INTRODUCTION

Francis Throckmorton was the son of Sir John Throckmorton and his wife Margaret Puttenham. He was a committed Catholic but, unlike his father who had progressed well professionally under Queen Mary and initially under Queen Elizabeth, he found difficulty in conforming to the established church. In 1578 he was briefly imprisoned and examined on suspicion of attending mass, after which he and his brother Thomas went abroad and became involved with fellow Catholic expatriates in the Netherlands including Sir Francis Englefield and others with whom Francis discussed the possibility of the government being overthrown by a foreign invasion. In the early 1580s Throckmorton returned to England in order to serve both Rome and the imprisoned Mary Queen of Scots. In the spring of 1583, Walsingham had become aware through his contact in the French embassy that Throckmorton and Lord Henry Howard had become the Scottish queen’s chief agents. In November 1583 Throckmorton was arrested at his London house, where among his papers was a list of names of Catholic noblemen and gentry including those of the Earl of Northumberland and William Shelley, alongside details of sites and harbours in Sussex suitable for the landing of a foreign invasion force. He was subsequently found guilty of treason, on evidence obtained after he had been racked. He was executed at Tyburn on 10 July 1584.

There had been a number of plots on the part of the Spanish and French to invade England with the intention of removing Queen Elizabeth and replacing her with Mary Stewart. Charles Paget, the Catholic fourth son of William, Baron Paget, had become acquainted with the Scottish queen through his association with Thomas Morgan, Mary’s representative in Paris, during his self-imposed exile there. In 1583, he volunteered to travel to England with the purpose of enlisting support for such an invasion of several Catholics, the most notable of whom were Henry Percy of Petworth, the eighth Earl of Northumberland, and William Shelley of Michelgrove in Clapham whose families had suffered greatly for their Catholicism. The earl himself had previously been found guilty of plotting to rescue Mary, though not of treason, and had been imprisoned for more than two years before being released to internal exile within the environs of his London house and Petworth; he was prohibited from returning to his family seat in Northumberland on account of its proximity to Scotland. Paget wished to meet the earl about a planned landing in Sussex of a small diversionary French force to be led by Mary’s kinsman the Duke of Guise, while a more powerful Spanish invasion force would land near the Scottish border. The earl had already learned of the plan from his son, Lord Henry, and dispatched his man, Robotham, across the channel in an attempt to forestall Paget’s visit. However, Paget had already left and in the early hours of 8 September landed at Arundel, from where he was taken to the home of William Shelley’s servant William Davies, a farmer who lived at Patching, three miles from Arundel and half a mile down the valley from Michelgrove House. Paget subsequently met Shelley and Northumberland at Petworth, where he stayed for about a week in Conigar Lodge in the Park. Charles Paget knew Northumberland well, as he
had ostensibly been looking after the education of the earl’s sons in Paris, although by 1583 the eldest, Lord Henry Percy, was meeting not only English exiles but also Catholics at the French court.5

The earl invited Thomas, Lord Paget, to Petworth in order to meet his younger brother Charles, where he also met Shelley and thereby became unintentionally implicated in the conspiracy. Thomas Paget was also a Catholic, who had been imprisoned in 1581 for assisting the Jesuit Edmund Campion on his return to England, but he had not been a party to the present plotting. He was fearful for his safety and six months earlier had quietly converted much of his estate into cash with a view to joining his brother in exile.6

Charles Paget returned to Davies’s house the following week and met Shelley again at Patching Copse on the 16 September; he may also have met Henry Howard.7 It was from Davies’s house that John Haler, a master and part-owner of a large vessel moored at Arundel, had collected Charles Paget, together with Anthony Snap, another of Shelley’s servants, and an unnamed stranger (possibly Robotham) for the return journey to France on the night of Wednesday 25 September.8

Charles Arundel and Henry Howard (uncle of the Earl of Arundel) were cousins, nephews of Queen Catherine Howard. Both were courtiers, and in 1581 had been wrongly imprisoned for ‘plotting’, based on the false testimony of the Earl of Oxford.9 The pair fought long and hard to clear their names, and on examination Howard was able to prove his innocence and Arundel was released without charge after more than ten months in custody; they were subsequently placed under house arrest, Arundel at Sutton, ten miles from Petworth. As with other members of recusant families, they had also been under suspicion for their Catholicism, and when news emerged of Throckmorton’s imprisonment, Charles Arundel and Lord Paget determined to flee to France. Arundel feared he would be implicated in the plot hatched so close to his house; Lord Paget suspected that the Privy Council were intent on his entrapment for treason, and now feared that his brother’s connection with the Scottish queen, and his own with the plotters, had provided the necessary ammunition.10 Charles Arundel remained at Sutton and Lord Paget and his manservant lodged with William Davies at Patching while William Shelley made arrangements for their escape.

