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ABSTRACT

The presence of several hundred English Catholics in Paris in the 1580s held immediate and longer-term significance for both England and France. Their status as exiles could be ambiguous, yet the rhetoric of exile offered them a powerful way to justify their position and appeal to Catholic Europe for practical and ideological support. However, those Catholic gentry who went abroad varied in the extent to which they were alienated from the Elizabethan state. As a consequence, their experience abroad was not necessarily one in which their position vis-à-vis the Protestant government polarised: it was not only active conspirators who sought to spend time in a Catholic country.

This thesis argues for the importance of France, particularly Paris, as a refuge for English Catholics in the 1580s, testing historiographical approaches to Catholic exile which privilege English clergy and those in Habsburg lands. Despite the exiles’ lack of a representative institution in Paris, at a time of political and religious uncertainty for France they could draw on established precedents for their presence and take advantage of instability to carve a foothold for themselves. The more obdurate opponents of Elizabeth I found a ready audience and useful ally in radical Parisian Catholics, a partnership that caused problems for the French and English Crowns. Others, however, engaged with Catholic renewal in more nuanced ways.

Drawing on printed and manuscript sources in both France and England, this thesis demonstrates the complexity and significance of English Catholic exile in sixteenth-century Paris. It had consequences for the exiles themselves, for their hosts, for the English and French Crowns, and for longer-term developments in post-Reformation English Catholicism.
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Note on the Text

All translations of French primary and secondary sources are my own. In quoting contemporary sources, I have retained the original orthography; in French texts the diacritics (or lack thereof) have not been modernised. Personal names are given as cited in the original source.

Dates refer to the country in question. References to dates of primary sources are given as stated in the document itself, or as they have been calendared (ie. with both new style and old-style dates).
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INTRODUCTION

In Spring 1580, the English government were increasingly concerned by reports of large numbers of their Catholic subjects gathering in Paris. These seemed to confirm other indications of an imminent attack on England by continental Catholic powers, with English Catholics in mainland Europe taking a central role. With Spanish and Papal support for uprisings in Ireland, rumours of an anti-English League amongst Catholic powers, and the imminent arrival of the Jesuits in England, Elizabeth’s ministers feared the worst. Both Catholic and Protestant despatches reported the influx of Catholics into France, ‘... arriving daily...from Rome and other places’.1 One government agent wrote of the arrival of important exiled figures in Paris with a sense of impending doom:

Their coming in this sort cannot be without great cause and secret intent. I pray God that these things, which prognosticate small good for England, may be soundly looked into.2

Such fears contributed to a succession of Parliamentary acts and royal proclamations. Measures against Catholic subjects within England were now also designed to prevent their movement out of the kingdom. Those who had left unlicensed were especially targeted. The earlier focus on fugitive rebels was now extended to those who went


2 TNA, SP 78/41/75, R. Lloyd to [Walsingham], Paris, 31 May 1580.
abroad for a Catholic education, or who left as prospective missionaries. Elizabeth I, unlike her sister, was unwilling to allow religious dissidents to depart England: she recognised the danger that they would secure foreign aid in Europe. Whilst concern about a potentially subversive group beyond the reach of the government was not new, it grew in the 1580s, a time of increased speculation about the future of the English and Scottish kingdoms, and the intervention of foreign powers in determining that future.

In addition to efforts to halt the movement of Catholics across the Channel, Elizabeth determined on a two-pronged approach: to dispossess Catholic fugitives from their position in English society, and to prevent them gaining a position abroad threatening to the Protestant status quo. In the 1580s, this concern focused on Elizabeth's Catholic subjects in France. Throughout the 1580s, Elizabeth and her representatives pressed Henri III to secure the expulsion, extradition and dispossession of English Catholics in his territories. These efforts were accompanied by a multi-media campaign to convince an English audience of the treasonous nature and practical miseries of exile. The repetitiveness of legislation and diplomatic demands imply these measures had little effect. The substantial number of English Catholics in Paris in 1580 suggests that,

---

3 13 Eliz.c.3, An Acte Against Fugitives over the Sea, explicitly linked withdrawal from England to rebellion and service of foreign princes. Those leaving unlicensed or exceeding the limits of their licence were to lose lands and property unless they returned and submitted to the Crown within 6 months. However, if an individual could be proved to have left for religious zeal alone, their wife and children were to be allowed to receive a portion of the revenues from their estate. 14Eliz.c.6, An Acte for the explanation of a Statute made againste Fugitives over the Seas, tightened up on loopholes in the earlier act. A 1575 proclamation prohibited merchants and soldiers from service of foreign princes. A declaration against rebels and traitors in foreign parts, 15 July 1580, announced that English Catholics abroad were involved in a league for the invasion of England. The proclamation of 10 January 1581 declared that all Jesuits and seminary priests entering the kingdom were traitors. Those maintaining kin abroad were to make report of it, and ensure their return within 4 months, or halt their support. Merchants were forbidden to draw bills of exchange to aid them. The ruling that only merchants could leave the kingdom without licence was reiterated. The following year, A Proclamation to Denounce Jesuites traitours, repeated the demand that students return from the seminaries. 27Eliz.c.2, An Act Against Jesuites Seminary Priests and other such like disobedient Persons, imposed a £100 fine or imprisonment on parents sending their children outside Elizabeth's territories without special licence. The Statutes of the Realm, (11 vols, London, 1810-1828, reprint London, 1963), vol. 3, part 1, pp. 531-34, 598-99, 706-708; R. Steele (ed.), Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, 1485-1714 (2 vols, Oxford, 1910), vol. 1, pp. 75, 79-82. Fugitives and others abroad without licence were also excluded from the Queen's general pardons, 13Eliz.c.28, VIII; 23Eliz.c.16, VIII; 27Eliz.c.30, X. Statutes of the Realm, vol. 3, part 1, pp. 584, 700, 760. This exclusion continued into James I's reign. K. J. Kesselring, Mercy and Authority in the Tudor State (Cambridge, 2003), p. 71.

4 Elizabeth's government went to considerable lengths to get Spanish pensions to English Catholics abroad curtailed in 1575, although this victory was temporary. Robert Lechat, Les Réfugiés Anglais dans les Pays-Bays Espagnols durant le règne d'Élisabeth 1558-1603 (Louvain, 1914), Appendix VI, pp. 237-38.

5 Below, Chapter Two, pp. 91-92; Chapter Three, pp. 179-80.

6 Below, Chapter Four, pp. 211-19.
whilst the government had established informers in their midst, they had not managed to halt the exchange of people, correspondence and funds across the Channel.

In the early 1580s, Paris was one of the most popular destinations for those choosing to remove themselves from the kingdom. The reaction of their hosts was not clear-cut. The apparently ambivalent position of Henri III, in part emanating from his need to preserve the Anglo-French entente, did not match general expectations of the Most Christian King. However, in other respects France was an easily accessible territory for Catholics to relocate to, and Henri’s ambivalence could help rather than hinder their cause. Most in Paris had travelled without a licence from the English crown, but Henri licensed their presence and resisted demands for the extradition of English conspirators. Moreover, Catholic figureheads in Paris had their own reasons to aid them.

Meanwhile, on paper at least, the municipal authorities in Paris did not receive the English Catholics with open arms. Along with a larger body of students and foreigners they were subjected to enquiries and targeted for expulsion when the city was threatened by epidemic. This existed alongside a lively anti-foreigner polemic, which was often directed against, but not limited to, the Italians in France. Like English government measures, however, municipal directives were difficult to realise, and the repetition of instructions suggests a failure to implement effective surveillance of Paris’ outsider populations. The English government and Parisian authorities converged in holding a less than complimentary picture of English Catholics on the move. They were cast by Parisian authorities as hazards to both public health and law and order, and by the Elizabethan government as rebels and traitors. Nevertheless, this did not prevent

7 Henri’s ability to dissimulate was well known. His apparent ambivalence was a conscious political strategy to win freedom of manoeuvre: Xavier Le Person, <<Practiques>> et <<Practiquers>>: la vie politique à la fin du règne de Henri III (1584-1589) (Geneva, 2002), pp. 38, 236, 583.

8 Deliberations of the Bureau de Ville record frequent orders to contain and control the influx of foreigners, which sometimes endorsed royal demands for quarteniers to obtain basic information on all strangers in their quartier. During the annual Saint-Germain fair, special orders were given to disarm students and other rowdy groups. When the city was in the throws of plague, cinquantiers and dizainiers were instructed to order all foreigners, soldiers and vagabonds to leave the city in 24 hours. Only the orders are extant – there is no proof they were implemented. Paul Guérin (ed.), Registres de délibérations du bureau de la ville de Paris, tome huitième, 1576-1586 (Paris, 1896), pp. 36, 149, 190, 221-22, 233-34, 331.

their departure, or exclude them on arrival. They continued to visit and reside in Paris in the 1580s, despite a host of constraining factors, including epidemic, political instability and religious tension. Indeed, such circumstances could even facilitate their existence. This thesis seeks to explore why the specific religious and political circumstances in England and France served to create such a scenario. It will investigate the impact of time in Paris for English Catholics themselves, for the Elizabethan government, for political and religious developments in France, and for the wider relationship between English Catholicism and Catholic Europe. Paris in the 1580s offered singular opportunities for English Catholics abroad; in return the exiles offered Parisians a number of ways to form and articulate their own interests.

Until the second half of the twentieth century, the presence of Elizabethan Catholics on the continent received limited historical attention. Where they had been observed, one of two approaches was usually taken. Firstly, research was generally linked to clerical and religious institutions in Europe, particularly those in Habsburg territories. Belgian scholars, for instance, usually explored English laity in Europe only through their activist element. The religious orders were usually prioritised, allowing historians to stress their ancestors’ credentials as benefactors to needy coreligionists.\(^\text{10}\)

There was little real acknowledgement of the considerable lay presence in France.\(^\text{11}\) The other approach was to explore the exiles’ significance in Anglo-Spanish diplomacy. This focused on official documents, relating the views of those governing England and Spanish territories rather than the exiles themselves.\(^\text{12}\) An evolution in English scholarship was suggested by Peter Guilday, who took up the subject with a wider perspective. Evidently, Guilday anticipated a larger project on English Catholics on the continent. Unfortunately, only the first volume of his work was published, focusing on the English religious houses in the Low Countries.\(^\text{13}\)


\(^{11}\) Cyrille Jean-Baptiste Destombes, La Persécution religieuse en Angleterre sous le règne d’Élisabeth (Paris, 1863). He admits the importance of the relocation of the Douai seminary to Reims, but makes no mention of any English laity there.


\(^{13}\) P. K. Guilday, The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795, volume 1: The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries (Louvain, 1914).
Thus, early studies never went much beyond recounting the experiences of religious orders or missionary clergy in Europe.\textsuperscript{14} Crucial to the development and sustenance of a sacerdotal religion, English clergy in Europe were undeniable symbols and instigators of Catholic renewal. However, their time in Europe before returning to England as missioners was assumed to be the only form of Catholic exile in the period. Little attention was paid to the large numbers of laity who went abroad, who in the early days were hangers on at the colleges.\textsuperscript{15} Partly due to the geographical location of the colleges and religious houses, research was limited to Catholic exile in the Spanish lands, or to particular groups – priests, monks, nuns, and, in some cases, rebellious nobles. Little was known about those Catholic laity who chose French rather than Spanish territories as their refuge, and who were neither clerics nor rebels. The association between English Catholics and Spain, which became firmer in the course of the 1580s, has subsequently dominated our view of Elizabethan Catholicism. In contrast to the historic alliance between Spanish and English interests, France was the traditional enemy, so it was more difficult to ally with or seek help from France. The focus of historiography in this direction is justified by the importance of links between English Catholics and Spain, and by the comparative wealth of available evidence.\textsuperscript{16} This relationship was a defining one and should not be underestimated. Nonetheless, exile relations with the Habsburgs should not overshadow important connections with other European powers. Anglo-Spanish Catholic relations were not devoid of tension, and as Elizabeth’s reign drew to a close, certain parties felt considerable hostility towards Spain. Relations with France were problematic, and perhaps less striking, but they had their own significance. They offered exiles an opportunity for involvement in international and specifically French Catholic issues, which was not available to them in the Habsburg territories.

\textsuperscript{14} John Hungerford Pollen, \textit{The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth: A Study of their Politics, Civil Life and Government 1558-1580, from the Fall of the Old Church to the Advent of the Counter-Reformation} (London, 1920, reprint, London, 1971), pp. 244-98. This recounts the early years of the Douai seminary.


The first serious treatment of Elizabethan Catholics in France came with John Bossy’s pioneering PhD thesis in 1960. Bossy delineated the nature and makeup of the English presence in Paris, Reims and Rouen under Henri III, the League and Henri IV, underlining their radicalising potential in the French context. He argued coherently for their close connection to the Catholic League, and their contribution to debates and conflicts over the French monarchy as a Catholic institution. This was contrasted to a subsequent emigration under a restored Bourbon monarchy, in which English Catholics turned from the radical demands of enterprise to quietism and the establishment of English institutions, with support from the French Crown and court. Bossy stressed the divided nature of English Catholics abroad, emphasising the split between the laity and their clerical leaders over the future of Catholicism in England. Bossy devoted attention to the politically active émigrés in the crucial decades of the 1580s and early 1590s, whose conspiratorial activities challenged the English and French Crowns. This he saw as part of the paradox of English Catholicism under Elizabeth I: that a conservative religion, dominated by the landed gentry, toyed with the possibility of challenging and overturning the status quo. These are themes to which Bossy returns on several occasions, and his ideas remain persuasive and influential.

The political and ideological implications of exile for the Tudor state have provoked more recent historiographical interest. In particular, in recent scholarship the English presence in Paris under Elizabeth is connected to post-Reformation Catholicism

---

17 Bossy, ‘Link’.


in England, and to religious conflicts in France.\textsuperscript{20} This work often takes up Bossy’s line on the radicalising potential of the Catholic exiles, demonstrating how they contributed, through direct involvement and allegorical example, to the wave of radical propaganda in Paris in the 1580s. For some historians, this association between the exiles and radical subversion has become almost inviolable. The Jesuit Francis Edwards, for example, argues that Jesuits working in England should be exonerated from accusations of political activity, of which those in continental exile were guilty.\textsuperscript{21}

There is scope in which to expand or complicate this picture. The significance of the English Catholics to polemical activity on the continent is undeniable, and this thesis will consider this in some detail. At the same time, the link between the Catholic League and English Catholics in the city was not as absolute as some secondary works appear to assume, especially prior to the city’s repudiation of Henri III and the installation of a radical Catholic government. Hence the focus in this thesis on the period before the League takeover, when there was a range of options open to individuals. To fully explore the significance of this, the later part of the thesis covers some important subsequent developments, and probes some assumptions made on the topic. It will explore a wider English Catholic presence in Paris, including those not involved in radical politics. Bossy acknowledged the existence of these English Catholics abroad, but for the most part they are not recognised as a significant element in their own right; this thesis aims to redress this.

Recent historians from both sides of the Channel have probed the ambiguities in the written texts and lived experience of early modern Christians. Olivier Christin argues persuasively for possible coexistence between Catholics and Huguenots in some French towns. A number of towns accepted, however reluctantly, the need for competing groups to work together through representative institutions. These strategies of mutual existence and cooperation were motivated less by attachment to ideals of toleration than a pragmatic desire to safeguard everyday life. Nonetheless, this


\textsuperscript{21} Francis Edwards, \textit{The Jesuits in England from 1580 to the present day} (Tunbridge Wells, 1985), p. 21.
recognition of the possibility of religious coexistence in certain circumstances offers a valuable corrective to reductionist views of how religious identity determined social and political relations. Meanwhile, across the Channel, scholars of the English Reformation acknowledge the complexity and instability of religious groupings. Alexandra Walsham and Michael Questier challenge an over-rigid definition of the Catholic community, and reassess the significance of church Papists. Walsham views church-papism not as the beginning of a slide into spiritual apathy but 'a positive option, a conscious decision to deal with the Catholic dilemma in a particular way'. The binary opposition between heroic recusant and lax or worldly church papist does not bear direct relation to lived experience. Questier demonstrates that an individual could be recusant and conformist at different points. He argues for recusancy as a 'negotiable quantity' that Catholics engaged and experimented with. Evidently, there were a variety of ways in which to be a Catholic. Historians recognise the possibility of being a loyal, non-subversive Catholic within England, but there is little consideration of how this might apply to those living in mainland Europe. Perhaps partly due to reliance on evidence which privileges those of political influence or treasonous inclination, Catholics abroad are primarily characterised as conspirators and agitators for a foreign invasion of England.

Prior to Bossy’s work, the presence of English, Scottish and Irish Catholics in France had attracted comment from French scholars. Daumet, for example, provided a study of English, Scottish and Irish religious institutions in Paris, but his work was weighted towards the seventeenth century, when the French Crown was more prepared

---


26 Lechat, *Réfugiés*, pp. 145, 205. Lechat noted that a few exiles had serious qualms about a foreign invasion, but treated them as exceptional. In contrast, for him Catholics in England were loyal to the Crown.
to support such initiatives. The sixteenth century, which is central to our understanding of later developments, remained largely unexplored, perhaps because it is more difficult to research. Some early twentieth-century French commentators considered that English and Scottish Catholics on the continent could have had a more constructive effect. For instance, a catalogue for a 1948 exhibition on British life in France lamented that the League takeover caused the evaporation of foreign visitors. It remarked that, until then, the British in Paris made a notable contribution to the city’s reputation as a centre of learning, rather than to France’s internal struggles. Meanwhile, Georges Ascoli’s study focused on the interest that England held for French polemicists. He devoted attention to the radicalising potential of the English Catholic situation for a wider cause, but nevertheless recognised that not all the English in France were political exiles. Ascoli distinguished between a small core of propagandists and active conspirators, and a larger group, who were in France for a range of reasons: soldiers and scholars, for example, who were drawing on established precedents. Ascoli observed that despite difficulties and risks caused by political and religious instability, a sizeable group of English travellers continued to visit France in the sixteenth century.

Aside from some incidental comments, Bossy’s and Ascoli’s work remain the only consideration of the mixed nature of this Catholic exile group.

This study of English Catholic laity in Paris will address issues relating to recent scholarship in three different areas: the nature of English Catholicism under Elizabeth I; Paris’ experience of the French Wars of Religion; and the experience and portrayal of religious exile in the sixteenth century. It will contribute to these spheres by examining a group of individuals whose significance to these developments has yet to be fully probed. On the English side, recent Reformation historiography recognises the extent of


29 Georges Ascoli, La Grande-Bretagne devant l’Opinion Française depuis la Guerre de Cent Ans jusqu’à la fin du XVIe siècle (Paris, 1927), pp. 164, 175. He saw the League period as an exception to this. Englishmen in France could be schoolboys, young men in service of diplomatic corps, or gentlemen touring Europe to complete their education.
interaction between Protestant and Catholic rivals within the kingdom.\textsuperscript{30} An English Catholic might negotiate a place within Protestant society, whilst protecting and perpetuating Catholic identities and practices. This compromise, as well as the crusading zeal of armed conspirators or acts of martyrdom, is now recognised as helping to sustain Catholicism within England.\textsuperscript{31} However, as Dillon argues, the study of English Catholic identity has been inadvisably Anglo-centric.\textsuperscript{32} Assessments of Catholics in England are usually articulated with little or no reference to how laity on the continent dealt with similar dilemmas, or to how those in England viewed those in Europe. The result is generalisation and speculation, rather than informed or detailed study, and an oversimplified or skewed impression about Catholic experience. Some years ago, Bossy suggested a way out of this trap:

There has been an understandable tendency among more recent Tudor historians to discount the value of foreign sources in the interpretation of English history; but those concerned with the history of English Catholicism, seeking to estimate what part foreign influences had in determining that history, must try to make them yield sense.\textsuperscript{33}

By exploring the lay gentry presence in Europe and its connection to the gentry Catholicism within England, this study aims to engage with this wider picture.

Recent scholarship on Paris during the Wars of Religion has opened up new approaches to the study of French Catholicism in the 1580s. The 1580s are often viewed solely as a run-up to the Catholic League’s takeover in 1588, or as a period in which the official ultramontane Counter-Reformation made inroads through new orders like the Jesuits. In fact the religious and devotional milieu in the city was undergoing a major transformation, which was far more complex than a push for a monolithic reactionary Catholicism. Explorations of religious and laity in the city, together with studies of the religious ideals and reforming initiatives of Henri III’s court, demonstrate the


\textsuperscript{31} For example, Lisa McClain, \textit{Lest We Be Damned: Practical Innovation and Lived Experience Among Catholics in Protestant England}, 1559-1642 (London, 2004), especially pp. 234-69.

\textsuperscript{32} Dillon, \textit{Construction}, p. 10.

\textsuperscript{33} Bossy, 'Henri IV', p. 81.
complexity of Catholic revival in early modern Paris. However, despite scholarly interest in the ideals of civic unity and harmony in urban communities, there is little exploration of how ‘outsiders’ got on in Paris in the 1580s. There is room to consider how Catholics from outside French territories experienced its religious and political upheavals. The considerable xenophobia of the League period is usually taken as proof of a more widespread and deep-rooted hostility towards outsiders. However, amongst some at least, particular ill feeling was directed against the Spanish, as the backbone of the League and violators of French liberties. There is relatively little mention in contemporary accounts of the English Catholics in Paris: this could suggest they did not always provoke conflict within the city. Paris in the 1580s offered a number of opportunities to English Catholics abroad, some of which were available elsewhere in Catholic Europe. But its immediate political and religious circumstances may have been particularly conducive to English exiles. Paris had an attraction and character distinct from the urban centres of the Low Countries, which prior and subsequent to the 1580s were so central to English Catholic exile.

The theme and experience of exile, of perpetual interest to scholars, has recently been given prominence within studies relating to travel, migrations, tourism and literature. Some scholarship takes an anthropological approach, exploring the experience on a generic level; elsewhere, it is studied in a time specific context, in terms of the experience itself, or its portrayal by contemporary writers. Paris is well recognised as a centre for itinerant or refugee populations or individuals, particularly by scholars of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, but its earlier status in this regard


is often overlooked. Religious exile has been a fruitful area of enquiry for historians of the sixteenth century; to date, however, the onus is on the Protestant experience. In the course of the century, various Calvinist congregations moved to and from England. Studies tend to present Protestants who left their country for their faith as cohesive groups with a strong sense of purpose, diligently exploiting the opportunities presented by exile. As such, they were able to forward their own interests and the wider cause of Protestantism in England and Europe. The limits of Protestant exile unity have recently been challenged, as the divisions between and within various Marian exile communities in Europe become apparent. Nevertheless, the view of exile as a crucially formative period for the Elizabethan Church remains influential. Ideologically, exile was taken as practical proof of the righteousness of the Protestant cause, strengthening their identification with God's chosen people of the Old Testament. In contrast, the history of the Catholic experience of exile in the sixteenth century remains mostly unwritten. Elements of the Protestant exile experience have been closely wedded to Protestant theology and ideology in subsequent historiography. Consequently, any features of the experience which were generic to exile rather than specific to Marian Protestantism risk being overlooked. Indeed, some aspects of the Marian exile are directly comparable to the experience of Catholics on the continent under Elizabeth I. Certainly, Catholic and Protestant exile in the early modern world have not been fully considered in relation to each other. The interconnected nature of Catholic and Protestant resistance theories, and Catholic and Protestant martyrdom is recognised; approaching the exile of the two groups in a similar way may prove productive.


41 Shagan, 'Introduction', p. 17.
One possible explanation for the scant attention given such a significant subject is the state and availability of relevant sources. This thesis exploits a variety of source material, created or collated for very different ends than those to which they will be put here. The majority of English language material derives from a hostile government, aiming to undermine the very Catholic networks that the sources document. Reports from ambassadors and other government agents abroad inevitably focus on the clergy and laity who were obviously involved or implicated in seditious activity. They primarily provide information on suspected ringleaders rather than other individuals, who may have had little to do with these schemes. Even given this material's obvious slant, it provides invaluable information on the personnel, geography, residence, sociability, and activity of English exiles in Paris. Meanwhile, contemporary printed material created with the approval or collusion of the government has an obvious propagandist bias, but still provides incidental details on English Catholics in Paris. Without this, we would know very little about the lay presence in Europe.

In fact, the inspiration for this thesis was a list of English and Irish Catholics in Paris and elsewhere in France, dated April 1580. Drawn up by Sledd, a government agent lambasted in Catholic propaganda, it names 337 Englishman in Paris at this point and gives some clues to their geographical origins and status. This list influenced my early research - especially the study of families with particular geographical origins in Chapter One - although I did not limit myself to exploring only those named there. It is only one, if particularly lengthy, example of government efforts to keep tabs on their activities abroad.

---

42 Elizabeth's advisers were very conscious of the need for information on English Catholic activity in Europe. In addition to sending agents abroad, they were keen to win over Catholics to spy on their coreligionists and foment divisions. Conyers Read, *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the policy of Queen Elizabeth* (3 vols, Oxford, 1925), vol. 2, pp. 319, 328, 330-36, 415-33.


44 For Anthony Munday, below, Chapter Two, p. 129.


46 William Allen, *A Briefe Historie of the Glorious Martyrdom of XII Reverend Priests, executed within these twelve moneths for confession and defence of the Catholike faith: But vnder the false pretence of Treason. Wth a note of sundrie things that befel them in their life and imprisonment: and a preface declaring their innocencie. Setforth by such as were much conversant vvith them in their life, and present at their arraignment and death* ([Reims], 1582), pp. 17, 126-27. For more of Sledd's work, BL, Yelverton Ms, Addenda 48029, ff. 132-46, printed in Clare Talbot (ed.), 'Miscellanea: Recusant Records', *CRS*, 53 (1960), pp. 193-245.
subjects abroad. Whilst such lists and reports are invaluable, they sometimes reveal frustratingly little about who these men and women actually were. Many reports list only a surname, and tell us how many of that family were present. We often do not know which part of England their families originated from, never mind their individual identity. Sometimes this can be gleaned from other sources, but a large number cannot be personally identified. 47

The tactic of recording Catholics abroad was not specific to Paris in the 1580s: there are several examples for the Low Countries, and lists continued to be made throughout the reign. 48 The exact purposes of these lists are somewhat unclear. In general terms, the government wanted to remain informed of those abroad, not an easy task in itself. English intelligence networks abroad in 1580 were in relatively early stages of development, and the comprehensiveness of reports can be questioned. 49 Even the compiler of an apparently extensive list admits there were many more English Catholics in Paris whom he was not able to identify; we know from other government sources that this was indeed the case. 50 Whether the list had a more specific political objective than the identification of Catholics abroad is debatable. At an earlier period, lists of fugitives in the Low Countries were probably drawn up with an eye to confiscating their lands, and the government had not lost interest in this. 51 Alexander Wilkinson offers a further suggestion, that by 1580 the lists were made to identify possible recruits to work as double agents for the Crown. Certainly, a few of those listed later gave information to the government, but there is little sign of their willingness to

47 The difficulties of establishing prosopographical details, or even the size of Catholic exile in the sixteenth century, is recognised elsewhere. Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 147; Bossy, 'Link', p. 37.

48 For lists from the Low Countries, TNA, SP 12/89/6, A note of divers suspect men and rebelles on thother syde of the seas, 29 September 1572; John Strype, Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and other various occurences of the Church of England, during Queen Elizabeth's happy reign (4 vols, Oxford, 1824), vol. 2, part 2, Appendix Book 2, no. 1, pp. 596-97. For another list of those in France, TNA, SP 15/27b/11, The names of the Queen's Majesty's subjects being or having been very lately in those parts of France, [April?] 1580. For a later example, Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series in the Reign of Elizabeth, 1601-1603 (London, 1870), CCLXXXIII, no. 17, p. 147, List of 55 recusant fugitives, 26 January 1602.


50 TNA, SP 78/4a/63. The informer estimates at least another 100 English and Scottish Catholics, 'who, living secretly and disguised... can not so readily be known.' Other sources reinforce this. TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece V, Edward Stransam to Mr Middlemore of Hawxly [Hawkeslew?], 9 October 1580. Neither Hawkesley nor Middlemore are listed as being in France. TNA, SP 12/137/49, John Middlemore to William Middlemore, April 1580. William, for instance, was in Paris in April 1580, but does not feature in the list.

do so in 1580. Moreover, given the informer's admission of the list's incompleteness, he may not have been party to all the activities of double agents, and remained ignorant of their identity.

As for English material created by sympathetic parties, it does not give as full a picture of lay activity as might be hoped. The letters and published works of mission leaders give invaluable information about the construction of the English Catholic cause, and the ways in which individuals could seek support from the Catholic hierarchy. However, this is filtered through a mentality often infused with ideals of suffering under persecution, which prioritises martyrs and missionaries. The laity with which Allen and Persons directly concern themselves are usually those with clear Catholic credentials, styled by the Protestant government as major enemies of the state. Nonetheless, read carefully, the written output of the mission leaders provides incidental information about the movement of individual laity abroad, their appeals to mission leaders, and their differences with them.

Little useful English language material is available in private collections. For example, letters home from young gentry abroad are not particularly abundant in the Elizabethan period. Those abroad kept in touch with kin and friends at home, but no wealth of private epistolary documentation survives. Where correspondence between those on the continent who were not political activists and their coreligionists in England still survives, it is because the authorities intercepted it, and it was subsequently preserved. It must not have reached their intended recipients, and in this sense can only offer a limited impression of cross-Channel interaction.

52 Wilkinson identifies Chalmers as one such man. He argues that the section of the list entitled 'great practisers' was an inventory of those who were on, or would join, Walsingham's payroll. Wilkinson, *Mary*, p. 30. George Norton, named on the list, but not as a 'Great Practiser', became an informer for Walsingham at a later date. Below, Chapter Five, p. 298.


54 In researching families from East Anglia, Worcestershire and Yorkshire, I found no substantial correspondence between individuals and their families at home from the 1580s. Collections for other parts of England exist, although one of the most notable, concerning Thomas Houghton, mostly predates the period of this study: John Rylands University Library, Manchester, English Mss 213.
French source material, scattered across various collections, is even more fragmented in its coverage. In one sense, research on a foreign minority group in Paris in the sixteenth century encounters an exacerbation of source material problems experienced by historians of Parisians in Paris. There is a major shortage of evidence for Leaguer Paris, let alone for English Catholics who may have lived through it. Researchers cannot benefit from any effort by the French authorities to keep track of foreigners in the capital, or of the refugees themselves to organise into an independent corps. There are no returns of strangers or church registers, which served as crucial starting points for scholars of Huguenot exiles in England.\(^{55}\) Unfortunately, too, there are very few physical remains to shed light on the English Catholic presence in Paris. Key sites for the exiles, such as the Church of SS Cosme-et-Damien, no longer stand. Saint-Séverin, whose churchyard was the site of an explosive anti-Elizabethan tableau in 1587, remains, but there are few signs within the church of the past English congregation.\(^{56}\) A similar story applies to potential documentary evidence: substantial material, such as the complete registers of the left-bank parishes, and the correspondence of Archbishop James Beaton, has been lost or destroyed. The lack of a fixed institution for the English in the city compounds these problems. With the absence of an obvious body of sources with which to construct a picture of the community, information must be gleaned elsewhere. The correspondence of the official representatives of foreign powers in Paris generally reports the presence and activity of the political conspirators or the mission leaders, rather than the daily experience of lay exiles in a wider sense. Even so, the correspondence of successive Spanish ambassadors and Papal nuncios in Paris offer some useful insights, especially when used alongside the State Papers and the correspondence of Henri III and his ambassadors in London. The records of the German nation at the University, where they survive, can also fill in some gaps for those of an academic profile.

New information, albeit disjointed, comes from a larger body of primary evidence which to date has not been mined for signs of an English presence in the city.\(^{57}\)


\(^{56}\) There is a fifteenth or sixteenth-century stained glass depiction of Saint Thomas of Canterbury in the church, but it is unclear whether it was in place in the 1580s: Jetta S. Wolff, *The Story of the Paris Churches* (London, [1918]), p. 125.

\(^{57}\) Bossy recognised notarial sources as a source of further information, but did not make extensive use of them. Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 8.
The notarial records of sixteenth-century Paris have long been recognised as an abundant source of evidence for the social and political history of the city. They contain vital information on individuals who would otherwise be unknown to us, including a number of foreigners in Paris. A trawl through the études of over 20 notaries revealed some surprising and interesting evidence, allowing me to substantiate existing impressions about English patterns of residence, business, and other associations. Wills and documents recording financial transactions suggest how English Catholics in Paris associated with each other, and with their hosts, and how they may have responded to the political activity relating to England that was ongoing in the city.58

The ‘fit’ between English and French sources is not perfect; this has influenced the direction of this thesis, and in part dictated its coverage. Names of Englishmen appearing in French sources do not always match those in English government sources, so it often impossible to build up ‘thick’ prosopographical descriptions of a significant number of individuals. Additionally, the nature of this material means that it cannot be seen as representative in an unproblematic sense.59 Those appearing in extant records are more likely to be exceptional than typical – individuals rich enough to engage in business deals, notable enough to attract the attention of the mission leaders, or possessing sufficient political contacts or credentials to incur the suspicion of the English government. Nevertheless, a careful examination and assessment of this material can shed valuable light on how English Catholics in Paris responded to exile as a concept and as a practical experience. It suggests that it could be a polarising process, but that English Catholics responded to their exile dilemma in ways that could diverge from the expectations of the Protestant government at home, and the directives of clerical leaders on the continent. By extension, their complex impact on their host environment and their homeland had both immediate and longer-term consequences.

In coming to terms with a mixed collection of sources, I confronted the need to impose some terminology on a description of English Catholics in France. Bossy refers to them always as ‘emigrés’, but this suggests a relocation more permanent that that of many Elizabethan Catholics. Instead, I have used the term ‘exiles’, in full awareness of

58 There has been considerable disruption for researchers at the Archives Nationales, Paris in recent years. Some of the études I intended to consult were undergoing conservation, or had been withdrawn from circulation, between 2002 and 2005. I consulted all the possible relevant études.

59 A problem also recognised by Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 4.
its problematic nature. As I will argue, not all English Catholics abroad were exiles, in the sense that they had not been officially expelled from England, and many lacked the elements of real alienation from the status quo which the terms often implies. Nevertheless, the term 'exile' does more to capture the ideological potential of their presence in Europe, a potential that both hostile and sympathetic parties could latch onto and exploit. Exile was a familiar, if destabilising idea in the early modern world, and its religious and political resonance was widely recognised. It may not be accurate in a practical sense to describe all English Catholics abroad as exiles, but the potential implications of the term have the most resonance for the experience of Elizabethan Catholics abroad.

Chapter One sets the scene for the thesis by examining the position of exile families in England up to and around 1580, that is before or during their time abroad. Focusing on Catholic families from three regions of the kingdom – the North, the West Midlands and East Anglia – they are examined in their native environment, and assessed for the extent to which they were dispossessed of their accustomed position in local society. The chapter explores the various ways in which these families responded to political and social change, taking into consideration any open challenges to the Protestant government. This is substantiated by an examination of their marital strategies and educational opportunities within England. The extent to which these families had been sidelined varied significantly in the different regions, but overall there was evidently still some room for manoeuvre, despite increasingly stringent anti-Catholic measures on the part of the Protestant government. Importantly, this chapter explores the possible links these families had with the continent before one or more of their relatives appear in Paris. Despite a general assumption of England's isolation from Europe during Elizabeth's reign, I argue that there were connections to Catholic Europe on which laity could draw and expand, the nature and extent of which varied in each region. Those who went abroad at this point helped, and would continue to help, to sustain them. Whilst England was increasingly unattractive for some families, all Catholic gentry could see Paris as an increasingly attractive destination when travelling abroad. Chapter One suggests that not all of the sizeable group of gentry abroad had been driven there directly by persecution or to escape the consequences of treasonous action, although the small number who had were often used to characterise the group as a whole. The situation for exile families who were themselves religiously 'mixed' was

---

60 Kingsley-Smith, *Shakespeare's Drama*; Tucker, *Homo Viator*. 
in fact more complex than this, although once abroad, the exile identity was to hold a peculiar attraction.

Chapter Two explores the Parisian milieu of the exiles' place of refuge. It sets out the political and religious conditions into which English Catholics would have arrived, suggesting how they sought to establish themselves through reliance on established precedent or by exploiting new opportunities arising from the specific circumstances of the 1580s. Paris is considered in some of its many aspects: a hotbed for Catholic reform and renewal; the home of the French court and the seat of monarchical authority; a major venue for trade and tourism; a centre for learning and the dissemination of ideas through print; a headquarters for international political conspiracy. Special emphasis is given to the role of the University of Paris in providing a context for the English Catholic presence, and in offering its members a range of opportunities for survival. The chapter then tries to give a sense of the everyday experience of Catholics in Paris, presenting information about patterns of accommodation, sociability, study, business and devotion. Through pinpointing the exile presence to particular sites and areas on the left bank, it offers an impression of how English Catholics in Paris confronted and interacted with their host city. The chapter also explores the possible impact of their presence on English Catholics themselves, and on their French hosts.

This theme is explored more fully in Chapter Three, which investigates the ideological and political implications of the English Catholic presence in Paris, and argues that it had a simultaneous potential to unite and divide. It explores sources of financial and moral support for English exiles, asking how effective they were in providing practical assistance or in uniting the exiles as a group in themselves and as a constituent part of an international Catholic cause. The chapter questions assumptions about the apathy of Catholic exiles, with reference to five specific areas. Firstly, I address the importance of exiles in a polemical context, as subjects of, and collaborators in, radical works produced on Parisian presses. Secondly, their impact on international diplomacy, specifically Anglo-French relations, is explored. Thirdly, the devotional activity and educational initiatives of exiles in Paris are examined. Fourthly, the English exiles are considered as active competitors with other interest groups in the city for recognition and influence. Finally, the exiles are assessed in their guise as active disseminators of news, or potential catechisers. The chapter closes with a consideration
of possible hostility in Paris towards the exiles, or at least their radical contingent, which explores portrayals of them that contrast to those in radical polemic.

Chapter Four moves away from practical experience or action in Paris to consider the rhetorical and political issues provoked by exile, and the responses they provoked from various parties. The value of exile in general, and the legitimacy of English Catholics to live abroad in particular, were contested topics for those trying to stabilise the English state, and those trying to define and construct the English Catholic community. The chapter opens by exploring the presentation of English Catholic exiles in Protestant sources. This is contrasted with the official printed defence of exiles launched by their clerical leaders from the continent, particularly that relating to the fugitive rebels from the 1569 revolt. The chapter then moves on to explore the different, if more confusing, approach contained in Leicester's Commonwealth, one of the most notorious Elizabethan anti-government tracts. A closer study of the French translation of this work, and the way in which it was infused with a specifically French pertinence, offers new perspectives on relations between exiled English courtiers and their French hosts, and on what the exiles may have been looking to achieve by the mid-1580s. Finally, the chapter argues for an examination of alternative views on exile, as voiced by the exiles themselves. Evidence from incidental and neglected source material in both France and England reveals a range of attitudes amongst English Catholics towards their removal from England. It demonstrates how nuanced, and sometimes volatile, representations of religious exile could be. Whilst this is common to the exile experience in general, in this case it was also informed by the specific circumstances of later sixteenth-century Europe.

The fifth and final chapter places the experience of exiles in the 1580s in a longer chronological context, arguing that experiences particular to the religious and political upheaval of the later sixteenth-century had significance for longer-terms trends in English Catholicism and its relations with the Continent. In addition to the base provided to the Stuart court in the 1650s, I suggest links between the exiles of the 1580s and two later developments of significance for English Protestants and Catholics alike: the foundation of English religious houses abroad, and the evolution of the Grand Tour. In both these development, Paris had an important place. This chapter also explores the emerging fissures between lay exiles and their clerical leaders, and between Catholic laity in England and their counterparts abroad, demonstrating how the divisive potential
of exile interacted with divisions amongst Catholics in England. As part of a more widespread anxiety about the future of English Catholicism, the exiles were directly confronted with the dilemma of homecoming when England remained a Protestant kingdom. The prospect of return provoked a variety of responses amongst Catholics abroad, both theoretically and practically. These are explored through the different fates of individuals from families in those areas of the country discussed in Chapter One. By drawing together these different strands, the chapter argues that post-Reformation Catholicism in England cannot be properly understood without close consideration of its connections to Catholic Europe, particularly those forged by the laity.

In the 1580s the links between Catholics in England and their French counterparts became crucial to the practical and ideological cause of the English Catholics, whilst simultaneously exacerbating religious and political tensions within Paris. The physical presence of large numbers of Catholic gentry signalled their status as a persecuted group, forcibly dispossessed and separated from their homeland. It also allowed the exiles to advance their own interests by seeking support from their hosts. In the peculiar circumstances of the 1580s, the interests of English exiles and their French hosts could overlap, providing the two groups with common ground. The experience of English Catholics in the 1580s, and their interaction with developments in France, was complex and varied. In the earlier part of the decade this did not have to mean commitment by the exiles and their hosts to an oppositional stance towards their own and each other's governments. Although the period in which France became the main haven for English exiles was comparatively brief, it proved central to the process by which the Catholic community in England came to define and present itself. It may also have had longer-term effects on the ways English Catholics thought about themselves, as a minority in England but members of a wider international Catholic network, which could provide space for religious devotion and sociability. Interaction between English Catholics and their French coreligionists, the laity as much as the clergy, was an important part of the process by which the situation of English Catholics became or was constructed as an international Catholic cause. In broader terms, it also maintained links between the English gentry class and Europe in general. The potential volatility of the exile trope and the exile experience itself need to be considered alongside alternative ways in which English Catholics configured or approached the time they spent in France. Not all were exiles, and not all presented themselves as such, although the opportunity to do so was there. This rhetoric, which was replete in meaning to a Europe
divided by religious conflict, should not be allowed to hide the extent to which Catholic experiences in Paris could vary.

This thesis will thus contend that the experience of lay exile in the later sixteenth century was both more complex and more pertinent to larger political and religious issues for post-Reformation Catholicism in England than has been recognised. Incorporating the links between English Catholics and Paris, which in the 1580s were to provoke increased radicalism amongst certain parties, into the story of the emerging character of English Catholicism, shows that the cause of English Catholicism was neither entirely insular, nor entirely dependent on Spain. Relations with France were perhaps more complex and problematic than with Spain, but they were still central to the process in which the situation of English Catholicism became internationalised, and Catholics in England and across Europe could make common cause in the fight against Protestantism. At the same time, a study of the exile experience in Paris sheds light on developments concerning a different experience of Catholicism for both the exiles and their hosts. The close contact between laity abroad and their coreligionists at home, and, in many cases, the return of those abroad to England, suggests a degree of fluid interaction between English Catholics and Catholic Europe. A period of time abroad rather than indefinite exile could apparently inspire or reinforce a different kind of religio-political commitment, replacing subversion of the Protestant status quo with efforts to negotiate with it. The experience of lay exile is more central to the emerging character of post-Reformation Catholicism in England than is usually acknowledged; it was an important factor in shaping the religious identities of Catholic gentry. It affected that character in a variety of ways, offering more than one way in which to articulate an English Catholic identity.
CHAPTER ONE

Prospective Exiles: English Catholic Gentry in their native context, c.1580.

In the early part of her reign, Elizabeth’s religious and political regime was far from established, and there was a degree of reliance on those with established social standing and authority. Many of these were religious conservatives or Catholics. As her government became more established, however, and partly in reaction to Catholic activity and to international politics, measures against Catholics were increasingly strident. The official line insisted they were guilty of secular rather than religious offences. Catholics seen as overtly subversive had always been held at arm’s length, but now all were increasingly viewed as potential traitors. The revolt of the Northern Earls in 1569, and the publication of the papal bull of excommunication, were read as proof that Catholics put loyalty to their Church and its foreign representatives before sovereign duty to the Crown of England. From 1574, continentally trained seminary priests began to implant a renewed commitment to Catholicism in England. The much-feared Jesuit mission of 1580 provoked a backlash against the more uncompromising approach of Campion and Persons, and their links with foreign Catholic powers. It was increasingly obvious that Elizabeth could not watch Catholicism wither away within the borders of her kingdom when circles outside the control of her government were providing the impetus for its resurgence. Government measures against priest harbourers as well as clergy from 1580 were partly a reaction to the perceived link between the mission and a Catholic invasion of Protestant England. A series of statutes officially identifying priests as traitors also pronounced the death penalty for any layman found harbouring a priest, and aimed to enforce the regular financial penalties on recusants.

Although persecution was not a daily and constant reality throughout the period, it was nevertheless a backdrop to Catholic activity in England as the 1580s progressed. It must have been a factor for those Catholics considering going overseas. Ideally, the

---


government wanted Catholics to be submissive and to remain within the realm: from 1572, anyone leaving without licence, or anyone who had left before that point but had not returned, stood to lose income and goods. The government's investment of time and manpower in keeping track of Catholics extended to those who had reached, or wanted to reach, Catholic Europe. Walsingham's operations began to infiltrate Catholic networks in England and abroad. The government had reason to fear the response of Catholics within their borders should an outside invasion force arrive, backed by the exiles. Some prominent Catholics abroad, together with coreligionists in England, were involved with foreign Catholic powers, as pensioners, clients, intelligence agents, or soldiers. Moreover, the series of proclamations and laws against Catholics and their relatives abroad, and even the agreed expulsion of English Catholic rebels from the Low Countries, did not succeed in curtailing the activity of English Catholic exiles.

Whilst Protestant polemic read political intent into the movements and activities of English Catholics, they were given a polar opposite identity by their own partisans. Historiography, following in the train of Persons and others, often presents the situation in black and white terms. Here, Catholics were constantly persecuted, and subjected to a harsh series of financial and geographical restrictions. Those of gentry status and above suffered social and political dispossession. Catholics thus had to be prepared to sacrifice everything for their faith, a sacrifice which affirmed and sustained the truth of their cause, and the community of which they were a part. Some laity - although male clerical martyrs were usually prioritised - died as martyrs, rejecting the legitimacy of the persecuting authority. Persons had specific reasons to present such cases as definitive representatives of the true faith. The aim was to inspire a population struggling in increasingly hostile conditions, and to convince them that their continued sacrifices would count. This was shot through with an anxiety to guard against the 'church papists', those trying to balance participation in their local community with continued Catholicism. In the eyes of mission leaders on the continent, church papists were a serious problem. Their actions, blurring what was construed as the confessional barrier between orthodoxy and heresy, were seen to threaten the continuation of the Catholic community in England.

3 Above, Introduction, p. 12, footnote 3.
4 Above, Introduction, p. 12, footnote 4.
This contemporaneously produced paradigm has continued to influence the way historians characterise and delineate the post-Reformation Catholic experience in England. Bossy defined his English Catholic community as a group formed on separatist principles, fed from the activity of missionaries in spite of increasing tension between gentry and clergy. He saw no organic link between Marian or pre-Reformation religion and the uncompromising stance of Elizabethan recusants, who followed Counter-Reformation precepts and pursued a separatism in their liturgical, devotional and social activity which rendered them distinct from their Protestant or church papist peers. Bossy's insightful account continues to spark debate on the real nature of English Catholicism in the period. Most famously, Haigh argues for a recusant community prior to and almost independent of the missionaries; he criticises the mission for what he sees as its misdirection, or concentration on the more affluent and obviously profitable gentry sector. The mission, he says, neglected the remaining Catholic population, who had retained its links to its medieval past. Bossy's community was growing from a membership of zero from 1568 onwards, while Haigh's continued to shrink. Despite the clear differences between them, neither scholar probes the real significance of church papists to the community. Those who tried to reconcile their conscience with a life within Protestant society had no part in Bossy's separatist community. Meanwhile, Haigh seems to assess them along the same lines as contemporary mission leaders. The apparently increasing numbers of church papists are read as the slippery slope to Anglicanism, thus proving that the Catholic community was in decline.

The assertions of Catholic polemic would lead us to think that all Catholics on the continent, including the laity in Paris, had been forcibly driven from England by government persecution. In 1581, Allen claimed that he and others:

... were constrained to flee and forsake our country... by the warrant and example of Christ... and other our forefathers in faith, in the like persecutions.

5 Bossy, Community.


7 William Allen, An Apologie and true declaration of the institution and endeavours of the two English Colleges, the one in Rome, the other now resident in Rhemes: against certaine sinister informations given vp against the same ([Reims], 1581), reprinted in D. M. Rogers (ed.) English Recusant Literature, 67 (1971), f. 13.
Fleeing the country in fact only invoked further penalties. Attainted rebels and others risked loss of land and family fortune, whilst specific measures created additional costs for those with sons in Catholic Europe who had left unlicensed. However, the polemical representations of English Catholics merit closer examination. If not all Catholics in England were persecuted in 1580, those in Paris had not all been driven abroad in the ways polemicists claimed.

Both recent historiographical debate and contemporary controversial literature thus provide a useful background context for an examination of families with relatives abroad in the later sixteenth century. The motivations for leaving England of a large group of individuals of varied status must have been wide-ranging and complex. Paris had considerable pull factor as a Catholic centre, but there were also factors which pushed them from England, including their situation at home, and perhaps also the precedents set by Catholics under Henry VIII and Edward VI. Using one government list as a starting point, this chapter will address the position of particular gentry families in England under Elizabethan rule, and ask to what extent they had been sidelined from their accustomed roles. The extent and scope of the list described above is such that a full analysis of every family is not feasible. Rather, an exploration will be made of the religious and political milieu of three areas of the country – Yorkshire and ‘the North’, Worcestershire and the West Midlands, and East Anglia – from which some gentry had left for Paris by 1580. These areas were selected in order to gain some impression of the situation for Catholic gentry in three distinct and mainly non-urban areas of the kingdom. As we shall see, it is difficult to claim that there was a specific ‘type’ of family who sent relatives abroad; rather there was a real range of gentry who did so. The varied nature of their experience, and their positions within local and national society, will imply that their links to each other were crucial to their situation in England, and informed their continental experience. At the same time, however, their relations with their Protestant peers and their previous links to the continent also require examination. Whilst it may have been easier for gentry and aristocracy to withdraw into a Catholic network than it was for Catholics of a lower social standing, across the country as a whole they did not take that path. Their decision to go abroad will be
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8 Sir Thomas Copley made very little headway on requests to be granted some of the revenues from his lands. Richard Copley Christie (ed.), Letters of Sir Thomas Copley of Gatton, Surrey, and Roughay, Sussex, knight and baron in France, to Queen Elizabeth and her Ministers (London, 1897). A £100 penalty was imposed in 1585 for those with sons abroad unlicensed. Rose, Conscience, p. 12.

9 Marshall, ‘Religious Exiles’, pp. 5-7, 10-12; Religious Identities, Chapter 11.
explored in terms of their immediate situation in England in a regional context, and on a national level.

Scholars of the history of religion have observed how regions further from direct Crown control, where the provisions of the established church failed to meet actual demand, engendered traditions of religious autonomy, or to some extent, 'self-provision'. The three areas discussed below can be viewed as such to varying degrees. All retained something of an older local character, but none were hermetically sealed from each other or from wider influences.

1: '... wholly blinded with the old popish doctrine': Catholics in the North of England.

The religious climate of the north of England in 1580 was such that Catholic gentry cannot accurately be described as a withdrawn or sidelined group. Whilst often intermarrying and socialising with each other they had not completely withdrawn from a wider role in local society and government. There was a deeply ingrained conservatism in their religious outlook, but there were also signs that a new kind of Catholicism was taking root. Meanwhile, when it came to turning their attention towards Catholic states on the continent - whether for assistance, or for Catholic education and training - there were precedents on which to draw.

The recusancy of Yorkshire gentry has received considerable scholarly attention. Although in its early stages in 1580, a Catholic network, often informed by kinship links, was functioning. Catholic families with relatives abroad in 1580 were religiously 'mixed': different religious stances existed within a familial group,

10 TNA, SP 15/15/77, Ralph Sadler to William Cecil, York, 6 December 1569. Sadler commented that the people flocked to the cause of the Earls through attachment to Catholicism. Meanwhile, even the Queen's forces were 'altogether wholly blinded with the old popish doctrine that their hearts were with the rebels'.


sometimes in tension with each other. Marriage to social equals was crucial to family strategy, so it is unsurprising that gentry within the same county would intermarry. The exile families were often connected to each other prior to the Reformation, and certainly before some of their members were sent abroad. Individuals in these families married Protestants and church papists as well as notorious Catholics. Many, though, married locally and cultivated links to other exile families. Some families were particularly closely related to one another, with kinship links being reiterated within a few generations. Brother and sister Walter Calverly and Margaret Beeston, née Calverly, married sister and brother Ann and Christopher Danby. The Fairfax-Hungate alliance signalled by the marriage of Nicholas Fairfax of Gilling and Joan Hungate of Saxton was perpetuated when Nicholas’s nephew married into the Sandhutton branch of the Hungates. Religious sympathy was possibly not the dominant reason for this match; rather it was one factor that complemented other motives. The two families were neighbours in the North Riding, so the match would further consolidate local family influence. Similarly, the reiteration of the Fairfax-Stapleton link by two marriages in three generations may not have been due to religious sympathy alone. Likewise, the marriage of Thomas Wentworth of Wentworth Woodhouse to Margaret Gascoigne brought Thomas a considerable landed income as well as a Catholic alliance.

Kinship was recognised in everyday discourse as a way for an individual to orientate themselves in the world. It probably had peculiar importance in times of social and political crisis, when other avenues of advancement or self-defence did not

---

13 Bastow argues there were enough religiously conservative families for Yorkshire gentry not to need to marry Protestant peers; this may have been true, but was not the practical reality. Bastow, ‘Aspects’, p. 116.

14 Joseph Foster (ed.), The Visitation of Yorkshire Made in the years 1585/6 by Robert Glover, Somerset Herald, to which is added the subsequent visitation made in 1612 by Robert Glover, Somerset Herald, to which is added the subsequent visitation made in 1612 by Richard St George, Norroy King of Arms (London, 1875), p. 264.

15 The marriage of Katherine Fairfax to Sir Robert Stapleton of Carlton of 1622 perpetuated the marital link made by her grandparents, Sir William Fairfax of Gilling and Joan/Jane, the daughter of Brian Stapleton of Burton Joyce and Carlton. It was further reinforced in the following generation, when Katherine, daughter of Katherine and Robert, married her Fairfax cousin, William of Steeton. H. E. Chetwynd-Stapylton, Chronicles of the Yorkshire family of Stapelton (London, 1884), p. 430. Stapylton’s information varies from that given in Joseph Foster (ed.), Pedigrees of the County Families of Yorkshire (3 vols, London, 1874-1877), vol. 2.


function in expected ways. Stuart Carroll observes that for the French nobility, ‘during the civil war comradeship and kinship was even more important [than usual] to the survival of a noble house’; in England and France there was a greater reliance on kin when circumstances were precarious. Likewise, studies of northern England imply that alliances between Catholic families established in an earlier period became more significant under Elizabeth I. For families faced with the dislocating experience of exile, they were perhaps of added weight. Marriage links forged at home presumably attained new weight when individuals were displaced from the close kin circles of home and found themselves in an unfamiliar environment. Claims of kinship could be flexible in the early modern world: evidently this allowed comparatively distant links, which may never have been utilised at home, to carry potential benefits and obligations in a foreign environment. Certainly, other sixteenth-century exile communities were closely interrelated by kinship and career connections, which could help to increase group solidarity.

Kinship links may also have been reflected in the landed connections of gentry families. Landholding was a major route to influence and standing for ‘newer’ families, and the means for those of established rank to perpetuate and consolidate their standing. Landowning patterns underwent changes in sixteenth-century Yorkshire, partly due to central government policies in the north relating to the Dissolution of the Monasteries, the Pilgrimage of Grace and the Revolt of the Northern Earls. These changes were

---


perhaps most acutely felt by families with seats in the remoter North Riding - classified
as a Catholic stronghold - and the more densely inhabited West Riding.\textsuperscript{22}

A large amount of ex-monastic land changed hands subsequent to the
Dissolution, allowing some families to improve their landed status. Some were granted
lands directly by the Crown, whilst others purchased them outright. These lands could
then be used to create a settlement for younger male members of the family.\textsuperscript{23}
Meanwhile, the political actions of northern Catholic gentry also provoked change. Key
rebel families in the Pilgrimage of Grace or the revolt of the Northern Earls had their
lands confiscated. These were granted to men seen as loyal servants to the Crown, and
who were often without a natural foothold in the area. George Bowes, the royalist
commander received lands in recognition of his service in putting down the 1569
rebellion.\textsuperscript{24} The extent to which this redistribution curbed the influence of a family,
however, is debatable. The predominance of the Norton family in the wapentakes of
Gilling West and Hallikeld was seriously threatened by Crown confiscations, but thanks
to the presence of relatives in the vicinity and their links to other local families, their
influence was still felt.\textsuperscript{25}

Significantly, land confiscated from the fugitive rebels was not always granted
to gentry with impeccable credentials. Central government still had to accommodate
those with local influence, even if they were not totally free of Catholic connections. In


\textsuperscript{23} Cuthbert Fairfax, younger son of Sir Nicholas of Gilling, was granted Dunsley Manor by his father in 1588. This was part of the former lands of Whitby Abbey, which Nicholas obtained in 1545. William Page (ed.), \textit{Victoria County History of the County of York, North Riding} (2 vols, London, 1914-1923), vol. 2, pp. 518-19.

\textsuperscript{24} Cuthbert E. Sharp, \textit{Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569} (London, 1840), pp. 388-89.

\textsuperscript{25} Richard's son John was in possession of lands previously part of the family chantry at Norton Conyers until 1574. \textit{VCH, North}, vol. 1, p. 365. For his sister Jane, below, p. 41, footnote 30.
fact, some of those families with relatives abroad were granted lands taken from the fugitives. For instance, Norton Conyers was granted to Sir Simon Musgrave.\textsuperscript{26} Musgrave’s kinsman was probably in Paris, where he was likely to know the Nortons. Similarly, Thomas Calverly received part of the manor of Gilling, previously held by the Markenfeld family, in the very year that his relative was reported in Paris alongside the fugitive rebels.\textsuperscript{27} Two of the Markenfelds were key rebels; they were not listed in the cities of France, but had connections with earlier exiles and kinship ties with Richard Norton.\textsuperscript{28} The lands confiscated from the Markenfelds were in close proximity to those of the Nortons in Gilling West, and close collaboration between the families probably continued in exile. The fact that attainted lands went to those who knew the attainted party prior to their exile, and probably had relatives associating with them in Paris, was possibly coincidental. Nevertheless, given the interlinked and interdependent nature of northern gentry society, it is likely that the influence of fugitive families in their homeland had not been curtailed.

It is difficult to speculate about the impact that a family’s landholding patterns may have had on members abroad, but particular correlations between marriage links and land ownership appear to have been important. Gilling West until 1569 was a Norton stronghold, whilst the Gascoignes were fairly new to neighbouring Sedbury.\textsuperscript{29} This may have influenced the marriage between Richard Gascoigne and Jane, daughter of Richard Norton, whose recusancy and support for returning rebels sustained Norton influence in the area.\textsuperscript{30} However, such associations could only be realised by actual residence in the area. The Middletons, for example, did not spend much time at Stockeld, where they could have cultivated links with neighbouring Catholic families.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{26} VCH, North, vol. 2, p. 395.

\textsuperscript{27} VCH, North, vol. 2, p. 78.

\textsuperscript{28} Thomas Markenfeld, an early exile, and Dr Morton, another relative of the Nortons, visited England soon before the revolt. Foster (ed.), Pedigrees, vol. 2; Taylor, ‘Crown’, Appendix 1, pp. 117-18, 122.

\textsuperscript{29} VCH, North, vol. 1, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{30} Jane was reported as ‘a recettor of passengers from beyond the seas, and a prevye supporter of her father’. She and Richard were held suspect by the government. British Library, London, Lansdowne Ms, 15, no. 95, Articles of Information exhibited by William Whartone gent of Ripon, 9 December 1572. For their recusancy, Timothy J. McCann (ed.), ‘Recusants in the Exchequer Pipe Rolls 1581-1592, extracted by Dom. Hugh Bowler’, CRS, 71 (1986), p. 66; CRS, 53, p. 87; E. Peacock (ed.), A List of the Roman Catholics in the County of York in 1604 (London, 1872), p. 82.

Obvious patterns of residence or ownership thus may not provide accurate insight to the exiles as a whole. On the other hand, several families had acquired new parcels of land in the period. These newer procurements, as well as providing patrimony for younger sons, facilitated contact with new neighbours, and new links with Catholic peers.  

Sociability was an integral part of gentry culture and served to reinforce such alliances. The significance and function of hospitality underwent a shift with the religious changes in early modern England, but the obligation of hospitality remained incumbent on Protestant and Catholic gentry alike. The Fairfax family of Gilling frequently played host to neighbouring families, many of whom were also kinsmen. For instance, the Stapletons, Vavasours, Musgraves and Hungates were guests at various points over 1579 and 1580. Some gathered there for celebrations over the Christmas period in 1580-81, a point at which their relatives were probably socialising with each other in Paris. Families would also act for each other in the legal sphere. When William Fairfax remarried in 1573 and needed trustees for a lease, he enlisted the cooperation of local families, including those whose relatives later appear abroad. Scholars have recently challenged the assumption that individuals chose scribes or witnesses according to ideological sympathy, but in relying on each other to act as witnesses the northern gentry engaged in relations that reinforced ties of kinship and sociability.

Although only a small number of northern gentry were direct participants, the north of England was deeply marked by the 1569 revolt, its failure, and the subsequent shifts in regional society. Significantly, the active rebels, or those suspected of involvement in the rising, constituted a significant segment of the northerners listed in

32 Above, p. 40, footnote 23. Cuthbert's family were the first branch of the Fairfaxes to be openly Catholic.


Paris in 1580.37 Four amongst the northern families in Paris had key roles in the revolt and were attainted. Of the others, seven more were implicated, and others presumably decided to leave England rather than await possible repercussions. Those who were in Paris because of their links to the revolt had thus probably been abroad for over a decade by 1580. This should not necessarily be read as symptomatic of the exiles' backward-looking nature. Like William Allen, the rebels had recognised that the Catholic cause in England would not survive without some degree of foreign impetus; and when their revolt failed, they turned to the continent for refuge.38

Gentry participation or complicity in the revolt can only partly be explained by their affinities with the northern earls. The revolt is sometimes read as a protest by the earls against their increased exclusion from positions of regional and national influence. Certainly, Percy and Neville fortunes within the kingdom were much diminished, but in the north a small number of Catholic gentry still saw them as men of considerable influence, and wanted to acquire connections to them.39 Service in the great noble households was a traditional means for family advancement, and was still a favoured route for some gentry. Several of the exile families had younger sons serving in the Percy and Neville households; others were stewards of their lands or members of their council. Richard Norton, for instance had been brought up in the household of the sixth Earl of Northumberland. Several of his kin were in the seventh earl's household by the 1560s, as were younger sons of the Fairfax of Gilling.40 Further north, John Swinburne continued family tradition by serving as steward for Percy lands in Northumberland, and emerged as an activist in the revolt. Meanwhile, Peter Vavasour of Hazlewood was legal advisor to the Earl of Northumberland and Lennox.41 To

37 At least thirteen families named in Paris were involved to some extent.

38 Fletcher and MacCulloch argue that the earls' self-representation was nationalist in slant. Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, Tudor Rebellions (4th edn, Harlow, 2004), p. 108. However, the fact remains that some of the ringleaders looked abroad for help. Taylor, 'Crown', p. 361.


40 Taylor, 'Crown', p. 124. Nicholas Fairfax, second son of Sir Nicholas, served in the household at the time, and had a part in the revolt. Aveling, Northern, pp. 83, 124, 264. Interestingly, the connection between the Percy household and the exile families does not appear to have outlived the seventh earl. G. R. Bathoe (ed.), 'The Household Papers of Henry Percy, Ninth Earl of Northumberland (1564-1632)', Camden Society, 3rd Series, 93 (1962), pp. 149-64.

41 Aveling, Northern, pp. 124, 264.
varying degrees, connections to the earls encouraged a loyalty beyond participation in their revolt, and could offer personal advantage to the gentry. Recent studies on the 'parties' that formed around the great families of France emphasise the fluid nature of such ties and their potential profitability to both sides. The extent to which lesser nobility were in the direct thrall of their superiors and the impact of ideological factors in this relationship are debatable. 42 Certainly, the banner of Catholic religion alone was insufficient to raise the whole of northern society. 43 Evidently, Northumberland and Westmorland were not personally adept at enlisting the support of their 'parties' in the run-up to the revolt. 44 Their wives, or more vociferous gentry like Richard Norton, seem to have been the most important influences. 45 Nevertheless, however diminished their power, some northern Catholics still looked to their traditional leaders as an alternative to Protestant rule in 1569, and perhaps continued to so do. Subsequent to the revolt, the exiled Earl of Westmorland continued to be viewed by hostile and favourable parties as a major player in invasion plans, despite his notorious vacillations. 46

Following the accession of Elizabeth, there was no wholesale attempt by the centre to place local government in the hands of the most diligent Protestants. Practically, such an ideal was unfeasible, as there were not enough sufficiently godly gentry across England to do so. Rather, there was a degree of acknowledgement that effective governance depended on securing the cooperation of those with local standing, even when their religious beliefs were less than ideal. This could be a problematic solution, and a consensus was not always easily reached. Nevertheless, especially in the north, the official disqualification of Catholics from office holding was not a reality by 1580.


44 M. E. James, 'The Concept of Order and the Northern Rising 1569', Past and Present, 60 (1973), p. 70.


46 TNA, SP 53/17/417, Charles Paget to Mary Queen of Scots, 10 April 1586. Government agents went to considerable efforts to win over Westmorland; Catholic exiles feared their success.
The Council of the North was designed as the direct arm of royal authority in the north of England, but it and its associated Ecclesiastical Commission encompassed personnel of varied religious outlooks. Some Catholics were removed from their position in these bodies in the early years of Elizabeth's reign for religious offences — Thomas Wharton for instance, when he was charged with hearing Mass in 1561/62. Meanwhile, Richard Norton's dismissal was provoked by his general disruptiveness, rather than his notorious Catholicism alone. In fact, new appointees did not all boast impeccable Protestant credentials. William Tankard, a known Catholic, was appointed in 1566, and was soon accused of partiality in his administration of justice.47

Rivalries between neighbouring families - in which religious tensions frequently had a part - were often played out within the magistracy. Membership of the bench was an important status symbol, affirming and demonstrating a gentleman's standing to his peers and social inferiors. Despite the increasingly burdensome nature of a JP's responsibilities, it was seen as an office worth obtaining and defending from one's rivals. The role of the JP as godly magistrate, working alongside his clerical counterpart the godly minister in implanting Protestantism, was recognised on rhetorical and practical levels.48 Nonetheless, there is little sign that the godly had gained the upper hand in the north in 1580. In the 1590s, Puritan ministers and magistrates were still highly contested in the North Riding, partly for their outsider status, partly for their religious zeal and challenge to 'traditional' gentry society.49 The need for local men of good standing to maintain equilibrium in society meant that those with a less than desirable religious outlook could retain a role. Officially Catholics had forfeited their right to hold office, but many suspected of Catholicism or with known Catholic connections, including those with family abroad, sat on Yorkshire benches. Sir Brian Stapleton of Carlton was a West Riding JP and sheriff of Yorkshire in 1585, although his two sons were recusant, and he had earlier been assessed as a 'great Papist'.50


50 Cliffe, Yorkshire, p. 241.
Thomas Danby served on the bench, and as Sheriff in 1575-76, despite being considered 'not well affectyd in Religyon' and a partisan of Mary Queen of Scots in 1572. Danby also seems to have aided the prison furlough of the recusant Edward Vavasour, and made repeated efforts to undermine the Protestant minister in his Leake parish. His younger brother Christopher and brother-in-law John Neville were rebels who had fled to Catholic Europe. However, in other contexts a gentleman's Catholic links certainly worked against him. Sir Robert Stapleton of Wighill, a former ward and favourite of Elizabeth I, was clearly a Protestant, but was on poor terms with Archbishop Sandys. After he tried to provoke a scandal over Sandys' sexual conduct, the Archbishop used Stapleton's known Catholic connections to cast further doubt on his character.

Catholics retained some freedom of manoeuvre in the legal sphere, despite government rhetoric to the contrary. Questier demonstrates how they could be active agents in legal process, engaging their own and others' skills to procure themselves a better deal. The Inns of Court, derided by the godly and the government as dens of popery, guarded their own independence against attempts at outside interference. Their benches were ruling bodies autonomous of parochial control, and could guarantee a space tolerant to a degree of nonconformity. Traditionally places of accommodation and sociability for the qualified lawyers, by the middle years of Elizabeth's reign the Inns also functioned as educational forums for the unqualified. It is unclear how tolerant the Inns were of overtly Catholic behaviour by 1580, but they were certainly potential forums for those who became exiles. Young Catholics of varying wealth,


52 NYCRO, ZS Swinton Estate and Middleham Estate Records (Microfilm 2087/000306), Edward Vavasour to Sir Thomas Danby, York Castle, 3 June, n.d.; NYCRO, ZS Swinton Estate and Middleham Estate Records (Microfilm 2087/000308), Edward Vavasour to Sir Thomas Danby, n.d. Vavasour pleaded for money, then asked for a sum owed him to cover expenses in London. They included money 'to kepe the warden of the flete so harmless for my goinge abroade so long'. Bastow, 'Aspects', pp. 222-23; below, p. 48, footnote 65.

53 Sir Robert's attempt to set up Sandys with an innkeeper's wife, and blackmail him when 'discovered', was pursued by Sandys through the courts, and led to Robert's imprisonment in 1583-84. In 1587, Sandys assessed his relatives as Papists of 'the worst sort', claiming they spent conspicuous amounts of time in Sir Robert's company. Chetwynd-Stapylton, Chronicles, pp. 418-21.

54 Questier, 'Conformity'.


social status and geographical origin could receive training to help them manage and protect their estates, and socialise in an arena sheltered from outside incursions. Despite complaints from godly members, the membership of those of suspect beliefs was not generally challenged. It was even sometimes possible to reinstate those 'put out' for their beliefs. There are in fact indications that northern Catholic gentry preferred the Inns to the Universities as educational forums inside England for their sons. In general, Yorkshire families were associated with Grays Inn, although there is no clear link between the northern exiles and a particular Inn. Yorkshiremen whose family names later appear in Paris do feature amongst those 'put out' for nonconformity in 1577. Lincoln's Inn, one of the most notorious for harbouring Catholics, apparently sheltered a number of northern students who were later in Paris. John Smitheson, for example, was reinstated there after 1577, and was probably in Paris a few years later. He presumably made contact at Lincoln's Inn with families such as the Babingtons and the Rokebys, who also appear in Paris by 1580.

The precise character of Catholicism in the north at this point remains a subject for debate. The actual experience of lay Catholics has been characterised as a complex mix of older, more 'traditional' outlooks, and the more aggressive approach practised and encouraged by continentally trained clergy. Elsewhere, Catholicism in the north, particularly in the border shires, is seen as a mixture of northern English and Scottish elements. The continued presence of former religious generally perpetuated a conservative outlook, but this does not equate with a committed withdrawal from the Elizabethan Church. Members of a few listed families had reached fairly high positions within their convents before the Dissolution; they continued to identity themselves as religious, as perhaps did their lay counterparts. William Calverley took in John

---


58 Bastow, 'Aspects', pp. 312, 318.


60 John Smitheson of Lincoln's Inn was reported as a non-communicant. CRS, 22, p. 101. Nearly 25% of the membership of Lincoln's Inn was considered recusant in 1577. Parmiter, 'Inns', p. 23.


62 McClain, Lest We Be Damned, pp. 204, 218-27.
Alanbridge, the last abbot of Byland before 1563; his house was the site of Alanbridge’s death.  

As for lay piety, families such as the Stapletons and Vavasours had pre-Reformation chapels in their homes, but there is debate as to whether they were actively used in this period for services. Catholic families, including those with relatives abroad, certainly continued to play a role in the parish communities of the north. Several held advowsons to their local parish, thus retaining some influence over the religious character of their parish. The Fairfaxes, for instance, held the advowson for the church at Gilling until 1769. Sir Thomas Danby was by the 1580s making life very difficult for the vicar of Leake, who felt his authority was being undermined. Although Thomas was the more ‘conforming’ face of his family, he was nevertheless accused of leading other parishioners in their ‘superstitious rites’ in 1584. The continued involvement of Catholic and exile families in parish politics at this time is an indication of their possible integration into, and influence in, their local community.

Recusancy was not fully developed in Yorkshire by 1580. The early years of Elizabeth’s reign had seen a number of Marian priests in the region, who were joined by their missionary counterparts by the 1570s. Prosecution for recusancy in the north was neither systematic nor concerted at this stage, but it is interesting to note that some gentry who appear as recusant in 1577 had family in Paris a few years later. By the early 1580s, however, there are some signs of a greater separatism from the Elizabethan Church with regard to sacramental and the liturgical practices. For instance, the marriage of Thomasin, daughter of Richard Stapleton, and Robert Gayle during a Mass was part of a wider ‘Catholic’ lifestyle. They had been absent from their parish church for eight years, and had their children baptised according to Catholic rites in 1584.  

---


64 Bastow believes Anne Vavasour’s position as gentlewoman of the Queen’s Bedchamber facilitated the continued use of their household chapel; Bossy doubts whether Vavasour and Stapleton chapels were ever used for private service in this period. Sarah L. Bastow, “‘Worth Nothing but very Wilfull’: Catholic Recusant Women of Yorkshire”, *Recusant History*, 25 (2001), p. 600; Bossy, *Community* p. 137.

65 Bastow, ‘Aspects’, pp. 196, 222. Danby held the advowson to the Leake parish, so there was probably a personal element to his dispute with Richard Comyn. Danby slandered Comyn and refused to accept communion from him.

66 Aveling, *Northern*, p. 204. The marriage cannot be traced in the genealogies.
Thus, a degree of interaction with Protestant peers and local government was accompanied by Catholic activity. This activity included efforts to retain links with Europe which had developed well before 1580. The Vavasours' York household was a known forum for Catholic education, worship and propagation. Dr Thomas Vavasour was an Edwardian exile. On return to England, he and his wife were often imprisoned but managed to maintain a household fostering individuals such as the convert and martyr Margaret Clitheroe and her hagiographer, the secular missionary John Mush. Punished for recusancy from an early point, the Vavasours sent at least one son abroad: he later became a guide to seminary priests.\textsuperscript{67} Further north, from the 1560s the government was concerned about ties between Durham Catholics and clergy and gentry on the continent.\textsuperscript{68} This anxiety, and investigation of these links, escalated after the 1569 revolt. In particular, the Catholic community around Brancepeth in County Durham was made up of Westmorland's partisans who maintained contact with him in exile.\textsuperscript{69} Meanwhile, Richard Norton had maintained contact with kinsman Thomas Markenfeld and Doctor Morton, who had left England soon after Elizabeth's succession and returned as key mobilizers in the run up to the revolt. They may also have inspired other northern Catholics to adopt an exile course.\textsuperscript{70} In the mid-1570s, a network between the north and Douai acted as a commercial route, and a channel for money and personnel to sustain the seminary. It was also a useful route for the exiled rebels to communicate with home.\textsuperscript{71} Government concerns predating the revolt about links between northern Catholics and their counterparts in the Low Countries were enhanced by the presence of an active rebel presence there.

\textsuperscript{67} Richard Rex, 'Thomas Vavasor, M.D.', \textit{Recusant History}, 20 (1990-91), 436-54. The York Vavasours were a younger branch of the West Riding family.

\textsuperscript{68} Taylor, 'Crown', p. 49; Cliffe, \textit{Yorkshire}, p. 172.


\textsuperscript{70} Dr Morton was sent by Rome to sound out the likely effect of a papal bull excommunicating Elizabeth; Markenfeld apparently returned to England to agitate for the revolt. The Earl of Northumberland, and apparently also Richard Norton, made unsuccessful attempts to leave England before the revolt. Taylor, 'Crown', pp. 110, 122, 151.

\textsuperscript{71} Aveling, \textit{Northern}, pp. 54-56.
By 1580, these links to the continent had diversified: there was contact between gentry on both sides of the Channel, as well as between gentry in England and academics or clergy abroad. A mechanism for conveying correspondence and funds to the continent was also in evidence; the assistance it provided could reinforce or complement existing kinship lines. John Pullaine, noted as a ‘great friend and abettor of papists overseas’, had kinship ties to the Vavasours and Tankards, who were in Paris in 1580. Efforts at maintenance were also coordinated on a slightly larger scale, by funding a fellow northerner to assist peers abroad. The Yorkshireman Edmund Arthure, apparently the same man bringing in books and letters for prisoners in Marshalsea, received financial backing from a group of six northern gentry. They each paid a quarterly subscription of at least 6d to fund his activity in Paris. This was apparently independent of those supporting fugitives or individual relatives on the continent, and provided a wider context for the decision to send or support a relative abroad in the 1580s.

Amongst certain of the northern gentry, there was particular support for Mary Stuart from an early stage in her English captivity. The imprisoned Queen of Scotland never succeeded in uniting all English Catholics to challenge the Elizabethan regime, but she remained central to Catholic restoration plans, including the 1569 revolt. As the strongest Catholic claimant to the throne, Mary was the obvious figurehead around which Catholics could rally. Northern Catholics, who may have felt connections to a common Anglo-Scottish Catholic identity, were apparently more likely to be partisans of her cause. At the same time, their support for Mary Stuart created potential bonds with Catholics from elsewhere in England, perhaps especially once they were in France. Christopher Norton had been a guard over Mary Stuart at Bolton Castle, when he was presumably won over to her cause. He and other family members had been machinating for her liberation from an early stage; Christopher himself was executed for his part in

---

72 TNA, SP 12/146/137, The names of certain papists who be great friends and aiders of those beyond the Seas, 1580[?]; Foster (ed.), Pedigrees, vol. 3. Pullaine’s family also later produced missionary priests.

73 CRS, 53, p. 203; TNA, SP 12/146/137, The names of certain papists who be great friends and aiders of those beyond the Seas, 1580 [?]. Subscribers were William Clerenote, Ralph Grimston, Samuel Thrackwraye, Christopher Darley, Thomas Gill, and Nynian Atkinson. Atkinson was possibly paying him to reach a relative in Paris at this point.

74 Above, p. 47, footnote 62.
the revolt.75 Through personal contact with Mary Stuart, Norton may have cultivated links with one of the Nau brothers, French partisans of Mary’s cause.76 This was presumably useful for Norton’s relatives when they later arrived in Paris. The Naus were Guise clients, prominent landholders, and churchwardens in the left-bank parish of Saint-Benoît, an area that accommodated exiles and Parisian radicals. Certainly, they were very useful contacts for a newly arrived Englishman to call on upon arrival in Paris.77 Elsewhere, the Fairfaxes and Vavasours had been in attendance on Mary Stuart during her time in county Durham. Mary Stuart had taken refuge at the house of Henry Curwen and his wife Mary, née Fairfax, in 1568. The Earl of Northumberland, together with some of Mary Curwen’s Yorkshire relatives, came to pay court to her there.78 However, none of the northern gentry in Paris in 1580 appear to have been directly in the Scottish queen’s service before leaving for the continent. Before 1569, they seem to have looked to the Northern Earls as their champions, rather than a Scottish queen whose position in England was precarious. Any support Mary received from northerners appears to have been due to personal and individual connections as much as recognition of her wider position. She was a Catholic figurehead, and a fairly ambiguous one at that, rather than a northern leader. In this sense, the initial decision of northern gentry to spend time in France was probably unrelated to her.

The experience of Paris, however, may have led them and other English gentry to embrace Mary Stuart’s cause as part of a wider international struggle. She became integral to a Catholic restoration, and to their return home. Exiles, English as well as Scottish, had a host of reasons to be drawn to her wider ‘affinity’ when they were transplanted to a new environment.79 Some served her directly as counsellors or

75 Taylor, ‘Crown’, pp. 138, 151; CSPD, Addenda, 1566-1579, p. 272, Christopher Norton to the Council, 8 April [?] 1570. Christopher Norton declared to Mary Stuart he would do her any service that he could do lawfully.

76 Antonia Fraser, Mary, Queen of Scots (London, 1969), p. 550. It is unclear which of Claude’s brothers was in England at this point, although one of them had been in attendance on Mary Stuart. Claude Nau was later her secretary.


78 Taylor, ‘Crown’, Appendix 1, p. 116; Fraser, Mary, p. 458.

79 Carroll argues for the use of the term affinity to describe the fluid relations in aristocratic followings, which could be informed by ideological motivation. Carroll, ‘Review’. This seems appropriate to the disparate group of British nobles and gentry who took up Mary’s cause.
intelligence agents, whilst others depended on her to fund their education. As the 1580s progressed, Mary became a rallying point for the international Catholic cause, most of all after her death, which transformed her into a Catholic martyr. Previous experience in England may have informed these attachments, but at least for some, the Parisian environment created an opportunity for a more direct commitment. In fact, Mary’s cause provided clear grounds on which northern exiles could identify and associate with exiles from elsewhere in England and Scotland.

2: ‘not only of good wealth, but great alliance’: Catholic gentry in Worcestershire.

In contrast to northern England, the number of exiles from Worcestershire seems small. Given the large number of Catholic gentry in the West Midlands and its emerging reputation for recusancy in the early 1580s, it is notable that only six men were listed abroad in 1580. However, another seven families, listed under ‘Sundry Counties’, can be traced as having probable Worcestershire origins. Additionally, other West Midlands families were also abroad at this point. Closer examination of these families reveals some similarities with their northern counterparts, although their particular experiences varied.

80 James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, her ambassador to France, and head of her French council, was in France from 1564 and remained there after Mary’s death. Ralph Liggons was employed as her agent from 1572. ‘Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury Preserved at Hatfield House’, Historic Manuscripts Commission, 9, part 2 (London, 1888), no. 11, p. 5, De Monceaux [Lyggyns] to Master Barker; below, Chapter Five, p. 295. The Bree [Bray] boys had their journey to and reception in Paris in 1574 arranged by Mary Stuart, in recognition of their mother Catherine Bray, who served in Mary’s household. Alexandre Labanoff (ed.), Lettres, Instructions et Mémoires de Marie Stuart, Reine D’Écosse (7 vols, London, 1844-1849), vol. 4, p. 237. They were probably relatives of the Brays of Gloucestershire, listed in Paris in 1580. Mary also had several scholarships at her disposal. Labanoff (ed.), Lettres, vol. 4, p. 273; vol. 7, p. 253.

81 Wilkinson, Mary, p. 158.


83 The Warner, Powell/Pole, Smithe/Smythe, Lovell, Barnes, Vaughan and Throckmortons in Paris in 1580 probably originated in Worcestershire/Warwickshire. These names later occur in the Recusant rolls.

84 For instance, the Middlemores of Hawkesley, cousins to the Giffords. William Middlemore had two sons in France in 1580. He was in correspondence with them, and they were mentioned in other sources. Their cousin, Robert Middlemore of Edgbaston, was at the English College at Rome at this point. CRS, 53, p. 96; TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece III, Thomas Bailey to Giles Gifford, 9 October 1580; TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece XI, Richard Gifford to George Gifford, Amiens, 12 October 1580; TNA, SP 12/137/49, John Middlemore to his son William at Paris, April 1580; T.N.A., SP 12/146/137, The names of certain papists who be great friends and aiders of those beyond the Seas, 1580 [?].
Catholic families in Worcestershire were closely bound by residence, landholding and marriage. In contrast to the Yorkshire group whose lands spread over a wide and varied landscape, their landed wealth was concentrated in a far smaller area. This is partly explained by the comparative size of the two areas, and the respective size of each group, but it may also indicate something of the nature of their interaction. With the exception of the Sheldons, all of the Worcestershire families listed in Paris had their main seat in southern parts of Worcestershire, and thus functioned within a much smaller space.

