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ABSTRACT

This thesis is biographical in form, and follows a chronological development. James Croft's life illustrates many of the problems of an ambitious man of the period, and spans more than seventy years and four reigns. His early career was as a soldier, and this aspect, as well as a survey of his family background, has been dealt with in Chapter One. In 1551, Croft served in Ireland, originally as leader of an expeditionary force, but later as Lord Deputy, the first post in his career of major importance. The accession of Mary to the throne in 1553 prompted Croft to take part in the poorly-planned and ill-fated Wyatt's Rebellion, which led to Croft's imprisonment and subsequent loss of revenue. Following Elizabeth's accession in 1558, Croft was made Governor of the town of Berwick, on the Scottish border, and took a major part in the action against the French troops at Leith. His eventual disgrace led to his exile from Court until 1570, in which year he was created Comptroller of the Queen's Household, a position he held for the remainder of his life. Chapter Five deals not only with his duties as Comptroller, but contains an examination of Croft's growing importance in his home county of Herefordshire, and shows his increasing influence and range of contacts at Court. Croft's final appearance two years before his death, was as a commissioner to negotiate with the Spanish in the Low Countries in early 1588. The final chapter of this thesis attempts to examine the significance of Croft as typical of a section of Tudor society, and deals with some of the problems raised by modern historians of the period.

Investigation has necessarily been limited by the shortage of records available for research. In the absence of any collection of family papers,
the principal sources have been various collections of state papers and letters, contemporary annals and diaries, and such sources as the Acts of the Privy Council and parliamentary records. In spite of the difficulties involved, a surprising amount of information concerning James Croft is extant. A reasonably clear outline of his activities can be seen, and it has been possible to place him in the larger context of sixteenth century society.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>AN ARMY APPRENTICESHIP (1518-1551)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>SERVICE IN IRELAND (1551-1553)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>WYATT'S REBELLION AND ITS AFTERMATH (1553-1558)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>CROFT IN SCOTLAND (1558-1560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>EXILE, AND POLITICAL RESURRECTION (1560-1587)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>NEGOTIATIONS WITH SPAIN (1587-1590)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOTNOTES</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

AN ARMY APPRENTICESHIP (1518-1551)

To obtain a position of power and prestige, and, therefore, of wealth, at any time during the sixteenth century, it was not enough only to have talent. The primary consideration making advancement possible was definitely not what you knew, but who you knew. The Court was the source for advancement of any kind, and a position at Court, or connection with somebody who had a position at Court, was essential if one wished to obtain placement of any kind, be it civil, political, or ecclesiastical. Of course, if one was born into a noble family, advancement was made considerably easier, and positions of importance were frequently given to young men who had little more to recommend them than an inherited title. The example of such men as Thomas Cromwell, the son of a smith, who entered royal service under Wolsey, became Chancellor, Treasurer, and eventually was given the title of Earl of Essex, shows that ability could be rewarded, but even Cromwell had needed influence to reach his position, and that was not enough to save him from the block. In most other cases, rise to power was neither as spectacular nor as sudden as Cromwell's, but it would be impossible to find an example of anyone reaching a position of importance without influence being used. Talent was recognized during the Tudor era, but never inevitably and never entirely for its own sake.

To one who was neither born into a noble family nor was of outstanding natural ability, advancement in any field was difficult, and often dependent to a large extent on good fortune. And yet, by far the largest number of officials, of the relatively new civil service, the army, or the church, came
from families which were not among the foremost in England, and power and wealth, even if on a relatively small scale, were for them a question of hard work, luck, and a great deal of time. It is easy to remember the Cromwells and Cecils, whose importance dominates so much of the sixteenth century in England, and to overlook the vast mass of administrators and officials who were responsible for implementing the programmes and policies of the Tudor monarchs. Cromwell and Burghley, because of their talents and success, were really atypical. Much more realistic a picture of the Tudor official can be seen by studying the life of one of those minor figures who do not feature in general studies of the age, and who have not merited full-scale biographies. One such official, and one whose work for Tudor monarchs spans four reigns and fifty years, and yet who has rated only passing mention in accounts of the period, was a Herefordshire gentleman named James Croft.\(^2\)

If events had followed a normal pattern, and if Croft had not been ambitious, his life would have followed a different course. Born into a Herefordshire family of considerable local importance and with a background which could be traced back to the time of William the Conqueror,\(^3\) he could have been expected to have a position of power as a landlord and local administrator in the area of north-west Herefordshire where he lived. As the eldest surviving son of the family, he would probably have become a Justice of the Peace, might be expected to represent his county in Parliament, and might even have taken a part as a member of the Council of the Lords of the Welsh Marches, which met in Ludlow, a few miles to the north, in Shropshire. As events occurred, he held all these positions at various times, but he also became Lord Deputy of Ireland, Governor of Berwick, and spent the last twenty years of his life as Comptroller of Queen Elizabeth's household and as a member of the Privy Council.
To understand how he reached these positions and what part he had to play in English affairs of the sixteenth century is to understand a little better the pitfalls and the rewards which awaited a fairly typical and ambitious administrator of the period.

The birth-date of James Croft has to remain speculative, as do the birth-dates of many Elizabethans, because of the absence of church or other records. However a probable date is 1518, as it was recorded upon the death of Richard Croft, his father, on January 1, 1562, that "... the said James Croft is son and heir and 44 years of age." 4 James Croft's father, Richard, lived the type of quiet life that one might expect of a country gentleman, serving as a Justice of the Peace, and, no doubt, looking after his lands and tenants. At his death in 1562, the estate left to James, his heir, included more than three thousand acres of land, together with cottages, water mills, and further income in rent, 5 which would have provided a comfortable income if one did not have ambitions further afield. It would not be necessary to mention James's grandfather, Sir Edward Croft, were it not for the fact that, in July, 1625, he had been appointed one of the counsellors to Henry VIII's daughter, Mary, 6 who was to become Queen in 1553. Edward Croft had a distinguished career in local affairs and in the western counties of England, bordering Wales. He died in March, 1547, and it is quite possible that his long and successful career had an influence upon his grandson.

The family into which James Croft was born was not only a long-established one, but also a large one containing a wide range of connections. James's great-grandfather, Sir Richard Croft, held a number of high positions under Edward V, including those of Treasurer of the Household and adviser to Arthur, Prince of Wales. 7 His wife, Eleanor, had previously been
married to Sir Hugh Mortimer, and her descendants included John Dudley, First Duke of Northumberland, and his son, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. The eleven children of Sir Edward Croft, James's grandfather, married principally into local Herefordshire and Shropshire families, as did the seven brothers and sisters of James. Thus, through marriage alliances, Sir James already had very close connections throughout the Welsh border regions, and these were to be useful to his later career. The relationship with those men of national importance, such as Northumberland and Leicester, is extremely tenuous, but it is possible that Sir James attached much significance to the connection. At least, in 1561, Dudley, later to be Earl of Leicester, was acting on Croft's behalf in pressuring John Scudamore to allow a marriage between his nephew and Croft's daughter, Eleanor, whom he referred to as "my kinswoman." Sir James married twice, the first time to Alice Warnecombe, widow of William Wigmore of Shobdon, near Croft Castle, by whom he had three sons and four daughters, and the second time to Katherine Blount, by whom he had no issue. Katherine was a daughter of "Edward Blount, Esq.," but whether she was connected to the important family of the same name is not clear. The most important connection Croft was to obtain through the marriages of his children was the one above mentioned, that of his daughter Eleanor to John Scudamore. He was to become Gentleman Usher to Queen Elizabeth, and his sister a lady-in-waiting to the Queen, and there are frequent references made, particularly in the 1570's and 80's to influence which Lady Scudamore was able to wield at Court on her kinsman's behalf. In his book *Two Tudor Conspiracies*, D. M. Loades notes that Croft was connected by marriage with Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, with whom Croft certainly had many close contacts, but there does not appear to be any evidence to support this statement of a marriage relationship. Nevertheless, influence obtained through kinsmen was to play
an important part in Croft's career, and was one of which he was to take full advantage.

Except that he was probably born in 1518, nothing is known about the early life of James Croft until the first reference is made to him in 1540. As the eldest son of a well-to-do gentleman, he would have several courses of action open to him. If he were not particularly ambitious, he could follow the leisurely country pursuits of his father, living at the family residence of Croft Castle and tending his estates. If he desired to get ahead, he may have wished to attend university, and from there obtain a position, perhaps in the Church, or possibly in some field of the King's service. However, the records of Oxford and Cambridge, the only universities in England at the time, do not show his having attended either university, and, while it is possible that he could have studied in Europe, no references at later dates indicate that this happened. The field of endeavour which Croft chose, and which was not surprising considering his family background and probable lack of a university education, was that of military life, and first references to him depict him as a soldier.

Croft's interest in military affairs persisted throughout his life, and his early career in the army was served in relatively unimportant positions. However, Croft is not an uncommon name, and it is possible that the "Jas. Crofte" referred to in December, 1540, as a gunner serving at six pence a day in the King's fortress at the "Castle next Sandwich" was a different man with the same name. The possibility increases with the next mention of Croft as a knight of the shire of Hereford in 1541, and with notice of his responsibility, in the following year, of mustering a force of thirty-seven men at Shobdon, a village about four miles distant from Croft Castle. Listed as a
"demilance", Croft's duties included not only making sure that thirty-seven men were available, but also that they were provided with "harness, artillery and other habiliments of war."\(^\text{15}\) Although his duties as a member of Parliament and as a local official might suggest that Croft intended to settle into local affairs, the next references to him indicate a different type of life to be in store for him.

In 1544, with a grandiose show of force, Henry VIII sent some forty thousand men to invade France from Calais in a move intended, as G. R. Elton states, "... to combine with a Spanish thrust towards Paris."\(^\text{16}\) The only result of this unnecessary attack was the rapid conquest of Boulogne, which England was permitted to keep until 1554, under the treaty made between France and England in June, 1546. Henry, although infirm and, at fifty-four, an old man, insisted on accompanying his forces. He was joined by Edward Seymour, later to become the first Earl of Hertford, Duke of Somerset, and Lord Protector in the first half of Edward VI's reign. Seymour was not in charge of the siege of Boulogne, which was under the command of the Earl of Surrey, son of the Duke of Norfolk. There was already bitterness between Surrey and Seymour, because Seymour was known to favour ecclesiastical reform, while Surrey (although not a Catholic) and his father were religiously conservative. The bitterness must have increased with the addition of personal jealousy when Seymour was called in to rectify the blunders of Surrey in late October of 1545.\(^\text{17}\) The details of their relationship would not be relevant to the topic were it not for the fact that it was under the Earl of Surrey that Croft first began his rise, and under Seymour (then Duke of Somerset) that he was later to be given a knighthood and his first major position of authority.

At Boulogne, however, Croft was, at first, in no position to be thinking
of a knighthood, or of a clash in loyalties between his immediate superior, the headstrong Surrey, and the more influential Seymour. First mention of Croft is as an under-officer, where he is described as a waterbailiff, with four men serving under him.\textsuperscript{18} Although Boulogne was a port, and most supplies would have to be sent by ship from England, his duties could not have been heavy, as he was later discharged from his position, which was described as "superfluous," in a letter from the Council at Boulogne in February, 1546.\textsuperscript{19} The Council, headed by Surrey, recommended Croft as a lieutenant of "the Old Man," the ancient tower which had been fortified by the English and which guarded the approach to the harbour of Boulogne.\textsuperscript{20} However, the position had already been filled, as Paget informed Surrey later that month.\textsuperscript{21} The fact that the same letter also contained the news that Seymour was being sent over to replace Surrey as lieutenant general at Boulogne would indicate that favour shown by Surrey might not be advantageous to a soldier seeking advancement, but, in any case, the post was no longer available. A month later, however, on March 21, Surrey was informed that, the position of under-marshal being void, "... the King has ordained Mr. Croft, whom you lately commended, to be under-marshal."\textsuperscript{22} Seymour was, at this time, in Boulogne, and Surrey technically under his command. However, Surrey may well have found it easier to have his way with the Privy Council if Seymour was not present to veto his recommendations, and, for this reason, he may not have objected to Seymour's presence in Boulogne.

It is not clear what authority Croft had as under-marshal, but the position probably made him a member of the Council of Boulogne, which governed the town and adjacent territories under direction from the King and Privy Council. That this is likely is indicated by the fact that Croft's name first turns up
as a member of the Council on August 21, 1546, and, in September of that year, he was listed as being a vice-marshal, with authority, with others, "... to hear and determine according to the laws of the county of Guisnes all causes criminal and civil arising within the towns of Upper and Lower Boulogne, and the castles or fortifications called le Olde Man, Bolenberge and le Citidel [sic]." Mention of Croft as a Councillor continues until February, 1547, although it is possible he may have served longer. The Council, by the time Croft first appears as a member, was under the direction of Lord Grey, Surrey having returned to England, where he was shortly to become rashly involved in a plot against Henry, and to lose his head. The principal purpose of the Council, as a letter of January 4, 1547 states, was probably to keep the Council in England informed about "... the garrisons in every piece, the money in the treasurer's hands, the furniture of victuals, and all other things meet to be advertised." Position on the Council would have given Croft an opportunity of being noticed by those who would be able to advance his career, and he would no doubt have attempted other than purely administrative methods in order to advance his cause.

The three years Croft spent in Boulogne would not entirely be taken up with his duties as an officer and, later, a Councillor. In July, 1546, Dudley, later to become Duke of Northumberland, arrived in Boulogne, from where he travelled to Mêlun, near Paris, to meet with the French King. At this time Dudley was Lord Admiral, and his entourage as ambassador included "divers lords and gentlemen." It is not unlikely to suppose that Croft was one of these gentlemen, although this is entirely conjecture. As indicated by Dudley's visit, relations with France at the time were cordial, although this was only a temporary situation. As with the other officers at Boulogne, Croft
entertained, and was entertained by, his French counterparts, and evidence exists that he and "other English gentlemen" dined and hunted with Chastillon, the French commander. At Croft's house in Boulogne, the French were wined and dined, and no doubt army life could be made quite pleasurable in such ways. Celebrations were held on February 24 to 28, 1547, marking the coronation of Edward VI, Henry having died on January 28, and at the ceremonies Croft took part as a "padrino," or leader, of the challengers in the jousts between the English and the French. The four days of "honourable pastimes" ended with a masquerade, at which Croft was attired "... in a very fair mask, all suited in pilgrims' [sic] apparel of black velvet ...." It is unlikely that Croft would have got ahead if he had not been a hard-working member of the Council, but frivolous activities, of the type mentioned, probably brought him attention which was equally as important as that aroused by his administrative abilities.

Between the last mention of Croft in Boulogne, in February 1547, and his next recorded appearance, in 1549, he was granted a knighthood. Unfortunately, no evidence exists as to the exact circumstances surrounding his receipt of this honour, which certainly indicated that he was well thought of by Somerset, the Lord Protector. It is improbable that he received it for service at Boulogne, which was, as indicated, peaceful at this time, even though hostilities were to break out again shortly afterwards. As a fairly junior officer, it is not unlikely that Croft may have been transferred to serve in Scotland, which was invaded early in 1547 by troops under the leadership of Somerset. The campaign in Scotland was remarkably successful for the English, and at the end of the year the Lord Protector raised a large number of gentlemen to the rank of knight. Although Croft's name is not included in the list given
by Grafton in his *Chronicles*, this does not preclude Croft from having received a knighthood at this time, and, in fact, this is most probably what occurred.

In May, 1549 Croft was in Haddington, a town on the Scottish border, where he may have been since leaving Boulogne two years previously. In a letter from the Council to the Earl of Rutland, who had been appointed Lieutenant of the North, Croft, and a Mr. Cotton, are recommended as men who "... serve the King very well and in places of credit ...", but the places of credit are not mentioned, although the inference is that they were both in Haddington. Henry Manners, second Earl of Rutland, was apparently a friend of Warwick's, and had made depositions early in 1549 against Seymour, the Lord Admiral and brother of the Protector. Later, he was to show himself an extreme member of the reformed church party, and was imprisoned, on Mary's accession, for being an adherent of Lady Jane Grey. These facts are interesting, as they explain a good deal of Croft's actions during the next few years. Like Rutland, Croft was to benefit from Lord Protector Northumberland, and was also to spend some time in imprisonment as a rebel against Mary Tudor. Rutland and Croft appear to have been quite close friends, and Croft's rise would not be hurt by the amity which existed between Rutland and Northumberland.

Even before Rutland arrived in Haddington, he was apparently well known by Croft. At least, Croft describes himself as "your poore frende" and does not hesitate in giving Rutland a great deal of advice about his duties. Much of the advice appears largely a matter of common sense—"doo noo ponishmente upon colour [i.e., anger]," "advise well what you promese and kepe it," "deall streyghe"—but Croft would hardly be likely to offer such advice to a new
commander unless he already knew him well. Croft must have had himself in mind when he suggested that "In matters of warr tacke thadvise of men of warr, and soo in all other matters use men of the self skill."\textsuperscript{36} Croft was trusted sufficiently by Rutland to be sent to report to the Council on the state of affairs in Scotland in October, 1549,\textsuperscript{37} but by this time had reached a position of some importance, having become general of Haddington.

Croft's appointment as general appears to have come about almost by luck, as he was one of the best qualified men available when Sir James Wilford, the appointed general, was taken prisoner by the French, who controlled the garrison of Dumbarre.\textsuperscript{38} Of course, the job could have been given to someone else, but Croft was readily available, had some knowledge of warfare, and was, to put the cap on it, a friend of Rutland's.

