

THE RISINGS IN NORFOLK, 1569 AND 1570

By NEVILLE WILLIAMS, M.A., D.PHIL.
An Assistant Keeper of the Public Records

THE risings in Norfolk in December 1569 and during the first half of the year following have received scant attention from both national and local historians. The fullest account, that given by Mason,¹ is solely concerned with the trial of the traitors who rose at Harleston Fair on Midsummer Day, the last of a series of incidents. A number of documents have recently come to light, however, which provide many fresh details about these events, enabling a more accurate account of them to be pieced together. If the following story appears somewhat complicated, a number of threads unfinished, we must plead that stratagems and plots are necessarily difficult to reconstruct; we know far too little of what went on behind locked doors and even the evidence for what took place quite openly is at times conflicting. But at any rate this is a chapter of Norfolk history that deserves to be rescued from oblivion.

In the summer of 1569 there had been general unrest in East Anglia. The closing of the traditional market for English cloth on the continent, through Alva's advance in the Netherlands, caused a crisis in the clothing industry.² It was only natural that workers on short time should resent the presence of so many Huguenot settlers in Norwich and elsewhere, who, they feared were responsible for flooding the market with woollen manufactures. In the sphere of religion a vigorous attempt to enforce the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity had brought cold comfort to those Catholics who had for some years been permitted to wink at the law. Uneasiness and suspicion increased up and down the county with the news that the Duke of Norfolk had been sent to the Tower on 11 October. The central government was not deaf to the various reports on the state of Norfolk which reached it, and on more than one occasion in the autumn reminded the Justices of the Peace that their first task was to maintain public order. These Justices in their charges at Quarter Sessions underlined the iniquity of civil strife, while Sunday by Sunday loyal parsons read to their flocks long extracts from the homily on obedience, perhaps adding their own anathemas for those bent on disturbing the settlement of Church and State. On 1 December the new sheriff, Sir Christopher Heydon, and the Justices assured the Privy Council that all was well in their shire. They had caused "a universal privy search to be made with the straightest order they could for the due punishment of seditious attempts. And we find hereunto all things in good order."³ But before this letter reached Westminster the first rising began. On 6 December the men of Kenninghall, all trusty tenants of the Duke, were encouraged by news of successful rebellion in the north by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland to show their hands.

It was significant that the trouble should begin at Kenninghall. Kenninghall Palace, rebuilt by Thomas Howard, the third duke, on a magnificent scale, was

the principal residence of the Norfolks. The officials who managed the great house and its vast estates constituted a royal household in miniature. Although it was not fortified, its armoury boasted a good store of weapons and its stables numbers of horses. The tenants in the neighbouring countryside regarded the Duke as their feudal overlord, for whom they would willingly risk their lives, with a fanaticism more attuned to the twelfth than to the sixteenth century. Robert Nunham, the vicar, had been presented to the living of Kenninghall by the Duke during Mary's reign. There is little doubt that in this stronghold of Catholicism he regularly celebrated mass; Nunham was to be deprived of his benefice in May 1571.⁴ On Tuesday 6 December 1569 a group of villagers, led by John Welles, a sawyer, John Barnarde, a linen-weaver, and Thomas Alexander, a yeoman farmer, levied public war against the Crown by declaring themselves adherents of the northern earls. By their proclamation at Ripon on 16 November the earls had called on all of the "old Catholic religion" to come to their aid in rescuing the Queen from evil advisers, who had disordered church and state "and now lastly seek and procure the destruction of the nobility"; this last seemed to the men of Kenninghall to have especial reference to the Duke of Norfolk, particularly as Jane, Countess of Westmorland, who had played no mean part in urging her husband to action, was the Duke's sister. "We therefore," continued the proclamation, "have gathered ourselves together to resist by force and the rather by the help of God and you good people to see redress of those things amiss, with restoring of all ancient customs and liberties to God's Church and this noble realm."⁵