The Petworth meetings and subsequent events came to the attention of Francis Walsingham; the Privy Council, which had for some time been aware of what was being planned in France, had summoned the ambassador and required him to inform King Henri III of Guise’s plans, to which the king immediately ordered a halt. Despite this outcome, as evidence was revealed by Throckmorton’s torture, Walsingham ordered the arrest and interrogation of the Earl of Northumberland and William Shelley (who had failed to make his own escape) and the examination of all those involved in the circumstances leading to the flight of Arundel and Paget, among whom was numbered one Christopher Haynes.

THE FAMILY OF HAYNES OF READING

Christopher Haynes was the fourth son of Richard Haynes and his wife Thomasine Folkes of Whitley in the parish of St Giles, Reading. He was one of six brothers and a sister (Fig. 1), and in some respects was the most colourful of all of them.11

Next to nothing is known of his early life, although he was probably born in the family home at Whitley in the mid-1520s, as his nearest younger brother, Nicholas, was born in 1529. All the brothers were literate and at least three of them, one styled esquire, the others ‘gentlemen’, subsequently held positions in the royal household, for which literacy and fluency in spoken and written English were prerequisites.

It is possible that the Haynes family was involved in cloth-making, on which the prosperity of Reading was based, but of the six brothers only Thomas, the eldest, continued to live in the family home at Whitley in the mid-1520s, as his nearest younger brother, Nicholas, was born in 1529. All the brothers were literate and at least three of them, one styled esquire, the others ‘gentlemen’, subsequently held positions in the royal household, for which literacy and fluency in spoken and written English were prerequisites.

John Haynes, citizen and fishmonger of London, probably entered royal service in the reign of Queen Mary and by 1568 had progressed to the position of sergeant of the acaty, the largest and most important division within the royal household, responsible for the purchase of meat, fish and salt.13 He had reporting to him some six separate purveyors for beef, oxen, sheep and both fresh fish and sea-fish, this last post being held
by his brother, William Haynes, also a London fishmonger. As sergeant of the acatry, John had the ear of Lord Burghley. The third brother to be in royal employ was Nicholas, who for more than 20 years was a yeoman harbinger, throughout the seventies working on the lengthy royal progresses of that decade. As the queen’s personal security became threatened in the dangerous eighties, progresses were suspended, and at the age of about 57 Nicholas was appointed yeoman purveyor of wheat in the royal bakehouse. He and his family lived at Hackney.14

Christopher Haynes left Reading for Sussex, and in the mid-1550s, by now styled gentleman, he married Elizabeth Colebrook, and settled in Arundel for the rest of his life; they would leave no children.15 Elizabeth was the daughter of John Colebrook, probably a prominent burgess of Midhurst. Like Reading, Midhurst was a centre of the cloth trade and a parliamentary borough, and several members of the Colebrook family had served as its bailiff and returning officer.16

Christopher soon rose to prominence in Arundel, being elected a burgess in January 1557.17 After this time his name appears in most entries in the borough minute book until October 1585. At one of his earliest meetings he seems to have been rather too outspoken for his own good; in June 1558 he was ejected from the council for being rude and disrespectful and ‘saying shameful words’ to the mayor, but was subsequently reinstated later that year. He was himself mayor of Arundel in 1562 and 1578. Christopher’s final recorded appearance was on 4 October 1585, when he witnessed the installation of the new burgesses for the last time (Fig. 2).18

Christopher Haynes served as customer of Arundel, which included Littlehampton harbour, and would have been entitled to repay himself from receipts and to keep any profits, which included the usual ‘portage’ of £1 for every £100 delivered to the Queen’s cofferer.19 Christopher worked with his brother-in-law,
Thomas Colebrook, who was the searcher, the officer of the custom house appointed to search ships, baggage or goods for dutiable or contraband articles. The third member of the customs team was Thomas Bridger the controller, the person who kept a separate set of accounts or counter-rolls. There was a suggestion that he was also related to Colebrook or Haynes, in whose footsteps, and doubtless with whose support, he followed, becoming one of the Arundel burgesses on 30 April 1572. Contemporaries would have seen no necessary conflict of interest in three closely related individuals working in the same government enterprise, but nevertheless their kinship would soon become the cause of concern, rumour and innuendo that the three were lining their pockets at the country’s expense.

SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS

On 15 August 1572, serious allegations against Christopher Haynes were penned by an unidentified informer who, from the details given, was clearly one with considerable local knowledge. The recipient was either William More of Loseley in Surrey, who had been created vice-admiral for Sussex in 1559, or his deputy William Morgan of Chilworth Manor, whom More had appointed a decade later.

The informer alleged that Haynes, aided and abetted by Colebrook and Bridger, had increased the customs receipts for their own profit and before the interests of queen or country. As well as enjoying the right to collect customs duties, Haynes had actually purchased the rights to many of the customs themselves from the queen’s grantee, so was effectively running the operation for his own benefit. It was also alleged that Haynes had persuaded the clothiers of Reading to bring their cloth to Arundel, where he had assisted in its sale, with the obvious implication that his motive was either to assist his fellow townsman in evasion of the duties levied on each piece of woollen cloth sold or to increase the port’s traffic for his own benefit.

It was further alleged that Christopher Haynes had a vessel laden with cloth or similar merchandise in France which at that very time was making its return journey to England. On previous occasions such suspect goods had been observed being moved by pack-horse to a house or warehouse held by Haynes at Ford or Climping, villages nearer the coast to the south of Arundel. The inference was that Christopher Haynes was either a smuggler bent on withholing duty from the queen or, at best, importing foreign goods without a licence.

Such allegations against Haynes had evidently been brought before, as the writer also mentioned what could only have been his earlier responses: that those peddling these rumours were people with malice towards the Earl of Arundel or to the borough of Arundel itself. Haynes maintained that the earl had a valid licence for the export of his wood ‘over the seas’, and that the borough was licensed for the export of wheat. He did not forebear to mention that he had the earl’s ear and if necessary would use his powerful influence at court through his brothers in the royal household.

The charges appear to have come to nothing, yet there are reasons to suppose that at least some of them were well-founded. There are several reports to the Lord Treasurer alleging that customers of different ports had diverted receipts to their own advantage, and indeed their actions, which provided significant opportunities for both ‘private enterprise’ and malicious denunciation, were often difficult to distinguish from those of pirates. At least two of the Arundel men, customer and searcher, were definitely related by marriage. Christopher did indeed have a vessel and he is said to have taken part in voyages for ‘taking and spoiling such things as he could meet withall upon the seas’, after which he conveniently locked his plunder away in the custom house at Arundel. If it was true, he was not alone; in 1569 James Milles, the customer of Rye, kept most of the spoils which had been seized upon the arrest of Captain Chichester. Haynes may have been one of those whom Elizabeth, through the Earl of Lincoln, Lord Admiral of England, had sent to cleanse the seas of pirates who were harassing the fishing fleet and trading ships. In view of his position as customer, it is possible that he behaved legally, or at least operated through a smokescreen of legality. Under a patent granted by Queen Mary, the Lord Admiral, through the vice-admiral for Sussex and the customers, had the right to the goods and chattels seized from pirates and traitors, which right was not withdrawn until 8 June 1577. It would therefore have been perfectly within his rights for Christopher Haynes to have
used his boat in order to intercept contraband or pirated goods.

Christopher’s vessel was a 40-ton hoy called the *Falcon*, which had been duly notified to the vice-admiral of Sussex on 25 January 1569 as berthed at Arundel.\(^{29}\) It was a single-masted vessel twice the size of a fishing boat, rigged as a sloop, and such hoyes were commonly used to carry passengers and freight on short coastal journeys. One of 40 tons’ burden, the heaviest reported in the returns, would have been quite capable of crossing the Channel.

On 25 April 1574 the Bishop of Chichester informed the Lord Treasurer of the considerable harm being done by rovers stealing corn and foodstuffs with the active assistance of the locals, and by piracy on the seas. So much grain seemed to be misappropriated in this way that prices had rocketed to four shillings and four pence a bushel and the populace was becoming restive.\(^{30}\) As Arundel market was described as among the chief corn markets in Sussex, and grain destined mainly for London and various south coast ports was one of the town’s biggest exports, the pirates were waiting to intercept it as it left the Arun.\(^{31}\) One is left wondering about Christopher Haynes’s role in all this. He was almost certainly right in claiming that the town enjoyed a royal licence for the transport and delivery of wheat, and five years later he would be the beneficiary of a warrant from the Privy Council ordering the sheriff and justices of Sussex ‘to suffer Christopher Heynes, purveyor of the seafish, to transporte 500 quarters of wheate’.\(^{32}\) Such a volume of grain would have been carried from Sussex to London only by sea, and Christopher may even have transported it himself.\(^{33}\)