... Sir James Crofts was thought a man most meet to supplie the place and therefore by the lord protector and others of the counsell was ordeined generall of that towne of Haddington, and the garrison there, in which room he bare himself so worthilie, as if I should not be suspected of flatterie, for that he liveth yet, and in such credit (as the world knoweth) I might moove myself matter to saie rather much than sufficientlie inough in his due and right deserved commendation.\textsuperscript{39}

Holinshed was over-complimentary, but he was no doubt correct in assuming that Croft did his job well. Rutland was probably sorry to lose a gambling companion\textsuperscript{40} almost as much as he was to lose a general when, on November 12, 1549, the Council decided to appoint Croft as "Generall of the Fotemen" at Boulogne.\textsuperscript{41}

The conquest of Boulogne in 1544 had never been an outstanding success. England controlled the town, but against mounting French bitterness. Tension was increased when the French provided money, arms, and men to help the Scots, as evidenced by their capture of Croft's predecessor as general, Sir James Wilford. The original agreement was that France would repurchase Boulogne,
but neither side wished to live up to the bargain. Although both France and England hesitated to commit themselves to war, on August 8, 1549, war was finally declared by the English. Mounting pressures both in Scotland and in France, coupled with several ignominious defeats, forced the Council to make peace, and on April 25, 1550, Boulogne was returned to France after less than six years in English possession. As "Generall of the Fowemen," Croft would have had an important position, but it is unlikely that any blame would be attached to him for the English abdication of the city, which was a political, rather than a military, defeat. In fact, Nicolas records that two of Croft's brothers, John and Edward, were killed at the siege of Boulogne, and Croft's appointment less than a year later, as Lord Deputy of Ireland, would hardly have been made if Croft had not borne himself well.
CHAPTER II

SERVICE IN IRELAND (1551-1553)

By 1551, Croft may well have felt that he was due for further recognition. He had managed to hold increasingly important positions in the army, both as a soldier and administrator, and, most importantly, had not made any influential enemies. His friendship with such men as Rutland would be useful to him, and he had doubtless brought himself to the attention of other influential men at Court. The position he was eventually given was in Ireland, and depended on his military abilities. Considering the perpetually unsettled conditions existing there, the task facing him was one which would tax his ingenuity to the utmost.

Conditions in Ireland in the mid-sixteenth century could best be described, in an understatement, as "tangled," and any attempt to cut the Gordian knot of confusion and to sort out the problems is difficult indeed. What makes the task particularly complicated is that no internal unity existed within the country, with the exception of the unity which England was able to impose on that small strip of territory, extending along the coast north and south of Dublin, known as the Pale. Although England nominally controlled Ireland, it was not until the mid-1530's that England decided to re-establish control over Dublin, a decision which was prompted primarily by fears that, after the English Reformation, an Irish Catholic nobility might combine with a foreign power, Spain, or, possibly, France, to eject the English. Re-establishment of control was complicated by the fact that great ruling lords had carved out what amounted to small kingdoms of their own, and objected to relinquishing any of their power. Religious disunity, although
it had originated with Henry VIII's Reformation, did not become a vital issue until 1547, with the application to Ireland of changes which had been brought about in England by Somerset, and, later, Northumberland. The situation facing England by 1551, therefore, was of a semi-barbaric and wholly disunited country, consisting of rebels fighting both themselves and the English, with the added threat of possible intervention by a foreign power. England's policy of forcing religious changes onto an already dissatisfied people further complicated the issue, and made the job of administrator both onerous and extremely difficult.

The Lord Deputy of Ireland, through whom England governed the country, had been Sir Anthony St. Leger from 1540, with a hiatus in 1548. He had been responsible for Henry VIII's programme of gradually subduing the Irish and replacing the old tribal system of land tenure with the English system. St. Leger's policy of "a judicial admixture of force and conciliation" was successful, although Henry thought that St. Leger was somewhat too free in granting Irishmen their requests. This complaint was, in fact, to lead to St. Leger's dismissal, although this did not occur until Edward's reign and was to prove to be only temporary. Although his methods had proved remarkably successful, St. Leger had encountered jealousy and resentment, particularly among certain Anglican clerics, who were offended by his policy of enlightened tolerance. It was complaints from Archbishop Browne of Dublin in 1551 which eventually led to his dismissal in April of that year, and to his replacement by Sir James Croft, who was already in Ireland at the time.

Croft had been summoned by the Council on February 3, 1551, to return immediately to London, presumably from Boulogne where he was General in charge of the Foot. Apparently, it had previously been decided that an ex-
pedition commanded by Lord Cobham would be sent into Ireland. Although this plan had been altered, Croft was sent to make necessary preparations for such an expedition.6 St. Leger was ordered to credit Croft, who was "... to view Cork and Kinsale and the ports adjoining; to appoint places to be fortified; to view Baltimore and Beare, and the havens between them and Kinsale ...."7 The Council, which included Lord Cobham, a devoted adherent of Northumberland and the man who had been chosen to lead the Irish expedition, ordered two hundred pounds to be paid over to Croft for his duties in Ireland.8 By the end of March, the young King Edward was noting in his chronicle that Croft had arrived in Waterford, where he was consulting with St. Leger about fortifications for that town.9

The original purpose in sending Croft to Ireland had been to prepare for an expedition to be led by Cobham. The suspected threat from France, however, had diminished, and Cobham's proposed expedition had been cancelled by the Council. Nevertheless, it was decided to keep Croft in Ireland, and even to increase the number of foot and horsemen under his command. This decision suggests that Northumberland had decided that the conciliatory efforts of St. Leger were unsuccessful, and that a military government, led by Croft, might succeed where the gentler methods of St. Leger had failed. Croft was qualified to serve as a military governor, having had some ten years of army experience, and, as this was virtually his only recommendation, it is most likely that he was chosen to replace St. Leger in the hope that the problem of Ireland could be solved by a display of force. On April 11 "... it was determyned Sir Anthony Seintleger, now Deputie there, shulde be revoked and that the saied Sir James Crofte shall supplie the place,"10 but St. Leger was not notified of this decision by the Council until April 15, when he was
ordered to leave the King's lands in the same state as he had found them, and to see government turned over to Croft. St. Leger can hardly have been pleased at the news, even if, as Strype suggests, the King had declared he wished him close at hand, where he could be of more use to the kingdom. At any rate, St. Leger could not have antagonized Northumberland in any way, as he was to replace Croft in the same position only two years later.

As Lord Deputy, Croft would be forced, because of the distance and time involved in sending directions, to use his own initiative, but, in general, he had to follow the orders laid down for him by the Council, which acted as a rubber stamp for Northumberland. His principal duties would be to increase English sovereignty over the island, to build up defences against a possible invasion, and to ensure that religious attitudes were suitably Protestant, in accordance with Northumberland's policy. Of more immediate concern, however, Croft was ordered to farm out lands, and to sell wardships and marriages, which were in the King's holding. Also, he was to hear complaints made against English soldiers, and to punish offenders according to martial law. These instructions, which included the statement that the Lord Deputy was to be paid one thousand pounds a year, are included in the King's Warrant-Book, which mentions, in addition, that a surveyor of mines and metals was to be appointed, who would also look into the matter of coinage.

Although Croft was now appointed Lord Deputy, his position was already in jeopardy. According to Strype, the young King included in a list of things to be deliberated upon the interesting consideration that, for the good of Ireland, it might be better if three councils were set up there, each under a different chairman, and each sitting in a different part of the country. Although nothing came of this idea it showed a surprising degree of maturity
and originality on Edward's part. No doubt, if the idea was ever broached to Northumberland, he would be eager to suppress it, partly because it would lessen his control on the government of Ireland, and also because it would indicate a weakening of his personal rule. In addition, Edward made the suggestion "... whether Croft should still remain deputy, or some person of nobility ... be placed in his room." There is no indication that this thought had anything to do with Croft's abilities, or lack of them, but it probably suggests that Edward believed that someone of noble birth in the position of Lord Deputy would indicate the importance England placed upon Irish affairs.

The change-over from St. Leger to Croft was smooth and apparently without acrimony. Croft had been appointed Lord Deputy on April 11, but even as late as May 20 official notification of his appointment had not been received in Ireland, and it was recorded that "Sir Anthony Sentleger governs but by Sir James Croft's advice till the patent for Croft's deputation shall arrive." One thousand of the soldiers which the Council had decided should be sent to Ireland had landed, but, as was often the case in similar situations, money to pay the troops was not forthcoming. Shortly before the soldiers arrived, Richard Croft, presumably a relative (but not likely Croft's father), had also been sent there by the Council, and was to be given "... some rome there convenient for him in the consideracion of his service." It was, of course, common for nepotism to flourish at Court, but this is the first recorded time that James Croft had been able to reward his own relatives in any way. However, as an illustration of this facet of administrative life, he also rewarded a nephew of St. Leger's, by giving him a position in the north of Ireland because he had "... honestly served his uncle in those parts." Relationships between St. Leger and his successor could not have been too acri-
monious if Croft would use his position to reward St. Leger's relatives.

The primary reason that Croft had been appointed Lord Deputy was probably because of Northumberland's desire to increase English control over Ireland. To bring this policy into effect, Croft had to lead the large number of soldiers which had been sent and to establish direct rule over parts of the country beyond the Pale. Although he did not officially become Deputy until June 1, it is probable that before that date Croft had begun to subdue some of the more rebellious parts of Ireland. Among his orders from the Privy Council were those which would ensure "... the fortification of certain havens in the south and north," and the reducing of Leinster to order, "... wherein the Cavernaghs, Tooles, and Byrnes doo inhabite." By June 10, the Council was noting that Croft was in the remote parts of Ireland, "... beginning to set justice and law in good hand where they were unknown." The same letter from the Council mentions that many of the havens which had belonged to the enemy had been captured by Croft, and were being fortified by English troops. To begin with, therefore, Croft seems to have been successful in effecting Northumberland's prime objective, that of tightening English control, and the Council must have been pleased that it could justly affirm that "Ireland grows towards good policy."

To someone of Croft's temperament, the act of subduing the rebellious Irish must have come a lot easier than finding a solution to some of the other problems to which the Council had referred. As mentioned above, Croft's predecessor, St. Leger, had been dismissed largely on the strength of objections raised by Archbishop Browne, who believed St. Leger's policy of toleration to be objectionable. One of St. Leger's suggestions had been that the liturgy used in the service should be in the Irish language, understood by a vast
majority of Irishmen, rather than in English, which was spoken by only an educated few. This suggestion had been turned down flat, by the Council as well as by Archbishop Browne, but would undoubtedly have made advancement of the Reformation easier among the Irish-speaking population. St. Leger, however, had ordered to be printed an edition of the recently established liturgy (in English), and this Book of Common Prayer, the first book ever to be printed in Dublin, ended with a prayer for the Lord Deputy "... Sir James Croft, now governour over this realm, under our most dread and sovereign Lord, Edward the Sixth." Not all church leaders in Ireland were as zealous Protestants as Browne, the Archbishop of Dublin. Croft's major opponent in effecting changes within the Irish church was the Archbishop of Armagh, George Dowdall. Dowdall had refused point-blank to accept any of the proposed changes in the liturgy "... by which, as he expressed it, every illiterate fellow might be enabled to read Mass." Dowdall's forthright disapproval made him extremely popular among the majority of Irishmen, and their wish to keep the old form of service was strengthened by the conduct of many of the English troops, who had looted churches and sold what they had stolen.

Croft himself seemed to be in favour of the new changes within the church. At least, he must have given Northumberland that impression, or he would never have been chosen as the successor to St. Leger. Croft's position, in this as in other matters involving religious changes, appears to be one of opportunism. At no time in his life did he evidence any particular preference or leaning either towards protestantism or catholicism, but there is no doubt that he realized the necessity of supporting his superior's policy if he did not want to be speedily replaced. Because Dowdall was such an influential figure in
the Irish church, one of Croft's first cares, as Leland suggests, "... was to labour by persuasion and address, to soften his opposition, and reconcile him to the new regulations of public worship." Of course, Croft could have attempted a heavy-handed approach and thus have further angered Dowdall, who had retired to an abbey outside Dublin and refused to have any contact with those, such as Browne, who accepted the new liturgy. But it is to Croft's credit that he attempted a conciliatory approach and requested a meeting with Dowdall to discuss the changes in worship, thus flattering Dowdall and at least averting a confrontation before letting each side of the question be heard. Croft further reminded Dowdall that even the bishops of Rome acknowledged that a subject must be obedient to his sovereign, and suggested that a public debate be carried out between Dowdall and himself, supported by the Bishop of Meath, who advocated reform of worship. Although Dowdall thought the meeting would be to no avail "... as our judgments, opinions, and consciences are different," he agreed to accept Croft's offer, and the conference was held on June 17, 1551.

It was vain to hope that either side would be converted by the arguments of the other, but as a diplomatic gesture towards conciliation, the conference was a hopeful idea on Croft's part. The meeting might also have helped to discredit the religious conservatives, although, considering the nature of the protagonists and the situation chosen for the debate, this hope would have been somewhat in vain.. It was also diplomatic of Croft to agree that the talks should take place in St. Mary's Abbey, where Dowdall had been in seclusion. Croft himself had little part in the conference, which was principally a theological dispute on such matters as the origins of the Mass and the importance of the Virgin Mary, and left the debate to Staples, Bishop of Meath.
However, at the beginning of the debate, in answer to a question of Dowdall's, Croft explained that his reason for wanting Dowdall to comply with the bishops favouring reform was that he "... would fain unite you and them, if possible," a noble motive, but one pre-doomed to failure. As Dowdall noted at the end of the meeting:

... I signified to your honour, that all was in vain, when two parties should meet of a contrary opinion; and that your lordships pains therein would be lost....

However, the debate had been amicable, and it is doubtful that Leland is correct when he writes of Croft and Dowdall that "... each retired with still greater acrimony against the other." Although nothing profitable resulted from the discussion it was a worthwhile attempt on Croft's part, and certainly nothing had been lost by it.

Needless to say, however, religious controversy had not been stilled by this debate, and was to remain a major problem. It was intensified by Browne's insistence on being named Primate of All Ireland, a title which had previously been given to the Archbishop of Armagh, but which the King granted to Browne, much to Dowdall's chagrin. Dowdall, although at the height of his popularity, retired to the continent, probably because he feared further sanctions being carried out against him, and remained there until the beginning of Mary's reign, when he resumed his former position as Primate. Croft also had the responsibility of recommending bishops to vacant sees. Although Leverous, whom Croft suggested should be made Bishop of Ossory, was known to be attached to the old doctrines, Croft probably put forward his name because Leverous was acknowledged to be both learned and discreet. However, the see was eventually given to John Bale, an Englishman who was eloquent and sincere, but had little
feeling or sympathy for the problems of the Irish. Croft's suggestion of Basnet for the now-vacant see of Armagh was apparently prompted by the consideration that Basnet was "... experimented in the wars of the country," but Edward turned down this appointment and named another Englishman, Hugh Goodacre, as bishop. The final vacant see, that of Cashel, remained without a bishop during the rest of Edward's reign. Croft's suggestions for the two posts were unorthodox but imaginative, and although neither man was appointed bishop, they might have been more helpful to Croft than the two men who were appointed, as well as been more acceptable to the Irish.

The other major problem which faced Croft during his period as Lord Deputy was the new Irish coinage. There had been no difference between English and Irish coinage until 1460, when, with the intention of loosening English ties, the coinage had been degraded. By the time of Henry VIII, Irish coinage was more than half alloy, and trade was thrown into confusion, with resulting discontent. Irish coinage came to be used only within Ireland, and trade had to be carried out with a reputable currency, either sterling or foreign crowns. Inhabitants of the major Irish cities had signed a petition to the King, asking that coinage be identical in both kingdoms, but the Council hesitated to act. Although the King's advisers did not deny the facts, they took no action until early 1552, after a year of rising crisis in the coinage. That Croft recognized the problem to be of primary importance is shown by a letter he wrote to the Council in August 1531, in which he requested that Irish money be made of equal value with English. To anyone with a fixed income, which Croft nominally had as Deputy, inflation would be particularly bad, as he pointed out:

Neyther ys ther any man presently habull to lyve apon his
entertainment, but as we force the country, the continuance whereof will grow to a wearness.  

Although goods were plentiful, prices were beginning to soar, and "... everything that was worth one penny is now worth four ..." The Council was beginning to realize that the situation would have to be set right, as was shown when the Councillors commented, on September 25, on the fall of the money, and added "... that order may be taken therein according to the sayd Deputie and Counseller's request."

The year 1551 had been a good one for Croft. His appointment as Lord Deputy was a major achievement, and his first months in office had been reasonably successful, even if the principal problems still existed. He had tried to extend English power without being involved in any major conflict, and had secured and strengthened many of the ports against a possible foreign attack. Relationships with the Church had been cordial, even if Dowdall had not been convinced by any arguments to alter his strong Catholic stance. The problem of the debased coinage had at least been noticed by the Council, which appeared ready to act to make coinage of the two countries equal. Although Edward may have had doubts about Croft's effectiveness, in November he signified his pleasure at Croft's months in office by rewarding him with one thousand pounds, and by making him a member of the Privy Chamber. Unfortunately, 1552 was not to be as successful a year for the new Lord Deputy.