The physical proximity of the Worcestershire families was reinforced by their close kinship ties. Thomas, the head of the Folliatt family, became the brother-in-law of Ralph Liggons, whose family’s seat was almost adjacent to his. John Russell, who was later attainted, married into the Sheldons of Beoley in 1572, a marriage that linked him more distantly to the Throckmortons. The Russells were connected twice in two generations to the Sheldons, and were also closely tied to the Liggonses. Sir Thomas Russell’s second wife was Margaret Liggons: her brother Richard went on to marry her stepdaughter, Mary Russell. These marriages also created more distant links with the Folliotts and Throckmortons. Such alliances may have had more to do with longstanding ‘dynastic’ considerations than the immediate demands of mutual Catholic ‘self-defence’. Marriage strategies within the county were not necessarily forged on the basis of confessional identity. Marriage to neighbouring families facilitated the consolidation of their estates, an aim which was not always compatible with religious interests. In the case of the Sheldon-Russell match, both families probably hoped to consolidate local influence rather than create a Catholic network. John Russell was a

---

85 More than a third of the northern families held land in the North Riding; half had land in the West Riding, but many had land outside the Riding of their own seat.

86 The borders of Worcestershire were idiosyncratic: although Beoley, the seat of the Sheldons, was situated to the north, it was in the same administrative hundred as Abberton, which contained the seats of the Russells, Liggonses and Folliatts. Additionally, Sheldon’s older seat of Aberton was in close proximity to the other families.


88 Phillimore (ed.), ‘Worcester’, pp. 91, 119, 128. John Russell’s mother-in-law and Sheldon’s wife was Anne, the daughter of Robert Throckmorton. Mary’s husband Richard was the brother of Thomas Folliatt’s wife Katherine.
Protestant: his wife’s Catholicism apparently contributed to an acrimonious relationship, which sparked a bitter feud between the heads of each family.  

If the reinforcement of Catholic identity was the guiding principle of marriage strategy, it was sometimes best served by looking beyond county boundaries. Families often made matches outside their immediate county. The Sheldons, for instance, married peers from Staffordshire, Shropshire and Oxfordshire. Family strategy was informed by several factors: Catholic families did not rule out the prospect of acquiring Protestant kin. Nevertheless, those Worcestershire families with relatives abroad display particularly close kinship links to each other. The Bishop of Worcester noted darkly in the late 1590s that the recusant group were ‘not only of good wealth, but great alliance’; his observation is applicable to the exile families a decade or so earlier.

The wealth and standing of those with relatives abroad varied considerably. Although the families were nearly all well established, the fortunes of individuals within them diverged. Some benefited from the Dissolution of the religious houses, like their northern counterparts. The Sheldon presence in the Pershore hundred was augmented by the redistribution of the lands of Pershore Abbey. Further estates stretching across four counties, a coalmine in Lancashire and a renowned tapestry workshop in Warwickshire made them a very wealthy family. Ralph Sheldon was apparently able to afford the sums demanded as recusant fines in the 1580s: his imminent financial ruin in 1590 was due not to hostile government action, but to massive debts to a fellow recusant. The Russells had more modest success, but were sufficiently secure to buy land in the

---

89 Elizabeth moved back to her father’s house, apparently to escape her husband’s violence. Her father claimed Russell’s accusations about Elizabeth’s religion were driven by malice. Russell disinherited his wife and children. Leslie Hotson, *I, William Shakespeare, Do Appoint Thomas Russell Esquire* (London, 1937), pp. 29-34.


91 *VCH, Worcester*, vol. 2, p. 54.

92 One exception is the Hynckes family, who cannot be traced in the county visitation. They were possibly the Hunckes family, who have no obvious connection to the other families.

93 *VCH, Worcester*, vol. 4, pp. 5, 14, 39, 154.

1580s. In contrast, within a few years, certain of their fellow exile group had their lands seized for recusancy. Others, like Hugh Liggons, pleaded poverty to excuse their failure to meet the Crown's financial demands. Although the Liggons family was of good status, the lot of their younger sons was not particularly fortunate, a situation which could be exacerbated by exile. In Ralph Liggons' case, his small annuity appears not to have reached him during his long stay on the continent.

The religious climate in the diocese of Worcester was in flux in the middle years of the reign. With zealous Protestants fairly thin on the ground, Bishop Whitgift bewailed the entrenched nature of Catholicism in the diocese. The hierarchy apparently struggled against conservatism, but there were also signs of a new approach amongst Catholics. Some religious conservatives were intent on preserving the little Catholic practice left to them, while others took a more pro-active stance. In fact, there may not have been as clear a division between these two parties as is usually assumed. The circulation of equipment for mass 'in mails and bags' was perhaps not solely a conservative effort to retain older objects and rituals; it could have been inspired by missionary priests who were operating in the diocese from at least 1577. As in the north, there were signs of some liturgical separatism: the burial of Catholics was being carried out at night, to avoid submitting to the required funeral rite.

Exile families from Worcestershire held a number of presentments to ecclesiastical livings, which had either long been part of their patrimony or had been acquired more recently as a consequence of the Dissolution. Their Catholic members retained varying degrees of initiative in this sphere. The Russells, for instance,

---

95 John Russell of Strensham bought the Manor of Eckington in 1583; it stayed with the family until the late seventeenth century. VCH, Worcester, vol. 4, p. 71.

96 Michael Folliatt had his lands seized for recusancy in 1588. CRS, 71, p. 63.

97 TNA, SP 12/190/11, Piece XI, Petition of Hugh Liggons to the Crown, 9 June 1586.

98 Family strategy dictated that younger sons receive no parcels of land from the main estate. They were usually given a lump sum when they came of age, sometimes supplemented by an annuity. Dorothy E. Williams, The Lygons of Madresfield Court (Logaston, Herefordshire, 2001), p. 6.

99 The editor of CRS, 22, p. 125, says he returned to England in 1575. This may be in addition to his visit of 1577. Ralph apparently came to England in 1605, to claim the arrears of his £8 annuity. Williams, Lygons, p. 8; The Madresfield Muniments, with an Account of the Family and the Estates (Worcester, 1928), p. 25.

continued to hold the advowson to their parish church of Strensham. Although the head of the family was Protestant, he did not necessarily control nominations. John Russell made the appointment in 1578, but had not done so on the two previous occasions. 101 Meanwhile, the Sheldons retained the right to present to the church at Beoley, although in the early seventeenth century, at least, others acted as patrons. 102 In fact, where families remained active benefactors, they may not always have been influenced by obvious ideological imperatives. Before 1567, Sir William Liggons appointed a minister to Madresfield who had been deprived under Mary I for his marriage; and the next incumbent was notable for being an ex-monastic. 103

Like Yorkshire, Worcestershire came under the remit of a regional Council, which acted as the direct arm of central government. The Council of the Welsh Marches had ecclesiastical as well as temporal jurisdiction, and, thanks to Whitgift, provision was made for a commission dedicated to recusant matters. 104 Catholics in the West Midlands and Welsh borders were thus living under a supplementary governmental body, something akin to the ecclesiastical commission in the North. Around the time of the first Jesuit mission in 1580, greater attention was paid to Catholics, or at least those suspected of ‘political’ activity. Ralph Sheldon, Thomas Throckmorton and John Talbot of Grafton were called before the Privy Council: the result was Sheldon’s imprisonment in Marshalsea. 105 All three men had relatives abroad in 1580. 106 Others also came under scrutiny, particularly the Liggons brothers: Hugh was pressed to contribute to the furnishing of light horsemen, whilst Thomas’ home in Gloucester was searched for


103 Williams, Lygons, p. 8.


106 Sheldon is listed under the gentry of Worcester; a Throckmorton is listed under the students in Paris in 1580; a Talbot was probably in Rome in April 1580. TNA, SP 78/4a/63; TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece 1, Thomas Croft to George Middlemore, Poissy, 3 October 1580; TNA, SP 12/137/49, John Middlemore to his son William at Paris, April 1580.
evidence of priest harbouring. The fact that these families had relatives abroad at the time may not necessarily be coincidental. The series of searches ordered on gentry households in 1581 suggests the authorities had cracked a support network. Government activity here was apparently part of a wider attempt to pressurise Catholic gentry. More specifically, in the summer of 1580 attention was turned to those who had some associations with the Jesuit mission. Importantly however, the connections of these families with the continent are not dependent on the mission itself. Families in England supported the mission, but the presence of their relatives in Paris rather than Reims in April 1580 implies that lay movements on the continent were not directly contingent on the mission party.

Those with relatives abroad were not necessarily known as non-conformists, or sidelined from local society. Thanks to Whitgift, efforts against suspect office holders in Worcestershire were probably more concerted, but there was still a degree of ambiguity in such initiatives. The Catholicism of Thomas Folliott's younger brothers was known by 1574, but he continued to serve as a JP, and did not adopt a recusant stance until 1592. Richard Liggons presided over a family with a range of political and religious stances. One brother, Ferdinand, had tried to place Elizabeth on the throne in place of Mary I; Hugh was a recusant from at least 1580; Thomas was suspected of priest harbouring. A fourth brother, Ralph, a servant to the Duke of Norfolk, had departed for the continent, and entered Mary Stuart's service, promoting an enterprise
from abroad. Richard, however, conformed, and despite his brothers' activities, attracted little suspicion about his own religious persuasions. In 1574, when the government was trying to have his fugitive brother expelled from the Low Countries, he was High Sheriff of Worcester. Richard served on the shrievalty again in 1585, whilst Ralph was working to secure Parma's commitment to an enterprise against England.

In most parts of the country, the Sheriff was a role of decreasing influence in local society. Interestingly, whilst Liggins served as sheriff there is no sign that he obtained a place on the bench, which would have offered him a greater influence. He seemed to have toed the line of least resistance, perhaps as part of an overall strategy to safeguard the family fortune and future. Whether Richard actually approved of his brother Ralph's activities is unclear. His strategy was something akin to the politique approach of his superior, William Somerset, third Earl of Worcester. Somerset's brother was imprisoned for recusancy, and his sister, the Countess of Northumberland exiled after her part in the 1569 revolt. He was suspected of supporting plans for the Mary Stuart-Norfolk marriage, but strove to establish a reputation for loyalism and religious conformity. When sent on an embassy to Paris in 1572, he refused to see his exiled sister as a mark of his loyalty to Elizabeth. He also attended the trial of Norfolk, and was a commissioner for the trial of Mary Stuart.

Such a position perhaps combined a desire to conform and to ensure the security of the next generation. Within the Liggins family, Richard's son and heir reaped the benefits of his father's strategy, obtaining positions that surpassed those of his father. William Liggins was JP and Sheriff of Worcester in the 1590s, an MP by 1603, and a knight by 1604. The family fortune was significantly reduced in his lifetime, but this was unrelated to suspicions over his Catholicism. Rather

112 Williams, Lygons, pp. 8-9; Madresfield Muniments, p. 25; TNA, SP 53/14/90, Liggins to Mary Queen of Scots, 2 September 1584; CRS, 21, p. 281. Liggins was not very successful here, apparently because he lacked the right court contacts in the Low Countries and influence over Parma. For instance, William K. Boyd (ed.), Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603, volume VII, 1584-1585 (Edinburgh, 1913), no. 303, p. 325, [Robert] Persons to Mary Queen of Scots, 10 September 1584.


than incurring recusancy debts, William followed principles of conspicuous consumption, and spent large sums, some of which went to rebuilding the family seat.116

In Worcestershire, then, there was still a role in government for those whose religious beliefs left something to be desired. In the eyes of central government, Ralph Sheldon’s wealth and influence made him worth negotiating with, despite his contacts with and track record of Catholic activity. Ralph was imprisoned prior to 1580 for non-conformity. His apparent conformity in 1581 was followed by prosecution for hearing Mass in his house, and a further string of recusant fines. Nevertheless, he was not deprived of his seat on the Worcestershire bench until around 1587: the authorities were apparently reluctant to deny him this.117

In the course of the 1580s, Catholic ‘misdemeanours’ in England increasingly acquired a political resonance. In such circumstances having friends in high places was essential for survival. The fact that Sheldon kept his wealth and survived unscathed from associations with plots against the Queen was due partly to Elizabeth’s personal view of him.118 Elsewhere, friends at court proved valuable allies when Catholics attracted Crown reprobation. In 1586, royal physicians William Gilbert and Lancelot Browne defended Mr Hungate’s absence, claiming his time on the continent was due solely to ill health. All three men were alumni of the Puritan St John’s College, Cambridge, although the Hungate abroad could well have been a Catholic relative. Certainly, the social and institutional ties of relatives could go some way towards mitigating government actions.119

116 Williams, Lygons, p. 10.
117 CRS, 22, p. 99.
118 Through kinship links, Ralph became the financial backbone of an invasion attempt in the 1590s. TNA, SP 12/249/64, Declaration of Henry Young, 12 August 1594; TNA, SP 12/249/70, Second examination of Richard Williams, 12 August 1594; TNA, SP 12/249/72, The examination of Richard Williams, 13 August 1594; TNA, SP 12/250/1, Articles of examination of Ralph Sheldon; TNA, SP 12/250/2, Interrogatories of Ralph Sheldon, 6 September 1594; Hotson, I William, pp. 138-51.
The West Midlands lacked the great Catholic magnates of the north but there were other strategies for support or protection amongst the gentry. The burgeoning Catholic networks were not dependent on an individual magnate, although they may have looked to one to forward particular interests. Ties to the nobility could certainly be strengthened or called on when necessary. Some Worcestershire gentry turned to the household of Lord Berkeley in neighbouring Gloucestershire, who also had relatives in Paris in 1580.120 William Liggons, son and heir to Thomas, spent his formative years as servant and scholar in the household of Sir Thomas Berkeley, the eldest son of Lord Henry Berkeley.121 The Berkeleys were kin to the Arundels, and thus a possible route through which certain Worcestershire families obtained positions with the Duke of Norfolk. For instance, Ralph Liggons and Laurence Banister of Shropshire were linked to Norfolk's household; both were wanted men for their part in the Ridolfi Plot. Liggons escaped arrest and interrogation, and appeared in Paris in 1580, at the same time as Bannister or one of his relatives.122 The indications are that involvement in Catholic conspiracy in England, and previous ties of 'loyalty' to the same master, could serve as a bond for those men once in exile, just as rebel credentials may have done for their northern counterparts abroad.123

Gentry contacts reaching beyond the West Midlands and across the Channel already existed by 1580. Educational, business, and social connections opened a wider world to the gentry, although these may have been less extensive in Worcestershire than

---

120 TNA, SP 78/4a/63.

121 John Smyth, The Berkeley Manuscripts: The Lives of the Berkeleys, lords of the honour, castle and manor of Berkeley in the county of Gloucester from 1066 to 1618, ed. John Maclean (3 vols, Gloucester, 1883), vol. 2, pp. 394-95, 399. William Liggons was about 20 when he entered the household in 1584. He may also have served the family by endeavouring to bring Sir Thomas Berkeley back from his lengthy Continental sojourn in the early seventeenth century.

122 'Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury Preserved at Hatfield House', HMC, 9, part 1 (London, 1883), no. 1607, pp. 524-25, Interrogatories and Answer of Robert Highford, 16 and 17 September 1571; no. 1610, p. 525, Interrogatories and Answers of Lawrence Banister, 17 September 1571; no. 1659, p. 536, Interrogatories and Answers of Lawrence Banister, 13 October 1571. Norfolk commended Bannister in his final letter to his son. In 1583 Bannister became steward of the Arundel lands in Shropshire. CRS, 21, p. 6. A Banester was listed in Paris in 1580. TNA, SP 78/4a/63. Bannister was from a Shropshire gentry family, some of whom later emerge as 'Arch Papists'.

123 They may have associated with other former servants of Norfolk: the Barkers, listed as students in Paris in 1580, were possibly relatives of Norfolk's servant William Barker, who had been in Europe prior to 1580. TNA, SP 78/4a/63.
elsewhere in England.¹²⁴ Exposure to this wider world informed their decision to go abroad, and their subsequent experience there. Ralph Sheldon for instance, spent time in London for business as well as pleasure, and the family tapestry business, which was heavily influenced by continental designs, maintained connections with Catholic Europe.¹²⁵ Links with a national and international community were always possible in an educational sphere. Although officially impossible to graduate without taking an oath of allegiance, no consistent campaign was launched to exclude suspected Catholics from the universities. Oxford especially continued to harbour those whose religious persuasions were undesirable to the authorities. In 1577, two sons of the Catholic lawyer Edmund Plowden were listed as recusant members of the reputedly Catholic Exeter College. They must have been familiar with the case of alumnus Thomas Hole, another Catholic, who had left for Paris by this point.¹²⁶ Meanwhile, Henry Russell of Little Malvern spent most of his life as an Oxford academic, building contacts with Catholic and Protestant peers, obtaining appointments and lands in the surrounding area, and extending family influence. As principal of Gloucester Hall, he was ideally placed to cultivate relations with other Catholic gentry.¹²⁷ Time spent at this college probably informed later relations on the continent. For instance, William Bishop, a member of Gloucester Hall, went on to become an important Catholic polemicist. Much of Bishop's work was published in Paris: he may well have been there at the same time as Russell, other Gloucester Hall alumni, or his kinsmen.¹²⁸


Given the significance of this Catholic foothold for West Midlands gentry, other educational forums such as the Inns of Court were perhaps not so important. The links between the Worcestershire group and others in the English legal sphere do not seem extensive, but contacts here may have attained greater significance once individuals or their relatives were abroad. During his time at the Inner Temple, for instance, Francis Folliott studied alongside Robert Atkinson, an Oxfordshire man and ‘discontinuer’. Their acquaintance was replicated in their relatives’ subsequent residence in Paris. 129

Edmund Plowden provides one of the clearest demonstrations of the flexible connections between Catholics and the legal sphere. Plowden, one of the most prominent lawyers in England, was a known Catholic and member of Middle Temple, which had seen members depart for the continent by 1577. At least one of his sons and a nephew were in Paris in 1580. 130 Membership of an Inn could advance mutual support for Catholics, without necessarily precluding them from legal practice. Within the precincts of Middle Temple, men such as Plowden, Francis Englefield junior, Thomas Paget, and Thomas Bowyer could socialise and debate. Such men and members of other inns had relatives in Paris in 1580. 131 These men were not near neighbours, or even equals in England, but they shared the common situation of having relatives abroad by 1580. Members who continued to participate in the legal system in various ways were also given the chance to make contact with exile families from other parts of the country.

Despite these suggestions of connections to the continent via professional institutions at home, there are few signs that the Worcestershire group had obvious links to fellow laity in Catholic Europe preceding 1580. Their deprived Bishop Bates, an exile in the early years of Elizabeth’s reign, may have set some kind of precedent for his gentry flock, and the West Country in general was receiving and harbouring missionary


131 Parmiter, ‘Inns’, p. 46. John Lancaster, a practicing lawyer, also appears to have a relative in Paris.
priests by 1577. However, the authorities apparently did not view Worcestershire as harbouring particularly dangerous continental links. This may have been due to the landlocked nature of Worcestershire, providing fewer natural links to the continent than a southern or coastal county, or to the lack of immediate connections to 'fugitives' already resident in Europe. Comparative to the northern families, the Worcestershire group had fewer kinship links to laymen who had been, were, or would later be living in Catholic Europe. Continental links were revealed in sources drawn up by a hostile government, particularly interested in northern Catholics abroad because of their significant rebel element. As attainted rebels, they were an obvious seedbed for Catholic invasion plans, and an easier source of income for the government. Anti-Catholic measures in the West Midlands may seem fairly lenient before 1580, although this impression could be due to lack of surviving evidence. Interestingly, only those West Midland gentry who were obvious activists seem to have been observed. Hence the authorities' interest in Ralph Liggons, who was abroad because of his intrigues relating to Mary Stuart. He was not, of course, the only West Midlands man to oppose the regime, but his activity made him particularly interesting. It seems that the exile group in the West Midlands had forged fewer direct continental links from their native environment prior to 1580. They appear to have needed London or the Universities to widen their existing networks to encompass a European element. This differentiated them from gentry in the north and the East, whose direct connections to the continent were more obvious. Contact in the Inns or Oxbridge may not have been so necessary to their coreligionists in East Anglia, for instance, who had precedents for interaction with Europe.

132 Bates was deprived and imprisoned soon after Elizabeth I's accession. On release, he went abroad, was present at the Council of Trent, and died in Louvain in 1565. George Miller, The Parishes of the Diocese of Worcester (2 vols, London, 1889), vol. 1, p. xlv. In contrast to the attitude of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in Worcestershire, the bishop of Sussex was particularly concerned to question his flock on their exile connections in 1577. Roger B. Manning, Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex: a study of the enforcement of the religious settlement 1558-1603 (Leicester, 1969), pp. 81, 86.

133 In their memorandum for the invasion of England, Allen and Englefield name 12 exiled gentry as key supporters: all but one were fugitives from the 1569 revolt. CRS, 58, p. 289, Memorial for the Invasion of England, [February 1576].

134 In a demand for his expulsion from the Low Countries in 1574, Liggons is listed with those who had carried arms or acted against the public good and tranquillity of the realm. Proost, 'Réfugiés', p. 284.

135 Walter Smythe of the Shropshire family at Acton Burnell took part in the 1569 revolt.
However, once the movement of lay exiles began, Worcestershire families apparently supported each other readily. A self-sustaining network sprung up to transmit correspondence across the Channel. John Middlemore’s son delivered correspondence to and from various West Country gentry in Europe, including the Giffords, Talbots, and Plowdens. Meanwhile, his brother George was a conveyancer on the other side of the Channel, with their cousin as a possible contact at the English College, Rome. In this operation, kinship links, and personal knowledge of the courier remained important. Middlemore was a cousin of the Giffords, and his wider family could claim marital ties to the Throckmortons of Coughton and Sheldons of Beoley. The use of kin as cross-Channel couriers engaged the West Country gentry with a wider Catholic world, although there is no evidence that this network was as extensive or as well organised as those of the north. Meanwhile, Ralph Liggons had been active in the continent for almost a decade by 1580. His experience was not representative of the West Midlands exile families as a whole, although it offered them a possible precedent. Ralph apparently retained contact with family members during his long sojourn abroad and was sufficiently close to bring a brother, probably Hugh, to Paris. He had messages relayed to Hugh, and sent his servant back to his elder brother in the same year.

Gentry Catholicism in the West Midlands may have been influenced by the relative proximity of the imprisoned Mary Stuart. Two members of the Folliatt family were seen as likely supporters of her cause in 1574, whilst a Gloucestershire family, the

136 TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece XI, Richard Gifford to Gilbert Gifford, Amiens, 12 October 1580; TNA, SP 12/137/49, John Middlemore to his son William at Paris, April 1580.

137 TNA, SP 12/146/137, The names of certain papists who be great friends and aiders of those beyond the Seas, 1580(?); TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece XI, Richard Gifford to Gilbert Gifford, Amiens, 12 October 1580. Thomas Crofte sent letters via his brother-in-law George Middlemore, who was based in Fleet Street. Robert Middlemore, son and heir of Thomas, ‘a man of great revenues’, was in the English College when the first Jesuit mission embarked for England. CRS, 53, p. 199.


139 TNA, SP 12/146/137, The names of certain papists who be great friends and aiders of those beyond the Seas, 1580(?).

140 TNA, SP 12/146/99, A Memorial for Mr Eely, 1580(?); TNA, SP 78/4a/31, Cobham [to the Secretaries] 12 March 1580; TNA, SP 78/4a/78, Cobham to Walsingham, Paris, 23 May 1580. Ralph sent his servant Alexander Hayford back to his elder brother in Worcestershire. Whether this was part of an attempt to raise support for a Marian plot is a matter for speculation.
Brays, were long-term servants and beneficiaries of her patronage abroad.\textsuperscript{141} Ralph Liggons had been employed abroad in her service from 1571. The links he maintained with home, and his return visit there in 1575, imply potential for a Marian party in Worcestershire by 1580. Nevertheless, Mary was problematic as a Catholic figurehead at this stage. If there was any consensus in support of her, it was in exile that it gained real strength.\textsuperscript{142}

3: ‘A wicked nest’, ‘... of late years grown in number’: Catholics in East Anglia.\textsuperscript{143}

Catholic gentry in East Anglia were operating in an atmosphere somewhat different to other parts of the country. On first inspection, Norfolk’s exiles do not hail from leading county families. This is partly because boundaries between Norfolk and Suffolk were somewhat blurred, on the list and in practice.\textsuperscript{144} In general, interaction between families in Norfolk and Suffolk was greater than that of other neighbouring counties in the kingdom. Most families had a landed presence in both counties, which was supported by a high incidence of marriage across county boundaries.\textsuperscript{145} The Kittsons and Caitlins, for instance, had bases in Suffolk and Norfolk, and both had trans-county kinship links.\textsuperscript{146} In some respects Norfolk’s exiles are more accurately seen as belonging to East Anglia. Only five Norfolk families were reported to have members in Paris in 1580. These, however, can be augmented by those who were of standing across East Anglia,

\textsuperscript{141} CRS, 13, p. 131. Francis and Thomas Folliatt were listed as Mary’s supporters in 1574, and referred to as ‘banished’. For the Bray family, above, p. 52, footnote 80.

\textsuperscript{142} He appears in a 1575 list of men in Gloucestershire who are ill disposed to Burghley. ‘Salisbury’, \textit{HMC}, 9, part 2, no. 229, p. 84, Thomas Geaves to Lord Burghley, 20 January 1574.


\textsuperscript{144} TNA, SP 78/4a/63. There is no separate listing of gentry from Suffolk. Of those classified as from Norfolk, the Kittsons were a Suffolk family; the Caitlins had land and influence in both counties; the Huddlestones probably originated in Cambridgeshire, whilst the Benningtons’ origins are obscure.

\textsuperscript{145} Diarmaid MacCulloch, \textit{Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500-1600} (Oxford, 1986), p. 9. When marrying outside the county, Suffolk gentry were far likelier to make matches in Norfolk than any other county.

and those listed as students with probable Norfolk backgrounds, including the Doyleys, Cornwallises and Lovells.\textsuperscript{147}

The East Anglian exiles were of varied wealth, status, and local influence. Whilst families such as the Beningtons seem to have lacked a pedigree, the Cornwallises could boast kinship ties to the nobility and friends in high places.\textsuperscript{148} The pedigree of the families' local credentials likewise varied. The Windhams had owned Felbrigg since the 1460s, whilst the Lovells' new seat of East Harling had only been constructed in the 1520s.\textsuperscript{149} Both were wealthy, well-established families. Meanwhile, the Caitlins were of lesser influence: they continued to straddle the counties without having a leading position in either.

As elsewhere, the redistribution of monastic property created new opportunities for ownership and influence in East Anglia. The Lovells, Windhams and Cornwallises made gains following the dissolution.\textsuperscript{150} As in Yorkshire, profiting from ex-ecclesiastical lands did not preclude attachment to a way of life that had passed, nor did it curtail conservative sentiment in the community.\textsuperscript{151} Interestingly, there was a degree of uneasiness amongst certain Catholics about gains made at the expense of the pre-Reformation Church. The Lovells and Cornwallises were amongst those who were to seek Papal dispensation for their ownership of ex-monastic lands.\textsuperscript{152}

\textsuperscript{147} Lovells of Harling, Doyleys of Shotesham and Cornwallises were probably the students of the same names in Paris in 1580. TNA, SP 78/4a/63.


\textsuperscript{151} MacCulloch discerns some nostalgia for the last days of Bury by the 1580s. Abbot Reve, the last head of the house, was on close terms with the Cornwallises. MacCulloch, Suffolk, pp. 137-38, 188.

\textsuperscript{152} CRS, 53, p. 230. This dispensation was apparently granted in 1579; others seeking it included Anthony Browne and Lord Paget. A government informer, however, claims that some Catholics were given this dispensation in 1569 by Dr Morton, who was sent by the Pope to mobilise the North of England. BL, Yelverton Ms, Addenda 48029, f. 135.
East Anglia was a prosperous and thriving commercial area; the gap between the gentry and their social inferiors here was not always particularly pronounced. There were opportunities for gentry investment in commerce and fledgling industry, even if they were not always eager to exploit them. As a group, the Norfolk ‘exile’ families did not derive a great deal of wealth from such manufacturing or mercantile activities. Standing and influence still came through land and office holding, although the legal sphere, as we shall see, was also much frequented by gentry from this region.

The East Anglian exiles again demonstrate the perennial importance of marriage for family advancement or consolidation. On the whole, intra-marriage amongst exile families was not as marked as elsewhere, but certain matches were of particular import. Thomas Kittson’s marriage to Elizabeth Cornwallis reinforced his relations with his father-in-law Sir Thomas, and presumably promoted the Catholic grouping across both counties. Such kinship ties were to prove important when individuals found themselves in difficult circumstances. The listing of the Huddlestones, a Cambridge family, as gentry from Norfolk is a case in point. The recusant Lady Bridget Huddlestone resided with her Lovell in-laws at East Harling from the time of her widowhood in 1557. Due to her poverty, she was ‘living off the entertainement’ of her daughter’s mother-in-law, Lady Lovell. Lady Huddlestone's Catholicism may have made her presence at Harling more acceptable to her hosts, who were also determined recusants. Her presence also allowed them to demonstrate attachment to older models of hospitality, which were themselves associated with Catholic theology. Taking in kin who had fallen on hard times was one way in which non-conformist families of a higher social position could continue to assert a local influence. As we shall see, the practice of generosity towards kin and coreligionists provided a context for new relations in an exile environment. Obligations felt in a native environment were not lost in the dislocation of exile: rather, in a modified form, they attained a new import.

---

154 The Cornwallis base was in Suffolk prior to 1570. The purchase of ex-monastic land, then a house, signalled a shift in focus to Norwich and Norfolk. Smith, County, p. 215.
155 CRS, 22, p. 97. Lady Bridget’s daughter Mary married Thomas Lovell of East Harling.
156 Lady Lovell was listed as a non-attender and consorster with other Catholics in the same list. CRS, 22, p. 79.
157 Heal, Hospitality, pp. 171-73.
Some of East Anglia’s exile families were part of a wider, loosely connected group, which was later to include recusants, missionaries and martyrs. Importantly, such families were rarely exclusively Catholic. Key members of the exile group were closely related to integral members of the establishment, and Catholics in East Anglia were not totally friendless at the centre. Kinship links could help sustain the uneasy balance between living as part of the county community and refusing to recognise the legitimacy of the Elizabethan Church. Francis Windham, for instance, was brother-in-law, business associate, and close friend to Nathaniel Bacon, the leader of the emergent Puritan grouping in Norfolk. As well as providing legal and financial aid, Francis played host to Nathaniel and his sister for several years whilst their Stiffkey mansion was under construction. Meanwhile, Francis’ brother Edmund was disqualified from legal practice for his Catholicism in 1571, and later imprisoned for his faith. Francis’ own attachment to Puritan ideas was genuine, but his position nevertheless proved beneficial to his Catholic brother: intervention by Francis’ Bacon in-laws may well have softened measures against him.

Until 1571, East Anglia had a major magnate to act as a leader and representative at the centre. Hence, county politics in Norfolk were deeply destabilized by the sudden removal of the Duke of Norfolk and his execution in 1572. The extent of his power as a great feudal overlord is debatable, but his absence did leave a serious power vacuum. There was no likely contender for his replacement as the ultimate mediator between county and court. The gentry were thus forced to forge new ways to

---

158 Augustus Jessopp, *One Generation of a Norfolk House: A Contribution to Elizabethan History* (Norwich, 1878), pp. 181-87. The Southwells and Cornwallises were linked to the Walpoles, who produced four Jesuits from six sons.


162 Interestingly, Edmund was Francis’ natural brother; he perhaps had greater freedom than a legitimate son to pursue ideological imperatives.
keep in contact with and seek favour from the centre. The lack of such a mediator contributed to the particularly bitter rivalries between Norfolk gentry groupings after 1572.

The religious milieu of the region was markedly different to the west and north of the country. The politico-religious situation in Norfolk polarised fairly quickly, thanks to the duke's downfall and indigenous religious developments. Reformed ideas were implanted at an early date in East Anglia among certain sectors of the population. By Elizabeth's reign, this was manifested in the existence of radical non-conformist groupings such as the Family of Love, but also by a strong Puritan element. A homegrown Puritan faction developed around the Bacon brothers, so that in East Anglia godly magistrates did not have to be imported by central government. However, the tensions of an alliance between the authorities and the godly gentry soon became apparent. The ecclesiastical hierarchy found itself challenged on two fronts: by the recalcitrance of a persistent and deliberately Catholic segment of local gentry, and by the demands of an active Puritan group. As for the Catholic gentry in Norfolk, who found themselves in a more aggressively Protestant environment, their daily lives were perhaps more problematic than elsewhere in the kingdom.

The strength of recusancy in South-East Norfolk is often emphasised. This pattern is possibly explained by dispersed settlement patterns, encouraging a tradition of self-provision; by poor livings failing to attract dedicated Protestant ministers; or by the stronger godly presence further north. Certainly, a gentry recusant 'community' is discernable by 1570. This group was maintained despite godly opposition, partly because of the absence of a dedicated regional council with jurisdiction over such matters. In the light of this absence, the central authorities turned to other methods of policing, as demonstrated in the last-minute change of itinerary for the 1578 royal progress in the east. The physical presence of the Queen reinforced the message that non-conformity was unwise and disadvantageous. In the course of the progress, twenty-three suspect gentry were made examples of, whilst those of ambiguous religious reputation, such as Thomas Kittson, who conformed and lavishly entertained the Queen,

163 Smith, County, p. 46; MacCulloch, Suffolk, pp. 217-19. MacCulloch argues that the disappearance of Howard influence in Suffolk had the opposite effect, bringing the county leaders to a consensus about county government.

were rewarded with knighthoods.165 Such measures presumably were an ad-hoc substitute for the kind of permanent central government body that dealt with such matters in the north and west.166

As in other parts of the country, there is no necessary relationship between families who were recusant as early as 1580 and those with relatives abroad.167 Certainly the listed families, with bases spread across the region, were not concentrated in the recusant stronghold of the Southeast.168 Nevertheless, in an area where confessional divides were perhaps more pronounced than elsewhere, it is unsurprising to find some exile families as recusants. Two generations of the Lovells were indicted for nonconformity in 1577, and various members were continually noted or prosecuted for recusancy.169 Their residences became established mass centres, and were probably used by members of the extended kin circle who likewise appear as recusants.170 The Lovells were bound to other recusants by close kinship ties.171 Thomas Lovell's relative was listed as a student in Paris in 1580; he probably influenced their Huddlestone kinsman who also turned up there.172 At the same time, families were also linked to coreligionists who adopted less overt stances. Thomas Kittson had a family member abroad, but despite his known Catholicism his immediate family had not been indicted by this stage. The Caitlin family had recusant relations, but were not themselves noted as recusant before 1580.173

166 Influential Catholics were targeted to play host to Elizabeth, to send a message of conformity and obedience to the wider community. MacCulloch, Suffolk, p. 196.
167 There are no signs of the Benningtons being recusant, or suspected of Catholicism up to 1592, yet they appeared in Paris in 1580. TNA, SP 78/4a/63.
168 Windham lands were located in North Norfolk, and several of the families had significant residences in Norwich.
169 CRS, 22, p. 56.
171 Lady Lovell kept company with Ferdinando Paris, probably a Cambridgeshire relative through her father's family. Her daughter Alice married Sir John Huddleston, reinforcing the link created through her son Thomas' marriage to Bridget Huddleston. CRS, 22, pp. 79, 56.
172 CRS, 53, p. 204. A Lovell was staying in Bayon College, having travelled to Paris from Rome.
173 Richard Caitlin's daughter Lettice married William Guybon, who was listed as recusant in 1577. Richard's widow went on to marry a Southwell. CRS, 13, p. 94.
At roughly the same point, the north and the east of England experienced the fall of regional leaders, those who traditionally determined the balance of local power and acted as influential intermediaries at court. The consequences in Norfolk and Suffolk, however, were distinct. MacCulloch argues that by the mid-1580s the Suffolk godly had emerged as unchallenged leaders of county society, although Smith sees ruling society in Norfolk as rent by bitter divisions into the 1590s. In neither was the Catholic or conservative grouping triumphant. Nonetheless, despite increasing pressure from central government and local adversaries, they had not renounced the struggle for influence by 1580. Catholic, Protestant, conservative and Puritan power blocks were not hermetically sealed; members of opposing blocks were tied to each other by complex, if seemingly contradictory, bonds. Moreover, in early 1580, the Puritan grouping was on shakier ground. Bishop Parkhurst's work to establish godly government was being reversed by Bishop Freke's controversial alliance with religious conservatives.

Catholic gentry, including members of the exile families, retained something of their accustomed position as ecclesiastical patrons in Norfolk, although they were highly contested. This tension, partly due to growing Puritan strength, was exacerbated by contrasting policies of successive bishops. Bishop Parkhurst, for instance, opposed Kittson's promotion of Thomas Atkinson to the parish of Forneham All Saints, pronouncing Atkinson "...an earnest papiste in the hole countrey". This challenge was unsuccessful, and under Freke Kittson appointed Atkinson to a second benefice, which he enjoyed until the 1590s. Puritans likewise complained that Sir Thomas Cornwallis appointed "papish idiots, non-residentes or unlemed instrumentes" to his livings. As long they retained the right to make appointments, gentry in certain parts of East Anglia could reach a compromise between the demands of central government and the exhortations of the Catholic leadership on the continent. For instance, Cornwallis' rector

---


176 MacCulloch, Suffolk, p. 194. He continued to use the medieval form of address for a priest, 'Sir Thomas'.

at Stutson was employed as a Protestant minister, but also celebrated mass in Cornwallis' 'parlour chamber'.

The Crown could ensure that men in favour in the previous regime were sidelined from central influence, but control over local government office was more problematic. Many gentry, including Catholics, held office in both Norfolk and Suffolk. Whilst the centre officially deprived Catholic office-holders, or at least brought them to submission, for the first decades of Elizabeth's reign the Howard clientèle perpetuated conservatism at most levels of county administration. Ducal interference in returns of 'suspicious' JPs ensured that reports were evasive or deliberately misleading, omitting known Catholic clients. The duke was responsible for Kittson's appointment as JP in 1564, which he may later have used to promote his own kinsmen. Purges of Catholic officeholders rarely had a lasting impact before the Duke's downfall. Subsequent to his death, however, competition for office escalated. JPs began to challenge the rights of fellow magistrates to hold office, and religious outlook was often a contributory factor in these wrangles.

In these circumstances, family strategies were complex and varied. For this, the Cornwallises provide an interesting, if not necessarily representative case. Sir Thomas, sidelined from central influence and the Suffolk bench, nevertheless expanded his influence into Norfolk, and for a while wielded influence over Bishop Freke. Whilst his offspring adopted a range of different paths, he was held in some reservation and prosecuted for Catholicism, but was keen to maintain amicable relations with the government. Like Ralph Sheldon, he had contacts to call on should occasion demand. Recusant kin would also seek his intercession when faced with prosecution. Interestingly, Cornwallis' son-in-law Thomas Kittson was also suspected, but he was more eager to outwardly conform, and he never faced.

178 McGrath and Rowe, 'Cornwallis', p. 241. He did this as late as 1583.
179 MacCulloch, Suffolk, p. 86; Smith, County, pp. 33-34.
182 TNA, SP 12/143/10, Sir Thomas Cornwallis to Cecil, 21 June 1570.
183 Houlbrooke (ed.), 'Parkhurst', p. 121.
prosecution. The two were nevertheless very close: Cornwallis advised him in his quarrels with other JPs; they were travelling companions; stayed at each others’ houses; and when the terms of Cornwallis’ imprisonment were relaxed, he was confined to Kittson’s house in 1588.

An East Anglian exile family could house a range of religious and political outlooks. Thomas Lovell for instance, was never actually prosecuted for recusancy. He relied on friends at court to make assurances of his conformity, and even provided the government with information about mass going in Norfolk. Thomas retained a place on the bench, although not without a considerable struggle, given his feud with his Puritan rivals, the Gawdys. Other family members were involved in more controversial activities. His mother was a leading member of the recusant community, attending mass, aiding seminary priests, taking in poorer relatives, and arranging Catholic rites of passage for kin. His brothers were also determined recusants, and one was lodging in a Paris College in 1580. Like gentry elsewhere in the country, Thomas’ approach was probably part of a strategy to safeguard family wealth and position whilst allowing relatives to take up more explicitly Catholic stances.

---

184 Both were arrested in the wake of Norfolk’s downfall. Kitson made a declaration of obedience soon after. It took several months in the company of Protestant clerics before Cornwallis reluctantly followed suit. McGrath and Rowe, ‘Cornwallis’, p. 263.


188 The Gawdys were probably involved in his dismissal from the bench in 1601; they took delight in it. This was a feud over local influence, in which religion was a contributory factor. Victor Morgan, Jane Key, Barry Taylor (eds.), ‘The Papers of Nathaniel Bacon of Stiffkey, Volume 4, 1596-1602’, NRS, LXIV (2000), p. 138.

189 Her daughter Catherine’s marriage to William Baxter was apparently concluded according to Catholic rite. Lady Lovell was also responsible for a Catholic baptism of her grandchild in the late 1580s. Smith and Baker (eds.), ‘Stiffkey’, vol. 2, pp. 271-72; A. Hassell Smith and Gillian M. Baker (eds.), ‘The Papers of Nathaniel Bacon of Stiffkey, Volume 3, 1586-1595’, NRS, LIII (1987 and 1988), p. 147.

190 CRS, 53, p. 204. A Lovell, having travelled from Rome to Paris, was staying in Bayon [possibly Bayeux?] College.
Unlike the West Country, the religious changes of Elizabeth’s reign did not pass without protest in the East, although the stand taken here was even more unsuccessful than that of the north. In fact, the risings in Norfolk were not solely inspired by religious grievances. The eclipse of the Howards was the background for a series of unsuccessful risings in the later 1560s and early 1570s. A group of Norfolk’s officers at Kenninghall declared their support for the Northern Earls, perhaps looking to the Howard-Neville connection; this was an unsuccessful pre-emption of the Northern rising.\textsuperscript{191} The disgraced Duke’s later flight from court to Kenninghall, however, was less a chance for rearguard Catholic action than a crisis point for the East Anglian community.\textsuperscript{192} Cornwallis, Kittson and Hare were hauled before the Privy Council, and pressed to declare allegiance to the Queen and her Church.\textsuperscript{193} They were not guilty of an armed rebellion comparable to the northern fugitives, and did not suffer attainder or confiscation of land. Nevertheless, the Duke may have inspired some partisans to act: a rising in 1570, ostensibly to expel Low Countries refugees from Norwich, was perhaps a cover for effecting the Duke’s liberation and restoration.\textsuperscript{194} Whether or not this was the case, the conservative group in East Anglia perhaps had some common ground with northern rebels: their plans immediately incurred suspicions about their loyalty.

These uprisings did not have a decisive impact, or feed a Catholic identity comparable to that of the Northern Revolt. None of the East Anglian exiles appear to have been direct participants, and in any case, the anti-government sentiment their stand expressed was not specifically Catholic. In contrast to the North, participants did not resort to Catholic Europe for practical backing or moral justification, and conspirators did not flee abroad. The only signs of foreign influence were the efforts to track down a Frenchman for his involvement. His role was probably due to connections to the cause.


\textsuperscript{192} MacCulloch, \textit{Suffolk}, p. 96. Those flocking to the Duke after his flight were not exclusively Catholic: they included Nathaniel Bacon.

\textsuperscript{193} MacCulloch, \textit{Suffolk}, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{194} The declared aim was to expel Flemish immigrant artisans from Norwich. Insurgents related to Amy Robsart also targeted the Earl of Leicester. Williams, ‘Risings’, pp. 72, 77; \textit{VCH, Norfolk}, vol. 2, p. 268 says hatred of the refugees was the real motivating factor. MacCulloch says that the pronounced hostility to the refugees was a cover for a pro-Howard challenge to the Protestant succession. MacCulloch, \textit{Suffolk}, p. 313.
of Mary Stuart: he turned to her agent, the Bishop of Ross, for assistance in getting out of England.\textsuperscript{195}

There is little indication of an active Marian party in Norfolk prior to 1580, although a few individuals from future exile families were listed as potential supporters should her claim to the throne be advanced.\textsuperscript{196} William Cornwallis' activity as a Marian courier was perhaps a result of time spent on the continent, but did not predate 1580 and may not have come from experience within the region.\textsuperscript{197} Mary Stuart was associated with the conservative hopes of the late 1560s and those who had risen in the Duke's name. Perhaps her close association with the Duke's death acted as a cautionary brake on potential activity in her favour. She was a general figurehead for English Catholics, and future monarch of England, but her cause did not seem to inspire personally the East Anglian exile group in their native environment.

MacCulloch discerns a distinct East Anglian identity in the sixteenth century, which informed attitudes towards contemporaries from outside the region. This, however, need not distract from the region's links outwards. Contact with the wider kingdom and with the continent was a constituent part of the East Anglian gentry experience, although the form it took was informed by a specific regional framework. As elsewhere, the precedents linking gentry to educational institutions in London apparently acted as a springboard to time on the continent. In an area famed for the litigious nature of its inhabitants, Norfolk gentry often sought some legal training, and were particularly well represented in Lincoln's Inn. Members of the Huddleston, Caitlin, Windham, Doyley and Lovell families were affiliated to the Inn at different points in Elizabeth's reign.\textsuperscript{198} For an exile such as Edmund Windham, time at the Inn

\textsuperscript{195} Williams, 'Risings', p. 78; 'Salisbury', \textit{HMC}, 9, part 1, no. 1697, p. 557, Interrogatories and Answers of the Bishop of Ross, 31 October 1571.

\textsuperscript{196} Christopher Lovell of Harling, possibly a son of Lady Lovell, and a Doyley of Shotesham were listed as potential supporters in 1574. \textit{CRS}, 13, p. 95.


\textsuperscript{198} \textit{The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn: Admissions from A.D. 1420 to A.D. 1893} (London, 1896), pp. 66-70, 72, 74, 76-77, 80. Dr Edmund Windham was deprived of the right to practice on grounds of religious non-conformity.
could facilitate associations with members from elsewhere in England who had left for Europe, such as Thomas Copley, who departed England in 1570, or Godfrey Fuljambe of Derbyshire who was with him in Paris in 1580.\textsuperscript{199} Fellowship provided through the Inns could also open up possible routes for cross-Channel correspondence: in 1580, Raphe Downes of Lincoln’s Inn was delivering letters from exiles to imprisoned Catholics in Norwich.\textsuperscript{200} To complement their presence at the Inns, East Anglian families had also created something of a Catholic enclave in Spitalfields by the 1580s. This served as a space for the exchange of Catholic texts and the celebration of Catholic services.\textsuperscript{201}

Some of the Norfolk exile families show particular connections to a wider Catholic network within England, one whose shared interests included marriage, sociability and even music, rather than political intent. The Cornwallises and Kittsons were part of broad circle of aristocratic and gentle Catholic acquaintances stretching across the kingdom. The common link for most of them was a close connection to Thomas Lord Paget, and their recourse to his hospitality in the 1570s and early 1580s. Kittson had a direct link to Paget, as his first wife had been Paget’s sister. If Cornwallis and Kittson can be seen as leading figures within the Catholic gentry community of East Anglia, their link to the Pagets also facilitated links with counterparts in the west. Ralph Sheldon, for instance, was a frequent guest at the Pagets in Staffordshire.\textsuperscript{202} Through their aristocratic friends, there is evidence to suggest that some families from the east and west of the kingdom were acquainted prior to their time in Paris, and in fact may have been socialising in England whilst their relatives were abroad. So exile families from the east and the west were not exclusive communities, but part of a wider network with shared protectors and intercessors at court.

With its high levels of commercial activity and extensive sea trade, parts of East Anglia were likely to have established links with Europe. Norfolk’s coastline had long brought exposure to the Continent; in this period, this could also be shaped by

\textsuperscript{199} Copley was excluded for his absence in Catholic Europe in 1581; his son also suffered for this. The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln’s Inn: The Black Books, Volume I from A.D. 1422 to A.D. 1586 (London, 1897), p. 424.

\textsuperscript{200} Strype, Annals, vol. 2, part 2, pp. 342-44.


\textsuperscript{202} For more on this circle, Crankshaw, ‘New Evidence’, pp. 19-23.
ideological conflict on both sides of the sea. Whether this necessarily made Norfolk more disposed to Protestant ideas from the continent is debatable, but the high proportion of Marian exiles emanating from East Anglia implies a significant potential for interaction. Meanwhile, for the Catholic world the Norfolk coastline was targeted for Catholic enterprises and for the landing of missionaries. As in the North Riding of Yorkshire, the coastline and its associated links to Catholic Europe rendered the region more suspicious in the eyes of the government. In contrast, Worcestershire did not incur comparable government suspicion, but neither did it benefit from these more immediate links with the continent.

Norfolk had in fact played host to its own exile community. With ducal and governmental backing, Flemish Calvinists fleeing Spanish persecution were implanted in Norwich by the early 1570s. These strangers were of a different social background to the future Catholic exiles, and had a distinct impact as skilled textile workers. Numbering over 4,000 in 1583, they were a sizeable part of the city’s population: gentry families with contacts to, or living close to Norwich must have been aware of their presence. The refugee presence had two possible effects on their hosts. The strangers perhaps served as proof of Catholic cruelty, thus inducing hostility towards English Catholics in the region, who could be seen as allies of their Spanish persecutors. Certainly, the accounts of Catholic cruelty the strangers brought, and their example of Calvinist ecclesiastical governance, had a dramatic impact in Kent. On a more general level, the foreign Calvinists offered an example of exile integration into a foreign environment, and exposed some of its attendant risks and possibilities. This was perhaps something on which Catholic gentry could also draw.

203 Smith, County, p. 9; Raingard Essar, ‘The Early Strangers in Norfolk’, (2005), http://virtualnorfolk.uea.ac.uk/strangers/early strangers (11 December 2005); Williams, ‘Risings’, p. 73. Counted at 4, 678 in 1583, the strangers were one third of Norwich’s total population, and were made scapegoats for the depression in the local cloth trade. Several exile families had links to Norwich. The Cornwallis presence in Norwich was increasing from 1570; Windhams were often resident; Caitlins had property to the south and west of the city. MacCulloch, Suffolk, p. 185; Smith, Baker, Kenny (eds.), ‘Stiffkey’, vol. 1, p. xv; Armstrong, Norfolk, vol. 2, p. 56.

204 The presence of English Catholics in Paris was used by French radicals to encourage hostility against Huguenots, Henri III and the future Henri IV. Below, Chapter Two, pp. 101, 110; Chapter Three, pp. 175, 184-89.

There were pre-established links between Catholics in East Anglia and continental exile centres before 1580, although these appear less extensive than in the north. Kinship again underwrote lay links with the continent. Sir Thomas Cornwallis boasted of his former secretary's departure for the continent and entrance into a religious house in Brussels. A member of the Rous family, suspended from the Suffolk bench soon after Elizabeth's succession, sent money to Louvain and by 1570 was apparently funding his brother's stay in Rome. Such an existence was sustained or inspired by other relatives, and could in turn serve to sustain or inspire them. Rous' kinsmen Anthony Goldingham fled to the continent for matters of conscience soon after 1562. Elsewhere, Norfolk gentry had attended European universities in the Marian period, perhaps setting an example for others. Edmund Windham had links with the University of Padua, which welcomed a considerable number of Englishmen in the sixteenth century. He also spent time in the Low Countries in the early 1570s, where he may well have moved in rebel circles.

A lack of information about the movement of men, money, and information between East Anglia and Europe could be due to the survival of intelligence rather than a lack of such activity. Where there are signs of cross-Channel exchange, they were evidently inspired by a variety of motives. Father William Cornwallis was supported on the continent by his brother Sir Thomas. His annuity was increased as the years went by, although we do not know how this money reached him. Before leaving England, Thomas Copley entrusted his lands to his brother-in-law Humphrey White, and East Anglian Thomas Doyley. Doyley's presence in Paris in 1580 was thus probably connected to his role as courier for Copley's correspondence with Burghley. His

---

206 McGrath and Rowe, 'Cornwallis', p. 241.

207 MacCulloch, Suffolk, pp. 64, 85, 191. His brother had doctorates in canon and civil law. The family had been in service of the Duke of Norfolk.


209 TNA, SP 12/89/6, A note of divers suspect men and rebelles on thother sydeof the seas, 29 September 1572. Windham is listed as a 'greate papiste' in Bruges.

210 McGrath and Rowe, 'Cornwallis', p. 253.

211 Christie (ed.), Copley, pp. xxv, 65, 71, 83, 88, 188. Copley's brother-in-law White was possibly related to the Whites of Shotsesham, the in-laws of Doyly's brother Henry.
connections to the continent were thus established before 1580, when he attracted government attention.

Once abroad, East Anglian gentry kept in touch with kin and coreligionists at home and may have encouraged them to join them in exile, just as Marian exiles had done. In 1580, the imprisoned recusant Robert Downes received a letter from his kinsman Solomon Aldred, boasting of the great favour shown him by the Pope, and urging Robert to join him in France. Aldred and his family appear to be part of a wider network, which worked to have funds transferred to Europe on behalf of prospective exiles, and set them up once they got there.

The removal of young gentry for overtly religious reasons tapped into a wider development in cross-Channel interaction. Despite government efforts, Protestant and Catholic gentry were sending sons abroad: perhaps established continental links made this practice less unusual in East Anglia than elsewhere in the country. Nicolas Bacon, for instance, saw continental experience as vital to his sons' future careers, even if once abroad they did not always follow his intended route. Catholic neighbours also went abroad at a similar point. William Cornwallis and his brother-in-law Thomas Kittson were on the continent in 1575, ostensibly seeking a cure for Cornwallis' ailment. The destinations they prioritised are interesting: from Spa in Germany, an acknowledged Catholic resort, they had intended to reach Italy, but the plague forced them to change course for Paris.

Foreign travel was a contentious issue, and in some respects England under Elizabeth I was more isolated from the continent than it had been under the earlier Tudors. This was partly due to its emerging identity as a Protestant island surrounded by

---

212 Strype, Annals, vol. 2, part 2, pp. 342-44; Appendix book 2, no. XXVII, pp. 674-77. Aldred recommended Lyon or Reims, but urged him to avoid Paris, 'for fear of the ambassador'. Aldred, apparently a disruptive influence in Rome, later became a spy for Walsingham, but there is no clear proof he was acting as such when he wrote this letter. Read, Walsingham, vol. 2, pp. 425-26; Philip Caraman, The Other Face: Catholic Life Under Elizabeth I (London, 1960), p. 95.


214 Edmund, younger brother of Nicholas and Nathaniel, avoided inclusion in Paulet's train to Paris in 1578. He took up his own route, which offered exposure to Catholic France and Italy. Simpson, Wealth, pp. 98-99.

papist lands, and partly due to government efforts to wield tighter control over entrance to and exit from the kingdom. Key political figures may have been aware of the advantages of foreign travel for the next generation of the ruling classes, but it was a privilege the authorities tried to restrict to very few. These restrictions were reinforced by the monitoring of the ports, which made it increasingly difficult for Catholics to make the journey abroad. It was a difficult and risky transition, but nevertheless it was considered as a possibility by a considerable number of Catholics, who may not always have viewed it as a last resort. Interestingly, both the Catholic Thomas Kittson and the Protestant Bacons were amongst those obtaining a licence to travel before their departure.

4: The impact of national events on prospective exiles.

The ‘local’ experience of prospective exiles varied, but all were affected by the attitudes and policies of central government. Certainly, Catholic influence at the centre was waning around 1580, and policies which potentially promoted their interests became crucially important. This was true of one of the most controversial issues of 1578-82, the proposed marriage between Elizabeth and François duke of Anjou, the brother and heir of Henri III of France. The presence of the duke’s envoys, and the Duke himself, and Elizabeth’s evidently favourable response raised hopes in 1578-80 that Catholics would be accorded toleration, and even some influence over national policy. Between summer and winter 1579, there were rumours that Elizabeth considered appointing Catholics to the Privy Council in an effort to outweigh the opponents of the match. Realistically, however, neither Anjou nor Henri III prioritised the improvement of conditions for Catholics in England. Anglo-French entente was based on expediency, and the French Ambassador swiftly withdrew his support from the Catholic court circle.


217 TNA, E/157/1, Licenses to pass beyond sees [1572-78], f. 2. Thomas Kittson was given a licence to travel for 18 months in April 1575; half-brothers Nicolas and Anthony obtained a licence to be abroad for 3 years in June 1578.

when circumstances demanded.\textsuperscript{219} The marriage negotiations nevertheless provide an important context for any attempt to explain the movement of some English families to Paris, and the nature of their outlook once they were there. Negotiations over the match from 1578 encouraged some English Catholics to consider France as a preferable ally to Spain.\textsuperscript{220} Families such as the Cornwallises, who were involved in the promotion of the marriage at the English court, were in Paris at a point when the balance seemed to be tipping against it, but when they may have remained optimistic. Whether they and others sent relatives abroad as a sign of faith in the Anglo-French alliance, or whether they went abroad as the marriage became increasingly unlikely, seeking a more sympathetic environment, is unclear.

With the failure of the marriage plan, some English Catholics subsequently turned against France, realising that Henri III was very unlikely to commit himself to improving their situation. By 1582, there was some ill feeling about apparent French indifference towards their plight.\textsuperscript{221} This sense of disillusionment informed the experience of Catholics on the continent; Bossy thinks it unsurprising that most English Catholics became pro-Spain rather than pro-France. Nevertheless, more positive hopes of France, all be they short-lived, also informed the subsequent exile experience of English Catholics. When notable laity went to France, contacts made whilst the marriage negotiations were still alive could prove significant. Jean de Simier, baron de Saint-Marc, for instance, had been Anjou’s personal representative in England from 1578.\textsuperscript{222} Englishmen who had been promoting the match seem to have forged a bond with him. When, for example, Simier was warned of a planned attempt on his life at the English court, he turned to Charles Arundel to provide him with protection.\textsuperscript{223} Once in Paris, Stafford, Arundel and Thomas Lord Paget sought out Simier and developed a long-term connection with him. Simier’s house, for instance, was a place of resort for


\textsuperscript{221} TNA, SP 12/153/14, P.H. to Walsingham, 19 April 1582.

\textsuperscript{222} He was also partly funded by Henri III and Catherine de Médicis.

\textsuperscript{223} For Simier’s appeal to Arundel: TNA, SP 12/151/48, articles 6 and 7, Arundel’s answers to interrogatory articles, 1581 [?]. The original 26 articles to be administered to Arundel, at TNA, SP 12/151/47, are in places faded to illegibility.
them. Anjou's other envoy, Pierre Clausse, sieur de Marchaumont, did not arrive in England until 1581, when the match was no longer viewed as a realistic prospect in most circles, but he too was apparently resorted to by certain Englishmen in Paris. He was a major creditor to Edward Stafford, the English ambassador; by 1586, he and Simier allegedly had him in their control. For Marchaumont, these links may later have acted as an obstacle to his chosen course of radicalism. After Anjou's death, Marchaumont entered the service of the Duke of Guise, but when he tried to gain a place in the governing body of the League his credentials were not sufficiently unambiguous to convince hardliners. Marchaumont was ostensibly excluded on the grounds that he was not a native Parisian, but perhaps his religious credentials were undermined by his past association with Anjou and his English supporters, and by extension, with a heretical Protestant Queen. However, for the English Catholics in the city, this association offered them a potential foothold in Paris. Those exiles with links to the failed marriage presumably hoped that their existing French contacts would ensure a non-hostile reception in the city.

A number of those on the list, being men wanted for involvement in revolt or conspiracy, may have been pushed abroad. The authorities were anxious to keep track of these fugitives. They were only a small proportion of the English Catholic presence in France, but their significance is disproportionate to their numerical size. They caused the government to construe all Catholics abroad as a threat to the state, although not all

224 Sophie Crawford Lomas (ed.), Calendar of State Papers Foreign Series in the Reign of Elizabeth, 1586-1588 (London, 1927), p. 34, [Thomas Rogers] to Francis [Mills?], June [?] 1586. Simier had a house on the rue de Bièvre, and perhaps another one near Saint-Germain. CSPF, 1586-1588, p. 96, Stafford to Walsingham, Paris, 2 December 1586. Arundel, Stafford and Simier were associates in Paris in summer 1586. Stafford had been in France in June 1580, negotiating with Anjou to promote the marriage. Later, Simier was involved in Stafford's leaking of information to Spain, via Arundel. Mitchell Leimon and Geoffrey Parker, 'Treason and Plot in Elizabethan Diplomacy: The "Fame of Edward Stafford" Reconsidered', English Historical Review, 111 (1996), pp. 1142, 1145. For more on Stafford and Simier, below, Chapter Four, p. 229, footnote 96.

225 Leimon and Parker, 'Treason', p. 1145. Burghley reports this as one of the accusations made against Stafford. Stafford was certainly in heavy debt to Marchaumont, although the extent of Marchaumont's hold over him is debatable.

226 Leimon and Parker, 'Treason', p. 1145. Marchaumont was elected prévôt des marchands in the first municipal elections in Paris after the Barricades, but was replaced by Chapelle-Marteau. Guise declared Marchaumont's inability to take up the post, 'n'estre natif de ceste ville... et avoir particularités et raisons qu'il reservoit à dire'; 'not being a native of this city, and for other particularities and reasons which he reserves from stating'. François Bonnardot (ed.), Registres des délibérations du bureau de ville de Paris, tome neuvième, 1586-1590 (Paris, 1902), p. 120.
of those abroad had been driven there through active opposition to the Elizabethan establishment.

The movement of Catholic laity was not solely a consequence of shifts in English government policy, but nor can it be wholly attributed to the impact of missionary efforts in England. In early 1580, the government linked lay Catholics abroad to the impending Jesuit mission, and their gathering in Paris was viewed with foreboding. In fact, those in Paris had left England before the arrival of the Jesuit mission. There is little evidence to suggest they were encouraged by seminary priests to go abroad - unless, of course, as prospective seminarians. Some who left prior to spring 1580 later became involved in promoting the mission, but this was not their original motive for leaving England.

Few were led abroad by vertical ties of obedience to their nobles and superiors. They engaged with them, entered their service, and used them as figureheads when it served their interests, but for the most part the decision to go abroad remained theirs alone. In any case, most Catholic nobles had been sidelined from their traditional niche in central government by 1580, and were not in an ideal position to protect their gentry inferiors. In the early part of the reign, nobles abroad offered some places in their own exile households, but this was not a large-scale development.

---

227 Sledd, the supposed author of TNA, SP 78/4a/63, had been in Rome immediately prior to the Jesuit mission. He accompanied the mission group across Europe, but left for Paris when they headed for Reims. From his reports, it is possible to conclude that the many Catholics in France were part of a wider push against Protestant England, personified in the Jesuit missionaries. CRS, 53, pp. 193-245.

228 A few individuals in Paris may have later emerged as clergy. Robert Pilkington of Lancashire (named of Yorkshire and the North) and James Vavasour of Hazlewood studied at Douai, entered the college at Reims in 1581, and became missionary priests. They seem to have been in Paris before entering Reims. Godfrey Anstruther, The Seminary Priests: A Dictionary of the Secular Clergy of England and Wales (4 vols, Ware, Ushaw, 1968-1977), vol. 1, pp. 277, 366.

229 The Shelleys of Michelgrove, who sheltered Persons, had a relative abroad in 1580. In 1583, William Shelley associated closely with Charles Paget when he returned to England to prepare for a Guise invasion. Haynes, Gunpowder, p. 5; CRS, 21, pp. 71, 131; Manning, Sussex, p. 164.

230 Manning, Sussex, pp. 136, 228-29, 273. Lord Montague in Sussex was an exception. His nephew was in Rome in 1579-80.

231 The Countess took rebels into service in her Low Countries household in the 1570s, and received grants from Philip II and Rome. The former was specifically for her and others in her care. Loomie, Spanish, p. 95; Note of sundry English rebels and fugitives Abroad, 6 July 1575, in Knox (ed.), Diaries, pp. 298-301; TNA, SP 12/89/6, A note of divers suspect men and rebelles on thother sydeof the seas, 29 September 1572; Lechat, Réfugiés, pp. 140-41, 234; William Murdin (ed.), A Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (London, 1759), p. 49.
The failure of the French match, together with harsher anti-Catholic measures from 1580, marked a turning point for Catholic fortunes in England. However, this alone does not explain the large exile influx in Paris. The movement of English gentry towards the French capital took place against a larger milieu of Catholic revival and regeneration in the French capital, often at the instigation or with the backing, of Henri III.232 This impulse to religious renewal and new forms of Catholic devotion was only one among a number of ‘pull’ factors in Paris’ favour. There were thus considerations encouraging Catholics to go to France as well as factors within England driving them abroad. A large, disparate group of Catholics could have felt pulled towards the Catholic continent, as well as being pushed from Protestant England.

Most came from known Catholic areas: they may not have been persecuted, but were perhaps finding it difficult to participate in local society, government, and the royal court to the extent that they had previously. The situation in educational institutions was also increasingly difficult, but there was still a degree of ambiguity when it came to access for Catholics. In fact, it seems that time within certain institutions in England may have encouraged the decision to go abroad, by facilitating contact with those who had set precedents in this area. In contrast to the early Elizabethan exiles, most of this group were not established scholars but the sons, sometimes the younger sons, of less distinguished gentry. Some were perhaps buying into ideals about the benefits of foreign travel and education, which had been developing since the early Tudor period. These were now rendered more complex by contemporary religious divisions.233 Paris in 1580 was enjoying a period of relative stability and prosperity, making it an attractive destination for foreign travellers. For any English gentleman embarking on a foreign tour Paris was an obvious port of call, but the Catholic segment of the gentry group also had the religious environment to add to their list of motivating factors. For instance, the University’s pre-eminence as a seat of learning in the Catholic world made it an appropriate milieu for a Catholic education. Once in Paris, their religious motivations for leaving England could, as we shall see, acquire an added ideological resonance.

232 Below, Chapter Two, pp. 104-108.

The situation for Catholic gentry in 1580, then, was not uniform across the country. In the north, the Earls no longer wielded power from inside England. However, the government was seriously concerned about Westmorland's presence abroad and those in England and beyond who were willing to use him as a figurehead. There was often surviving Catholic involvement in local government, and northern Catholics were not friendless at Court. Catholic gentry in the West Midlands could no longer boast a predominant role in government, but retained local influence. Some had sufficient friends amongst office holders to soften recusant penalties. Catholics were in a more embattled state in Norfolk, confronting the loss of their accustomed magnate protector from the 1570s, and a vigorous Puritan opposition. Although overall they had not resorted to armed rebellion with foreign aid, perhaps they felt more pressed than Catholics elsewhere to seek a more welcoming space abroad. They also had some friends in high places, so that penalties were not always applied. Nationally, the government determined to exert control over its borders and the movement of religious non-conformists beyond them. In one sense, England was more cut off from the continent than it had been, and opportunities for cultural exchange were not so freely available. However, the missionary priest was not the only possible route by which English Catholic gentry were exposed to developments in Catholic Europe. Another route, which is often overlooked by historians, was provided by relatives on the continent.

As with the study of post-Reformation Catholicism inside England, the most noticeable Catholics abroad come from the 'recusant' group, but they are not necessarily representative of the exile group as a whole. The mobilisation and educational and financial momentum of the English Catholic population shifted to mainland Europe, so it is not too fanciful to expect laymen in Europe to have significant exposure to late sixteenth century continental Catholicism, and to be influenced by this as much as they were influenced by its pre-Reformation predecessor in England. There is, however, room for debate on the nature of Catholicism in Paris in the 1580s, which may not have been marked solely by the 'missionary' style of Catholicism. Recent studies demonstrate that strands of both medieval and Counter-Reformation piety are

---

234 Davidson, 'Sheldon', pp. 3-4.
235 TNA, SP 78/4a/63. For instance, the large number of exiles listed from Yorkshire and the North could be anticipated. There are however, a few surprises: the relatively small number from Lancashire, and the relatively sizeable representation from Northampton.
discernable in the Catholic League, thus complicating our idea of religiosity in the period immediately preceding it. The same seems to have been true around 1580 in England. Dividing lines hardened with the Jesuit mission, when the government denounced the subversive intent of missionary priests and their lay helpers. However, there was no absolute relationship between a gentleman’s Catholic reputation and the extent of social or political dispossession. A decision to go abroad, or send a relative overseas, was one way of asserting, or perpetuating, the Catholic character of a family, and could be employed to a number of different outcomes. By extension, the piety and religio-political framework of English Catholics in Paris must have been varied and complex. The considerable numbers of lay English Catholics in Paris implies a disparate group, rather than a hardcore band of activists.

It is interesting to note that, across the country in general, those who were abroad were of varying wealth and status. The exile group included members of some of the wealthier Catholic families across England, including the Gascoignes of Yorkshire and the Sheldons of Worcestershire. However, others, such as the Tankards of Arden, were consolidating recently attained positions. Overseas travel was not affordable to all, and Paris was an expensive stopover. For the non-rebels, maintaining their family position and wealth at home would have facilitated time abroad. Catholics abroad constantly complained of financial shortage. This must be considered against a wider picture of financial instability, and the conventions of the time. For those who did not leave England as fugitives, it was partly the continued status and wealth of their families that made their trip possible. Those whose families were less able to support them, or those deprived of funds by government measures, often looked to other Catholic powers for support. Going into exile, whether voluntary or enforced, was expensive. Having said that, it was not only the wealthiest who took this path, or who were necessarily to do the best out of it.


238 TNA, SP 12/142/24, George Gifford to Giles Gifford, Paris, 22 September 1580; TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece I, Thomas Crofte to George Middlemore, Poissy, 12 October 1580; TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece XII, Thomas Crofte to Alexander Crofte, Poissy, 13 October 1580; TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece XIII, Peter Copley to Thomas Copley, Poissy, 13 October 1580. TNA, SP 53/17/417, Charles Paget to Mary Queen of Scots, 10 April 1586. Paget told Mary that the government was exploiting the exiles’ necessity, offering pardon in return for information.
All indications are that the exiles were predominantly a male group. Although some took their wives and families with them, many left them at home, to safeguard their estates, because they hoped to return, or because the nature of their departure left them little choice.²³⁹ By the 1590s, the presence in England of many wives of exiles was beginning to be seen as a potential liability, and provoked parliamentary debate.²⁴⁰ Married laymen intending to leave were not discouraged from bringing their wives, but Paris in particular was not seen as a safe place for them.²⁴¹ There is of course evidence that Catholic gentlewomen took the route of exile, but the available evidence concentrates on the exceptional rather than the typical female experience.²⁴²

It seems the gentry group in Paris decided independently of clerical influence to go abroad, and may have achieved this through lay networks. This could suggest a strong sense of identity as individuals or as part of a wider Catholic network, and perhaps a less coherent sense of a larger, looser group identity. They were not necessarily hostile towards the clerical mission - in fact, they would not have encountered the Jesuits in England before leaving - but they could well have been influenced by factors other than clerical precepts. Rebels aside, the decision to go abroad, or to send a relative there at this point, was no doubt based on a complex range of considerations.

With a group so large, generalisations are problematic; in part this is why this chapter has approached the issue by looking only at groups from three geographical areas. Nevertheless, whilst acknowledging the range of experience, outlook, and worldly situation of our exile group, it is possible to discern a general theme. Their journey into exile, and their early days of exile, was influenced by a range of factors:

²³⁹ When rebel Christopher Danby fled, his wife Margaret depended on the goodwill of his elder brother. In a letter of 1587, her assertion '... truste me he is not in Englande' presumably refers to her absent husband. NYCRO, ZS Swinton Estate and Middleham Estate Records, Danby Family Papers, (Microfilm 2087/000422), Margaret Danby to Thomas Danby, 2 April 1587.

²⁴⁰ When Parliament discussed the use of banishment as a legal penalty for male non-conformists, there was concern about how to deal with their wives and children. Some argued they should be banished with their husbands, solving the problem of providing for the wives and children remaining in England. Kesselring, Mercy and Authority, p. 35. This conceivably reflected an existing situation where a number of the exiles' wives and children remained in England.

²⁴¹ Strype, Annals, vol. 2, part 2, pp. 342-44; Appendix book 2, no. XXVII, pp. 674-77. Aldred recommended Lyon or Reims as the best place for an exile to establish themselves, but urged Downes to avoid Paris. It was, he thought, definitely unsuitable for Downes' wife.

²⁴² For the Countess of Northumberland, above, p. 83, footnote 231; for Elizabeth Johnson, below, Chapter Five, pp. 298-99.
disappearing hopes for accommodation with the Protestant status quo; a family’s local position; pre-existing links to the Catholic continent; a desire to obtain educational experience in a Catholic environment; and, for the rebels of 1569, the need to escape likely execution. Any credentials they may have felt as a persecuted group were apparently less important at this stage. Whether exile changed their view of themselves or other coreligionists, and how they responded to the positive and negative opportunities the experience offered, are issues to be explored in the course of this thesis.
CHAPTER TWO

Paris: the Exile Environment

‘Durant les années 1581 à 1584, c’est la France qui sert de théâtre aux grandes menées des anglais’. ¹

1: Introduction.

Paris has a long history as an international melting pot, and as an urban refuge. Historians of the nineteenth century emphasize Paris’ role as an international refuge for intellectuals, and those of the eighteenth century its status in the Grand Tour, whilst its importance for royalists and Catholics during the English civil war is recognised.² However, there were earlier antecedents for the acceptance of outsiders. Like other early modern cities, Paris relied on the influx of outsiders for its own regeneration. This interaction should temper the impression given in prescriptive contemporary sources of overwhelming hostility to outsiders. A closer investigation of Paris’ left bank suggests that the city’s reaction to new arrivals in the sixteenth century was complex, and at times pragmatic. However, the terms of sixteenth-century religious exile were very different to nineteenth-century intellectual refuge. Paris was a Catholic bastion in the later sixteenth century: its role and example as a refuge could strengthen ideological division, rather than offering a tolerant space. The most obvious effect of the English Catholic presence was increased dogmatism, but the degree of pragmatism in the way English exiles were met also deserves investigation.

Although sixteenth-century France remained deeply regional, Paris served as a model for the kingdom as a whole and perhaps as a forum for the articulation of a ‘national’ identity. Profoundly attached to his southern estates, Montaigne nevertheless expressed a connection to Paris:

Je l’ayme tendrement, jusques à ses verrues et ses taches. Je ne suis francois que par

¹ ‘From 1581 to 1584, it was France which served as the theatre for the great intrigues of the English’. Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 141.
Paris was both a real and an idealised metropolis, a source of wonder and inspiration for an international audience. Literary sources celebrated its diversity and cohesiveness as an urban unity; in reality this was complicated by many other factors. Presumably, the city's size and complexity of structure was overwhelming to those seeking refuge, but they could work in favour of new arrivals. In the Catholic world of the sixteenth century, Paris remained second only to Rome in Christendom. Consequently, it was a popular destination for migrants leaving Protestant homelands. Many of the English in 1580 had had exposure to their county town or London, but life in Paris was very different to their indigenous experience. They found themselves in dynamic yet unstable and unfamiliar urban conditions. It offered the opportunity to develop and articulate a particular ideological identity in a Catholic environment, even if not all English gentry in Paris actively did so.

This chapter briefly discusses the practical issues of going into exile, and the authorities' efforts to prevent religious emigration and immigration. The specific milieu of Paris as an exile centre in the late 1570s and early 1580s will then be investigated. Possibilities for accommodation, education, employment, devotion and sociability, both individually and institutionally, will be explored. A more detailed 'micro-geography' of the left bank will suggest how English Catholic gentry reacted to the French capital, by articulating an exile identity distinct from their Parisian hosts, or seeking a degree of integration with them.

3 'I love it tenderly, including its warts and its blemishes. I am French only by this grand city... the glory of France, and one of the most noble ornaments of the world'. Michel de Montaigne, 'De la Vanité', Essais, ed. Alexandre Micha (3 vols, Paris, 1979), vol. 3, p. 185.


1.1: The failure of preventative measures.

The Elizabethan government employed different strategies towards their religious non-conformists. Whilst they would countenance the movement of Protestant non-conformists to Ireland, and considered plans for emigration to the New World, in principle they endeavoured to prevent Catholic movement outside the kingdom. A group of Puritans many miles away were unlikely to pose an immediate threat, but allowing Catholics access to Europe raised the likelihood of their involvement in invasion attempts. In trying to stem the flow of Catholics across the Channel, the government primarily aimed to curtail the supply of new recruits to continental seminaries, but those sending children abroad for a Catholic education were also affected.

In the late 1570s and 1580s, measures within England were accompanied by diplomatic efforts to prevent Catholic rulers aiding English Catholics abroad. Elizabeth I insisted that fugitives be dispossessed and dislodged from their place in English society and from a position abroad where they could pose a threat. In the first instance, those abroad without royal licence were declared rebels, and the onus was placed on the French and Spanish monarchs to oppose those challenging her unlawfully. Elizabeth stood on shaky ground, as both Henri III and Philip II were aware that England offered support to their rebels. An Anglo-Spanish agreement of 1577 declared the expulsion of English rebels from the Low Countries, and the annulment of their Spanish pensions, but Philip II was unlikely to enforce these terms. Theoretically, supporting the rebels of a recognised monarch was controversial; but politically it was a means to hamper the pretensions of a rival power without open war. Henri III discovered this in the late 1570s. Whilst his flirtation with James Fitzmaurice's enterprise was his last direct involvement in a dissidents' scheme against Elizabeth, he retained an interest in their cause. Under heavy pressure from Elizabeth, he denied, or skirted round, the existence of the Reims seminary, and declined the opportunity to expel rebels from his kingdom. Rather, in 1582 he licensed the refugees to remain in Paris, Orléans or Rouen, and

---

7 Although settlers were often far from committed Puritans. Nicholas Canny, 'The Ideology of English colonization; from Ireland to America', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 30 (1973), 573-98; *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 121-64.

refused to pursue those responsible for a fund raising campaign in France in 1582. When demanded by the English authorities to extradite individuals, Henri refused or prevaricated. He may even have provided pensions for particular Englishmen.

Both Henri III and Elizabeth I recognised the necessity of an Anglo-French alliance to undermine Spanish predominance in Europe. The entente was complicated by the internal and external threats each monarch faced, and did not follow a coherent path. Relations had their crisis points, but were never completely ruptured. English Catholics were appearing in Paris at the point when the first Jesuit mission was waiting in France for a decision on their progress. When this mission was first mooted, hopes were high for the marriage between Elizabeth I and Anjou, and with it Catholic toleration in England. Rumours, for instance, had reached the continent that Elizabeth was about to admit three Catholics, or known Catholic sympathisers, to the Privy Council. These hopes were fading by mid-1580. Meanwhile, the Desmond rebellion remained a serious problem for the Elizabethan government, even if Henri was much less likely to back an Irish attack on England. The rebels' use of international Catholicism as a rallying call fed anxiety about the involvement of English Catholics at


10 Henri kept Thomas Morgan in the Bastille, but paid for his upkeep and refused to extradite him. L. Hicks, An Elizabethan Problem: some aspects of the careers of two exile-adventurers (London, 1964), pp. 83, 178-80; Bossy, 'Link', p. 105. In 1584, he declined to answer a formal demand that Lord Paget and others be surrendered into English hands. DNB, vol. 15, p. 59. Henri insisted that the Pagets, Arundel and Morgan were exiles on account of their religion, although he promised that if proper proof be provided of their conspiracies, he would punish them satisfactorily. John Lingard, The History of England from the first invasion by the Romans to the Accession of William and Mary in 1688 (6th edn., 10 vols, London, 1874), vol. 6, p. 180. Elizabeth later demanded the surrender of Morgan and Charles Paget for their involvement in the Babington plot. CSPF, 1586-1588, p. 97, Instructions from the Queen for Mr Wooton, 29 September 1586.

11 When looking for prospective couriers in 1586, Mary wanted to consider the English pensioners of the King of France, as well as members of his Scottish guard. Labanoff (ed.), Lettres, vol. 6, p. 263, Mary Stuart to Châteauneuf, 24 March 1586. However, there is little direct evidence of these pensioners.


home and abroad in conspiracy. Without Spanish goodwill, decent relations with Henri III were necessary, but he was not unsympathetic to the very people who were a liability for Elizabeth's government. Henri's refusal to do exactly as bidden frustrated the Elizabethan government, but his failure to commit wholeheartedly to the exiles simultaneously alienated him from his radical subjects.

1.2: Leaving the homeland.

This diplomatic tangle, alongside the varied situation for Catholics within England, formed a complex milieu for gentry families, especially those with relatives abroad or soon to be there.

Each area of the country probably had different routes for conveying individuals overseas. Given its secret nature, exact logistics of this activity can only be speculated upon. The movement of contemporaneous Irish Catholic refugees to France involved the exploitation of existing river and sea routes, which were often dictated by trade; a similar scenario apparently applied in England. Merchants sometimes ran considerable risks on re-entering England, but nevertheless enjoyed a freedom of manoeuvre unavailable to others. Prior to departure, prospective exiles turned to them to channel their wealth and goods out of the country. Gentry attempted to get out of the country under their supervision, and sometimes employed them as their agents at home whilst

---

14 As late as 1583, exiles in Paris were apparently convinced that Henri III and Catherine de Médicis would support an attempted invasion. CSP Scotland, 1584-1585, no. 9, p. 10, Intercepted letter, dated 28 December [1583].


16 Merchants were exempt from requirements to hold a licence before leaving the kingdom. When Thomas Copley tried to justify his unlicensed exit, he claimed he went in his mercantile function, even if he chose to live as a gentleman. Christie (ed.), Copley, p. 8.

17 Ralph Letherborow, who eventually became a naturalised Frenchman, established businesses in Rouen and Lille. Exiles would make over their money to him by exchange, and send goods to him as if they were his property. Loomie, Spanish, p. 26.
they were in France. Merchants were also key channels by which Catholic books and goods reached England from the Continent.

Similarly, those in coastal regions in England perhaps relied on already frequented routes to the continent. The government was certainly aware that the Norfolk and Yorkshire coastlines and northern port cities were landing points for priests. Those for Jesuit missionaries in particular were not well established in 1580, but their subsequent rapid development indicates that the gentry did not lack similar means. Meanwhile, those in landlocked regions probably reached the Continent via London. Alternatively, their journey may have been dictated by the internal topography of their region. The seats of Worcestershire gentry who went abroad suggest that river routes to west coast ports were a viable alternative.

Reaching the continent was by no means impossible: young gentlemen could leave England well provisioned and without great difficulty from all coastal areas. Crossing the Channel could be a hurdle; after that the exact route varied. In France, itineraries depended on the length and purpose of the visit, and whether passports had been obtained for travel to a particular destination. The wealthier went with servants, and possibly spouses and children; young men often travelled in the company of fellow

---


19 In March 1582, Dr Darbyshire and Hayes had dispatched ‘as many booke as an asse can carry’ to a French merchant, Peter Corteney, who was to smuggle them into England, via La Rochelle or Bordeaux. TNA, SP 78/7/65, Cobham to Walsingham, 3 March 1582. For more on merchants in Catholic networks, Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 80.