Welles was the hothead, the orator of the group. He haranged his fellows: "There are two earls amongst other in the north who been in great business and trouble, and except they be holpen they be but undone. But if all men would do as I would, they should have help." The crowd around him grew, but the passive mutters of agreement which greeted his words disappointed the ring-leader; so Welles now did his utmost to spur the men to rise in force. "It is a pity you live and that one hundred of you were not hanged one against another for that you have not stirred all this while; for those that dwelled three hundred miles of us have done more for his Grace (the Duke of Norfolk) than you. But if you will do as I will we should rise for the delivery of the Duke out of the Tower; and if I had but two others I would go ring out to assemble the people, for I know where to have the key of the Church door. And the longer to tarry the worse it will be, for the key will be taken away; but I care not if it be, for I will go in at the window or set the door on fire. My Lord's council have set open Kenninghall gates to the intent that every man that would might have arms and armour there; and you shall not need to doubt the want of a head or captain, for I can govern five or six hundred men; for it is my fortune to be captain of so many."

Welles's capacity to lead an army was clearly doubted by the majority of his hearers, who saw him for what he was—a mob orator, all words and no action. Later that day Welles and Barnarde pledged themselves to raise a host of followers and place themselves under Henry Howard (styled Earl of Surrey), the Duke's brother, who was then at Tambridge, and go with him to aid the men

of the north. They needed a drum to call men to their colours, and Barnarde going off to borrow one that he had brought "out of Scotland, which was sold to a town nearby," disappears from the scene. The crowd dispersed and Welles walked down the village to the house of Thomas Heylocke and persuaded him to join. Two men from Bunwell, John Symson, labourer, and Henry Sporle, a sawyer, were also active in Kenninghall and the neighbouring villages exhorting men to rise during the next few days.⁶ But the whole affair fizzled out. We hear nothing more of Welles, the leader, between 8 December when he was still at Kenninghall and 16 May when he appeared in custody at the Shirehouse, Norwich with some of his fellow conspirators to be tried for treason by the Justices sitting in special sessions. The Kenninghall rising was indeed premature, ill-organized and lacking in leadership. It had been all too easy for the authorities to arrest the principal trouble-makers. News of the affair had reached Sir Christopher Heydon, the sheriff, at Bunwell, not ten miles away, all too soon, and he had sent a posse to deal with the rebels: his official expenses in "apprehending the conspirators dwelling in and about Kenninghall" amounted to £13 6s. 8d.⁷ Before Christmas they were all safely locked up in Norwich gaol. On 9 January the Spanish ambassador, reporting the incident to Philip II, commented: "if they had been able to join with the northern people they might have succeeded. All these enterprises are lost by bad guidance, and although they are undertaken with impetus, they are not carried through with constancy."⁸ To succeed, the malcontents must wait for the better weather in the Spring and, more important, must find a leader of very much greater weight and experience than the sawyer of Kenninghall. Yet by the spring of 1570 conditions were very different. With Lord Hunsdon's victory over Dacres on 19 February the fate of the northern rebellion was sealed. Although the rescue of the Duke from the Tower was one of the various objectives of the insurgents who troubled the government in Norfolk in 1570, so far as is known the men of Kenninghall remained entirely aloof. Sir William Buttes, Thomas Gawdy, serjeant at law, and their fellow justices sentenced Welles and the other chief conspirators to imprisonment to await Her Majesty's pleasure. Four-and-a-half years later, with the Duke executed and the country quiet and prosperous, they were all pardoned and released at the petition of Buttes and Sir Christopher Heydon.⁹ But Kenninghall's connection with the northern rebellion did not end there. Some years later Jane, Countess of Westmorland came to live in Norfolk. Her husband, the last of the Nevilles, had fled to the Spanish Netherlands to spend the rest of his life in exile. His vast estates were confiscated and Queen Elizabeth was moved to grant the Countess an annuity of £300. She died in 1593 and was buried in Kenninghall Church.¹⁰

* * * * *

The spring of 1570 had passed without apparent incident in Norfolk. In the second week of May the sheriff was able to assure the Privy Council that the justices had been active in rounding up suspect and idle persons, committing some to gaol and binding others over to appear at the next sessions of the peace. He hoped that through such diligence "this whole country shall grow to better state

and quietness."¹¹ Yet, as in the previous December, the sheriff's words were scarcely dry when trouble began again. On 16 May the standard of revolt was raised at Norwich and for the next six weeks, until the fateful Midsummer Day, a succession of risings threatened the established order of Church and State in Norfolk.