Inflation, which had been growing rapidly, got completely out of hand in the first few months of 1552. The Council could no longer continue its policy of mouthing platitudes and was forced to take concrete action to prevent trade from breaking down completely. In January, a "common supplication" had been sent to the Council from Croft and the Council in Ireland, which included...
signatures of members of the Irish nobility, merchants, and "gentlemen." The lack of goods in Ireland, they asserted, was caused by the money crisis "... without remedy thereof yt is thought almost impossible to sett a staye." On March 22, the situation had still not been remedied, and Croft reported that corn which should be selling for two or three shillings a measure, but which had been six shillings and eight pence when Croft first arrived in Ireland, was now selling for thirty shillings. He added that the situation did not bother the average Irishman, who "carethe onely for his bealy and that not delicately ...," but was most grievous to those with fixed incomes, such as himself. While Croft was correct in assuming that those with fixed incomes suffered most during a period of inflation, it was unrealistic to include himself among these. His pay as Deputy was fixed, but it would be naive to consider this amount his total income. As J. E. Neale has explained, compensation was obtainable in such forms as "fees" or "gratuities," which swelled an official's income far beyond what it would appear to be simply looking at his salary. It was true that a money crisis had no great effect on the average Irish peasant, who probably had little chance to use money, and Croft was correct, if somewhat hard-hearted, when he ascribed the greatest suffering to gentlemen with fixed incomes. All things being relative, an Irish peasant probably suffered no more in the Spring of 1552 than he had a year earlier, while pensioners, or "stypendaries" as Croft called them, were beginning to feel the pinch. Finally, on June 7, the Privy Council took the long-overdue step of making Irish money of equal value with English money, but its dallying had been quite unnecessary and had increased English unpopularity. However, no blame for the situation should be laid on Croft, who had recognized the problem early and urged solutions many times. The Irish coinage problem cannot be treated independently from the
English coinage problem, although conditions were undoubtedly worse in Ireland than in England. The process of debasement had begun under the direction of Cardinal Wolsey, in 1526, and had continued throughout Henry VIII's reign. As a result of Wolsey's and later measures, after the contemporary gold coins and good silver coins of an earlier date had been withdrawn by hoarders, the base-ness of coins left in circulation contributed to a sharp rise in prices. Edward VI's councillors continued to strike base currency from Henry VIII's dies, but, by 1551, reform of the coinage, prompted by increasing evidences of discontent, had begun. However, the efforts of Northumberland and Gresham, his financial adviser, were unsuccessful, principally because bad money continued to drive out good, the proportion of improved coins in circulation being very small compared to the mass of debased coins still current. As J. D. Mackie states, "Only the complete demonetization of the base issues could effect a true rehabilitation of the coinage, and this was not finally achieved until the reign of Elizabeth." However, Northumberland's attempts at monetary reform had had some effect, and might have been even more successful, as A. E. Feavearyear suggests, if he had had time to complete the plans he had begun. The problem of the coinage in Ireland was inextricably linked with that in England, and any hopes of reform in the Irish situation were futile until the problem had been solved in England.

Although there had been few uprisings in Ireland in 1551, their absence was only relative and temporary. Within the Pale it was possible to keep fairly stable government, but throughout the rest of the island this was impossible. It would have required an enormous number of troops stationed throughout the country to have kept order by force, and this the Council was neither willing, nor able to afford, to do. Ulster was the most turbulent
part of the country, and was kept so by constant incursions of Scots, who aided the native chieftains against English troops or Irish farmers who were under English protection. Irish hatred for the English was fanned by looting which periodically broke out, even though it had been forbidden by successive Lord Deputies. At the beginning of 1552 the great church at Kieran had been thoroughly looted, not as a reprisal, but presumably on the initiative of the chronically unpaid soldiers.

There was not left, moreover, a bell, small or large, an image, or an altar, or a book, or a gem, or even glass in a window, from the wall of the church out, which was not carried off.\(^5^2\)

The soldiers' looting, combined with the attempted enforcement of unwanted religious changes, and an unstable currency acted on a wild and naturally rebellious people to ensure that uprisings would occur constantly.

In 1552 the trouble, as usual, took place in Ulster. Croft himself led the English troops into Ulster against the Irish, commanded by Hugh O'Neill, and the Scots. A preliminary party of English troops was defeated, and even though Croft managed to reach Belfast and to erect a fortification there, his victory was hollow. As the Chronicle states, "... they gained no victory, and obtained no hostages or spoils; and their spirits were greatly damped on this occasion."\(^5^3\) Although O'Neill's son, in a typically complex manoeuvre, decided to help Croft, he was, in turn, attacked by one of his kinsmen at night and thoroughly routed. Croft was forced to retreat south, having accomplished nothing. Although he made another foray into Ulster in the Autumn, the results of this expedition were even more disheartening for him:

... he effected nothing, except that he destroyed corn-fields. After having lost a great part of his people, he returned without submission or peace.\(^5^4\)
It is difficult to decide how Croft could have managed any better. The best course would probably have been to have left well enough alone, stopping incursions into the Pale and against English troops wherever possible, and hoping that the situation would gradually improve in time. This might have taken many years, but conditions were already better in most of Ireland than they had been fifty years previously, and might have changed for the better in Ulster too, particularly when the Scottish problem was overcome. As it was, Croft had to fight against what amounted to guerilla warfare, often carried on at night, and had to attempt to settle soldiers in a completely alien territory, with not enough money or troops to do a really effective job. He cannot be blamed for failing to subdue Ulster, but his expedition into the north was ill-advised and demonstrated the need for a complete re-thinking of the Irish problem.

Probably because of the failure of Croft's expeditions into Ulster, on November 6, 1552, he was given leave to return to England, presumably so he could report directly to the Council about the general state of affairs in Ireland. There had been other complaints raised against Croft, including one made in July by the Earl of Tyrone, who had been arrested by Croft, and who asked that a commission be sent from England to hear the accusations made against him. Also, the King's profits accruing from mining leases granted in Ireland had been negligible, and Northumberland may have laid blame for this on Croft. Whatever the reason, his recall indicates dissatisfaction with his services and, even though he did not eventually leave his post in Ireland until early in 1553, the events of 1552 marked his downfall. In May of 1553, the King wrote to Tyrone that he should make contact with Sir Anthony St. Leger, "... whom he purposes to send presently into Ireland as Lord Deputy,"
and on the twelfth of the month, Croft received a payment of one thousand pounds, probably to soften the blow of being deprived of his position.

Even if Croft had not been able to solve all the problems in Ireland, he had made a good attempt at providing an efficient government, and had shown himself sympathetic to the Irish in such matters as hardening the currency and listening to their point-of-view regarding Church reform. Some years later, Campion, writing in his History of Ireland, briefly recorded of Croft's two years in office:

Upon Saintleger came Sir James Croftes, of whose bounty and honourable dealing towards them, they yeald at this day a generall good report.

In fact, it is possible that Northumberland felt Croft had been too zealous, and that his proposals had been too costly for England. Croft had made little headway in subduing the Ulster chieftains, but neither had St. Leger, who preceded him and was named to succeed him. The reappointment of St. Leger suggests that the attempt to solve the problem of Ireland by military means (which were expensive) had failed, and that a return to a "political" deputyship was called for. At any rate, Croft could still count on influential friends on the Council, among them Cecil, who had shown himself useful to Croft before, and Northumberland. Although he had been responsible for Croft's dismissal from the post of Lord Deputy of Ireland, Northumberland gave him another job, which, while not having the prestige of his former position, would have given Croft a reasonable income. Croft and Sir Andrew Dudley, brother of Northumberland, were both attached to Sir Edward Warner, Captain of the Tower in London, positions which would have been principally honorary, but which justified the statement that Croft had "... placed himself in the service
of the Duke of Northumberland." This statement, made by a Spaniard working for the Emperor, was contained in a letter which also foreshadowed, although unknowingly, Croft's fall from even this position. The young King was already extremely ill and in danger of death, and it was to be only two months after this letter was written, on July 6, that Edward was to die.

Although Croft had been chosen to replace St. Leger because Northumberland intended to pursue a "military" policy, his position depended on his keeping in Northumberland's good graces. Croft had accepted Northumberland's plans for church reform, which were part of his policy of creating a party which would be hostile to Mary when she came to the throne, but it does not seem likely that Croft was a member of the inner group which surrounded Northumberland. It is true that he had been granted a profitable, but virtually meaningless, position in the Tower, but the events which followed the death of Edward VI were to show that Croft could not legitimately be termed a pawn of the Duke of Northumberland.
CHAPTER III

WYATT'S REBELLION AND ITS AFTERMATH (1553-1558)

By the beginning of 1553 rumours of Edward's extremely ill health were circulating, and his death on July 6, at the age of fifteen, caught nobody by surprise. However, it made an enormous difference to Northumberland, and to all those who owed their positions entirely to his patronage. Northumberland's chief adherent had probably been Edward, and it is not an exaggeration to state, as G. R. Elton does, that "... the whole English Reformation depended on the life of Edward VI." Under the terms of Henry VIII's will, Mary would succeed to the throne, and her accession would bring a sudden halt to the Reformation in England, and to the career of Northumberland, the chief proponent of Protestantism. Realization of these facts prompted Northumberland to attempt to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne, an abortive plan which, in two weeks, was completely broken. Mary was left triumphantly in power with a completely mistaken impression of the popularity of her Catholic position rather than her legitimate position as Queen by right of being the daughter of Henry VIII.

James Croft had, as it were, backed the wrong horse. There is no doubt that he had reached positions of power because he had been an adherent of Northumberland, and of Northumberland's protestant policies. Whatever his intrinsic value as a soldier or administrator, he was not important or brilliant enough that Northumberland could not have done without him. Even if he had not been an ardent protestant, and his conciliatory attempts in Ireland show that he was at least sympathetic to the Catholics, he would have had no chances of advancement if he had not accepted wholeheartedly the Reformation
policies laid down by Northumberland. Therefore, Croft could not expect any favours to be shown to him on the accession of an avowedly Catholic monarch. His best policy would probably have been to retire discreetly to the family estates in Herefordshire, and wait to see just how far Mary intended to take reprisals against those, such as himself, who had helped to bring about the religious changes of the past few years. This, however, Croft was unwilling to do, and the five years of Mary's reign were to see him involved in a plot against the Queen, imprisoned, fined, and relegated to finding an income by accepting money from Catholic Spain.

As a supporter of Northumberland, Croft was extremely fortunate that he was neither particularly influential nor, as events turned out, particularly favoured by the Regent. The day after Edward's death, Northumberland, realizing that immediate action was necessary, retired to the Tower with his supporters and proceeded to barricade it and to strengthen it with arms and ammunition. Croft, as a constable of the Tower, and one placed there only a few months earlier by Northumberland himself, might have been expected to stay as a member of Northumberland's rebellious band, but this is not what happened. As soon as Northumberland's men had taken the Tower, "... they discharged sir James Croft of the constabullshype of the Towre, and ther thay put [in the said lord] (sic) Admerall, and toke ys othe and charge of the Towre ...."² It is possible that Croft had requested the discharge himself, realizing the folly of Northumberland's ambitions, or that Northumberland realized Croft could be of no use, and that a more confirmed adherent, namely Clinton, the Lord Admiral, would make a more trustworthy Constable. This latter course is more likely, because, as Tytler states, Northumberland "... dreaded intrigue, aware that he had heads as crafty as his own to deal with."³ Whether one re-
gards Croft's dismissal as of his own initiative or because Northumberland did not consider him important or faithful enough, he was extremely fortunate to be free from the Tower and Northumberland's patronage, and not to be involved in any way with the preparations to put Lady Jane Grey on the throne.

By the end of July, the reign of the Nine Days Queen was over, Northumberland and his cohorts were imprisoned, and Mary was firmly in control of the throne and the country. Sir James was by no means out of suspicion, nor was he likely to receive any favours from Queen Mary, having been allied with Northumberland for too long. Nevertheless, on July 23, Croft, with several other protestant noblemen and knights, was officially given a pardon by Mary:

... the lord admirall, and the lords Greye, Garrett, Wormon, and the lord Fitzwarren, sir Henry Sidney, and sir James Croffts, with divers others, have already their pardon graunted them. 4

Croft had not, apparently, taken part in the attempt to replace Mary, but several of the lords named had been active participants. They had also, however, been quick to desert Northumberland, whose fears of intrigue had been well founded, when it became obvious that his was a lost cause. As early as July 19, a delegation of some of Northumberland's leading supporters "... had been persuaded that the Lady Mary was rightful Queen, and had decided to proclaim her as such this very day ...." 5 Their support was, of course, a matter of necessity, considering Northumberland's steadily waning popularity, and their decision to implore the Queen's forgiveness 6 was another prudent gesture. Mary realized that she could not afford to alienate the country by imprisoning or decapitating all her erstwhile enemies, and she knew she needed their support, however hypocritical, during the crucial early period of her
reign. Her decision, therefore, to pardon such men as Grey is understandable, considering the circumstances, and Croft, being only a minor and unimportant figure, featured in the large number of pardons handed out on July 23.

Mary's personal claim to the throne had been overwhelmingly endorsed, but it was not apparent to Mary that popular support did not mean an eagerness to refute all that had taken place in the English Reformation. Protestants would not willingly surrender the achievements of the previous twenty years, and yet it appeared obvious, considering Mary's avowedly Catholic tendencies, that religious strife was inevitable. Both France and Spain feared the ambitions of the other in England, and Renard, the Spanish ambassador, urged the Emperor to consolidate his position. Noailles, Renard's French counterpart, feared an alliance of England and Spain, and had even offered aid to Northumberland, although it had never materialized. Although both Renard and Noailles over-emphasized the precariousness of Mary's position, there was a real danger, as events were soon to show. Mary, who had been accustomed to look to her Spanish kinfolk for advice, began to do so again, and the fears which many in England had of a marriage alliance between England and Catholic Spain began to seem well founded. This background to the events which were to occur in early 1554 explains some of the reasons why a group of discontented Protestants, including James Croft, were to attempt an uprising against a monarch who had been greeted with genuine feelings of approval only a few months earlier.7

The rumours which had been circulating were confirmed on January 15, 1554, when it was officially announced that Mary was to marry Philip of Spain.8 Although Mary indicated that she realized the match might be unpopular, she
tried to allay fears that England would be at all dominated by the Spanish by adding that "... the said Prince was not to meddle with the public affairs of the state, but the Queen's great Council of the realm, as before was accustomed." Although some of Mary's Council, including Paget, approved of the match, there were others, among them Gardiner, the Chancellor, who had tried to persuade Mary to marry Edward Courtenay, newly created Earl of Devon. Courtenay had the primary advantage of being English, and he was also of royal blood and had not made any important enemies. To many Englishmen, who had a genuine and well-based fear of a union between the Spanish and English royal houses, almost anyone other than Philip would have been acceptable, and Courtenay was loudly championed throughout the country. The announcement of January 15, however, meant that all hopes of averting the dreaded Spanish marriage by arranging a liaison between Mary and Courtenay were lost. The only course which now seemed open to many was a show of force, and within ten days of the announcement, reports of the beginnings of a rebellion were being heard throughout London.

The uprising was not a spur-of-the-moment idea, and even though it was ultimately to fail, plans had apparently been laid at least a month previously, in the event that the Spanish marriage should materialize. The conspirators, according to Loades, who cites a later indictment, included Croft, Sir Peter Carew, Sir Nicholas Arnold, Sir William Pickering, William Winter, Sir Edward Rogers, Sir Thomas Wyatt, Sir George Harper, William Thomas, Sir Edward Warner, and Sir Nicholas Throckmorton. They were all men who had held reasonably important positions under Edward, who stood to gain nothing by the accession of Mary, and who probably had a genuine fear of an English alliance with Spain. Although the connection is tenuous, Croft and the other conspirators were
probably well known to one another. Several of them, including Pickering, Wyatt, Throckmorton, and Carew, had served in France during the 1540's, and Throckmorton had also accompanied Protector Somerset to Scotland in 1547, and had taken part in the Battle of Musselburgh, as had Croft. Two of the conspirators, Sir Nicholas Arnold and William Thomas, were probably acquainted with Croft from their positions in the area of England and Wales near Herefordshire. In 1551, Arnold was listed with Croft as being a member of the Council in the Marches of Wales. Thomas, as his name suggests, was a Welshman, and as Clerk of the Privy Council secured a number of valuable grants. In December, 1551, he obtained a patent for life "... of a toll of all cattle, merchandise, and other customs and subsidies, within the towns of Presteigne, Beelth, and Elvel, in the Marches of Wales: ... and an annuity of 40 marks of the fee-farm of the city of Hereford ...". Presteigne and Beelth, though in Wales, are very close to Croft Castle, and contact between Croft and Thomas was quite likely. In addition to these contacts, Croft had served under Sir Edward Warner, Lord Cobham's son-in-law, who was Lieutenant of the Tower from October, 1552, to July 28, 1553, during much of which time Croft, together with Sir Andrew Dudley, had been Deputy Lieutenant. Loades states that Croft also knew the Duke of Suffolk, who joined the conspirators late in December, by which time plans for the uprising must have been well laid.

The project of these men was given impetus by the interest shown by Noailles, the French ambassador, who feared the marriage plans almost as intently as the majority of Englishmen did. Obviously, a Spanish-English military alliance would pose a far greater threat to French interests than Spain by herself. Noailles had already heard, in December, about plans for an
uprising, and had been informed on the 23rd. that Croft "... had plans for stirring up "infinite troubles" in England and Ireland and wished to enter the French King's service." Croft later admitted that there was an understanding between the rebels and Noailles, and Renard, whose figures should be regarded with some suspicion even if he is correct in the broad outlines, reported to Prince Philip that:

The King of France had promised help in troops and money, and had already distributed some 10,000 to 12,000 crowns to private individuals.