20 Priests, books, rosaries and other Catholic paraphernalia were smuggled in and out of Newcastle amongst cargoes of fish. Rosamund Oates, ‘Recusants in Durham and Newcastle in the Archiepiscopate of Tobie Mathew’, paper given at the Catholic Record Society Conference, Plater College, Oxford, 29 July 2003. Fewer families in the East Riding sent relatives abroad, but similar cargoes were passing through Hull in the early 1580s. CSPD, 1581-1590, CLVIII, 18, p. 91, Note of books, catechisms and testaments, and of the going over of Mallory Conyers from Hull to Rouen, and so to Paris, 17 January 1581.

21 Many Worcestershire exiles lived in close proximity to the River Severn.

22 Thomas Birch (ed.), Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, from the year 1581 til her death. In which the secret intrigues of her court, and the conduct of her favourite, Robert, Earl of Essex, are particularly illustrated (2 vols, London, 1754), vol. 1, p. 41.

23 TNA, SP 12/143/33, piece 33, XII, Thomas Crofte to Alexander Crofte, Poissy, 13 October 1580. Crofte had to wait 12 days for a crossing. In Europe, his company faced warfare in the Low Countries, plague in France and general inhospitality. TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece XIII, Peter Copley to Thomas Copley, Poissy, October 1580. Copley also complained of a ‘harde and perilusse’ journey into France.
students. Some headed for Paris for trade or education. Some went hoping to join family members already established there. For others, Paris was part of a wider tour, and in this sense not the priority destination.

Levels of preparation for relocation also varied. Most of the 1569 rebels, fleeing to preserve their lives, had not meticulously planned their move. Unable to rely on money put aside, they ended up in Paris more through necessity than immediate choice in the later 1570s. Non-rebels made more concrete plans, depending on the purpose of their visit. Younger boys sent to study under Catholic tutors were provided with funds and contacts determining their arrival and reception. Students arrived with money and some provisions, even if they quickly diminished. Others turned to family, kin and acquaintances already in France. With the right contacts, a Catholic could exchange his money at a factor's in London, and have it delivered to him on arrival in France. Some established banking arrangements in France prior to departure, so that they could expect financial backing on arrival in a foreign environment; others took measures to safeguard their estates in their absence. Meanwhile, correspondence with those on the continent provided some guidance on the best way to proceed on arrival in France. George Gifford, for example, advised his uncle to avoid Paris during the plague epidemic. Solomon Aldred wrote to encourage his kinsman, Robert Downes, to go abroad and

---

24 TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece III, Thomas Bailey to Giles Gifford, 9 October 1580. Gifford's tutor sent him in the company of 4 other young Englishmen to Pont-à-Musson, a French Jesuit college in Lorraine, founded in 1575.

25 TNA, SP 78/4a/31, Cobham to [the Secretaries], 12 March 1580. 'Liggons, a young gentleman from the West Contry' - presumably Hugh - arrived with Henry Parker on 12 March 1580. Hugh went to join his older brother Ralph in Paris in 1580, apparently at Ralph's instigation. Neither stayed there permanently.

26 The tour of Christopher Roche, of Wexford, Ireland from the mid-1580s took in Bordeaux, Libourne, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Paris, Lorraine, Spa, Antwerp, Brussells, Doauli, St Omer, and Calais. Hans Claude Hamilton (ed.), Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1588, August-1592, September (London, 1885), CLXIII, 12, pp. 455-56.

27 TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece II, Thomas Bailey to Giles Gifford, 9 October 1580. Gifford's allowance quickly ran out.

28 Lord Paget was known to have established banking arrangements in France before leaving. His account was well stocked by his departure in 1583. CSPF, 1586-1588, p. 598, Stafford to Walsingham, 24 April 1588. He was wealthy enough to maintain a large household, including English musicians. Bossy, 'Link', p. 52, footnote 1. Charles Paget, meanwhile, received sums of money through the offices of English and Frenchmen. The London merchant, Mosley, exchanged money with a Rouen merchant, Barthelemey Martin, who then delivered it to Paget in late 1583. Sophie Crawford Lomas (ed.), Calendar of State Papers Foreign Series in the Reign of Elizabeth, July 1583-July 1584 (London, 1914), no. 310, p. 269, Stafford to Walsingham, 15 December 1583. For Thomas Haughton's efforts to safeguard his fortune, E. A. J. Honigman, Shakespeare: The Lost Years (Manchester, 1985), p. 9.

29 TNA, SP 12/142/23, George Gifford to Giles Gifford, Paris, 21 September 1580.
offered advice on how best to proceed. Downes was instructed to head for Lyons or Reims, and make contact with Aldred’s brother, who could see him safely established. He was told to avoid Paris, which was particularly dangerous for English Catholics. New arrivals were thus probably aware of the need to remain alert to the English spies haunting Paris. By 1583, Catholics turned to the Spanish ambassador in England to convey money and correspondence to coreligionists abroad. Mendoza reported:

The Queen maintains such a multitude of spies in France to dog the footsteps of the English Catholics there, that it is not possible for their friends to send them a penny without her hearing of it. They therefore constantly have recourse to me, and I send the money as if it were my own. I have now 10,000 crowns which they have asked me to send to Rouen and Paris.

Often, those leaving England had some idea what to expect in France, or at least what to be wary of.

Nevertheless, Paris was unfamiliar territory: its intricate infrastructure contrasted to the largely manorial framework of English gentry life. Despite experience of their county town, Oxbridge, or London, the majority of English in Paris were unaccustomed to life in a large urban environment where they did not own property or enjoy local standing. Paris’ organisational structure was particularly complex, partly because of its double status as capital city and seat of the French monarchy. Tension between municipal and royal bodies could be detrimental to the city as a whole. Individuals or corporations sometimes resorted to sidelining or bypassing institutions they were expected to work through. Otherwise, overlaps or clashes between rival bodies in Paris occurred in secular and ecclesiastical matters, between the Bureau de Ville, the Parlement and other royal courts, the Crown, the University, parishes, religious houses, and religious orders. Overlapping jurisdictions could, as we shall see, offer outsiders an

30 Strype, Annals, vol. 2, part 2, pp. 342-44; Appendix book 2, no. XXVII, pp. 674-77. Aldred tells Downes to visit his father’s factor in London to arrange for the transfer of his money. He says Paris is to be avoided for ‘fear of the ambassador’. Downes, imprisoned at the time, did not leave England.


32 Calendar Simancas, no. 336, p. 471, Bernardino de Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 6 May 1583. Mendoza also channelled funds sent by exiles to England. Calendar Simancas, no. 138, p. 177, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], London, 1 October 1581. He later provided support for the Parisian exiles after his appointment to France. Below, p. 120; Chapter Three, p. 163.

33 Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 43.

opportunity to establish their own foothold. The congruity of Paris' civic, religious and royal identities was seriously contested in the period. The municipality, whose corporation theoretically worked alongside the royal government of the city, increasingly wedded itself to Paris' Catholic identity. Hence the mutually complementary nature of Paris' status as a royal city and as a Catholic city was challenged. Paris' corporate urban character thus presented something of a challenge to exiles. Certain methods of interaction from home had some currency, but in an unfamiliar environment exiles also had to try other means.

Paris was an expanding and diversifying city. Its population doubled in the course of the century, reaching about 300,000 in 1580. Meanwhile, royal servants were elevated to hereditary offices, often at the expense of longer-established bourgeois and merchant groups, who were used to working with elected offices. One consequence of this was the increasing tendency amongst the bourgeoisie to define themselves in terms of their roots in the locality, as well as by their bourgeois status. Physical residence in Paris was vital for the right to the title and privileges of bourgeois de la ville de Paris, as well as its obligations. Outsiders and students were free of these obligations, but conversely could not 'belong' to the urban community in the same way.

The city was in a state of flux in 1580. France was at war, and whilst Paris did not experience direct combat its population remained deeply hostile to Protestantism. Parisians felt the disruption of civil war and general instability, poor harvests, and a dramatically fluctuating population. With the traditional granaries and transportation system failing to sustain the population, the strain felt in Paris in 1580 was exacerbated

38 The eighth civil war broke out in November 1579 and lasted until the following November.
39 Diefendorf, Cross, p. 9.
by plague and whooping cough epidemics. Plague was a familiar scourge to the Early Modern city, but the impact of the 1580 epidemics seems particularly striking. There were an estimated 30-60,000 victims, as much as 20% of the population. The city, which was relatively well equipped to cope with crises, found its Hôtel-Dieu inundated. As the plague dragged on, outsiders were made into scapegoats, and the Bureau de Ville took special measures. In August 1580, students, soldiers and ‘vagabonds’ were to be ordered to leave, on pain of death. Unlike Rouen and Reims, however, there is no sign of specific surveillance measures against the English.

The fate of English Catholics in Paris at the onset of the plague is unclear. Much of the urban élite fled in an effort to escape contagion. Given the scale of the crisis, there seemed little reason for foreigners not to do the same: L’Estoile says they kept away for six months. Many students arriving in France diverted to Pont-à-Musson; others complained of the ‘universall plague in France’. Those remaining on the left bank must have found their normal routine seriously disrupted. Businesses were suspended or experienced a dramatic decline in activity. Collège Bourgogne, a likely

---

40 The Beauce area, one of its largest grain suppliers, experienced a production shortfall. Jean-Marie Constant, La Ligue (Paris, 1996), p. 82; Sluhovsky, Patroness, p. 56. Prices for grain in Les Halles market were slightly higher in 1580 than in 1579 or 1581, although not as high as the later 1580s. Micheline Baulant and Jean Meuvret, Prix des Céréales: Extraits de la Mercuriale de Paris (1520-1698) (2 vols, Paris, 1960-1962), vol. 1, pp. 60-65.


42 Robiquet, Paris, p. 133; Registre-Journal, vol. 3, p. 105. Tents were set up in the faubourgs to house the sick. A new post of prévôt de la santé was created to visit and assess affected areas.


44 Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 68.

45 Robiquet, Paris, pp. 130-33.


47 TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece XII, Thomas Crofte to Alexander Crofte, Poissy, 13 October 1580; ‘Copie d’une Missive Envoyée de Paris à Lyon, par un Chidam à son bon amy, Contenant nouvelle de la santé et du nombre des morts de la contagion, auspict lieu et cite de Paris. Avec en un autre recit memorable, le tout receu nouuellement’ (Lyon, 1580), printed in L. Cimber and D. Anjou (eds.), Archives Curieuses de l’histoire de France depuis Louis XI jusqu’a Louis XVIII, 1st series (12 vols, 1837-1840), vol. 9, pp. 320-26.

48 AN, MC, VIII, 110. Notary Claude Boreau needed only one short register to cover the years 1580-81, ‘en raison de la peste qui a regné, il y a en peu de contrats’; ‘because of the plague which was here, few contracts were made’. This note is made on the front of the register. Boreau, based on rue des Augustins in front of the convent, would normally have two registers to cover a two-year period.
exile haven in 1580, shut its doors for a year.49 Other colleges did likewise, or at least streamlined their activity.50 However, those English listed in Paris in April may not have chosen to flee. Evidently, efforts to clear the University quarter of its transient population and keep track of those remaining in temporary accommodation foundered.51 Having reached Paris, many English may not have had sufficient funds for another journey. It is likely that some fell victim to the plague.

The indirect effects of war and the immediate impact of food shortage, epidemic and earthquake presumably engendered instability in Paris in spring 1580.52 The eschatological anguish, which is seen as endemic in the period, undoubtedly intensified. Plague, earthquake, and strange celestial signs were certainly viewed in such terms in popular newsheets. In England, they were read as omens of an imminent Catholic enterprise.53 On both sides of the Channel, commentators saw them as signs of a larger crisis, whose meaning or purpose was contested.54

Despite these deterrents, Paris retained its attraction for refugees and those looking for foreign experience. As serious as the plague was, population fluctuations were not unusual and numbers could only be maintained by immigration.55 This practical consideration should modify the prescriptive measures taken by the authorities against outsiders, and historians’ theories about the exclusive nature of urban solidarity. Draconian laws such as the droit d’aubaine, by which the Crown could confiscate the property of an unnaturalized foreigner dying in France, probably disguised a more


50 During the 1583 plague, the university continued teaching only those students resident in college. The martinets who lived elsewhere were excluded. Jean-Baptiste Louis Crevier, Histoire de l’Université de Paris depuis son origine jusqu’en l’année 1600 (7 vols, Paris, 1761), vol. 6, p. 371.

51 Guérin (ed.), Déliverations, pp. 249-50. Complaints were made in May 1581 that hôteliers and landlords had failed to make regular reports about those staying with them.


54 Seguin, L’Information, p. 97.

nuanced reality. Not all groups were equally welcome, and there were complaints about the multiple naturalisations granted by the last Valois kings. The Crown, however, recognised advantages in welcoming particular groups, and in granting individuals or national groups favourable terms to stay in France. These groups often, but not exclusively, gravitated to Paris.

1.3: Anglo-French interaction.

Alain Tallon argues that a strong Parisian civic identity could coexist with a wider interest in French affairs; as we shall see, this extended to interest in events beyond the kingdom. Anglo-French cultural exchange continued against a backdrop of varied diplomatic relations, and there was demonstrable popular interest in each kingdom about the other. In the early sixteenth century, English nobles sent children across the Channel for education in a French household, and perhaps to widen their marriage prospects. By the early seventeenth century, a young English nobleman would go to France to ‘polish’ his education with instruction in martial and social skills. In the later sixteenth-century, it was also becoming fashionable in France to send sons abroad to study under a foreign tutor, or to University under foreign academics.

---


58 In the fourteenth century, three-quarters of recorded immigrants in France were living in Paris. The Crown could draw on the financial resources of resident foreigners in times of crisis. In 1578, Henri III taxed foreign bankers, regardless of whether they had obtained letters of naturalisation. In 1587 all foreign merchants and courtiers were required to pay for letters of naturalisation, whether or not they had done so already. By 1586, foreigners had the right to purchase rentes on theHôtel de Ville. Peter Sahlins, Unnaturally French: Foreign Citizens in the Old Regime andAfter (London, 2004), p. 38; Claudine Billot, ‘L’assimilation des étrangers dans le royaume de France sur XIVe et XVe siècles’, Revue Historique, ccclxx (1983), 273-96; Bonolas, ‘Question’, p. 313.


60 For English interest in French events, Andrew Pettegree, Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion (Cambridge, 2005), p. 99.


62 Mathorez, Étrangers, vol. 1, p. 36. Tutors of French children were mainly Scottish or German rather than English.
Throughout the sixteenth century, Frenchmen demonstrated remarkable interest in English affairs. The 1550s saw an unprecedented level of interest in events in the British Isles. Having lost out in Italy to his Habsburg rival, Henri II turned his sights towards a Franco-British Empire, realised in the marriage of the dauphin François and Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland and the Catholic claimant to the English crown. Although it is unclear how widespread these ideals were in French political society, imperial pretensions were explicitly and notoriously displayed at court. The English Crown was incorporated on the styles and coats of arms of the young François I and Mary Stuart.

The English presence in Paris influenced, whether directly or indirectly, the awareness of English events, particularly those of relevance to France. From mid-century, religious tensions became central to these issues. French authors began to use English examples to warn of the danger posed to France by the Huguenots. Ultra-Catholics produced a special edition of Henry VIII’s diatribe against Luther in 1561. An appended attack on Henry VIII’s morals and his ‘whore’ Anne Boleyn changed its political and religious messages for a French audience. Jean Gay’s ostensibly ‘historical’ work on the French Crown’s crusade against the Albigensians was a radical call for an explicitly anti-Huguenot policy from the Crown. Despite the parlement’s authorization, the Crown did not privilege the work, partly due to English diplomatic pressure; the work cited Henry VIII and his six wives as an example of heresy. The real impact of such works remains debatable, but the English government made efforts through diplomatic channels to counter such polemic. As we shall see, they were right to recognise its potential impact on French opinion. Much of the black legend of Henry VIII as a bloody tyrant was soon to be transferred to Elizabeth I.

---

63 Pamela E. Ritchie, *Mary of Guise in Scotland, 1548-1560: A Political Career* (East Linton, 2002), pp. 196-97. Their use of the English Crown was a major bone of contention for the English government and was a factor in English support for the Reformation Rebellion in Scotland in 1559. The government were also anxious about the possibility of French support for rebels in Ireland.


There are indications that reports about England were highly sought after by certain parties. The librarian of the Abbey of Saint-Victor, for instance, recorded English and Scottish news, received from exiles who apparently visited him frequently. It is unclear whether he went on to publicise what he had heard, but his residence became a crossover point for cross-Channel news. Meanwhile, in the latter part of the century, printed reportage acquired pointed ideological aspects. By the mid-1580s, English events were used by propagandists in France to warn their audience against apathy; this was to be reversed in the 1590s, when the French experience was used to warn an English audience against internecine conflict and a disputed succession. On a practical level, some Frenchmen were involved in forums hostile to the English Crown. In 1575, for instance, a French doctor met with exiles and Catholic agents in the Low Countries, and declared that Elizabeth would not live for longer than 22 months. This background of French involvement with exiled opponents of Elizabeth, and of French pretensions to imperial power in ‘Britain’, coloured the reactions of the English government to their fugitive rebels, and to the wider English Catholic presence abroad.

Importantly, radicals were not alone in their interest in events across the Channel. The ‘moyenner’ party in France were intent observers of English events. Gallicans were perhaps encouraged by the moderate, erastian church settlement in England and considered it on certain levels a model for France. The English Church settlement could appeal for its formulation of doctrinal changes, its establishment of a royal supremacy over the Church, and its independence from Roman tutelage. Although the extent of this can be exaggerated, recognising mutual interest between


69 'Salisbury', HMC, 9, part 2, no. 233, p. 87, Thomas Greaves to Dr Wilson, 12 February 1575. The French doctor is not named.

moderates across the Channel will bear weight in the assessment of English Catholic experiences in Paris.\textsuperscript{71}

2: Why Paris?

Revolt against Philip II, hostility against foreigners living on Spanish money, and Anglo-Spanish diplomatic agreements rendered the Low Countries dangerous ground for exiles by the later 1570s. France was easier and cheaper to reach than other Catholic centres. Not all stayed in Paris: Orléans, Rouen and Bordeaux had established links with English Catholics and emerged as exile centres, as did Reims. Rouen was an important exile haven and the seedbed for radical Catholicism.\textsuperscript{72} Orléans had the prestigious Faculty of Civil Law that Paris lacked, and was reputed to be the place where the best French was spoken.\textsuperscript{73} Bordeaux had trade links, a University, and historical associations with the English Crown, and Reims became a centre for English Catholics when their seminary was relocated there from Douai.\textsuperscript{74} Paris's size and complex organisation, however, was perhaps best able to absorb a large number of foreigners and weather demographic crises.\textsuperscript{75}

Paris was chosen by exiles for a number of interacting factors, none of which were dominant in every case. The city's multiple identities offered different precedents and reasons for English Catholics to gather there. The possibilities it offered need to be examined in further detail in order to explore the nature of Catholic exile in Paris. Some of the 'pull factors' of the city were generic to an early modern urban environment; others were peculiar to Paris.

\textsuperscript{71} Tallon, Conscience nationale, pp. 185, 206. Nevertheless, Tallon stresses the negative image of England in France.

\textsuperscript{72} Bossy, 'Link', pp. 78-91.

\textsuperscript{73} Brennan (ed), 'Somerset', pp. 96-97. Although a Venetian observer said the French spoken in Paris was considered to be the best. N. Tommaseo (ed. and trans.), Relations des Ambassadeurs Vénitiens sur les affaires de France au XVie siècle (2 vols, Paris, 1838), vol. 2, p. 589.

\textsuperscript{74} Bossy, 'Link', pp. 66-77.

\textsuperscript{75} Lyons, 'Franco-Irish', p. 337. Rouen's size and established mechanisms of charitable provision made it more able to cope with an influx of poor Irish immigrants in the early seventeenth century. Similar factors must have been significant for late sixteenth-century Paris and Rouen, which coped better economically than Reims with the English Catholic presence. Bossy, 'Link', pp. 67, 81.
2.1: A Centre for Catholic Reform.

Given its size, the level of religious orthodoxy in Paris was striking. The city provided a startling array of points of religious orientation, and there were tensions between competing claims, but all were Catholic. Some religious options could unite the city as a whole whilst still asserting or reflecting difference within the community.\footnote{Sluhovsky, Patroness, p. 4. Sluhovsky demonstrates how urban religion and religious ritual did not always serve as a unifying force.}

1580 can be identified as a turning point in French Catholic spirituality; although in Paris the roots of change were laid earlier. Religious sentiment was evolving from a raw anti-Protestantism to a complex amalgam of impulses, encompassing the 'traditional' practices of the medieval church, newer developments of Spanish and Italian origin, and a sense of struggle against heresy. The Mendicants and other older orders maintained and even expanded their influence in the heart of the city.\footnote{Armstrong, Politics, pp. 16, 85-110.} The laity continued to value them as prayerful intercessors.\footnote{Ramsey, Liturgy, p. 14; Robert Sauzet, Les Réguliers Mendiants: acteurs du changement religieux dans le Royaume de France (1485-1560) (Tours, 1994), p. ix.} They also shared it with newer orders, combining community life with an active apostolate. The Capuchins, for example, worked as teachers and confessors amongst the ordinary populace, enjoying the royal licence the Jesuits lacked. The city initially had a mixed response to them, but they won support for their commitment to the victims of the 1580 plague.\footnote{The Capuchins combined older forms of piety with responsiveness to preaching and pastoral needs. Father Cuthbert, The Capuchins: A Contribution to the Story of the Counter-Reformation (2 vols, London, 1928), vol. 1, p. 206; Diefendorf, Penitence, pp. 58-60; Armstrong, Politics, pp. 82-83; Hans Hillerbrand (ed.), Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation, (4 vols, Oxford, 1996), vol. 1, pp. 260-61.} Their work was reflected in the growth of practices such as frequent communion amongst the laity, the production of devotional literature with Spanish and Italian influences, and an upsurge in Marian sodalities.\footnote{Marc Venard, 'Catholicism and Resistance to the Reformation in France, 1555-1585', in Philip Benedict and others (eds.), Reformation, Revolt and Civil War in France and the Netherlands 1555-1585 (Amsterdam, 1999), p. 141.}

The influence of the religious orders was not unchallenged, for it touched on the perennial conflict between secular and regular clergy over respective spheres of
The Mendicants, like the Society of Jesus, claimed a papal licence to minister anywhere in the city; the University had been in dispute with Rome about such privileges in the early sixteenth century.

Meanwhile, the new orders were not always welcomed in France. The Jesuits aroused opposition from their instalment in 1563. The Society claimed the right to administer communion throughout the city. Parisian curés protested this was detrimental to their work, and complained that the Jesuits, who were not ‘gens de qualité’, enriched themselves despite their claims of poverty. The dynamism of the new orders was novel to the English, and in the course of the 1580s proved inspirational to some. The Jesuits certainly helped English members of the Society in Paris, and probably offered support to lay exiles.

The proliferation of new religious orders owed much to royal support. For a Crown struggling to realise its authority over Paris, the establishment of religious foundations was one means of asserting Catholic credentials. Henri founded several penitent congregations from the early 1580s. Inspired by Mediterranean models, they expounded ideals of asceticism, penitence, and charity, later embraced by mainstream reform in the seventeenth century. In the midst of religious crisis, the function of the hermit, devoted to study, penitence and contemplation, could prove attractive in the fight against heretical infection. Royal support for new religious orders complemented the king’s own devotions: he aimed to bring himself, and his disordered kingdom, back into God’s favour.

At grass roots, the religious climate of Paris varied considerably, even on the left bank. Unlike the missionaries entering England by 1580, Parisian curés were neither

---

82 James K. Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500-1543 (Leiden, 1985), p. 229; Armstrong, Politics, p. 113.
83 Journal d’un Curé Ligueur de Paris sous les trois derniers Valois, ed. Edouard de Barthélemy (Paris, 1886), p. 184. In their early days they relied on backing from a few ecclesiastical dignitaries. They originally were only accepted as administrators of the Collège de Clermont, rather than as an order.
fully trained in Counter-Reformation activism, nor engaged in a peripatetic mission. Nevertheless, with a legitimacy emanating from the city's civic and religious culture, they were seen as respected authorities. They were highly educated, usually recipients of the prestigious doctorate in theology from the University of Paris, and active preachers. In short, they could be highly influential. Curés were joined in their parishes by a plethora of less well-educated supplementary priests. Parish activity was also supplemented by the burgeoning literary programme of the Catholic hierarchy. Printed works ranged from traditional items, such as breviaries, to popular catechisms and books of songs and hymns, which could be sung aloud at home, or read in silence in church. The potential of printed works, sermons, and priestly influence to encourage religious zeal were factors the exiles could use to their advantage.

Anne Ramsey asserts the complexity of Catholic religiosity and devotion in late sixteenth-century Paris. Connections between burgeoning new forms of devotion during the League period and the Baroque spirituality of the seventeenth century should not, she argues, be overemphasised or oversimplified. Her study of testamentary provision shows that Parisians remained attached to traditional, 'medieval' practices; these converged with or at least coexisted with, newer Counter-Reformation practices. A similar idea is skilfully argued by Megan Armstrong. Her study of the Observant Franciscans demonstrates that sixteenth-century reforming impulses did not originate solely in Tridentine ideals, an insight applicable on a wider scale. At least some of the new orders, congregations and devotional practices in Paris had roots in older forms of piety. In this, as in other areas, the complex French reaction to the decrees of the

---

86 Ramsey, Liturgy, p. 120; Arlette Lebigre, La Révolution des Curés, Paris 1588-1594 (Paris, 1980); Pierre Chaunu, La Mort à Paris (16e, 17e, 18e siècles) (Paris, 1978), p. 214. Venetian reports marvel at the ability of preachers to speak for 3 or 4 hours without pause. Tommaseo (ed. and trans.), Vénitiens, vol. 2, p. 583. Armstrong demonstrates how a theology doctorate from the University of Paris could open up opportunities to influence public opinion. Armstrong, Politics, p. 120.


88 Ramsey, Liturgy, pp. 76, 145, 224. However, much of what she defines as characteristically 'League' religiosity can be seen in wills of the earlier 1580s: it predated, and was perhaps independent of, Leaguer rule.

89 Armstrong, Politics.
Council of Trent made Catholic reform in the kingdom distinct to that of other European territories.90

Lay Parisians remained attached to traditional forms of spirituality. It was possible, for instance, to own works of popular devotion inspired by Counter-Reformation currents and maintain older devotions to a plethora of relics.91 Continuing a medieval precedent, the extraordinary jubilees announced by the papacy retained their popularity with Parisians.92 Whilst the Jesuits promoted a specifically Marian devotion, the wills of left bank residents continued to display an attachment to saints such as Sainte Geneviève, whose appeal was traditional and municipal as well as individual and immediate.93 In times of crisis, older practices would be reverted to. Churches were highly dressed for the main Sunday mass: ornaments and decoration were used to create a paradise in the sacred space, as a means of warding away evil.94

The religious climate of Paris in 1580, then, was a complicated mix of older and newer currents. Informed by the recent experience of religious wars, it was also underwritten by longer-term characteristics: Gallican hostility to papal interference, tensions between secular and regular clergy, the strong influence of the University of Paris, and a devotional activism which was apparently long-standing.95 Intense devotional activity in public and private spheres may have attracted some Catholic

90 Whilst the Tridentine decrees were not officially recognised, their ideas were diffused through Counter-Reformation liturgical works in France. Denis Pallier, 'Les Impressions de la Contre-Réforme en France et l'apparition des grandes companies de libraires parisiens', Revue Française d'Histoire du Livre, 31 (1981), p. 267.


92 Tallon, Conscience nationale, pp. 242-43. However, the 1580 jubilee to help the people of Portugal was not as popular as anticipated.

93 Sluhovsky, Patroness, p. 213. In the early modern period, Paris' patron saint shifted from being a symbol of municipal unity and harmony to the figurehead of particular Catholic groupings within the city.


exiles to Paris: it was certainly unlike their native environment. The city presented a space of overt activism, and a heavy clerical presence, which was alien to Protestant England. Parisian religious culture was also marked by less constructive impulses, particularly a deep anti-Protestantism. As we shall see, exiles could use this to legitimise their own presence in Paris, by presenting themselves as Catholic victims of a Protestant persecutor.

2.2: The Home of the French Court.

Henri III's support for new orders in Paris complemented his efforts to inculcate a particular culture of piety at court. Henri III rarely travelled around France; Paris became the permanent base for the king and his entourage. In order to gain office, present a suit, or establish contacts, it was necessary to go to Paris.

Henri was unlike his predecessors in personality, and his kingship contrasted greatly to his subjects' expectations. Many sought a proactive monarch to defeat the Huguenots, and end France's internal divisions. Rather than fulfilling his earlier potential as a Catholic warrior, Henri seemed to display a lack of martial ambition. The style of his court, reflecting a different approach to the problems of government, disappointed those looking for clear and unambiguous rule. Until recently, Henri's innovations have been judged through the lens of hostile League propaganda. According to this, Henri aimed only to give free reign to his demonic passions. His splendid entertainments and extravagant devotions were read as an invidious hypocrisy, endangering his people and kingdom.

This impression has been successfully challenged, with a more constructive assessment of what Henri achieved by the middle years of his reign, and a closer examination of his methods. By 1580, the Crown was engaged with attempts at reform and the seventh war of religion had not destroyed achievements made prior to it. Progress had been made in overhauling the administrative system, and by 1585 the budget had been balanced. Calls for large-scale reform did not go completely unheard, as demonstrated by the Edict of Blois or the introduction of the Gregorian calendar. The

---


problem came not in formulation of reform, but its decisive enforcement across the kingdom.\textsuperscript{98} Removed from armed conflict elsewhere, Paris and the court could meanwhile perhaps enjoy a sense of renewal.\textsuperscript{99}

Henri did not envisage permanent toleration for Protestants within France, but could not accept that the solution lay in an all-out crusade. He sought a workable pacification for the kingdom. In order to restore order and peace it was first necessary to elevate the authority of the Crown. By 1583, he told the Assembly of Notables that as the military assault on Protestantism had repeatedly failed,

\ldots il estoit besoing d'user d'autres remedies...presches, ieusnes, priers, oraisons et bonne vie.\textsuperscript{100}

These ideas \textit{per se} were not without precedent, but the particular means employed to realise them proved controversial.

Henri's belief about the best route to stability was reflected in the style of his court. Against a backdrop of Renaissance learning, he tried to gather opposing parties and reconcile them in a round of entertainments and festivities: courtly reconciliation was one step towards reconciling the kingdom as a whole. The plethora of music, banquets, and entertainments were not just attempts to impress, but part of a larger programme for personal, moral, and spiritual renewal. The aim was to broadcast, from the centre outwards, a model by which conflict was diffused and the King and his people, individually and collectively, could return to divine favour. Neo-platonic academies espoused ideals of love and virtue, promoting harmony and synthesis. Court splendour seemed incongruous with the realities of life in Paris, or France as a whole, but in one sense this made it all the more necessary. Amidst considerable instability, the necessary elevation of the Crown could partly be achieved through displays of learning, peace and magnificence.

\textsuperscript{98} '... its implementation and observation could not be as we desire...because there remained many relics and of past troubles in various provinces of our kingdom '. Preamble to the Ordonnances of Blois, January 1580.

\textsuperscript{99} Venetian reports refer to the peace enjoyed at the French court around 1579 while other parts of France and Europe were in turmoil. Tommaseo (ed. and trans.), Vénitiens, vol. 2, pp. 341, 343, 367.

\textsuperscript{100} '... there is a need to use other remedies... preaching, fasting, prayers, orisons and right living'. David Potter and P. R. Roberts, 'An Englishman's view of the Court of Henri III 1584-5: Richard Cook's description of the Court of France', \textit{French History}, 2 (1988), p. 320.
Henri gathered a group of close associates around him to counter radical opponents. He created a new *Ordre du Saint-Esprit*, intended to bind certain individuals to him and to elevate his own status as head of a *milice chrétienne*. The order, to which new members were appointed annually, welded traditional noble chivalric ideas to spiritual ideals of penitence and charity. Henri, making a noble virtue of a non-violent form of Catholic renewal, looked to align this with religious developments in Paris and the wider kingdom.\(^{101}\) The *chevaliers* were to be a model of a new noble behaviour, inculcating pacification and stabilisation when diffused throughout the kingdom.\(^{102}\)

Bossy argues that Henri’s public stance to English émigrés and the character of his court offered them few opportunities. He premises that the majority of exiles were ‘markedly uncourtly’, and ill-equipped to progress at a Neo-platonic French court.\(^{103}\) Certainly, the court’s approach to the dilemma of competing faiths contrasted to the English rebels, who had responded with arms to a Protestant regime. The more politically-minded exiles were no doubt unhappy about Henri’s conciliatory approach to the Huguenots, and his alliance with Elizabeth I. However, whilst Henri was unwilling to support the exiles openly, he never rejected them completely. His evasiveness was read by some as sympathy, and the exiles found a space in France from the later 1570s. Despite official efforts to curtail foreign influence over the church, state, and economy, the court was open to foreign visitors.\(^{104}\) Those at the French court, for instance, had greater access to the monarch than they would have done in England.\(^{105}\) Not all the exiles had been completely alienated from the Elizabethan regime before their departure: this may have stood them in good stead when in Europe, and a few made

---


\(^{103}\) Bossy, ‘Link’, pp. 51-52. Bossy argues that Henri’s court was akin to the courtly Puritanism of the English court, which alienated traditional Catholic families.


\(^{105}\) CSPF, 1579-80, p. 162, Cobham to the Secretaries, 21 February 1580. Henri asked Cobham if Elizabeth had to endure crowds of subjects at her court, and how she managed to control them.
progress at the French court. In 1577, Henri raised Sir Thomas Copley and his son to the ranks of baron and knight respectively, while Thomas Fitsherbert became secretary of foreign letters to Catherine de Médicis. Copley and Fitsherbert were exceptional characters, and were closely watched by government agents. Nevertheless, they demonstrate that the late Valois court was not totally closed to émigrés. Whilst most probably lacked necessary funds to make a good impression at court, others considered it worth the effort. Richard Norton, for instance, was at court in 1577 in the company of a Frenchman, and seems to have encouraged other exiles to try their luck there too. Other English and Scotsmen, meanwhile, may have been linked to participants in Henri’s palace academy.

Henri’s court was a great promoter of the Counter-Reformation at this point, but it did not necessarily propagate a crusading spirit. In this context it could be inspirational for visitors, and played an interesting role in the conversion of foreign Protestants in France. William Douglas, Earl of Angus, left Scotland as a Protestant, but was deeply impressed by preaching, theological disputes at the Sorbonne, and Henri III’s court. These were the main influences on his conversion, and his subsequent attachment to Paris. Meanwhile, Henri’s court, in tandem with exiled English clergy and Jesuits, had a critical role in George Gilbert’s conversion. The court thus probably held a wider attraction to foreign Catholics than has been acknowledged, and may have

106 Edmund Plowden enjoyed Crown favour: his son was granted a licence to go abroad for 3 years in 1579. TNA, SP 12/154/5, List and particulars of licenses granted to sundry noblemen and gentlemen to travel beyond the seas, 28 February 1572-12 June 1582.

107 Loomie, Spanish, pp. 108-109; Christie (ed.), Copley, p. 108. Fitsherbert held the position from 1586 to 1589. An informer described him as ‘Secretary to all the persons...of our nation and of the Jesuits’ party’, and his house as a place where ‘he receives intelligence to and from all places... the place of common conference’. TNA, SP 15/29/39, Nicholas Berden to Walsingham, Rouen, 11 August 1585.

108 Thomas Lord Paget, Charles Paget, Thomas Morgan and Charles Arundel also attended the French court at various points. For example, CSPF, 1583-1584, p. 329, Stafford to Walsingham, 6 December 1583.


110 TNA, SP 78/1/42, Paulet to Walsingham, Paris, 23 May 1578. Paulet thought Egremont Radcliffe would stop seeking pardon because he had fallen into Norton’s company, and was going to the French court with him.

111 Both George Crichton and the principal of Collège Bayeux, which may have housed exiles, are named as participants in the meetings of the academy. Alain Cabos, Guy du Faur de Pibrac, Un Magistrat Poète au XVIe siècle (1529-1584) (Paris, 1922), p. 407.

112 For both cases, below, Chapter Five, p. 276.
been an important forum for English Catholics there. Unfortunately, the scant primary evidence in this area means that this remains a speculation.

2.3: A Trade and Tourist 'Hotspot'.

Paris was a huge centre for trade and 'tourism'. Goods from across France and abroad were brought to Paris for sale, although the price of ordinary comestibles was fairly high as a consequence.\(^{113}\) Despite the serious disruptions of religious conflict, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw Anglo-French trade prosper. Paris offered a very profitable market to English traders, whilst the exiles opened up new areas of business. Existing links between merchants and the French capital were significant for those wishing to maintain cross-Channel communication.\(^{114}\) A gentry group without a comparable freedom of manoeuvre over the Channel found mercantile activity important for their own interests.\(^{115}\)

Even during periods of conflict, Paris attracted a large number of international visitors. Travellers would stop in cities to see the sights, and meet up with family, friends, or acquaintances made whilst in other continental centres. A fairly inchoate group of travelling Englishmen would have been in Paris to visit friends or kin who were there for more specific purposes.\(^{116}\) The city drew large numbers of foreign visitors: those with a place reserved at the University, those travelling with their own tutor, or those hoping to infiltrate academic circles on arrival. Visitors could avail themselves of publications made for their benefit, offering information on roads and the

\(^{113}\) Tommaseo (ed. and trans.), *Vénitiens*, vol. 2, p. 24; Montaigne, ‘De la Vanité’, p. 185. Montaigne described Paris as incomparable in the variety and diversity of its commodities.

\(^{114}\) Lyons, ‘Franco-Irish’, p. 10. Towns like Saint-Malo, Rouen and Bordeaux, with established trade routes to Ireland, later emerged as centres for Irish refugees. Notarial sources from the period also suggest continued contact between members of mercantile families when they were in France and Scotland prospectively. For example, AN, MC, XLIX, 172, ff. 6-7v.

\(^{115}\) Above, p. 93.

\(^{116}\) Similar patterns are observable at Douai and Padua. Aside from its core of scholars, administrators, seminarians and students, Douai played host to a wider group who came to trade or visit friends and family en route to other destinations. Knox (ed.), *Diaries*, pp. xxxviii, lvi. Many English at Padua were not members of the University’s English nation, but students in a looser sense. Woolson, *Padua*, pp. 5-6.
most important sights or places to visit. The ideal of educational travel had its critics in Elizabethan England, but France was seen as less dangerous than Italy from the 1570s, and travel was backed by key figures such as Walsingham and Cecil. Whether Protestant or Catholic, Paris was an important stop for the young gentleman traveller.

The stream of English Catholic gentry continued in the 1580s, was curtailed by the League occupation, but picked up again by 1609, when they began to write accounts of their travels. By this time, itineraries could be meticulously planned, and there were established routes and practices to be followed, even down to recommended lodging houses in Paris. Perhaps their Elizabethan predecessors had a role in establishing such associations.

Evidence on Englishmen in Paris at this later date is suggestive of the ideals of the ‘tourist’ experience. Sara Warneke distinguishes between those who went abroad to study at a particular University and those following new ideals of educational travel, but the two groups probably interacted when abroad. Unattached to the University, or to a tutor, Edward Herbert left his wife and children behind in the early seventeenth century to embark on a voyage of intellectual, moral and social edification. He later wrote:

My Intention in Learning Languages being to make myself a Citizen of the world as farre as it were possible.


119 Brennan (ed.), ‘Somerset’, p. 70. By the 1590s the ‘the signe of the Golden Tree’, in rue de Grenelle, faubourg Saint-Germain, was recommended as most suitable for English travellers.

Paris was an ideal place to cultivate courtly and martial accomplishments, and to improve language skills. The early seventeenth-century was radically different to the 1580s, and Henri III’s court was not the place to perfect martial skills, but it had its own attractions.

2.4: A Centre for Catholic learning.

Aside from military occupation, Paris’ exposure to Englishmen had often come through academia, and this pattern continued in the sixteenth century. Student numbers at the University of Paris had fallen dramatically: religious warfare, demographic and economic crisis, competition from humanist-inspired local colleges and new foreign universities took their toll on academic vitality. The University was not untouched by changing contemporary moods, but the reform programme in the Blois Ordinances, and several attempts at internal reform, mostly remained a dead letter. This, however, did not immediately detract from an institution which retained a powerful reputation as an independent spiritual authority. It remained a bastion of Catholic learning, and continued to attract intake from a large catchment area. William Allen, for instance, recommended it to his godson as the best place to study theology, and in his printed works praised it as the seat of venerable learning and authority.

---


123 Henri III backed the rector’s intention to search out heretical material in the University in 1587, as it gave him the opportunity to seek out works hostile to him. Armstrong, *Politics*, p. 139.


125 Knox (ed.), *Allen*, pp. 141-42; William Allen, *A True, Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholiques that Suffer for their Faith both at home and abroad: against a false, seditious and slanderous libel intitled: The Execution of Justice in England. Wherein is declared, how unjustlie the Protestants doe charge Catholiques vwith treason; how untrue and they deny their persecution for Religion: and how deceitfulie they seeke to abuse strangers about the cause, greatness, and maner of their sufferings, with divers other matters pertaining to this purpose* (1584), reprinted in D. M. Rogers (ed.), *English Recusant Literature*, 68 (1971), p. 73.
the University population apparently constituted half of the activity of the entire city.\footnote{126} Perhaps more so than other areas of Parisian life, this was a world open to English Catholics.

As a corps outside municipal jurisdiction, the University actively defended its independence from outside authorities. Its exact status came under scrutiny, but the University could claim both ecclesiastical and secular jurisdictions.\footnote{127} The later sixteenth-century is generally viewed as its time of decline, but it fought to assert itself against the Crown and Rome, eventually wedging itself to the radical Catholic League. It was an unwieldy collection of various institutions, but for those associated with it the University provided an identity distinct from that of the city. If the Crown did not extend the welcome exiles hoped for, some at least could find a niche in an institution that often acted as the Crown’s strongest critic.

In the lower Faculty of Arts, the German Nation - including arts students from England, Ireland and Scotland and the Germanic countries of mainland Europe - had been the fastest growing of the four nations. After a decline in the fifteenth century, English and Scottish students were reasserting their dominance within the nation.\footnote{128} Increasingly articulate, they demanded, as we shall see, their own space, both sacred and profane, and the recognition of their distinct corporate identity. In the higher faculties, law and medicine took second place to the Faculty of Theology, an internationally recognised source of Catholic erudition and a guardian of orthodoxy. Despite humanist and Protestants attacks, it had not lost this status in the eyes of English Catholic leaders and others.\footnote{129}

\footnote{126} Tommaseo \textit{(ed. and trans.)}, \textit{Vénitiens}, vol. 2, p. 12.

\footnote{127} This was a key issue in the dispute over the University’s right to nominate to the parish of Saints Cosme-et-Damien: the University won when it was recognised as a secular and religious institution. Below, p. 137.

\footnote{128} The receiver’s and procurator’s books of the nation contain a growing number of English and Scottish names. AN, H*2590, Livre des receveurs de la nation allemande; AN, H*312589, Délégations de la nation allemande.

\footnote{129} Farge, \textit{Orthodoxy}, p. 1. In 1581, English Catholic leaders sought official condemnation for Catholics in England attending Protestant service. They appealed to the Faculty of Theology before Rome. The Faculty judged the practice to be unlawful, although the impact of this on Catholics in England is debatable. Perez Zagorin, \textit{Ways of Lying: dissimulation, persecution and conformity in early modern Europe} (London, 1990), p. 151; \textit{CRS}, 58, p. 31, note 1.
Students were often categorised by the municipal authorities as a health hazard and a threat to public order. Hôteliers and others renting out rooms were enjoined to provide information on tenants, and in times of unrest the militia of the University area were under special orders. The frequency with which these orders were repeated, however, implies their lack of effect. These prescriptions may not provide a realistic impression of everyday experience. Foreigners and students were regarded with some suspicion, but were probably only targeted on specific occasions, or when they had antagonised Parisians. In fact, differences between members of the same national group may have been more common than quarrels between Parisians and foreign students.

An English presence at the University was not new, but the consolidation of a Protestant regime in England gave it new weight. English academics at the University were joined in France by a group of younger boys, studying at Jesuit colleges or under an English tutor. Some Catholics still spent time at the Universities and Inns in England, although changes there made this more problematic. In France or England this stint was more about acquiring some learning or cultivating useful contacts than completing a degree. For students arriving in Paris, the educational and social experience of University was different in several respects.

For younger gentry, a sojourn in Catholic Europe could be brief and dictated by educational considerations. William Middlemore, for instance, was sent back to Worcestershire when his tutor concluded he was not suited to further study of Latin, but his brother Richard was recommended to stay in France and progress to the study of logic. However brief, this stint abroad was seen as an important stage in their education, feeding into ideals about foreign education and travel which were prevalent in England. These boys were more restricted than their senior counterparts in their movements, and perhaps their interaction with the city. For them, specific developments in Paris may not have been as important as the generic experience of being taught in a Catholic country. Meanwhile, academics attached to a particular University were

130 The commissioners of the areas around Saints-Cosme-et-Damien and the Cordeliers were under special instructions to prevent any 'scandal' during the 1580 Saint-Germain fair. Guérin (ed.), Délégations, p. 221.
132 TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece V, Edward Stransam to Mr Middlemore of Hawxly [Hawkeslew?], 9 October 1580.
probably more static than gentlemen travellers, who toured various European centres. Whilst they operated within a framework of established precedent, the specific circumstances of the 1580s gave scope for English students and academics to form new affiliations.

2.5: A Conspiracy centre.

Henri’s ambiguity, rather than hostility, towards exiles facilitated their continued arrival in France. English government concern at this was inflated by reports of growing numbers of English Catholics gathering in Paris, including those seen as particularly seditious. This sense of trepidation was not unfounded. Thanks to some of his most powerful subjects, and to foreign activists within France, in the course of the 1580s France became the seedbed for invasion plans relating to the British Isles. Paris emerged as a headquarters for those plotting against the Elizabethan government. Henri himself was not about to launch an attack: in fact, those who were had determined to keep him ignorant of their plans. Nevertheless, he was sheltering those intent on doing so. Moreover, 1580 and the years following were troubling for England. Spain and Rome had backed Fitzmaurice’s manoeuvres in Ireland with a view to an expedition to England; the impending Jesuit mission was viewed as an intended invasion; the pro-Guise, pro-Mary Stuart Catholic party was on the ascent in Scotland; and it was feared that when Philip II had subjugated Portugal he would turn his sights on England. The gathering of dissident Catholics was bound to cause unease to the English ambassador in Paris in 1580; it continued to do so until the city fell into Leaguer hands and Elizabeth’s representative left. It is difficult to gauge how involved most English were in conspiratorial activity in Paris. The government was realising the need for up-to-date-intelligence, but in 1580 Walsingham’s spy network abroad had yet to fully develop and the objective accuracy of reports is questionable. Moreover, extant sources

133 Above, Introduction, p. 11.

134 Calendar Simancas, no. 266, p. 372, Juan Bautista De Tassis to the King [Philip II], Paris, 18 May 1582. They feared Henri would inform Elizabeth and use the opportunity to his own advantage. Also, Calendar Simancas, no. 334, p. 465, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 6 May 1583.


136 Pollen, English Catholics, pp. 233-41. Cobham sent alarmist reports of a league between Spain, Rome and Tuscany soon to act against England in 1580 and, in the following year, of a league between Spain, Rome and France. There was scepticism over the reliability of Cobham’s intelligence for the former: his source was the Bishop of Ross.
created by hostile parties only provide information on suspected ringleaders. Nevertheless, the perception of seditious engagements between the Catholic powers and the exiles were sufficient to raise fears in England.

The prospect of a Catholic assault launched from Scotland and France in the early 1580s was particularly critical for the exiles. In Scotland, James VI's Catholic cousin Esmé Stuart rose to prominence by late 1580, and rumours were circulating in Paris of plans to transport James to Catholic Europe: the tide was turning against the English-backed Protestant faction. There was a crucial French element to this Catholic resurgence in Scotland. Esmé had been briefed by Mary Stuart's ambassador in Paris before departure, and was acting under instructions from his kinsman, the Duke of Guise. He was closely linked, partly through Guise, to the pro-enterprise exiles in Paris: other exiles presumably supported his preparations for departure in 1579.  

The Guise, the English mission leaders, and the potential of France's northern coast as a launch pad were central factors in any invasion scheme. Exiles began to view the Jesuit mission and the proposed marriage between Elizabeth and Anjou as constituent parts of the same scenario, opening the way to Catholic restoration in England. Hopes for the marriage were still alive on the continent in spring 1580, out of sync with developments in England; this set a pattern whereby politically active exiles maintained high hopes for an imminent homecoming. Meanwhile, a Scottish Jesuit informed the nuncio in Paris that 6,000 men would be sufficient to secure Catholic restoration in the British Isles. Guise poured money into his college at Eu on the Normandy coast. Between 1581-82, it acted as a prep school for the seminary at

137 Esmé Stuart's will was drawn up in 1583 by Jacques Chapellain, a notary with a client base of other exiles, members of the German Nation, and Guise clients: AN, MC, LXXIII, 89, f. 330.

138 Westmorland and other exiles were apparently hopeful in October 1580. Rawdon Brown and G. Cavendish Bentinck (eds.), Calendar of State Papers and manuscripts relating to English affairs, existing in the archives and collections of Venice and in other libraries of Northern Italy, volume VII, 1558-1580 (London, 1890), no. 817, p. 646, Lorenzo Priuli, Venetian Ambassador in France to the Signory, 8 September 1580.

139 Gustave Baguenault de Puchesse (ed.), Lettres de Catherine de Médicis (vols 6-10, Paris, 1880-1909), vol. 7, p. 243; CRS, 53, p. 213. Catherine, for one, did not realise the strength of opposition to the marriage. Exiles in Rome in July 1579 asked new arrivals whether the marriage had not taken place. According to Philip II, opinion in Paris was still optimistic on the marriage in December 1581, when it looked increasingly impossible in England. Calendar Simancas, no. 190, p. 254, Philip II to Mendoza, 31 December 1581. The Venetian Ambassador also reported rumours that the marriage was soon to be concluded in October 1580, although he was sceptical about their accuracy. Calendar Venice, 1558-1580, no. 820, p. 647, Lorenzo Priuli to the Signory, Paris, 20 October 1580.
Reims, an observation and embarkation post for activity across the channel, and an exile honey pot. If Eu was a key departure point, Rouen and Paris were critical for meetings and the channelling of correspondence and funds related to invasion plans. From England, Mendoza advised Philip that any activity promoting Catholic restoration in England and Scotland should be carried out through Paris, not London. In Spring 1582 Paris hosted a meeting between the papal nuncio, the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Duke of Guise, William Allen, Robert Persons, William Creighton and the Spanish ambassador, at which plans were formed for an invasion via Scotland. This particular plot was unsuccessful, but the parties continued to work from Paris.

The fall of Esmé Stuart in late 1582 reduced the viability of Catholic restoration through Scotland, and by May 1583 Guise had ‘turned his eyes towards the English Catholics’, including the exiles, as the route to a successful venture. As part of the Throckmorton plot, the Paris-based Charles Paget went to England at Guise’s behest, to prepare the ground for a French-led offensive. The apparent exclusion of exiles like Paget from the conference in spring 1582 led to hostility towards the leaders of the English mission, but Guise was apparently keen to harness the exiles’ military potential. In the 1582 operation, those in Paris were to constitute part of the fighting

---


141 For instance, Calendar Simancas, no. 149, p. 197, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 20 October 1581. The shift was completed with Mendoza’s appointment to Paris in 1584.

142 Details of these plans were drawn up two years later by the government when Creighton, the Scottish Jesuit participant, was captured. Knox (ed.), Allen, no. CCLXIX, pp. 425-32, Father William Creighton and the proposed invasion of the England, 4 September 1584.

143 Calendar Simancas, no. 332, p. 464, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], Paris, 4 May 1583.

144 Joseph de Croze, Les Guises, les Valois et Philippe II (2 vols, Paris, 1865-66), vol. 1, p. 268; F. A. Mignet, Histoire de Marie Stuart (2 vols, Paris, 1851), vol. 2, p. 258. However, he had to work hard to convince English Catholics that the French could be trusted to leave England once the restoration was assured.

145 Guise’s plans of 1583 viewed English exiles as a crucial part of the invasion forces. Mignet, Histoire, p. 253. Westmorland, Norton, Dacre and others were expected to raise forces. Calendar Simancas, no. 358, p. 504, Instructions given to Richard Melino, the envoy sent by the Duke of Guise to Rome, 22 August 1583. Guise’s keenness to employ the exiles as an advance fighting force did not always complement Spanish plans; it was not prioritised in collaborative projects. Calendar Simancas, no. 345, p. 482, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], 24 June 1583. For resentment at exclusion from invasion plans, Hicks, Elizabethan Problem, p. 6; below, Chapter Five, p. 271, footnote 53; ODB, vol. 42, p. 342.
force, whilst the Earl of Westmorland was earmarked to provide leadership. As well as being a venue for planning, Paris was a source of necessary personnel, troops, and finance. In Persons' 1582 proposals, half of the money to support troops raised inside England was to come from Paris. With invasion plans developing in 1584, the papal legate in Paris was instructed to borrow from Parisian merchants to produce funds for an invasion force at short notice.

For those involved or interested in such schemes, Paris also offered access to Spanish support through its embassy. By late 1580, Juan Bautista de Tassis took up post as Spanish ambassador in Paris. He may have been a close friend of the Guise, but he was not esteemed by all parties engaged in the Catholic enterprise. In 1582, Mary Stuart insisted that he not be involved in plans for a Scottish landing: she asked Beaton to work through Mendoza, the ambassador in London. By July, she was refusing to work through him at all; and Guise apparently also doubted his reliability. In contrast, there was no such doubt over de Tassis' successor, Bernardino de Mendoza. Mendoza was not only a party to invasion plans, but often a key player from their inception. Mendoza's arrival in France in 1583, after his expulsion from England, was therefore the real turning point for Spanish involvement in schemes emanating from Paris.

Reports from English government agents in the course of the 1580s suggest a mounting confidence amongst a rapidly increasing exile group. There was an air of expectation that their homecoming to a Catholic England would not be long in the

146 Calendar Simancas, no. 266, p. 372, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], 18 May 1582.
147 CRS, 39, p. 164.
149 Vargas died suddenly in office in 1580. He was replaced by his secretary Maldonato for the remainder of the year. Baguenault de Puchesse (ed.), Médicis, vol. 7, p. 330.
150 Calendar Simancas, no. 242, p. 330, Mary Queen of Scots to Mendoza, 7 March 1582. In fact, the outline of the plan had been revealed to him by Beaton, and the details divulged by Jesuits William Holt and Robert Crichton as they travelled back from Scotland. Calendar Simancas, no. 266, pp. 372-73, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], Paris, 18 May 1582.
151 Calendar Simancas, no. 278, pp. 392-93, Mary Queen of Scots to Mendoza, 29 July 1582; Calendar Simancas, no. 319, p. 447, Mary Queen of Scots to Mendoza, 28 February 1583.
Not all were directly involved in invasion schemes as early as 1580. Some later became so, but others worked in other ways for the religious redemption of England. Nevertheless, the volatility of the exile environment allowed for the fomentation of challenges to the status quo at home; and Paris played a particularly important role here.

3: The everyday experience of exile.

Paris in its different aspects held many attractions for English gentry looking to spend time in Catholic Europe. Exploring how they managed their daily existence will suggest how time in Paris could alter their outlook, or that of their hosts. This discussion will be largely limited to accommodation, devotion, education and sociability on the left bank, as evidence implies the majority of them lived in the area around the University. This area was already known for its large transient population of outsiders and foreigners, and its potential for unruliness.

Robert Descimon demonstrates the complexity of patterns of wealth, occupation and residence in Paris, which displayed a ‘multi-nuclear pattern of wealth and prosperity’. The office-holding elite had begun to move from the centre, whilst the traditional bourgeois elite remained based in the central regions. For the former, the greener spaces of the Marais in the north and the faubourg Saint-Germain to the south were prime sites for their hôtels, whilst still being in close proximity to the residents of other social classes. This pattern, reinforced by close associations between particular areas and specific trades or businesses, theoretically presented a closed community to outsiders. However, the equation between membership of a trade and membership of one’s neighbourhood was looser on the left bank, where the heavy presence of clerics and students complicated this specialisation. The two quartiers of the left bank - Saint-Séverin, to the west of rue St-Jacques, and Sainte Geneviève to the east - and their faubourgs were home to a significant legal class, to large ecclesiastical mansions and

---

153 Anthony Munday, A Discoverie of Edmund Campion, and his confederates, their most horrible and traitorous practises, against her Maiesties most royall person and the realme (London, 1582), D. i. Munday said exiles in Paris in 1578 were talking of a 'matter of daunger... toward England and her Maiestie'. TNA, SP 78/4a/43, Cobham to [The Secretaries], Paris, 8 April 1580. English Catholics in Rome wrote to those in France assuring them that their sufferings were for a purpose, and that 'the heretics of England will not be suffered to continue long in their mischievous proceedings'.

PARIS
IN THE 1580s

Paris Quartiers

Halles
1. Saint-Honoré
2. Saint-Eustache
3. Saint-Jacques de l'Hôtel
4. Saint-Germain de l'Auxerrois
5. Saint-Innocents

Halles
6. Saint-Jacques de la Boucherie
7. Sepulchre
8. Saint-Esprit
9. Saint-Gervais
10. Saint-Martin des Champs
11. Temple
12. Saint-Jean en Grève
13. Saint-Antoine
14. Notre Dame
15. Sainte-Geneviève
16. Sainte-Sève

religious houses, many of which were in Guise hands, to a host of personnel and industries connected to the University, and to a large number of visitors. Parish churches, religious houses, and University colleges influenced the character of the neighbourhood, which encompassed individuals of varied wealth and status.

3.1: Accommodation.

With its large transient population, there was a range of accommodation options for new arrivals in Paris. It is possible to plot the location of a few private rooms rented by exiles. During his residence in Paris, Charles Paget moved at least once. In 1584, he was living in the faubourg Saint-Victor, on the eastern edge of the city. By 1586, he had relocated to the wealthier faubourg Saint-Germain, perhaps reflecting a desire to be more permanently established in the city. Those traceable to private lodgings seem to be wealthier. Thomas Fitsherbert, for instance, was able to rent a whole house. By the mid-1580s, this provided lodgings for other exiles, particularly those engaged in political conspiracies. Presumably, many exiles who were not involved in conspiracy also rented rooms, of differing number and size according to their means. Being tenants rather than owners gave them something in common with their French hosts. Rather than owning property, most Parisians rented rooms in larger subdivided buildings, and apparently moved lodgings fairly frequently.

The politically active could establish themselves in the wealthier half of the university quarter, perhaps with outside financial help, but more exiles appear in the less prosperous quartier Sainte-Geneviève. This was partly due to financial factors, but also

155 Dubost, *France Italienne*, p. 141.

156 Close to the Abbey of Saint-Victor, with its English associations. Above, p. 102; below, pp. 138-39.

157 AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 270; AN, MC, LXIX, 176, f. 223. Rue Neuve was only in the middle rank of wealth in its particular dizaine, but it was a step up from the faubourg Saint-Victor. Paget was still in rue Neuve in 1587. AN, MC, LXXIII, 94, f. 283. Foreigners trying to establish themselves in Paris would often live in the faubourg Saint-Germain rather than areas on the left bank containing more temporary accommodation. Dubost, *Étrangers*, p. 291.

158 TNA, SP 15/29/85, Thomas Rogers to Walsingham, Rouen, 11 August 1585. Perhaps because of his position at the French court, he could afford his own house. Unfortunately, there is no record of its location. A spy was offered a room there, but complained that Fitsherbert’s prices were too high.

to the location of existing institutions. The centrally located Commandery of Saint-Jean-de-Latran, home of the knights of Saint John of Jerusalem, became an exile honeypot. Archbishop Beaton, Mary Stuart's ambassador in Paris, had a house in the complex, which apparently set a precedent for other exiles.\footnote{AN, LXXIII, 87, f. 356. Beaton was there from c.1560. In 1581, he signed a 9-year contract for the 'maison de Flandres' within the complex. In the later stages of his life, he apparently moved: he owned a house in rue des Amandiers where he was living when he died, and which he bequeathed to the Scottish College. Daumet, Notices, p. 233. Beaton was buried in the order's church, which was normally reserved for members of the order.}

His presence, his financial support of needy exiles, and his involvement in invasion conspiracies transformed the extraordinary jurisdictional area of the commandery into an exile centre, especially, but not exclusively, for his compatriots.\footnote{Beaton apparently offered open house to any exiles appearing on his doorstep. He gave funds to English as well as Scottish refugees, in line with Mary's wishes. Adam Blackwood, Martvre de la Royne d'Escosse (Edinburgh, 1588), reprinted in D. M. Rogers (ed.), English Recusant Literature, 391 (1978), p. 51. In 1599, the English ambassador reported Beaton's guiding influence over Protestant Scottish nobles converting to Catholicism in Paris. Ralph Winwood, Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q Elizabeth and K James I, collected (chiefly) from the original papers of the Right Honourable Sir Ralph Winwood, ed. Edmund Sawyer, (3 vols, London, 1725), vol. 2, p. 134, Henry Neville to Robert Cecil, Paris, 16 September 1599.}

Scottish Catholics came here in the short and long-term. William Douglas, later a long-term resident of Saint-Germain, stayed there in 1584, possibly in Beaton's house.\footnote{AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 720. The notary initially stated that Douglas was staying in the house of the Scottish ambassador, but amended the acte to state he was staying in his own rooms in the commandery.}

The order could demand high rents for property, but they were not averse to leasing to those of less stable financial means. Thomas Winterhop, a senior member of the German Nation and key figure in the Scottish College, rented two studies immediately adjacent to the commandery church in 1580, and was treated leniently by the order when he let them fall into disrepair.\footnote{AN, MC, LXXIII, 86, f. 343; AN, MC, LXXIII, 86, f. 446.}

Tenants may also have benefited from a degree of independence from Crown and University interference inside the precinct. Paris' complex jurisdictional structures thus provided exiles niches in which to shelter.\footnote{Berty, Topographie, vol. 6, pp. 292, 521-26. The Nau family, servants and partisans of Mary Stuart, also lived in or very close to the cloisters.}

One group of expatriates went abroad in service of Catholic leaders such as Allen or figureheads like Mary Stuart. Their travel and accommodation costs were
provided for them. Meanwhile, a few exiles obtained accommodation through posts in French noble households. Significantly, it was not only radicalised households who were willing to take on English Catholics. A kinsman of Lord Mountjoy entered the service of Guy de Faur, seigneur de Pibrac. Pibrac was a member of the conseil privé and just before his death in 1584 entered the service of Henri de Navarre. A distinguished magistrate and diplomat, he was closely associated with Henri's palace academies, attempting to dissolve tension and realise an ideal harmony between competing parties.

The French family into which exiles most famously entered was the Guise. Bossy argues the personal aid they proffered exiles was only small scale and individual in nature. Nevertheless, the opportunity for employment, and the personal nature of the connection, was significant. Charles Arundel, for instance, served Guise as a household officer: in return for information, and perhaps advice, he received food and lodging, and probably the kudos of proximity to a Catholic hero. Such service resolved mundane questions of accommodation and sustenance, but could provoke a conflict of loyalties for exiles between their native Crown and new patrons.

Whilst their Irish and Scottish counterparts had a clear institutional base in Paris, there was no dedicated English college, despite the long-standing presence of English students. However, a tradition of Anglo-French intellectual exchange offered other options. College accommodation was popular, and falling numbers at the university

165 A. J. Crosbie (ed.), Calendar of State Papers Foreign Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1575-1577 (London, 1880), no. 294, pp. 113-114, Occurrences in Scotland, August 1575; CSPF, 1583-1584, no. 362, p. 299, Stafford to Walsingham, Paris, 8 January 1583. Mary Stuart's agent, Ralph Liggons, was probably put up by Beaton during his stays in Paris. In 1575, he was living 'privately' in Paris, but this was presumably at Beaton's expense.


167 Bossy, 'Link', p. 57.

168 G. Daumet, Notices, pp. 229-31, 274; Lyons, 'Franco-Irish', p. 319. The Scottish college, known as Collège de Grissy, was over 200 years old by 1580, although it did not have a permanent base until after Beaton's death. The Irish College was a new establishment in 1578, with a group of 8 scholars.
may have provided greater space for English students. Certain colleges had an established practice of accepting foreign academics, even if the German Nation had no proprietary rights there.\textsuperscript{170} \textit{Maîtres} could take up residence in particular colleges by the later medieval period, which was presumably cheaper than renting privately.\textsuperscript{171} For senior academics, a position at the University guaranteed them college accommodation. By the later sixteenth-century, they could sometimes also secure accommodation for others. In 1581, for instance, John Stuart, dean of the German Nation, was living in Collège Montaigu, which had a history of hosting foreign \textit{maîtres}. He was able to accommodate his nephews William and John there.\textsuperscript{172}

College rooms contrasted starkly to the nearby \textit{hôtels} of the office-holding elite. Whilst Paris was expanding, the majority of the buildings were small and old. Those in the University area were divided and subdivided in an illogical fashion, which did not create comfortable surroundings.\textsuperscript{173} Foreign visitors were struck by the city's filth, and areas around and inside college buildings were no exception.\textsuperscript{174} Exiles in college would share rooms, and often beds, with strangers. This close physical proximity could promote mutual help and perhaps the emergence of a common identity, but it was not something all gentry were used to.\textsuperscript{175}

Particular colleges were notable for housing arts students from England. The English presence at Collèges Mignon, Cambrai and Bourgogne was sufficient to arouse the attention of English authorities.\textsuperscript{176} In fact, the German Nation was linked to Collège

\textsuperscript{170} Gabriel, 'Étudiants', p. 399.

\textsuperscript{171} Brockliss, 'Attendance', p. 535.

\textsuperscript{172} AN, MC, LXXIII, 86, f. 361. Collège Montaigu played host to Irish students in 1578.

\textsuperscript{173} Tommaseo (ed. and trans.), \textit{Vénitiens}, vol. 2, pp. 491, 597. A college was estimated as housing as many as 1,000 students.

\textsuperscript{174} Van Buchel was amazed at the dirtiness of Collège Montaigu. Vider and Langeroad (eds.), 'Van Buchel', p. 62. Somerset saw the filth as ' no small blemish to... so faire a Cittie'. Brennan (ed.), 'Somerset', p. 87.

\textsuperscript{175} TNA, SP 15/27b/20, John Amyas to his brother Richard Amyas, Paris, June 1580. The practise of sharing beds with strangers was common in French inns, but English visitors were not always comfortable with the lack of privacy. Brennan (ed.), 'Somerset', p. 65; Claire Howard, \textit{English Travellers of the Renaissance} (London, 1914), p. 48.

\textsuperscript{176} CRS, 53, pp. 202-204. The informer lists four English/Welsh at Collège Mignon, three in Collège Bayonne [probably Collège Bourgogne, but possibly Collège Bayeux], and two in Collège de Cambrai. This implies a wider presence at each college.
Mignon before 1564: a key member of the nation and principal of the college had become responsible for the system of the nation’s messengers. Collèges Mignon and Cambrai continued to play host to both lowly students and recognised academics in the later 1580s. A specifically English presence at Collège Mignon, albeit a clerical one, persisted throughout League rule in the city. Subsequently, the college was central to plans for an English seminary in the city. Importantly, not all English Catholics staying in University accommodation were necessarily students. Colleges originally created to house poor students on bursaries had long since rented rooms to others for a supplementary income. Those colleges which emerged as exchange centres for exile information and funds were also probably a meeting place for academic and non-academic English Catholics in the city.

The exact location of some exiles was thus due to the position of existing colleges. Exiles were scattered across the University quarter, from Collège Mignon on the western edge, to the older écoles of rue du Fouarre and the Collège de Cambrai in the centre, to the Collège des Bernadins on the eastern edge of the left bank. With the exception of Collèges Mignon and Bourgogne, the ‘student’ exiles did not live on each other’s doorstep, although the University quarter was not large and places were in easy

---

177 In 1564 the Scotsman Thomas Winterhop made an appeal for the repayment of costs incurred by him and the College for running the messenger system since 1555. He was awarded control over future messengers, and all its future profits. The principal of Collège Mignon was involved in the agreement. AN, H 3* 2589, ff. 111-112. By 1581, however, non-English members of the nation were responsible for appointing the messengers, who seem to have been Parisians bourgeois: AN, MC, XLIX, 170, ff. 139v - 140 v.

178 Below, Chapter Five, p. 262.

179 The proposal to use the college as an English seminary emerged in 1597. In 1598, some priests pushed for a seminary based in Collège Mignon; the proposal was still alive in 1602. CRS, 58, pp. 272-73, Barret to [Persons?], 1 December 1597; George Wickes, ‘Henry Constable, Poet and Courtier (1562-1613), Biographical Studies, 2 (1954), pp. 282-83; Leo Hicks (ed.), ‘Letters of Thomas Fitsherbert, 1608-1610’, CRS, 41 (1948), p. 51; Bossy, ‘Link’, pp. 172-74; below, Chapter Three, p. 195.


181 CRS, 53, pp. 187-88; Gabriel, ‘Étudiants’, p. 399. The informer reports exiles at Collèges Cambrai, Mignon, and Bayonne. The latter was probably Collège Bourgogne, which was in close proximity to Collège Mignon, and had a history of accommodating English maitres, even though it officially welcomed students from the Franche-Comté. Alternatively, it was Collège Bayeux: we know some English exiles also stayed there in July 1584. CSPF, 1583-1584, p. 624, Henry Sedgrave and John Fox to William Nugent and Brian Geogheghan, 18/28 July 1584. Archibald Hamilton was teaching Greek and Hebrew in Collège des Bernadins, in the eastern corner of the left bank, in 1578. AN, MC, LXXIII, 84, f. 464 v.
walking distance. Moreover, this ‘scattering’ was probably mitigated by gatherings for teaching, worship, and socialising.\textsuperscript{182} Within this context, the student or academic exiles probably found it relatively easy to orientate themselves.

From 1580, most newcomers had links to other English in Paris, through kinship or professional or local associations in England.\textsuperscript{183} Networks of communication and conveyance were probably sufficiently developed for them to know who or where to turn to for assistance.\textsuperscript{184} An individual could draw on links whose precedents lay in England, but new relationships and bonds of mutual assistance could also be cultivated.\textsuperscript{185} John Amyas’ bedfellow, with whom he was unacquainted prior to his stay in Collège Mignon, offered him an alternative to the traditional university messengers for continued contact with home.\textsuperscript{186}

The unfamiliar environment also impacted on patterns of gentry hospitality. Despite apparent impoverishment, exiles maintained efforts to provide for fellow countrymen and coreligionists. Reformation ideology altered the framework within which hospitality and generosity were articulated in England, but it remained an important component of gentry identity. Paris was a space more conducive to traditions of charitable generosity and gentry largesse, even if the exiles lacked the means available to them in England. Acting as hosts allowed them to assert their gentry status and perpetuate older ideals of gentry hospitality, which was particularly important in a foreign urban environment, where they were not members of the local elite. In England, gentry generally catered only for close family and friends on a regular basis, whilst hospitality towards others would reinforce hierarchy and social difference.\textsuperscript{187} Nevertheless they had an obligation of hospitality to distant relatives or strangers, which was certainly felt when they were removed from their native context. Exiles, however, were willing to provide for any compatriot claiming Catholic credentials. Informers

\textsuperscript{182} Above, p. 115, footnote 126.  
\textsuperscript{183} Above, Chapter One, pp. 50-51, 62-64, 75-77, 81-82.  
\textsuperscript{184} For more on the sophisticated networks of communication and financial support, Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 42.  
\textsuperscript{185} Strype, \textit{Annals}, vol. 2, part 2, pp. 342-44; Appendix book 2, no. XXVII, pp. 674-77.  
\textsuperscript{186} TNA, SP 15/27b/20, John Amyas to his brother Richard Amyas Paris, June 1580. John Amyas was a pseudonym.  
\textsuperscript{187} Heal, \textit{Hospitality}, p. 59. Extended kin and gentry from within the same county were the usual guests of a gentleman. Ben-Amos, ‘Gifts and Favours’, p. 315.
were surprised at the extent of their generosity to fellow countrymen. In 1578, Anthony Munday relied on fabricated kinship links to a Catholic family, and letters of credit obtained at Amiens to support his European travels. Munday’s printed account, published in England to denounce Catholics abroad, admitted that in Paris some old acquaintances proved ‘verie courteous to me, bothe in money, lodging and other necessaries’. Through them he gained potential assistance from a ‘number of Englishe men more, who lay in the Cittie, some in Colledges, and some at their owne houses’. In this case, the exiles’ eagerness to be hospitable left them vulnerable to infiltration by hostile agents.

3.2: Education.

The medieval organising framework of the four nations at the University of Paris was giving way to Renaissance-inspired colleges as sites of living and learning. However, the exile experience implies that both remained important in the later sixteenth century. Foreign Catholics took advantage of space provided to them by both systems. Historians, using contemporary prescriptive texts, see the late sixteenth-century as a time of serious decline for the University’s reputation and numbers. Nevertheless, contemporaries still felt the student population to be overwhelming, and foreign students, perhaps especially Catholics from Protestant countries, continued to view it as a premier site for learning.

---

188 Anthony Munday, *The English Romayne Lyfe Discovering: the liues of the Englishemen at Roome* (London, 1582), p. 7. The ability of Munday’s acquaintances to put him in touch with exiles in late 1578 implies either that they were Catholic themselves, or that the location and identity of the exile group were common knowledge in Paris.

189 For discussion of Munday’s attitude, below, Chapter Four, p. 212, footnote 29.


191 Numbers in the Faculty of Arts collapsed, although perhaps not quite as dramatically as matriculation registers suggest. Brockliss does not identify any English or Scottish matriculands in 1574, and only 1 English matriculand in 1587. L. W. B. Brockliss, ‘The University of Paris in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’ (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1976), p. 272. Notarial evidence implies a heavy Scottish, if not English, presence in the Faculty of Arts.

192 The number of students at the University of Paris at the close of the 1570s was estimated as 25-35,000. Tommaseo (ed. and trans.), *Vénitiens*, vol. 2, pp. 607, 499.
Not all parts of the University were untouched by recent trends. Although the history of those colleges occupied by exiles is hazy, they were not necessarily impervious to humanist ideals and techniques. In any case, individuals could live in less reputable colleges and still benefit from ideas circulating in a wider academic forum. Here, exiles could engage with developing ideas and debates about the state of French Catholicism, and how it fitted into the wider Catholic cause. Those at Collège Bourgogne, for instance, were probably swayed by the influence if not the direct teaching of the radical Jean Boucher, curé of Saint-Benoît.

Educational opportunities in Paris had multivalent impacts. The education of a young boy sent abroad under an English tutor would have been similar to that available from a Catholic tutor in England. But there was the further opportunity to perfect French language skills and engage in openly Catholic devotion. Thus, the University and the opportunities it offered were not moribund in the eyes of those foreign Catholics who continued to attend it.

Exiles in the University milieu could take advantage of the ambiguous or competing jurisdictions of city and University. The Scottish and Irish, for instance, made use of the Collège des Lombards, forsaken by its owners for Italian universities. Meanwhile, Collège Mignon retained an English association throughout the 1580s, almost despite royal interference. A conflict over ownership of the college buildings in 1584 manifested the perennial tension between University and Crown jurisdictions. Henri III had moved the Grammont order out of its house in Bois de Vincennes to

---


194 Collège Bourgogne instituted a humanist-inspired curriculum including Greek by the late 1530s, and was a *collège de plein exercice*. Brockliss, 'University', p. 122.


196 Crevier, *l'Université*, vol. 6, p. 362. Boucher had taught at the college, and as the holder of various University offices he had worked to defend the University's status. Also below, Chapter Three, pp. 188-91.

197 AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, f. 262; AN, MC, LXXIII, 91, f. 287. John Stuart made a bequest to a sick priest living there in 1582; James Curl was residing there in 1585. The Irish made a deal with Collège des Lombards in the seventeenth century, whereby it became the base for Collège des Irlandais.
accommodate and promote the Hieronymites in Paris. His solution to the Grammonts' homelessness was to offer them Collège Mignon in recompense. This immediately sparked a challenge by the University, who claimed ownership of the college buildings. The dispute dragged on into the seventeenth century, but in the mean time, English exiles apparently continued to live there. An unstable exile group thus found space in an area contested by the Crown, University, and even Rome.

The status of certain English Catholics as exiles presumably helped to gain them space at the University. The presence of activists such as Nicolas Wendon at Collège de Cambrai, aided other Englishmen. Wendon's rooms were used as a meeting point for those who were pursuing a political agenda and were unconnected to the University. Even before the onset of the League, the University as a forum called for an active response to the challenges to Catholicism, and this unsurprisingly affected foreign Catholics. Their presence from the late 1570s established a position that was built on in subsequent years.

The University forum, therefore, provided a platform for the articulation of Catholic identities of national and international dimensions, and some foreign academics exploited the relative freedoms it offered. The late 1570s saw a disagreement among certain members of the German Nation, ostensibly about their role as landlord in rue Saint-Jean-de-Beauvais, in the centre of the University quarter. On a deeper level, the nation's responsibility to support its exile members was also under question. A group of Scottish academics appealed to the Parlement of Paris to rule that a room in a house belonging to the nation be dedicated to its exiled members; their opponents - who also included Scotsmen - complained that this would lower the rent they could ask of prospective tenants. The former group, however, were prepared to club together and cover the balance themselves. The room they said, would serve 'au plus grand proffet et

198 AN, M 177, 4-6. Henri granted Collège Mignon to the Grammonts on 27 April 1584. This was ratified by lettres patentes on 14 May, and given papal approval on 1 October 1584.

199 For the jurisdictional dispute, Crevier, l'Université, vol. 2, pp. 405-407; Berty, Topographie, vol. 5, pp. 481-86.

200 Rome supported Henri by confirming the transfer of ownership to the Grammonts. AN, M 177, 7-8.

201 CRS, 53, pp. 187-88. Richard Norton, an old man without links to the University, met other activists in Wendon's lodgings.

202 The commandery of Saint-Jean-de-Latran, an important site for Scottish exiles, was located on this road.
bien a tous les nations en generalle'. 203 Nevertheless, it was to have a very specific function, providing a space where they could ‘ayder par leurs scripts et diligences a remettrer la religion catholique au leurs... pays descosse’. 204 The group did not win their suit outright, but their quest for reserved space in a foreign city could be advanced by their self-fashioning as men forced to ‘sabsenter de la dite pays descosse a cause de la Religion’. 205

The relationship of this group of suitors to their English counterparts in the German Nation is an intriguing question. Judging from available sources, the English members of the nation were not equally active in searching for their own space. Certainly opinions diverged between English and Scottish lay exiles about larger issues, such as the nature and outcome of invasion attempts. Here, the ‘national’ pull of English and Scottish groupings appear to have been stronger than any trans-national ‘British’ Catholic identity. 206 At the same time, as the 1580s progressed, the English and Scottish in the nation were gaining sufficient ground to challenge the previous German dominance, but it is not clear that they formed a united front to do so. When the nation’s seal was stolen in 1586, some students had a new one made to replace it. This incorporated the English leopards, or lions, as well as the German Imperial Eagle, into the design. 207 This new crest appears not to have been adopted, as it met outcries from their German-speaking members. 208 Nevertheless, the following year, the English and

203 ‘to the great profit and good of all the nations in general’. AN, MC, LXXIII, 84, f. 464 v.

204 ‘... help by their writings and their diligence to restore the Catholic Religion to their country of Scotland’. AN, MC, LXXIII, 84, f. 464. The following year, when trying to reach agreement about the lease of another house, they stipulated that space should be kept aside, allowing members of the Nation to see to their business and studies in the said house. AN, MC, XLIX, 166, f. [7].

205 ‘to absent themselves from the said country of Scotland for Religion’. AN, MC, LXXIII, 84, f. 464. The petitioners dismissed the écoles as a meeting place, as inconvenient and designed only for the needs of arts students. A compromise was eventually reached: a different house in the same road, also owned by the nation, was to be let on condition that one of its rooms should be reserved as a meeting place.


208 Intriguingly, Crevier says the Scottish tribe made the move to add the leopards, although they were English emblems. Perhaps the English were part of the Scottish rather than German tribe, and it was Englishmen among them who tried to introduce the leopards. The German tribe appealed to a University tribunal against the new seal. The matter was discussed at tribunals, but there is no evidence of a decisive verdict. In the long term, the original, bearing the Imperial eagle only, was used.
Scottish tribe was officially recognised as holding equal status in the Nation with the German tribe.²⁰⁹

3.3: Employment.

Unlike Protestant refugees in England, exiles in Paris were a gentry group, without a trade. Some had a family background in trade, but few were able to support themselves through work. A few may have been in Henri III's personal guard, but overall they did not seek military service in France, or establish their own regiment as they did in Spanish territory.²¹⁰ In a time of economic difficulty, they would have found it difficult to find a livelihood. The majority had much more time for leisure. Aside from religious devotions and their possible conspiratorial activity, they presumably spent their time studying, thinking, or socialising, amongst themselves and with the wider city community. Unfortunately, the fullest account of contemporary Parisian life is almost devoid of any reference to their active presence.²¹¹

France presented some employment opportunities. Agents of Mary Stuart, or cross-Channel couriers, were usually recruited before leaving Britain. Passing through Paris, they lived on the edges of the exile group. The University offered academic employment: here, having the right contacts, or Catholic credentials, was advantageous.²¹² Jean Prevost, curé of Saint-Séverin and an influential member of the Faculty of Theology, secured William Bishop's entry to the Faculty although he had not undergone the compulsory preparatory study.²¹³ The nearby printing industry offered other employment. Printing itself was an option only for the technically competent, but

²⁰⁹ Crevier, l'Université, vol. 6, pp. 392-93. The equity was established in April 1587, and solemnly ratified on 5 May 1587.


²¹² The chances of obtaining an academic office were greater if the procureur of the Nation was sympathetic. Gray Cowan Boyce, The English-German Nation in the University of Paris during the Middle Ages (Bruges, 1927), p. 52.

²¹³ Bossy, 'Link', p. 96. Bishop went on to become a leading English Catholic controversalist and member of the Collège d'Arras in Paris, and later Bishop of Chalcedon. His politique views did not agree with Prevost's. ODNB, vol. 5, pp. 877-78.
some exiles acted as printers’ assistants. Finding lodging with a bookseller was considered advantageous, as it offered the possibility of making contact with the educated men who frequented the shop.

Gentry exiles were more accustomed to employing than being employed. Wealthier gentry brought servants with them from England, whilst others tried to secure English servants from exile. These men sometimes acted as Cross-channel couriers. For instance, Thomas Brooke, a longstanding secretary of Thomas Copley, kept open communication with Catholics in England. Thus the gentry themselves provided support for a group of Catholics abroad.

In general, the financial advantage exiles offered to their hosts was little more than small-scale business for food suppliers, tailors, landlords, and notaries. In a few cases, those who could afford to incorporated French servants into their households, or engaged Parisians as legal representatives. Thomas Copley, for instance, contracted a young Frenchmen for 6 years service in Paris in 1580. Again, those who were actively political show greater signs of interaction with their hosts. In 1586, with Charles Paget increasingly drawn into Mary Stuart’s party, he appointed Claude Nau as

---


215 Howard, English Travellers, p. 43.

216 TNA, SP 12/143/33, piece VII, Christopher Turner to Mr Haverly, Poissy, 10 October 1580; CRS, 13, pp. 123-24.

217 TNA, SP 78/1/53, Paulet to Walsingham, Paris, 5 December 1577. In the late 1570s Richard Norton’s servant John Grene passed backwards and forwards to England. He visited northern England, whilst maintaining contact with Nicolas Wendon. Grene was possibly a kinsman of Norton, from another rebel family.

