

SUMMARY: The document below contains answers in Charles Arundel's hand to the interrogatories in TNA SP 12/151/47, ff. 105-6.

Arundel's response to the first interrogatory, if it implies that Oxford and Arundel were both present at the 'first Mass', is inconsistent with his statement in TNA SP 12/151/44, ff. 98-9 that 'Oxford was never in our company at any Mass or conference'.

It should also be noticed that in TNA SP 12/151/44, ff. 98-9, Arundel, writing in July 1581, says: 'First, he accuseth me of hearing Mass six years past in Francis Southwell's chamber'. To this charge Arundel answers: 'Though my Lord speak rather upon hearsay than knowledge, yet this article, being the only true thing he objecteth, is confessed'. It would thus appear that by July 1581 the allegation concerning the 'first Mass' had been dropped, and the sole remaining allegation concerned the Mass in Francis Southwell's chamber, at which Arundel and others, but not Oxford, had been present. By July 1581, Arundel was ready to admit to this allegation, despite the fact that, as he says, Oxford had made it on hearsay, not having been present himself. Arundel says that this Mass in Francis Southwell's chamber occurred 'six years past', i.e. in 1575. If so, it indeed seems true that Oxford would only have known of it by hearsay since he was travelling on the continent in 1575. With respect to the other Mass, if by referring to it as 'the first Mass' Arundel means that it was first in chronological terms, that would date it earlier than 1575, that is, to a time at which there is no suggestion that Oxford had been reconciled to the Catholic church, a reconciliation which allegedly took place no earlier than his return from the continent in April 1576.

The evidence for Oxford's alleged reconciliation to the Catholic church is scanty. In his second answer below, Arundel says that his sole knowledge of Oxford's reconciliation is an alleged admission to that effect by Oxford himself at their secret meeting on the night of 25 December 1580 ('To the second, neither was I ever reconciled nor do I know any that is, the Earl of Oxford only excepted, who told me he was when he would have corrupted me with the proffer of one thousand pounds to accuse others'). Since it was this secret meeting which prompted Howard and Arundel's flight later that night to the house of the Spanish ambassador, all Arundel's evidence about the meeting is highly suspect, including his claim that Oxford had, during the meeting, for no conceivable reason made this entirely unnecessary and extremely damaging admission. On balance, it seems likely that while Howard and Arundel had been reconciled to the Catholic church, Oxford had not, although he may have heard Mass on some occasions after his return from the continent in April 1576.

Moreover it would appear from the allegations made concerning the 'first Mass' and the Mass 'in Southwell's chamber', and from Arundel's other evidence, that Oxford never heard Mass in the presence of Howard, Arundel or Southwell. It should also be noticed that in the first answer below, Arundel admits to having reached an agreement with Lord Henry Howard to lie about having heard Mass. Arundel's admission makes it not unreasonable to suspect that Arundel lied about much else, and that, in particular, his

account of what happened in the secret meeting between himself and Oxford on the night of 25 December 1580 is unreliable.

Arundel's response to the seventh interrogatory is somewhat ambiguous. The interrogatory asked: 'And likewise who it was that upon this cause would have borrowed a privy doublet of the Earl of Oxford?' Arundel avoids all mention of Oxford in his answer, saying merely that either du Bourg or Simier sent to him to borrow a privy doublet for Simier. It thus appears that the request was addressed to Arundel, not to Oxford, and that Arundel knew more about the attempted assassination of Alencon's agent Simier than the rest of his answers reveal. The assassination attempt is generally thought to have been made at Leicester's instigation, in retaliation for Simier's having told the Queen about Leicester's secret marriage on 21 September 1578 to Lettice Knollys .

Persons mentioned in the interrogatories in the order in which they appear or are alluded to in the interrogatories include:

- Richard Stevens
- Francis Southwell (d.1581)
- Henry Wriothesley, 2nd Earl of Southampton (bap.1545, d. 1581)
- Richard Southwell (d.1600) father of the Jesuit, Robert Southwell (1561-1595)
- Thomas Butler (1531-1614), 10th Earl of Ormond and 3rd Earl of Ossory
- Sir Walter Raleigh (1554–1618)
- Jean de Simier, Baron de Saint-Marc
- Henry Lyte
- du Bourg (unidentified)
- Francois-Hercules (1555-1584), Duke of Alencon, commonly referred to by the title 'Monsieur'
- Thomas Howard (1538-1572), 4th Duke of Norfolk
- Shawe (unidentified)
- Hales (unidentified)
- Mrs Arundell
- James Dalton
- Thomas Somerset
- Charles Paget (c.1546–1612), Catholic conspirator
- Mary (nee Browne) Wriothesley (b. in or before 1552, d. 1607), Countess of Southampton
- Edmund Heywood (unidentified)
- Lord Henry Howard (1540-1614), later Earl of Northampton
- Sir Thomas Kitson (1540-1603)
- Sir Thomas Cornwallis (1518/19-1604)

Jhesus

To the first thus I answer, that other conference had we none than of the Earl of Oxford's strange dealing with myself overnight, whereupon I thought it good, and also advised, that we should deny our being at Mass with Stevens, sith of the first Mass no man knew but the Earl and myself, and of the other at Southwell's chamber, he was not present, and seeing I found by his own discovery that he had most impudently belied and falsely accused both myself and others in matters of greater weight, I thought it not necessary to give him so much credit as to grant him so much; this, being once agreed on, was the sum of our whole speech.