On 16 May the citizens of Norwich heard for the first time a battle cry of the insurgents that was to become only too familiar to them and to many others throughout Norfolk. "We will raise up the commons and levy a power and beat the strangers out of the City of Norwich; and also take Sir Christopher Heydon and Sir William Buttes and put them in the Guildhall in Norwich and there keep them; for Norfolk had never the like cause to rise. And after we have levied our power, we will hang up all such as will not take our parts."¹² The leaders were of a very different stamp from Welles and Barnarde of Kenninghall, or indeed from Robert Kett of famous memory. Chief among them was John Appleyard, a man of some substance in the county. He was the son of Roger and Elizabeth Appleyard of Stansfield. After her husband's death Elizabeth married Sir John Robsart of Siderstern and bore him a daughter—the tragic Amy Robsart. With his half-sister's marriage to Robert Dudley, John Appleyard began to become prominent in local affairs.¹³ Thanks to Dudley's patronage he was appointed sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk in 1559 and enjoyed the issues of the portership of Berwick. His connections with Dudley and his supporters did not end with the mysterious death of his sister at Cumnor. More recently he had been involved in somewhat underhand political intrigues, concerning which he was examined at Court in 1567.¹⁴ About John Throgmorton we know much less, though he came from a well-known Norfolk family. Two other ring-leaders, George Redman of Cringleford and Thomas Brooke of Rollesby, each bore the quality of "gentleman"; Redman was possibly related to the future bishop of Norwich, at this time a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Of the remaining conspirators Brian Holland of Redenhall had been escheator of Norfolk in 1556-57; the Holland family administered much of the Duke of Norfolk's property in the county.¹⁵ Both John Jernegan of Somerleytown in Suffolk and James Hobart of Hales Hall came from important families, as we can see from the heralds' visitation of 1564; a Hobart had been sheriff in 1546. These conspirators, then, were men of some standing in their county. Although out of office at this time—and for good reason—they had all had some administrative experience; and they naturally expected that a successful rising would place the government of the shire in their hands. Even Thomas Cecil, a cousin of the Secretary of State, was involved in the plotting.

There was no sudden mass movement for which these men had hoped, as there had been in 1549. The commons to whom the proposed expulsion of the Huguenot weavers might have appeared attractive, sat tight. The mayor for his part let the incident of 16 May pass; Appleyard and his fellows went unmolested, the authorities perhaps thinking it would be as well to give them as long a rope as possible. Ten days later Appleyard publicly announced in Norwich that if he could get "but four faithful gentlemen in Norfolk" to take his part he would himself drive the foreigners out of the City. The idea of

appealing to the commons for aid had been shelved, though on 6 June the original battle cry was again in favour. On that day the ring-leaders, together with Anthony Nolloth of Yarmouth, Clement Haywarde of Norwich and Brian Holland treasonably assembled a little force in the city, armed with hand guns, daggs and pistolets and clad in armour ("coats of defence," as they were called). Their band of supporters was again mustered in Norwich on 10 June and at Trowse, on the outskirts of the city, on 16 June, with the numbers growing on each occasion. But still the authorities failed to take any action. Day by day the leaders plotted amongst themselves. The inclusion of Brian Holland in their councils on 6 June is significant. He hailed from Redenhall; and it was at Harleston in the parish of Redenhall, right on the Suffolk border, that the main rising was planned to take place.

