treatise by doctors from Padua mentioned in Cecil’s interrogatories. This is perhaps a mistake for ‘paris’;
37 Hatfield Calendar Vol. II p 72 no. 190; Matthew Parker to Burghley March 9 1574.
The association with dangerous causes that had enforced Parker’s silence in the matter also tainted Beale’s later service to the Queen upon his appointment as a Clerk of the Privy Council in 1572. In 1592 Beale related to Burghley his dissatisfaction with Hertford’s subsequent treatment of Hales and himself, and that because of all this he had served four years as a Clerk of the Council from 1572 to 1576 ‘before I could be admitted to kisse her Mates handes, by reason of some misconceipt about the Erle of Hartfordes matters.’ Whilst Beale’s pride and credit may well have suffered from his enforced exclusion from Elizabeth’s presence, Hales himself was held under house arrest for a number of years after the furore of 1564, and under royal displeasure till he died in December 1572. Elizabeth’s very personal sensitivity to any debate over the possibilities of marriage or of attempting to designate an acceptably protestant successor in Parliament ensured that any attempt to bounce her into making a decision was usually met by a royal rage sufficient to instil fear and trembling into her unfortunate subjects. This did not evidently stop them trying, and Hales was lucky to escape with house arrest in 1564. Fifteen years later John Stubbes’s fate was the loss of his right hand for attempting to turn Elizabeth away from marrying François Duke of Anjou in 1579 by printing and circulating his own notorious treatise *A Gaping Gulfe*. The disgrace of Hales in 1564 also held significant premonitions of Beale’s own later involvement in the execution of Mary Queen of Scots in 1587.39

The furore over the Suffolk claim to the succession in 1564 had exposed Beale’s name to the wider political world for the first time. Despite the souring of Beale’s reputation and name with Elizabeth for the time being, this was not entirely a bad thing - the involvement of prominent Councillors like Cecil, Bacon and Leicester in the investigation (and possibly at an earlier stage in the whole affair) meant that Beale’s learning in Civil law, his commitment to the reformed religion, and his network of

38 Lansd. MS 72 art. 73 ff 197-98; Beale to Burghley 16 October 1592. From Barnes; ff 197a/b.
contacts abroad were thereafter known more widely. Documentary evidence for Beale's whereabouts next appears in a letter written by Beale from Paris in November 1566, written to Cecil in conventional language of obligation and clientage and implying that he had been in correspondence with Cecil before. Just what it was exactly that Beale was doing in Paris is hard to pin down. As we will discuss in the following chapter, Beale was not a secretary, servant or member of the household of any of the resident English ambassadors Sir Thomas Hoby, Hugh Fitzwilliam or Sir Henry Norris. Beale might have been continuing his studies, but as we have already stated no records of his attendance at the University at the newly formed Faculté du Droit has survived. Other evidence for Beale's residence in Paris can be gathered from some of the documents now in the Yelverton papers which were acquired by Beale during his stay in Paris, and which also serve to help map out more details of when he was there and what he was interested in. One item describing the yield of various taxes in France in the 1550's is copied in his autograph and endorsed 'The State of the realme of France which I had of Sr Thomas Smith in Paris a[1566] 2 Maij.' Similarly, the tell-tale traces of Beale's characteristic thick and facile secretary hand can be tracked through the archives where other attribution to authorship no longer survives. Three letters written by Beale from Paris in 1567 and 1568 and sent to John Hales in England survive now in Cecil's papers in SP 70 with Beale's signature obliterated. These were unattributed in the CSPF series and have only come to light after a systematic trawl through the SP 70 volumes from 1566-72 with one eye looking for Beale's handwriting. These letters from Beale were, apart from the opening and closing sentences containing the formalised greetings and salutations, almost entirely composed of news and events from around the Continent.

The contemporary endorsements of 'Occurents' or 'Intelligences out of France' are a

---

40 SP 70/87 ff 75-6, Beale to Cecil, <November> 1566: 'I for that I have no other frend but yow...'
See the following chapter.

41 Add MS 48026, Art. 3 ff 29-31; endd. f 30a. Other material relating to Sir Thomas Smith's 1566 visit to Paris is in Add. MS. 48085, Art. 27 ff. 352-375b.

42 SP 70/89 ff 161-62 Endd. in a later hand '18 April 1567. Occurents sent of flanders-France'.
Add. by Beale 'To the right worshipful Mr John Hales<coverwriting in Cecil's hand> in London';
SP 70/94 ff 35-36 Beale to John Hales in London 16 September <1567>; SP 70/96 ff 65-67 (ink)
80-82 (pencil) Beale to John Hales 15 Jan 1568.
good indication of their genre and content, as are the numerous phrases or sentences that Beale begins with 'some say...' or 'it is thought...' when relating his various titbits concerning the toings and froings of European politics. The circulation of 'news' letters from correspondents abroad amongst friends, colleagues and political patrons was common enough in Elizabethan England.\(^{43}\) Beale had already at that stage been in direct correspondence with Cecil for a number of years, and so Hales's decision to pass these letters on for Cecil's consideration was presumably either known or acceptable to Beale.

The overwhelming characteristic of these letters, which their apparently impersonal relation of news and events belies, was the persistent confessional bias Beale manifested. The relative successes and failures of the Catholic Guise and the Huguenots parties in the turbulence of the later 1560s in France were related by Beale with appropriate relish or dismay according to his own firmly protestant convictions. Beale's black and white perception of the confessional divide in the French Civil wars was laid bare in its (two) colours, where the 'Papists and Guysardes', who never 'berr her maty any good will... but have always sought... her utter destruction', were contrasted with the 'Protestantes', who would 'deale with none whome they suspect to be of a contrary religion... for that they take her maty to be the chiefest patron and defendour of this cause'.

The events in France over the next few years were persistenly connected by Beale in his letters to Hales to the wider European situation in Scotland, the German States and to the 'misery of flanders' under the the Spanish yoke and the forces of the Duke of Alva.

\(^{43}\) Contemporary to Beale in Paris was John Herbert, who was also passing on information to Cecil: SP 70/100 ff 82-83 ink 114-15 pencil John Herbert to Cecil 29 July 1568 autograph; 'Whereas it hath pleased youe to will mye frind Mr Alford to certifye me yor pleasure to be such, that I shold impart to yor honor, such occurrents as the present state of ffrance yelds...'. 'Mr Alford' here was Francis Alford; see SP 70/104 ff 15-17 ink 14-16 pencil John Herbert to Francis Alford 4 Dec 1568 from Paris, which has been endorsed by Cecil's clerk. Herbert was friends with Beale during this time, and was later also in communication from Paris to Beale in London; see Aberdeen MS 1009/2/22 6 August 1570.
Behind all these conspiracies and threats, whether in France, the Netherlands or in Scotland, lay the grim shadow of the influence of the Spanish King Philip II, ‘who ys only author and contynower of all this mischeif’. This belief in an international Catholic conspiracy masterminded by Philip II and the papacy, and abetted by the Guise in France, was a fear shared by many of the Protestant English at home and abroad. This Catholic league, whether real or imaginary, was perceived as a direct threat to the safety of their own beleaguered Isle, and therefore the only effective response would be a defensive Protestant league of their own. Beale continued to Hales in 1568 that it was ‘marueled at here’ that given the ‘general danger of the ruyne of religion’ and the ‘desire which the papists haue to turne the sute in England’ that Elizabeth had not (despite constant entreaties) to ‘entreate with our princes for some remeady for so great a disease’. This was all the more surprising, continued Beale, given that as ‘the papists haue their league… so yt were not amis that the princes protestants for theyre defence had the like’.

Beale sought to persuade men like Hales and Cecil that the only sensible policy to pursue was to ally England with the Huguenots in France, and then extend this sympathy to co-religionists further afield. Beale was telling Hales what he undoubtedly already thought, but Cecil’s own sympathies for international Calvinism should not be underestimated. It is fairly clear that Cecil shared in the consensual anti-Catholicism that pervaded Elizabethan politics, but the extent of his more proactive sympathy for protestantism abroad in Scotland and France has recently been brought to our attention by Dr. Steve Alford. Cecil’s contacts during the 1560s with figures like Hales and

---

44 SP 70/96 ff 65-67 (ink) 80-82 (pencil) Beale to <John Hales> 15 Jan 1568.
46 SP 70/96 ff 65-67 (ink) 80-82 (pencil) Beale to [John Hales] 15 Jan 1568.
Beale helps to show how consensual some of these ideas were within the early Elizabethan polity, whether or not anything concrete came of them in the long run. Beale had no doubt imbibed many of these prejudices during the Marian exile and from Hales himself, but the virulence and strength of his convictions can only be properly understood in the context of his continuing experience of the continent in the later 1560s.

The visual and physical experience of the French wars of religion during his time in Paris affected Beale deeply, but perhaps the most significant intellectual influence on him during this time was the Calvinist diplomat Hubert Languet. Languet was born in France in 1518, converted to Protestantism and adopted Wittenberg as his spiritual if not physical home in 1549 under the guidance of the German reformer Melanchthon. Languet spent most of his long life travelling between the urban centres of the reformation, from Frankfurt to Wesel, Strasbourg to Wittenberg, and from Paris to London. Beale and Languet came into contact when Beale studied at Wittenberg in the early 1560s, but their paths may have crossed before this. Languet’s many travels had taken him to England in the early 1550s, to Frankfort in 1556, and to Paris a number of times in the 1560s. In 1581 Languet wrote to George Buchanan and remembered their own mutual personal contacts amongst the protestant intellectuals that both had met twenty years before in 1561 at the house of their mutual friend the printer Andre Wechel. Beale himself also frequented the house of Wechel in Paris in the 1560s and early 1570s, and then in Frankfort when Wechel moved premises after the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacres in 1572. Languet also had extensive contact with Christopher Mount, the German agent for much of England’s continental intelligence.

---

48 Ruddiman, T. ed. Georgii Buchanani ... Opera omnia ... in unum jam collecta ... curante Thoma Ruddimanno ... cum indicibus ... et praefatone Petri Burmanni Edinburgh 1725, 2 Vols; II.764 Languet to Buchanan 20 February 1581;’Hoc ego magnae felicitati ascribo, quod Lutetiae, ante viginti annos, contigerit mihi non solum videre te, ... sed etiam te conuiaum habere, una cum clarissimis viris, Turnebo, Aurato, Balduino Iurisconsulto, Sambuco Pannonio, Carolo Clusio, & aliis quibusdam.’
during the 1560’s. Languet himself is perhaps best known to English historians for his correspondence with Sir Philip Sidney, selectively edited and translated by the Reverend Stuart Pears, and for his supposed authorship of one of the most notorious political treatises of the age, the *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos* printed in 1579. Like Sidney, Beale held Languet in high regard for both his educated latinity and his cosmopolitan Calvinism, but their strongest shared commitment was to a Pan-European league of reformed powers to balance what they saw as the threat posed by an international Catholic conspiracy to the reformed European states. Twenty-one letters written from Languet to Beale between 1569 and 1582 still survive in Beale’s papers as testimony to their ongoing intellectual and political relationship. When Beale was in Paris with Walsingham in 1571 Languet dined at the ambassador’s residence on more than one occasion, and forwarded information and letters to Beale and Walsingham for them to send back to Cecil in England concerning the proposed marriages of Elizabeth. Languet also mentions his contacts with Beale and Walsingham in his letters to Sidney in the later 1570s, describing Beale as his ‘amici veteris & charissimi’ and Walsingham as ‘bonnum & praestantem virum’.

The first of the twenty-one letters from Languet to Beale to have survived is dated 12 June 1569 from Frankfurt and addressed to Beale in Heidelberg at the house of

---


52 SP 70/118 ff 131-32 ink 161-62 pencil 30 June 1571 Walsingham to Burghley autograph from Vernon: ‘for the state of Germanye I refer your L to this inclosed of Lanquets’, ie. SP 70/118 ff 133-34 ink 163-64 pencil 28 June 1571 Languet to Walsingham from Paris autograph French; Languet, H. *Epistolarum Politicarum et Historicarum ad Philippum Sydneum* Lugd. Batavorum, Ex Officina Elzeviriorum 1646 Epistola LXIII Frankfurt 15 Feb 1578; Epistola XVI Vienna 26 February 1574.
Girolamo Zanchi, an Italian Calvinist minister.\textsuperscript{53} Beale had been in Heidelberg since February 1569 waiting to accompany the English diplomat Sir Henry Killigrew on his mission to propose an alliance with the protestant princes of Northern Germany and the Kings of Sweden and Denmark, and to consider the grant of financial subsidies to Duke John Casimir’s army for support for the Huguenots in France. Beale’s persistence with Hales and Cecil in urging for a protestant league had obviously paid off in some form or another, although Beale was not officially accredited to Killigrew’s mission. Also converging on Heidelberg to meet with Killigrew and take part in the negotiations for the Protestant alliance was Louis de Lumbres, a servant of William of Orange. De Lumbres had previously been with Languet in Frankfurt, and had also written to Beale at Heidelberg in February 1569. Killigrew’s mission was also linked to the presence in England of the Cardinal du Châtillon, the brother of Admiral Coligny and a prominent Huguenot, who had arrived in England on 8 September 1568.\textsuperscript{54} Killigrew finally arrived in Heidelberg on 31 March 1569, where he encountered Beale and then had an audience with the Elector Frederick and his sons John Casimir and Christopher.\textsuperscript{55} Killigrew left Heidelberg later in April, and waited, in the company of de Lumbres, for the arrival of the Merchant Adventurers Cloth fleet at Hamburg till the end of May, and both Killigrew’s and de Lumbres’s letters to England were carried jointly by Killigrew’s bearer. On the 20 June 1569 the Huguenot diplomat de Vézines arrived at Heidelberg bearing correspondence from England from the Cardinal Châtillon, including a letter to Beale in which Châtillon addressed Beale as a kindred spirit in the fight against Catholic domination of Northern Europe.\textsuperscript{56} In June Killigrew travelled to Dresden to

\textsuperscript{53} Egerton MS 1693, f 3. Only one of the many letters Beale must have written to Languet survives; this is now Paris Bibliothèque Nationale MS lat. 8583, ff 158-59: this is dated 23 January 1579 from London, and is simply a brief apology for not greeting Languet’s arrival in England in person due to Beale’s illness.

\textsuperscript{54} Aberdeen MS 1009/1/ 22; Atkinson, E. G. The Cardinal of Châtillon in England, 1568-71 London 1890.

\textsuperscript{55} Kouri, E. England and the Attempts to form a Protestant Alliance in the late 1560’s London 1981 passim.

\textsuperscript{56} Egerton MS 1693, f 4 Châtillon to Beale June 1569; See also Aberdeen MS 1009/2/ f 16 Châtillon to Beale in London 2 February 1570; Languet writes to him in London from Frankfurt 27 March 1570, and again to Beale in London from Spire 5 November 1570; Egerton MS 1693, ff 5-6, in which Languet mentions Beale’s letters to him from England.
confer with Augustus, Elector of Saxony. He then left Dresden for Leipzig on 8 August 1569, took part in the negotiations at Kassel in August, and then travelled to Hamburg at the end of the month before returning to England, arriving on 22 September. The attention of the protestant alliance switched then to the convention at Erfurt which took place in mid September, at which Killigrew was not present. The failure of this conference effectively stalled the attempts of the late 1560's to align the German Protestant princes with England, the Huguenots and the Dutch rebels against the perceived Catholic threat. Beale then served as the bearer of the letter of Frederick III Elector Palatine sent to Elizabeth, dated 28 September 1569, which arrived in England in the middle of October. The failure of the convention at Erfurt did not, however, dissuade Beale and others like him that an alliance of some sort between the Northern Protestant powers was desirable in the face of the perceived Catholic threat, and this protestant alliance appears as a leitmotif throughout Beale’s diplomatic life.

So at last we have a definite date in 1569 for Beale’s return to England, although Beale had undoubtedly been in England before this at some time, as he had married Edith St. Barbe, daughter of Henry St. Barbe of Somerset, sometime in the mid 1560’s. Through this marriage Beale gained Francis Walsingham as a brother in law, who had married for a second time to Ursula St Barbe, sister of Edith, in 1566. At what stage they had first became acquainted is unclear, whether in exile under Mary, or in France or in England at some time in the early or mid-1560s. It would be interesting to know which man had introduced the other to which bride, or which bride to which husband perhaps, but what is certain is that thereafter Walsingham became a central figure for Beale’s political and public life. Beale’s relationship with Walsingham provides the connecting threads for the fabric of virtually everything that followed in Beale’s public life, and hereafter it is necessary to follow the development of the political careers of both men.

57 Kouri, E. I England and the Attempts to form a Protestant Alliance in the late 1560’s Helsinki 1981; p 176. The copies in London are Cotton Galba B XI 82, 83. Lansdowne MS 11/32 is a document entitled ‘The names of the Princes of Germany whose Ambassadors met at Naumburg’. See also Add MS 5935 ff 64 Monsieur Pezines to <Beale> 20 September <1569>.
58 Read, C. Mr. Secretary Walsingham 3 Vols Oxford 1925; Vol I, p 28.
as they proceeded more or less in tandem. Both married their respective St. Barbe sisters in the 1560s, both rose to initial political prominence through their service together in France in 1571-72, and both toiled at the administrative heart of the Elizabethan polity in the Privy Council thereafter, Walsingham as Principal Secretary and Beale as a Clerk of the Council. Beale was living at Barn Elms by the mid-1570’s, taking advantage of the easy access to the river and along this to the Royal palaces and Westminster, and Walsingham himself followed his brother-in-law to settle in the area in 1579. Their familial bond is shown by the continuing close relationship of the two men for the rest of their lives; in their correspondence Walsingham habitually referred to Beale as ‘my loving brother’, and Beale’s own public career was hereafter inextricably tied to that of Walsingham.

It is with Walsingham’s appointment as a replacement resident ambassador to Sir Henry Norris in Paris on 17 December 1570 that we begin to get more continuous evidence for Beale’s activities. Throughout these early years Beale’s conduct in the political issues and affairs he was increasingly involved in, and his ever-widening familiarity, through first his foster-father Hales and then the rising star of Walsingham, to Sir Thomas Smith, William Cecil and Leicester, shows that Beale was manifestly motivated by concerns that touched more than his own immediate education or private estate. These concerns were chiefly centred around the determination to keep England protestant - through ensuring that the succession to Elizabeth was tied up with an acceptably protestant heir, and by striving for an alliance of Northern European protestant powers in opposition to the perceived Catholic threat headed by Philip II. Before he was appointed as one of the Clerks of the Privy Council in July 1572, Beale was driven in these concerns not by the explicitly acknowledged oath of duty and service to Elizabeth and the Crown but by a more personal ideological concept of service to God, Queen, the principal Privy Councillors who shared (more or less) in these concerns and a distinctively protestant commonwealth. Some of the other different forms that this

59 Harl MS 1561, f 65; Lyons, D. ed. The Environs of London London 1792; p 12.
concept of service might take and the ways and means whereby it was expressed as a secretary and diplomatic representative constitute the subject of the next chapter.

'And therfore as it is most necessary to haue an Embassadour here, so think I the wisest and politikest man in England not sufficient: for he shall finde matter enough to cumber his brayne & employ his whole wittes...' Beale to Cecil from Paris, November 1566.¹

Beale was patently living in Paris for most of the mid 1560s, but any record of him continuing his studies at the University has so far not been forthcoming. His correspondence written from Paris to Hales and Cecil in England also fails to show conclusively whether he was formally part of the household of any of the resident English ambassadors before his service to Walsingham in 1571-72. Previous attempts to identify the secretarial and household personnel serving in the English embassy by F. J. Weaver and by Gary Bell have relied exclusively upon printed sources. These printed sources are the relevant Calendars of State Papers Foreign, and then specifically for Walsingham's embassy from 1571-73 Dudley Digges's collection of letters The Compleat Ambassador printed in 1655, and C. T. Martin's 1870 printed edition of Walsingham's Journal.² This reliance on printed sources has led to some avoidable errors in identifying the various personnel serving under an individual ambassador. These issues are clarified below as the various secretaries and servants serving each ambassador in turn at the English embassy in Paris are identified for the period when Beale was presumably in Paris, beginning with the shortlived embassy of Sir Thomas Hoby in April 1566 till the end of that of Francis Walsingham in April 1573. This

¹ SP 70/87/ ff 75-6.
survey of secretarial personnel has been based on research in the correspondence sent home from the English ambassadors, residing chiefly now in SP 70 in the PRO.

Each newly-appointed resident ambassador in the Paris embassy tended to bring over his own secretaries as part of his own household of general servants, the departing ambassador would take his own secretaries and servants back with him, and never the twain would mix. We begin with an exception that proves the rule, as Sir Thomas Hoby (April 1566- July 1566) was forced to ask the departing ambassador Sir Thomas Smith to leave him with secretarial staff until his own choice could join him from England. The bureaucratic continuity of serving personnel in the embassy would seem to make sense if judged by more modern criteria, and contemporaries also realised that the experience gathered by previous secretaries in Paris should not have been wasted. However, men who had served previous ambassadors were rarely able or expected to fit into the household of a subsequent ambassador, simply because of the personal rather than bureaucratic nature of the service required of them.

From the outset of Hoby’s embassy the different roles that the term ‘secretary’ might cover are defined as ‘outward’ and ‘inward’. The ‘outward’ role involved the less important duties of waiting on the French court and communication back and forth from thence to the ambassador. For this role Hoby said that he was loathe to continue to use Sir Thomas Smith’s son, ‘for as much as I understand and partlie see him of that unstaiedness for youthfull partes, that he is not to be ruled out of his fathers presence’.

---

3 It must be emphasised that this survey is not intended to follow the political issues that preoccupied the men serving in the Paris Embassy over this period; the French Civil Wars, the revolt of the Netherlands against Philip II, and the various plans for the marriage of Elizabeth: see Read, C. *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth* 3 Vols Oxford 1925, esp. Vol I Chaps. 2, 3 and 4; MacCaffrey, W. *The Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime* Princeton UP 1968; Holt, Mack P. *The Duke of Anjou and the Politicke Struggle during the Wars of Religion* Cambridge CUP 1986.

4 Cotton MS Titus B.ii ff 362-63 Cecil to Smith 1 April 1566 from Greenwich autograph: ‘he <Hoby> is marvelouslie destitute of a mete servant to be his secretary, or as on to be sent to ye court, to sollicit his causes. dyuers have bene offred to hym, but none hath bene found voyde of some reasonable exception. If you may lend hym on of yours to this end for some tyme, you shall greatly plesure hym...’; see also SP 70/83 28 April 1566 Smith to Cecil, and SP 70/83 Thomas Hoby to Cecil April 29 1566.
Hoby used instead ‘one Molineaux’, who had petitioned him in England to be offered a chance to serve with him before Hoby had left for Paris. This was, however, to be a temporary arrangement till Hoby’s brother-in-law Edward Cooke could attain sufficient proficiency in the French language to take on this role himself. The latter ‘inward’ role was to be filled by a man who already had an established relationship of trust with his master and who had the necessary linguistic and diplomatic skills born of experience abroad: ‘the place bout me of weight and most credit’, Hoby continued to Cecil, ‘I reserue to the coming of Scudamore’. ‘Scudamore’ here was almost certainly Richard Scudamore, who had served as a secretary with Sir Thomas Hoby’s elder brother Philip from the mid-1540s onwards.\(^5\)

Sir Thomas Hoby did not live long enough to see the language skills of Edward Cooke improve or to welcome Richard Scudamore to Paris to allow either of them to perform their intended duties. Hoby died suddenly from an unspecified illness on 13 July 1566, leaving a grieving wife and a vacant ambassadorship, and Cecil hurriedly designated Hoby’s companion in Paris Hugh Fitzwilliam (July 1566 - January 1567) as a temporary chargé d’affaires. Fitzwilliam was not of sufficient credit at the French court to become a permanent ambassador, and was in his own estimation not sufficiently wealthy, and so awaited his replacement with some concern.\(^6\) Fitzwilliam’s acquaintance with Hoby went back to the days of their Marian exile in Italy together, and he was probably the ‘Mr Phitzwilliams’ that Sir Nicholas Throckmorton reported had returned to England via Paris in 1559.\(^7\) A month before Hoby’s death Thomas

---


\(^6\) See his later requests for reimbursement: SP 70/94 ff 140-41 Hugh Fitzwilliam to Cecil 15 Oct 1567 autograph: ‘when I was there appointed, being a privete gentleman ’to a publicke place in a strange contray; consider that daly I resorted to all other princes seruice ambassadors for her maties better service... by which means I strayed my self to be in all respectes as it became one in that place...’.

\(^7\) Hasler, P. (ed.) *House of Commons 1558-1603*; also CSPF 1558-9 p 436 Throckmorton to Cecil August 2 1559 ‘That mr Phitzwilliams and Mr. Haywood had come as students from Italy, and that Mr. Paget had retired to Lyons.’ This identification is supported by Fitzwilliam’s later comments: SP 70/86 ff 28-29 Fitzwilliam to Elizabeth September 14 1566 autograph, ‘I do not
Fitzwilliam had written to his brother Hugh in Paris, describing Hugh as a ‘secretary’ to Hoby, but Hoby himself makes no mention of Hugh Fitzwilliam in his own correspondence to England, despite his complaints over his own lack of personnel, and nor was Fitzwilliam’s hand used to pen any of Hoby’s correspondence. Hoby’s death had suddenly thrust unexpected and unwanted responsibilities upon Fitzwilliam, and Fitzwilliam later rued to Cecil his failure to keep ‘copyes of all such letters as I haue written’, as being so ‘pestered with busynes’ and ‘alone without helpe’ he had been unable. He had to fulfil his duties alone without a secretary for himself, and all of Fitzwilliam’s surviving correspondence, like that of Sir Thomas Hoby, was penned in his own hand.

During Fitzwilliam’s brief and uneasy tenure the possible political divisions within the wider English community in the turbulent events of the French Civil Wars became apparent. Fitzwilliam, and Beale with him, were of a stronger, harder Protestant persuasion than Sir Thomas Hoby had been before them and, they feared, than Fitzwilliam’s eventual replacement Sir Henry Norris might prove to be. Beale, wary of reports that were reaching Paris concerning Norris’s religion, wrote to warn Cecil in November 1566 that ‘yf Mr Norrys smack after the likis and garlick of Egipt as the bruite ys herr... the Admirall and hole Hugonoticall faction, which he must most stick to, will sone smell him out.’ Beale also told Cecil of his good estimation of the job that Fitzwilliam had performed in the meantime. Fitzwilliam and Beale supported each other ideologically in their recommendation of political allegiances along confessional lines, and in their professed intention to serve the Huguenot cause as and when they might. Conversely, they sought to warn their correspondents in England about the threat posed to England’s security of the Catholic Guise and their cousin and natural ally, Mary Queen of Scots. In September 1566 Sir Henry Killigrew related to Fitzwilliam of...
his recent interview with Mary in Scotland who had 'let fall that she was aduertysed out of france how yll offices mr hoby had don ther agaynst her', as well as 'agaynst yor great frynd my l. of lecester also'.

Leicester himself confirmed this to Killigrew upon his return to England, and Killigrew was effectively warning Fitzwilliam to be careful of what he said about whom in Paris, as there were channels of information back to the English court other than his own letters to Queen and Council. The month before Killigrew’s advice, Thomas Hoby’s brother-in-law Edward Cooke had written privately to Cecil to tell how since Hoby’s death Fitzwilliam had been openly criticizing English Bishops. The ‘hotter’ protestantism of some of the English residents in Paris was occasionaly on open show, and that could serve to drive wedges in amongst the English community in Paris as much as back in England itself. In these troubled times, the ideological coherence of an ambassador’s household was highly desirable. As we shall see later in Chapter 4, Fitzwilliam had already dug his own grave as far as Principal Secretary Cecil was concerned, as Fitzwilliam had made a crucial political blunder in attempting to bypass Cecil to write directly to Elizabeth in September 1566. The outcome for the unfortunate Fitzwilliam was political embarrassment and disgrace before both Elizabeth and Cecil. Without the support of a household of his own, without sufficient credit or experience, without sufficient money, and in his eyes without sufficient support from Principal Secretary Cecil, Fitzwilliam patently did not have an easy time of it.

Fitzwilliam’s permanent replacement Sir Henry Norris (January 1567 - March 1571) had at least received enough time to prepare his departure, and he travelled out to France with his household and serving staff already in place. The first man he refers to as ‘his secretary’ was John Barnaby who travelled out with him. Barnaby was used when necessary as the main amanuensis for Norris’s correspondence back to England.

---

11 SP 12/40/60 Henry Killigrew to Hugh Fitzwilliam 3 September 1566.
12 SP 70/85 f 113 Edward Cooke to Cecil, August 18 1566. ‘En la vie de mon feu beau frere il <Fitzwilliam> pouvoit aucunement dissipimel, ainsi a ceste heure il commence descouvrire soy mesme en telle sorte que tournellement il parle irreuerement des Eueques de Angleterre. ..’
13 SP 70/88 ff 29-30 Jan 26 1567 Norris to Elizabeth autograph.
and also as a messenger to the English and French Courts for important communications.¹⁴ Barnaby was Norris's 'inward' man, trusted with the most sensitive information in the correspondence he penned. It is therefore interesting to note that Barnaby was not exclusively Norris's 'man' in terms of patronage and service: he was Leicester's, and had been chosen for Norris by the Earl before Norris's departure.¹⁵ Barnaby addressed Leicester as 'my singular good lord' in his own direct correspondence to him, and Norris referred to Barnaby as 'your honours servant' in Norris's own correspondence with Leicester.¹⁶ Barnaby's name also appears on one of the livery lists for Leicester's household dating from c.1567-68, at which time Barnaby was predominantly in France with Norris.¹⁷ When Barnaby fell sick in the summer of 1567 Norris wrote to William Cecil and not to Leicester to suggest a replacement secretary, which caused Leicester some angst when he heard of this request passed as he saw it behind his back. Norris was then forced to justify his failure to approach Leicester for the same, 'knowing how I ons troubled yow for this I thought it not mette to send to yow for one other.'¹⁸ John Barnaby was also in correspondence from France independently with Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, and the relationship of the ambassador Norris with his 'servant' Barnaby was, as we shall discuss, by no means simply top-down and directive.¹⁹

---

¹⁴ SP 70/89 ff 157-58 Norris to Leicester 18 April 1567 in sec. hand with autograph postscript and sig.: 'I sent my secretary to the kinge...'; SP 70/90 ff 84 Norris to [Leicester] 23 May 1567 autograph, 'Sr to aduertyse yr Lordshype of soche occurrantes as be heer although yr servaut mr bernaby be now dispatched...'.

¹⁵ The identification of John Barnaby as Leicester's servant is confused by the mistaken attribution of the recipient of SP 70/90 ff 84 Norris to Leicester 23 May 1567; this is endorsed incorrectly in later hand 'xxiiij of May Sr H. Norres to Sr N. Throk'. Norris refers in this letter to Robert Percyval as 'your honours' servant, and Percyval was Leicester's man: 'The xviij of this monethe Robert Percyval your honourse servaut was stayed at Diepe...'.

¹⁶ SP 70/92 ff 28-29 Norris to Leicester 6 July 1567 from Poissy, in hand of Thomas Jenye.

¹⁷ Adams, S. 'Household Accounts' 1995 p 426 has a 'Barnaby, [John] Mr.' in the index, relating to a 'Mr Barnabie' who is included in the 'Bill for Livery Cloth [c.1567-8]'.

¹⁸ Barnaby's expressed allegiance to both Leicester and Throckmorton is politically unsurprising. Barnaby signed a letter to Throckmorton 'Yours moost assured to use and command J. Barnaby'; SP 70/147/ ff 320-21 pencil 22 Aug 1567.

The second of Norris’s ‘secretaries’ was Thomas Jenye. Jenye also travelled over with Norris in early 1567, and his hand first occurs in Norris’s correspondence in February when Barnaby was sent back to England.20 Jenye was not by any means ‘inward’ to Norris in the same sense that Barnaby was. In June 1567 Jenye was used as an amanuensis in a letter to the Queen, but on the same day Norris wrote to Cecil asking for a replacement secretary for the sick Barnaby, and this use of Jenye as an amanuensis in important correspondence was probably due to necessity rather than choice.21 Jenye was sent later that month to Normandy to enquire into the preparations of 8 French ships that Norris had heard might be used to kidnap the young James VI from Scotland. In September the French King had heard of Norris’s fears by other means and Norris suspected that it had been Jenye who had, purposely or not, caused the leak of information. Norris wrote to Cecil of his suspicions that his own secretary was ‘so faulty’ that he asked that Jenye should be ‘duely examined, and yt faulty haue soche punishment as may be to others ensample to use the like in hir Mates seruyce and affaires’.22

The difference between Norris’s attitude to Barnaby here is obvious; Jenye was a minor servant whose service was not invaluable or irreplaceable. In the following year, despite Barnaby’s absence in England, Norris pleaded with Cecil for a replacement for Jenye and asked that Jenye would not be allowed to return, ‘being euer fflleting awaye, & cheffly when greatest nede is of his seruice.’23 Norris was evidently less than careful in his own choice of servants, as the third man to serve Norris as a ‘secretary’ was Edmund Mather, a man who was soon to have a questionable involvement in the plotting amongst the English Catholics in Paris around the proposed marriage of Mary

20 SP 70/88 ff 53 2 Feb 1567 Norris to Cecil? ‘Sr I haue receyfedy this your third letter the six of ffebr by my sone william norris... Thus thinkynge yt barnabyy wyll auertise you more at full...’. Also SP 70/91 ff 19-20 Norris to Elizabeth 4 June 1567.
21 SP 70/91 ff 21-22 Norris to Cecil 4 June 1567.
22 SP 70/94 ff 39-40 Norris to Cecil 18 Sep 1567 autograph.
Queen of Scots and the Duke of Norfolk. After Mather’s involvement in these plots had been exposed, Daniel Rogers was to write to Cecil in January 1572 of his opinion of the ‘factual disposition’ of both Mather and Jennye, which he had experienced first hand. Rogers exposed his own involvement in Norris’s household as well as Mather’s inconsistencies and infidelities: Mather had so ‘trusted’ him, Rogers wrote, that ‘ther was neuer a letter that he writte for my L. Ambassadour which he would not furst let me see, and receaung no aduertisement, of the which he would not aske my opinion’.  

The patent inadequacy of Norris’s secretarial staff was only rectified with the arrival of the ultimately more politique Francis Walsingham as replacement ambassador.

The inconsistencies of Weaver and Bell’s lists of secretarial personnel drawn from the printed Calendars are graphically evident for Norris’s household. Bell’s Handlist suggest that Norris was served by a ‘Crispe’ and also Daniel Rogers, who had both been listed by Weaver. Henry Crispe was indeed a servant of Norris’s who is mentioned as the bearer of packets of letters to England, but did not fulfil either of the secretarial functions of waiting at Court or penning correspondence, and no other evidence exists to testify to his closeness to Norris. Daniel Rogers was, like Beale, studying in Paris before Norris’s arrival in 1567. Thereafter Rogers entered Norris’s household in some respect, but not as a replacement secretary: none of Norris’s correspondence was written in his hand, although copies of items relating to France in his handwriting appear now in SP 70, and he carried letters over to England from Norris at least once.

Neither Weaver nor Bell mentions Barnaby, Jenye or Mather.

---

24 SP 15/21 ff 25-27 ‘Mine declaration to my Lord Burley, written at his request touchinge Mathers mater against his Honnour. 28 Jan. 1572’ in autograph hand of Rogers; printed in CSPD Addenda 1566-79 pp 381-83. Mather was imprisoned for a fortnight in the spring of 1570 when carrying correspondence back to England, and his questionable loyalties may well have been exposed in the process; see CSPF 1569-71 p 213 Robert Hogan to Norris from Cordoba 2 April 1570.

25 SP 70/98 ff 158-59 ink ff 243-44 pencil Norris to Cecil 28 June 1568: ‘the x th of this present one ‘Rogers’ <name in cipher> and Inglishman and well lernd cam to me...’. Some of the documents in SP 70 from this time are in Rogers’s hand, but none that emanated from the Ambassador’s household - more usually copies of items perhaps forwarded (either through Norris or directly) to Cecil; eg. SP 70/95 ff 8-9 ink 7-8 pencil Dated 1 Jan 1568 copy of verses ‘De Carolo Nouo Gallorum Rege Vaticinium Ad Corolum Noum’; SP 70/106 Daniel Rogers to Cecil
Norris's replacement as ambassador was of course Francis Walsingham (January 1571-May 1573), probably one of the most lauded and mythologised of English ambassadors ever to have served, thanks partly to his future prominence as Principal Secretary, partly to his reputation as a spy-master extraordinaire, and partly also to the huge posthumous influence of the *Compleat Ambassador* printed by Dudley Digges in 1655. The preface to Digges's edition of Walsingham's correspondence reminded the reader to note as they proceeded to peruse the pages following how 'vigilant' Walsingham had been to 'gather true Intelligence', how 'punctual' he had been to stick to his brief and instructions, and how 'wary and judicious' he had been where he could advance Elizabeth's best interests on his own account.26 This judgement has in many ways persisted and been repeated over the ages, and this characterization adopted and distorted further along distinctly machiavellian and sinister lines. Walsingham's early political life is correspondingly shadowy. He returned to England from his studies at Padua and Basle under Mary in time to sit for Lyme Regis in the 1562 House of Commons. His first marriage to Anne Carleill ended with Anne's premature death in 1564, but he married again in 1566 to Ursula St. Barbe, the sister of Beale's wife Edith. The first surviving letter from Walsingham to Cecil implies that Walsingham had connections with Throckmorton and France, but the beginnings of his political life are only first properly documented with his aid to Cecil investigating the involvement of the Italian banker Ridolfi in the proposed marriage of the Duke of Norfolk and Mary Stuart in 1569 and 1570.27

---

3 March 1569 from Paris; SP 70/115 ff 56-57 ink 83-84 Norris to Cecil 13 December 1570; 'thise bearer Rogerus...'.

26 Digges, Dudley *The Compleat Ambassador: or Two Treaties of the Intended Marriage of Qu: Elizabeth...* London Thomas Newcomb 1655, 'To the Reader'. See also Naunton, Robert *Fragmenta Regalia* p 22 that Walsingham had 'certayne curiosities and secret wayes of intelligence beyond the rest'. There is no adequate history of Walsingham and the Elizabethan 'secret service'; see Haynes, Alan *Invisible Power, the Elizabethan Secret Services* 1570-1603 London 1992; Plowden, Alison *The Elizabethan Secret Service* London 1991.

27 Read, C. *Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth* 3 Vols 1925; Stählin, K. *Sir Francis Walsingham und seine Zeit* Heidelberg 1908.
Walsingham was 38 years old in 1570 and about to begin his service to Elizabeth which was to occupy the rest of his life and, it can be fairly stated, alter the course of European politics for good. He was first sent to France in an official capacity in August and September 1570 to test the water for his coming role in the marriage negotiations, and then crossed the channel again with his instructions to replace Norris as the resident ambassador over the new year of 1570/71. Both Walsingham and Beale emerge from the political and archival shadows during this embassy into France, and it was a crucial time for both men in further defining and confirming their outlook on European politics and their own responsibilities to Elizabeth, the Privy Council and to the wider Elizabethan polity. Walsingham landed in France on 3 January 1571, and with him in his household were two men in whom he reposed absolute trust - his 29 year old brother-in-law Robert Beale, and his 25 year old secretary Ralph Warcop, who had been in Walsingham’s service since the previous year.²⁸

Because of their known familiarity, Beale has commonly been described as Walsingham’s ‘secretary’ in France, but Walsingham always refers to Beale in his correspondence as ‘Mr. Beale’ or ‘my brother’ and never as his secretary. The presence of Warcop in Walsingham’s household has hitherto escaped the notice of historians, but it was Warcop who stayed with Walsingham until the end of his service in Paris in the spring of 1573 whilst Beale returned to England in the spring of 1572.²⁹ Ralph Warcop was the eldest son of the 10 children of the London mercer Cuthbert Warcop and Anne Symonds, who had settled in the village of English in Oxfordshire and who had been connected during Edward VI’s reign with the Oxford reformers John Jewel and Laurence Humphrey. Cuthbert had then left England for the Continent under Mary with his sizeable family in tow, and had finally settled in Frankfurt in 1556, where he died

²⁸ See SP 12/74/12 Walsingham to Cecil Oct 22 1570 from London. This is addressed in Warcop’s hand.
²⁹ SP 70/127/ff 56-57 pencil 27 April 1573 Valentine Dale to Burghley from Moret. ‘It may please your L. to aduertys the Q. matie yt yesterday the Q. mother willed Secretary Pinart to send me worde by mr Warcuppe being then at the court, that I sholde be at the court this daye in the morning...’.
on 8 October 1557.\textsuperscript{30} Beale was a few years older than Wecop, but their paths may well have first crossed here in Frankfurt in 1556-57. Ralph then returned to England with his devoutly protestant mother, entered Peterhouse in Cambridge in 1559, and finally graduated with a BA from Christ Church at Oxford in 1565.

Wecop was to become a noted scholar who made his initial mark in the world of learning by translating the \textit{Prayers on the Psalms} by the French reformer Augustin Marlorat in 1571 during his service to Walsingham in Paris. Wecop left Walsingham’s service after their return from Paris in the spring of 1573, but remained in regular communication with Walsingham and the Privy Council from his home in Oxfordshire into the 1580s. Wecop’s association with Oxford University was to continue as a fellow of New College until his death in 1605, and he was, according to Wood, ‘the most accomplished gentleman of the age he lived in, and master of several languages’.\textsuperscript{31} Ralph Wecop’s family history, his Marian exile, his further education and his linguistic skills all display the intellectual qualities and ideological commitment that place him alongside Beale and Walsingham, at home in the cosmopolitan European courts but utterly committed to the Protestant cause. Wecop’s mother Anne fell terminally ill in July 1571, and when Wecop hastily returned to England to visit her death bed he carried over brief letters and messages from Walsingham to Cecil and the courtier Thomas Heneage, both closely involved in Elizabeth’s deliberations concerning the marriage plans. Walsingham wrote to Cecil of the haste of Wecop’s need to see his sick mother, and that Walsingham was therefore ‘dryuen to refer your L. ouer unto him to imparte unto you the present state of thinges hare’ orally in person.

\textsuperscript{31} Wood \textit{Ath. Oxon.} ed. Bliss vol I p 754; see also Hasler \textit{House of Commons 1558-1603} Vol III: ‘A manuscript that is almost certainly Wecopp’s commonplace book survives in the Bodleian... containing copies of accounts of the trial and execution of Mary Queen of Scots, a spy’s description of Spain, of notes on the Netherlands... From this commonplace book it seems that Wecopp had access to important state papers’ - I have been unable as yet to consult the MS, now Bodleian Eng. Hist b.117; Kingsmill, William ed. \textit{Encomium R. Wecopp}i 1605 STC 19049.5. No copy of Wecop’s 1571 translation of Marlorat’s \textit{Prayers on the Psalms} is listed in \textit{STC}. 
rather than at length in a letter. Walsingham then added in a postscript that as he found 'this bearer godly honest and secrat', he beseeched Cecil 'to geue him some woordes bothe of compforte and cownsell to contynewe in that coorse.' Likewise, Walsingham told Heneage that Warcop was 'verry godly and honest in whom I repose great trust'. Warcop saw Heneage first to deliver his message, and Heneage then wrote on Warcop's behalf to Cecil excusing Warcop from visiting the Principal Secretary as well in order to allow him to hurry home to his mother's sickbed. Walsingham's description of Warcop's qualities as 'godly, honest and secrat' amply summarise of the characteristics required of an inward secretary and confidant at the Paris embassy.32

A third 'secretary' Lisle Cave entered Walsingham's service in Paris sometime in the summer or autumn of 1571, most probably whilst Warcop was away visiting his dying mother.33 It remains unclear whether Cave had any previous connections with Walsingham. Most of the biographical information on Cave comes from his own hand: Cave made a neat copy of many of the letters he had written in French during his years of service to Walsingham between 1571-89, including some private letters written to his family in England. Here he mentions his 'cousins' Edward Cave, Sir Robert Smith and the merchant William Villiers. His motivation for producing the letterbook was

32 SP 70/119 ff 16-17 ink 14-15 pencil 11 July 1571 Walsingham to Burghley autograph from Meaux. Cecil endorsed this letter "Mr Fra: Walsyngham by Warcopp his secretary"; SP 70/119 ff 18-19 ink ff 16-17 pencil 11 July 1571 Walsingham to Heneage autograph from Meaux. Add by Warcop: 'Sr yours of the vij the I haue receuyed and for that this bearer my secretary thorowgh the syckeness of his mother... I must refer you ouer to him he is verry godly and honest in whom I repose great trust. He wyll at large declare unto you in what tearems we stande here...'; SP 70/119 ff 34-35 ink 32-33 pencil 16 July 1571 Heneage to Burghley from Court autograph.

33 Lisle Cave's French Language Letter Book is now SP 104/62. The first reference to Cave's service to Walsingham comes in a letter dated 12 Sep 1571 pp 5-6 to 'Monsieur mon pere', stating that the money sent 'pour le demy an ce seroit bon car monsieur lambassadeur est incertain quant je m'en rotourneray chez luy pour ce qu'il veult que je apprenne a tirer des chateaux a la plume enquoy je prent grand plaisir'. The first letter included in this book explicitly written on behalf of Walsingham is dated 13 November 1571 p 15, addressed to 'Monsieur le Preuost de paris'. Walsingham's Journal also lists a letter to a 'Mr. Cave' carried to England by Harcourt on 18 February 1571. Collinson 'Letters of Thomas Wood, Puritan, 1566-1577', Bull. Inst. Hist. Res. Spec. Supp. 5 1960 prints letters from Thomas Wood to a Dr. Francis Cave and Thomas Cave in Leicestershire. Cave also refers to the merchant William Villiers as his 'cousin'; see letter pp 5-6 12 Sep 1571 addressed to 'Monsieur mon pere' and SP 12/103/67 ff 137-38 22 June 1575 William Villiers to Laurence Tomson: 'wth my most hartie comendacions to yow & my cussen Cave not ffforgotten. as also to mr mylls I praye yow doe the lyke from mee &c.'
probably for self-publicity after Walsingham’s death in 1590 had deprived him of a political master. The first letter explicitly written on behalf of Walsingham entered into this letter-book dates from 13 November 1571, but Cave also copied a letter to his father of September 1571 in which he specifically mentions his abode at Walsingham’s residence in Paris. The evidence for Cave’s service from the identification of his handwriting in Walsingham’s correspondence is partially hindered as Cave’s English secretary script is identified only by default, as a signed and dated sample writing in English written by Cave has not been located. The French language letter-book is not a convenient comparison sample writing: Cave used a French secretary script which was dissimilar to that which he would have used for English, and furthermore the letter-book was written twenty years after his initial service to Walsingham in Paris in c.1590.

In the autumn of 1571 some of Walsingham’s correspondence begins to be penned by a different secretary hand to that of Warcop, and this new hand continues to be used in the correspondence for 1572. By default, this is assumed in lieu of any better explanation to be Cave’s English secretary script.34

Once again, the inadequacies of the printed calendars for compiling lists of secretarial personnel are graphically evident for Walsingham’s household. Neither Weaver’s early work nor Bell’s Handlist mentions Warcop or Cave, and Bell lists Beale and also Sir Henry Killigrew as Walsingham’s secretaries, where Killigrew in fact acted as a replacement ambassador during Walsingham’s sickness in the winter of 1571/72. Responsibility for this confusion must also be shared by the continuing misinterpretation of the ‘Journal of Sir Francis Walsingham’, familiar to scholars since its printing for the Camden Society by C. T. Martin in 1870. The original Journal consists of a neat copy made from rougher notes for purposes of keeping track of Walsingham’s movements to and from the French and English Courts, of the various

34 The hand assumed to be Cave’s first occurs in SP 70 as SP 70/121/ ff 4-5 7 November 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris. Warcop had left Paris on 11 July 1571, and returned in late October; see SP 70/120 ff 89-90 ink 124-25 pencil 19 October 1571 Walsingham to Burghley in Warcop’s hand with autograph end. Add. by Warcop. Thereafter letters written either in Walsingham’s autograph or in the hand of Warcop or Cave.
visitors he received, and of his incoming and outgoing correspondence. It is a pre-bound paper book that has been copied into over the years rather than constructed from discrete gatherings copied and then bound together.\(^{35}\) Martin’s printed version of Walsingham’s *Journal* is a faithful transcript but suffers from some minor inconveniences; the decision to place the lists of letters sent and received at the end of the *Journal* breaks up the integrity of the manuscript, and the names of the messengers carrying this correspondence are omitted altogether. Furthermore, Martin’s introduction is misleading as to the character of the manuscript. Martin notes correctly that the *Journal* is copied up in 4 discrete periods of time: from 3 December 1570 - 17 January 1572; from 21 December 1573 - 30 December 1574; from 1 April 1575 (missing all of May) - 13 June 1578; from 29 March 1580 - 20 April 1583 (missing August/September 1581 when Walsingham was in France again). Martin then notes that ‘although all the entries are in the first person, the manuscript is not in Walsingham’s own hand, but in that of his secretary.’\(^{36}\) These four periods of time were generally copied in one as neat entries, but with some important variations. Firstly, the first period covering Walsingham’s embassy in France 1570-1572 was copied in by two different secretaries. The first section (ff 1-7a) covering the period December 1 1570- May 31 1571 was copied into the *Journal* in the hand of Warcop. As we have seen above, Warcop travelled to England in July 1571 before returning a few months later, and it seems likely that during his absence Walsingham engaged the services of another secretary. The second section (ff 7b-12a) covering the period June 1 1571- January 17 1572 was copied in another hand: this is in all probability, as discussed above, the English secretary script of Lisle Cave.

In the *Journal* further servants of Walsingham in France are also mentioned by name: Walter Williams, John de Rosse, and a ‘Harcourt’ and a ‘Digby’.\(^{37}\) Walsingham was

---

\(^{35}\) PRO 30/5/5.
\(^{36}\) Martin ed. *Journal* preface p i.
\(^{37}\) E403/2260 Tellers View of Payments 1570 f 34a: Walsingham £936 5 s 7d - William Dodington and Walter Williams mentioned as receiving monies. Two entries for Walsingham on f 35b both refer to Dodington and Williams. Dodington receives money in E403/2261 Tellers
also in correspondence back to England with Francis Mills, another of his familiars who served him as a secretary for twenty years, whilst Walsingham’s ‘factor’ in England during his absence was his ‘brother’ William Dodington. Daniel Rogers is mentioned as bringing post from England on 3 February 1571 and taking post there on 27 April 1571. Henry Killigrew’s servant ‘Jeffreys’ and Sir Thomas Smith’s nephew and ‘inward’ man John Wood are also named as both Killigrew and Smith were back in Paris during Walsingham’s embassy. However, none of these other servants in Walsingham’s household seems to have been in a position of trust and confidence comparable to Beale, Warcop and then Cave.

The principle contemporary distinctions between a ‘secretary’ and a ‘servant’ were a function of the relatively intangible sense of familiarity and trust between two ideologically-congruous men. This familiarity was then combined also with the easier-to-trace bureaucratic and administrative functions performed. The fluidity in contemporary usage of the two terms is evident throughout the ambassador’s households examined above: for example, Mather was referred to in Norris’s correspondence as both a ‘servant’ and also as a ‘secretary’. However, in the analysis above we have also already implicitly classed these individual servants into a hierarchy ordered by the extent of the level of political intimacy evident between master and servant. This intimacy might be manifested in a number of ways, and both secretaries and servants, whether they might be counted as ‘inward’ or ‘outward’, could be expected to fulfil a number of duties for the ambassador that varied greatly in their level of confidentiality. The main duty that any class of servant might be expected to perform were the various tasks involving the carrying of oral or written information, either to

View of Payments 1571-72, and also E403/2262 1573-74. Williams last recorded as receiving money E403/2264 1576-77; SP 12/83/65 ff 149 -50 <1571-72> Letters of safe conduct for a variety of people, including John de Rosse, described as a servant of Walsingham’s in France; SP 70/123 ff 35-36 ink 42-43 pencil March 1572 Walter Williams to <Cecil?>.

38 SP 12/85/49 ff 116-17 William Dodington to Burghley February 20 1572; SP 70/122 ff 97-98 ink 102-03 pencil 19 Jan 1572 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris. Autograph. Add. by Walsingham: ‘I haue desyered my brother dodyngeton to make your L. acquaynted wt the cause whye my byll of espayll rysethe to soe great a somme...’. William Dodington, Edmund Carey and Beale were the overseers of Walsingham’s will in 1590.
and from the French Court, or back and forth to England. During Walsingham’s ambassadorship, Williams, Harcourt and Digby are regularly mentioned in carrying post to and from England. Less important packages of letters were also carried by individuals who had little personal connection with the ambassador - merchants, or men returning from the continent - but who could be trusted to deliver their package intact.\(^{39}\)

The ambassador’s servant or secretary would be expected to make visits to specific personages in Paris or the Court - to foreign ambassadors, or to particular French political figures. In April 1571 Walsingham wrote to Cecil that the Archbishop of Cashel had ‘sent one of his men unto me willing me to send som trusty servant of myne with whom from tyme to tyme he mighte communicate the Spanishe enterprise, and so gyue me knowledge thereof’. Walsingham sent Ralph Warcop and reported the proceedings to Cecil accordingly.\(^{40}\) A household servant or secretary was occasionally used as an ‘espial’ in order to gather information first-hand, but here again the level of intimacy and trust could vary widely. A good example was the mission of Thomas Jenye into Normandy in the summer of 1567 to enquire about the preparations of a French fleet suspected of an attempt to kidnap James VI of Scotland in 1567. Similarly, the expense account submitted by Walsingham after his 1578 mission into the Netherlands lists the various servants and gentlemen sent as ‘Intelligence or Spialls’ and their respective charges.\(^{41}\)

The exact nature of these duties and others depended heavily on the ‘inwardness’ of the personal relationship between master and servant. The hierarchical distinctions between ‘master’ and ‘servant’ become less meaningful and the relevant distinctions between ‘secretary’ and ‘servant’ more apparent within the more amorphous and intangible duties of counsel and advice, and of ideological and intellectual support. We have


\(^{40}\) SP 70/117 ff 107-08 ink ff 117-18 pencil 4 April 1571 Walsingham to Cecil in Warcop’s hand with autograph postscript.

\(^{41}\) British Library MS Microfilm 488 pp 9-11.
already seen that Norris’s first and principal secretary John Barnaby had been appointed to serve Norris by Leicester. Barnaby himself was in correspondence directly with Leicester and Throckmorton on his own behalf concerning French policy, and also with Cecil when occasion saw fit. In April 1567 Barnaby wrote to Leicester and criticized the appointment of Sir Thomas Smith to lead the English delegation in the negotiations over the return of Calais. It had been his own ‘good hope’, he wrote to Leicester, ‘that some such speciall man should be chosen to come hether for the demaunding of Callais, whose creditt and honourable estate might haue mowed the frenche to do us right or reason.’ ‘But nowe I perceyue the matter is otherwise handled’, Barnaby continued, ‘and one sent whome they will neither greatly respecte, nor yet thinke yw do much force whether they gyue yow any satisfaction of not.’ This was not necessarily a criticism of Smith’s abilities, but a realistic assessment of the social and political status necessary for the coming negotiations, as Smith was neither a nobleman nor a Privy Councillor. Sir Henry Norris then repeated the same criticism of Smith’s appointment to Cecil three weeks later, following almost word for word Barnaby’s example. The extent of Barnaby’s political and ideological influence within Norris’s household was made explicit when Leicester discovered that Norris had approached Cecil to provide a replacement secretary for the physically ailing Barnaby in July 1567. Norris then felt obliged to reassure Leicester that the reason for this was not that Norris was ‘jelous of `mr’ bernabeiis doinges’ or of Barnaby’s familiarity with

---

42 SP 70/90 ff 72-73 Barnaby to Cecil 18 May 1567. Autograph; ‘Thus haue I enterprised to aduertise yor honor in my L. ambassador’s name aswell bycause it woude require longer tym then is meet or convenient for her Mates seruice to go first to paris and so by his meane sende worde thereof.’

43 SP 70/89 ff 139-40 Barnaby to Leicester 10 April 1567. Autograph.

44 SP 70/90 ff 6-8 Norris to Elizabeth 1 May 1567. Autograph. Endd. ‘Sr Henry Norris to the Q. Mate By Sir Thomas Smith’; ‘But most humbly crauinge pardon for my boldnes of yr majesty, yf yt might haue lykyd yr hygnes so as to haue sent one of yr most honorable coundells about thys yr majestys so wayghty affayre they wolde not `so’ lyghtly haue estymyde yt as they dyd ... so I assure yr mayesty the frenche hadd no great garde to that was syde on yr behalf.’

45 For Norris’s request, see SP 70/92 ff 26-27 Norris to Cecil 6 July 1567. Autograph. ‘that I may hauwe from yow or by yr appointmeone to assist me in hir hygnes affayres: whos entertainment I trust shalbe to ys contenacyon or as yt shall please yow to appoint. ... I wolde be gladd of mr Somers but very willinge to receyue who yow shall think good of.’ Norris wrote to Leicester with his excuses in August 1567: SP 70/93 ff 86-87 Norris to Leicester 27 August 1567 from Paris. Autograph.
Catherine de Medici. Norris also wrote that he had not concealed any of these negotiations from his secretary, and neither had he ever received any ‘letter from hir maty nor wrote eny to the same that I dyd not first shew him and aske his adviçe & cownsell therin’, and would not have acted in such manner if he had not trusted Barnaby implicitly.\textsuperscript{46}

This scenario of the inversion of roles of ‘master’ and ‘servant’ was obviously dependent on the circumstances and the individuals involved, and here in the case of Barnaby the politics are made more opaque as it is unclear whether this was a manifestation of any political rivalry between Leicester and Cecil or more a case of wounded pride. It is perhaps harder to see an ambassador like Walsingham obliged to seek counsel and advice before the eyes of a secretarial ‘censor’ in like sort, but Walsingham was certainly aware of the relative influence that other personages’s own secretaries might bear upon them. He told Burghley in 1571 that Paul de Foix, counsellor to the Queen Mother and one who was perceived to favour the English side, was ‘nyche governed’ by his secretary Florence, and that Burghley should accordingly therefore direct his policy and persuasion as much at the secretary to ‘take some profyt of him’ as at the master.\textsuperscript{47} Within his own household, Walsingham undoubtedly did see Warcop and Beale as his own familiars to be trusted, relied upon and certainly turned to for advice. As we have seen above, when Warcop returned to visit his dying mother in 1571, Walsingham described him as ‘godly, honest and secrat’ to Burghley, and to Heneage as a man who was ‘verry godly and honest in whom I repose great trust’. Warcop’s personal religious background appears to have fitted in seamlessly with the ideological outlook of both Walsingham and Beale. Walsingham’s relationship to Beale himself obviously transcended common ties of background, outlook or politics: ‘No

\textsuperscript{46} SP 70/93 ff 86-87 Norris to Leicester 27 August 1567 from Paris. Autograph.
\textsuperscript{47} SP 70/119 ff 76-77 ink 77-78 pencil 3 August 1571 Walsingham to Burghley autograph. Add. in same sec. hand as other letters. Endd. by Burghley ‘Mons du foix speecehe at Mellun’.
man knowethe better' wrote Walsingham to Cecil in January 1572, 'then this bearer my
brother in lawe whoe is pryuye to my state.'

The chief intellectual qualifications for such an ‘inward’ role were a solid academic
education, extensive previous travel and experience of the continent and the associated
linguistic skills that resulted. Beale’s early education at Coventry, Strasburg, Zurich
and then at numerous continental universities has been dealt with above, and Ralph
Warcop’s intellectual attainments were evidently not insignificant. When Walsingham
finally left Paris in 1573, his replacement Valentine Dale wrote to Burghley of the
qualifications of his choice of one Thomas Wilkes from All Souls College, Oxford, to
be his secretary, ‘of whose sufficiency bothe in the Italian and frenche tongue and other
good learning and experience it maie please your lordshipp to be adwertised by Mr
Walsingham.’ Dale’s choice was retrospectively validated as Wilkes, like Beale, rose
to become one of the Clerks of the Council and a busy diplomatic servant of the
Elizabethan polity. For University-educated men who desired to break out of the
college cloisters the most common means of getting a foothold on the first rung on the
ladder of political career advancement was as a secretary or member of the household
of an ambassador or diplomatic envoy. Gary Bell’s general study of diplomatic
personnel broadens this out as the career progression of men from household member to
secretary, to independent diplomatic envoy and then as a resident ambassador, to the
apex of diplomatic service as Principal Secretary.