The allegation that Christopher Haynes had persuaded the clothiers of Reading to bring their cloth to sell in Arundel also has the ring of truth about it. Reading was Haynes’s home town, his mother’s cousin was a fuller there and his brother Thomas may also have been involved in the cloth industry; his widow, Agnes Haynes, made several bequests of uncoloured broadcloth in her will of 1589.\(^{34}\) Arundel was a port from which cloth was exported to Normandy and Ireland in the 16th century and Christopher also had the means of shipping it in the *Falcon* – and doubtless the benefit of any custom receipts on its export.\(^{35}\)

Why the informer’s charges against Christopher Haynes came to nothing one can only surmise. They would certainly have been investigated, so the customer’s version of events must have prevailed, possibly with some assistance from his brothers at court. On 4 October 1572, William More had replaced his deputy vice-admiral William Morgan with William Lussher of Thakeham for the Rapes of Arundel, Bramber, Lewes, Pevensey and Hastings, but not the Rape of Chichester.\(^{36}\) The timing of this appointment, within two months of the allegations against Haynes, suggests that the two events might not have been unrelated and that pressure might have been brought to bear on More to remove Morgan. Lussher eventually moved to Arundel, where he became a burgess and a close and ‘trusty’ friend of Christopher Haynes.\(^{37}\)

**EVENTS IN SUSSEX AFTER THROCKMORTON’S ARREST**

It was the same Christopher Haynes who, in November 1583, had organised the shipment of a cargo from Arundel to Dieppe which was to lead to his being implicated in and questioned over the events culminating in the flight of Arundel and Paget. Throughout December, the witnesses to these events were examined in Sussex before Henry Goring, Richard Lewknor and his brother Thomas Lewknor, and the suspects interrogated, probably at the Tower, by Thomas Wilkes and Thomas Norton. The choice of investigators is of interest. All but Goring were MPs; the Lewknors were both Middle Templars and, despite being crypto-Catholics, they between them discharged most of the judicial work in the Rape of Chichester.\(^{38}\) Norton, Cranmer’s son-in-law and a particularly virulent Protestant, earned the sobriquet of ‘rackmaster’ by his frequent insistence to the Privy Council on the use of torture, an activity in which he was assisted by Wilkes, a diplomat and one of the clerks of the Privy Council.\(^{39}\)

Haynes maintained that a London merchant named Isham had sent two large packs down to him at Arundel, to be carried over to one Lawrence Adams in Dieppe. In September, Isham had used the same route to send boards over to Dieppe which had been carried by John Haler, the co-owner of a hoy called the *Dragon* moored in Arundel haven. In the middle of November, more complicated arrangements were made for the shipping of the two further packs, the contents of which were apparently unknown. Haynes sought
the help of Simon Smyth, a servant of the Earl of Northumberland, to superintend their loading at the White Hart in Southwark, from where they were brought to Smyth's house in Petworth by Downer the carrier. Although Smyth had been at Southwark when Downer loaded the packs, he could only assume that they had been brought there by Isham or his apprentice. Smyth then hired John Ramsden and Richard Thwaites to carry the packs over the last seven miles from Petworth to Haynes's house at Arundel. In the course of his questioning on 28 December, Ramsden confirmed that Simon Smyth had hired him to carry an enormous package resembling a woolpack, marked with ink at both ends, to Christopher Haynes in Arundel, from where it was to be sent overseas; Smyth had told him that it belonged to a merchant who was staying with Haynes. Ramsden complained that the pack was so heavy that it had 'almost spoiled his horse in carrying of it between Petworth and Arundel'. Thwaites had also carried a similar pack to Haynes's house, but neither carrier knew what their load contained. It puzzled Smyth that, although he had agreed a price of two shillings for the seven-mile journey, when Ramsden and Thwaites arrived at Arundel Haynes paid them four shillings and sixpence.40

What Christopher Haynes did not know (or at least denied knowing) was that his earlier cargo had accompanied Charles Paget on his return to France in September. When he was examined on this specific point, Haynes said he knew of 'no such gentleman that repaired out of France and was in the house of William Davies', although he did know that 'one Robotham was wont to pass to and fro unto the Earl of Northumberland's children being in France'. Haynes explained that he kept a tabling (gambling) house and tavern in Arundel, frequented by merchants, but he knew of no-one that went to Davies' house. He claimed ignorance of the whole business.42 Haler's testimony supported that of Haynes, in that his passengers went from the haven straight to and from Davies's house and did not stop off in Arundel town. It is obvious that he recognised Robotham, and he was anxious to deny that he had had any discussions with him on the subject of the transporting of 'the gentleman'.43 Thus, if his testimony is to be believed, Christopher Haynes appears to have been inadvertently caught up in the conspiracy to assist in the escape of the two fugitives. As will become clear, he became implicated for other reasons as well.