The chapelry of Harleston was a liberty of the Duke of Norfolk. The chapel itself, dedicated to St. John Baptist, had been dissolved under Edward VI, but the annual fair continued to be held on the patronal festival, though shorn of much of the pageantry which the religious processions had provided. Midsummer Day was, indeed, Harleston's great day. From far and wide people came to the fair; and it seemed to Appleyard and Throgmorton an ideal place at which they could recruit followers, with sound of trumpet and drum. Smaller gatherings were to be made on the same day nearer Norwich. The troops raised at Harleston, gathering reinforcements at Bungay and Beccles, were to march on Norwich. There they were to have surprised the mayor and principal citizens at a banquet, to have taken charge of the city and used the civic plate to finance further operations.¹⁶ The Flemish immigrants were to be hustled out of town and a proclamation was to be made against the Queen's "evil advisers" in much the same form as the northern earls' proclamation at Ripon.¹⁷ The port of Yarmouth was then to be betrayed to the Duke of Alva and a force of Spanish troops; and it was hoped that this great soldier would soon make himself the master of East Anglia and march on London. The imagination of the conspirators knew no bounds. During the previous weeks the word had been passed round the county to all sympathizers with the cause to be at Harleston Fair on 24 June with arms and horses. Edward Smith, who farmed a small holding at Oxnead, was one of the many who failed to reach Harleston. He got no further than Aylesham, where he attempted to raise rebellion more or less single-handed. "If all things had fallen out right," he proclaimed, "I should not have been here this day, but I should have been at Harleston Fair with my fellows and horse and armour; and if we had been there we should have been good enough for a good many to have rapped them down."¹⁸

Although the conspirators did muster a small force at Cringleford on 24 June, which on the following day appeared at Trowse just outside the city, armed with guns, daggs and pistols, the grand design at Harleston simply petered out.¹⁹ The rebels' plans had been betrayed to the authorities with disastrous results. Some said it was a Kett (a Thomas and a William Kett are both mentioned) that discovered the conspiracy to Drew Drury, J.P.; others that William Holmes confessed his own and practically everybody else's share in the affair to the deputy-lieutenants and the mayor of Norwich. Even Appleyard was not, it

seems, to be trusted by his fellows, for at his trial he maintained to the end that he had intended "to have had them to a banquet, and to have betrayed them all, and to have won credit thereby with the Queen."²⁰ At any rate the whole affair failed miserably. The justices and civic officers pounced swiftly and soon had all the ring-leaders and many of the lesser fry in gaol. Only a very few managed to escape, such as a servant of the duke of Norfolk who was safely sent over to France by the bishop of Ross.²¹ Norwich gaol had never been so crowded; indeed, the sheriff had to take over a number of other buildings as additional prisons and provide suitable warders for them at a further cost of £5 a week. Rounding up the traitors had cost the Crown £26 13s. 4d.²²

News of the Norfolk conspiracy soon reached London. Antonio de Guaras, a Spanish merchant there, already knew the main facts on 1 July, when he sent home a brief account of it.²³ But the matter was not officially reported to the Court for some days. Mr. Secretary Cecil wrote to the deputy-lieutenants:

"We greet you well. Although we have heard much more by common report of the Conspiracy there intended at Norwich than we could hitherto by any your letters, and did hear thereof a good space before any knowledge came to our Council from you, yet do not think but your care hath been as much as the case hath required, and so are we persuaded and by some your late letters with examinations of some of the authors, we do well perceive that you have begun well and will proceed further to the apprehension of the rest. And considering such attempts cannot at the first be wholly discovered, but that wisdom willet to suspect of more, we will that you shall have special regard of the state of the City of Norwich, where the conspiracy, as it seemeth, had its beginning; and for maintenance and comfort of the citizens who generally are faithful—and yet consisting of a great multitude of people of mean and base sort cannot be void of fear—we would have you so order the matter betwixt you as one of you might be there by turns, to tarry there, or at least to be frequently there, where by your presence, with the company of Edward Clere and Drew Drury, our faithful servants, and such others the heads and governors of the City may be boldened to retain the multitude in quietness and obedience."