A shared ideological and religious outlook was as important as these more impersonal
intellectual attainments. These men were obviously eager for the career possibilities
that such service oversees in an ambassadorial residence could open up for them, as the

48 SP 70/119 ff 18-19 ink ff 16-17 pencil Walsingham to Heneage 11 July 1571 autograph from
Meaux. Add by Warcop: SP 70/122 ff 97-98 ink 102-03 pencil Walsingham to Burghley 19
49 SP 70/127/ff 39 pencil 21 April 1573 Valentine Dale to Burghley from Paris.
50 G. M. Bell A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives 1509-1688 Royal Historical
later careers of Beale and Wilkes testify. They were more often than not considered within the same brackets of quality and credit as the resident ambassador and therefore seen as a potential suitable replacement. When Walsingham fell sick in the autumn of 1571 and declared himself unable to perform his duties of waiting at the French court, he automatically recommended Beale as the natural replacement. Burghley concurred and wrote to Walsingham authorising him to appoint Beale in his place for as long as necessary. This was a prospect which appears, perhaps surprisingly at first glance, to have terrified Beale. Beale hastily wrote back to Cecil exclaiming his ‘unabilitye’ and petitioned that ‘so great a burden be not layd upon so unsufficient a Parsons necke’. Beale’s uncharacteristic declarations of his own insufficiency stemmed more from his fears of financial ruin under the unavoidable expenses that he would incur than from a sincere belief that he was unqualified for the post. In the event Sir Henry Killigrew was sent out and Beale’s fears of insolvency allayed.51

The academic and intellectual sufficiency of these ‘inward’ secretaries such as Warcop and Beale ideally augmented rather than merely fed off the reputation and standing of the ambassador himself. The intellectual and cultural standing of an ambassador’s secretaries was a significant reflection of that of the ambassador himself, and rested more on ideological congruity than social or intellectual snobbery. Beale himself had a pre-existing extensive network of correspondents and acquaintances that he brought with him intact to Walsingham’s household in the Quai des Bernardins in the Faubourg St Germain, which was an important meeting point for the international protestant community during the years 1571-72.52 Hubert Languet and Pierre de la Ramée were

51 SP 70/120/ff 56-57, Beale to Burghley September 15 1571 f 56a.
52 The location of Walsingham’s residence in Paris is indicated by Osborn, J. M. Young Philip Sidney 1572-77 Yale UP New Haven and London 1972, p 67 n. 16; ‘De Thou p 408 says Walsingham in ‘Rue de Bernardins’ but Stählin, 1:527n, pointed out that this street was in the university sector and ‘Quai des Bernardins’ is correct.’ Lisle Cave refers to Walsingham’s house in a letter to his father in SP 104/162 p 11-12 dated by Cave Oct 8 1571 ‘Monsieur mon pere demeurant’, ‘et aussi en ce que me mandes vous certifier du lieu ou Je me tiens Je vous plaira sceuoir que cest en l’universite pres de mont sainte Jeneueiefue en la rue des almandiers a lenseigne de Fest-lautruche chez le veneur defeu monseur leclerc, et monseur lambassadeur qui est encor a la court a blois (de ou on pense que le roye ne bougera encor de long temps) est pournet de vynne maison sure les fauux bourge a coste des champe St marceau nomme lhostel debulles...’.
two of the many visitors to Walsingham’s residence whose initial contact with the English embassy was probably with Beale rather than with the ambassador himself. Beale’s own relationship with Languet already stretched back a decade, and his abode in Paris during the mid-1560s had brought him into contact with many other significant European protestant intellectual figures. Another important nexus for the international protestant community before the St Bartholomew’s day massacre was the house of the printer André Wechel nearby to Walsingham at the Rue Saint-Jean de Beauvais.\textsuperscript{53} André Wechel’s father Chrétien had operated a printing press in Paris since the 1530s, which had become reknowned for the quality of the reformed humanist educational and classical editions it produced. The house of Wechel was the main printer of the works of Pierre de la Ramée, and Chrétien Wechel had also printed Johannes Sturm’s educational works produced in Paris before Sturm returned to Strasbourg.\textsuperscript{54} The house of Wechel was as important for Beale’s network of continental contacts as the house of Walsingham. Languet often stayed with Wechel when in Paris in the 1560s: he reminded George Buchanan in a letter written in 1580 of the Protestant intellectual luminaries they had met there such as Charles Utenhove, Pierre l’Escluze and Jean Muret.\textsuperscript{55} Beale’s relationship with André Wechel worked both ways; Wechel printed his compendium of Spanish History, the \textit{Rerum Hispanicarum}, from books taken from Beale’s library and thanked Beale in a letter of 1579 for ‘la faveure qui vouz m’avez fait de vostre exemplaire’.\textsuperscript{56}

---

See also SP 70/116 ff 15-16 ink and pencil John Herbert to Cecil 9 Jan 1571 from Paris. To help the L. of Rutland as promised; ‘...I haue provided, yt his L. shalte lodged at his first aborde at the hostell of Tore, right ouergeinst Mr Ffrancis Walsingham’s l. Embassadour...’.

\textsuperscript{53} Week \textit{Languet} p 93.


\textsuperscript{55} Ruddiman \textit{George Buchanan... Opera Omnia...} Vol II.674; Languet to Buchanan 20 February 1581; ‘Hoc ego magnae felicitati ascribo, quod Lutetiae, ante viginti annos, contigerit mihi non solum videre te, ... sed etiam te conuiuam habere, una cum clarissimis viris, Turno, Aurato, Balduino Iurisconsulto, Sambuco Pannonio, Carolo Clusio, & alius quibusdam.’

\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Rerum hispanicarum scriptores aliquot...ex bibliotheca clarissimi viri dn. Roberti beli angl...} Frankfurt Andre Wechel 1577-81; Aberdeen University MS 1009/2/ f 53.
The characterisation of the relationship between master and servant as ‘inward’ or not is difficult to classify unless the details or circumstances of these particular personal relationships are known and understood more fully. One of the ways available to us to help to classify these servants is by analyzing in more detail the correspondence written from within each ambassador’s household. This is by no means a particularly novel approach: ‘There is no kind of Writing’ commented the editor of the The Compleat Ambassador in 1655, ‘that men do generally with more greediness look into, then letters; especially, if they be letters of State, from great and wise persons, and in a wise time, as these are...’ 57 Hand-written letters and correspondence form the basis for much of the analysis presented here in this study of Beale, and have since time immemorial been the first port of call for antiquaries, historians or even budding politicians and diplomats expressing an interest in the early modern age. The epistola or letter-form in the Renaissance was an endlessly variable genre: it could take the form of a complex and allusive work of literature, of a familiar greeting between friends, or of what is commonly assumed to be merely the ‘bread and butter’ document of politics, administration and government. Whether as literature, as an expression of friendship, or of news, administration and politics, the composition of the letter-form was governed by a complex set of educational, cultural and social guidelines. 58

One aspect of this complex cultural process was the form of composition and the choice of whether to pen the missive in one’s own autograph hand or to utilise a secretary as an amanuensis, either working from an autograph draft or from simultaneous oral dictation. It has been previously assumed as a matter of course that the main distinction

57 Digges, Dudley The Compleat Ambassador: or Two Treaties of the Intended Marriage of Qu: Elizabeth.... London Thomas Newcomb 1655; ‘To the Reader’.
between a secretary and a servant would have been the use of the former to write letters on behalf of his master. It is also generally assumed to be one of the truisms of early modern history that if you wanted something to remain secret you wrote it yourself:
‘Bycause the matter yss such ass I wold not have knownono to any that servith me’ wrote Sir Nicholas Poyntz to Sir Thomas Heneage in 1579, ‘therefore I have writon to Mr. Secretary in my owne scribli hand’.\(^{59}\) As we have seen above, Walsingham had a household of perhaps ten or so men in Paris, not to mention the various English gentlemen and scholars such as Timothy Bright and Sir Philip Sidney that we know passed through his doors at his residence in the Faubourg St. Germain. During the calendar year from January to December 1571 he utilised only three men (Ralph Warcop, Robert Beale and Lisle Cave) as an amanuensis to write any of his correspondence for him, the three men that have been identified already as the most ‘inward’ of Walsingham’s servants. The use of a secretary as an amanuensis was just one of many ways in which this intimacy was manifested, and this ‘inwardness’ was one of the defining characteristics of their status as secretaries.

There are 60 letters now surviving in the PRO SP 70 volumes written from within Walsingham’s household in France and sent to England during the calendar year 1571, and 2 more letters sent from Walsingham to Leicester in 1571 survive in the various collections of Leicester papers.\(^{60}\) Of these 60 letters from Walsingham from 1571 now

---


\(^{60}\) HMC Third Report HMSO 1872, pp 180- Marquess of Bath lists on p 185 ‘1571 Aug 7 Blois. Walsingham, Ambassador in France, to the Earl of Leicester.’ This item does not reoccur in the more recent calendar HMC 58 *Report on the MSS of the Marquess of Bath: V. Talbot, Dudley and Devereux Papers 1533-1659* (ed. G. Dyfnallt Owen HMSO 1980), which lists two letters from Walsingham to Leicester in the Dudley Papers pp 171-72 Walsingham to Leicester March 5 1571 from Paris, (signed, endorsed but no indication of autograph); pp 184 Walsingham to Leicester September 15 1571 from Blois. Oral message by bearer. Signed. Only postscript in autograph. I have not been able to check the Browne-Evelyn collection in Pepys MSS 2502-04. I have not located any others in the relevant Cotton, Hatfield or Lansdowne volumes: Cotton MS Caligula E.V contains only one dated letter from Walsingham, ff 164-66 Walsingham to Sir Thomas Smith from Paris 26 February 1573 Autograph. Add. by sec; ff 211, ff 213 undated letters in hand of Walsingham; Vespasian F.VI contains both Walsingham and Leicester papers from 1572; eg. ff 121-22 Walsingham to Leicester 13 July 1572 in Warcop’s hand, but none from 1571. No correspondence from Walsingham in France for 1570-72 is calendared in HMC
in SP 70, roughly 2/3 (39) were written in Walsingham's autograph hand, and then 21 by Warcop and Cave, and 3 by Beale.61 This ratio predominantly favouring autograph rather than amanuensis was not exceptional, as can be seen by comparing Walsingham's efforts with some of the other ambassadors we have already come across. Despite the presence in Sir Thomas Hoby's household of Molineaux, his brother-in-law Edward Cooke and also of Hugh Fitzwilliam discussed above, Hoby had no 'inward' man who embodied the functions of familiar, administrator and linguist. All of Hoby's correspondence (including also the addresses on the outside of the folded sheets) covering the three brief months of Hoby's residence was therefore penned by the ambassador himself in his clear roman hand.62 Hugh Fitzwilliam, bereft of any servants or secretaries of his own, was forced by necessity to pen all the 28 surviving letters to England in his own hand.63 But the scenario described by Fitzwilliam to Cecil quoted earlier of the ambassador so frantic, busy and bereft of support that he was

Hatfield Vols. 1-2, Vol 23 Addenda 1562-1605. Lansdowne MS 13 for year 1571 contains nothing from France

61 Beale's autograph hand is not only very familiar to me but also very distinctive and involves little problem in identification. Ralph Warcop wrote in a neat secretary script that is also relatively distinctive but has instead left two problems hindering proper identification: no autograph letter with Warcop's signature nor any reference to his christian name occurs in any of the correspondence from Paris. The identification of Walsingham's 'Warcop' with Ralph Warcop relies on the parallels between the biographical details available for each, and the documented death of Ralph Warcop's mother Anne Symonds in July 1571 whilst her son was abroad. There are a number of firm clues to the positive identification of Warcop's hand in specific letters. All the correspondence in the first half of 1571, a period when only Warcop is referred to by name as a 'secretary', that was not written in Walsingham's hand was written by only one other hand. Warcop was used as Walsingham's amanuensis in his first letter to Cecil from Boulogne when travelling to Paris in January (SP 70/116 ff 2 ink 1 pencil Walsingham to Cecil from Boulogne 2 January 1571) and fittingly addresses the last in April 1573 when Walsingham's successor Valentine Dale had already arrived to take over (ff 45-46 pencil 22 April 1573 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris. Autograph. Add. by Warcop). If not Walsingham's autograph, the predominant hand is identified by the name in brackets eg. (Warcop); Walsingham might also add an autograph postscript occasionally. The positive identification of the hand of Lisle Cave has presented more difficulties than that of Warcop. Unlike Beale and Warcop, who travelled over with Walsingham from England, Cave came into Walsingham's service in autumn of 1571 when in Paris already, and, as we have already discussed, firmly identified sample writings in his handwriting is harder to come by. The 60 letters run from SP 70/116 ff 2 ink 1 pencil Walsingham to Cecil from Boulogne 2 Jan 1571 (Warcop) to SP 70/121 ff 128-29 ink 132-33 pencil 31 Dec 1571 Walsingham to Burghley autograph.

62 There are 6 autograph letters from Sir Thomas Hoby to Cecil in SP 70, running from SP 70/83 ink ff. 212 Hoby to Cecil April 25 1566 from Paris autograph to SP 70/84 ink ff. 172-74 Hoby to Cecil 11 June 1566 autograph.

63 There are 28 autograph letters from Fitzwilliam to Cecil, Elizabeth and Heneage in SP 70 running from SP 70/85 ff 62-63 Hugh Fitzwilliam to Cecil July 29 1566 autograph to SP 70/87 ff 130-31 Hugh Fitzwilliam to Cecil 28 December 1566 autograph.
unable to keep copies was not the only situation that could enforce the use of one’s own autograph hand for correspondence. In February and March 1571 Thomas Sackville Lord Buckhurst made a more leisurely journey to the French Court as part of the discussions over Elizabeth’s proposed marriage. Sackville was accompanied by at least one personal secretary and also by the same John Barnaby who had served under Sir Henry Norris. Despite the access to these secretaries, just over 11 of the 13 letters despatched by Sackville from France written and addressed to Elizabeth, Cecil and Thomas Heneage were written in his own hand. These statistics would seem to support Sir Robert Naunton’s epitaph written a generation later that Buckhurst’s reputation as a scholar and a man of letters meant that his secretaries ‘did little for him’.  

In comparison to both Hoby and Fitzwilliam, however, the predominant use by Walsingham of his own hand for his correspondence was by choice rather than by necessity. Even when it is evident that either Warcop, Beale, or Cave were present in the ambassador’s household, Walsingham tended to pen his letters himself. The duties of his secretaries and familiars like Beale and Warcop did indeed involve absences from the ambassador’s side - usually as a messenger or intermediary either at the French or English Courts. But only 5 of the 39 letters written in Walsingham’s autograph were then also addressed by him, the other 34 being addressed by a secretary - usually by Warcop or later on that year by Cave as well. Had Walsingham needed or wanted to use an amanuensis for the main text of the letter itself, we can only presume

---

64 Sackville’s letters to Heneage are calendared in HMC 71 Report on the manuscripts of Allan George Finch 4 Vols London 1913-65, Vol 1 pp 3-18; these are now in Osborn collection at Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscript Library, Yale University. BL MSS RP 36 photocopies of originals. All 7 letters to Heneage are in his autograph: February 1; 8; 11; 15; 21; 24; and March 8 1571. See also SP 70/116 through to SP 70/1. Of the 13 letters that survive written by Sackville from France in February and March 1571 to Heneage, Elizabeth and Cecil, 11 are in his own autograph secretary hand, and just the 2 to Elizabeth penned by an amanuensis. Cf. Zim, R. ‘Dialogue and Discretion: Thomas Sackville, Catherine de Medicci and the Anjou Marriage Proposal 1571’, Hist Journal 40 (1997), pp 287-310; p 288 ‘unusually for a man in his position at court, Sackville wrote so many of his own letters that the majority of the large number that survive are autographs.’

65 Naunton, Robert Fragmenta Regalia London 1641, p 41.
that he could have used his secretary then waiting on him who addressed the letter. The use of Beale as an amanuensis was somewhat exceptional. Beale’s handwriting was a facile secretary hand which would not have been considered a standard clerk’s hand (as Warcop’s and Cave’s hand would have been), and the 3 instances of Walsingham using Beale’s hand all occur during the months of July and September 1571 when Warcop was absent in England and before Cave entered Walsingham’s service.66

Walsingham choice of autograph over amanuensis was by no means out of the ordinary and was not due to his status as a serving ambassador. Anyone with any familiarity of the main archives for Elizabethan political history in the British Library, the PRO and Hatfield House cannot fail to be impressed by the number of documents in the autograph hand of the other great Elizabethan Principal Secretary Sir William Cecil, and the same can now be said for Leicester’s personal correspondence as a result of Dr. Simon Adams’s research. During the preparation of the Domestic and Foreign ‘Calendars’ in the Nineteenth Century it often caused the transcribers puzzlement why ‘great men’ such as these with pressing schedules and numerous secretaries on hand at their commandment chose to pen so much of their own correspondence themselves, and this puzzlement is ongoing today.67 Even for the men at the apogee of political society such as Burghley, Walsingham and Leicester, there was more method than madness in this propensity to pen their correspondence in their own hand. This choice between autograph or amanuensis depended upon a combination of practical and cultural assumptions governing both the original act and then the reception of autograph handwriting.

66 The letters in Beale’s hand are SP 70/119 ff 49-50 ink and pencil 30 July 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Melun. Add. in another sec. hand as prev. letter. Endd. by Burghley ‘30 Julj. for ye’ ic. Queen; SP 70/119 ff 90-93 ink 91-94 pencil 12 August 1571 Walsingham to Burghley in Beale’s hand from Paris; SP 70/120 ff 47-49 ink 58-60 pencil 16 Sep 1571 Walsingham to Burghley in Beale’s hand from Blois. Autograph end of letter.
67 CSPF Vol 12, introduction p 1: ‘It has not been thought necessary in every case to specify ‘holograph’ letters. Leicester’s are nearly always in his own hand. Wilson and Rogers rarely employ an amanuensis; Walsingham less often than the reader could have wished, especially when such a beautiful hand as that of Laurence Tomson was at his disposal’.
These factors influencing this choice are made more graphically evident when considering the occasions when the reverse prevailed and an amanuensis was employed. Perhaps the most common reason to utilise the services of an amanuensis was illness or physical incapacity for some other reason. Headaches, fevers and other ailments could drive a man to use his secretary where he would normally choose not to: Walsingham apologised to Cecil in an autograph postscript for using the 'helpe of a secretarye' (Warcop) as an amanuensis for the main text of a letter in February 1571, as 'this nyght a fytt of a fyuar assayed me'.68 Later, in 1583, Walsingham similarly asked Burghley to be excused 'that I use not nowe myne owne hand', (he had used Francis Mills) as he had been 'taken with an extreame fitt of the chollick... as I am not able to write'.69 On these occasions when physical ailments prevented the sender from penning his own letter, we can also assume that the author dictated the letter orally, rather than provide his secretary with an autograph draft from which to copy.

Sometimes it was more than temporary physical incapacity that prevented the writer using his own hand. At the most practical of levels, legibility was a concern to contemporaries as well as to modern transcribers.70 Legibility was by contemporary criteria inversely proportional to individual distinctiveness, and the closer to a standard clerk’s hand then the neater and more legible but also more anonymous a hand became. Neither Walsingham, Beale nor Burghley could every be accused of sacrificing distinctiveness for the sake of legibility. Beale’s handwriting, a distinctive facile secretary, has been described by two eminent modern historians as at best ‘thick and vigorous’, and at worst ‘very bad’.71 Burghley distinguished himself as one of the few

69 Harl. MS 6993 ff 50-51 2 July 1583 Walsingham to Burghley from the court.
70 “I cannot carry my Respect for Antiquity so far as not to recollect that the direct Purpose, and therefore the first Merit, of writing, is to be easily read by all.” John Rickman, Clerk Assistant of the House of Commons, 3 March 1836; quoted on title page of Hector, L. C. The Handwriting of English Documents London, Edward Arnold 1958.
prominent statesmen of Elizabethan England to use a roman hand for his regular correspondence, but this was by no means a calligraphic hand. Cecil’s long sufferance with gout and other illnesses would often require him to pen his correspondence from his bed, and in 1569 he apologised to Ralph Sadler for the resulting state of his hand: ‘Sir in my bedd I doo scrible as you may see and therfor am forced to wryte shortly and rudly...’.

However ‘scribled’ Cecil considered his own hand to be at times, it was a veritable oil painting compared to that of George Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury. In 1571 Shrewsbury wrote to Leicester regarding a suit to the Privy Council, and such was the state of his handwriting he was forced to petition Leicester to read it for him: ‘becayse this lettre is of my owne hand to the councell make the best exposyton of it.’ Walsingham’s own distinctive facile secretary hand could disintegrate under the stress of haste and currency, and he too was not above apologising for himself when occasion and haste forced his hand: ‘Yr. L. must pardon me at this present, for the desyre I haue to dyspatche this messanger away in hast yf I reserve neyther forme, sence, nor that legyblenes of hande, that were fyt for me to use...’. Given this contemporary awareness of their potential fallibility, it is perhaps all the more remarkable that more men like Walsingham, Cecil and Shrewsbury did not utilise the services of an amanuensis more often, especially when fair and regular hands were at their disposal. Part of the reason for this was of course that contemporaries were more used to what Geoffrey Elton labelled the ‘scrawls affected’ by their fellows. Legibility is, after all, in the eye of the beholder. The occasional problems with legibility were more often than not caused by haste and pressures of time and circumstance rather than by any

---

72 See the comment by Alfred Fairbank that Cecil’s hand ‘make[s] up in nervous energy what it lacks in clarity.’; in Fairbank, A. and Wolpe, B. Renaissance Handwriting: An Anthology of Italic Scripts London 1960, p 33.
73 Add MS 33593 ff 19-20 20 Nov 1569 Cecil to Sadler autograph from Windsor.
74 Harl. MS 6991 ff 1-2 22 July 1571 George Earl of Shrewsbury to Leicester. Autograph. From Sheffield Castle. Endd. by Leic’s sec. Shrewsbury may well have suffered from arthritis.
75 SP 70/119 ff 51-54 both ink and pencil 30 July 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Melun autograph. Same sec. hand as before add. Burghley endd. ‘30 Jul. privat’.
biomechanical or congenital defects in the writer. When a suitable messenger was departing, the tide was turning or wind was set fair, then it was simply quicker to pen a note yourself rather than employ an amanuensis.\textsuperscript{77}

The confirmation of the mutual expectation of confidentiality that autograph handwriting conferred was ultimately more important than the haste, circumstances of composition or perceived legibility. Sir Henry Norris pleaded with Cecil in February 1567 to ‘beare with my ill scrybled hand’ in the conventional terms of illegibility much as we have seen other such as Walsingham and Shrewsbury do above, ‘hauynge to yow no secretory but my selfe as may appeare.’\textsuperscript{78} Norris’s autograph hand was, however, a very fair, neat and to modern eyes extremely legible roman hand that was obviously a mark of education and a matter of some personal pride. When men like these did use an amanuensis for reasons of illness or incapacity in circumstances that demanded confidentiality and secrecy, this would sometimes occasion an apology on behalf of the author. The examples given above of Walsingham vouching for the confidentiality of Warcop and of Mills to Burghley are testimony that the opposite was normal and accepted practice. Autograph handwriting was a necessary indication of confidentiality in an age when correspondence carried sensitive and crucial information, and when some of the business contained within this was limited to Monarchs and chosen Councillors alone, and not to those who served them and carried their letters.\textsuperscript{79}

In an age when the physical interception of the packet of correspondence between the ambassador in Paris and the Court in England was a common occurrence, correspondence could be further safeguarded from prying eyes by encoding the message by a mutually agreed cipher system. The use of cipher or encryption in a

\textsuperscript{77} SP 70/126 ff 104-105 pencil 28 February 1573 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris. Autograph: ‘Your L. must pardon my scrybelyng for yt the messauge had haste. And so beseeching your L. to imp[art] thes scrybld newse to the E. of leycester...’.

\textsuperscript{78} SP 70/88 ff 72-73 Norris to Cecil 12 February 1567. Autograph.

\textsuperscript{79} Some of the wider cultural connotations associated with this choice between autograph or amanuensis for each type of document in each situation are examined in greater depth in Appendix 2.
particular letter would at first glance appear to be the most direct means of measuring the sensitivity and 'inwardness' of the enclosed information. There are, as ever, a number of problems with this assumption. Firstly, a satisfactory history of the use of cipher and encryption by Elizabethan diplomats has yet to be written. Secondly, one of the clearest results of the survey of correspondence in 1571 is that cipher was in fact rarely used by Walsingham: only two of the 60 letters sent back by Walsingham extensively utilise cipher, and both these are autograph letters to Cecil. When messages of extreme confidentiality and importance had to be transmitted back to England then only a trusted messenger would be employed: *ergo* this messenger would be entrusted with the message orally rather than in a potentially more compromising written letter, whether encrypted or not.

Another important consideration to bear in mind was the intended audience of these handwritten letters, and the forms of control or censorship that were utilised accordingly. Of these 60 letters written by Walsingham in 1571, 57 were addressed to Cecil, 2 to Leicester and one to Heneage. The predominance of Cecil as the addressee of Walsingham's correspondence is explained through the role of Cecil as Principal Secretary as the nexus through whom Walsingham's news and advice would be transmitted to the relevant others: in this case chiefly to Elizabeth as Queen and to Leicester and Heneage as the other intimates involved in the Anjou marriage.

---


81 SP 70/120 ff 58-59 ink 77-78 pencil 26 September 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Blois autograph; SP 70/121 ff 128-29 ink 132-33 pencil 31 December 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris autograph.

82 See SP 70/125 ff 52-53 ink 58-59 pencil 2 October 1572 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris, in Warcop's hand: 'My very good L. for that this gentlemanis one whome I dare truste, I haue requested him to declare unto your H. certayne thinges which I thinke not conventyent to commit to writing. ...'.
negotiations. The manner in which the Principal Secretary was expected to pass on information during audience with Elizabeth (discussed below in the following Chapter) also influenced the possible means of controlling the flow of information to the Queen. Letters might either be read aloud to Elizabeth or she could often read them herself. Walsingham would therefore always ensure that at least one letter sent addressed to Cecil was fit for the eyes of Elizabeth if necessary, and if there was something else he wished to impart he would write a separate private letter. Distinguishing between the letters to Cecil which were specifically intended for Elizabeth’s eyes or ears and those that were not is not always a straightforward task. The only occasion during the year when Walsingham addressed a letter explicitly to Elizabeth was a joint missive sent with his departing predecessor Sir Henry Norris in January 1571.\(^3\)

Instead, Walsingham adopted some less explicit procedures to signal to Cecil what to do with a particular letter. During the calendar year 1571, there were 13 occasions when Walsingham despatched 2 letters addressed on the outside to Cecil on the same day when no indication of haste or of immediate circumstances seems to explain the duplication of correspondence. One explanation for this duplication was that one of these two letters was intended for Cecil’s eyes in private and the other for Cecil’s audience as Principal Secretary with the Queen. Walsingham would utilise a number of different methods to indicate for which purpose the respective letters were intended. Often he was explicit between the ‘private’ letters intended for Burghley and the ‘public’ letters for Elizabeth. One of the two letters despatched on 27 July to Cecil began ‘I thought good to let your L. by this a pryuat letter understande...’; this was then duly endorsed by Burghley ‘27 Jul. priuat’.\(^4\) Conversely, the other letter dated the same

\(^3\) SP 70/116 ff 49-53 ink 65-69 pencil Walsingham and Norris to Elizabeth 29 January 1571. In sec. hand of Mather. Endd. by Cecil.
\(^4\) SP 70/119 ff 45-46 ink and pencil 27 July 1571 Walsingham to Burghley autograph from Melun, add. by another sec. hand. Endd. by Burghley ‘27 Jul. priuats’. Cf. SP 70/121 ff 128-29 ink 132-33 pencil 31 December 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris autograph; ‘Yt may please your L. to understande by this my pryuat letter...’ and SP 70/116 ff 74-75 ink 96-97 pencil 9 February 1571 Walsingham to Cecil from Paris. Autograph: ‘Sr I thought good to make you pryuye of certeyne pryuat taulke (which I shall desire you to resere pryuatly to your selfe)...’.
day to Cecil included the opening phrase ‘Yt may please your L. to aduertys yer matye...’ which Burghley has then endorsed ‘27 for ye Q.’. The two letters despatched three days later on the 30 July followed the same pattern, one being endorsed private and the other for the Queen. Very often the contents of these two letters to Cecil and to Elizabeth through Cecil would be quite different. On 31 December 1571 Walsingham sent two letters back; the one began ‘Yt may please your L. to understande by this my pryuat letter, that I lease at my departure from the coorte the matter of maryage most desperat...’. Walsingham went on to detail the gloomy prospects for the Anjou match which Cecil was to pass on to Elizabeth only as and when he saw fit. The other letter addressed to Cecil for the Queen’s audience written the same day gives the general summary of events but does not even hint at the desperation of the other.

Other forms of internal evidence may point to the intended audience of a particular letter. As perhaps to be expected, Walsingham’s tone and frankness as well as the particular information imparted differed between the ‘private’ and ‘public’ letters. Walsingham despatched three letters on 28 April 1571, two addressed to Cecil and one to Leicester. One of the two to Cecil was written by Warcop, and in the other written in his own autograph hand Walsingham asked Cecil to ‘excuse the use of my secretarye unto her Matye, yf there be any exceptyons taken to the same; I dare answyr for his secrecye...’. Walsingham’s use of Warcop to write the letter intended for Elizabeth had to be explained in the aftermath of the obvious problems encountered during Norris’s embassy with Jennye and Mather. Walsingham then used his own hand to tell Leicester that as he had ‘no leisure to write at large’ to consult the longer letter in his

---

85 SP 70/119 ff 43-44 ink and pencil 27 July 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Melun. Autograph. Add by Walsingham.
86 SP 70/119 ff 49-50 ink and pencil 30 July 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Melun in Beale’s hand, which begins ‘It may please yor honor to aduertys yer Maiestye...’ and was endorsed by Burghley ‘30 Julj, for ye’; ff 51-54 both ink and pencil 30 July 1571 Walsingham to Burghley autograph, which ends ‘I shall not neade to desyre your L. to make this letter priuat to yowr selfe’ and which Burghley has endorsed ‘30 Jul, priuat’.
87 SP 70/121 ff 128-29 ink 132-33 pencil 31 December 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris autograph (private letter); SP 70/121 ff 124-25 ink 128-29 pencil 31 December 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris autograph (for Elizabeth).
88 SP 70/117 ff 154-55 ink 177-78 pencil 28 April 1571 Walsingham to Burghley autograph.
autograph sent to Burghley. Both the autograph letters to Leicester and Burghley contain explicit information about the progress (or rather the lack of it) of the marriage negotiations that the letter in Warcop’s hand intended for Elizabeth does not.

Some letters sent by Walsingham were simply never intended to be taken by Cecil into the audience with Elizabeth, and some were. Lying somewhere in between these two explicit ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ were the letters encoded by the ambassador, albeit at a very basic level, for Cecil’s benefit so that he could keep or pass on to Elizabeth accordingly, as and when the Principal Secretary saw fit. In a similar vein, Sir Thomas Smith wrote to Burghley in January 1572 to tell him how to differentiate between the letters he was sending concerning his recent interview with the Queen Mother. ‘I haue allreadie written to the Quenes matie in two letters’, wrote Smith, ‘thone marked a the other b’. Of these two, he continued, ‘the furste ye may deluyer to her highnes when ye will. Theother in my mynde I thincke yt best ye do not deluyer untill yow haue considered with yourself how to insinuate the matter in my furste latter unto yow, that her matie be not in so much hope, that all was so forward here, as monsh de la motte would make yow beleue there.’ 89 The following day Smith despatched letters to Cecil, one of which he had marked ‘γ’, in continuation of this form of marking his correspondence.90

In conclusion, we can say with some certainty that Walsingham deliberately chose to write most of his correspondence in his own hand, and that he would also distinguish between an ‘open’ letter to the Queen and a private ‘closed’ letter to Cecil. The chosen form of identifying the respective letters was very simple and relied upon the role of William Cecil as Principal Secretary receiving all posts directed to the Queen and then filtering them accordingly. Walsingham’s preference for autograph over amanuensis was governed as much by cultural expectations concerning the reception of hand-

89 SP 70/122 ff 36-41 ink 37-42 pencil 9 January 1572 Smith to Burghley from Amboise.
90 SP 70/122 ff 49-50 ink 50-51 pencil 10 January 1572 Smith to Burghley from Amboise. Smith’s or sec’s hand. Add. in same hand and marked ‘γ’.
written correspondence as by the political circumstances and sensitivity of the information he was transmitting: it is obvious through the use of both Warcop and Beale during 1571 that he trusted these two secretaries and familiars implicitly. This trust was based on a close ideological homogeneity and a common political outlook that complemented the more personal ties that Walsingham shared with Beale in particular, and not, as some more wayward commentators have suggested, on a shared homo-erotic relationship. This ‘inwardness’ of certain servants with their masters is taken to be the defining characteristic of the ‘secretary’ over the ‘servant’ in the household of a particular ambassador, highlighting once again the primacy of personal over bureaucratic relationships in early modern government. Beale’s own ‘inward’ relationship with Walsingham was to define the next two decades of service that constituted his political maturity, and it is to his appointment as one of the Clerks of the Privy Council that we now turn.

---

Chapter 4. The Principal Secretary and the mid-Elizabethan Polity: Sir William Cecil and Sir Francis Walsingham

‘For the secretary... was the eare and mynd of the prince, yea her penne & mouth...’. Sir Walter Mildmay, speaking at the trial in Star Chamber of Principal Secretary William Davison in 1587.¹

Beale left Walsingham’s house in Paris on 8 March 1572 and returned to London bearing letters from Walsingham and Smith to Burghley.² Walsingham’s reference to his ‘secretary’ in a letter written from Paris of 27 August 1572 has led to the assumption that Beale was an eyewitness to the St. Bartholomew’s day massacres in Paris on 24 August.³ As we have seen in the previous chapter, Walsingham consistently referred to Warcop as his secretary and to Beale as ‘Mr. Beale’ or as his brother-in-law, so this was more likely to have referred to Warcop or possibly Cave. It is highly unlikely that Beale returned to Paris during the summer of 1572, and evidence for his continued residence in London over the summer of 1572 is plentiful enough. Beale’s hand occurs in copies of various foreign items sent to London from locations other than France during the spring and summer of 1572, and a letter from Antoine Olivier in Flushing of October 1572 was addressed to Beale in London.⁴ Beale’s own archive also provides evidence for his whereabouts in the summer of 1572, although some of this is at first glance misleading. One letter from Leicester of 7 July 1571 addressed to Beale in France was later endorsed and misdated by Beale himself to 1572: similarly misleading is that many of the original French papers and copies of items relating to the

¹ SP 12/199/ ff 137-39 ink no. 70. Copy of anonymous letter signed in ‘Temple Barre... in hast’ 29 March 159<8>7.
² SP 70/123 ff 32-33 ink 37-38 pencil 30 March 1572 Smith to Burghley from Blois; ‘we do long so much for answer out of England, being now xxij dayes sith mr Beale departed from us...’.
⁴ SP 70/123 ff 2 ink 1 pencil 1 March 1572 copy of Prince of Navarre to Queen of Navarre in Beale’s hand; ff 25 ink 30 pencil 28 March 1572 copy of Letter from Heidelberg in Beale’s hand; ff 62 ink ff 80 pencil endd. ‘19 April. Advertisements out of the Low countries’, copy in Beale’s hand; BYU MS 457 Letter 3 Dated ‘ce dernier d’octobre 1572’ from Anthoine Olivier to Beale, which is transcribed in Add MS 48149 ff 113-14.
massacres of 1572 now in Beale’s Yelverton papers were not acquired by Beale directly from France - these are in fact part of the papers Beale acquired from Thomas Norton in the later 1580s.5

The massacres of St Bartholomew’s day did undoubtedly made a deep impression on Beale but this does necessarily not mean that he witnessed them in person. Beale wrote an extensive treatise on the European political situation in late 1572 or early 1573 (considered in detail in Chapter 7 below) in which he often refers to these massacres but does not give the impression that he was actually in Paris to witness them first hand.6 The descriptions or reminiscences of other Englishmen such as Timothy Bright and Sir Philip Sidney who were present in Paris during the massacres do not mention Beale amongst those who sheltered at Walsingham’s house during the troubles.7 The main evidence for Beale’s continued residence in London during the summer of 1572 was that he was a very busy man. Beale was sworn in as a Clerk of the Privy Council at Westminster on 8 July 1572, and he immediately began to construct a formulary book that gives evidence for his involvement in Privy Council business over the next few months.8 The timing of Beale’s promotion to royal service was due to the death of the senior Clerk of the Council Bernard Hampton in the spring of 1572. Hampton’s death had left the relatively inexperienced Edmund Tremayne alone as a serving Clerk. The


6 The treatise is now Add MS 48049 ff 340-57. In this, Beale refers to the massacres only by reference to second hand reports: eg. f 340b ‘By thes late horrible accidentes in Ffrawnce...’; f 344a ‘employed part of the mony which shalbe gathered of the sale of the late murdered protestantes goodes, as from the Embassadors & otherwise ye be advertised...’; f 345b ‘I remember that talking with the french Embassadors & lamenting the miseries & horrible executions comitted appon so many innocent...’.

7 See dedications by Timothy Bright in In Physicam Gvtilem Adolphi scribonii, ...Animaduersions Timothei Brighti Cambridge 1584, and in Abridgement of The Booke of Acts and Monuments of the Church written by that Reuerrand Father, Maister John Foxe: and now abridged by Timothee Bright...London by J. Windet 1589.

8 PC 2/10 p 106; Printed in Daset VIII p78: “At Westminster the viij and xi of Julie, 1572. Thapparauences as before. The othe of Robert Beale, esquier, to be one of the Clerkes of the Privy Counsell; Add MS 48150 f 17a for 10 August 1572.
processes of political patronage behind Beale’s promotion involved three Privy Councillors: Smith, Cecil (now Lord Burghley) and Leicester. Beale was already on familiar terms with Sir Thomas Smith, who was sworn in as Principal Secretary in the same month as Beale’s entry to royal service in July 1572. Smith and Beale had known each other since at least their time in Paris together in early 1566, and in March 1572 Smith had talked of Beale as a ‘rare man of excellent gifts’ to Burghley.9 When Burghley had agreed with Walsingham’s initial suggestion that Beale stand in for him as Ambassador in the autumn of 1571, Beale had hastily petitioned Burghley’s lawful favour to send over Sir Henry Killigrew instead, claiming his own ‘insufficiency’ after ‘so longe & yet unprofitable travaile.’10 Beale had also asked Burghley’s assistance in obtaining for him ‘somwhat towards a poore lyving’, which may presumably have materialised partly through Burghley’s influence in the form of Beale’s appointment as one of the Clerks of the Privy Council nine months later. Beale’s own foster-father John Hales was the original link between Cecil and Leicester and Beale, and Hales had continued to act as an intermediary, forwarding Beale’s letters from Paris to Cecil during the late 1560s as suitable for the Principal Secretary’s knowledge of continental events. Hales had then directly petitioned Leicester in 1571 on Beale’s behalf, adopting a tone and manner in his address to the earl that varied between humble supplication and firm correction that Leicester seemed to inspire in more than one of his godly correspondents. Hales had petitioned Leicester to place Beale ‘where her Matie at yor sute determyned’: ‘It is pitie’ Hales continued, that ‘he shulde lose tyme in doyng nothing, as he dothe by that I parceau, that myght not be don by another eny comen bodic.’11

Beale was therefore known to and had presumably impressed Cecil, Leicester and Smith, and a combination of his educational background, his linguistic and secretarial

---

9 Quoted in Dewar _Sir Thomas Smith_ 1964 p 136; SP 70/146 9 March 1572 Smith to Cecil.
10 SP 70/120/ff 56-57 Beale to Burghley September 15 1571; f 56b.
expertise, his already extensive personal contacts with continental correspondents, his service with Walsingham in Paris and his impeccable Protestant credentials coalesced to form a convincing *curriculum vitae*. Beale’s appointment confirms the recent work done to revise the impression of a factional divide at the heart of the mid-Elizabethan Privy Council that was expressed partly through the competition for patronage and office. In this case the opposite certainly appears to be the case, as the two key political heavyweights Cecil and Leicester worked together to forward Beale into royal service. Beale’s domestic service as a Clerk of the Council and his diplomatic service at home and abroad during his political heyday of the 1570s and 80s was hereafter focused on the Privy Council chamber. The role and duties of the Clerks of the Council in and out of the Privy Council Chamber were completely interlinked with their service to the Principal Secretary, and before we consider the details of Beale’s own service more closely in Chapter 5, the respective roles of the Principal Secretary, Queen and Privy Council in the mid-Elizabethan system of administration, government, and counsel must be examined in greater depth.

The bureaucratic processes administered by the Principal Secretary had two main foci: on the Monarch and the Privy Council. The forum for the first was the royal audience, and here the mid-Elizabethan Principal Secretary acted more in the role of a private personal secretary than as chief minister. Here in Elizabeth’s private chambers he had three main tasks: to present the various items of correspondence, letters, warrants and suits requiring Elizabeth’s signature for authorisation, to present information and counsel to the monarch, and to listen to instructions for the drafting or dictation of documents in Elizabeth’s name. Beale recommended in his 1592 *Treatise* that the Principal Secretary should prepare himself for this private royal audience by carrying with him a note of business divided into public and private matters, and by ascertaining the particular royal mood from the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber before access.\(^\text{12}\) It was this focus on the person of Elizabeth and the mechanics of audience that controlled

\(^{12}\) Beale *Treatise* p 437.
the form of presentation of information, advice and counsel. After two years service as
Principal Secretary, Walsingham sanguinely concurred with Burghley in 1575 on the
need for patience in the management of Elizabeth, in waiting for the right moments for
persuasion, and also against the ‘unseasonale moving’ of suits and counsels.13

The most apparently simple of all these duties was to carry papers to receive the Royal
signature: for example, Principal Secretary William Davison described the bundle of
papers he carried into Elizabeth’s private chambers on Wednesday 1 February 1587 as
‘divuers warrantes and other thinges to be synged that concerned hir service’.14
However, unlike in this most celebrated of examples (covered in detail in Chapter 8
below) the royal signature was not always so forthcoming. The classic topos for
Elizabethan historians here are the series of letters written by joint Principal Secretary
Sir Thomas Smith to Burghley during the 1570s that have long been used to illustrate
the irresistibile vacillation of Elizabeth and the resulting frustration of her Principal
Secretaries: ‘With daily attendyng for the most part iij or iiiij tymes in the day yt maketh
me wery of my lief,’ complained Smith to Cecil ‘I nether can get thother leters signed,
nor the letter `all redy´ signed, which yor L. knoweth, permitted to be sent away...’. The
next day Smith continued to lament his fate: ‘I wait whiles I nether haue eys to se, nor
legs to stand uppon... They had ned within a while to haue an horse or an asse to carie
billes after us, encreasyng daily & neuer dispatched.’15 Smith’s complaints demonstrate
not only his own frustrations but also the continuing reliance that Elizabeth placed on
William Cecil’s presence around her when decisions of any consequence had to be
made.16 Smith’s most modern biographer Mary Dewar stated that the 200 or so

13 Harl MS 6992 ff 31-32 8 Dec 1575 Walsingham to Burghley.
14 Harl MS 290 f 218b.
15 Harl MS 6991 ff 124-25 6 March 1575 Smith to Burghley from Richmond. Autograph; Harl
6991 ff 126-27 7 March 1575 Smith to Burghley from Richmond. Autograph.
16 Harleian MS 6991 ff 19-20 7 January 1573 Smith to Burghley from Hampton Court.
Autograph: ‘My very good lord, yor hasty goinge hence hath made as apereth all thinges here to
torne backward. I had somewhat a do to get to the Queene, & more to get eny thyng signed, yet I
haue goten signed the letter to the k. the Q. the Q. mother & the Q. of navarre, which he <Earl of
Worcester> should carie signed, but neither could I get the warrant for his deites signed, nor his
pasport. thone is but differed for the other, because it is vi li p diem, hir mate saith it is more then
was wont, ...’.
surviving letters relating to Smith’s service as Principal Secretary from 1572 to 1577 were ‘an invaluable source of information on the ordinary routine work and daily duties of the Secretary’, but also that ‘they show that the Secretaryship had gained no secure and lasting increase in status or power.’

The other main duty of the Principal Secretary when in royal audience was to pass on information to the Queen. This he could do in two forms, by oral presentation (either by reading the document verbatim or by abbreviating the contents - here either ex tempore or by reading a pre-prepared abbreviate), or by showing the document to Elizabeth to allow her to read it herself. Once again, this process had its roots in early Tudor practice, before the roles of chief minister and private secretary had coalesced under Thomas Cromwell. Before Cromwell, Henry VIII’s private secretaries in the 1520s such as Richard Pace and Thomas More had read aloud passages of correspondence or handed over letters for Henry to read himself as and when he commanded them. Nearly seventy years later John Wolley, acting as Principal Secretary during the period of William Davison’s banishment from Court in 1589, wrote to Burghley that he had not hitherto been able to ‘fully acquainte her matye with the letter yor L. sent me, bothe yesteraye and this daye, but euen now yt hath pleased her to peruse them all, eyther with her owne eyes, or by hearing me reade them to her...’. Likewise Thomas Windebank, acting in the same role the following year, wrote to Burghley that Elizabeth had ‘red her self a good parte of this writing yor Lordship’s labor’, and had then ‘caused me to reade the other parte’.

17 Dewar Sir Thomas Smith 1964 p 171.
18 Richard Pace to Cardinal Wolsey, 29 October 1521, (SP 1/79 quoted in Elton 1982 no. 62): ‘I nevyr rehersyde Your Graces letters diminutely or fully, but by the Kyngis expresse commaundement; whoo redyth all your letters, wyth gret diligence... Hys Grace doith rede them all hys selfe and examine the same at laysor.’ See Elton Tudor Revolution 1953 p 56; note 4. ‘Henry hardly ever read anything himself but had letters read out to him, a sensible proceeding when he might find in necessary to cope with some of the scralls affected by his servants’.
19 Harl MS 6994 ff 168-69 11 April 1589 John Wolley to Burghley autograph. From the court; Harl MS 6995 ff 32-33 20 Feb 1590/91 Thomas Windebank to Burghley from Greenwich autograph. Cf. Harl MS 6992 ff 79-80 13 Sep 1577 Walsingham to Burghley from Otelands autograph: ‘receiving your L. letters at my being with her mat in her withdrawing chambre, she opened them & after she had perused them, she grewe to this resolutyon...’; Cf. Harleian MS
The political system within which Beale and the other Clerks of the Council served was regulated by the Principal Secretary and the administrative assistants at his disposal both within his own private household as well as within the various royal administrative departments. The Principal Secretary was fundamental in liasing between Queen, Privy Council and wider political society at home and abroad, and was in effect, as Sir Walter Mildmay stated, the 'care and minde' as well as the 'penne and mouthe' of the Prince. Nicholas Faunt, one of Walsingham's household secretaries during the 1580s, described the unique position of the Principal Secretary, 'howe greate matters are committed chiefly (and oftentimes onely) to his trust', 'what free access he hath to ye Prince', and, with a similar metaphor to that used by Mildmay, 'howe hee is the mouth of the Councell of State'. The predominance of Cecil as the addressee in Walsingham's correspondence from Paris in 1571 shows how Cecil as Principal Secretary was indeed the 'eyes and ears' of Elizabeth, and the chief conduit for the flow of information and written correspondence towards the Queen and her Privy Council. There were other channels of information and sources that Elizabeth could utilise if she so chose, but, in the normal course of affairs, if and when Elizabeth either required or was required to know something, then this would be through the means of her Principal Secretary. This state of affairs was especially characteristic of Sir William Cecil's relationship with Elizabeth, which transcended Cecil's formal office of Principal Secretary which he held from Elizabeth's accession in 1558 to 1572. Cecil built on the personal bond he had with Elizabeth to concentrate significant political power through the Principal Secretary's monopolisation of the royal signature. Others could and did

6992 ff 63-64 16 Nov 1576 Walsingham to Burghley from Hampton Court autograph: 'And as towchinge the matter of the exchaynge, I shewed her the latter parte of your letter,...'.
20 Faunt, Nicholas 'Discourse touchinge the Office of principall Secretarie of Estate', printed from Bodleian Tanner MS 80 ff 91-94 in EHR xx (1905) pp 499-508.
advise or counsel the Queen on her policy and options, but only Cecil as Principal Secretary held the keys to so many of the executive aspects of royal government.

This peculiar mix of Cecil’s administrative competence and the personal bond between Queen and minister is well illustrated by the unfortunate circumstances of Hugh Fitzwilliam in Paris in 1566, referred to in the previous chapter. In the summer of 1566 the resident English ambassador in Paris Sir Thomas Hoby had died of an unspecified illness, and, when the news of Hoby’s death had reached London, Cecil had deputed Hugh Fitzwilliam to take over as chargé d’affaires until a replacement ambassador could be despatched. Fitzwilliam was a political novice whose commitment to the international protestant cause was far greater than his knowledge of the diplomatic practicalities of how to deal with Elizabeth, the Privy Council and the Principal Secretary. Fitzwilliam admitted in a despairing letter directed to Elizabeth herself that he was so ‘bare in instructions and all manner of necessaryes appertayning to this place’ that it ‘passethe my witte to tell what to do in thinges that may daly happen’, and Fitzwilliam then stated that he did not even know how he should send the letter he was writing. Fitzwilliam also claimed not to be able to ‘tell mr Secretaries meaninges’ in Cecil’s correspondence, and believed that Cecil was not doing all he might to help Fitzwilliam with the expenses of the duties he was required to carry out. Fitzwilliam had therefore begun to search for alternative means of alerting Elizabeth to this problem, who he rather naively believed would, once alerted to his plight, then quickly instruct her Principal Secretary to rectify all and de facto end of problem.

Fitzwilliam therefore tried petitioning the treasurer of the chamber Thomas Heneage, a courtier known to be inward with Elizabeth, in order to help to persuade the Queen to either grant him sufficient allowance or to recall him. In response, Heneage said that he

---

22 Fitzwilliam refers to a letter of 18 July 1566 from Cecil: see SP 70/85 ff 62-63 Hugh Fitzwilliam to Cecil July 29 1566 autograph.
23 SP 70/86 ff 28-29 Fitzwilliam to Elizabeth September 14 1566 autograph. Endd. by Cecil.
24 SP 70/85 ff 62-63 Fitzwilliam to Cecil July 29 1566 autograph.
would do what he could but still advised him to continue to pass on his requests and demands through the mediation of Cecil. Fitzwilliam’s continuing belief that Cecil was turning a blind eye to his problems then led him to make an enormous political error, as he took up his pen and wrote directly to Elizabeth to explain his predicament and his own sense of injustice at his situation. Fitzwilliam purposely sent this letter addressed to Elizabeth via the senior serving Clerk of the Council Bernard Hampton in an attempt to bypass Cecil. The political fallout of Fitzwilliam’s action is best left to the pen of Hampton, who was subsequently instructed by Elizabeth to explain the ins and outs of the situation to Fitzwilliam:

‘I receiued v or vj dayes passed yor letter of the vijth of this moneth, with a pacquett addressed to her Queens Matie. And albeit it coulde not but seeme very strange unto me to be required to deluyor letters unto hir highnes, mr secretary hym self being at the cowrte, who onely is wolnt to doo that office, and withowt whose appointment or hir maties speciall commandment, I haue at no tyme accesse unto hir highnes, yet because yow pressed the mater, with such earnest wordes, I dyd according to your request, deluyor the pacquet unto hir mates owne handes.’

Elizabeth’s reaction to this state of affairs was not positive, as Hampton reluctantly reported:

‘so can she not but think yow haue muche forgotten yor self, not onely in sending letters unto hir matie by this indirect and extraordinary meanes, but allso in the manner of yor writing... wherein yow utter certayne speeches touching mr Secretarye farr unmeete to passe from yow towards one of his sorte and caling... I am sorry mr ffitzwilliam that yow dyd choose me to be a dealer in this matter, soeuer that I am driuen to returne yow such an answer, but soriest of all that yow had not better advised yor self in the manner of the writing and addressing of these yor letters ...’.

---

25 SP 70/86 ff 28-29 Fitzwilliam to Elizabeth September 14 1566 autograph. Fitzwilliam’s first letter to Elizabeth directed via Bernard Hampton dated 8 September 1566 has not survived; SP 70/86 f 20 Thomas Heneage to Fitzwilliam from Bradham 8 September 1566 autograph.

26 SP 70/86 f 44 Bernard Hampton to Fitzwilliam 21 September 1566 autograph.
The chill that must have passed down Fitzwilliam's back upon reading this must have transfixed him to the spot. He had further insulted Elizabeth by attempting to use her as a postman to pass on a letter to the Privy Council enclosed in the same packet, and had also alienated Cecil further from him into the bargain, as, contrary to what she had instructed Hampton to tell Fitzwilliam, Elizabeth made sure Cecil was made fully aware of all that Fitzwilliam had implied against him.27 Fitzwilliam received the revocation that he desired but not on the terms that he may have imagined. He submitted his bill for expenses but nearly a year later had not received any recompense. Whether or not Fitzwilliam had ever harboured political or court ambitions, no more was ever heard of him.28

But what other options did Fitzwilliam have? He had felt that his access to Elizabeth was circumscribed by either the nonchalance or antipathy of her Principal Secretary, and had therefore attempted to approach her through the alternative routes of her ladies-in-waiting and other Court favourites. It was common enough for Elizabeth's male intimates like Heneage, Leicester and Hatton to read or show the Queen correspondence they may have received from their own sources, and to counsel or advise her accordingly although not themselves formally a Privy Councillor (although all three were eventually sworn in).29 A good example of this were the 'pruieate letters to mr Heneage' written by Thomas Sackville Lord Buckhurst from France written and directed to Thomas Heneage in 1571, 'from whos mouthe' Sackville told Elizabeth, 'your majesty might understande their particuler discours with much better speche then

---

27 SP 70/86 ff 37-38 Fitzwilliam to Elizabeth September 18 1566 autograph.
28 Fitzwilliam's list of expenses are now SP 70/88 f 12. For his continuing entreaties for reimbursement see also SP 70/94 ff 140-41 Hugh Fitzwilliam to Cecil 15 October 1567 autograph.
29 Pulman, M. B. The Elizabethan Privy Council in the 1570's Univ. California Press, Berkeley 1971, p 53 quotes Hatfield MS 57 f 55, printed in Haynes 1740, Thomas Heneage to Cecil in 1570: 'my owne consyens can not accuse me, that I ever gave her majesty advyse in a corner agaynst the determinacion of her cowncell, or ever opened my mouthe to her highnes in matter concernynge the publick estate or government, except yt pleased her to aske myne opinyon.'
my pen coulde geue them'. Elizabeth's Court intimates could also pass on news and information not originally intended for Elizabeth in a less artful or organized manner. Leicester had written to Beale in July 1571 that, unknown to Beale, he was in the habit of showing 'your dyscourses to her maty, who lyketh very well of them'. These different sources or channels of information to Elizabeth need not have been contradictory or mutually exclusive, and nor does their existence testify to any congenital factionalism at court. Once Heneage had learnt of the outcome resulting above from Fitzwilliam's letter directed to Elizabeth via Hampton, he had repeated his advice to Fitzwilliam (with some exasperation) to refer all complaints through Cecil, 'for surely I hold him <Cecil> both the most honest & upright gentilman, that is in the seruyce of thy state, & besydes the most trusted man of her maty for his report & judgement, of her servyce and affaires, & therefore the most able to doe yow good.'

Fitzwilliam's own personal political debacle can serve to illustrate the significance of the office of Principal Secretary with access to the Queen's ear and the importance of Sir William Cecil in the eyes of the Queen, and also that this estimation was shared by most of the rest of the Elizabethan polity. Cecil's administrative omniscience continued after he had formally relinquished the office of Principal Secretary in 1572. The peculiar characteristics of the politics and administration of the Privy Council during the middle decades of Elizabeth's reign are partly defined by the partnership between the newly incumbent Principal Secretaries (Thomas Smith, Francis Walsingham and Thomas Wilson) and the familiar hand of William Cecil guiding, drafting and managing Council business throughout these middle decades. One of the principal sources for the drafting and preparation of documents and minutes for Privy Council business are the surviving letters written by these three new Principal Secretaries to Cecil during the 1570s and 80s when Cecil was absent from court, either

30 SP 70/116 ff 109-113 ink 146-50 pencil 24 February 1571 Buckhurst to Elizabeth from Paris. In his secretary's hand.
31 Egerton MS 1693 ff 9-10: Leicester to Beale 7 July 1572 <recte 1571> f 9a.
32 SP 70/86 ff 35-6 Heneage to Fitzwilliam 17 September 1566.
for his own private business or increasingly when bed-ridden with gout. These letters testify above all to Cecil’s continuing centrality to the administrative heart of the political and administrative processes centred around the Privy Council despite the promotion of the new men. Burghley may well have relinquished some of the more onerous duties of attendance, but he did not relinquish his central role in drafting and guiding policy, which he continued to do in the very literal sense of overseeing and drafting, penning and correcting many of the Privy Council letters throughout the 1570s and 80s. In 1573 the newly promoted Sir Thomas Smith wrote to Cecil that he would ‘cause letters to be made for her mat as yow write, to the L. deputie...’.33 Two years later, Smith was busy preparing a proclamation against the carrying of small arms, and wrote to Burghley that he had drafted it ‘acordyng as I take was yor ll. meanyng, with a prouiso which some of my lords thought necessary, to thentent, that yor L. perusing `it’ may correct & amend it, as yow shall thynk good, & so if yow please send it me agayn, that I may haue it in a redynes, & haue (if yor LL. thynk so good) some of my lords opinion in it before’.34

Lest we think that this involvement of Burghley in the daily administration of the Principal Secretary’s office was peculiar to Smith, whose historical reputation has suffered in the comparison with that of his illustrious former pupil, we also have the mature and experienced Walsingham writing to Burghley in 1585 to ‘send your L. tow mynutes of a letters, the one for the trayning of the marityme counytes, the other for the dysarming of the recusents. I praye your L. after you haue perused and corrected them to returne them.’35 Burghley’s involvement in this fundamental process of drafting, correcting and despatching Council letters grew in importance in proportion to the weight of the matter touched in the letter. As we will discuss later in Chapter 8, Burghley also took it upon himself to draft the original warrant for Mary Stuart’s execution and then the Council letters sent to accompany this when it was finally sent

33 Harl MS 6991 ff 23-24 10 January 1573 Smith to Burghley from Hampton Court. Autograph.
34 Harl MS 6992 ff 33-34 10 December 1575 Smith to Burghley from Windsor. Autograph.
35 Harl MS 6993 ff 76-77 7 April 1585 Walsingham to Burghley autograph. Add. by other sec.
down in February 1587. Beale’s treatise on the office of Principal Secretary written in 1592 also testifies to the peculiarly mid-Elizabethan partnership of the Privy Council Clerks, Principal Secretary and the Lord Treasurer in the production of documents: ‘Afterwarde’, Beale advised, ‘upon sight of the Ires sent and the notes thus taken of their Ls resolucion, the Clerck of the Councell may drawe a Ire or Minute (if it be a great cause) written with large lines, to be perused by the Secretarie and likewise communicated to the L. Thr. before it be preferred to the other Ls to be signed.’\textsuperscript{36} Cecil was viewed as the \textit{paterfamilias} of each of the new Principal Secretaries, not merely as a recognition of his past service in that office, but of his continuing centrality to the Privy Council administrative process and his general authority within the polity.

The practical working relationship of Walsingham and Cecil that defined the bureaucratic process of the mid-Elizabethan years gradually came to an end with the increasing physical problems both men experienced in the later 1580s, and the final end of the partnership with Walsingham’s death in 1590 then led to the position of the Principal Secretary of State coming into ‘public’ political consciousness as never before.\textsuperscript{37} The other main catalyst for this contemporary interest was the indeterminate position of joint Principal Secretary William Davison after his public disgrace in Star Chamber for his role in the execution of Mary Queen of Scots in 1587, covered in detail in Chapter 8 below. Although he remained formally in office, Davison was never allowed to fulfil his duties as Principal Secretary again, and, after his release from imprisonment in 1588, Davison was left in effect in a form of political limbo. Despite Davison obtaining support at Court and amongst some of the Privy Councillors, Elizabeth’s perception of political necessity and of her own honour continued to negate his re-admittance to political society, and the duties of Principal Secretary were performed from February 1587 onwards by a mixture of the ageing Walsingham, Sir John Wolley, Sir Thomas Heneage, Thomas Windebank and Sir Robert Cecil (who was

\textsuperscript{36} Beale \textit{Treatise} p 425.