Henry II, however, apparently had doubts as to the effectiveness of the English conspirators, and the help which he offered eventually came too late. Success on the part of the conspirators would have been in the interests of France, and Croft and his associates appear to have counted on French support. It is unlikely that they would have been as sure of themselves in January if they had realized that unconditional aid from France would not necessarily be forthcoming.

When the conspirators met at the beginning of December, they were faced with the immediate problem of deciding on an objective. It was one thing to begin a revolution which would force Mary off the throne, but a totally different problem to decide what would happen to her when they had succeeded, and who would replace her. Several accounts indicate that plans had been considered to assassinate Mary, and Renard reported that the French had approached Croft with the suggestion "... to hinder the marriage of his Highness and the Queen, to raise Elizabeth to the crown, to marry her to Courtenay, and put the Queen to death ...." However, a contemporary account mentions that the idea of assassinating Mary was broached by William Thomas, who was repulsed by both
Croft and Wyatt when he suggested the idea:

... Nicholas Arnolde . . . told yt to maister Croftes, who also
tolde it to maister Wyat; and they bothe detesting the horryble-
nes of the cryme, the said Wyate ware, under his long gowne, a
great waster [cudgel] . . . to beat the said William Thomas with,
that he wolde have lefte him for dedd.23

Loades mentions that leadership, at the end of December, had passed to Croft,24 but, while there are numerous indications of his playing a leading role, there
is no suggestion that he led the movement at any time. If Mary was to be de-
posed, as was the only alternative to assassination, then Elizabeth would have
to be chosen to succeed her, and the suggestion which Renard indicated the
French had put forth—that Elizabeth should marry Courtenay—was part of the
plan adopted by the conspirators.

As Mary was to discover later, Elizabeth was extremely cautious regarding
any written commitment, and there are no papers in her writing, or signed by
her, which indicate that she was in any way associated with the plot. How-
ever, it was important that the French should be convinced that Elizabeth was
in the conspirators' confidence, and Croft indicated to Noailles that Eliza-
beth was fully aware of the plans being made. Noailles wrote in January that:

... she sees the fine claim she has to the crown and the expec-
tation she has of gaining it, especially if the matters under-
taken for her come to a successful end.25

Croft may have been indulging, as Harbison suggests, in wishful thinking, but
he apparently managed to persuade the French that the conspiracy was worthy
of support, because Noailles later reported that "I shall continue to encour-
age Croft and his companions in this good intention."26 With the understand-
ing that France would support the rebellion, and that Elizabeth approved
tacitly of their plans, the conspirators were prepared to act on their plans as soon as the announcement of the Spanish marriage was made on January 15. Little more than a week later, Wyatt's Rebellion was set in motion.

Attachment of Wyatt's name to the rebellion is somewhat misleading, considering the facts leading up to the actual outbreak of the rebellion in January. There is nothing to indicate that, at this time, Wyatt was any more than merely a conspirator, and although various people have been suggested as leader, including Thomas and Croft, Wyatt was probably simply one of many. The reason that his name has been attached to the rebellion is that, of the four uprisings which were planned, the one in Kent under his leadership was the only one which served as a threat of any sort to the Queen, and the only one which appeared to have even the shadow of a chance of succeeding. For his comparative success, Wyatt was to forfeit his life, but the lives of most of his co-plotters, who were equally as much to blame for the concept of the conspiracy as he was, were to be spared because of the last-minute thoughts they had and the dilatory way in which they carried out their part of the scheme.

It had been decided in December that the projected uprising would occur simultaneously in four areas, and would then converge on London. Croft would raise a force in Herefordshire, Wyatt would see to Kent, Carew and Courtenay to Devon, and the Duke of Suffolk to Leicestershire. Although the Council had urged the population to accept announcement of the marriage "with all humblenes and rejoicing," a contemporary chronicler records that "... allmost eche man was abashed, loking daylie for worse mattiers to growe shortly after." Expectations were confirmed when word came, on January 21, that Carew and others in Devon had captured the city and castle of Exeter,
and, on January 25, when it was learned in London that various castles in Kent had been captured by the rebels. Croft had probably left London a few days earlier, and it was rumoured that "... about this time sir James Croftes departed to Walles, as yt is thought to rayse his powre there." Soon afterwards, probably on January 30, reports were circulating that "ther was a companye upp in Hervodeshier," but this, as it turned out, was nothing more than unsubstantiated gossip, even though it had been Croft's purpose to raise such a force. The rebellion, which had begun with confidence and some success, was, however, doomed to failure, and a few weeks after the reports of castles being captured in Devon and Kent, and forces being raised in Herefordshire, the conspirators were all to be securely immured within the Tower.

The end of the conspiracy occurred within a remarkably short time. Carew, in Devon, had already fled to Normandy on January 25, having found that he was unable to whip up anti-Catholic feeling, and that he was hampered by the diligence of local authorities and the failure of the Earl of Devon to declare himself. On January 26, the Duke of Suffolk had been declared a traitor (as had Carew, Wyatt, and others) after he had fled to Leicestershire, where he was captured on February 6, after putting up a weak opposition. Suffolk's attempted insurrection had been minimal, but at least had more effect than Croft's. As Loades states:

With the exception of the projected Herefordshire rising, which never materialized at all, this was the weakest stroke of the conspiracy.

Croft was apparently arrested at Ludlow, in Shropshire, on February 13, or, if not arrested, was at least examined on his connection with Lord Thomas Grey, one of Suffolk's brothers, about whom Croft denied any knowledge. In spite
of his denial, Croft must have known about Grey, who had fled towards Wales with the intention of escaping from there into France, and who would probably have stayed with Croft on his way to the Welsh coast. As for Wyatt, he had succeeded in leading his Kentishmen, numbering approximately two thousand, into Southwark, across the Thames from the Tower. Having crossed the river upstream on February 8, Wyatt and his men marched up Fleet Street to Ludgate, where they were repulsed by Lord William Howard and forced to retreat to Temple Bar. Wyatt decided to give himself up, and was brought down the Thames to the Tower as a prisoner. Two days later, Suffolk was in the Tower, and soon after that, Croft, too, was imprisoned. With the exception of Carew, who had fled to France, the leaders of the proposed uprising were now immured in the Tower, the rebellion having been a complete failure. Shortly after their imprisonment, Elizabeth joined them, suspicions of her involvement in the conspiracy being reasonably well founded, if unproveable.

It is not difficult to find reasons for the failure. What we would today term "lack of communications" must have hindered the effort immensely, but even more would lack of confidence. The idea of raising opposition in four parts of the country may have seemed a good idea, but four such isolated movements would have been easier to suppress than a more coordinated uprising in one area. As well, Wyatt could not know, while he was waging his reasonably successful struggle in Kent, that Carew, in the south-west, had already given up the fight, and that Croft, on the Welsh border, had never begun his part of the conspiracy. Native cautiousness on Croft's part may account for his having left Wyatt and the others in the lurch, or he may have felt that his influence in Herefordshire was not strong enough that he could act decisively. It is true that his was an old family and that the area was scattered with rela-
tives, but it was to be several decades before the Crofts could by any means be considered the leading family in the county. However, Croft was not the only one of the rebels who could be faulted for indecision at the last moment, and only Wyatt, in Kent, put up any sort of a fight whatsoever.

The attempted rebellion against Mary was symptomatic of the discontent felt by many throughout England, but the fact that it had been suppressed in so short a time indicated that popular feeling was not so strong that the country wished to plunge itself into civil war. Mary could feel well satisfied that the rebellion had been so ineffective and short-lived, and, because it had not posed any great threat to her, she was probably more lenient to the conspirators than she would have been had they been more successful. If Mary had taken harsh, recriminatory action, it is likely that she would have antagonized influential people whose support she needed, and severe punishment of the conspirators would not have made this possibility worth while. However, once the rebellion was over and the ringleaders safely locked inside the Tower, judgment was carried out with great speed. In fact, several of the leading conspirators, including Wyatt and Lord John Grey, had been arraigned even before Croft arrived at the Tower. Wyatt had been tried, and condemned to death, on February 19 and Grey on the 20th, but Croft was not brought to the Tower from Shropshire until the 21st, accompanied by Lord Thomas Grey. Numerous of Wyatt's followers had been executed, and Renard reported to the Emperor as early as February 17 that "... in London executions have taken place in twenty or thirty different places, and one sees nothing but gibbets and hanged men." However, Mary had also pardoned a large number of Kentishmen, and Machyn tells of a group of them who had been forgiven by the Queen:
... the powr presonars knelyd down in the myre, and ther the Quen('s) grace lokyd owt over the gatt and gayff them all pardon, and thay cryd owt 'God save quen Mare'!46

It was a simple enough matter to forgive the ignorant peasants of Kent, but quite another to be as generous to the knights and peers of the realm who had led the uprising. On February 23, shortly after Wyatt had been condemned to die, the Duke of Suffolk was beheaded in the Tower.47 Suffolk had been tried on the 17th and convicted of treason,48 and, as the father of Lady Jane Grey as well as an outspoken protestant and leading conspirator, had no hope of being spared the death penalty. Neither, of course, had Wyatt, but with the exception of these two, and of Suffolk's brothers, the rest of the conspirators were to be let off lightly.

The participation of Elizabeth in the conspiracy, if any, is impossible to prove, as she never committed herself in writing. However, she had been considered essential in the plot, as a reassurance to the French, from whom the conspirators had hoped to get help. Elizabeth was living at Ashridge, some twenty-seven miles from London, and it is probable that she had been visited by Croft while he was on his way to Herefordshire in mid-January. Croft had intimated that he had conferred with Elizabeth about the projected conspiracy late in December, when he wished to assure Noailles of her support, and Elizabeth later showed that she was acquainted with him, when they were both imprisoned in the Tower. At that time, on being questioned whether or not there had been talk at Ashridge between her and Croft about moving from there to Donnington Castle, she replied:

... as concerning my going unto Dunnington Castle, I doe re­member Master Hobby and mine Officers, and you sir James Acroft had such talke, but what is that to the purpose, my Lords, but that I may goe to my own houses at all times.49
In spite of her protestations, it would appear likely that such a talk took place. Mary had realized that any uprising could well be centred around her sister, and had requested, as early as January 26, as soon as the conspiracy had been confirmed, that Elizabeth leave Ashridge and come to the Court. Mary mentioned in the letter that "certain evil disposed persons" had recently "spread divers lewd and untrue rumours," but made it quite clear that Elizabeth was to come to London without delay. Elizabeth's reply, that she was sick and could not travel, seems a patent falsehood, and it is not surprising on Mary's part that she had her sister forcibly carried to Court, and from there to the Tower. However, Elizabeth's imprisonment was only for a short period, because, as Mary might have guessed, nothing directly incriminating could be found to prove her involvement in the rebellion.

Croft was particularly fortunate in escaping the axe, because it appears that Wyatt was implicating him deeply in the conspiracy. Although Wyatt had been condemned to death, he was probably being tortured to tell everything he knew. At least, it is recorded that the Chancellor and other Councillors had "... laboured to make Sir Thomas Wiat confess concerning the Lady Elizabeth," and that Wyatt had said that "Sir James Croft knows more of the matter." As indicated above, Croft probably did know a good deal about the negotiations which had taken place with Elizabeth. Later, in March, he was examined as a witness against Elizabeth, and protested that:

... I take God to record before all your honors I doo not know anie thing of that crime that you have laid to my charge, and will therupon take my death, if I should be driven to so strict a triall.

His fervour may have convinced his examiners that he was speaking the truth;
at least, he did escape the death penalty. His reluctance to speak at the time may have been that he realized that a confession would be fatal not only to Elizabeth but to himself, but perhaps one should grant him the benefit of the doubt and see his statement as one of particular loyalty to Elizabeth. At any rate, his silence must have paid dividends when Elizabeth came to the throne.

Wyatt cannot be blamed for attempting to save his neck, but any such efforts were useless. No amount of information he could give would help him, nor would any efforts to get influential people to intervene on his behalf. According to Renard, both Wyatt and Croft were making frantic efforts to speak to Gardiner, the Chancellor, whom Renard feared "... out of spite, may behave in a manner contrary to the Queen's hopes." Even if Gardiner had opposed the Spanish match, it was futile to hope that he would risk his neck for the sake of the rebels, and Wyatt and Croft were simply clutching at straws. On April 11, after an imprisonment of thirty-four days, Wyatt was beheaded on Tower Hill and his body quartered. As an example to the citizens "... his quarters were set up in divers places, and his head set upon the gallowes on Hay Hill ...." Six days later, Croft and three other rebels were taken to the Guild Hall, but, of the four, only Throckmorton was arraigned, and he, after defending himself with spirit, was acquitted by the jury. This acquittal was an unexpected, and unwelcome, surprise to the Council, who ordered the jurors to the Star Chamber, where some were fined and others sent to Fleet prison. No doubt the next jury was given explicit orders not to show any such originality as had occurred at Throckmorton's trial, but when it met, on April 29th, four jurors apparently refused to convict Croft, and had to be replaced with four men more amenable. After these setbacks, the expected verdict was passed:
... Sir James Croft, knight, was arrayned in the Guildhall of treason, and there by a jurie of the citizens of London condemned and had judgment of death.61

Croft's trial, although nothing is recorded of it except the bare facts, is interesting in that it shows how far jurors were willing to oppose the stated wish of the Council. The fact that four men wished to acquit him, even though they would be punished for their disobedience, shows not that they believed Croft innocent of being involved in the conspiracy, but that he was not guilty of treason. They obviously sympathized with his fear of Spanish domination, and believed that his involvement was for the good of the nation.

Even though Croft had been sentenced to death, for some reason he was not executed. Obviously, his death would not increase Mary's popularity, but Mary could not afford to allow "traitors" to go scot-free. An interesting situation had been reported by Renard on March 22, which might explain Croft's escape. The Council, in Gardiner's absence, had met to inform the Queen that they believed the rebels to have been "cruelly punished" already, and that they did not think it good for the Queen to follow the opinion of "blood-thirsty men," by whom they meant Gardiner. Gardiner had certainly opposed the Spanish match, and by this had given the conspirators hope of a mild sentence, but he was also a loyal servant of the Queen and would have taken strong measures against Croft and the others had Mary desired it. The Council further urged Mary to pardon Suffolk's brothers, and stated that "... the Council would not allow the other prisoners in the Tower to be executed."62

Renard is a somewhat unreliable source of information, but it is true that there was a split in the Council, that Gardiner was absent at the time, and that the rebels, excluding Suffolk's brothers, were eventually pardoned.
Mary might perhaps have agreed to the Council's suggestion, but insisted on a form of trial taking place. Once Croft and the others had been sentenced to death it would appear that the Queen's will had triumphed, and a discreet pardon and release some years later would pass virtually unnoticed.

Whether or not the conversation occurred as Renard reported it, events did follow the pattern indicated above. After the trial Croft was taken back to the Tower, where he remained for the remainder of 1554, being there at the same time as Elizabeth. Then, on January 18, 1555, he and other prisoners, including Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, who had apparently been imprisoned in spite of his acquittal by the jury, were suddenly released, after spending less than a year in the Tower. Richard Baker, in his chronicle, suggested that the release of the prisoners occurred in January "in hope of the Joy that was expected" of Mary being delivered of a child. Mary's pregnancy, as it turned out, was a false one, but it is possible that she would wish to express her thankfulness in January, at which time she believed herself three months pregnant, by pardoning the conspirators. It would, at least, have been a convenient excuse, and a way of ridding herself of an embarrassing reminder of the rebellion.

Croft's release on January 18 left him free, but hardly in an enviable position. Never rich at the best of times, the fine he incurred of two hundred pounds must have put a heavy strain on his finances, even though he was fortunate not to have to pay the two thousand pounds demanded of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton. Croft's pardon acquitted him of treason, and included "... remission of all pains, etc., incurred thereby," but, in spite of this, he appears to have suffered from loss of revenue during Mary's reign. On
August 6, 1554, for example, one John Wall was named keeper of a wood in Herefordshire and Shropshire, which position had been forfeited by Croft when he had been sentenced, together with "... all due and accustomed fees and profits." Having burned his fingers once, Croft would have had no wish to be involved in any more conspiracies, as Throckmorton apparently was the following year, when one of his kinsmen attempted to rob the Exchequer "to maintain war against the Queene." For the next few years, although there is no direct evidence, Croft probably settled down in Herefordshire, until he was next called upon in mid-1557.

By 1557, the chief disadvantage of the Spanish match became apparent when Mary felt it her duty to provide military assistance to Spain in its conflict with France. Although the Council disapproved, war was declared against France in June, 1557, and dragged on into 1558, arousing nothing but violent dislike against Mary throughout England. Because of the war in France, and because of incessant warfare on the Scottish borders at the same time, Mary needed all the military experts she could muster. In June, various captains were appointed for duty in France, among them Sir Peter Carew, an avowed protestant who had been involved in the conspiracy three years previously. The captains also included "... other nobles, knights, and gentlemen of right approved valiancie: although diverse of them were suspected [sic] to be protestants." England itself was remarkably free of rebellions, and for this reason it was probably thought safe to make use of those who had been involved in former risings, and whose expertise the government could now use. On July 11, the Council, in a letter to the Earl of Shrewesbury, Lord President of the North, ordered Sir James Croft to go to Berwick, "... to thende he might use his advise and service in the governaunce and orderinge tharmie committed
to his charge if nede shall require." Croft was to give advice about the fortifications of Berwick, and was also to assist the Governor, Lord Wharton, in training and positioning the troops there.