Cecil went on to require them to order all loyal gentlemen to muster their tenants, to find arms for them and to arrange for inspections of these voluntary bands up and down the shire. They were to make a full return to him of all available men, horses and weapons. They were to see that warning beacons were in readiness, and to make special orders for suppressing vagrants, for seeing the Queen's peace was kept in fairs and markets, to prohibit unlawful assemblies and punish all rumour-mongers.²⁴ In the next few weeks the sheriff, the two deputy-lieutenants and the justices made amends for their earlier silence and spent over £20 in sending letters to the Court.²⁵

The government was extremely anxious to discover any ramifications the Norfolk plots might have, especially since the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis* had been published, by which Pope Pius V deposed Queen Elizabeth and absolved her subjects of their oaths of allegiance. The international situation loomed dark and uncertain. In the middle of July the five principal conspirators were sent

under an escort of the Queen's guard from Norwich to Chenies in Buckinghamshire, the seat of Francis Russell, earl of Bedford, where Her Majesty was staying. With them went forty-five witnesses.²⁶ For their cross-examination Cecil and the other ministers had by them an elaborate table, drawn up by Clere and Drury, the deputy-lieutenants. This table showed which of the seventeen main charges referred to which prisoners, and gave the names of the various witnesses in each case: the charges ranged from imagination of the Queen's violent death and rescuing the duke from the Tower to firing beacons and "foreknowledging the hurly burly." This is the document printed *in extenso* by Mason;²⁷ but it has nothing to do with the trial of the conspirators. It was a summary of all the available evidence on the rising which the Secretary of State needed by him in connection with investigations into other conspiracies in those tangled weeks of plot and counter-plot.

Prisoners and witnesses were escorted back to Norwich ready for the Assizes, which began on 17 July before Sir Robert Catlin, Chief Justice of Queen's Bench (very much on his home ground as a Norfolk man) and Gilbert Gerrard, the Attorney-General. The smaller fry were summarily dealt with, thus easing the shortage of accommodation in the gaol. After formal indictments for high treason had been preferred, the trial of the others was adjourned until the arrival of a special tribunal.²⁸

On 28 July Cecil ordered the Lord Keeper to make out two commissions of oyer and terminer. One was for the trial in London of John Felton, in the Tower for high treason for fixing the Papal Bull to the door of the bishop of London's palace in Paul's Churchyard; and the other commission was for the "seditious and rebellious persons . . . of late indicted of treason in our counties of Norfolk and Suffolk and in our City of Norwich, who we mean to have arraigned and tried according to the course of our law." The commission for Norfolk was a powerful one. It was headed by Thomas, Lord Wentworth, the lord lieutenant of the county, who had himself been in the Tower during the first year of the queen's reign but was acquitted of high treason. In 1572 he was to be one of the peers who tried the duke of Norfolk.²⁹ With him sat the Chief Justice of Queen's Bench and the Attorney General, fresh from the Norwich Summer Assizes. There were also Thomas Bromley, solicitor general, the principal justices of the peace in the county, including Thomas Gawdy, a future Justice of Queen's Bench, Edward Flowerdue, a future Baron of the Exchequer, and the mayor of Norwich.³⁰ The chief counsel for the Crown on whom the weighty task of the prosecution lay was Robert Bell, serjeant at law, acting in place of the Attorney General who was sitting on this occasion with the judges. Bell considerably enhanced his reputation by his handling of the prosecution. He had served as a member for King's Lynn in the last Parliament, and on his re-election in May 1572 was to be appointed Speaker of the House. In 1577 he was knighted and appointed to the important judicial office of Chief Baron of the Exchequer.³¹

The Chief Justice and his retinue arrived at Norwich on Saturday 19 August to find a suite of rooms prepared for them at the *Crown Inn*. The bill for the judges' lodging and entertainment during their five-day stay is happily extant.³²

Although they did not enjoy sturgeon, as did the Justices of Assize in July, they did themselves well.