218 Christie (ed.), Copley, pp. xxvii, 102; ‘Salisbury’, HMC, 9, part 2, no. 458, p. 153, Thomas Wilson to the Earl of Leicester, 18 May 1577. Brooke was arrested in 1577, and interrogated by the Privy Council about letters and other items he had brought into England. He was probably the Brooke reported in Paris in 1580. TNA, SP 78/4a/63.

219 AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, f. 563; AN, MC, LXXIII, 89, ff. 618v-619v. Jean August, a marchand tailleur, was based near porte Saint-Michel in the Sorbonne area. He was engaged in property deals with members of the German Nation, whilst another exile was his debtor.

220 AN, MC, XLIX, 155, f. 534.
his procureur. Nau, a Guise client and partisan of Mary Stuart, served as her secretary in England whilst his brothers dominated her council in France.221

Exile correspondence often dwells on their deprived state. Paris was an expensive place to live, credit was more difficult to secure than in their home environment, and the financial crises of the University colleges presumably removed another potential charitable source.222 Complaints of poverty were common to the medieval as well as early modern student, although if Henri's monetary reforms had been enforced their situation would have worsened.223 Exiles frequently appealed to their families as their allowance ran out, while others, as we shall see, turned to Catholic leaders.224 The necessity of English Catholics abroad could be exploited by the English government.225 In certain circumstances, however, their financial troubles could be recast in light of their exile status, so that the deprivation and instability of life abroad took on a new resonance.

3.4: Devotion and Spirituality.

The multiple opportunities for Catholic devotion in Paris contrasted to the situation in England. Forms of Catholic spirituality and fellowship, reinterpreted and reformulated for existence under a Protestant regime, were internal or secret.226 In Paris space on the streets, and inside the churches, was Catholic space, and there was wide scope and opportunity for public and private practice. In some respects English Catholics were outsiders to this sacred space. However, drawing on the established English presence in

221 AN, MC, LXIX, 176, f. 223. By making him his procureur, Paget gave Nau the right to do business in his name and manage his financial affairs. Nau's brother-in-law was Jean de Champhuon, sieur de Ruisseau, who was also on Mary Stuart's council, and a churchwarden at Saint-Séverin. Bossy, 'Link', p. 95. Below, Chapter Four, p. 254.

222 Pardailh-Galabrun, Intimacy, p. xiii. Prices were higher for English in Paris than in Reims. CRS, 58, p. 39, Barret to Agazzari, 16 November 1582.

223 C. H. Haskins, 'The Life of Medieval Students as Illustrated by their Letters', American Historical Review, III (1898), pp. 208-10; Chevallier, Roi Shakespearien, p. 520; Tommaseo (ed. and trans.), Vénitiens, vol. 2, pp. 345, 585. Coinage reform included the outlawing of foreign currency in France. Venetian reports suggest that foreigners suffered, but Chevallier argues it was not efficiently enforced.

224 TNA, SP 12/142/24, George Gifford to Giles Gifford, 22 September 1580; TNA, SP 12/143/33, Piece I, Thomas Croft to George Middlemore, 12 October 1580; Brockliss, 'Attendance', p. 535.

225 TNA, SP 53/17/417, Charles Paget to Mary Stuart, 10 April 1586.

Paris, and on their emerging identity as religious exiles they could gain entrance, and sometimes even lay claim to it. The development of Catholicism as an international cause facilitated the formation of a common identity between guest and host, so that their interests at least partly converged.

The complicated organisational and jurisdictional history of the city’s parishes resulted in their varied size, social makeup, and the loyalty of their parishioners. On the left bank this was complicated by the traditional competition between a number of bodies with claims of influence: the Episcopal authorities, the University of Paris, and the powerful religious houses. Saint-André-des-Arts, for instance, was characterised more by its wealthy magistrate population than the colleges within its boundaries. Elsewhere, University influence was more strongly felt, and was to provide a site for the expression of exile identity. This was evident in Saints-Cosme-et-Damien, a parish in the heartland of the University, which had long held the rights of nomination to the church. In particular, the German Nation made significant contributions to the maintenance of the church, and the curé was often chosen from among its ranks. The link between the church and the nation was reflected in the celebration of the nation’s feastdays there; reciprocally, the parish’s feast day was incorporated into the University calendar. Testamentary evidence reflects a continued association between the parish and the nation. In 1581, whilst remembering fellow maîtres, John Stuart requested the annual celebration of a high mass for his intentions at Saints Cosme-et-Damien.

The Nation competed with another corps, the confraternity of barber surgeons, for influence in the parish: in the later sixteenth-century the German Nation had

---

227 For a recent treatment of the jurisdictional muddle of Paris’ parochial system, Harding, Dead.

228 BN, Ms Clairambault 987, Extrait des Registres de L’Eglise Paroissiale de St André-des-Arts à Paris, depuis l’an 1525 (Microfilm 14622); BN, fonds français, 32589, Extrait des Registres des Baptêmes, Mariages et Sépultures de la paroisse de Saint-André-des-Ars à Paris, 1525-1746 (Microfilm 14622). Collèges Mignon and Bourgogne were in the area, but extant parish records show only a small academic presence, and no trace of English gentry or students. Parish records are dominated by wealthy parlementaires and officeholders, some of whom, like the Hotmans, were in Mary Stuart’s service.

229 AN, MC, H*2590, Livre des receveurs de la nation d’Allemagne. This records many feastday masses celebrated in SS Cosme-et-Damien. The nation’s archæ and keys were possibly kept in the church. Boyce, English-German, pp.178, 180.

230 AN, MC, LXXIII, 86, f. 259.
precedence. This position was reinforced by the appointment of Scotsman John Hamilton as curé, and the confirmation of the University’s right to nominate to the cure in 1588. Hamilton’s activism as a senior member of the German Nation, as preacher and curé, and as promoter of the cause of Catholics in England and Scotland boosted the confidence of fellow members of the nation. Being eager to define and improve the church as their own sacred space, they presumably also had a hand in the building works which were undertaken at a time of financial crisis.

The Nation’s identity was to be affirmed through control of space within the church: in one sense, Saints-Cosme-et-Damien provided an ecclesiastical equivalent to the campaign for space in rue Saint-Jean-de Beauvais mentioned above. The nation presented a series of demands, in return for their donations towards the church fabric. They asked for their pews to be nailed to the floor of the church, giving them a degree of permanency. They wanted the windows between the nave and chevet to be opened, so the nation could see the priest celebrating Mass. Consolidating their recognised right for burial space, they also claimed the prime area between their pews and the High Altar for the burial of ‘ceux des nations d’Allemagne et d’Irlande’. The absence of an English or Scottish claim to space here is notable. As the more numerous group, they conceivably had already obtained specific burial space. Alternatively, perhaps the

231 According to legend, Saints Cosme-et-Damien, patrons of surgeons, had been medical men. Their relics were held in Notre-Dame, not the parish. Sluhovský, *Patroness*, p. 74; Brockliss, ‘University’, p. 204. As the more distinguished of the two companies of barber-surgeons in Paris, members of this guild were independent of the University. Their hostility to the German Nation was probably partly due to its status as part of the University corps.


233 Extensions to the church were begun in 1578. Babelon, *Nouvelle*, pp. 245, 518. His source for this information is not stated. Hamilton’s predecessor’s attempts to obtain funds from the parish council to improve his own lodgings had provoked bitter dispute. AN, L 634, no. 37, ff. 1-6; AN, SS 318, dossier 2, f. 1.

234 They wanted their pews to be nailed down ‘afin qu’ils ne fussent pas déplacés’; ‘in order that they are not moved’: probably, the barber-surgeons had tried to move them. The pews were probably bedecked with the shield of the nation, as they were in the early seventeenth century. Berty, *Topographie*, vol. 5, p. 361. The windows referred to were presumably in a screen which separated them from the high altar. The use of the term ‘chevet’ here is confusing, but if it is taken to refer to the chancel in general, we can assume they were talking about a rood screen.


236 The Irish College was established in 1578, but its numbers were small. The numbers of native German-speakers among the nation may have been stagnating.
English and Scottish were led by a self-image as exiles not to seek a permanent burial space: to do so could be an admission that their exile was long term, and they would not return home before death.

Here the nation could well have been seeking the official ratification of already established practices. The exiles associated with the University's lower faculty were utilizing a space already open to them to construct and articulate a Catholic identity. Through their claims over some of the most important lay space within the church, they sought recognition of their status in a public, sacred forum that was an established part of Paris' urban fabric. In this case, the instability of the 1580s must have worked in their favour. Although they continued to arouse the resentment of the barber surgeons, being in Paris allowed them to assert themselves as a University corps, and also perhaps as a group exiled from their homeland.  

There was also plenty of opportunity for extra-parochial worship in Paris. Considerable lay attachment to the religious orders was not limited to native Parisians, and the large number of houses offered devotional, liturgical and sacramental provision for foreigners. Bossy delineated the Capuchins' importance, attracting Englishmen into the religious life, but other houses served a wider function for English laity. Exiled brothers Charles and Thomas Paget attended Mass at the Cordeliers, next door to Saints-Cosme-et-Damien. Newly restored by royal and notable patronage, this house of Observant Franciscans was to become a League hotbed. Others drew on older associations with the Abbey of Saint-Victor on the eastern edge of the city. Famed for its library and learning, it also had an immediate relevance for the English. Thomas Becket had stayed there in 1171 before making his return to England from exile. In the sixteenth century, Englishmen, some of them living nearby, resorted to the abbey on an everyday basis, visiting its librarian and discussing English news with him. The feast


238 Harding, Dead, p. 41; above, pp. 104-105.

239 Bossy, 'Link', pp. 101-103.

240 CSPF, 1583-1584, 329, p. 281, Stafford to Walsingham, 27 December 1583. However Stafford reported their devotion was cooler than it had been. Laure Beaumont-Maillet, Le Grand Couvent des Cordeliers de Paris (Paris, 1975); Armstrong, Politics, pp. 29-31, 135, 143-64.

241 Charles Paget was living in the faubourg Saint-Victor in 1584. Above, p. 123.
day of St Thomas, presumably integral to the house’s devotional calendar, had a clear importance for the exiles. Englishmen flocked to the house on the saint’s feast day in 1585. A high mass was sung, and a number of other masses were celebrated by English priests. The large congregation also heard a sermon in English.242

The Scottish, meanwhile, were linked to the Carmelite house. This was located on the doorstep of the Collège des Lombards and the Commanderie de Saint-Jean-de-Latran, both of which had Scottish connections.243 The Carmelite church contained a chapel dedicated to Saint Ninian, a fifth century British missionary bishop, known as the ‘chapelle des escosses’.244 John Stuart, dean of the German Nation, established a foundation in his will of 1581, whereby a perpetual round of masses were celebrated by the order. He asked all four mendicant orders to attend the funeral service, and for a plaque to mark his burial site in the Carmelite church. This zeal, and a presumed belief in the efficacy of Mendicant prayer, did not preclude attachment to other sacred sources in Paris. Stuart made bequests to his parish church of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont, even if he did not wish to be buried there, and asked for Sainte-Geneviève, patroness of Paris, to intercede for his soul.245 His will thus suggests an effort to integrate into the social and religious community of Paris, on a local and a municipal level. Sluhovsky argues that Sainte-Geneviève was unique in being invoked not only by individual intercessors, but also on behalf of the city as a whole. A foreigner asking for her intercession, therefore, perhaps envisaged himself as part of a wider urban community, or even the French kingdom, rather than just as part of the immediate neighbourhood of his exile.246

242 BN, fonds français, 20309, Journal du bibliothécaire de Saint Victor, f. 357 v. The feast day occurred on 29 December, when ‘anglois catholiques en tres grande multitude sont venues’. A sermon was preached by English priest Thomas Corbicir [?]. Unfortunately, the extant journal spans less than a year: we can only speculate this was an annual event for English Catholics in Paris. The abbey held some items of St. Thomas, which were revered as relics. Fourier Bonnard, Histoire de l’Abbaye royale et de l’Ordre des Chanoines Réguliers de St-Victor de Paris (2 vols, Paris, 1905-1907), vol. 1, pp. 225-56.

243 The nation had an earlier association with the Carmelite house. Boyce, English-German, p. 52.


245 AN, MC, LXXIII, ff. 257-63. Perhaps he wanted to identify himself with the Parisian magisterial elite, who often requested burial in a religious house rather than their parish church. Stuart’s residence in Collège Montaigu put him in close proximity to the shrine of St Geneviève, to whom his parish had a close link; he left money for the illumination of her statue.

246 Sluhovsky, Patroness, p. 28.
Elsewhere, exiles may have attended college chapels - Mignon and Bourgogne had their own chapels in the later sixteenth century - or the Commandery of Saint-Jean-de-Latran. This potential separateness from the Parisian populace was perhaps mitigated by other factors. Sermons, for instance, took place at many other sites in the city. Preaching was a powerful anti-Protestant weapon in France; it also became significant for Anglo-French relations in the later 1580s, and for constructing an exile identity for English Catholics in Paris. Additionally, English Catholics must have witnessed a range of religious processions, from the traditional Corpus Christi celebration, the appeal to Sainte Geneviève against natural calamity, the marches of new penitent orders, or the annual celebration of a parish's patron: processions emphasised both the ideal unity and the divided reality of Paris' populace. Exiles also came into contact with debates about French Catholicism. In 1580, the church of Saint-Séverin was the venue for heated debates over the legitimacy of ultramontane innovations in France. Through residence in Paris in general, and certain parishes in particular, exiles gained exposure to Catholic debates in a broader, international context which would not have been readily available at home.

Parisian devotions did not necessarily exclude outsiders. Unlike Protestant exiles, those in Paris did not establish their own sacramental or liturgical provision. This apparent apathy could actually complement Catholic liturgical ideals, and contemporary ideas about religious community. Liturgy acts to define the boundaries of a particular

247 Corrozet, Antiquitez (1577). No chapel is listed for Collège de Cambrai. The chapelle Mignon also features on two contemporary maps of the city: Truschet and Hoyau's plan of 1552, and the plan de Saint Victor of 1555. In the sixteenth and early seventeenth century, it seems that college life was increasingly centred around communal mass in the chapel. Brockliss, 'University', p. 96.

248 Wilkinson, Mary, p. 121. Wilkinson argues there were ways other than physical presence to be exposed to their message.

249 A Venetian commentator at the close of the 1570s was impressed by the learning and capability of French preachers. Tommaseo (ed. and trans.), Vénitiens, vol. 2, p. 581.

250 Sluhovsky, Patroness, pp. 54, 76. Exiles presumably witnessed the procession of the saint's relics through the streets for protection against flood in 1577. Foreign observers were impressed by the depth of French devotion, and that every parish church would hold a procession for its patron's feast day, regardless of its means. Tommaseo (ed. and trans.), Vénitiens, vol. 2, p. 259; Brennan (ed.), 'Somerset', p. 92.

251 The papal bull In Coena Domini was read publicly, provoking Gallican concerns over papal intentions. It issued a series of excommunications against secular authorities who were deemed to have impinged on ecclesiastical jurisdictions: Ramsey, Liturgy, pp. 126, 374; Pallier, 'Impressions', p. 240.

252 AN, MC, XLIX, 155, f. 534. Thomas Copley and his family lived in the parish of Saint-Séverin, in rue Saint-Jacques, in 1580.
community. The need for vernacular liturgy drove Protestant exile groups to establish separate churches. This consolidated their identity, and expressed a symbolic union with their countrymen in exile elsewhere. For Catholics, however, Latin had been confirmed and elevated by the Council of Trent as a mark of Catholic ideology, scholarship and worship. Latin was a mark of identity, and, as the Church embraced its international character, it was a common vehicle for communication. This was particularly significant for those outside their home environment. Despite the practical problems of using spoken Latin on the continent, a common liturgical language had great unifying potential. By participating in mass and other devotions in Paris, foreign Catholics could express themselves as an exile community in certain contexts. Part of a specific foreign community of Paris, they were also participating in the general international Catholic community. Attending mass abroad provided connection to England’s Catholic past, and to Europe’s Catholic present. It also highlighted the immediate dilemma of English Catholics: in order to openly worship as their continental coreligionists did, they had to leave their homeland and share the physical space of others.

Through these various spaces, Paris offered new forms of devotional experience, and exposure to wider religious and political debates. English Catholic participation in the worshipping community of Paris was caused by worldly, political circumstance, but ideologically, they were united with their hosts in a common faith. It also affirmed wider membership of the international Catholic Church, encompassing kin in England. It was not necessarily indifference that explains the lack of their own church in Paris: their community was constituted along different lines. The sociability, charitable


255 William Brenchley Rye, England as seen by foreigners in the days of Elizabeth and James the First (London, 1865), p. xxxvi; Feret, Faculté, p. 21. Measures for students to speak Latin at all times, and in some cases to counter foreign pronunciation of Latin, were reiterated. The Latin of educated Englishmen was apparently unintelligible to most Europeans. English students apparently had to adopt Italian pronunciation to be understood. In fact, some English exiles, including those involved in the print industry, could speak neither French nor Latin. BN, fonds français, 3305, f. 45, Henri III to Mauvissière, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 25 January 1584.

256 Given the multinational nature of the left bank’s population, it is likely that the English worshipped alongside those of other nationalities as well as their French hosts.
support, and information or intelligence offered to Protestant exiles through their separate churches was found by Catholic exiles in other forums.\textsuperscript{257}

The exile state presents a dilemma between integration and remaining a distinct group. Philip Selznick discerns a continual tension between civility and piety as sources of integration in a moral community. Civility requires diversity and a degree of toleration, whilst piety - associated with a traditional, 'folk' society - demands devotion and integration.\textsuperscript{258} The exiles seem to have stood at the point of confrontation for these ideals. Their stay in Paris rested partly on 'civil' traditions of accommodating newcomers, and partly on their 'pious' appeal as Catholics coreligionists. Their presence in churches, streets and colleges in itself implies a degree of integration. They occasionally took a more pro-active stance, identifying with specifically Parisian religious issues, such as Jean Stuart's bequest in 1581 towards the rebuilding of the Cordeliers convent, which had burned down a year previously.\textsuperscript{259} These gestures, suggesting a desire for integration into the pious community of Paris, can be glimpsed in very few cases. It seems that overall, whilst stressing a common religious faith, exiles were more likely to play up their difference to their hosts: they were not just Catholics, but Catholics estranged from their homeland.

Paris, a celebrated Catholic city, offered an opportunity to resume practices or beliefs that were no longer 'mainstream' in England, or in some cases, to adopt them for the first time. Jurisdictional complexities and existing tensions between rival authorities and competing sites could work to the exiles' advantage. Some may have sought integration into the urban religious community, whilst others played on their status as outsiders, specifically as Catholic refugees. Nevertheless, the roots set down by a small core of Englishmen and Scotsmen in Paris in the 1570s and early 1580s created a context in which the radicalised political and religious debates of the late 1580s and beyond could be articulated and polarised. It remains to be fully discussed whether a


\textsuperscript{258} Philip Selznick, \textit{The Moral Commonwealth: Social Theory and the Promise of Community} (London, 1992), pp. 365-66, 387, 391. Although he concedes that the two are not always only antagonistic.

\textsuperscript{259} AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, ff. 261-65. A more 'normal' bequest would have been to a parish church or religious order.
larger segment of the exile population could appropriate the complex devotional milieu of Paris in 1580 to different effect.

3.5: Sociability.

Not all their time was spent in religious devotion: there was plenty of opportunity to drink in taverns, listen to public debates, and mull over political developments. Unfortunately, the exiles' daily interaction with Paris is to some degree inaccessible from extant sources. A transitory group were unlikely to have left substantial evidence, and subsequent events in Paris have destroyed potential sources.\(^{260}\) This is especially frustrating for the study of a gentry group, as the large amount of free time they had rendered patterns of sociability particularly significant.

However, something can be said about where and how exiles lived; and where and how they may have socialized amongst themselves, with their French hosts, and with other groups in Paris. Non-ecclesiastical locations were significant, if difficult to trace. Those attached to the University were provided with obvious meeting places. Arts students had the *écoles*, where the faculty's teaching was carried out in the medieval period, and which remained in the nation’s hands. The cloister of the Mathurins was utilised for more formal assemblies of the leading officers of the nation.\(^{261}\) Meanwhile, the rooms of those living in college served a variety of purposes. Students sharing accommodation would be acquainted with other students. Rooms served as studies and as meeting places, sometimes with subversive overtones.\(^{262}\) Nicolas Wendon, for example, used his rooms as a meeting point for a group of exiled clergy and laity interested in effecting Catholic restoration in England.\(^{263}\)

None of these were novel sites, but they acquired a new import in the period. The efforts by Scotsmen to obtain a meeting space of their own was innovative,

---

\(^{260}\) The church of Saints-Cosme-et-Damien, and cemeteries in which exiles may have been buried, no longer exist; Archbishop Beaton’s correspondence was lost after relocation during the French Revolution. *DNB*, vol. 2, p. 20.

\(^{261}\) Below, Chapter Three, p. 177. The *archae* of the nation was possibly held in the private rooms of its senior members. Boyce, *English-German*, p. 180.

\(^{262}\) Boyce, *English-German*, p. 160.

\(^{263}\) *CRS*, 53, pp. 187-88. Wendon was definitely resident in Collège de Cambrai from 1582; he may well have been there when others visited him in 1579.
although the chosen site had been in the nation’s hands for at least a century. Securing it was closely linked to their self-perceived exile status, but also to the increasingly politicised council of Mary Stuart, and the reinvigoration of the Scottish college. Conversely, the lack of similar factors for the English may explain their apparent ‘quietness’ on this issue. The English exiles lacked their own educational institution, and their embassy was a source of hostility and danger. However, the Scottish party’s room probably functioned as a meeting place for the German nation as a whole. It was a likely space for English exiles to meet each other, and fellow Scottish and Irish exiles.

Outside the University, there are some incidental suggestions about the exiles’ interaction in Paris. Having met in particular taverns in the medieval period, by the early seventeenth century certain establishments were known for their English clientèle. Thus taverns, as well as the premises of the Parisian businesses they patronised, were probably meeting points; they were also spaces in which to interact with Parisians.

The most obvious example of exile association through business is their recourse to the same notary. Historians recognise the notary as an important cultural intermediary; it is likely that he acted as such for English gentry in an unfamiliar environment. The notary was a ‘local’ in the sense that he usually lived and worked in the same rooms, and attracted a clientèle from the area immediately surrounding him. A notary would have been intimate with his area, and a potential source of information or advice for those who employed him. There is no necessary relationship between the personal, political, and religious outlook of a notary and that of his clients, but it seems that particular notaries tended to attract groups with common backgrounds or opinions. A notary probably built up an exile clientele partly from his location, but

---


267 Pardailhé-Galabrun, Intimacy, p. 115.
also through recommendation by other émigré customers. For particular actes, exiles would have gathered in his office, which may have been a meeting point more often than surviving evidence suggests. The notary provided a forum for interaction amongst exiles, and with native Frenchmen who could act as legal witnesses and proxies. With agreements being sealed with a drink, the ratification of an acte was a social as well as a business exchange.

Another important site for interaction between exiles, and with Parisians, were the left bank print shops. By the mid-1580s exiles were very involved in Paris' large and prolific publishing industry, especially in the production of radical Catholic propaganda. Richard Verstegan depended on the support of a Parisian printer who offered him his press and the assistance of his son. Other exiles were employed there, or frequented the print house. The location of this press is unknown, but it was probably sited around the intersection of rues Saint-Jacques, Saint-Jean-de-Beauvais and clos de Bruneau, where the exiles were in evidence. The printer's workshop was a site for the exchange of practical expertise, knowledge, and news of current events. The premises of a bookseller was likewise a space for making new acquaintances. As positions polarised in the later 1580s, propaganda aimed to identify the interests of British Catholic exiles and radical French Catholics. The physical presence of the exiles in the printing houses and in the city in general, as well as their contribution to polemic must have shaped French opinion towards Protestant England and English Catholics.

268 James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, was a frequent client of Jacques Chapellain, on rue Saint-Jacques. His servants and other Scottish émigrés also appear amongst Chapellain's actes. The close proximity of some exile residences may also have led them to use the same notary.

269 AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 19v. Richard Cook came to Chapellain's office in January 1584 for a procuration concerning his financial deals with Parisians. Fontaine comments that an acte should be viewed as the culmination of a series of encounters, nearly all of which are now lost to us, between the parties involved and the notary, and amongst the parties themselves. Fontaine, ‘L'Activité Notariale', p. 478.

270 Petti, 'Catholic Martyrologies', p. 70; TNA, SP 78/11/6, Stafford to Pinart, 13 January 1584. Below, Chapter Three, pp. 179-81.

271 Descimon, 'Eve', p. 90.

272 Above, p. 134, footnote 215. Through contacts with booksellers, the printer could be an important intermediary. Lodging with a bookseller was considered advantageous, as it meant possible contact with educated men frequenting the shop.
4: Conclusion.

Paris in 1580 initially offers a model of a ‘territorialized’ city, exuding a strong sense that its space, sacred or profane, belonged to its ‘native’ people. Official prescriptions in England and in Paris militated against an English Catholic presence there. The reality was, however, somewhat different. The influx of outsiders was crucial in sustaining an urban population. Paris was comparatively well equipped to cope with a large transient population, and the complexity of its jurisdictional framework could work to the advantage of the exiles. Their presence did not detract from Parisian identity, and could even help to confirm its Catholic credentials. There was a continued, if disjointed interest in English affairs, and by the later 1580s particular individuals were keen to be well informed about events across the Channel.273 Parisians were not automatically sympathetic to the fate of Catholics in England, but when the cause aligned with their own, or provided warnings for their own future, they were very much aware of it.

The exiles were a mixed group of new arrivals and older fugitives who had been abroad for many years: Paris was both a first choice destination and a last resort. By building on existing associations, and appealing to new ideological precedents, they could gain a foothold in Paris. The long-standing tradition of English in the city was significant, but at a time of political and religious instability, their presence acquired new import. Daily proximity encouraged the evolution of new bonds, amongst those who may not have interacted within England, and between exiles and their Parisian hosts. Residence in Paris did not curtail the traditional, flexible forms of kinship support: it expanded existing solidarities, and exposed them to a wider Catholic context. Paris was highly volatile, politically unstable, international yet parochial, and replete in possibility for renewed religious activity not experienced in England. The convergence of political instability and religious renewal in Paris could be problematic, for Parisians and for those dependent on their goodwill. There were different ways to be a Catholic exile in Paris, just as there were different ways to be a Catholic in Protestant England. The exiles offered their Parisian hosts and other benefactors a means to confirm their own identity. Their presence, problematic on several levels, and often a polarising force, nevertheless initiated cultural negotiation and appropriation. Both host and guest gave

and took something from the exchange. These issues will be explored further in following chapters.
CHAPTER THREE

A Disparate Group or An Active Arm of International Catholicism?

'Exile provokes new forms of interpretation by defamiliarizing the familiar and familiarizing the unfamiliar... foreigners encountered a well-developed French society, political and intellectual traditions... also... some of the most stimulating and disturbing tendencies in modern European society.'

1: Introduction.

Protestant and Catholic sources report large numbers of English Catholics in France, although each ascribes them with different purposes. English informers give the impression of a group driven by evil intent against the English government. Meanwhile, leaders of the Catholic mission were struck by their large numbers and their varied status. Given the fluid nature of the group, the numeration, classification and identification of the exiles are problematic. Nevertheless, it seems that the Elizabethan Catholics significantly outnumbered their Marian counterparts, and their gentry status gives a special significance to their removal from England. Guilday offered a figure of 3,000 for the English Catholic community in Europe. His work remained incomplete, and perhaps underestimates the presence of English Catholic laity on the continent. Bossy estimated that English Catholics in France as a whole numbered 1,000 at the most. It is possible to offer a 'guestimate' of 400 English Catholics in Paris in 1580. If

---

1 Kramer, Threshold, p. 2.

2 TNA, SP 78/12/58, Thomas Becknor to Walsingham, Rouen, 31 August/10 September 1585. 'I never sawe so many inglishe men and women as be here and dayly come over in my lyfe, and supported as far as I can leanere by inglishe men trading this place, or ells they cold not do as they doo'.

3 CRS, 39, pp. 180-82, Robert Persons to the rector of the English College Rome, Paris, 24 August 1583. It was acknowledged that those who left England were married gentry with families as well as seminarians.

4 Marshall, 'Religious Exiles', p. 8. The Marian exiles are estimated as between 800-1000.

5 Guilday, English Catholic Refugees, p. xx.

6 Bossy, 'Link', p. 37. He argues that their presence was non-existent before 1575, and peaked in 1588. Paris and Reims were the largest centres, with roughly equal numbers.

7 This is based only on those included on the government list, with an additional 50-70 added as wives and servants, or unidentified by informers. The young men who went to the continent to travel, observe, and polish their education, went on their own. Many others left their wives behind. Howard, English Travellers, p. 64; Cherbury, Life, p. 7. A few, like Thomas Copley, took their families into exile.
we use these figures, however approximate they may be, over 10% of English Catholic exiles were based in Paris.

The subsequent lack of interest in these lay Catholics contrasts with the historiographical interest that Protestant exiles have attracted. Protestants forced to leave England under Mary I or seeking refuge in Elizabethan England were apparently more organised and cohesive. They are generally seen as making a clear impression on their host environment and, in the case of the Marian exiles, a decisive and long-term impact on return to their homeland. The industriousness of Protestant exiles, particularly those of artisan status, and their varied integration into the host environment apparently throw into relief the situation of English Catholic laity on the continent. If not apathetic, they are viewed as divided and disloyal, engaging in political schemes whose futility was partly due to their own infighting. There is some truth in this representation. If the exiles were aiming for Catholic restoration by force in England, the lack of a successful enterprise can be read as a sign of failure. However, there is room to examine their experience in the wider context of sixteenth-century religious exile, and to ask whether exiles in Paris were necessarily apathetic, dispossessed, or treacherous. English Catholics were involved in a variety of activities, bringing them into contact with their Parisian hosts and the wider Catholic cause. They did not all adopt an identical stance towards living outside England, and some showed a degree of activism in exile, albeit different to their Protestant counterparts. The difference between Protestant and Catholic exile experiences can be explained by both practical and ideological factors. Catholics abroad were generally of a different social background to Protestant congregations who went into exile; their experience of exile was in some respects distinct.

This chapter will examine how exiles made their presence felt in Paris, and what their impact may have been, on coreligionists at home and abroad, and on the French and English Crowns. Against a background of shifting international diplomacy, the available sources of practical and ideological support informed the exile position.

English Catholics were only one of a number of ‘foreign’ groups in Paris, and not usually the most conspicuous or vociferous. The size of the English contingent, and their apparent lack of an institutional base, may not, however, be proportionate to their symbolic significance. The specific conditions of the 1580s, internationally and within France, could be exploited by an activist minority. The exiles acquired new pertinence in an England mobilising for war against a Catholic enemy, and within a Catholic city increasingly riven by internal tensions.

1.1: Exile poverty and apathy?

In spite of government measures, English Catholics continued to leave and return to England, and to fund family members abroad. Cross-Channel links provided sustained if uneven support for those abroad, and continued contact with England, which was important for their return home. Nevertheless, the expense of travel and harsh statutory measures against those abroad unlicensed could create serious financial difficulties. Protestant claims that Catholics abroad were ‘groaning under the burthen of an extreme and calamitous necessitie’ were not entirely fabricated. Catholic sources also report exiles ending their days in privation or starvation in the Low Countries. Reliance on English kinship links did not, however, preclude the infiltration of other networks on the continent. Some sought and accepted support from English Catholic sources abroad, and from European powers. However ambiguous Henri III’s role as a practical benefactor, his kingdom remained a forum in which help from other sources could be solicited. Paris itself could provide sustenance to those exiles in its midst, and there were a range of sources for alms: parishes, religious institutions, individual bourgeois, or Catholic leaders.

---

9 Mendoza’s claim that Catholics were incapable of leaving England was obviously inaccurate. Calendar Simancas, no. 79, p. 97, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], April 1581. The 1581 statute against those overseas without licence forbade their families to provide them with money.

10 Lewis Lewkenor, The Estate of English fugitives vnder the King of Spayne and his Ministers: Containing besides, a discourse of the sayd kings manner of government, and the injustice of many late dishonourable practices by him contriued (London, 1596), preface, p. 3.

1.2: English Institutional Support.

English educational institutions were a first point of call for needy lay exiles. In the early years of Elizabeth's reign, Louvain and Douai were important centres of relief; by the 1580s, institutions in France took on a similar function. In Paris, the administrators of the Jesuit Collège de Clermont, which housed Englishmen travelling through Paris, faced a stream of appeals.\(^\text{12}\) Meanwhile, there were significant numbers of non-clerics at the seminaries, looking for charity or accommodation. Those in charge of the Reims seminary were constantly petitioned by lay exiles.\(^\text{13}\) The proliferation of requests posed a serious problem to the already precarious finances of the seminary. Allen, mindful of the political implications of supporting those with possible designs against Elizabeth I, took a clear line on aiding necessitous exiles. He advised Persons and Aquaviva to give appellants what they could afford, but not to get involved in their long-term financial affairs, or in any appeals they made to the Pope or other Catholic leaders.\(^\text{14}\) Individual laymen were not the primary concern of the seminaries, who prioritised the support of students and clerics.\(^\text{15}\) Nevertheless, Allen would intervene for them, and some relied on the prospect of alms from the colleges.\(^\text{16}\) As for the recipients, they were led by necessity as well as ideology. Receiving alms from Reims did not necessarily result in commitment to the international Catholic cause. However, it did bring individual laity into contact with a clerical network that was both English-focused and continentally orientated. This contact may have proved more significant in the long run than the immediate provision of alms.

\(^\text{12}\) English Jesuits like Thomas Darbishire resided there; other English would stay there when in Paris. Bossy, 'Link', pp. 41, 100.


\(^\text{15}\) '... our profession and good will is to is to help every body, mary the students and priests be in special recommendation'. CRS, 58, p. 11, William Allen to Richard Hopkins, Reims, 5 April 1579. Printed in Knox (ed.), Allen, p. 77, as Allen to Richard Hopkins, Paris, 12 May 1579.

\(^\text{16}\) Below, p. 167, footnote 101.
1.3: Foreign maintenance.

With the funds of English institutions on the continent insufficient to relieve all lay exiles, the main resort was to non-English sources. An individual’s approach depended on the specific circumstances of Paris, and their status in the wider Catholic world. A few were able to call on French contacts for financial help.\footnote{Above, Chapter One, pp. 50-51.} For others, the city’s parishes and religious houses provided an opportunity for integration with Parisians, and access to their charity. Guillaume Roussel, curé of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont in the University quarter, procured financial aid for exiled academics, men such as William Nicholson, who worked as a private tutor in Paris. Roussel also influenced the Parisian laity in this direction. As spiritual advisor, in 1582 he encouraged the wealthy Pierre Acarie to act as benefactor and distributor of alms to exiled English clergy. Acarie was a prominent member of the Parisian bourgeoisie, a royal office holder and substantial landowner. From 1582, he was also churchwarden in the right-bank parish of Saint-Gervais. His public demonstration of charity towards exiles served as an example to others, and his immediate circle displayed similar intentions.\footnote{César Paul Emmanuel de Broglie, La Bienheureuse Marie de L’Incarnation, Madame Acarie, 1566-1618 (Paris, 1903), p. 17; Henri Brémond, Histoire Littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France, depuis la fin des Guerres de Religion jusqu’à nos jours, tome 2: L’invasion Mystique (1590-1620) (Paris, 1930), pp. 194-256; Robert Descimon, Qui étaient les Seize? Mythes et Réalités de la Ligue Parisienne (1585-1594) (Paris, 1983), p. 101. Acarie was a conseiller du roi et maître in the Chambre des comptes. He was to be a key figure in the formation of the Sixteen. His wife Barbe became a famous mystic and religious advisor, and central to the establishment of the Discalced Carmelites and the Ursulines in Paris. It is interesting to note that the influence of a left-bank cleric could draw Parisian notables into the exile cause from a wider catchment area.} If men of influence were committing time and money to the relief of foreign priests, such acts of charity may not have been isolated incidents. Charity could also have been a response to a wider campaign backed by the Bishop of Paris, and Rome, to aid English exiles. Following appeals in the Lenten sermons of 1582, collections were made in Paris for the Reims seminary and for exiled Catholics generally. These appeals targeted all levels of the Parisian populace. The English ambassador was uneasy that preachers were exhorting ‘...the principal personages and the people to bestow alms on the English Romanists’.\footnote{TNA, SP 78/7/43, Cobham to Walsingham, 28 March 1582. English Catholics were being ‘dailie praised... in the pulpite’, while the Bishop exhorted Parisians to offer devotions for suffering English Catholics. TNA, SP 78/11/57, Francis Nedham to Walsingham, Paris, 18 March 1583.} Apparently, the preaching campaign was not very successful, but it probably raised awareness. It may also have prompted later acts of almsgiving, such as that by the
Sorbonniste who forwarded money to Reims by 1585.\textsuperscript{20} By this point, too, the Society in general was promoting their cause, although Reims was prioritised above individual laity.\textsuperscript{21} Their almsgiving and preaching to aid and promote the cause of English Catholics elicited the praise of Allen.\textsuperscript{22} Practical support, whether from individual bourgeois, Sorbonnistes, or institutions in Paris, was reinforced by regular face-to-face contact, and even financial cooperation between exiles and their Parisians hosts. At a time when the city was struggling to deal with large numbers of poor, Parisians apparently remained willing to give to exiled coreligionists.\textsuperscript{23} Perhaps there was an element of snobbery in providing for needy foreigners of respectable birth, as opposed to the 'undeserving' poor in one's own community.\textsuperscript{24} Giving could create a sense of common purpose between exiles and some of their Parisian hosts, who came to see themselves as engaged in the same struggle for international Catholicism.

Parisians could express receptivity to the exiles in a number of ways. When avocat Guillaume Bellenden signed a rental agreement for a house on rue Saint-Jean-de-Beauvais with the German Nation in 1578, he agreed that members of the nation could use a room within the property. The room was intended as a weekly meeting place for the nation, but particularly as a headquarters for an activist Scottish group, 'quand bon sens semblera'.\textsuperscript{25} Perhaps Bellenden was willing to take on this unusual lease to gain a

\textsuperscript{20} For the failure of the campaign, Bossy, 'Link', p. 94. For the gift from the Sorbonniste, CRS, 58, p. 181, Barret to Agazzari, Paris, 29 September 1585; Knox (ed.), Allen, p. 132. The donor was possibly Guillaume Lucanus: Allen wrote of his love for England, and how much Reims was beholden to him. The money was left with Thomas Covert, the main agent in Paris, to be passed on to Richard Barret, principal of the seminary.

\textsuperscript{21} CRS, 39, p. 344, Letter and Instructions of the General Father Aquaviva, sent to the Provincials of the various Provinces of the Society concerning the collections to be made for the support of Reims, 21 January 1582. Aquaviva wrote to Jesuit provincials and preachers, instructing them to publicize the plight of English Catholics 'in private discourse or public sermons'. Their situation was apparently so grave that 'it has seemed necessary to have recourse to the piety and charity of all the faithful'.

\textsuperscript{22} 'Miscellanea VII', CRS, 9 (1911), p. 103, Allen to a French Jesuit, Reims, 6 May 1585.

\textsuperscript{23} In contrast there was considerable hostility against the English in Rouen and Reims, for placing extra strain on urban charity: Bossy, 'Link', pp. 67-68.

\textsuperscript{24} Clare Walker demonstrates that the suffering of English nuns for Catholicism gave them a spiritual kudos in the eyes of their hosts that locally born nuns lacked. This made their hosts more inclined to support them. Claire Walker, Gender and Politics in Early Modern Europe: English Convents in France and the Low Countries (Basingstoke, 2003), p. 176.

\textsuperscript{25} 'when it seems sensible'. AN, MC, LXXIII, 84, f. 464. Above, Chapter Two, pp. 131-32.
desirable property in the heart of the University quarter; perhaps he did so out of 
sympathy for the exiles and their aims.26

Recent studies emphasise early modern dependence on credit networks. In 
England, Catholics were mostly not excluded from networks founded on 
'creditworthiness' and good reputation.27 Gentry abroad, however, operated outside an 
established system. To survive, they must have obtained credit in France.28 Parisian 
businessmen were not unused to extending credit to foreigners, but perhaps they were 
more amenable towards exiles. Jean August, a marchand tailleur d'habits located next 
to the porte Saint-Michel, had exile clients and debtors.29 He also had several clients or 
associates with Scottish and Guisard connections.30 The exiles' ability to obtain credit 
perhaps rested on a religious or political reputation. Creditworthiness was a measure of 
an individual's reputation and standing: connections to Catholic powers or status as a 
persecuted Catholic could increase creditworthiness. Unfortunately, there is little 
indication of how the less politicised Englishmen fared in this sphere. If they remained 
outside Parisian credit networks, they presumably became more reliant on charitable 
donations or funds from home.

Within France, Henri III was not generally viewed as a great protector of 
persecuted coreligionists. By 1586, despite the recent renewal of the Auld Alliance, 
Scottish Catholics agitating for the liberation of their queen decided not to expect any 
help from him. They felt that 'they could hardly expect a King who did not strive to 
protect the Catholic religion in his own realm to help them to establish it in theirs'.31

26 AN, MC, LXXIII, 85, f. 95. The following year he conceded to another of the nation's requests: he let 
a man, his wife and children stay in part of the property. The man had been impoverished by a sentence 
given by the prévôt of Paris.

27 Craig Muldrew, 'Hard Food for Midas: Cash and Its Social Value in Early Modern England*, Past and 
Present, 170 (2001), 78-120; The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations In 

28 For the exiles' ability to gain credit in Antwerp, Arblaster, Antwerp, p. 39.

29 AN, MC, LXXIII, f. 720. When William Douglas died in 1584, he owed August 32 écus 7 sols 6 
deniers. August's place of abode is given in AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, f. 563.

30 AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, f. 563 points to his involvement with Marian partisans in Paris. George Douglas, 
acting in Mary Stuart's name, drew up a transport with August in 1581. In 1584, August appeared as joint 
owner with Scotsman James Colville of property which was sold to avocat Thomas de Rochefort. AN, 
MC, LXXIII, 120, ff. 483-485 v. Presumably, August was recommended to exiles by sympathetic 
Parisians, or other exiles already using his services.

31 Calendar Simancas, no. 458, p. 598, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 23 July 1586.
Neither did he offer pensions to exiles on a significant scale.\(^{32}\) His perceived failure to aid needy coreligionists was linked to a wider policy of pacification and reconciliation rather than military conquest. Henri III was not an ultra-Catholic hero, nor champion of the exile cause. At the same time, he did not bow entirely to English demands regarding exiles in France.\(^{33}\)

This perceived reluctance by Henri III to aid the exiles allowed the Guise to assume the mantle of protectors of international Catholic activity in France.\(^{34}\) Guise charity towards exiled laymen and clerics served to enhance the family's reputation as Catholic champions. Measured against the king's apparent lack of interest, their patronage of Scottish and English exiles became further 'proof' of heroic Catholic status. Guise assistance took several forms: personal service in the family's households; support of institutions such as the college at Eu; or financial backing for publications.\(^{35}\) The Guise also had financial dealings with those controlling the affairs of their kinswoman Mary Stuart.\(^{36}\) With direct dynastic interest in English and Scottish affairs, they were keen to sustain a cause of potential advantage to themselves.\(^{37}\) By helping

\(^{32}\) In contrast, Henri IV saw the value of buying the loyalty of dubious émigrés: from 1598, he was increasing involved in directing the pensions paid by the Assembly of the Clergy to English institutions and individuals in France. Bossy, 'Link', pp. 187-90.

\(^{33}\) Above, Chapter Two, pp. 91-93.

\(^{34}\) TNA, SP 78/7/79, Cobham to Walsingham, 28 March 1582. Henri III conceded that the Papal Bull in favour of English Catholics be published in France, and that they receive 500 crowns in aid. This was a small amount and not a straightforward royal grant. The Cardinals de Birague and de Guise offered 200 crowns between them, and were apparently keener to contribute than Henri. Allen praised the Cardinal of Lorraine as 'such a kind and outstanding patron of myself and my nation'. CRS, 58, p. 194, Allen to [Cardinal of Guise], Rome, 10 August 1587.


\(^{36}\) AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, f. 365. In 1581, Guise realised and guaranteed the gift made by the deceased Cardinal of Lorraine to George Douglas of rentes worth 15,000 livres on the Hôtel de Ville. They had been given to Douglas in form of rentes on land in Guise's duchy of Cheveuse. AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, f. 529. Later that year, Douglas sold them to Thibault Hotman, having apparently first asked permission from his mistress Mary Stuart.

\(^{37}\) The Guise remained attached to the ideal of a Franco-British Empire, which had peaked when their kinswoman Mary Stuart, Queen of Scotland, married François, the Dauphin of France and future François II. Above, Chapter Two, p. 101, footnote 63; Arblaster, *Antwerp*, pp. 25-26; John Guy, *My Heart is My Own: The Life of Mary Queen of Scots* (London, 2004), pp. 104-105.
exiles, the duke of Guise furnished himself with ready support for his schemes to invade England, although his priorities changed with the death of Anjou in 1584. Moreover, he recognised their potential in a more abstract sense, as vehicles for propaganda. 38

1.4: Non-French support for the exiles.

Other sources of support were similarly imbued with political and ideological connotations. The activity of the papal nuncios in Paris is often overlooked, but they were important figures for the exiles. Their involvement in invasion plans and in the formation and consolidation of the League was considerable. 39 Importantly, from 1583 until 1596 the nuncios in Paris held jurisdictional responsibility for the English mission, and were keen to inform themselves of all English Catholics in France. 40 Diplomatically, they pressed Henri III to resist English demands regarding the exiles, if not intervene directly for them. 41 Practically, they recommended individuals engaged in the international Catholic cause to Rome, presented their cases to Henri III, and provided for the daily support of exiles in Paris. 42 From 1560, successive nuncios were apparently based in Hôtel de Sens, on the right bank, and Hôtel de Cluny, which was

38 Bossy, 'Link', p. 58.


40 Arblaster, Antwerp, p. 33; TNA, SP 12/175/74, A note out of J. G.'s letter [21584], reports that the nuncio had a detailed list of all English Catholics living in France. The nuncio in 1584, Girolamo Ragazzoni, was known for his aid to English Catholics.


also a residence for the Cardinal de Guise. The latter was also a meeting point for those planning Catholic restoration across the Channel. Unlike ambassadors from other states, the nuncios maintained a fairly fixed base, establishing an association between a particular place and possible assistance for exiles. However, the curia itself was not the most promising source of aid for individual exiles. Gregory XIII's interest in the English cause is well known. Nonetheless, he decided that subsidies to the English seminaries, rather than to individual pensioned laity, would be the most efficient form of aid. Rome was not as forthcoming as many hoped, and the situation for pensioners and their families worsened after Gregory XIII's death in 1584. Sixtus V was not well disposed to maintaining a large number of exiles. Many pensions were cancelled, and some funds which exiles expected to receive were redirected to Guise projects.

The success of an appeal to Rome and the amount granted to an individual varied. Some received money for travel around Europe; others were maintained in Rome itself. Rome was seen by some as a lucrative source of backing, and proof of

---

43 Nicolas de Pellevé, a senior counsellor of the Cardinal of Lorraine, was resident in Rome from 1572: his episcopal palace in Paris was occupied by the nuncios. Hôtel de Sens was on the right bank, very close to the Bureau de Ville. Toupin (ed.), Castelli, p. 21. Dubost, however, claims that papal envoys were based at the Hôtel de Cluny. Dubost, France Italienne, p. 137. Importantly, the Hôtel de Cluny was the residence of the Cardinal of Lorraine, who was Archbishop of Reims and Abbot of Cluny. It was on rue des Mathurins, very close to the Mathurins convent, which had close links to the German Nation. Below, p. 177. The Hôtel de Reims had been in the hands of the Archbishop of Reims from the fourteenth century. It housed a range of individuals in the late sixteenth century: ecclesiastical dignitaries, ambassadors, printers, booksellers, and even a troupe of actors. Berty, Topographie, vol. 6, pp. 325-27.

44 In June 1583, a meeting took place there between the Spanish ambassador, the duke of Guise, a Spanish envoy returning from Scotland, and the nuncio. Calendar Simancas, no. 345, p. 481, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], 23 June 1583; Toupin (ed.), Castelli, no. 299, p. 563, Castelli to the Cardinal of Como, Saint-Cloud, 11 June 1583.


46 CRS, 39, p. 286.

47 CRS, 58, p. 164, Allen to Agazarri, Reims, 2 July 1584; Arblaster, Antwerp, p. 35. Lord Paget failed to secure a papal pension in 1585, apparently because the money had been dedicated to the Duke of Guise. TNA, SP 12/178/72, Secret Advertisements to Walsingham, 26 May 1585.

48 Anthony Bulmer, a rebel in the 1569 rebellion, was given money by Spain and Rome to fund his movements. CRS, 53, p. 211; Strype, Annals, vol. 1, Part 2, p. 53. William Brown, nephew to Lord Mounteagle, had his journey to Rome funded by Philip II. Once there, he obtained a monthly pension. CRS, 53, p. 195. For earlier papal aid to the exiles, Pollen, English Catholics, pp. 248-49.
Catholic status. Certainly, the chances of obtaining papal maintenance were usually increased by an appropriate reputation. Richard Norton, for instance, secured a pension and papal recommendations to secular leaders on the grounds of his faith and the sacrifices he had made. In any case, Papal support was spiritual and ideological as much as practical in nature. Gregory XIII instituted measures to encourage Catholics to donate to the English cause, particularly the colleges. His bull *Omnipotens Deus* of January 1582 recommended the needs of English Catholics to the rest of Europe. He prescribed twice-weekly sermons on the sufferings of English Catholics, and regular collections to relieve their financial plight. In addition, a particular form of spiritual aid was granted to the English cause. Plenary indulgence was to be conferred on all Catholics who, having confessed and received communion, prayed in the chapel of the English College, Rome for the re-conversion of England.

Representatives of Europe’s secular rulers were also central to exile maintenance. The key agents of Mary Stuart in Paris were major sources of aid. At his own expense, the Archbishop of Glasgow offered an open house to anyone appearing on his doorstep. Officially at least, he was also in charge of Mary’s finances in France: her agents were paid, and individuals received marks of her favour, through him. Mary ordered money to be distributed in Paris ‘...aux pauvres principalement Anglois et Ecossois’.

49 Writing home to a kinsman in 1580, Aldred boasted of the entertainment and pension he was given by the Pope, together with assurances that more was available if requested. At this point, it seems he was still a Catholic, and not in Walsingham’s employment. Strype, *Annals*, vol. 2, part 2, pp. 342-44, Appendix book 2, no. XXVII, p. 675.


52 CR5, 39, pp. 341-42. The Jesuit General Claudio Aquaviva issued an associated letter. Appearing in the 1582 edition of *Persons De Persecutione Anglicana*, this was a huge marketing success. Dillon, *Construction*, pp. 143-44.

53 Beaton apparently made available to English and Scottish Catholics his purse, his house and his table. Blackwood, *Martyre*, p. 51. For his generosity to the earl of Westmorland in 1586, *Calendar Simancas*, no. 469, p. 608, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], Paris, 13 August 1586.

54 ‘to the poor... principally the Scottish and English’. Labanoff (ed.), *Lettres*, vol. 5, p. 11, Mary Queen of Scots to Beaton, 6 November 1576.
Guise relatives to support needy English exiles with her money as early as 1574. Some, such as Ralph Liggon or Thomas Morgan, were paid as her agents over a number of years. Support on a more short-term basis was offered to others with a history of service to her, or those whom she personally felt worthy of favour. Mary recommended to Beaton the Bray boys, sons of a household servant, asking that they be well looked after at her expense during their stay in Paris. She was keen to fill the scholarship places for the Scottish College in Paris in her patronage, and in her 1577 will made a legacy to scholars in Paris. Not all this aid was directly political, and it is unlikely her requests were always carried out. They did, however, reinforce her hope that the exiles would ultimately be her means of liberation. Personal service to Mary could simultaneously be thought of as promoting the international Catholic cause. In 1586, for instance, Mary argued that Morgan should be awarded a Spanish pension because he: ‘...a tant enduré non seulement pour moy mais pour la cause commun’.

Beaton’s consistent attention to poor relief was apparently shared by other Stuart partisans with official positions in France. Members of Mary’s dowager council provided a crucial link between the exile cause and the charitable and social networks of Parisian parishes. The Nau brothers, key players on her council and substantial property owners on the left bank, collaborated closely with her partisans amongst the English and

55 Labanoff (ed.), Lettres, vol. 4, p. 128, Mary Queen of Scots to Beaton and the Cardinal of Lorraine, 29 March 1574; vol. 4, pp. 197-98, Mary Queen of Scots to Beaton and the Cardinal of Lorraine, 4 August 1574; vol. 4, p. 254, Mary Queen of Scots to Beaton and the Cardinal of Lorraine, 9 January 1575; vol. 4, pp. 313-14, Mary Queen of Scots to Beaton, 1 June 1576; vol. 5, p. 66, Mary Queen of Scots to Beaton, 15 September 1578; vol. 6, p. 435, Mary Queen of Scots to Mendoza, 17 and 23 July 1586.

56 Labanoff (ed.), Lettres, vol. 4, p. 296, Mary Queen of Scots to Beaton, 20 February 1576; vol. 4, pp. 349-50, Mary Queen of Scots to Beaton, 20 January 1577; vol. 5, p. 177, Mary Queen of Scots to Beaton, 24 July 1580. Mary was especially keen that Liggon, a former servant of Norfolk be rewarded, ‘... car je me sens obligée à luy pour la mémoire de seu son maistre. Et en reconnaissance des bonnes services qu’il ma faites jusques à présent’; ‘because I feel obliged to him for the memory of his master. And in recognition of the good services he has done me until now’.

57 Awaiting execution, she asked Henri III to ensure her servants received revenues from her dowager lands. Labanoff (ed.), Lettres, vol. 6, p. 491-95, Mary Queen of Scots to Henri III, 8 February 1586. She also left money in her will for the poor of Reims.

58 For the Bray family, above, Chapter One, p. 52, footnote 80. The scholarships she mentions were presumably at the Scottish College, which had earlier been the focus of the Bishop of Ross’ reforming efforts. For Mary’s will of 1577, Labanoff (ed.), Lettres, vol. 4, pp. 356-57.

59 ‘... he has endured so much, not only for me, but for the common cause’. Labanoff (ed.), Lettres, vol. 6, p. 311, Mary Stuart to Bernardino de Mendoza, 20 May 1586.

Scottish gentry. Claude Nau was churchwarden at Saint-Benoît, and thus well placed to facilitate the relief of needy exiles. He also acted as procureur for one of the most controversial English exiles, Charles Paget.

The most conspicuous source of aid for exiled Catholics was the Spanish Crown. Protestant polemic made much of this, partly because of English assumptions about Spain's potential threat to the Protestant regime. Albert Loomie has examined in detail the system of Spanish pensions for English Catholics, and suggests how holding a pension could affect the tenor of an individual's exile. The majority of pensioners in the Low Countries and Spain gained their stipend through service to the Spanish Crown, as soldiers or intelligencers. However, a significant number played a less than active role in political or military affairs and were not long-term Spanish partisans. Ostensibly, some were rewarded for their piety or loyalty to Catholicism, but the reasons for others' subsidy is even less apparent. This general vagueness, however, is perhaps less applicable to Spanish pensioners residing in France.

Philip II granted one-off sums to individuals, channelled as alms through the Spanish court. However, he never intended laymen to become dependent on them, and wanted worthy cases enrolled on his pension lists. To help this process, Francis Englefield, an English exile at the Spanish court, forwarded individual petitions. By 1581, Englefield was apparently inundated with pleas for assistance from those in England, the Low Countries, Rome, and in Reims, Rouen and Paris.

---

61 Carroll, 'Revolt', p. 317. In 1595, he was also renting a property from the commandery of Saint-Jean-de-Latran, an important site for Scottish exiles. Berty, Topographie, vol. 6, p. 526. For more on the changing make-up of Mary's council in France, Wilkinson, Mary, pp. 29-30; Greengrass, 'Dowager'.

62 Above, Chapter Two, p. 135, footnote 221; below, Chapter Five, p. 254.

63 Philip's support of exiles, particularly the rebels, caused tension between Elizabeth and the Spanish ambassador in London. Calendar Simancas, no. 27, p. 33, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 11 June 1580; Calendar Simancas, no. 111, p. 143, Mendoza to the King, [Philip II], London, 4 July 1581.

64 Loomie, Spanish.

65 Richard Gage was granted the pension of his brother who had fought for Philip. Richard himself was 'not interested in the King's service for he is more inclined to be a religious than a soldier': Loomie, Spanish, Appendix 3, p. 249.

The terms qualifying an individual for a pension are sometimes unclear. A large proportion of pensioners served in Spanish forces, but others were valued primarily for their potential influence in England. The Earl of Westmorland, for instance, received a generous pension. Despite recurring suspicions about his loyalty, the Spanish and certain exiles valued his 'high birth which could be of advantage if he is present in an invasion'. Less exceptionally, those receiving a Spanish pension were generally regarded as '... Catholics, and... the greater part of them have lost country and property for that reason'. The English government's characterisation of the Catholic abroad as a 'Hispaniolized' Englishman was only partly accurate. Whilst some were in the pay of Philip II, comparatively few set foot in Spain. The majority were scattered across the urban centres of the Spanish Low Countries. There was also a small but significant contingent of pensioners residing in France.

Of several hundred English Catholics in France in the 1580s, at least 30 were, or later became, Spanish pensioners. The evidence does not reveal how unusual it was to be able to live on a Spanish pension when outside Philip II's territories. Some individuals received Spanish funds whilst based in France. Unsurprisingly, these tend be exceptional individuals involved in political schemes, like Charles Paget, rather than the young students or travellers who were in Paris in much larger numbers. Richard Norton and Christopher Danby, fugitives from the 1569 revolt, obtained Spanish funds at a relatively early stage, and spent at least some of their exile in France.

---

67 Loomie, Spanish, p. 35. Above, Chapter Two, p. 120, footnote 146. He continued to be considered important by all parties. In 1583, de Tassis was informed that Westmorland should lead exile troops from Flanders. Calendar Simancas, no. 345, p. 485, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], 24 June 1583; Knox (ed.), Allen, p. 431, Father William Creighton and the proposed invasion of the England, 4 September 1584.

68 Report on the state of Spanish pensions, 1596, cited by Loomie, Spanish, p. 32.

69 Survey loosely based on the list at TNA, SP 78/4a/63, on Loomie's research, and other incidental information on pensions, such as that given in CRS volumes.

70 Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 140.

71 Paget was a leading influence over Mary Stuart's French interests, deeply involved in plots for Catholic restoration, and a key member of the anti-Jesuit faction. From the later 1580s, he was seen as anti-Spanish, but still appears to have been maintained by Spain whilst in Paris. His pension has been dated from 1587, when he left France for Brussels, but a report on pensioners states that prior to 1596, he had been given '50 gold escudos a month in Paris'. Loomie, Spanish, Appendix 3, p. 255.

72 John Fisher, The History and Antiquities of Masham and Mashamshire (London, 1865), p. 261; Aveling, Northern, p. 261; Cliffe, Yorkshire, p. 171; Loomie, Spanish, Appendix 3, p. 255; DNB, vol. 12, p. 663. Danby had a Spanish pension from 1572 if not earlier; Norton probably obtained one at this point.
Foljambe, an agent of Mary Stuart, was granted an allowance in 1586. Foljambe travelled in Mary’s service: although he was mainly based in the Low Countries, it was recommended that his allowance be paid ‘even whilst he is in France’.  

For others, the experience of Spanish maintenance was less smooth. Sir Thomas Copley received Spanish funds whilst in France, but was treated with some circumspection. Copley had forsaken his original Spanish pension, obtained in 1573, when he sought reconciliation with the English Crown. In financial difficulty in Paris in 1581, he managed to have his pension and appointments restored: these supported himself and his family for a few years in France. Nonetheless, he claimed he was forced to return to Spanish territory for fear of jeopardising his long-term livelihood. Whether this was an excuse to defend his reversion to Spanish territory, or whether the Spanish Crown actually demanded his relocation, is difficult to ascertain.

Those seeking Spanish aid in Paris had an important source of help in Philip II’s ambassador. From late 1584, the ideologically driven and politically active Bernardino de Mendoza was of central importance to the exiles, not least because of his previous involvement in English affairs. Expelled from England in the wake of the Throckmorton plot, Mendoza used his knowledge of English affairs, and from his base in Paris resumed the channelling and distribution of funds between various Catholic sources. He also turned attention to exiles within Paris, acting as intercessor for

---

73 Calendar Simancas, no. 448, p. 587, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 26 June 1586. Meanwhile, Thomas Throckmorton relied on his dead brother’s fame as a Catholic martyr to gain a pension payable to him wherever he decided to reside. It was paid in Paris, then Flanders. By 1595, he wanted it transferred to Milan. Loomie, Spanish, Appendix 3, pp. 260-61.


75 Mendoza, who frequently referred to working ‘underhand’ with English and Scottish Catholics in England, was closely acquainted with many principal nobles and gentry. He was involved in conspiratorial activity centred on England and Scotland, although his exact role in the Throckmorton conspiracy, for which he was expelled, is not clear. For example, Calendar Simancas, no. 249, p. 342, Philip II to Mendoza, 22 April 1582; Calendar Simancas, no. 204, p. 276, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 27 January 1582. Once in France, he was considered something of an expert on the situation in England. Toupin (ed.), Castelli, no. 301, p. 567, Castelli to the Cardinal of Como, Saint-Cloud, 20 June 1583.

76 When in England, Mendoza intervened in the distribution of food and gifts to imprisoned Catholics. He oversaw the circulation of funds between exiles and their coreligionists in England, and between Catholics in England and the continental seminaries. Above, Chapter Two, p. 96.
prospective pensioners, and as distributor of payments to pensioners in Paris. Beyond his official remit, he offered immediate relief through extraordinary alms. Money from his expenses account went to Catholic charities, the seminary at Reims, and to English exiles. Prior to his French posting, he had been a key player, even initiator, in political schemes. In Paris, he was visited by nobles, gentry and clergy searching for funds and support for invasion projects. He cultivated and encouraged exiles to agitate for Catholic restoration in England or Scotland, and tried to ensure their projects promoted Spanish, rather than French interests.

There were mixed motives for accepting Mendoza’s help, as the Earl of Westmorland demonstrates. In his early years abroad, he apparently maintained a household of 12 servants, despite heavy debts. By 1586, however, he was impoverished: daily survival depended on dining every night with Mendoza or Beaton. For Westmorland, accepting foreign charity was at least partly a matter of necessity. For the donors, however, it advanced overtly political plans, in which Westmorland was assigned an important role.

Spain also aided exiles more indirectly, by patronising their great protectors in France, the Guise, who were one of the best hopes for a successful invasion scheme. Guise’s reliance on Spanish funds had a pedigree. Officially, accepting funds from a

---

77 Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 140; Labanoff (ed.), Lettres, vol. 6, pp. 309-311, Mary Queen of Scots to Mendoza, 20 May 1586; Loomie, Spanish, p. 43. Several of those identified by Loomie as Spanish pensioners had been recommended by Mendoza.

78 Jensen, Dogmatism, pp. 103, 126-27; Calendar Simancas, no. 405, p. 544, Philip II to Mendoza, 6 September 1585. His predecessor in Paris had also made donations to the seminary. Calendar Simancas, no. 303, p. 428, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], Paris, 29 December 1582. For Mendoza’s concern for priests exiled from England, Calendar Simancas, no. 388, p. 536, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], Paris, 4 March 1585. He later provided vital supplies to Parisians during the League.

79 Mendoza was more consistently supportive of invasion projects than Philip II. He always tried to prevent French involvement - with the exception of Guise - so that French ambitions could not be forwarded at the expense of Spain.


81 Calendar Simancas, no. 469, p. 608, Mendoza to Philip II, 13 August 1586; Calendar Simancas, no. 476, p. 616, Philip II to Mendoza, San Lorenzo, 5 September 1586. Westmorland’s centrality to prospective invasion apparently caused his financial troubles. He was detained in Paris in 1586 by the Duke of Guise, who was developing a Catholic restoration project, and presumably wanted his commitment. Westmorland spent significant periods in Paris, but apparently lacked his own house. In 1580, for instance, he lodged with a Florentine banker. TNA, SP 78/4b/109, Cobham to [the Secretaries] Paris, 2 July 1580. This report also says that Westmorland was ‘intertained and succoured’ by Spanish merchants.
foreign power incurred suspicions of treason, but French princes did look beyond the Crown for maintenance, and accepted money from several sources.\textsuperscript{82} Spanish aid was envisaged as a means to forward the duke’s ambitions, not only towards the British Isles but also ultimately towards the French Crown. Guise was not the only French prince to treat with Philip II in the 1580s, although the extent to which he and the League came to rely on Spain was remarkable.\textsuperscript{83} His declarations of service to the Spanish Crown in the early 1580s were infused with an awareness of his duty to the Crown of France. When formulating invasion plans for England and Scotland in 1582, he stressed that forces should not be launched from Spanish territory, or be obviously Spanish. These concessions apparently helped to salve his conscience about his previous oath, taken on entering the \textit{Ordre de Saint-Esprit} ‘not to employ himself in favour of any foreign prince without the consent of his sovereign’.\textsuperscript{84}

\textbf{1.5: Foreign maintenance and exile allegiance.}

In the act of giving, the benefactor as well as the recipient can expect to gain, even if the timing of the return is unknown.\textsuperscript{85} Catholic leaders replied to the pleas of exiles - particular exiles more than others - because in doing so they could confirm their Catholic credentials and forward their political projects. Philip II, Henri III, the Pope, Mary Stuart, and the Guises were Catholic leaders as well as donors; their charity towards the exiles was politically infused. Mary’s correspondence reveals an eagerness to care for individuals to whom she was personally attached, but also a determination to help the wider exile group. She claimed to have received numerous letters of petition from needy Catholics in England and abroad, which may have been fabricated by her followers to convince her of the support she enjoyed. Mary nevertheless insisted that her supporters in Catholic Europe, particularly in Paris, were maintained as best as

\textsuperscript{82} An English traveller in early seventeenth century France commented that accepting a pension from a foreign prince without prior permission from the King left a Frenchman open to charges of \textit{lèse-majesté}. Brennan (ed.), ‘Somerset’, p. 53.

\textsuperscript{83} The Duc de Montmorency engaged in protracted negotiations with Philip II, Henri III and Henri de Navarre. However he did not have as much to offer Spain as the Guises, and after 1584 Philip II ceased to prioritise him. Joan Davies, ‘Neither Politique Nor Patriot? Henri Duc de Montmorency and Philip II, 1582-1589’, \textit{Historical Journal}, 34 (1991), p. 544.

\textsuperscript{84} \textit{Calendar Simancas}, no. 270, p. 378, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], 29 May 1582. For his declarations of loyalty to Philip II, Croze, \textit{Guises}, vol. 2, p. 4.

possible. She saw them as the most likely agents of her liberation, and the key to a successful Catholic restoration in Scotland and England. Philip II's support of high-status English Catholics likewise allowed him to develop political schemes. From the mid-1580s, his interest in those soliciting money was dominated by his plans for the English enterprise. Pensioned gentry, clerics and soldiers offered potential intelligence and even a fighting force. Nevertheless, Philip's motives for supporting needy and dispossessed exiles, and his attitude towards an English enterprise, were never as unambiguous as mission leaders hoped. He wanted to curtail Elizabeth's ability to aid Protestant rebels in the Low Countries, but was unwilling to effect an invasion at any price. His attention towards the exiles was probably partly a diversionary tactic to engage the resources and attention of the English government, thus freeing him to pursue other interests. By helping the exiles, he hoped to ensure they were pro-Spanish. As for the Papacy, its maintenance was more ideological: financial aid was only available to those few distinguished for their disaffection from the English Crown. Practically, aid varied considerably according to the pontiff's personal outlook. Certain high profile exiles, however, responded to papal support with an increased attachment to Rome. Those few with papal recommendations presumably felt an obligation to the Pope, which reinforced their self-perception as Catholics loyal to Rome. Meanwhile, the duke of Guise's support for the exiles was intimately linked to his designs on the British Isles. After 1584, however, he turned his priorities to internal politics in France: he no longer viewed a cross-Channel invasion as his priority, but continued to support those exiles in France.

---

86 Hicks, Elizabethan Problem, p. 150; Greengrass, 'Dowager', p. 178.
87 Davies, 'Montmorency', pp. 549-50.
88 Exiles in Paris were seen in this capacity by the later 1580s. Jensen, Dogmatism, p. 105. For exiles as a fighting force, above, Chapter Two, p. 119, footnote 145; below, p. 166, footnote 95. When surveys were made of Spanish pensioners under Philip II and Philip III, attention was paid to an individual's past services to the Spanish Crown and potential use in the future.
89 Carroll, Noble Power, p. 175. Philip's motives in funding French nobles were ambivalent: whilst he wished to see England weaker and less able to aid the rebels in the Low Countries, he had no desire to see a pro-French regime installed in Elizabeth I's place. Calendar Simancas, no. 342, p. 476, Philip II to Mendoza, 6 June 1583; Calendar Simancas, no. 350, pp. 492-94, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 16 July 1583.
91 For example, CRS, 58, p. 150, Allen to Agazzari, 30 April 1583.
92 For instance, Gregory XIII's recommendation of Richard Norton to Don John of Austria. Above, p. 158, footnote 50.
Giving secured the direct service of individuals, but also proved credentials generally and boosted a reputation for largesse.\textsuperscript{93} Offering aid to the needy demonstrated a donor's status and power. By the act of giving to co-religionists, a donor manifested Christian charity towards troubled fellow believers, and confirmed their own religious ardour. For instance, Philip II could strengthen his reputation as leader of the Catholic world by protecting and maintaining persecuted coreligionists. By the 1580s, he perhaps offered a Catholic rejoinder to England's growing reputation as refuge for persecuted Protestants.

An individual in difficult circumstances might feel a sense of dependency and obligation towards a benefactor, but the acceptance of a pension did not guarantee undivided loyalty.\textsuperscript{94} An individual could seek support from multiple sources. Westmorland, for instance, accepted foreign pensions or maintenance whilst exploring other options. He was targeted by the English government and by continental Catholic powers wanting to win him over permanently. His alleged standing amongst Catholics in England and exiles abroad gave him a potentially crucial status in any invasion attempt.\textsuperscript{95} Despite this standing, however, he was not immune to poverty. Given his status, his lack of a substantial household in later exile is remarkable. His struggle to survive at times made him receptive to the overtures of others.\textsuperscript{96} Meanwhile, Thomas Copley continued to protest loyalty to Elizabeth I and his desire for reconciliation whilst receiving funds and titles from Spain and France. Copley's self-justification was often strained. Whilst he praised Philip II as 'the good king whoo feedith me', he expressed continued hope that Elizabeth, his natural sovereign, would welcome him back as a subject innocent of any crime.\textsuperscript{97} The appeal to multiple patrons did not ensure an easy

\textsuperscript{93} A subject did not have to be the direct recipient of gifts to feel reassured by a king's generosity towards his own: '... it is agreeable to think that the monarch is generous, even if one does not personally benefit from his favours'. Paul Veyne, \textit{Bread and Circuses: historical sociology and political pluralism}, translated by Brian Pierce (London, 1990), p. 351.

\textsuperscript{94} One recipient of Guise household patronage was reportedly mindful of the favour done him, and of his obligation to Allen and the Jesuits for his placement. \textit{CRS}, 58, pp. 174-75, Richard Barret to Alphonsus Agazzari, Reims 23 August 1585.

\textsuperscript{95} Those working on plans for a Scottish landing in May 1582 viewed Westmorland's involvement as crucial for a simultaneous rising in Northern England. \textit{Calendar Simancas}, no. 266, p. 372, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], 18 May 1582.

\textsuperscript{96} \textit{Calendar Simancas}, no. 469, p. 608, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 13 August 1586. In fact he made an attempt to seek pardon from the English Crown. BL, Lansdowne Ms, 31, no. 9, William Parry to Lord Burghley, Paris, 30 July 1580.

\textsuperscript{97} Christie (ed.), \textit{Copley}, p. 176, Thomas Copley to Francis Walsingham, Rouen, 8 July 1583.
existence, or bring an end to exile. After 32 years, Westmorland had failed to return to England at the head of a Catholic restoration force. He died in the Low Countries in 1601, ‘... in as many mens debt as he could borrow money of’.

As with funds awaited from home, the chances of receiving a pension in monetary form on time were slim. The most influential pensioners rarely received the promised sums promptly; unsurprisingly, lowlier individuals faced the same problem. Even those with powerful intercessors and impressive family reputations were not paid punctually. With the majority of payments in arrears, many pensioners struggled as much as their non-pensioned counterparts. However, noblemen and gentry were usually short of money, and reliant on networks of credit. Complaints about the inability to live as befitted their status were an accepted part of noble rhetoric. In one respect, the exiles were similar to their peers in England or France. Their financial problems, however, could serve a specific purpose. For those presenting themselves as sufferers for their faith, an impoverished exile status could serve as proof of their readiness to endure for the Catholic cause.

The sporadic nature of foreign maintenance partly explains the failure of pensions to create a common identity amongst recipients. Loomie observes that the potential of the pensions system to mould the exiles into ‘... a faction with its own means of support and commonly shared ideals’ was never realised. Exiles awaiting an imminent Catholic enterprise saw their residence on the continent as temporary. Accepting alms or a pension from a foreign source was thus a provisional expedient. By the late 1590s, the enterprise of England was a non-event, and reports suggest that pensioners were often drifting to other sovereigns, namely Henri III or Elizabeth I.

98 For one account of Westmorland’s life, Sharp, Memorials, pp. 289-304.
99 Lewkenor, Estate, pp. 35-36. This is a hostile source, but seems to reflect something of the reality for some exiles.
102 Loomie, Spanish, p. 31; Meyer, England, p. 252.
Meanwhile, quarrels over pensions caused serious discord amongst Catholics abroad. Allen identified such divisions as a serious threat to English Catholicism, perhaps more damaging even than persecution. Successful engagement of foreign benefactors depended on an individual’s contacts and credentials. Holding a Spanish or Roman pension could raise an individual’s standing amongst fellow exiles, and open channels of communication with a wider Catholic sphere. However, in Paris as elsewhere, neither a sense of solidarity nor an impulse for unified action was visible amongst pensioners. Receiving funds simultaneously from different Catholic sources could demotivate and divide rather than activate and unite.

Papal and Spanish pension funds were not systematic schemes: they did not seek to support every individual, and failed to forge strong common bonds between recipients. Nevertheless, pensions were viewed as worth pursuing and, once obtained, worth maintaining. Eagerness for a pension may have sprung from optimism about the chances of receiving it, or more simply a realisation that there were few other opportunities for maintenance. The pension systems brought certain exiles from amongst a larger group into a wider network, where what was being exchanged was perhaps less significant than the exchange itself. A correspondence of petition evolved between those seeking financial support, key intermediaries and Catholic leaders. Exiles became enmeshed in a web in which Mary Stuart, Philip II, the Guise, the Pope and their representatives were possible benefactors and beneficiaries. In this respect, petitioners shared some common experiences. They often came to forge closer ties with those regarded by the English government as their greatest adversaries. The government’s response was to regard the pensioners as typical of a larger group of Catholics. Consequently, pensioners helped to polarise relations between the English government and their Catholic subjects at home and abroad.

103 Richard Norton blamed other Catholics when he did not receive his pension for five months. TNA, SP 12/175/74, A note out of J. G.’s letter [?1584]; Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 47. Verstegan aroused the hostility of fellow exiles in the Low Countries when he received a double pension. Strype, Annals, vol. 4, p. 207, William Holt to Cardinal Allen, Brussels, 6 January 1593.

104 Knox (ed.), Allen, pp. 315-16, Allen to Lord Paget [Rome], January 30 1590. By the 1590s government propagandists used the example of disappointed pensioners as proof of Spanish treachery, exploiting this to exacerbate divisions amongst Catholics abroad.

105 Blakistone was one amongst a number of ‘earnest suitors’ for papal support in Brussels in 1571. He was probably successful by 1575, and had left Brussels. CSPD, Addenda, 1566-1579, XX, no. 46, p. 352, John Lee to Burghley, Antwerp, 11 June 1571; Knox (ed.), Diaries, p. 300. Richard Norton was struggling to retain his pension by the mid-1580s. Above, p. 168, footnote 103.
2: Exiles as Propagandists.

Paris was one of the largest printing centres in Europe, with a lucrative international market. From the mid-sixteenth century, religiously conservative institutions and a desire for orthodoxy created conducive conditions for the production of Catholic propaganda. Encouraged by the University, the presses were crucial weapons in the fight against heresy. Works defending Catholicism appeared rapidly, in response to Protestant polemical activity. Theoretically, the Parlement, Crown and the Faculty of Theology collaborated to police the book trade. Within Paris itself, however, these institutions were far from united, and close control over the industry was unlikely. In their battle against Protestantism, Catholic polemicists and propagandists increasingly operated independently of royal initiative as the 1580s progressed. The wider crisis of royal authority was mirrored in its progressive loss of control over the Parisian printing industry.

The significance of polemic produced on Parisian presses is best understood against the backdrop of international diplomatic relations. Until 1581, protracted negotiations for the unlikely marriage alliance with Elizabeth I at least ensured Henri III's contact with England, and continued the policy of Anglo-French entente established in the 1572 Treaty of Blois. Meanwhile, Henri allowed Anjou to don the mantle of sovereign in the Low Countries to distract Spain from interference in France. However, Anjou's death left Henri without a direct heir and ended the viability of his independent stance. The nearest claimant to the throne, Henri de Navarre, was a

---


107 Catholic polemical and propaganda efforts were central to the radical fight back against Protestantism. Racaut, Hatred; Pettegree, 'Project', p. 17.


109 Cobham may have received assurances that those responsible for accounts of Campion's martyrdom would be punished; but the King's promised actions had little impact. CSPF, 1581-1582, p. 454, Cobham to Walsingham, January 14 1582. Arrêts and lettres patentes aimed at controlling the industry remained dead letters. André Blum, L'Estampe Satirique en France pendant les Guerres de Religion (Paris, [1916?]), pp. 153-61.
Protestant and thus intolerable to a large proportion of the population. Henceforth, internal problems in France intensified rapidly, exacerbated by outside intervention. The Catholic League, which tied itself to Philip II in 1585, exploited public disillusionment at Henri's style of kingship, his failure to launch an anti-Huguenot crusade, and his entente with Protestant England. Anjou's death presented the League with a cause - the struggle against a heretical succession - sufficiently urgent to mobilise large parts of the French population, and Parisians were amongst the most vociferous.

By 1585, Henri's options were more limited: in the face of radical intransigence, his policy of reconciling what others believed irreconcilable was losing viability. Losing out to the League, he needed foreign allies to bolster his position: hence his closer engagement with England. The prevention of Spanish hegemony in the Low Countries was of concern to both parties, although Henri was more immediately threatened by possible Spanish domination in France through the Catholic League. Meanwhile, the English government was anxious about the prospect of all-out Anglo-Spanish war, given Elizabeth's aid to the Dutch rebels and English attacks on Spanish shipping. In this case, the goodwill of France could be vital. For England, an Anglo-French alliance was also a counter to the spectre of a Catholic regime in Scotland, backed by France. For both monarchs, the best answer to their fears was mutual alliance and, in Elizabeth's eyes at least, joint intervention against Philip II in the Low Countries. This was not an easy option for either party, and over certain thorny issues - the support of each other's rebels, Elizabeth I's treatment of Catholics, and her

---

110 In the Treaty of Joinville, January 1585, Philip undertook to fund the fight against heresy in France and the Low Countries for as long as it took to extirpate Protestantism. He and Guise entered it as an inviolable agreement.

111 However, Le Person has recently argued that Henri was still playing the political game, and succeeding, until May 1588. Le Person,<<Practiques>>, p. 583.

execution of Mary Stuart – the alliance appeared precarious. Both sovereigns incurred vilification for it, but they persisted in maintaining the entente.

Henri III’s growing commitment to this cordiality, and reaction against it in Paris, were evident when he accepted membership of the English Order of the Garter in 1585. Elizabeth I had elected him to membership as early as 1575, but it was not until 1584, when in greater need of English goodwill, that he officially accepted. An English party, led by the Earl of Derby, was sent to confer the honour in early 1585, and great efforts were made at the French court to welcome them. Henri re-employed courtly ceremony to present idealised manifestations of the harmony and balance between England and France. Magnificent entertainments - feasts, ballets, masques, and music - were laid on for the English party: Mendoza, who would not have been the favourite guest at court, reported that Derby was ‘...feasted in an extraordinary way by the King, who gave him a buffet of plate worth 4,000 crowns’. These extravagant displays were more than expressions of goodwill between the two crowns. They were a clear signal of Henri’s commitment to a Protestant alliance, to Navarre as his successor, and to a policy of religious toleration. As we shall see, this was an explosive direction to adopt.

113 Very soon after the Garter Ceremony Elizabeth agitated for the extradition of Thomas Morgan. The language and tone of her letter to Henri III, and her rage at his refusal to release Morgan’s papers, are in dramatic contrast to the tone in which she conferred the Garter on him. Sophie Crawford Lomas (ed.), Calendar of State Papers Foreign Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, August 1584-August 1585 (London, 1916), pp. 264-65, Elizabeth to the French King, [Jan] 1585; CSPF, 1584-1585, pp. 337-38, Elizabeth to the French King, 10 March 1585. At other points she felt the need to justify anti-Catholic measures to Henri. For example, CSPF, 1581-1582, pp. 659-61, The Privy Council to Cobham, 26 April 1582.


115 Carroll, ‘Revolt’, p. 312.

116 Catherine de Médicis actually asked that the English delegation delay their departure for France, so that fuller preparations could be made to welcome them in a fitting manner. Baguenault de Puchesse (ed.), Médicis, vol. 8, pp. 198, 203.


118 It was known at court that Henri intended to send his favourite the duc de Joyeuse to England, to offer formal thanks and to confirm any agreements the two nations might reach. Preparations for Joyeuse’s embassy were apparently underway before Derby arrived in Paris. Calendar Simancas, no. 386, p. 530, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 7 February 1585.
Henri III found himself on even shakier ground in 1587, over the execution of Mary Stuart. Familial and religious ties demanded his intervention to rescue her. However, Henri could not afford to jeopardize the English alliance. He protested against the death sentence, but his envoy in England did nothing to change the course of events. Diplomatic considerations made it impossible to pursue the issue beyond appropriate mourning and a display of outrage. Ultimately, he failed to prevent or to avenge his sister-in-law’s death at Elizabeth’s hands.

Henri was increasingly unable to curb the production of propaganda attacking Elizabeth and undermining his own aims. This proved to have significant international ramifications. He found himself trying to conciliate both Elizabeth and his Catholic subjects, aware that losing either’s support could be critical. In the relative stability of the early 1580s, he could still assert his own will. Cobham complained about publications relating the persecution of Catholics in England in 1582; he was assured that orders would be given to prohibit their sale and punish those involved in their production. However, Henri would not comply entirely with English demands, and was unprepared to risk the complete wrath of his subjects for the sake of the English

---

119 Bellièvre could do little more than obtain a 12-day delay on the execution: the French ambassador in London, Châteauneuf, complained to a friend that Henri III was not doing enough to help. This feeling must have been reinforced by the knowledge that, some months before, Henri had given audience to an English envoy sent specifically to convey proof of Mary’s guilt. Horatio F. Brown (ed.) Calendar of State Papers and manuscripts relating to English affairs, existing in the archives and collections of Venice and in other libraries of Northern Italy, volume VIII, 1581-91 (London, 1894), no. 434, p. 219, Giovanni Dolfin to the Doge and Senate, 7 November 1586.