THE ESCAPE OF ARUNDEL AND PAGET

After Throckmorton's arrest, the word of the escape of Paget and Arundel had spread like wildfire. The fugitives and their armed escort were observed riding towards the sea at Ferring, west of Worthing. It was Sunday evening about an hour after nightfall when Thomas Barnard of Ferring saw eight men on horseback in the main highway. One of them rode ahead with his sword drawn, six others followed in pairs and the eighth made up the rear, probably also with his sword drawn, but Barnard didn't get a good view of them. Neither the men nor their horses returned the same way. The two were then taken across the Channel by a local mariner called Thomas Clinsall in a vessel owned by Thomas Banks, another Catholic.44

For some reason Christopher Haynes felt he needed to discuss what he knew of the escape with William Dartnall of Drungewick, Wisborough Green, his nephew by marriage to Thomasine, daughter of his brother Nicholas (Fig. 1), doubtless in the belief that he could rely on his family’s discretion. Haynes told his nephew that William Shelley of Michelgrove, who had organised the escape and been arrested, would have done better to have spent whatever was necessary to hush up his involvement (a sum of £500 being mentioned), rather than let it be known to the authorities. According to Haynes, its revelation would create reverberations the likes of which had not been experienced for a century – ‘it would reap up such a matter as had not been reaped up this hundred years’. Christopher Haynes had further told his nephew that his brothers in the royal household were greatly concerned that his name was causing ripples; the eldest, John, had written the week before to say that, if Christopher were shown to be a traitor, he would be on his own and could expect no help from them. They would disown him ‘for they would no more take him for their brother’. Unfortunately for Haynes, Dartnall had passed on these details to Shelley’s servant Thomas Pellet, a yeoman farmer at North Stoke two miles outside Arundel. Pellet was interrogated with Shelley's other servants on 9 December, and the transmission of the results to Walsingham undoubtedly led to Christopher's being questioned the following week.45

Christopher Haynes more or less corroborated
Pellet’s statements in his own evidence. Although he knew him well, as a farmer living only a couple of miles away, he said he had not met Pellet since his last visit to Michelgrove on 24 November, and nor been to Pellet’s house at North Stoke for the past two years. Haynes believed that his comments had been made to the controller at the custom house and also to William Dartnall, but ‘he used no speech of reaping up of matters’. What is quite telling about his evidence is Haynes’s likely response had he been in the same situation – he would have simply bribed his way out of it.

A curious event took place on 9 December. Edward Caryll of Shipley, esquire, was examined at Angmering at his own request by Thomas Lewknor, because on the previous Saturday the mayor of Arundel had told him that Haynes had spread the rumour that Paget and Arundel had lodged in Caryll’s house at Shipley. Caryll was incensed at being wronged by Haynes and sufficiently concerned to make for Lewknor at once to put the record straight. He took along his servant John Mychell, yeoman, a member of a well-known land-owning family who had had been left in charge at Shipley during Caryll’s absence. Caryll knew nothing of the escape apart from what he had heard ‘by the common voice in London’. He was on only nodding acquaintance with the two fugitives, whom he had passed by in the street a couple of times in London. He had no idea where they had stayed or whence they had embarked, apart from the rumour that they had left from Sussex. He had held no discussions on the matter with anyone, certainly not his servants. Mychell was then examined in his master’s presence. He had no idea why he was being questioned. He said that Caryll had come home the previous Thursday, 5 December, from London, where he had been for several months, and that on Saturday he went to Arundel. Asked to name anyone who had resided in Caryll’s house and whether any strangers or guests had been staying there, he listed the permanent household of 14, a servant of the Earl of Arundel who had come a month before to collect money for Caryll, Francis Hobbes and Ralph Rainbow, servants of Edward Caryll’s kinsman John Caryll of Warnham, Sares, a yeoman of Abinger in Surrey, and Richard Beard and Giles Vale, servants of William Palmer, who had all stayed the previous Friday night. He believed he had known Lord Paget some 12 years ago before his ennoblement, but probably would not recognise him now; he had seen Charles Arundel in Angmering Park recently, shooting deer, but had never spoken to him. He had heard of the fugitives’ departure from his fellow servant Giles More, clerk to Caryll’s ironworks. His master had not said a word on the matter. When asked if he had heard any credible reports of where Paget and Arundel had lodged or where they had embarked, he said that he had heard in Horsham market the previous Saturday that they ‘were shipped about Felpham’, but he knew of nobody who had assisted in their departure.