- “ In primis paid for the hire of the Inn called the Crowne at Norwich aforesaid, in which the said Justices lay during the said sessions, with the furniture of household stuff, wood, coal and hay, 20*l*.
- “ Item paid for 2 hogsheads of wine, 6*l*.
- “ Item paid for one little vessel of sack, 11*s* 4*d*.
- “ Item paid for spices and sugar, 8*l*. 6*s*. 8*d*.
- “ Item paid for bread and beer, 16*l*. 19*s*. 4*d*.
- “ Item paid for 4 steers, 10*l*. 18*s*.
- “ Item paid for 24 muttons, 8*l*. 12*s*.
- “ Item paid for 7 veals, 3*l*. 10*s*.
- “ Item paid for geese, swans, capons, rabbits, pigeons and chickens, 10*l*. 4*s*.
- “ Item paid for all kind of wild fowl, 9*l*. 5*s*.
- “ Item paid for butter and eggs, 5*l*. 12*s*. 7*d*.
- “ Item paid for fruit : apples, pears, cherries, quinces and strawberries, 52*s*.
- “ Item paid for candles, 25*s*.
- “ Item paid for horsebread and oats, 6*l*. 9*s*.”

On the Monday the great trial opened. Many witnesses were present in court ; others had sworn to depositions. Among those to give evidence was the Reverend John Gascoyne, rector of Howe and parson of Portingland, who knew about a design to proclaim the Duke of Norfolk as king, once he was out of the Tower ; and Gascoyne “ vehemently suspected ” William Cantrell, the vicar of Hingham,³³ for his “ continual conversation with the chief traitors.” Dr. Martin Alcumbe (or Holcombe), a physician, gave evidence with others of the “ sowing of sedition, slander and boiling treasons ” of Throgmorton, Heyward and Thomas Cecil. Ten of the accused had also made statements, some, like William Holmes, hoping to save their necks by implicating others in the plots. Of the nineteen chief conspirators only three were found guilty on the principal counts—namely, the destruction of the Queen’s person, the imprisonment of Cecil, Leicester and other ministers, the release of the Duke and the banishment of the alien settlers. Appleyard succeeded in saving himself, but Throgmorton, Brooke and Redman were sent to the gallows : all three were hung, drawn and quartered. On his arraignment Throgmorton had stood mute, but at the gallows he confessed that he was the arch conspirator. A number of hotheads paid for their rash words by imprisonment or fine, whether they were guilty of expressing a vague hope to see the Duke as king of England before Michaelmas, or a vow to wash their hands in Protestant blood when Alva should land at Yarmouth. One individual who had been bold enough to suggest that the earl of Leicester had had two children by the Queen was to lose both his ears if he could not find the £100 for his fine.³⁴ Justice was however tempered with mercy. James Hobart of Hales Hall had pleaded not guilty to participating in the conspiracy ; he was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment with forfeiture of his goods. Some three years later, at the special pleading of the earl of Leicester, he was pardoned and released. Edward Smith of Oxnead, the supporter on Appleyard who had failed to reach Harleston Fair on Midsummer

Day, and Robert Fludd of Norwich were also released from their life imprisonment by the Queen's graciousness in November 1574.³⁵

Thus ended the fiasco of Harleston Fair. Already, before the special sessions began, the Duke had been moved from the Tower to his own residence in the Charterhouse; the county of Norfolk was again quiet. The news of the rising had temporarily frightened the central government, but the leaders had shown themselves to be no more able to achieve their wild schemes than the leaders at Kenninghall in the previous December. The experiment was not to be repeated. When the Duke of Norfolk was eventually executed, although there was trouble at Sawston in Cambridgeshire with the Howard standard carried by "a lusty gentleman out of Suffolk,"³⁶ not a soul in Norfolk stirred.

¹R. Hindry Mason, *History of Norfolk* (1884), pp. 157-59.

²*Cal. State Papers Venetian*, 1558-80, p. 437; *Cal. State Papers Spanish*, 1568-79, pp. 179, 181.

³Public Record Office, State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth (S.P. 12), Vol. LX, fo. 2. In this, as in all quotations from documents in English in this article, the spelling has been modernized for the sake of clarity.