\textsuperscript{37} Evans, F. M. G. \textit{The Principal Secretary of State 1558-1680} Manchester Univ. Press, Manchester 1923.
then granted the office officially in 1596). A number of treatises for manuscript
circulation resulting from this contemporary interest survive: two treatises by Beale and
Nicholas Faunt on the office of the Principal Secretary date from 1592; one by Thomas
Wilkes on the office of a counsellor that covers much of the same ground from c.1586-
92; and another set of short notes by serving Principal Secretary Sir Robert Cecil
written c.1600. 38

The treatises on the office and role of the Principal Secretary, especially those of Faunt
and Beale, are particularly useful in attempting to reconstruct the relationship of the
Principal Secretary with the various household and royal clerks he might utilise in the
course of his duties. 'When anie businesses cometh into the Secretarie's handes,' wrote
Beale in his 1592 Treatise, 'he shall doe well for the ease of himselfe to distribute the
same and to use the helpe of such her Majesties servants as serve underneath him, as
the Clerckes of the Counsell, ye Clercks of the signett, the Secretarie of the Latin and
the French tonge...'. Alternatively, he would use what Beale and Faunt referred to as
the Secretary's 'own servants', the members of his own household organised into a
'secretariat', kept and maintained by the Secretary as a private person and not by the
Queen.39 This household secretariat was not exclusive to the Principal Secretaries:
every major Elizabethan political figure established their own secretariat that would
mutate and grow as circumstance and ambition dictated. Cecil's secretariat after c.1580
has been described by A. G. R. Smith; the establishment and growth of the Earl of

38 Wilkes, T. 'A briefe and summary Tractate shewing [the] what appertaineth to the place,
dignite and office of a councellor of Estate in a monarchie or other common wealth. Written by
Sir Thomas Wilkes, kno, one of the Clerkes of her Maties Counsell, and by him dedicated to Sr
Robert Cecill Knight, one of her Maties Privie Counsell, and Principal Secretary of Estate' BL
Sloane MS 296 ff.7-20, an early C17 copy. The copy bears no date. Internal evidence suggests a
date of c.1586-1592 - Wilkes talks of his 'Tenn yeares experience in a schoole of State' (Wilkes
was appointed as one of the clerks of the Privy Council in July 1576) in his dedication to Robert
Cecil, who himself became a Privy Councillor on 2 August 1591; Beale, Robert 'A Treatise of
the Office of a Counsellor and Principall Secretarie to her Majestie', BL Additional MS 48149 ff
1-9 is an early C17 copy, printed in Read, C. Mr Secretary Walsingham and Queen Elizabeth 3
Vols London 1925, Vol I Appendix pp. 423-43. See also Cecil, Robert 'The State and Dignity of
a Secretary of State's Place', printed in The Harleian Miscellany: or, a Collection of Scarce,
Curious and Entertaining Pamphlets and Tracts... London for T. Osborne 1744 Vol. II pp 265-
66.

39 Beale Treatise pp 426-27; Faunt Discourse p 500.
Essex’s secretariat in the 1590s has been described by Paul Hammer, whilst the structure of Leicester’s secretariat is clearly part of Simon Adams’s work on Leicester himself. Of all the great Elizabethan household secretariats, Walsingham’s, although patently large and active, is served most inadequately by modern historiography: Conyers Read’s three volume study of Walsingham does not address the issue of his household or secretariat, and although more recent studies have raised the issue only to pass on, they have also misinterpreted some of the key sources.

The structure of Walsingham’s secretariat was based on that of the administrative and household models handed down to him by the two key previous Principal Secretaries, his immediate predecessor in the office William Cecil and before him Thomas Cromwell. In preparation for both the royal audience and for the meetings of the Privy Council, the Principal Secretary from Cromwell onwards would use his own personal household clerks to receive, log, transcribe, abbreviate and note all the correspondence and business that was directed to him as a servant to the crown. Elton was unable to dissect this household structure below the level of Wriothesley and Paget, but still interpreted this as yet another facet of Cromwell’s distinctive and innovatory style of government and as ‘a portent of the future’, that was then inherited by Cecil and Walsingham. This model of the bureaucratic and administrative practice of the

---


Principal Secretary’s office survived Cromwell’s demise in 1540, and was transmitted passively through to Edward’s reign by Cromwell’s former servants, secretaries and associates such as Wriothesley, Sadler, Mason, Paget and Petre. Despite the relative longevity of these figures in the forefront of mid-Tudor politics, not one of them established a monopoly of political power comparable to that enjoyed by their former master, and each therefore did not require a personal household of their own comparable to Cromwell’s. The next Principal Secretary to maintain an equivalently prominent position of political power that both enabled and necessitated the construction of an equivalent household secretariat was William Cecil under Elizabeth. The forms and means of the Principal Secretary’s utilisation of both his private household and the lesser royal office holders had been grasped firmly by Cecil as he served first as a private secretary to Protector Somerset and then as one of the Principal Secretaries to the Duke of Northumberland in 1551. Cecil’s early service after his education at Cambridge in the late 1540s is sparsely documented, and the identity of his own clerks and his personal household during the 1540s and 1550s is correspondingly unclear. Roger Alford and Francis Yaxley appear to have served Cecil as clerks in the 1550s, and then Thomas Windebank and Hugh Allington in the 1560s. Cecil’s relationship with Clerk of the Council Bernard Hampton during the 1550s and 60s was administratively very close but Hampton was certainly not exclusively Cecil’s


44 Barnett, R. C. Place, Profit, and Power: A Study of the Servants of William Cecil, Elizabethan Statesman James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science Vol 51, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill 1969; For Allington as Cecil’s ‘inward man’ see CP 155/103 Nicholas White to Cecil February 26 1569, printed in HMC Salisbury I, p 401 no. 1280; ‘Edward Waterhouse, Secretary to the Lord Deputy, arrived here, furnished with all instructions as well concerning his master’s private causes as also touching the whole state of that realm. And as he is wise, so the writer knows him to be an inward man with his master, and the same in effect that Mr. Allington is to Cecil in the affairs of his office.’
household servant in the 1550s and 60s, just as Beale was not exclusively Walsingham’s in the following two decades.\textsuperscript{45}

It is only through the identification and then reconstruction of papers belonging to Walsingham during the years of his Principal Secretaryship that the membership, hierarchy and specialisation within his secretariat can be reconstructed along the guidelines given by Beale and Faunt. His secretary Thomas Lake recorded the contemporary organisation of Walsingham’s papers into a quarto notebook in 1588.\textsuperscript{46}

On Walsingham’s death in 1590, Beale related in his 1592 \textit{Treatise}, all the papers both of ‘public’ and ‘private’ were seized by ‘those that would be loath to be used so themselves’, which can only mean by Cecil and his fellow Privy Councillors.\textsuperscript{47}

Walsingham’s papers were then handed by the Privy Council for safe keeping into the custody of Dr. Francis James, a civil lawyer who had been associated with Walsingham’s household at the time of Walsingham’s death in 1590.\textsuperscript{48} James seems to have kept hold of these throughout the 1590s. In two of Beale’s treatises on diplomatic affairs written in c.1594 and in 1596 discussed later in Chapter 5, Beale referred to James’s possession of Walsingham’s papers, and Beale also recorded in October 1596 that he had delivered back to Burghley some of Walsingham’s papers that he had received off Dr. James in order to complete his report on the debt of the Estates General in 1595/96.\textsuperscript{49} Lake’s quarto inventory made in 1588 also contains later annotations in an

\textsuperscript{45} Alford, S. \textit{The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558-1569} Cambridge CUP 1998, \textit{passim}; Alford offers extensive evidence for the co-operation of Cecil and Hampton in all forms of business - drafting Parliamentary bills, Privy Council letters and Signet letters. See also Add MS 48150 f 92 loose leaf of a draft signet letter in Bernard Hampton’s hand dated 22 November 1569. Cecil’s personal clerks in the 1570s are identified in Barnett’s \textit{Place, Profit and Power} and in A. G. R. Smith’s \textit{Sir Michael Hickes} previously cited: Vincent Skinner served from c.1575 onwards, and then Michael Hickes, Henry Maynard and Barnard Dewhurst from c.1580 onwards.

\textsuperscript{46} BL Stowe MS 162, as discussed above in Chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{47} Beale \textit{Treatise} p 432.


\textsuperscript{49} Add MS 48044 f 339b, in Beale’s autograph; ‘wherof mr D. James may mak a particular extract out of the papers of mr Secretary Walsingham...’; also Add MS 48102 f 356a ‘wherof mr D. James can geue you out of mr Secretaries papers particular notes.’; Add MS 48116 f 100a endd. by Beale ‘memorandum that the xi the day of October 1596 I Robert Beale deliuered to ye L. Thresor at his house in the strande, two Buckeram baggs full of papers somtimes belonging to
unidentified hand (possibly that of James) recording loans of items to Sir Robert Cecil in 1596.\footnote{Mr Secretary Walsingham, delievered to Sr Henry Killigrew and myself heretofore by Mr D. James: Item his L. had at the same tyme of the bundell O. the peces marked 1.6.9.10.17 of the bundell marked O. the pre. 6.'} At some time soon thereafter Walsingham’s papers were dispersed, mainly into the State Paper office at Westminster, the Cotton library and elsewhere.\footnote{Stowe MS 162 f 2a has a note; ‘Ireland A book of Plotts and discourses Sr R Cecill hathe it of me 1596.’}

By the early 1580s Walsingham was a major political figure in his own right and the size and complexity of his household reflected this. Indeed, both Beale and Faunt in their 1592 treatises criticized their former master for allowing his household to get too large in these later years: ‘burthen not yourselfe with to many Clercks or servants as Sir Francis Walsingham did’, wrote Beale, ‘let your secret services be knowne to a fewe, the Lord Threasurer Burghley, being Secretarie, had not above two or three.’\footnote{For the dispersal of Walsingham’s papers see Adams \textit{Leicester Papers} 1993 pp 140-41; Tite \textit{Cotton Library} 1993 pp 109-10.} The household secretaries who had precedence in Walsingham’s secretariat in the 1570s and 1580s were (in rough chronological order) Francis Mills, Lisle Cave, Laurence Tomson, Nicholas Faunt and Thomas Lake. Other less well-documented men who performed secretarial services in the 1580s were Thomas Edmondes and the partially anonymous ‘Ciprian’, ‘Bayley’, and ‘Weekes’.\footnote{Beale \textit{Treatise} p 429.} Only Laurence Tomson has provoked any interest in secondary literature, and this for his links with Puritanism and his translation work and not for his involvement in Walsingham’s household.\footnote{Harleian MS 6035, passim: Ciprian, Faunt, Mills, Tomson and Lake mentioned throughout in terms of secretarial tasks - especially copying or abridging or fetching papers.} The early membership and formation of Walsingham’s secretariat in Paris has been examined in some depth in Chapter 3 above. Warcop and Mills had both known and served Walsingham before Walsingham’s embassy to France in 1571-73, and Cave entered Walsingham’s service in the autumn of 1571 in Paris. Laurence Tomson’s hand appears endorsing and abbreviating items now in SP 12 immediately upon Walsingham’s

\footnote{Bauck, I. ‘Laurence Tomson (1539-1608) and Elizabethan Puritanism’, \textit{Journal of Ecclesiastical History} 28 (1977), pp. 17-27.}
elevation to the office of joint Principal Secretary in December 1573, and in 1586 Tomson wrote to William Davison of his ‘twelve years’ service. Tomson had presumably replaced Ralph Warcop who returned in late 1573 to his academic career at New College, Oxford after his service in France with Walsingham. Faunt appears to come into Walsingham’s service in the late 1570s and Lake in the early 1580s. This list of secretaries does not include the many household servants who apparently performed no secretarial duties such as William Dodington, Walter Williams, William Stubbs, Edward Burnham, and Charles Francx. The ‘fame’ of Walsingham as a spy-master and intelligence gatherer with ‘certaine curtesies and secret wayes of intelligence above the rest’ has led to some speculative and inadequate studies of the more secret aspects of his household and of the network of informers he encouraged. This aspect of Walsingham’s fame requires significant revision but alas not here, and so this list also does not include Thomas Phelippes, whose talents were used more selectively by Walsingham in the 1580s.

These individual members of Walsingham’s secretariat are initially approached by modern historians by the paper record that each one was responsible for. In theory, the various secretaries were ordered by their precedence in closeness and confidentiality to Walsingham, and in their subject matter of specialisation. Faunt recommended that ‘the principall servaunt in whome the greatest trust is to be reposed’ should be ‘cheiffly charged with Forraine matters...’. The second servant would then have the responsibility for ‘the dispatch of ordinarie matters, and cheiffly for Continuall attendant

55 SP 12/95/1 ff 1-2 January 5 1574 Ennd. by Walsingham ‘1573 matters agreed on in counsell the v. of Januare.’ and then by Tomson ‘supplie of money & victuals for ye L. dep. of Ireland’; SP 12/195/69 27 December 1586 Tomson to Davison.

56 Harleian MS 6035 also mentions Burnham (f 15b and f 34), Ciprian and Charles (f 27), Walter Williams, and Weekes (f 33). Adams 1995 p 356 n. 702 mentions Charles Francx as Walsingham’s servant in 1586. Exchequer Tellers Books of Issues E403 2262 (for 1573-74) through to 2273 (for 1586-87) give identities of men who signed for Walsingham’s annuities other than himself. These include William Dodington, Ralph Pendlebury, John Cotesforde, Walter Williams, Christopher Barker, Roger Draunsfelde, William Stubbs, Thomas Oldsworth; Francis Mills, and Peter Proby. Another important but problematic source is SP 12/45, a letter-book covering the later 1570s.

57 Quote from Naunton, Robert Fragmenta Regalia London 1641, p 22.
in the Chamber where the papers whose perticuler charge may bee to indorse them or
giue them their due titles...’. This second servant acted as a filing clerk who endorsed
incoming correspondence and sorted it into its relevant category, which, Faunt
continued, ‘are noted to be three kinds namely home lettres which are the greatest
multitude, Counsell matters concerninge anie priuate or publique cause, and diuers
matters which conteine peticions to the secretarie, discourses, proiects, relacions
declaracions or informacions of priuate or publique causes etc., and euerie morninge to
sett them in seuerall bundells for the present use of them.’58 In these terms, Faunt’s
Discourse provides a different and complementary perspective to Beale’s Treatise.
Both Faunt and Beale proceeded by directing the prospective Principal Secretary to the
types and forms of written record he was either to produce or encounter. Beale then
mainly instructed the prospective Principal Secretary how to delegate and order the
Clerks of the Council in Council matters, which is dealt with in greater detail in the
following chapter. Faunt meanwhile concentrated on directing the newcomer on how to
organise their personal household in relation to the whole range of duties the Principal
Secretary was required to compass. Here, within the Principal Secretaries own
secretariat, there was an immediate distinction to be made between the ‘loose’ items
produced within the secretariat, and the more organised ‘books’, which would be
written into as previously organized paper books or constructed from separate items or
smaller segments of notes. As far as these ‘books’ are concerned, enough volumes from
Walsingham’s household have survived to allow us to make a correlation between what
Faunt and Beale describe and specific surviving examples in each case.

The ‘Memorial Book’ performed the function of daily organization comparable to the
modern diary, filofax or Personal Digital Assistant. Faunt described this as ‘a generall
memoriall booke in paper lyeinge beeore him, so sone as hee riseth from his Bed or
whilst hee lieth in his bed... hee may sett downe or cause to bee sett downe all things
presently accurringe or yt upon anie occasion shalbee remembred, and though for the

58 Faunt Discourse p 501/2.
multitude of them they cannot be dispatched in one day, yet daily to add newe unto them, and to marke out with the penne soe manie as are dispatched, or not to be dealt in at all to thend that the multitude of affaires do not cause some important matter to bee forgotten... though it bee done in one word or darkly in tearmes not easily to bee understood of others if the matter bee of secrecie."59 The only surviving example of these volumes is now Harleian MS 6035 covering the period from 1583-85. This volume, as indicated above, is a highly complicated book that consists of additions and emendations made in its pages by a multitude of different hands: the sense and order of entries is opaque, and different marginal annotations such as crosses, carets and trefoils are added to many of the various entries. Next, Faunt described the 'Journal', 'wherein is continually to bee recorded, the certaine day of the month and the howers when anie dispatch is made or receiued, for that thereupon may growe greate question if negligence bee used either in goinge or comeinge... further in this booke should alsoe bee noted the arrivall and dispatch of anie Ambassador or messanger sent abroad or comeinge hither... the particular assemblies of the Councell out of the court and the occassion if it bee remarkable the times of conferences and private meetings of the Sec: and others in the commission'. The 'Journal' covering Walsingham's years in Paris and his first years as Principal Secretary has been familiar since its printing for the Camden Society by C. T. Martin in 1870. The original Journal itself is a pre-bound paper book that has been copied into over the years rather than constructed from discrete gatherings copied and then bound together.60 It consists of a neat copy made from rougher notes for purposes of keeping track of Walsingham's movements to and from the French and English Courts, of the various visitors he received, and of his correspondence.

Finally, there are what have been termed the 'foreign entry books', described by Faunt as 'sundrie booke of paper for the registreing of all instruccions and lettres of charge committed to such as are to bee sente abroad into forraine partes into Ireland or unto the

59 Faunt Discourse p 503.
60 PRO 30/5/5
Sea, and the minutes of lettres of further direccions groweing upon sundrie accidents and newe occasions sent unto them beinge materiall and concerninge the seuerall negociations in hand... Lastly it shall not bee amisse but happilie of good consequence at ye end of the said negotiacion message commission treatie etc. to sett downe brefely the causes or occasions whereupon the same was discontinued or howe it end and what effect it brought forth etc. which would serue instead of an Historie and apt introduccion to other negotiacions that are likely to followe of the same nature...'. These ‘foreign entry books’ were organised by area treated, but in their own way these books do indeed serve as ‘histories’ of a kind. Laurence Tomson’s ‘foreign entry book’ covering the years c.1577-79 has the form of a simple narrative history, interspersing copies of original documents (such as instructions to ambassadors and incoming letters, regularly copied in another hand) with autograph commentary on these proceedings either abbreviating and summarising the contents or linking proceedings with an independent narrative. When Beale departed to the States of Germany in 1577, Tomson wrote in this book that ‘Mr Beales dispatche deliuered unto him by a messager from Otlandes ye 29 Aug 1577’; Tomson then noted the actual departure in the margin ‘departed from London onn Sunday 25 Aug. about midnight’. Tomson then inserted a copy of Beale’s instructions, and a few folios and a few months later abbreviated the messages sent from Beale in September. In a later section Tomson records the return of Beale in January 1578 ‘retourninge from his Amibassage out of Germanie, where he hath not frutelesly laboured in her Mties name, as may appeare by dathenus letters & languets and other’. Contempoary to Tomson’s book dealing with Northern Europe is another letter-book relating to Ireland, containing copies of letters from May 1578 to December 1579.62

---

61 SP 104/63: Beale’s instructions are ink ff 42a-43a old fol 33a-34a; copies of letters from Beale and Rogers ink f 46b old fol. 37b; commentary on return ink f 105b old fol 96b.
62 PRO 30/5/4; printed by Hogan, James et al eds. The Walsingham Letterbook... May 1578- Dec 1579 Dublin 1959. This is also organised partly by Laurence Tomson and another hand - possibly that of Nicholas Faunt.
The nature of the relationship between Walsingham as Principal Secretary and his monarch Elizabeth was at once peculiarly mid-Elizabethan and yet also entirely characteristic of the ‘reformed’ Tudor state. Walsingham’s dealings with Elizabeth in person were conducted in the same ways as his predecessors Thomas More and Richard Pace as private secretaries and also Thomas Wolsey and Thomas Cromwell as chief ministers had dealt with Henry VIII. One of the key differences separating these eras, however, was the more immediate and ongoing example of William Cecil. Walsingham’s personal secretariat was built up due to the practical necessities of his administrative duties but he did so in a personal manner designed to complement and continue the ideological congruity of his household in Paris. The roles and functions of these various private secretaries are partly testified by the odd mentions of each other in surviving correspondence and in the record of their handwriting in the surviving paper record. The dual nature of Beale’s relationship with Francis Walsingham thus functioned to integrate him further into the heart of the polity. Beale was a familiar and friend at the same time as he was an official under Walsingham’s command as Principal Secretary. In many senses the one role begat the other and the symbiosis between the two roles characterised the whole of the system of government within the mid-Elizabethan polity. Beale’s relationship with Walsingham was not, however, exclusively responsible for his own position. Beale cultivated and maintained a close relationship with Cecil, Leicester and Smith, and it was the ‘collegiate’ nature of his integration into the Privy Council process that most characterised his relationship with the Councillors as individuals. It is to Beale’s role as a Clerk of the Council and his position at the administrative heart of the polity to which we now turn in the following chapter.
Chapter 5. Beale as Clerk of the Privy Council, July 1572 to c.1588

‘In the later end of the Reigne of King Hen. the 8th, the Authoritie of this counsell was established by commission under the Greate Seale of England... And then established the Office of the Clerke of the Counsell to the end that Acts and Recordes might bee kept of their dooinges and consultacions, for the benefitt of the kings seruice, commoditie of his subiects whose causes should come before them, and discharge of themselues in the course of their proceedings.’ Thomas Wilkes, Clerk of the Council Treatise on the Office of a Counsellor, c.1592.

Outside of the Royal presence, the Principal Secretary’s other main forum for the fulfilment of the duties of his office was the Privy Council chamber. Here, at the executive heart of the Elizabethan polity, the Principal Secretary no longer functioned as a private personal secretary to the monarch, but as the administrative motor of the Privy Council process. In the Privy Council Chamber the Principal Secretary’s chief administrative assistants were not his own private household secretaries but the Clerks of the Privy Council. The office of the Clerk of the Council was probably the key position available to men of the ‘second-flight’ such as Beale. Other men who filled the same office under Elizabeth that we have already encountered were Bernard Hampton, Edmund Tremayne, Thomas Wilkes, Daniel Rogers and William Waad. The administrative service of these men to the Privy Council and to the Elizabethan state forms the main subject of this chapter, focusing of course on Beale himself throughout. This service at the heart of the polity implicitly involved Beale and his fellows in issues that were central to the forums for political decision-making circulating around the Privy Councillors and the Court. The administrative and bureaucratic services performed by these Clerks was often indistinguishable from their more intangible forms of political and ideological service in the role of informed advisors, facilitators and sources of counsel.
Our knowledge of the physical topography of the Privy Council process and where the Clerks of the Privy Council fitted into this is fairly slim. In 1625 Sir Julius Caesar described the provision of a Council chamber in the still slowly itinerant court, where the Privy Council 'have had alwaies & so nowe, a fair chamber in every standing howse, where the kings maties abode is, where they keape the counsell table; with a little 'roome' thereto adjoyning, where the clerks of the said counsell & their servants sit & wright.' Caesar's retrospective 'have had alwaies' here invites us to apply his description retrospectively to the Sixteenth Century, but recent research by Simon Thurley into the construction and layout of the Royal Palaces shows that not all the Council chambers in the various royal London residences contained a separate 'little room'. The Privy Council was also not constrained to meet only in their own chamber, and could gather in the private chambers of individual councillors such as Cecil. Caesar then referred to the '3 or more ordinary clerks' attending the Privy Council 'to enact their orders, & wright such letters, or aansweres, as their llps shall give to petitions deliuered at that table, or sent thether from his maty, & what els theire llps shall commaund them.' These three clerks would have been the number of Privy Council Clerks in office and not necessarily the number of those waiting at any one meeting.

If the attendant Clerk or Clerks were present within the Council meeting at these palace Council or private chambers, then we must presume they were present in the council chamber itself during some or all of the Council meeting. The very few surviving descriptions or relations of specific Privy Council meetings barely fill out the details.

1 Add MS 34324 ff 238-39.; f 239a. Sir Julius Caesar's 'Concerning the Private Counsell of the most High and Mighty King of Greate Britaine, ffrance...' Dated 'Ult. Octob. 1625'.
Beale himself was present in Burghley’s private chambers in the Council meeting on 3 February 1587 to give his own opinion on the drafts of the Council letters to accompany the warrant for Mary Stuart’s execution, and then to write them up neat whilst the Councillors dined. In more regular and everyday occasions, Beale noted in his Treatise that as and when further notes or letters required writing or drafting, the Principal Secretary would then utilise the attendant Clerks as required, ‘commandinge the Clerckes of the Counsell to approach and give good care for his better direccion to frame their Ls Ire or answer.’ The Council could always purposely choose to exclude the Clerks on certain occasions. In 1541 the then Clerk of the Council William Paget wrote to his colleague Thomas Wriothesley of Council affairs. Upon finishing the first page of his letter, he told his friend that he was ‘sent for to the counsail and therfor must stay my writing until soone’. Once he had done what had been required of him by the Council, who were then sitting in their judicial role in Star Chamber to try Lord Dacre’s case, Paget was then asked to leave and returned to his letter to Wriothesley, and he then related how ‘albeit I was excluded yet they spake so lowde sum of them that I myght here them notwithstanding two doors shut betwene us’.

One important distinction between the Clerks of the Privy Council and the Principal Secretary’s other household and signet clerks was the timing of their involvement in Privy Council business. In general, the Principal Secretary’s household clerks drafted letters and aided the Principal Secretary in preparation for the Council meeting, and thereafter the Privy Council Clerks completed the proposed letters, circulated them for signing before despatch, and entered copies of them into the Privy Council Register. Beale’s Treatise written in 1592 essentially performed a parallel function for the

down the warrant for Mary’s execution was deemed unexceptionable in this case due to the ‘hurt of the Lord Treasurer’s leg’

3 Beale Treatise p 425.
Principal Secretary’s relations with the Clerks of the Privy Council to what Faunt’s
*Discourse* had done for his relations with his household clerks. Beale began with the
recommendation that the Principal Secretary prepare *aide memoires* to take with him
for each Council meeting; ‘in a severall paper a memoriall or Dockett of those which he
mindeth to propounde and have dispatched at everie sittinge.’ These memorials were
used in conjunction with the abbreviations of in-letters and notes jotted onto separate
pieces of paper by the Principal Secretary for further instruction. Surviving examples
of these memorials prepared for Council meetings are the series of quarto booklet
foldings dating from the first few years of Walsingham’s duties as Principal Secretary
1574-76 now in the PRO in SP 12, typically listing items of business or titles of letters
to be drafted. The identification of the handwriting in all of these shows that these
were made by Walsingham before the relevant Council meeting in conjunction with his
household clerks, Tomson, Cave and Mills, and not by the serving Clerks of the Privy
Council Tremayne, Beale, and Wilkes.

Cromwell’s household clerks Wriothesley and Sadler had similarly drawn up lists of
matters to be treated in council in the later 1530s. Elton explained this use of
Cromwell’s household clerks for Council matters as an aspect of the continuing
‘flexibility’ of the Principal Secretary’s office. The Principal Secretary was the focus
for both his own household clerks and of the Clerks of the Privy Council, and the
integration of the whole process depended upon the Principal Secretary’s management.
Walsingham’s only surviving ‘Memorial’ book for the period 1583-85 confirms these

---

4 SP 1/166/ ff 65-66 ink 73-74 pencil Paget to Wriothesley 26 June 1541 from Westminster; cf.
Gammon, S. G. *Statesman and Schemer: William, First Lord Paget Tudor Minister* David &
5 Beale *Treatise* p 425; p 437.
6 SP 12/95/1 ff 1-2 January 5 1574 Memoranda by Walsingham of business transacted in council,
endorsed by Walsingham ‘1573 matters agreed on in counsell the v. of Jaunarye.’ and then by
Laurence Tomson ‘supplie of money & victualls for ye L. dep. of Ireland’. Sundry other
eamples of Walsingham’s notes occur throughout SP 12, up until SP 12/108/25 ff 67-68 20 May
1576 ‘Matters to be propounded in cowsayll’.
distinctions whilst also recording how interconnected all were around the person of the Principal Secretary himself. The entries into the ‘Memorial’ book are all made in what first appears as a confusing mish-mash of Walsingham’s autograph and the hands of his various household clerks, and not of the Clerks of the Privy Council. Walsingham jotted reminders either to himself ‘to make up a docket of couwnsall causes’, or to his personal household clerks, such as ‘to cause faunte to put all counsell matters together’. Walsingham also documented here his use of Beale and Wilkes for Council matters: before his journey north to Scotland made reluctantly in August 1583, Walsingham noted non-specifically ‘2 August couwnceil causwes wilkes’, and the following year ‘to cause Mr Wylkes to sett downe the changes of the muster masters’. These ‘Memorial’ books were personal to the man and not to the office. Beale, as we shall discuss later, acted as a temporary Principal Secretary during Walsingham’s absences in the early 1580s. Beale’s hand occurs in this Memorial book for one day only, when on 12 May 1583 he entered material concerning Mary Queen of Scots.  

The thousands of letters agreed upon by the Privy Councillors were either passed in previously drafted or completed form during the Privy Council meeting, or the Principal Secretary would require the waiting Clerk to make a draft according to the instructions of the Privy Council following the various pre-existing models or templates. Each individual Clerk constructed and kept hold of their own individual formularies culled together from various different sources in order to help them in this task. Beale himself constructed two formularies: the first from his appointment in 1572 to 1574; the second during his ‘maturity’ from 1575 to 1585. Both of these contain copies of letters taken from three principal sources: letters written by Beale and other Clerks during their

---

7 Elton Tudor Revolution 1953 pp 360-64.
8 Harleian MS 6035 f 34b, f 44a, f 23b, f 70b. Cf f 105a in Walsingham’s hand: ‘Mr Wilkes: To warne the L. Morley to be before the counsell, To warne Sir Edward Herbert to bryng in his awunswer, To causw Mr Wilkes to abrydge the same’; Beale’s hand on f 10a.
times of attendance on the Privy Council, copies of letters from existing Privy Council registers, including older Henrician and Edwardian Registers that were lost in the Whitehall fire in 1619, and, finally, copies of letters from other formularies. The personal formularies constructed by the other Clerks show a similar pattern; initially constructed upon their appointment, they were then consistently added to with new material produced during their own times of attendance, and also included some older forms from the past Registers in the Council chest. Edmund Tremayne’s formulary was put together in 1571, the year of his appointment, and then added to during the following decade of his attendance, and that of Anthony Ashley likewise.9

Beale is of course the best documented of any of the individual Clerks for examples of letters composed either by him or during his time of attendance on the Council. The first of his two formularies is full of examples that show him learning his trade. In the beginning there are items copied from other sources that involved filling in the blanks for the dates and names as required; Beale’s first dated entry for 10 August 1572 is for a model text for the recording of appearances before the Clerks of the Council in discharges of bonds or recognizances when the Privy Council itself was not sitting.10 Beale also made notes in his first formulary on the sources of information that he was to look into to help him prepare himself for his new duties; he has noted reminders to himself to find out ‘howe many counsellors handes to every act’, on the sending and payment of messengers with Council letters, on ‘ye presence & eldership in naming’, and ‘of the keping of ye counsell boke’. The various textual and personal sources for the answers to his queries were listed on the following page; a list of recognisably

---

9 Add MS 32323 drafts of letters by Edmund Tremayne, Clerk of the Council, 1571-81; Egerton MS 3048 Clerk of Council Anthony Ashley’s precedent book, c.1540-90; Stowe MS 160 is another formulary book of Privy Council out-letters dating mainly from 1578-80, but has no indication of provenance from any of the attendant clerks, unless possibly the ‘phantom’ Henry Cheke. One sec. hand throughout ff 3-163, then same hand italic ff 164-168b, and later C19 addition to table f 169.
English books such as the ‘Bible in Inglish’, the unnamed ‘Boke of presidentes’, ‘The boke called the Register’ and ‘The boke of Statutes’, as well as a wide variety of volumes of examples of Italian and French letters and books on notarial practice. Among the persons listed by name are the by-now-familiar clerks, secretaries and diplomats such as ‘Mr Norton’, ‘Mr Hampton’, ‘Mr Killigrey’, ‘Mr Somer’, as well as reminders to see ‘Mr wood for ye bok of presidents he sayeth he hath’ and to fetch ‘The key of Sr Tho. Smith’; these latter two references are probably to John Wood, Sir Thomas Smith’s nephew and ‘inward’ man, and to the key to the council chest from the newly-appointed Principal Secretary himself.\textsuperscript{11}

These little notes and reminders that Beale made in the first months of his service show the multiplicity of the textual and personal sources for authority and information on proper practice that a budding Clerk of the Privy Council needed to become familiar with. The purpose of this was obviously to perform his service to the Principal Secretary and the Privy Council as required, to the best of his ability. This service was more demanding than the repetitive and formulaic composition of Privy Council letters might at first suggest. The Clerks were expected to be able to draft and complete Privy Council letters themselves when necessary without help from either the Principal Secretary or the other councillors. Numerous examples of minutes or drafts of Privy Council letters from as early as 1574 show Beale either correcting a clerk’s copy or making an original draft.\textsuperscript{12} As Clerks like Beale became more experienced and trusted

\textsuperscript{10} Add MS 48150 f 17a ‘Actes of Apperances before the Councell discharges of bonds&’ ‘x. aug. Anno 1572 et 14 Re Elizabeth. Memorandum that AB made his personall apparrance...’.
\textsuperscript{11} Add MS 48150 ff 29-32.
\textsuperscript{12} Add. MS 48063 ff 261-63 two draft letters from Privy Council of 25 May 1574; ff 261-62 ‘To the Sheriffes and Justices of peace’, partly in Beale’s hand; ff 263 ‘To the L. Deputy of Irland’, partly in Beale’s hand. Both letters endorsed in another hand with dates added; SP 12/95/22 ff 52-53 22 February 1574 Bond of William Walpole, not ‘to found or sell iron ordnance without licence’, Endd. by Beale ‘Thobligacon of Willm Walpole to her Mates use: concerning the founding and selling of ordnance in Sussex’; SP 12/95/67 ff 146-48 Minute. Endd. by Beale ‘A M. of a comission for the Musters: havning a relation to ye former of more length 1573’; SP 12/95/79 ff 175-78 4 April 1574; dated ‘Quinto Marij 1573’ and cond. by Beale ‘The names of the owners and founder of ordnance’.
within the Privy Council their responsibilities increased accordingly. On 4 August 1581
the Privy Council met to discuss the implications of the recent examination of the Jesuit
missionary Edmund Campion and the information gleaned from him about Catholics in
the North. The Council agreed that a letter containing this information be drafted and
sent to the Earl of Huntingdon as President of the Council of the North. The entry for
this letter in the Privy Council register is in the hand of Beale’s personal Clerk A for
the Council meeting of 4 August.\textsuperscript{13} The letter was then drafted and copied up in
the hand of Clerk A as entered into the register, to which Beale made a number of
autograph additions and emendations. This letter was then addressed ‘Erl of
Huntingdon L. President in ye Northe’ on the recto of the letter in the bottom left hand
corner by Beale himself, and then signed by a mixture of the Councillors recorded as
present in the register on the two following Council meetings of the 6 and 7 August.
After the letter had been signed by the Privy Councillors, Beale has then subsequently
added a side of further autograph instructions and information gleaned from more
recent interrogations of Campion, detailing with whom and for how long Campion had
been in contact, and the letter was finally dispatched on 7 August 1581.\textsuperscript{14} It is
impossible to show whether such things as the example given of Beale’s autograph
additions to Privy Council letters such as this were independently motivated by Beale
or simply written under instruction or dictation by the Principal Secretary or other
Councillors. Perhaps it is enough to say that Beale obviously still thought that the letter
was suitable to be sent out on Council business despite the obvious identification of his
distinctive autograph. It should be noted that Beale and the recipient, Henry Hastings

\textsuperscript{13} PC 2/12 pp 474-75 4 August 1581 at Greenwich.
\textsuperscript{14} Huntington Library Hastings MSS Box 2 HA 4140, Privy Council to Huntingdon 7 August
1581. Written in hand of Clerk A with Beale additions. Signed by Burghley, Bedford, Leycester,
Knollys, Croft, Hatton. Beale was present at some of the interrogations of Campion: see HMC
\textit{Rutland} I, p 128 Beale to Earl of Rutland 18 September 1581 from Greenwich; ‘Touching
Campion; he hath been ones conferred with by Mr. Deans of Pooles and Windesore, at which
time I was present’. For the form of the letter, Cf. Inner Temple Petyt MS 538/47 ff 15-15* Privy
Council to Whigift 7 March 1582; in hand of Clerk A; Beale has written in bottom left hand
corner of f 15a ‘L. B. of Worcester’.
3rd Earl of Huntingdon, did have a personal connection and had exchanged correspondence before this date: Huntingdon would have known Beale’s hand.\textsuperscript{15}

As well as the drafting and despatch of Council letters such as this, the other main responsibility of the Clerks of the Council was to ensure that copies of these letters were entered into the Privy Council Register. This was the primary purpose of the first Privy Council Register initiated in 1540, written into its opening pages as a ‘registre’ of ‘all such decrees determinacions letters and other such things... to remayne alwayes as a leger, aswell for the dischardge of the sayde counsaillors touching such things as they shuld passe from tyme to tyme, as also for a memoriall unto theim of their owne procedinges’.\textsuperscript{16} Nearly 80 years later Sir Julius Caesar’s description shows that the purpose of the Register was essentially the same, as the ‘greate faire paper bookes... where all the Actes of that counsell should be written, \\& copies of letters, \\& whatsouer that table should ordaine, to be safely kept by one called the keeper of the counsell chest, to presence them when the Ils shall at any time call for the same.’\textsuperscript{17} The utility of these ‘fair’ registers in the Council chest was to act as a memorial to the Councillors and a point of reference to authenticate executive Council decisions, with the Clerks of the Council acting as intermediaries between the individual councillors and the record of the Privy Council as a corporate body.\textsuperscript{18} They were not a record of the deliberative or political processes whereby these executive decisions had been reached. The responsibility for the care of the Council chest containing the Registers and the Council chamber in general belonged to the Keeper of the Council chamber. The two keepers of

\textsuperscript{15} Egerton MS 1694 ff 6-7 Earl of Huntingdon to Beale 19 April 1576. This was addressed ‘To my [lov]aynge frend M' Beale’ and signed ‘Your frend in ye lord, H. Huntingdon.’
\textsuperscript{17} Add MS 34324 ff 238-39: Caesar carries on; “But as there were none left in the end of Q. Ellizabeths dayes more auncient them 36. of king H. the 8 his Raigne, so in the time of king James of blessed memory, by occasion of the sudden fier, which consumed the banqueting howse at Whitehall, most of manie of those bookes are perished.”
the Council chamber named in the surviving Registers for Elizabeth’s reign were Robert Langham and Randolph Bellin. The keeper of the chamber was also used as a messenger to circulate amongst the various individual Privy Councillors at Court to inform them of council meetings.

The use of these surviving Registers by modern historians is complicated, however, by their variable nature. Anyone with any familiarity with the original Privy Council registers now mainly in PC 2 in the PRO will be aware that Caesar’s description of ‘greate faire paper bookes’ is not always applicable. The variations in character of these volumes were perhaps unintentionally obscured by the nineteenth-century editors of the printed editions of the Privy Council Registers Sir H. Nicholas and J. R. Dasent. For the period 1540 onwards that concerns us here, Dasent was able to perceive that the extant registers displayed a variety of different characteristics, but he was guilty of some inconsistencies in his application of the terms ‘fair’ and ‘rough’ copies when referring to these original registers. These inconsistencies in terminology were exposed and then clarified in two short but extremely helpful articles by E. R. Adair in 1915 and 1923. Adair showed how Dasent’s misuse of the terms ‘rough’ and ‘fair’ stemmed from a misapprehension of the process by which the Registers were produced; whether they had been copied up neat as a ‘fair’ copy or, more problematically, whether they were the contemporary ‘rough’ notes of the Clerks which had then been collected

---

18 PC 2/2 January 31 1547 to October 4 1549 ff 16/17; p 11/12 Wednesday 2 February 1547.
19 PC 2/12 8 April 1578 p 159 for Langham; PC 2/20 p 561 22 August 1592 to 26 August 1593 for Bellin. PC 2/12 p 424 has signature ‘Ran: Bellin’ and latin motto on verso of last leaf of first part of Register.
21 eg. APC Vol. VIII 1571-1575 intro p viii: Dasent terms this a fair copy and ‘heavily compressed’, or that the Clerk of the Council must have felt at liberty to abstain from transferring the less important business from the rough copy to the fair copy; as, however, no rough copy unfortunately remains, we are in this instance unable to supplement the information preserved in the fair copy.’
together and sorted into a chronological order to form the Register. Adair thought that only 4 volumes from the initiation of the Privy Council record in 1540 to the end of Elizabeth’s reign could be properly called ‘fair’ copies, where a ‘fair’ Register was one that had been copied up by one hand (or possibly more than one hand) in one go retrospectively (not concurrently) to the Council orders entered with the intention of a providing a neat copy. These neat copies were entered into a specially purchased and prebound paper book.\footnote{Adair 1923 p 415: these are now PRO PC 2/4, 7, 10, 11.}

These ‘fair’ registers are what Sir Julius Caesar described as the ‘greate faire paper bookees’, and it is not too difficult to spot the Registers that conform to this model. Firstly, the physical appearance of the paper utilised in a prebound book used is distinctive. The book was prebound and then cut to a uniform size either before or after being written in. The extant Registers are full of references to warrants to the Treasurer of the Chamber for the Clerks of the Council for money ‘for provision of paper, pennes, yncke and other necessaries’ as well as for the provision of paper ‘bookes’, which would then have been written into as ‘fair’ registers or for the construction of the other Council books dealing with Musters, etc.\footnote{Because of the practices of paper utilisation and merchandising, paper bought as a whole like this, whether prebound before being written on or not, tended to be either of a single paper stock or at least of a recognizably homogenous source. What this means in practice is that paper of the same price was of comparable physical dimensions (thickness and sheet size), and of either an identical or at the very least homogenous paper stock and watermark. Secondly, the form of entry of the Privy Council letters is regular and consistent: entries from different Council sessions and locations follow one another with no irregularites. Thirdly, the entries are generally made in the same hand, although this is not necessarily an indication of a}
‘fair’ register. It is apparent in some cases that the whole ‘fair’ copy was made in one go; sometimes they were not, and more than one hand was used. This also means that any signatures of Councillors entered in are copies in the hand of the clerk, and not autograph.

The other end of the spectrum was the ‘rough’ Register, made up of the collected drafts and notes made concurrently on separate sheets of paper by each attendant Clerk at the time of the Council sitting, and which were then collected and bound together to form the Register for that period. This brings us very quickly to some more questionable assumptions about the Privy Council process which are best examined in the company of other evidence than the Registers alone. Many of the surviving Registers refuse to conform conveniently to either of these two models for ‘fair’ or ‘rough’. Many Registers will simultaneously include different sections which may be closer in character to either the ‘rough’ or ‘fair’ model: sequences of neat copies of business covering a number of months entered neatly in one hand followed by a sequence of separate sheets of paper written in a number of different hands. From the two ends of the spectrum defined above, we can quickly appreciate that ‘fair’ registers tell us relatively little about the various administrative processes of the mid-Elizabethan Privy Council. Some of the useful things they can tell us are which documents were preserved, which Councillors sat in Council and whereabouts this was; what they do not allow is a closer insight into the process by which the Council drafted, debated and enacted its decisions on the broad range of issues it was expected to decide upon. For the purposes of investigating the Privy Council process and the various stages of drafting, debate and finalisation of documents, then the ‘rougher’ the register the better. Another associated problem for the history of the Privy Council is that the coverage of

the Registers for Elizabeth’s reign is not complete, partly due to the varying different ‘rough’ or ‘fair’ states of the surviving Registers, and partly also due to the outright loss of some of the Registers. Where we are left with ‘rough’ registers alone or none at all we can assume that the loss of the ‘fair’ registers was due to the Whitehall fire of 1619 and not the Clerk’s negligence.\textsuperscript{25}

The two registers now PC 2/12 and 13 covering the period 26 July 1577 to 26 June 1582 are excellent examples of the different processes by which working registers were compiled.\textsuperscript{26} These two Registers also give us the best insight into Privy Council process during the apogee of Beale’s own personal involvement as a Clerk of the Privy Council from c.1575 to 1587.\textsuperscript{27} The two registers previous to these (PC 2/10 and 11) that cover Beale’s early years as a Clerk are both fair copies made under the direction of the senior clerk Edmund Tremayne and are relatively uninformative, and the register or registers from July 1582 through to January 1586 are now unfortunately missing. PC 2/12 and 13 are ‘working fair’ registers, whose character matches neither the extremes of ‘fair’ and ‘rough’ described above. PC 2/12 is in fact made up of three separate books, each of which has been occasionally interspersed with inserted leaves when necessary.\textsuperscript{28} Both registers were compiled concurrently to Council meetings under the direction of the three attendant clerks Beale, Tremayne and Wilkes with the aid of their own personal clerks. The different forms of entry and compilation depended chiefly on the period of attendance that each Clerk was serving, which could vary from daily through to monthly stints. The period of attendance of each individual clerk seems to

\textsuperscript{25} Disregarding the varying coverage depending on ‘rough’ and ‘fair’ distinctions, we are missing (presumably due to the Whitehall fire of 1619) the Register for Elizabeth’s reign completely for the following periods: 12 May 1559 to 27 May 1562; PC 2/9 gives very patchy coverage from 28 May 1562 to 3 May 1567; 4 May 1570 to 23 May 1570; 27 June 1582 to 31 January 1586.
\textsuperscript{26} Cf. Pulman The Elizabethan Privy Council 1971 p 161.
\textsuperscript{27} Cf. APC Vol. X 1577-80 Introduction p viii; ‘Whilst the whole work seems to have been supervised and corrected by the hand of the principal Clerk of the Council, whose handwriting is worse than that of any of his subordinates...’. Not surprisingly, this refers to Beale.
have been decided amongst the Clerks themselves, which resulted in a fairly random pattern based presumably on individual convenience. In the summer of 1576 Beale’s fellow clerk Edmund Tremayne wrote to absolve him of any guilt in forcing on Tremayne his ‘continuall attendance to serve the place alone’, as Tremayne had himself witnessed that Beale had travelled on his first diplomatic mission to the Netherlands (discussed in the following chapter) ‘with a very evil will’. Poor Edmund Tremayne’s complaints were justified, as he was forced to act as the serving Clerk alone for the whole period Beale’s absence of April to July 1576. A period of four months without respite was rare indeed for the Clerks of the Privy Council. With on average two or three serving clerks, periods of actual ‘waiting’ on the Council at court were more likely to be a matter of days or weeks rather than months. Our only means of tracking these times of attendance is through examining the incidence of the handwriting of the serving Clerks and their respective personal clerks on the pages of these ‘working’ fair registers, and showing that the entries in these registers were made concurrently by the attendant clerks.

The transition in attendance between Clerks from day to day is indicated by the hand of one Clerk finishing off the entries from a previous Council meeting before starting off another that he was personally attendant upon. The periods of longer attendance are

---

28 PC 2/12 pp 1-206 26 July 1577 to June 23 1578, pp 207-424, pp 425-820 29 June 1578- 29 April 1580.
29 Brigham Young Vaults MS 457 letter 14, Tremayne to Beale 21 June 1576; there is a copy in Add MS 48149 ff 41a-41b.
30 Evidence for Tremayne’s attendance in the previous months of April and May 1576 is plentifully in Privy Council items in his hand; SP 12/108/10 29 April 1576 Council to Sir. T. Scott, T. Wotton et al.; 108/14 ff 49-50 4 May 1576 from Greenwich Council to Mr. Osborne of the Exchequer; 108/17 ff 54-55 9 May 1576 from Greenwich Council to Vice President and Council in the Marches of Wales. Thomas Wilkes and Henry Cheke were appointed as Clerks in July 1576 a matter of weeks after Tremayne’s complaint.
31 PC 2/12 pp 293-98 4 November to 9 November 1578. Beale and Clerk A finished off the entries for 4 November at Richmond, then Beale wrote the date for 6 November and list of Councillors present, first two letter texts and then lets Clerk A finish the rest to p 295. Beale then wrote date 8 November at Richmond and list of Councillors present as before, and then completed entry to p 296. Clerk A wrote date of ‘9 Novembris 1578 present as before’ and text to p 298, when Wilkes’s personal Clerk took over for that date’s entries. See also pp 749-50 entris
indicated where the entries of this character continue on for longer periods, or, more normally, periods of whole weeks or months are entered retrospectively in a neat fashion most usually in the hand of one of the Clerk of the Council's own personal clerks.\textsuperscript{32} The relative compression or space available for register entries can also help to indicate the variation between concurrent and retrospective entries. Where register entries had already been completed and the need to insert more material subsequently arose, then the Clerks would simply insert loose leaves or gatherings into the existing 'working' register that were then bound in at the correct date. These insertions are generally clearly evident as the handwriting may well be different to the rest of the register entry for that date, and the watermarks of the papers inserted indicating a separate stock.\textsuperscript{33} The general model for the register entries was for the waiting clerk to take the working register in hand after a period of time, most usually a week or so, and enter the headings of date, place, and presence lists in his own hand, perhaps also adding the introits of the following letters, the main text of which were then normally copied in by his own personal clerk or in the Clerk's own handwriting. This evidence of the handwriting in the registers also indicates the times when more than one Clerk was attendant at the same time and that these entries were necessarily concurrent with the Council meetings they referred to. In the last two weeks of April 1578 when the Court was at Greenwich both Beale and Clerk A and Tremayne and his own personal clerk

\textsuperscript{32} Evidence of copying up weekly in PC 2/13: on p 179 an unidentified hand finished entry at end of Oatlands sojourn 16 September 1580; Clerk A then began entries on p 179 for Richmond 18 September 1580 up until p 184 for 22 September 1580, when Beale added in the proceedings for 24 September 1580 at Richmond. Evidence for copying up monthly in PC 2/12 pp 666-79 4 September to 27 September 1579; all in hand of Clerk A. PC 2/13 pp 186-88 26 September 1580 Clerk A with Beale marginalia. Then pp 189-220 inserted sheets written up as a fair copy for proceedings 28 September 1580 - 24 October 1580 Richmond, all written by Clerk A. Beale has then added in pp 223-24 the odd missing letter for 8 and 10 October on next leaf of main book. Thereafter another hand takes over 30 October up until entry for 31 December 1580 on p 275.

\textsuperscript{33} PC 2/13 p 41/42 and 47/48 inserted single sheet written in hand of Clerk A 'At the Starre Chamber the viij of June 1580'. Beale has endorsed it on p 48 and has noted in margin 'But he came not for yt'; PC 2/13 pp 353-60 Declaration of Judgement of Arthur Hall 2 April 1581.
alternate in the register entries. Later that summer during the first week of June when the Court was at Greenwich again, the hands of Beale, Tremayne, Wilkes and their respective personal clerks made entries spanning only a couple of days. As perhaps might be expected, these periods of multiple attendance by the Clerks occur only when the Court is at Westminster or the more central London palaces and not when on progress further afield. Each of the Clerks of the Council such as Beale, Wilkes and Tremayne had their own personal Clerk - in Beale’s case, he employed two men, anonymous now and termed here as ‘Clerk A’ and ‘Clerk B’ over the period of his public life. Just as the service of the office holders such as Beale as Clerk of the Council could oscillate between ‘personal’ service to Walsingham as a man as much as to Walsingham as Principal Secretary, the service of these personal clerks could be transferred between the attending Clerks of the Council as and when necessary.

The system (or rather lack of it) of attendance upon the council was one decided upon between the serving clerks, and in early January 1579 the four clerks (Beale, Tremayne, Wilkes and also Henry Cheke) drew up on their own initiative a table outlining the months of attendance for each during the coming year so that only one was to be in attendance at any one time. A note in Beale’s hand at the foot of the table then entered the agreement into the Register ‘their to remain of record & to be observed ’by them’

---

Written up in another hand, signed by Hall on each sheet. The paper stock of both these examples differed from the stock used in the main register at each point.

34 PC 2/12 pp 163-70; Beale writes in date 13 April and begins list of councillors present which is finished by Clerk A, who continues letter text to bottom of p 165. Beale then fills in p 164 a letter concerning a controversy between Sir John Killigrew and Ambrose Digby. On p 167 Clerk A wrote date 16 April 1578 and list of Councillors present and then text of a letter with odd Beale additions to p 168. Tremayne and his personal Clerk then wrote in pp 168-69 the entry for Greenwich 19 April, and then Beale and his Clerk A wrote on p 169 the entry for Greenwich 27 April. Clerk A writes place and date and present list; then letter texts with Beale additions to bottom of p 170, then Tremayne and his Clerk onwards.

35 PC 2/12 p 188. Clerk A has written entries for place, date and list of councillors present for the entry for Greenwich 1 June 1578. Tremayne has then written the first paragraph of the first letter, followed by Clerk A with the rest of the letter text, and then Wilkes wrote the entry for 2 June 1578 on p 189.
accordingly.\textsuperscript{36} The idea of rotation or alternation of times of waiting for the various clerks had not hitherto been formalised to such an extent for the Clerks of the Privy Council, but it was not an altogether novel idea: the four serving Clerks of the Signet had been organised on a rotation of 2 serving each month by Cromwell as Principal Secretary in the 1530s.\textsuperscript{37} This schedule drawn up by the Clerks of the Privy Council in January 1579 went out of the window immediately. If there actually had been four serving clerks to alternate times of attendance, it may have worked better, but as we have already mentioned Cheke never fulfilled his duties: the absence of Cheke’s handwriting from the register serves to indicate that he probably never attended on the Council during his five years of holding the office.\textsuperscript{38} The plan for the months of attendance for Beale, Tremayne and Wilkes was never really followed to the letter, as the pattern of entries into the register indicates that Beale and Wilkes took over the duties of waiting more and more as Tremayne travelled into his native West Country later on in the year. The plan for the rotation of waiting drawn up on January 3 1579 was therefore no watershed in the history of either the Elizabethan Privy Council or of its Clerks: what it indicated, however, is that the perception that terms of waiting should have been as organised and as mutually acceptable to the individual clerks as possibly could be. The practicalities of an itinerant court and council, and of the multifarious other duties that the individual clerks carried out meant that these periods of waiting were most probably sorted out on a weekly or monthly basis nearer the time.

The main responsibilities of the Clerks therefore centred around the production of letters and then the efficient entry of these into the Register. The first part of this involved integrating their work in drafting and copying letters with the Principal

\textsuperscript{36} PC 2/12 pp 355-58 inserted sheet; p 355 written on in another clerk’s hand; 
Secretary, whilst the second part did not. Once the Privy Council letters had been
drafted, copied, circulated, signed and despatched, it was the responsibility of the
Clerks alone to ensure that these were then entered into the register. For the registers
that are not too ‘fair’ to preclude learning anything of this process, there is a singular
absence of any indication of any involvement of the Principal Secretary (or any other
Councillors at that) in the keeping of the registers. In all of the surviving registers for
Elizabeth’s reign, the handwriting of a Privy Councillor occurs only twice, and on both
these occasions it is Cecil’s roman hand correcting items that have been inserted into
the respective registers as loose sheets of paper.\textsuperscript{39} Not once (as far as I am aware) does
Walsingham’s hand occur in the registers covering the period of his Principal
Secretaryship from 1573 to 1590.

Disregarding the obvious differences between the characters of the registers depending
on how ‘rough’ or ‘fair’ they might be, it would seem that the ‘model’ for the reformed
Privy Council register was perfected under William Thomas, Armigal Waad and
Bernard Hampton under Northumberland in the early 1550s. Beale himself certainly
seemed to have thought that the keeping of the Council register under the duke of
Northumberland was the ideal model to be striven for. In his 1592 \textit{Treatise} he pointed
out that the practice of circulating letters for signing amongst Councillors at Court
meant that no record of these signatures was recorded in the Register; ‘And therefore it
were good to renewe the order kept in K. Edwards time, the next daye after their Ls had

\textsuperscript{38} Cheke had been abroad in July 1576 when he was meant to have taken the oath with Wilkes,
and upon his return to the country in 1579 headed North.
\textsuperscript{39} PC 2/9 p 137 main text in secretary hand of Bernard Hampton, Cecil’s hand indicated by italic;
‘At Westminster the xiiiij th of december 1564. Thapparance as before, except mr. Petre... The
matters in controversie betweene the marchantes of Moscovia and Bondes and foxall with their
parterners trading to the narue ‘in lyveland’...’; PC 2/13 pp 521-24 17 September 1582. Date and
present appearances by Beale, then draft of letter in Clerk A hand with corrections by Cecil and
Beale. ‘Uppon the cominge upp of certaine [inhabitantes] of ye Erle of Shrewsburyes tenantes of
his manor of Gossopdale...’.
signed ye lres, to sett their handes to the entries of the booke.\textsuperscript{40} The only surviving Edwardian Register to conform to this description is now PC 2/4, the Register from 19 April 1550 to 15 June 1553. This was organised and kept by William Thomas, appointed clerk on 19 April 1550, and continued in like fashion by Bernard Hampton, and the copies of the despatched Council letters entered into the Register are regularly signed by the Councillors themselves. Thomas was also given express responsibility for the keeping of the Register, and also that no Council warrant for payment sent to the Treasurer should be allowed if not also bearing his signature.\textsuperscript{41} The registers for the last decade of Elizabeth’s reign under the care of Armigal Waad’s son William as senior Clerk of the Council show a reversion to this format; the ‘working’ fair volumes such as PC 2/12 and 13 that characterise Beale and Wilkes’s decade of waiting are replaced by fairer volumes which were still copied up concurrently by the waiting clerks and their personal clerks into whole paper books. These fair books show signs of manifest care that were hitherto absent, including lists of the councillors inserted invariably by Waad or Rogers into the front cover or the front papers, which are then signed by the serving clerks, and on occasion Waad signed pages of the register himself.\textsuperscript{42}

The settled number of three serving Clerks, who rotated their time of waiting either individually or in pairs, seems to have been continued from the early 1540s through to the following century. One consequence of the perpetuity of the office was that the timing of the coming and going of the Clerks of the Council was, like that of the Privy Councillors, a fairly random motion controlled mostly by the mortality of their immediate predecessors. The other main catalyst for new appointments was the enforced absence of one or more of the clerks abroad. The clerks were generally all

\textsuperscript{40} Beale \textit{Treatise} p 425
\textsuperscript{41} PC 2/4 p 320 April 1550, printed Dasent Vol. 3 p 4.
\textsuperscript{42} PC 2/15 list of councillors names and signed by Waad on p 1; Ashley has added his signature at a later date; ‘W Waad’ at foot of p 445 and p 466, the last page in Register. Also PC 2/17 front
men who served the crown in diplomatic missions, special envoys used for their knowledge of the continent, and for their linguistic and bureaucratic skills as much as for their trustworthiness. William Waad and Thomas Edmondes were created Clerks in 1583 and 1599 respectively to raise their status before embarking on diplomatic missions; Daniel Rogers was given the office in 1587 more as a retrospective reward for his long service abroad. These stints away from court and the Privy Council were therefore often also the catalyst for the appointment of new clerks. As noted above, whilst Beale was away in the Netherlands in the summer of 1576, poor Edmund Tremayne’s ‘blind eyes’ would find respite with the appointment of two new Clerks Thomas Wilkes and Henry Cheke in July 1576. A combination of the political fall-out of the execution of Mary and the demands of the Netherlands expedition in 1587 led to the appointment of Rogers and Anthony Ashley.

Another possible influence on the appointment of the Clerks was of course the death of the reigning monarch and the transition from one ‘regime’ to another. Here we might expect the effect of political patronage to be most blatant as the change of regimes hastened the pursuit of offices by anxious clients. Thomas Chaloner and William Honningses oversaw the transition from Henry VIII to Protector Somerset under Edward, but may well have been encouraged to retire after the fall of Somerset in 1549. Likewise Armigail Waad, appointed under Somerset, may not have continued to serve under Northumberland, when William Thomas and Bernard Hampton were both appointed. In comparison, the only apparent casualty of the three serving Clerks in the transition from Edward VI and Northumberland to Mary 1553 was William Thomas, too closely affiliated to Northumberland and then involved in the Wyatt conspiracy in 1554. The change of ‘regime’ from Mary to Elizabeth was anything but revolutionary as far as the Clerks were concerned. By the time the Marian Privy Council had settled
down under the tutelage of William Paget in 1555, the three Clerks Francis Allen, William Smith and Bernard Hampton were able to continue their service into the first decade of Elizabeth’s reign. The next transitional period of 1571-72 was brought about solely by the deaths of these three incumbents rather than by any more political manoeuvring. Their replacements Tremayne and Beale were solid protestants who had close links with Cecil, Leicester and Walsingham in turn. The following batch of Clerks who served in the late 1580s and 1590s William Waad, Anthony Ashley and Daniel Rogers again manifested the same diverse political affiliations with the principal Privy Councillors. Both Waad and Rogers had links with Burghley, Leicester and Walsingham alike; Ashley passed from his West Country links to Bedford and Leicester to follow Essex in the 1590s.

Despite the predominantly random issue of mortality, these periods or decades are characterised in the various Registers by the dominant hands of the waiting clerks and their sub-clerks. The Clerks of the first decade of Elizabeth’s reign, Hampton, Smith, Allen and Armigal Waad, were all regulars who had served either under Edward VI and Mary if not both. The period from 1576 onwards is dominated by Tremayne, Wilkes and Beale until Tremayne retired in 1580, when Wilkes and Beale between them waited alternately until the mid-1580s. The care of the registers and daily attendance on the Council was then passed into the hands of a new threesome consisting of William Waad, Anthony Ashley and Daniel Rogers during the late 1580s until the late 1590s, when Rogers was replaced by Thomas Smith in 1596.