William Shelley, it subsequently transpired, had indeed arranged for a barque to be made ready at Ferring, and had hired the services of Thomas Clinsall, a master mariner, for £30. Clinsall maintained that it was Shelley and not the Earl of Northumberland (as accused by the government) who had repeatedly asked about the readiness of the barque and arranged for the passengers to be at Davies’s house at Patching by six in the morning on the day of departure. This meeting place was undoubtedly chosen because it was just a short distance to the north of Ferring. John Shelley, William’s recusant brother, also lived at Clapham, yet he appears to have been completely oblivious of the events unfolding on his doorstep and was not examined.

It appears highly likely from Christopher Haynes’s evidence that he himself introduced Thomas Clinsall to Shelley. He had been to see Shelley at Michelgrove on Sunday 24 November, three weeks before, accompanied by Clinsall, whom Haynes had invited along only the day before. Haynes had clearly wanted him there and, despite what emerged at his interrogation, the choice of Clinsall could have been no accident, as he was the one mariner who lived near to Michelgrove, Davies’s house and Ferring. The reason Haynes gave for his visit to William Shelley was one ‘of good will’ as Shelley had just returned home, and because Haynes leased land from him. Shelley had also detailed Haynes at Michelgrove to entertain his cousin John Shelley of Patcham. Haynes’s introduction of the mariner to Shelley raises the possibility of his own involvement in Clinsall’s barque, although his interrogation was limited to his dealings with John Haler, whose ship, the Dragon of Arundel, was commonly used for trips between England and France. It was Haler who had brought Charles Paget from France on
8 September and returned him on the 25th, without Paget’s identity being disclosed. Haynes said that he had used Haler on two occasions only for the purpose of transporting packs to Dieppe. The first of these probably accompanied Charles Paget on his return trip on 25 September; the second comprised the two large packs carried to him, via Petworth, for the last seven miles by Ramsden and Thwaites. These then were the ‘suspicious-looking packs’ that had inadvertently been caught up in the conspiracy and believed to contain the possessions of Lord Paget and Charles Arundel.

Haynes was clearly both defensive and evasive in playing down his knowledge of Haler, and his feigned ignorance of the means by which ‘the gentleman’ had been carried overseas was demonstrably untrue. There can be no doubt that he was well acquainted with John Haler. As long ago as 1561 he had certified Haler and his vessel to the vice-admiral, and Haler had been paying wharfage dues for more than 20 years to the Arundel bridgewarden, an office undertaken by Haynes during his mayoralty in 1562. Haler lived at Wisborough Green, the home of Haynes’s nephew William Dartnall. In 1583, Haler’s hoy was the only vessel of its size based at Arundel haven, and had been for more than 20 years, during which time Haynes had been on the customs establishment at the port. If anyone would know about shipping movements and capability of ships to cross the Channel, it was he. He claimed to have no idea of anyone that had left Arundel without a licence over the past year, although he was aware that Robotham had recently travelled to France and back on behalf of his master the Earl of Northumberland, a journey he had previously made a number of times. Haynes professed in evidence that he first heard of Paget and Arundel’s escape in a letter from John Young, customer of the Port of Chichester which included Rye and Arundel, and it dawned on him that it had to be by the barque sailed by Clinsall. It was only then that he proffered his opinion to both the controller and William Dartnall ‘that Mr Shelley was thereby under’ (‘sunk’; done for). He agreed that he had received a letter confirming Young’s report from his brother John Haynes, sergeant of the acatry, and advising him to make sure he could answer for his involvement in the matter, as he was bound to be thoroughly interrogated. Christopher had prudently burnt his brother’s letter. In denying any knowledge of the affair, Haynes tried to deflect the blame on to the searcher, an office perhaps still held by his brother-in-law Thomas Colebrook.

He neither knoweth that any person of account hath been the means to convey any persons over the seas at Arundel Haven or thereabouts, nor ever was privy to any such matter. If the searcher were diligent, as he looketh not to his office, and never goeth down out of the town, but is tippling, none could pass, but that he must be known.

The final element of the examination has been torn away, but the words ‘his right hand lame of’ can still be made out; perhaps he had already experienced a minor stroke, a recurrence of which may well have brought about his sudden death less than three years later.