For the rest of Mary's reign Croft was to remain on the Scottish borders, during which time he would have accumulated the experience which caused him to be placed in a more responsible position shortly after Elizabeth ascended to the throne. Because the border troubles were increasing, and because the Earl of Shrewesbury did not have much experience in military affairs, the Council had decided to send to his assistance "some expert and wyse man of credytt." For this stated reason, the Council sent Croft and, shortly afterwards, Wharton, "... with whome he may conferre and use their advise in suche thinges as he shall think convenyent ...." The Council had been having some trouble with Lord Wharton, who was suspected of not being as diligent in guarding against the Scots as he might, and at the beginning of August declared that the Earl of Northumberland was to share the responsibility of Warden of the East and Middle Marches with him. Croft was told to break with Wharton and support Northumberland, a decision which apparently annoyed Shrewesbury, who wished Croft to attend him. Northumberland, aided by Croft, had more success against the Scots than had Lord Wharton, and was thanked by the Council, on August 25, for his "advertisement of the Scottes dispersing." The decision of the Council to bring back former rebels, such as Croft, appears to have been a wise one. At least, Croft's abilities were widely in demand if both the Earl of Shrewesbury and the Earl of Northumberland specially requested his services in the North, and the Council seems to have realized the value of his military experience.

Shrewesbury soon indicated that he valued Croft highly, and praised him
as equal with Northumberland, Wharton, the Earl of Westmoreland, and Sir Ralph Bulmer:

... they have shewed in this present service a great good wil, much intelligence, and a patience in doing and suffering the weather and the want of things.  

Croft had also been one of the signers of letters written to the Privy Council from Scotland, and had apparently been sent down to London to communicate at first hand with the Council there. Part of Croft's value may have been in his ability to worm information out of the Scots, such information being necessary because the Council was unwilling to embark on a major expedition until it knew if Scotland was merely continuing its constant pressure on the border, or whether it intended to send troops further south into England. Strype reports that Croft and Bulmer had managed to get together with a Scot and a Frenchman, and "... where using free and open conversation together, (and perhaps that accompanied with liberal drinking,) they learned divers material points relating to the Scots' present designed enterprise...." If Croft had managed this, Mary's reported comment, that she "liked it well," was deserved, and augured well for him.

A responsible position in the army, although accompanied by effusions of gratitude from his commander and the Queen, did not, however, make up for the income Croft had lost. There are no indications that Mary intended to restore the income he had received from lands he had formerly held in Herefordshire, and the pay he would have made in Scotland would not be close to his previous income. Therefore, it is not surprising to find Croft listed as being a pensioner of the King of Spain, from whom he had received two hundred crowns, equivalent to fifty pounds, for the last six months of 1557. It is not
apparent whether or not he had been a pensioner before mid-1557, but it is unlikely, for the simple reason that he would have had no information of any importance to impart. As a man of some importance in the North, he might be expected to pass along an occasional tid-bit to the Spanish spy network, and, even if he did not, it was as well to keep Spain in Croft's good graces at a hundred pounds a year. This amount, compared to what others were receiving, was very small. The Earl of Derby was collecting five hundred pounds per annum, as was Croft's commander, the Earl of Shrewesbury, and the amount owed to "pensioners, chamberlains, gentlemen and other servants" in April, 1558, was £8,814. 2s. ld. Some men, such as Shrewesbury, received money because they were "good Christians," or, in other words, good Catholics, but it is recorded of Croft simply that "He is a serviceable man." Croft continued to be a pensioner of Spain for much of the rest of his life, but, although it was at various times reported by Spanish officials that he was a Catholic, it is more likely that Croft was a religious opportunist. Knowing that he would receive an income from Spain if he appeared Catholic, he would be unwilling to cut off a profitable source of income by denying what Spain believed, but neither would he want to damage the even more profitable relationship he held with Elizabeth. Receiving an income from Spain was a penalty Croft incurred, as did many others, because of their chronic need for money which was not forthcoming from a notoriously grudging Court.

For the remainder of 1557, and until Elizabeth succeeded Mary in November, 1558, Croft remained in service on the Scottish border. In January, 1558, he was in command of three hundred men at Berwick, where, at the end of April, he was reported "sore diseased," most likely of the plague, although this is conjecture. To add to his distressed financial position, he had apparently
not received any pay for over a month, a condition which was not uncommon in the army, and restitution of twenty shillings a day "for his dyettes" was ordered to be paid him. For their exploits in a border skirmish in July, Croft and others were thanked by the Council in a letter of September 7, "... both that they were so redy and forwarde to serve and also that they kept their men in so good order...." Finally, on October 17, exactly one month before Mary was to die, the Council ordered Croft to return to London, and to delegate whom he thought most responsible to look after the Borders and the town of Berwick, which indicates that he had risen even further up the scale. What the Council wished to consult with Croft about is unclear, and, in any event, the consultation may not have occurred, because of the Queen's death. The accession of Elizabeth, while Croft was in London, must have pleased Croft greatly, and hopes for advancement, and for a return of his lost income, must have seemed a definite possibility.
CHAPTER IV

CROFT IN SCOTLAND (1558-1560)

Elizabeth's accession to the throne was accompanied by great hopes on the part of those Englishmen who had suffered under Mary for their Protestantism or suspected lack of faithfulness to the Queen. However, Mary had not been unpopular only because of her religious policies, but, as indicated above, her entanglement in the Spanish wars with France had antagonized the whole country. Elizabeth, of course, had to tread warily, but her accession could hardly help but be the occasion for joy among many, and Elizabeth soon indicated that her subjects' hopes were not to be in vain. Barely two months after Mary's death, many of the Protestant clergy who had been in voluntary exile on the Continent returned to England, and the first Parliament of Elizabeth's reign, called on January 25, 1559, proved to consist largely of protestants. Hayward records that Elizabeth was gaining the good will of the country "... by erecting a military discipline in every shire, and by giving pensiones and preferments to men of actione," and was having a list drawn up of all those who had served her father, brother, or sister, to discover who were most suitable for advancement. Such news must have been most welcome to Croft, who had not only served Henry VIII, Edward, and Mary, but knew Elizabeth personally, having been imprisoned with her. If anyone were to benefit from the new monarch, Croft was one who stood an excellent chance. In April, 1559, peace was concluded between England and France and, at the same time, between England and Scotland. With the signing of the peace treaty, one of the major grievances of the people appeared to be at an end. However, the war with Scotland was not to conclude for another year, and it was in this war that Croft was to be given his first
important post under Elizabeth, a post which was to end in his disgrace and in involuntary absence from Court for almost ten years.

The first military problem facing Elizabeth after she came to the throne was that of a threatened invasion from the north. Mary, Queen of Scots, was also Queen of France and, in her absence, the country was ruled by the Dowager Queen, Mary of Guise. There were French troops in Scotland, and England faced the possibility of a combined attack of Catholic forces from both north and south. However, although Mary and the Dowager were firm Catholics, not all Scots wished to follow this religion, nor did they relish French troops being stationed on Scottish soil. Opposing Mary was the formidable John Knox, who supported Maitland of Lethington, the leader of the faction which sought to depose Mary of Guise and eject the French soldiers. England's defences in the north had never been strong, as could be seen by the periodic forays made by Scots into the northern counties, which frequently went unpunished. Security of the frontier was under the direction of the Wardens of the East, Middle, and West Marches, and of the commander of Berwick, the chief town, located near Edinburgh on the east coast. Part of the problem lay in the difficulty of keeping Berwick supplied with food, a problem often referred to later by Croft, but another major difficulty occurred because the Council was notoriously stingy with money, and troops were often unpaid and unable to be clothed and armed properly. Outside of Berwick, defence of the Marches lay in the hands of the three Wardens, and these were occasionally incompetent and even disloyal, turning a blind eye to infractions, and seemingly unable to identify the offenders. With a growing militancy on the part of the Lords of the Congregation, led by Maitland of Lethington and Knox; with an ever-increasing number of French troops being shipped to Scotland; and with a border
situation that appeared to be growing as a problem, it was obvious that Elizabeth had to take steps to alter the situation, and that she needed competent and loyal men to carry out the plan. Although a peace treaty had been signed with France in April, 1559, which had ostensibly ended English-Scottish difficulties, the situation in the north steadily deteriorated, and outright hostilities were again to occur early in 1560. However, long before that time, there had been minor outbreaks of violence, and it was obvious that the situation would have to come to a head. Among those who had received experience on the border and in combat was James Croft and, as a protestant who had been punished by Mary, his advancement was only a matter of time.

For a year previous to Mary's death, Croft had been serving in Berwick as an adviser to the Earl of Westmoreland, and had several times been commended for his good service. His advancement was unlikely, however, as long as Mary lived. Croft was probably in London at the time of Mary's death, but shortly afterwards was sent back to Berwick with a message from the Council to Westmoreland concerning the management of the Marches. At the time, Berwick was without a Captain, although one was needed immediately because the town was to be fortified and extra troops sent there. The importance of the position of Captain was indicated by the Council when it declared that "... the most sufficient man in the realm should be placed there, it being a place of so great moment." The Council decided eventually to appoint Lord Thomas Evers as Captain, presumably because he had served as a lieutenant on the borders for several years, and summoned him to London. Evers indicated that he wished to confer about his office with Cecil, in the presence of Croft and Sir John Brende, two others who had had considerable experience in the north. Therefore, in early January, 1559, Evers, Croft, and Brende went down to
London, where Croft was to receive additional orders from the Council.

Evers' appointment is somewhat of a mystery. It may have been meant purely as a stop-gap until a more suitable candidate could be found, or it may have been a deserved reward for services rendered. At any rate, there are several indications that Evers accepted the post reluctantly, and his visit with Croft to London may have been to convince the Council that Croft would be a more suitable man than himself as Captain of Berwick. Earlier, in December, Evers had requested that he be allowed to leave Scotland for a time, but had been informed that "... his Lordship is required to forbear that matter untill a more conveyent tyme hereafter..." Berwick was not the most pleasant place at the best of times for a courtier to while away the hours, and it is quite reasonable that Evers would prefer to be in London rather than in an isolated and cold little Scottish border town in mid-winter. At any rate, whether or not his appointment was intended as being temporary or permanent, he served for only a few months before being officially replaced by Croft, and, even during that time, he was generally in London, and left Croft in command at Berwick.

Even though the war between England and Scotland had not been concluded at the beginning of 1559, both sides appeared to be continuing the fight reluctantly. Nevertheless, while in London Croft was ordered to confer with the Earl of Northumberland and with the Bishop of Durham concerning the raising of another thousand troops to serve in Scotland, which he did before returning to Berwick on January 23. On his arrival there, he passed on to Evers a letter from the Council permitting him to go to London, and naming Croft as deputy in his absence. Although Evers did not leave immediately,
because of increased hostilities on the border, from January 23 until he was formally named Captain in March, Croft held all the responsibilities that Evers would have had. In fact, although Evers was still at Berwick, Croft made decisions that cannot have pleased Evers, particularly as the Council concurred with Croft. On January 4, Evers had complained about the insubordination of a Captain Vaughan, whom he asked to be dismissed, but on the 30th, Croft was writing to the Council, praising Vaughan as "trusty," and asking that he be returned to Berwick, which he was. Croft's principal duty in the next few months was to take part, with the Earl of Northumberland and his brother, Sir Henry Percy, in the peace negotiations with the Scottish commissioners. These included Lord Bothwell, a Frenchman named Sarlabos, and the Secretary of Scotland, Maitland of Lethington, the three representing a rather odd combination of interests, both national and religious. As Croft had reported earlier, "... all parties are weary of the wars," and both England and Scotland must have been pleased by the signing of a preliminary peace treaty on March 6, which provided for a cessation of fighting for two months. However, peace was not officially declared until April 2, at the same time the treaty was signed between England and France, at which time the Scots agreed to tear down the fortresses built by them and the French along the borders. By March 28, Croft had been officially declared Captain of the town and castle of Berwick. His duties included that of supervising the withdrawal of forces from the border area, but it is unlikely that either he or the Council ever seriously considered carrying out this part of the agreement.

Money continued to be a major problem at Berwick, and a shortage of funds made dismissal of the troops impossible. With the peace treaty signed, it was
presumed in England that a smaller body of men would be required in the border area, and Croft was told to cut down on the number of troops there. Elizabeth had intimated that "she thinks he will do well" in cashiering two bands of horsemen, which Croft had proposed in order to "abridge the Queen's charges at Berwick," but this was easier said than done. On April 14 the soldiers were still not dismissed, because they had not been paid, and Croft suggested that "... it were better for the Queen to borrow money on interest than that those men should remain in wages..." On approximately the same date, however, the Council in London had decided to send "the Quenes Majesties threasure" northwards, and presumably the troops at Berwick were paid and dismissed shortly afterwards. However, the problem of cutting down expenses at Berwick continued, and Croft was to write to the Council several times in reference to the necessity of paying the soldiers.

Adding to the expense of maintaining the garrison at Berwick was the difficulty of procuring food. The town could not be supplied from the surrounding countryside, particularly during the winter months, and most supplies had to be shipped up from London. At this date, early in 1559, the problem was not as great as it was to become six months later, but was nevertheless an item often raised by Croft in letters to the Council. There was also the possibility that the Surveyor of Victuals, Abbingdon, was either incompetent or crooked. Croft referred to there being five or six thousand pounds worth of provisions at Berwick, but that he "... remembers 13,000l. or 14,000l being delivered into the hands of the surveyor of victuals." On May 19, Croft reported that Abbingdon would leave his post at the end of the summer, and requested that the Council choose someone to replace him, because he could find "... no one dwelling here about desirous to meddle with so great a bur-
then." The is of interest, because Croft was later to be accused by the Duke of Norfolk of using his position as Captain for his own benefit, intimating that Croft had as good as stolen money from the Treasury. If this had been the case, however, it is unlikely that Croft would have asked the Council to appoint a suitable person to the position of Surveyor of Victuals, a post which was extremely responsible and included the handling of large amounts of money. Had Croft wished to steal from this office, it is far more probable that he would have at least suggested someone to fill the post. That he did not suggests his innocence of Norfolk's charges.

Croft's concern with money was not, however, confined to his position as Captain of Berwick. The position was a responsible one, and carried a salary of twenty shillings per day, besides which Croft was entitled to payment for servants and for such expenses as food, accommodation, and arms. However, he was chronically short of money, and frequently requested that Cecil grant him extra sources of revenue. At Elizabeth's first parliament, which met from January 25 to May 8, 1559, Croft, and others who had been involved in Wyatt's Rebellion, were given back the revenue of which they had been deprived by Mary. This, however, did not satisfy Croft, who wrote to Cecil on May 2, complaining pitifully about his poor health, and asking to be allowed to withdraw for a time and to appoint a deputy. He added that he hoped "... that some greater man will be appointed in his behalf, one able to support himself of his revenues, whereof he is utterly destitute," and begged Cecil "... to remember his small tithes to help to find his children bread." Obviously, Cecil was not to take Croft's hand-wringing at surface value, such melodramatic utterances being part of the rhetoric generally applied in such cases, and it is most unlikely that Croft ever seriously considered leaving his hard-
earned and long hoped-for position. The piteous appeal did bear fruit, though, and on August 3, Croft thanked Cecil "... for his opinion of the tenths which he [Croft] sued for, and desires that the Queen be thanked on his behalf." The grant he received was that of a twenty-one year lease on lands in Herefordshire which had formerly belonged to Leominster priory, and which had a yearly rent of £40.16.0.34 Previous to this, in January, he had been granted a similar lease of land in the same area, with a yearly value of £98.16.9½,35 probably at the time he had been restored in blood. His income from these two leases of land, plus the land his father already owned at Croft Castle, plus his salary and perquisites from his position at Berwick, plus a pension which he may still have been receiving from Spain,36 would have given Croft a reasonably large income, and he had little to fear of being unable "to find his children bread," as he had plaintively stated to Cecil.

Religious dissension within Scotland was becoming more pronounced throughout 1559, and it was increasingly difficult for England to avoid being embroiled in the conflict between the Lords of the Congregation and the forces of Mary of Guise and France. In May, Croft reported that "the dissension of religion continues,"37 and clashes between the followers of Knox and those of the Dowager occurred frequently. Croft was approached secretly by the Protestants, who asked that assistance be given them by England,38 and on July 8 Cecil had replied to Croft that he should tread warily, but that he should "endeavour to kindle the fire":

The Protestants there shall be essayed with all fair promises first, next with monsy, and last with arms. Wisdom is to provide for the worst.39

Promises being of scanty comfort to the Scots, Croft reminded Cecil that "...
in all practices, money must be one part,"\(^{40}\) but that the Queen should hesitate to aid the Scottish protestants until they were completely unified.\(^{41}\)

The problem of whether or not to offer aid to the Lords of the Congregation and, if so, what form the assistance should take, continued to bother the Council for several months. If money were proferred ostentatiously, it could well by taken by the Dowager as a deliberate provocation, while support by English troops would be tantamount to an outright declaration of war. As the year progressed and it seemed to England that increasing numbers of French troops were arriving in Scotland, and that military installations were being strengthened rather than destroyed, aid to the protestant forces increased and became more blatant, until, in the Spring of 1560, direct confrontation of English and Scottish forces was to occur.