The Privy Council owed its remarkable administrative resilience and ongoing evolution over the mid-Tudor years to the continuity of these key groups of inter-connected personnel who filled the offices of Principal Secretary and Clerks of the Council during

p 589 list of Council members drawn up by Rogers and signed by him and Waad at bottom.
the years c.1540 to c.1570.\textsuperscript{43} This is not to say that all these men serving as Principal Secretaries were equal merely on account of their office holding, or that all utilised the same procedures and wielded the same power. The mainstay of this unbroken succession was undoubtedly the chain of personnel whose political ideologies and practices were chiefly characterised by a shared attitude to the centrality of an effective ‘reformed’ Secretaryship in government: Wriothesley, Paget, Sadler, Mason, Petre, Cecil and then Walsingham.\textsuperscript{44} These Principal Secretaries were backed up and abetted by the men of the second tier of political society who served them as either their household servants or as administrative royal servants such as the Clerks of the Council, some of whom later rose to become Principal Secretary themselves. It was through the means of this unbroken succession of personnel that the succession of common administrative practice was continued. Although it is no longer true to say that behind every great man is a great woman, here it is suggested that behind every great Principal Secretary was on the one side his own secretariat staffed by his own trusted or ‘inward’ men, and on the other the Clerks of the Council. It was this continuity of personnel rather than any independent institutional momentum that defined the form of conciliatory government passed on into Elizabeth’s reign.\textsuperscript{45}

Given these broader trends, it is interesting to observe how well these fit in with recent evaluations of the Privy Council politics of the mid-Tudor and Elizabethan years. The


\textsuperscript{44} Elton Tudor Revolution 1953 p 368.
Clerks of the Council worked hand in hand with the Principal Secretaries, and the continuity offered to the Edwardian and Marian Privy Council by the three Principal Secretaries Paget, Petre and Cecil seems to have been mirrored by the men serving them as the Clerks. Bernard Hampton served under Cecil under Edward VI, and then with Paget under Mary. In the first decade of Elizabeth’s reign William Cecil as Principal Secretary guided the administration of the Privy Council with Petre, John Mason and Ralph Sadler alongside initially as experienced support. The continuing service of Hampton, Francis Allen, William Smith and Arnigal Waad as Clerks of the Council strengthened this administrative and political continuity. The mid-Elizabethan years of Walsingham’s office from c. 1571 onwards to c. 1587 are dominated by a new group of men without explicit patronage obligations to any particular Privy Councillor, linked instead by their cosmopolitan outlook and ideological coherence with the three principal Privy Councillors Cecil, Leicester and Walsingham. The last 15 years of the reign saw William Waad, Daniel Rogers and Anthony Ashley take over and continue the administration of the Council as before.

Each of the individual Clerks obviously entered as a relatively inexperienced novice in Council affairs and learnt their trade within the environment of the Council chamber with their more senior colleagues and the serving Principal Secretaries (as well as William Cecil for the mid-Elizabethan clerks) to guide them. Beale had entered into royal service as a junior Clerk in 1572, and then gradually rose to play a senior role by the end of the 1570s. The degree of responsibility accorded to each of the Clerks could vary: Beale’s multi-faceted link with Walsingham as clerk and servant yet also as a familiar ensured that during the later 1570s and early 1580s he was at the heart of Council process. When Walsingham was absent during his missions to France from

45 Partly to support this argument, a chronological list of the appointments and then the length of service of each individual Clerk of the Privy Council over the period c.1540-1600 is provided in Appendix 3 below.
June to October 1578 and from July to September 1581, Sir Thomas Wilson as second Secretary had acted as sole Principal Secretary. Wilson had died at the end of 1581 and had not been replaced, so when Walsingham’s mission to Scotland was to take him away from the Court and Council for the autumn of 1583, Beale was in Walsingham’s eyes the natural temporary replacement for his own position as Principal Secretary. ‘Ffor that mr Sommers fyndethe him selfe unapt for the seruyce’, Walsingham wrote to Burghley before his departure, ‘I thinke no other wyll be fownde more apt for the place than this bearer my brother Beale, yt her matye shall allowe thearof.’ And so whilst Walsingham travelled north to Scotland Beale fulfilled the duties of Principal Secretary that were already extremely familiar to him from his years of service to Walsingham and Privy Council as Clerk. Beale forwarded information and news back and forth to Walsingham when necessary and took care of administrative matters himself. Beale was forced to act as both Principal Secretary and Clerk of the Council for some of this time and was accordingly fairly busy. ‘I have little leisure to write’, he told the Earl of Rutland in September 1583, ‘being forced alone to supply Mr. Secretary’s room and my ordinary place.’

We have no means of verifying Beale’s performance as Clerk as the register for these years is lost. More fragmentary evidence from this time is provided by surviving Privy Council letters drafted or sent out; for example, at the end of September 1583 three letters in the name of Elizabeth, Burghley and the Privy Council were written to

---

46 British Library MS Microfilm 488; British Library RP 1084/2.
47 Harl MS 6993 ff 54-55 6 August 1583 Walsingham to Burghley from Barn Elmes. Autograph. Temporary replacements for Principal Secretaries were not unknown: cf. Add MS 35831 ff 32-33 25 May 1562 Robert Jones to Nicholas Throckmorton from Belchers; ‘Mr Secretary goeth this next weke as it is said into Lincolnhire for a three wekes as some thinke that mr mildmay shall for the tyme supply his place but this is uncertaine. ...’.
48 Harl MS 6993 ff 56-57 26 August 1583 Walsingham to Burghley from Newcastle. Autograph. ‘My verrye good L. fynding by a later letter receyued from my brother Beale yt your L. during that tyme of a lyttle progresse begunne by her mat on Tuesday had somme dysposytyon to retyre home: I thought good to dyrect the packet unto your L.’
49 HMC Rutland I p 140; Beale to Rutland 12 September 1582 <ie. 1583> from Oatlands.
Richard Bingham to act against pirates. These are all drafted by Beale and Burghley together and then copied up neat by Beale’s Clerk A.\textsuperscript{50} Beale was at this time at the apogee of his political power and was therefore now more than able to offer his service to those he felt obliged to or to those he felt deserved it. In August 1583 Beale wrote to the earl of Shrewsbury on the subject of the failure of the attempts to achieve a tripartite treaty between Elizabeth, Mary Queen of Scots and James VI: ‘Although I be no great dealer in the matters of this world,’ Beale continued on a more personal note, ‘yet shall I be glad to doe you any service’.\textsuperscript{51} Walsingham returned to England in October but Beale hereafter continued to fill in as acting junior Principal Secretary as and when necessary. A ‘memoriall of affayres’ in Beale’s hand for the first week of December 1583 lists the Privy Council issues and the subject items to be tackled that week, from a meeting with Archbishop Whitgift to a review of the state of the maritime fortifications of England beginning with the Isle of Wight.\textsuperscript{52} Later that month Beale was writing to Walsingham informing him how he had been forced to insist to Elizabeth that although her ‘hed ake’d she must sign the papers he had brought with him. Beale was also reading material aloud for Elizabeth’s digestion, and patently continuing to aid Walsingham in his performance of his duties as Principal Secretary.\textsuperscript{53} During these years, whenever Walsingham fell ill or was unavailable, Beale would present himself

\textsuperscript{50} Add MS 35831 ff 299-300 31 Sep 1583 ‘Instructions for Richard Bingham gent. appoynted to repayre with two of her Mates shippes unto the seas for the takinge of suche pirates as infest the costaes of this realme’, written in hand of Clerk A and endorsed ‘At Otelandes Ultimo Septembri 1583’, signed by Privy Council; ff 302-03 Draft of letter from Elizabeth to Council to instruct Richard Bingham in action against pirates October 1583; main text in Burghley’s hand, with introit and conclusion (both added later) by Beale; copy of this in Clerk A’s hand is ff 304-05; ff 306-07 is a neat copy in Clerk A’s hand of letter from Elizabeth to Bingham directing him to follow Privy Council instructions.


\textsuperscript{52} SP 12/164/ f 4 December 1 1583 endd. by Beale ‘A memoriall of affayres. p^° Deceb.;’ item preceding this is SP 12/164/ ff 2-3 ink Burghley autograph notes on Council matters endd. ‘ij Dece. 1583. Memorayll of matters of Counsell’.

\textsuperscript{53} SP 12/164/ ff 56-57 Beale to Walsingham 17 December 1583 at Windsor autograph.
before Elizabeth to read correspondence, take notes and do whatever else was necessary for the smooth running of her busy commonwealth.\textsuperscript{54}

This period of Beale’s political maturity coincided with the succession of John Whitgift to the see of Canterbury and the intensification of the struggle for the heart of the English church that would occupy much of Beale’s time and energy till his death in 1601.\textsuperscript{55} The controversy over the Oath of Subscription demanded by Whitgift of all ministers in late 1583 had rumbled on over the winter, and Beale had been advising, directing and encouraging the complaints of some of the dissatisfied ministers. Whilst serving as Principal Secretary during this time, Beale had delivered the supplications of the ministers of Suffolk and Kent to Whitgift in the autumn of 1583 at the orders of the Privy Council. He had also used his position at the Council table to attempt to influence the Privy Councillors to act against Whitgift, who had then accused Beale of encouraging the disaffected ministers in their disobedience by insisting that Whitgift was out on a limb against the rest of the Privy Council. Whitgift wrote to Cecil to accuse Beale as ‘one of the principall causes of the waywardnes of diuers’, ‘because he giuseth encouragement unto diuers of them to stande in the matter, telling them that the articles shalbe reuoked shortlie by the councell, and that my hands shall be stopped’. Beale was then obliged by Burghley the following July to justify himself against Whitgift’s charge of being ‘ouerbolde in speakinge in Counsell’. ‘Attendinge althoughe unworthlie in mr Secretarye’s absence,’ Beale replied that he may well have ‘cast out some wordes in matters concerninge papistes, gods & her maties mortall enemys’. If

\textsuperscript{54} SP 12/173 ff 17-18 ink September 7 1584 Beale to Walsingham from Oatlands autograph.
\textsuperscript{55} Collinson, Puritan Movement; passim; Lake, P. Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church CUP Cambridge 1982.
any further complaints were forthcoming then Beale simply offered to be ‘ridd of my place’, and ‘someother preferred that maye serve better.’ The offer was not taken up.56

Beale was to lose his battle with Whitgift, but he did not go down without a fight conducted for the best part of the next decade, and the eventual outcome was probably beyond the control of any single individual other than Elizabeth herself. Beale’s service in supplying Walsingham’s place as Principal Secretary in the mid-1580s signalled the apogee of Beale’s political influence. The next most graphic instance that clearly demonstrates how closely intergrated Beale was in mid-Elizabethan political life was his role in the execution of Mary Queen of Scots in early 1587, which is covered in detail in Chapter 8 below. Somewhat ironically perhaps, this incident also signalled the end of his abode here at the centre of public life: ‘sithe which time’, he complained to Burghley a few years afterwards in 1593, ‘I haue neither had anie credit or contenance’.57 Beale stopped attending the Privy Council Chamber as a Clerk of the Privy Council after 1587, although he continued to enjoy his fee paid quarterly for the office. Thereafter, Beale’s service to the Elizabethan polity was continued along more strictly diplomatic lines, principally as a technical advisor on form and precedent as well as at a more ideological level in terms of advice on policy. These forms of diplomatic service were conducted for most of Beale’s political life from the late 1560s in parallel to the administrative services he performed as a clerk of the Privy Council described above. It is to Beale’s role as a specialist in diplomatic affairs that we now turn in the next Chapter.

56 Add MS 48039 ff 48-56 in hand of Clerk A ‘The answer of Robert Beale concerninge such thinges as haue passed betwene the L. Archbishop of Canterbury and him.’ dated by Beale ‘Primo Julij 1584 For my L. Ther,.’; f 49a, f 55b. See also SP 12/172/1.
57 Add MS 48064 ff 106-115b draft of Letter in hand of Clerk B from Beale to Burghley 17 March 1593. See also Lansdowne MS 73 ff 4-14b for letter actually sent to Burghley.
Chapter 6. Beale as a Diplomatic Specialist, c.1576 - 1601

'The Worthie Instrument of State Robert Beale Esq: …one of her Maties Councillors For the affairs of the Lowe Countrey with the Earle of Leicester, and extraordinary Ambassador at sundry times to the Princes Electores and other Protestant Princes of Germany, and implored in the Treaty of peace with Spain at Bullen’. Inscription on tomb of Beale’s daughter Margaret Yelverton, Easton Maudit, Northamptonshire.1

By the early 1570s Beale was well on the way to becoming a recognised diplomatic specialist - or man of business if you like - whose travels, education, secretarial and administrative expertise and political familiarity with the most powerful and influential men in England all recommended him as the ideal ‘instrument of state’. It is perhaps surprising, then, that Beale’s name appears in the standard narrative accounts concerning Elizabethan foreign policy as literally no more than a footnote. Beale is mentioned less than a handful of times in the formidable body of work produced over a period of nearly forty years by R. B. Wernham, and is equivalently anonymous in the discussions of foreign policy in the three volumes of Wallace MacCaffrey’s account of Elizabeth’s reign.2 The actual extent of Beale’s involvement in diplomatic affairs over the years discussed below might call this relative historiographical anonymity into question. In addition to this, it is Beale’s own archive of manuscript papers that often forms the primary source basis of much of our knowledge of many of these affairs.

1 Bridges, J. The History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire ed. P. Whalley, 1791 Volume II p 166.
Beale could perform this diplomatic service in a number of ways. The most direct form of service was to undertake whatever mission or legation was necessary and act as a diplomatic representative in person. His first diplomatic mission of this sort was to the Netherlands in the summer of 1576, and his last as part of the English negotiating team for the Treaty of Boulogne in 1600. In between, he journeyed to the German States in the winter of 1577/78, to the Netherlands again in 1587 as one of the English representatives on the council of State, and to the captive Mary Queen of Scots six times between 1575 and her death in 1587. However, the performance of service in person in missions such as these was not seen by men like Beale as a career in itself, but more as either a necessary prelude or as an ongoing but occasional aspect of their wider diplomatic service. In this wider capacity, Beale also performed service by acting as a resident intellectual or technical advisor to the Privy Councillors who were responsible for the formulation of policy and for the provision of advice and counsel in person to the Queen. Beale’s advice and counsel to these men was delivered through two associated means: firstly, through the more technical aspects of drafting, composing or checking diplomatic correspondence and treaties utilising Beale’s legal, linguistic and secretarial skills, and secondly through the associated but more nebulous role as a general advisor on policy and alignment in the complex and changeable world of European politics. The forms of interaction between this diplomatic service as a legate or ambassador, as a technical expert and as an advisor or source of counsel constituted the fabric of much of Beale’s mature political life.

The use here of ‘diplomatic’ as an adjective to qualify this particular arena of Beale’s performance of service itself invites some further qualification. ‘Diplomacy’ in most cases is used by historians interchangeably (or at the least synonymously) for ‘foreign
policy’, and the most recent historiographical battles over Elizabethan ‘foreign policy’ have generally been conducted around the issue of whether any of the aims and motivations lying behind the conduct of Elizabethan diplomacy were sufficiently conscious and coherent to be dignified by the title of a ‘policy’ at all.\footnote{Wilson, C. Queen Elizabeth and the Revolt of the Netherlands 1970; Wernham, R. B. The Making of Elizabethan Foreign Policy 1558-1603 University of California Press LA 1980. For a brief review see Pettegree, A. ‘Elizabethan Foreign Policy’, Hist Jour 31 (1988) pp. 965-72 and Doran, S. ‘The Principles of Elizabeth’s Foreign Policy’, History Review 15 (1993), pp. 1-5.} Whilst not wishing to become bogged down within the terms of these debates, it is possible to suggest that there were a few areas of consensus concerning the most basic and fundamental issues categorized now under ‘foreign policy’ that concerned or drove contemporaries like Beale.\footnote{MacCaffrey, W. T. ‘The Anjou Match and the Making of Elizabethan Foreign Policy’, in P. Clark, A. Smith and N. Tyacke (eds.), The English Commonwealth, 1547-1640 NY 1979, pp. 59-76; Adams, S. ‘Spain or the Netherlands? The Dilemmas of Early Stuart Foreign Policy’ in ed. H. Tomlinson Before the Civil War London 1983, pp. 79-101; Thorp, M. ‘Catholic Conspiracy in Early Elizabethan Foreign Policy’, Sixteenth Century Journal 15 (1984), pp. 147-68; Kouri, E. I. ‘For true faith or national interest? Queen Elizabeth I and the protestant powers’, in Kouri, E. I. and Scott, T. eds. Politics and Society in Reformation Europe 1987.} The first issue of consensus suggested here is that the inhabitants of Elizabethan England by no means perceived their country to be an island state capable of withstanding any invasion whatsoever behind the defensive shield of its invincible navy. To the contrary, many of the good protestant Elizabethans such as Beale were consistently terrified of the prospects of an invasion, threatened as they saw it from the French intervention in Scotland in 1560, from the alliance of Spanish and Irish forces with rebel domestic Catholics in the West, or from the threat posed by the Spanish forces based in the Netherlands being loaded onto a passing Armada and deposited on the shores of Essex and Kent.\footnote{For the realistic grounds of such fears, see Parker, G. ‘If the Armada had Landed’, in his Spain and the Netherlands London 1989, pp. 135-48.} The second issue of consensus suggested here is that ideology, and here that means religion, mattered in some significant manner to the English diplomats and Privy Councillors responsible for the evaluation of foreign policy, and that it is probably true enough to say that religion mattered more to many of these advisors and servants than it did to Elizabeth herself. ‘Religion’ or ideology was
never the sole significant driving force for any individual diplomat and Privy Councillor, but in Beale’s case his religious commitment to an evangelical reformed faith cast an enormous shadow over the rest of his outlook, either obscuring or transforming other issues into allied or subservient roles. The third and for the moment final issue of consensus suggested here is the persistence of the importance of English trade and commercial interests in the formulation of policy throughout the myriad circumstantial twists and turns of European politics.

The dynamic controlling the relationship between these three chief concerns of defence, religion and trade are well demonstrated in Beale’s first solo diplomatic mission to the Prince of Orange at the end of April 1576. The immediate causes for Beale’s mission were the recent kidnapping of Lucrecia d’Affeytadi, the Italian fiancée of the Portuguese Ambassador in London, and the molestation of the Earl of Oxford returning from France by Dutch vessels based out of Flushing. At first glance these incidents seem small beer compared to the wider manoeuvring of European politics, however annoying they may have been to Oxford’s pride and to the ongoing negotiations between England and Portugal to re-open trade. They were, however, two of the long line of straws that were being heaped upon the proverbial camel’s back, as Burghley complained of the ‘the universall barbarysme’ of the ‘rable of common pyrates or worse’ that manned the Dutch fleet based out of Flushing, and recommended that Beale persuade the Prince of Orange to hang ‘v or vj such therein, as if he war rid of an hundred of them, his cause wold prosper better, and his frendes wold increase.’

More importantly, the catalyst for a complete breakdown in the relations between the Prince of Orange and the English had come with the seizure in early April of a good

---

part of that most prized and important of the cogs that kept the English economy turning - the vessels of the Merchant Adventurers. Eight Merchant Adventurers’ ships had set sail from Antwerp to London via Flushing on around the 2nd April, and these had been stayed by the Dutch at Flushing four days later when they attempted to pass through; to make matters worse, six more ships belonging to the Merchant Adventurers bound from London to Antwerp travelling in the opposite direction had also met the same fate.⁸ William of Orange could probably hardly believe his luck, and by means of an excuse the Dutch quickly put it out that they had stayed these Merchant Adventurers’ ships in reprisal for four Dutch ships held by the English at Falmouth for suspected privateering in early March 1576.⁹ This was the beginning of a situation of complete stalemate, where these four Dutch ships held in the West Country provided the Dutch with a somewhat specious counter-demand to balance that for the release of the Merchants Adventurers’s ships. Meanwhile, heavily pressed by his military commitments that summer, the Prince of Orange attempted to extract a significant loan from the reluctant Merchant Adventurers in return for the release of their ships. When the Prince said as much to Beale’s fellow English envoy Daniel Rogers, Rogers suggested a compromise that the ships bound for England might be allowed to depart and those bound for Antwerp held as many of the English merchants were in danger of bankruptcy. The Prince’s answer to this, Rogers reported, was that ‘it were better for merchantes to be banckroutes than that he should be banckrout’. Beale also stated later in October that he also had been told to his face that ‘the `prince´ never ment to release

⁷ SP 70/138/ff 42-43. Also printed in Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l’Angleterre sous le règne de Philippe II. Publiées par M. C. Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove 11 Volumes Brussels 1882-1900 (hereafter Relations politiques) vol 8 p 340.
⁸ Relations politiques 8 p 328. SP 70/138/ ff 3-5 Daniel Rogers to <Walsingham or Burghley> 1 April 1576; Relations politiques 8 p 333.
⁹ First mention is had of the 4 Dutch warships stayed in Falmouth sometime near the end of February in Herle’s letter to Burghley of 11 March: “four shippes of warre, having more than iij men aboord, shoold be stayed in the west country to their extreme charges these xiiij or xvij dayes, without cause whye, and long heffore this chance happened...”. Relations politiques 8 p 250-56; see also Add MS 14028 f 7.
[that] ‘the said shippes’ without som composition’. The possible ironies of the situation were not lost on some contemporaries: Beale himself compared this with Elizabeth’s seizure of the Genovese Merchant’s gold bound for Alva in December 1568.

English trade had not yet come to terms fully with the rapidly evolving political and military barriers and obstructions that the Dutch revolt had thrown up. The transition in the 1560s from the traditional Anglo-Burgundian alliance and the revolt in the Netherlands had led to collapse of the Antwerp wool mart, and English trade was transferred to various other continental venues over the following decades with variable levels of success. The wartime necessity to limit their enemy’s trade brought the Prince and the rebel provinces into direct conflict with the interests of two main Merchant groups in England; the all-powerful Merchant Adventurers, and the fledgling Spanish Company. Despite ongoing negotiations with the English merchants, the Prince of Orange’s dilemma was that whilst he appreciated the importance of not antagonizing the English government too much, he appreciated equally the importance of the trade embargo against the Spanish controlled provinces. There was a certain natural sympathy for the Prince’s dilemma amongst many of the protestant English: ‘for

---

10 Add MS 48116 f 15a.
11 Read, C. ‘Queen Elizabeth’s seizure of the Duke of Alva’s pay-ships’, Journal of Modern History 5 (1933), pp 443-64. See also Beale to Burghley, 5 June 1576 Cotton Galba C.V ff 254-55; printed Relations politiques 8 p 396-98, ‘I am a’frayd they will have monye upon these goodes before they be released: ffor bye that which I heare of som of his counsell, the prince thinketh he may lawfully do ‘so’ upon bondes of the Estate for ther repayment, as her mty stayed for her uses money comeng out of Spayne.”
these questions rise not, because those of Zeeland have hadd wille to deale with the
Inglish nation’, wrote John Hastings to Burghley in March 1576, ‘but that they seeke to
cut of ther ennimies trade, wherin I cannot blame them.’

Despite this, in early 1576 the irritation and exasperation expressed by Burghley with
what was seen as Dutch ‘piracy’ was shared by a number of influential men whose first
instinct was otherwise to support Orange. When Beale departed for the Netherlands in
April 1576, he also carried with him a joint letter from Sussex, Leicester and
Walsingham to the Prince of Orange that articulated the frustration brought about by
the misdemeanours of the Flusshengers from the men who were his strongest favourers
on the English Privy Council. These three Privy Councillors were pressed into
underlining the negative effects that the incessant privateering had inflicted on the
standing of the Prince’s cause with the country in general, and with the Queen in
particular. The seriousness of the diminution of the Prince’s standing was further
emphasised in letters that Beale received from other men writing on behalf of English
merchants: Sir Edward Horsey wrote on behalf of John Marsh, one of the chief
Merchants Adventurers, and Henry Hastings 3rd Earl of Huntingdon and John Hastings
on behalf of another merchant, Peter Geydon of Poole. Huntingdon urged Beale to
persuade the Prince ‘to take sum order that flusshynge may be freed from that slander
which seemyth in mannye partes of thyss realme to bee spreddde of yt.’ For men like
Huntingdon and Beale, this was not all about taxes and trade, but about the diminution
of the standing of the reformed religion with which the Dutch success against Philip II

---

13 For the Merchant Adventurers, see Ramsay 1975 and 1986. For the Spanish Company and its
attempts to be incorporated during the period 1574-77, see Croft 1973. For the blockade of
Emden from 1574 to 1576 see Pettegree Emden 1992 Chapter 7.
14 , SP 70/137/ ff 243-44 Hastings to Burghley, 19 March 1576; printed Relations politiques 8 p
287-88.
15 Relations politiques 8 pp 341-42.
was inextricably tied: ‘At which owre papystes doo not a lytell rejoyce, and take as they thynkes no smalle cause of aduantage agaynst ye professors of ye gospell.’

The narrative of the negotiations conducted by the English representatives Beale, Daniel Rogers and then Sir William Winter with the Prince of Orange and his advisors and the Admiralty court at Flushing over the spring and summer of 1576 is long and tortuous and was patently frustrating for Beale, caught in between the rock of an irate Queen on the other side of the channel, and the hard places of some nervous English merchants and a polite but ultimately politique Prince of Orange. The wider political background and context for Beale’s mission was formed by the ongoing debate over whether or how to aid the breakaway states of Holland and Zealand under the authority of the Prince of Orange. English diplomatic envoys had been sent in late 1575 and early 1576 to Spain, to the Spanish government in the Netherlands under Requescens, and to the Prince of Orange to try to arrange a peaceful solution in which Elizabeth proposed herself as mediatrix. Return delegations from Orange and Requescens had arrived in London in early 1576, and William Davison had then been despatched to the Spanish Council of State on an eventually futile mission to attempt to manufacture a peaceful solution. The English position was shot through with the inconsistencies resulting from their desire to forestall at all costs the approach by the Dutch to the French for protection, and their inability to offer the Dutch anything concrete as an alternative. At the same time the continuation of English commercial trade with the Spanish-controlled Netherlands was also considered of paramount importance.

---

16 Egerton MS 1694, ff 5, 6-7, 8-9.
17 Sir Henry Cobham fell ill on the way to Spain and was unable to complete his assignement; John Hastings was sent to the Prince of Orange and Robert Corbet to Requescens in October 1575 Hastings’s instructions are Cotton MS Galba C.V ff 191-200, ‘taken from a copy in my Lord Treasurer’s hand’; printed in Relations politiques 8 pp 10-16; Corbet’s instructions are printed in Relations politiques 8 pp 2-10.
18 See Burghley’s memo now Cotton MS Galba C.V no. 32; printed Relations politiques 8 p 127-29. On the possible split between Sussex, Leicester and Walsingham on the one side and
Beale's instructions drawn up in the Privy Council meeting of 15 April outlined the importance of the release of the Merchant Adventurers' shipping stayed in Flushing, and for good measure Beale was also given a list of English mercantile grievances stretching back over the previous years.\textsuperscript{19} Beale met first with the officers of the Admiralty in Flushing on 27 April to demand the release of the ships and to present the list of other English shipping or goods taken, and also he presented a more general enquiry into the legality of the conduct of the Flussingers in the light of international law and extant treaties between Flanders and England.\textsuperscript{20} The officers of the Admiralty sent Beale a brief reply on the last day of April, and the Prince of Orange made his first formal declaration of the stalemate in the Mémoire du Prince d'Orange sent to England on 7 May 1576.\textsuperscript{21} The Dutch advisor to the Prince of Orange Jean Calvart wrote to Walsingham recognising that these replies were unlikely to be to the 'entire contentment' of the English Privy Council, given that the Prince's answer was in fact a straight reply in kind, listing the injuries done by the English to subjects of Holland and Zealand on the seas, and guaranteed to please no one on the other side of the channel, least of all the Queen.\textsuperscript{22} Walsingham wrote back to Beale, in a brief addition to a Council letter that is not extant, stating that if the Dutch 'myght be redused to som resonable order and to forbeare to owtrage her ma\textsuperscript{e} sobiects', then they would be 'suer to fynd us thowghe no frendes, as the necesytye of ther state and owre pollecye requirethe: yet shall they be sure to fynde us no enemyes.' Walsingham then warned, however, that the logical conclusion of the present state of affairs, if allowed to continue unchecked, would be far different: 'On the other syd yf they shall wyfully

\textsuperscript{19} Beale's original instructions are Add MS 48116 ff 11.13. See also Daniel Rogers' list of demands of 24 April 1576, printed in Relations politiques 8 pp 358-63.

\textsuperscript{20} Add MS 14028 f 5.

\textsuperscript{21} Add MS 14028 f 4; Demands of Rogers now Relations politiques 8 pp 373-74; Add MS 14028 f 6b; Mémoire is PRO SP 70/138/??; Relations politiques 8 pp 375-78.
contyne newe ther evyll usage by arrest and other wyse: yt is fully resolved that we shall ioyne with the K. of Spayne ageynst them.\textsuperscript{23}

Beale and Rogers spent the month of May together in the company of the Prince of Orange, his advisors and the Admiralty Court of Flushing as demands and counter-demands were exchanged whilst the Dutch attempted the relief of Ziericksee by sea.\textsuperscript{24} Beale and Rogers observed the military manoeuvres and continued to write back to Walsingham that unless the Prince ‘would have the Merchantes Adventurers to give somewhat unto him by way of assurances’ then they doubted that the English ships would ever move very far. Back in England Walsingham was also very much aware that without any movement of cash or credit from the Merchant Adventurers to the Prince then nothing was going to change for the better.\textsuperscript{25} The other reason that Walsingham perceived for the delay was the continuing uncertainty over the status of the French offer of support for the Dutch struggle against the Spanish.\textsuperscript{26} On the 30 May both Rogers and Beale dined with the Prince, and the next day one of Orange’s advisors Jean Calvert brought them the four letters the Prince had drafted for England, one each to Elizabeth, the Privy Council, Burghley, and Walsingham, assuming that Beale would carry them over.\textsuperscript{27} The Prince had little to offer by the way of excuse other than the ‘urgente nécessité qui nous pressé’, and hoped for sympathy and patience from the Privy Council till Ziericksee be relieved. A further complication to what was for Beale a fairly thankless task was added when news arrived in Flushing in early June of the

\textsuperscript{22} 3 May 1576, \textit{Relations politiques} 8 pp 372-73; SP 70/138/ ff 92-93.
\textsuperscript{23} Egerton MS 1694 ff 3-4.
\textsuperscript{24} Beale’s demands of 12 May are now Add MS 14028 ff 9-10; of 18 May Add MS 14028 ff 12-15; Add MS 48149, ff 83-85.
\textsuperscript{25} Add MS 5935, f 41; \textit{Relations politiques} 8 pp 384-85; Egerton MS 1694 ff 12-13.
\textsuperscript{26} Egerton MS 1694 ff 14-15: ‘I am sorrye that the P. taketh so straynge a course towards us by the deleyeng of the release of owre shippes. I imagen that the hope he hath of ffraunce is the cause thereof but... he is lyke to have smaule releaffe that waye.’
\textsuperscript{27} Journal for May. The four letters are SP 70/138/ ff 149-50, 151-52, 153-54, 155-56. These are printed in \textit{Relations politiques} 8 pp 386-89.
apparently parlous state of the 4 Dutch ships held in Cornwall. This was, observed Beale to Walsingham, to ‘the no small discredit of the offer which I made unto them in ther LL. name for their release’, and gave the Prince further excuses to prolong Beale’s diplomatic frustration.

Things were going from bad to worse, and something was needed to break the downward spiral of the English relations with the Prince of Orange and the breakaway provinces. In early June all shipping was stalled in Flushing at the Prince’s commandment, some of the goods of the English ships were sold and the Merchant Adventurers’ ships were taken from Flushing to Middleburgh. Alarmed at these developments, Rogers departed for England on the 17 June, leaving Beale to hold the fort alone, and was back in Flushing with Sir William Winter by the 27 June. Winter was an experienced diplomat in naval affairs, and had been given further instructions drafted by Burghley and Walsingham jointly on the 19 June. Winter was requested to inform Beale of all the latest developments from London, and then to proceed to communicate what was in essence a recapitulation of arguments concerning the previous behaviour of the Flushing privateers, but with mounting and unabated ire on behalf of the Queen. In addition it becomes clear from Winter’s instructions that the value of the goods in the Merchant Adventurers’ ships was about £200,000 - large enough for the second part of the instructions to counsel now a possible secret ‘stealing awaye of the sayd ships, eyther by bryngyng of them into this realme or conveyeng them back to Antwerpe’ to be essayed at ‘your good discretyon’. If this were to fail, then the third part indicated that the commissioners were to threaten ‘all hostilitye’ against the Prince of Orange. How much of this was designed as a negotiating ploy and

---

28 Beale to Walsingham 4 June 1576 Add MS 5935 f 26; printed Relations politiques 8 p 394-96.
29 Add MS 48149 ff 33-36. See also Beale to Burghley, 5 June 1576 Cotton Galba C.V ff 254-55; printed Relations politiques 8 p 396-98.
30 The draft is SP 70/138/ ff 193-203; printed from this in Relations politiques 8 p 399-404. Final copy is Add MS 48023 Art. 37, ff 330-339, endd. by Beale f 339b.
how much a realistic threat of re-alignment with the Spanish against the Prince and the two provinces is obscured, but the extent of the frustration felt by the Queen and many others was palpable.

Winter and Beale met with the Prince on the 1 July at their lodgings, and the next day the two English envoys dined with the Prince again, informing him that the two English factors for the Merchant Adventurers William Calthorp and Richard Goddard were to treat with the Prince about the money required, as to do this was not within their own commission. The English diplomats then put a lot of pressure on the Merchant Adventurers to agree to compromise and to offer something financially tangible to the Prince. This compliance by the Merchant’s factors was allied to some political backtracking to the offers made at the negotiations between the Dutch representatives and the Privy Council the previous January. Rogers was sent from Winter to the Prince on the 15 July ‘to know of him if he were yet in the same moode in which he was when he sent his deputes into England for yt offer which he had made’, to which the Prince answered that because of the delay he had been forced to look elsewhere - ie. to France - and he was now waiting for an answer there.31 Over the next week Winter and Beale managed to manufacture an accord that was then signed on the 23 July at Middleburgh.32 In this the release of 20 English ships from Flushing was agreed; six of the Merchant Adventurers ships then left for Antwerp, another eight were then given leave to depart for London, and the other six belonging to the Spanish company also released. In return the four Dutch ships detained at Falmouth were to be released in the state in which they were taken in February 1576. In addition Beale and Winter promised more generally that ships belonging to or under the authorisation of the Prince would be unhindered by the English so long as the Prince’s ships did not provoke

31 Rogers Journal for July; printed Relations politiques 8 p 407-08.
attack. This accord of 23 July was only manufactured by Winter and Beale with the
concession of the Merchant Adventurers to loan the money required to the Prince of
Orange.33 Included in the bargain, the Merchants Adventurers were to provide the
Prince with 200 pieces of artillery, and were to pay taxes for passage through the
territories of the Prince and Estates.34

By 25 July Sir William and Beale had left for England, relieved that the ships were
finally released, but wary of the future conduct of the Prince.35 Meanwhile the English
side of the bargain also had to be kept - the release of the four warships of Flushing at
Falmouth.36 The news of the accord did not smooth over the ruffled waters of
Elizabeth’s sensitivity to privateering by the rebellious Dutch provinces. During the
first two weeks of August a decision was made, and it is unclear whether this was by
Elizabeth herself or shared by many of her councillors, to renege on the accord of
Winter and Beale and to prosecute actively the Dutch ships in the Channel regardless of
authorisation by the Prince or not. On the 6 August William Holstock, recent
replacement of Henry Palmer as Admiral of the High Seas, was ordered to apprehend
all ships based out of Holland and Zealand that he encountered either in English ports

32 Copies are Add MS 14028 ff 18-19 and ff 20-21; Cotton Galba C.V ff 287-88. The marginal
insertions indicate that Beale’s copy is contemporary to the negotiations, the Galba C.V copy
being made sometime later.
33 The later disagreement between the Merchant Adventurers and the Spanish Merchants over the
form and authority of the agreement made in Middleburgh in July led to two examinations of
Beale by Sir William Cordell, Master of the Rolls, and Doctor Lewes, Judge of the Admiralty.
These, and the various petitions made by both sides to the Privy Council, provide us with
additional information on the negotiations of July 1576. See Egerton MS 1694 ff 22-22* 9
December 1576; ff 23-23* 13 January 1577 Supplication of Merchant Adventurers; ff 25-25* ‘The Answer of the those merchants adventurers Ladars of the goodes stayed att flushinge to the
Camplaint of William Salter Reynold Hollingworth George Homes and other merchants’.
34 See the ‘Requête du Prince d’Orange’ 23 July 1576, SP 70/139/ f 43; printed Relations
politiques 8 p 419.
35 See SP 70/139/ ff 39-40; printed Relations politiques 8 pp 413-16 Edward Chester to Burghley
July 1576.
36 Add MS 48149 ff 92-94 Privy Council to the vice-Admiral for Cornwall William Lower 29
July; Egerton MS 1694 ff 20-21 draft of Privy Council letter to Justices of Peace in Cornwall;
APC p 196, 30 August 1576 passport to Jacques Despontine for release of four ships. Even by
the 20 November the Privy Council had been unable to sort out the responsibility for their
or on the high seas; a week later all ships based out of the rebel provinces in the port of London were still under an order of stay. What had caused this apparent change of mind? The Prince of Orange became aware of Elizabeth’s displeasure on about the 20 August, and on the 23 August he addressed letters to Elizabeth, the Earl of Sussex and Walsingham. In these he expressed regret that three ships had already been taken, in direct contravention to ‘la promesse faicte par lesdicks Srs Winter et Beale, soubs l’autorité et expresse charge de sa Majesté et de vous aultres, Messieurs du Conseil’. The rising star of Dutch diplomacy Philip Marnix St Aldegonde further explained the frustration and sense of betrayal now felt by the Prince and those struggling against Spain in a letter to Laurence Tomson. Elizabeth had sent her ‘legates’ Winter and Beale, explained St. Aldegonde, together with the representatives of the Merchants, and the agreement had been reached freely and in ‘good faith’. ‘Ubi’ now asked St. Aldegonde, ‘est hic fides violata?’

Some urgent diplomacy undertaken by the Prince of Orange eventually persuaded Elizabeth to call off Holstock on 7 September, but the issues and dilemmas facing all parties continued to reverberate through the following decades. Within this microcosm in the summer of 1576 the principal issues controlling Beale’s diplomatic career were pitted against each other, as the natural sympathy felt by Beale and many others for their co-religionists’s struggle against the Spanish was confronted by the commercial frustration of the English merchants and the more straightforwardly political fear that the Prince of Orange would turn to France and not England for support, thereby replacing one potentially hostile rule (Spain) with another (France) in the commercially and strategically sensitive Netherlands. The complex relations between England, Spain,

---

restitution; see Jacques Taffin to Privy Council, 20 November 1576, printed Relations politiques 9 p 51, art. 2
37 APC p 181. See also SP 12/108/70 letter of PC to Holstock. APC p 184/5.
38 SP 70/139/ ff 101-02; printed in Relations politiques 8 p 435-36.
France and the rebellious Dutch provinces were to occupy Beale and his fellows for much of the following decades and still await a proper and full account. For the time being, Beale’s involvement in the Netherlands in 1576 helped to familiarise him further with the often tangled practical implications of these three key issues of defence, religion and trade driving the formulation of policy back home in London.

Beale’s equal specialisations in Northern Europe (Germany, the Hanse and the Scandanavian States) as well as in the Netherlands and France involved him in virtually every major diplomatic project of the later Elizabethan years. Beale’s early experience of the continent in the 1560s was then allied to his service as a Clerk of the Council during the 1570s, completely integrating his diplomatic training and experience into the administrative heart of the Elizabethan polity. Beale was drafting and correcting letters in various languages from Elizabeth and the Privy Council to foreign powers and personages just as we have already seen him drafting and composing letters on behalf of the Privy Council to Justices of the Peace and Lord Lieutenants on Muster matters. Examples of the drafts of letters written by Beale on behalf of his sovereign for diplomatic purposes survive still in Beale’s papers: in 1580 Beale drafted a letter in Spanish from Elizabeth to the King of Morocco; in 1583 whilst serving as a stand-in Principal Secretary he drafted the instructions for Sir Edward Stafford as ambassador for France, and in 1585 composed a letter in Italian to the Signoria of Venice concerning the commercial dealings of the Levant company.\(^\text{40}\) It is often unclear in these cases whether Beale was acting especially at Walsingham’s behest, either because Walsingham himself was otherwise engaged, or merely acting in the course of his

---

\(^{39}\) SP 70/139/ ff 105-06; printed in \textit{Relations politiques} 8 p 440-42, but mistakenly attributed as addressed to ‘Lampsonius’.

\(^{40}\) Add MS 48126 ff 261-62 Draft in Spanish of a letter from Elizabeth to Mulai Ahmad al-Mansur, King of Fez and Morocco, dated from Richmond November 1580, with autograph amendments by Beale; Add MS 48152 ff 286-92 endd. by Beale on f 292b ‘M. of the instructions for Mr Edward Stafford’, a draft in hand of Clerk A with amendments by Beale, see
duties as a Clerk of the Council. Once again, it was probably not the ‘office’ that made
the man, but a combination of the two that coincided with Beale’s own personal
connections and specialities.

One of the salient characteristics of this diplomatic service was its ongoing nature.
Once established as a specialist in a particular area or matter, the particular individual
would then be turned to repeatedly by Queen and Privy Council when new matters of
dispute or of controversy arose. This made sense not only in terms of personal
experience and skills, but also in terms of the necessary documentary substance at hand
which these individual specialists like Beale gathered over their years of service. These
specialities and experience were recognized by the Queen, her Principal Secretary and
her Privy Councillors and utilised accordingly. Beale’s participation in diplomacy
relating to Denmark is a good short example. Beale had since the early days of his
service as a Clerk of the Council been involved in the diplomatic relations with
Denmark, and had helped draft the trade Treaty agreed in 1583. The death of Beale’s
friend and colleague Daniel Rogers in 1591 had then bequeathed to Beale further
diplomatic responsibilities for dealing with the Scandanavian countries. Beale drafted
and prepared instructions and memoranda for Edward Baron Zouche’s mission to
Denmark in the summer of 1598, and drafted letters from Elizabeth to Christian IV
during the following year. In September 1599 Robert Cecil wrote to Beale that he had

SPF 1583-84 no. 137; Add MS 48126 ff 187-88 Letter from Elizabeth to Signoria of Venice, 12
March 1585, a draft in hand of Clerk A with amendments by Beale.
41 Add MS 48152 ff 41-44 Latin. draft of Letters patent of Elizabeth I clarifying ambiguities in
treaty for Baltic trade between England and Denmark on 23 June 1583, in italic hand of Clerk A.
Endd. on ff 44b ‘Declaration? of the treaty with the king of Denmark. 3.’.
42 For Rogers see Slavin, A. J. ‘Daniel Rogers in Copenhagen, 1588: Mission and Memory’, in A.
J. Slavin and M. Thorp (eds.) Politics, Religion and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe Vol. 27
Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 1994, pp. 245-66. For Denmark in general see Treschow,
Chr. de Denmark and Queen Elizabeth London 1871; Cheyney, E. P. ‘England and Denmark in
the Later Days of Queen Elizabeth’, Journ Mod Hist 1 (1929) pp. 9-39; Kirchner, W. ‘England
and Denmark, 1558-88’, Jour Mod Hist 17 (1945) pp 1-15.
43 Add MS 48152 ff 6-13 memorandum by Beale for Edward La Zouche, 11th Baron Zouche, for
a mission to Denmark May 1598, written in hand of Clerk B, with autograph additions by Beale;
Add MS 48126 ff 116-117 endd. by Beale f 117b ‘Heddes of a letter to the king of Denmark’, a
been informed of a meeting of Danish commissioners the following month to consider trade matters, and therefore passed on to Beale the petition of certain English merchants from Hull concerning their trade grievances against the Danish; ‘whereat her myty requires you’, wrote Cecil, ‘that wrote the last letter, to consider for some draught of another’. 44 Beale accordingly then drafted the letter which was sent over with the merchant Stephen Lesieur to Denmark later in 1599. 45

Beale’s service and involvement in Dutch affairs in 1576 described in detail above was also continued in like manner. Beale was sent over with Sir Henry Killigrew to the Netherlands in June 1587 to act as the English representatives on the Council of Estates, a role that would require all of his many interlinked talents and skills garnered at home and abroad over the previous decades. These very skills were also needed at home at the same time, and Walsingham wrote to Beale a few months later that he was to be sent back with the next package at ‘the soonest opportunitie’, ‘for that I find her matie hath an intent to use you in the treatie, and therefore would be gladde you were retourned before it be proceeded’. 46 Beale’s long experience of the Netherlands volunteered his services for the increasingly complex debates over the financial obligations of all parties involved during the years of war from 1585 onwards. In 1590 he was required to account for the payments made by the Lord Willoughby to troops in

draft in hand of Clerk A with amendments by Beale, sent 12 Oct 1583; Add MS 48126 ff 118-129 titled by Beale on f 123a ‘Copied out of a booke gien to mr Secretarye Walsingham 13. Aug. 1588’; Add MS 48126 ff 132-33 written in hand of Clerk B, endorsed by Beale ‘4. Octobris 1588 <recte 98> The king of Denmark’s letter to them of Elbing touching certificates to be made of the Merchants goods in the shippes’.

44 Add MS 48152 ff 107.120 letter of Robert Cecil to Beale <No date, c. September 1599>, addressed to Beale on f 120b ‘To my loving freind mr Robert Beale esq. Clerk of the Counsell.’ A copy in hand of Clerk B of the petition of the Hull merchants is Add MS 48152 ff 117a-118b.

45 Add MS 48152 ff 108-09 part of autograph draft of Beale titled ‘A memoriall for her myty servuant Stephen le sieur, presently sent unto the k. of Denmark. September 1599; ff 110-111a neat copy of this in hand of Clerk B. Dated at the Court at Nonsuch 26 Sep 1599.

46 See Add MS 48014 ff 167-176b, the Journal kept by Beale on his expedition to the Netherlands with Leicester, dating from 20 June - 7 October 1587; Add MS 48127 ff 97-98 Walsingham to Beale, endd. by Beale on f 98b ‘2 Septembri 1587. Mr Secretary’.
the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{47} In 1595 Beale, Sir Henry Killigrew and Arthur Atye were approached by Burghley and the Privy Council to prepare a report on the debts and obligations of the States General to Elizabeth for moneys paid out over and above the agreement laid out in the Treaty of Nonsuch of 1585. Beale had of course served along with Killigrew and Atye in the Netherlands at the time and was already extensively versed in the issues. Their first report ‘made as the shortnes of time would permitt’ was submitted in July 1595, and then the three men waited for Sir Thomas Wilkes to return from the Netherlands in August.\textsuperscript{48} A ‘Second declaration’ was drafted by the three men in response to the arguments of the States General, based on their own experience during the years of Leicester’s involvement and on two new sources: the papers of Muster Master Thomas Digges, requisitioned from his widow’s chest in the first week of September 1595 and taken back to Beale’s house, and some of Walsingham’s papers obtained from Master Dr. James. Beale’s personal Clerk B drafted this ‘second declaration’ twice under the direction of Beale and his fellows, and the completed version was sent to Burghley on the 18 September 1595.\textsuperscript{49}

Beale’s experience of France was also continually drawn upon by his contemporaries. In early 1596 he prepared an extensive treatise propounding the benefits of an ‘alliance defensive and offensive’ between England and France for Sir Robert Sidney, who had been English ambassador in France in the early 1590s and was one of the commissioners for the Treaty of Greenwich in 1596.\textsuperscript{50} Beale outlined his belief that

\textsuperscript{47} Add MS 48127 ff 89-90 Willoughby to Beale 3 July 1590 f 89a: ‘Sr It hath pleased her Matie to appoint Mr killigrew & yow to accompany the Lo: Tresorer, and Buckhurst for the tryenge whether upon my Count and reckoninge I am to be checked 4000 li...’.
\textsuperscript{48} The draft of the first report is Add MS 48084 ff 333-343; the copy sent to Burghley is now Cotton MS Galba D.XI Art. 54 ff. 125.
\textsuperscript{49} The first draft is Add 48116 ff 127-144b; the second ff 110-125. Both these drafts of the report of Beale, Atye and Killigrew in hand of Clerk B. The copy of final report sent to Burghley is now Cott Galba D.XI, ff 106-117b. Art. 62 ff. 137-163. The second declaration concerning the exceptions of the States General against the Q.’s demands for restitution, by HK, RB and Arthur Atye. Sep. 18 1595.
\textsuperscript{50} Add MS 48102 ff 351-60 ‘Notes concerning a treatye and league offensive and defensive between her Matie, the frenche etc...’: cf. ff 356b-57a: ‘And if yt be replied that as your desire an
England joined with France and the Netherlands would be in a far stronger position against the Spanish than alone, and how necessary it was to persuade the French that the Spanish were only eager for world domination by subjugation of the English, the Dutch and the French also ‘under the color of religion’. In this Beale indicated that he himself was not immediately part of the internal policy-making process of counsel that was part of the preparations for the treaty; ‘for the matter of the said league or treatie’, he told Sir Robert Sidney, ‘you shalbe directed by your instructions.’\(^{51}\) Beale’s technical services were once again utilised by Sir Robert Cecil and his father Lord Burghley when the Treaty of Greenwich with France came to be drawn and finalised in the spring of 1596. It was then Beale who made a draft of the Latin version of the Treaty on 13 May 1596, which was then signed the next day.\(^{52}\)

In 1598 he was at the side of Thomas Lake for the negotiations preceding the second Treaty of Nonsuch with the States General of the Netherlands.\(^{53}\) Lake’s report of the process of the Treaty negotiations is a good description of the kind of uses that a technical diplomatic specialist might be put to. The role envisaged for the likes of Lake, James and Beale as the three technical advisors is evidently distinct to that of the three Privy Councillors Sir Robert Cecil, Lord Buckhurst and Sir John Fortescue who were involved in the negotiations. Lake, James and Beale were first called in to Sir Robert Cecil’s chambers by Cecil and Buckhurst to be made ‘acquainted with what had passed betweene the Ils and others of her mats privie councell, and the deputies of the states of the owe countries in dyuers conferences had with them from the time of their landings

---

alteration of and-the estabylshment of the reformed religion in fraunce: so the Catholikes wold demaund the like in England: The diuersity of the cases may be obserued and their reasons answered, as in conteyned in an other pamflett which I drewe for you, when you were sent into fraunce’. This other treatise was titled ‘Touching a toleration of two religions in one Realme, for Sir Robert Sidney her Matties Ambassador in France’, and is now Add MS 48044 ff 253-74b.

\(^{51}\) Add 48102 f 357a

\(^{52}\) Add MS 48126 ff 167-71, inc. f 169*: f 171b endorsed by Beale ‘13 Maij 1596. Acta cum legatis Gallicis’.
untill that daie'. The isolation of Lake, James and Beale from the deliberative processes that had preceded was evident; they were there to advise on the drafting and the wording of the treaty to be agreed and not on its content. The Dutch commissioners Oldenbarnaveld, Hessels and Caron met again with Cecil and Buckhurst to iron out their disagreements on the content, with Beale on hand to offer technical advice. Lake then reported that he, James and Beale were then commanded to go to London with the Dutch commissioners, ‘and on Friday the eleventh of August we went to them meeting first at mr Beales, where we had conference together, and compared the articles sett downe in french with that mr Beale had conceiued in Lattin, who in that tongue had framed a treatie in fourme, because it was intended that it should passe in Lattin.’ When the Dutch commissioners met again the next day with the English Privy Councillors the new articles were read and the debate then turned to which language - French or Latin - the treaty should pass in. After another week of to-ing and fro-ing the time for completion had come, and Lake then described the final signing of the Treaty:

‘And soe the next day being wednesdaye the sixteenth daie of August their llps assembled at the L: keepers house, where aboute three of the clocke in theafternoone, the deputys came to them and being sett as the custome was their llps in their degrees on the one side of the table, and the deputys on the other side, the treatie ingrossed was read, one parte by me standinge at the end of the the table, the other counter parte held by hessels, and by Barnavelt their Paper coppie amended the daie before, and by mr D. James ours’.

Lake is in essence describing a picture familiar to us from the painting of the Somerset House conference of 1604 hanging now in the National Portrait Gallery, London. A familiar picture indeed, but with one exception - the absence of the diplomatic clerks such as Lake and Beale reading, advising and checking at the shoulder of the

53 Add MS 48129 ff 3-47 Account of Thomas Lake of negotiations leading Treaty of Nonsuch in August and September 1598 <mis-dated 1596 on f.3a>.
Councillors. The following month the Dutch presented their ratification of the treaty to Herbert, James, Lake and Beale to inspect, and make further small changes. Throughout the two roles of the Privy Councillors deliberating and discussing the import of the Treaty and that of the advisors like Lake, James and Beale were kept separate.\footnote{\textit{Add MS 48129 ff 3a; 11a; 14a; 29a-b; 37b. Cf Add 48149 ff 65-66 Thomas Lake to Robert Cecil undated, referring to Treaty of Nonsuch; 'I beseech your honour that Mr Beal may peruse this draught of myne before it be sent if your honour like of this way.'; Add 48126 f 165 Robert Cecil to Beale autograph, endorsed by Beale on f 166b 'Preface of the treatye set down by Mr Secretary', mis-attributed in the British Library 1994 Catalogue to Walsingham.}}

This demarcation evident in the 1590s between the duties or role of the counsellor and the clerk was not always that clearly defined. Beale’s own personal ideological commitments were often sufficient to persuade him to put pen to paper and compose a treatise or ‘position’ paper directed specifically either to a single person or a small group of councillors, covering anything from a specific point or question or the general European political situation. We will encounter in more detail in Chapter 7 two examples of Beale’s work along these lines; his 1571 treatise written for the French King and Court against Mary Queen of Scots, and his treatise written in 1572 again against Mary and analyzing the European political situation from an English perspective. Beale’s motivation for producing treatises such as these was an amalgam of the pressures of contemporary political circumstances, individual political and religious ideology, and the mutual responsibilities of service and personal ambition. As Beale became more integrated into the heart of the Elizabethan polity during the course of his service in the 1570s, the circumstances of production of these treatises was gradually transformed away from personal advancement and more towards recognized specialization. In late 1583 he composed a treatise on Germany, in 1587 another on the war in the Netherlands, and his connections to individual courtiers and councillors
could also prompt his efforts to advise on policy, such as his treatise ‘On the Toleration of Religion in France’ written in 1593 for Sir Robert Sidney.\textsuperscript{55}

It is sometimes hard to tell whether a particular treatise was written by Beale acting on his own inspiration or on specific demand by the Queen, an individual Councillor or the Privy Council in general. William Cecil’s long working relationship with Beale was the basis for often frank and undecorated demands for the production of analysis and advice in the form of a treatise: many of Beale’s more specifically polemical treatises were written at Burghley’s bequest during the late 1580s and 1590s in response to either particular issues and questions or in reply to what Cecil considered as libels that demanded retort. In 1589 Beale produced a Latin treatise entitled the \textit{Declaratio Causarum} in order to justify the seizure by the English fleet in Portugal of Hanse ships carrying grain and supplies to the King of Spain. This was then translated into English and printed by the Queen’s printer Christopher Barker in the same year.\textsuperscript{56} Once established in a geographical area or in a polemical context as a specialist, then service would be continually expected as new demands and circumstances cropped up. The following year Burghley wrote to Beale and Laurence Tomson to send them ‘the chief pointes collected out of that lewd book entitled Confutatio Causarum &c’. Burghley then asked them ‘to take some paines in preparing of some matter fitt for answer, such as which you Mr Beale in your observaciones and travayle, or yow Mr Thompson in

\textsuperscript{55} Add MS 48126 ff 58-61 written in hand of Clerk A, endorsed on f 61b ‘Discourse touching the present troubles in Germany’: Beale notes on f 58 ‘R. B. mad this when Mr Daunson was sent into Holland to the Elector of Colleyn’; Add MS 48104 ff 572-81 marked by Beale on f 572a ‘A letter or discours sent to the L. Chancelor 4. Aug 1587’; Add MS 48044 ff 255-274a draft by Clerk A and Beale ‘Touching a toleration of two Religions in one Realme; for Sr Robert Sidney her Maties Ambassador in France’.

\textsuperscript{56} Printed as \textit{Declaratio causarum, quibus Serenissimae Majestatis Angliae classiarii adducti ... quasdam naves ... in ipsis faucibus Ulissiponae, ceperunt. 30 Junii ...} Christopher Barker, London 1589: Add MS 48023 ff 220-29 is Beale’s draft; ff 228-39 copy of English translation ‘A Declaration of the Causes, which moved the cheife commanders of the Navie of her most excellent Maiestie the Queene of England, in their voyage and expedition for Portingal, to take and arrest in the mouth of the Riuver of Lisbone, certaine Shippes of corne and other provisions of warre bound for the said Citie... Imprinted at London by the Deputies of Christopher Barker... 1589’.
your employment of later tyme or understanding otherwise can deliver'. Beale and Tomson were to confer and submit their final version upon completion.\(^{57}\)

The following year Beale either produced or was required to produce (and again the distinction appears increasingly meaningless in this reciprocally or mutually driven relationship) a straightforwardly polemical treatise listing the injuries perpetrated on Elizabeth and the English by Philip II of Spain beginning with the failure to honour their obligations to support the English claim to Calais.\(^{58}\) Beale’s position as a diplomatic jack-of-all-trades is nowhere better demonstrated than in the requests put to him by Burghley in 1594. Burghley wrote that he was to be bold in his requests to Beale, ‘because I know yow can satisfye in sondry thyngs wherof my `lack of` lesur will not suffer me to inform me as I know yow can.’ In one elongated breath Burghley then required Beale to answer queries on the history of the Pope’s authority and jurisdiction in England, Spain and France, on the form of the rejection of Papal authority in the reformed German and Swiss states and cities, on the ‘foule factes ageynst gods law’ committed by the King of Spain, and on ‘what Quenes haue had hereditary monarch’ and ‘whyther haue gouerned soly without mariage’. This was quite some enquiry, and Burghley admitted that ‘I thynk I shall weary you with so many questions for I am wery in scriblyng of them’. Two months later Burghley received the ten-page treatise that Beale had written in reply and wrote back to Beale thanking him for his ‘lardg answers’, ‘perswading with my self that few or non others cold so amply answer the same’.\(^{59}\)

\(^{57}\) Add MS 48115 f 207a Burghley to Beale and Laurence Tomson 3 August 1590.

\(^{58}\) Harleian MS 253 ff. 43-49 copy endorsed ‘Mr Robert Beale’s Collection of the Kinge of Spaines Injuries offered to the Queene of England... With a vindication of the Queen against the Objections of the Spaniards.’ Dated 30 May 1591.

\(^{59}\) Add MS 48101 ff 303.09* letter from Burghley to Beale 2 March 1594. Drafts of Beale’s reply in the hand of Clerk B are then ff 304-09, ff 310-27; ff 328.33 letter from Burghley to Beale 13 May 1594 thanking him for his services.
The use of Beale in such a manner was not a simple directive service, although exactly what it was that Beale got out of it himself is often hard to pin down. Cecil offered his thanks, to be sure, and precious little else it may appear. But the request from men like Cecil to perform such work was viewed as a privilege and as a mark of esteem and position in political society as well as a natural corollary of service. This was a privilege entrusted or accorded to very few, and would have been recognised as such. Only those men with the experience and knowledge of the European situation that Beale himself manifested were able to perform such services, and therefore these men were valued as rare and worthwhile resources. Wider recognition for the successful performance of such particular acts would also be forthcoming. A good comparison is the use made of that other man of business Thomas Norton by Francis Walsingham in the winter of 1581/82 when Norton was ‘at leysur by reason of the restraint of his libertie’, condemned by Elizabeth temporarily to the Tower for his recent outspoken criticisms of the royal policy. Walsingham wrote to Norton via the Lieutenant of the Tower Sir Owen Hopton to present his demands on the 31 December 1581. In his ‘enclosed note’ for Norton, Walsingham had included ‘certaine pointes for the reformation of the present corruption in religion’, and asked Hopton to ‘deliuer him the sayd note, with penne and ink and paper to write his opinion theron.’ At first glance these requests appear at best heartless and at worst downright cynical and exploitative. But Walsingham also offered to look after Norton’s wife Alice whilst Norton himself was incarcerated, and in reply to this request for the production of what became his ‘Devices’, Norton wrote back to Walsingham to acknowledge ‘that the work which you have sent me is of a purpose to haue occasion to do me good.’

60 Add MS 48023 f 41b copy of letter of FW to Owen Hopton 31 Dec 1581; f 43b copy of Norton to Walsingham <not Hopton as in Catalogue, January> 1582.
heartless requests for continued services were very much to Norton’s advantage as he desperately sought to regain royal favour.