**UNANSWERED QUESTIONS**

Were Christopher Haynes’s responses to questioning entirely straight? Apart from the Petworth carriers, who appear to have entered the scene innocently at a most unfortunate time, he knew all the individuals questioned that December intimately, including Shelley. Whatever the motivation behind Christopher’s assistance to Shelley, religion was not it, as from the preamble to his will he was certainly no Catholic. It would not be out of keeping with the rest of his endeavours if his interest turned out to be solely pecuniary. Those who knew him well might have expected him, of all people, to be one who would keep his mouth shut, but clearly, as the plot unravelled and the consequences became clearer, his instinct for self-preservation came to the fore.

Were the heavy packs delivered to Haynes in Arundel really packs of timber, or was this explanation a lie to throw the examiners off the scent? Certainly Francis Walsingham suspected that they contained Lord Paget’s possessions, and was aware that John Haynes knew that his brother was privy to the fugitives’ plan. This would seem to make sense; why else would Smyth, the Earl of Northumberland’s servant, be at Southwark to ensure that the packs were delivered to the carrier? This can only have been at the earl’s behest, and it would be truly surprising if he had sanctioned Smyth’s journey merely to assist with a load of timber. In any case, why was the
timber wrapped like a woolpack? Smyth had told the carrier Ramsden that the packs belonged to a merchant who was staying with Haynes, yet Haynes implied that it was for an Englishman in Dieppe. If Christopher Haynes’s evidence was untrue, the possibility remains that he was acting on behalf of the earl but was ignorant of the packs’ true contents, having been told that they contained timber. Alternatively, if he knew or even suspected that the packs contained the fugitives’ possessions, he must have concocted his plausible story to deceive the examiners. Whatever the explanation of these inconsistencies, Haynes never implicated the Earl of Northumberland, apart from identifying the earl’s servant Robotham as a frequent traveller to and from France. If the second lot of packs had contained the possessions of Lord Paget, it might also have cast doubt on the earlier shipment that had accompanied Charles Paget on his return to France. Might that too have been organised by Christopher Haynes on behalf of Northumberland or the Pagets?

Was Edward Caryll’s part as innocent as he made out? What was the nature of his business in Arundel that Saturday, two days after returning from an absence of several months? Did he speak to Haynes? Why did Haynes implicate Caryll by telling the mayor that the fugitives had stayed at Caryll’s house at Shipley, a long way from that of Davies in Patching? Was the location simply a mistake, or was it at Caryll’s London home that Paget and Arundel had stayed? Caryll knew Shelley very well; their families were after all joined in marriage, both were Catholics and Caryll was known to be a recusant and presented as such in 1580. Furthermore, Caryll was steward of the estates of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, also implicated in the Throckmorton affair, of whose will he was named executor. It must also be of significance that after his examination Edward Caryll was imprisoned in the Tower. Although he had trained as a lawyer and entered the Inner Temple, he somehow managed to avoid taking the Oath of Supremacy.  

There is every possibility that Caryll’s servant John Mychell was not as innocent as was made out. Who were the men Mychell hardly knew, Sares, Richard Beard and Giles Vale, who had stayed at Shipley the day after Caryll’s return? Were these the men seen escorting the fugitives to Ferring? Why did Mychell say that he had heard that the fugitives had departed from Felpham, much further to the west? Was it to deflect Lewknor’s attention from the true departure point?

It is an interesting coincidence that it was on that same Saturday as Haynes’s reported conversation with the mayor that he had arranged for Clinsall, the only mariner to live near Davies and within an hour’s walk of Ferring, to join him on a visit to Shelley the following day. Why did Christopher Haynes choose this mariner, when there were so many in Arundel and Littlehampton? The obvious answer is that he must have known what was going on. Clinsall was imprisoned for the part he played, and his subsequent release from the Marshalsea was upon recognisance. Who provided the surety for him? After his release, Clinsall would become a tenant of Christopher Haynes in Arundel – was it because of an obligation on Haynes’s part?  