120 Henri’s declaration that he would treat the death sentence as a personal affront came to nothing: Read, Walsingham, vol. 3, pp. 201-202. His declaration that all Christian princes would act against Elizabeth, ‘...especially the king of France’, was an empty threat. Calendar Simancas, no. 525, p. 675, Antonio de Vega to the King [Philip II], 17 December 1586; Calendar Simancas, no. 526, p. 678, Antonio de Vega to the King [Philip II], 18 December 1586; Calendar Simancas, no. 529, p. 680, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 24 December 1586. Henri suspended communication with England for a brief period. His rage at Elizabeth’s virtual imprisonment of his ambassador provoked rumours of an Anglo-French war. Nevertheless, within a few months, Stafford was reaccepted at court. Henri was apparently more concerned about Elizabeth’s treatment of his ambassador than avenging Mary’s death. CSPF, 1586-1588, pp. 269-70, Stafford to the Queen, 4 April 1587, and Stafford and Waad to Walsingham, Paris, 4 April 1587.

121 Henri’s attention to relevant initiatives did not translate into practical results. Wilkinson, Mary, pp. 112-13.

122 CSPF, 1581-1582, p. 454, Cobham to Walsingham, 14 January 1582.
alliance. Conscious of a religious duty, and inspired by a more personal response, he displayed some concern for the fate of his coreligionists in England, and approved certain books concerned with the English Catholic cause. These were privileged in preference to less temperate works, which would have further antagonised Elizabeth and challenged his royal authority. This approval of certain texts was, however, qualified by other initiatives aimed at reining in radical Catholic propagandists. These only provoked further anti-English and, by implication, anti-Valois works. Disseminated by a radical Catholic minority, texts and sermons exacerbated hostility to Henri III as a king who was perceived to be failing in his Catholic duty; they would later present him as an outright atheist. So, from the mid-1580s, when successive English ambassadors tried to eradicate anti-English material in Paris, their chances were slim. The primary target for appeal was a king unable to curtail criticism of himself, never mind a foreign government. Knowing Henri’s previous attitude, and the growing challenges to his rule, by 1587 Stafford must have been unconvinced by assurances that such activity would be pursued. Anti-English messages in radical polemic were by this point neither accidental nor infrequent.

There was an unprecedented demand amongst French audiences in the later sixteenth century for information on political and religious issues. The general focus on events within France expanded to interest in international issues, especially those pertinent to the domestic situation. A pre-established interest in English affairs was infused with ideological and political pertinence in the 1580s. Developments in England became important for the analogy they provided to the situation within France. This was an area in which exiles were particularly well qualified to comment or contribute. Their own interest in the topic - its bearing on the issue of Catholic restoration at home - was different to that of the French audience to whom they

---

123 For Henri’s resistance to English demands, above, Chapter Two, pp. 91-92. He instructed his ambassador in England to inform Elizabeth he would punish any who were guilty of seditious activity, but he refused to pursue Catholics who had entered his kingdom as a religious refuge. BN, fonds français, 3305, Henri III to Mauvissière, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 25 January 1585.

124 Wilkinson, Mary, pp. 72-74. The Discours des Troubles nouvellement aduenuz au Royaume d'Angleterre, au mois d'Octobre 1569, received the royal privilege. So did other works, including those recounting Campion's martyrdom, and Persons' controversial De Persecutione Anglicana. CSPF, 1581-1582, no. 634, pp. 584-85, Cobham to Walsingham, 28 March 1582.


126 Wilkinson, Mary, pp. 67-68; Tallon, Conscience nationale, pp. 200-203.
appealed. Nevertheless, there was common ground to exploit. As radical French Catholics faced the prospect of a Protestant succession from 1584, they turned to English examples, and sometimes to exile propagandists, to persuade audiences. English examples were adopted and appropriated by exiles and radical Parisians to encourage opposition to a Catholic king suspected of heresy, and to his Protestant successor. Hence the slant of intemperate Parisian polemic became explicitly anti-English.

Recent studies emphasise the importance of non-written polemic or propaganda in early modern societies, particularly the role of oral discourse. Much oral discourse - the rumours circulating in a neighbourhood, or the words of an inflammatory preacher - is lost to us, although written sources, such as the diary of Pierre de L’Estoile, offer some useful vignettes. The immediacy and potential significance of oral culture leads to a more cautious estimation of the impact of written materials alone in the sixteenth century. As Luc Racaut argues, ‘Printing was an addition, not replacement, to oral culture.’ Nevertheless, Parisian presses were remarkably productive, even before the explosion of Leaguer printing, and their potential impact is of considerable significance.

Scholarship stresses the extent and significance of connections between the exiles and Leaguer propaganda, which was overtly antagonistic to Elizabeth I and increasingly hostile to Henri III. Dillon demonstrates how the English Catholic community in Elizabeth’s reign was ‘forced to look towards the continent for its survival’. The construction of English martyrdom in Europe was profoundly influenced by exiles who were ‘necessarily dependent upon, and ultimately, much influenced by


129 Racaut, Hatred, pp. 39-41.

130 Denis Pallier, Recherches sur L'Imprimerie à Paris pendant La Ligue (1585-1594) (Geneva, 1975). Pallier dates the beginning of the League period of printing at 1585. This perhaps risks overlooking the developments in the industry in the earlier part of the decade.

their hosts'. 132 Thus the presence of the exiles offered radical French Catholics a chance to engage with the international Catholic cause, and ultimately to identify with and claim the English Catholic martyrs, now on an international stage, as French martyrs. Research often focuses on the famous tableau displayed in the churchyard of Saint-Séverin in 1587. This display, based on the earlier work of an English exile, drew large crowds to its depiction of the cruelty and torture practised by the English government on their Catholic victims. Scholars have discussed its impact on the Parisian scene, and the reactions of the English and French monarchs. 133 There is further work to be done on exploring the links between the English exile presence and the international stage for polemic relating to their cause, particularly in Paris. The Saint-Séverin display, which provoked a riot on the left bank, was not an isolated incident, but the culmination and polarisation of existing tensions in Paris. 134 The English example featured more prominently in propaganda from 1587, but developments prior to this deserve further attention, particularly in the light of the physical exile presence there. 135 With French radical Catholics facing an uncertain future, the exiles amongst them, and the relation of their sufferings, acquired local and international resonance.

As argued previously, there was a Parisian market for works about English affairs. It was here that exiles found collaborators and a ready audience for their work. The *Discours des Troubles* (1570), printed in Paris and Lyon, was an early sign of future cooperation. 136 This account of English Catholic affairs ended with a summary of the proclamation made by the Northern Earls. It perhaps owed something to the presence in France of recent fugitives from the 1569 revolt, who presumably helped to

132 Dillon, *Construction*, p. 10.


134 Jérôme Anroux, a churchwarden at Saint-Séverin, was carefully chosen by the king for the task of removing the display; his family had strong Seize credentials. He was vilified by League pamphleteers for following royal orders. L’Estoile, *Registre-Journal*, vol. 5, p. 310. Below, p. 189, footnote 203.


136 *Discours des Troubles nouvellement aduenuz au royaume d’Angleterre, au moyz d’Octobre 1569: Avec une declaration, faite par le Comte de Nortumberland et autres grands seigneurs d’Angleterre* (Paris, 1570), and (Lyon, 1570).
raise awareness of these events. Parisian printers also anticipated the market for works on the English martyrs. Thomas More and John Fisher were not immediately promoted as martyrs after their deaths even within England, but when they were the portrayal came from Parisian presses. Nearly fifty years later, a French pamphlet on the death of Edmund Campion, published in Paris and Lyons, was widely circulated and translated into Latin and Italian. Meanwhile, efforts were made to direct works in the opposite direction, meeting the need within England for Catholic literature. By the mid-1580s, Parisian printers were producing devotional works to be smuggled into England. As we shall see, this interaction between exiles and Parisian printers and propagandists became more extensive in the course of the 1580s.

In general terms, the Parisian print industry was not closed to foreigners. In particular, it provided a nexus for Catholic exiles and Parisian radicals. Although the impact of English printers in Paris was not as dramatic as that of the exile movement on the Genevan industry, the close association between English exiles and Parisian printers and polemicists was both practical and symbolic. Exile lodgings were often in close proximity to the premises of printers of radical work, if not the presses, and printers presumably knew some of their readers personally. Parisian booksellers and printers, for instance, were based around the Carmelite convent, an area with particular

---


138 A pamphlet on the subject produced in 1536 had a wide circulation; it was followed by a printed French edition. For more on this, Brad S. Gregory, Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2001), p. 262; Tallon, Conscience nationale, pp. 187-88.


140 TNA, SP 78/10/11, Cobham to Walsingham, Paris, 19 July 1583. ‘The Jesuits have sent to Rouen two “dry fats” of books to be dispersed into England, Scotland and Flanders, conveyed by Peter l’huillier, librarian of this town... The books are of their new translated testaments, catechisms and small pamphlets concerning the Jesuits miracles, done in sundry countries’.

141 Mathorez, Étrangers, p. 189.

142 Pettegree, Persuasion, p. 144.

143 Pallier, L’Imprimerie, p. 43. Pallier suggests the ecclesiastical and legal inhabitants of the left bank were probably more avid and diligent readers than the merchants and royal officers of northern and eastern Paris. Those of humbler background were numerous on the left bank, but they were more likely to be ‘poorer intellectuals and basochiens’. Descimon, ‘Eve’, p. 87.
significance for Scottish Catholics. Meanwhile, the Mathurins convent, an important site for the German Nation, became closely associated with the industry. In 1582 the confrérie des libraires, relieurs, enlumineurs, écrivains et parcheminiers relocated. It moved from the parish of Saint-André-des-Arts to the Mathurins, partly to be nearer a lucrative business area. The Mathurins was a recognised nucleus for University life, and for militant Catholicism. In the heartland of Catholic radicalism, learned left-bank inhabitants met here and exchanged ideas. With both the confraternity and the German Nation holding meetings in the convent complex, English scholars, members of the city's print industry, and members of the League's inner circle shared physical and associational links with the house.

From an early stage, exiles made a contribution to international polemic and propaganda. Protestant England was remarkable in the later sixteenth century for its contemporary Catholic martyrs: there was a real demand for up-to-date information for the accounts printed on the continent, just as relics of the English martyrs were highly sought after. New arrivals were an important source of information on the English situation. Even non-radicals, who did not see themselves as exiles, could have

---

144 Above, Chapter Two, p. 139.

145 For example, AN, MC, LXXIII, 85, f. 93; AN, MC, LXXXI, 87, ff. 353-54v. Most actes concerning the German Nation in Chapellain's étude were drawn up in the cloisters of the Mathurins, the accustomed venue for assemblies of the nation. The nation's arches may also have been kept there. Boyce, English-German, pp. 35-36, 180; Rashdall, Universities, pp. 343, 424. The Mathurins had played host to various University bodies since the thirteenth century. Another less frequented site for meetings of the nation was the parish church of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont. AN, MC, XLIX, 166, f. [114].


147 New acts of the University were pronounced, meetings of the University were held, and official ceremonies and procession would start out from the convent. It was also the official site for the purchase of parchment. Closely associated with the crusading ideal, the order played an important role in militant Catholicism. Ramsey, Liturgy, pp. 78-79, 132, 156-57; Berty, Topographie, vol. 6, p. 333.

148 AN, MC, XLIX, 223, f. 548. Jean Champhuon, a member of Mary Stuart's council and brother-in-law to the Naus, lived on rue des Mathurins in 1588.

149 Pettegree underlines Chrisman's distinction between polemic, which still includes elements of persuasion, and propaganda, in which persuasion is absent. Pettegree, Persuasion, p. 183; Miriam Usher Chrisman, 'From Polemic to Propaganda: The Development of Mass Persuasion in the Late Sixteenth Century', Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, 73 (1982), p. 175. Although most of the texts examined in this thesis can be characterised as propaganda, Discours de la Vie, examined in Chapter Four, could be described as polemic.

150 Allen, Briefe Historie, p. 44. Allen claimed that Catholics from Italy, Spain and France as well as England 'make extreme sute' to obtain relics.
contributed to emerging printed accounts, or made an impression on those producing them. Exiles arriving in Europe provided source material for newsheets and martyrologies, which was highly valued by mission leaders.\textsuperscript{151} In 1584, for instance Persons went to considerable effort to collect accounts of recent events in England from a variety of sources in Paris. Aside from written accounts sent from England, he used the oral testimony of English Catholics in Paris, and written reports they brought with them or had subsequently drawn up.\textsuperscript{152} Persons forwarded his work to his contact in Rome, to be disseminated across Catholic Europe. It was probably subsequently used by martyrologists working throughout Europe.

The close association between English exiles and Parisian printers and propagandists can also be discerned in the content of works produced. In November 1583, for instance, obscene pictures of Elizabeth were set up on the streets of Paris. She was depicted on horseback, her left hand holding the bridle, her right pulling up her skirts. Anjou was underneath her, holding a hawk, '... which continually baited and could never make her sit still'. Stafford tried, unconvincingly, to argue that Anjou's honour was offended more than Elizabeth's. He nevertheless admitted that English exiles were probably at least partly responsible for the display:

\begin{quote}
I am afrayde somme of or... Englishmen here have a parte in ytt... there are nott many naughtie people in the worlde as some of them be.\textsuperscript{153}
\end{quote}

Being removed as swiftly as it had appeared, and before Stafford could act against them, the displays must have taken considerable organisation and collaboration with local residents. The positioning and the timing of such exhibitions were very deliberate.\textsuperscript{154} Its display at three different locations indicates that exiles were amongst its creators and its intended audience. Aside from the Place de Grève - one of the main public spaces on the right bank, directly in front of the Hôtel de Ville - the picture was displayed on the left bank, on the corner of the Augustins, and outside Collège Montaigu. Those familiar sites would have been heavily frequented by left-bank inhabitants, whether exiles or

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{151} Gregory, \textit{Salvation}, pp. 287-88.
\item \textsuperscript{152} CRS, 39, p. 237, Robert Persons to Ribadeneira, Paris, 10 September 1584; Dillon, \textit{Construction}, p. 122.
\item \textsuperscript{153} TNA, SP 78/10/79, Stafford to Walsingham, 17 November 1583.
\item \textsuperscript{154} Wilkinson, 'Mary', p. 194; Carroll, 'Revolt', p. 319.
\end{footnotes}
locals. Exiles determined to raise opposition towards Elizabeth and her policies knew how to harness a Parisian populace already hostile towards England.

Less than a month later, Stafford discovered this was part of a larger campaign against the Anglo-French entente. Visual and written media were employed to portray the cruelty and injustice practised by the Elizabethan government on its Catholic subjects. The project was well organised, staffed by exiles committed to its output, and occurred soon after Guise launched preparations to land in England in 1583. The broadsheet of engravings and accompanying verse depicting the persecutions of Catholics in England was entitled Breifve Description des Cruautēz que les Catholiques endurent en Angleterre pour le foy. Its contents and message put Anglo-French amity at risk, openly criticised the English government, and placed a question mark over Henri’s position. The man held responsible for the work was the exile Richard Verstegan, who made a name for himself as a skilled propagandist, writer, and intelligencer.

Stafford obtained drafts of Verstegan’s broadsheets in late 1583, but their creators still produced some copies in Paris, and were not discouraged from taking their efforts elsewhere. Latin and French versions were to be printed elsewhere in Europe, whilst Verstegan’s work was to reappear in a different format in the churchyard of Saint-Séverin a few years later. Stafford pushed for a raid on the printing house, and got Verstegan and his associates arrested. But royal assurances that those responsible would be punished held little real weight, as the printing industry, the preachers, and

---

155 Collège Montaigu was on rue Saint-Étienne-des-Gres, a few minutes from the Carmelites or Saint-Jean-de-Latran. The Augustins was further west, nearer the church of Saint-André-des-Arts.

156 CSPF, 1583-1584, p. 344, The Queen to Stafford, 7 February 1584.

157 For Verstegan’s subsequent career, Arblaster, Antwerp; Petti, ‘Verstegan’; CRS, 52.

158 For the draft copies, CSPF, 1583-1584, no. 263, p. 231, Stafford to Walsingham, 23 November 1583; CSPF, 1583-1584, no. 311, p. 270, Stafford to Walsingham, 15 December 1583. Details of the extant pamphlet are given in Petti, ‘Catholic Martyrologies’, p. 89. The Latin version of the work, Descriptiones quaedam illius inhumane et multiplicis persecutionis quam in Anglia propter fidem sustinent Catholicici Christiani (Rome, 1584) used illustrations by another engraver. A French translation of this Latin work also appeared in 1587. Richard Verstegan, Le Théâtre des Cruautés des hérétiques de notre temps (1587), ed. Frank Lestringant (Paris, 1995). Based on evidence in L’Estoile’s copy of the Breifve Description (1583), Dillon speculates that copies were in circulation in Paris for several years, and were distributed to the crowds at Saint-Séverin in 1587. Dillon, Construction, p. 165. For the clear link between the engravings of the Breifve Description and the Saint-Séverin tableau, Jacques-Auguste de Thou, Histoire Universelle de Jacques Auguste de Thou depuis 1543 jusqu’en 1607 (11 vols, The Hague, 1740), vol. 6, pp. 443-44. Arblaster suggests that Verstegan could have returned to Paris in 1587 and been involved in the Saint-Séverin display: he was certainly absent from Antwerp. Arblaster, Antwerp, p. 42.
ultimately a segment of the urban population were beyond Crown control. Thanks to the
efforts of the nuncio, Verstegan was released and escaped to Rome.\textsuperscript{159} He reappeared
briefly in Paris, and settled permanently in the Low Countries. Despite Henri's apparent
willingness to consider English demands, he did not pursue the exiles responsible, and
was probably complicit in Verstegan's escape to Rome. These less overt actions,
however, did not win over his adversaries, who continued to be alienated by his pro-
Elizabethan policy.

The writing and production of early modern books was a collaborative process,
and the concept of authorship fluid.\textsuperscript{160} Several printers might collaborate on one work,
particularly if it was a large or expensive undertaking. In most cases, this collaboration
was brief and limited. Given these specific circumstances, however, and the exiles' personal stake in producing anti-English polemic, their collaboration with Parisian printers takes on new significance. The production of the 	extit{Breifve Description} illustrates this, involving as it did both exiles and native Parisians. The operation of a press involved several people, and Verstegan received practical help from a number of Englishmen, amongst them Ingram Thwinge, a rebel from 1569.\textsuperscript{161} Another Englishman was employed to 'carry the stones for printing upon' and the 'corrector' of the text was presumably also English. These men were imprisoned alongside the printer's son, even

\textsuperscript{159} Nuncio Ragazzoni had considerable influence with Henri III, and used it to help Verstegan after his arrest. Blet (ed.), 	extit{Ragazzoni}, no. 28, p. 183, Ragazzoni to Cardinal of Como, Paris, 23 January 1583; Blet (ed.), 	extit{Ragazzoni}, no. 69, p. 257, Ragazzoni to the Cardinal of Como, 19 May 1584; CSPF, 1583-1584, 383, p. 322, Stafford to Catherine de Médicis, Paris, 1 February 1584; CSPF, 1583-1584, 376, pp. 315-16, Stafford to Walsingham, 18 January 1584; CSPF, 1583-1584, 392, p. 331; Stafford to Walsingham, 30 January 1584. Also Petti, 'Catholic Martyrologies', pp. 73-77.


\textsuperscript{161} Even the operation of a small press involved many individuals. Pettigree, \textit{Persuasion}, p. 147. Thwinge was apparently unrelated to the eponymous half-brother of the Earl of Sussex, executed in Namur in 1578. His service to Northumberland led him to join the 1569 revolt, for which he was attainted in 1571. He may have sought employment with the exiled Countess of Northumberland before being taken on as a courier by the Douai seminary. Escaping arrest in Paris in 1583, he fled to Reims, then the Low Countries, where he lived on a Spanish pension. He apparently resumed contact with Verstegan here. Petti, 'Verstegan' p. 249; 'Catholic Martyrologies', p. 89; Knox (ed.), \textit{Allen}, p. 134; Arblaster, \textit{Antwerp}, pp. 36, 74. He reappears in Paris in the late 1590s, involved in Jesuit-sponsored printing activities. TNA, SP 12/267/67, A brefe note of the practises that divers Jesuites hath had for the killing of Princes and changing of states, June 1598. And above, Chapter Two, p. 134, footnote 214.
before Verstegan himself was arrested. Meanwhile, other English Catholics provided physical protection: Thomas Morgan and one of the Owen brothers guarded the press to prevent Stafford gaining access. Close cooperation on this project perhaps forged permanent ties. After both had relocated to the Low Countries, Verstegan and Owen collaborated to provide information and news to mission leaders, and to produce other pamphlets.

Exiles wishing to produce printed works often could not afford, or did not wish, to establish their own press on the continent. The costs of ownership and production and the space needed were perhaps beyond their immediate means, especially if they had fled England unprepared. Instead, they used existing foreign presses, ideally employing an English editor to correct the linguistic errors which escaped foreign editors. Verstegan's operation in Paris used a press belonging to one of Paris' poorer printers, who usually produced books of hours and short prayers for the king. The printer's readiness to take on this project, and even lend his son to help, implies his confidence of a ready audience. The disruption of the book trade in France by civil instability possibly worked to the advantage of exile propagandists here, as small-scale printers could be more willing to churn out their works, which had a rapid turnover and

---

162 English and French accounts vary slightly. According to Henri III, only 2 men were arrested at this point: the printer's son and the Englishman who had carried the pages between Verstegan and the printer. Unfortunately, the name of this printer is unknown. BN, fonds français, 3305, f. 45, Henri III to Mauvissière, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 25 January 1584. TNA, SP 78/11/6, Stafford to Pinart, 13 January 1584.

163 TNA, SP 78/11/6, Stafford to Pinart, 13 January 1584; CSPF, 1583-1584, 311, p. 270, Stafford to Walsingham, 15/25 December 1585. Both Hugh and Robert Owen were in France in the 1580s; it is unclear which was guarding the press. Presumably the man who had passed the proofs to Stafford was also an exile.

164 Verstegan was responsible for the production of a pamphlet on which Owen and Godfrey Fuljambe had collaborated in 1588-89. Fuljambe had also spent time in Paris. Petti, 'Verstegan', p. 135; Mary Anne Everett Green (ed.), Calendar of State Papers Foreign Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1591-1594 (London, 1867), no. 44, pp. 533-34, Confession of Henry Walpole, July (?) 1594.

165 Wolfe comments that a printing press was not hugely expensive. Wolfe, 'Henri IV', p. 184. However, in 1588 one George Foster was struggling to set up his own press in Paris. AN, MC, XLIX, 178, f. 569. In addition to the press itself, a considerable amount of space was needed. Pettigree, Persuasion, p. 147. It would thus have been unfeasible for those living in college or small rented rooms. Below, Chapter Two, p. 123.

166 Petti, 'Verstegan', p. 60.


168 BN, fonds français, 3305, f. 45, Henri III to Mauvissière, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 25 January 1584. The printer's son, having admitted to printing the offending work, was arrested in the absence of his father. He was imprisoned and questioned.
promised quick profits. Stafford attributed the involvement of French printers to necessity alone, but they could also have been motivated by ideological sympathy. Verstegan expressed in his writings the hope that continental Catholics feel charity, piety and pity towards suffering coreligionists in England. Amongst particular Parisian printers, it seems his hopes were realised.

The symbolic and practical potential of English Catholics to mobilise radical opinion in Paris increased from 1584. The ramifications of the Duke of Anjou's death for England and France went far beyond the impressive and large-scale ceremonies of his funeral. His death extinguished residual hopes for Catholic toleration in England, and confronted the French populace with the prospect of a Protestant successor to the throne. This possibility was already an anathema for some, but the knowledge of persecutions in Protestant England exacerbated negative reactions. French Catholics, who had claimed English martyrs as their own and identified with them in the international Catholic cause, now faced an equivalent prospect of persecution for their faith within France.

Parisians confronted this debate directly when they played reluctant host to the Garter Ceremony in February 1585. The court festivities, conducted away from the populace, provoked widespread hostility. Courtly magnificence, already vulnerable to criticism, did not win over public opinion. Radical Catholics were enraged by Henri's acceptance of a 'heretical' honour, which, they claimed, contradicted his oath on coronation to defend Catholicism. He was decried for embracing a queen who persecuted their coreligionists, as exiles in their city could testify. Radicals attacked Henri for spending prodigiously to entertain heretics, rather than fighting heresy in

---


170 In the foreword of his *Descriptiones*, the reader is exhorted: 'You who are a member with us of the same body of Christ and of the Church may sympathise with us your afflicted brethren and may join your prayers with us... to still this tempest and soften the hearts of the persecutors and move them to the faith which they have rejected'. Translated from the Latin original in Fetti, 'Verstegan', p. 85.

France. The treatment of several hundred Protestant lords as equals with French Catholic nobles and members of Henri’s *Ordre du Saint-Esprit* was controversial. The official English presence in Paris also held ominous connotations with the gathering of Protestant nobles in the capital for the wedding of Navarre and Marguerite de Valois in 1572. The consequence of this manifestation of the Crown’s will for reconciliation had been a rash of rumours about Protestant conspiracy theories, culminating in the Massacre of St Bartholemew’s Day. By 1585, Paris was remarkably religiously homogenous, but it retained a deep paranoia about Protestant uprisings from within. Radical preachers proclaimed that Henri was plotting with Elizabeth to destroy Catholicism in his own capital. The fact that many of the Protestant English nobles were lodged with bourgeois within the city could only have exacerbated tensions. The ecclesiastical hierarchy mobilised in opposition to Henri’s diplomacy, and Guise was notably absent from court at the time of the ceremony. Presumably, this sense of disgust at Henri’s acceptance of the Garter was shared by English exiles in the city. Radical rejection of Henri’s policies was clearly manifested when the League were in a position to dictate terms later that year. In the Treaty of Nemours in July, all previous edicts of toleration were revoked, and Catholicism was to be the sole

---

172 The conferral of the Garter was read as part of Elizabeth’s plan to procure Henri’s commitment to war in the Low Countries against Spanish interests. L’Estoile, *Registre-Journal*, vol. 5, p. 13. Derby promoted this during his stay. *CSPF, 1584-1585*, pp. 295-96, Derby and Stafford to Walsingham, 23 February 1585.


174 Apologists for the massacre present it as a pre-emptive action against a planned Huguenot takeover and subsequent slaughter of Catholics in Paris. The belief that Henri III was bringing in Protestant forces to deliver France into heresy provoked further mobilisation and, ultimately, the capital’s repudiation of his rule. Carroll, ‘Revolt’, p. 312; Strong, ‘Festivals’.

175 ‘Ils préchoient au peuple que le Roi ne pensoit qu’a faire alliance avec les herétiques pour détruire le Religion de nos ancêtres, tandis qu’il négligeoit ceux qui en étoient les défenseurs’; ‘They preach to the people that the King thinks only of making an alliance with the heretics to destroy the Religion of our ancestors, since he neglects those who are its defenders’. De Thou, *Histoire Universelle*, vol. 6, p. 476.


177 Cardinal de Bourbon apparently gathered with several prelates to discuss their duty to abide by the papal bull against Elizabeth I. Carroll, ‘Revolt’, p. 312; Murdin (ed.), *Collection*, p. 469, Thomas Morgan to Mary Stuart, Paris, 15/25 February 1585.

178 Morgan reported this deep sense of discontent in February 1585. ‘Salisbury’, *HMC, 9*, part 3, no. 143, p. 95, Thomas Morgan to Mary Stuart, Paris, 15/25 February 1585.
religion permitted in France. Less than six months after committing to an English alliance, Henri conceded to measures anticipating a new campaign against the Huguenots. With little intention of enforcing these terms, he presumably hoped that outward capitulation was the best means to indirectly pursue different aims. Nevertheless, his wider aim of concord between opposing parties had been openly repudiated by his opponents, and his own position consequently weakened.

The clearest deployment of English analogies in propaganda hostile to Henri III came with Louis D’Orléans’ *Advertissement des Catholiques Anglois aux Francois Catholiques*, first published in Paris in 1586. This work, subsequently published in the provinces, apparently appeared in 15 different editions within a few years, and sparked a volley of counter-replies from Protestant and *politique* writers. Although D’Orléans also took the guise of an Englishman in later works, its use was most striking in his work of the mid-1580s. Adopting the persona of an English Catholic writing to French coreligionists, the author used English examples to urge the prevention of a similar course of events in France. The audience is impelled to turn to moral reform, and to complete the task begun with the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew’s Day, the

---

179 ‘... il ne sera doresvenant aucun exercice de la nouvelle Religion pretendue reformée, mais seulement celuy de nostre Religion Catholique... tous nosdites sujets seront tenues de vivre doresvenant selon ladite Religion Catholique Apostolique et Romaine: & ceux qui sont de la dicte Religion Nouvelle de s’en departir, se reduire A ladite religion’; ‘... from this time there will be no exercise of the new so-called reformed Religion, but only our Catholic Religion... all our subjects will live from this point according to the Catholic Apostolic and Roman Religion: and those who are of the said New Religion are to leave it and submit to the said [Catholic] religion’. ‘Edict du Roy, sur la reunion de ses sujets a l’église Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine, 18 juillet, 1585’, printed in Simon Goulart, *Les Mémoires de la Ligue, sous Henry II & Henry IIII, Rois de France* (4 vols, Paris, 1602-1604), vol. 1, pp. 197-98.

180 Le Person even argues that Henri was setting a trap for the Leaguer Princes: by seeming to capitulate, he was hoping to exploit potential divisions amongst his adversaries. Le Person, *<<Practicques>>*, pp. 220-24, 583.


182 *Replique pour le catholique Anglois, contre le catholique associi des Huguenots* ([Paris], 1588), p. 3. This refutation of Mornay’s response to the 1586 work claimed the *Advertissement* had reached fifteen different editions, and a Latin translation had been made. For more on printed responses to the work, Gould, ‘D’Orléans’, p. 21.

183 He later re-employed a similar analogy to write in justification of the League and mobilisation against Navarre, but it was not so central to his argument. *Second Advertissement des Catholiques Anglois, aux Francois Catholiques, & à la Noblesse qui suit à present le Roy de Navarre* (Paris, 1590).
extermination of heretics. D'Orléans claimed these to be the only means to save French Catholics from the fate of their English coreligionists. 184

D'Orléans’ presentation of England and France, or at the least their Catholic populations, is striking. Completely bypassing the ancient enmity between the two countries, his English gentleman clearly states they are ‘deux royaumes proches, & seulement divisée dvn trajet de mer’. Both are infected with heresy, but England is far worse off: France, he says, still has some hope of recovery. 185 A despoiled England thus serves as an example, and source of reproach to French Catholics for their idleness and compromise in the face of imminent physical and spiritual ruin. 186

Although a study of his cahier indicates a fascination with English matters, there is no direct evidence for D'Orléans’ interaction with exiles in Paris. 187 Nevertheless, his comments on the treatment of Catholics by the Elizabethan government are similar in tone and language to English propaganda on the same subject. 188 His English gentleman also made direct reference to exiles in Paris, and the help they received from certain

---

184 Catholic persecution in England was presented to the French reader as ‘un bel exemple & un miroir assez clair pour y cognositre le danger vous menace’; ‘a good example and a mirror which is clear enough for you to recognise the danger that threatens you’. D'Orléans, Advertissement, p. 6.

185 ‘two kingdoms close [to each other], divided only by a ride across the sea’. D'Orléans, Advertissement, pp. 4-5.

186 ‘Nostre pauvre Angleterre vous faites sages, qui de jour a autre nous reproche nostre laschetd’; ‘Our poor England makes you wise, that from one day to the next we reproach our own cowardliness.’ D'Orléans, Advertissement, p. 70. De Thou described the work as ‘...un tocsin general. Bientôt on n'entendit plus à Paris, et dans toute l'étendue du royaume, les chaires retentir d'autre chose que des persecutions d'Angleterre’; ‘a general tocsin. As soon as its sound dies out in Paris and across the length of the country, the pulpits ring with nothing else but the persecutions in England’. De Thou, Histoire Universelle, vol. 6, p. 443.


188 Allen and D’Orléans protest against the social, physical and legal shames and the deprivations impressed on Catholics in England. Allen complains of martyrdom, imprisonment, physical suffering, despoiling of goods and wealth in his Defence, pp. 37, 54-55. D’Orléans claims: ‘Le jour, la nuit, en toute saison, et en toutes heures, vos maisons seront foulees, vos meubles derobez, vos argent pillé... [les] grosses amendes: les tortures, les questions extraordinaires, les cordeliers & les gibets ne vous ne manqueront jamais’; ‘Day or night, in all seasons and at all hours, your houses will be searched, your goods made away with, your money pillaged... great fines, tortures, extraordinary questions, nooses and gallows will not pass over you’. D’Orléans, Advertissement, p. 38. In many ways, D'Orléans provides an answer to Allen’s plea that the miseries of Catholics in England be a warning for ‘all Princes and Provinces that yet happily enjoye the Catholique religion’; Allen, Defence, p. 16.
parties.189 Presumably, D’Orléans was amongst those aiding English Catholics: their stories may have contributed to his work. A direct exile input to his work cannot be proved, but some influence over his use of the English analogy was likely.

D’Orléans was not alone in calling for Catholic mobilisation in these terms. Between 1584 and Henri III’s death in 1589, at least 24 works are obviously concerned with events in England, or employ the English example to activate a French audience.190 Meanwhile, the translation and publication in Paris of official announcements by the English government about Catholic conspiracies was potentially explosive.191

The execution of Mary Queen of Scots in 1587 was a turning point for the League’s open repudiation of Henri III. News of her death provoked outcries from Parisian preachers and polemicists. One famous printed response was Adam Blackwood’s martyrological account of her life and death. Stressing Mary’s French identity, his work was accompanied by sermons decrying the heretical tyrants responsible for her death. Blackwood offered ‘proof’ of Henri’s betrayal of his sister-in-law, coreligionist and fellow sovereign.192 Elsewhere, the tableaux displayed in the Saint-Séverin churchyard in 1587, in which we know some exiles had a hand, probably included pictures of her execution. Here, and in printed works in French Latin and English, Mary was proclaimed as a Catholic and royal martyr.193 Henri was criticised for having done so little to save his sister-in-law, and for failing to avenge her death,

189 ‘La France... a receu nos pauvres freres en leur affliction’; ‘France... has received our poor brothers in their affliction’. D’Orléans, Advertisement, p. 89. D’Orléans also mentions Thomas Morgan by name, as suffering from the calumnies of English Protestant authorities. D’Orléans, Advertisement, p. 19.
190 This is based on Pallier’s list of work produced by the League. Pallier, L’Imprimerie. His research was extensive, but not completely exhaustive. It does not cover the period before 1584: there may have been others prior to this.
193 Stafford reported that a book entitled Advertissements des Advertissements, featuring her execution appeared in Paris at the same time as the tableau and contained similar material. Verstegan’s printed work in Latin, Theatrum Crudelitatis, was printed in 1587. The French version, Théâtre des Cruautés, appeared a few months later. Both included an engraving of her execution, with prose and verse honouring her as a Catholic and royal martyr. Petti, ‘Verstegan’, pp. 93, 104; Dillon, Construction, pp. 273-74.
now viewed as martyrdom. There were rumours of an armed invasion to avenge Mary's death in France, but tellingly Henri's involvement was never considered.\textsuperscript{194}

The boundaries of the conflict had thus shifted, and the attack on Henri and his English allies was increasingly overt. This was reflected in the 1587 publication of \textit{Théâtre des Cruautés}, an updated collection of Verstegan's engravings. The urban backdrop for the English persecution here was Parisian, rather than English: Catholic sufferings had been brought to the streets of their own city.\textsuperscript{195} The impact of this must have been increased by the physical presence of the exiles, offering further 'proof' of these sufferings. Opposing their king's alliance with Protestant England, and fighting heresy at home, radical Catholics in France were now also fighting for their own survival. Sparked by news of Mary Stuart's execution and funded by the Guise, the city's pulpits and tracts had a clear message for an uneasy populace: if Henri III's policies and Navarre's succession were not opposed, they would suffer a persecution akin to that inflicted by the 'she-wolf' Elizabeth I on her Catholic subjects.\textsuperscript{196}

Clearly the idea that all exiles passed their time in apathy must be qualified.\textsuperscript{197} A minority were closely involved in the propaganda enterprise, taking up combat for their faith in a different way. Those who had experienced anti-Catholic measures firsthand in England were additionally qualified to comment, seeing and representing themselves as part of the suffering group. The hardcore group were convinced their contribution could have an impact on the international situation, and thus on their own fate. In 1583, they intended to personally present Henri III with 'three handsome copies' of Verstegan's

\textsuperscript{194} In March 1588, Mendoza reported Beaton had gone to Reims to deliver a funeral sermon for Mary Stuart. It was felt that Beaton's probable meeting with Guise there could initiate a new invasion project. Croze, \textit{Guises}, Appendix XXV, p. 322, Mendoza to Philip II, 15 March 1588.

\textsuperscript{195} Dillon, \textit{Construction}, p. 163. Dillon believes Verstegan probably pirated plates made by Protestant polemicists to represent the Massacre of Saint Bartholemew's Day. Hence the martyrdom of English Catholics in Verstegan's work was depicted on the streets of Paris, not London.

\textsuperscript{196} Robiquet, \textit{Paris}, pp. 263-64; Wilkinson, \textit{Mary}, p. 121. Elizabeth was often referred to as the she-wolf in League propaganda, a classical symbol of lewdness. Like the 1583 display, propagandists made a clear link between Elizabeth's heresy and her alleged sexual depravity, as they had with Henry VIII. Above, Chapter Two, p. 101.

\textsuperscript{197} Bossy argues that the conspiratorial activities of a few masked the essentially apathetic character of the exiles. Bossy, 'Link', p. 39.
work, believing this would secure his unqualified support.\textsuperscript{198} This was not necessarily just wishful thinking: contemporary accounts suggest Henri ordered Verstegan’s release after viewing pictures of tortures in England, rather than because of pressure from the nuncio.\textsuperscript{199} The direct engagement of exiles with Parisians, and the print trade in particular, increased the explosive potential of their activities: their presence and activity was destabilising to English and French Crowns alike. They attacked Elizabeth, and seriously questioned Henri III’s reputation.\textsuperscript{200} In fact, propaganda initiatives were often aligned with the continental conspiracies for Catholic restoration in England, rendering it all the more damaging.

Criticism of Henri III’s reliance on Italian advisers and his promotion of behaviour alien to traditional French values were common in anti-courtier literature. Thanks to exile efforts, his English policy was also viewed as very dangerous, and was used to explain apparently unconnected developments. When Henri attempted liturgical innovation, such as the introduction of the Roman breviary, he met with stiff opposition. Rather than voicing a Gallican defence against ultramontane pretension, critics argued that Henri wanted to be a king very different to his predecessors. They claimed that their king was aiming at the kind of tyranny that Henry VIII had established over the church in England.\textsuperscript{201}

The possible import of links between nascent Leaguers and ‘political’ exiles can be revealed through two Parisians, a cleric and a lay printer. Jean Boucher, curé of Saint-Benoît became one of Henri III’s harshest critics. Later known as ‘le roi de la Ligue’, and refusing to recognise Navarre as king until his death, his radicalism had a long pedigree. A teacher at University colleges renowned for radicalism, as well as a

\textsuperscript{198} TNA, SP 78/11/6, Stafford to Pinart, 13 January 1584. Stafford’s copy of this letter initially stated that copies were aimed for the Queen Mother and one other grandee of the court, but this information was then crossed out. In Henri III’s account, one of the printer’s servants said the copies were made ‘pour m’en donner, et aux premiers conseillers, et pareillement aux principaux de Justice dudit Paris’; ‘to be given to me, to my chief counsellors, and also to the principal justices of Paris’. BN, fonds français, 3305, f. 45, Henri III to Mauvissière, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, 25 January 1585.

\textsuperscript{199} For the nuncio’s intervention, above, p. 181, footnote 159. For Henri’s reaction to accounts of Catholic sufferings, Petti, ‘Verstegan’, p. 90.

\textsuperscript{200} TNA, SP 78/11/6, Stafford to Pinart, 13 January 1584.

prolific preacher and writer, Boucher's activities provoked open conflict with the Crown. A Guise protégé, he was a key player in disturbances associated with the exile cause. L'Estoile names him amongst the Sorbonnistes responsible for the tableau in the neighbouring churchyard of Saint-Séverin.\textsuperscript{202} Henri III tried to have Jean Prévost, curé of Saint-Séverin arrested. Boucher rang the tocsin, mobilising the quartier's inhabitants to prevent the arrest of his former tutor. He probably also had a hand in a pamphlet denigrating those who helped to remove the placards as 'politique foxes', unconcerned for Catholic blood shed in England:

\begin{center}
Laissez ceste peinture, ô Renars politiques, \\
Laissez ceste peinture, en laquelle on void peints \\
Les spectacles piteux et les corps de sang teints, \\
Sang, dy je, bien heureux des devots catholiques.\textsuperscript{203}
\end{center}

Boucher's attachment to the exile cause sprang partly from an awareness of how it could advance his own agenda. Conscious of the potential of exploiting anti-English sentiment, he made good use of the analogy of an England laid waste by heretical tyrants. In 1582, he wrote a Latin account of the persecution of regular clergy under Henry VIII, associating this with those suffering under Elizabeth.\textsuperscript{204}

The equation between English kings and heresy, and its application to contemporary French crises, was even more explicit in a 1588 publication. Boucher collaborated with Pierre d'Espinac, Archbishop of Lyon to produce \textit{L'Histoire tragique et Memorable de Pierre de Gaveston}, a French version of Thomas Walsingham's

\begin{quote}
\textit{Historia Ecclesiastica de martyrism fratrum ordinis divi Francisci...qui partim in Anglia sub Henrico octavo rege, partim in Belgo sub Princepe Auriaco, partim in Hybernia tempore Elizabethae regine idque ab anno 1536 usque ud hunc nostrum presente annum 1582 passi sunt} (Paris, 1582). It was reprinted in 1585.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{202} For more on Boucher and his University duties, Crevier, \textit{L'Université}, vol. 6, pp. 362-64. He was considered to be in the pay of Mme de Montpensier. After the Saint-Séverin display he was called before the king, who declared he was doubly condemned for having spoken against his king, and for proceeding to celebrate Mass without having confessed his crimes. Henri's attempt at verbal chastisement had no impact. L'Estoile, \textit{Registre-Journal}, vol. 5, p. 330. Boucher also preached at Reims, another English Catholic centre. Bossy, 'Link', pp. 70-71. The Saint-Séverin display was known as the 'tableau de Mme de Montpensier'. The widowed Duchesse de Montpensier, sister of the duke of Guise, was an active patron of Parisian radical preachers. Her assumed involvement in the tableau illustrates the links between the Guise family and radical exiles.

\textsuperscript{203} 'Leave this picture, you politique foxes/ Leave this picture on which one sees painted/ pitiful spectacles and bodies of bloody complexion/ the blood, I say, most blessed of devout Catholics'. L'Estoile, \textit{Registre-Journal}, vol. 5, p. 310.

\textsuperscript{204} \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica de martyrism fratrum ordinis divi Francisci...qui partim in Anglia sub Henrico octavo rege, partim in Belgo sub Princepe Auriaco, partim in Hybernia tempore Elizabethae regine idque ab anno 1536 usque ud hunc nostrum presente annum 1582 passi sunt} (Paris, 1582). It was reprinted in 1585.
chronicle of the early reign of Edward II.\textsuperscript{205} In the preface, direct parallels were drawn between Edward II's favourite Gaveston, and Henri III's 'archmignon', the duc d'Épernon.\textsuperscript{206} By extension, Henri was compared to Edward II, whose love for his favourites infamously cost him his kingdom and his life, at the hands of the nobles he had repeatedly alienated. The \textit{Histoire Tragique}, an open attack on the king's favourite, contained numerous insults and barely-veiled threats to Henri III. Whilst the original text itself was in some sense less important than the preface and closing 'comment', the translation itself was carefully skewed, adapting certain comments to the contemporary French crisis.\textsuperscript{207} The work was printed no fewer than nine times.\textsuperscript{208}

The \textit{Histoire Tragique} transformed an account of the corruption and weakness of a medieval English monarch into a call to arms for contemporary French nobility.\textsuperscript{209} Keith Cameron posits that this comparison between a corrupt and heretical English monarchy and a seemingly ambiguous French Crown would not have been the obvious line of attack for Parisian propagandists had they not been collaborating with exiles.\textsuperscript{210} The Gaveston analogy drew attention to Henri III's association with England, a country detached from God and the Catholic Church. Both Leaguers and exiles would have


\textsuperscript{207} The French translation was an adapted version of the 1574 Latin edition, printed in England, which was overtly Protestant in tone. Ascoli, \textit{Grande-Bretagne}, p. 122. The French translator plays much more on the fear of foreign influence than Walsingham did. The English Barons become an analogy for contemporary French nobles: the Barons' slowness to act against the king's favourite was presented as a spur to Catholic nobles in France to crush Épernon.

\textsuperscript{208} Wilkinson, \textit{Mary}, p. 154.

\textsuperscript{209} Racaut observes that the anti-English sentiment of League writings was in part an answer to the \textit{politiqes} anti-Spanish polemic. Racaut, 'Anglicanism and Gallicanism', p. 213.

\textsuperscript{210} Cameron, 'Polémique', p. 193. Exile writers also used the example of Edward II's nasty end to impress on their audience the need to break the Earl of Leicester's hold over Elizabeth I. D. C. Peck (ed.), \textit{Leicester's Commonwealth: The Copy of a Letter Written by a Master of Art of Cambridge (1584) and related documents} (London, 1985), pp. 188-89. For more on this, below, Chapter Four, pp. 226-32. Verstegan also used the Gaveston analogy when writing against Cecil in 1592. Arblaster, \textit{Antwerp}, p. 57.
wanted to emphasise this. We can only infer the direct input of exiles on the text, but the presence of activists in Paris, and their potential influence, was considerable.\textsuperscript{211} They may have provided French radicals with a printed version of Walsingham's Latin chronicle, available in England from 1574.\textsuperscript{212} The \textit{Histoire Tragique} effectively examined precedents for nobles to execute their king. This was an issue which subsequent League writing examined in some depth; it was also considered by those undertaking to kill Elizabeth to restore Catholicism in England.\textsuperscript{213}

In other areas, the exiles' links to key radicals are less straightforward. Racaut's study of printer Nicolas Chesneau demonstrates the rapid response of French Catholic presses to Protestant growth, and the growing market for radical Catholic material in Paris. Based in rue Saint-Jacques, Chesneau was one of the most important and prolific left-bank printers. He published a range of material, a significant proportion of which was devotional or polemical, including some with an English or Scottish bent.\textsuperscript{214} Chesneau had obvious links to the Guise and Mary Stuart's partisans, and his portfolio includes works closely associated with intransigent Catholicism.\textsuperscript{215} Racaut argues that his death in 1584 cut short a nascent relationship with the League.\textsuperscript{216}

\textsuperscript{211} Wilkinson suggests the exiles made the League aware of the potential of visual propaganda. Wilkinson, Mary, p. 119.

\textsuperscript{212} The printed chronicle was produced in 1574 under the title \textit{Historia Brevis}. V. H. Galbraith (ed.), \textit{The St. Albans Chronicle 1406-1420 edited from Bodley MS. 462} (Oxford, 1937), pp. x-xi. It was considered to have been produced under Archbishop Matthew Parker's supervision. R. I. Page, 'The Conservation of Ancient Records and Monuments', in Matthew Parker and his books: Sanders Lectures in Bibliography delivered on 14, 16, and 18 May at the University of Cambridge by R. I. Page (Kalamazoo, 1993), p. 58. Some of the same exiles could well have attended Mass in Boucher's church, or heard his sermons.

\textsuperscript{213} Cameron, 'Satire', p. 161.

\textsuperscript{214} In 1563 Chesneau was granted a 4-year privilege to print Jerome Osorius' \textit{Remonstrance à la Madame Elisabeth Royne d'Angleterre touchant les affaires du monde}. This letter by a Portuguese prelate urged Elizabeth to convert to Catholicism. Wilkinson, Mary, pp. 57, 67. Chesneau produced editions in 1563, 1565 and 1567. In 1581, he published Archibald Hamilton's polemic against Protestantism in Scotland, \textit{Calvinae confusionis demonstratio, contra maledicam ministerum Scotiae responsonem}, dedicated to Mary Queen of Scots. Allison and Rogers (eds.), \textit{Contemporary Printed Literature}, vol. 2, pp. 88, 190.


\textsuperscript{216} Luc Racaut, 'Catholic Reform in Print in Sixteenth Century France', paper given at the Reformation Studies Colloquium, Birmingham, 6 April 2004.
However, Chesneau should not be categorised unreservedly as a zealot. Overall, his work was not highly emotive or politicised; even potentially inflammatory publications were not unwaveringly extreme. As Wilkinson argues, his 1570 piece on Catholic rebellion in England, *Discours des Troubles nouvellement advenuz au royaume d’Angleterre, au moys d’octobre 1569*, deliberately lacked explicitly controversial arguments. This gained him a royal privilege, without perhaps alienating French activists. By 1587, when a second edition was published in Paris and Rouen, the stand of the rebels in 1569 could be given a sharper ideological slant. At the same time, Chesneau was connected to René Benoist, curé of Saint-Eustache on the right-bank, a former confessor of Mary Stuart, and a partisan of her cause. The two men collaborated on several projects, most famously Benoist’s translation of the Bible, which was condemned by Rome and earned him expulsion from the University of Paris. Benoist himself was a committed non-Leaguer, and one of the few dissenting voices amongst Parisian curés. A prolific writer, his polemic against Protestantism was relatively moderate; in fact, he was led by different priorities, above all providing for the spiritual needs of ordinary Frenchmen. It is not unsurprising that Benoist would embark on a project of which radical Catholics would not approve; what is more notable is the cooperation of Chesnau. The nature of his publications as a whole, then, do not just reflect commitment to radical Catholicism. They suggest that other factors could dictate Chesneau’s printing career, which may not have been solely financial. In the early 1580s the production of Parisian works relating to England was not inevitably a polarising process; by the end of the decade, however, Boucher clearly links English exiles to a radical challenge of the status quo. Nonetheless, evidence indicates that a general awareness of the situation of English Catholics, and even a degree of sympathy with them, did not necessarily lead individuals to radicalism.

217 Wilkinson, ‘Mary’, pp. 100, 143, 234. In the 1570 pamphlet, the rebels are presented as acting in the defence of the ancient liberties of the Church. Mary Stuart’s captivity is lamented, but no mention is made of plans to liberate her. The latest consideration of this tract is Busse, ‘Anti-Catholic’, pp. 11-30. This does not fully explore the French context of its production, but convincingly argues that this work was independent of the more radical publication by the Countess of Northumberland in 1572. Above, p. 175, footnote 136.

3: Devotional and Educational Activism.

There were ways other than conspiracy to be active in exile, the most evident being religious activity. English exiles elsewhere in France could boast their own centres by the 1590s, but the lack of dedicated institutions made the Paris group somewhat indefinite and poorly focused. However, alternative ways to meet, socialize, and worship could make use of existing facilities. An English agent in 1584 reported nervously that English Catholics were gathering ‘... in every church that is in Paris and in every church that is ten leagues about Paris’. There was no compulsion to establish a vernacular service, an issue causing difficulties for some Protestant exile communities. Without a self-financing church, exiles in Paris were not occupied by the constant search for funds and for ministers. The lack of a dedicated church probably advanced integration into Parisian churches and local devotional and charitable practices. Presumably, English Catholics abroad did not insist on the observance of English devotional practices, mainly because they were no longer a feature of everyday life in England. For the English, and for some other foreign groupings in the city, reliance on existing parochial and conventual systems was one means for some level of integration.

The English thus avoided the hostility other ‘national’ groups faced for devotional particularism. In 1591, for instance, the Walloons had their traditional celebration of the feast of Saint Job overturned by Leaguers. L’Estoile was apparently amused by the noisy procession of a man riding backwards on a donkey, handing out

---

219 The Reims seminary was initially granted use of one the parish churches; under the League it built its own chapel in 1589. The new chapel of the Syon convent served a similar purpose in Rouen, and in fact was a centre of League radicalism. Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 74.

220 TNA, SP 12/176/71, Inspection of letters at Rye from English Catholics in France, February [?] 1585. The informant seems to ascribe a political motive to their gathering; this may not have been the sole reason for their meeting.

221 Danner, Pilgrimage, pp. 18-24; Collinson, Grindal, pp. 72-79; Kellar, Scotland, pp. 160-64. The Frankfurt community was split between those who felt that English worshipping abroad should reflect English practice, and those pushing for a more international approach, aligned with continental models of reformed worship. The radicals lost the struggle and relocated to Geneva. Once in their host city, English exiles had to work out a system of sharing places of worship with other foreign exile communities.


223 The Italians, for instance, maintained their own confraternity, but attended services in existing Parisian churches and did try to provide for sermons in their own language. Dubost, France Italienne, p. 135.
blessings from the creature’s backside, but other Parisians told them to stop their celebrations immediately, as practices ‘mocquans de Dieu et de la religion catholique’. Objection to ‘foreign’ traditions was shot through with a pious disgust for traditional or ‘superstitious’ practices. Hostility to Spanish and Walloon practices was perhaps also informed by a growing resentment of their military presence in the city. In fact, English Catholics forged a compromise between provoking hostility for their particularism and retaining some sense of their English identity. The monastery of Saint-Victor had its own devotion to Saint Thomas of Canterbury. The English in Paris could integrate themselves into this tradition whilst also celebrating a saint of particular relevance to themselves. On 29 December 1585, St Victor played host to English Catholics ‘en tres grande multitude’ who came with English priests to celebrate his feast day.

Historians often use lay donations to the church as a benchmark of devotional enthusiasm. Unfortunately, with the dearth of parish records there is little evidence of exiles’ donations to the physical or liturgical life of Parisian churches, aside from the few testamentary bequests mentioned above. We do know that exiles were supporting their own priests: this indicates commitment to their homeland, rather than close attachment to the exile environment as a permanent home.

Given the large number of Englishmen flocking to Paris and the mission leaders’ high regard for the University, the lack of a dedicated educational institution is in one sense remarkable. However, it need not be dismissed as a lukewarm attitude towards educational provision. There were rumours of an English Jesuit foundation in the city in

---

224 ‘mocking to God and the Catholic Religion’. ‘Registre-Journal’, p. 53. The Spanish in Paris also encountered open hostility when they brought their masked and decorated straw figures onto the altar during the 1591 Easter liturgy. One Mass-goer declared this proved that ‘la religion des Hespagnols n’estoit que masque et plastré’; ‘the religion of the Spanish was only mask and plaster’. ‘Registre-Journal’, p. 48.

225 The fiercest hostility to outsiders was articulated against soldiers, particularly Spanish, Walloon and Neopolitan garrisons. Descimon, ‘Milices’, p. 900. For more on French attitudes to Spain, Tallon, Consience nationale, pp. 213-35.


227 Above, Chapter Two, pp. 139, 142.

228 TNA, SP 78/7/69, Cobham to Walsingham, 12 March 1582. A Fr Sutton, travelling from Reims to England, was ‘apparalled newly at the cost of the Papists in Paris.’
the mid-1580s, although they never transpired to a practical project. Without support from the French Crown or a powerful intercessor at court a new foundation in Paris was unlikely. Political crisis in Paris, the slump in new foundations at the University, and the differing priorities of the leaders of the English mission counted against the project. Nevertheless, the foothold established at Collège Mignon stood the next generation in good stead. With the new atmosphere of the Bourbon monarchy, and with better contacts at Henri IV’s court, the idea of a college or school for English scholars at the University of Paris could become a serious proposal. Significantly, the proposed site for the institution in the late 1590s was Collège Mignon, where some of the project’s main promoters - most notably the courtier-poet Henry Constable - were living. In fact, the plan foundered for lack of financial support from the French Assembly of the Clergy, and the final outcome, the foundation of Collège d'Arras in 1611, signalled an adapted project on a new site. Nevertheless, the efforts of Constable and others bridged an important gap between the exiles of the 1580s and the scholars of the seventeenth century, when the battle for English Catholicism was being fought on very different grounds.

In the case of educational provision in Paris, the judgement of the exile group as apathetic can thus be qualified. Certainly, the Spanish ambassador did not view them in this light: he constantly referred to their ‘sanguinity’ about an invasion of England, and their optimism about the strength of support to be found within England. Evidently, it was not so much apathy, but internal wrangling that made the establishment of an institutional missionary base in Paris impracticable. Sir Thomas Fitzherbert attributed the failure of the Collège Mignon project to ‘the dissention of those, who shuld have erected and upholden yt, amongst whom none wuld be subordinat to other’. Divisions over the college between highborn anti-Spanish exiles and the internationally-focused

229 ‘... the papists and Jesuits have a colledg graunted them in parys’. TNA, SP 12/176/71, Inspection of letters at Rye from English Catholics in France, February [?] 1585.

230 For the story of efforts to establish the English College, above, Chapter Two, p. 127, footnote 179; Chapter Five, p. 262; Bossy, ‘Link’, pp. 170-74; Allison, ‘Richard Smith’; CRS, 41 (1948), p. 51. One other possible reason for the failure of earlier attempts was the unresolved quarrel between the King and the University over Collège Mignon, making the jurisdiction of the buildings contentious. The project eventually evolved into a college for English Catholic writers, rather than a seminary.

231 Calendar Simancas, no. 345, p. 483, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], Paris, 24 June 1583; Calendar Simancas, no. 377, p. 522, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], Paris, 18 April 1584.

232 CRS, 41, pp. 51-52, Thomas Swynerton (Fitzherbert) to Salvin (Father Birkhead), 27 June 1609.
Jesuits, and perhaps also between the Society of Jesus and English secular clergy reflected wider divisions over the purpose and direction of the exile state itself.\textsuperscript{233} These dissensions were also occurring amongst Catholics within England in the mid-1580s, even amongst those otherwise likely to be activists. As early as May 1583, Mendoza lamented that ‘each [Catholic was] acting and thinking separately... so they not only distrust one another but avoid expressing their opinions’. \textsuperscript{234}

4: Competition with other groups in the City.

The English were not the only foreign group seeking a niche or appealing to the French Crown. Where possible, looking beyond the English as an isolated group and comparing their situation with that of other groups in Paris could be instructive. Paris offered opportunities for interaction with other foreigners, and sometimes for them to identify with their plight.

Their exiled situation led to an interaction between English agents of Mary and her Scottish followers which otherwise would not have occurred. Charles Paget, for instance, was a major influence over Mary Stuart and became involved with other members of her dowager council, English, Scottish and French. George Norton, a rebel from 1569, became so closely involved with a circle of Scottish exiles that his knowledge of their schemes won him a pardon and a return to England.\textsuperscript{235} Beyond overt political action, the University, and in particular the German Nation, presented English Catholics with an established link with Scottish and Irish counterparts. In this respect, the English in Paris were more disadvantaged than their celtic counterparts. The long-established Scottish presence at the royal court, the revival of the Auld Alliance in the 1550s, the Scottish College at the University, and the presence of a coreligionist ambassador gave Scottish exiles stronger precedents on which to draw.\textsuperscript{236} These circumstances, together with continued hope for Mary Stuart’s restoration, inspired

\textsuperscript{233} Below, Chapter Five, pp. 266-68.

\textsuperscript{234} Calendar Simancas, no. 335, p. 467, Bernardino de Mendoza to the Queen of Scotland, [6?] May 1583.

\textsuperscript{235} George Norton’s circle included the Bishop of Ross, the Archbishop of Glasgow, Lord Seton, Paget and Morgan. Below, Chapter Five, p. 298, footnote 162.

\textsuperscript{236} Officially, subjects of the Crowns of France and Scotland held the rights of naturalised citizens in each other’s countries. Elizabeth Bonner, ‘French Naturalisation of the Scots in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries’, Historical Journal, 40 (1997), pp. 1088-89.
Scottish Catholics in Paris to activism. Scottish ecclesiastical leaders and academics evidently perceived and portrayed themselves as active agents in the struggle for Catholic restoration, whilst not involving themselves in conspiracy. Meanwhile, the Irish presence in Paris at this point was small-scale and predominantly characterised by clerics, young students or merchants rather than gentlemen, but they could boast their own educational establishment.

Symbolically, each group was assumed to be working for the deliverance of their native country: given their interlinked nature, the deliverance of one increased the chances of the same for the others. In this sense, close cooperation could have proved mutually advantageous. However, as we have seen, there were divisions within each ‘national’ group, so a lack of unanimity between the groups is not surprising. English and Scottish views about armed invasion of their homelands diverged, particularly amongst those activists attracting government scrutiny. When the Spanish ambassador assessed the prospects for invasion in 1583, he recognised clear differences between Scottish and English exiles. The Scottish exiles were actively engaged in attempts to win their country back for Catholicism, and turned to parties in France to realise this aim. The English, however, were concerned only for an attempt on England itself and, crucially, were keener to solicit Spanish backing. Any effective cooperation between the English and Scottish for an invasion of Scotland apparently dissolved in a divergence of views about the purpose and consequences of the enterprise. The English aimed to remove Elizabeth and restore Catholicism. The Scots, however, prioritised Mary Stuart’s liberation, enabling her to pursue claims to the English throne. Meanwhile, there were different visions about the long-term outcomes of any project. A successful invasion would lead to a new Catholic ‘Empire’ in Britain, but the practical

---


238 The Irish College was founded with 7 or 8 Irish clerics in 1578. Like the Scottish College at this point, it did not have a permanent home in a dedicated building. Lyons, ‘Franco-Irish’, p. 319.

239 Calendar Simancas, no. 458, p. 698, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 23 July 1586. Not all Scottish academics approved of the schemes of activists. By the later 1580s, they were disillusioned with Henri’s lack of assistance and turning to Spain. This reorientation away from France and towards Spain may also be partly due to disappointment at the failure of the Guise-backed scheme to restore Catholicism in Scotland in 1581-82.

240 For the pro-restoration activities of Scottish academics at the University, above, Chapter Two, pp. 131-32.
consequences of this provoked mutual suspicion. The English, who saw their kingdom as paramount, were hostile to the possibility of Scottish dominance in this new empire. In short, diverging views amongst the exiles about the shape of a future Catholic world proved an obstacle to closer collaboration between Catholics of the two nations.

A useful comparison can also be made between the English and Greek communities in Paris. Greek students had attended the University in small numbers since its foundation, but when Constantinople fell into Turkish hands the Greek presence in Paris, and its social profile was extended dramatically. Boosted by the strength of Hellenism in France, there were places for them at the University, court or in the households of Greek notables who had fled. Greece’s long-term exiles were displaying an impulse for action in the later sixteenth century, contemporaneously to the English, Irish and Scottish in Paris. Seeing a forced political change as the means to achieve their homecoming, they began to form secret societies and sent agents provocateurs into Greece to agitate against the Turkish occupier. The exile of the Greeks was overtly political: they were dissidents from a foreign occupying force. There is little sign of practical interaction between the Greek and the English, although academics from each must have crossed paths at the University or at court.

However, there were some similarities between the respective situations of the two groups. Both, for instance, benefited from the support of Gregory XIII. Meanwhile, English and French propagandists linked the situation of Greek Christians

241 Calendar Simancas, no. 345, p. 483, Juan Bautista de Tassis to the King [Philip II], Paris, 24 June 1583. For more on the lost chances of a British empire, Highley, “British lamb”.


243 Mathorez, Étrangers, p. 206. English Catholics and Greek Orthodox refugees were also found in Livorno. Brennan (ed.), 'Somerset', p. 187.

244 A colony of Greek intellectuals was established at the University from the fifteenth century, and Catherine de Médicis employed Greeks at court and in her entourage. Mathorez, Étrangers, pp. 119, 206. There was little sign that Orthodox Greeks were willing to call on Latin help when faced by the Turkish invasion in the fifteenth century. For those in France a century later, the situation may have been slightly different.

245 Gregory XIII instituted the foundation of a Greek seminary in Rome by the early 1580s, to parallel the established English College in the city. Allen, Defence, p. 131.
to that of English Catholics. English texts drew comparisons between persecution at the hands of the Protestants and the cruelties of the Turks. The plight of the Greeks at home and abroad, to have their country overrun by the infidel, was thus seen as similar to that of the English Catholics, whose country was ruined by heretics.\(^{246}\) These analogies predated the 1580s, but personal contacts between the groups in Paris probably increased their pertinence. Within France, the dilemma of Greek Christians was long known at court.\(^{247}\) Meanwhile, the League used the Greek position as an example and warning, just as they did the English case. In 1590, for instance, the fate of the Greeks under Turkish tyranny was proffered as a warning to French Catholics. The onus was on them to resist the succession of the heretic King, Navarre, and the subsequent tyranny he would establish.\(^{248}\)

In addition to other foreign groups, parties native to Paris could be a source of opposition or competition. These relations are only evident amongst the more politically active English, and those within Paris who were equally eager to assert their influence. As we have seen, when it came to attendance at mass English Catholics for the most part were integrated into the existing parochial system. However, a group of academics

---


---

\(^{247}\) In 1564, the future Henri III put on a court masque to honour his brother. In the scenario, Charles IX, despite his alliance with the Turkish Sultan, was prophesied as the saviour of Greece from the Turkish infidel. Tallon, *Conscience nationale*, p. 89.

---

\(^{248}\) D’Orléans, *Second Advertissement*, f. 166 v. Interestingly, after Henri IV’s conversion Greece was again used as an example of the perils of straying from union with the Papacy. Tallon, *Conscience nationale*, pp. 278-79.
in the faculty of Arts at the University were keen to claim dedicated space within the Church of Saints-Cosme-et-Damien. The German Nation was engaged in a longer-term struggle with the guild of barber-surgeons for influence in the parish. The dominance of the English and Scottish in the church in the later years of the sixteenth century is partly explained by particular jurisdictional and ecclesiastical conditions in Paris. The parish had a recent history of contested allegiances and jurisdictions. John Hamilton's predecessor had been engaged in a protracted quarrel over his rights as curé, and Hamilton's appointment was also challenged. In the long term, the nation did not win out over the increasingly strident surgeons' guild. Nevertheless, the fact that the Nation was winning over the barber-surgeons during what were crucial years for English and Scottish Catholics is notable. Their campaign, informed by the conditions of Paris, must also have been driven by their potential exile status. In an environment in which they could claim some precedents, the status of exile could provoke a new assertiveness and encourage them to claim a space in a foreign city which was unavailable to them at home.

4.1: French reactions to the English presence.

Paris' general openness to newcomers could break down when foreign involvement in particular issues was judged to be detrimental to the city. Those involved in polemical enterprises were a minority amongst English Catholics. Their French collaborators were likewise a small segment of the Paris populace, and did not necessarily carry the opinion of the whole city. Some politiques felt that League claims to be upholding the Catholic faith in the face of royal tyranny were little more than a mask for disloyalty and megalomania. Their attitude towards exiles collaborating with the radicals was not favourable, as reactions to the death of Anjou in 1584 illustrate.

The succession crisis in France from 1584 divided Catholic opinion between those who considered that Navarre's Protestantism invalidated his claim and those who

---

249 Above, Chapter Two, pp. 137-38.

250 This story can be traced through AN, L634, no. 37. For the challenge to Hamilton's appointment, Antheunis, 'L'Odyssée', pp. 731-33; Crevier, l'Université, vol. 6, pp. 380-82.

251 By the seventeenth century the surgeons were in the ascendent: their badge, rather than the German Nation's, was plastered on the church pews. Berty, Topographie, vol. 5, pp. 362-63.
supported him and hoped for his conversion. Within Paris, this was a highly contested issue. In itself, Anjou’s death was not something which exiles could have welcomed: they now faced the prospect of being foreign Catholics in a future Protestant kingdom. In one sense, it is unsurprising that some associated with the opposition to Navarre, particularly as Leaguers offered them patronage and protection. Critics of the exiles viewed their contribution to the succession debate as fairly direct. Contemporary *politique* writers felt the exiles were polarising political opinion. In September 1584, a pamphlet was circulated in Paris and at court making a clear association between English and Scottish exiles and the French radicals.²⁵² Its *politique* author vilified both Huguenots and Leaguers for using religion as a front to advance their ambitions, ambitions seen to give the two groups something in common.²⁵³ The pamphlet related a fictional scenario, where Huguenot and Leaguer adversaries met to engender a joint revolt. Huguenot ministers became uneasy about some Sorbonniste policies, such as the right to remove the king by any means, so a joint council of twelve was established to maintain concord. Each side was represented, the Huguenots by two Swiss, two German and two Polish deputies. On the Catholic side, two Jesuit representatives were joined by two English and two Scottish refugees.²⁵⁴ The wider membership of this imagined council indicates how far *politique* polemicists vilified the postures of the League. Alongside the foreign Protestants and Catholics, the League is willing to entrust the future of France to the hands of ‘un Turq de chacune des deux principes sectes’ and ‘un cannibal’. In *politique* eyes, both Huguenots and Leaguers had a shared aim: ‘que Henri de Bourbon, roi de Navarre, ne peult et ne doibt se rendre catholique, ni y estre receu’.²⁵⁵ Importantly, English and Scottish exiles were clearly identified with this radical campaign.


²⁵³ In L’Estoile’s words, the two groups were ‘divisés en religion, mais unis d’ambition’; ‘divided in religion, but united by ambition’. Registre-Journal, vol. 4, p. 153. This propaganda was apparently a response to the simultaneous but separate meetings of Huguenots at Montauban and Guiards in Lorraine to discuss their campaign regarding the succession.

²⁵⁴ Interestingly, the English and Scottish representatives must specifically be from seminaries ‘deçà la mer’; ‘on this side of the sea’.

The portrayal of prominent exiles was bipolar: they were either heroes and near-martyrs or radical malcontents, using religious zeal as a front for other ends. French polemicists’ use of English and Scottish Catholics to vilify Leaguers suggests a widespread perception of the exiles as collaborators in the radical Catholic cause. Those heavily involved in the embryonic League were only a small segment of a larger grouping. They did not represent a wider group, but they were perceived to do so in propaganda. Works like these, circulating in the neighbourhoods in which exiles lived, must have divided opinion over the utility of the exile group and their possible role in contemporary Parisian conflicts. Anti-League pamphlets could also rely on a strong strain of anti-English sentiment, stemming from the past history of the two nations and exacerbated by the recent black legends of Henry VIII and Elizabeth. Both past history and the more immediate dilemmas of contemporary France created a potential source of suspicion towards the exiles in Paris. Parisian reactions to the exiles are poorly documented, but deserves further historical attention.

Meanwhile, Henri III also recognised the potential of exile influence in Paris. In May 1586, he tried to channel this influence to discourage their close relations with Spain. Mendoza reported that Henri and his mother were encouraging exiles to write home, telling family and friends not to trust Philip II or rely on his aid. This was part of an effort to convince English Catholics that Philip II had his own designs on England, thus winning their support away from Spain, and by extension from the League. As Mendoza predicted, Henri’s activity bore little fruit, and those supporting an enterprise were not dissuaded from appealing to Spain. Nevertheless, in a period of crisis, the French Crown recognised the exile community and their audience within England as bearing crucial influence on the international Catholic stage, thus showing the exiles’ significance in 1580s France.

5: Exiles as news carriers and catechisers.

Much is made of the growing split between English Catholic laity and their clerical counterparts in the Elizabethan period. Exiled nobles such as Charles Paget asked why priests could not restrict themselves to their sacerdotal role: he felt that certain clerics

256 Calendar Simancas, no. 433, p. 576, Bernardino de Mendoza to the King [Philip II], Paris, 11 May 1586.
were operating in spheres that were the prerogative of the gentry. In theory, the two spheres were distinct, but the roles of lay Catholic and priest were not always mutually exclusive, particularly in an exile context. The privileged status of the exiled clergyman allowed him to keep in contact with his homeland, and he often took up a role in catechesis or exhortation. In 1586, for instance, John Hamilton wrote short Catholic works, which he had printed in Paris. They were transported to and disseminated in his native Scotland at his own expense. A comparable role, however, was not necessarily closed to the laity. Encouraged by the opportunities of exile, they could adopt roles of leadership and guidance that they otherwise would not have had. Some Catholics in Europe acted, in their own way, as lay catechisers, or exemplars for fellow Catholics and potential converts. They often cast themselves in the role of advisor or teacher when writing home. Ralph Liggons, for instance, was anxious to ensure his brother’s continued commitment to the Catholic faith. He kept in contact with his family throughout his career as Mary Stuart’s agent, and arranged a continental visit for his younger brother Hugh. Given Liggons’ status, this may not have been innocent of political intent. His brother Hugh, however, returned to England within two years, and followed his own course. His continental stay possibly inspired his protracted career as a recusant, but he was always careful, as far as necessary, to avoid involvement in political schemes. Meanwhile, before reinventing himself as an informer, Solomon Aldred keenly encouraged kin in England to take up the route of exile for conscience’s sake.

Such activity was facilitated by the maintenance of cross-Channel correspondence networks. The English ambassador commented on the efficiency with which those in Paris were receiving ‘many letters’ and ‘good intelligences’ daily.

---


258 BN, fonds français, 20309, journal du bibliothécaire de Saint Victor, f. 360 v, 3 February 1586.

259 Above, Chapter One, p. 64, footnote 140.

260 Hugh excused himself from contributions to the Queen’s light horsemen in 1586 on the grounds of illness and mean resources. TNA, SP 12/190/11, piece XI, Petition of Hugh Liggons to the Crown. He was prosecuted for recusancy in 1587, and had goods and land seized in 1588. He and his wife appeared on the recusant rolls of 1592, and he was included among an early seventeenth century list of wealthy recusants. There is no indication he was involved in conspiracy. CRS, 71, p. 111; CRS, 18, pp. 357, 364, 369, 370; CRS, 53, p. 129.

261 Above, Chapter Two, pp. 95-97, footnote 30.

262 TNA, SP 78/7/36, Cobhham to Walsingham, Paris, 3 March 1582.
Catholics who were not permanently exiled would return to England after a short time abroad. Some acted as carriers, smuggling in letters, books and other Catholic objects, often with the help of French printers and merchants in strategic towns. Exiles could thus keep Catholics in England updated on how they were being presented on the continent, and provide them with new martyrologies and works of propaganda. Some exiles returned to England, and took up leadership roles in their home environment. Anthony Bulmer, for instance, returned to County Durham in 1582 and encouraged recusancy and perhaps dissidence in his local area. He was viewed as dangerous to the religious and political balance of the North.

The colleges of the University were crucial exchange points for correspondence and funds. Collège Mignon appears to have been particularly notable in the 1580s. Robert Tempest, based at the college, was employed by Catholic leaders for that very purpose. He acted as the long-term agent of the English colleges, overseeing the transferral of funds and correspondence from Rome to the French exiles. A potentially large and complex task, its administration could have involved a number of exiles. During the League years, the college remained a primary route of enquiry about events in Paris for those English outside it. Bases such as Collège Mignon could be crucial in relaying a certain picture of England to the hosts and neighbours of the exiles, and in arousing sympathy and pity for Catholics in England. Importantly, they may have been funded by the mission, but they were maintained on a daily basis by a group of men who were not all clerical missionaries.

6: Conclusion.

The charge of apathy laid against the English Catholic exiles in Paris is not entirely accurate. The Catholic presence in France contained a core of activists, of which the Elizabethan government was very aware. But the group was larger than is normally assumed, and a large proportion of those in Paris were there temporarily and through choice. Although the model was there for them to draw on if they wished, they did not view their sojourn solely in an exile framework, and did not seek involvement in Catholic restoration plans. Of those who can definitely be labelled as exiles, they were

263 Above, Chapter Two, p. 94, footnote 19; Chapter Three, p. 176, footnote 140.
264 Below, Chapter Five, pp. 300-301.
265 Above, Chapter Two, p. 127; below, Chapter Five, p. 262.
not so much apathetic as divided in their activism. The impulse for action was spent in internal wranglings rather than unified mobilisation. There may also be another response to the charges of apathy. If they were looking to restore Catholicism in England by force, then the exiles were unsuccessful, and apathetic. But, as we will see, they could view their time abroad in other ways, and could involve themselves in other kinds of activity, with different ends. There were ways other than political conspiracy to work for Catholic restoration. Paris, particularly as a print centre, was a fertile site for this.

English Catholics interacted with their hosts on multiple levels, but there is little sign of permanent roots being established in the city, for instance in the form of intermarriage. They pursued integration at certain levels and maintained a conscious distinctiveness from their hosts at others. Their apparent integration into the parochial system, for instance, did not preclude an exploitation of their distinctiveness, a tactic that was particularly effective in the sphere of printed polemic and propaganda.

Exile could mean severe financial hardship, but also relative freedom, for spiritual or educational renewal as well as for political conspiracy. Unfortunately, religion and politics were inextricably bound together: not all exiles were treasonous, but they were categorised as such by hostile parties, in England and in France. The impact of English Catholics on their host environment was volatile, multilayered and complex. Parisians could gain from their presence, socially and ideologically; but these gains were not always obvious or necessarily permanent. As individuals, exiles did not always intend to polarise opinion, in France or in England. However, as Parisians themselves became divided over the future of their city and the kingdom, their presence could exacerbate division.
CHAPTER FOUR

The rhetoric of exile: contemporary polemic and alternative voices of exile.

'The soldiers, spies, priests, merchants, musicians, courtiers and bookbinders... In exile communities from across Europe in every land, lived in a constant state of mediation between their home and host cultures'.

1: Introduction.

There is a wealth of historiography exploring Protestant exile in sixteenth century Europe, but a comparative lack of similar work for its Catholic counterpart. This is possibly due to their different approaches towards the issue of exile. Perez Zagorin maintains that Catholic leaders never really encouraged exile, wanting Catholics to remain in England in preparation for the restoration. Here, Catholic leaders inadvertently complemented the aims of Elizabeth I’s government, to contain Catholics within the kingdom and curtail their collaboration with continental Catholic powers. Certainly, there is little sign that Catholic leaders actively encouraged individuals to forsake their accustomed wealth and position for an uncertain continental existence, in a way comparable to some Marian Protestants. Consequently, each church’s presentation of exile could diverge. Often, Catholic polemic was more likely to defend those abroad from Protestant condemnation than to advocate exile itself.

The social make up of the exile group impacted on its contemporary and subsequent image. Protestant exiles entering England when Catholic gentry were leaving it were generally, but not exclusively, of the middling-sort. In one sense they

1 Arblaster, Antwerp, p. 267.
2 Zagorin, Lying, p. 141.
3 R. B. Merriman, ‘Notes’, p. 482. Read observed that whilst the government wanted to expel missionary priests they went to considerable lengths to prevent laity from going abroad, and to induce them to return. Read, Walsingham, vol. 2, p. 424.
4 Marian exiles reproached Protestants living in Catholic England for submitting to idolatry. They were urged to depart from papal superstition through flight or exile. Zagorin, Lying, pp. 101-11. This campaign was waged through printed propaganda and personal correspondence. For example, Patrick Collinson, ‘The Role of Women in the English Reformation illustrated by the Life and Friendship of Anne Locke’, G. J. Cuming (ed.), Papers Read at the Second Winter and Summer Meetings of the Ecclesiastical History Society: Studies in Church History, 2 (1965), pp. 264-65; Kingsley-Smith, Shakespeare’s Drama, p. 17.
had less to lose by flight, and greater potential for self-support in exile. Catholic exiles however, were usually of a high social status, less likely to be self-sufficient, and generally dismissed as apathetic or ineffective. Interestingly, although the Marian exiles were predominantly of a similar social group, they are not generally seen as apathetic: their exile is portrayed as a time of political opposition, or as a seminal period for the future Church of England. The fact that England's return to Catholicism was not realised means that Catholic exiles cannot be judged retrospectively in terms of what they contributed to the establishment.

Scholars emphasise the double character of exile as both timeless and time-specific. The experience of one individual can be explained by contemporary politics and immediate circumstances specific to them; at the same time, their position and some of its attendant dilemmas are common to exiles of other times and places. These common assumptions and ideas could be employed to strengthen personal as well as communal identity, and enabled self-justification. An exploration of the exile theme in Catholic writings needs to take account of this background context.

In the sixteenth century, exile was simultaneously familiar and unprecedented. Early Christians had fled the persecution of pagan rulers, but the Reformation resulted in the persecution of Christians by other Christian denominations, and the large-scale movement of religious exiles across Europe. Earlier movements of Catholic exiles from the England of Henry VIII and Edward VI were not comparable to the waves of religious refugees in mainland Europe. Nevertheless, on both sides of the Channel the literate populations of Europe were well versed in ideas of exile and return. They ran through the voyages of classical heroes, the wanderings of God's people in the Old Testament, and the flight of members of the early church, to more recent writings of

---

5 There are, however, signs that low status Englishmen were also on the continent: AN, MC, XLIX, 214, f. [445].

6 Garrett, Marian Exiles, p. 42. Marian exiles in Italy are seen as noble in character, and politically active. Bartlett, 'English Exile'.

7 Randolph Starn, Contrary Commonwealth: The Theme of Exile in Medieval and Renaissance Italy (Berkeley, 1982), p. 1.

8 Kramer, Threshold, p. 4.

9 Above, Chapter One, p. 36, footnote 9.
poets exiled from the Italian city-states, and renaissance drama. The concept also attracted considerable attention and debate amongst European humanists. Scholars, most of whom could claim personal experience of it, posited polar views of exile. The Ovidian ‘elegiac’ approach lamented the loss of the homeland and the deplorable state of the exile. In contrast, the Stoic approach presented the experience as an opportunity to demonstrate fortitude and gain virtue for the next stage in the journey of life. This dichotomy, however, was complicated by the latter half of the sixteenth century.

Writers like Guillaume du Bellay and Pierre Belon portrayed exile as the opportunity to live in a desired space, enabling the formation of identity through a process of ceaseless dialogue. These new approaches may have been digested by exiled English intellectuals: Thomas Harding’s Louvain library, for example, contained a copy of Belon’s Observations.

Exile was also an issue for Elizabethan criminal justice. The Crown began to initiate banishment as a penalty for serious crimes such as complicity to murder and religious dissidence. From 1584, banishment was considered as a means to deal with Catholic priests. Banishment was not used against Catholic laity until 1593, and never on a large scale. Nonetheless, as we have seen, exile could be a self-fashioned status as much as a legal category: the absence of particular Catholics from England took place against this wider debate about banishment.

---

10 Eric Leed, ‘The Ancients and the Moderns: From Suffering to Freedom’, in Susan L. Roberson (ed.), Defining Travel: Diverse Visions (Jackson, Mississippi, 2002), pp. 5-12; Zagorin, Lying, p. 64; Starn, Contrary; Tucker, Homo Viator, p. xi. Tucker highlights the influence of the discourse of the Marrano diaspora on late Renaissance concepts of exile. He also argues that writers could use the concept of exile for their own aims. Tucker, Homo Viator, pp. 184-86. English audiences were also to come across exile as a recurrent theme in Shakespeare’s plays. Kingsley-Smith, Shakespeare’s Drama.