Beale’s own personal utility as a provider of advice and counsel on policy was underpinned by the forms of his access to up-to-date and informed knowledge of the ever fluctuating European political situation. Beale was able to provide this by maintaining an extensive personal correspondence with men who were in effect performing an equivalent role to that of Beale in their own particular countries. Beale corresponded with the secretaries, diplomats, intellectuals and ecclesiastical figures abroad who shared with him his position at the heart of their respective political societies, and who also shared with him an enduring commitment to the reformed church and the corollary of resisting what they saw as the international catholic threat. The ideological symmetry between Beale and virtually all of his correspondents, and the ‘bon désir que vous ayez de servir a la cause de Dieu’ (attributed to Beale by the Cardinal de Châtillon in 1569) resonates through the hundreds of letters he received.61 In many senses this correspondence should not be labelled as ‘personal’: it was ‘personal’ in the sense that it was directed to Beale by name and on account of various personal and ideological ties between Beale and his correspondents, but it was not if by ‘personal’ we assume any familiarity and sociability defined along modern lines. Almost all Beale’s correspondence directed to him by name from correspondents abroad fall into the category of ‘news’ letters which offer a bare litany of news and information passed on third hand with as little embellishment as possible. Depending on the situation of the correspondent, sometimes this was simply ‘common’ news circulating generally in foreign cities or court, or sometimes much more specific information based on a correspondent’s own personal connections or involvement.62

61 BL Egerton MS 1693 f 4b Châtillon to Beale June 1569.
Chief amongst all of Beale’s European correspondents was Hubert Languet, introduced
above in Chapter 2, whose own familiarity with Sir Philip Sidney and his presumed
authorship of the notorious monarchomach treatise *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* has
ensured his own ongoing familiarity to British historians. Twenty one letters from
Languet to Beale survive, dating from 1569 to 1581. Languet maintained an extensive
network of correspondents, and just over a thousand of Languet’s letters to over a
hundred of correspondents has survived.⁶³ Beale was, however, one of the most regular
of these many correspondents, as the two men worked together in their shared
commitment to a league of the evangelical states of Northern Europe to counter the
perceived Catholic threat throughout the 1560s and 1570s. Beale also maintained
correspondence with other figures who manifested either diplomatic or regional
specialisations. Among Beale’s more regular were Johannes Glauberg in Frankfurt,⁶⁴
Christopher Ehemius in Germany,⁶⁵ Renatus Henniquin in Paris,⁶⁶ Johann Drusius in
Germany,⁶⁷ and David Chytraeus from Denmark.⁶⁸ Other names supplying similar sort of
information or coming from a similar political background included the French diplomats Christophe de Harlay, and Charles Danzay, French envoy to Denmark.69

The extent of the reciprocity of this correspondence is hard to measure: for example, only one letter from Beale to Languet has survived in Languet’s own papers now mostly in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Without trawling through the relevant European archives, we can only rely on the occasional explicit references within much of this correspondence to show that Beale had also written letters to the sender. This pan-European network of correspondents were invariably the highly educated Calvinist intellectuals who fulfilled roles in their own political society comparable to that which Beale himself fulfilled as a recognized diplomatic specialist in London. They were not then the mixed bag of subversives, merchants, informers or budding poets that have been assumed to characterize the Elizabethan ‘intelligence’ service abroad.70 ‘Intelligence’ was too important a commodity in early modern Europe to be left to chance:

---

'advertisement of any great importance you have from no place', Beale commented to Burghley in late 1572, 'the cause I knowe not: perchaunce we thinck yt not nedfull, and seke to spare: I pray god yt be not in sauing a penny to spend a pound.' Beale then contrasted to Burghley this potentially short-sighted parsimony with the practice of 'the king of Spaine', who was 'suffred to haue sondry espials Spanish & Italians openly beside the good store of our owne papistes, and yt be kept up by the heles'. Beale's idea of 'intelligence' and 'espiall' here was not of an undercover informer operating within the camp of the enemy, but of a less covert and open network of informed co-religionists ('those which make profession of like religion') spread around the continent in friendly powers, who would then serve as a conduit for information back to England through correspondence such as he himself maintained. The end of this information would be to inform policy and prevent misfortune, and furthermore to propose action where necessary.71

Beale's complaints were acted upon over the next two decades as Walsingham did his best to remedy the situation. Writing twenty years later, Beale gave his 'opinion' on 'the charge of forraine Espialls and Intelligences' to the prospective Principal Secretary Sir Edward Wotton, expanding on this theme of the neccessity of maintaining as wide a network of correspondents as possible. The intervening years had taught Beale the utility of maintaining inward informants in both friendly and hostile camps: 'Mr Secretarie Walsingham', Beale stated, had 'with her Majesties allowance and his owne purse, entertained in above fortie severall places', and had become 'beloved' of many 'of the Nobilitie, Ministers and others' of Scotland through his munificence. Moreover, Walsingham had also paid money for information 'both of the French and Scottish dealinges' from Secretaries in the French embassy in London 'of Mr. La Mott and Mr.
Mauvesier’, as well as ‘corrupting’ with money various ‘Priests, Jesuits and Traitors’ to betray their ‘practises against this Realme.’ Beale clearly valued the information channels that money and corruption could engender, but this was always balanced with the less exotic channels he himself cultivated and maintained through his extensive personal ‘above the line’ correspondence with his fellows and equals around Europe.

Beale cared deeply about, and was also deeply involved in, the issues of England’s military and defensive engagement with her continental neighbours, be they friends, enemies or something in between. Beale observed for himself the military conduct of the Prince of Orange’s forces in the Netherlands on land and sea, and was as a Clerk of the Privy Council very much aware of the state of the Musters and militia in England. His own attitudes to his fellow English Catholics and the threat of Mary Stuart was also completely intertwined with his realistic fear of the possibilities of a foreign invasion. It is also evident that Beale’s concerns over England’s military survival stemmed from his own personal educational and ideological experiences that coloured the rest of his political life. Ideology or religion was fundamental to Beale’s perception of the European political situation. His commitment to the evangelical Calvinist faith underscored his perception of European politics throughout his entire lifetime, from his early upbringing under the Marian exile on the continent until his death in 1601. Finally, trade was another of the driving issues controlling Beale’s own thinking and that of his political masters. Beale’s own diplomatic and linguistic skills allied to his specialisation and contacts in the Protestant German states allowed him to shoulder much of the burden of domestic specialisation in trade matters during the search for other outlets for English trade after the collapse of the Antwerp mart. The interaction of these concerns formed the dynamic process whereby Beale struggled to accommodate equally England’s trade interests, her defence and the ideal of a reformed alliance.

71 Add MS 48049 ff 354 a-b.
Beale’s diplomatic service and the ways in which he formulated his own views on policy according to the three different and potentially conflicting priorities of defence, religion and trade acts as another well-documented microcosm of all these concerns in the wider Elizabethan polity.

Perhaps the most ill-defined aspect of Beale’s diplomatic service is the extent of his influence on the deliberative process of counsel and policy formulation. Whereas before in the 1570s and 80s we have encountered clear indications that Beale was acting as an executive agent and much more than a clerk or amanuensis, in the 1590s the scales are tilted back again to give Beale a more subservient and less influential role. Beale’s technical services in drawing up, negotiating and finalising diplomatic letters and treaties were continually utilized by Burghley and then by Sir Robert Cecil into the 1590’s, but any indication of Beale’s presence at the centre of debate is usually notable only by its absence. In this final decade, as far as Beale was concerned, policy was decided elsewhere and only then was he asked to put it into proper form and language. It was with these specifically diplomatic skills that Beale’s service to the Elizabethan polity was to be perpetuated through his final decade, and often he was to play a supporting role to a younger man, such as to Thomas Lake at Nonsuch in 1598 or to Thomas Edmondes at Boulogne in 1600. Beale was increasingly considered by both Cecils as a diplomatic do-it-all, useful to have around to perform services of a technical nature, but was no longer at the heart of the polity, circling around the Court and the Council Chamber, as he had been in the 1570s and 80s. He was on the peripheries, marginalised accidentally by the passing of a generation of councillors and his brother in law Walsingham, and perhaps more purposely by the generation that had replaced them. Or perhaps it was a combination of ill-health and Beale’s own choice, we may never know the details. The result was that he had stopped attending the Council.

72 Beale Treatise on the Office of Principal Secretary pp. 435-36.
chamber as a Clerk at the end of 1588, and his usefulness was thereafter increasingly defined exclusively in terms of his technical diplomatic skills. Yet another possible reason for his exclusion from the centre of the polity was his involvement in the execution of Mary Queen of Scots, to which we turn now in the following chapter.
Chapter 7. Robert Beale and Mary Queen of Scots 1563-1587: a ‘Succession’ or ‘Exclusion’ Crisis?

‘But yet nevertheless god forbidde, that for any private respect of myne owne, I shold thinck or do any thing then that which might redounde, to ye benefitt of my princes & countrye, & preservacion of soche religion and libertye as they nowe enioye. And therfore heretofore I have alwayes thought, & yet thinck the Q of Scottes to be a pernicious & viperous enemy to the Q matyes estate...’ Beale to Cecil 1571.1

As every student of Elizabethan history surely knows, Queen Elizabeth I never actually married, and though she indulged in numerous serious and not-so-serious dalliances with a variety of suitors from her accession in 1558 until the early 1580s, she lived out her many years as an increasingly solitary, not to say cantankerous, ‘virgin’ Queen. In horrendously simplified terms, this is one of the versions of the complex and often fraught events surrounding Elizabeth’s marital state that has occupied and will continue to occupy historians as unceasingly as it occupied Elizabeth’s own contemporaries and subjects.2 For most of Elizabeth’s ‘good Protestant’ English subjects such as Beale, who were unable to avail themselves of the comfort hindsight might have otherwise conferred, all these marriage negotiations were, to put it mildly, an ongoing problem. From their point of view Elizabeth either chose the ‘wrong’ candidates for prospective marriage at the ‘right’ time, or refused the ‘right’ ones when it mattered most. An unmarried Queen would obviously have no children, and the longer Elizabeth remained unmarried then the issue of who would succeed her as next in line to the throne assumed greater and greater prominence. For her 'good Protestant' subjects, a situation

1 SP 70/121 ff 52-53 ink ff 50-51 pencil 3 Dec 1571 Beale to Burghley from Salmure.
2 Doran, S. Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I Routledge, London 1995; Doran, S. ‘Juno versus Diana: The Treatment of Elizabeth’s I marriage in plays and
where a Queen who suffered from bouts of smallpox and the malevolent attentions of Catholic would-be-assassins (real or imagined), and who then compounded their misery by refusing to allow them to arrange for a suitable successor on her behalf, amounted to a ‘crisis’ indeed. For the significant political minority of Protestant Englishmen who ruled the country under Elizabeth, the ‘succession’ crisis was therefore premised on the inability to persuade the Queen to marry acceptably and produce an heir herself, or alternatively to define the most effective means for the designation of an acceptable protestant successor to Elizabeth in accordance with hereditary right and the will of Henry VIII.3

This ‘succession’ crisis also had a negative corollary, or a flip side to the coin. If Protestant Englishmen could not get a successor that they were happy with by either marriage or law, they also kept one eye at least on the associated problem of avoiding the successor they least wanted by any means at all. Expanding on this theme, Professor Pat Collinson has adapted the concept of the ‘Exclusion Crisis’ of the 1670s and 80s and applied it to Elizabethan England before 1587, stressing the virtual unanimity within the protestant political nation of the abhorrence of the possibility of a Catholic succession to the English crown in the form of Mary Stuart. This abhorrence stretched also to encompass the lesser evil of a co-habitation of this throne via the marriage of Elizabeth to a foreign Catholic prince.4 Collinson then harnessed this concept of


‘exclusion’ in order to question the conventional perceptions of the form and functioning of the Elizabethan polity. His exploration of Elizabethan political culture reacting to these stresses resulted in what he termed the concept of an ‘acephalous monarchy’, where Elizabeth’s Councillors and subjects were forced to consider the possibilities of running their commonwealth without the benefit of a monarch to guide them, a concept developed by Cecil in the 1560s but most fully articulated in the debates over the Oath of Association and the proposed conciliar and parliamentary interregnum in 1584/85. In the search for an answer to the undecided succession, sources for the continuity of authority and jurisdiction were sought outside the person of the monarch in the institutions of the Privy Council and in Parliament, and Collinson locates an awareness of these issues inside a broad and inclusive definition of the ‘Elizabethan polity’ itself, permeating through the political nation down from the Privy Council to the country yeoman, stretching geographically from Westminster to Swallowfield and metaphorically from the head of the commonwealth to the tips of the fingers and toes.

However, here we see only one side of the ‘exclusion’ story. There was an inherent contradiction in Cecil’s belief in a conciliar and parliamentary interregnal solution and the continuing threat of Mary Stuart’s title by both hereditary succession and the terms of Henry VIII’s will. The relative ease with which James VI, Mary’s son, was declared

---

5 On Cecil and the 1560s see Alford, S. William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis in the 1560s Cambridge CUP 1998. The two key texts for 1584/85 are Lansdowne MS 98 ff 14-18 [Digges, Thomas] The Daungers that may ensue by the Othe of Assotiation hereafter if it be not qualified by a coveniency act of Parliament, and SP 12/176/32 (there is also a copy of this in Beale’s papers now Add MS 48099) [anonymous] A Briefe discourse against succession knowen, discovering a most assured meane for your Maiesties sauetie, and to cutt of all searching for ery other heire or successor during your Maiesties lyfe and yet fullie to content all such faithfull dutifull Subietes as desier the Sauetie of the Realme ioyned with the securite of your royall person.

king of England 'by law, lineal succession and undoubted right' fifteen years after the death of his mother at the block surely testifies to this. Hence, though the 'radical conservatism' of Cecil's conception of the polity is exciting on many counts, it was also simply not enough for many contemporaries. The multiple spectres of the feared-to-be imminent death of Elizabeth at the hands of a kamikaze Jesuit assassin, of an invading Spanish army linked with disaffected English Catholics, and of the relatively clear title to the throne of the catholic Mary Stuart was enough to disturb the sleep of every good English protestant. The other side of the 'exclusion' crisis was as direct as it was comparably radical on its own account - the persistent pressure for the death of Mary Stuart, by fair means or foul. For many members of Elizabethan political society the only 'good' Mary was a 'dead' Mary.

But it remains unclear as to the exact details of when and how the 'succession' and 'exclusion' crises discussed above differed or diverged in the minds of our 'good protestant' Elizabethans. One way of exploring these issues is by tracing the transformation of Beale's own reactions and responses to these dilemmas. We have already seen in Chapter 2 above that Beale played an active part in the pressure for the recognition of the Suffolk claim through Lady Catherine Grey as a solution to the succession crisis in 1563 and 1564. In the years that followed no answer to these issues and questions was offered by Elizabeth herself, and in response Beale's attitude to this succession question underwent a significant transformation at the beginning of the 1570s, shifting from this positive support of the leading convenient English protestant candidate to an emphasis on the negative exclusion of the leading Catholic candidate - Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. This was, no doubt, partly due to the recognition that the question of marriage was fraught with numerous difficulties, and that Elizabeth was

---

7 From the Royal Proclamation, drafted by Robert Cecil immediately before Elizabeth's death, issued to declare that James was, 'by law, lineal succession and undoubted right' was to become
increasingly unlikely to produce an heir herself. However, there were other important ideological and political contexts that informed this change in Beale’s views. One was his perception of the ‘succession’ issue firmly embedded not only in a ‘British’ dimension with the kingdoms of Scotland and Ireland, but predominantly in a pan-European political context. The protestant English government had laboured through the 1560s under the continuing apocalyptic belief that continental Catholic powers were intent on a dual policy of invasion and the substitution of Mary for Elizabeth as monarch. After the crisis of the Northern rebellion and the souring of the traditional Hapsburg alliance in the late 1560s, the early 1570s were crucial in redefining the alignments of European diplomacy, with the reinvigoration of the armed Dutch revolt to Alva in the Netherlands and the massacres of St Bartholomew’s Day in France.

Beale’s own considerable personal experience of the continent and his extensive contacts with the European protestant humanist intelligentsia detailed in the previous chapters meant that he was well placed to analyse the implications of the question of Mary Queen of Scots. Two treatises relating to Mary written by Beale in the early 1570s survive; the first written in December 1571 when Beale was in France, the second written in late 1572 soon after the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacres that had swept past the door of his brother-in-law Walsingham’s house in Paris. These treatises


give a clear picture of Beale’s political and religious sympathies, and how these crystallized in his attitude to the issues surrounding Mary Stuart. Beale’s first treatise consisted of a reply to four rhetorical questions that Beale hypothesised that the French King might have considered to ‘recommend the Quene of Scotts cause’. This first treatise was written in December 1571 whilst Beale was serving with Walsingham at the English embassy in Paris, during the period of Walsingham’s resort to ‘ physic’ that had brought Sir Henry Killigrew out to Paris as acting ambassador. Killigrew then decided to send Beale’s treatise to Cecil, excusing Beale’s recent composition with the standard rhetorical conceit of enforced leisure.

Beale’s treatise was of course no outcome merely of enforced leisure, and Killigrew for one saw the propaganda potential quite clearly. He informed Cecil the he meant ‘to haue hyt translated into french’, and, if Cecil agreed, to circulate it selectively within the French court, one copy to ‘thadmirall’, another to ‘the duc of montmorency’ and another to the ‘marshall dauylye’. These three, continued Killigrew, all bore ‘great swaye’ with the Queen Mother, who ‘rulyth all.’10 Beale’s ‘discourse’ was therefore intended to persuade a select courtly audience, and he adopted a moderate tone throughout the treatise, emphasising the necessity for Mary’s continued imprisonment in England without mentioning the possibility of her execution in the wake of the revelations of the Ridolfi plot. The arguments against Mary were very carefully versed, and based on historical examples from French and Spanish sources of the deposition of tyrannous monarchs, of the transference of sovereignty from mother to son, and of the imprisonment of rivals to the succession by other monarchs. Beale’s treatise formed a part of the ongoing English campaign to prevent Mary’s continuing imprisonment

10 SP 70/121/ff 46-49 ‘Reasons whie the ff. kinge should recomend the Quene of Scotts cause’. Another copy of this treatise was obtained by Thomas Norton - it was returned, so to speak, to Beale when Norton’s papers came into his possession - now Add MS 48023 ff 133-36. Other copies are Cotton MS Caligula C.III ff 412-14 and Harleian MS 398 ff 38-41; and also notes by
becoming a hindrance to the proposed Anglo-French alliance against the threat of Hapsburg Spain, and the associated attempts to obtain French recognition of the then protestant government in Scotland. Beale explained in his own accompanying letter to Cecil that his treatise could be used as part of this concerted campaign by the English in Paris to sully Mary’s reputation, and to ‘seke means to disgrace her <ie. Mary> in as much as her mty iustly may, & thother iustly haeth the deserved’, so that not even her French Guise cousins could have the gall to support her.

It is characteristic of how men like Beale involved themselves in political opinion and debate that Beale had taken this opportunity to add his tuppence worth either on his own volition or in tandem with Killigrew, and not at the behest of Cecil. Beale and Killigrew were also busy utilising other material suited to the matter in hand. Killigrew told Cecil soon after in early December 1571 that he had already embarked upon the targeted circulation of copies of George Buchanan’s Latin anti-Marian polemic Detectio amongst the French Court, one to ‘du Pin’, and then from him to ‘thadmirall and the duc montmorency’ and also to ‘cause the said to be translated into french and prynted.’ Similarly, at the end of December Killigrew then told Cecil that he had also given one of ‘buca<chanan’s> latin booke of late com forth’ to the Venetian Ambassador to pass on homewards. Sir Thomas Smith arrived from London in early January 1572 bringing with him more of ‘bucanans booke bothe in latin and inglysh which were myche desired in this court’. Killigrew had then distributed these ‘one to cabagnes, another to mons. de foix, and the therd to one montagne of montpellier that

Burghley dated 28 March 1572; CSPF 1572-74, p 64; CSP Scot. 1571-74, pp. 182-84. The accompanying letter from Beale to Burghley 3 December 1571 is SP 70/121/ff 51-7. 11 SP 70/121 ff 45-47 ink 43-45 pencil 3 December 1571 Killigrew to Burghley autograph; this was the Latin edition of the Detectio Mariae reginae Scotorum printed in London in 1571 - for the complicated bibliographical details of the printing of this work see McFarlane, I. D. George Buchanan Duckworth 1981, and Durkan, J. (ed.) Bibliography of George Buchanan Glasgow 1994. This is what Jenny Wormald has recently termed the ’gutter press’ of Buchanan - see Wormald, J. ‘The Usurped and Unjust Empire of Women’, Journal of Ecc Hist 42 (1991), pp. 283-92.
wrightyth the universall story of our tyme.' Killigrew asked that Cecil supply him with further copies of both, ‘for I am sure they wyll stopp many menes mouthes besides the good they haue done hear allreadye’.12

The frame of reference and the terminology utilised in Beale’s treatise intended for the French court had been quite restrained, but in his accompanying letter to Cecil he gave more of an indication of the virulence of the sentiment against Mary harboured in the breasts of protestant Englishmen.13 Beale did not argue for the execution of Mary in this first treatise, but the notion that a dead Mary was politically more useful than an imprisoned Mary was not alien to the Paris embassy. Later that month Killigrew wrote to Burghley that some of the French counsellors he had talked to were ‘of opinion that her lyffe is the greatest impediment of any other to the weale of all iii realmes I meane Ingland, france & Scotland’ because of the Guise expectation of ‘the greatness of her line and her succession’: ‘this made them to marvayle’, continued Killigrew, ‘how she was left a lyve’.14 The pressure placed on Elizabeth from all sides for Mary’s execution during the summer of 1572 was considerable, but Elizabeth still did not yield. The Duke of Norfolk was tried, convicted and executed for his perceived treason, but Mary Stuart survived to live (and plot, contemporary English protestants muttered) again another day.

Beale returned to England in the spring of 1572, too late to sit in the Parliamentary session that executed the Duke of Norfolk and failed to persuade Elizabeth to pass the same sentence on Mary Stuart. His return to England also took him away from Paris

12 SP 70/121 ff 112-14 ink 116-18 pencil 29 December 1571 Killigrew to Burghley autograph from Amboise; SP 70/122 ff 36-41 ink 37-42 pencil 9 January 1572 Smith to Burghley from Amboise; SP 70/122 ff 46-48 ink 47-49 pencil 10 January 1572 Killigrew to Burghley from Amboise autograph.
13 SP 70/121 ff 52-53 ink ff 50-51 pencil 3 December 1571 Beale to Burghley from Salmure; see opening quotation.
14 SP 70/121/ff 116-18 Killigrew to Burghley December 29 1571, f 116b.
before the outbreak of the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacres in August that year that shocked the protestant English, and confirmed for many the existence of the shadowy hands of the Vatican and Philip II acting in tandem with the Guise in France. These events also precipitated Beale to write his second treatise for Burghley: ‘by theis late horrible accidentes in Ffraunce’, Beale insisted, ‘the coniuracon of the Counsell of Trent to root out all such as contrarie to the popes tradicons make profession of Christes Gospell... so manyfestly now appereth as I thincke yt cannot be denied of any persons.’ More than the simple savagery reported, there appeared to be an ominous rationale behind events, and he prognosticated the alliance of the French and Spanish, resulting in an inevitable three-pronged threat to England from Catholic France, from the Duke of Alva’s troops from the Netherlands and from a simultaneous rising of domestic English catholics. Mary Queen of Scots was to be married to the Duke of Anjou, and the nobility of England slaughtered in their beds. Beale argued that this hitherto unimaginable alliance of France and Spain would be greased by the mutually acceptable eventuality of Mary’s accession to the English and Scottish thrones, and then also by their shared Catholicism that ‘shall knitt the knott of this concorde... of so mortall enemies as the frensh man and Spaniardes euer ’hitherto’ haue ben, hath in so short a time mad so faithfull & constant fryndes.’

Beale then passed on to what the beleaguered English could do to try to avoid such a fate. Mindful of his own personal experience and of that of his foster-father John Hales, Beale purposely avoided the issue of succession, claiming that it ‘passeth to farr my capacity’. Furthermore, he showed little regard for the effectiveness of any statutory disablement against Mary’s hereditary right to the succession, ‘To disable her only from

15 Add MS 48049 ff 340-357; untitled discourse by Beale addressed to Burghley, on foreign affairs and dangers to England, written after the massacre of St. Bartholomew; <late 1572 or early 1573>, autograph draft, quote is from f 340b. For a fair copy see Cotton MS. Titus F. III, ff 302-308b.
16 Add 48049 ff 345a; f 347b.
succession ys a toye ffor yt is sett downe for an unfallible principle the boke of her title, that no parlement, lawe n{or} any other fact, can take awaye a princes interest.' Beale compared this to recent historical precedents in England and France, and from these concluded that 'neither Edicte n{or} parlament could sufficiently disable any, or suppress entirely any interest pretence or faction: but when opportunity servued, the principall remayneng force disanulled all & toke place...'.

Beale therefore recommended three paths of action. First, Beale advised increased support of as 'our brethren and neighbours in frauce and fflaunders', using the characteristic tone of confraternity to refer to his co-religionists abroad so common among the self-conscious group of cosmopolitan protestants to which Beale belonged. Beale equated the importance of aid to his continental co-religionists with that of aid to the reformed Scots, balancing somewhat any notion of an exclusively English protestant nationalism. Beale's second proposal was the associated attempt to impose a more effective control of English catholics at home. Finally, it is only in Beale's second treatise written less than a year later that Beale's own virulent fear of the possible repercussions of Mary Stuart's continued existence find what many contemporaries thought of as their logical conclusion. Beale's third recommendation was therefore that 'their chiefest hedd must be removed'. This was both a literal and

---


metaphorical suggestion: 'I meane the Quene of Scottes, who as she hath bin the
principall cause of the ruine of the ij realmes of ffraunce & Scotland, hath pretely
played the like parte here.' Beale pressed home to Cecil the amazement of all 'wisemen'
across Europe at Elizabeth's 'overmilde' leniency in 'norishing in her owne bosome so
pestiferous a viper', who had so obviously 'gon about the destruction of her highnes
person & estate, hath empoysoned & alienated the hartes of dyuers of the subiectes of
this lande, and so contyneweth daily.'

Beale's belief in the efficacy of a designated protestant succession centered on the
Suffolk claim had therefore been transformed by late 1572 to that of the necessity of
the death of Mary Stuart, come what may. For Beale, this was no longer an issue of
'succession', but one now dominated by the specific negative succession - or exclusion
if we like - of Mary Stuart by the permanently effective means of execution as opposed
to a Parliamentary act. From 1572 onwards we find no discussion of possible heirs, no
positive mention of a preferred successor, merely the persistent and merciless call for
the death of Mary. Why should this be so?

One way of answering this is to take a step back and look at the ideological context for
this call for execution. The first layer in Beale's anti-Marian ideological firmament was
formed by the arguments developed against the rule of Mary Tudor in England by
Beale's fellow Protestant Marian exiles Christopher Goodman, John Ponet and John
Knox. These men had developed a series of arguments for the legal resistance to Mary
Tudor based on a convenient amalgam of Biblical precedent, Roman law, and anti-

19 Add MS 48049 f 350a.
Press 1964, which portrays a gradual progression from attacks on the moral conduct and
character of Mary to confessional attacks against her catholicism.
gynocracy. The strength and persistence of Marian ‘resistance theory’ and how it informed attitudes towards Mary Stuart was graphically evident in the speeches and debates over the execution of Mary in the 1572 parliamentary session. Beale had not sat in this 1572 parliament due to his service with Walsingham in Paris, but he would have swiftly familiarised himself with the proceedings in the matters of Norfolk and Mary on his return to England that spring. He was later to acquire many manuscript items relating to the session himself, and also many from the papers of that other busy and influential ‘man of business’ Thomas Norton who had himself actively pressed for the death of both Norfolk and Mary.

The Parliament of 1572 demonstrates that one aspect of the ideological ammunition for the articulation of the ‘exclusion’ crisis was already in place. Another crucial contributing factor to Beale’s own ideological make-up was the dismay felt in all quarters of protestant England at Elizabeth’s refusal to sanction the execution of Mary. Recent work on Tudor conceptions of ‘counsel’ has cast much light on the centrality of the efficient functioning of the channels and expectations of counsel for the internal stability of the Tudor polity. When these channels and expectations failed members of the political nation were forced to question the fundamental structures and processes which held the polity together, and also their own places within it. Elizabeth’s refusal

---


22 See Appendix 1.

to allow the execution of Mary Queen of Scots in 1572 forcibly disillusioned most of the protestant political nation with the conventionally accepted paths and processes of counsel. They had tried for the last fourteen years to persuade Elizabeth that they could decide what was in her best interests far better than she could herself, and they had singularly failed. This had an enormous impact on traditional attitudes to counsel, and concomitant implications for contemporary conceptions of authority, sovereignty and political responsibility. In his second anti-Marian treatise written in 1572, after insisting on the necessity of Mary’s death, Beale reminded Cecil of the ‘dismay and discontentment the best subjects of this realme universally had at the dissolution of the last session.’ Cecil needed no reminding: he himself had written to Walsingham that as a consequence of their inability to persuade Elizabeth to agree to Mary’s execution ‘all persons shall behold our follies’ and that the ‘shame doth as much trouble me as the rest’. Cecil had then lamented further to Walsingham that ‘these lacks and errors’ would be publicly imputed ‘to some of us that are accounted inward counsellors, where the fault is not.’24 Elizabeth’s personal responsibility may well have weighed heavily on her own shoulders and conscience, but the clemency that resulted from her decision weighed down heavier on those of her subjects. Beale had also felt impelled to ‘add by the waye’ to Cecil how men like him considered that ‘yt is not good that either prince or private men be so wedded to their owne conceites & opinions’, and that Elizabeth (heavily implied but not named in person of course) ‘shold be content nowe & then, to heare and folowe other mens councells being so grounded uppon lawe reason & necessity.’25

The failure of the conventional channels of counsel, advice and persuasion to break down Elizabeth’s entrenched opposition to Mary’s execution in 1572 had radical implications for men like Beale. Beale’s own involvement in the ‘path to 1587’ was

24 Printed in Strype, Annals, II, i, pp. 198-99.
from now on continuous and ideologically coherent. The third layer of Beale’s anti-
Marian ideological firmament was constituted by an amalgam of contemporary
Calvinist resistance theory contained in the arguments on civil government and
resistance to tyranny thrown up by contemporary events outside England. Beale
collected and read the polemical treatises concerning the deposition of Mary in
Scotland in 1567, the post-St Bartholomew’s Day polemics by French Huguenots, and
those of his Dutch co-religionists’ in their struggle against the perceived tyranny of
Philip II. The authors of these works were invariably the ‘brethren’ of protestant
Englishmen like Beale, whose shared commitment to a pan-European Reformed
alliance against the perceived post-Tridentine threat of the French Guise and Philip II in
the Netherlands dominated their political world during the 1570s and 80s. ‘Calvinist
resistance theory’ in the second half of the Sixteenth Century is better characterized as
‘resistance theory used by Calvinists’ due more to their particular political
circumstances rather than to any implicit logic in Calvin’s political theology. In
Beale’s case, his religion was always the driving force behind his consuming paranoia
over the continuing vulnerability of a specifically protestant conception of the English
commonwealth. Beale’s involvement with this calvinist resistance ideology
complements the suggestions of a more secular infiltration of alternative forms of
governance rooted in classical republicanism in recent work by Collinson and Peltonen.
When conventional modes and channels of counsel had apparently been exhausted,
historical models of classical republicanism may well have informed the manner in
which contemporaries sought to explore the viable alternatives of action within the

---

25 Add MS 48049 f 353b.
Malament After the Reformation Manchester 1980, pp 309-30; Kingdon, R. M. ‘Calvinism and
polity, but, for men like Beale from the early 1570s, they did not drive the more ‘practical’ aspects of the exclusion crisis.\(^{27}\)

We can document this ideological transition in detail through Beale’s career and through his continuing acquisition of what for him were the twin intellectual pillars of this ‘exclusion’ ideology; the literature generated by Mary Stuart’s claim to the English throne, and the Scottish, Huguenot and Dutch polemics on civil government, justified resistance and tyrannicide. A single volume from Beale’s papers can serve to illustrate this ‘progressive radicalisation’ beginning in the 1560s that characterises the transition from involvement in a ‘succession’ crisis to an ‘exclusion’ crisis.\(^{28}\) The volume was only collected together and bound in the 1590s, but its genesis and growth offers an allegory of Beale’s own personal ideological journey. The contents of this volume read like a contemporary introduction and reading list firstly to Mary Stuart’s claim to the English succession from the 1560s and secondly to the Calvinist resistance theory of the 1570s. It begins with a refutation of John Knox’s *First Blast of the Trumpet* written in 1559 by Richard Bertie, husband of Catherine Duchess of Suffolk. Following this are three treatises dating from the 1560s arguing for and against Mary’s right to the throne of England, and then an account of Mary’s guilt in the murder of her husband Darnley. These items Beale acquired from the papers of Thomas Norton and John Hales, who had both been up to their necks in these debates in the 1560s.


The transition from these discussions of Mary’s title to the succession in the 1560s to the pan-European arguments of the Calvinist theories of resistance in the 1570s is encapsulated in the next item, a copy of George Buchanan’s platonic dialogue *De jure regni apud Scotos* that Beale almost certainly obtained from Daniel Rogers when in Germany in 1577, two years before its first publication in print in Edinburgh in 1579 (see Appendix 1). The application of these potentially radical theories of civil resistance to the Dutch revolt against Philip II in the 1570s is signalled by the following item, a copy of the oath of Philip II on the abdication of Charles V as ruler of the Netherlands in 1549 (which Beale obtained at the same time as his copy of Buchanan’s dialogue), a key text in the arguments of the Dutch calvinist rebels that Philip had broken his oath to uphold their traditional liberties and thus forfeited his rights of sovereignty.  

Beale’s extensive involvement in the French Huguenot cause and the literature of resistance that the political contexts of the 1560s and 70s had generated is testified by the four treatises that complete the volume. At the end of the copy of the oath of Philip II in 1549 Beale has inserted a copy of Etienne de la Böetie’s ‘Discours de la servitude volontaire’, a mid sixteenth-century treatise that was hijacked by French Huguenots in their need to justify their own limited obedience to a persecuting monarch in the 1560s.  

There follow copies of three French Huguenot discourses written in the same hand; two concerning the right of resistance to an unlawful sovereign dating from the end of the 1560s, and one dating from 1572 calling for the execution of Mary Queen of Scots. These demonstrate once again how closely Beale and his continental ‘brethren’ shared the connection between the pan-European struggle against the

---

perceived Catholic tyranny of Philip II and the Papacy and the exclusion of Mary Stuart from the British throne.\textsuperscript{31}

Beale’s avid collection of this literature was no dry intellectual interest in the political theory and polemics thrown out of the contemporary European political situation. We have been amply warned by studies of early modern reading that reading in itself was never simply a dry, passive or even isolated activity.\textsuperscript{32} Gabriel Harvey, arch-annotator and neighbour and acolyte of Sir Thomas Smith in Essex, is probably the best documented contemporary of Beale’s as a reader of texts in Elizabethan England. Harvey had been an academic prodigy at Cambridge during the 1570s before requalifying as a Doctor of Civil Law in the 1580s, and during the course of his varied career Harvey acquired, read and annotated a wide variety of printed books, many of which still survive today with their tell-tale marginalia.\textsuperscript{33} Harvey’s reading of Livy’s \textit{Roman Histories} was partly undertaken in the company of specially-gathered groups of courtiers and ‘men-of-action’ such as Sir Thomas Smith’s son and Sir Philip Sidney.

\textsuperscript{31} Add MS 48043 ff 193-200b, tract in the form of a letter headed ‘Pour Jhean Cousin ministre de leglise francoise A Londres’, dated 7 March 1569; ff 205-225, tract beginning ‘Il est fort malaisé de juger des affaires du monde...’ c.1568; ff 226-235b, tract urging the trial of M Q of S beg. ‘Nostre aage a produit en la pluspart des estats de la Christenité des accidens..’. Beale also obtained a copy of this last treatise from the papers of Thomas Norton; see Add MS 48023 art. 16 and the Schedule in Appendix 1. Versions of the first two of these French treatises were included in the huge collection of Huguenot treatises published in 1576 by Simon Goulart under the title \textit{Memoires de l’estat de France sous Charles ix Geneva} 1576; ff 205-225 similar to ‘Le Politique Dialogue traissant de la puissance, authorité, & du devoir des Princes...’ in Goulart III, pp 61-116; ff 226-235b similar to Eusebe Cosmopolite [pseud.] 1574 \textit{Le reveille-matin des François...} 2nd edn. 1578 i pp 181-199.


These men gathered together to read these classical texts for specific political, military and diplomatic purposes. Because of this, Grafton and Jardine suggest, Harvey is of particular interest to any attempt to monitor the practical applications of Elizabethan political thought. The basis of these readings of classical texts lay in the contemporary belief in the continuing relevance of the example of classical history to contemporary politics. This relevance was more than didactic: situations and personages across the intervening centuries were regularly compared directly with one another. Harvey correlated the prominent figures of mid-Elizabethan Cambridge with those whom he imagined to have been their classical counterparts in terms of rhetoric and eloquence: Nicholas Carr to Demosthenes, Roger Ascham to Isocrates, Thomas Smith to Plato, and John Cheke to Aristotle. Harvey did this through a combination of the identification of the role in their respective society of each figure to another, and also through the personal preferences of the contemporary figures with their classical counterparts. Thus Thomas Smith might be compared to Plato because of the emphasis Plato’s work had in his teaching as much as the similarity Harvey might have envisaged between the two men. You were, Harvey might have argued, who you read, and vice versa.

Secondly, Harvey equated the qualities and virtues necessary for political success across the ages. Contemporary success was only to be achieved by means of emulating the right classical counterpart for your particular situation, and Harvey identified the success or otherwise of contemporary politicians and councillors within the framework of Livy’s description of Roman politics. Nicholas Throckmorton’s reputation as one of

34 Demosthenes’s *Gnomologiae, sive sententiae collectaneae et similia ex Demosthenis orationibus et epistolis .. collectae per J. Loinam* Basle 1552 (Harvey’s copy is British Library C.45.a.9) p 43.
35 Demos. *Gnom* p 215; ‘In the flourishing time of Sir John Cheek, Sir Thomas Smith, Bishop Watson, & M. Ascham; the fowre souerain Autors, that reigned in that Uniuersitie, were Tullie, & Demosthenes; Aristotle, & Plato. And next them, Isocrates, & Xenophon. M. Cheeks
the ‘cunningest, & shrewdest ambassadours in Fraunce’ was, Harvey noted, built on
Throckmorton’s immersion in the correct classical literature. Throckmorton had eyes
only ‘for Cesar, & Liuie; Liuie & Cesar’, and as a result he had been one of the most
‘resolute’ men in England, and ‘few deeper heds: as Mie Lord Burgley will still saye.’
Harvey’s political ‘heroes’ were therefore men like Wolsey, Cromwell, Gardiner, and
More from Henry’s reign, Northumberland, Cranmer and Smith from Edward’s, and
Cecil, Bacon and Smith again under Elizabeth. These men were by no means
identical, either to Harvey’s or to our own eyes, but they all manifested the necessary
combination of educational *ars*, what Harvey termed as a ‘roman’ or military *virtus*,
and the simple practical retrospective success that Harvey admired.

Beale’s reading of this ‘Calvinist resistance theory’ would have been undertaken in a
similar, pragmatic and directed manner. Beale’s archive was a ‘living library’ like that
of other early modern English scholars such as Harvey and John Dee, and Beale
utilised his collection in the course of his own work and extensive involvement in the
diplomatic negotiations with Mary in the early 1580s. In November 1582, in the midst
of his involvement in the negotiations on a possible three-way treaty between Elizabeth,
Mary and her son James VI, Beale drew up a memorandum titled ‘On the Scotishe
Queenes demeanors towards her Mtye’. This was a virtual paraphrase of Buchanan’s

*Singularest choice of all other, to make an excellent man, with gods Bible. He would wish a good
student to parse thorowgh all good Autours, Greek, & Latin: but to dwell in their few onlie.’

36 Harvey’s *Livy*; quoted in Grafton and Jardine 1990, p 54.

37 Quintilian, M. Fabius *M. Fabii Quintiliani Oratoris eloquentissimi, Institutionum oratoriarum
Libri XII* Paris, Robert Stephanus 1542. Harvey’s copy is British Library C.60.II; sig T3b.
‘Omnes iere Megalandri, egregii erant vel natura, vel arte Oratores. Quales sub rege Henrico 8o:
Cardinal Volsaeus: Prorex Cromvellus: Cancellarius, Morus: pragmaticus, Gardinerus: quator
heroici Consiliarii. Sub principe Edouardo 6to: Dux Northumbrius: archiepiscopus Cranmerus:
secretarius Smithus: Cheus paedagogus. Sub regina Elizabetha, smithus Cineaes; Cecilius Nestor;
Baconus, Scaevola; Essexius Achilles.’

38 Moore Smith 1913, p 141; ‘Ye Lord Cromwell: ye Duke of Northumberland: Captain Stekley,
ye popes general: Captain Drake, her Majesties adventurer &c. of a RomanDisposition, plus
Virtutis quam Artis’; p 192 ‘But fewer right politiques of late memory: Wulsey, Cromwell;
Gardiner, & Cicill. All the rest, children in comparison. But noovies, & pupills in pollicy.
History and Detectio, the two anti-Marian polemics that he had helped Sir Henry Killigrew circulate selectively in France ten years beforehand, and Beale carefully noted his sources in the margin of both the draft and of the fair copy. One of the clauses he includes in his case against Mary concerns her intent to 'reduce that realme <ie. Scotland> to popishe religion'; not content, he has inserted in his own thick and distinctive hand her attempt to 'overthrowe the estate of religion then established in that realme by Tirany'. Professor Collinson's suggestions of the vibrancy of the humanist classical republican tradition around the fringes of the 'exclusion' crisis have been echoed in the work of Peltonen, who has argued that 'the most pervasive and extreme employment of humanist and republican arguments occurred at the margins rather than at the centre of the political community'. The 'marginal' context of Beale's employment of the radical continental monarchomach ideology is only applicable here in the margins of Beale's own writings in a very literal sense: in all other aspects we must take Beale, as Clerk of the Council, acting Principal Secretary and adviser to the great and good of Elizabethan politics, as a figure as central as could be to the processes of government and political debate.

These ideological foundations for Beale's own response to the succession and exclusion crises indicate a contrast to the picture previously painted of a diluted, passive and almost unwanted infiltration of radical continental political theory into Elizabethan England. John Salmon, in his seminal work on the influence of French political thought in England, contrasted the outspoken loyalty to Elizabeth professed by John Stubbes in 1579 to the Huguenot criticism of monarchical despotism. Beale's involvement in these issues and the shared connections between them on both sides of

40 'A declaration of the Scotishe Queenes demeanors towards her Mtye &c. since her cominge to the Crowne'; draft is Egerton MS 1693 ff 58-61; fair copy Add MS 48049 ff 241-44.
41 Peltonen Classical Republicanism 1995 p 54.
the channel displays a much more critical and conscious involvement of these continental issues in English domestic politics.\(^{43}\) Beale owned, read and absorbed the continental literature on resistance to tyranny, just as he owned copies of the literature conventionally associated with the ‘domestic’ aspects of the Elizabethan ‘succession’ crisis. Beale obtained a copy of Sir Thomas Smith’s famous *Dialogue on the Queens marriage* written in 1560, and also owned two copies of Sir Philip Sidney’s letter to the Queen of 1579 arguing against the proposed marriage of Elizabeth with the French Duc d’Alençon. Bound now into another of the Yelverton volumes of Beale-related manuscript items is also a rare untrimmed printed copy of John Stubbes’s *The discoverie of a gaping gulf*... circulated to the author’s ultimate peril in 1579, and arguing like Sidney against the Alençon marriage. For the sake of balance presumably rather than conviction Beale then also obtained a manuscript copy of Henry Howard’s refutation of Stubbes’s arguments written in 1580 to support Elizabeth’s proposed marriage to Alençon: this is now bound into the same volume following Stubbes’s printed treatise.\(^{44}\) It is Beale’s library and his use of the multitude of seemingly eclectic textual sources that demonstrate most clearly how intertwined the ‘domestic’ and ‘European’ aspects of the Elizabethan succession question truly were in the minds of contemporaries like Beale, and also how the ‘succession’ and ‘exclusion’ crises were

---


\(^{44}\) The copy of Sir Thomas Smith's *Dialogue* is Add MS 48047 ff 96-135; the two copies of Sidney’s letter are now Add MS 48027 ff 230-35 and Add MS 48044 ff 240-46; The untrimmed printed copy of Stubbes’s *Gaping Gulf* is Add MS 48027 ff 152-95, see Bland, M. “‘Invisible Dangers’: Censorship and the Subversion of Authority in Early Modern England’, *Pap. Bib. Soc. Am.* 90 (1996), pp. 151-93; A copy of Henry Howard’s refutation of Stubbes’s book follows in the same volume, Add MS 48027 ff 197-215.
indeed truly two sides of the same coin, whose outward aspects appeared to change continually whilst the essence remained fundamentally the same.

Beale was by no means alone in these concerns, and the involvement of a significant minority of the secretarial and diplomatic servants at the administrative and ideological heart of the Elizabethan polity is well documented in at least two other figures that we are already somewhat familiar with here - William Davison and Daniel Rogers. Rogers has already been encountered a number of times, either in France with Beale in the late 1560s, in the Netherlands and in Germany in 1576 and 1577, and as a Clerk of the Council in the later 1580s. It was Rogers’s involvement in the politics of the Dutch revolt against Philip II that had led him to begin to pressurise George Buchanan in 1576 to ensure this anti-Marian dialogue the *De jure regni apud Scotos* saw the light of day in print, and Rogers was also instrumental in the circulation of printed copies of this work in England after it was eventually printed in Edinburgh in 1579. Like Rogers, William Davison was also immersed in Dutch affairs throughout the unravelling of the Dutch revolt under the Prince of Orange in the 1570s. A series of undated notes on the proposal that the English intervene directly in the Netherlands written in his autograph hand, broken down into the bi-furcating structure of a rhetorical argument, survive now in Davison’s papers in the Harleian MSS. In these notes he broke down his argument to justify intervention on behalf of the Dutch under headings such as ‘That which distinguishes the King from the Tyrant’ and ‘On Magistrates and who they are’, all illustrated with quotations from Cicero, Calvin and Peter Martyr. This characterisation of Philip II of Spain as a tyrant by Davison in order to justify resistance by his Dutch

---

45 What is now Bodleian Library Savile T.10, a compilation of astronomical tracts, bears the inscription ‘Danieli Rogerio amico suo charissimo Robertus Belus Dono dedit’; see McFarlane *George Buchanan*, p. 362. Rogers’s autograph MS book of poems and epigraphs now Huntington MS 31188 (BL MSS RP 363) contains eight separate poems addressed to Beale; ff 85b, 87a, 104a, 184b, 188b, 216b, 228b, and 234a. There are also poems to Buchanan, eg. f 88a. 46 Harl MS 290 ff 257-58 folded sheet containing notes and rhetorical breakdown of argument; ff 259-61 three leaves; entitled f 259a ‘De Magistratibus & iis qui praesunt’.
subjects was partly rooted in the historical depiction of the eponymous Philip of Macedonia by the Greek orator Demosthenes. The resurrection of the study of Greek in mid-Tudor Cambridge by Sir John Cheke and Sir Thomas Smith had passed on a legacy of enduring respect for the pithy force of the Greek orator amongst many of the men who became the leading intellectuals and politicians in Elizabeth’s reign. Thomas Wilson, diplomat and joint Principal Secretary in the late 1570s, translated the *Three orations of Demosthenes...* in 1570 and dedicated the work to William Cecil. Wilson also included in his translation ‘those his forver Orations titled expressly & by name against King Philip of Macedonie: most nedefull to be redde in these daungerous dayes, of all them that loue their Countries libertie’.

The parallels between the contemporary Philip and the Philip of old were easily drawn, as was the call to Cecil to emulate the orator Demosthenes: ‘God graunt unto England many such true, faythfull, stowte and wise counsellors’ wrote Wilson, ‘as was Demosthenes to Athens’. Likewise, Philip of Macedonia’s historical exploits elicited Gabriel Harvey’s admiration and condemnation in the same breath: ‘glorius animus, sed tyrannicus’.

The direct correlation of the tyranny of Philip II of Spain with that of his conveniently eponymous Macedonian predecessor was not simply a knee-jerk reaction of humanist-educated contemporaries to a current polemical context. The reactions of Rogers, Davison, Wilson and Harvey as well as Beale all show how an immersion in the historical literature perceived to be relevant to the contemporary political situation was

---

47 *The three Orations of Demosthenes chiefe Orator among the Grecians, in fauour of the Olynthians, ... with those his forover Orations titled expressly & by name against King Philip of Macedonie: most nedefull to be redde in these daungerous dayes, of all them that lose their Countries libertie, and ... Englished out of the Greecee by Thomas Wyson Doctor of the ciuill lawes.* London Henry Denham 1570.

48 *Three Orations of Demosthenes...* Sig M iij b; Marg. ‘Adiuce and counsell to go before mens actions’.

49 Demosthenes *Gnomologiae, sive sententiae collectaneae et similia ex Demosthenis orationibus et epistolis, ... collectae per J. Loi num.* Basle 1552. Harvey’s copy is BL C.45.a.9, p 159. Beale did not make a connection between the tyranny of Mary Stuart in Scotland and of Philip II in the Netherlands with Elizabeth’s refusal to be advised or counselled as the protestant nation saw fit. He did, however, equate the increasing authoritarian control of the destiny of the Church of England by John Whitgift and his principle abettors John Aylmer and Richard Bancroft with the
considered as a *sine qua non* of responsible and informed contemporary political action. Put quite simply, these men were the opinion-formers at the heart of the Elizabethan polity, and this was part of the process whereby their own opinions were formed.

Beale had become through his diplomatic service and ideological involvement the resident ‘expert’ on Mary, to whom Walsingham and Burghley would turn to for advice on policy and precedent. In the preparations for Mary’s second trial in October 1586 Walsingham wrote to the then bed-ridden Beale that he and the relevant others were ‘nowe making of collections towching the scotishe Queens proceedings’. Walsingham then asked Beale to ‘set down what hath past your owne knowledge, aswell of her complaintes as her mates aunswers to the same, and of the things that you weare willed to chardge her particularly withall.’

Beale replied to Walsingham’s request giving his thoughts on what the charges against Mary should be, and described his four previous missions to the captive Scottish Queen in 1575, 1581, 1583 and 1584. Beale was to perform two more journeys to Mary, the first in November 1586 in the company of Thomas Sackville Lord Buckhurst to inform her of the verdict of the trial that had ended finally at Westminster, and the second, as we shall see in greater detail in the following chapter, to carry the signed warrant for her execution to Fotheringay in February 1587.

There was a shared vision of the political reality of the domestic, British and European contexts that bound men like Beale, Rogers, Davison and Walsingham together as they continued to countenance the convenience of the death of Mary Stuart. After Mary had

---

50 Add MS 48027 f 374; Walsingham to Beale 21 September 1586. A copy of Beale’s reply follows, ff 375-76, 78. The original reply sent is now Cott. Cal. C.IX ff 445-47, printed in *SP Scot. 1586-88* no. 46.
finally been executed in 1587, Beale made copious notes which documented his search for precedents and authority during the various stages of exclusion by execution. Beale was documenting how a preparedness to contemplate and even plan the demise of Mary Stuart had always existed at the highest level of the Elizabethan government. He noted the authority that had been conveyed to the Earls of Huntington and Hereford in the autumn of 1569 (when Mary Stuart was brought south to Coventry during the Northern rising) ‘to choppe of her heade if anie trouble or stirre had ben in the countreye’. Beale also noted that his colleague Sir Henry Killigrew had told him that when Killigrew was in Scotland in 1572 there had been a failed attempt to arrange the judicial execution of Mary Stuart by the Scottish government.\textsuperscript{51} Every time Beale visited Mary during the 1580s he had brought back hopeful accounts of her imminent death through ill-health and depression. Throughout the years of Mary’s captivity in England the to-ing and fro-ing of the political situations in Scotland, France, Spain and the Netherlands had continually acted to bring this political convenience of Mary’s death back and forth in the minds of men like Beale, Rogers, Davison and Walsingham.

Eventually, as the conspiratorial atmosphere of the 1580s stifled all possibilities of peace, compromise and clemency, and after the final condemnation of Mary in the parliament specially called for this purpose in November 1586, Elizabeth herself gave into the long years of pressure and also came to share in this political vision. However, unlike Beale and the others, Elizabeth’s change of heart sprang from an attempt to shift responsibility from herself as head of state onto the more expendable shoulders of some private person, and so she sought to give as broad a hint as she might that someone should rid her of that turbulent Queen. Prodding her loyal subjects under duress of their

\textsuperscript{51} Leader, J. D. \textit{Mary Queen of Scots in Captivity, 1569-84} Sheffield 1880.
\textsuperscript{52} Add MS 48027 f 638b.
\textsuperscript{53} Add MS 48027 f 709a. See also f 638b \textless in margin\textgreater ‘Mr Henry Killigrew told me R. B. that he being in Scotland had commission from her mty to deale with the Erl Morton the Regent to receaue her home to execute her, but he wold not’.
Oath of Association and the Act for the Queen’s safety (27. Eliz. c. 1) Elizabeth proposed the convenience of Mary’s death to the joint-keepers of the Scottish Queen Sir Amyas Paulet and Sir Dru Drury. In a letter drafted by Walsingham and Davison, she reprimanded the joint-keepers for the ‘lack of that care and zeal’ of her service that she looked for at their hands, ‘in that you have in all this time of yourselves (without other provocation) found out some way to shorten the life of that Queen.’\textsuperscript{54} The circumstances of this desperate royal demand are confirmed in Beale’s own official relation of the affair, where he mentions that on his arrival at Fotheringay on the 5 February both Drury and Paulet told him that they had been asked to have Mary ‘violentlye murthered’, and how they had both refused.\textsuperscript{55} In this retrospective account of his conduct Beale was dismissive of Elizabeth’s intimation for them to murder Mary, but elsewhere he noted that it was only after a furtive discussion between all concerned (the two commissioners Shrewsbury and Kent, the two keepers Paulet and Drury, and Beale) on whether to proceed or not under authority of the Oath of Association and with the historical precedents of Richard II and Edward II, that the option of this private murder was finally discarded, and on the 7 February Mary was informed officially of the commission and of her execution the next day.\textsuperscript{56}

Mary’s death at the hands of the anonymous executioner at Fotheringay signalled the end of the Elizabethan exclusion crisis, but it did not resolve the legacy of the tensions this crisis had generated that still continued to reverberate within the polity. Beale, as

\textsuperscript{54} Morris, J. ed. The Letter-Books of Sir Amias Paulet London, Burnes and Oates 1874, pp. 359-62. Paulet replied to this letter immediately on receipt on the 2nd February. Walsingham received this reply the following day and his own reply to this was copied by Beale: this is now Add MS 48027 f 644b. See also Read, C. ‘The Proposal to Assassinate Mary Queen of Scots at Fotheringay’, \textit{EHR} 40 (1925), pp 234-5; Heisch, A. ‘Lord Burghley, Speaker Puckering and the editing of HEH Ellesmere MS 1191’, \textit{HLQ} 51 (1988) pp211-26; Heisch, A. ‘Arguments for execution: Queen Elizabeth’s “White Paper” and Lord Burghley’s “Blue Pencil”’, \textit{Albion} 24 (1992) pp 591-604.

\textsuperscript{55} Add MS 48027 f 639b. Cf Beale’s notes on f 640a; ‘one wingfield (as it was thought) shold haue bin appointed for this deede: and it semed that her mty wold haue had yt don so rather then otherwise pretending that Archibald Douglas the scotch ambassador had so advised her: of all her counsellors it is thought that the Erl of Leycester did most exort her unto this course: But both the secretaryes misliked therof: and so did Sr Amyes Paulet and Sr Drue Drury’.
we have seen, collected material and made copious notes not only to justify his own conduct but also to document the progression over the years of the campaign for Mary’s execution. Six years after Mary’s death in 1593 Beale complained to Burghley that, ‘contrarye to promis and the veary wordes of the comission’, he had not yet received the copy of the commission for execution under the great seal, in case the ‘wofull day’ were ever to come where he would be ‘called into question’ for his conduct therein.57 And well might he have been afraid of that ‘wofull day’. Beale’s own copy of the Commission written by his personal Clerk A bears Beale’s autograph comment that ‘Her mty hand was also in the coppe’; another copy of this commission (again in the hand of Beale’s Clerk A) that was then passed on to his fellow commissioner Henry Grey, 6th earl of Kent, has recently come to public light at the Sotheby’s sale of Fairhurst papers in December 1996.58 In this copy, Beale has underlined the parts of the text referring to the commissioners, and in the top left hand corner Beale himself has scrawled ‘Elysabeth R’ in an imitation of the Queen’s signature.

The need to remind Elizabeth of her overall responsibility by such apparently indirect means was very pertinent. Another of the documents to come to light in this recent Sotheby’s sale is a draft of a letter from the two earls of Kent and Shrewsbury to Elizabeth composed soon after the execution. Banned by Elizabeth from appearing at court, the two earls complained of this apparent attempt by Elizabeth to ‘lay the blame uppon us’. ‘It doethe satisfie our consciences’, they continued, ‘that by the iudgement of your matie and the whole realme, she deserued it, and we had your commission for

56 Add MS 48027 f 639b.
57 Add MS 48064 f 107b.
58 Beale’s copy is now Add MS 48027 ff 645a-46a; Kent’s was sold in Sotheby’s Sale Catalogue 16 and 17 December, lot 42. The 7 lots from this are a mixture of papers belonging to Whitgift, taken by John Selden from Lambeth during the Civil War, and of Henry Grey, 6th earl of Kent, presumably passed on to Selden’s wife Elizabeth Grey.
our warrant and so we trust it will suffice all others, to shewe our innocencye and upright dealinge.' Mary had died according to the due legal and parliamentary process, and the Earls blew out a long sigh of implied relief that no 'respecte to the Association, or other violent zeale towards your safetie' had induced them to 'have dealt otherwyse' - to have had Mary conveniently murdered - as they saw only too clearly now in the aftermath 'what would haue ben the event, that is the wracke of our honor and all that we haue.' The two earls were well aware that Elizabeth was then frantically searching for a scapegoat, and they were not prepared to volunteer their services: 'whatsoever shall ensue herafter', they continued, 'in discharge of our consciences and dueties, towards your matie and our countrye, whereof (as your commission saith) we haue the honor to be principall members, to accepte this our sincere meaninge in good parte'. Sincere they most certainly were, and they proceeded to warn Elizabeth away from emulating the conduct of King David in 'bewaylinge of Absalon', and thereby 'shaminge your good subiectes and seruantes' for doing no more than carrying out her own commandment in the interests and 'safeguarde of your life and estate'. This behaviour, they warned, could only compound the present misery: 'the ende, by the doctrine and example of gods booke, is lyke to be worse, then all the evill that hathe hitherto happened'.

Here the juxtaposition of 'consciences' and 'dueties' on the one side, and 'matie' and 'countrye' on the other well illustrates the tensely constructed amalgam of loyalties at play. The Elizabethan polity below the Queen were pressed into the examination of the source of the authority for the deed they had just carried out, and the myriad layers of loyalties to monarch, commonwealth and country that motivated them to do it. The implied questions of political responsibility and the differing visions of loyalty that the affair exposed are at times beautifully lucid.

59 Lambeth Palace Library Uncatalogued Fairhurst Papers Lot 43 ff 1-2; copy of letter of earls of
Shrewsbury and Kent to Elizabeth, February 1587.
Chapter 8. Robert Beale, William Davison and the Execution of Mary Queen of Scots 1587

‘The place of the secretary is dreadful, if he serve not a constant prince; for he, that liveth by trust, ought to serve truly; so he that lives, at mercy, ought to be careful in the choice of his master’ Robert Cecil, *Treatise on the Office of Principal Secretary* c.1600.¹

A proper understanding of the wider role within the Elizabethan polity of men such as Beale relies on locating their political ideology in a broader canvas than the management of Parliamentary bills concerning ‘shipping and fishe’. The involvement of Robert Beale and William Davison in bringing Mary Stuart to the block in 1587 was one such canvas, ‘an episode’, wrote Professor Collinson, ‘too well-known to require more than a passing mention.’² This final chapter constitutes a more-than-passing mention of the roles of William Davison as Principal Secretary and Beale as Clerk of the Council in the complex and detailed politics surrounding the prelude to and aftermath of Mary’s execution at Fotheringay on 8 February 1587. As the final chapter in this thesis, it also attempts to bring together some of the issues and concerns that have occupied us throughout this study of Beale’s role in the Elizabethan polity. The political and ideological motivations for the death of Mary Queen of Scots discussed in the previous chapter form the background to the differing concepts of conciliar authority and jurisdiction expressed and implied during this whole complicated business, and also to the ideas of political loyalty and of service that motivated men like Beale and Davison. Here, in a different arena to the House of Commons, Beale and

Davison acted in concert with and obedience to the Privy Council, but they did so on a basis of their own independent convictions and conceptions of service to Queen, country and a distinctively Protestant Commonwealth. These different foci of loyalty and service could, when placed under sufficient pressure by external circumstances and events, sometimes disengage from each other in contradiction, and degenerate into uncomfortable internal conflict. The execution of Mary Queen of Scots in February 1587, and the long process leading up to this described in the previous chapter, was the Elizabethan polity’s crowning example of such a potentially disruptive situation.