To the second, neither was I ever reconciled nor do I know any that is, the Earl of Oxford only excepted, who told me he was when he would have corrupted me with the proffer of one thousand pounds to accuse others.

To the third I say that for this five year past I was never at confession. At Mass have I been four or five times, in two places only, at the Earl of Southampton's here in town, and at Mr Richard Southwell's.

To the fourth, I never had intelligence nor any other dealing with nobleman, gentleman or any other of Ireland, neither have I written or received thence any letters save from my Lord of Ormond in causes of friendship, and one from Raleigh.

To the fifth, as I never conferred, so do I not know any such persons, either of Wales or Cornwall.

To the sixth, I protest before God I was never acquainted with any man that gave Monsieur Simier intelligence of her Majesty's dealing, nor with any such mark in Lyte's garden. Only I saw, as I conceived, Simier take up a paper which he read long of, but whether it fell out of his hand or whether he found it there I do not know, but not long after, du Bourg told me that Simier had advertisement that he should have a stab with a dagger given him if he looked not well to it.

To the seventh, it is most true I never heard by whom or whose procurement it should have been done, nor where he learned it, but hereupon he sent to me to borrow him a privy doublet.

To the eighth, I take God to witness I never knew or heard of any letter or other private advertisement taken out of her Majesty's pocket, therefore far from sight of any such thing.

To the ninth, I heard Raleigh say that the Earl of Oxford told him that Monsieur would give him ten thousand crowns a year whenever he list to come into France. Other knowledge have I none but that Raleigh told it me, and what my answer was, Raleigh can testify, so far off was I then, and am now, from believing it. For the jewel, it was sent him, as I remember, after Monsieur's departure.

To the tenth, I never saw any such book.

To the eleventh, I cannot deny but I have seen a book touching the cause of the Duke of Norfolk, and further I do confess that a six year past I gave it the Earl of Oxford, being very importunate and often in hand with me for to get it him, and the reason that made him so desirous of it I have declared and will avow on my oath, and maintain with my sword as to the rest.

To the twelfth, I do not remember any word or sentence written [+to] the defamation of her Majesty, but against some special persons in authority most spiteful, which made the Earl of Oxford so fond of it.

To the thirteenth, I never knew where or by whom it was written.

To the fourteenth, I know not of any man that was consenting or devising.

To the fifteenth, whether it were originally written in English or after translated into French I know not, but Shawe of whom I had it told me he thought it to be one Hales' (?) doing that is beyond the seas.

To the sixteenth, I never maintained disputation or defended controversy in religion at Mrs Arundell's.

To the seventeenth, Mr Dawlton [=Dalton?] is the man I know not, and therefore I never challenged him in suchlike cases upon wagers.

To the eighteenth I answer I never saw any other English treatise than that I have confessed, nor any other book in any other tongue wherein her Majesty's ancestors are termed as bastards.

To the nineteenth, I do not remember in the treatise I saw that her Majesty is threatened with(?) the rebellion of her nobility. The time is long since, and what was contained therein I have clean forgotten.

To the twentieth, I make the like answer.

To the twenty and one, as it is most true I never saw Jesuit, so do I not know whether they say Mass before reconcilment, and as for Stevens, he never declared any such thing or made any such exception to me, and to prove the contrary, the first time that ever I saw [+him] I came to his lodging in Holborn and found him going to Mass.

To the twenty and two, neither hath it passed my mouth nor did I ever hear it spoken that either Wales or Ireland, for the mislike that the people had of this religion, would revolt.

To the twenty and three, Mr Somerset I never spake withal, and for Mr Paget, I had never dealing with him but once, and that was touching the cause of my Lady of Southampton; in his company have I been but very seldom.

To the twenty and four, as I never saw any prophecy written, so can I not deny but that I heard of a rime by one Edmund(?) Heywood a year and a half since, at which time I told it the Earl of Oxford, walking in the garden at Greenwich alone with him, upon what occasion himself knows & I will remember his Lordship when time serves, and never thinking to have heard more of it, but a little after her Majesty's coming last to this town, being with him private in his chamber, he put me in mind of such a thing I told him, and desired me to repeat the words, which after some study calling them to my remembrance, having almost forgotten them, and least mistrusting whereabout he went, with his help rehearsed them to him, and as God knows both his intent and mine, so I beseech him in his justice to reward us.

To the five and twenty, my Lord Harry, to my knowledge, burnt none. Myself in mine own lodging burnt four women's letters which touched no matter of state. Other errand had we none at Sir Thomas Kitson's than to dine, and I some business with Sir Thomas Cornwallis. In my life I never heard Mass there. After dinner my Lord Harry and I returned to his lodging at Dacre House, where I left him and went to the court.

To the six and twenty, as I am not acquaintance with any Jesuit, so know I not any man that succours or haunts their company, nor in what places of this town they be entertained.