Reports from Berwick indicated not only a growing Catholic-Protestant antagonism, but, as suggested above, an increasing preparedness for war. Croft had indicated, on June 26, that he was unwilling to discharge any more soldiers, and that "... the loss of Calais should also be remembered,"\(^ {42}\) a subtle hint that must have jolted the Council. Throckmorton wrote to Cecil that he had been told that Croft's secretary was being entertained by the Dowager, a report that may have been circulated to discredit Croft, as Throckmorton says, or which may have indicated treachery on the part of the secretary. Throckmorton believed "... that Sir James Crofts himself is utterly void of all suspicion, but what his secretary may be, God knoweth."\(^ {43}\) Of course, it is possible that Croft was guilty, but as nothing else was said of the matter, it is unlikely. Throckmorton was a friend of Croft's and had been imprisoned with him after Wyatt's Rebellion, so he would be unlikely to report that Croft was a traitor. The Dowager had replied several times to Croft that
fortifications, particularly at Eyemouth, were being destroyed\(^4^4\) as had been promised under the treaty, but there was little evidence that any serious work was being undertaken to pull down the battlements. The situation in Scotland going from bad to worse, the Council decided to send to Berwick Sir Ralph Sadler "... as well to view the state of the fortifications there as also to consider the reckoning of the Treasurer there."\(^4^5\) Sadler's appointment, on August 6, marks a turning point in England's rapidly deteriorating relationship with Scotland.

Throughout the remainder of 1559, Croft and Sadler worked together in negotiating with the Scottish protestants and in looking after the fortification and government of the border area. Sadler, described in the *Dictionary of National Biography* as a "diplomatist,"\(^4^6\) had had considerable experience in Scotland in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, but, as a keen protestant, had gone into voluntary retirement on the accession of Mary. In August, 1559, together with Croft and the Earl of Northumberland, Sadler was appointed a commissioner to settle the border disputes with Scotland, and to meet with their Scottish counterparts, Bothwell, Lord Hume, and the Laird of Cesford,\(^4^7\) to discuss the ransom of prisoners.\(^4^8\) However, it was unknown to Sadler's fellow commissioners that he had been entrusted with secret instructions by Cecil "... to conferr, treate, or practise, with any manner of person of Scotland," and that he could reward any suitable person he chose with sums of up to three thousand pounds.\(^4^9\) As this was what Croft had been urging the Council to do for several months, it is not surprising that he was very soon told of the plan by Sadler, and that all negotiations from then on were carried on by both men together. Sadler arrived in Berwick on August 18 or 19,\(^5^0\) and on the 29th wrote to Cecil that he had taken Croft fully into his confidence:
Cecil had recommended that Sadler use the advice of any he felt most competent, but Croft was apparently the only man he trusted. Northumberland he dismissed as "very unmete," and Percy, the Earl's brother, he considered not "... a man of such integryte as in any wise may be comparable to sir James Croft." The fact that both Northumberland and his brother were Catholics explains Sadler's decision, as it would hardly be possible for these two men to be involved in discussions with the anti-Catholic Lords of the Congregation. Croft's religious feelings were in no way an interference, and his imprisonment in 1554 a good recommendation, and he and Sadler worked together well while they were in Berwick.

As the months passed, it became more apparent to Croft and Sadler that a confrontation would be unavoidable, although the Council was still not convinced. Sadler had numerous verbal clashes with Northumberland, whom he rebuked when he stated that he had never known the border area to be worse governed, and he and Croft intimated to Cecil that Northumberland had been receiving secret information from the Clerk of the Council. On September 9, Cecil asked Sadler's opinion about changing the wardens of the East and Middle Marches (Northumberland) and the West Marches (Lord Dacre), both of whom were Catholics and unable, or unwilling, to stop the constant incursions there. Although Sadler had suggested Croft for warden of the East Marches, and had protested that he did not wish to bear the responsibility or expense himself, nevertheless, on October 30, Elizabeth made him warden of both East and Middle Marches in Northumberland's stead, "... as one whome we willingly can be con-
tente to burden with a charge of spciall trust and auctoritie..." This flattery was small comfort to Sadler, although his appointment would mean the border area would be better governed. He shifted the responsibility somewhat by creating deputies of Relph Grey, in the East Marches, and Sir John Forster in the Middle Marches, but the burden would still largely be Sadler's. Northumberland's dismissal indicates that the Council was realizing at last that it could not continue government of the border area in the old, lackadaisical manner, and that preparations were under way for decisive action in Scotland. Further developments throughout 1559 showed that competent and faithful leadership was very necessary there, particularly as all indications were that England would soon be involved in another war.

Rumours that French troops were being sent to Scotland, and that Mary of Guise was preparing for war, continued to circulate, and were eventually confirmed. Among Mary's preparations was that of fortifying the town of Leith, a seaport just outside Edinburgh, which the Lords of the Congregation wished to attack, and for which purpose they requested aid, in the form of money, from England. Sadler and Croft favoured open support of the protestants by England, but, as Cecil pointed out, such support could not be given without bringing about a total breach with Scotland, and England was not yet ready to do that. However, the Council was supplying money, and was beginning to prepare for battle, if it should eventually occur. There was little chance of keeping these measures secret, particularly after Bothwell had captured a messenger, on November 3, who was carrying one thousand pounds to the protestants. Cecil was also beginning to fear that the skirmishes that had occurred between the troops of the Lords of the Congregation and those of the Dowager were proving disastrous for the protestants, and that if England
did not involve herself directly, the protestants might well be beaten entirely. In a letter to Sadler and Croft on November 12, he gave reasons why the conflict should be stepped up, the chief reason being that "... whencesoever they [ie. the French] shall make an ende with Scotlande, they will begin with Inglande...". Two days later, on November 14, the Duke of Norfolk was appointed lieutenant-general of the north, a move which marked the beginning of definite plans for the by-now inescapable confrontation.

Thomas Howard, fourth Duke of Norfolk, was, in 1559, a young man of twenty-one, and his post as lieutenant-general was the first important one in his career. As the head of one of the leading families in England, it was crucial for Elizabeth, during the somewhat precarious early years of her reign, to attract his allegiance. This she did by giving him the charge of the first great undertaking of her reign, the expulsion of French troops from Scotland. Norfolk was not due to arrive at Berwick until the end of December. He was to be assisted in his first campaign by Lord Grey, a soldier of much experience if little imagination, who was made leader of the foot, and Sir William Wynter, a sailor who had taken part in many sea battles, including the burning of Leith and Edinburgh in 1544, and who was put in charge of the navy to ensure that no more French troops were landed. As well, Norfolk had been ordered by the Queen and the Council to take the advice of such men as Sadler and Croft, who were experienced in warfare and in the affairs of Scotland. To further ensure that Norfolk did not make any foolish mistakes in his first assignment, both Cecil and Elizabeth wrote numerous letters to him, giving advice on matters both trivial and important. Norfolk could be expected to do his best, but, being very young, inexperienced, and headstrong, his best might well not have been good enough. It is
possible that he resented the advice, and the advisors, that had been thrust upon him, feeling himself too confined, as he indeed was, to do much on his own initiative. However, he soon showed that he did not wish to accept all the blame as well as all the glory, and when the major defeat of the campaign occurred, he quickly exonerated himself by blaming others. It so happened that one of Norfolk's principal scapegoats turned out to be Sir James Croft, but it is quite likely that someone else could have been chosen to shoulder the responsibility for failure.

Although Norfolk arrived at Berwick with no apparent animosity to Croft, after several weeks the first indications of antagonism appeared. Norfolk's early indications of friendship might have been feigned, particularly if he had known that Croft was distantly related to Robert Dudley, whose affair with the Queen was well under way by the time Norfolk left for Scotland. As a disappointed rival, Norfolk had reason to be jealous of Dudley, and may have vented his anger on one of Dudley's kinsmen, although there are no signs during Norfolk's first month in the north that Croft was in disfavour. By the time the war with Scotland was over, however, Croft was to be in disgrace, entirely through the initiative of Norfolk. It is important, therefore, to understand Norfolk's qualifications and experience before judging Croft's guilt, and events would appear to prove that Norfolk's charges were entirely unfounded, and that Croft was to be a sacrifice necessary for Norfolk's self-esteem. Elizabeth could afford to rid herself of a minor official if it meant keeping Norfolk firmly attached to herself and to the Crown.

Disagreement between Croft and Norfolk began almost as soon as the Duke had arrived at Berwick in mid-February. As Captain of Berwick, Croft was in charge of fortifications for that city, but on January 23, 1560, Norfolk was
complaining to the Council that Berwick was "... marvelously unapt to be for-
tified without great pain, travail, and industry,"^70 and requested that some-
one be sent from the Court who had more skill than Croft in planning fortifi-
cations. However, Norfolk had not yet broken with Croft, and he admitted that
there were good reasons on both sides on the differing plans for fortifica-
tions. If it should seem odd that Norfolk, a completely inexperienced young
man, should be differing with Croft, who had almost twenty years of military
experience under his belt, over what was a military matter, his reasons should
not be hard to uncover. It is not unusual for someone taking over a new job
to try to win favour with his superiors by uncovering errors, real or imagined,
in a predecessor's or subordinate's work, and it appears that such was Norfolk's
strategy. Nevertheless, for the first month at his new assignment, Norfolk
attempted to mollify Croft, by praising him in letters,^71 while, at the same
time, complaining to Cecil, the Council, and the Queen about his conduct.
Even though Croft agreed with Norfolk that "men of skill and judgment"^72 should
be sent from London to consider the fortifications, animosity between the two
men appears to have been increasing. The situation must have been worsened by
a letter from the Council to Norfolk on February 20, in which it was stated
that his letter containing his difference of opinion with Croft over Berwick
had been discussed with Elizabeth, "... who doth not disallow the answer of
Crofts.",^73 The state of affairs could not continue indefinitely, and it was
no doubt felt by the Council that the most strategic move would be to separate
Croft and Norfolk. This was done, but instead of abating, animosity continued
and became even more bitter.

It was decided by the Council that Croft should be released from his posi-
tion as Captain of Berwick and put out of Norfolk's way by making him second-
in-command to Lord Grey, who was in charge of the foot soldiers. This was an obvious move to make, although rather unfortunate for Croft, who had done nothing wrong except to cross Norfolk. Apparently, it was realized in London that Croft might well feel slighted, and a flurry of letters passed from Cecil, the Council, and the Queen to both Norfolk and Croft, explaining their reasons and underlining the fact that Croft was in no way to feel he had done anything wrong. The move had first been suggested by Lord Grey himself, on February 19, when he asked that Croft accompany him with the army into Scotland:

... it was requisite to have some discreet man of good authority and credit to go with him in that journey, that in case any misfortune happen to himself, the other might be able to go forward with the enterprise.74

Croft learned of this plan from Grey on the 23rd, and, comparing himself to "an overburdened horse,"75 said he would be unable to take the position, being a man of small means. However, on the 28th, the Queen informed Norfolk that Croft was to receive payment "which shall seem convenient for his Degree,"76 and Croft was promised by the Council that "... the Lord Lieutenant will have due regard of your lacks, and thereafter augment your intertainment."77 Sadler commended Croft to Cecil upon the appointment and, presumably referring to a complaint made by Norfolk, said that Croft "... will show himself a serviceable man, being right honestly determined so to do, notwithstanding his late warning."78 With Croft safely out of the way, Norfolk could carry out his plans unhindered and could probably feel that he had won a major victory. Unfortunately for Croft, however, it was inevitable that their paths would shortly cross again.

Elizabeth had never been eager to invade Scotland, but had accepted the
majority decision of her Council. Although Norfolk had been sent north to keep peace in the border area, to organize defences, and to encourage the protestants, he soon realized that the situation would never be resolved without a direct show of force. Writing to Cecil on February 2, Norfolk declared:

... I believe that if any Thing make them [i.e. the protestants] shewe them selfe open Ennemys to the Frenche, it must be our open Hostyltytie agenste the Frenche; wyth out the plain Shewe and Manyfestacion whereof, and till they shall perfectly see the Entrye of our Aide, they will suerly sett still as they have donn hitherto.

Recognizing the inevitable, Elizabeth made preparations for war, but refused to give the word for invasion until she was convinced, by reports from Scotland and France, that open intervention was the only alternative to a French occupation of Scotland. Finally, on March 29, the English army, which had been assembled on the border for almost four months, was given orders to cross into Scotland. Lord Grey, leading six thousand infantry, crossed the border and headed towards Edinburgh. The march was uneventful, and by April 6 the troops had arrived at Leith, where some four thousand French troops were entrenched, and where the principal action of the Scottish campaign was to occur.

Although the French soldiers were firmly in possession of Leith, Mary of Guise had retired to Edinburgh Castle, and it was decided to negotiate with the Dowager before initiating an attack. Accordingly, a safe-conduct pass was provided for Croft, Sir George Howard, and six others, and both sides promised not to begin hostilities while the conference was going on. Croft and the other negotiators declared to the Dowager that, if she could persuade the French to depart, the English troops would also leave Scotland. Mary replied that she would have to confer with the French before giving an answer, which apparently annoyed the English, although they agreed to her wish. In spite
of the agreement to halt hostilities while the negotiations were being carried out, some one thousand five hundred French troops had issued forth from Leith and had begun a skirmish with Lord Grey's troops. The engagement was inconclusive, but was the opening round of the battle which was to occur soon afterwards, and showed the relative strength of the two opposing forces.

The English had two choices regarding the plans for Leith; they could surround the city and starve it into submission, or they could mount a direct attack. The first would be costly in terms of time and money, the second would entail a large loss of life. However, it was decided to prepare for a siege, largely because the Scottish protestants were beginning to get the wrong impression of England's intentions. On April 14, Elizabeth wrote to Norfolk that:

As she would not have the Scots mistrust her, she desires that the siege should be more earnestly prosecuted, and the treaty less regarded...

Accordingly, the English troops began to dig trenches and to mount various attacks on the town throughout April, none of which were successful, because Leith was so strongly fortified and because the incursions were not thoroughly planned. However, at the beginning of May a new campaign was drawn up, which was to be a fully coordinated and full-scale attempt to dislodge the French. This attack, while not successful, was to lead to conferences which would end the war, and, in effect, was successful in the long run in removing the French from Scotland.

The attack on Leith was scheduled for May 7, and on the evening before, Grey gathered the troops together to announce the plan of action. In the days previous, a breach had been made in the walls of the city by the artillery,
and it was intended that this would be the focal point of the attack. However, on the evening of the 6th, Croft, Sadler, and Lord Grange had made an inspection of the breach, which they decided to be "veri insufficient." Sadler and Grange returned to the camp, agreeing that the plan was not ready to be put into operation, while Croft was delegated to report their findings to Lord Grey. He, however, after a cursory examination of the situation, decided to go ahead with the attack as planned, and the order to advance was given shortly after three in the morning. If Grey had listened to Croft's advice to delay the operation until a larger breach had been made in the walls, the attack would have stood a much better chance of success, and Croft may well have evaded the ignominy that was heaped on him afterwards by Norfolk. As matters stood at the time, the operation appears, in retrospect, to have been doomed from the start.

The accuracy of Croft's information was proved as soon as the first men reached the walls of Leith. The attack was to be on three sides, concentrating on the breach, with Vaughan and Randall leading two bands of soldiers, and Croft the third. Stow records that the attack failed because the French had diverted the river flowing through the town and had filled up the moat surrounding it, and adds that "... by reason of the unfitnesse of the ladders, being too short, the assailants were repulsed...." After several hours of fighting, the English troops were forced to draw back, having lost, according to Stow, seven or eight score, besides at least two or three hundred wounded. The actual total was undoubtedly higher than Stow's estimate, and the entire attack had been a major disaster. Grey now altered his tactics and decided to starve the French into submission, and an investigation began to decide whom to blame for the fiasco. By the beginning of June, the inhabitants and
occupiers of Leith, no doubt sick of a diet of "doggs, catts, and vermine of more vile nature,"\textsuperscript{91} appeared ready to surrender, and the death of the Queen Dowager on June 10 made the English situation stronger. The French position was immeasurably weakened by the death of Mary of Guise, and without her formidable presence, the French were far more ready to come to terms with the English than they would have been while she was alive. Peace was eventually concluded on July 7, under which all Frenchmen were to leave Scotland, and Mary Stuart was to give up her claims to the English throne.\textsuperscript{92} By the end of July the French forces had departed for France and the English forces back to England, and the first military campaign of Elizabeth's reign had come to a successful, if ignominious, conclusion.