This re-telling below of what is after all a relatively familiar story is, it is hoped, justified on a number of other counts, and it is only partly intended as a rescue operation for the reputations of Davison and Beale. One of the less complicated justifications for this re-telling of the story is that it is a very good story indeed. To paraphrase Natalie Zemon Davis on Martin Guerre, the story of the execution of Mary Stuart has been told many a time, and it flows so agreeably off tongue and pen that I hope that I shall not be blamed for finding another way to tell it again.3 These events make such a good ‘story’ partly because our knowledge of the crucial days in February and March 1587 surrounding the execution is remarkably complete. This is mainly due to Davison and Beale, both of whom wrote long and detailed accounts of their actions in the affair. Davison’s two accounts of his conduct, one long and one shorter version, were written out on or around the 20 February during his imprisonment in the Tower awaiting trial after the execution, and both survive in a number of copies (4 copies of the longer and 2 of the shorter account survive).4 Beale’s account was written

---

4 The four surviving copies of the longer account are Harleian MS 290 ff 218-221: ‘A discourse sent by Secretary Dauison being then prisoner in the tower of London unto Secretarye Walsyngham Contaynyng a somary reporte of that which passed between hir matie and him in the case of the Skottshe Queene from the signyng of the warrant to the tyme of his restrainte. 20 ffebruary 1586’; Cotton MS Caligula.C.IX ff 149-55; Cotton MS Titus. C. VII ff 48-53; a later copy is Inner Temple Petyt MS 538/50, ff 51-54. The two copies of the shorter account are
independently soon after Davison’s trial for the purpose of defending his own conduct should he himself have to face the still vengeful Elizabeth, and survives in a single copy." The narrative of events from the signing of the warrant for Mary’s execution by Elizabeth on the 1 February 1587 up until the trial of William Davison in Star Chamber on the 28 March can therefore be reconstructed in loving detail from one side due to comparing and collating these accounts, which are utilised extensively below in order to give as authentic a flavour as possible. The other side of the story has been reconstructed mainly from the viewpoint of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, who, we will argue, was the key director of events before the execution acting as the pre-eminent member of the Privy Council. The level of detail of this narrative is also intended to provide a background against which to judge the version of events and of political responsibilities publicly propagated in Star Chamber during the trial of Davison at the end of March which is discussed in the second part of this chapter.

A draft of the warrant for Mary’s death had been prepared by Burghley and Walsingham in early December 1586 after the trial of Mary Stuart begun in that October had delivered the required verdict of guilty, which had then been duly proclaimed in the Parliament called for that purpose in November. Davison stated that Burghley had then handed the final version of the death warrant to him soon afterwards to be engrossed and to await Elizabeth’s instructions.6 Davison then had a long wait until the morning of Wednesday 1 February when he received directions from Lord

---

Harleian MS 290 ff 222-23, the second is printed in Nicolas 1823 pp 270-85 Appendix C from ‘Ayscough Catalogue of MSS. 3199’.

5 Beale’s account is now Add MS 48027 ff 636-41, written in hand of Clerk A with Beale’s autograph additions. It is important to note that these two individuals’ accounts were written independently; both discuss the same set of circumstances, but Beale does not mention Davison’s account and it is clear from internal evidence that Beale had not had access to Davison’s account whilst composing his own version. Read, C. Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth London, Jonathan Cape 1960, p 366 note 118 suggests erroneously that Beale’s account was ‘based on’ Davison’s.

6 Murdin, W. ed. A Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, from the Year 1571 to 1596... London 1759, pp 576-77; ‘A warrant for a Direction
Admiral Howard to bring the warrant to Elizabeth for signing. Once inside Elizabeth’s chambers, Davison stated that Elizabeth had asked him specifically for the warrant, and he had then ‘delivered it unto her handes’. Elizabeth had then, ‘callinge presently for pen & inke’, stated Davison, ‘signed it, & plased it downe by her upon the mattes’, and had then ‘finally willed me to picke up the said warrant & to cary it immediatley to the great seale comaunding me expressly to dispatch & send it awaie unto the commissioners with all the expedicion I might’. Davison could not have been much clearer as to the express nature of this command.

Elizabeth then jested to Davison that on the way to the Lord Chancellor he should show the warrant to Walsingham, then sick in bed at his house in London, ‘and communicate the matter with him, because the greife thereof would growe neere (as she marily said) to kill him out right’. The opportunity provided by Elizabeth to shock his fellow Principal Secretary was probably the last thing on Davison’s mind, and he proceeded instead straight away to Burghley’s chambers, where he showed the signed warrant to Burghley and Leicester. Their shared sense of urgency was immediately apparent, and they both directed Davison to proceed to the Lord Chancellor’s with all haste, offering to take care themselves of business that Davison had arranged previously with the Dutch commissioners that afternoon. Davison then left the Court and travelled to Walsingham’s house in Seething Lane, where, in addition to the attempt to frighten Walsingham to death, he had also been commanded by Elizabeth to carry out one further instruction. This, as mentioned in the previous chapter, was to write to the joint keepers of the Scottish Queen Sir Dru Drury and Sir Amyas Paulet in an attempt to seek

---

7 Harleian MS 290 f 222a.
8 Nicolas’s somewhat nineteenth-century reaction to Elizabeth’s apparent demeanour here demands quotation: ‘When giving vitality to the warrant of death, she exhibited a levity unsuitable to a Sovereign, and disgraceful to a woman... <that she> could condescend to jest, and
a more private solution to Elizabeth's unease with her responsibilities as head of state. This letter was reluctantly drafted by Walsingham at home whilst Davison took the warrant for signing to Lord Chancellor Thomas Bromley. The warrant itself was sealed by Bromley between 4 and 5 o'clock of the afternoon, and Davison returned again via Walsingham's house, where the letter to Paulet and Drury was signed, sealed and despatched, and then Davison retired to his house in London for the night with the warrant in his safe keeping.

At 10 am the next morning, Thursday 2 February, Davison received a message from Elizabeth stating that if the warrant had not yet been sealed he should delay the process. Troubled by this apparent backsliding, Davison travelled to the Court to inform the Queen that the warrant had indeed, as instructed by her express command, been sealed. Elizabeth then expressed her concern over the haste in the matter, but also, according to Davison, said that she wished 'no more to be troubled with the matter'. Davison recognised the possible dangers to himself from the Queen's ambiguous attitude, as he was only too aware of the Queen's wishes to wash her hands of it all. From thence, he stated that he showed the warrant to Hatton, 'adding what I feare of her inclination to throwe this burden from herself, if she might finde anie iust pretext'. To communicate this concern more fully, Davison then reminded Hatton of 'how things had passed heretofore in the course of the D. of Norfolk, ... and therefore told him plainely that what soever direction she had giuen me for sending it awaie unto the commissioners ... I was absolutely resolued not to medle in it alone.'

Either Davison was indeed aware of the potential danger at that time, or else, sitting in the Tower when he wrote this, he was indulging himself (albeit understandably) in a

---

be satirical; for as we have seen, in directing Davison to inform Walsingham of what had been done...'. Life of Davison p 110.
little retrospective wisdom. Hatton and Davison immediately informed Burghley of
their concerns, and Davison implies that from this moment on, Burghley took control
and directed the proceedings more closely. The three of them then decided that the
Privy Council, ‘being as deeply interested in this care & dutye as our selues’, would be
called to meet the next day. Davison stated that Burghley also ‘tooke upon him the
charge to proiecte the letteres that should be written to the Earles and others to whome
the afforsd warrant was directed’, and therefore asked Davison to hand warrant to him
for this purpose.9 There are two independent items of evidence outside of Davison’s
account to confirm Burghley’s charge of the proceedings from hereon; Beale’s account,
discussed below, and also, resting now in Burghley’s Hatfield papers, a plan of the
timetable for the sending down of the warrant and for the execution itself dated the 2
February, written mainly in Walsingham’s hand with Burghley’s later additions. This
draft plan of the proceedings is practically complete, detailing the timing of the arrival
of the commissioners, the place of execution, and the need for absolute secrecy. In their
different roles Walsingham and Burghley in tandem were running the show;
Walsingham as the background director, and Burghley managing the front of the house
at Court and in Council.10

Beale stated that he was informed on the evening of the 2 February to meet Davison the
next morning at Walsingham’s house in London. At 9 am on the 3 February
Walsingham showed the warrant to Beale and informed him that he was to accompany
Davison to the Council meeting at the Court that morning, and that he would be
required to carry the commission down to Fotheringay. This, and Walsingham’s

9 Harleian MS 290 f 222b; f 219a; ff 219a-b; f 223a: ‘thereupon resolued to breke the matter the
next day with the rest of the counsell & to take their opinions. And in the meane time his Lo:pe
hauing some use of the wart, praied me to leaue it with him, which in presence of mr
Vicechamberlain I dd into his lops owne handes, who from henceforth kept it till it was sent
away.’
involvement in the draft plans for the execution written the previous day, imply that
Burghley must have passed on the original warrant for Walsingham’s inspection. That
morning Burghley showed to Davison and Hatton the first drafts for the council letters
already written to accompany the warrant, and the other Privy Council members were
called to come to Burghley’s private chamber at 10 or 11 o’clock of the morning.11 The
councillors were made aware of the meeting by the means of Randolph Bellin, keeper
of the council chamber, circulating as usual through the Court to inform them. Present
at the meeting were 10 Privy Councillors (but not Walsingham) and Beale as the
intended messenger to Fotheringay.12 Davison stated that Burghley then ‘shewed and
read the warrant’ out aloud, and told the gathered Councillors that ‘he sawe not whie
they being all alike interested in the cause shold not make it their generall & comon
acte’ and dispatch the warrant ‘without troubling her Matie anie further in that behalf’,
given their sworn duty, the importance of the cause and the evidence of Elizabeth’s
signature as sufficient authorisation.13 Burghley then addressed Beale on behalf of the
Council, handed the warrant to Beale, and informed him that he was to take this and
accompanying letters to Fotheringay. The second draft of these accompanying letters
were approved by the Councillors, who then dined whilst these letters were written up
neat by Davison and Beale. Once these had been signed, Beale carried these letters to
Walsingham, still bed-ridden at his house in London, to obtain his signature later that
afternoon. The Councillors had all agreed by mutual oath that no one - including the

10 Hatfield CP 164/9; printed in HMC Salisbury Vol. 3 no. 471 pp 216-18; Read’s comments on
this in his Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth London, Jonathan Cape 1960, p 369 suggest he
has mis-read the original manuscript, as he confuse Walsingham’s and Cecil’s handwriting.
11 The second of Davison’s accounts Harl MS 290 ff 222-23 states that Burghley called the
Council meeting on 3 February to inform the council of Queen’s signing of the warrant, and then
the letters were drafted and then signed the ‘next day’, i.e. the 4 Feb. This is also the case with the
first account ff 219b. Beale’s account indicates that the letters were drafted and signed on the
same day. This discrepancy was also noted in Nicolas Life of Davison, pp. 76-97.
12 Burghley, Leicester, the Earl of Derby, The Lord Admiral Charles Howard, Lord Cobham, The
Lord Chamberlain Hunsdon, Sir Francis Knollys, Sir Christopher Hatton, John Wolley, and
William Davison, together with Beale. The names of the ten Privy Councillors present are taken
from Beale’s account and the copies of their signatures made by Clerk A eg. Add 48027 f 642a.
There is no mention of the meeting in the relevant Privy Council Register PC 2/14.
Queen - was to be informed of their proceedings. Davison related how the following day in the Privy Chamber Elizabeth enigmatically told him that she had dreamed of Mary’s death on the night of the 3 February. True to his oath made in Burghley’s chamber the previous day, Davison diplomatically avoided mention that Beale was riding north at that very moment.

As it had been ordered, so it did proceed, and Mary died with two strokes of the axe at around 10 am on Wednesday 8 February. Beale and the commissioners wrote their official account of the execution for the council after the deed was completed, and Henry Talbot was entrusted with the post to London and directed to deliver the news to Burghley.14 Talbot arrived at Greenwich early on the following morning Friday 9 February, and Davison said that Burghley, Hatton and ‘otheres’ decided not to tell the Queen immediately. The news did, of course, spread swiftly. The French ambassador Chateauneuf reported that he became aware of Mary’s death at midday on this Friday, and at around 3 pm ‘all the bells of the town began to ring and bonfires of joy were made in the streets, with celebrations and banquets, in sign of the great rejoicing’.15 Elizabeth, who had been out riding with the Portuguese ambassador that morning, was therefore in effect the last to know. What she thought of this is not hard to imagine. Davison reported that on that Friday evening Elizabeth, in public at least, first chose to feign absolute indifference, but the following morning (Saturday 10 February) Elizabeth called Hatton to her private chambers to bear the first breath of the stirring dragon, as Davison related, ‘castynge the burden generally upon them all but chiefly

13 Harl.ian MS 290 f 222b.
14 Add MS 48027 ff 646b-49a (Beale’s own copy); also Cotton MS Caligula C.IX ff 214-16. A shorter version marked by Beale as ‘A memoriall for Mr Henry Talbot Esquier, sent by the Earlis with their letter’ is Add MS 48027 ff 649b-50. Other accounts of Mary’s execution are discussed in Phillips, J. Images of a Queen 1964.
upon my shoulders because (as she protesteth) I had in suffering it to goe out of my handes abused the trust she reposed in me’.

The Council assembled again in Burghley’s private chambers later that Saturday morning, and advised Davison to absent himself from court for a few days, to which he reluctantly agreed. The Privy Councillor John Wolley related to the diplomatically-absent Leicester how that night the Queen had called her Privy Councillors into her withdrawing chamber where she had rebuked them ‘exceedingly’ for concealing their actions. Elizabeth’s ‘indignation’ had ‘particularly lighted upon my Lord Treasurer and Mr. Davison’, whom she held responsible for calling the meeting, as she maintained that she had given ‘express commandment to the contrary, and therefore had taken order for the committing of Mr. Davison to the Tower,... albeit we all knelt on our knees to pray her to the contrary’.\(^\text{16}\) Despite the prostration of the Council, the Queen persisted in her course. In the space of two days Davison’s political fate was sealed. He was at home in his sick bed when he received the news that he was to be committed to the Tower, ‘which at first seemed a matter very strange unto mee’.\(^\text{17}\) This tone of naive surprise was surely somewhat exaggerated: Davison had been fully aware that someone would have to stand up to the Queen’s fear of ultimate responsibility. What he had not planned was that particular someone was to be him, and him alone, stripped of the company of the equally complicit Burghley and the others of the Privy Council who had despatched the warrant.

The subsequent fame and association of Davison with Mary’s death in the eyes of posterity has obscured the possibility, brief and slender though it was, that the public blame and approbation was not necessarily to be his alone to bear. Writing his account

\(^{16}\) Cotton MS Caligula C.IX ff 220 John Wolley to Leicester <10> February 1587.

\(^{17}\) Harleian MS 290 f 220b.
in his *Annales* a decade later, William Camden went as far as to suggest that Davison, ‘a man ingenuously good, and simply practised in Court arts’, had been promoted to be joint Principal Secretary in September 1586 and ‘brought upon the Court stage’ simply to provide suitable cannon-fodder for the aftermath of Mary’s execution. ‘Soone after, this person being taken away,’ Camden continued, ‘as if he had failed in the last act, hee was thrust downe from the stage, and not without pitty of many, shut up a long time in prison.’ If it is indeed true that the timing was awkward, we do not necessarily need to share in Camden’s conspiracy theory in all its Machiavellian splendour. There were of course plenty of other possible candidates to shoulder some amount of responsibility. Principal amongst these was William Cecil Lord Burghley, and next the other Privy Councillors who had signed the warrant for Mary Stuart’s execution on 3 February. As well as these who had despatched the warrant were the men who had performed the deed in Elizabeth’s name: Robert Beale who had carried the warrant, Sir Amyas Paulet and Sir Dru Drury, Mary’s joint keepers at Fotheringay, and the two earls of Kent and Shrewsbury, the commissioners named in the accompanying Council letters. All of these others were distinctly aware of the threat of their possible martyrdom in the heat of the Queen’s ire in February and March 1587, and all were aware that, merited, lawful, just or not, they too could be sacrificed on the altar of Elizabeth’s anger and selfish political necessity as Davison was to be.

Davison was furthermore no minor political non-entity but a highly experienced diplomat, who might well have proved a worthy successor to Walsingham as Principal Secretary, had he been given time and chance enough. Davison was indeed singled out very quickly as one of the men who were to bear the brunt of Elizabeth’s anger, but at

---

the first he shared this reception with Burghley and the rest of the Privy Councillors. Beale later noted that Elizabeth’s initial desire to imprison Burghley was deflected only on consideration that ‘her myt thought that to comitt him to the tower wold kill him’. Next, Beale noted, Walsingham was considered too ‘stout’, and ‘wold utter all’, and so William Davison was singled out.19 Burghley meanwhile, not yet conscious of the seriousness of his own position as an individual, quickly drafted two submissions on behalf of the Council as a body to the Queen for forgiveness. The first draft written on the 11 February, although it was not actually delivered to Elizabeth, bears witness to the moment when Burghley had not yet completely transferred the responsibility of the act of sending down the warrant off his own shoulders onto those of Davison. It also shows that this transferral was not very far off.20 Following the constant crossings out and interlineations, we can perceive how Burghley proceeded to name Davison explicitly and to implicate the junior principal secretary in place of his own involvement. Burghley began one sentence of this submission with ‘therfore perceauynge that it had pleased ’almighty’god ’to’ inclyne hir mynd to sign a commission lawfully devised’: he then began the next clause ‘wheren I by a...’, but then thought better of it, deleted the incriminating first person singular pronoun, and inserted instead Davison as protagonist in showing the warrant; ‘and being shewed to us by Mr Davison under hir hand and great seale of england...’. Later in the same submission, Burghley changed his description of Davison from a passive presence ‘being at ye Consultation of ye Counsell’ to the active subject of ‘whan Mr Davison had shewed and redd ye comission unto us’.

19 Add MS 48027 f 402b.
20 The draft first submission is Hatfield CP 164/10, printed in HMC Salisbury Vol 3 no. 472 pp 218-19; this is mis-dated 2 February (the contemporary endorsement on the first submission by Burghley is ‘fbr. 1586’ but the preceding date is unclear on the microfilm) in the Hatfield Calendar, and probably predates the second by one day. The second draft submission is Hatfield CP 164/15 is dated 12 February and endorsed by Burghley ‘A wrytynge in ye name of all ye counsellors yt sent mr Beale to ye Er. of Shrewsby’. 
Either the Lord Treasurer's memory was playing tricks on him, or he was beginning to cover his tracks. A month or so later, some time soon after Davison’s committal to the Tower, Burghley ensured that the evidence of his own distinctive Roman hand remained obscured from the Queen’s eyes. Beale later made a note in his private papers that ‘the l. Threr. uppon the committinge of mr davision after gott the originalles of the said draughtes coneyued by him self into his owne handes agayne’. This must have referred to the original drafts of the two council letters to the commissioners that had been drafted by Burghley on the morning of the 3 February and then written up neat by Beale and Davison over lunch. For the present, after Burghley had seen that these submissions of the 11 and 12 February on behalf of the Privy Council had caused no sign that Elizabeth’s wrath was abating, he stopped writing on behalf of the Council and began to concentrate on his own cause, beginning with a draft of a letter to the Queen on 13 February. In this first draft letter Burghley stuck up for Davison explicitly, saying that if Davison was committed to the Tower 'the example will be sorrowful to all your faithful servants, and joyful to your enemies'. His next letter drafted to Elizabeth on the 17 February omitted to mention Davison at all, and concentrated instead wholly on himself.

The cloud of royal displeasure over Burghley and the rest of the Court remained in place for the next few months, stalling the process of government by Privy Council and hindering, as Walsingham wrote to Leicester in April, the ‘necasserye consultatyon that were to be desyered for the prevenycyon of the manyfest perryells yt hang over this

---

21 Add MS 48027 f 637b.
22 The draft of the first letter of 13 February 1587 is now Lansdowne MS 102 ff 6-7, which is endorsed by Burghley ‘xij febu. wrytyng from me to hir Maty by Mr vichamblen’. The second letter to Elizabeth dated ‘17. febru. 1586’ was drafted twice by Cecil; first in Lansdowne MS 115 ff 89-90, and second Lansdowne MS 102 ff 4-5.
realme’. Elizabeth’s greatest fear was of a political and military backlash from abroad, and her greatest regret her own inevitable condemnation in the eyes of posterity. Camden’s original description of Elizabeth’s ‘pretended’ grief at Mary’s death was altered in the manuscript draft of his Annales to ‘either conceiued or pretended’, allowing an element of doubt over her true feelings to linger in print at least. Whilst Elizabeth’s grief and remorse may well have been feigned, her anger was only too real. The letter from Wolley to Leicester of 10 February quoted above tells of Elizabeth’s utter rage and how the Privy Council literally got down on their knees to beg forgiveness. This was not yet enough. Only the complete abjection of Burghley, consistent appeals to Elizabeth’s clemency, and also perhaps Elizabeth’s fear of further public disgrace for herself if she were to proceed against them, saved the Privy Councillors from their own public appearance in Star Chamber. The significance of Elizabeth’s choice of sending Davison to the Tower was not lost on contemporaries, as Burghley had intimated in his letter to Elizabeth of 13 February. He had then stated how he could ‘remember many examples in your Fathers, your brothers, your sisters, and yea your own time’ where councillors had been committed to their own or other men’s houses. ‘So can I not remember’, continued Burghley, ‘any one example of a counsellor committed to the towre, but where they war attainted afterwards of high treason, and so were served afterwards.

23 Cotton Galba C.XI ff 315-16 old fol 288-89 Walsingham to Leicester 3 April 1587 autograph from the Court; cf. Leicester to Burghley ‘From the Bath’ April 9 1587 printed in Murdin, pp 586-87.
25 See Beale’s comments in Add MS 48027 f 675a: ‘After that Mr Davison was thus proceeded with it was thought that the lorde of the Counsell that were priuye to the sending down of the Commission shold haue ben called into the Starr Chamber.’; f 690b: ‘It was thought and gien forthe, that the lords of the Preuye Councell that had sent down the commission for the execution of the scotiche Queene without her Mtys priuity shold be likewise called into the starre chamber. But that course was stayed.’
26 Lansdowne MS 102 f 7a draft letter of 13 February 1587.
Elizabeth’s preference for hanging Davison by his neck in retribution for the severance of that of her cousin had initially been given spurious legality by Chief Justice Anderson, who had meekly affirmed in the face of Elizabeth’s ire that this line of revenge was indeed within Elizabeth’s prerogative. Elizabeth had then informed Buckhurst of Anderson’s answer, and Buckhurst had moved quickly to deny it and had subsequently given Anderson a severe dressing down. Buckhurst and others then ensured that when Elizabeth enquired again regarding the limits of her prerogative she was faced with a concerted denial of her wish for execution. Buckhurst had also written a strongly worded letter to Elizabeth, surviving uniquely now in a copy taken by Beale, expressing the dangers of this to her own credibility as a monarch: ‘ffor when they shall knowe that the commission had bothe your hande and seale, doethe your h. thinke that this contempt and error of your Secretarie shalbe beleued: and if it were, can it make your danger lesse for that respecte now?’ The English had gone to extravagant lengths to ensure that the proceedings against Mary had the form at least of watertight legality, and this was thrown back now into Elizabeth’s face. Were Elizabeth to persist in her prosecution of Davison, Buckhurst argued, it was not only her own credibility at stake but that of the rest of the Elizabethan polity, including ‘the lls of your maties counsell, and all other the lordes, knightes and gentlemen, that were actors and accomplishers of this execucion (which indeede are very many)’. If Elizabeth persisted, warned Buckhurst, then all involved would be judged by their contemporaries and by posterity as little more than ‘murtherers’.28

Davison’s friend and diplomatic colleague Thomas Randolph visited Davison in the Tower on 11 March, and then reported back to Walsingham on Davison’s continuing

27 Lansdowne MS 108 no. 54 ff 90-92; copy of letter from Burghley <to Mildmay?> in hand of Hickes, with sheet of clues f 91. See Neale 1957 p 141.
hope that, 'as the matter dieply concerneth you all that were partakers of the facte', the Privy Council would as a body stand 'constantlye and faythfullye with hym as ye haue ether nobilitie, honor or feare of God 'in yr hartes''.\(^{29}\) Unfortunately for Davison, neither nobility, honour nor fear of God were to be the deciding motivations in this most serious of cases. Although Burghley and the others of the Privy Council were to desert Davison in public, in private they at least resisted Elizabeth's own preference to see Davison executed. In an attempt to moderate Elizabeth's own more 'Old Testament' conception of justice of a neck for a neck, the Queen's learned counsel had during late February and early March devised a policy of trying Davison alone in Star Chamber, and as a preliminary to the trial preparations Davison was questioned in the Tower in mid-March 1587 by Hatton and Wolley.\(^{30}\) Using this procedure, Beale recorded some time later in the 1590s, there had remained the ultimate possibility of a royal pardon for Davison and remittance of the fine at a later date when the heat had died down.\(^{31}\)

Burghley himself was also examined alone both before and after the trial of Davison on March 28, but his own escape was intertwined with that of the rest of the Privy Council who has sent the warrant down.\(^{32}\) On the eve of Davison's trial Burghley and the Privy Council together made their final submission before Bromley and Whitgift. In this they divulged to Davison all responsibility for the calling of the Council meeting, for the reading of the warrant, for the writing of the letters to accompany the warrant and for

\(^{28}\) Add MS 48116 f 151a. Copy, endorsed by Beale endd. on f 152b 'Feb 1586. L. Buckhursts letter to her mty'.


\(^{30}\) Harleian MS 419 ff 168-69, Articles administered to Davison on 12, 14 and 16 March 1587.

\(^{31}\) Add MS 48027 f 403a: 'Mr Davison told me Robert Beale that Sr William Bruncke brought him word from Sr Walter Mildmay that mr John Popham then her mty Attorney Generall, and mr Tho. Egerton the solicitor did playnly say, that they wold rather lease their offices then be brought to deale agaynst him otherwise, then in the star chamber.'

\(^{32}\) Add MS 48027 ff 702-03 Burghley's answers 1 April 1587 in hand of Henry Maynard. Cf. Beale's note Add MS 48027 f 675a: 'But first the L. Threr. had sett to his hand to a writing wherby he confessed that he had bin abused by mr Davison: which was produced as an evidence against him.'
the oath of secrecy. Davison had, they stated, ‘brought and showed to us the same commission, being signed with her majesty’s hand and sealed with the great seal of England’; he had then read this to them, and had then failed to communicate to them any ‘doubt of her majesty’s meaning’ other than ‘it should be executed.’

33 We may perhaps imagine Davison thinking to himself ‘with friends like these...’: Davison’s fate was already in effect sealed due to an act of extreme political compromise by Burghley and the other Privy Councillors, with the single exception of Walsingham who alone of the Privy Councillors responsible for the sending down of the warrant did not sign the submission.

34 Davison was then ready to be led out to a metaphorical slaughter into what was the sixteenth-century equivalent of a show trial in a courtroom under the full glare of lights and cameras.

Davison was tried in Star Chamber before 13 Commissioners and 4 members of the Queen’s learned counsel, and the trial lasted four hours, from ten in the morning to two o’clock of the afternoon.

35 Significantly, none of the 11 Privy Councillors responsible for sending the warrant for Mary’s execution down sat as Commissioners in judgement.

36 The trial was opened by each of the 4 members of the Queen’s counsel

---

33 SP/53/21/27 March 27 1587 Concerning Commission for Mary’s death. Printed in CSP Scotland Vol. IX pp. 343-44 no. 325.
34 Cf. Beale’s autograph note Add MS 48027 f 675a: ‘This her highnes shewed to the scotish Ambassador who told me that all their hands were unto yt: saue mr Secretarye Walsingham. I haue heard that Sr Chr. Hatton did not sign yt: but he thought otherwise ... ’; also Beale’s note on Add MS 48027 f 690b: ‘The copy of this order was sent to the scotish king: to thentent he might hold her Mty wholly excused andt Innocent, and thinck the fault to be in her Counsell and especially in Mr Davison.’
35 SP 12/199/ ff 137-39 ink no. 70 is a later copy of an anonymous account of Davison’s trial in the form of a letter, signed in ‘Temple Barre... in hast’, dated ‘29 March 15<9>87’, see Read Lord Burghley 1960 p 375 follows the nineteenth-century identification of ‘yor brother’ to refer to Leicester and hence the recipient as the Earl of Warwick, and the sender to be Walpole. The ‘brother’ referred to in the letter is also credited as being the subject of rumours that he had ‘sought the preferment of mr ffortescue to be secretary’.
36 The 13 Commissioners were: Sir Christopher Wray, Chief Justice of England, acting Lord Privy Seal; Archbishop of Canterbury Whitgift; The Archbishop of York; The Earls of Worcester, Cumberland and of Lincoln; Lord Grey; Lord Lumley; Sir James Croft, Comptroller of the Household; Sir Walter Mildmay, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Sir Gilbert Gerrard, Master of the Rolls; Sir Edward Anderson, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas; Sir Roger Manwood, Lord Chief Baron. The 4 members of the Queen’s learned counsel were: Mr Serjeant
speaking and laying before Davison their prepared allegations, to which he replied in
turn. The chairman of the judges and the first of the commissioners to speak was Sir
Walter Mildmay, who no doubt considered himself unfortunate to be placed in a
position of judgement of his fellow councillor.\(^{37}\) Mildmay discussed at length the
conduct of Mary Queen of Scots and the legality of the judgement passed against her
before he entered into the circumstances of the case against Davison, finally suggesting
the punishment of a fine of 10,000 marks and imprisonment at the Queen’s pleasure.
The rest of the commissioners then spoke one after the other; some doing no more than
muttering their agreement with Mildmay, some going into length into other aspects of
the case.\(^{38}\) All, however, concurred and accepted Mildmay’s judgement and the
suggested punishment of fine and imprisonment.\(^{39}\)

The proceedings of Davison’s trial have been familiar enough to modern historians due
to the inclusion in the printed calendars of one of the versions of the accounts taken
from Davison’s own papers.\(^{40}\) A further 5 accounts of the trial were collected by Robert
Beale;\(^{41}\) Davison’s only biographer to date printed two further versions from
manuscripts in Cambridge and Oxford, and another version survives in the Petyt

\(^{37}\) On Mildmay’s role in the trial of Davison as ‘the most degrading episode in his long public
career’ see Lehmburg, S., *Sir Walter Mildmay and Tudor Government* University of Texas Press,
Austin 1964, pp. 278-81. Copies of Mildmay’s opening speech are also in Sloane MS 326, ff
122-30; Harl. MS 6265 ff 101-03; Stowe MS 296 ff 3-6 as well as those in Add MS 48027 listed
below.

\(^{38}\) The sequence of speakers was: Popham, Egerton, Sergeants Gawdie and Puckering with
Davison replying after each in turn; then Mildmay for the commissioners, followed by Manwood,
of York, then Mildmay/Wray and finally Davison again.

\(^{39}\) Add MS 48027 f 679a; The case was summarised finally by Sir Christopher Wray, ‘who satt
for L. Chancellor who was not well at ease...’, acting as Lord Privy Seal.


\(^{41}\) Add MS 48027 ff 398-401b; ff 666a-674b; ff 677-79; ff 680-86b; ff 688-690a account signed
William Mill, clerk of the Star Chamber.
transcripts in the Inner Temple. None of these 9 surviving different versions is exactly the same as any other and only one (that of the clerk of the Star Chamber William Mill) can be labelled tentatively an ‘official’ version. The differences between these accounts are not due to errors or variations in copying. Each is apparently the work of an eye witness working from either memory or notes, or a combination of both. Some witnesses were obviously better placed to hear the various speakers, and some better able to remember the proceedings in detail. Of the versions that survive, most accounts are also anonymous - only those of William Mill and that of William Nutt bear a signature or name as evidence of authorship.

The first allegation laid against Davison was that whereas Elizabeth had commanded him ‘to use secrecy’, and he had answered that ‘he wold do as apperteyned’, he had then ‘shewed it to the hole body of the counsell.’ Davison’s defence was that the Queen herself had already informed 4 members of the Privy Council, ‘namly hym self, the L. Admirall, mr. Sec. Walsingham and the Lo. Chancellor who ought to loke upon euery thing which he sealeth’. As well as these four, Davison argued, Burghley had been informed by the Lord Admiral, and Leicester and Hatton by the Queen herself. Davison stated that he had assumed from this that Elizabeth had no qualms about involving the whole of her Privy Council in the matter. This assumption had been based in what Davison believed to constitute a ‘counsellor’, as, he stated, ‘he knoweth no

---

42 Nicolas Life of Davison 1823 prints two accounts from MSS in ‘Caius Coll. Camb. Class A 1090, 8. p 267’ and ‘Bodleian Ltr. sub. tit. Juridici 7843. 862 p 235’. Appendix F pp 302-49 (I have been unable to consult these two MSS in person); Inner Temple Petyt MS 538/50, ff 39-44 ‘The arraignement of matters obiected in ye starr chamber against Mr Davison, late secretary to the Que: matie & on of her priuyc counsell, together with his aunswere, & of the opinion of the commissioners, Mar 28 1587.’

43 For example, Add MS 48027 f 671b: ‘The mr of the roules spake soe softly that I cold heare note one worde of his opinion or judgement...’; f 678a: ‘Then Sr James Crofte, whose speache in particular I remember not...’.

44 Add MS 48027 ff 688-690a: William Mill’s Account in hand of Clerk A. I have been able to identify the handwriting in only this of the 6 versions I have seen, and as this is the hand of Beale’s own clerk it tells us nothing but that it is a copy.

45 Harl 290 f 226a.
reason while the lordes of the councell being counsellors of estate should not be made privie & acquainted with a matter which ded so neerly concerne the state of the Realme.\textsuperscript{46} Lord Grey, prominent amongst the commissioners in speaking out in favour of Davison, therefore also found it unsurprising that if, ‘when the warrant was sealed he imparted it to suche counsellors of estate as are well known to haue ben acquainted with the greatest matters of secrecie concerninge her matie and the realme, since the begininge of her highnes reigne....’.\textsuperscript{47} Grey was, like Davison, expressing here a concept of a ‘counsellor of estate’ who was naturally and openly involved in matters of state from a publicly recognized position of accustomed trust through their membership of the Privy Council. This ‘open’ or inclusive concept of a Privy councillor was repealed by Mildmay, who replied that, ‘although they be all of her maties priuie counsell by name, yet they are but onely soe farre priuie as it shall please her hignes to call them unto it.’ Elizabeth could choose to acquaint ‘fewe’, or ‘sometimes one’ with ‘greate actiones of secrecie and importaunce’ as she wished: otherwise, continued Mildmay, ‘it might fall out daungerous many tyme to prince & state, that euerie one of counsell shold be partaker of all secretes of princes’.\textsuperscript{48}

This was the only really incontestable allegation that Davison was faced with, as it was not based in disputed fact or recollection of proceedings. Neither did this allegation founder on the question of who it was that bore responsibility and authority for the decision of how and when to send the warrant down. Instead, what was at question were two differing conceptions or definitions of the role of the councillor and of the Privy Council within the political structure of Elizabethan England. Were Privy Councillors to expect to be informed of such matters that touched the heart of the polity

\textsuperscript{46} Harl MS 290 ff 220b-21a; f 227b.
\textsuperscript{47} Add MS 48027 f 672a.
\textsuperscript{48} Add MS 48027 f 669a. Cf. Harl MS 290 f 229b; Add MS 48027 f 684a.
simply because of their office and their oath to counsel, or because of express royal command and choice?

The next two allegations were more closely connected to each other as they both revolved around the reported 'facts' of the proceedings. The Queen's learned counsel charged him 'to have abused' the rest of the Privy Council who had signed the warrant, as Davison had 'answered affirmativelie' when Burghley had asked him 'whether he was sure that her matie continewed in the same mynd still for the execution'. Furthermore, they continued, when another Councillor had asked Davison the same question, he had 'aunswered that her matie tould him, she would not further be troubled with it.' Davison was effectively disabled from mounting a defence to this second allegation as it boiled down to a matter of the interpretation of the Queen's mind - surely not an area to be defended securely by anyone other than Elizabeth at any time, let alone in this most serious of matters. Davison attempted to mitigate the circumstances by reminding the court of his relative inexperience as a principal secretary, and though he had been sure that it had been Elizabeth's intention that Mary was finally to be executed, it had been 'an easie matter for hym to mistake the Q: meaninge', due to his short acquaintance with her 'manner of spech'. Solicitor General Egerton sagely reminded him of the practical point at issue; that in a situation where the remembrance of events and oral exchanges were disputed between Elizabeth and any other, 'cor regis being inscruteable', then it was likely that the royal version would win. Davison may well have had the sympathy of many of the commissioners in this point, but there was no way out of the cul-de-sac imposed by Elizabeth's particular recollection of her own mind. In addition to this, Davison was faced also with Burghley's own recollection of the events of the 3 February given as testimony under

49 Add 48027 f 399b.
50 Harl 290 f 226b;
51 Add MS 48027 f 666b.
his own interrogation. Solicitor General Egerton had then stated that ‘my Lord
Treasurer did aske you, whether it was her Majesty's pleasure?’; and that Davison had
answered ‘yea’. This was not as Davison recollected the matter: ‘To that’, said
Davison, ‘I remember not that.’ Egerton had then retorted that this was Burghley’s
sworn testimony: Davison could do no more but bow to this, and reply that he did
‘reverence’ his testimony.52

So Davison was faced with a situation where on the one hand Elizabeth said that she
had not said what Davison thought she had said, and on the other with Burghley saying
that Davison had said what Davison could not say that he had not. The third allegation
was a natural consequence of this particular version of events. The Queen’s learned
counsel drew attention to the oath of secrecy that the Privy Council had sworn in
Burghley’s chamber, and how ‘this resoluccon amongst the IIs did growe upon mr
Davison his owne wordes’, when he had stated that ‘it was not her Maties pleasure to
be troubled any more with that matter...’53 This oath to maintain secrecy for security
reasons had not been an explicit responsibility of Davison’s, but rather an act of mutual
and shared connivance of the whole of the Privy Council. And yet here, in public, the
whole responsibility for the Privy Council’s moment of executive splendour was
dumped squarely on Davison’s insufficient shoulders. Davison was unable to point the
finger at Burghley for organising the oath, and was required to respond in general terms
that could never answer the allegation.

Davison was unable to contradict the word of the Queen or of Burghley, but his defence
was also limited in other ways. The trial was partly about his duties and obligations as a
Privy Councillor and sworn servant, and one of these obligations was the issue of

52 Nicolas p 311. Cf. Add MS 48027 f 682b: ‘answerung that he wolde not disclaime my L. Threr
his testimonie he confessed the same.‘
53 Add MS 48027 f 684a.
confidentiality of matters of Counsel, which did not sit easily with the professed intent to discover the ‘truth’ of the matter in public in Star Chamber. All the longer and shorter versions of Davison’s account of the circumstances of sending down the warrant are distinguished by the omission of any mention of the proposal favoured by Elizabeth since at least early January 1587 to have Mary conveniently assassinated. When the attention of the commissioners turned to areas of his conduct that involved the proposal for assassination, Davison was forced to beg for leave to remain silent, which was in effect to incriminate him with no defence against the allegations. The Queen’s learned counsel were able to plunder and pillage Davison’s own account, ‘reading some part & not the rest’, whilst Davison realised that his complaint that ‘yf he read th’one parte he must also read the other’ was already made ineffectual due to ‘the pointes of secrecy’ contained within. All he could do was bow to the circumstances and obey his oath to secrecy, pleading that ‘he might not be pressed therewith’, still ‘insynuating that as he would not contest against her matie nor dyscover any counsaill contrary to his othe, so would he not endure that his modesty should bred any preiudyce to his honestie, which he held deare then his lyfe.’  Davison’s colleague and friend Beale indicated his own dissatisfaction with these proceedings in his copy of William Mill’s account. This brief and ‘official’ account stated that Davison ‘did confesse and acknowledge aswell by his owne speache and declaracion in open corte as by examinacion in wrytinge before taken and subscribbed with his owne hand, which were also openlie red...’. Beale has underlined the words ‘were also’ and inserted in the margin “but in part”.  

Davison had arrived at a state where he was alone with his conscience before the eyes of God, having been deserted as it seemed by she whom he had served and by those Privy Councillors that he had counted as his political allies and in many respects as

---

54 Add MS 48027 f 399b.  
55 Add MS 48027 f 689b.
equals. There were some things he simply could not say in the presence of any other than the Queen alone, but if he did not say these things then he was to be found guilty as charged. Even before the trial during his interrogations in the Tower by Hatton and Wolley, Davison had omitted to enter into any discussion of the proposal for Mary’s assassination, ‘for those things he said he wold not open whatsoever becam of hym’, knowing that in this matter at least he had no recourse to any earthly judge.\textsuperscript{56} Davison heard the judgement passed against him, and his final attempt to restate his innocence, cut short by Mildmay, ended up as a simple plea for mercy. Camden summarised the pathos of the Principal Secretary’s dilemma, torn on the one side between his conscience and his version of the truth, and on the other by his oaths and concepts of loyalty to Queen and Council, as he ‘prayed the Queens learned Councell with teares running down his cheeks, that they would not urge the matter more sharply, but remember that he would not contest with the Queen.’\textsuperscript{57}

The trial of William Davison in Star Chamber was intended to produce a credible account of the proceedings leading up to Mary’s execution that exculpated Elizabeth (and to a lesser extent her Privy Council) in the eyes of European political society, and accounts of it were duly sent into Scotland and abroad by Burghley and the Privy Council.\textsuperscript{58} However, most of the surviving eye-witness accounts of the trial, although recording the prosecution argument and the sentence passed, are at the very least sympathetic towards the Principal Secretary. An effective barometer of the sympathies of the various reporters are the characterisations given of the manner of speaking of two

\textsuperscript{56} Harl 290 f 227a. Cf Harl MS 419 ff 168-69 Interrogation of Davison in March 1587: ‘To the fifth, he remembret that upon some letters received from Mr. Paulet, her Majesty falling into some complaint of him upon such cause as she best knoweth, she uttered such a speech that she would have matters otherwise done, the particulars whereof I leave to her best remembrance.’

\textsuperscript{57} Camden Annales 1625 p 347.

\textsuperscript{58} Cotton MS Caligula D.1 ff 216-221 Burghley to Hunsdon, dated by Cotton/Starkey on f 216a ‘Scot. 1588 5 Apr’; the damaged sections in this copy can be reconstructed from the later copy in Harleian MS 4647 ff 52a-54b; ff 220b-21a. There are a series of drafts of this letter from Burghley to Hunsdon in SP 52/42 artt. 34, 35, 37, 38.
of the commissioners in particular - Lord Lumley and Lord Grey. Lumley was the only commissioner to question the leniency of Mildmay’s proposed punishment, and spoke in harsher words of Davison’s conduct than any other Commissioner. His delivery is criticised in most versions as being too low and stumbling. On the other hand, Lord Grey was the most open of all speakers in his sympathy for Davison’s position and call for leniency from his fellow Commissioners and from the Queen. In comparison with Lumley, Grey was praised in most of the accounts for his ‘acustomed zeale, ...incomparable dexteritie of spirit, & aptnes of elocution’.

The respective rhetorical skills reported of the speakers in one sense serves therefore to distinguish the extent of the sympathy of the reporter for Davison. Similarly, the length as well as the style and content of the speeches reported are indicative of the various reporters’ political sympathies. Grey’s speech is second only to that of Sir Walter Mildmay’s in the length given to it in all accounts of the trial. Other speakers, who might well have spoken for equivalent lengths, are cut off and passed over in many accounts as ‘tedious’. One final indication of the pro-Davison tone of most of these accounts is the utilisation of the troubled physical appearance of the tragic hero to elicit our sympathy. One account speaks of Davison ‘being faint by reason of his late sickness, and carrying his left arm in a scarf, benumbed, I think, by his late taken palsy’, another emphasises his stoical fortitude ‘with a countenance resolute and well assured (though his body was weak and his voyce lowe)’. In this grandest of theatres, Davison was cast as the tragic hero undone by an ‘overabundance of zeal’ (as phrased by one of the commissioners, Whitgift) and the un-mentioned but patently understood political desire of Elizabeth to avoid public responsibility. Davison was led to the Tower, where he remained for the next year, in disgrace but perhaps not forgotten. Though he was to bear the burden publicly at least, in private he was left with what Camden called ‘the pitty of many’.

59 Add MS 48027 f 400b.
60 Nicolas Life of Davison p 334 from William Nutt’s Bodleian account; Add MS 48027 f 398b.
Some of the narrative described above from the signing of the warrant on the 1 of February to the execution on the 8 February is familiar from the accounts in Conyers Read’s Lord Burghley and Neale’s Elizabeth I and her Parliaments. Familiar too are some of the conclusions taken from this account: both Read and Neale accept that Davison was sacrificed, that the overall responsibility for the sending down of the warrant by the Privy Council belonged to Burghley, and that Elizabeth’s conduct was extreme to say the least.\textsuperscript{61} What seems most clear after reading both Read’s and then Neale’s account is the tendency of biographers to exculpate their subjects, and this surely is a charge that I myself, speaking on behalf of Davison and Beale, may have to face.\textsuperscript{62} Neither Read nor Neale was aware of the variations and richness of the accounts of Davison’s trial, nor were the differences between the various versions of Davison’s account of his conduct and the independence of Beale’s account fully realised. However, my chief intention in all this is not to attempt to rescue the reputation of William Davison and Robert Beale, nor to sully those of Elizabeth and Burghley, nor simply to pick at details in Read and Neale. Unlike Mary Stuart, Davison did in the end keep his life and his conscience, however close he may have come to losing the former. Perhaps the most pragmatic judgement of Davison’s conduct was given by the Earl of Lincoln at the trial, lamenting the ‘great lacke of witt in the man, in not foreseeing and

\textsuperscript{61} Read, C. Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth London, Jonathan Cape 1960, pp 369-70; ‘Reviewing the events of the momentous week which lay between Elizabeth’s signing of the death warrant and Mary’s execution - and there can be little doubt about the facts - it appears that the immediate responsibility for Mary’s execution lay squarely on Burghley’s shoulders.’

\textsuperscript{62} Read, C. Lord Burghley pp 376-77; Read refers to Beale as a ‘prejudiced’ witness and refuses to accept that Burghley confessed that he had been ‘abused’ by Davison, when Burghley’s submission to the Council of 27 March acted as such in terms of the trial. Neale, J. E. Elizabeth I and her parliaments 1559-1601 2 Vols London 1953, 57, esp. pp 141-43; ‘When news of the execution arrived, the Queen was overwhelmed by a sense of irrevocable tragedy and the infamy of a sacrilegious deed. Her doubts cleared, her deep-seated, persistent instinct seemed right. But it was too late. In unreasoning anger she heaped her own responsibility on that of others.’ Neale felt compelled to believe that there ‘was at least some excuse for Elizabeth’s bitter complaint of their ‘dainties’ and of the ‘perjury’ of men, who, contrary to their Oath, would cast the burden upon herself.’
providing for himself better'. Rather than the misfortune of one man, what the richness and variety of the accounts of Davison's conduct and trial in Star Chamber display most clearly is the glaring discrepancies between conceptions of Counsel and political authority at the heart of the Elizabethan polity. The clearest distinction here was not between the Privy Councillors themselves, and their servants such as Beale, but between a small minority headed by Elizabeth and virtually everyone else. One of this minority centred on Elizabeth was Lord Lumley, who alone of all the commissioners had 'pursued mr. davison mightelie'. Lumley first emphasised Davison's own misconduct as Principal Secretary in not confirming the Queen's intention, and then openly transferred the emphasis of guilt from the Principal Secretary to the whole Council as a body. As far as Lumley was concerned, 'the haynousnes of the cryme' lay in the fact that 'the warrant was sent downe without her privitie.' Furthermore, Lumley objected to the 'mutuall promises of the lords of the counsell', which constituted the heart of the 'haynous thing' that Elizabeth's own Council 'shold conspire together in a priuie chamber in her owne house.' Here surely is the kernel of the 'heinous' truth that none of the other commissioners chose to dwell upon, and that was not allowed to be propagated outside the Queen's private chambers - that her Privy Council under Burghley's direction had indeed effectively conspired against her, albeit in what they saw as her best interests.

Lumley saw the action of the Privy Councillors in terms of 'conspiracy', but there is also an argument for seeing it in terms of alternative concepts of conciliar government. It is clear that throughout the crucial days of the 2 and 3 February, Burghley had been
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63 Add 48027 f 672b.
64 SP 12/199/ ff 137-39 ink no. 70. Copy of letter signed in 'Temple Barre... in hast' 29 March 15<9>87
65 Harl MS 290 f 234b. Cf. Camden p 347: 'The Lord Lumley.. constantly affirmed that never in any age was such a contempt against a Prince heard, or read of, that the Queenes Councell, in the Queen's palace, in the Councell Chamber, neere the Queene, who was as it were President of the
the acting leader of the Privy Council. Burghley’s own conception of conciliatory
government, as Alford and Hoak have argued, had its genesis in his early education and
service to Somerset and Northumberland under Edward. Burghley’s role in the
execution of Mary was in effect as the President of the Council, an office familiar to
him from his service to Northumberland during Edward’s minority.66 The draft of the
Interregnum plans of 1584/85 written out by attorney general John Popham had
envisaged the rule of a council of 30, made up of the privy councillors serving at the
time of Elizabeth’s death with the addition of the chief legal officers and others of the
’same calling’ as the Privy Councillors drawn from the Parliament also to be called.67
Burghley had then gone through the document and inserted ‘gret’ before every
reference Popham had made to ‘counsell.’ Likewise, he had also referred in a private
journal to a meeting of the whole Privy Council to consider the sending of troops to
Scotland in 1570 as a ‘gret counsell’.68 The differences between the ‘Privy Council’,
the ‘Gret Councell’ and a ‘Council of estate’ may or may not be merely semantic, and
whatever the roots in classical models and early and mid-Tudor practice, it is clear that
in times of trouble Burghley would instinctively turn to an inclusive concept of
Conciliatory government to embody and ensure the continuity of political authority.69

Councell, resoluded upon so great a matter without her advise or knowledge...’; cf Add MS 48027
f 400b.
66 Hoak, D. E. ‘Rehabilitating the Duke of Northumberland: Politics and Political Control, 1549-
67 Huntington Ellesmere MS 1192 ff 1-4; written by Popham with Burghley’s emendations: ‘4
That the same privie consell or the more part off them shall warne so manylords of parliyment
ecclesysastycall & temporall as whithin xx xx x dayes off her highnes deceas may conveyently
be assembled and off them shall select so many as with the prevye consell aforssayd may make
uppe the nombre of xxx person at the least and that they together with the cheyff Justice and one
other lustycye off eyther Bench, the Mr off the Requests and cheyff Baron off the state for the
tyme being shall for the tyme aforssayd be the grand’ gret’ consell off the realme, and euer off
these shall take ane othe for the dew observarycon of this act, as in this act shable compiled.’
68 SP 12/83/54 ff 128-31 Diary of Burghley’s 1558-71; f 130a: ‘14 Mart. 1569 <70> Consult. at
Hampton Court what shall be donne towards Scotland wt the army by ye Er. of sussex. 29 April
1570 at Hampton Court a gret cownsell of ye whole consell whyther ye Er. of sus. shuld invade
scotland.’
But Burghley’s inclusive concept of conciliatory government was not by any means consensual. Walsingham, for one, had privately not been convinced of this method of proceeding involving the whole of the Privy Council in the plans for the execution of Mary, but his absence from the centre of the action precluded any further controlling input from him. In his own separate letter written to Paulet and Drury carried by Beale from London dated 3 February Walsingham had written of the ‘greate care taken to haue the matter passe in secrecie’; he had also betrayed his fears that as there were ‘so manic commissioners – consellers made acquainted withall’, that he considered the likelihood of this as ‘impossible’.\(^{70}\) So for Walsingham at least the issue of secrecy outweighed that of constitutional conciliarity. Walsingham’s concern for secrecy above all else and the restriction of knowledge or involvement to selective groups of Privy Councillors was not equivalent to conciliatory faction, and was common practice throughout the ‘great causes’ of Elizabeth’s reign.\(^ {71}\) But here, when push came to shove, the reactions of Burghley and Walsingham diverged. Walsingham was content to proceed along a ‘need to know’ basis, and this for him did not involve obtaining the signature of each and every of the Privy Councillors. One of those whom both Burghley and Walsingham did agree upon as ‘needing to know’ was Beale; he was not a member of the Privy Council, but Walsingham and Burghley had selected him as ‘the fittest person theie could advise of to whome theie might commit that charge’.\(^ {72}\)


\(^{70}\) Add MS 48027 ff 64-65.

\(^{71}\) eg. SP 12/105/28 ff 64-65 18 Aug 1575 Walsingham to Sir Thomas Smith autograph: ‘you shall doe well to confer with my L. of Leycester & the L. Chamberlain touchinge the course you are to howld to drawe her mat to use yt expedytion in this matter yt is requysyte. Besyde thes two noblemen the L. Therssoer and owre selues yt are secretyres ther are none of the rest of her mates cownsayll acquaynted wt the matter: and truly yt ys most necessarye yt the matter by esed wt all secreasye...’.

\(^{72}\) Inner Temple Library Petyt MS 538/50, ff 39-44.
The scapegoating of William Davison brought it home to contemporaries as much as to any later commentators that the ‘monarchical republicanism’ of the mid-Elizabethan polity was ultimately a system of government reliant on the compliance and goodwill of the reigning monarch. Thereafter, Beale, like Walsingham, put not his trust in Princes, nor, in this case, in their Privy Councils. In his treatise on the office of the Principal Secretary he wrote for Sir Edward Wotton in 1592, Beale advised that:

‘When ther shalbe anie unpleasant matter to be imparted to her Matie from the Councell or other matters to be done of great importance, let not the burden be layed on you alone but let the rest ioyne with you. Excuse yourself by your yeares and for lack of experience; doe not overthrowe yourselfe for anie of their pleasures or other respect as M. Davison did, for if anie thinge be misliked, it wilbe saied That it was the Secretarie’s doinge, that they signed it for companie, that the lettre was brought to them, &c.’

Beale’s cynical opinion of the Privy Council’s action was one born of hard experience. But his concern was not that the Privy Council had overstepped itself, but that it had then backed down before Elizabeth’s rage. In the privacy of his own papers at least, Beale stood his ground on his reading of the legality of the proceedings as they had been carried out. The warrant itself had been ‘signed with her mates hande’ and bore the ‘greate seale of Englane’ as was necessary: this, together with the ‘letters of the counsell’ that Beale had himself written out were then in his mind at least ‘a sufficient warrant & direction according to the Statute beforemade the 27. yere of her mates reigne’. Buckhurst, as we have seen previously, had argued to Elizabeth herself that the Privy Council, ‘havinge this warrant under your hande and seale shewed unto them’, were ‘bounde in allegiance even with all speede to cause the same to be executed’. Buckhurst had then questioned the credibility of Elizabeth’s chosen course of revenge and self-exculpation, and that Elizabeth’s intention ‘to make a question of

---

73 Beale Treatise p 425.
your highness’s will and pleasure when by your hande and seale is declared’, was a
‘verie meere follye or rather a manifest contempt in duetie’. The duty of men like Beale
to obey this commission had been sworn explicitly in their oaths as Privy Councillors or
as royal servants, and this very same sense of duty hung around the neck of every good
Protestant Englishman. Beale himself stated that, ‘hauing receyued these letters and
messages’, he had thought that he could ‘in no sorte refuse the carryinge of `it´ downe´,
‘being her mates sworne servant and by his office bounde to obey their lordships
commandements.’\textsuperscript{75}

But this sufficient authority was inadequate in itself without the requisite political will,
a quality that the Privy Council could not lay claim to in this episode. Beale’s own
private opinion of the Council submission of March 27 is evident in his annotations to
his copy of William Mill’s ‘official’ account of the trial of Davison. This submission
was first ‘imprudent’ legally, as it ‘being of so great a moment... may serve `as´ an
evidence to condemne’. Beale then compared it to a recent precedent that contained
more moral undertones. ‘Immediately appon the Massacre’ in France in 1572, Beale
wrote, the French King Charles IX ‘wold haue layed it appon the house of Guise: and
so were his first letters.’ But, Beale continued, ‘they wold not beare yt: and so he was
faine to advowe yt himself.’\textsuperscript{76} Beale was, as we have seen, no natural supporter of the
house of Guise, and this was no comparison to make of Elizabeth, or at least not to her
face. Here, at the last and in the privacy of his own papers, Beale was not a ‘man of
business’ in the sense of an automated instrument of the Privy Council’s desires, but a
man driven by his own personal political and religious ideologies and loyalties to act as
he saw fit.

\textsuperscript{74} Add MS 48027 ff 638a/b.
\textsuperscript{75} Add MS 48027 f 638a.
\textsuperscript{76} See Beale’s autograph note, Add MS 48027 f 687a: ‘Mr Davison was committed to the tower,
and released by a letter form the L. Tresorer to mr lieutenant of the tower: This fine sett appon mr
Dauison by the decree of the Starr chamber was reuoked unto mr Davison about june or july
1589: Quod nolle et iud. Judia.’
Appendix I. Watermarks and Paper Stocks in Beale’s archive: an undated copy of George Buchanan’s *De Jure Regni apud Scotos* and the Papers of Thomas Norton

‘The examination of paper is not an open sesame unto truth.’ Allan Stevenson, *The Problem of the Missale Speciale* 1967.\(^1\)

Beale’s remarkable archive discussed above in detail above in Chapter 1 (and which forms the core of the primary research for the rest of this thesis) has in many ways left as many questions as it has supplied answers. The British Library 1994 catalogue has provided the means of reference to investigate properly both the distinctive characteristics of Beale’s collection as an archive as well as the means to extract and map out the biographical and political details of Beale’s life. The examination of the means whereby Beale produced, accumulated and collected his archive in Chapter 1 above has tried to go one step further on from this. The unravelling of the details of the proportion and extent of Beale’s papers within the Yelverton volumes has been premised on the dissection of each volume into each and every single separate item as the lowest common denominator of the process of growth of the archive. The many thousands of separate items within the Yelverton volumes have then been categorized according to whether they were acquired or produced by Beale during his lifetime: these are what may be termed ‘Beale-related’ items.

There are four main criteria by which to judge whether a separate item is ‘Beale-related’; chronological dating, palaeographic evidence, the general subject matter, and the instances when it can be established firmly that papers from another man or source
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are known to have been assimilated into Beale’s papers. All these criteria can help to decide whether an item originally ‘had something to do with’ Beale or not. The simplest and first criteria to apply is that of dating: any item whose subject matter post-dates Beale’s death in 1601, or that has been written on paper that can be proved conclusively to have been manufactured only after this date, cannot therefore be Beale-related. The second criteria is that of palaeographic evidence; we can definitely label as ‘Beale-related’ any item in the hand of Beale or of either of his two personal clerks Clerks A and B. This criteria also covers endorsements and annotations to items in another hand which had therefore been collected or acquired by Beale (with the proviso that some items either in the hand of or endorsed by Clerk B might possibly originate from after Beale’s death given that Clerk’s continued service to the Yelvertons). The third criteria of subject-matter is also perhaps the most ambiguous, based as it is on distinguishing items that concerned Beale in a way that we can say that it was likely he might have acquired them. A fourth and final criteria is whether an item originated from another individual’s collection that we know came into Beale’s possession during his own lifetime, whether by inheritance, luck or for a particular purpose. The extensive survival of Beale’s papers detailed in Chapter 1 above lists the present locations of all the Beale-related items that were part of Beale’s papers on his death that have also then survived the intervening centuries intact. In addition to the bulk of Beale-related items now in the Yelverton volumes, there are other Beale-related items that were part of Beale’s archive at his death in 1601 that did not make the journey to Easton Maudit in 1601, and those that were either generated or acquired by him and were then dispersed or sent out purposely during his lifetime.

A subset of all ‘Beale-related’ papers are what may be termed ‘Beale-originated’ papers: those items that owe their existence to Beale in an original sense. The same four main criteria outlined above for the identification of ‘Beale-related’ material
automatically apply to their subset of ‘Beale-originated’ items, with the additional criteria that these ‘Beale-originated’ papers were written on stocks of paper obtained or purchased specifically by Beale. These Beale-originated items were generated through him personally; autograph letters and drafts of treatises that bear his revision, items perhaps generated due to his service to the government as a diplomat or clerk of the council, or items that were copied under his instruction during his service or for other more personal reasons. A Beale-originated item is therefore defined as every single piece of paper that came into Beale’s possession blank, passed through Beale’s hands and was written on either by himself or at his command, and then either remained in his archive or left with textual matter inscribed upon it. The extensive survival of various drafts of letters and treatises and made-to-order copies means that most of this Beale-originated material was kept by Beale himself and subsequently transferred into what became the Yelverton library. However, some ‘Beale-originated’ items were purposely dispatched during his lifetime and were never part of his personal archive or manuscript papers. Examples of these have been encountered throughout this thesis: letters and treatises sent to Burghley now in the Lansdowne or Cotton collections, letters sent to Walsingham now in the PRO, treatises on ecclesiastical law and government sent to Whitgift (and also copies of material relating to the execution of Mary Queen of Scots given to Henry Grey earl of Kent) now in Lambeth Palace Library.