11 Kingsley-Smith, Shakespeare’s Drama, p. 113.


14 The 1593 Bill for restraining the Popish recusants in some certain place of abode and the Act to retain the Queen’s subjects in Obedience made non-voluntary abjuration of the realm a penalty for Catholics and Protestants not conforming after repeated offences. Between 1584 and 1603, priests and a very small number of laity were granted pardons conditional on their banishment from England. The expense of transportation, however, made large-scale banishment unfeasible. Kesselring, Mercy and Authority, pp. 32-35, 88-89. Kingsley-Smith, Shakespeare’s Drama, pp. 9-11.
Exile was not just a subject for literary, academic or Parliamentary debate; it was deeply implanted in Christian theology and thus familiar to a far larger audience. The idea was connected to the wider concept of the journey of life, where an individual lives in a constant state of wandering. Theologically, all humans on earth can be viewed in a state of exile, distanced from, and perpetually seeking proximity to, God. Alison Shell observes that the discourse of exile can relate to a separation which is ideological rather than physical or geographical. Catholic prayers and hymns reflected such sentiments, drawing on the idea of earthly life as an exile from eternal life with Christ. Reciting the Salve Regina, for instance, an individual asks for reunion with Christ after the exile of life on earth, whilst earthly existence was viewed as 'this exile and transitory life' in the Golden Liturgy of 1595. This timeless view was not inspired by recent events, but provided a context in which contemporary exile movements, with their time-specific causes and impact, could be understood. The theme of banishment was likewise prominent in contemporary hymns.

For Catholics and Protestants, exile was a religious and political discourse as well as a lived experience. Both churches addressed the subject in print, and it featured in Catholic writing before the 1580s. Catholic partisans and their adversaries engaged in heated debate in an effort to define exile and categorise subjects living outside the kingdom. However, a dedicated study of Catholic representations of exile in the sixteenth century remains unwritten. With the Tudor state machinery being turned against them, the issue of flight was a thorny question for Catholic commentators. They must also have been conscious of the success of the Marian exiles in defending their position. Marian propagandists had striven to present a united front to the world during its exile: they are generally viewed as highly effective. Nevertheless, there were

---

15 Tucker, Homo Viator, p. 54.
16 Shell, 'Muses' Exile'.
17 Caraman, Other Face, p. 189.
18 Alison Shell, Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558-1660 (Cambridge, 1999), p. 195.
19 Shell gives a sensitive and detailed examination of the issue, but focuses on literary sources. Shell, Controversy, pp. 169-223.
20 Collinson, Grindal, pp. 79-82.
dissensions between various Marian exile communities. There is room to consider whether divisions amongst Elizabethan Catholic exiles were so exceptional, and to reassess the significance of their output. The rhetoric of exile itself was adaptable, allowing universally acknowledged sources to be appropriated and applied to new situations. There were, as we shall see, discrepancies in the way different interest groups employed it. Catholic leaders' representations of exile did not necessarily mirror the experience or mindset of laity who went abroad. The impact of rhetoric on those abroad and those remaining in England was correspondingly complex.

Exile was a volatile trope: the grounds on which one side built their justification of foreign residence could be inverted by their adversaries into proof of disloyalty. Direct engagement between the two opened lively and protracted debate about the nature and purpose of residence on the continent. This debate helped to polarise the two groups on wider issues of contention, whilst also ensuring that, officially at least, a Catholic layman's journey to Catholic Europe was a source of controversy. These widely disseminated printed debates may not, however, accurately reflect how a looser group of English Catholics perceived their time abroad. Printed evidence provides the reader with contemporary generalisations, and detailed accounts of famous individuals, but if read closely can also suggests internal strains in Catholics' defence of their coreligionists' activities. They have little to say about the more mundane experience of those who went abroad for a variety of reasons and configured their absence in alternative ways. An examination of fragmented and incidental evidence later in this chapter suggests ways in which to address this discrepancy. We need to consider how individuals abroad represented or styled themselves in a context which was perhaps more immediate and less geared towards public recognition. Previously unexploited material from English and French archives offers an opportunity to explore other 'voices of exile' amongst English and Scottish Catholics in Paris.


22 Gabriel Audisio stresses the importance of making use of such sources when attempting to reconstitute a sixteenth-century exile community. Gabriel Audisio, 'The First Provençal Refugees in Geneva (1545-1571)', French History, 19 (2005), 385-400.

23 A term coined by Stam, Contrary.
1.1: Protestant configurations of Catholic exile.

The efforts of the Elizabethan regime to discredit and dispossess English Catholic exiles were of apparently formidable range and scope. Parliamentary speeches, official proclamations and cheap pamphlets presented an impressive front. Elizabethan proclamations announced in no uncertain terms that Jesuit and missionary priests were 'traitors, practisers of treasons, and the seed-men of sedition and rebellion'; the Reims seminary was 'a nursery of... seditious and traitorous lewd instruments... sent hither to disquiet her [Elizabeth's] state'. 24 As for lay subjects leaving the kingdom unlicensed, they were disloyal, if not automatically traitorous. The Catholic, particularly the Catholic abroad, had renounced natural duty to Queen and country in favour of unnatural and ungodly service of foreign powers. 25 The equation between physical removal from England and the termination of loyalty to the Crown, constantly repeated in governmental proclamations, spread to other media through official patronage. The potential of the Protestant language of condemnation should not be underestimated. Bernard Cottret, for instance, suggests that the English Catholic was less trusted than a Protestant foreigner in England, even when the latter was the subject of a hostile sovereign. 26 Nevertheless, a brief overview of printed Catholic responses will show that English Catholic leaders could prove resilient, with help from their continental coreligionists.

With an eye to the Catholic sovereigns of Europe, the government was keen to disseminate its portrayal of exiles to an international as well as domestic audience. This was part of a wider campaign, mentioned above, to prevent European rulers supporting them. Exiles were condemned as Elizabeth's '... disloyal subjects, who withdrawing from their native country without... license of privity, under pretence of their freedom of conscience...shall there receive any support or maintenance to the encouraging of


25 Warneke, Traveller, p. 5.

them to remain obstinate in their disobedience.27 By stressing Catholic disloyalty, and the falsity of claims to be abroad for reasons of conscience, it was hoped to remove the grounds on which foreign powers could legitimately support them. Whilst the government failed on this score, the rhetoric of statutes and proclamations was effectively appropriated, with greater effect, in less formal media of printed tracts, ballads and poems.28 Munday's account of English Catholics on the continent was infused by and fed into this rhetoric. Munday had gone abroad as a Catholic in the late 1570s. He claimed to have done so because this was the best way to find credit, but from the outset he might have been employed by the government to infiltrate exile networks.29 Munday's account of travel through France en route to Rome, published in 1581, offered ample 'evidence' of Catholic disloyalty abroad. He presented first hand testimony that those who had left England were 'practising, and daylie looking for the ouerthrowe and ruine of their Princesse and Countrye'.30 His later work reiterated the argument that being a politically loyal Catholic was impossible:

the Papistes have shown themselves so addictcd to their superstition, and so captivated to an undue reverence of their tyrannous Pope, that they have for it reiected the care of Countrie, and of those to whom naturall dutie bounde them.31

The clearest printed condemnation of Catholics as evilly inclined towards the state came from Elizabeth's chief minister, William Cecil. His Execution of Justice

27 TNA, SP 78/7/63, The Privy Council to Cobham, 26 April 1582. Cobham was instructed to present a defence of anti-Catholic measures in England, to reiterate demands not to harbour Elizabeth's rebels, and to demand the expulsion of English Catholics from France. The tone and subject of the instructions are similar to Cecil's Execution, below, pp. 212-14. The government was aware of the need to disseminate these messages: royal proclamations, including that revoking students from foreign countries, were published as pamphlets. Peter Milward, Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources (London, 1977), p. 67.


29 Munday claimed he had needed a year's continental experience to secure patronage in England, and had disguised himself as a Catholic to get to the continent. Celeste Turner, Anthony Munday: an Elizabethan man of letters (Berkeley, 1928), p. 13. The latest scholarship however, argues that Munday remained a Catholic loyalist throughout his life, even whilst testifying against other Catholics in court. Hamilton claims that Munday chose loyalty to the crown over open dedication to Catholicism. By doing so, he could sustain other elements of Catholic ideology in his writings. Donna B. Hamilton, Anthony Munday and the Catholics, 1560-1633 (Aldershot, 2005), pp. xvii-xviii, 31-32, 39, 47-49, 66.


31 Anthony Munday, A Watch-Word to Englande to beware of traytours and trtcherous practises, which have beene the overthowe of many famous kingdomes and common weales (London, 1584), f. 43v.
(1583) enjoyed wide circulation in England, and thanks to government efforts was also distributed on the continent. The government had long been aware of the need to refute French books critical of its anti-Catholic policies, and the continental distribution of Cecil's work was evidently a response to this. The main thrust of the *Execution* was to portray anti-Catholic measures as just and legitimate actions by a government against its rebels; and the exiles are central to Cecil's argument. Catholics, he said, were not being pursued for their 'beads, cakes and ceremonies', but for withdrawing their obedience and working for a foreign-sponsored invasion of England. Cecil argued that the government was fair and patient; it had not persecuted Catholics and those of other beliefs who remained in England and demonstrated loyalty and willingness to fight in Elizabeth's defence. The Catholics' leaders, however, enjoin them to do otherwise from the continent. According to Cecil, the Catholic threat to the status quo was led and initiated from exiles in Europe.

Cecil was uncompromising towards Catholics abroad: on the continent, they live under papal orders, and turn to other foreign princes to undermine their legitimate government. He admitted that those abroad were of 'divers conditions and qualities', and may have left for a variety of reasons. Aside from fugitive rebels, Catholics abroad included those

not able to live at home but in beggarie, some discontented for lack of preferments, which they gaping for unworthily at the universities, some bankrupt Marchants, some in a sort learned to contentions, being not content to learn the lawes of the lande.

This mixed band was a dangerous seedbed for further sedition. Having acknowledged their varied background, he nevertheless presented Catholics abroad as holding a

---


33 Wilkinson, *Mary*, p. 80. From the 1560s Cecil and other ministers endeavoured to keep informed on French publications on English affairs, and to offer refutations of any critical works.

34 Cecil, *Execution*, pp. [7-8].

common identity and a cohesiveness they often lacked in reality. All abroad had ‘forsaken their native countries’; at best they were of dubious loyalty. Even those who intended no harm against the state when leaving England would, according to Cecil, be drawn into sedition by activists, those who worked to maintain numbers at the seminaries, and promoted themselves as innocents victimised for their faith. Cecil condemns the apologists’ distinctions between active rebels who had fled England and clergy sent into England to maintain the faith of Catholics. The latter group might declare political loyalty, but were simply a different kind of weapon in the hands of the Pope. Without using arms, priests withdrew the laity from their obedience to queen and country, acting as ‘secret espielles and explorers in the Realme for the Popc’. Writing for a Catholic as well as Protestant market in England, Cecil sought to drive a wedge between English Catholics abroad and those remaining in England.

Cecil’s message was clear: all Catholics who absent the realm withdraw from their Crown. He reiterated this in other writings, to an international audience and to individuals. In the Execution, he denied that Catholics with apparently innocent motives for leaving were any different to overt rebels. Unarmed scholars and priests, defended in Catholic polemic as workers for religion, spend their time abroad in ‘the company of the principal rebels and traitours at Rome and other places, where it is proved they were partakers of their conspiracies’. These ‘other places’ probably included Paris, a city where Thomas Copley spent part of his exile. Copley maintained a correspondence with Cecil throughout his time abroad, arguing that he had left England for conscience’s sake, proclaiming his innocence of any treachery, and appealing for restitution of his estates. In reply in 1574, Cecil proffered the argument that he was to put in print nearly ten years later. Copley, he said, deserved the hostility of his fellow countrymen. His wilful determination to remove himself and his family from his native country was effectively a withdrawal of loyalty. Copley should not be surprised that he was to be ‘accompted if not a traytor, yet a companion of traytors and conspirators’.

Cecil’s work proved a blueprint for later works, although not all took an identical line. As the 1580s progressed, the campaign against Catholic disloyalty was

36 Cecil, Execution, pp. [5], [12].
37 Cecil, Execution, p. [38].
38 Christie (ed.), Copley, p. 36, William Cecil to Thomas Copley, 28 December 1574.
stepped up. For instance, *A brief discoverie of the Doctor Allens seditious drifts* (1588) attacked Allen for his persistent opposition to Elizabeth’s rule. He was condemned for breaking Christ’s commandment to render obedience to the civil ruler, and encouraging other Catholics to do likewise. The author, however, expressed hope that not all Catholics will follow Allen’s lead. Instead, they should heed contemporary warnings, such as the 1569 revolt and Leaguer France, that to do so can only have nefarious consequences. Catholics who otherwise could have lived in peace at home are ‘driven to abandon their country to live abroad like outcasts and vagabonds’.  

Alongside the image of the exile as disloyal traitor, the government was keen to present him as a miserable and impoverished being. This treatment was notable in the work of Lewis Lewkenor, a Catholic expatriate who returned to England, was reconciled to the Crown and by the late 1590s engaged in the campaign against Catholics abroad. His *Estate of the English fugitives* (1595), which reflected the changed situation of the 1590s, was a direct attack on Spain when the two countries were still at war. Much of Lewkenor’s work concentrates on condemning Spanish behaviour towards English Catholics who seek their help, but he takes a clear line on the issue of exile more generally. He admits that the motives and extremism of Catholics abroad vary greatly. Some, he says, plot changes of state; others are unlearned individuals looking only to amass Catholic goods in anticipation of restoration at home. The former pose greater danger, but all refuse to submit to their lawful sovereign. Using the example of early Christians living under non-Christian emperors, Lewkenor enjoins quiet obedience to a ruler of a different faith rather than open opposition and exile. For those who have already removed themselves from England, the only option was to throw themselves on Elizabeth’s mercy. Lewkenor’s critique was founded both on questions of political loyalty and on practical issues. He was keen to emphasise the material and social disadvantages of exile, important issues for the well-
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39 G. D., *A brief discoverie of Doctor Allens seditious drifts: contriued in a pamphlet written by him, concerning the yeelding vp of the towne of Deuenter (in Ouerissel) vnto the king of Spain, by Sir William Stanley: The contentes wherof are particularly set downe in the page following* (London, 1588).

40 G. D., *Discoverie*, p. 87.

41 Lewkenor, *Estate*. This was printed twice in 2 years. The anonymous *A Discourse of the vsage of the English fugitives, by the Spaniard* (1595), is also attributed to him.

42 Lewkenor divides the exiles into four groups: those aspiring to effect great changes in state; the ‘Jesuit devotees’ always ready to do harm; the patriots who love Elizabeth I but are in search of freedom of conscience; and those without ‘learning, wit and civilitie’, searching for Catholic goods out of dogged attachment to traditional practice. Lewkenor, *Estate*, pp. 48-49.
born considering such a move. He was emphatic that the time had passed when
individuals could go abroad only with intentions of ‘attaining the language of forreine
Nations... the knowledge of militarie discipline, and the state of the world abroad’.
43 The Catholic gentleman going abroad is thus to invoke a loss of wealth and status in
England on himself. He then faced a miserable hand-to-mouth existence on the
continent, vainly hoping for Spanish maintenance. His departure was treason to his
sovereign, a reproach to family and parentage, and a danger to himself; his end would
not be happy.44 Lewkenor expressed a hope that his work would dissuade other
Catholics from leaving. Measuring his success here is not possible, but his derogatory
images of exile possibly encouraged divisions between Catholics in England and those
abroad.

A similar view permeated the reports of English ambassadors and agents abroad.
Stafford, for instance, claimed that Verstegan’s prints in Paris were proof that ‘our
refugees have been expelled, not for religion, as they say, but for their wicked deeds’.
He equated their creators with the general English presence abroad. In his eyes, they
were

... ne sont point gents religieux, mais des fasteux... leur precepte de Religion ce
n’est pas leur conscience mais une couleur seulement depenser [despenser?] leur
mauvaise volonté.45

Meanwhile, Nicolas Faunt was despatched to France to bring the Protestant
Anthony Bacon back to England in 1584. Bacon had strayed from the prescriptions laid
out for his gentleman’s tour, and remained abroad far longer than anticipated. Pleas
from family members had failed to sway him, so Faunt used another tactic. He claimed
that Bacon’s protracted ‘voluntary banishment’ was beginning to cast doubt on his
loyalty to the Crown. Bacon was missing opportunities for advancement, and thus
jeopardising his standing and reputation. His actions were all the more reprehensible
because he had chosen to establish himself in France, ‘where our utter ruin is

43 Lewkenor, Estate, p. 132.

44 Lewkenor, Estate, preface, p. [i].

45 ‘... not religious men, but vainglorious persons... their pretext of religion does not derive from their
conscience but is simply a colour under which they execute their evil designs.’ TNA, SP 78/11/6, Stafford
to Pinart, Paris, 13 January 1584.
threatened, and the beginning of our woe hath already grown.\textsuperscript{46} The equation here between physical removal from England and the withdrawal of allegiance is clear, as is the view of France as a particularly harmful catalyst. His mother had already condemned Anthony on similar grounds: ‘you are a traitor to God and your country; you... seek her death’.\textsuperscript{47}

The view of Catholic exiles as miserable impoverished beings, disloyal at best and active traitors at worst, was not limited to government-created sources. Advice poetry to travellers in the 1570s emphasised the need to eschew the company of exiles. George Gascoigne in his ‘Councell given to Master Bartholemew Withipoll’ warned that exiles have nothing to offer; moreover, they can tempt others to treason. He told his charge:

\begin{quote}
and flee from them, which fled with every wynde  
From native soils to forraine coastes by stealth:  
Their traynes are trustlesse, tending still to treason.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

However, there was a discernable difference between the exile image disseminated by the government, and that appearing in other literature. Generally, both associated illegitimate removal from England with questionable allegiance to the Crown.\textsuperscript{49} However, only government-sponsored works emphasise a religious and specifically Catholic element to this disloyalty. The rebel and the generic man abroad were usually associated with potential treason, but in general only works supported by the government openly attributed this to their Catholicism. This differentiation implies that despite widespread and formidable government propaganda a more nuanced approach was possible.

\textsuperscript{46} Birch (ed.), \textit{Memoirs}, vol. 1, pp. 43-44, Nicholas Faunt to Anthony Bacon, 17 December 1583.

\textsuperscript{47} Howard, \textit{English Travellers}, p. 74. Bacon sent a Catholic servant to Burghley with secret intelligence; his mother had him locked up.


\textsuperscript{49} After travel in the late 1590s, Fynes Morrison’s work condemned Englishmen who converted to Catholicism whilst abroad. Howard, \textit{English Travellers}, p. 99.
Sara Warneke’s study of travel advice literature in early modern England distinguishes between what the government presented as the major dangers of international travel and what commentators more generally highlighted as the greatest risks. She observes that despite a prolific and widely disseminated literature in the 1580s on the moral and physical dangers of travel, there was little open comment on its spiritual dangers. Government measures and accompanying literature laid bare the perils of Catholic Europe, primarily those in Rome, a city full of spiritual and moral trials for the English Protestant. Informers’ reports from across the continent expressed a double fear: that the Catholic gentleman would agitate against the government from abroad, and that the Protestant gentleman would be converted in Catholic Europe. However, other literature and the private correspondence of gentlemen in Europe had different emphases. Continental Europe was held in suspicion for its possible nefarious influences on the next generation of Englishmen. Those with sons abroad were apparently terrified they would return corrupted or affected. The letters of Protestant travellers themselves, however, offer a very different experience. Philip Sidney’s commentary on his European stint in 1572-75 suggests an exciting, challenging and character forming experience, rather than a degeneration into papistry, sedition and sexual immorality. In printed literature, too, there was an apparent lack of an explicit fear about potential Catholic corruption. Concern was focused on the risk of moral, sartorial and cultural corruption rather than religious deviance. On one level, this was perhaps a device through which writers - both Catholic and Protestant - could argue about the loyalty of young men abroad. A closer reading of these texts may, however, reveal that anti-Catholicism was not absent, but was being expressed through implicit association rather than explicit denunciation. In texts of the English Protestant canon,

50 Warneke, Traveller, p. 161.

51 TNA, SP 78/4a/16, Cobham to [Walsingham ?], Paris, 20 February 1580.


53 Warneke, Traveller, pp. 14, 155, 161. Warneke argues that for some the risk of atheism was greater than the risk of conversion to Catholicism. Conversely, the government were obviously concerned about Catholic influences on the traveller, but paid little attention to the risk of atheism.

54 Warneke, Traveller, p. 68. Warneke’s view here may require some qualification. Howard argues that Protestant parents did worry about their sons being converted when in Catholic Europe. Howard, English Travellers, p. 99. Some contemporary travel advice literature contained injunctions to travellers to persevere in their ‘first faith’, for example, Robert Dallington’s Method for Travel (1598), cited by Rye, England as seen by foreigners, p. xxii.
fine clothes, jewels and wanton luxury are associated with the inner evil of popery.\textsuperscript{55} Perhaps, then, young men bedecked in continental finery, trying to import foreign customs, were also religiously suspect, as well as socially and politically ridiculous. Thus, travel advice writers could adopt techniques more subtle than the government to promote further suspicion of the Catholic presence abroad.

For the English government, the exiles were a building block to construct a justification of their policies on a domestic and international stage. The government’s conflation of Catholic Europe and the growth of English Catholic conspiracy was deliberately and effectively diffused, to the extent that exiles trying to reconcile themselves with the Crown adopted similar rhetoric in their appeals.\textsuperscript{56} However, it may not have exerted a stranglehold over the popular imagination in Elizabethan England. Despite its apparent dominance, the view of Catholic exiles presented by their adversaries was not all pervasive. As we have seen, the Protestant construction of the Catholic exile may have been more complex than first impressions suggest.

1.2: The printed defence of English Catholics.

The ways in which exiles configure and present their position to a wider audience are perennially complex. Those of the later sixteenth century were no exception: Catholic leaders’ representation of their time abroad underwent some changes in the course of Elizabeth I’s reign. Their protracted contest with Protestant writers often took the customary form of a written challenge followed by a refutation. One such exchange took place in 1583-84, between two key activists, William Allen and William Cecil. This section will focus on the Catholic side of the debate, Allen’s \textit{A True Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholics} (1584), published in response to Cecil’s \textit{Execution}.\textsuperscript{57} A close reading of Allen’s work illuminates wider dilemmas confronting those who were constructing an image for the English Catholic presence abroad. It reveals an element of uncertainty about the presentation which even their clerical leaders sometimes found difficult to explain or resolve.

\textsuperscript{55} Shell, \textit{Controversy}, pp. 24-54.

\textsuperscript{56} Below, Chapter Five, pp. 297-98.

\textsuperscript{57} Allen, \textit{Defence}. 
The Defence was a small part of Allen's long polemical career. It was closely linked to English missionary activity: as a central figure in the movement, Allen had already written in defence of the English seminaries in Europe. Given his leadership and patronage of the seminaries, this is unsurprising. However, Allen and other clerical authors usually focused on the work and trials of Catholic priests in England, rather than laity. Significantly, his Defence began to break away from this. Its tone was less temperate than his earlier work; whilst avoiding outright attack, it hinted at a hostility that became more pronounced in subsequent writing. Allen still reserved his most ardent support for the priests. He argued that they seek only to spread God's word, not to agitate for Elizabeth I's destruction. He was careful, for instance, to stress a clear distinction – one that the Elizabethan government deliberately blurred – between laymen who rose in armed revolt and the young men who were training in continental seminaries to minister in England. Fifteen years on, Allen wanted to imply that the Northern Revolt was instigated and realised by laymen. His message was that clerics, as men of God, would never challenge the status quo in armed rebellion.

The Defence became progressively less temperate, moving from a lament for the suffering of innocents to an anticipation of the retribution to be suffered by their enemies. Allen came close to upholding exile conspiracy on the continent, by examining past cases of a king being challenged by his bishops, and the latter's appeal to foreign powers for assistance. He reiterated the apologist line that those leaving England were driven by persecution and their conscience, not a desire to subvert the Crown. He did acknowledge a link between exile and anti-government activity, but the government was held responsible for this, having brought these troubles on its own head. The government should, Allen said, have recognised that anti-Catholic measures would provoke the movement of 'manie persons of honour and qualitie' from England. These laymen may have originally left for conscience's sake but once abroad, discontent, misery and zeal could have lethal effects. Predictably, 'their absence [from England] might prove dangerous to their enimies state'. In 1584, Allen could not openly endorse exile conspiracies. Thus, rather than arguing for their legitimacy, he

58 Allen, Apologie and True Declaration.
60 Allen, Defence p. 17.
61 Allen, Defence, p. 182.
made them understandable, and the blame for them was laid firmly with the government.

Allen carefully implied that any activity construed as treasonous stemmed from lay exiles, not missionary priests. Realistically, clerics, including Allen, were more likely to be at the head of such schemes than innocent of them. Officially, however, he continued to separate missionaries and scholars in continental institutions from the more amorphous group of lay Catholics abroad. This *per se* is unsurprising; but it is notable that by the mid-1580s the issue of lay exile featured in contemporary propaganda aimed at an international audience. Allen directly examined the impact of persecution on laity in England, and those ‘driven’ abroad by their conscience. The longstanding argument that Catholics inside England suffered for conscience’s sake was thus also applied to those who had left it. Adopting the topos of Protestantism as the ruin of all moral and divine order, Allen laments its detrimental impact on the English social fabric, particularly on marital and familial life. Banishment, like prison, caused ‘manie godlie and honest maried couples most deare to one another’ to be ‘pitifullie sondered’. Family units were dissolved, the children often drifting abroad and risking poverty and mishap. The lucky ones end up in seminaries, ‘to passe the time during their Parentes calamitie’, whilst others fall into ‘most desparate warres and fortunes’. Allen initially envisaged an English-speaking rather than international audience, but like Cecil he aimed at Protestants and Catholics at home and abroad. A Latin translation subsequently made his message available to a wider audience. His work was probably directed towards a laity lacking advanced Latin skills, but with a certain level of education. Realising the power of Cecil’s work being distributed to an English and continental audience, he presumably envisaged an international audience for his

---


64 *Ad Persecutores Anglos pro Catholicis domi forisque persecutionem sufferentibus* (1584). Milward, *Controversies*, no. 258, p. 70.
own. He intended it to provide comfort to the suffering, and to alert continental Catholics to the plight of England. At worst, he said, fellow English Catholics would receive compassion of their continental counterparts as a result of the book; at best, the latter would be inspired to intervene for them. Allen's representation of English Catholics suffering in England encompassed those living on the continent in difficult circumstances. Catholics who left England were equated with those who had stayed: all were part of the same suffering group.

This equation, and its international scope, reappeared in subsequent continental productions. For instance, Concertatio Ecclesiae (1588) was an updated version of a 1583 work. Compiling multiple sources, it attempted to offer a definitive account of contemporary English Catholic sufferings. Following the example of Persons' De Persecutione Anglicana (1581) and Allen's Breie Historie (1582), the authors undertook to update an international audience on the plight of English Catholics. Unlike other martyrologies, no attempt was made to prove a continuous link with the early Church's martyrs: it focused exclusively on recent and contemporary Catholic suffering in Elizabethan England. The authors' use of Latin was deliberate: original source material had to be translated from English. This narrowed its audience in the English-speaking world. However, it gained a potential international learned audience, and trumpeted the Church's embrace of Latin, in defiance of Protestant criticism. It was presumably a costly work to produce, but those involved could be confident of good returns on their investment. By aiming at the higher end of the market, they
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65 Allen, Defence, preface, p. [i]. Allen comments that the production and dissemination of Cecil's Execution in France made it potentially more harmful than other Protestant polemic.

66 Verstegan expressed similar sentiments in his work. Above, Chapter Three, p. 182, footnote 170.

67 Allen, Defence, preface, p. [ii].

68 Concertatio. An exiled secular priest, John Gibbons, working under the pseudonym of John Bridgewater/Johannes Aquapontus, was responsible for its production, which benefited from the backing of the German ecclesiastical hierarchy, and was dedicated to Elector Johann von Schoenenberg, Archbishop of Trier. See introduction by D. M. Rogers in Concertatio ecclesiae Catholicae in Anglia adversus Caluinopapistas et Puritanos sub Elizabeth Regina (Famborough, 1970).

69 For a recent discussion of the Concertatio, Dillon, Construction, pp. 81-82.

probably hoped to attract sympathy and support from the wealthy and learned across Europe. The *Concertatio* was significant for its wide circulation, its immediacy, its appearance in the year of the Armada, and its conscious use of Latin. Importantly, the work closed with an index of those who had suffered for their faith, stating the nature of their ordeal: imprisonment, exile, or martyrdom. Many of those listed were laymen, and the 1569 rebels received special attention. Laity and lay exiles were ranked alongside their clerical counterparts here, as witnesses to the faith. As well as over one hundred martyrs, more than six hundred 'confessors' and exiles were recorded. Many of these were exiled gentlemen, a proportion of whom had spent time in Paris.

Amidst escalating politico-religious tensions, polemicists in the mid-1580s paid increased attention to the issue and experience of exile. Catholic works reflected earlier defences of Catholics within England. As we have seen, their longstanding portrayal as victims of religious persecution, seeking only freedom of conscience, was extended to exiles. Held in greater suspicion than Catholics within England, exile polemicists sought to offer further proof of persecution to justify their removal. In his French publication of 1587, Verstegan depicted the plight of one individual caught trying to leave England 'pour la liberté de conscience, et servir à Dieu sans danger de ces barbares tourmens'. The man was caught and imprisoned. Left to die of cold and starvation, his body was stripped and despoiled by his persecutors. Lay exiles such as this man thus had a symbolic potential which polemicists and martyrologists were able to exploit. Exiles could be presented as exemplars and motivators to continental Catholics, as the 1582 French translation of Persons' *De Persecutione Anglicana* illustrates. Bossy highlights how the translator, Leaguer cleric Mathieu de Launoy, targeted the emotions of a literate but less educated French bourgeoisie. Recounting tales of persecution in England, including that inflicted on would-be exiles, was a means to raise awareness and mobilise French Catholics to the aid of their coreligionists.
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72 The Earl of Westmorland and Anthony Copley, third son of Thomas, appeared alongside others. *Concertatio*, p. 413.

73 'for liberty of conscience, and to serve God without danger of these barbarous torments.' Verstegan, *Théâtre des Cruautés*, p. 132.

74 Bossy, 'Link', p. 97; Dillon, *Construction*, pp. 124, 146. De Launoy was a founder member of the League and curé of the right bank parish of Saint-Merry.
Near-contemporary Protestant exiles offer interesting comparatives. An extensive historiography often highlights the 'artisanal' nature of Protestant exiles in England, and gives the impression that Marian exiles were inspired by a diligent fervour. Historiography often portrays them as resourceful workers, establishing their own ecclesiastical provision whilst displaying varying degrees of integration in their host society. More recent studies suggest these groups were diverse, and sometimes not particularly unified, but the former image has endured. In contrast, Catholic gentry and nobles who went abroad are generally seen as parasitic and ineffective. There is some truth in this characterization, but the problems encountered by each group would not have been alien to the other. Economically, prosopographically and perhaps statistically, Catholic and Protestant exiles are problematic to compare. Nonetheless, recognising differences and similarities in their respective voices of exile could deepen our understanding of the phenomenon.

Partly because of each group's respective priorities, their literature displayed different content and purpose. Specific issues could be discrete; for instance, the question of church government was not a priority for Catholics as it was for their Protestant counterparts. Nevertheless, whilst exile could be employed differently in each side's propaganda, it also served a similar general function. With a shared intellectual background, polemic on both sides reflected a common framework of assumptions. Leading Marian exiles in Geneva saw themselves and fellow congregations across Europe as examples of doctrine and apostolic church polity for their homeland. Catholic exiles similarly presented themselves as an example and inspiration to others, especially to coreligionists at home. Meanwhile, exiled rebels could be viewed as active political agents for Catholicism, and the ideal leaders of an invasion force. Across the ideological divide, exiles were employed as a call to arms. When Foxe began his martyrology, he hoped it would be a wake-up call for the international Protestant cause. Decades later, Verstegan used the persecution of Catholics in England to mobilise his
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77 Danner, Pilgrimage, p. 118.

78 CRS, 39, pp. 161-64, Robert Persons' memorial to the Pope and King of Spain, Paris, 22 May 1582.
coreligionists across Europe. From exile, both men were intent on raising awareness of the plight of their coreligionists at England. They and others pitched their work at an international audience and a confessional market within England.\(^79\)

Scholars of Protestant works often remark on the exiles’ use of biblical analogy to make sense of and justify their condition. An apocalypticism initiated by the Marian exiles was embedded in English Protestant theology, giving particular importance to the concepts of providence and a special covenant with God.\(^80\) However, these were fairly flexible tropes, exploitable by both sides: biblical analogy was by no means a Protestant preserve. In fact there is striking overlap between Catholic and Protestant writing on exile regarding the rhetorical uses of scriptural analogy. Both presented their trials as part of God’s plan, a divine punishment for their sins. Marian Protestants struggled with the fact that after being a Protestant nation under Edward VI, England strayed into Catholic idolatry: this was explained as punishment for the nation’s sin. With the rejection of Mary’s Catholic restoration in 1559, Elizabethan Catholics faced a comparable situation. This view of affliction under a hostile regime as divinely imposed punishment was thus also applicable. Catholic and Protestant polemicists alike expressed hope for the restoration of their church in England and the homecoming of the exiled.\(^81\)

Self-recognition as God’s chosen, albeit persecuted, people encouraged steadfastness in adversity and bestowed powerful group and individual identities. Elizabethan Catholic scholars appealed to Old Testament examples from a fairly early stage. When John Story was kidnapped, brought back to England and tried for treason in 1571, he justified residence in the Low Countries in such terms. Story argued he left England only for conscience’s sake: in doing so, he had followed God’s injunction to

\(^79\) Pettegree, ‘Latin’, p. 120.


\(^81\) For example, the preface to Peter Martyr, \textit{Defensio de Eucharistiae} (1558), cited by Pettegree, ‘Latin’, p. 121.
Abraham, to leave his native land and kin for another country. To counter government presentations of his exile as the wilful choice of a disobedient individual, Story gave it the character of a divinely imposed mission. As an exile, he was a suffering member of the true church; his exile state was a sign of righteousness.

Richard Bristow, seen as part of the ‘apologetic school’ of exiled scholars, turned to Scripture to make sense of Catholic trials. His Brief Treatise (1574) configured Catholic suffering as divine punishment for England’s sins. English Catholics were God’s chosen people, destined to ‘weepe, sobbe and sigh, to remembre Sion and the Temple of our Mother Jerusalem’. This view of the present as a period of trial or penitence for past sins offered a comfort and spur to the faithful. Like the Israelites, their time in ‘the drie wildernesse’ would come to an end. Bristow provided assurance that the epilogue to their ‘captivitie’ was England’s return to Rome, and divinely ordained renewal and reconciliation. He said God would bring exiles ‘home againe to the sweete Angelical sunges and heavenly service of the same’. Like Allen, Bristow’s vision of the English Catholic community extended beyond contemporaries in his homeland. It encompassed recusants in England who had left the country in soul, if not body; Church papists who remained body and soul within the English status quo; exiles who had left it in body and soul; and deceased Catholics, departed completely from the earth. All belonged to the same community, praying that God will end their captivity and bring them to their earthly homeland, and to salvation. This hope for a simultaneous return to an earthly home and God’s favour in fact ran throughout less belligerent Catholic writings, reappearing most obviously in the later 1590s, when writers disengaged from resistance theories.

Other exile publications took a more complex approach than Bristow to debates over political and religious loyalty. Most notably, Leicester’s Commonwealth (1584) appears less interested in certain religio-political debates and the exile issue. Published
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82 Loomie, Spanish, p. 8. Protestant polemic claimed he colluded with exiled rebels to overthrow Elizabeth I. James K. Lowers, Mirrors for Rebels: A Study of Polemical Literature Relating to the Northern Rebellion, 1569 (Berkeley, 1953), p. 44.

83 Richard Bristow, A Brief Treatise of diuers plaine and sure waies to finde out the trueth in this doubtfull and dangerous time of Heresie: conteyning sundry worthy Motiues vnto the Catholike faith, or Considerations to moue a man to beleuue the Catholikes, and not the Heretikes (Antwerp, 1574), reprinted in D. M. Rogers (ed.), English Recusant Literature, 209 (1974), f. 136.

84 Holmes, Resistance and Compromise, p. 143.
in France, this highly popular scurrilous attack on Elizabeth’s favourite, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester seemed more intent on damaging Leicester than engaging with religious controversies.\(^{85}\) Leicester is painted as the ultimate Machiavellian monster, the offspring of traitors, and the ruin of England. However, the work has much to say on other key issues, including the succession debate and the position of English Catholics at home and abroad.\(^{86}\)

*Leicester’s Commonwealth* reflects a strain of Catholicism specific to an exile group at a particular point, whilst also feeding into a distinct strand of Elizabethan polemic.\(^{87}\) The authorship of this work was and remains debatable. Recently, it has been seen as a collaborative effort between Persons and a highborn courtly group, chief amongst them Charles Arundel.\(^{88}\) This reading will privilege the role of the latter group. Promoting the Anjou marriage in the late 1570s and early 1580s, they fell from favour when the project disintegrated, and some individuals left the country.\(^{89}\)
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85 The full published title reads: *The Copie of a letter, wryten by a Master of Arte of Cambrige to his Friend in London, concerning some talke past of late betwen two worshipful and graue men, about the present state, and some procedinges of the Erle of Leycester and his friendes in England Conceyued, spoken and publyshed, wyth most earnest protestation of al duteyful good wyl and affection, towards her most excellent Ma. and the Realm, for whose good onely it is made common to many ([Paris?], 1584). It was probably printed in Paris, Eu or Reims. For its circulation in print and manuscript, Peck (ed.), *Commonwealth*, p. 8; H. I.- Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 147-49, 389.


89 Above, Chapter One, pp. 80-81; Chapter Two, p. 92.
mid 1580s, they found sufficient support in France to have their work printed there and be despatched across the Channel.\textsuperscript{90}

This group saw an attachment to Rome as integral to the identity of England’s ancient nobility; they rebuked the Protestant upstarts controlling Elizabeth, who lacked social, political or religious pedigrees.\textsuperscript{91} To make their revenge more devastating, they also sought common cause with Leicester’s non-Catholic opponents.\textsuperscript{92} Appealing to grievances that cut across religious lines, the authors argued that not all Catholics were intemperate and of dubious loyalty. In addition to Leicester’s wickedness, the work covered themes of central importance at the time. For one, it promoted the Stuart claim to succeed Elizabeth I, against the Earl of Huntingdon, whose kinsman Leicester was said to be set on obtaining the Crown himself. It also voiced a plea for religious toleration, as the means for England’s return to peace and prosperity. The way this last issue in particular is handled offers a new perspective on the outlook of lay exiles in the mid-1580s.

\textit{Leicester’s Commonwealth} reports an imagined dialogue between a Protestant scholar, a Protestant gentleman and a Catholic lawyer over recent anti-Catholic measures. The lawyer was presented as an exceptional Catholic: he is moderate and willing to listen, even if he insists on following laughably superstitious rites.\textsuperscript{93} In fact, the views of the three characters converge, proving that the Catholic position can be reasonable, and allowing the reader to wonder if the lawyer is so exceptional amongst Catholics after all. Meanwhile, the Protestants show themselves to have supported policies which would have benefited the nation at large and promoted Catholic interests:


\textsuperscript{91} Peck (ed.), \textit{Commonwealth}, p. 17. This identification of the Catholic cause with the old nobility was also clear in the proclamation of the Northern Earls in 1569, and in [John Leslie], \textit{A Treatise of Treasons against Q. Elizabeth, and the Croune of England}, divided into two partes: whereof, The first parte answereth certaine Treasons pretended, that never were intended: and the second, discovereth greater Treasons committed, that are by few perceiued (1572), reprinted in D. M. Rogers (ed.), \textit{English Recusant Literature}, 254 (1975).

\textsuperscript{92} The author said a polemical campaign against Leicester was arousing sympathy for those who had fallen foul of him. Peck (ed.), \textit{Commonwealth}, p. 122. \textit{Leicester’s Commonwealth} was the main spark for an anti-Leicester genre; until this point, Catholic polemic was generally not concerned with him. Peck, “The Letter of Estate”, p. 21; Peck (ed.), \textit{Commonwealth}, p. 3.

the two are not mutually exclusive. These projects, the reader learns, were ruined by Leicester. There is thus a groundswell of opinion against the earl, extending beyond a Catholic minority.

In the catalogue of Leicester’s crimes, vices, and abuses of position, his actions in international diplomacy are especially damaging. The Protestant gentleman, not the Catholic lawyer, blames Leicester for the demise of the French marriage project. Anjou and his envoy, Simier, are presented in a favourable light whenever they appear. The detail given on Leicester’s repeated attempts to assassinate Simier suggest a particular interest in the topic. Simier and Charles Arundel were well acquainted in England. This association continued when the two men were in Paris: Arundel often stayed at Simier’s house on the left bank. Given the link between the authors and Simier, they probably got the stories from him directly.

*Leicester’s Commonwealth*, the complaint of a disgruntled court faction, is in some respects both a manifesto of opposition and a work of self-defence. The authors, employing the rhetoric of courtly complaint, blamed Leicester alone for England’s ills, although the government reacted to the work as if Elizabeth had been personally attacked. The Protestant scholar condemned Catholics who act maliciously towards the Crown. However, he warned that its real enemies are Leicester and his supporters, the wolves in sheep’s clothing. They, he argued, use initiatives against a largely loyal Catholic populace as a front for developing their own treasonous projects. When it comes to a Catholic self-defence, meanwhile, the lawyer took a similar stance to Allen.

---

94 Peck (ed.), *Commonwealth*, pp. 78-79. The authors deliberately have a Protestant speak of the French match in very positive terms. Holding Leicester solely responsible for its failure purposefully overlooks the massive public outcry against it.

95 Above, Chapter One, p. 81.

96 In France, Simier was also in contact with Edward Stafford, who had been connected to the pro-marriage party in France. If Stafford contributed material, it was perhaps in connection with him. Leimon and Parker, ‘Treason’, p. 1142; Bossy, ‘French Marriage’, p. 5. On Arundel frequenting Simier’s house, above, Chapter One, pp. 81-82.

97 For the alleged attempts on Simier’s life, Peck (ed.), *Commonwealth*, pp. 85, 92.


99 Peck (ed.), *Commonwealth*, p. 181. This is similar to the line taken in *Treatise of Treasons*. 
He did not deny that some exiles engage in seditious activity, but blames Leicester for this: Leicester’s tyranny drove men abroad, where they have been forced to seek assistance from foreign princes. Consequently, they would become ‘fire-brandes to carrie home the flame of warre, upon their countrie’. 100 Like Allen, the authors of *Leicester’s Commonwealth* acknowledged the exiles’ subversive potential, but held the persecuting regime accountable for this.

Although the text may partly have been written there, absence from England was an advantage for the authors of *Leicester’s Commonwealth*. Printing a virulent attack on a nobleman and royal counsellor was far more feasible from outside the country, away from Protestant censorship and the threat of prosecution. 101 Starn observes that ‘name-calling was one of the few obvious pleasures of exile’; exile also provided space to infuse this name-calling with greater potency. 102 The authors employed more than one of the voices available to exiles. They record a woeful voice, which lamented the loss of a well-ordered, prosperous commonwealth; and a jeering voice, which offered Leicester as scapegoat, and hoped for his ruin.

One often under-explored element in *Leicester’s Commonwealth* is its plea for religious tolerance. In the closing section, the lawyer and the gentlemen agreed that the best way to ensure the stability of the realm is some compromise on religious issues. This plea for the ‘bearing of th’one with th’other’ is unusual in English Catholic polemic. It was, for instance, absent in the work of clerical exiles, who had other priorities or addressed toleration on different grounds. More strikingly, *Leicester’s Commonwealth* posited toleration for all religious minorities, not just the Catholics. All groups, they argue, should obey the civil authorities in return for guaranteed freedom of conscience and the right to live unmolested. Interestingly, this ideal is linked to their justification of Mary Stuart’s cause, giving it political and dynastic as well as ideological significance. 103 She was promoted in the text as the most legitimate

100 Peck (ed.), *Commonwealth*, p. 183.
successor to the English throne and as a champion of religious toleration. Responding to those opposing her succession to the English Crown on religious grounds, Mary’s religious compromise in Scotland was cited as proof of a desire for ‘toleration’. Her practical inability to institute a workable reciprocal toleration is overlooked, for the onus is on her wish for ‘liberty of conscience and free exercise of religion to those of the contrary profession and opinion, without restraint’. Mary’s actions in Scotland were lauded alongside other contemporary efforts, including Henri III’s attempts to dispel religious discord in France.

Recent scholars argue that sixteenth-century pleas for moderation were often merely rhetorical, employed for political or polemical purposes. According to this approach, the toleration plea in *Leicester’s Commonwealth* was a front for political subversion. However, its prominence in the work deserves further consideration. A stance of moderation was often employed in contemporary texts as a tool of persuasion. In this case, an outward expression of a desire for toleration and reconciliation refuted the government portrayal of noble exiles as obdurate opponents of the regime. The plea could also be contextualised by contemporary political debates in England, where William of Orange’s assassination by a Catholic zealot raised fears for Elizabeth’s life. Certain elements in Parliament, court and council were pushing Elizabeth I to concede to growing pressure for immediate provisions to protect her person, and harsher anti-Catholic measures. Having been excluded in person from this political forum, the authors could thus be attempting to engage with the struggle from a distance. They presumably aimed to support the moderate line in the 1584-85 parliamentary debates, and exploit the known differences between Elizabeth and her more radical MPs and counsellors.

---

104 Peck (ed.), *Commonwealth*, p. 168. For a recent discussion of her religious policies in Scotland, W. Ian P. Hazlett, ‘Marie, Reine des Écossais et la liberté de conscience: la mise au monde d’une idée mort-née’, in Wanegffelen (ed.), *l'Hospital*, 33-49. This treatment of Mary as a champion of toleration is in stark contrast to her portrayal as Catholic martyr a few years later. Above, Chapter Three, pp. 186-87.


The plea for toleration could be merely a front for a particular political strategy; alternatively, French *politique* ideas may actually have impacted on the English authors.\(^{108}\) The early 1580s are too early to track the dissemination of *politique* ideas in English: Montaigne’s *Essais* had a lucrative market in England by the 1590s, although the printed English translation was not produced until 1603.\(^{109}\) However, English gentry in France were more likely to have been exposed to such ideas. It is possible that these ideas were more than empty rhetoric. In the French context, as we shall see, this was to be particularly significant.

Holmes argues that *Leicester’s Commonwealth* marked the beginning of a phase of English Catholic political thought advocating resistance to a heretical monarch.\(^{110}\) The full impact of *Leicester’s Commonwealth*, however, is best understood through its international career.\(^{111}\) A French translation appeared in late March 1585, very soon after the English original. The *Discours de la vie* (1585) attacked Leicester more scurrilously, in an even less conciliatory tone. The work consisted of some verses addressed to the reader, Leicester and Elizabeth I; a preface to the French reader; a

108 Holmes and Bossy deny that *Leicester’s Commonwealth* was a *politique* work. Holmes, ‘Authorship’, p. 430; Bossy, ‘Heart’, p. 146. However, it contains the *politique* idea that removing religious division from the public sphere will re-establish peace and prosperity, and earlier scholars classified it as such. Lecler, *Toleration and the Reformation*, vol. 2, pp. 374-75; W. K. Jordan, The Development of Religious Toleration in England, volume 1: From the beginning of the English Reformation to the death of Queen Elizabeth (Gloucester, Massachusetts, 1965), pp. 404-406. *Leicester’s Commonwealth* argues that if people are ‘permitted to live quietly to God and themselves at home in their own houses’ they will ‘perform otherwise their outward obedience and duty to their prince and country’. Peck (ed.), *Commonwealth*, p. 185. This is close to the line taken by Montaigne. David Lewis Schaefer, *The Political Philosophy of Montaigne* (Ithaca, 1990), p. 368; Alan Levine, ‘Skepticism, Self and Toleration in Montaigne’s Political Thought’, in Alan Levine (ed.), *Early Modern Skepticism and the Origins of Toleration* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 68-69. For more on French *politique* thought arriving in England: Parmelee, *Good Newes*.

109 Frances A. Yates, *John Florio: The Life of an Italian in Shakespeare’s England* (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 213-40. Prior to Florio, other efforts had been made to translate Montaigne into English. It is unclear how proficient gentry were in French, and to what extent Montaigne’s writings were accessible before the English translation. There are, however, indications that manuscript translations were in circulation before 1603.

110 Holmes, *Resistance and Compromise*, p. 131. However, he admits a degree of ambiguity in the political theory of *Leicester’s Commonwealth*: it has to be read carefully to discern its argument for resistance. Lake argues the work was intended to clear the ground for a Catholic assassination of Elizabeth. Questier, ‘Elizabeth and the Catholics’, p. 81.

direct translation of *Leicester's Commonwealth*; and a lengthy *Addition*, or supplementary account of the Earl's crimes.\textsuperscript{112} The French edition engaged more directly with contemporary religious and political issues. For instance, it sought to arouse French hostility by stressing Leicester's betrayal, in England and the Low Countries, of Anjou, a prince of far superior rank.\textsuperscript{113} Realistically, Anjou's political and religious vacillations ensured he was not much loved or respected by zealous French Catholics. Here, however, he was presented to a French audience as a virtuous prince wrongfully betrayed.

On other issues, the *Discours* held strong resonance with the developing programme of the League. There were further reports of Leicester's sexual exploits, most notably the story of his attempt to seduce a lady proving impervious to his approaches. On the advice of a sorceress, Leicester concocted a potion containing some of his own semen, and contrived to get the lady to drink it.\textsuperscript{114} Offered as proof of Leicester's bestial nature and engagement with all things unchristian, this had possible echoes with the alleged sexual misconduct of Henri III. There is no explicit comparison in the *Discours* between the two men, but a French reader aware of rumours at court could be encouraged to draw parallels for himself.\textsuperscript{115}

Appealing to a French audience, the translators and editors of the *Discours* displayed no desire for compromise. The main body of the text was directly translated from *Leicester's Commonwealth*, aside from the alteration or omission of a few names.\textsuperscript{116} Nothing significant was excised, including its temperate pronouncements on religious issues. However, the supplements in the *Discours* were not disposed to a

\textsuperscript{112} *Discours*.

\textsuperscript{113} *Discours*, ff. 241[sic]; 124-124v. The pagination is confused throughout.

\textsuperscript{114} *Discours*, ff. 131-116v [sic].

\textsuperscript{115} The tactic of suggesting vague similarities rather than direct analogies, was employed in other English Catholic texts. Lake, 'Sejanus', p. 130.

\textsuperscript{116} The *Discours* referred to Stafford as Robert rather than Edward Stafford, and removed any names from the stories relating to his wife's relations with Leicester. She is named directly as 'Lady Sheffield' in *Leicester's Commonwealth*; in the corresponding places in *Discours*, she is referred to as 'une dame'; or 'une autre Dame de laquelle i'ay desia fait mention'; 'another lady of whom I wanted to make mention'. *Discours*, f. 23 v. She is named only once as Lady Sheffield in the *Discours*, and no reference is made to her relationship to Leicester. *Discours*, ff. 128 v-129. This suggests Stafford may have had some input in the French translation. For Stafford's complex reaction to the English and French versions, TNA, SP 78/13/86, Stafford to Burghley, Paris, 30 March 1583; TNA, SP 78/15/15, Stafford to Walsingham, Paris, 20 January 1586.
similar approach. They voice disgust at the English status quo, and an implicit disapproval of religious tolerance. This sits somewhat incongruously with the work's professed loyalism to Elizabeth and approval of Henri's attempts at reconciliation. The preface told the reader to attribute any strange or unpleasant language in the text to its Protestant origins: the plea for moderation was presumably part of this alien rhetoric. More significantly, whilst asserting the work contains nothing contrary to the Catholic faith, the preface was openly critical of the English lawyer. His willingness to enter dialogue, and find common ground, with Protestants was condemned as proof of the weak and cowardly nature of his faith. The lawyer, it is declared, did nothing for the international Catholic cause: 'à mon avis l'Eglise Catholique ne se servira jamais de tel Champion pour combattre ses ennemis'. The Addition also devoted attention to religious divisions within the English church, something which barely occasioned comment in Leicester's Commonwealth. The message that Leicester, champion of the radical Puritan faction, was actually an immoral atheist perhaps held particular interest for an anti-Protestant readership in France.

Accepting Peck's view that the authors of Leicester's Commonwealth were responsible for the French translation, this effective shift away from the toleration message in the second text is significant. It seems to indicate a change of attitude amongst the disgruntled pro-Stuart group, perhaps as a result of the experience of exile and the developing religio-political crisis in France. Its assumed categorisation as a pro-League polemic could reflect their embrace of League ideas. Although Crown control over Parisian printers was precarious, between 1584-85 it succeeded in obtaining a lull in the production of works hostile to Elizabeth and England. The Discours was an

---

117 The author says there is nothing in the text contravening the Catholic faith, 'sinon la Phrase seulement & le maniere de parler qui sent son Protestant'; 'if not only the phrasing and the manner of speaking, which is felt to be Protestant'. Discours, Address 'Aux Benevoles Lecteurs', f. 23 v.

118 'in my opinion, the Catholic Church will never be served by such a champion to combat its enemies'. Discours, Address 'Aux Benevoles Lecteurs', f. 23.

119 Discours, f. 130.

120 Peck (ed.), Commonwealth, p. 11. Arundel was apparently in Paris in late 1584 and early 1585, when the French translation was presumably undertaken and put through the presses. Traditionally, the translation is attributed to Nicholas Throckmorton. Allison and Rogers (eds.), Contemporary Printed Literature, vol. 1, no. 31.1, p. 7; CSPF, 1584-1585, p. 387, Stafford to Walsingham, Paris, March 30 1585. Stafford believed that Throckmorton started the translation sometime previously, and it had been finished and rushed through the press by someone else.

121 Wilkinson, Mary, p. 77.
exception to this and, unsurprisingly, was produced without the royal privilege.\textsuperscript{122} The book was deemed to have radical or seditious content, or at least the potential to encourage a French audience to sedition. Henri III was very unlikely to approve a text which could undermine his English alliance.

Whether or not they had been converted by Leaguer ideas, the authors were certainly aware of how to maximise the impact of their text for a French audience. Having found a foothold in the world of Parisian propaganda, and living alongside radical Catholics, the translators and adaptors of \textit{Leicester’s Commonwealth} were alive to what would best appeal to such an audience. Radical Catholics, for instance, would not have countenanced an outright appeal for interfaith toleration when they were fighting to extirpate Protestantism in France. The praise for Henri III’s ‘molification necessaire’ of opponents in France, and subsequent ‘paix... abondance & reunion’, would have won no friends amongst the increasingly powerful Leaguers.\textsuperscript{123} Moreover, the original arguments regarding the succession would have jarred with the League’s opposition to a Protestant successor to the French throne. Any praise for Mary Stuart’s experiment with coexistence in Scotland, or a denial that a claimant to the throne could be rejected for their religion, would hardly be well received. Hence, presumably, the need to attribute any unwelcome ideas to the work’s foreign origins.

The timing of the \textit{Discours’} publication soon after the Garter Ceremony in Paris could have been critical to the format it took, as well as its potential reception. The text’s hostility towards Protestant England could be extended towards its ally, Henri III. If this was a pro-League tract, the early spring of 1585 was an opportune time for exiles to raise awareness of events at the English court, and to arouse hostility towards Anglo-French cordiality. The contradictions between the main text and its supplements could be explained by the need for speedy publication and circulation. Striving to provide an immediate comment, it was easier to write radical supplements and add them to an existing text than to revise the entire English work. Alternatively, its inconsistencies or even contradictions could be explained by the observed willingness among early

\textsuperscript{122} I have seen four of an identified eighteen copies of the work; none boast a privilege. The editions tracked by the French Reformation Book project at Saint Andrews likewise lack a royal privilege. The privilege presumably still had some, if declining, clout in 1585. Pallier, ‘Impressions’, p. 256.

\textsuperscript{123} ‘necessary mollification’, ‘peace... abundance and reunion’. Peck (ed.), \textit{Commonwealth}, p. 185.
modern thinkers, writers and polemists to take ideas from different, even contradictory, sources to support their argument at a particular point.\textsuperscript{124}

Perhaps, however, there is another way to approach the Discours without dismissing the toleration message in Leicester’s Commonwealth as empty rhetoric. Scholars of Catholic texts in England observe how writers appended anti-Catholic introductions and conclusions to Catholic texts, in an attempt to escape detection and ensure dissemination.\textsuperscript{125} Maybe a similar scenario applied with the Discours. Knowing the importance of radical Parisian support, and being attuned to the mood in the city, perhaps the authors recognised the need to dress up their work as a pro-Leaguer tract in order to get it printed. Whilst they undoubtedly had potential common ground with disgruntled French radicals, it is conceivable that they had not lost sight of their original politique ideals, or at least their persuasive power for polemical purposes. Supplementing their work with more inflammatory writings was perhaps a means to disseminate a message of religious accommodation to a French audience.

In this context, the Discours’ treatment of individual exiles, completely absent in Leicester’s Commonwealth, is also significant. Charles Arundel, for instance is named. The Discours’ claim that he was forced into exile to keep his liberty rather than to preserve his faith contrasts to the usual radical portrayal of exiles as victims of religious persecution.\textsuperscript{126} It intimates something of the original politique view of the work: the need to place civil accord above immediate ideological difference.

The Discours certainly presents a curious mélange of ideas. It retains the plea for toleration and praise for religious compromise; it voices deep regret for the lost promise of the Anjou match and Anglo-French alliance. These, however, compete with clear messages of disgust at the English status quo and disapproval of religious tolerance. It is thus difficult to give a definitive, unequivocal categorisation of the work: it depended which part of the text a reader concentrated on. It was more anti-English and anti-

\textsuperscript{124} Armstrong, Politics, p. 147.


\textsuperscript{126} Discours, f. 133 v.
Elizabethan than other works published that year in Paris, and opened the way for more overtly subversive works by French authors. However, given the support voiced for earlier attempts at an Anglo-French alliance, neither was it a straightforward vehicle for League ideas or English Catholic revolutionary theory.

The publication of the Discours is proof of Henri III’s inability to stamp out anti-Elizabethan works. Its authors may or may not have still been hoping to secure greater support from Henri, but they knew that the possibility of this would arouse government fears. At the same time, they highlighted issues of great relevance for a radical French audience. The portrayal of England as a land ruined at the hands of an ambitious Machiavellian atheist encouraged hostility to Henri III for dragging his country into an English entente. Tapping into the well-established genre of anti-favourite literature on both sides of the Channel, the English situation was contextualised and made pertinent for a wider audience.¹²⁷ Leicester’s Commonwealth had a captive audience in England and in Paris: thanks partly to its timing, the Discours presumably had a similar reception in France.¹²⁸

The Discours demonstrates that printed defences of lay exile, aimed at an international audience, were far more convoluted than a denial of evil intent. The product of influential laymen and clerics in exile, Leicester’s Commonwealth outwardly adopted a different stance to exiled clerical leaders. It aimed to critique the status quo and justify the grudges of a sidelined court group; more debatably, it justified the overthrow of that regime. It continued to engage with political controversies in England, in which its authors continued to feel involved. Like clerical writers, the authors of noble libels did not seek integration into French society to gain support for their cause. Those responsible for both works played on their ‘difference’ to their hosts to promote aims concerning England. They ostensibly employed political, rather than religious ideals to mobilise international opinion. At the same time, they made able use of arguments and analogies with resonance for their French hosts and audience. The exile element of the work gave this Elizabethan polemic a considerable international


¹²⁸ TNA, SP 78/12/105, Stafford to Walsingham, Paris, 29 October 1584.
significance. Like the works of other exiled polemicists, it begs the question whether the views of its authors can be accepted as representative of the wider exiled group. The fact that it offers a more complicated picture probably implies that it can. 129

1.3: Exiles as fugitives or confessors? The use of the 1569 rebels in Catholic and Protestant propaganda.

Of all Catholics abroad, those who had openly rebelled provoked the most attention and controversy. What the 1569 rebels represented or came to represent was an enduring source of controversy between the Protestant establishment and English Catholics. Subsequent characterisations of Catholic exile were conditioned on both sides by the memory of the revolt. Even years later, if employed in a certain way, the rebels dramatically polarised divisions. They became a key part of English Protestant mythmaking about Catholics, whilst Catholic writers praised them for their sacrifice. The argument of hostile pamphleteers in the wake of the revolt - that all Catholics were potential traitors - were still echoed years later, blurring distinctions between the rebels and a younger generation of Catholics in Europe. 130

The characterisation of Catholics in polemical reactions to the revolt was powerful and enduring. 131 In Protestant propaganda following 1569, all subsequent Catholic plots were linked back to the revolt. From 1570, at least, works with tacit royal approval if not official endorsement presented the rebellious 'northern men' as proof of the treachery of all Catholics. 132 The rebel’s appeal for foreign aid was seized as proof of the necessary link between English Catholics and those foreign powers bent on England’s destruction. If Catholic activity was seditious, Catholics abroad were doubly disloyal. Cecil, for instance, portrayed the exiles as a rag-tag bunch. Not all were directly connected to the northern rebellion, but in his eyes it was clear that a Catholic

---

129 Questier argues that the strain of polemic by ‘disappointed courtier politicians’, including Leicester's Commonwealth and Treatise of Treasons, bears relation to the wider English Catholic community. I imply above that Leicester's Commonwealth and its French translation have a relationship to the English exile community in particular. Questier, ‘Elizabeth and the Catholics’, p. 85.

130 Thomas Norton, To the Quenes Maisties poore deceived subjectts of the northe contrey, drawn into rebellion by the Earles of Northumberland and Westmerland (London, 1569).


132 Lowers, Mirrors, pp. 50-60.
presence abroad was an inevitable threat to the establishment. It was only by grace of God that Elizabeth and her kingdom were preserved from the rebels, but now they continued to subvert her by providing example for other Catholics. The rebels thus served to sharpen the pitch of government propaganda, providing a general characterization of a wider Catholic exile presence which ran throughout Protestant polemic.

The condemnation of Catholic rebels often focused on particular individuals, and the Earl of Westmorland was at the centre of a particularly heated exchange. Protestant propaganda claimed Westmorland had been defamed for lewd living before the revolt. Cecil could thus convey his subsequent exile existence as doubly miserable, a just punishment for depravity and rebellion. Westmorland, he told the reader, underwent the loss of high position to which he had been born, and the disjunction of life in a foreign land. In addition, he suffered the loss of his son and heir, and the physical deterioration associated with sexually transmitted disease. As 'a person utterly wasted by looseness of life', God ordained his line to be curtailed and his body to be 'eaten with ulcers of lewd causes'; 'no enemie he had can wish him a viler punishement'. Here and elsewhere, the fate of Westmorland and other rebels was used to argue the invalid and evil character of the state of exile, and to dissuade Catholics in England from pursuing a similar path.

The condemnation of fugitive rebels was not limited to government-approved sources. By the 1580s, tracts critical of some aspects of Elizabethan government also condemned Catholic fugitives in Europe. The Letter of Estate displayed none of the Catholic sympathies of its famous predecessor, Leicester's Commonwealth. It categorically presents Westmorland as a traitor. Westmorland's flight may have enabled him to evade a 'moste worthely merited' execution, but actually condemned him to 'a life worse than death, exiled forth of his native country to wander in a forrene enemies [sic] of the same'. In exile, the reader is told, Westmorland was constantly confronted with his crimes: a wider group of 'the basest and rascalste kinde of people' agitated

---

133 Cecil, Execution.

134 Cecil, Execution, p. [3]. A 1584 edition comments on his fate as 'a pitifull loss to the Realme of so noble a house, never before tainted for disloyaltie'. The focus on the earls' moral degeneracy was a ploy to show how misguided the rebels had been to place their faith in them as leaders. Kesselring, "Cold Pye", p. 431.
around him for further action against the government.\footnote{Peck, ""The Letter of Estate"", p. 27.} Here, Westmorland’s identity as a fugitive and traitor was not explicitly linked to his Catholicism. The onus was on his contravention of loyalty to the Crown, and jeopardising everything as a consequence.

Partly in direct response to Protestant accusations, Catholic propagandists were quick to deny the treacherous character of the rebels.\footnote{Treatise of Treasons. This claimed the real traitors were Cecil and Bacon, conspiring against the crown and feeding bad counsel to Elizabeth I.} As we have seen, Paris was already familiar with their cause by 1580.\footnote{Two tracts relating to the revolt were published in France in 1570. One, the Discovrs des Troubles, is discussed above, Chapter Three, pp. 175-176, 192. The other, Continuation des choses plus célèbres & mémorables avenus en Angleterre, Ecosse & Irlande, depuis le mois d'Octobre M.DLXIX jusques au XXV. jour de Decembre ensuyvant et dernier passé, (Lyon, 1570), steered remarkably clear of political support. Wilkinson, Mary, pp. 62-63. It was markedly more anti-English in tone: it appears more interested in topographical descriptions than arousing sympathy for the rebels.} Initial impressions suggest that the rebels’ legitimacy in the Catholic world had been established largely through their presentation as martyrs and victims of a persecuting regime. On closer inspection, however, there was a degree of ambiguity amongst Catholics who wrote in their defence.

A Protestant pamphlet of 1571 condemned the Pope’s treatment of the rebels as martyrs, reporting his desire to obtain the bodies of those executed to make them into relics.\footnote{Stephen Peele, The pope in his fury doth answer returne, to a letter ye which to Rome is late come (London, 1571). The Pope expresses a wish that the bones of the rebels be displayed ‘As reliques of greate dignitie/ for every man that comes to see/ Those Jewels of such grace’.} This was not far from the truth: whilst Rome could not get hold of their physical remains, Catholic polemicists were not slow to emphasise their martyr status. The first attempt to do so in print was Nicholas Sander’s De Visibilib Monarchia (1571), which proved very popular.\footnote{Dillon, Construction, p. 13. A French edition appeared in 1587. Milward, Controversies, no. 262, p. 70.} By 1574, Richard Bristow was praising ‘the good Erle of Northumberland... the Nortons... and so many hundredes of the Northernmen’. These executed rebels were located in a line of martyrs stretching back to St Stephen. Bristow praised them for their witness to the Church, ‘in their life, and at their death’, and rebuked Protestant claims of their disordered and dissolute lives prior to the revolt.\footnote{Bristow, Breife Treatise, ff. 73-73 v.}
The government reaction was to class Bristow and Sanders as opponents of the Crown; they featured them in the ‘bloody questions’ put to captured priests.\textsuperscript{141}

The project to present the rebels – executed or exiled – as martyrs had international scope.\textsuperscript{142} Polemic aimed to reach Catholics in Europe and England, and possibly Protestants too, and was not limited to printed text. As a visitor to the English College, Rome, Anthony Munday listened to readings during mealtimes from scripture and a martyrology.\textsuperscript{143} Munday claimed that in 1578 the executed rebels Thomas and Christopher Norton were spoken of as martyrs and exemplars, alongside Saints Agatha, Martin and Cecilia.\textsuperscript{144} The College also established a more permanent representation of the rebels in 1583. The frescoes of its Chapel depicted the history of English martyrs from the early church to those who had died very recently. Priority was given to clergy tortured and executed for ministry in England, but there was room for a reference to laymen who suffered death for their rebellion.\textsuperscript{145} The murals were funded by George Gilbert, a lay devotee of the Society who had converted to Catholicism in Paris. He and other English laymen were financially responsible for this portrayal of the rebels alongside martyred priests. The subsequent publication of woodcuts of the frescoes opened these images, originally intended for seminarians, to a wider potential audience.\textsuperscript{146}

Catholic polemicists were ready to respond to personal attacks on their high-status exiled rebels. Allen, for one, defended Westmorland from charges of moral depravity. If the earl was guilty of such crimes, he said, they must have been committed in his youth. As a product of Camp or Court, he was no worse than of any of his peers;

\textsuperscript{141} Sander’s work was far more radical in tone, while Bristow rejected resistance to the Crown. Holmes, \textit{Resistance and Compromise}, pp. 26-33; Milward, \textit{Controversies}, p. 72.


\textsuperscript{144} Munday, \textit{English Romayne}, p. 26. These claims were furiously denied by Allen, \textit{Briefe Historie}, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{145} Dillon, \textit{Construction}, pp. 219, 225. Thomas Plumtree and Thomas Woodhouse are named individually. Plumtree was executed in Durham in 1572, Woodhouse at Tyburn in 1573.

indeed these alleged crimes must have arisen from his Protestant environment. Allen moved on to reject Protestant claims by portraying Westmorland as a nobleman in physical and moral health, living 'in honest charge of the service of the King Catholique'.

Hailing the rebels - those executed and those living abroad - as men devoted to the Church was an effective means to rebuke Protestant claims. However, it could also help to perpetuate the conflation between foreign residence and treachery. Because they had risen against their lawful sovereign, any claims of the rebels' obedience could be treated with derision. Catholic polemic reflected an awareness of this, and uneasiness about exonerating them of suspicion. The political and even martyrological credentials of the executed rebels, and perhaps by extension the rebels living in Europe, were not always blindly accepted, as Allen's *Defence* demonstrates. The work implies that Catholic attitudes to the 1569 rebels were not as equivocal as some propaganda suggests. Allen was aware that his declaration that all English Catholics were loyal and obedient could be undermined by an unfavourable portrayal of those involved in rebellion. Portraying them as unblemished heroes would jeopardize his careful formula that those abroad harboured no seditious designs. Therefore, whilst Allen defended the honour of individual nobles like Westmorland, his identification of the rebels as martyrs was more qualified than Bristow's. Bristow claimed the rebels were martyrs in life and death; Allen could not openly condone their treasonous activities on earth. He took a more nuanced line: whatever their actions in life, he argued, the rebels nevertheless died as martyrs. Northumberland, for instance, should be seen as a martyr for the manner of his death, rather than for the actions which provoked his execution. Extending this argument, the rebels who fled abroad should also be understood to have proved their Catholic credentials by their sufferings.

The rebels of 1569 were central to propaganda struggles between Catholic and Protestant adversaries. Those executed and those who had fled were pronounced condemned traitors or exemplary martyrs. At the same time, printed attitudes could be

147 Allen, *Defence*, p. 47.

148 For example, the Appellant treatment of the 1569 rebels. Thomas Bluet [and William Watson], *Important Considerations, which ought to move all true and sound Catholikes* ([London], 1601), reprinted in D. M. Rogers (ed.), *English Recusant Literature, 31* (1970), p. 13.

more nuanced. There were diverging opinions within as well as between confessional groups over the polemical treatment of the rebels. The complicated use of the rebels in polemic of the 1580s highlights the advantages and difficulties each side encountered when employing the exile trope for their own purposes.

2: Parisian exiles in their own words?

An examination of well-known sources demonstrates the potentially divisive impact of the image of the Catholic exile, within as well as between confessions. Significantly, the Catholic lawyer in Leicester's Commonwealth conceded that some Catholics in England and abroad work for 'some change in state', but he also stressed that they did not represent English Catholics as a whole.\(^{150}\) Certainly, the examples discussed so far seem specific to a particular group of exiles. Edward Said has warned against reading the literary output of one exile as typical of a larger 'undocumented' group.\(^{151}\) More specifically, Shell cautions against accepting the arguments of Verstegan or Sander as representative of all Catholics.\(^{152}\) These cautionary words similarly apply to the wider English Catholic presence on the continent: perhaps Verstegan was the exception rather than the rule. This is a crucial consideration for any investigation of English Catholics in Paris. The picture presented by a poet, courtier or cleric should be measured against suggestions of how others experienced and configured their time abroad.\(^{153}\) Evidence such as wills, financial transactions, and letters home can provide useful indicators. Such a study is inherently limited by the existence of sources, and again comes up against the issue of how representative this material could be. What these sources say about these 'exiles' may not be any more characteristic than the presentations of printed

\(^{150}\) Peck (ed), Commonwealth, p. 66.

\(^{151}\) Edward W. Said, 'Reflections on Exile', in Roberson (ed.), Defining Travel, p. 179. Said argues that the 'dignity' that the poet lends to the exile position does not reflect the reality of the 'unaccountable mass of refugees', the 'undocumented thousands without a reliable history'.

\(^{152}\) Shell, Controversy, p. 121. In fact, Arblaster demonstrates how Verstegan's radical polemic was only one part of a wider and more nuanced literary program. Arblaster, Antwerp. Lechat observed that there were a good number of more modest and peaceful refugees in the Low Countries, but that they rarely made their voices heard. Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 140.

\(^{153}\) An investigation of great literary figures of the sixteenth century demonstrates how the concept of exile was problematicised, but leaves us with little idea of how the non-poets amongst the exile populations of Europe conceived of their circumstances. Tucker, Homo Viator.
polemic. Nevertheless, the representation of exiles away from sources intended for wide circulation deserves greater historical attention.  

Where private correspondence of Englishmen abroad is extant, it is due to the diligence of the Protestant government. Letters they wrote home and those they received from friends and relatives in England were intercepted: otherwise, they would be unavailable to the historian. Such letters are scattered: they cannot provide a consistent account of an individual’s attitudes in the course of their continental residence, but can offer some interesting vignettes. They offer a way into the experience of those who were not political players or in negotiations with the Crown.

Letters from or relating to young men in France in the early 1580s are mostly concerned with practical issues – the vagaries of foreign travel, the progress of their studies, the need for further funds or a reliable route for correspondence. There are, however, a few signs that the experience engendered a sense of dislocation. New arrivals forced to leave plague-ridden Paris in 1580 clearly found it a trying time. Thomas Crofte told his brother Alexander that he found himself ‘tossed from pillar to post’. George Gilbert spoke of a similar experience in terms suggestive of an exile mentality. Forced to leave Paris for Pont-à-Musson with other students, he declared to his brother, ‘nowe I do departe as it were into a wilderness’, being separated from home and from the communication route with home which was available in Paris. Similarly, a young student living at Collège Mignon under the name of John Amyas also displayed continued bonds to home. His letters largely consist of expressions of good will towards various family members, and attention to the means by which their correspondence can be safely conveyed. In one letter, John urged his brother to write soon. He eagerly awaited his letters, ‘beinge out of my Natyve Countrie and accomtyng ye my cheifest Comforthe next unto god’.

---


155 Only sources relating to exceptional individuals reveal an individual’s attitudes over a longer period of time. See Christie (ed.), Copley.

156 The state papers reveal many exiles claiming loyalty and submission to the Crown in an attempt to return to England. They are discussed in Chapter Five, but not included in this discussion.

157 TNA, SP 12/143/33, no. XII, Thomas Crofte to Alexander Crofte, Poissy, 13 October 1580.

158 TNA, SP 12/142/23, George Gilbert to Giles Gifford, Paris, 21 September 1580.

159 TNA, SP 15/27b/20, John Amyas to Richard Amyas, June 1580, Paris.
These statements hint at, but do not clearly voice, a suffering exile identity. There is little explicit statement about the ideological or religious expectations of their time abroad, or its potential impact. This contrasts to the correspondence of exile figureheads or notable individuals, who wrote of banishment patiently borne, or of having been banished for their religion.\textsuperscript{160} The contrast may be due to the character of correspondents: the former group were young men sent to Paris to travel and study, not to escape persecution at home or to train as missionaries. If their time in Paris was educational and of limited duration, there is no particular reason why they should make declarations of religious zeal. Alternatively, as Warneke suggests, the omission of references to religious issues in their writings may have been a deliberate strategy, discussed with their families before leaving England.\textsuperscript{161} In either case, they were presumably aware of the risk of their letters being intercepted, particularly as the government increased its surveillance of postal routes.

Nevertheless, there are references to confessional issues in intercepted correspondence. Philip Strangewaies, for instance, wrote to his mother Eleanor from Paris in 1582. He was very solicitous for his mother and his sister during his absence, which was possibly of considerable length. His greatest concern was that she and his sister not alter from the state in which he left them. He enjoined his mother ‘for gods sake be careful of yourself and her, that when it shall please god that I do returne I may finde you as I left you’. This could just be a plea for them to remain in good health. However, its tone suggests something more, as does his closing wish that his mother be defended from her ‘spirituall and ghostlie eveninge’. Strangewaies writes of bringing his sister out of England now he can feasibly provide for her: he presumably intended to facilitate her residence in an environment more conducive to their faith. Strangwaies wanted to fulfil a self-prescribed role as guardian to his family, one aspect of which was a spiritual guardianship. His absence from England made this problematic, but also presented alternative ways to do so.\textsuperscript{162}


\textsuperscript{161} Warneke, \textit{Traveller}, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{162} TNA, SP 12/156/6, Philip Strangwaies to his mother Elinor, Paris, 9 December 1582.
Correspondence also suggests how families in England viewed the religious connotations of a period on the continent. William Middlemore’s time in Paris was an educational experience rather than a period of exile. He was apparently no great scholar, but may have benefited from his stay in other ways.\footnote{163 TNA, SP 12/143/33, piece V, Edward Stransam to Mr Middlemore of Hawxly, 9 October 1580.} His father was keen for it to encourage and reinforce his religious faith. Writing to William in April 1580, he urged him to apply himself in his studies, remain firm in his faith, and avoid ‘evil conference’.\footnote{164 TNA, SP 12/137/49, John Middlemore to his son William at Paris, 30 April 1580.} Other letters address the thorny question of loyalty or resistance to the English government, and express a desire to eschew radical action. In 1585, one unidentified Catholic in England urged a Mr Brown to ‘be cercompspect and wary in [all] that he toke in hand consernenge hys Religion and… to be pacient untill such tyme that god had better provided for’. This plea for caution and stoicism rather than open opposition is placed alongside a warning not to trust any government overtures at reconciliation, which could be deeply compromising.\footnote{165 TNA, SP 12/176ni, Inspection of letters at Rye from Papists in France, February [?] 1585.}

Testamentary evidence demonstrates that many Catholics abroad turned to fellow countrymen for support, and remained deeply attached to family and friends at home.\footnote{166 Pettegree shows that, even after 30 years in England and a considerable degree of integration, Protestant immigrants retained connections to their foreign churches. Pettegree, ‘Thirty Years’, p. 310.} Historians have become more sceptical about what wills can tell us, and how far we can read an authorial voice into an official document usually drawn up by another party. Nonetheless, they provide information about individuals we would not otherwise have.\footnote{167 John Craig and Caroline Litzenberger, ‘Wills as Religious Propaganda’, Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 44 (1993), 415-31; J. D. Alsop, ‘Religious Preambles in Early Modern English Wills as Formulae’, Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 40 (1989), 19-27.} As the last official statement an individual makes, a will is an important source of personal expression, particularly for those living away from their native environment.\footnote{168 Pettegree, ‘Thirty Years’, p. 299.}

Of the exile wills discovered so far, most do not specify a place of burial. This could reflect an exile mindset, and lack of attachment to the place of residence at time
of death.\textsuperscript{169} It generally contrasts with native Parisians living in the same areas of the city, some of whom gave very specific instructions regarding the place and form of their burial.\textsuperscript{170}

The will and codicils of Thomas Copley reflect something of his exile experience. Each is written in a different location and reflects the influence of foreign residence, but all display a strong connection to his past life in England.\textsuperscript{171} Throughout his wills, he was not uninfluenced by his continental experience, but remained occupied with safeguarding his affairs in England. The main beneficiaries of his will were direct family members who were with him in exile. Particular attention was paid to the future of his son and heir, who was not to return to England before he was 21, perhaps to prevent royal seizure under rights of wardship of any land or property remaining to him. However, those named as executors, and the majority of other recipients of bequests were kin in England.\textsuperscript{172} Interestingly, Copley hoped to return home and made considerable appeals for reconciliation with the Crown. His wife returned to England with some of their children shortly after his death, although they did not stay permanently. His will was proved in the Canterbury courts and, unlike other exiles, his wishes regarding his position in England could be realised after his death.

Copley's case was fairly exceptional, but the wills of other laity abroad, such as that of Thomas Houghton, also expressed attachment to home. Houghton, from a Lancashire gentry family notorious for Catholicism, was on the continent by 1570. Thomas clearly refused to submit to the Elizabethan regime if it meant compromising

\textsuperscript{169} For instance, Charles Paget leaves the manner of burial to the 'discretion et bonte volunte de ses executeurs'; 'discretion and good will of his executors'. AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 270. William Douglas was equally non-specific. AN, MC, LXIII, 90, f. 720. Thomas Copley asked for a burial without pomp, in the parish, religious house or 'convenient place where I shall fortune to dye'. Christie (ed.), \textit{Copley}, Appendix, p. 181.

\textsuperscript{170} AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 273. Guillaume Badet, bourgeois of Paris, using the same notary, gave very specific instructions in his will. He requested burial, 'en leglise de saint benoist sa paroisse aledroit de defunte sa femme en la chappelle des troys maryes'; 'in the church of Saint-Benoit, his parish, at the right-hand side of his wife, in the chapel of the three Marys'.

\textsuperscript{171} Christie (ed.), \textit{Copley}, Appendix, pp. 181-91. The first will of 1576, which Copley later altered, was ratified in Lierre, in the Duchy of Brabant; the codicil of 1580 was attested by the notaries of the King in Paris; the second codicil was ratified in Spanish and French at Tournai. They were proved in the prerogative court at Canterbury in 1585. Only copies of the originals remain.

\textsuperscript{172} His close links to the Shelley, Gage and Southwell families are clear in his will.
his faith. If he was the author of the 'The Blessed Conscience', he took the stance of an exiled poet:

Lyke fryghted bird, I left my neste
To kepe my conscience. 173

Thomas persisted in his exile, even when his brother went with royal licence to Antwerp, apparently with the specific mission of bringing him back.174 By 1580 he was in Paris, and then Liège, dying there in June.175 In his long residence abroad, he apparently embraced his exile status, associating with Verstegan and perhaps even funding his work on the continent.176 Nevertheless, he did not oppose the government in any way comparable to Verstegan, and his will reflected a continued attachment to home. He left a bequest to pay for two organs, a ‘fayr table’, and books of music for the church in Preston. He presumably hoped Catholicism would be restored imminently, and his family could reassume their place in local devotional life. However, his articulated connections with home were curtailed by his executors, who realised their immediate infeasibility, and changed the conditions of his bequest. After consultation with William Allen, an old friend of the family, the £100 Houghton wanted to give to Preston church was diverted to poor scholars at the English College in Reims. Although Thomas had been a benefactor of Douai, this appropriation nevertheless suggests some divergence between the views of an individual laymen and clerical leaders about the purpose and value of their removal from England.177


174 Richard Houghton obtained a licence to travel to Antwerp for 2 months in 1576, on the grounds he would persuade Thomas to return to England and submit himself to the Protestant Crown. CRS, 13, pp. 2-3 dates the licence at 1576. TNA, E/157/1, Licenses to pass beyond sees [1572-78], records its issue in 1575. Richard managed the family fortune in Thomas’ absence and looked after his half-brother’s interests. He was later arrested for housing Edmund Campion. Other members of the family appear not to have supported Thomas in exile. Gillow, Haydock, p. 16; Honigman, Shakespeare, pp. 10-12, 17.

175 TNA, SP 78/4a/63; Knox (ed.), Allen, p. 85.


177 Knox (ed.), Allen, no. XXXV, pp. 85-87, Instrument relative to the estate of Mr Houghton, deceased, Reims, 26 June 1580. However, Allen personally guaranteed that £100 would be given to Preston church as soon as Catholic restoration occurred in England. Gillow, Haydock, p. 17.
A study of exile self-representation must obviously take account of sources created in the host environment. One body of material which remains notably underexploited for Catholic exiles in Paris is contained in the notarial archive. Research on the records of over 20 notaries, covering various years between 1574 and 1589, reveals more about the presence of English and Scottish in Paris, and the extent of their involvement in their host community.