While it was a relatively simple matter to starve the French into submission, particularly after the death of Mary of Guise, it proved less easy to affix the blame for the defeat of May 7. Grey and Norfolk each blamed the other, but, considering their importance, they escaped relatively unscathed, while a major portion of Norfolk's denunciation fell on Croft. Knox, who was truly a fair-weather friend, recorded that Croft "was blamit of mony for not doing his dewitie that day," and that "sum ascribit the schortnes of the ledderis [ladders] to him,"\textsuperscript{93} but these observations do not bear up under scrutiny and were made after Croft had been indicted. Norfolk wasted no time in deciding where the blame lay, and on May 28 wrote to Cecil that he had sent for Croft to answer charges.\textsuperscript{94} These were presented on August 19, and included the charge that since Croft had gone into Scotland he had done everything possible to "discourage her Majesty's friends there,"\textsuperscript{95} that he had neglected his duty during the siege of Leith, and that he had outrageously deceived the Queen. The first charge is patently ridiculous, the second unproveable, and
the third so vague as to be meaningless, but a scapegoat had to be found, and, being no friend of Norfolk's, Croft had little chance of acquittal from an already committed jury. In spite of protestations from Lethington and Randolph, who wrote to Cecil that "he never found man franker than he [Croft] was to set forth the purpose," Croft, whose trial took place in London, was duly found guilty of the charges laid against him by Norfolk, and for a short time was confined in Fleet prison. It was hardly an auspicious ending to a hard-fought campaign, and Croft must have felt unjustly punished. However, if one could rise through the ranks of administrative or military service by having important connections at Court, one could also fall through crossing someone as influential as Norfolk, as Croft had discovered to his chagrin. Once again, Croft was in disfavour and bereft of a Court appointment, and, as he had done six years previously, he returned to Herefordshire to ruminate and to wait until official favour would again fall on him. This time he had ten years to wait until he was once more called upon to serve the Queen in London, but it was the last time that he was to go into involuntary exile away from the favours of Court.
CHAPTER V

EXILE, AND POLITICAL RESURRECTION (1560-1587)

As a private citizen once again, with few prospects in sight of changing his situation, Croft returned to Herefordshire. His term of imprisonment in the Fleet was apparently a short one, and his conviction had not been accompanied by any penalties, with the exception of the loss of revenue he had received as a Crown official. Elizabeth did not penalize him further, and he continued to enjoy the income from lands that had been returned to him on her accession and others which had been granted him later. The fact that Croft did not suffer unduly indicates that he had not incurred great disapproval by Norfolk's charges, and it is more than probable that Elizabeth, Cecil, and the Council realized that Norfolk's accusations were wild and unproveable. Although Croft returned to Herefordshire, he did so unwillingly, and for the next ten years was to make repeated efforts to be restored to the Queen's favour. These attempts were only partially successful, and until 1570 Croft had to be satisfied with local offices within his home county, and with minor appointments which he managed to secure outside Herefordshire.

Being a big frog in a small puddle is seldom satisfying after one has occupied centre stage for even a short time, and Croft must have accepted his county responsibilities with a feeling of anti-climax. However, his duties in Herefordshire were of at least local importance, and Croft managed to contribute to local administration in a number of ways. In 1562, and again in 1564, he was listed as being a member of the Commission of the Peace, consisting of thirty-five of the most prominent gentlemen in the county. These Justices of the Peace also included important Court personages such as the Earl of Arundel
and the Marquis of Winchester, who were members of a large number of Commissions in various counties,\textsuperscript{1} and they were given a prescribed list of offences on which to give judgment.\textsuperscript{2} Later, in 1569, Croft was one of the Commissioners of Musters for the county,\textsuperscript{3} his duties principally being to inform the Council of the number of horses, condition of armour, and number of men who would be available to fight, if necessary. These duties could not have been very onerous, nor were they terribly distinguished, but Croft also managed to keep in touch through his election to the House of Commons as the senior member for the county in the second parliament of Elizabeth's reign, which met in 1562-1563.\textsuperscript{4} Croft had been elected previously, in 1541, but had not sat in parliament from that date until 1562. However, his election was to be the beginning of a long and continuous record, and he sat in every parliament from 1562 until his death in 1590. Other than attending to his duties in local affairs, Croft must have spent some time looking after his estates in the county, as he was the principal beneficiary of his father's will, Richard Croft having died in January, 1562.\textsuperscript{5}

Finances continued to be a major preoccupation with Croft, even though the opportunities or need to spend conspicuously had been curtailed by his exit from Court circles. One of the best recognized ways to obtain an income was to procure the wardship of an orphan, the marriage of whom could often be extremely profitable to the guardian. The system led inevitably to abuses, as its major purpose was to raise money for the State, rather than to protect orphans. It has been calculated that the Elizabethan government could call upon an income of fifteen thousand pounds a year from the Court of Wards.\textsuperscript{6} Besides providing revenue, wardships were handed as rewards to faithful servants, thereby saving royal expenditure. The receiver of a wardship would
generally have to pay out a large sum of money, which he would hope to recoup upon the marriage of his ward. It is not recorded how much Croft had to pay for the two wardships he obtained in the early 1560's, but on May 10, 1560, he was granted the wardship and marriage of William Rudhale, and on July 11, 1561, that of John Scudamore. The date of the first grant is significant, as it occurred at the time Croft was presumably in disgrace, and it would surely have been withheld had Elizabeth wished to punish him severely. Neither would the second wardship have been granted if Croft had not maintained influential friendships. In fact, the wardship of John Scudamore had been procured through the intervention of Robert Dudley, who, in a letter to an uncle of Scudamore's in December, 1561, said that "... at the request of my Lady Croft, I obtained the wardship of your nephew for her husband, trusting thereby to procure a marriage for my kinswoman Sir James Crofts daughter...." Scudamore's uncle had been demanding large sums of money from Croft, and Dudley requested him to be more reasonable, hinting that he might find occasion to "favor you from time to time." A family link between Dudley and Croft does much to explain the wardships Croft received, and was to be of considerable importance at a later stage in his career.

After five years in exile from the Court, Croft must have believed that, by 1566, time was ripe for him to attempt to get back into public life. Although England was at peace with Scotland, there were still troops positioned on the border marches and at Berwick. Croft may have wished to return there, or could have had aspirations in Ireland, which was still in a state of constant turmoil. On April 13, 1566, the Spanish ambassador was reporting that "warlike stores" were again being sent to Berwick, and that Croft was in London, as he was usually consulted on matters of this sort. The writer's
opinion of affairs in Berwick may have been at fault, as may his opinion that Croft was attached to the service of the King of Spain, but it is quite reasonable to suppose that Croft would have liked to return to service, preferably at his former position of Governor of Berwick. Nevertheless, Croft apparently did not return to Scotland but to Ireland, where, in December, 1566, the Spanish ambassador wrote that "... they had only two good soldiers here who understood war, and now that Randolph is dead, the only one left is Crofts." The Lord Deputy requested, on May 12, 1567, that "Mr. Vice-Chamberlain Knollys or Sir James Croft ... be sent to take the government, while Sydney [ie. himself] is absent in the field," but whether Croft did so or not is unclear. However, his appointment to service in Ireland, and even more the consideration that he would be suitable to serve as temporary Deputy, indicates that he was again returning to the good graces of the Council. This was made startlingly apparent by his sudden appointment to the office of Comptroller of the Queen's Household, on January 9, 1570, the most important position he had yet occupied, and which he was to hold for the remainder of his lifetime.

The position of Comptroller had apparently been vacant for several years, the previous holder of the office, Sir Edward Rogers, having died in 1567. Croft's appointment is somewhat of a mystery, as there had been no previous indications that he might be given the office, nor were there any reasons stated (as might be expected) for the position being offered him. He had shown an interest in the affairs of the Household when, as a Member of Parliament in 1563, he had assisted the current Comptroller, Rogers, in the making of the Statute of Artificers. At one point, in March, 1563, the Statute had been referred to a "committee," consisting solely of Croft, which had the task
of examining certain clauses relating to compulsory service and apprentice-
ship. 17 Even though Croft had had this experience, this alone would not have
been enough to determine his worth, though it may have been an important con-
sideration. A possible reason can be seen in the fall from grace of Norfolk,
Croft's foremost opponent, whose aspirations were matched only by the over-
estimation of his limited abilities. Norfolk resented the fact that lesser
men, as he saw them, were being given positions he felt due to him as first
peer in the realm, and it was probably Elizabeth's treatment of him which
gave him the idea of marrying Mary, Queen of Scots. From the end of 1568 un-
til his execution three years later, he became increasingly reckless, and his
thorough implication in the Ridolfi Plot made his death a certainty. 18 As an
enemy of Norfolk, and one who might have been remembered by Elizabeth as un-
justly treated, Croft benefited from Norfolk's sudden downfall. A third pos-
sible reason for Croft's selection as Comptroller was, as Wallace MacCaffrey
suggests, that Croft was thought to be friendly to the Catholics and was pro-
Habsburg, and his appointment would be a conciliatory move towards Elizabeth's
Catholic subjects. 19 The selection of Croft would make the Council more
evenly balanced, and would give a voice on the Council to those who favoured
a conservative, pro-Habsburg policy, and were relatively un-bellicose on the
question of the Queen of Scots. It is certainly true that Croft was a Spanish
pensioner, but there is little to suggest that his religious feelings were
heartfelt, or anything more than opportunistic. Nevertheless, after ten years
of waiting, Croft suddenly found himself the possessor of one of the most in-
fluential positions in the country, and one he was to hold for the remaining
twenty years of his life.

Unfortunately, as a previous writer has stated, "the duties of Comptrol-
ler of the Household are not of a description to produce an official correspondence," and there are very few records that one can draw upon to determine what Croft was doing in his position as Comptroller. The Royal Household was the largest department in the Elizabethan civil service, and was both elaborate and costly. The three chief officers consisted of the Lord Steward, who had complete control, although it was seldom exercised, the Treasurer of the Household, and the Comptroller, who jointly supervised the whole Household in the absence of the Lord Steward. As indicated above, Croft held the position of Comptroller from 1570 to 1590, while that of Treasurer was held even longer, from 1570 to 1596, by Sir Francis Knollys, the two men thus having virtually complete control over all Household matters and finances for two decades. Under such circumstances, it would not be surprising if they should realize the possibilities for graft, but whether they avoided the temptation or not is open to question. Most royal servants were hopelessly ill-paid, particularly as many of the tasks they were called upon to perform fell outside the formal boundaries of their positions. As Wallace MacCaffrey states of the indefinite nature of the assignments of numerous royal officials:

From the government's point of view this arrangement provided a reservoir of servants of many-sided competence, from the official's it meant burdensome, sometimes costly tasks to perform, but also opportunities for wider reaches of connection, of influence, and perhaps of profit.

If it seems strange that a professional soldier should be appointed to a position where he would be required to check costs and amounts of food, accommodation for Court figures, and entertainments for visiting personages, Croft's appointment can probably be explained in the light of the above quotation. Although nominally Comptroller, Croft served numerous other purposes, and was particularly conscientious in his attendance at meetings of the Privy Council.
There is little doubt that he made use of his position to widen his connections and influence, and thereby profit himself, but it is doubtful whether one can state, as Miss Woodworth does, that he "practiced graft and placed his own interests above those of the queen."²⁵ Throughout his period as Comptroller he frequently referred to his poverty and need for further grants from Elizabeth, and if he was, in fact, stealing from the Household, it cannot have been on a large enough scale to be profitable or to incur the wrath of the Queen.

Although Burghley attempted to keep a lid on the ever-increasing expenses of the Household, he had little success. This was partly because the officers of the Household held only loose control over the number of servants that abounded, but also because the Queen appeared to have small regard for limiting her expenses in any way.²⁶ One of the major causes of increased Household charges was the large number of progresses made by Elizabeth, which necessitated extra expense not only for transportation but for food and service. Croft accompanied the Queen on many of these progresses, as when she visited Worcester in August, 1575, escorted by a large retinue of noblemen, bishops, and ladies-in-waiting, plus their servants and members of the Household staff generally employed at Court.²⁷ It is well known that entertaining Elizabeth on her progresses could easily be crippling expensive, but not so obvious that expenses must have been correspondingly high for the Queen. As Comptroller of the Household, Croft would be in charge of such expenses, together with Knollys, but final authority for providing expenses would have rested with Burghley. As for daily expenses at Court, a list showing the amount provided for members of the Household in 1576, together with the sums of money actually spent, illustrates a wide discrepancy.²⁸ For example, the Queen herself was
entitled to have a diet costing £1,288.8.9½ per year, when, in fact, the eventual cost was £2,509.18.4, an increase of almost one hundred per-cent. Croft was allowed £494.2.2. but spent £585.14.9 and the rates of diet of other members of the Household show similar increases. As Comptroller, Croft should probably have attempted to put a curb on spending, and there are indications that he at least made the effort, but there were limits to his powers, particularly if he did not wish to offend the Queen, and Household costs continued to rise throughout the century.

Part of the correspondence which has survived is a remembrance issued by Croft to Burghley, concerning Household expenses and written on December 7, 1583. It is of interest as it provides an example of some of the problems facing Croft, and shows that he was concerned with rising expenses, although he did not know how he could deal with them. Among the reasons for increased costs, Croft listed the keeping by officers and ministers of more servants and pages than necessary, many of whom "hang upon the Butterie barre, wasting the fragments which should be geaven to the poore." Because wages were so low, servants were forced to steal from the kitchen, and also "everie office that can help with bred Drinke Fuell and lyghtes, are corrupted." Croft suggested that, to redress these disorders, wages and allowances should be raised to a reasonable level, particularly as he was already supplying extraordinary allowances to some members of the Household. Costs had also been rising because "the pryces of victualls and incydents are encreased above ten or twelve thousand pou nds by the yeare," and he suggested that a new book of allowances be drawn up, reflecting the increased costs. The remembrance indicates that Croft knew what the problems were, but it is doubtful that he could have dealt with any of them by himself, and certainly could not be held to blame because
of Elizabeth's extravagances or rising prices in general.

One of the first positions to which Croft was appointed after being made Comptroller and a Privy Councillor was as a member of the Council in the Marches of Wales. As mentioned in Chapter Three, Strype lists Croft as being a member of the Council, together with Sir Nicholas Arnold, as early as 1551, but even if Strype is correct, Croft's appointment at this early date would have been of short duration. His appointment, on May 27, 1570, less than five months after he had been made Comptroller, indicates that Elizabeth valued Croft as much for the advice he could give elsewhere as on the Council. The Council, which sat in Ludlow, in Shropshire, was, as Penry Williams observes, "... part of the remarkable Tudor policy of creating regional administrations within England and Wales." Like the Council in the North, it was created to administer a difficult and relatively isolated area, and had jurisdiction over all of Wales, as well as the counties of Shropshire, Hereford, Worcester, Gloucester, and Monmouth. The Council had wide and somewhat vague powers, both criminal and civil, and could enforce particular aspects of the Crown's policy. Later, in 1586, its authority was to be restricted, a move which pleased many of the Councillors, including Croft, who favoured limitation of its powers. Croft continued as a member of the Council through the 1570's and 80's and was a particularly influential figure, both because of his importance in national life and as one of the leading gentlemen in the affairs of Herefordshire.

Croft's importance in the county can be determined not only by the offices he enjoyed himself, but also by those which were held by his friends and relatives. Not only did Croft sit for every parliament as the senior member for the county from 1562 onwards, but various relatives were also elected
as members. These included his son, Edward, in 1584 and 1586, as M.P. for Leominster, his son-in-law, John Scudamore, in 1572, 1584, 1586, and 1589, as junior member for the county, and a cousin, Fabian Philippes in 1572, as junior member for Leominster. As well, James Warnecombe, junior member for the shire in 1562 and senior member of the City of Hereford in 1572, was related to Sir James through his wife, and Thomas Wigmore, a close friend, was twice member for Leominster, in 1584 and 1586. John Scudamore, the uncle of Croft's son-in-law of the same name, had been Sheriff of the county in 1553, and in 1565 was Steward of Hereford City. He was a member of the Council of Wales in 1560 and probably in 1570 and 1578, although it is not clear whether it is the elder John Scudamore or his nephew who is referred to in the two latter years. Fabian Philippes was listed as "one of the justices of North Wales" in 1586, and a member of the Council of Wales in the same year. Thus, through a widely spread network of relationships, Croft could well be said to be the most important man in Herefordshire in the 1570's and 80's, and his influence must have been strong throughout the area of the Welsh Marches.

Although Croft sat in the House of Commons for a span of almost thirty years, the scarcity of records makes it almost impossible to discover in what ways he was involved in parliamentary business. However, in 1572, he spoke on the Bill to reform the Book of Common Prayer, and supported Cecil, who declared that matters of religion should be left to the discretion of princes. Croft added that "... since we acknowledge her [ie. Elizabeth] to be supreme head, we are not in these petty matters to run before the ball, which to do, and therein to offend, were great folly." It is quite likely that Croft had received instructions from the Queen to inform the Commons that she disapproved
of parliament meddling with what she considered her prerogative, or the statement may reveal Croft's own views. In the same parliament, Croft was also named a member of a committee appointed to look into the situation of the Queen of Scots, which resulted in a bill being passed by both Houses, but quashed by Elizabeth, who "would not suffer it to pass into a law." Besides these mentions of Croft, there is little to tell what part he played in parliament. His appointment to the committee is significant, though, because fourteen years later he was named one of the commissioners to try Mary Stuart at Fotheringay Castle.

Mary had been a constant embarrassment to Elizabeth ever since she had fled to England in 1568, after being forced to abdicate in favour of her two year old son, James. The discovery of Mary's implication in various plots against Elizabeth brought matters to a head, and the conspiracy of 1586—the so-called Babington Plot—was her final undoing. The disclosures of the conspirators caused a commission to be appointed to try Mary, which assembled at Fotheringay on October 12, 1586. At first, Mary refused to appear, denying that the commissioners had any right to try her, and saying that she "was a free prince, borne a queen, and, therefore, not subject to any but to God." Nevertheless, she eventually appeared and her trial continued. The outcome, considering the mass of evidence against her, was a foregone conclusion, and when the commissioners reassembled on October 25, the death sentence was given. Elizabeth had a horror, however, of ordering the death of a fellow ruler, and delayed putting the sentence into effect for as long as possible. On November 14 she had replied to parliament that she

... could be well pleased to forbear taking of her blood; if by any other means to be devised, by the Great Council of this realm, the safety of her maj.'s person and govt. might be preserved, without danger of ruin and destruction.
Elizabeth could not temporize indefinitely, however, and eventually, on February 7, Mary mounted the scaffold at Fotheringay Castle. Although she had signed the warrant for Mary's execution, Elizabeth was distraught when it was put into effect, and vented her anger on William Davison, the second Secretary of State, whom she had tried and, for a short time, imprisoned. At Davison's trial in March, none of the Queen's ministers who had sat in judgment on Mary and signed the letters that had accompanied the warrant for her execution appeared, with the exception of Croft, who had, as Sir Harris Nicholas states, "the modesty and good sense to say little on the occasion." 49 Elizabeth's anger did not last for long and, with the exception of Davison, none of her ministers suffered for their part in the trial and execution of Mary Stuart.