Each separate manuscript item, whether a single leaf, a sheet of paper or a composite ‘book’ of many hundreds of folios, is in effect equivalent to one of the many building blocks of paper with which Beale constructed his archive. This process of dissection into discrete items is based eventually on the paper as paper. These definitions of ‘Beale-related’ and ‘Beale-originated’ papers are also partly founded on an attempt to catalogue and investigate the system of the utilisation of paper by Beale and his two secretaries Clerk A and B. This whole endeavour is itself premised on the absolute
distinctiveness of individual paper stocks visible through the evidence of watermarks, a concept familiar enough to paper historians and perhaps most incunabulists, but perhaps not to most Elizabethan historians, and is a concept that might require therefore some more extensive explanation. The absolute distinctiveness of watermarks is a natural corollary of the age-old manufacturing process used for hand-made laid paper in Europe from its introduction into Southern Europe by Arabian craftsmen in the Thirteenth Century until the beginnings of mechanisation in the Nineteenth Century. The nature of the watermark itself, how to view and describe them, and the concept of paper stocks all follow directly from this manufacturing process. Only after digesting the implications of this manufacturing process can we turn to the possible ways (and limitations) of interpreting and utilising paper evidence. Two examples of the ways of utilising paper evidence in terms of a private archive such as Beale's are then given below. The first example describes the dating of a manuscript copy of George Buchanan's inflammatory dialogue De Jure Regni apud Scotos by reference to the other occurrences within the rest of Beale's archive of the same paper stock upon which the dialogue was written. The second example establishes and maps out, by means of differentiating between the various different provenances of distinctive paper stocks, the survival of many of the papers of Thomas Norton within Beale's papers.

But first, the paper as paper. The papermaking team consisted of two men, the vatman and the coucher. Each was armed at any one time with one of a pair of 'twin' oblong moulds and one wooden frame called a deckle that fitted in turn on top of the wooden frame of each of the pair of moulds. The mould consisted of a rectangular wooden frame with a series of brass wires running parallel to both the long and short sides that enabled the vatman to scoop out the paper mixture from the vat. The vatman would
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2 Clapperton, R. H. *Paper: an Historical Account of its making from the earliest times down to the present day* Oxford 1936; Hunter, Dard *Papermaking: The History and Technique of an Ancient Craft* 1943; repr. 1978. Also of interest is Turner, S. and Skiöld, B. *Handmade Paper*
hold one of the moulds by the shorter sides, with the deckle in place on top of the mould frame, dip the long edge towards him into the liquid mixture of shredded linen rags and water called the ‘stuff’, take out enough ‘stuff’ to cover perhaps 1/3 of the mould, and then spread this mixture evenly over the whole surface of the mould with a series of shakes that constituted the skill of the craftsman learnt over many years. The vatman would then remove the deckle from the mould, and pass the mould with the newly-formed sheet of paper in place along the slab or across the bridge of the vat to the coucher, who would in turn pass him the other ‘twin’ mould for the vatman to fit the deckle to and begin the process all over again. Meanwhile the coucher would turn the first mould upside down on the surface of the slab adjoining the vat so that the sheet of paper, now mostly drained of superfluous water, rested on a sheet of felt. The coucher would then place another sheet of felt on top of this sheet of paper, and pass the first mould back to the vatman who was passing him the next mould with another sheet of paper ready to be couched. The pile of newly-formed sheets of paper and felt was termed a ‘post’, which, when of a certain size, would be taken away and pressed to remove more water. The paper was now strong enough to handle, the felts removed and the pile of paper pressed again. The paper was then hung up to dry and mature on long lines of cord in the rafters of a suitable loft, which could involve a few months of hanging for each sheet. At this stage the paper was still very absorbent, so was dipped in a mixture of animal gelatine to ‘size’ the paper and reduce its absorbency. The sized paper was then pressed, dried, pressed again and possibly smoothed by hammering or rubbing with stones. This finished paper was sorted into folded quires of 24 or 25 sheets, and packed into reams of 20 quires, i.e. of 480 or 500 sheets, depending on the area of manufacture. There were then 10 reams to the bale. The timing of the whole process from ‘stuff’ to packed ream might take a few months once the time for the

constant alternation of drying and pressing and the time the paper might be left to
‘mature’ and to allow the fibres to knit is taken into account. A competent two-man
team of vatman and coucher might make up to 5000 sheets of smaller (foolscap) sized
paper a day, equivalent to about 8 to 10 reams, or one bale. The packed reams were
then stored in the mill’s warehouse or often sent direct to a papermerchant or the
printing press where contracted or required.

The ‘watermark’ viewed each time we hold a piece of handmade paper up to the light is
not therefore nascent in the material of the paper, but an imprint made by the wires of
the mould that made the paper on the portion of the stuff taken out of the vat to make
each sheet. The lighter lines in the ‘lookthrough’ are simply the areas of paper made
thinner by the slight counter-gravitational pressure of the wires of the mould as the
fibres in the paper knitted and dried initially as the mould with deckle attached was first
passed from vatman to coucher. So the watermark we see is a secondary phenomena, an
imprint of the brass wires used to make the mould, and this same imprint may also be
found on the next sheet of paper to be made with that particular mould. The mould
wires were divided into a series of thicker wires running parallel to the shorter side of
the frame, called ‘chain lines’, and a more numerous series of thinner wires running
parallel to the longer side of the frame called ‘laid lines’. These wires were sewn or
twisted together in a variety of ways to form the semi-permeable surface that held the
‘stuff’ but let unwanted water drain off. The earliest Arab and European papers
consisted of no more than this, the lines running back and forth, until watermarks were
first introduced in Western Europe in the late Thirteenth Century. The watermark
consisted of a pattern fashioned by craftsmen from more brass wires bent around nails

57-77. The paragraphs below draw on all of these works.

3 Turner and Skjöld Handmade Paper Today 1983 pp 26, 50; Balston, Thomas James Whatman,
arranged in a pattern that was then sewn onto the surface of the wires of the mould, most usually in the centre of one half of the mould. For example, this means that in a folio format sheet of two leaves the watermark will appear in the centre of one of the leaves. The familiar watermarks depicting images of crosses, animals and beasts, heraldic insignia and so on were initially used as indicators of the location and identity of the paper mill and manufacturer, and only later in the Sixteenth Century became roughly standardised indicators of size and quality of the paper. What we see as watermarks are not intrinsically different to any of the other wire-imprints within a sheet of paper: they are just more distinctive and easier to recognize and to differentiate.

The idea of a ‘paper stock’ is implicit in the manufacturing process described above. The rhythmical two-man operation of vatman and coucher necessitated the use of a pair of moulds: these two moulds are designated ‘twins’ by bibliographers, but this twinship was fraternal and not identical.⁴ Mould wires were fixed onto their frames by craftsmen, and watermarks were bent, twisted and fashioned by human hand. A pair of moulds was made to look similar: partly for the workmen as they clocked in in the morning to take the pair in hand and begin to work, and partly for homogeneity of identity of paper stocks, but no two moulds could ever be exactly the same. Perhaps the most graphic demonstration of this was the execution in 1770 of Edward Burch and Matthew Martin for the forgery of the will originally made in 1764 by Sir Andrew Chadwick. Burch and Martin were convicted of forgery on the testimony of James Whatman Jnr, papermaker. The paper on which they had forged the will was made by Whatman on a mould that he stated he started using only in 1768; when asked in court under cross-examination whether any person could copy the mould or paper, he replied that ‘I have ordered
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several pair of moulds to be made alike, but never saw any two pair alike; they will
differ in a wire or something.” 6 Hence each and every one of the sheets of paper that
started their life in the moulds were marked, forever, with the imprint of one of the pair
of wire moulds used for their manufacture. This concept of ‘twinship’ is therefore used
to denote a specific paper stock made by a pair of moulds. A ‘stock’ of paper is therefore
those sheets of paper that were made at the vat at the same time on a single pair of
moulds.

This concept of a paper stock can be broken down further. A pair of moulds might
manufacture perhaps half a million sheets of paper in a maximum lifetime of one or two
years if used regularly. During this lifetime the watermark wires would be battered and
bent due to wear and tear of the manufacturing process, and the whole mark experience
a horizontal slippage along the laid wires towards the edge of the mould. 7 Given enough
surviving evidence, each primary ‘stock’ of paper made by a pair of moulds can
therefore be broken down further into different ‘states’ of the moulds depending on the
evidence of wear, tear and then repair that may be sorted, given sufficient evidence,
into a chronological pattern. 8

The description of any sheet of handmade paper must take into account the nature of
the mould and of the watermark imprint described above. Measurements to the nearest
mm should be taken of all the different variables that contribute to identify a particular
stock of paper: the size of the uncut sheet, the spacing of the chain lines and of the

6 See Balston, T. James Whatman 1957 Appendix 4 for the record of Whatmans’ testimony. Paul
Needham nominates Burch and Martin as the patron saints ‘of the bibliographical obscuri viri
who continue to misprize the uses of paper evidence’, see his ‘Allan H. Stevenson and the
7 Stevenson, A. The Problem of the Missale speciale London, Bibliographical Society 1967;
Excursum IV: “The Movement of a Mark on a Mould”; cf. Bühler, C. F. ‘Last Word on
8 Stevenson, A. ‘Paper as Bibliographical evidence’, in ed. J. B. Jones Readings in Descriptive
Bibliography Kent State Univ. Press 1974, pp. 128-147.
shape and identity of the watermark. These measurements require a high degree of accuracy and methodological consistency if they are to be utilised and interpreted properly. The complications of noting and accounting for small-scale details and the instances when the watermark or the pattern of the chain or laid lines is not readily visible to the naked eye means that the traditional technique of observing the 'lookthrough' of a piece of paper and then sketching or tracing the outline of the watermark is of limited value. When high levels of detail and consistency are required, watermarks are 'traced' using a technique termed the 'Leningrad' method: a perspex plate impregnated with a low-intensity Carbon-14 isotope is placed on the sheet of paper to be studied, and a sheet of sensitive photographic paper placed the other side. In just over 10 minutes a photographic life-size image of the mould (including watermark) used to make the sheet of paper results. Essentially the low-energy isotopes measure the differences in paper thickness; what we see is a perfect life-size reproduction of the mould and watermark imprint. Once an image of the watermark of a particular sheet of paper has been satisfactorily obtained, the first port of call for anyone interested in what a particular watermark can tell them are the main watermark albums collected with such care and perspicacity by paper historians such as Briquet, Picard, Heawood and others. By matching the watermark of the sheet of paper in front of you and one

---


depicted in any of these albums, information on where and roughly when that sheet of paper was manufactured and being used may be forthcoming to a degree. Care should be taken in that many of these watermark albums utilise tracings or sketches to depict the watermarks and do not differentiate between watermarks that look similar to the naked eye, nor between mould ‘twins’.

Once the nature of the watermark is fully digested, we still need to clarify how this can be used as a tool in historical or bibliographical investigations. The evidence of watermark distribution and sequences within a particular item, manuscript or printed book is most often used to examine the physical processes of construction and disruptions within an item - for instance in printed books this evidence can help to indicate cancels, errata and excisions. Beyond this, scholars have always assumed that paper evidence would be most useful in helping to date documents or printed books. This assumption has so far proved to be true, but only to a certain extent and with certain significant limitations. In the later Twentieth Century, the most comprehensive use of the identification of watermarks and paperstocks has been undertaken by incunabulists investigating early printing house practice. The apogee of this work came in Allan Stevenson’s examination of the paper stocks used in the printing of the Missale speciale, which succeeded in helping to place its date of printing to within a six month period in 1473. Before Stevenson’s work some scholars had proposed, based on the problematic and eventually inconclusive typographical and liturgical evidence, that the

---


Missale had been printed in c.1450 and was therefore the earliest surviving work of Gutenberg. Stevenson was only able to show this hypothesis to be incorrect by exercising his enormous knowledge of the manufacturing process of paper and its use in other early printed books, and by incorporating this paper evidence into existing knowledge of printing house practice and to the typographical evidence of the Missale speciale that scholars had long pondered over.

Stevenson established a method which showed the utility of paper evidence for dating printed books by providing a ‘terminus a quo’, meaning a date after which it is likely a book dates, as opposed to a ‘terminus ante quem’, meaning a date before which it is likely to have dated. If a succession of securely dated books containing what Stevenson termed as large ‘runs’ of homogenous paper stocks can be shown to have a cut-off point before which no book utilising this exact same paper stock has come to light, then, because of the relatively quick turnover and utilisation of expensive paper stocks by printers, it can be said with some confidence that these paper stocks were manufactured around this time. The corollary of this was therefore that no printed book utilising large ‘runs’ of these same paper stocks was printed before that time. Stevenson showed how the surviving copies of the Missale speciale contained large runs of paper stocks that coincided with other runs of the same paper stocks in books printed in the early 1470s. Stevenson did so by comparing the watermarks produced by each pair of moulds involved, and by showing how these moulds had been battered, bent and subsequently mended by their handlers during the manufacturing process to produce different states of the watermark imprint for each separate paper stock. Since Stevenson’s work in the


1950s and 60s others have carried his method forward, but significantly only in the area of fifteenth-century printed books.\textsuperscript{15}

Conversely, no matter how many dated handwritten documents one can provide on the same paper, there is still no assurance in trying to place an undated example on this paper before a given date. The reason for this lies in the differing usage of paper once it had left the mill and warehouse between paper that was used in the printing house and paper that was written on by hand. Stevenson and other paper historians have always drawn attention to what anyone who has experience in an office stationary cupboard already knows: ‘a man who buys a supply of writing paper may, at his discretion, use it up within a few months, or else allow it to linger within his desk or workroom for a number of years’\textsuperscript{16}. Because of the absolute variability in end-usage, the interpretative (as opposed to the simply descriptive) utility of the study of watermarks in collections of manuscript papers assembled over time has always been queried by such prominent figures as Briquet and Stevenson. These queries are largely responsible for the absence of any systematic study of the paper stocks and paper utilisation within any personal archive, and Beale’s papers are no exception to this. The 1994 catalogue of the Yelverton papers mentions watermarks in conjunction with only three out of nearly 100 volumes containing Beale’s papers, and in these few instances the information is unclear and incomplete.\textsuperscript{17} In the course of my own research I have looked at the


\textsuperscript{16} Stevenson \textit{Missale Speciale} 1967, p 91.

\textsuperscript{17} See descriptions for: 1) Add MS 48006, a composite MS consisting of contemporary papers from negotiations with the Hanse for the Treaty of Utrecht in 1474 2) Add MS 48022, a collection of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century copies of documents relating to the Cinque ports 3) Add MS 48031A, a Fifteenth Century precedent book.
watermarks for nearly every single MS item which I consider to have been Beale-related within the Yelverton papers and the various volumes of Beale’s papers listed above, and in addition many more which are not Beale-related in order to provide a sufficient context. From this examination, watermarks for over 500 distinct stocks of paper (as opposed to single leaves) occurring in Beale-related items have been definitely identified and then been recorded. As each of these single items more often than not consist of more than a single sheet of paper, I suppose I have looked at (or to be more precise through) many thousands of leaves of paper in search of watermarks. This is by no means a huge figure - I cannot recall where, but Stevenson I am sure mentions figures of half a million or so, in a kind of offhand way; Briquet’s Album contains 16,112 tracings of separate watermarks (his private papers apparently contain a total of nearer 70,000), so within the broader scheme of things my own study of the paper in the Yelverton manuscripts and other Beale-related items is fairly limited.

During the course of looking through so many sheets of paper some familiar watermarks have come to be recognized, ‘friends’, as it were, from amongst the many thousands of possibilities. A list of these has been drawn up, and nearly 50 marks (or pairs of marks) have then been isolated and allocated a number. These 50 or so watermarks do not by any means exhaust the number of paper stocks contained either within the definitions of ‘Beale-related’ or even ‘Beale-originated’ papers. These have been chosen because of the combination of firstly the frequency of their occurrence within Beale’s papers and then secondly their relative distinctiveness as far as watermarks in general go. As we have discussed, all watermarks representing a pair of moulds and therefore a particular paper stock are in theory unique and therefore

---

18 French and German manufactured paper stocks predominate in paper supplied to Beale during his life. There is also evidence of English-manufactured papers in the 1590s in the occurrence of watermarks that do not occur in Briquet or any of the watermark albums based on continental archives: for examples of paper manufactured at Dartford by John Spilman in the 1590s see Stevenson, A. ‘Tudor Roses from John Tate’, Studies in Bibliography 20 (1967) pp 15-34.
distinguishable from each other. In practice, the level of detail of reproduction that has been needed in my own work in the Yelverton papers is less than that required by bibliographers using beta-radiographic reproduction to examine the changing states of watermarks within large ‘runs’ of paper utilised during the manufacturing process of printed books. By comparison, the largest items in Beale’s papers which use a distinct and homogenous paper stock consist of perhaps a couple of hundred of leaves: it is sufficient therefore in this context to distinguish these paper stocks made from a single pair of moulds from other stocks, and not necessary to investigate the various possible stages of the life of the pair of moulds that made them.

Some of the watermarks from Beale’s papers have been described as accurately as possible relying on the naked eye: two examples that both figure below will suffice for the moment; a paper bearing a watermark of a Frankfurt Eagle similar to Briquet no. 149, and a paper bearing a watermark of a shield with blazon on a sword similar to Briquet no. 1027. The occurrence of both of these water marks within the Yelverton papers is interpretatively significant in a different way; the former eagle mark for the dating of a pre-publication MS copy of George Buchanan’s *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, and the latter shield and sword mark for the survival of a significant amount of Thomas Norton’s papers within Beale’s archive.

We begin with Beale’s copy of George Buchanan’s *De Jure Regni apud Scotos Dialogus*, surviving in an undated and unendorsed copy written in the hand of Beale’s first Clerk A within one of the many Yelverton volumes containing exclusively Beale-related papers. Buchanan had most probably originally written the *De Jure Regni* in late 1567, and surviving correspondence from the 1570s shows that manuscript copies of the treatise were circulating in the hands of some of Buchanan’s close associates.

---

19 BL Add. MS 48043 ff 123-152.
before the De Jure Regni was first printed in Edinburgh in 1579: most relevant to this argument here, one of these copies was in the hands of Daniel Rogers in the Netherlands in September 1576. 20 As we have partly seen in Chapter 6 above, Beale and Rogers spent a significant amount of time together on diplomatic duties both at home and abroad from the approximate date of Rogers acquiring his copy of the De Jure Regni before September 1576 and the first printing of the dialogue in 1579. They were involved together in diplomatic representations to the Prince of Orange over the summer and autumn of 1576; in August 1577 Beale departed for the Continent again, met with Rogers in Germany in September, and then the two men separated for a few months before returning together via the Netherlands to England in February 1578. We have also seen above how close Beale and Rogers were in their friendship as well as their upbringing, careers, political and religious interests.

The undated and unendorsed De Jure Regni copy in Beale’s papers is written entirely on a paper of fine quality watermarked with a large eagle with a distinctive ‘F’ in the chest. Both watermarks of the pair described here as ‘E1’ and ‘E2’ share the same outward dimensions; 90mm from the tip of the tail feather to the top of the crown, and 85mm across the tips of the outer wing feathers. Other similarities are the same number of seven wing feathers, a single strand of wire for a tongue, and similar tails. 21 This pair of watermarks are similar to Briquet no. 149, but without close scrutiny of the originals.

20 Opera Omnia Epistola XIV. Daniel Rogersius Georgio Buchanano S. P. D. Londino Trinobantium, 3 Cal. Sept. 1576, pp. 736-737. The original is National Library of Scotland Adv. MS. 15.1.6, f. 20; ‘Dialogismum de Regno, ab hos temporis statu non alienum, avidissime perlegi, ex quo & illud cognovi, quam studiose in Platone versatus esses. Eum ego Philologis Hollandis communicavi, ac typis edituri essent, si de tua voluntate essent certiores.’

21 The twins are distinguishable by the wires used to denote the ‘arm’ within each wing, and the differences between the initials ‘F’ in their chests. In what I have called E1 the ‘F’ clearly retains the bottom horizontal wire across the base of the letter that closes it off. The height from the base of this to the top of the letter is 16mm. The wires that make up the arm to the ‘open’ side of the ‘F’, however, join the bottom of the wing. On the other of the twin, that I have called E2, the ‘F’ is not closed by a bottom wire, but the two wires of the descender of the letter spread out to join the bottom of the body. Here on the ‘open’ side of the ‘F’, the arm wires are fatter, more spread out than in E1, and join the chest of the eagle at a point parallel to the top horizontal bar of the ‘F’.
used by Briquet we do not know whether they are from exactly the same moulds as Briquet's example or not. The examples Briquet gives of this watermark all date from the late 1560s, and the geographical locations of the examples he found are all grouped along the rivers of southern Germany, suggesting that the distribution of this stock or others very similar to it was not extensive. The initial 'F' in the eagle's breast was distinctive of the paper mills of the Frankfurt region - it is distinctly possible that Beale acquired this stock when in the area himself, either in the company of Sir Henry Killigrew in 1569 or when on his own independent mission to the German princes in September 1577. The volume of papers now Add. MS 48043 (described in some detail in Chapter 7 above) in which Beale's copy of the *De Jure Regni* is bound is a composite volume containing different articles written or copied at different dates, and then collected and bound together under Beale's direction in the 1590s; four other MSS in Beale's papers using similar bindings include articles from the 1580's. The first quire in Add MS 48043 using the Frankfurt paper is that beginning the *De Jure Regni* on f 123; leaves of papers from different stocks are used for the inserted folios 173-173* and for ff 174-191, a copy of Etienne de la Boetie's *Discours de la servitude volontaire*. The Frankfurt paper is then used to the end of the MS in the last five quires.

---

22 Briquet no. 149; '31.5 x 43. Hiedelburg, 1565. Genève, B.: Ms franc. 197aa. ...: Cologne, 1566-70; Eltville, 1567-69; Mecklenbourg, 1568; Spire, 1569.' Briquet's notes on 'l'aigle à la lettre F' are: "Nos lecteurs remarqueront que les plus anciennes, 136 à 139, portent pendue à la queue une marque particulière que l'on ne retrouve pas plus tard. Puis que les 140 à 145, de 1544-69, ont une membrane accentuée dans les ailes et une queue que se termine en un large épanouissement. Les types 146 à 148, usités en 1545-64, représentent l'aigle dans membrane aux ailes et sans écu; la lettre F est posée et comme perdue dans la corps de l'oiseau. Les 149 et 150 (1565-70) ont de nouveau une membrane aux ailes, mais la queue est moins conventionnelle; quant aux 151 à 153 (1573-80) ils présentent des formes dégénérées et accusent un dessinateur de peu de goût."

23 SP 81/1/19; CSPF Vol. 12 1577-78 p 179-83. Robert Beale to Walsingham from Frankfurt, dated 21 September 1577. When in Frankfurt I suspect Beale stayed at the printing house of André Wechel in 1577; see the letter dated 1579 from Wechel to Beale concerning the progress of Beale's compendious *Rerum Hispanicarum aliquot*, Aberdeen University MS 1009/2/ f 53.

24 The contents list f v of the MS is in the hand of the Clerk B who worked with Beale from 1593 onwards. One of these MS in a similar binding, Add MS 48037, also includes a contents list in the hand this Clerk B.
The item immediately following the De Jure Regni using the exact same Frankfurt paper is a copy of a tract arguing for the right of the Prince of Orange to resist the Duke of Alva, and this is also partly copied in the same hand into the end of the last quire of the paper used for the De Jure Regni. This next item is clearly contemporary to the De Jure Regni, and is endorsed by Beale himself ‘An liceat Principi Auricae resistere Duci Albano. Themata collecta anno 1572’. The other material in this volume that uses this Frankfurt paper is all copied from French tracts with original composition dates c.1569-1572 relating to the French Wars of Religion and Mary Queen of Scots.

From this it would be tempting to date the De Jure Regni copy to c.1572 due to the date endorsement by Beale on the subsequent article that must have been copied at the same time as it shares both paper and partly the hand used for the De Jure Regni. This hypothesis would presume that Beale obtained a copy in Paris in 1572, which he then showed to Rogers in the summer of 1576, and which Rogers then reported in his letter to Buchanan of September 1576. But what did Beale mean by ‘themata collecta anno 1572’, and when did he make this attribution? It was characteristic of Beale to add endorsements retrospectively to items of his collection, most probably during the later sorting of his library and binding in the 1590’s. The date of ‘1572’ subsequently endorsed by Beale, perhaps added at the time of binding, may well refer to some event connected with the subject matter of the material rather than the date Beale obtained the copy. So we turn back once again to the paper: once we have established the identity of

25 The quires using the Frankfurt paper are termed I, ff 123-134; II, ff 135-148; III, ff 149-160; IV, ff 161-172. The copy of de la Boetie’s Discours de la servitude volontaire uses a paper similar to Briquet no. 12745.
26 The first part of this treatise is written in the same hand as the De Jure Regni copy; the second hand used in this treatise on f 157b also occurs in article 12, ff 205-225, which is also written exclusively into a quire of 11 sheets of the Frankfurt paper. Art. 12 was composed c. 1568, and was published in a different form by Goulart in 1574 as Le Politique Dialogue traitant de la puissance... No date or endorsement is indicated in the Add. MS 48043 copy.
27 Art. no. 8, ff 155-157. The text, in thirty seven sections, is followed by the oath taken by Charles V and Prince Philip, 5 July 1549, on the installation of the latter as Duke of Brabant (see also Add. MSS. 48014, art. 18 and 48088, art. 5) The end of the De Jure Regni takes up the first
this distinctive stock of Frankfurt paper, we can track this paper stock through the rest of Beale’s papers. The underlying hypothesis is that Beale did not purchase individual paper stocks (with identical states of moulds and watermarks) more than once: the logistics of production, and the multiplicity of possible permutations of paper stocks through the paper makers at the mill to the paper merchants must surely preclude this. So any identical paper stocks we observe in Beale’s papers must have been acquired, but not necessarily used, at the same time.

This Frankfurt paper stock occurs in four other separate items in Beale’s collection, two of which are also in the italic hand of Clerk A who copied the De Jure Regni text. This same paper is used throughout almost the entire volume of Add MS 48042, a collection of historical material on the genealogies of Royal and noble families in Britain from the Norman conquest to c.1573. The Frankfurt paper is used for the front papers ff ii-vii, and then the whole of the book ff 1-577, with only a later article ff 577-88 dating from the 1580’s on a different paper bound in with the main treatise. This genealogical collection is almost entirely in the hand of Clerk A who wrote the De Jure Regni copy; the only exceptions are additions by Beale that have been added to the main text. The ornate titles, the use of this fine paper and the spacing of the text indicate that this genealogical collection of Beale’s was a fair copy and not a preliminary draft. From the internal evidence the date of composition of the text is some time in or after 1573, although the date of actually writing up of this fair copy is

---

4 leaves (ff 149-152) of the third quire of the Frankfurt paper; art. 8 uses 3 later leaves (ff 155-157). One of these (ff. 152-157) is therefore a conjugate pair; a shared sheet.

28 Add MS 48085 ff 34-57 (f 58 lacking; f 59 formerly used as the front end-paper, but is now remounted in sequence), copies of material relating to the assembly at Frankfort in September 1577 in hand of Clerk A dating from Sep 1577-26 Dec 1577; Add MS 48042, ff ii-vii, 1-577, text of succession of sovereigns and English nobility up to c.1573 in the hand of the Clerk A; Add MS 48040 ff 327-408 autograph Beale undated notes on St. Matthews Gospel Chapters 1-13; Add MS 48117 ff 221-32 autograph Beale undated notes on Scottish history.
another matter. Two other items on the Frankfurt paper are undated autograph notes by Beale; the one an extended run of nearly 80 leaves of notes and glosses on St. Matthews Gospel, and the other a few sheets of notes on Scottish history. Neither can offer any external or internal evidence for their date of composition. What may possibly solve the problem is the fifth and final item that utilises this same Frankfurt paper stock. This is now Add MS 48085 ff 34-53, a selection of copies of material relating to the Frankfurt assembly in September 1577, and a number of letters written to Elizabeth from German princes concerning Beale’s mission, which all date originally from 24 September to 26 December 1577. Many of the originals of these letters to Elizabeth are now in SP 81 in the PRO or in the Cotton Galba series in the British Library. All these copies in Add MS 48085 are in the same roman hand of Clerk A. As the original letters brought back by Beale were to be handed over to Walsingham and Cecil for Elizabeth’s perusal on Beale’s return, Beale must have had these copies made from the originals during his journey back from Germany to England via the Netherlands in January and February 1578 - a journey he made with Daniel Rogers. Rogers and Beale arrived back in the country five days apart, on the 1 and 6 February respectively, after Rogers had made a small detour to visit the Prince of Orange in the Netherlands whilst Beale returned directly. Finally, it is crucial to note here that no other example of the hand of Clerk A occurs in Beale’s papers in material dating from before early 1577, which can therefore be taken as the date when Clerk A entered Beale’s service.

The comparison material on the same Frankfurt paper stock also suffers from the same problem of the *De Jure Regni* copy in that it is all either autograph or copies of material, and the date when these were noted or copied is not indicated. It is possible, although highly unlikely, that Clerk A might have copied the material relating to

---

29 The date 1573 is frequently mentioned as the last in some of the genealogies; for instance f 356b - under Lincoln and ‘Guilhelmus Fiesnes’; ‘...comes Eouurdus qui nunc est anno 1573 per lineam masculinam descendit.’
Beale's mission to Germany of late 1577 from the originals after these originals had been handed over in February 1578. A more conclusive finding would be to find some material that was copied in the same hand, on the exact same paper stock, and could be dated with assurance. Even then the possibility of discrepancies in the date of copying still arise. A more important contention might be that despite the same hand occurring on the same paper stock nothing is really proved at all.\(^{30}\) Although this argument is not valid within the strict terms of formal logic, it is preferable perhaps to think of Beale and Rogers on the roads of Northern Europe, with their entourage of a few servants, Clerk A included, discussing literature and politics in the same breath, and mulling over the implications of the Scottish History contained in Buchanan’s *De Jure Regni* to the contemporary European political situation and the peculiar case of Mary Queen of Scots. During this journey, Beale instructed his new secretary to take a good copy of the text of this as yet unprinted treatise from Rogers. As they travelled Beale took notes on Scottish History on the paper stock he carried with him, whilst also making a more personal spiritual gesture of writing out the commentary on Matthew’s gospel. When Beale arrived back in England, he handed over to Walsingham and Burghley the originals of the letters written to Elizabeth from the Protestant German Princes, but kept for his own record the copies of these that his new Clerk had taken on the journey back. He also kept (it is presumed) the fair copy of Buchanan’s *De Jure Regni* that the same clerk had copied from the text belonging to his friend and colleague Daniel Rogers, as it was still unsure whether this powerful polemic would ever be printed.

Our second example uses the evidence of paper stocks in Beale’s archive in a different although ultimately complementary manner. One of the significant characteristics of Beale’s archive described in detail in the ‘Introduction’ to this thesis was its apparently organic growth and the manner in which he was able to digest the papers that he had

\(^{30}\) Dr. Roger Mason’s work on the text of the MS version indicates that this does indeed pre-date
obtained from other sources and those originally belonging to other men. These papers from elsewhere were then mixed up, rearranged and effectively confused with others of Beale’s own during the later sorting and binding process. Beale obtained papers from other sources partly due to his professional involvement in so many of the relevant political issues of the day. In 1595 Beale, Sir Henry Killigrew and Arthur Atye were directed by the Privy Council to prepare a report on the mutual financial obligations and debts between the United Provinces and Elizabeth, and in order to fulfil their duty they requisitioned the papers of muster-master Thomas Digges concerning Leicester’s campaign in the Netherlands 1585-87 to aid them in their work. Digges had died a matter of months before Beale’s services were commissioned, and Sir Thomas Wilford was ordered to resort to Digges’s house in Kent and requisition the relevant papers for the enquiry. These papers were then never returned to Digges’s widow’s chest, and they remained instead in Beale’s possession, where they were sorted and bound into two Yelverton volumes containing papers concerning the Netherlands.31

Beale also obtained papers or copies of papers from other men through his own personal connections. Beale himself, as we have seen in Chapters 3 and 4, was living in France during the 1560s and early 1570s at the same time as some of Sir Thomas Smith’s embassies, and many of Beale’s papers appear to have been copied from Smith’s papers during these French sojourns, as well as later in the 1570s whilst both men were in service with the Privy Council.32 Beale was also one of the executors of his

31 HMC Salisbury Vol V HMSO London 1894 p 367 Sir Thomas Wilford to Sir Robert Cecil September 7 1595; ‘I have been with the executrix of Mr. Thomas Digges, and there I find all such writings as concern her Majesty’s affairs in the Low Countries chested under lock and key in three chests. His widow desires a warrant to herself for her discharge, because her husband had them upon an instrument signed to the parties, delivered to him by her Majesty’s special order.’ Digges’s Netherlands Muster papers reside now in Add MS 48083 and Add MS 48084.

32 One item describing the the yield of various taxes in France in the 1550’s is copied in his autograph and endorsed ‘The State of the realme of France which I had of Sr Thomas Smith in Paris a’ 1566 2 Maij; Add MS 48026, Art. 3 ff 29-31; endd. f 30a. Other material relating to Sir Thomas Smith’s 1566 visit to Paris is in Add. MS. 48085, Art. 27 ff. 352-375b.
foster-father John Hales’s will in 1572, and, given Beale’s personal involvement and political interests, it is reasonable to assume that Beale would have acquired at least some of Hales’s papers on his death. Identifying any items possibly descending from Hales has proved, however, a predominantly frustrating task. Only one item now residing in Beale’s papers is in Hales’s autograph hand, and most of the items whose provenance could be assigned tentatively to Hales bear no further internal or external clues to help.\textsuperscript{33}

The most significant ingestion of material into Beale’s archive was undoubtedly that of many of the papers of that other ubiquitous ‘man of business’ Thomas Norton. Elizabethan historians have known for some time that a number of items in Beale’s papers must have originally come from Norton, based on either their obvious personal link to Norton or their correlation with items listed in an inventory made of some of Norton’s papers in 1584.\textsuperscript{34} This inventory of Norton’s papers was noted but then subsequently largely ignored by Michael Graves in his otherwise wide-ranging study of Norton.\textsuperscript{35} Graves’s omission is understandable: before the completion of the 1994

\textsuperscript{33} The only item in Beale’s collection in Hales’s autograph hand is now Add MS 48043 art. 4 ff 65-81, notes taken by Hales on a treatise of John Leslie. Other items that possibly belonged to Hales are now Add MS 48043 ff 1-9b, endorsed on f xvb in Beale’s hand ‘These answers were mad by m[Mr] Rychard Bartye, husband to the lady Catharine Duchess of Suff. against the book of John Knox: 1558’; Add. MS. 48030 Art. 1 ff. 1-21b. Art. 2 ff. 27-39b. Two treatises on Divorce; Add. MS. 48062 Art. 26 ff. 414-415. A late C16 copy of the second draft of the bull granting dispensation to H VIII to be requested from Pope Clement VII in 1527; Add. MS. 48114 Art. 3 ff. 54-68. Tract on marriage, consanguinity and legitimacy by Francois Baudin al. Franciscus Baldiniius, prof. of civil law at Heidelberg, add. to English Privy Council c.1561; Yelverton Vol 56 CMA pp. 142-143; descriptions including ‘2. A Book made by J. Loe <rect. H.>, and delivered to the Queen’s majesty by my Lord of B. at the beginning of her Reign by John Halls, f. 11; 3. John Halls concerning the title, & succession to Crown of England against the title of the Queen of Scots, f. 20; 4. Mr. Giles’s answer to it, f. 29.’


British Library Catalogue of the Yelverton papers any further systematic investigation into the possible extent and present location of Norton’s papers within Beale’s archive would have been practically impossible due to the inadequacy of the old CMA descriptions. Beale and Norton had known each other personally: Beale was ten years younger than Norton, but during the 1570s and early 1580s the two men shared many of the forums within which they both carried out their various, often overlapping, services to Queen, Privy Council and the furtherance of their more personal or professional interests. Beale referred to ‘honest, poore, playne Norton’ in his correspondence with Burghley after Norton’s imprisonment in the Tower in December 1581, and it is clear that the two men held each other in terms of mutual respect and friendship. Norton left no will but we know that Beale did not obtain these Norton papers directly through this personal connection. On Norton’s death in 1584, Thomas Wilkes had been despatched on the orders of the Privy Council to seize and confiscate the papers stored in Norton’s study in London that touched on ‘matters of state’. Wilkes searched the room, and produced a ‘catalogue of all the Bookes, papers and matters of state from Tho. Norton’s studie’, an itemised list of 74 items which is now in the Hatfield Cecil archive. It is unlikely that these consisted of the entirety of Norton’s papers: these papers listed by Wilkes were all of a ‘public’ nature, connected in some way or another with Norton’s busy political life during the 1560s and 1570s. The Norton papers confiscated by Wilkes in 1584 then remained in his hands till at least 1586, after which date some if not all found their way into Beale’s possession.

Add. MSS 48000-196), which probably contain more of Norton’s papers than have so far been identified.’

36 Add MS 48039 f 48b.
37 Hatfield Cecil Papers 140/5. The inventory contains titles of 74 (numbered 73 but no. ‘67’ repeated twice) items of Norton’s papers seized by Wilkes.
38 See Cotton MS Caligula C.IX f 445; printed CSP Vol. IX pp. 50-53 no. 46. Beale to Walsingham September 26 1586 from London: ‘I sought for such things as I had and your honour desires, and send to you herewith the bill that passed both houses concerning her <Mary Queen of Scots>. Other particular things which were done I think your honour may have of Mr. Wilkes among Mr. Norton’s papers, who then was of the house and gathered the actions better than I could; who was then with you in France.’
The 1584 Hatfield inventory is the basis from which the Norton papers in Beale’s archive have been identified by title, content and subject matter and listed below in the schedule at the end of this Appendix. The first column of this schedule gives the brief description of each item found in Norton’s study transcribed directly from the 1584 Hatfield inventory. The second column gives the location of the item where it has been identified within Beale’s papers in the Yelverton papers. The process of identification of Norton papers has been complicated somewhat by the loss in the Eighteenth Century of volumes 56 and 97 from the Yelverton library. As stated above in Chapter 1, Yelverton volume 56 in particular held many items relating to the succession debates of the 1560s and then from the 1572 parliamentary session on Norfolk and Mary, which in all likelihood was made up chiefly from the papers of Thomas Norton and John Hales. Hence the identification of the items from Norton’s papers that came into Beale’s archive is more assured where they reside still in the Yelverton papers, and less so when the brief descriptions in the Hatfield inventory are being matched up against the similarly brief descriptions in CMA.

The results of this comparison of the titles listed in the Hatfield Inventory and the present or past descriptions of items in Beale’s papers shows that nearly all of these ‘public’ papers seized by Wilkes in 1584 from Norton’s study came into Beale’s hands: nearly fifty of the 74 items listed in the Hatfield Inventory are more or less identifiable in amongst the rest of Beale’s papers that came into the Yelverton library in the early Seventeenth Century. Of these items, 40 are now still resident in the Beale-related papers within the Yelverton papers and are identified in the schedule below. Another 8 items are identified based on the descriptions of the lost Yelverton volumes in CMA alone, and these cannot therefore be pinpointed with 100% accuracy. Of the 26 items that remain unidentified, 12 are parliamentary bills or drafts of bills that were itemised
singly. Hence the bulk of the separate items, treatises, histories and collections of letters from Norton’s study has survived along with the rest of Beale’s papers.  

The third column in the schedule below records the palaeographical and paper evidence for Norton items that have been either identified or suggested as remaining still in Beale’s papers in amongst the Yelverton volumes in the British Library. Many of these were written in Norton’s autograph hand; care has been taken here as Norton’s autograph secretary hand is fairly regular and not particularly distinctive nor the easiest to identify. Norton also quite often signed his letters, copies of letters or other autograph material with his ‘TN’ monogram, where the verticals of the letters are elided. Where positive identifications have been possible the watermark of the paper of the item involved has also been noted, and then compared to the record of the familiar papers stocks within the whole of the Beale-related Yelverton papers. The 74 items seized by Wilkes in 1584 were not in all probability the whole of Norton’s papers, but whatever their proportion of Norton’s original archive, these items form if you like a microcosm of ‘Norton-related’ papers within the ‘Beale-related’ papers within the broader whole of the Yelverton papers. Just as in Beale’s own archive, not all these ‘Norton-related’ papers would have been ‘Norton-originated’, so we should expect a similarly wide range of paper stocks. However, there is also a reassuring reoccurrence of some paper stocks, for instance a paper watermarked with a shield on a sword (‘number 15’ in my own record of familiar watermarks) occurs in 8 of the

39 The 40 items are Hatfield Inventory no’s 2-7, 9-10, 12, 14, 16-27, 30-33, 37, 39-43, 47-49, 52, 54, 56, 58-59. The 8 items identified from the lost Yelverton MSS are no’s 8, 13, 15, 28-29, 60-61, 73. The 26 unidentified items are no’s 1, 11, 34-36, 38, 44-46, 50-51, 53, 55, 57, 62-72 (with ‘67’ repeated twice). Some of the 40 Hatfield items identified as presently within the Yelverton papers are not without their problems: item 4 survives only in what was probably a copy made by Beale in the hand of clerk A from the original Norton item.

40 Examples of Norton’s autograph hand are Add MS 48023 ff 26-54; also Lansdowne MS 31 f 12 Norton to Burghley 6 June 1580.

41 Add MS 48023 f 32a; also for example Add MS 32091 ff 167-69 Copy of a letter of John Knox to Elizabeth excusing his argument against the rule of women; in Norton’s hand with Norton’s ‘TN’ monogram.
items.\textsuperscript{42} Another schedule of all items in the Yelverton MSS using this shield on sword ‘no. 15’ paper has been extracted from my record of watermarks throughout the Yelverton MSS: from this, it can be seen that every single use of this paper within the Yelverton papers can be traced to the Norton papers recorded on the 1584 inventory.\textsuperscript{43} When attempting to identify the Norton papers from their brief description in the Hatfield inventory, cross-checking with the occurrence of the paper ‘no. 15’ has increased the probability that the item is from the Norton papers.\textsuperscript{44}

The underlying hypothesis of the argument is that by identifying paper stocks we are taking a step to identifying the provenance of items of paper. By this I mean the end-provenance of the utilisation of paper rather than that of the manufacture. I am also hypothesising that paper stocks were individual affairs; that men bought stocks of paper and kept them for their own use.\textsuperscript{45} An appropriate analogy to this study of paper stocks in the Yelverton papers is found in terms of conventional textual bibliography. Beale’s life is like a printed book: there are many single leaves or gatherings of sheets that make up this book, and some are from the same paper stocks. As Beale progressed through his life, different bits of paper were acquired by him, and either added to his archive where they have remained, or used and sent out where perhaps they may still be located in some other archive. This study has recorded which occur where in the course

\textsuperscript{42} For instance one watermark of a shield with a single band, upon a sword. Similar to Briquet no. 1027 but without two animals in halves of shield; “30.5x42 Poitiers, 1568. A. Vienne, G.44: \textit{Cpites de la recette de Chauvigny}. Var. simil: Nantes, 1570; Niort, 1576; Poitiers, 1577; Angers, 1578-79.”

\textsuperscript{43} This ‘no. 15’ paper occurs elsewhere in Beale’s archive but only when used as blank front or end papers for binding purposes; it does not occur on any items in the Yelverton MSS that are not from Norton’s papers.

\textsuperscript{44} Very few other Norton papers seem to have survived. Add MS 33271 is a volume of early C17 copies of what patently were Norton papers. Cotton MS Titus f.iii contains late C16 copies of a number of Norton papers, some of which (but not all) were part of the ‘State Papers’ that were confiscated by Wilkes and then found their way into Beale’s archive. It is likely that these copies were taken before Beale obtained the papers. Inner Temple Library Petyt MS 535 vol IV ff 200-315 contains material relating to the execution of Norfolk in 1572 and Mary Queen of Scots that could have come from Norton’s papers.
of Beale’s life, a sort of bibliographical chronological sequence analogous to a collation of a text, and has attempted to see if there are any patterns, links or sequences to be drawn from this. In a sense this is what we as historians always do - whatever it is we study, we invariably look at lots of different bits of paper and try to make sense and order of whatever is written on them. In this case it is not what is written on the bits of paper that has concerned us, but only with the bits of paper themselves as paper.

Schedule 1: Thomas Norton’s Papers In Beale’s Archive

Column 1 is a transcription of Hatfield MS 140/5, “A catalogue of all the Bookes, papers and matters of state from Tho. Nortons studie; and committed by her Matie to the charge of Tho. Wilkes Clarke of the Councell.”

Column 2 is the location of each item in Beale’s archive; either present location and BL 1994 Catalogue description, or reference to Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum ... Oxford 1697 for lost Yelverton MSS.

Column 3 is a record of the watermark on the paper used for each item, with any additional notes.

Columns 2 and 3 are left blank for those items that cannot be identified; Column 3 left blank for items identified by title only from descriptions in CMA for lost Yelverton MSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no. and description from 1584 inventory</th>
<th>Location of item in Yelverton MSS</th>
<th>Bibliographical Notes: Watermark of paper, Handwriting etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Booke of sixe reasons of the papiste that matters of faithe are not to be tried by the Scriptures.</td>
<td>48066 ff 319-73; Nicholas Harpsfield, ‘Life of Sir Thomas More’.</td>
<td>pot 55mm high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The life of Sr Thomas More.</td>
<td>48066 ff 193-316; Treatise by Nicholas Harpsfield on the divorce of Henry VIII (no title); [c. 1553-1558].</td>
<td>pot 42mm high; ff 313-18 on glove mark with five pointed star 85mm high with initials ‘R-B’ in palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A discourse of the divorce of king henrie the viijth from Queene Katherine.</td>
<td>48066 ff 90-182; George Cavendish’s Life of Wolsey c.1557.</td>
<td>NB. Beale’s copy - Not Norton’s. Title and first six lines of prologue by Beale, main text in hand of Clerk A. Paper watermarked with pot 45mm high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The life of Cardinall Wolsey.</td>
<td>48023 ff 246-73; ‘The orders of the royall Exhaunge of London...’.</td>
<td>two copies both watermarked with pot with ‘IC’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Th’order of the Realli exchange touching assurance.</td>
<td>48027 ff 83-88; ‘The Submission of Thomas duke of Norfolk’; ff 89-96: Account of the arraignment and trial of Norfolk for high treason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. An abstracte of the duke of Norffolks arraignment.</td>
<td>48023 ff 117-64; This text dated Feb 1572. There follows 3 treatises against Mary and Norfolk, and then letters and submissions.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A discourse whether it were fitte for her Matie to toyne in action with F-d in the enterprise of †: with a discourse in fffrenche agaynst the Queene of Scottes: and certen Ires and submissions written to hir Matie by the D of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harl. MS 1582 ff 38-41 uses ‘Duke of Anjou’ and ‘Low Countries’ for symbols.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norfolk.


See also 48063 ff 60-64; Tract on the office of Earl Marshall.

Watermarked with a glove with star 85mm high, with initials ‘P-O’ in band on palm.

9. Confatatio tituli scotici ad coronam Angliae

48049 ff 4-8 (See also Yelv. MS 56 ff 79); ‘Confatatio titulo Scotici ad Coronam Angliae’; 1565? Latin.

10. A journal of matters of state happened from time to time as well within as without the Realme from before the death of king Edw. the 6th until the yeare 1562.

48023 ff 350-69; Memoranda on events 1548-52 (ff 350-51b); then a narrative Sep. 1559-Dec 1562 (ff 352-69b)

Watermarked with a glove with five-pointed star; 83mm high in all on f 8; and a pot 50mm high with initials ‘O O’ in body on f 14.

11. The negotiation of the L. delavare Sr Ralfe Sadler etc. with the Scottishe Queene.

12. The duke of Norfolks speeche uppon the scaffold.

48027 ff 114-16; ‘Account of the Duke of Norfolkes speaches on the scaffold’.

ff 84-106 pot with ‘IC’
ff 107-16 pot with ‘PO’

13. Errors upon the statute made the xxvth of Edw: the thirde of children borne beyond the sea conceaued by Sergeant Browne and confuted by Sergeant Fairfax.

Yelv. MS 56 f. 401. ‘Certain errors upon the Statue of 25 Ed. III of children born beyond the sea, conceived by Sergeant Brown and confuted by Sir John Fairfax’.


48049 ff 74-103; Treatise addressed to Elizabeth I, on the title of Mary, Queen of Scots, to the English throne, dating from April - May 1571. Notes and amendments, possibly in Norton’s autograph, ff. 74, 79 etc. For a fair copy see Add. 48098.

Watermarked with a pot with ‘IR’ with 3 balls

15. A proiecte or plotte for lawes against the Scott. Q.

Yelv MS 56 ‘Reasons drawn by the learned in the Common law to move the Queen’s majesty to proceed against the Q. of Scots according to the first bill which imported the taking away of her life, f. 342? Causes to induce her Majesty to proceed according to Law and Justice, f. 345?

16. A plotte for the reformacion

48066 ff 2-15;

15; these three artt. in 48066
of sondrie imperfections in the administration of Justice and ordering of the Churches goodes. A copie of the will of king henrie the viijth. Certaine fragmentes for legitmacie and forren borne. Notes out of the civil lawe upon those matters. Title of K.Henrie to the crowne of ffrauce.

17. Touching the generall arrest betwene Englane and Spaine.


19. reasons to induce her matie to procede [ageynst] the Scott. Q. according to the firste motion in parliament. Th’execution of the duke of No{rfolk}.

20. Reasons to proue that her Matie for her safe{ty} ought to procede judicallie against the Scott. Qu.

21. Fragments in papers to induce th’exection of the Scott. Q.

22. Conference betwene the Erle of Morton and John Durie and Walter Balanquall tow{ching} the matters whereto the said Erle was charged etc. a proclamation by him published against suche as rebelled with the Scott. Q.

23. A discourse of the troble

Papers relating to religious reform. 1994 catalogue wrongly dates these to 1589 parliament. now ff 2-75 have an old foliation ff 33-106.

H VIII will: 48066 ff 20, 24-29; also Yelv MS 56 f 55.

‘Certaine fragmentes’ and Title of King Henry to France; 48066 ff 30-75b.

48023 ff 320-27; Memoranda concerning the mission to England of Christophe d’Assonleville, Jan-Feb 1569.

48023 ff 123-26b Herle to Burghley December 1571.

48023 ff 159-162 ‘Reasons provided...’ by Thomas Digges and Thomas Darnett; also copies in 48027 ff 108-11 ff 112-14 ‘A forme or platt for the grounde and order of a petition to be framed to her Matie for the executing of the Duke of Norffolk: prouided by T. N.’

48049 ff. 249-250b. Five causes against Mary, Queen of Scots, presented by the Attorney and the Solicitor-General to a Committee of both houses in the parliament of 1572; 13 May 1572.

48049 ff 251-56. Memoranda concerning Mary Queen of Scots and plots against Eliz. 1; 1570-82.

48027 ff 129-36; Paper relating to Scotland 1582-83.

48027 ff 137-42 Confession of the Earl of Morton as recorded by John Durie, Walter Balanquall and other ministers of Edinburgh; 2 June 1581. Also another copy in Add MS 48049, art. 16. See also Add MS 48023 ff 127-32.

48043 ff 97-117; ‘A discourse Watermarked with pot ‘PO’
24. A lea from the Q. of Scottes to the Erle of Bothweill.

of the late trobeles hapned in Scotland be tweane the quenes maiesty and the King... 1565 [1566] 9 marti'.

60mm high

Paper watermarked ff 276,279 on pot with 'O O'. ff 277,288 inserted.

ff 272-75 glove with star.

25. Th'examnation and confession of Nicolas Hoberte of the murdering of the K. of Scot.

48027 ff 272-75; 292-95; Examination and deposition of Nicholas Haubert concerning death of Darnley; 10 Aug 1569.

ff 272-75 glove with star.

26. Discourses in french by forges.

48023 ff 137-45; beg. 'Nostre aage a produit...', a tract urging trial of M Q of S c.1572. see also Add MS 48043 art. 13.

15

27. Edicte of the pacification in ffraunce. some discourses of the massacre: matters of the Lowe Countrieys in loose papers.


15

28. A discourse upon the title of the Q. of Scottes to this crowne.

Yelv. MS 56 ff 254-99; 'A treatise touching the right, Title and Interest of mary Q. of Scotland to the succession of the crown of England'

29. A defence of the Q. of Scottes title to the crowne of Englane, with an answer ther(in) without a begining.

Yelv. MS 56 ff 300-229: 'A description of the Queen of Scotland's Title to the Crown of England, f. 300; Thomas Norton to the Queen concerning Religion and the aforesaid treatise made in behalf of the Queen of Scots, f. 303. Also poss. Yelv. MS 56 ff 44?

30. Certaine breife notes of the countrouersie betwene the

48126 ff 6-17; 'Certayne brife notes of the

Watermarked with 15 and pot mix.

48126 ff 6-17; 'Certayne brife notes of the
dukes of Somersett and Northumberland.

controversy betwene the dukes of Somerset and the duke of Northumberland'

31. An abstract of certaine statutes published by king henrie the vi th.

48023 ff 15-20; ‘Statuta Edita per III. Principem Henricum Sextum [sic; recte Quintum]...; C15 copy of Nicholas of Upton’s Latin paraphrase of Ordinances of Mantes 1419.

32. A booke contayning lres. examinacions and papers matters of the Dukes conspiracie and Bushopp of Rosse.

48027 ff 37-43; 45-70. ff 37a-43b; ‘A briefe discourse containing a trewe declaration of the freundly and honest parte kept at all tymes by the Bishop of Rosse toward the right honourable lorde the late Duke of Norfolk ...written in maner of an Apologie for his defence’. ff 45-70; ‘Here followeth the discourse of the proceedinges of the Q. of Scottes afeyres in England since the xj of April 1571. to the xxvij of Merche 1572.’One hand to f 65a; then a change of hand to end on f 70b. Watermarked with a pot with ‘P/AR’.

NB. note by Beale on f 70b that original found in study of Henry Howard, who confessed before Mildmay, Norton and Beale that it had been sent to him by Leslie on his departure from England.

33. Sondry loose papers contayning matters of Scotland.

48048 ff 1-45. History of Scotland 1436-1561 by John Leslie, Bishop of Ross. an incomplete English version to 1512 only. Watermarked with a mix of 15 and pot 45mm high with no initials and a three-leaved fdl on top. NB. f1a title by Beale. One hand throughout.

34. Lres and minutes collected by Bernard Hampton Clarke of the Counsell of matters of state, written manie yerers paste containing sondrie Quieres of paper.

35. Bounds arraignement.

36. A discourse of pgsuasion to the Q{uene to} become a Catholique by B.

37. A lre from K. Henrie the viij th to the Bishoppe of London his ambassador with the Emperor.

48045 ff 175-79; Letter from H VIII to Bishop of London, Wingfield and Sampson as ambassadors to Charles V, 1525. Seventeenth-century copy

38. {Eleuen} pedigrees of the kings of England published by the Bishoppe of Rosse and fue sclanderous libells against her Matie found in Fraunces

See McN. Lockie 1954 p 100, note 7; p 144.
Throgmorton's house.

   48043 ff 10-55; heading by Beale 'A Declaration of the right title and interest, of the high and Excellent princess Mary the Q. of Scotland, unto the succession of the crown of England, with a defense of her honor.'
   Incomplete copy of three books by John Leslie Bishop of Ross; published c.1569 and printed in Rheims 1569 STC 15505.
   ff 11-32 watermarked with letters 'IP' 12x20mm and a fleur-de-lis.
   Watermarked with a glove and crown; 57mm high in all, and 20mm across crown

40. Th'examinacions of th'Erle of Northumberlande the L.
   Henrie Howarde, Ffra.
   Throgmorton and others, in grossed in certayne quyres of paper.
   48029 ff 64-68; Information obtained from the interrogation of Francis Throckmorton 2 Dec 1583.

41. Notes delivered by Charles Slade to Mr Secretarie touching practise of the pope and th'englishe traitors and fugitives at Rome.
   48029 ff 121-42;
   'A general discourse of the Popes Holynes devices' by Charles Sledd.
   48023 ff 94-109; 'A general discourse of the popes holinesse devices...'. Book 2.

42. Sondre ires founde in Fra:
   Throgmorts hors we.
   48029 ff 50-53b 'Letters of Nicolas Sanders S. J.'.

43. A discourse of William Herle touching the state of the low countreys.

44. A plotte to keep Jesuites and Seminaries from infecting the Church.

45. Notes of the disputacion with Campion.

46. A paraphrase upon the firste psalme of his owne writing.

47. A plott for the reforming of the universities and sundrie disorders of the ministerie.
   48023 ff 45-48; Norton's 'Devices' - see also Lansd. MS 155, ff 87-96.

48. The Bushoppe of Canterburies articles.
   48101 ff. 281-288b;
   Watermarked with a double-helix 55mm high and a band with letter in 52mm across

49. A discourse written by himself entitled the chaene of treasones.
   48029 ff 58-72; 'Thomas Norton's Chayne of reasons'; collection relating to Catholic plots 1583-84; Oct. 1583-Feb
   Watermarked with a glove and crown; 57mm high in all, and 20mm across crown
50. Certaine papistaills papers & wriytynes founde at one Burtons.

51. Collection of matters concerning Cuthbert Mayne executed for treason.

52. The plotte of the late treasons intended against her Matie and the Realme drawn out of sondrie examinaciones.

53. A table gathered out of a booke named a treatise of treasons against Q. Elizabeth.

54. A treatise written to her Matie agaynst the Q. of Scottes.

55. An answer to a libel in the praise of Campion.

56. A defence of the honor of the Q. of Scottes printed.

57. Verses written to the K. of Scottes in latini by Henrie Steward, gieing him the title of King of England, Scotland, france and Irelande.


59. A pamphlet printed in

1584.

48049 ff 277-79*; Extracts from correspondence of Mary Queen of Scots, and from other letters concerning plots against Elizabeth, 1570-77.

ff 277-79 watermarked with a pot with 'PA / R'.

Norton's A discoverie of treasons was later printed by Holinshed; draft copy now SP 12/171/ no. 86.

Possibly a draft of A Declaration of the favourable dealing of her Maisties Commissioners [Thomas Norton] printed by Christopher Barker in 1584; see Graves 1994 p 277.

48027 ff 284-91b; A defence of the honor of the right high... Marie Queene of Scottlande Paris 1569. Fragment comprising Preface and Book Two of STC 15504. Also see Add 48023 art. 2.


48035 ff 185-86 Copy of

Watermarked with no. 13; seventeenth-century copies.
Spanishe in commendacion of the atteemtes of the traitors in Ireland.

60. A parlament bill for an acte against the Scott. Queene.

61. The petition of the Lords of [the] highe house and of the burgesses of the neather house: orations pronounced to her matie by the speaker of the parlament house.

62. A bill for the perfections of the Statute made in the xij th yere of her Maties raigne to reforme disorders touching ministers of the Churche.

63. Articles for the reforming of proporcie <?>.

64. A bill for reformation of religion.

65. A bill to remove popishe officers.

66. A bill for comeng to the Churche.

67. A bill for presenting the oathe.

67.<sic> The bill at large against preistes and jesuits for reconciling of her Matie subiects as it was first exhibited in the parlament house.

68. A bill of the Bushoppes for religion.

69. Sondrie droughtes of the Bill for religion with articles and notes in loose papers concerning the same.

70. A bill for seales of Officers.

71. A bill for the watermen of the Thames.

72. A bill concerning Vernon and Gody.

73. Petition exhibited by the

‘Relacion muy verdadera...’
print Valladolid 1569.

Yelv. MS 56 f. 367 ‘The bill that passed both Houses against the Scottish Queen’.

Yelv. MS 56 f. 373. ‘The Oration made by the speaker the day of the prorogation of the first session, 14. Eliz’.