Where English and Scottish Catholics appear, they are generally styled according to the conventions of notarial dynamic. Their name, social status, and geographical origins are usually followed by the formula ‘estans en present a Paris’. In this sense, there is nothing to distinguish them from any other outsider employing a notary in the city. However, this is not to say that such individuals did not have other reasons to be in Paris. Scotsman George Douglas, for instance, claimed to be in Paris ‘pour ses affaires’ in 1581, a formula usually employed by foreign merchants in Paris. This may be true, although he was a ‘gentilhomme ecossois et gentilhomme de la chambre du Roy’, rather than a merchant. A former servant of the Cardinal of Lorraine, Douglas was owed large sums by the Guises; he was also involved in property deals with a Parisian merchant Jean August, who had business connections to other foreigners in Paris. Similarly, Richard Cook was involved in property deals on both sides of the Channel in 1585. He is presented in 1585 as ‘gentilhomme angloys en present residant a Paris’, although there is no sign that his presence on the continent was temporary. The use of customary terminology in these sources may thus mask an activism or a degree of integration which is not immediately apparent. It is not obvious why bootmaker Thomas Nycholls was in Paris in 1582. He claimed the decision for his journey was taken by ‘quelques personnes’ in England, and that he had obtained ‘certitudes et approbations... dudit angleterre’ before leaving. Soon after his arrival he


180 For further details on some of the notarial records consulted, see Appendix II.

181 AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 18v.

182 AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, f. 365; AN, MC, LXXIII, 86, f. 529; AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, f. 563.
approached a notary for certification of his presence in Paris. Interestingly, although he had lodgings on the right-bank, he approached a left-bank notary distinguishable for his radicalism and 'leaguer credentials'. Unfortunately it is unclear whether the actes de comparution he requested were sought as standard procedure on arrival in a foreign city, or whether they were in response to a particular case. It is just possible that the gentlemen who sponsored his journey were Catholics unable to leave England themselves, who had entrusted Nycholls with their business.

The few wills scattered amongst the records of left bank notaries reveal that Catholics abroad had a mixed attitude towards their status and 'exile'. We have seen that Scottish Catholics in Paris were generally more involved in Parisian life than their English counterparts. In an examination of these sources for exile self-representation, a comparison between Scottish and English examples could thus be instructive.

The wills of two Scottish gentlemen, James Curl and William Douglas, offer useful examples. Both Curl and Douglas' wills were fairly brief and lacking in detail, as they apparently believed themselves to be on their deathbeds when they were drawn up. Both men displayed connections to the Scottish Catholic community in Paris through their place of residence: Curl was staying in a college long known for accommodating Scottish students, whilst the nobleman Douglas was at the commandery of Saint-Jean-de-Latran. Both men left the majority of their goods to immediate family members, who were also named as executors. In Curl's case, additional witnesses to the will were either Englishmen or Scotsmen. In this sense, they were still orientated to make bequests that were little different to those they may have made in their native

183 Presumably Nycholls here followed the practice of other early modern cities, where a foreigner on arrival in a city would approach a notary to have his presence registered, giving names of individuals who could vouch for his presence. This document would be required if the foreigner had to appear before a court.

184 AN, MC, XLIX, 214, f. [75]. There is no sign from extant records that Nicholls was granted a licence to travel, but this in itself does not prove he lacked one. Nicholls went to the office of notary Clement Bernard on rue de la Harpe, even though he was staying near the Bastille: this is in contrast to the usual pattern of notaries serving clients in their immediate neighbourhood. Ramsey gives Bernard a 'performativity' rating of 67%. He did not have an English clientele, but Thomas Perier, the notary who co-signed Bernard's acte, did. Ramsey, Liturgy, p. 267.

185 Above, Chapter Two, pp. 124, 139.

186 For James Curl's will, AN, MC, LXXIII, 91, f. 287. For William Douglas' will, AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 720.

environments. But further details reveal the impact of residence abroad. Douglas was in debt to several Frenchmen, including Jean August. Meanwhile, Curl displayed greater signs of financial and religious interaction with the city. Like other Scotsmen, he requested burial in the Carmelite convent, unless his executors felt somewhere else was more convenient, and the participation of members of the order at his funeral. This devotion to the Carmelites did not, however, exclude attention to his parish of residence. He stipulated that priests of the parish of Saint Hilaire attend his funeral, and made a bequest to the fabric of that church. Curl's will manifests considerably less attachment to local saints, holy sites or devotions than some contemporary Parisian wills, but nevertheless suggests the city environment had had an impact.

Interestingly, both men are referred to as acting 'comme un bon Chrestien et Catholique'. This was not an uncommon formula, especially as Curl and Douglas employed the same notary, but it has been associated with radical Leaguer sentiments. Certainly, being in France gave them the opportunity to openly express their faith in a way that would not have been possible in their home environments. There is little sign however, that either man was keen to present his removal from Scotland as an act of faith in any sense. In Douglas' case, at least, this was not an option. He had arrived in France as a Protestant and converted whilst in Paris. He could not present himself as an exile on arrival, although this later became possible. Whilst their wills clearly show their Catholic identity, there is little sign that either man construed it in terms of suffering or opposition.

188 Above, Chapter Three, p. 154, footnote 29.

189 AN, MC, LXXIII, 91, ff. 287-87v. Parisians, including those of high status, generally displayed attachment to their parishes in their wills: only nobility were likely to elect a religious house as their place of burial. Chaunu, Mort, p. 325.

190 AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 273. The will of bourgeois Guillaume Badet, drawn up by the same notary in 1574, made numerous bequests for local people and the poor, and exact instructions about his funeral service. Many French testators paid attention to the details of their funeral service and burial. Brockliss and Jones, Medical World, pp. 70-71. For further examples of detailed funeral provision in Parisian wills, the will of Jeanne Passavent, 1582, in Harding, Dead, Appendix 4, p. 295.

191 Chaunu, Mort, p. 304.

192 After his conversion, Douglas returned to Scotland. He was later disgraced for Catholic activities, and returned to Paris, where he died in 1611. His funeral sermon was printed, in which he is styled as a religious refugee. Thomas Pelletier, Discours funèbre sur la mort de feu M. le Comte d'Anguys, seigneur escossois, décédé à Paris, où il était réfugié pour y avoir libre exercice de la religion Catholique (Paris, 1611). Below, Chapter Five, pp. 276-77.
Curl and Douglas’s testaments contrast in several areas with the lengthy and complicated will of John Stuart, a Scottish academic in Paris.¹⁹³ The fact that Stuart had the leisure to make subsequent alterations and additions to his will could explain the detail into which he entered. Another explanation lies with the respective positions occupied by these men in Paris. Curl and Douglas were gentlemen: they may have had contacts with the University, but were not integral to that institution.¹⁹⁴ Their primary status was that of ‘gentilhomme ecossais’, not ‘doyen de la nation’, like Stuart. Stuart’s bequests to the German Nation, in which he was an important figure, to his parish church, and for his funeral and masses for his soul were closer to the wills of native Parisians than to other exile testaments.¹⁹⁵ In his preamble, he asked for the intercessory prayers of Sainte-Geneviève, patron saint of Paris, and Sainte Catherine, patron saint of scholars and the Faculty of Theology at Paris. He made detailed provision for masses to be celebrated in the chapel of Saint Ninian, otherwise known as ‘la chapelle des escossois’ at the Carmelite convent, at which members of his nation were to be present, and for masses in the Chapel of St Damien on the feast day of Saint Ninian.¹⁹⁶ Through these associations to a religious house, a university corps and a devotion to an English missionary bishop, Stuart articulated a multivalent identity which was institutional, local, Parisian, Scottish and international.

The only comparable English example comes from the problematic Charles Paget, who was untypical of the wider community. Paget was politicised and politically active in exile. He was intimately involved in Mary Stuart’s council in Paris, and closely linked to Guise plans for an invasion of England in 1583. Then, and subsequently, Paget was a divisive influence for the English Catholic community abroad, exacerbating divisions between the clerical missionary party and nobles and gentry who wanted more direct control over the emerging character of post-Reformation Catholicism.¹⁹⁷ His wills show where he saw himself in the mid-1580s, and prompt questions about his multiple loyalties. Paget wrote at least two wills whilst in France.

¹⁹³ For Jean Stuart’s wills, AN, MC, LXXIII, 86, ff. 257-63; AN, MC, LXXIII, 86, f. 529; AN, MC, LXXIII, 87, ff. 261-65.

¹⁹⁴ Douglas had attended lectures at the Sorbonne; Curl was staying at Collège des Lombards when his will was drawn up.

¹⁹⁵ Above, p. 251, footnote 190.

¹⁹⁶ AN, MC, LXXIII, 86, f. 529.

¹⁹⁷ Below, Chapter Five, pp. 267-68.
From 1584 onwards, he was styled in notarial documents as ‘gentilhomme anglois natif de Londres en angleterre... Banny du pays dangleterre pour la Religion Catholique’.  

This clear self-portrayal as a man driven abroad for the sake of his religious beliefs, a victim of his own faith, is notable for its exceptionality in notarial sources. In fact, Paget had not been expelled or banished from England, but had chosen to leave some time before drawing up these wills. His brother Thomas Lord Paget perhaps had more of a claim to this title, having left England in 1583 for fear of a government round up. Interestingly, although they did not take up identical stances once in exile, Charles presented his brother and himself in the same terms, as men suffering unjust penalties for their faith. In neither will did Paget really acknowledge the city that hosted him. His apparent indifference to his place of burial is not remarkable in itself, but he also wasted no attention on any charitable bequests, or repaying any debts he owed to Parisians. The only real acknowledgement of his stay abroad comes with a mention of the property he has acquired during his exile. In 1584, he left to his brother all that he owned, ‘en ce pays de France que en angleterre et autres lieux et pays que ce soyent’.

However, his exile existence was not retired or insulated: he did not take up a stoic approach to his dilemma. The beneficiaries and executors of both wills were on the continent, and were all fellow English exiles. The changes in his will reflect the changing political situation for individuals like Paget who were looking for imminent Catholic restoration in England. By 1586, Paget bequeathed his wealth not to his brother but to three exiled clerics who were closely involved in radical international Catholic

---


199 Crankshaw proves that Paget was abroad in 1574. Crankshaw, ‘New Evidence’, p. 12. This was probably a visit: he was in England after this, and was probably not permanently abroad until 1581. Hicks, ‘Elizabethan Problem’, p. 8.

200 AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 270 v. Lord Paget was likewise described as ‘banny hors du pays angleterre pour la Religion Catholique’. TNA, SP 12/267/67, A brefe note of the practises that divers Jesuites hath had for the killing of Princes and changing of states, June 1598. Paget counted himself among ‘the principall Catholikes both in England and on this side the sea that hath longest endured for the cause’.

201 Although significant numbers of Parisians did leave the details and place of their burial to the discretion of their executors.

202 ‘whether they be in this country of France, in England, or in other places and lands’. AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 270.
politics. John Leslie, Bishop of Ross was a long-term servant of Mary Stuart and since 1579 suffragan bishop of Rouen; he had a history of associations with conspiracies.\textsuperscript{203} Father Nicholas Wendon had been in Paris for several years, had served as a point of contact for exiled rebels, and by 1586 was probably in the pay of the Spanish ambassador.\textsuperscript{204} Father Woodward was probably the same man who had provided a base for English Catholics passing through Amiens.\textsuperscript{205} Paget was also acutely aware that the imprisonment of his close associate Thomas Morgan could affect his own plans. Morgan and Lord Paget had originally been named as executors, but following Morgan’s arrest in 1585, and presumably a difference of opinion with his brother, Paget made a codicil to his first will. Wendon was named in their place.\textsuperscript{206} It was at this time that he also appointed Claude Nau as his procurator. Nau, a member of Mary Stuart’s council and partisan of her cause, was given substantial control over his financial affairs.\textsuperscript{207} The terms of his will suggest that by 1586 Paget made a more strident commitment to the international Catholic cause, placing this call on his loyalty above familial obligations to his brother.

More surprisingly, despite an apparent indifference to his immediate surroundings, Charles Paget is the only exile in notarial sources to claim a legal ‘French’ identity for himself. In both 1584 and 1586, he claimed to be ‘regnicolle en France’, that is naturalised by the French Crown.\textsuperscript{208} This legal status, offering exemption from the disadvantageous penalties of living as a foreigner in France, was not sought by many Englishmen at the time. Letters of naturalisation did not come with statutory requirements for assimilation. However, those applying for letters usually felt that declaring their credentials for ‘Frenchness’ would help their case.\textsuperscript{209} The account


\textsuperscript{205} Munday, English Romayne, pp. 4-6; Munday, Discoverie, C viii. Munday claimed Woodward alerted him about a Catholic invasion of England. Woodward and Allen denied this in his Briefe Historie.

\textsuperscript{206} AN, MC, LXXII, 90, f. 270v. This codicil is written in the margin of the original will. Morgan was arrested in March 1585; Paget’s codicil is dated December 1585.

\textsuperscript{207} AN, MC, LXIX, 176, f. 223. It was stipulated that Nau has no control over his financial dealings with ‘certains personnes’. Above, Chapter Two, p. 135, footnote 221; Chapter Three, p. 160, footnote 62.

\textsuperscript{208} AN, MC, LXXIII, 90, f. 270; AN, MC, LXIX, 176, f. 224.

\textsuperscript{209} Sahlins, Unnaturally French, pp. 110-16.
Paget proffered may have been based on his identity as a banished Catholic, or more practically, his service for Mary Stuart. His reasons for wanting to become a naturalised Frenchman remain unclear. Perhaps the most likely explanation for seeking regnicolle status was the immunity it brought from the droit d'aubaine, the king’s right to seize the property of any foreigner dying his realm, and to disable a foreigner from making a valid will in France. By claiming this status, which was not particularly quick or cheap to gain, Paget perhaps hoped to guarantee the future of his fortune. This, rather than any personal attachment to the French Crown, was probably his main motivation, and he does not seem to have received any titles or offices from Henri III. His efforts demonstrate how the loyalties of English Catholics could be further complicated by residence abroad. Paget continued to look to England for the future, but this involved becoming a naturalised Frenchman whilst still proclaiming his status as an English Catholic refugee. More than other exiles appearing in notarial sources, Paget apparently viewed his will as a public declaration of his identity, even if the document had a limited audience. This in itself suggests an element of religious extremism: Englishmen of radical opinion in the sixteenth century also conceived of their last will and testament in such terms.

Testamentary evidence thus suggests that the self-representation of individuals abroad was complicated and varied. There is no clear distinction between those who saw themselves as exiled and those who showed signs of integration. Nor is there an exclusive link between those who were abroad on more ambiguous terms and those who still orientated themselves by their life in England.

3: Conclusion.

The existence of exiles, and the status of exile in general, were issues on which ideological barriers could be strengthened. The volatility of exile could be the source of division to the Catholic community itself, seriously in some cases. In this sense, the process by which exile was constructed and articulated could be similar to martyrdom,

210 However, the beneficiaries of his will would have been subject to the droit d'aubaine themselves, and thus unable to receive their bequests. In the event, Paget died in England after reconciliation with the Crown and the restoration of his English property. His fortune passed to his niece. ODNB, vol. 42, p. 344.

strengthening confessional identity whilst creating intra-confessional tension.\textsuperscript{212} Defences, whether outwardly laudatory or more qualified, and condemnations of exiles could contain contradictions. Where discernable, the voices of lay exiles, and Parisian exiles in particular, are also varied and complex. There were no easy answers for those grappling with how their own identity could be reconciled with the claims of the English Crown. They were aware of the risks they ran in leaving England, and the way in which they could be pursued or condemned by the government. Catholic leaders produced a host of works to exhort and guide, but these did not always provide a consistent or unambiguous line. Catholics abroad reflected this in the range of their responses to their dilemma. Even those individuals who can be interpreted as overtly and actively political in exile - those who in other circumstances may have made efforts at integration - would not renounce their original identity completely.\textsuperscript{213} The retention of their identity as subjects of the English Crown was significant for their relations with their French hosts. Their English Catholicism could be used to win sympathy and financial support. Paris offered the opportunity to embrace a persona of international significance, to adopt an exile identity, with all its advantages and risks, and to contribute to a militant international movement. This chapter has demonstrated that it is highly debatable that all chose to do so. In fact, the retention of an English identity was the main common element to a disparate group of laity in Paris. A continued interest in and affection for home is a central part of the generic exile mentality, but also indicates that some of those in Paris saw themselves as Englishmen abroad, not as exiles.\textsuperscript{214} They were interested in England because it was their home and they would soon return to it. Importantly, none of the English Catholics abroad in 1580 had been officially expelled by their government: those who were exiles were exiles because they had identified and presented themselves as such. Conversely, travellers or students did not see themselves as exiles and hence did not present themselves in this light.

\textsuperscript{212} Gregory, \textit{Salvation}, p. 314.

\textsuperscript{213} Tabori, \textit{Anatomy}, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{214} This stance aligns itself with Petrarch's views on exile, which were presumably known to English gentry abroad. Petrarch argued that an individual's inner attitude determined whether their experience is an exile: 'If you depart sad and dejected you will know without doubt that you are an exile; but if [...] willingly and with the same appearance and state of mind that you had at home... you are a traveller and not an exile'; cited by Tucker, \textit{Homo Viator}, p. 38. This metaphysical and Stoic definition, highlighting the importance of inner mental attitude rather than external compulsion alone, was given increasing emphasis in literary expositions of the later sixteenth century. Tucker, \textit{Homo Viator}, p. xiii.
The Protestant exile experience is sometimes interpreted through the anticipated epilogue to exile – return home. Historians have had much to say on the ways in which returning exiles made their impact on the emerging Protestant Church under Elizabeth. Because the Catholics did not return after a short exile to a restored Catholic England, their impact and their "success" cannot be measured in the same terms. Nevertheless, the strategies of those looking to return, and the subsequent actions of those Catholics who did return to England can tell us more about the impact of exile and how exiles viewed themselves. These issues are to be explored in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

1: Introduction.

Gottfried Locher has argued that all flights into exile should be cast as acts of political criticism, because exile itself contains an inherently anarchistic element.1 Where English Catholic exiles have received historical attention, they are usually viewed as opponents of the English government, or groups disruptive to the Catholic monarchies of Europe. Evidently, this view is not without foundation. English Catholics in Paris significantly polarised contemporary debates and quarrels. Directly or indirectly, they had a radicalising influence in the run-up to the League era. However, as previous chapters have demonstrated, this was not an entirely representative portrayal of the wider English Catholic presence abroad, whether in France, Spain or the Low Countries. Observations made regarding other exile groups are not always applicable for Catholics in Paris; this suggests the need for an alternative approach.

Standard works on English Catholicism generally characterise the English abroad as separate from those in England, operating one step removed from the kingdom. Scholars tend to assume, or at least do not challenge the view that 'the most seditious men were in exile'.2 As a result, there has been little consideration of the range of options available to English Catholic laity abroad. Rose correctly identifies the importance of the religious life for English Catholics by the seventeenth century, which embraced flight from the present secular world in search of God's promised land and a reunion with the divine after death.3 The English religious houses, which appeared in Catholic Europe from the close of the sixteenth century, are clear proof of this. However, Rose implies that the mission or an enclosed religious life were the only options compatible with an English Catholic experience of exile. This thesis has so far


2 Holmes, Resistance and Compromise, p. 182. Although Holmes acknowledges that numerically they may only have been a small proportion of Catholics abroad. Also Edwards, Jesuits in England, p. 21.

3 Rose, Conscience, p. 110.
qualified this view. In addition, the lay Catholic presence abroad needs to be further considered in terms of its impact on the character of Elizabethan Catholicism. This chapter will explore further some of the tensions surrounding that presence abroad - the differences amongst exiles, and the possible tension between exiles and their co-religionists at home - and how this influenced efforts to define English Catholic exile. It will suggest what it meant for Catholics in England to have a lay relative abroad, and how in the 1580s this could tie in with longer-term developments for English Catholicism.

The varied make up of the group is crucial to understanding their mixed motivations and aims. It contributed to the problematic nature of their identity, an identity which could be self-proclaimed, or imposed or suggested by others. Michael Brennan's work offers an interesting approach for assessing the significance of a minority group living in or visiting the continent. Brennan argues that for the Crown, the potential danger of having subjects abroad in the seventeenth century lay not so much in their encounter with Catholic countries but their exposure to alternative forms of government. In this sense, Locher's analysis is relevant: by leaving England, Catholics exposed themselves to influences which otherwise may have remained distant to them, such as the French Catholic League. However, there is no inevitable relationship between leaving home and directly embracing new ideas. The ways in which a large group inspired, reacted to, or interacted with radical activists in France were complex. This impacted on English Catholic communities abroad, and on the post-Reformation Catholic community in England and the latter's links to the continent.

2: A Transient Presence? The impact of events in France.

Due to scarcity of evidence, it is difficult to track the English experience of events in France in detail. French politics and religion in the 1580s were in a state of flux. The Catholic League is generally viewed as an organisation with long-term roots in religious ideals, dissatisfaction with the Valois monarchy, and the specific conditions of Paris. Its major platform – the defence of France's Catholic future – appealed to a broad audience of varied social status. However, support for the radicals was not immediately forthcoming; in fact, ideological barriers took some time to reach this state of

4 Brennan, 'English Civil War', p. 10.
polarisation. Until Anjou’s death in 1584, Henri III still had a Catholic heir, and had done much to stabilise royal authority. Open tension between Leaguers and Politiques were not a part of everyday life in Paris when the exile presence was increasing around 1580. In the earlier 1580s, this ‘mixed’ outlook within France was reflected in the English presence in Paris. The shifting political and religious terrain encouraged the residence of a large and diverse group, and must have continued to influence the group after its arrival. English Catholics had a range of reasons to be there; like Parisians, they could be Catholics whilst not being Leaguers. The situation they experienced in Paris is also of relevance to historiographical debates about the traditional or innovative character of Catholicism in England.

The instability of the Parisian environment proved advantageous to foreigners, both practically and ideologically. Jurisdictional quarrels between the Crown and University, and between University and the parochial infrastructure, allowed English and Scottish Catholics to carve out their own spaces. This was perhaps particularly important for the English, who lacked the institutions, representatives or figureheads of their Scottish counterparts. In the University English academics and probably other of their countrymen occupied and maintained a space in Collège Mignon whilst the Crown and University were competing for the right to own and control it. In the later 1580s, Englishmen connected to the University used the theft of their seal to assert their importance as a constituent group of the German Nation. The English did not obtain long-term change here, but their challenge to German dominance of their corporate identity implies a growing confidence on their behalf. In both cases, an assertion of the right to occupy a particular space, or to articulate a separate identity, tapped into debates or rivalries with deeper roots in the city’s history. Identifying pre-existing rivalries between various interest groups, the exiles were able to exploit them to further their own aims. Here, the peculiar circumstances of the later sixteenth century allowed for greater opportunities to exploit these long-established tensions.

---

5 This parallels Walsham’s argument for church papists in England: ‘...meaningful religious distinctions were only gradually evolving... those deceptively neat denominational labels we are so tempted to employ were profoundly anachronistic’. Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, conformity and confessional polemic in early modern England* (Woodbridge, 1993), p. 3.

6 Above, Chapter Two, pp. 104-108.

7 Above, Chapter Two, pp. 130-31.

8 Above, Chapter Two, p. 132.
As we have seen, exiles had a crucial role in anti-Valois propaganda. Exile propagandists continued to have a similar impact during Henri IV’s reign, when radical Catholics continued to question his right to rule. In 1598 a work against the French King was published in France by two Englishmen, Thwinge and Typping. The relationship between residence in Paris and seditious activity, however, was not inevitable. There was a range of reactions among native Parisians to contemporary events, and opinions likewise varied amongst the exiles. An exploration of their exile in Paris highlights what Bossy identifies as the ‘contradictions’ of Elizabethan Catholicism. These contradictions were present not only within the borders of the kingdom, but also amongst Catholics abroad.

The situation changed for foreigners in Paris after the League takeover of the city in 1588 and Henri III’s assassination the following year. Paris was no longer attractive to casual visitors or students, and the numbers of each dropped dramatically. Colleges were shut, with student accommodation being given over to soldiers during the crisis years. English families were now more likely to send their children to Eu, Reims or the Catholic Low Countries. The young Englishmen who visited and stayed in Paris as students or travellers in the 1580s had almost disappeared by 1588; many of those who remained in the city during the 1590 siege died there. In contrast, with the cessation of armed conflict the Low Countries regained status as a haven for English Catholics. We know little about how Leaguer Paris actually functioned, and there is even less to provide a view on how English exiles experienced the era. Correspondence was disrupted, and Englishmen probably found it very difficult to survive in a poorly supplied metropolis that was twice besieged.

9 TNA, SP 12/267/67, Charles Paget, A brefe note of the practises that divers Jesuites hath had for the killing of Princes and changing of states, June 1598. The licence for printing the book was obtained by Fr Holt, who apparently also paid some of the printing costs. For Thwinge, above, Chapter Two, p. 134, footnote 214; Chapter Three, p. 180, footnote 161.

10 Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 344.


13 Lechat dates the reorientation towards to the Low Countries as early as 1585. Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 144. Also Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 110; Proost, ‘Réfugiés’, p. 299.
Certainly, Catholics elsewhere were concerned for those living in Paris in the 1590s. Nevertheless, there are indications that the English presence was not completely curtailed. It is reasonable to suppose that those choosing to stay rather than relocate to a royalist city or leave France were more likely to support the League’s radicalism. However, those who did remain in Paris continued to associate with sites that had previously offered a foothold to a larger group of coreligionists. In 1590, Collège Mignon was still a central hub for exiles: Robert Tempest was ensconced there as the main conveyor of correspondence between England and Catholic Europe. This association with Collège Mignon both predated and outlived the League. Even before Paris submitted to Henri IV, Henry Constable, a Catholic convert and prominent advocate of Catholic toleration and political reconciliation in England, was in Paris. He tried to give the college a central role in representing the English in the city. So, even when the city was still under League rule, it continued to provide a forum for English Catholics with little interest in challenging the French Crown. Constable epitomised what Bossy describes as the ‘second emigration’. With a resurgent monarchy in France, and a new union of the English and Scottish crowns under James I and VI, Constable’s attitude to the English government and the circumstances he encountered in France were markedly different to his predecessors of the 1580s. Importantly, he had initially only been in Paris because he was sent in a diplomatic capacity by James I: his departure from England was thus very different to the exiles of the 1580s. Nevertheless, the possibility of a moderate Catholic finding a niche in an obdurately radical city is notable. It suggests that there was once again room for anomalies, or at least a degree of inconsistency. Leaguer rule was seen by royalists as an aberration from the norm. For

---

14 For the problems of communication, TNA, SP 15/31/109, Thomas Stilllington to Robert Tempest, Madrid, 24 January/3 February 1590; CSPD Addenda, 1580-1625, XXXI, no. 165, p. 313, Francis Englefield to Richard Hopkins, Madrid, 31 October/10 November 1590. By late October, Englefield expressed great concern for 'our fryndes in Parys (any be left alive)'. By this point he only had two contacts in Paris, Robert Tempest and Richard Hopkins; having heard from neither, he feared they had died. TNA, SP 15/31/166, Francis Englefield to William Gifford, Madrid, 31 October/10 November 1590.

15 Bossy, ‘Link’, pp. 134-35; CSPD Addenda, 1580-1625, XXXI, 101, p. 296, Francis Englefield to Robert Tempest, Madrid, 24 January/3 February 1589; CSPD Addenda, 1580-1625, XXXI, no. 108, p. 298, William Copley to Robert Tempest, Madrid, 24 January/3 February 1589; CSPD Addenda, 1580-1625, XXXI, no. 162, p. 312, William Copley to Robert Tempest, Madrid, 31 October/10 November 1590. Letters, packages, jewels and information were sent through him. He was probably a relative of exiled rebels of the same name. When the siege of Paris was lifted in September 1590, many of those English who had lived through it, including Tempest, left. Those who remained participated in the League States-General.

16 ODNB, vol. 13, p. 9. Constable may have been at Collège Mignon at an early stage, although he is generally associated with it later. He made efforts to improve provision and prospects for English in the city. Above, Chapter Three, pp. 195-96.
the English exiles, it offered continuity with sites of worship and study, and with a longer-term English presence in the city.

Within a few years, Paris was again to prove central to English Catholic activity, although this time the struggle was internecine rather than anti-government. By the late 1590s Catholics were splitting more clearly into pro-Jesuit and anti-Jesuit camps. Restored authority and stability in France offered the Appellants a profitable terrain on which to advance their complaints in the Archpriest controversy. Travelling to Paris, the Appellant representatives tried to exploit Henri IV’s need to prove his Catholic credentials to gain themselves international support. By the time they presented their second appeal in Rome in 1602, the French ambassador there was supporting their cause. The Appellants thus took this specifically English quarrel outside its Anglo-centric context. In the process, they perhaps tried to identify with the Gallican Church, as a model which was neither defined nor dominated by the Jesuits or Rome. Their arguments, the ways they bought into French religious politics to strengthen their cause, and the effect of Gallican writings on an English audience are beyond the scope of this study. Nevertheless, their experiences - despite their lack of proficiency in French - demonstrate that English Catholics felt some connection with their French neighbours, and were aware of how to mobilise support for their cause there: elements already


19 Meyer, England, pp. 419-21. Meyer possibly oversimplified the case by characterising the two groups as the Gallican Appellants, and the papal supremacist Jesuits. Not all seculars agreed with the Appellant stance. In addition, the role he attributes to anti-Spanish hostility in deciding the French to listen to the Appellants is debatable. Bossy has since argued that the French Crown could not have supported the Appellants on shared anti-Jesuit sentiment. At the time, it was increasingly supportive of the Jesuits. Bossy, ‘Henri IV’. The Appellants also secured the support of Etienne Pasquier and Anthoine Arnauld, whose works were known in English translation. Milward, Controversies, p. 123.

20 Salmon demonstrates how English translations of Gallican and politique literature may have affected English fear of the Jesuits. Salmon, ‘Gallicanism and Anglicanism’, pp. 173-74, 179-81. Tallon argues that the Anglican church functioned in Gallican discourse most often as a negative model, and that there was more than one type of Gallicanism; to conflate it with Anglicanism is misguided. Tallon, Conscience nationale, pp. 185-211. For a careful assessment of how the two influenced each other, Racaut, ‘Anglicanism and Gallicanism’.
observed amongst their predecessors in 1580s Paris. There were, of course, longer-term consequences to involving continental political powers in English Catholic quarrels – the exacerbation of existing divisions.21


3.1: A common cause with kin abroad.

If the most seditious Catholics were in exile, there were also those within England keen to promote their projects. In the field of political conspiracy, there was co-ordination or at least shared purpose between laity leaving England and their relatives remaining there. The latter, we know, offered both practical and moral support; in some cases, they may have acted as a fifth column within England. If not actually mobilising for a foreign invasion, relatives could keep hopes of Catholic restoration alive, rally support for exiled lords, or encourage greater commitment to recusancy. Certainly, the kin of fugitives were identified as sources of internal disruption by governments, as exemplified by the case of Jane Gascoigne and Richard Norton.22 As the daughter of Richard Norton, most of Jane Gascoigne’s male relatives were incapable of shoring up the family’s local standing, or raising support for its exiled members. However, Jane and her husband Richard, who was also involved in the 1569 revolt, were judged by ecclesiastical authorities to be religiously suspect by 1577; she appeared as a recusant into the early seventeenth century.23 Jane was also actively subversive, taking up the cause of executed, attainted and exiled kin. Several years after the revolt, she was ‘greatly suspected to be a recettor of passengers from beyond the seas, and a prevye supporter of her father’.24 Interestingly, the report does not specify if the new arrivals she accommodated were missionaries or Catholic laity re-entering the country. What is clear however, is Jane’s intention to maintain links with Europe, and that she seemed to act on her own initiative, rather than in response to clerical influence.

22 Stam, Contrary, p. 52.
23 The couple feature in Archbishop Sandys’ list of 1577. Dickens, ‘First Stages’, p. 175. Jane is in the Pipe Rolls for 1587/88, convicted for 6 months’ recusancy. CRS, 71, p. 66. In a 1604 survey, she appears as a ‘widowe... Recusant for divers years last past’. Peacock, (ed.), York, p. 82.
24 Aveling, Northern, p. 92; BL, Lansdowne Ms, 15, no. 95, Articles of Information exhibited by William Whartone gent of Ripon, 9 December 1572.
Jane Gascoigne offers an atypical example of the activity of those with family overseas. There were ways to realise a common purpose with relatives who were abroad permanently without committing to political activity. The case of the Houghtons demonstrates a range of possible attitudes in this regard. Thomas Houghton was classed as a 'banished Catholic' as early as the 1570s. His brother Richard was only granted a licence to visit Thomas on the grounds that he would bring him back to England and reconcile him to the Crown.\(^{25}\) He presumably had little intention of meeting these terms: Richard was also a Catholic, and was taking care of his absent brother's interests in England.\(^{26}\) It was equally important for Richard to return home after his foreign visit and protest loyalty as it was for Thomas to maintain his exile stance; one almost facilitated the other. Richard's travels and, crucially, his homecoming probably helped to prolong the latter's absence rather than curtail it. Thomas' exile was certainly made easier by his assistance. Interestingly, Richard was apparently the only relative to keep in contact with or support Thomas. Other kin did not assist Thomas, and may have tried to profit at his expense.\(^{27}\)

Strategies of long-term exile, accompanied by statements of loyalty to the Crown; of uneasy loyalism within England, including a record for recusancy and harassment by the authorities; and of renouncing an exiled relative could thus coexist within a family. Richard, a Catholic layman with experience of travel in Catholic Europe, supported close family members judged to be of dubious loyalty whilst trying to forge a loyalist path in Protestant England.\(^{28}\) Thomas was not a political agitator, but had deliberately removed himself from England. He nevertheless remained in close contact with his brother, and displayed evident continued attachment with home.\(^{29}\) Richard's actions as the family member remaining in England may not have been as unusual as they first appear. In some sense, they complement the strategies employed by members of other Catholic gentry families within England.

\(^{25}\) CRS, 13, p. 123; above, Chapter Four, pp. 247-48.

\(^{26}\) Honigman, Shakespeare, pp. 10-12.

\(^{27}\) ‘... And brethren all dyd thus me cross/And little regard my fall, save only on - that rued my loss /

\(^{28}\) Richard was held in suspicion for his connections to Edmund Campion. Honigman, Shakespeare, p. 11.

\(^{29}\) Above, Chapter Four, pp. 247-48.
3.2: Sources of tension.

The previous chapter explored the diverging potential contained within exile as rhetoric. As an experience, exile likewise provoked tension between Catholics in England and their countrymen and coreligionists in Europe. The difficulty stemmed less from individual laity abroad than from the exiles' leaders, and their attitudes and aspirations regarding their homeland. This issue is generally under-explored by historians. Scholarship usually concentrates on contemporary debates over the legitimacy of challenging a Protestant Crown, on the growing differences between noble exiles and their clerical leaders, or rivalries amongst lay exiles. Catholic attitudes within England are generally examined in isolation from those of their compatriots abroad. Our understanding of contemporary debates can be deepened by further attention to how Catholics overseas, who were outside the immediate circle of political activists, viewed the situation. We need also to examine Catholic opinions within England about the value and consequences of exile.

The potential for difference between exiled clerical leaders or aristocratic figureheads and the wider laity on the continent was being openly expressed by the 1590s. The reasons for these splits amongst those with an ostensible common identity and purpose have provoked scholarly debate. One interpretation places them in a wider context of revived Franco-Spanish rivalry for European dominance. Thus the rival groupings of English Catholics are categorised as pro-French or pro-Scottish, and pro-Spanish or pro-Jesuit. These groupings already held some resonance, but by the 1590s were polarised by the issue of the succession. Elizabeth was ageing and childless: the naming of her successor, which had informed Catholic debates throughout the reign, became urgent. Mary Stuart's execution had changed the parameters of this debate by

30 Read, Walsingham, vols. 2 and 3; Meyer, England, pp. 240-50, 289, 357; Bossy, 'Character', and 'Catholicity and Nationality'. The only explicit statements of exiled gentry's opinion of clerical leaders comes from the political activists. For example, TNA, SP 12/267/67, A Brief note of the Practises that divers Jesuites have had for killing Princes and changing of States, June 1598. The feud between Paget and Arundel is traced through the State Papers, including: CSPD Addenda, 1580-1625, XXIX, no. 39, pp. 149-50, Thomas Rogers to Walsingham, Rouen, 11 August 1585; CSPD, Addenda, 1580-1625, XXIX, no. 55, p. 158, Thomas Rogers to Walsingham, 16 December 1585. Extant English language sources thus privilege an exploration of quarrels between political activists.

31 The divisions manifested in the Appellant controversy of the 1590s have been variously explained as: a conflict between those of 'nationalist' and 'universal' Catholic tendencies; between Catholic gentry and the continentally-trained Catholic clergy; between competing conceptions of the post-Reformation Catholic church as a traditional or missionary church; and as part of the wider competition between France and Spain for European hegemony. For more on these views, Bossy, 'Catholicity and Nationality', p. 285.
removing the direct Catholic heir. Politically-aware Catholics apparently split into two
groups: a French or Scottish group, supporting the claim of James VI, hoping for his
conversion, or for toleration to be granted for Catholics; and a pro-Spanish group, many
of whom were in the pay of Philip II, promoting a Catholic Habsburg succession. The
perceived split between these parties was greatly influenced by those residing in French
and Spanish territories. Groupings were not always clear-cut: as we have seen, exiles
could live in the territories of one Catholic monarch whilst drawing maintenance from
another.32 Nevertheless, there was divergence over whether France or Spain should be
their ultimate protector.33 There was considerable disappointment at Henri III’s non-
performance as champion of their cause, and disillusionment at the failure of the Anjou
marriage and associated toleration in England. This had not pushed the large number of
English Catholics in France to leave immediately, but by the close of the 1580s there
was a drift towards Spanish territory.34 By 1594, when the League was losing its battle
against Henri IV, there were few English Catholic laity left in French territories.35
However, as the 1590s progressed there was also increased disillusionment about the
value of Spanish support in achieving Catholic restoration in England.

In some cases, the French/Spanish divide overlapped with the gentry/clergy
divide delineated by Bossy: individuals such as Charles Paget were pro-French and
virulently anti-Jesuit. Paget is certainly not representative as a spokesperson, but his
case indicates how destabilising these debates could be.36 In the 1590s, he launched a
campaign from Europe for the expulsion of the Jesuits from England. Writing to the
English government, he claimed Jesuit involvement in politics threatened English
Catholicism. He praised those who persevered in their faith without being in thrall to the

32 Above, Chapter Three, pp. 161-62.

33 Bossy sees this split as crystallising after Henri IV re-established control in France. Bossy, ‘Character’,
p. 54.


Countries in 1592 and 1593 respectively. A certain group of exiles, who had been close to the League and
were dissatisfied with Spain, did however return to France after the Peace of Vervins in 1598.

36 Paget’s stance could be described as anti-Spanish and anti-Jesuit, but he was not a loyalist in the same
way as the Appellant priests or Thomas Cornwallis, for instance.
Jesuits: they, he felt, 'have the longest endured for the faith'. Interestingly, Paget located the essential division between Jesuit and anti-Jesuit; both groups had members in England and Catholic Europe. Thus resistance to Jesuit domination was the task of 'the principal Catholics, both in England and on this side the sea'. He envisaged an anti-Jesuit front stretching across the Channel, encompassing those abroad and within England. Unsurprisingly, Paget's schema simplifies the situation somewhat. By the late 1590s, the idea of a clear clerical/lay split had been further complicated. An anti-Jesuit consensus, for instance, could exist between laity and certain clergy, and clergy could be sympathetic to particular lay ideas. Hence, the divides in the English Catholic community could be more multifarious than their own protagonists suggested.

A similar volatility and bitterness is discernable in Protestant exile communities, although the causes of their divisions were different in character. The wrangles of Marian exile communities were often about religious liturgy, which had profound implications for the future character of their church. Catholics abroad never shared this urgent need to define devotional practice. Those in Paris could fit into existing liturgical provision, and draw on established precedents in a way their Protestant counterparts in the German speaking lands could not. Catholics argued about the identity and actual purpose of their 'community' in a more dispersed sense, rather than how that community, in a defined, congregational sense, expressed itself in religious ritual.

In England, the 1590s saw a flurry of writing debating the legitimacy of Elizabeth's rule and the succession. Given the queen's attitude to the discussion of these questions, this was more easily produced outside England. The succession was particularly controversial: few, whether they were at home or outside England, were happy to accept the prospect pushed by Persons of a Habsburg on the English throne. Henry Constable, a gifted Catholic polemicist, opposed the pro-Spanish party in

37 TNA, SP 12/267/67, A Brief note of the Practises that divers Jesuites have had for killing Princes and changing of States, June 1598. Interestingly, Paget's appeal to the English government for the expulsion of the Jesuits predated that of the appellant clergy. He appeared to have some of the same grievances of this group, but was acting independently of them.

38 Bossy argues that the common ground between appellant clergy and laity was only as deep as their hostility to the Jesuits: ultimately, their aims were divergent. Bossy, Community, p. 39.

39 Persons envisaged a Habsburg succession as the realisation of an ideal, essential unity between the Low Countries and England, reflecting the 'true' Christian past of both kingdoms. Bossy, 'Catholicity and Nationality', p. 293. The concept of a common Saxon history, identity, and Christianity was also pushed by Verstegan.
published and unpublished writings. In 1597, for instance, he reiterated to the Earl of Essex the argument that toleration was the only route to stability and eventual spiritual unity. His history and the conditions of his exile were very different to the Paris group of the 1580s, but his viewpoint on the toleration issue apparently aligned with the authors of Leicester's Commonwealth. Meanwhile, an anonymous fellow exile and contemporary of Constable employed arguments identical to those of Leicester's Commonwealth to promote toleration. He gave Burghley examples of other states, where toleration had bought only benefits:

We see what safety it hath been to France, how peaceable the kingdom of Polonia is where no man's conscience is forced, how the Germans live, being contrary in religion without giving offence one to another. Why might we not do the like in England seeing every man must answer for his own soul at the latter Day.

Constable and the other man wrote from exile – Paris and Liège respectively – and both were keen to reject the pro-Spanish, anti-toleration attitudes associated with their clerical leaders. Ironically, this hostility was shared by exiles who did not advocate moderation and loyalism, albeit for different reasons. Charles Paget, a very different kind of English gentleman abroad to Constable, also condemned Persons' work. As we have seen, Paget committed to a more hard-line stance as the 1580s progressed, and associated with those closely connected to the English mission. Nevertheless, his

---

40 Constable's Discoverye of a Counterfecte Conference (1600), published in Paris under a false Cologne imprint, was a refutation of A Conference about the next succession to the crowne of Ingland... whereunto is added new and perfect arbor or genealogie of the discents of all the kinges and princes of Ingland ([Antwerp],1594). This work is thought to be a collaborative venture between Persons, Allen, Francis Englefield and Richard Verstegan. Allison and Rogers (ed.), Contemporary Printed Literature, vol. 2, no. 167, pp. 40-41. Constable converted in the early 1590s, although his views on religious division predated this. Bossy, 'Link', pp. 191-97.


42 'Salisbury', HMC, 9, part 7, p. 364, (?) to Lord Burghley, Liège, 24 August 1597. Towards the end of Leicester's Commonwealth, the Protestant gentleman voices a similar opinion: 'all the world beholdeth at this day in all the countries of Germany, Polonia, Boemland and Hungary... We see in France... what peace, wealth and reunion hath ensued in that country, that was so broken, dissevered, and wasted before'. Peck (ed.), Commonwealth, pp. 184-85.

43 In fact, even clerics considered to be the most pro-Spanish/Jesuit did not continue to advocate resistance beyond 1596: Persons' subsequent work shifted to a more moderate stance. Holmes, Resistance and Compromise, p. 205.

44 Above, Chapter Four, pp. 252-55.
condemnation of Persons’ *Conference About the Next Succession* was unambiguous. Paget described the work as ‘to the prejudice of the Nobility and ancient custom and laws and privileges of England’, the elements he saw as pillars of English Catholicism. Admittedly, the situation for exiles in the early 1580s and the late 1590s had changed considerably. Nevertheless, the outpourings of radical and moderate writers are concerned with some of the same issues: loyalty to the Crown, and the legitimacy of launching resistance or seeking toleration.

In addition to the divergence between lay exiles and their clerical figureheads, there appears to have been a growing distance between the continentally based mission and Catholics remaining in England. Some lay exiles had reservations about the arguments of Persons and others on the grounds of their inherent radicalism, reservations which were shared by Catholics within England. Those in England presumably felt an added sense of distance, or alienation, from the printed arguments of fellow countrymen on the continent. Holmes argues that despite claims that Persons’ and Allen’s ideas was unpopular in England, ‘very little criticism of their political ideas appears to have been made at the time’. However, there are suggestions of dissension. Political activists in Paris were not always happy with the clerical leadership and their foreign colleagues; coreligionists in England were also disgruntled, if for different reasons. Sir Thomas Cornwallis, for instance, continued to steer a course of loyalism and enjoyed royal favour despite a reputation for recusancy and the dubious activities of various kin. He did not isolate himself from potentially beneficial links with Catholic Europe. He sent some of his sons abroad for an education, was a keen reader of books and news from the continent, and maintained a lively interest in European affairs into his old age. At the same time, he objected to pro-Spanish refutations of the English

---

45 Paget may have funded the printing of Constable’s *Discoverye of a Counterfecte Conference*. Bossy, ‘Link’, p. 197.

46 TNA, SP 12/267/67, A Brief note of the Practises that divers Jesuites have had for killing Princes and changing of States, June 1598.

47 Holmes, *Resistance and Compromise*, pp. 169, 176. He rightly emphasises that those laity who published their views were closely connected to the clerical leaders.

48 Above, Chapter Two, pp. 119-120, footnote 145.

49 Jason Scott-Warren, ‘News, Sociability and Bookbuying in Early Modern England: The Letters of Sir Thomas Cornwallis’, *The Library*, 7th series, 4 (2000), 388-95. The Cornwallis named in the 1580 list may have been one of his sons. TNA, SP 78/4a/63. Alternatively, he may have been in Paris himself: government reports record that an old man named Cornwallis was also there. *CRS*, 53, p. 204.
government’s legitimacy. Writing to a friend in 1592 Cornwallis expressed anger at works produced on the continent that condemned government measures against seminary priests.\textsuperscript{50} Evidently, his anger was less at the inherent message of the work than at its practical consequences for Catholics in England. Cornwallis told his correspondent that Catholics in England would suffer increased harassment as a result of Persons’ work:

I am very sorry and so (I am sure) be all good Catholics of these lewd libelles. It will but exasperate matters... They be out of the rech themselves and therefore do not regard what we endure.\textsuperscript{51}

Subsequent scholars suggest his articulation of this view had as much to do with expediency and personal circumstance as genuine conviction.\textsuperscript{52} Certainly we need to consider possible motivations for adopting this stance.\textsuperscript{53} Having retained royal favour, Cornwallis had greater reason than most to be seen to be expressing such opinions. Nevertheless, his letter demonstrates that not all Catholics were happy with ideas threatening to the status quo in England. Cornwallis’ reaction to works that provoked problems for Catholics in England was shared by both laity and clergy.\textsuperscript{54} Catholics within England could thus distinguish between themselves and their countrymen abroad, or at least their clerical leaders in Europe.

\textsuperscript{50} Cornwallis was probably referring to a work by Persons published in France, Germany, Italy and the Low Countries between 1591 and 1593, entitled \textit{Elizzabethae Angliae Reginae saevissimum in Catholicos sui regni edictum... Cum responsione ad singula capita... per D Andriam Philopatrum presbyterum}. This was a reaction to the vitriolic royal proclamation of 18/28 October against seminary priests and Jesuits. McGrath and Rowe, ‘Cornwallis’, p. 258. Also Philip Hughes, \textit{The Reformation in England} (3 vols, London, 1952-1954), vol. 3, pp. 381-82; Meyer, \textit{England}, pp. 350-52.

\textsuperscript{51} Bodleian Library, Tanner MS. 285, no 27, Thomas Cornwallis to John Hobart, 8 June 1592, cited by McGrath and Rowe, ‘Cornwallis’, p. 257-58, and Scott-Warren, ‘News, Sociability and Bookbuying’, p. 392. This was not the only instance of Cornwallis condemning his radical coreligionists on the continent. In 1595 he wrote: ‘... how so ever the publyssher of suche pamphltettes please themselves wythe the Raylyng; I ame suer the same yeldes no pleasure to the Catholikes at home.’ Scott-Warren, ‘News, Sociability and Bookbinding’, p. 393.

\textsuperscript{52} Holmes, \textit{Resistance and Compromise}, p. 179.

\textsuperscript{53} In attacking Persons, Paget implied that as a priest Persons interfered in the sphere in which gentry were meant to act. Perhaps Paget would not have objected so much to clerical ‘meddling’ in political matters if Persons and Allen had not decided to exclude him from the inner circle planning the invasion of England in 1582. Knox (ed.), \textit{Allen}, no. CCXXIII, pp. 391-94. For more on Paget’s reaction to being excluded, \textit{CSPD Addenda, 1580-1625, XXIX}, 39, p. 151, Thomas Rogers to Walsingham, Rouen, 13 August 1585. Persons always claimed that Paget was inspired by a grudge, and had said as much to a priest as he left France. For more on Paget’s antipathy to the clerical mission, \textit{CRS}, 58, no. 87, pp. 202-203, William Allen to Charles Paget, Rome, 4 January 1592.

\textsuperscript{54} Walsham, ‘’Domme Preachers’’, p. 102; Bluet, \textit{Important Considerations}, p. 32.
Despite extensive links with those at home, there is a sense that by the 1590s if not before, exiles were losing touch with their coreligionists, or at least failing to grasp the realities of daily life under a hostile regime. Dillon observes that the split was also a social divide: the exiles were highborn, whilst those in England were of the 'middling sort'. This may require some qualification. Those abroad were generally from the higher social echelons, but of mixed rank and status. Moreover, there were some gentry within England who were not unqualified supporters of their exiled leaders, and held the Jesuits in suspicion. George Brown, a son of Viscount Montague, would not welcome Jesuits into the family home, although he recognised them as sources of moral authority. He wanted advice on whether a woman he wished to marry could be considered released from a previous agreement, and felt they could offer useful guidance. Brown sent his servant to find and consult a Jesuit, rather than giving orders for the priest to be brought to him. This more convoluted route was due to his father's intransigence: 'Sir George would not bring any Jhezeut or Semenary Preest to Cowdray because my Lorde woulde have none of them come within his house'. The Viscount was not isolated from new developments, having had kin in Catholic Europe in the 1570s, but allowing a Jesuit into his own home was apparently a very different matter. Although other evidence does not come from impartial sources, it seems his attitude was not exceptional. In 1598, Paget asserted that Catholics who 'have longest endured for the cause... do not nor will not receave theme [the Jesuits] into theyr houses'. Thus exile, particularly in its more political manifestations, could divide those of a shared background. Those in England did not necessarily support the activity of gentry outside the kingdom who were living in very different conditions. The latter were at least perceived to sometimes embrace radicalism more readily.

55 McClain, Lest We Be Damned, pp. 6, 29.
56 Dillon, Construction, p. 9.
58 In 1579, Lord Montagu was one of the Catholics expected to be appointed to the Privy Council. Above, Chapter One, p. 80, footnote 218. The two Browns listed as students in 1580 were probably relatives. The George Brown mentioned above could be the son of Anthony Brown, Viscount Montagu, who was implicated in Norfolk's prospective marriage to Mary Stuart. It is not clear exactly why Montagu refused to accommodate a Jesuit: fear of detection probably exacerbated any larger objections.
59 TNA, SP 12/267/67, A brefe note of the practises that divers Jesuites hath had for the killing of Princes and changing of states, June 1598.
The risk of slippage between exile expectations and actual conditions in the homeland is common to most exile experiences. There were, for instance, similar tensions between Huguenots in France and those who left for Stranger churches in England. Exiles accused coreligionists in France of compromise and temporising, and cultivated an independent identity as God’s little flock. For the English Catholic movement, such tensions took time to surface and crystallise, but the longer their absence from home, the greater the probability of this slippage. Some loss of perspective on the real situation in England was almost inevitable. Dillon observes that Persons’ writings suffered from the physical and practical distance between him and the English laity he often addressed. This distance reflected a wider difficulty between exiled leaders and Catholics in England. In the early years, it seems the English in Europe were well informed about events running up to the 1569 revolt. Knowing the earls’ mixed motivation, and French and Spanish ambivalence, they favoured the cause without rushing to support the rebels. Busse even argues that at this point the exiles had a more realistic view of the chances of a successful revolt than those in England.

However, this balance began to shift, and by the early 1580s the hopes of Catholics abroad were probably one step behind events in England. This could have an impact on the way in which potential foreign powers reacted to exile requests for support in armed invasion. Foreign commentators were also aware that the exiles’ hopes might not have been realistic. In 1583, the Spanish Ambassador to France assessed conditions on the continent amongst those with vested interests in an invasion of England. De Tassis relayed the conviction of Allen and others that a landing would be immediately supported by Catholics within England: ‘They are so confident of success... that it is

---

60 Cottret, Huguenots, p. 8.


62 Lechat commented on the lack of understanding amongst exiles in the Low Countries that things in England had changed. Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 206.

63 Busse, ‘Anti-Catholic’, p. 27.

64 For example, the hopes of English in Italy regarding Elizabeth’s marriage to Anjou in 1580. Above, Chapter Two, p. 118, footnote 139.

65 Meyer argues the Spanish would not commit fully to exile requests as they realised their claims were not accurate. Rome was more willing to believe them, and thus keener before 1588 to launch an invasion. Meyer, England, pp. 278-94.
impossible for anyone hearing them to help being convinced'. 66 Declaring his own support for an invasion of England, De Tassis was nevertheless aware of a possible gap between exile hopes and the chances of real success. He admitted to Philip II that 'exiles are apt to be sanguine'. 67 In fact, it seems Philip was well aware of this. In 1586, the Venetian ambassador to Spain reported his careful reaction to the exiles' claims:

...there are some great English Lords who promise much... But the King is prudent and knows quite well that exiles can never be fully trusted. 68

The impetus for invasion is usually seen as coming from without whilst Catholics in England, reconciling their faith with a duty of obedience to the Crown, did not have such a polarised outlook. In fact, not all in England categorically rejected the prospect of invasion, and not all exiles were set on it. Those who did could not always convince Catholics monarchs of their reliability. Meanwhile, Catholics in England trying to distance themselves from conspiracies stressed the contrast between themselves and conspirators abroad. In doing so, they inadvertently strengthened the government's claims about the exiles by confirming hostile portrayals of their disloyal coreligionists in Europe.

Studies on the emerging international Protestant cause in the British Isles observe how exiled contingents of a religious minority were particularly committed to international projects which promoted common ground with foreign parties. 69 The involvement of some exiles in French debates in Paris and in projects promoting an invasion of England support this view. Although a small proportion of a much larger group, they were active or vociferous in initiating or supporting action against Elizabeth I. This minority was backed by a group of zealous laymen and priests in England,

66 Calendar Simancas, no. 345, p. 484, Juan Bautista De Tassis to the King [Philip II], 24 June 1583; Calendar Simancas, no. 361, p. 508, De Tassis to the King [Philip II], 15 November 1583.
67 Calendar Simancas, no. 361, p. 483, De Tassis to the King [Philip II], 15 November 1583.
68 Calendar Venice, 1581-1590, p. 160, Vincenzo Gradenigo, Venetian ambassador to Spain, to the Doge and Senate, Madrid, 1 May 1586.
69 Kellar, Scotland, pp. 149-50, 155-83. The Genevan congregation were unique amongst the Marian exiles in promoting this vision. Elsewhere, Obermann has argued that Calvin had a very international vision of his church, as a gathered church in exile, which could not be located and identified in a geographical location. Consequently, its enemies were throughout Europe, not just in Rome. Heiko K. Obermann, 'Europa Afflicta: The Reformation of the Refugees', Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, 83 (1992), pp. 107-110.
promoting an international solution to the problem of their religious future. However, the association between exile, sedition and an international outlook can rest, as we have seen, on an uncritical acceptance of particular sources. In the Catholic case, there was negativity towards a foreign-backed crusade. For instance, some English Catholics were dissatisfied with the Pope's Irish enterprise in 1580, particularly because Nicholas Sander had met his death there. Sander was highly respected, and viewed as a major Catholic figurehead by certain parties. They felt he had been sacrificed to Rome's international schemes instead of being allowed to sustain his countrymen. So, at home or in exile it became highly contentious to align hopes for England's future with a larger vision of the Catholic world. The experience of exile did not necessarily bring unqualified openness to international Catholic plans, especially if they appeared to jeopardise particularised English objectives. Like their allegiance to the English Crown, the subjugation of English Catholics to wider international ambitions could be conditional and contested. This kind of tension, negotiation, and conflict remained with English Catholics, at home and overseas.

Another model of exile, based on quietness and retreat, was available to Catholics abroad. This was obviously expressed in the English religious houses abroad, but the inclination for a religious life was only one possible response to Paris' religious and devotional revival. The city apparently had multiple functions for English and Scottish laity, allowing them to discover or confirm a Catholic identity. It allowed an outward Catholicism unavailable at home, which did not have to include activity against their native government. Paris was also an important space for the conversion of Protestants. Its role here was not limited to the 1580s, but conversions took on an immediate importance in the period. The English ambassador was concerned about the
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70 In 1580 it was rumoured he would be raised to the cardinalate at the same time as Allen. DNB, vol. 7, pp. 749-50; ODNB, vol. 48, pp. 859-62. Calendar Simancas, no. 79, p. 97, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 6 April 1581; Calendar Simancas, no. 94, p. 118, The King [Philip II] to Mendoza, 28 May 1581; Calendar Simancas, no. 222, p. 301, Mendoza to the King [Philip II], 1 March 1582. For more on Sander, Pollen, English Catholics, pp. 300-304.

71 An individual in exile can acknowledge and advertise their national or religious identity for the first time. Time abroad could be the first instance in which individuals openly took on a Catholic identity. Abigail Lee Six, 'Juan Goytisolo's Portable Patria: Staying on Home Ground Abroad', Writing in Exile: Renaissance and Modern Studies, 34 (1991), pp. 83-84.

number of conversions that apparently took place on arrival in the France.\footnote{TNA, SP 78/4a/16, Cobham to Walsingham, Paris, 20 February 1580. ‘ther cometh hither wekelie dyvers gentleman... which doe alter their religione, and at ther cominge are accompanied by such as are papists, and malitiouslie bent towarde the state’.
} These may have been church papists openly embracing their faith in a Catholic environment. In other cases, however, Paris acted as a catalyst for conversion. Some converts confirmed Protestant fears by becoming partisans of the international Catholic cause or key missionaries.\footnote{The 1581 Act to Retain the Queen’s Majesty’s Subjects in their obedience made a distinction between punishing those who were already Catholic by fine and imprisonment, and punishing those who became Catholic by death. Conversion was equated with withdrawal of allegiance from the English crown. Meyer, England, p. 148.} A notorious example is the conspirator and agent provocateur William Parry, who apparently converted in Paris, befriended Thomas Morgan, and took an oath to kill Elizabeth. Parry’s career as a government agent and subsequent execution complicates any interpretation of his conversion. Either he became a Catholic zealot on conversion, or his conversion was a cover for double-dealing. In the first scenario, Paris was a genuine ground for conversion; in the latter, it was used in the belief it would provide a sufficiently convincing story. Either way, Paris was viewed as a hotspot for such activity.\footnote{In one statement, Parry claimed to have been reconciled to the Church twice, in Paris and Milan. Leo Hicks, ‘The Strange Case of Dr William Parry’, Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review, 37 (1948), 343-62; Read, Walsingham, vol. 2, pp. 399-406. For an official version of his story, see Thomas Cromwell’s parliamentary journal for the 24 February 1585, in Hartley (ed.) Proceedings, vol. 2, pp. 84-88. Parry had also been working in the distribution network for Catholic books in England. Bossy, Bruno, pp. 34, 54-55. For more on his execution, Bossy, Molehill, pp. 96-99, 132-34, 142-43.
}

As the venue for conversion, Paris could also inspire a different kind of zeal. George Gilbert was received into the church in Paris by the English Jesuit Thomas Darbishire. He became an invaluable patron and protector of the English mission.\footnote{Persons was his godfather. Dillon, Construction, p. 175; CRS, 58, pp. 20, 115; Pollen, English Catholics, p. 342; McCoog, ‘Mission’, p. 208; above, Chapter Four, p. 241.} Conversion in Paris did not have to provoke radical mobilisation. The Scottish earl William Douglas converted in Paris after being deeply influenced by the spirituality of Henri III’s court and disputations at the Sorbonne. Evidently it was French religious culture that inspired him, rather than Scottish or English clerics. Returning to Scotland, he abjured Catholicism but was still implicated in anti-government conspiracies. With James VI’s permission, Douglas retired to France and a life of Catholic piety, attending daily services at the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. His funeral in 1611, a clear signal of his standing as a devout nobleman, was attended by a number of French
bishops, and French and foreign notables, including the English Ambassador. Douglas demonstrates the viability of a non-oppositional route for Scottish nobles abroad. Clear evidence for his English counterparts is less forthcoming, but we can assume they had the same opportunity. In the 1590s, for instance, Henry Constable openly embraced Catholicism in France; we can assume the possibility likewise existed in the 1580s.

The process of conversion was neither necessarily rapid, nor the result of the pressure of being a 'heretic' in a Catholic country. John Healy, for example, took the opportunity to attend Mass in France and Italy. He did not undergo rapid conversion, but a gradual process that culminated in his reception into the church in Florence in 1606.

Paris, then, could be a place of experimentation and exploration for potential converts, allowing for the cultivation of pious and devotional practices. Recognised as a refuge for political fugitives, it was also a haven for those who converted in their homeland and left for religious rather than political reasons. The young Englishman Samuel Debenham, forced into hiding after being caught at Mass, 'decided to go to France where he would be free to serve God according to his conscience'. For the Scottish academic and polemicist Archibald Hamilton, Paris in 1576 was also an ideal refuge from the Protestant homeland he renounced.

---


78 Wickes, ‘Constable’, pp. 275-76, 296; ODNB, vol. 13, p. 9. He later wrote that his conversion was God's plan, but also the result of his own careful study. He does not mention concrete circumstances; it is not definite he converted in Paris, but it was certainly in Northern France.

79 TNA, SP 14/20/80, fourth examination of John Healy, 27 April 1606, cited by Warneke, Traveller, p. 173.

80 Debenham went on to enter the order of Friars Minim: he was an author and active missionary in France. Debenham spent part of his life in the convent in Nigeon, just outside Paris. David Rogers, ‘An English Friar Minim in France’, Recusant History, 10 (1969-70), p. 274.

81 DNB, vol. 8, p. 1022; ODNB, vol. 24, pp. 768-69. Hamilton was no stranger to France: he had been there in 1548 and 1553. He is listed as procureur of the German Nation in 1581. Notarial records show Hamilton's involvement in the Nation's activities. For example, AN, H*2590, Livre des receveurs de la nation d'Allemagne; AN, MC, LXXIII, 84, ff. 464-465v; AN, MC, LXXXIII, 86, f. 205; AN, MC, LXXIII, 86, ff. 257-263; AN, MC, LXXXIII, 88, f. 105. Hamilton was one of the Scottish priests in Paris agitating for a return to Scotland, even at the risk of their lives. William Forbes-Leith (ed.), Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI (Edinburgh, 1885), p. 196. For his Parisian-printed work dedicated to Mary Stuart, Allison and Rogers (eds.), Contemporary Printed Literature, vol. 1, nos. 630-32, pp. 88.
English authorities saw the chance of their subjects falling into error increased by exposure to continental Catholic culture. Prior to 1581, some licences to travel overseas were granted on condition that the individual would avoid Rome, which was viewed in the English literary imagination as the den of the Antichrist. John Bamforde was even granted a licence to go abroad with specific instructions to bring his wife back from the dangers of the continent.82 Meanwhile, Protestant fathers tried, sometimes unsuccessfully, to control the itinerary of their sons' travels, excluding places and company that presented the greatest Catholic danger.83 On both sides of the confessional divide, conversion was seen as vindication of the cause. Thus Paris' role as a conversion site made it a milieu full of danger or promise, depending on ideological perspective.

Recent historiography accepts that recusancy was not the only measure of Catholicism: whilst the government were determined to categorise them as recusants and traitors, Catholics configured a different identity for themselves.84 This was true for those abroad and in England. A significant proportion of Catholics in Paris in the early 1580s probably came from church papist families.85 In fact, of the known 139 licences granted for overseas travel between 1572 and 1582, about one quarter went to Catholic individuals or those with Catholic connections.86 Some individuals probably saw different opportunities in Paris than their more hard line coreligionists, and a stay in

---

82 TNA, E 157/1, Licences to pass beyond sees [1572-78]. Bamforde was allowed to go in search of his wife and a Mr Stapleton, '... to the end he may persuade them to returne'.
83 Brennan (ed.), 'Somerset', pp. 20-21; above, Chapter One, p. 79, footnote 214. The most famous seventeenth-century case was that of Tobie Matthewe, son of the future Archbishop of York. He went to Italy against his parents' wishes and converted there. ODNB, vol. 37, p. 350; John Stoye, English Travellers in Europe 1604-1667: Their Influence in English Society and Politics (Revised edn., London, 1989), pp. 76-77.
85 Of the 347 Catholics listed in Paris in 1580, at least 124 neither had a subsequent record for recusancy, nor appeared in government documents relating to Catholic activity. These findings are based on a systematic search of printed recusant rolls and surveys up until 1604, a search in the indexes of the State Papers, and the use of a range of other related material. Given that the recusant rolls are neither exhaustive nor the only way to measure English Catholic sympathy or sentiment, they do necessarily offer a generalised picture.
86 TNA, E 157/1, Licenses to pass beyond sees [1572-1578]; TNA, SP 12/154/5, List and particulars of licenses granted to sundry noblemen and gentlemen to travel beyond the seas, 28 February 1572-12 June 1582. 33 of the 139 have suggestions of Catholic links.
Paris did not have to result in determined recusancy. By 1585, for instance, increased government surveillance of ports had brought a man named Hearne under suspicion. Questioned on Hearne’s religious credentials, the undersearcher at Rye claimed that:

When he was in Fraunce he was a Papest and when he was in Ingland... he was a protestand.

On these grounds, Hearne’s correspondence was opened. It revealed clear ties to Catholic communities in England and on the continent, particularly France. He was not a convinced Protestant, whatever his show of outward conformity. At the same time, his support of Catholics at home and abroad was not seditious in the sense the government usually portrayed such actions as. Hearne’s correspondence actually contained efforts to dissuade other Catholics from anti-government activity. In one letter, a Mr Brown was told

> to be cercomspect and wary in [all] that he toke in hande consernyng hys Religion... to be pacient untyll such tyme that god had better provided for them.

This evidence, even when filtered through a hostile government source, nevertheless conveys a sense of opportunity for religious negotiation. Hearne apparently passed frequently across the Channel despite government directives. In France, he could practice openly as a Catholic, presumably alongside Frenchmen and exiles. Once back in England, he conformed: being described as Protestant ‘when in England’ implies regular attendance at parish liturgy rather than recusancy. Assuming he maintained this for some time before incurring the authorities’ suspicions, Hearne was able to remain a part of his ‘native’ parish community whilst being actively engaged with Catholic communities in Europe. We know little about his background, but he may not have been alone in combining time in Catholic Europe with a position in his locality.

Hearne’s case illustrates the possibility that other long-term exiles may not have fitted the hostile categorisation of them as dedicated anti-government activists. In fact,

---

87 Haigh argues that recusancy, particularly in the North, was not the result of missionaries. He claims it existed in the 1570s in areas unchartered by seminary priests. Haigh, 'Continuity', pp. 191-92. If we accept the denial of a positive link between missionary priests and recusancy, the possibility of an absolute link between time spent abroad and subsequent recusancy could be similarly reduced.

88 TNA, SP 12/176/71, Inspection of letters at Rye from Papists in France, February [?] 1585.
limited evidence offers a more complicated picture, and suggests that they may have had things in common with church papists who had not left England. For instance, when corresponding with members of the Elizabethan government, some long-term Spanish pensioners claimed a longer standing allegiance to the English Crown. This is normally dismissed as the opportunism of individuals who were in difficulty abroad. Perhaps these were attempts, however problematic, to reconcile conflicting loyalties: in this sense they are comparable to the declarations of loyalty made by church papists inside England. Removal from the country obviously rendered these assertions more tenuous. When Sir Timothy Mockett approached Burghley in 1594, he stressed his constant loyalty to Elizabeth. Despite twenty-two years in Spanish territories and a pension from Philip II, he claimed to have:

...opposed myself against the intemperate speeches of strangers with the hazard of my lyf offering to maintain the Honour of our Nation things of no good digestion in these parts.

His defence of Elizabeth apparently risked him friends and favours, even his life, but he did not shirk from a natural duty as her subject. Mockett promised to offer real proof of his loyalty should reconciliation be effected. He claimed he would forego his present existence, maintained by his wife and a Spanish pension, to dedicate the remainder of his life to Elizabeth's service. His oath of loyalty as a soldier of Philip II would, he claimed, be void as soon as he withdrew from service. Mockett nonetheless injected a conditional element into this, requesting that he serve Elizabeth in the Low Countries, rather than England, and that his employment pose no threat to Spanish interests. His natural allegiance was with England, but he also felt some obligation to those who maintained him in a lengthy exile:

...as I holde it un juste for any man to procure the Ruine of his Countrey, so is it not lawful to deceive them that trust him.89

89 TNA, SP 12/248/24, Sir Timothy Mockett to Lord Burghley, Antwerp, 9 July 1594. Mockett received a Spanish pension from 1584 until his death.
His marriage to a member of a ruling family in the Low Countries must also have increased his obligations there. Certainly his ties to the host government were sufficiently strong to complicate his ‘natural’ duty to England.

It is unclear how much of Mockett’s appeal was rhetoric, and how much was genuine sentiment. He was part of a larger group of individuals who sought pardon from the Crown at some point after 1588. They were perhaps driven less by an immediate desire to return to Protestant England than a wish to escape the disfavour of the Habsburg authorities. Of the twenty reported as suitors for pardon, at least six were of the ‘Scottish faction’, or generally troublesome and ill disposed to Philip II. Their attempt at reconciliation in the 1590s was probably inspired by internal quarrels amongst exiles as much as by a desire to return to Protestant England.

Mockett’s appeal was unsuccessful: on one level, he anticipated this response. He recognised it would be highly unusual for Elizabeth to pardon him, as it would not be of immediate practical advantage to the government. As he put it:

I am not ignorant... that in matter of state it is a new president to give mercy upon so barren an offer, and no service done.

Many individuals were pardoned only after providing intelligence on fellow Catholics abroad. Either Mockett had no intelligence to offer in 1594, or he was unprepared to

---

90 Mockett married the sister of governor Baptiste Dublys. After his death, she appealed to the Habsburg government for financial aid for herself and their three children. Loomie, Spanish, Appendix 3, p. 254.

91 ‘Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House’, Historic Manuscripts Commission, 9, part 13 (1915), pp. 117-18. The names of such fugitives as desire by her Majesty’s favour and pardon to return into England. The document itself is calendared as ‘after 1572’; using other evidence it can be dated to after 1588. It was probably after 1591, when one of the men listed, William Momperson, apparently left England. For more on Ralph Liggons, also listed, below, pp. 295-97.


93 TNA, SP 12/249/24, Sir Timothy Mockett to Lord Burghley, Antwerp, 9 July 1594.
compromise his Habsburg hosts by doing so.\textsuperscript{94} Even given the rhetoric of petition, Mockett seemed clear about where his various allegiances began and ended. His vision did not align with what the Elizabethan government would have demanded of a repentant Catholic exile, but nor did it easily coalesce with the approach demanded by the leaders of the English mission.

Thomas Copley's correspondence reveals an exile explicitly trying to negotiate and articulate a complex of identities over time. He defended his acceptance of a Spanish pension, and promotion to the peerage at Henri III's hands, on the grounds that he had been denied all means of maintenance from England. He was forced, he said, 'to graze whear I am tied... being afforded no hoape of myn oune from home'.\textsuperscript{95} In Copley's eyes, his duty to foreign princes sprang from his reliance on them for survival. Thus Philip was 'the mightie and virtuous king catholique whoo feedeth me in this time'.\textsuperscript{96} Nonetheless, until his death in 1584 Copley continued to proclaim loyalty to Elizabeth, and to seek reconciliation with the Crown.\textsuperscript{97} Like Mockett, he sought a royal licence to serve the Crown abroad more readily than the possibility of reinstation in England.\textsuperscript{98} He requested access to the income from his English lands to support his wife and family in exile. He was willing in 1581 to rescind his Spanish pension and relocate to France to demonstrate goodwill to Elizabeth, but was not prepared to compromise completely his personal objectives.\textsuperscript{99} More importantly, Copley definitely rejected the


\textsuperscript{95} Christie (ed.), \textit{Copley}, p. 162, Copley to Walsingham, Rouen, 8 July 1583.

\textsuperscript{96} Christie (ed.), \textit{Copley}, pp. 25-26, Copley to Burghley, 6 November 1574.

\textsuperscript{97} TNA, SP 15/27a/94, Copley to Walsingham, Rouen, 5 July 1582.

\textsuperscript{98} In 1582 he expressed the hope to represent England in diplomatic approaches towards any Catholic power. TNA, SP 12/153/25, The effect of Lord Copley's protestation to Thomas Heron, 6 April 1582.

\textsuperscript{99} He would not accept Cecil's proposal of relocation to Germany in return for reconciliation with the English Crown in 1575. Christie (ed.), \textit{Copley}, p. 52, Copley to Burghley, Antwerp, 5 March 1575.
offer of restoration in return for intelligence. He refused, for example, to give
information about the authorship of the *Treatise of Treasons*, although he was seen as
someone with access to accurate and up-to-date intelligence. It seems that he likewise
never provided information to any other agencies.\(^{100}\) It is unclear just how involved he
may have been in various conspiracies, but given his status and close contacts with
activists he was potentially a useful source of information.\(^{101}\) Whatever the other
ambiguities of his position, the leaking of intelligence was apparently one area in which
Copley would not compromise. At the same time, he risked losing his standing in the
exile community by his continued negotiations with the Crown: apparently he was
willing to sacrifice this to promote his allegiance to England.

On one level, Copley and Mockett are comparable to Catholics within England
who adopted a path of non-resistance or compromise. It was problematic, but not
impossible to reject Protestantism whilst advocating non-resistance to the Protestant
government, particularly before 1584 and after 1596.\(^{102}\) For those abroad, their religious
and political allegiance was more problematic. To the government, they had proved
their treachery by unlawful removal from the kingdom, and would have to work harder
for royal mercy. For exiles, a conflict between loyalty to the Crown and loyalty to the
Pope was further complicated by any moral or practical debts owed to secular Catholic
princes who provided them with refuge. Conversely, however, the call of international
Catholic militancy could be mitigated or complicated by loyalty to England or kin at
home. Mockett, Copley and others were struggling to mould their own Catholic identity.
Elements of this identity were distinct, if not completely separate, from the exile model
which was aligned with the international Catholic cause. The timing of their appeals
suggests that expediency and disillusionment at their position abroad and at Catholic
prospects in England were significant contributory factors. By the mid-1590s, the
prospect of foreign intervention and a rapid restoration to Catholicism was seen as
increasingly unlikely. There was a growing sense that Spanish aid was not the answer,

\(^{100}\) Christie (ed.), *Copley*, p. xxxv.

\(^{101}\) Hostile sources accused him of violent Catholicism: he allegedly vowed to personally see all
Protestant ministers hung by the bell ropes of their churches. TNA, SP 12/155/29, Walter Williams to
Walsingham, 25 August [?] 1582; TNA, SP 12/155/31, The confession of a papist being procurer at Rye
who is servant unto Syr Thomas Coppley.

\(^{102}\) Holmes, *Resistance and Compromise*, pp. 68, 161, 175. Holmes identifies 1584-96 as the period of
Catholic resistance theory. By the close of Elizabeth's reign, there was a shift from agitating for a
78.
and even increasing suspicion about Spanish designs on England.\footnote{Above, p. 281, footnote 92.} Petitions for pardon could indicate that particular individuals hoped for reconciliation, but were not prepared to neglect all other obligations to achieve it. In fact, these men defended the identity they had carved out for themselves, even when this jeopardised the success of their suit. The forging of an identity was never without tensions and contradictions, but individual exiles endeavoured to distinguish themselves not only from the Protestant subjects of Elizabeth but also from those Catholics actively opposed to the Crown.

4: ‘Her Majesties wandering subjectes’\footnote{TNA, SP 78/7/65, Cobham to Walsingham, Paris, 3 March 1582.}: the longer term trends of Catholic relations with the continent.

The movement of Elizabethan Catholics around Europe had an immediate impact on England, the host territories, and contemporary political discourse. It was also significant for developments beyond this which affected the evolution of English Catholicism and wider cultural trends in England. Lay Catholics abroad in the 1580s set patterns for two later developments: the English monastic movement in Europe, and the evolution of the Grand Tour. English Catholic gentry were probably more likely to spend a substantial period of time in Paris than their Protestants counterparts, especially in fraught circumstances. Their presence helped to establish or maintain a foothold in Paris, from which later Englishmen, both Catholic and Protestant, were able to benefit.

Anglo-Spanish peace at the beginning of James I’s reign and the restoration of monarchical authority in France significantly reduced the practical and diplomatic problems of movement around Europe. By the seventeenth century, attitudes to invasion plots had shifted from those of the previous generation in exile. Foreign invasion was not prioritised, and Paris was no longer the centre for related planning. Later generations of Catholics often had positive reasons for leaving home: education in an environment that acknowledged and affirmed their sacrifices. However, their absence from England could still be viewed as in some sense enforced, and Catholics abroad could see themselves as persecuted witnesses of the true church.\footnote{Brennan, ‘English Civil War’, p. 10.} The practical precedents of the 1580s and its polemical legacy apparently had persistent influence.
Paris continued to function as an international refuge, being central, for instance, to the exiled royalist cause during the middle years of the century. The future Charles II and his supporters turned to Louis XIV for ideological and practical support with greater success than their predecessors, returning to England and restoring a government advantageous to their interests. Interestingly, they were living in the same part of Paris as the exiles of the 1580s: followers of the future Charles II were ensconced in the faubourg Saint-Germain, as were a large proportion of gentlemen on tour in the eighteenth century. This is partly due to the left bank's traditional openness to newcomers, but there may have also been a more specific continuity with the contested years of the 1580s.

The decades after the 1580s saw the formation of continental institutions representing English Catholics in a more established and recognised sense. From the 1590s, English religious houses were founded in the Catholic Low Countries, France, Catholic parts of the German speaking lands, and Portugal. They experienced movement and migration, financial crises and religious conflict, but ultimately established themselves in the long-term. At first glance, the seventeenth-century enclosed religious life was far removed from the fluid existence of laity in 1580s Paris. However, the presence of particular Elizabethan families in Europe probably established an awareness of continental opportunities for the sustenance of English Catholicism on which future generations could draw.

The English houses had an obvious impact, providing an outlet for both male and female Catholic spirituality. They engendered a double conception of exile - physical separation from the homeland and withdrawal from the world - and an experience of being an English Catholic abroad which was very different to that of the 1580s. Importantly, the early wave of foundations was dominated by contemplative orders: initially, little attempt was made to minister to the wider host community. This partly reflects the religious mood of the early seventeenth century. It was also a consequence of their status as guests: to engage in pastoral or preaching work would

106 Sir Richard Browne, agent to Charles I and Charles II until 1660, briefly resided in Saint-Germain. His house was an exchange centre for royalist correspondence across Europe, and offered accommodation to newly-arrived royalists. Interestingly, the division between exiled royalists and ordinary travellers was not always clear. Stoye, English Travellers Abroad, pp. 281, 311-12. For the popularity of Saint-Germain with tourists, Jeremy Black, The British Abroad: the Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century (Stroud, 1992), p. 140.
have led them into damaging jurisdictional quarrels. Guilday observed that the host country was not really affected by this form of exile.\textsuperscript{107} Whilst they had connections to the urban community in which they lived, and could name local dignitaries as invaluable benefactors, the houses were separated from the main populace and did not hold the immediately inflammatory potential of Elizabethan laity in Paris.\textsuperscript{108} Ultimately, their raison d’être, and their focus, was the plight of Catholics in England. Members of these houses looked towards England, and often saw themselves as exiles. The government recognised this, and sometimes viewed convents as centres for political conspiracy. Like the laity of the 1580s, they became the subject of intelligence reports, albeit to a lesser extent.\textsuperscript{109}

Barbara Diefendorf demonstrates the underlying complexity of the astonishing revival of enclosed houses in seventeenth-century Paris, when one new female house was founded every year between 1604 and 1650.\textsuperscript{110} This is usually explained as League fervour finding a new outlet, shifting from violent mobilisation to an interior, penitential piety. Diefendorf’s research demonstrates that individuals central to these establishments were also members of royalist families, with very different views on the future salvation of France.\textsuperscript{111} She problematises any theme of ‘continuity’, as ‘traditional’ elements existed alongside and interacted with ‘new’ impulses.\textsuperscript{112} This context is pertinent to the English houses in Europe. English historians have usually seen them as the continuation of English medieval monasticism. Whilst they may not have had a profound impact on their locality, their relationship to these continental developments requires greater consideration. For instance, the male English Benedictine

\textsuperscript{107} Guilday, English Catholic Refugees, p. xx. Guilday’s remains the most comprehensive coverage. Earlier treatments include Edward Robert Petre, Notices of the English Convents Established on the Continent, ed. F. C. Husenbath (Norwich, 1849); Proost, 'Réfugiés', pp. 277-314; Daumet, Notices. For a recent study of female religious houses, Walker, Gender and Politics. Lechat argued that the exile presence in general in the Low Countries had a minimal impact, but the religious acted as exemplars for Catholic revival under the Archdukes. Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 198.

\textsuperscript{108} The Sisters of the Immaculate Conception in Paris, known as the Blue Nuns, were indebted to their Parisian benefactor and patron, Mme de Fontenais. Walker, Gender and Politics, pp. 89, 95, 109, 176.

\textsuperscript{109} Walker, Gender and Politics, pp. 116, 19, 103, 127. Mary Knatchbull, Abbess of the Ghent Benedictines was an active royalist agent in the 1650s.

\textsuperscript{110} Diefendorf, Penitence, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{111} Diefendorf, Penitence, pp. 43-48.

\textsuperscript{112} Diefendorf argues that the ‘medieval’ tendency to penitential mysticism was not a remnant of outdated practice, but ‘a response to historically specific events and attitudes’, which developed its own distinctive logic, character and momentum. Diefendorf, Penitence, pp. 19-20.
house was formed in Paris in 1615, when French equivalents were also springing up in the city. Based on a penitential and contemplative rather than active life, its spirit reflected that of its French contemporaries. Similarly, the English Augustinian canonesses, founded in 1634, apparently reflect the mid-century Parisian scene, with a shift towards a more active mission in the world. Its order traditionally promoted a more flexible approach to the enclosed lifestyle, whilst the associated Sisters of the Immaculate Conception had a specific pedagogic mission in Paris. In other cases, however, the character of new English foundations did not match the Parisian scene, which was evolving towards an active and compassionate charity by the 1650s. The English female Benedictine house, founded in Paris in 1650, did not mirror this shift. Perhaps significantly, none of the main English houses in Paris were those of new or reformed orders, such as the Discalced Carmelites or the Ursulines, which made a profound impression in France. Mary Ward’s Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, with its non-enclosed character and its impulse to activism in the world, was notably absent in France.