Clearly something had set the alarm bells ringing in London that had prompted the Haynes brothers to warn Christopher to get his story straight and to let him know that, if he turned out to be a traitor, to expect no support from them. In the summary of possible charges, three matters are written against the name of Christopher Haynes. The first was that he had been accused ‘by his brother to be privy to the going over of the Lord Paget and Charles Arundel’, the second that he had ‘made [Thomas] Banks set his hand to a blank [paper] for the discharge of the cocket’, the third that he was ‘of counsel with Clinsall in the conveying of the Lord Paget and Arundel’. The first could not be proved – Christopher had destroyed the letter from his brother John, who appears to have received information on Christopher’s involvement from Young, possibly via Young’s father-in-law, who worked for Lord Burghley. The fact that Christopher had encouraged Banks to sign the blank cocket, the custom house warrant that would allow Clinsall to set sail, might, if true, have implicated him to a similar extent as Shelley. As the Arundel customer, Haynes was in a position to issue the cocket without anyone else being involved – and falsification of customs documents including ‘false cocketting’ turns out to have been the modus operandi of the crooked Chichester customer and his men.  

Was it Banks’s boat that had been used, as Christopher had apparently suggested to Dartnall? Probably so. Thomas Banks, a member of a staunch Catholic family, was also under suspicion for his
part in the disappearance of Paget and Arundel. On 1 September 1583 his brother Richard Banks wrote to him from exile in Paris, railing against the heretics whom he prayed would ‘break their necks headlong and to be blown from the face of the earth and the name of them not to be known, which God in his infinite mercy grant’. Such was the strength of feeling harboured by the Catholics against their persecutors. He finished by urging his brother to keep the letter to himself, but the fact that it ended up in the state papers suggests that Walsingham had intercepted it.

THE AFTERMATH

Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, was apprehended trying to leave the country from Sussex and imprisoned in the Tower of London with Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, and William Shelley, who under the threat of the rack had confessed to providing, at Percy’s request, the ship that took Paget to France. Shelley was tried by a special commission in Westminster Hall, where on 12 February 1586 he admitted his guilt. He was condemned to death for high treason, but the sentence was not carried out; his uncle, the exiled diplomat Richard Shelley, petitioned the queen for clemency in a letter written at Venice on 24 May. William Shelley was still in the Tower in July 1588, but was subsequently transferred to the Gatehouse Prison, Westminster. After his attainder, his estates were confiscated and his immediate family reduced to penury. Shelley was a member of a well-known family of recusants considered dangerous by the state, and it seems likely that the temporary suspension of his death sentence was granted in order to control the troublesome activities of the rest of the family. His wife prayed for her husband to die in his bed, claimed ‘she was undone by him’, consulted an astrologer at Cambridge about the chances of his escape and even seven years after his trial suffered extreme anxiety over the possibility that William might yet be executed. He died in prison on 15 April 1597. Philip Howard was eventually convicted of treason in 1589, but died in his cell in 1595, Queen Elizabeth having commuted his death sentence. Charles Arundel was pronounced guilty of high treason in 1585 and died in exile in Paris two years later. Thomas, Lord Paget was attainted in absentia and his lands confiscated, the income from which (almost £2300) was put towards the maintenance costs of Mary Queen of Scots. He died at Brussels in 1589. Charles Paget was able to return to England with the accession of King James. His attainder was reversed and he recovered his lands. He died in 1612.

Only glimpses of Christopher Haynes’s domestic life remain. In 1580, he and his wife Elizabeth lived with their manservant Richard Wooldridge, who had arrived in Arundel that year from Stafford at the age of 18. Their house adjoined the White Horse in the High Street, which was owned by wealthy burgess Francis Garton and let to Francis Cradle, a tailor and confessed receiver of pirated goods. Wooldridge’s service was eventually generously rewarded by a bequest of £10 and the rent-free life tenancy of one of Christopher Haynes’s houses in Arundel, where he lived for 15 years.

Christopher Haynes was predeceased by three of his siblings: Richard, at Wargrave, Berkshire, in December 1566, his sister Christian Gunnell also at Wargrave, in February 1572, and Thomas, who died at Reading in February 1583.

In the autumn of 1586 Christopher was taken ill while visiting his brothers in London. On Saturday 26 November there was a scramble to get his will in order. As well as bequests of money and goods to his family, he left five houses and a shop in Arundel, one of which was still occupied by Thomas Clinsall, to his brother William for the term of his life, with remainder in tail to his nephew Richard Haynes. On his death in 1634, all Christopher’s former properties passed to Richard’s daughter Susannah Hopkinson (Fig. 1). He died on Sunday 27 November and was buried later that day in the choir of the church of St Nicholas Cole Abbey, the parish church of John Haynes; probate was granted to his brother and executor William Haynes the following day. The will was challenged by Christopher’s wife Elizabeth, his brother Nicholas and nephew Richard, but was confirmed following their failure to pursue their case by a sentence dated 27 February 1587.
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