Yelv. MS 56 f 352 ‘An humble
petition to her Majesty by some in Parliament, assign'd with reason, that it stands with Justice, and with the Queen's honour, and safety, to proceed criminally against the pretended Queen of Scots'
Appendix 2. The Identification of Autograph Handwriting and its Cultural Connotations in Early Modern England

“The primary purpose of handwriting analysis is identification. In other words, it is based on the commonly agreed hypothesis that any piece of naturally occurring handwriting may, if it is sufficiently extensive, contain information that will enable its author to be identified.” Tom Davis, handwriting analysis expert 1992.¹

The identification of the autograph handwriting of Beale himself and of the various individual secretaries, clerks, diplomats and Privy Councillors who lived in Beale’s political world has figured in much of the thesis above. This process of identification has been pursued in order to trace the various different roles and service of these individuals within the personal household secretariats, administrative bureaucracies and the Privy Council chamber. Each chapter has utilised this process of handwriting identification in various classes or forms of document - in letters, in their addresses and endorsements, and in other written records such as the Privy Council registers - in what is hoped has been a sufficiently interesting and convincing manner. In Chapter 2 evidence for Beale’s residence in Paris during the later 1560s was identified on the basis of his handwriting in the correspondence back to John Hales in England; the discussion in Chapter 3 of the often overlapping roles of a secretary in an ambassador’s household as an amanuensis and as an ‘inward’ counsellor relied to a great part upon the identification of the hands of Beale, Warcop and Cave in writing Walsingham’s correspondence during 1571; the analysis in Chapter 4 on the relative roles of the Clerks of the Council and the household servants of the Principal Secretary in Privy

Council administration again followed their individual hands in the paper record to determine their times of attendance and their respective roles.

None of this use of the identification of handwriting is claimed to be particularly ground-breaking or novel. The identification of autograph handwriting has always been an essential tool for generations of historians whose work has involved them in extensive archival research, and examples of historians putting handwriting identification into practice are readily available. Geoffrey Elton, the teacher or doyen of many of the current generation of early modern 'document-based' historians, identified and tracked the hands of Thomas Cromwell and his servants such as Thomas Wriothesley and Ralph Sadler in his 'revolutionary' work on early Tudor administration.2 Other good contemporary examples are Colin Tite’s familiarity with the different forms of Robert Cotton’s secretary hand in his study of the construction of Cotton’s Library, and Simon Adams’s use of the endorsements of in-letters by Leicester’s secretaries’ for his reconstruction of the Leicester papers.3 Yet for most historians the prevailing wisdom on the identification of handwriting has been experientially rather than systematically based, with no mention of a process of identification that is then related and referenced to published material. Individual hands are identified through extreme familiarity rather than through the implementation of a structured system of identification which a less experienced researcher might utilise just as effectively given the same material. The end-result has been a situation where, in the words of Tom Davis, a member of Birmingham University English Faculty and also a practising forensic document analyst, ‘a research student faced with a problem in the

---


identification of handwriting would have a considerable problem in finding out even the rudiments of how to do it."^{4} 

This potentially frustrating state of affairs is partly due to the history of the collection and display of autograph handwriting over the previous four centuries. Up until fairly recently the collection and examination of handwriting has been the preserve of antiquarians and amateurs, and nowadays it is still probably too closely associated with the superficially similar practice of graphology. The classic history of the growth of interest in signatures and autographs in Britain from the early Seventeenth Century is A. N. L. Munby's short but fascinating *The Cult of the Autograph Letter.*^{5} The legacy of the principal manuscript collectors such as Dawson Turner, William Upcott, John Payne Collier and Sir Thomas Phillipps who indulged their fascination for autographs over the course of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries and still influences the form and survival of much early modern source material. Another legacy of this often frenzied antiquarian interest has been the manner in which autograph handwriting has been perceived since as a picture or image.^{6} The first printed work to display a facsimile image of the autograph handwriting so lovingly collected by men such as these was published by Dawson Turner at Yarmouth in 1848, and promoted as a 'guide to the historian, the biographer, the antiquary, the man of literary curiosity, and the collector of autographs, towards the verification of manuscripts, by reference to engraved facsimiles of handwriting'. These wholly admirable but absolutely general intentions are not that different from those of the numerous photographic collections of autograph handwriting produced since for a less exclusive market, beginning with that of W. W.

---


^{6} See especially Harl. MSS 6989-9; see C. E. Wright *Fontes Harleiani: A Study of the Sources of the Harleian Collection of MSS. preserved in the Dep. of MSS. in the British Museum* London
Greg in the first decades of the Twentieth Century, and more recently the collections made by Anthony Petti, Peter Croft, and Peter Beal. These books are helpfully supported by extensive palaeographical analysis of the changing influences on handwriting development in England during the period from c.1350-c.1700, but the absence of any structured practical guidance on how to identify individual hands means that these guides are still more useful as a display of handwriting than as a means of identification.

A more systematic approach to the identification of autograph handwriting is available to the innocent beginner (such as the prospective early modern history PhD student) in the literature generated by the modern practice of forensic document analysis. Much as in the history of the collection of autographs and the practice of the modern historians described above, the transition from experientially to systematically based examination of handwriting has been a relatively recent development. The most influential figures of early twentieth-century forensic document analysis also relied on their immense (and, to be sure, wholly effective) experience gathered over the years. The prospective document examiner spent their years of apprenticeship at the feet of more experienced practitioners in order to learn what was termed by many suspicious outsiders as one of the ‘black arts’. Modern document examiners have striven to align their practice upon the more scientific principles of their more laboratory-based associated disciplines by

---


attempting to encourage and generate an experimental process and a much more systematic literature based upon this. I myself have no practical experience of this, so here use the work of two practising document examiners who I have found particularly helpful: Tom Davis, mentioned above, and David Ellen.⁹

Court-based practitioners have had to develop a systematic and regular procedure and a vocabulary that reflects this. The document with the hand to be identified is termed the questioned writing. We may well have some idea of the possible identity of the writer, and can therefore compare this questioned writing to other material where the identity of the writer is definitely known. These are the sample or comparison writings; these samples should be as contemporary to the questioned writing as possible, and must be the same kind of writing - signatures should only be compared with signatures, scripts with only the same scripts, and capital letters with capitals, and so on. The process of comparison, states Davis, involves the close examination of each letter in the questioned and the sample writings, and then a detailed comparison of each corresponding letter.' During this process, the examiner is looking for significant matches or mis-matches, on the level first of the form of the letter, and then of the fine detail of letter-formation.' At this level of detail, the examiner should note the relative proportions of letters, the links or spaces between each letter, the relative height of each letter above the line, and the quality of the pen line itself - is it smooth, tremulous, jagged, confident, does it pause, are there odd pen-lifts, and so on.'¹⁰

---

⁹ See previous note above; also 'Forged Handwriting', in R. Myers and M. Harris (eds.) Fakes and Frauds: varieties of deception in print and manuscript St Paul's Bibliographies, London 1989, pp 125-36; 'Forensic handwriting analysis in the UK' written in 1993 on the ‘Handwriting homepage’ on Birmingham University website; http://www.bham.ac.uk/english/bibliography/handwriting/ukhw.htm. This website also contains an extensive bibliography on different aspects of handwriting analysis that is invaluable to any student entering this field for the first time; Ellen, D. The Scientific Examination of Documents: Methods and Techniques London, Francis 1997.

¹⁰ Davis, T. ‘Forensic handwriting analysis in the UK’ 1992 p 60. The comparison is carried out by the examiner with the use of referenced sketches are made in a work-book of each example of the range of typical realizations of each grapheme.
The comparison of letters takes place on two levels, Davis continues: 'The first level is that of the basic form of the letter, the style characteristics that the writer might share with others, but not all others. The second is the level of the individual characteristics, the identifying idiosyncrasies that do not derive from a taught style or an assumed fashion and are likely to be unique to that writer.'\textsuperscript{11} Of course, writing is a human process, and even here within the individual characteristics of the same person there will inevitably be variations. However, the sum total or the 'combination of features' will be of a different character in the handwritings of different people.

The work-books with the range of realisations of each letter-form then form the basis for the presentation of the evidence - for the purposes of the forensic document examiner this means in court before judge and jury, but the same principles apply to us as historians. In the legal process, the conclusions of the handwriting expert is presented as a chart, which can include 'blown-up photographs illustrating the aspects of the handwriting under discussion', where the individual letters are shown in the 'the context of the word to which they belong... so that relative heights, relative spacing, and height above the base-line can be considered.'\textsuperscript{12} The expert or analyst will then express his opinion on whether the questioned and sample writings were written by the same person. It must be noted that on the whole handwriting analysts do seem to tend to be cautious either way. This is commendable practice in the legal system when personal liberty is at stake, but is equally true to the historian, whose reputation as a competent researcher might equally well be put on the line. As Ellen puts it, 'to prove that two writings were made by one person it is necessary to show that no other explanation is

\textsuperscript{11} Davis 1992, p 59.
\textsuperscript{12} Ellen 1997, p 22; see also pp 48-49: When variations are found in a letter or figure, they can be considered as falling into a range represented by an enclosed area such as a circle. The variations of the same letter written by another person can be regarded as being enclosed in a
possible’. This entails the need for absolute certainty: ‘it is not sufficient to note that the writings are similar, assume that everyone writes differently, and therefore conclude that they must be written by one person.’ In most cases we will obviously be seeking a firm positive or negative identification. Of course, certainty is not always possible given the evidence available, and Ellen recommends five gradations of judgment. These range from absolute certainty that they are by the same hand, then a ‘high probability’, then some ‘consistent connection’, then inconclusive and eventually definite denial.

Now this is all very well in theory, but the pleasing neatness of prepared work-books and the use of blown-up photographs in court bears little relation to the working environment of the researcher in the British Library or the PRO. The first point to make is the necessity of the use of sample writings from photographs or print-outs made from microfilm. The various anthologies of Sixteenth Century handwriting edited by Greg, Petti, Croft, Beal et al. concentrate on literary figures, and the individual hands contained within them bear little relation to anything outside a fairly exclusive literary world. The Elizabethan historian working in the archives will therefore need to make his own work-book of sample writings taken from properly identified examples that have been photographically reproduced. Any student investigating Francis Walsingham as Principal Secretary, for example, will then carry round a work-book containing positively identified samples of the handwriting of his household servants such as Mills, Tomson, Faunt and Cave, as well as examples perhaps of other men associated with his work such as the various clerks of the Privy Council. To this end all the secretaries, clerks, statesmen and diplomats who have appeared in this thesis are listed

different area or circle. .. If the two writers make the letter a similar way, the circles will completely or partly overlap.’
13 Ellen 1997, p 43.
by name in a table below, giving where possible a previously microfilmed or photographed positively identified autograph sample writing.

Once again, however, the provision of positively identified copies or images of handwritten letters is often not enough to sort the wheat from the chaff. Early modern English handwriting had its own peculiar historical characteristics that must also be borne in mind when attempting to identify any individual hand amongst the many that a historian might encounter. Perhaps the major point to note is that the variation of style rather than individual characteristics has a specific point of application to early modern handwriting in that each individual hand could, and regularly did, use more than one script. This was no phenomena exclusive to the Sixteenth Century: different scripts had been consciously used for different purposes for as long as people had been writing by hand.\(^{15}\) The predominant script utilised in sixteenth-century England was the secretary script: this, the English writing master Martin Billingsley explained in 1618, ‘is so tearmed (as I conceiue) partly because it is the Secretaries common hand; and partly also, because it is the onely usuall hand of England, for the despatching of all manner of business for the most part, whatsoever.’\(^{16}\)

On the other hand, distinctively humanist scripts developed in fifteenth-century Italy were then propagated throughout western Europe through the spread of the intellectual movement of humanism and the invention of the printing press. Intellectuals, pedagogues and secretaries, as well as printers of prestige humanist works all adopted the humanist scripts for their own purposes. These early printed works combined with the autograph example of the few foreigners resident in England then served as models

\(^{15}\) The fifteenth-century poet John Capgrave used different scripts for presentation copies of his work depending on to the social position of the patron and receiver of the work: see Lucas, P. J. ‘The Growth and Development of English Literary Patronage in the Later Middle Ages and Early Renaissance’, Library 6th Ser. IV, no. 3 (1982) pp. 219-248.
for the adoption of these new scripts in early sixteenth-century England. Until the last quarter of the Sixteenth Century these new humanist scripts were the preserve of a tiny minority of highly-educated elite, centred initially around foreigners employed at the court and then at mid-Tudor Oxford and Cambridge. The development of the use of humanist scripts in England was so closely intertwined with the educational revolution of humanism in early sixteenth-century England, as Strype remarked two centuries later, ‘so that fair writing and good learning seemed to commence together.’ The new humanist script was termed ‘roman’ by contemporaries, which Billingsley characterised as a ‘hand of great account, and of much use in this Realme... the easiest hand that is written with Pen, and to be taught in the shortest time’. Billingsley then described the ‘Italian’ as ‘a hand not much different from Roman,... which of late is growne very usuall, and is much affected by diuers...’. Billingsley’s characterisation of the italic script as ‘not much different than the Roman’ is in practice not far off the mark; contemporaries would not differ explicitly between them. In practice people normally employed a script that mixed the letter-forms of the secretary and humanist scripts to some extent or other, and these should strictly be called ‘mixed’ hands. The proportion of letter-forms from each script in the individual ‘mixed’ hand might be dependent on individual style, choice, education and date of composition: the predominant letter-form is used to characterise the script in question.

---

19 Strype, J. Life of Sir John Cheke 1702; quoted in Fairbank 1962, p 11.
20 Billingsley also states that the Roman hand is particularly used at the Universities - a good indication of what to some extent was the privileging of Roman and Italic over Secretary by aesthetic criteria.
From the beginnings of the Sixteenth Century it is therefore perfectly normal for any
given individual who had been exposed to a humanist education to write in both a
secretary and roman script on the same page according to their purpose. Furthermore,
each single individual could utilise more than one form of each different script, and
both Sir John Cheke and Roger Ascham in mid-Tudor Cambridge wrote at least three
different forms of the roman script.22 Fortunately for the purposes of identification, the
number of occasions when more than one form of each script was utilised by a single
man was limited mainly to either early experimentation, the use of these different forms
of scripts for display hands, or for conscious dissimulation. In the course of naturally
occurring everyday handwriting, roman script was most often used for foreign
languages, for proper names, marginalia and the offsetting of titles or other
‘typographical’ purposes. From the beginning of printing in the second half of the
Fifteenth Century, there was a symbiotic link between typographical and handwriting
practice that was important in the mutual development of both.23 Other foreign
languages such as French or Dutch, however, might also demand an altogether different
foreign secretarial script from the hand of the same scribe.24 For example, Beale’s first
clerk A who worked with him from c.1577-93 regularly employs a mix of roman and
secretary scripts for English, the same roman script for Latin and Italian, and a different
continental ‘secretary’ script for French and Dutch. This utilisation by the same
individual of different scripts (and possibly different forms of the same scripts) for

22 Fairbank 1962, p 12.
23 See Smith, M. M. ‘The design relationship between the manuscript and the incunable’ and
Barker, N. ‘The Aldine Italic’, both in A Millenium of the Book eds. R. Myers and M. Harris
London St. Paul’s Bibliographies 1994, pp 23-44 and 45-60. For a general introduction see P.
Gaskell A New Introduction to Bibliography Oxford 1974, esp. pp. 16-30. More specialised are
H. Carter A view of early Typography Oxford 1969 and A. F. Johnson Type Designs; their
History and Development 3rd. ed. London 1966. For Greek type and handwriting see N. Barker
Aldus Manutius and the Development of Greek Script and Type in the Fifteenth Century 2nd ed.
New York 1992. For Gothic type see H. D. L. Vervliet Sixteenth-century printing types of the
24 Bodiard, A. de Manuel de diplomatique française et pontificale Paris 1929.
different purposes must alter our procedure for identification of individual hands. A lot of the time we can see that two different scripts on the same page were written by the same hand because of the similarity of the ink or what the format or physical layout of the page may tell us; conversely the same forms of evidence may point to another hand at work.

The complexities involved in the process of the identification of handwriting outlined above are only fully exposed in the fortunately rare cases of different scripts consciously adopted by individuals for the purposes of dissimulation. A recent example has been John Bossy’s examination of the role of Giordano Bruno as the informer Henry Fagot within the French embassy in London in 1583. Bossy makes what appears to be a convincing identification of Fagot as Bruno from the known characteristics and biographical details of the ‘two’ men. The identification of Fagot as Bruno only holds if the discrepancies in the handwriting between the ‘two’ men can be explained as a conscious attempt by Bruno at dissimulation and disguise, in which he adopted a variety of different scripts for ‘Fagot’s’ correspondence: ‘it is just as well’ rued a somewhat confused historian who had examined the handwriting evidence as well as could possibly be done, ‘that my claim that Fagot and Bruno were the same person has not depended on their handwriting.’

25 The realistic difficulties in dealing with such complexities are a salutary reminder that the evidence of handwriting identification in the historical archives should be integrated with as many other forms of evidence where possible, and that the weight that this identification can bear is dependent on the amount of surviving documentation and the circumstances of composition.

Naturally occurring handwriting, as argued above, is something that is personal to each and every one of us, and this is equally true of sixteenth-century politicians, courtiers

and diplomats as it is of the rest of us in modern times. The apparently simple logical corollary of this is that if enough naturally occurring handwriting for a particular individual survives in the archive, there is enough there to identify that hand wherever else it may be found. This process of identification can only be applied back into the archives and into the Sixteenth Century if we can show that this assumption was also valid to Beale and his contemporaries. Beale, for one, showed ample evidence for his appreciation of the distinctiveness of autograph handwriting. During his altercation in 1584 with Whitgift discussed above in Chapter 5, Beale referred in a letter to Burghley to an unspecified attempt by Archbishop Parker to 'suggest thinges unto her Matie against the Erle of Bedforde, a Bishoppe of this realme, and others', which had been based on forged documentation. The letters counterfeyted in other mens names and written by common scholeboyes, continued Beale, 'were so grosse, the false ortography and maner of wrytinge and matter so apparrant as no wise man woulde euer haue geuen credit unto them.'

Similarly, one of the more enigmatic of the many autograph comments made by Beale in his papers occurs on a collection of notes concerning the succession to the crown made in the 1560s in John Hales's autograph hand. Beale has annotated this 'Mr John Hales his hand', a memorandum of sorts to the identity of the man who was his to all extents his surrogate father and whose memory Beale openly cherished. If it mattered to Beale that this was 'John Hales his hand', then perforce it must matter to us.

The degree of distinctiveness adopted in autograph handwriting became increasingly significant throughout the Middle Ages as levels of literacy increased in step with

---

26 Add MS 48039 f 49b, Beale to Cecil 1584. Cf. Harl MS 6995 ff 81-81 21 June 1592 Burghley to Lord Keeper of the Great Seal; Cecil complained of the grant of land made under a forged signature: 'I therefore praiye yor l. to examin whose hand the same is that hath written mr Powles name, and in what sort it was putt to yt: and whither yt haue ben a thinge used that clerkes or deputie may putt their mrs names to bookes and docquettes with owt their master priuities...'.

27 Add MS 48043, f 72a.
administrative demands. It would be reckless to posit a date here when the degree of
distinctiveness demanded of autograph handwriting overshadowed the earlier emphasis
on regularity and uniformity, but by the early Sixteenth Century it is certainly true that
individual handwriting was expected to be just that - individual. The secretary and
roman scripts used in the Sixteenth Century allowed a wide variation of individual
characteristics to those that either were encouraged or wished to develop them. Beale
redeems himself judged by these criteria, as his ‘thick and vigorous’ hand is indeed
distinctive, and hence easy to pick out when emending or annotating documents. To
Beale’s Elizabethan contemporaries some hands were more recognisable than others
and likewise some were therefore more important. The motivation for the collection of
autograph handwriting and signatures for show described above of course also relies
upon the recognition of individual hands. In one of the early catalogues of the Cotton
collection made in the 1630’s the anonymous cataloguer has noted that two volumes of
letters signed by Elizabethan noblemen were ‘collected only (as it seemeth) for the
keeping and shewing their signatures’. One letter from William Cecil to Sussex dating
from 1569 no doubt originally intended for one of these volumes now in the Cotton
Appendix is endorsed in an early seventeenth-century hand ‘1569 Will: Cecill Book of
Hand’.

In practice, if an individual was consciously striving to conform to a particular set
model over a number of years, individual characteristics were subsumed by the style

---

28 Clanchy, M. T. From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066-1307 2nd edn. Blackwell
Oxford 1993, p 128; ‘Because the competent scribe could write in a variety of styles, attributions of
manuscripts to particular writers on stylistic grounds alone are peculiarly difficult and tend
toward anachronism. .. Louis, clerk of Rockingham (temp. King John) even varied the way he
wrote his own name, as the idea of a distinctive signature was unfamiliar in England, where the
authenticity of a document depended upon seals and the word of named witnesses.’
29 Walter Bagot’s complaint that his son’s handwriting showed ‘a barren invention’, quoted in
Dawson 1966 Introduction, p 9, from plate 38.
30 Add MS 36789 f 108a; quoted in Tite 1980 p 148, note 31. Adams 1993 notes (p 143) that
Cotton was creating a ‘Book of Hands’ in 1618; see letter of Wilson to James I SP 14/96/75 of
March 1 1618, concerning Cotton obtaining autographs for this purpose.
characteristics of the formal script. Conversely, the less formal and set a hand, then the more distinctive it was to contemporaries as well. Take, for example, the erudite roman hand of Sir William Cecil, familiar to generations upon generations of Elizabethan historians. Sir Thomas Smith (as was to be expected of a former teacher) could recognize his ex-pupil’s handwriting straightforwardly enough: in 1573 Smith wrote to Cecil that he had been instructed by Archbishop Parker to send Cecil some written material, in which Smith perceived that ‘there is a note of yor l. hand & therfor whither yow will send that or the copie I dowte yet there is no great mater in that.’ 32 Cecil’s distinctive roman hand was also familiar enough to Beale, his servant and colleague at the Privy Council chamber, who noted that the emendations in his copy of the draft of the joint supplication of both houses of Parliament in 1586 were in Cecil’s ‘Roman hand’ on the original. 33 Similarly, Beale noted in his copy of a book of regulations for the control of the plague in London in 1578 that the ‘notes in the margent were written with the L. Tresorers hand at soche time as they were redd at the Counsell boorde’. In Beale’s copy, Beale’s personal Clerk A has utilised a secretary script for the main text of the regulations and his own roman script for these marginal notes originally in Cecil’s hand in order to distinguish between them. 34 Like father, it would appear, then like son: in 1591 the ageing Elizabeth could pick out the anonymous occurrence of Robert Cecil’s hand in a document submitted to her from Lord Burghley: this was some years before we might have assumed that the younger Cecil’s service as Principal Secretary would have made his handwriting easily familiar to her. 35

31 Cotton MS Appendix Vol L ff 121-22 Cecil to Sussex 30 May 1569.
32 Harl. 6991 ff 29-30 19 Feb 1573 Smith to Burghley from Greenwich, Autograph.
33 See Add MS 48027 ff 651-53 ‘The Supplication exhibited by bothe houses in parlement against the Scotishe Queene’; 12 Nov 1586. Copy; original notes by Burghley now Cott. Cal. C.IX art 276 ff 664-65. Beale has noted on f 653a: ‘Memorandum that the enterlinings in the Roman letter were of the hand of the l. Threr...’.
34 Add MS 48019 ff 167-77 Regulations for control of plague in London; 1578 f 170a.
35 Harl 6995 ff 32-33 20 Feb 1591 Thomas Windebank to Burghley from Greenwich, Autograph. ‘The Queenes Matie hauing red her self a good parte of this writng yor L. labor... Her mate knew the hand, and gauve very good speches of mr Cecill, for his many good partes of sufficiency in him to screu her.’
Part of the reason why autograph handwriting and signatures were intended to be distinctive by the contemporary writer was so that they could then by the means of identifying the individual concerned act also as an authentification. The predominant means of documentary authentification in Medieval England previous to the use of the autograph signature was the personal seal or the individual mark (ranging from a simple cross to more complicated and more personal monograms).\textsuperscript{36} The slow changes in levels of lay literacy meant that for most of the population the personal seal or mark continued to be the most suitable form of documentary authentification into the Sixteenth Century. The parallel use of all three forms of authentification for subscription to the Succession Oath of 1534 is graphically evident in a letter from Thomas Cranmer querying the proper procedure for each form:

'I know not how I shall order them that cannot subscribe by writing. Hitherto I have caused one of my secretaries to subscribe for such persons, and made them write their sheep mark or some other mark as they can scribble. Now would I know whether I shall instead of subscription take their seals.'\textsuperscript{37}

Surviving examples of the Bond of Association from 1584, circulated amongst men in the wider horizons of Elizabethan political society but who were still very much the ‘better sort’, show the continuing parallel use of signatures and imprinted personal seals on documents requiring gravity and effect even for highly literate men.\textsuperscript{38} The relative functions of the personal mark and signature continued to be ambiguous into the Sixteenth Century. The practice of either signing or referring to themselves with their

\textsuperscript{37} Quoted in Cressy, D. \textit{Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England} CUP 1980, p 64.
\textsuperscript{38} Huntington Library Ellesmere MS 1193 Bond of Association for Lincoln’s Inn, with signatures and seals attached.
individual initials or monograms as well as their signature persisted even for educated and literate men like Thomas Norton and Robert Beale. ‘This did I R.B. .’ or simply ‘I R.B. .’ is the typical form of self-reference among Beale’s copious autograph emendations and additions to his papers, and Norton consistently signed himself ‘TN’ rather than using his full name or signature. 39 But the personal autograph signature was, for the educated and literate at least, here to stay very much in the form and for the same purposes that would be recognizable today.

This ongoing development is well illustrated by the parallel use from the middle of the Fourteenth Century onwards of the sign-manual and the signet seal to authenticate documents from the King’s Secretary’s office. 40 By the mid-Fifteenth Century the proportion of surviving signet letters bearing the sign manual had increased to over half, and Henry VI could tell his chancellor in 1447 that ‘to thentent that ye mowe verrely knowe that this ooure writing procedeth of our certain science and of hert, we have signed thees ooure lettres with ooure owen hande.’ 41 The increasing importance of use of the autograph signature for royal documents as opposed to the seal is emphasised by the use from the early Fifteenth Century of that most peculiar hybrid, the ‘dry stamp’ of the King’s signature. 42 Using the ‘dry stamp’, the royal signature was applied to documents in a process mimicking that of a seal but carrying the form and therefore the

---

39 For Norton’s ‘TN’ monogram see Add MS 32091, f 169a and Add MS 48023 f 32a; for Beale see for example Add MS 48027 f 78b Mr Daniel Rogers returning out of Denmark whether he was sent in ambassages from her myt, told me R.B....’ and f 585b ‘This did I R.B. heare the said ambassador tell in December 1587.’
40 Otway Ruthven, J. The King’s Secretary and the Signet Office in the Fifteenth Century Cambridge 1939, p 24; ‘Concurrently with the development of the signet experiments were being made in the use of an altogether different method of authentification - the king’s own signature or sign manual.’ Earliest use from 1330 under Edward III, common only under Richard II.
41 Otway Ruthven, J. The King’s Secretary and the Signet Office in the Fifteenth Century Cambridge 1939, p 26.
42 Maxwell-Lyte, Sir H. C. Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England London 1926, p 82.; p 91 ‘An act passed in 1535 [27. Hen VIII. c. 11] lays down that all gifts and grant to be made under the sign-manual shall, before they pass any of the King’s Great Seals, be brought to his principal Secretary, or to one of the clerks of his Signet, so that “letters of warantie” to the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, subscribed by the clerk and sealed with the Signet, may be issued within eight days.’
personal authority of a signature. The process of application of the dry stamp to a
document could be two-fold: a facsimile of the royal signature was carved into a
wooden or metal stamp, which was then either inked beforehand with printer’s ink or
applied with sufficient pressure to make an indented impression onto the document,
which was only then carefully inked in by hand by another clerk. Whether the monarch
was physically indisposed or ill, or merely out hunting, the royal presence, and the
royal hand in particular, was by this means no longer required. A similar ‘tampon’ or
‘cachet’ carrying the King’s signature was used by the royal secretaries in France from
at least as early as 1484 during the reigns of Louis XI and Charles VIII. 43 In England,
the ‘dry stamp’ of the royal signature received its heaviest period of usage during the
last 15 years of the reign of Henry VIII, with perhaps its crowning glory its application
to the highly controversial will of late December 1546. 44

The dual form of authentification of Privy Council letters was by the signatures of both
the various Councillors and the Clerks and also, after 1555, by the affixation of a proper
Privy Council seal. 45 In comparison, Elizabeth seems to have not utilised a stamp at all -
er Principal Secretaries relied on the royal audience for obtaining her signature, and
the difficulties they could encounter are described above in Chapter 4. Perhaps the most
famous occurrence of Elizabeth’s own signature was on the warrant for the execution of
Mary Queen of Scots, which again is dealt with in great (some might suggest overgreat)
detail above in Chapter 8. Beale more than once referred retrospectively to ‘her

Lapeyre and Rémy Scheurer Les notaires et secrétaires du roi sous les règnes de Louis XI,
1926, pp. 91-92. For Henry’s will see Ives, E. W. ‘Henry VIII’s will - a forensic conundrum’, HJ
35 (1992), pp 779-804; ‘Henry VIII’s will: the protectorate provisions of 1546-47’, Historical
Historical Journal 37 (1994), pp 891-99. For Edward see Hoak, D. The King’s Council in the
Reign of Edward VI Cambridge 1976, esp. Chapter 5 ‘The Authorisation and Administration of
Business’, pp. 145-64.
45 Labaree, L. W. and Moody, R. E. ‘The Seal of the Privy Council’, EHR xliii (1928) pp. 190-
202; p 191.
majesties hand’ on the original warrant, implying very pointedly that this constituted
authorisation for William Davison to proceed as he had done to the Lord Chancellor
and the Great Seal. As if to intensify this, Beale has scrawled in his distinctive hand
‘Elyzabeth R.’ on the copy of the warrant for her execution that he had his personal
clerk draw up for the keeping of Henry Grey, Earl of Kent.

Autograph handwriting imparted authenticity and authority to documents for Beale’s
contemporaries in a similar manner to the shorter, more convenient personal signature.
At the apex of political authority, the royal autograph handwriting was as significant to
contemporaries as the autograph royal signature. In 1549 the Privy Council presented
their final draft of a letter of recommendation for William Paget’s mission to the
Emperor to Princess Mary for copying, under the belief that this would then carry more
weight with the Emperor. However, it is a fundamental law of market economics that
the rarer an item the more prized it becomes, and royalty were not generally expected or
required to pen the letters that bore their signature. Unlike most of her ministers and
courtiers, Elizabeth was accustomed to using the distinctively medieval practice of oral
dictation, and she either dictated aloud her own letters to her Principal Secretary or
merely approved letters already drafted under his auspices. The letters written in her
own hand were therefore relatively rare, and we can assume that when she did so there
was some special reason for this. As Clerk of the Privy Council and part-time Principal
Secretary, few would have been more aware of this than Beale himself. Immediately
before the execution of Mary in February 1587, letters were sent by Elizabeth to Henry
III of France and James VI in Scotland expressing the justice and inevitability of the

---

46 See Beale’s note on Add MS 48027 ff 645a-46a, a ‘copy of the commission under the greate
scale of Englande for the execucion of the Scotish Q.’: ‘Her myt hand was also in the coppe’.
47 Sotheby’s Sale of Fairhurst Papers, 16 Dec 1996, Lot 42.
48 Span Cal ix, 393-4 Van der Delft to the Emperor; June 13 1549; quoted in Hoak 1976 p 159.
49 See for example Kouri, E. I. ed. ‘Elizabethan England and Europe: 40 Unprinted letters from
of 9 letters written by Wolley; 1 by Christopher Parkins; 1 by Beale; 1 by Tomson.
judgement passed against Mary. In the aftermath of the execution, Beale referred to these letters as testimony that 'her matie desired to haue the contentes of the same commission executed without anie further doubt or staye'. On the facing page of this comment he brought especial attention to the fact that it was Elizabeth herself who had written them; 'Her mt letters of her own hand to the Freneh and Scotish kings can (as is credibly reported) declare somoche.'

In this most critical of matters the significance of the royal autograph handwriting on the other side of the dock was also in evidence. In the weeks following the disclosure of the Babington plot in late summer of 1586, the English government was busy in preparing for the planned trial of Mary. In early October Burghley wrote to Walsingham enquiring after the location of particular letters written from Mary to Charles Paget, Sir Francis Englefield and the Bishop of Glasgow to be used against her at the planned trial. In addition to these, Burghley added that 'If there be any papers to be hod of ye Scott. Quenes own hand concerning anye of these matters they shuld prowe for great purpose.'

These concepts of individuality and distinctiveness on the one side and authority and authentification on the other were linked of course to their shadowy corollaries of possible confusion or even deliberate forgery. The conscious reproduction of facsimiles of signatures and also of handwriting was not necessarily intended to deceive. The Clerks of the Privy Council under Edward VI and Elizabeth sometimes kept fair copies of council letters which included facsimiles of the signatures of the Privy Councillors.

---

50 Add MS 48027 ff 639b-640a.
51 Walsingham wrote to Beale asking him to report on his own diplomatic dealings with Mary over the previous twelve years; see Add MS 48027 f 374; Walsingham to Beale 21 September 1586. A copy of Beale’s reply follows, ff 375-76, 78. The original reply sent is now Cott. Cal. C.IV ff 445-47, printed in SP Scot. 1586-88 no. 46.
52 Cotton MS Appendix L art. 96 f 146 letter from Burghley <to Walsingham> 4 Oct 1586.
53 See Hoak 1976 p 24; ‘Edwardian clerks sometimes kept fair copies of council letters to which they added facsimiles of the hands of the councillors who had signed the originals. The retention of this type of record appears to have been unprecedented.’ I have only come across one example of a Privy Council letter sent out which appears to include facsimile signatures: HMC 71 Report on the manuscripts of Allan George Finch 4 Vols London 1913-65, Vol 1 p 5 Privy Council to
In late fifteenth-century France the ability of select royal ‘secrétaires de la main’ to imitate both their master’s signature and also his handwriting had, it appears, been actively encouraged and was still purposely continued in France under Louis XIV.54 No equivalent office was necessary for early modern England where the onerous work of producing, drafting and writing royal documents was carried out by the Principal Secretary and his clerks. Perhaps because of this, no one, as far as I am aware, was foolish enough to have attempted to forge Elizabeth’s handwriting, at least during her own lifetime. The same cannot necessarily be said for her more unfortunate cousin. We will never know if the Casket letters produced before the English commissioners at Mary’s first trial at York were authentic or not as the originals have not survived. Her defence against the alleged occurrence of her autograph in these letters is well known: ‘There are divers in Scotland, both men and women, that can counterfeit my handwriting, and write the like manner of writing which I use, as well as myself, and principally such as are in company with themselves.’55

Sir Thomas Fynche and Thomas Kees. 21 March 1559/60 from Westminster; ‘Seven signatures, not autograph, but imitations of the originals, apparently by the Clerk of the Council, as this is the letter actually sent.’


55 Mary’s declaratory statement at York in September 1568, quoted in Fraser, A. Mary Queen of Scots London 1970 p 483.
Appendix 2: the Identification of Handwriting In the following list I have indicated the location of sample writings for as many of the various secretaries, clerks and diplomats that have appeared in the previous pages as is possible. I list first the examples of autograph handwriting that are dated, signed and (importantly) which have been previously microfilmed, and which can therefore be printed out to allow easier reference and use for the identification of anonymous questioned writings. Documents with an SP 10, 11, 12, 15 or 70 classmark are microfilmed at the PRO. British Library Lansdowne MSS are microfilmed by Harvester Press and available at most institutional libraries; select Yelverton MSS (British Library Additional MSS 48000-196) have been microfilmed for St. Andrews University Library. Further examples for many of these individuals are cited in the main body of the thesis; otherwise, more examples then follow where possible, either to give a wider chronological span or to show the use of different scripts by the same individual.

Allen, Francis SP 11/10/2 No. 537 January 10 1557 Greenwich. Warrant in Allen’s hand; SP 12/47/27 30 July 1568 Francis Allen to Cecil from Hatfield.

Allington, Hugh SP 12/84 February 5 1562 Allington to Thomas Windebank.

Ashley, Anthony SP 12/218/14 November 12 1588 Ashley to Council; SP 12/223/61 April 3 1589 Ashley to Burghley from Plymouth.

Atye, Arthur SP12/74/31 3 October 1570 Atye to Cecil (Latin) italic script.

Barnaby, John SP 70/147/ ff 320-21 pencil 22 August 1567 Barnaby to Throckmorton; SP 70/90 ff 72-73 Barnaby to Cecil 18 May 1567.

Beale, Robert SP 12/164/34 December 17 1583 Beale to Walsingham from Windsor.

Cave, Lisle SP 70/121/ ff 4-5 7 November 1571 Walsingham to Burghley from Paris, English secretory script assumed to be Cave’s; SP 104/62 Letterbook 1571-90 in Cave’s French secretory script.


Dale, Valentine SP 12/34/55 3 September 1564 Dale to Cecil.

Davison, William SP 12/195/5 6 November 1586 Davison to Walsingham.

Edmondes, Thomas SP 12/212/38 12 July 1588 Thomas Edmondes to Thomas Wylkes; SP 12/274/66 March 3 1600 Edmondes to Robert Cecil.

Faunt, Nicholas SP 12/173 ff 26 ink 13 September 1584 Nicholas Faunt to Walsingham autograph Sec. hand with italic sig. See also Index to the Paper of Anthony Bacon in Lambeth Palace Library London 1974: eg. Lambeth Palace Library MSS 647 ff 100-10, Faunt to Anthony Bacon.

Fitzwilliam, Hugh SP 70/85 ff 62-63 Hugh Fitzwilliam to Cecil July 29 1566.

Fletewood, William SP 12/107/75 12 March 1576 Fletewood to Cecil.

Hales, John Add MS 32091 f 249 Hales to Leicester July 1571; Add MS 48043 f 72a autograph notes on Mary Queen of Scots c.1564.

Hampton, Bernard SP 70/86 ff 44 Bernard Hampton to Hugh Fitzwilliam 21 September 1566; SP 12/74/6 ink ff 29-30 October 2 1570 Bernard Hampton to Cecil
Heneage, Sir Thomas SP 70/119 ff 34-35 ink 32-33 pencil 16 July 1571 Heneage to Cecil; Lansdowne MS 12/7 11 August 1569 Heneage to Cecil.

Herle, William SP 12/83 18 November 1571 Herle to Cecil.

Hoby, Sir Thomas SP 70/83 ink ff. 212 Hoby to Cecil April 25 1566 from Paris; SP 70/84 ink ff. 8 Hoby to Cecil 4 May 1566.

Jennyce, Thomas SP 70/91 ff 32-33 ink Thomas Jenye to Cecil June 9 1567; SP 70/92 ff 46-47 Thomas Jenye to Cecil 13 July 1567.

Killigrew, Sir Henry SP 12/40/60 Henry Killigrew to Hugh Fitzwilliam 3 September 1566 secretary script; SP 70/121 ff 45-47 ink 43-45 pencil 3 Dec 1571 Killigrew to Cecil autograph. Killigrew’s secretary SP 70/121/ ff 56-57 ink 8 December 1571 Killigrew to Cecil (with Killigrew’s autograph postscript).


Mather, Edmund SP 70/105 ff 7-8 ink ff 6-7 pencil Mather <to Cecil?> 1 January 1569; SP 70/106 no fol. 31 March 1569 Mather to Cecil from Calais.

Mildmay, Sir Walter Lansdowne MS 19/36 6 October 1574 Mildmay to Cecil; Lansdowne MS 54/76 January 1579 Mildmay to Cecil.

Mills, Francis SP 12/194/42 14 October 1586 Mills to Davison.

Norris, Sir Henry SP 70/88 ff 29-30 January 26 1567 Norris to Elizabeth.

Norton, Thomas Add MS 48023 ff 26-54; Lansdowne MS 31 ff 12 6 June 1580 Norton to Cecil.

Phelippes, Thomas SP 12/194/21 6 October 1586 Phelippes to Davison; SP 12/186/78 25 February 1586 Phelippes to Walsingham.

Randolph, Thomas SP 12/194/51 19 October 1586 Randolph to Davison.

Rogers, Daniel SP 15/21/14 Jan 28 1572 Rogers to Burghley; SP 12/167/2 February 3 1584 Daniel Rogers to Walsingham.

Sackville, Thomas Lord Buckhurst SP 70/116 ff 72-73 ink 94-95 pencil 8 February 1571 autograph to Cecil.

Smith, Sir Thomas SP 70/121 ff 95-96 ink 26 December 1571 Smith to Cecil; Smith’s secretary SP 70/121/ ff 76-77 ink Smith to Cecil.

Smith, Thomas (Clerk of Privy Council) SP 12/256/24 Jan 23 1596 Smith to Sir E. Norris; SP 12/273/51 December 23 1597 Thomas Smith to [?].


Thomas, William SP 10/14/59 No. 695 August 14 1552 William Thomas to William Cecil; SP 10/14/69 No. 707 August 27 1552 The Council to the lord chancellor (Bishop of Ely) signed by William Thomas.

Tomson, Laurence SP 12/105/1 1 July 1575 Tomson to Laurence Humphrey; SP 12/195/69 27 December 1586 Tomson to William Davison

Tremayne, Edmund SP 12/143/34 Tremayne to Walsingham 24 October 1580; SP 15/12/48 March 29 1565 Tremayne to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton.
Waad, Armigail SP 12/40/44 15 July 1566 Waad <to Cecil>; SP 15/13/119 A. Waad to Cecil <1567?

Waad, William SP 12/195/71 December 31 1586 Waad to Davison; SP 12/234/47 December 7 1590 Waad to Daniel Rogers.

Walsingham, Sir Francis SP 70/117 ff 154-55 28 April 1571 Walsingham to Cecil (private letter).

Warcop, Ralph SP 70/117/ ff 158-59 ink 28 April 1571 Walsingham to Cecil (letter for Elizabeth in Warcop’s hand).

Wilkes, Thomas SP 12/163/54 7 November 1583 Wilkes to Walsingham.

Williams, Walter SP 70/123 ff 35-36 ink 42-43 pencil March 1572 W. Williams, Killigrew’s servant, on movements of Lord Fleming in France.

Wilson, Sir Thomas SP/12/105/901 15 December 1575 Wilson to Cecil (secretary script); Lansdowne MS 12/9 5 August 1569 Wilson to Cecil (roman script for Latin).

Windebank, Thomas SP 12/105/11 ff 27-28 8 July 1575 Thomas Windebank to Walsingham; SP 12/247/96 February 27 1594 Windebank to Sir Robert Cecil.
Appendix 3. Chronology of Clerks of the Council, c.1538 to 1600

A record of the date of appointment for each Clerk of the Privy Council can be accessed in one form or another from three separate sources. The office of clerk of the Privy Council was granted for life by letters patent under the Great Seal: the date of the appointment of each of the Clerks of the Council is therefore recorded in the relevant *Calendars of Patent Rolls* volumes taken from the Chancery Rolls now in PRO C66.¹ The date of the appointment of each Clerk was also generally (but not always) noted in the current Privy Council Register, most of which for the years in question are now in PRO PC 2.² The record of the Exchequer Tellers’ quarterly disbursements of the annuities and fees attached to Royal offices due to each Clerk survive also in the Exchequer Tellers Books of Issue now in PRO class E403.³

On the other hand, the termination of their service and the periods of actual attendance are not necessarily indicated in these records. An individual Clerk might cease to wait upon the Privy Council many years before the termination of annuity on their death as recorded in the Exchequer Tellers Books of Issue, and the date of termination of attendance is also never entered as a separate entry in the Privy Council Register. The *Calendars of Patent Rolls* provide further information when the individual Clerks are

---


² See the ‘Chronology of Privy Council Register survival 1540-1602’ at end of the appendix.

³ PRO E403/2259-2291 Issue Books (Pells) Tellers’ views of the payments and issues. Yearly views from 1569-1608 of fees, salaries, annuities and pensions paid out by the four tellers of the Exchequer of Receipt.
referred to by their title after their appointment in other grants or licences made, but once again provide no indication of periods of attendance.

For the actual periods of attendance of each respective Clerk we are chiefly reliant instead on the evidence of the handwriting of the Clerks themselves where it occurs in the records generated by the Privy Council. These include the ‘original’ or ‘rough’ Privy Council registers themselves, the out-letters and documents produced by the Privy Council, and other incidences such as endorsements to in-letters or petitions, notes on business to be performed in Council, and whatever other evidence relating to Privy Council business where the Clerk’s handwriting may occur. Beale is a good example of the problems encountered: he held his office and received his annuity from his appointment in July 1572 up until his death in 1601. However, after July 1588 his handwriting, hitherto so frequent and so easily identifiable in the paper record, fails to appear any more in the surviving Registers for the 1590s or in any of the other documents produced by the Clerks in their service to the Council that I have seen.4 These Registers from the 1590s are all ‘rough’ contemporary versions of the Register so the absence of Beale’s hand in them is a good indication that he was no longer attending on the Privy Council. The chronological narrative below for the periods of attendance of individual clerks is constructed from all of these sources and foot-noted accordingly. It serves hopefully as a source of reference for the names and times of attendance of each of the Clerks, and also partially as a form of explanatory background to the arguments offered in Chapter 4 above concerning the apparent continuity in the administrative model of Tudor conciliatory government from Thomas Cromwell through to Sir Francis Walsingham.

4 The last chronological entry in Beale’s hand in any Register is PC 2/15 p 221 Beale entries for most of 27 July 1588, p 223 Sunday 28 July 1588 heading and attendances by Waad and then Beale notes.
The description of Thomas Derby as the ‘clerk of the privy council’ in 1538 marked a distinctive moment in the evolution of the Council in the Sixteenth Century, a mark of its coming of age and ‘the first test of institutional veracity’. E. R. Adair was in 1924 the first to state the ‘claim’ of Thomas Derby as a clerk of the King’s ‘select Council’ and not for the judicial council in Star Chamber. ‘The appointment of a special clerk’, argued Adair, ‘marked a distinct stage in its development as an entity, an entity which took on an added flavour of self-consciousness when it decided, a few years later, to record its proceedings in a register book of its own.’ Whether the Cromwellian Council established in 1536 can be called a ‘Privy’ or a ‘Select’ Council, Cromwell did not himself institute a separate register for this Council out of Star Chamber, preferring to keep his own private record, and much of the business of the administration of the ‘Privy Council’ in the late 1530s was performed by Cromwell’s household clerks Wriothesley and Paget. The re-foundation of the Council by royal commission in the autumn of 1540 after Cromwell’s fall has been called by Starkey the ‘foundation document’ of the Council. The continuation of Cromwellian bureaucratic practice was ensured, however, as the clerk appointed in August 1540 to keep this new register was William Paget. Paget’s attendance on the Council for the first year of the new Register is traceable through the occurrence of his handwriting in this first register. John Mason was appointed as Clerk of the Council later that year but his hand replaces that of Paget only from September 1541 onwards. A second clerk William Honninges was appointed

---

5 Elton, G. R. *The Tudor Revolution in Government* Cambridge 1953, p 335. Thomas Derby’s appointment as Clerk of the Council C 82/664 no. 25 was printed in Appendix II. E; Derby replaced Richard Eden as ‘Clarke of our Counsaill attending vpon our person which Richard Eden lately had...’; Guy 1986, p 73; ‘In other words, the informal ‘inner ring’ of executive councillors attendant on Henry VIII at Court had now been provided with a salaried clerk - the first test of institutional veracity.’


8 PC 2/1 p 4 for 10 August 1540.
on April 13 1543 after Paget’s promotion to be joint Principal Secretary, but no change in the predominant handwriting of the register is discernible.

Both Chaloner, by then knighted, and Honninges were still serving under Edward on 18 April 1548 when the different fees for the Clerks were newly agreed, and they had been joined by Armigil Waad in Midsummer 1547.\(^9\) The coup of 1549 and the rise of Northumberland led to the new clerk William Thomas’s appointment in April 1550, and Waad and Chaloner were both re-granted the office for life.\(^10\) William Thomas was installed as the attendant clerk in charge of the Register, and the absence of the handwriting of Chaloner and Honninges indicates that both had stopped attending upon the Council before April 1550. Thomas’s hand fills in the register till September 1551, when Bernard Hampton began to serve in September 1551 and Hampton’s hand takes over, with Thomas coming back for one more session pp 485-515.\(^11\) In May 1552 the three Clerks Thomas, Hampton and Waad were again regranted the office with the continuing use of graduated fees, with Waad given 50l, Thomas 40l and Hampton 50 marks.\(^12\)

\(^9\) PC 2/2 f 304 for 18 April 1548; printed in Dasent Vol 2 p 183; Calendar of Patent Rolls Edward VI Vol II 1548-49 HMSO 1924 p 3 2 Edward VI part V 10 May 1548 ‘Grant for life, to the king’s servant, Armigil Wade, one of the clerks of the Privy Council, for his services in that office, of that office with 50 marks yearly payable by the treasurer and chamberlains of the Exchequer, quarterly, from midsummer last. ...’; p 4 2 Edward VI part V 5 May 1548 ‘Grant for life to the king’s servant William Honnyng, one of the clerks of the privy councl... 50l...’; Stowe 571, f 21; William Honninges listed as one of 4 clerkes of the signet and Thomas Eden as the Clerk of the Counsell in the Starchamber in Edwardian list of Household. Dewar 1964 p 26 has Thomas Smith appointed as Clerk of the Council in March 1547; I can find no evidence to confirm this.

\(^10\) Thomas’s appointment PC 2/3 f 147 for 19 April 1550. Printed in Dasent Vol 2 p 433. Calendar of Patent Rolls Edward VI Vol III 1549-51 HMSO 1925 pp. 187-78 4 Edward VI part II 20 May 1550; ‘Grant to the king’s servant Thomas Challoner, knight, one of the clerks of the Privy Council, of confirmation for life, in his said office of clerk with an annuity of 50l... payable...from Annunciation last’; ‘Grant for life to the king’s servant William Thomas of the office of one of the clerks of the Privy Council with an annuity of 50 marks .. from Annunciation last...’; ‘Grant to the king’s servant Armigil Wade, one of the clerks of the Privy Council, of confirmation for life, in his said office of clerk with an annuity of 40l.. payable...from Annunciation last.’

\(^11\) PC 2/4 19 April 1550 to 15 June 1553 MS p 392. Printed in Dasent Vol 3 p 362.

\(^12\) Calendar of Patent Rolls Edward VI Vol IV 1550-53 HMSO 1926 p 285 6 Edward VI part IV 12 May 1552 Grant during the King’s pleasure to William Thomas, esquire of the office of one of the clerks of the Privy Council, with 40l a year, payable at the exchequer, quarterly from
The politics of the change of regime after the death of Edward and the failed coup by Northumberland confused affairs for the first few months of Mary's reign. Two Council books were produced concurrently during the summer of 1553, with one Principal Secretary John Bourne responsible for the Kenninghall Council register and the other Secretary William Petre for the rival 'professional' Council volume.\textsuperscript{13} Petre's Council appointed two new clerks on 30 July 1553, William Smith and Francis Allen, who then continued to serve throughout Mary's reign and into Elizabeth's.\textsuperscript{14} Hampton was regranted the office in November 1553, although his name first occurs as acting Clerk in the Marian registers in November 1556.\textsuperscript{15}

Mary's death signalled a significant change of regime in terms of principal Privy Councillors, but not of the Clerks of the Privy Council. The men described as 'Clerks of the Council' during the first decade of Elizabeth's reign are the familiar William Smith, Bernard Hampton, and Francis Allen. Armigail Waad is also mentioned, but never with

\textsuperscript{13} See Hoak, D. 'Two Revolutions in Government: the Formation and Organization of Mary I's Privy Council', in C. Coleman and D. R. Starkey (eds.) Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration Oxford 1986, pp. 87-116. Bourne's Register is now Hatfield House CP 245/1covering 16 July - 3 Nov 1553; that of Petre is now PC 2/6 covering 14 July - 19 Aug 1553.

\textsuperscript{14} PC 2/6 p 7 for 30 July 1553; printed in Dasent Vol IV Appendix 1 pp 419. Calendar of Patent Rolls Philip and Mary Vol II 1554-55 HMSO 1936 p 189 1 and 2 Philip and Mary Part X 26 September 1554 Grant for life to Francis Allen, esquire, in consideration of his service to the queen at Fremlingham, co. Suffolk, at the time of the rebellion, of the office of one of the clerks of the privy council, and for the exercise of the same of an annuity of 50l from Midsummer day, 7 Edw. VI to be paid quarterly at the Exchequer. by ps. 26 September 1554 The like consideration of the like service to William Smyth, esquire, of the like office and annuity. by ps.'

\textsuperscript{15} Calendar of Patent Rolls Philip and Mary Vol I 1553-54 HMSO 1937 p 283 1 Mary Part XI 12 November 1553 Grant for life to the Queen's servant Bernard Hampton, esquire, of the office of one of the clerks of the Privy Council, also for the exercise of the same of an annuity of 50l from midsummer day last, to be paid quarterly by the treasurer and chamberlains of the Exchequer. by ps.' PC 2/7 p 537 for 9 November 1556, printed in Dasent Vol VI p 16.
the title of Clerk of the Council. It is impossible to pin down periods of attendance of these men on the Council during this first decade of Elizabeth because of the loss of the original Privy Council registers for much of this period. Hampton, Allen and Smith are all mentioned in the rough Issue book for 1560, and Hampton and Allen again in that for 1568. The surviving evidence suggests that William Smith and Bernard Hampton continued to attend from 1558 up until their respective deaths in 1568 and in 1572, and that Allen attended into the mid-1560s.

From c.1570 onwards the records of both the Privy Council Registers and of the Exchequer Clerks Tellers Issue accounts for the annuities paid to the Clerks are much more complete. It is therefore easier to track both the dates of appointment and also the

16 Calendar of Patent Rolls Elizabeth I Vol III 1563-66 HMSO London 1960 p 340 no. 1919 7 Elizabeth part VII C66/1018 19 Jan 1565 lease for 221 years to William Smythe, a clerk of the Privy Council, of the site and demesne lands of the Manor of Gillingham... for his service. p 479 no. 2638 8 Elizabeth part VIII C66/1026 5 July 1566 Grant for life in survivorship to Francis Allen, a clerk of the Privy Council, and Winifrid his wife, the Queen’s servants, of an annuity of 60l payable at the exchequer, from Michaelmass next. In consideration of the surrender by Francis of patents granting annuities for life...; Calendar of Patent Rolls Elizabeth I Vol IV 1566-69 HMSO London 1964 p 65 no. 462 I Elizabeth Part VI C66/1035 10 February 1567 Grant for life in reversion to Bernard Hampton a Clerk of the Privy Council, of the office of Queen’s Remembrancer of the Exchequer, as held now by Henry Fanshawe or formerly by Richard Pollard, ... by patent 12 Dec. 4 Eliz... for Hampton’s service to Edward VI, Queen Mary, and the present Queen.’ Waad is mentioned a number of times in the Calendar of Patent Rolls in the first decade of Elizabeth’s reign but never as a clerk of the Council.


E405/527 Rough Entry Book Issues 1568/69 has no mention of Armigal Waad or William Smith. ‘Bernardo Hampton unu clicor consilij de feod s ad iiijanni terminos I li Dicto Bernardo... xxvj li xijli iiij li d... Francisco Allen unum clickorum consilij de feod ad iiijanni terminos I li...’

18 Cf SP 70/86 ff 35-6 Heneage to Fitzwilliam 17 Sep 1566; ‘... I thank yow for your letters to mr Ashley and me... how your paquet was deluyered to her matuye I yet understand not, ffor nether hampton nor smith hathte told me any thinge of yt nor ther hath yet...’. Hampton’s handwriting occurs in much of the notes of Privy Council letters in PC 2/9 throughout the 1560s. See also Add 48150 f 92 loose leaf of a draft signet letter in Bernard Hampton’s hand dated 22 Nov in 12th year of reign - ie. 1569 with ‘Edw. Horsey’ in lower left hand corner. For Smith see PC 2/8 MS p 287 Dasent VII p 103; Westminster 12 May 1559 ‘Received by me, William Smythe, one of the Clerkes of the Counsell, ...’; PC 2/9 p 251 Dasent Vol VII p 270; Westminster 16 October 1565 ‘The Lordes this daye appointed Smithe, one of the Clerkes, to give warninge to Sir Henry Radclyffye... to repaire to their charge furthwith in Ireland, orles to appere before their Lordships on Thursday next, the xviij th of this monthe, being the next Counsell daye.’ BL Lansdowne MS 10/14 William Smith, son of the late Clerk of the Council, to Cecil. Feb 24 1568. For Allen see SP 12/47/27 30 July 1568 Francis Allen to Cecil from Hatfield.
terms of attendance for each clerk. The deaths of William Smith in 1568, of Armigail
Waad in 1571 and of Bernard Hampton in 1572 effectively coincided with the end of
the first decade of Elizabethan politics. The first replacement clerk in Elizabeth’s reign
was Edmund Tremayne appointed in September 1571.¹⁹ Tremayne was from an
established West Country gentry family who had himself spent the Marian exile as part
of the Earl of Devon’s household in Italy.²⁰ Bernard Hampton died in the spring of 1572
and was replaced by Robert Beale, sworn in as a clerk in July 1572.²¹ With Beale on
diplomatic duty in the Netherlands and Edmund Tremayne complaining of his ‘blind
eyes’, Thomas Wilkes and Henry Cheke were appointed in July 1576.²² Cheke was a
phantom Clerk; no doubt he was appointed at the behest of his cousin Burghley, but
Cheke’s handwriting occurs nowhere in the surviving registers to testify to his
attendance on the council. Cheke was abroad for much of the later 1570s in Italy and
France, and he returned to England some time before January 1579 when he took up
office in York. Tremayne was not getting any younger, and his hand does not occur in
the registers after his retirement in 1580 back to his native West Country recorded.²³

¹⁹ PC 2/10 p 57 for Westminster 28 April 1571. Printed in Dasent Vol VIII p 25; Calendar of
1571 Grant for life to Edmund Tremayn of the office of a clerk of the Privy Council, with an
annuity of £50 from Lady Day last, payable at the Exchequer. By PS.
²⁰ See Bartlett, K. R. ‘The English exile community in Italy and the Political Opposition to Queen
²¹ E403/2261 Tellers View of Payments 1571-72 f 3b: ‘mortuos Bernardo Hampton unum
clericorum consilij de ffeod suo ad lle per annum duran vita souend ad ...’. Last entry for receipt
by Stonley on Lady Day March 25 1572 for £12 10s ‘ad manum proprium’. So Hampton died
sometime between the end of March and June 1572 when Beale appointed. For Beale’s
appointment see PC 2/10 p 106 for 8 and 9 July 1572. Printed in Dasent Vol VIII p 78; Calendar of
‘Grant for life to Robert Bele of the office of a clerk of the Privy Council with an annuity of £50,
payable at the Exchequer, from Midsummer last’. Beale copied his patent into his second
formulary book Add MS 48108 f 5a, where it is dated from Goremhambury 4 August 1572.
²² PC 2/11 p 50 for 18 July 1576. This entry is added at foot of page in different ink. Printed in
Dasent Vol IX p 166; Calendar of Patent Rolls Elizabeth I Vol VII 1575-78 HMSO London
1982; p 25 no. 195 C66/1138 12 October 1576. Gorhambury. ‘Grant for life to Thomas Wilkes,
the Queen’s servant, of the office of a clerk of the Privy Council, with an annuity of £50, payable
at the Exchequer from Midsummer last’. No record of Cheke’s appointment, but C66/1156 31
December 1576. ‘Assignment to Henry Cheeke, Clerk of the Council, of a lease to the Queen by
Robert, bishop of Winchester, by indenture’.
The Privy Council register from between the end of June 1582 and the beginning of February 1586 is missing, and the Patent Rolls from 1582 onwards are still only partly calendared. William Waad was appointed Clerk sometime before March 25 1584, possibly as a precursor of his embassy to Spain in late 1583. Daniel Rogers was officially appointed as Clerk on 5 June 1587. Rogers had worked, travelled and suffered much during his service for the Elizabethan government and no doubt this was viewed as a deserved reward, and Beale himself departed for the Netherlands 20 June 1587. Rogers’s hand occurs in the relevant Privy Council register for entries from 12 March, so had been effectively performing the duties of clerk some months before his official appointment. Anthony Ashley was officially appointed on 19 March 1587, before Rogers but his entries into the Register post-date those of Rogers. Thomas Smith was appointed some time before 24 October 1596 but did not receive his annuity till Christmas 1597. Thomas Edmondes was appointed 29 June 1599. The last few years of the century are dominated by Waad, Ashley and Smith.

---

23 He received only half his annuity for 1581, paid on Michaelmas to a servant, and died sometime soon thereafter.
24 PC 2/14 Register from 1 February 1586 to 1 November 1587 MS p 360 note in Beale’s hand "The same day [ie. 5 May [Recte June] 1587] Mr Daniell Rogers was sworne of the clerkes of her mtys most honourable privye counsell, appon signification of soche her highnes pleasure [signified] `delivered` unto their lordshippes by Mr Secretary Walsingham".
25 Add MS 48014 f 167b.
26 PC 2/14 Register from 1 February 1586 to 1 November 1587 MS p 302. It is strange that Ashley’s name does not occur in the Tellers Issue books till 1595-96. See Add MS 48027 f 352b for account by Beale of imprisonment of suspect with Ashley.
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