It is difficult to judge whether the impetus for the foundation of English houses was influenced by the explosion of houses across France and the Catholic Low Countries. The English houses in Paris came to France via the Low Countries, so tracing the relative importance of outside influences is not straightforward. By the 1630s, founders of English houses could benefit from the French monarchy’s conscious

---


114 Daumet, Notices, pp. 75-107; Petre, Notices of the English Convents, pp. 56-57, 91-93. The female Benedictine house gained support from exiled Stuart princesses and French aristocrats. It was at this time that the rich female religious culture in the Low Countries was dealt a blow by the death of the Archduchess Isabella in 1633. Perhaps prospective founders of English religious houses began to look to France as better ground.

115 Diefendorf, Penitence, p. 18; Petre, Notices of the English Convents, p. 69; Daumet, Notices, pp. 35-75. However, Diefendorf recognises this shift was neither decisive nor clear cut. The Benedictines had more difficult beginnings in Paris than the Augustinians, although they had the support of the exiled Queen Henrietta Maria. It took them longer to establish a permanent base, and they remained outside French jurisdiction.

116 For the I.B.V.M, below, p. 289, footnote 123.

117 There were Henrician and early Elizabethan precedents for English regular life in the Low Countries, and a history of Spanish support for this. The English Benedictines in Paris were an offshoot of the Cambrai house; the founder of the English Augustinian house originally hoped to make the foundation in Douai; the Blue Nuns came to Paris from Nieuport. Daumet, Notices, pp. 5, 35, 75; Petre, Notices of the English Convents, pp. 56, 69, 91.
effort to advance Catholic reform and promote Catholic piety. However, the English houses clearly answered an ideological need specific to English Catholics. They offered a sense of continuity with a pre-Reformation past, and responded to their contemporary dilemma as a persecuted group awaiting return to their homeland.

By obtaining permanent institutions, the English religious in Paris made their mark in a way unavailable to their Elizabethan predecessors. Historians observe that the houses served as a source of continuity for English Catholic families. New recruits to a house were often relatives of those who had preceded them to the continent as founder members. Community and continuity were reinforced through the sense of a shared past: members came from families who had experienced persecution in one form or another. In fact, this continuity can be stretched further: there are discernable links between the exiles of the 1570s and 1580s and the personnel of the subsequent religious houses in Europe. The Gascoignes of Yorkshire provide the most notable example. Even in the 1580s, family members were pursuing different options for English Catholics abroad. Richard Gascoigne of Lasingcroft was implicated in the 1569 revolt and closely linked to the Norton clan: he was probably one of the Gascoignes in Paris in 1580. A kinsman, William Gascoigne, chose a different kind of exile, joining the Carthusians at Brussels at some point after 1560. Perhaps taking inspiration from their great-uncle William, Richard's seventeenth-century descendents became deeply involved in the continental monastic movement. Sir John Gascogine of Lasingcroft had four sons and six daughters: three sons took up religious orders, and two daughters attained high positions within enclosed convents. His second son John and third son Michael entered the Benedictine house of Lambsprings in Germany after a continental education; John became abbot. This proved beneficial for their elder brother Sir Thomas, who was arrested for suspected involvement in the Titus Oates scare. An old man when he was found not guilty, Thomas retired to Lambsprings. Meanwhile, the

---


119 Walker, *Gender and Politics*, p. 175.


121 Bastow, 'Aspects', p. 277; TNA, SP 78/4a/63. 2 Gascoignes were listed in Paris in April 1580.
Gascoigne sisters were also prominent in the monastic movement: Catherine became abbess of the Benedictine house in Cambrai when only thirty. Her sister Justina joined the same house and eventually became prioress of the Paris convent.\footnote{122 DNB, vol. 7, p. 923; Bastow, 'Aspects', pp. 281-82, 396. Catherine was granted a dispensation to become abbess at such a young age. For more on Justina and Catherine Gascoigne, Walker, Gender and Politics, pp. 14, 25, 80, 145-46, 152, 154, 157. Another brother Francis became a secular missionary priest, spending time in England. Aidan Bellenger, English and Welsh Priests 1558-1800: A Working List (Bath, 1984), p. 62. Their relation to Richard Gascoigne, husband of Jane above, p. 288, is unclear in the genealogies, but they were all of the Lasingcroft branch.} The family’s heavy investment in enclosed life outside England did not preclude an interest in religious life inside the kingdom: Sir Thomas Gascoigne was instrumental to the foundation of the Bar Convent, York in 1686.\footnote{123 The convent followed Mary Ward’s active apostolate. The institute’s first foundation in Yorkshire was in Sir Thomas’ house in Dolebank. His £450 donation facilitated the purchase of a house and land in York, where the convent remains today. Sister Gregory Kirkus, ‘An I. B.V. M. Biographical Dictionary of the English Members and Major Benefactors (1667-2000)’, CRS, 78 (2001), pp. 6-7, 84-85.} Nor did this explicitly Catholic activity signal withdrawal from society in England. Through judicious marriages to other Catholic families, the Gascoignes retained a place in the northern gentry community, and were raised to the baronetcy in James II’s reign.\footnote{124 Bastow, 'Aspects', p. 166. In fact, religious houses in Europe proved staunch supporters of James II.}

The religious houses also offered enlarged provision for Catholic education. Formerly, Catholic gentlemen who were not educated in England could be sent abroad: with an English tutor, or spent time in a seminary or a Jesuit preparatory school. The houses on the continent considerably widened this scope, as foundations ranging from elementary schools to academic colleges sprang up.\footnote{125 Walker, Gender and Politics, pp. 92-93; Guilday, English Catholic Refugees, p. 233.} Importantly, given women’s role in post-Reformation Catholicism, the houses offered ‘training’ to Catholic gentlewomen as well as men. More generally, in fulfilling the religious houses’ traditional function of hospitality, they also provided charity for new lay arrivals from England, something their Elizabethan predecessors had lacked.\footnote{126 The Brigittine House, the direct continuation of Syon in England, settled in Rouen in 1582, and was a frequent target for exile appeals. The English Dominicans probably spent a large proportion of their Spanish subsidy on relieving the poverty of newly arrived exiles. They also acted as a refuge during anti-Catholic scares in the seventeenth century. Guilday, English Catholic Refugees, pp. 59, 415; Walker, Gender and Politics, p. 94.} Overall, the religious houses were a stable and specific focus for the hopes and needs of Catholic laity in England. There was still a shortage of institutional representation for Catholics outside holy orders, but the
monastic movement offered an alternative exile experience to that of the missionary priest or conspiratorial rebel.\footnote{290}

Bastow argues that those gentry central to them viewed the monastic foundations as a continuation of their English Catholic past: in this sense they confirmed the ‘traditional’ nature of their religion. Entering an English convent abroad was a practical and spiritual manifestation of a continued or resumed connection with the monastic church absent from England. Bastow presents the seventeenth-century movement as proof that not all English Catholics bought into the brand of Catholicism trumpeted by their clerical leaders.\footnote{254} Whether the religious impulse behind these convents was necessarily as ‘traditional’ or derivative as Bastow implies is, however, debatable. Seventeenth-century religious still embraced the idea of withdrawal from the world and viewed life on earth as an exile from God, as their pre-Reformation predecessors would have done. But they were exiles in an additional sense, having abandoned their native kingdom to attain their retreat. Recent scholars argue that English gentry entering religious life on the continent were committing an act of political as well as religious defiance to the Protestant government: in this respect, seventeenth-century religious life was different to its pre-Reformation predecessor.\footnote{243}

The English monastic movement in Europe should also be considered alongside the larger continental explosion in enclosed religious life, whose nature was also complex.\footnote{230} Removal to the continent enabled the resumption of past practice, but also an exposure to ideas of European relevance. By maintaining houses in sympathetic areas, the gentlemen and women of Catholic England exposed themselves to continental developments whilst also reiterating a sense of continuity with England’s Catholic past. Aveling viewed the new houses as signs of renewal within the English Catholic community. However, his argument that English Catholics had no interest in renewal

\footnote{290} Petre, *Notices of the English Convents*, p. 104. Petre explicitly envisaged the English religious experience as one of religious exile orientated towards a return to the homeland.


\footnote{243} Walker, *Gender and Politics*, pp. 5, 37, 116.

\footnote{230} Historiography tends to stress the dramatic impact of Jesuit innovation, but recent work suggests the renewal was rooted in medieval precedents. For example, Armstrong, *Politics*; Diefendorf, *Penitence*.
before the 1580s overlooks the connections between Elizabethan exiles and later generations in the English houses.\textsuperscript{131}

The English houses in Europe actually came to participate in a seemingly discrete development - the expansion of the Grand Tour. Convents became popular stopping places for grand tourists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and there was particular interest in visiting English houses in France and the Catholic Low Countries. Protestants apparently did so with a fascinated repulsion, talking to nuns and sometimes witnessing ceremonies in which women took religious vows. Presumably, those travellers with Catholic sympathies who stopped at the English religious houses had very different responses. By the end of the seventeenth century some, like Henry Arundel Bedingfield, had their tour itineraries shaped by visits to kin in religious houses in France and the Low Countries.\textsuperscript{132}

The movement of sixteenth-century Catholic gentry around the continent alongside their Protestant counterparts was significant for the longer-term development of the Grand Tour. The experience, intended to 'finish' an individual's education and furnish them with the skills necessary for active engagement in the political nation, held common features across the confessional divide, but may also have served different functions for Catholic and Protestant gentry. The political and religious conflicts of the 1580s were not conducive to a cultural tour of European sites of historical, military and political interest, and the problem was compounded by reservations about sending young Protestants to Catholic countries.\textsuperscript{133} Nevertheless, evidence suggests that English gentry continued to travel abroad in the period, and that despite its internal crises France was central to their route.\textsuperscript{134} Certainly, English Catholics must have been more inclined to visit a city under Leaguer rule than their Protestant counterparts; in this sense, it was they who provided the continuity of English presence.


\textsuperscript{132} Many of the Catholic Grand Tourists would have been educated in continental institutions, and were less critical of Catholic continental society. Black, \textit{British Abroad}, pp. 240, 248-49; Walker, \textit{Gender and Politics}, p. 121. Henry Arundel Bedingfield was abroad from 1699. 'Miscellanea IV: Bedingfield Papers &c', \textit{CRS}, 7 (1909), pp. 45-6, 58-9, 75, 80, 86, 88, 90.

\textsuperscript{133} Above, Chapter Two, p. 113.

\textsuperscript{134} Stoye, \textit{English Travellers Abroad}, p. 7.
The potential of a continental trip to finish a gentleman’s education and prepare him for his future career, recognised by Elizabethan commentators, was still a central motivation for travel in the eighteenth century. In the long term, it could be seen as service to the state; in the short term, the government could also benefit from intelligence acquired by travellers. The Grand Tour served a particular purpose for the future ruling classes of England; its purpose for Catholic gentry officially excluded from active government service was not identical. Embarking on a foreign tour, Catholics still fulfilled the same rite of passage between school and married life, and demonstrated common class aspirations. Additionally, however, they could see more of the Catholic world, and practice their faith in ways that were impossible at home. On the continent, they could gain a wider perspective of their own country and their situation within it, whilst maintaining links with European Catholic cultures. They were willing to inform themselves about, and even get involved in, events springing from the religious and political problems of their hosts. As we have seen, this could entail radical mobilisation and physical action in defence of Catholicism. However, it could also equate to a less reactionary consideration of England’s place in a wider European scene. In constructing an identity, those abroad had to respond to their position in England, to their status in the Catholic Church, and to their situation vis-à-vis their host sovereign. This was problematic, and often owed something to expediency as well as religious zeal. The changes of the sixteenth century created an unprecedented need for the definition of an English Catholic identity; this remained pertinent in following centuries. This opening out to a wider continental perspective contained the potential for new divisions amongst English Catholics. Nevertheless, it also had had more creative possibilities. Generally, the Grand Tour is not viewed as inculcating a less insular English mindset. However, it had been a consideration that Elizabethan commentators valued highly, and Brennan also suggests that the royalist presence in Europe did in fact act in this direction.  

---

135 Although, by the eighteenth century, the Grand Tour could be undertaken for entertainment or for artistic reasons. Edward Chaney, The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian cultural relations since the Renaissance (London, 1998), p. 203.

136 Wameke, Traveller, pp. 6, 33, 48; Howard, English Travellers, pp. 30, 36. This was still partly the case in the eighteenth century. Black, British Abroad, p. 221.

137 See case of Timothy Mockett, above, p. 280-81.

138 Brennan, ‘English Civil War’, p. 30. Chaney argues that English Catholics were primarily responsible for keeping open the lines of Anglo-Italian communication. Chaney, Evolution, p. 79.
The eighteenth century is generally seen as the age of the Grand Tour. However, recent scholars have discerned the roots of the phenomenon in the movements of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century gentry.\(^{139}\) By the close of the sixteenth century, the prospective traveller could turn to a range of publications offering advice, but, like the Grand Tourists of the eighteenth century, itineraries were not strictly fixed.\(^{140}\) Journeys made by gentry of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries were generally underlined by a similar purpose: to acquire the manners and knowledge necessary for an active political career. The reestablishment of stability in France and Henri IV's amity towards England made his kingdom much more amenable to Protestants and Catholics alike.\(^{141}\) There were also elements within England encouraging European travel. James' court was more 'continental' and open to outside influences than Elizabeth's: it was probably easier for a gentleman to present his departure from the kingdom as a desire to travel without immediately incurring suspicion.\(^{142}\)

Michael Brennan observes that those travelling on the continent did not always do so by choice: he argues that the profound sense of exile felt by supporters of the future Charles II had an important, but generally overlooked, precedent in sixteenth-century religious exile.\(^{143}\) Practically, however, much of this remains speculative. One of the problems with drawing connections between gentry movements in the 1580s and

---

\(^{139}\) For the association of the Grand Tour with the eighteenth century, Jeremy Black, 'The Grand Tour', in Robin Myers and Michael Harris (eds.), *Journeys Through the Market: Travel, Travellers and the Book Trade* (Folkestone, 1999), p. 66; Constantia Maxwell, *The English Traveller in France 1698-1815* (London, 1932), p. 1. Black argues that mid-eighteenth century tourism, when Britain was much less threatened from within or without, must be distinguished from that of an earlier period, when religious and political crises made it 'difficult to interpret cultural links in a non-political fashion'. Black, *British Abroad*, p. 3. Stoye argues that the Grand Tour began to flourish at a much earlier point than is normally assumed. Stoye, *English Travellers Abroad*, p. 326. Chaney suggests that the Grand Tour as a fully developed social and educational phenomenon would have emerged in the later sixteenth century had the Reformation not curtailed England's links to Catholic Europe. Chaney, *Evolution*, pp. 77, 321. For more on an earlier dating of the phenomenon, Michael Brennan, *The Origins of the Grand Tour: the travels of Richard Montagu, Lord Mandeville (1649-1654), William Hammond (1655-1658), Banaster Maynard (1660-1663)* (London, 2004); Brennan, 'English Civil War', p. 7.


\(^{143}\) Brennan, 'English Civil War', p. 7.
later developments is the lack of comparable source material. To my knowledge, there are no travel journals created by English Catholics in France in the 1580s, whereas a decade or so into the Jacobean period they not only provide a valuable insight into practical questions, but begin to form a genre of writing deserving of focused study. Much scholarship of gentry travel thus focuses on James I's reign onwards, and as a consequence important Elizabethan precedents are given insufficient attention. The experience and impact of time on the continent in the Elizabethan period seems to have had a longer-term impact for English gentry culture. Certainly, it established patterns for following generations of English Catholics in France, who were there to travel and observe as well as escape difficult situations at home. Despite common elements with their Protestant counterparts, the experience of Catholic gentry may have been peculiar in many respects.

5: Return to the Homeland? The theory, practice and possibility of ending exile.

Perennially, exile looks backwards and forwards, lamenting the loss of position in the homeland and anticipating an ideal return, where reconciliation to the homeland does not require compromising those principles that necessitated the removal. Literary expositions and practical examples show that returned exiles could have a lasting impact on the homeland, but return also entailed inherent dilemmas and challenges. Elizabethan Catholic exiles faced a peculiar situation: their exile was long, and never concluded with Catholic restoration. Their exile contributed to the long-term evolution of English Catholicism, but was not a formative period for a new status quo in the homeland. Without a mass return, by the latter years of the reign even those exiled leaders who had spearheaded invasion initiatives were debating the merits of reconciliation. The experience of physical return is discernable only through isolated

144 Diplomatic reports relating to gentleman travellers and their own letters are more prolific in James I's reign, although the genre of the travel diary really took off under Charles I. Brennan (ed.), 'Somerset', p. I.

145 For example, Stoye, English Travellers Abroad, whose coverage commences in 1604.

146 By the 1590s English travellers would know to head for a particular inn on rue de Grenelle. Brennan (ed.), 'Somerset', p. 70.

147 For a literary example, Tucker, Homo Viator, p. 247.

148 By 1598, for example, Persons was hoping that clauses protecting the exiles could be written into the Anglo-Spanish peace. He wanted to secure a general toleration for Catholics in England, and an agreement that exiles be permitted to return. Holmes, Resistance and Compromise, p. 213.
individual cases, which may not be representative. These individuals’ rhetoric and strategies of return need to be measured against examples of continued displacement. There is room to explore further the character of individual Catholics abroad, and their range of options associated with a homecoming. To do so, this section will return to those families investigated in Chapter One. By revisiting gentry in northern, western and eastern parts of England, I hope to demonstrate the varied nature of the experience of ‘return’, and the role of expediency and well as ideological fervour.

Ralph Liggons, the younger son of a Worcestershire family, confronted the dilemma of long-term exile at a point when the probability of a Catholic restoration by force was significantly reduced. As an active agent for Mary Stuart, he spent part of the 1570s and 1580s in Paris, but overall was based in Habsburg territories. Liggons was not unusual in keeping in touch with family members. Abroad since the 1570s, by the mid-1590s, if not before, he found himself struggling like other exiles to secure financial support from the Spanish Crown. Despite his pension, Liggons was never as crucial to invasion plans as he probably thought. As early as 1584, the failure of a Catholic enterprise caused his disillusionment about the real motivations of Philip II.

Liggons is notable amongst exiles in Paris and elsewhere for the extent of the government’s knowledge of his movements, but this is unsurprising given the political nature of his activities. Despite this, Liggons apparently returned to England for short periods, in 1575 and 1577. This was presumably unusual for long-term exiles, but his travels were perhaps facilitated, if not necessitated, by his position as messenger and

---

149 Above, Chapter Three, p. 203.

150 In 1584 Persons felt that Liggons lacked the court connections and closeness to Parma that would have made him central to plans for Catholic restoration in England. For example, CSP Scotland, 1584-1585, p. 325, [Robert] Persons to Mary Queen of Scots, 10 September 1584.

151 Liggons told Mary Stuart that Philip II could have addressed ‘the matture of our ile’ long since; he had not done so because English Catholics, rather than Spain, would have benefited. CSP Scotland, 1584-1585, no. 456, p. 490, Liggons to Mary, Namur, 14 December 1584.

152 The classification of correspondence relating to Liggons is somewhat confused. Liggons used a least one pseudonym: he was apparently known as Monceaux at certain points of his service to Mary. However, it is not entirely clear that Monceaux was definitely Liggons. Mary always referred to them as separate people: perhaps she wrongly believed them to be so, or perhaps she was providing a smokescreen. The indexers may also have attributed some of the references to Ralph Liggons to a Daniel Liggons. For example, CSPF, 1575-77, no. 294, pp. 113-14, Occurrences in Scotland, August 1575; TNA, SP 33/13/77, Lady Hungerford to the Duchess of Feria, July 1584.

153 For his 1575 visit, CRS, 22, p. 125; for his 1577 visit, Williams, Lygons, p. 8.
agent for Mary Stuart. His visits may also have been useful when he apparently returned home permanently in 1605.\textsuperscript{154}

By 1588, Liggons was sufficiently disillusioned to consider rapprochement with the English Crown. The timing of his petition can be explained by the execution of his patron, Mary Stuart, the previous year, and perhaps by the failure of the Armada and subsequent disappointment about Catholic restoration. Liggons approached a government agent and declared his wish to return home. In asking for a pardon, he offered the Crown more promising rewards than Mockett. He could provide valuable intelligence relating to Catholic exile circles in which he had been active for many years, and on Catholic networks in England:

\begin{quote}
He ys a man of good dyscowse which knoweth much... in forine caysis, and... many menes secretes which live in England and deal in forine actions.\textsuperscript{155}
\end{quote}

Given his career as a courier and Catholic partisan it is difficult to assess Liggons' real intentions. He was one of a group who sought reconciliation with the Crown, a number of whom shared reservations about reliance on Spain.\textsuperscript{156} From the Crown's perspective, the rehabilitation of Liggons – who had after all played a part in conspiracies surrounding the Duke of Norfolk – could have been a major propaganda coup. By granting pardon to Liggons, Elizabeth's majesty as a monarch would have been considerably enhanced, whilst his submission could serve as vindication of the Protestant cause.\textsuperscript{157} It also provided an opportunity for the government to demand something more tangible than a declaration of loyalty from the repentant exile – vital intelligence on exile circles and their connections with foreign powers.

Crucially, by submitting to the English Crown the exile would have to renounce the Catholic faith for which he had departed. Turning queen's evidence to seek restitution, Catholics submitted to the criminal justice system, acknowledging the

\textsuperscript{154} Williams, Lygons, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{155} TNA, SP 84/26/299, Sir John Conway to Burghley, 14 September 1588. Liggons declared his desire to 'return himself under her Majestie's obedience and to becom her reformed god subject'.

\textsuperscript{156} Above, p. 282, footnote 92.

\textsuperscript{157} Kesselring, Mercy and Authority, p. 118.
government's legitimacy and its classification of them as secular criminals. Exiles seeking return in this way were embracing the rhetoric of the Protestant government, exactly what Catholic leaders wanted to prevent. Rather than achieving a triumphant return, they came back to a Protestant kingdom at the price of having renounced Catholicism and often having informed on their fellow exiles. Either Liggons was ultimately not prepared to take this step, or the government felt that bringing him back was too risky. In any case, there is no record of a pardon being granted to him. Instead, he remained in the Catholic Low Countries. Part of the exile community but no longer a key player in invasion plans, he was encouraging hostility to the pro-Spanish, pro-Jesuit faction. By 1597, Liggons was identified as one of the most dangerous of this group of loose cannons, by Spanish as well as English agents. It was suggested to Philip III that Liggons, Charles Paget and William Tresham be sent to Sicily, where they could do much less harm. It is unclear whether he remained keen to reenter England: presumably he did. At this point, like Charles Paget, he probably felt the prospect of a successful invasion was small, that the exiles were becoming over-reliant on Spain, and there was more to gain by approaching England than bowing to Spanish designs. In his case, personal issues of wealth and status as well as political feuds took precedence over wider hopes for international Catholic projects.

For exiles or fugitives, the question of return loomed large, but responses varied. The Northern clan of the Nortons are a good case in point. Richard Norton was an old man when he fled to the continent after the 1569 revolt, but age did not dampen his ardour for Catholic restoration in England. He and his family were considered important factors for various invasion plans or Catholic risings within England, and Richard continued to associate with radical laymen and clerics in exile. He associated with English Jesuits in Paris, and signed a pledge of support for the Pope, undertaking to forward his cause as and when he could. He made efforts to place himself at the French

158 Loomie, Spanish, p. 37. Interestingly, Robert, probably a relative of William Tresham, sought pardon at the same time as Liggons. He was also noted to be 'troublesome' and of the 'Scottish', anti-Spanish faction. 'Salisbury', HMC, 9, part 13, p. 118. The names of such fugitives as desire by her Majesty's favour and pardon to return into England; Loomie, Spanish, Appendix 3, p. 261.

159 For Paget's pardon, above, p. 282, footnote 94.

court, and by 1583 was a key member of a circle of Anglo-Scottish exiles agitating for direct action across the Channel.¹⁶¹

Two of Norton’s children who accompanied him into exile took interesting stances. George Norton associated closely with his father, and moved in the same politicised circles. However, he became disillusioned with their progress and resorted to reconciliation with the government. His offer of intelligence on the exile circles of which he was an integral part brought him success here.¹⁶² Walsingham intervened personally in George’s case, shipping him out of France when it became risky for him, securing him a pardon from Elizabeth, and rehabilitating him in England.¹⁶³ George was prepared to renounce his Catholicism and years of service to the international cause as the price for return to England.¹⁶⁴ Interestingly, George’s sister Elizabeth Johnson took a similar direction at the same time. Elizabeth sued for pardon from Scotland, which she had managed to reach by June 1584. She claimed her exile had never been a political or even religious act: she had only left the country out of duty to her father, so she could be his companion and nurse: ‘... nature moved me his daughter not to leave him in his old

¹⁶¹ CRS, 53, pp. 187-88. Richard and George Norton were meeting Thomas Darbishire and Nicholas Wendon in Wendon’s rooms in Paris at some point between 1578 and November 1579. For examples of Norton’s other activities, TNA, SP 52/34/12, Robert Bowes to Walsingham, Berwick, 24 January 1583; Sharp, Memorials, pp. 325, 346.

¹⁶² His career as a double agent can be traced in the Calendar of State Papers Scotland and Calendar of State Papers Foreign. For example, TNA, SP 52/34/12, Robert Bowes to Francis Walsingham, Berwick, 24 January 1583; TNA, SP 52/34/20, Robert Bowes to Francis Walsingham, Berwick, 13 February 1584; CSP Scotland, 1584-1585, no. 33, pp. 35-36, Robert Bowes to Walsingham, Berwick, 4 March 1584; TNA, SP 52/37/69, Walsingham to Edward Wotton, 17 June 1584; TNA, SP 52/36/80, George Norton to Christopher Shepardson, Edinburgh, 30 September 1584; TNA, SP 78/11/103, William Robinson to John Robinson, Paris, 20/30 May 1584; TNA, SP 78/11/110, William Robinson to John Robinson, Paris, 27 May/6 June 1584; TNA, SP 78/11/113, Thomas Becknor to Walsingham, Rouen, 29 May/8 June 1584; TNA, SP 78/11/135, Thomas Becknor to Walsingham, Rouen, 11 June 1584; TNA, SP 78/12/58, Thomas Becknor to Walsingham, Rouen, 31 August/10 September 1585; TNA, SP 78/12/99, Stafford to Walsingham, 23 September 1584. He used the name William Robinson when sending intelligence to Walsingham. As William Robinson, he writes as though he were a Scotsman reporting events to Walsingham, but other evidence in the correspondence points to Robinson being the son of Richard Norton. For example, TNA, SP 52/36/81, Lord Hunsdon to Burghley, Berwick, 1 October 1584.

¹⁶³ George’s pardon is found in TNA, C 66/1271, m. 15. He was pardoned on 13 April 1586 for having ‘treasonably conspired with other rebels... to compass the overthrow and death of the Queen, and the subversion of the constitution and established religion’. Translated and printed in ‘Draft Calendar of Patent Rolls, 28-29Elizabeth I 1585-1587’, List and Index Society, 242 (1991), p. 8. Walsingham’s assessment of Norton reads ‘... though the man have offended hertofer yet hath he... dutifull dispocicion towards her Majesty as doth deserve some extraordinary favor’. TNA, SP 52/37/69, Walsingham to Edward Wotton, 17 June 1583.

¹⁶⁴ The Archbishop of Glasgow was concerned by his sudden disappearance from Paris. TNA, SP 78/12/99, Stafford to Walsingham, Paris, 23 September 1584.
With her father dead, Elizabeth sought pardon and return to England. Presumably her brother’s recent success on re-entering England made her more hopeful of a positive response. In her petition, Elizabeth contrasted the state of exile with the possibility of life in her native environment. Her intercessor declared that she had ‘found the differenc betwene a dutifull and quiet lyf at home and an unquiet estate abroad’. It is unclear how much of this is generic to the rhetoric of petition, employed to give her case the best chance of success. Elizabeth stressed, for example, her desire to:

quietly repair without molestation into my native country, ther to submit my self to her Majesties will and pleasure to the end that I may spend the rest of my lyfe lyke a trew Subject.

Certainly, Elizabeth was not the submissive and dutiful female companion she portrayed herself as: she had strong ideas of her own, and a considerable influence over male family members.

Again, the motivation for seeking pardon is a matter for speculation. In correspondence, George complained of penury: this was a problem generic to exiles, but he may have suffered particularly following his father’s death if he was unable to access

---

165 TNA, SP 52/37/56, Petition of Elizabeth Johnson to Mr Wootton, June 1585. Elizabeth made her appeal only ten days after Walsingham had determined to see to her brother’s pardon. Interestingly, their brother Francis, also a rebel, had sought pardon as early as 1572, and aroused the hostility of his fellow exiles. Taylor, ‘Crown’, Appendix 1, p. 109; CSPD, Addenda, 1566-1579, no. 60, pp. 355-56, Francis Norton to Burghley, Antwerp, 20 July 1571.

166 TNA, SP 52/37/55, Edward Wotton to Francis Walsingham, Edinburgh, June 7 1585. Wotton forwarded her petition to Walsingham.


168 TNA, SP 52/37/55, Petition of Elizabeth Johnson to Mr Wotton, June 1585. There is no record in the Patent Rolls of a pardon being granted to Elizabeth Johnson. Latest research on Tudor pardons, however, suggests these Rolls were not completely exhaustive, so she may have obtained one. Kesselring, Mercy and Authority, pp. 73-74, 210-11.

169 Her husband Henry Johnson was a rebel in 1569. He was attainted and sentenced to death, but spared on the grounds that he was ‘very simple’, and had been ‘abused by his wife’. He was pardoned in 1573. Taylor, ‘Crown’, Appendix 1, p. 122.
the family wealth. Shortage of funds alone is not sufficient explanation for George's volte-face, but could have been a contributing factor. More importantly, Richard Norton probably exerted a powerful hold over those children who shared his exile. Evidently, he was able to motivate others through force of personality, as he had in 1569. Possibly his death or the last months of his life gave them greater space for independent action. With Richard incapacitated or dead, his exiled children were presumably freer to pursue their own paths. Intriguingly, however, it appears that Norton too may have been heading for England when he died on board ship in 1585. Perhaps he had conceded to pressure from his children to change his stance towards the status quo in England, and was with Elizabeth on her journey across the Channel. The younger Nortons, who had no more experience of life in England than their father, came to a different view of their situation. They sought a homecoming to England, not as part of a triumphant Catholic force, but as individuals renouncing their Catholic allegiance and submitting to the Protestant regime.

Amongst the northerners involved in the 1569 revolt, there were other approaches to a return to England. Anthony Bulmer, grandson of Richard Norton, took a different route to his kinsmen and women in engineering a return to England. Bulmer was implicated in the 1569 revolt when only eighteen. Having left England 'under color of travelinge', he had been to Rome, Spain and the Low Countries by 1580, had been given money at Rome, and was in receipt of a Spanish pension. His father was keen to obtain a pardon for himself and his son for their part in the revolt, and although one was granted in 1575 Anthony continued in his Catholic activism, and may have studied at Louvain. When he returned home at some point before 1582, he displayed

---

170 TNA, SP 78/11/110, William Robinson to John Robinson, 27 May /6 June 1584. Norton reported that Paris was 'unreasonable deare', and he had not received any help from his friends there. He had a Spanish pension, and perhaps benefited from his father's sources of income until his death.

171 TNA, SP 52/37/56, Petition of Elizabeth Johnson to Mr Wotton, June 1585; CRS, 58, no. 63, p. 155, William Allen to Alphonsus Agazzarri, 12 June 1585. Richard Norton died 'on the seas', leaving a number of debts unpaid. George had entered Walsingham's pay when Richard was still alive, but perhaps when he was ill and unable to exert his usual influence.


173 CRS, 53, p. 211; CRS, 13, p. 117.

174 Taylor, 'Crown', Appendix 1, p. 99; CRS, 13, p. 177. His servant was also noted as a banished Catholic activist. Anthony's father may have obtained him his pardon on the grounds that as a youth he was not fully responsible for his actions. This was an established way for youths involved in crimes with their father to petition for pardon. Kesselring, Mercy and Authority, pp. 113-14.
no sign of reconciliation with the Crown. Bulmer returned to the North, where he lived 'discontentedly and a recusant'. Presumably encouraging recusancy around his county Durham home, he also had contacts extending to London. Viewed as dangerous to the religious and political balance of the north, a government report described him as 'valiant, wiese, subtill and of great credit among the papists'. A significant part of his danger came from his continental links and activity. Bulmer revisited Europe: in 1584 he was delivering money to an exiled earl, presumably Westmorland. The death of his grandfather may have had little impact on his stance. Bulmer's pardon resulted not in submission to the Protestant authorities but enabled a return to England and a continued commitment to international activism. His Catholicism was neither introverted nor defensive; perhaps it was inspired less by the clerical mission than his own experience. Admittedly, a stay in Europe did not determine a choice of recusancy, but it did have that effect for Bulmer. He and other returning exiles may have influenced others into taking up a more uncompromising course within England: Bulmer's return allowed him to disseminate ideas that probably sprang from a more oppositional stance. Presumably his time on the continent brought him to this level of activism.

Meanwhile, the Catholic gentry of East Anglia took a different stance towards the issue of 'return'. As we have seen, Catholics managed to go abroad without licence, despite government efforts to the contrary. Many did not envisage their time there as a long-term option: they expected to return to England relatively soon. They returned to a Protestant country, but many perhaps expected nothing different. This, although increasingly risky as the 1580s progressed, was still possible. Richard Willoughby, a Norfolk Protestant, converted on a visit to Paris and may subsequently have become a missionary priest. For the majority of Norfolk families abroad, however, removal to the continent did not mean permanent disaffection from the crown. In these cases, the real impact of time abroad can only be speculated. It may have produced a more unequivocal stance in England: perhaps some returned to a life of recusancy and of

175 TNA, SP 12/175/74, A note out of J. G.'s letter [?1584].

176 Robert Masters, The History of the College of Corpus Christi and the B. Virgin Mary (Commonly called Benet) in the University of Cambridge, from its foundation to the present time (Cambridge, 1753), p. 414. The conversion of Willoughby, a respected academic, was controversial. He may have gone to Paris soon after 1578, and was possibly the Willoughby listed as a Protestant in Paris in April 1580. TNA, SP 78/4a/63. A government report claimed he was apparently a seminary priest, but there is no evidence of his ordination. On return to England, however, he did adopt a course of recusancy. Willoughby has been confused with the elderly Richard or John Willoughby, former chaplain to Anne Boleyn, dismissed from his living in 1572 for refusing to subscribe to the church articles. VCH Norfolk, vol. 2, p. 268; Houlbrooke (ed.), 'Parkhurst', pp. 146-48, 243-44.
encouraging others to do the same. Others, however, could maintain a 'church papist' stance, seeing their time abroad as a chance to practise their faith in an openly supportive environment. This opportunity could have been a source of mental and moral support when Catholic worship became increasingly difficult within England.

Thomas Kittson, for instance, had a relative in Paris in 1580 and the government associated him, along with other Catholics there, with seditious conspiracy. However, there is no evidence that Kittson's time abroad prior to April 1580 was spent in anything other than cultural, religious or social activities. Kittson returned to Norfolk, where he continued a close relationship with his father-in-law, Sir Thomas Cornwallis, and like him continued to be regarded with suspicion. Cornwallis, as we have seen, had serious reservations about the implications of a particular view of the mission, and how it undermined the duties owed by English Catholics to their queen. It is unclear whether Kittson shared his view, but the two men were confidantes, and were probably of a similar outlook. As a well-connected Catholic, Kittson clearly recognised the advantages of demonstrating loyalty to the Crown. There is little sign that he made efforts to challenge the status quo in England after 1580. There is no necessary link between his time abroad and his recusancy record in 1588 and 1590. We can, however, venture to say that Kittson's travels reinforced his connections to a Catholic network beyond East Anglia. The Kittson in Paris in 1580 must have met a relation of Ralph Sheldon there. A few years later, Kittson and Cornwallis were returning to Suffolk after a trip to Devon. They chose to break their journey at Beoley, Sheldon's house in Worcestershire. The families were acquainted before this point, although it is

177 Kittson had definitely been in France in 1575. Above, Chapter One, p. 79, footnote 215. It is unclear whether the Kittson reported in Paris in 1580 was Thomas. TNA, SP 78/4a/63. He may have returned to the continent; alternatively, he was supporting a relative who was in Paris.

178 He featured in a 1574 list of 'influential persons' and supporters of Mary Stuart. For his relations with Cornwallis, above, Chapter One, p. 73; MacCulloch, Suffolk, p. 108; Pollard Brown, 'Paperchase', pp. 1130, 1132.

179 Above, Chapter One, pp. 69-70.

180 Kittson was known to be Catholic as early as 1571. Houlbroke (ed.), 'Parkhurst', p. 98. For his later record as a recusant, CSPD, 1581-1590, CCXXXV, no. 21, p. 709, ? to the Council [1590?]; CRS, 22, p. 120.
not clear whether they had stayed at each other's houses. Perhaps further contact between the two families in Paris had strengthened the connection between them. A captured priest present at the meeting argued that the men 'had no conference of any mater of the state, but only of religion'. In this case, time abroad and return to England could engender mutually supportive relations between 'exiles'. There is less extant evidence for relations like these than there is for exceptional individuals such as George Norton or Ralph Liggons. However, Kittson's experience suggests that there was a range of options available to those considering or experiencing 'return' to England. There was no 'typical' experience, but the gentleman re-entering England with few official problems and negotiating a place for himself within a Protestant regime may not have been unusual.

This range of homecomings amongst the exiles reflects their varied personal approaches and the differing circumstances in which they departed from England. Fugitive rebels and potential figureheads left in the knowledge that return would not be easy. It would entail a Catholic rising in England or a foreign invasion; at first, hopes were high for imminent success. By the latter years of Elizabeth's reign, however, this prospect became increasingly dim. As the inner rifts of the exile group escalated, the vision of triumphant return faded. Another option, provoking further controversy, materialised: approaching the Protestant government for reconciliation. In contrast, a greater number of Catholics abroad in the early 1580s had, to all intents and purposes, chosen to be there. They combined a period of education, recreation or travel with a largely uncontested return to England. This was not a triumphant homecoming to a newly Catholicised England, but a return to a continual process of negotiation, of life under a Protestant regime. The range of different 'returns' for English Catholics abroad serves to highlight the varied nature of their time abroad. Catholic exiles never got the 'return' their Protestant counterparts under Mary I had done. This shaped their outlook to their homeland, and the emerging character of post-Reformation Catholicism in England, but it did so in complex ways.

181 Kittson and Sheldon were from different sides of the country, but part of a broad group of Catholics who socialised and corresponded with each other. Thomas Lord Paget provided the main connection for many of these families. He had been Kittson's brother-in-law, and a relative of Kittson was part of his household. Kittson and Cornwallis also alienated property to him. Sheldon was a fairly frequent guest of Lord Paget. Crankshaw, 'New Evidence', pp. 19-23. Cornwallis also sought Sheldon's knowledge for business enterprises. Scott-Warren, 'News, Sociability and Bookbuying', pp. 396-97.

182 TNA, SP 12/164/77, Evidence given by Hugh Hall (Marian priest) before Thomas Wilkes [?] and Thomas Martin, 31 December 1583. The visit took place in late summer or early autumn of 1582.
6: Conclusion.

In her work on the Catholic gentry of Yorkshire, Bastow assesses the nature of their faith: '... neither a continuation of medieval Catholicism nor a new Catholicism founded by the Jesuits, but an imperceptible mix of both, representing the conservatism of the northern gentry with the adaptability of a new generation who were capable of surviving hard times'.\textsuperscript{183} She does not, however, offer a satisfactory explanation for the origins of this new 'adaptability'. This issue is of relevance beyond a regional framework. Flexibility was probably an inevitable response to very changed circumstances. The long-term impact of the missionary priests, secular and Jesuit, was likewise undeniable in introducing a new commitment to Catholicism in these changed circumstances. Bastow cites the young gentry who went to the continental seminaries, and returned to England to minister to their peers, as the best manifestation of this integration of tradition and reform.\textsuperscript{184} This overlooks or at least underestimates the impact of continental influences that came via fellow laity as well as missionary clergy.

Haigh believes that Catholicism was a minority seigneurial religion in England by the end of Elizabeth's reign.\textsuperscript{185} This minority faith was often easier to maintain within a gentry household than in other contexts, although recent works have stressed the importance of urban networks and, as we have seen, the exile of Catholic gentry was a profoundly urban experience.\textsuperscript{186} The minority status of English Catholicism, however, did not dictate an introverted nature, as early links to Catholic Europe had not been severed. In fact, the Elizabethan period saw the initiation of new links to the continent that were to prove of great long-term significance. Catholic gentry and nobles in later centuries continued to send their children to Paris and other European destinations as students, scholars, seminarians, monks, nuns, and travellers. The enclosed religious life of the English convents was markedly different to the experience of the mainly male exiles of the 1580s and earlier. But the two were not completely unrelated.


\textsuperscript{184} Bastow, 'Aspects', p. 455.

\textsuperscript{185} Christopher Haigh, 'The Church of England, the Catholics and the People', in Christopher Haigh (ed.), \textit{The Reign of Elizabeth I} (Basingstoke, 1984), pp. 200-204.

\textsuperscript{186} McClain, \textit{Lest We Be Damned}, pp. 141-70; Arblaster, \textit{Antwerp}, pp. 12-21.
The nature of the host environment for those abroad in the later sixteenth century, or in the eighteenth century, informed the experience of English Catholics on a number of levels. Most of the laity abroad ultimately continued to orientate themselves towards the situation in England, rather than seeking assimilation in France. Nevertheless, as we have seen, Parisian religious revival and French political change offered unique experiences and opportunities for English Catholics abroad. They continued to influence individual and group identity of English Catholics long after Elizabeth’s reign. The interaction with continental Catholicism through France continued to inform their constant process of negotiation with the Protestant status quo. For those of that group who had personal experience of Paris, it must have been particularly significant.
On 22 March 1594, the day Henri IV regained Paris from the Catholic League, he received a request from the English ambassador. L’Estoile wrote that:

...à l’instance de l’ambassadeur d’Angleterre, le tableau de la cruauté de la roine d’Angleterre contre les catholiques, estalé par la Ligue dans la grande-eglise de Nostre-Dame, en fust osté, par commandement exprès de Sa Majesté.¹

Unfortunately, there is no way to corroborate speculation that this was the very same tableau that had been displayed to explosive effect in the Saint-Séverin churchyard in 1587.² However, its removal was accompanied a week or so later with the burning of D’Orléans’ Advertissement.³ The prioritising of these matters in 1594 suggests that even when Anglo-French amity was on more stable ground, the cause of English Catholics and their previous residence in Paris remained controversial. Elizabeth I and presumably Henri IV still felt it necessary to act against hostile propaganda, which owed its creation at least in part to the exiles in Paris in the 1580s. Their polarising potential had peaked, but was still felt in the continued display of anti-Elizabethan propaganda. In 1594, Henri IV was able and willing to concede to English requests, partly because he wanted England on side against Spain, and partly because it complemented his wider programme to remove vestiges of the League. The fact that this issue was apparently dealt with on the day Henri IV regained Paris - a critical time, when he had a host of internal problems to address - suggests that anti-Elizabethan propaganda remained significant, even if its creators were no longer active in Paris. Religious controversy in Paris, sparked by radical Frenchmen or exiled English gentry, continued to hold

¹ ‘... on the suit of the English ambassador, the tableau showing the cruelty of the English Queen against the Catholics, installed by the League in the Cathedral of Notre-Dame, was removed on the express command of His Majesty’. ‘Registre-Journal’, p. 218. L’Estoile’s dates, however, do not always agree with other sources.

² Dillon argues the Saint-Séverin tableau must have been placed there after its removal on Henri III’s orders. Dillon, Construction, p. 168. L’Estoile refers to the 1594 tableau as if it were a well-known fixture: if it was from Saint-Séverin, he might not have needed to state this explicitly. However, he gives no indication that this was the ‘tableau de Mme de Montpensier’, as he described it at Saint-Séverin in 1587. Also, given Henri III’s awareness that his removal of the tableau had been controversial, he would probably have been keen to destroy it in 1587, rather than letting it go on display elsewhere.

³ An annotation in a copy of D’Orléans, Advertissement (1586) at the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, reads: ‘Les Advertissements des Catholiques Anglais e[s]t furent brulés, le 2 avril 1594, a la place Maubert, et a la Croix des Trahoir[?], d’ou suite leurs grands rareté’: *Copies of* The Advertissements des Catholiques Anglais were burnt, on 2 April 1594 at Place Maubert and at the Trahoir [?] Cross; following this they were very rare’. The event is not reported in L’Estoile.
explosive potential on both sides of the Channel. The case of the Notre-Dame tableau suggests that the exiles' impact was not as transient as is first assumed. However, this thesis has also argued for a wider view of those abroad, beyond the small radical core. However influential the latter may have been, they did not define English Catholic life in Paris.

Glimpsed through fragmented and discontinuous evidence, the Catholic exile in Paris displayed some characteristics of a generic exile experience. There were discernable inner tensions amongst the Paris group, and a certain level of resentment from, or at least divergence from, groups who were in a similar position to themselves. There was also probably a kind of pecking order amongst the exiles, based on the timing and exact circumstances of departure from England. They could be a destabilising element for home and host communities, and provoked a range of responses from them. Alongside likenesses with a generic exile experience, they nonetheless display certain elements that are specific to their particular case. There may be something unique about the Paris experience in the period that cannot be observed in other territories playing host to English Catholics; most notably their direct involvement in the city's political and religious quarrels, and the way in which these could be associated with their own cause.

Certainly, a study of English Catholics in Paris helps to balance the large historiography focused on Protestant exile in the sixteenth century. The latter has pointed to the central importance of exile in the development of Protestantism in the early modern period; this thesis has suggested the phenomenon was also of significance to contemporary English Catholicism. In addition, an exploration of English Catholics in France also helps to broaden a scholarship usually focused on Catholic exile in Habsburg territories. However, a hermetically sealed study of the Paris experience runs the risk of isolation from a wider overview of Catholic exile. There is therefore scope for the study of English Catholic exile across Europe as a whole, and an assessment of how Parisian patterns compared or contrasted with those in the urban centres of the Low Countries.

---


5 Tabori, Anatomy, p. 35. The rebels from the 1569 revolt had a particular status. Above, Chapter Three, pp. 175-76, footnote 138; Chapter Four, pp. 240-43. Pensions may also have created a pecking order amongst the exiles. Above, Chapter Three, p. 168.
The most important historian of Anglo-French Catholic interaction in the early modern period offers a bleak view of these relations. Bossy argues that English Catholic relations with France were never particularly positive. For him, the two groups were and remained divided by language and, more generally, by a mutual incomprehension and mistrust. In his view, the English Catholic presence in France in the 1580s was born out of necessity, not choice; the Douai seminary - and presumably lay exiles - moved to France only on the back of Leaguer sentiment. Once the League disintegrated, so did the reasons for English Catholics to be there; they returned to the Low Countries, which could boast precedents for 'bonds of personal familiarity and confidence' absent in France. I hope this thesis suggests that Bossy's picture is perhaps too generalised. Admittedly, France was not the first choice of refuge for those who left England in the 1560s and 1570s, and the heavy English presence in Paris in the 1580s was partly due to necessity, as the Low Countries had become unsuitable. This is not to say, however, that links between English Catholics and France did not exist, or that English Catholics never turned to the latter to improve their situation, or to seek support. There were also, as Bossy admits, a number of profound personal relationships between English Catholics and important French nobles. At certain points, in fact, Catholics in England and in France had high hopes for Anglo-French amity.

Bossy's persuasive argument may need some qualification on another front: his assertion that the League had bought English Catholics to France, and its demise led them to abandon it. In part, this argument may rest on a premature dating of the League as a coherent organisation to around 1580, when the English began to appear in Paris in large numbers. Moreover, it apparently assumes that hard-line radicalism was the only reason for English Catholics to go to Paris. As we have seen, a range of factors drew them to Paris; their residence may have been prompted by less confrontational impulses. Paris failed to become the main centre for the clerical mission to England, or to house a dedicated English institution in the 1580s, but it continued to host Catholic laity with a range of religious and political outlooks. Many drifted to the Low Countries by 1590 - implying, in fact that they did not favour Leaguer Paris - but this was due at least partly to necessity. Some long-term exiles were by this point disgruntled with Spain, and not particularly happy to have retired to Habsburg territories. Charles Paget, for instance,

---

6 Bossy, 'Henri IV', pp. 109-11. It is unclear how widespread knowledge of French was amongst English gentry: possibly less so than had been in the medieval period. Sir Thomas Cornwallis, for instance, had a good Latin reading skills but lacked similar competency in French. Scott-Warren, 'News, Sociability and Bookbuying', p. 392.
endeavoured to get back to France: in 1598, he returned not to Leaguer Paris but to a city where peace and royal authority was being restored. As we have seen, Paget was an exceptional individual for a number of reasons; Bossy believes he only re-entered France as the likeliest means of getting back to England. Even if he viewed Paris as a gateway to England, Paget still demonstrates what could be true for a larger number of English Catholics abroad: there were factors that rendered Paris an attractive destination rather than solely a last resort.

Recently, scholars have recognised the need to include less prominent European centres into the study of the English Catholic diaspora. Jonathan Woolfson, for example, underlines the importance of considering locations in Europe which were not ‘aggressively Catholic’ or breeding grounds for conspiracy. This will indeed widen our perspective on Catholics abroad, their motivations, activity and impact, and move us away from a generalised picture of them as traitors or conspirators. At the same time, it is also necessary to examine closely those individuals who headed for or found themselves in ‘aggressively Catholic’ places, and their reactions to them. Paris was undoubtedly one such place, although it was in the process of redefining its Catholic identity. This thesis suggests that English Catholics in ‘aggressively Catholic’ places were not necessarily aggressively Catholic or determined on seditious activity.

Taken as a general phenomenon, the exile experiences in France and the Catholic Low Countries could also shed further light on the nature of early modern Catholic reform, and its realisation in England. In the 1580s, English missionaries who had not been in Rome were trained in Northern Europe. Arguably, one strand of the English Catholic experience was much closer to elements of Northern European religious renewal, with its strains of Augustinian, anti-Jesuit and anti-Protestant ideas. The religious upheaval and violence experienced in France and the Low Countries was in stark contrast to the situation in Spain and the Italian states. Whilst the latter remained staunchly Catholic, the upsurge of Protestantism in the middle years of the century posed a real threat to the Catholic governments and Churches of the Low Countries and France. In France, the Crown and Church were critically destabilised by

---

7 ODNB, vol. 42, p. 344.
9 Woolfson, Padua, p. 121. The city and University of Padua, with its reputation for religious tolerance, welcomed large numbers of English Catholics and Protestants in the sixteenth century.
a vociferous and strident Calvinist minority. This experience, and the perceived necessity of fighting back against heresy, was deeply engrained in the religious revival underway in Paris by the 1580s. Its combined elements of repentance, renewal and mobilisation must have held particular resonance for English Catholics in the city.

As we have seen, the common ground between Parisians and lay exiles at the radical end of the spectrum was manifested in the propaganda campaigns against Elizabeth I, Henri III, and Henri IV. As suffering Catholics, the exiles served to polarise opinion, urging French Catholics to mobilise against heresy in their own kingdom before the same fate befell them. Meanwhile, removal to a Catholic city offered them the opportunity to appeal to a shared sense of struggle against heresy. Increasing publicity for their plight, the exiles placed their cause on an international stage, wedding it to the larger struggles of the Church militant. Paris thus provided both practical and ideological aid for the radical exiles. The timing of the Catholic fight back in the Low Countries, also determined by armed conflict, was slightly different: whereas Paris was undoubtedly Catholic by 1580, the fate of parts of the Low Countries was still undecided. In fact, the English Catholic presence there in the 1570s on one level helped to increase Protestant antagonism against Philip II, who was acting as their champion. Conversely, Henri III’s failure to act as champion to the exiles in France alienated French Catholic opinion. Many English were forced by religious warfare and international diplomacy to leave the Low Countries; when Habsburg forces regained ground, English Catholics began to return to the Southern territories. A significant group chose to establish themselves in Antwerp: like Paris, this was a city recently rescued from the scourge of heresy. It now emerged as a Catholic stronghold, spearheading Catholic restoration.10

At the same time, there was much about the religious revival in Paris that was particular to the city. The complexity of Paris’ religious climate allowed for a range of approaches to Catholic renewal. Those laity who were not politically engaged could have picked up on other currents, which were of potential significance for English Catholicism in the future. Recent scholarship debates the portrayal of the Society of Jesus by its enemies, and questions the extent to which their agenda dominated all

10 Arblaster, Antwerp, p. 36.
reform initiatives. Even so, the uneasiness about their growing influence in France could have appealed to English gentry and secular clergy, resentful as there were of Jesuit dominance of their cause. Whether or not this would have been a productive option for them, the Appellants perhaps hoped to appeal to this when first launching their case in France, en route to Rome. It is conceivable that some English Catholics - including exiled clergy and laity - had more in common with a Northern European religious renaissance than with its southern Mediterranean variant, which had not experienced the same critical fight against Protestantism on its own ground. Through written communication, and through their subsequent presence in England, laity and clergy who had been in Europe may have helped to disseminate new ideas in England, just as those imbued with the crusading zeal of the mission did. If this was so, the government portrayal of English Catholics and their foreign connections does not reveal the whole story. Some Catholics abroad in fact rejected the model of the Hispanicised or Romanised Catholic gentleman, looking to the Pope or Philip II rather than Elizabeth as the source of religious and political authority. Whilst more exiles became likely to look favourably on Spain rather than France as their protector, the picture of exiles as Hispanicised Englishmen fails to reflect their actual experience, or their own conceptions of their religious and political allegiances. Bossy argues there was little cultural exchange between English exiles and the French during their residence in France in general, as English Catholics were always more disposed to look to Spain. This thesis has shown there is room to challenge the first part of this statement; I hope it has also identified related topics of considerable potential in the future.

Whilst there may have been broad areas of affinity with Northern Catholic Europe, the situation for Catholic renewal in England was obviously very different. Catholics were officially an outlawed minority, and the space for new developments in worship and devotion was very restricted. Haigh argues that, in some respects, English


12 Bossy, 'Henri IV'. Bossy is clear that when the Appellants turned to France, anti-Jesuit hostility was not a viable basis to gain support. However, they may not initially have realised this. An appeal to an ideal Gallican Church unbound by the dictates of Rome was a better basis for common ground; the Appellants, if not the French, presumably worked with this. Above, Chapter Five, p. 263.

13 For Paget and Cornwallis' agreement on the harmful nature of Jesuit activity, above, Chapter Five, pp. 270-72.

Catholicism and Catholicism on the continent were moving in opposite directions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a view which Walsham also cautiously advances.\textsuperscript{15} This thesis however, indicates that whilst there may have been a drift in direction, there were other areas in which they overlapped and even depended on each other. Links forged between English and French Catholics in a period of crisis could have informed subsequent relations between Catholicism in England and in the wider continent.

The vast majority of those in Paris and elsewhere in Europe in the 1580s continued to identify themselves as English Catholics. One characteristic of exiles is a sense of looking back to the homeland, often accompanied by an effort to continue to orientate oneself by the familiar world that has been left behind. Elizabethan exiles prioritised England and their return to it, but this did not preclude them from engagement in issues of international significance. Most notably, through their physical presence, everyday activity, and literary projects they made the plight of English Catholics a concern for the international Catholic Church. In this respect, their activity aligned with that of their clerical leaders, who defended and justified English Catholics inside and outside England. In addition to the yearning for home, however, there were other reasons why lay Catholics abroad continued to live with reference to England, and which rendered the Protestant picture of the English Catholic abroad inaccurate in many respects. Many of those abroad went back to England relatively soon after their departure, often resuming a life which engaged on some levels with the Protestant status quo. In this respect, they were not exiles at all. They practised greater freedom of manoeuvre than the English government permitted or acknowledged them to have; but they also took an approach more pragmatic than their clerical leaders may have viewed as desirable.

This study is unable to delineate and describe definitively the exile group in Paris, a problem applicable to other exile groups across Europe.\textsuperscript{16} A complete narrative of English Catholics in Paris in the 1580s, including their prior and subsequent movements, remains elusive. Full prosopographical studies of English Catholics in Europe, comparable to those achieved for English Protestant exile populations abroad

\textsuperscript{15} Haigh, ‘Continuity’, p. 122; Walsham, “‘Domme Preachers’”, pp. 121-22.

\textsuperscript{16} Gabriel Audisio demonstrates the problems with earlier attempts at sketching out an exile group. Audisio, ‘Provençal Refugees’, pp. 93-95.
are not feasible. We cannot know who all the Catholics were, and we cannot always easily apply the label of exile to those who are traceable. One possible response to the problem of definition comes through recognition of the shifting and impermanent nature of the exile category. Those gentry who went abroad only to return soon after did so for a variety of reasons. Some went overseas for a short while to 'lie low' and escape unwelcome government attention, intending to return home soon. Others, unhappy about the increasing severity of legislation in England, went in genuine search of freedom of conscience, without having acquired notoriety in England for Catholicism. Pursuance or persecution by Protestant authorities was not a necessary prerequisite for departure. Once abroad, the rhetoric of exile offered an explanation and justification for their position and, as we have seen, there were those who turned to it. In this way, their departure to the continent could become an exile almost after the event. They may have become exiles because of subsequent developments in England, or because they bought into the exile rhetoric and activity of radical coreligionists and countrymen abroad. This rhetoric was prevalent in many contexts, and could be alluded to even by those who were not politically disaffected. At the same time, those who left England on more ambiguous terms did not have to buy into it: they did not explicitly recast themselves as banished men, and left themselves other options. Their voice - the wider voice of lay Catholic interaction with the Continent - and even their existence is often lost in historical study, in contrast to the figureheads and those indisputably in exile. This thesis has endeavoured to shed some light on these laity and their options as part of a religious minority in Elizabethan England. Catholic laity had to work with what was available to them: within these constraints, they found different ways to respond to changed circumstances. Scholars recognise that Catholics negotiated a range of identities for themselves from within England. Catholic environments outside England provided other possibilities for this negotiation, and they require further examination. This thesis has proposed that Catholic laity, even those abroad in the short term, had a role in the process of the transmission of a Northern European Catholic revival to England, and in finding ways to reconcile this with the demands of daily life under a Protestant regime.

Lisa McClain believes there were plural Catholic communities in post-Reformation England, and an individual could be part of more than one community.

17 Garrett, Marian Exiles.
simultaneously. She defines Catholic identity as ‘a self-perception of sameness, likeness or oneness’ with other Catholics, and Catholic community as the sets of ‘relationships between those who identify with one another’. These are useful concepts with which to approach the English Catholic presence in Paris. Whilst remaining orientated towards England, they interacted with Catholic communities on both sides of the Continent. They had issues and experiences in common with their co-religionists at home and with their French hosts. In other respects, however, McClain’s views may be qualified. She asserts that: ‘English Catholics might identify with their co-religionists throughout Europe and on the continent in a broad sense, but they did not necessarily share communal relationships with them’. This thesis demonstrates that in some cases, and in limited numbers, they did just that. Communal relationships can be seen in the attendance of English at mass and other religious celebrations in Paris; by their acceptance of charity from Catholic leaders, French notables, and Parisian bourgeoisie; by their contribution to and in some cases spearheading of polemical initiatives in the city; by their membership of a University corps, alongside Catholics from other parts of Northern and Eastern Europe; and by the involvement of a few in international plans for invasions of England or Scotland. Meanwhile, they may have been physically absent from them, but could engage with Catholics in England and across Europe through networks of correspondence, manuscripts and books. The direct communal relations, born out of exceptional circumstances, were constantly shifting: in many cases they owed their existence to Paris and the opportunities attendant upon their stay there. Relations were not free of tensions and contradictions; in fact the sense of oneness that McClain sees as central to an identity was not always present. Nevertheless, communal relations between English Catholics and those on the Continent existed and continued; their exact nature and long-term significance require further attention. The English Catholic ‘community’ existed on many sites, in England and on the Continent, in the 1580s; this was to be the pattern for the following centuries. Initiatives, born out of the specific circumstances of different locales, could develop on more than one site, or one site alone. But there was an undeniable circulation of ideas between these various sites, in and beyond England. This thesis has argued that the Catholic laity, as well as their clerical counterparts, made a crucial contribution to this circulation; thus our accepted view of the English Catholic ‘community’ may need revision. It hopefully also sheds

---

18 McClain, _Lest We Be Damned_, p. 234.

19 Thanks to Anne Dillon for discussion of ideas contained in this paragraph.
light on other areas of study: foreign groups in early modern cities, the transmission of Counter-Reformation Catholicism, and Paris in the later years of Henri III's reign.

If we are to judge the short-term success of the English Catholic presence on the Continent in the period, it stands in stark contrast to its Protestant counterpart under Mary I. There was no mass return to an England restored to the faith: indeed, this proved a vain hope in the long as well as short term. Elizabethan exiles could not become leaders of the political and ecclesiastical establishment as the returning Marian exiles could. However, there are several reservations about judging significance on these terms alone. Firstly, only a small proportion of those who went abroad envisaged an active role for themselves in effecting Catholic restoration in England: a larger number probably attached themselves to the ideal of patient fortitude in response to persecution and exile, whilst continuing to hope for a Catholic England. Secondly, if some did not see themselves as exiles, they would not have viewed the idea of homecoming in polarised terms. Many of those abroad in the short term had found ways to live under an increasingly well-established Protestant regime before leaving, and resumed this on return from abroad. Thirdly, English Catholic laity in Paris arguably had a larger impact for their coreligionists in France and elsewhere in Europe than their Marian counterparts did on their adopted sites. Exiles in Paris not only lived alongside their hosts, they also worshipped with them. The close involvement of some in political developments inside France was one way to internationalise their dilemma, and to pursue a route by which it could be reversed or improved. I would argue that whilst certain Marian exiles used their removal from the country as an opportunity to bring down the English government, they did not involve themselves in the tensions of their host community to such an extent, and with such an impact.

Perhaps we need to assess an exile, or at least removal from the homeland, on grounds other than its immediate efficacy in realising the exiles' homecoming. If those abroad outside the circle of well documented conspirators did not aim to return in triumph on the back of a foreign invasion, they cannot fairly be charged with their failure to do so. Lechat suggests that English Catholic émigrés, particularly those in the Spanish Low Countries, were intermediaries between England and the rest of Catholic Europe. 20 This is an intriguing idea, but needs to be squared with the observation that many long-term exiles had lost perspective on the situation for their coreligionists in

20 Lechat, Réfugiés, p. 208.
England.21 Had all exiles lost touch, they could not be effective mediators for their
countrymen or for their hosts. Perhaps we again need to distinguish between those who
can be clearly delineated as émigrés or exiles, who were likely to have lost touch and
perspective with coreligionists in England, and those travellers or visitors who only ever
intended to be away for a short time. The latter, from the little that we do know about
them, were in a good position to act as intermediaries, given the active nature of
networks within and between families on both sides on the Channel. Having retained
some position at home, their continental experiences could be used to influence others
within England on their return. At the same time, whilst abroad they could provide up to
date information on the situation in England to interested parties, and assess how much
assistance they could expect from coreligionists on the continent. If not involved in
political conspiracy themselves, their kinship links and other connections to a number of
exiled activists may have helped to gain them a good welcome from their French hosts.
Again, it must be stressed that this more constructive role for the English Catholic
traveller is often speculative, but it does seem compatible with available evidence.

Exile, or at least time abroad, may not have effected a full Catholic restoration,
but it provided the space and time in which alternative views of English Catholic
identity and community could be explored and articulated. Exile in Paris certainly
offered English Catholics a voice they otherwise would not have had. It was from
abroad that the cause of English Catholicism was staffed and trained, and that they
found space, opportunity and support for their polemical, controversial and devotional
voices. The printing presses of Paris and elsewhere produced works of immediate
pertinence for English and continental audiences, but it also produced books of longer-
term devotional significance. An English Catholic voice also developed immediately,
through their physical presence. We know, for example, that some who conformed in
England declared themselves Catholic on arrival in France, whilst Protestants could
begin a longer process of conversion. None of this would have been possible within
Protestant England. Paris opened up a host of opportunities for English Catholic
identities and communities to be discovered or rediscovered. It was a critical site for the
sustenance of an exile that has recently been acknowledged as holding a ‘political
potency and self-renewing power’.22

---
21 Above, Chapter Five, p. 273.
I hope this study demonstrates that discussions of the nature of English Catholicism in the post-Reformation period cannot yield definitive explanations without a consideration of the English presence abroad, in French as well Spanish territories. Haigh has recently called for some new approaches in historiographical debate on the extent of continuity or innovation in the English Catholic Church as it emerged under Elizabeth I. 23 Perhaps the European context of this offers one such new way into the topic. We need to consider seriously the significance of the exile segment of English Catholicism in its lay and clerical guises. The experience of laity abroad fed into Catholic identity in ways distinct from those of the continentally trained priests, whose impact on changing forms of devotion in England has been acknowledged. One notable northern example is Dorothy Lawson, who built a new residence on the mouth of the Tyne in 1616 to act as a contact house for priests. The altar in this house was a leading example of new continental designs in England. 24 Such changes are always attributed to priestly influence, and in this case her close collaboration with Jesuit missionaries cannot be discounted. At the same time, however, Dorothy Lawson was sending her children to Europe for a Catholic education: the continental experience of those children who returned home may have impacted on the way their local communities approached their faith. Again, there is little direct information with which to assess this impact, but it is conceivable that such a transmission occurred. Perhaps those laity who had spent time abroad acted as a kind of bridge between Catholic Europe and Catholics in England, just as their clerical counterparts did. Most Catholic gentry in England were more likely to come into close contact with other gentry who had spent some time in Catholic Europe than they were to benefit from the permanent presence of a missionary priest. Perhaps, then, laity who had spent time abroad provided the mediating influence suggested by Lechat. They may not have encouraged the attitudes to exile that the English government or Catholic clerical leaders conveyed to their audiences. However, they may have been an important influence for kin and fellow coreligionists who were endeavouring to reconcile diverging loyalties in a Protestant England, and were thus dealing with issues which English Catholic leaders had not experienced for themselves, at least for some time.

23 Haigh, 'Bossy and Beyond', p. 494.

Exile is a polarising and destabilising state and process: it holds potential for a negative impact on home and host territories. Through physical presence, individual actions and the development of a particular identity those in Paris had a polarising effect. Their physical removal from England was taken by the government as proof of Catholic disloyalty; their actions influenced the production of increasingly stringent anti-Catholic measures. At the same time, whilst host-guest relations were not conducted on equal terms, they were mutually productive. English Catholics needed Paris as a Catholic refuge, but radical Catholics in France needed them for their own cause. Used by French radicals, often with their complicity and collaboration, the exiles crystallized opposition to Henri III and set out to push international opinion to an active response. On a mundane level, their existence abroad was unstable and precarious for themselves and their hosts: this was reflected in the destabilising impact they held for the English and French Crowns.

As demonstrated above, in their polemical aspect exiles could feature alongside contemporary martyrs. In some respects, the exiles had a similar function to the martyrs, who strengthened as they divided: strengthening the divide between Catholic and Protestant, but also causing tensions between the Catholics whose unity they were meant to bolster.²⁵ On an international stage the English martyrs, and by extension those suffering the white martyrdom of exile, were a rallying cry for Catholics across Europe to brook no compromise in the face of heresy. They were also exemplars for the faithful, proving the righteousness of their cause. At the same time, not all Catholics were called to martyrdom, and not all Catholics could be exiles. Exile was a model which was not always open to, or even approved of, by others. Catholics in England did not always support the exiled radical activists on the continent, as they had to bear the brunt of the negative consequences of their activism. The internal divisions amongst the politically active exiles seriously harmed the likelihood of any concerted action, and in part explained the transitory nature of their ‘community’. The extent of internal divisions may also have had a more long-term negative effect: by the mid-seventeenth century, it was a well-established observation that the English were a quarrelsome nation when abroad.²⁶ Perhaps this reputation can be attributed to the English Crown’s Catholic exiles as well as their Protestant subjects.


As underlined in the introduction, more research remains to be done on the English Catholic presence in Paris and in sites beyond the French capital. Further investigation of the notarial sources and greater prosopographical study with English sources could yield further insights to qualify some of the findings of this thesis. However, future research will, I hope, serve to confirm the view that the English Catholic laity on the continent, particularly in France, acquired crucial importance in the 1580s, for the Protestant government at home, for the English Catholic community at large, and for their host kingdom.

The exile of English Catholic gentry in the 1580s was replete in volatile and destabilising potential, for the enemy government in England, for a French crown struggling to contain profound divisions within its own kingdom, and for English Catholicism at home and abroad. However, this thesis has argued that the crisis of dislocation from home – in a physical, religious and political sense – could also harbour a constructive potential. Paris provided new opportunities to interact on a national and international scene, and to wield an influence over events which were unavailable in the native environment. Local county families came into contact with intellectuals and polemicists, forging patterns of sociability that were very different to that of a rural gentry community in England. However, this exposure did not serve to unite a confessional group which was already composed of a range of opinions and attitudes to the circumstances in which it found itself. The group in Paris was fluctuating in the period, in line with the religious flux in both England and France. Apparently a transitory radical presence, in fact the exiles had an impact on English Catholic identity, on events in Paris, and on immediate Anglo-French relations, whose significance is rarely recognised. Beyond this, it also had creative long-term consequences, by providing important precedents on which prospective religious or gentlemen tourists could draw.

Both the short-term and more prolonged impacts of the English Catholic presence in Paris were multivalent and complex. Exile polarised political and confessional groupings, but also offered alternative spaces for the negotiation and articulation of more nuanced identities. The profile of the English exile, or at least the English Catholic abroad, was not static in the course of the 1580s and continued to shift in subsequent decades. The English Catholic abroad could be a controversial figure, for the host country and for fellow countrymen at home, but there was no fixed way to
construe the goals of a Catholic gentleman when he went to Europe. The evidence of Catholic exiles in Paris in the 1580s indicates that studies of the English Catholic community in the post-Reformation world need to pay greater attention to the considerable lay, as well as clerical, presence abroad. Integrating them into the history of post-Reformation English Catholicism offers a more complex but perhaps more representative picture of pertinent issues and debates. Considering English Catholicism through a study of its exile challenges some of the assumptions about its nature in this period of crisis. As Bossy showed in 1960, as Anne Dillon demonstrates, and as this thesis also highlights, our view of the English Catholic community needs to encompass laity who were physically outside the kingdom but who continued to influence developments to varying extents and in different ways. The multifaceted nature of the English Catholic presence abroad further complicates a picture of early modern English Catholicism, and of the evolution of Catholic reform in Northern Europe. If we are to characterise the Catholic community in post-Reformation England, it was far from being a withdrawn and insular one, but was made up of men and women in England and on the continent who had a number of responses to their situation, a number of attitudes to their relations with Catholic Europe, and a range of approaches to the negotiation of their identity and community. Within this group, the exiles had a profound importance.
APPENDICES
## Appendix I

**Transcription of TNA, SP 78/4a/63**

The following is copied from Arthur John Butler (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers Foreign Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, July 1579-December 1580* (London, 1904). This retains the spelling, layout and marginalia of the original document.

### FOREIGN PAPERS.

A.D. 1580.  
April 27.  

279.  

The names of sundry Englishmen, Papists, presently abiding in Paris.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yorkshire</strong></td>
<td>Russell, Hynocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northumberland</strong></td>
<td>Darcy, Haddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derbyshire</strong></td>
<td>Darcy, Foulsham, Freshwell, Farlett, Deacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northampton</strong></td>
<td>Farley, Cresswell, Vawse, Varneham, Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheshire</strong></td>
<td>Hollambery, Savage, Turbridge, Hurton, Chambailey, Dution, Brewer, Manner, Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumberland</strong></td>
<td>Barley, Whittington, Tracy, Bray, Hanakeman, Aylworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wiltsire, Devon</strong></td>
<td>2 D'avers, 2 Hungerfords, Copton, Carwe (Devon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hantsire</strong></td>
<td>Lawrence, 3 Shelles, 2 Writheleys, Nofolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Widham</strong></td>
<td>Windam, Hindeston, Kivson, Catlin, Benington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxfordshire</strong></td>
<td>Barker, Harte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welsh Counties</strong></td>
<td>Parry, 2 Owens, 2 Soudamores, 2 Vaughans (Heref.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Hamers  
Salisbury  

Of Sundry Counties.  

2 Doyleys  
Allen, Lodge  

2 Redmans  
Gobbins  

Knivston  

Eannes  
Fortescue  

Budley  
Baker  

Buckle  
Elthrop  

Biscoit  
Kempton  

Baston  
Buckett  

Farrington  
Branington  

Jenings (Lajeces-Shrougborowe)  
Wroughton  

Hassock  
Walter  

Banes  
2 Bassedges (Nottingh.)  

Omer  
Travers  

Royston  
3 Wars  

Pudde  
Baymont  

Holland (Lincoln)  
Hardwigs  

Colmbye  
Rastall (Buckinagh.)  

Brighton  
Gossadge  

Cosley  
Cowlon  

Redborne (Heref.)  
Kempson  

2 Brounes  
Wolatrop  

Shields  
Lottis  

Turryle  
Banister (Salop)  

Cooper  
Brackett  

Mountjoy, kinsman to Lord Mountjoy, sometime appertaining to the Duke of Norfolk and now steward to M. Pibrac
These for the most part are gentlemen of good account here, and no students. Such gentlemen and others as are accounted for students and placed in Colleges or appertaining thereto:—

3 Smythes, one a kinsman of the late Earl of Arundel
2 Bridesmans, gent.
Erway
Ploydens, the lawyer's son
Dawson
Flood, brother-in-law to Lord Lumley
Bayly, Dr. B.'s son
Bancley
3 Nevells, gent.
Knight, gent.
Cornwells, gent.
Powell, gent.
Munday
Biggs
Oley, gent. Richardson
Front
Allyott
2 Wilbromes, gent
Lovel, g.
Daniell, g.
3 Skeynes, sons to Sir Tho.
Brompton
Speakes, g.
Jackson
Bearmore
Brackley
3 Barkers
Robinson
3 Clarks
Goodgin
Goodwin
Burnell
Bootstock
Hartley
Bushell
Brinckott
Beckett
Wood
Thorley
Ludwell
Broughton
Herson
Hockett
Harrison
Hamlett
Usher
Smithson
Tilley
Warner
Hudson
Boasey
Snowe
Snagge
Luddington
Playne
Vaghan
Lancaster
2 Webbs
Pilsbury
2 Sharlocks, g.
Boyer
Lovesett
Planckney
Poydell
2 Bracys, g.
Olyvett, g.
Barnes
Chudley
Barnets
Nightingsall
Ethrrop
Ruckby
Manley
Godfrey
Atkinson
Christman
Brasbridge, g.
Throgmorton, g.
Sutherston, g.
Edleston
Rogers, g.
Turton
Greenfield, g.
Litchfield, g.
Hathicke
Otwell
2 Johnsons
Allen
Watson
2 Gysfords, g. of Staffordshire
gone to the Isle
Wooley, g.
2 Crosses (erasèd) greatly suspected to be Papists

ENGLISH DOCTORS.
Dr. Allen
Dr. Darbishyre
Dr. Peashey
Dr. Robinson
Dr. Bayly
Dr. Richard
Dr. Tomkinson, a Jesuit
Dr. Farnham
Dr. Nicholson
Dr. Smiths
Dr. Smite
Dr. Robards
Dr. Smithike
Dr. Wilkinson
Dr. Barnet
Dr. Bristows
Dr. Knott, lately gone to the Prince of Parma

ENGLISH PRIESTS.
Fitzherbert
Bouler
Chambers
Fertley
Medlicote
Brahe
Cocks
Furston
Beckworth.

GENTLEMEN REMAINING AT ROCH.
Sir John Barkley
Mr. John Wootton
Anderton (Lancaster)
Sheilond, a practiser

GREAT PRACTITIONERS.
Tho. Morgan
Warbutton
Clitherowe
King
Hilliard
Watson, son to the Attorney in London
Brackford, a pensioner of the Scots Queen
Thomas Evans, a companion of David Chambers, a Scot
Orton
Sudgrave, an Irishman

IRISHMEN.
Lawrence
Edmunds (Priests)
Whyte

GENTLEMEN.
Fitzpatrick
Dowby
Trilough
Cooly
Mr. Hughes
2 Sudgraves

GENTLEMEN.
Dr. Allen
Dr. Darbishyre
Dr. Peashey
Dr. Robinson
Dr. Bayly
Dr. Richard
Dr. Tomkinson, a Jesuit
Dr. Farnham
Dr. Nicholson
Dr. Smiths
Dr. Smite
Dr. Robards
Dr. Smithike
Dr. Wilkinson
Dr. Barnet
Dr. Bristows
Dr. Knott, lately gone to the Prince of Parma

LICENTIATES IN CIVIL LAW.
Edwards, a Londoner
Percy of Yorkshire
Davison, Northampton.
Harding
Cover
Crompton
Weston
Appelton
Tempest
Francke
A.D. 1580.

Letherborowe  Lady Copley has only Smythe
Marshall     one, Mr. Brooke. Willoughby
Skevington   The whole number of Corbett
Whetston     Papists are 307. It is Buggins
Stillington (York) thought there are Porter
Gates        about 100 Papists or Hidgcock
Warden       rather more in this Windebancke
town, English and Champernowne
Phillipps    Irish, besides the for-

There are besides them named; who, living
many gentlemen and secretly and disguised
others at Rheims, as they do, cannot so
Orleans, and other readily be known.
known. Lady Morley besides those which
has these in her house: appertain to my Lord

Mr. Parker, her son 
Merideth     Mr. Bacon
Mr. Hall     2 Hoptons
Peyton       Mansfield
Hammer       Varroeham

Endd.: Mary I., the names of Englishmen residing in France,
being Papists. 3 pp. [France IV. 63.]
Appendix II
Some notes on Parisian Notaries

The following list highlights some notaries whose études are of particular interest for the study of English and Scottish Catholic exiles in Paris. It is by no means exhaustive, not least because a proportion of the notary archive of potential use was not available for consultation over the course of the past three years.

Pierre Belot (1572-1610).
Rue Saint-Jacques, parish of Saint-Séverin.
AN MC, CIX, 1-58.
He co-signed the actes of Guy Nynian, Jacques Fardeau and François Raffin, who had obvious links to English and Scottish exiles in the city. For instance, he co-signed the act that Raffin drew up with Thomas Copley.

Clement Bernard (1582-1600).
Rue de la Harpe
AN, MC, XLIX, 213-236.
Many of his clients were connected to University colleges, although he was not notably employed by the German Nation. His clientele came from left bank parishes such as Saints-Cosme-et-Damien and Saint-Séverin. He was also employed by the Naus and the Champhuons, who had clear links to Mary Stuart’s council in France. The English shoemaker Thomas Nycholls came from the Bastille area to use his services.

Claude Boreau (1539-1588).
Rue des Augustins, in front of the convent.
AN, MC, VIII, 66-117.
His clients included members of the Guise family, and academics from various left-bank colleges. Unfortunately, parts of his étude were not available for consultation.

Guillaume Cadier (1547-1586).
Rue Saint-Séverin.
AN, MC, CXXII, 105-127.
His clients included University colleges, amongst them Collège Mignon, individual academics, the curé of Saints-Cosme-et-Damien, the Champhuons and the Guise. A fair proportion of his clients came from outside Paris. Parts of his étude were not available for consultation.

Jacques Chappellain (1560-1589).
Rue Saint-Jacques.
AN, MC, LXXIII, 66-100.
His étude provides the most extensive evidence for English and Scottish exile activity in Paris. In the academic sphere, for instance, he was employed by the German Nation. Scottish clients included the Archbishop of Glasgow, William Douglas, Esmé Stuart, John Stuart, Thomas Winterhop and John Hamilton. English clients included Charles Paget. French clients included printers such as Nicholas Chesneau, colleges including Collège Bourgogne and Collège Mignon, the Naus and the Champhuons, the churchwardens of Saints-Cosme-et-Damien, and the parishioners of various left-bank parishes.
Berthelemy Dumarc (1569-1589).
Rue Saint-Jacques, parish of Saint-Benoît.
AN, MC, LXXIII, 127-141.
His clientèle had quite a strong academic profile, but there is little sign of any English among them. However, he was employed by Scotsmen, and by the French merchant Jean August, who had financial links to exiles.

Jacques Fardeau (1581-1629).
Rue Saint-Jacques, parish of Saint-Séverin.
AN, MC, XLIX, 169-212.
A strong academic client base. He was employed by a range of left-bank colleges, by religious houses including the Mathurins, and by printers and booksellers, including Nicolas Chesneau. Fardeau also had personal and business links to the German Nation: he drew up actes for them, whilst his son-in-law was the nation’s messenger. In terms of specific English clients, he was employed by Charles Paget, and by a messenger of Elizabeth I.

Philippe Lamiral (1555-1590).
Rue Saint-Jacques.
AN, MC, XXXIII, 194-205.
Employed by a number of colleges and faculties, including Collège de Cambrai, and by clerics such as the curé of Saint-André-des-Arts. He drew up actes for Scottish exiles and French partisans of Mary Stuart, such as Henry Kyer, Jean Champhuon and members of the Nau family. He did a great deal of work for the Mathurins Convent, and drew up actes for members of the Anroux family.

Mathurin Lenain (1577-1584).
Saint-Germain-des-Prés.
AN, MC, CXXII, 304-312.
Did a lot of work for Collège Bourgogne, although his actes show little sign of any Englishmen there, and for individuals resident on rue Neuve, where Charles Paget lived. A lot of his clientèle were non-Parisians. Those connected to Guise households also appear in his étude.

Guy Nynian (1560-1584).
Rue de la Harpe, parish of Saint-Séverin.
AN, MC, XXIII, 166-205.
His clientèle was usually drawn from Parisian office-holders, amongst them Pierre de L’E estoile. He also, however, drew up actes for the Guise, for individuals staying in Collège Bayeux, and for parishioners of Saints-Cosme-et-Damien.

Thomas Perier (1543-1589).
Place Maubert.
He did a considerable amount of business with University colleges that were in his part of the left bank, including Collège Montaigu. He was also employed by churchwardens of Saints-Cosme-et-Damien and other leftbank parishes, by a number of religious houses, and by printers including Nicolas Chesneau. He drew up an acte for the English ambassador, Edward Stafford, relating to his debts, and cosigned Clement Bernard’s acte relating to the Englishman Thomas Nycholls.
François Raffin (1565-1580).
Rue Saint-Jacques.
AN, MC, XLIX, 144-168.
University colleges are very well represented in his étude, including Collèges de Cambrai, Bourgogne, and Bayeux. He was employed by the German Nation during their internal dispute over the use of some their property in Paris. He also drew up actes for Englishmen Thomas Copley and William Davidson. Some of his études were unavailable for consultation; they may well contain more information relating to English exiles.

Olivier Roger (1560-1575).
Rue Saint-Séverin.
AN, MC, XXIX, 4; XXXIII, 60-74; CX, 20-24.
Employed by a number of University colleges, including Collège de Cambrai, by the Cardinal of Lorraine, and by Jean Prevost, curé of Saint-Séverin. His work was co-signed by notary Roland Hacte, a known radical who had a key role in riots at Saint-Séverin.
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