⁴F. Blomefield & C. Parkin, *Topographical History . . . of Norfolk* (1805-10), Vol. I, p. 222.

⁵Quoted in R. R. Reid, "The Rebellion of the Earls, 1569" in *Transactions of Royal Historical Society*, New Series, Vol. XX (1906), p. 197.

⁶These details of the Kenninghall rising are provided by Public Record Office, Chancery, Patent Roll, 16 Elizabeth Part 5 (C.66/1112) mm. 1, 2.

⁷Public Record Office, Exchequer, Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, Memoranda Roll, 13 Elizabeth, Hilary Term, Status et Visus Computorum (E.368/383) Norfolk membrane (Sir Christopher Heydon's cravings for allowance of his official expenses).

⁸*Cal. State Papers Spanish*, 1568-79, p. 225.

⁹C.66/1112 m. 1.

¹⁰*Dictionary of National Biography*, sub Neville, Charles.

¹¹State Papers Domestic Elizabeth (S.P. 12), Vol. LXVIII, fo. 57.

¹²Details of these incidents in Norwich and elsewhere given in the following pages have been taken, except where otherwise indicated, from Public Record Office, Queen's Bench, Ancient Indictments (K.B. 9), file 627 (i), No. 109.

¹³Members of the Lincolnshire and Yorkshire branches of the family, all descended from the fourteenth-century William Appleyard of Norwich, had held important offices in their counties earlier in the century (see *Lincolnshire Pedigrees*, ed. A. R. Maddison, Harleian Society, Vol. L, 1902, pp. 32, 33).

¹⁴*Complete Peerage*, Vol. VIII, p. 550; *Dictionary of National Biography*, sub Dudley, Robert; H. M. C. Salisbury, Vol. I, pp. 344-51.

¹⁵Blomefield & Parkin, *Norfolk*, Vol. I, p. 344.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 284.

¹⁷H. M. C. Salisbury, Vol. I, p. 557.

¹⁸C.66/1112 m. 1.

¹⁹K.B. 9/627 (i), No. 109.

²⁰John Stow, *Annales or a General Chronicle of England, continued . . . by Edmund Howes* (1631), p. 666; Edmund Lodge, *Illustrations of British History* (1838), Vol. I, p. 513.

²¹H. M. C. Salisbury, Vol. I, p. 557.

²²Heydon's cravings in E.368/383.

²³*Cal. State Papers Spanish*, 1568-79, p. 258.

²⁴Cecil's draft in S.P. 12, Vol. LXXI, No. 62 (fo. 155), undated but probably about 11 July 1570. Portions of this document were printed by Mason, *op. cit.*, p. 158, but with various inaccuracies.

²⁵Heydon's cravings in E.368/383.

²⁶*Ibid.*

²⁷*Op. cit.*, pp. 158-59. The document, S.P. 12/71, No. 61, is dated in *Cal. State Papers Domestic*, 1547-80 (1856) " ? July 28 " but was clearly written a fortnight earlier.

²⁸K.B. 9/627 (i), No. 109.

²⁹*Dictionary of National Biography*, sub Wentworth, Thomas.

³⁰S.P. 12, Vol. LXXI, fos. 151-52.

³¹John Hutchinson, *Notable Middle Templars* (1902), p. 17.

³²Heydon's cravings in E.368/383.

³³Cantrell at this time held the cure for Edward Thwayte, B.D., rector of Hingham.

³⁴Stow, *Annales*, p. 666; Lodge, *Illustrations*, Vol. I, pp. 512-14. Portions of the very informative letter to the Countess of Shrewsbury, printed by Lodge, are given in John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation* (1824 edn.), Vol. I, Part 2, pp. 365-66.

³⁵Their pardons are enrolled on Patent Rolls 16 Elizabeth Parts 4 and 5 (C.66/1111 mm. 18, 19 and C.66/1112 mm. 1-3).

³⁶*Ibid.*, Part 9 (C.66/1116 m. 18).