Although the above account covers some of Croft's principal activities of the 1570's and 80's, his duties were not confined to these. The Acts of the Privy Council show that he was a conscientious attender at meetings, and a large number of letters sent from the Council bear his signature. His advice was also apparently sought on affairs in Ireland, and the Spanish Ambassador wrote to his master in November, 1582, that Croft was appointed to a commission to enquire into Irish affairs, 50 while, in April, 1583, a servant of Croft's was sent to Ireland to find out whether the rebel, Desmond, was willing to submit to Ormond. 51 Although much of Croft's time must have been taken up with similar duties, as well as with his official responsibilities as Comptroller, there is little to show that his remuneration was particularly great, and by far the largest amount of correspondence of the period concerning Croft has to do with his efforts at getting favours from the Queen, and with the pension which he was receiving all the while from Spain.
As Comptroller and a Privy Councillor, the opportunities open to Croft were far greater than they had been previously, but the amount of money he needed for his position at Court was also necessarily greater. He kept on good terms with Burghley, who had the power to reward those he saw most suited, and several times asked favours of him. On July 14, 1578, for example, he requested that Burghley remember his suit for a grant of lands having an annual value of twenty-five pounds, and reminded Burghley of his long services. His petition to the Queen had probably been presented earlier by Lady Croft, as there is note taken in the same year of "... such debts and bonds as Sir James Croft" [sic] and his friends jointly stand in danger of. As was the case with a majority of the courtiers, Croft maintained a good relationship with Elizabeth by giving her a New Year's gift each year, which was occasionally reciprocated. Thus, in 1578, the Queen was given by Lady Croft "a feyer cushyn embrawdered with silke of sundry collars, with thistory of Icorus," while the following year, Croft's wife presented "a peticote of carnation satten, embrawderid with flowers of silke of sondry colours." In return, Croft was given a gilt plate and, in 1579, two gilt bowls from the Queen. The exchange of these gifts indicates that Croft was in favour at Court and, while the presentation of gifts had become a formality, the failure of a courtier to remember the Queen with a costly present at the beginning of each new year would doubtless be a black mark against him.

The Queen was petitioned again by Croft in 1583, when he asked for a grant of land "to relieve his present wante of necessite." While it is not clear whether or not his request was granted, he did receive a monopoly license to export grain from Norfolk to Ireland. This must have been extremely profitable, as there were several complaints made to Burghley about
the cost of grain in Ireland having increased "by reason of exportation under Mr. Comptroller's license." On December 14, 1585, Sir William Heydon wrote to Walsingham from Norfolk of the "... hard dealings of Mr. Comptroller's substitute for concealed lands, who had more regard for his own benefit than for Her Majesty's service," and this office must have provided a handsome income. Besides these favours shown to Croft, he was also allowed, in January, 1583, to share an award for the wardship and marriage of the daughters of Anthony Browne (or Browne), an arrangement similar to the two wardships he had been given in the 1560's. As in the former instance, one of Croft's children was married to one of his wards; in this case, Edward Croft wed Ann Browne, thus bringing her fortune into the Croft family. It is apparent, therefore, that Sir James remained in good favour at Court, and that he was able to procure a healthy income by reason of his friendship with important officials and with the Queen. However, his income cannot have been as high as he wished, because he continued to receive a pension from Spain throughout the entire period he was Comptroller of the Household.

Being a Spanish pensioner, Croft must have felt a conflict of loyalty on occasions, but the money he received from Spain was not of the order to make him a traitor, and numerous complaints from the Spanish Ambassador show that he sometimes had a difficult time getting any information out of Croft. However, as soon as he had been made Comptroller, Croft indicated that "in whatever thing he can honestly serve your Majesty [ie. Phillip II] he will do so." Perhaps it is important to emphasize the word "honestly" here, as it qualifies the opinion one might otherwise receive that Croft was entirely a Spanish puppet. There are numerous instances reported of Guerau de Spes, the Spanish Ambassador, attempting to induce Croft and other pensioners to influ-
ence events to the benefit of Spain. In March, 1570, for example, he attempted to persuade Croft to delay the opening of trade relations between England and Portugal, and this subject continued to be a major point of issue. Croft was not, of course, the only Council member receiving money from Spain, and others included such men of importance as Sussex, Cecil, and the Earl of Leicester, beside whom Croft would have appeared quite insignificant. Nevertheless, Croft's acceptance of Spanish money is not admirable, from a twentieth century viewpoint, even if his position can be blamed on a penurious monarch, or a system which allowed men such as Croft little choice but to accept money from Spain if they wished to continue to hold office. In 1579, Croft told Bernadino de Mendoza, who had replaced de Spes, that "... if his Majesty will not help him it will not be possible for him to remain at Court, he being at the end of his resources," which Mendoza assured the King was really the case, "and not mere vapouring." While Mendoza's statements must always be regarded with a degree of suspicion, in this instance he may not have been far from the truth. Croft's constant iterations of penury may be exaggerated, but it is quite probable that he was in frequent need of money, even if he was not in quite such dire distress as he tried to make Mendoza believe. As the situation deteriorated in the 1580's between England and Spain, Croft had to be more careful, and Mendoza reported, on April 1, 1582, that Croft "... has been almost dumb with me for some months past, and has told me nothing of importance." However, Croft apparently desperately needed the money he was getting from Spain, and he may even have accepted a further pension of two thousand crowns a year from France. Under the circumstances briefly described above, one must regard Croft's position as a Councillor with some suspicion, as it is inevitable that he would act occasionally in the interests of Spain rather than England if he wished to con-
tinue receiving his pension. Also, it is possible that accusations which were later to be levelled at Croft, after he had taken part in negotiations with the Spanish before the sailing of the Armada, had some basis in fact, although it is unlikely his accusers realized how long Croft had depended on Spain for an income. One can only say, charitably, that Croft needed the money, which he should have been able to get from the Queen, and that the information he gave Spain, if not useless, was seldom of great value.

Although Croft was undoubtedly a Spanish pensioner, this fact does not appear to have counted against him, and he continued to enjoy the friendship of influential men. It is possible that it was not realized that Croft was in Spain's pay, although this is unlikely considering Cecil's widespread information network. However, in June, 1574, a Roger Bodenheim wrote to Cecil of "... a nest of Spaniards who do nothing else but spy what is done and what is intended to be done, and give advertisements thereof," but added the names "... of two men whom he may make his assured friends, and who be worthy to be embraced and made much of,"69 one of them being Sir James Croft, the other a Mr. Dyer. This was probably Sir Edward Dyer, whose patrons included Leicester and Cecil, and who became the Queen's personal favourite after the fall of Hatton.70 If there was a connection between Dyer and Croft, he could have been a most influential friend.

Another of Croft's friends was Sir Thomas Smith, who had been made a member of the Council at about the same time as Croft, and who had been sent as an ambassador to France in 1572 to discuss the marriage of Alençon and Elizabeth.71 In that year he wrote a number of letters to Croft, almost entirely of a personal nature, in one of which he mentions his desire "... to be at home with you to eat a good piece of court beef and mustard, a cowsheel, and
a piece of ling and sodden oysters." Mary Dewar writes that Croft was, at the time, contemplating marrying off one of his daughters to Smith's son, and the friendship between the two men appears to have been one formed over a considerable period of time. Smith's other intimates of longstanding were Burghley and John Thynne, and it is surely carping of Miss Dewar to refer to them as "hardly a gay sparkling trio," even if the description fits.

Dr. Dee, the astrologer and mathematician, and a man frequently consulted by the Queen, also was closely connected with Croft. Although Dee had been born in Mortlake, near London, his family ties were with Knighton, in Radnorshire, some fifteen miles from Croft Castle. His biographer, Richard Deacon, writes that Dee "maintained his links with Wales throughout his life," and it would appear that the links extended from Wales into Herefordshire. In October, 1574, Dee asked his patron, Lord Burghley, to obtain for him the muniments of Wigmore Castle, which was even closer than Knighton to Croft's county residence. In the same year, Mistress Scudamore had helped Dee by asking the Queen to grant him a position at Winchester, and the close ties which Dee had both with Croft and Mary Scudamore can be seen by the following entry in his diary for 1581:

June 10th, baptisata a meredie hor. 5½ Katharina. Mr. Packington of the court, my Lady Katarin Crofts, wife to Sir James Crofts, Mr. Controller of the Queen's household, Mystres Mary Skydmor of the Privie Chamber, and cosen to the Queene, by theyr deputies christened Katharin Dee.

Mary Scudamore was a sister of the John Scudamore whose wardship Croft had obtained in 1561, and who had become his son-in-law the same year, and later a Gentleman Usher to the Queen. Both John and Mary Scudamore would thus have had close access to the Queen, and have been able to promote their kins-
man's cause.

Croft's range of contacts indicate a number of ways in which he could have applied influence at Court. Although it is not possible to discern all of Croft's patrons and friends, the number of influential people he could call upon for help appears to have been widening with time. The Earl of Leicester had been of assistance to Croft as early as 1561, but it is probable that he had given his kinsman help even before this date. In an unofficial, but very important, capacity, Mary and John Scudamore may have been as important contacts as any of the great Councillors, such as Burghley. So, also, may John Dee, who had great influence over the Queen at various times. Croft himself would have been a useful contact for such men as Dyer and Smith, and they would probably have counted on him for assistance as much as he counted on them. Throughout the 1570's and 80's, there is little doubt that Croft used his connections whenever possible to attempt to bolster his apparently inadequate fortunes and to remain at Elizabeth's Court, the centre of all power in England.
The relationship between England and Spain, which had been a close one during the early half of the century, began a steady deterioration shortly after Elizabeth came to the throne, and reached its nadir in 1588 with the defeat of the Spanish Armada. Reasons for this are not hard to find. France, which was kept divided by religious and political factions, was no longer a threat to English security, and Spain had become the champion of Catholicism in Europe, and of Mary Stuart in Scotland. The imprisonment and eventual execution of Mary offered Philip the opportunity for a religious crusade against the heretical English, and Elizabeth and her advisers thought it politic to prepare for the worst by seeking better relations with France. To this end, Elizabeth had appeared to consider an alliance with France by suggesting marriage first with the Duke of Anjou, in 1570, and later with Catherine de Medici's youngest son, the Duke of Alençon. Although neither plan came to anything, and were probably not intended to, they had served the purpose of securing friendlier relations between the two countries. Spain, on the other hand, continued to foment plots, and to ensure the support of some influential men by providing them with pensions. One of the most important causes of antagonism was England's growing encroachment on Spain's erstwhile monopolistic trade with the New World, with the exploits of such men as Hawkins and Drake increasingly infuriating the Spanish. In the Netherlands, too, England and Spain faced one another with a sense of mounting tension, and from 1585 an expeditionary force had been maintained in the towns which England controlled in the Low Countries. Under such conditions it appeared inevitable.
that a major conflict between Spain and England was only a matter of time, and that little could be done to halt the coming confrontation. However, such a war was not desired by all of Elizabeth's councillors, and efforts to keep the peace were attempted throughout the 1580's. The most serious of these attempts was made less than a year before Spain sent the Armada down the English Channel, when a group of commissioners were sent to the Netherlands to negotiate with the Spanish to seek a settlement for peace.

Elizabeth herself probably feared taking the final step which would lead to war, and hoped until the last moment that it could be evaded. War with Spain would be costly not only in terms of paying for troops and equipment, but would also mean the end of the British cloth trade with the Netherlands, which provided England with an important source of revenue. However, the successes of the Duke of Parma in 1584 and 1586 in the Low Countries, with the resulting loss of trade, caused Elizabeth to send an army to the Netherlands under the leadership of the Earl of Leicester, her current favourite. Leicester's incompetence, plus the heavy drain on resources, explain why Elizabeth was willing to seek peace by 1587, and in this she was encouraged by Parma. It appeared that he was spurring on English hopes for peace in an effort to gain time while Philip built up the navy, in which case the negotiations would have been nothing more than a farce. Nevertheless, Elizabeth was willing to continue with the peace talks, probably because she had been falsely persuaded that Parma had the power to conclude a treaty. As the end of 1587 approached, a commission was selected to be sent to the Low Countries to negotiate with Parma, and for almost a year the talks dragged on to their hopeless, and pre-ordained, conclusion.¹

Although Elizabeth probably favoured a peace policy, many of her Privy
Council were opposed to any form of peace-making. Chief among these was Leicester, who was in charge of military operations in the Netherlands, and who stood a better chance of making a reputation if the war was continued than if a peace were signed. Walsingham, the Queen's principal secretary, continually urged Elizabeth to oppose Spain vigorously, but his warnings had little effect. The chief proponent of peace was probably Burghley, although it is unlikely that he was any more ardent than Croft, even if his influence was greater. Both Burghley and Croft had been jointly involved in negotiations for peace since mid-1586. A letter from Parma to Burghley on June 23, 1586, mentioned that Andrea de Loo, a merchant who acted as an intermediary between the English and Spanish, had "... put before me what more he thought needful for me to understand of the continuation of the good inclination which you show towards peace." The Queen's inclination being towards peace, it is not surprising that she should seize the opportunity offered to deal directly with Parma in 1587, and that some of the leading advocates of a peace policy should be put on the commission which was appointed. Although a few of her advisers, particularly Leicester and Walsingham, feared that Elizabeth might pursue peace to the neglect of the defense of England, their advice was ignored. On September 12, 1587, Bernardino de Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador in England, wrote to Philip that "the Commissioners the Queen was sending to Flanders were being hurried off," and that they included the earls of Derby and Hertford, Lord Cobham, Dr. Dale (Master of Requests), John Herbert (doctor of the Court of Admiralty), as well as the Comptroller, Sir James Croft.

Croft's presence on the commission was an obvious one. During all the years he had been on the Council, and even before 1570, he had been a Spanish pensioner, and had been the most ardent proponent of a peace policy. His
appointment by Elizabeth was no doubt made, as Conyers Read suggests, because she believed that Croft would do his utmost to achieve peace. Not only had he been involved with Burghley in preliminary negotiations, but a cousin of his, named Bodenham, was in the service of Parma, and an Edward Morris, described as "Mr. Controller's man," acted as an intermediary between Bodenham and Croft. Parma had "good liking of Mr. Controller," and kept in close contact with him through de Loo, who had been persuaded by Croft to deal with Parma and to ensure him of the Queen's desire for peace. The other commissioners eventually included the Earl of Derby, Lord Cobham, and Dr. Dale, as de Mendoza had listed earlier, but not the Earl of Hertford or John Herbert. The fifth member was originally Sir Amias Paulet, but, for some reason, he was later replaced by Dr. John Rogers. Derby, appointed chief commissioner, was little more than a figurehead, and Cobham was an old friend of Burghley's. Both of these men, as well as Croft, were Privy Councillors. Dr. Dale was a civilian who had been ambassador in France for some years and who had sat on a number of important royal commissions, including that which had met to try Mary Stuart. John Rogers was a brother of Daniel Rogers, Clerk of the Council, and had been employed previously on diplomatic missions abroad. None of the commissioners, with the exception of Croft, was noted as an enthusiastic pacifist, and Croft was kept in check by the two experienced men on the commission, Dale and Rogers, who had had sufficient experience previously to understand the problems they faced.

Elizabeth's instructions to the commissioners made it clear that they were to do little on their own initiative, but were to refer back to England for directions. Although the Queen gave directions that the commissioners were to use all discretion "... as shall, with regard of her honour tend most
speedily . . . to the conclusion of a good and sound peace," in almost every particular, instructions were sent from England. Croft was to discover later that it was fatal to attempt to act on one's own initiative. Above all, the Commission was to make sure that its Spanish counterpart had full authority to conclude a peace.

Although the commissioners had departed from England on February 26, 1588, the negotiations did not get under way for another three months, the intervening period being occupied with wranglings over where the conference should be held. Elizabeth wanted the meeting to take place in Ostend, where the commissioners had landed, but Philip favoured Antwerp. After much pointless argument, during which the names of Bruges and Ghent, among other cities, were suggested, eventually the town of Bourbourg was chosen as a compromise, and the Commission proceeded there on May 23. The delay was not as pointless as it may seem; at least, not on the part of the Spanish. In March, Parma had written to Philip that it was the general feeling that it might be a good idea to conclude a peace in the Low Countries, in which case "... we should not jeopardize the Armada which your Majesty has prepared." However, he intended to delay the English commissioners as long as possible, and to confer with them until the Armada was ready to sail:

... I will not, until I am obliged, desist from the negotiations, so that in case the Armada does not come, or any other unforseen accident should prevent the principal enterprise from being carried out, your Majesty may be able to choose the course you think fit. I greatly doubt, however, being able to entertain the English so long as will be necessary for such a contingency as this, as I am not able to produce for them a special power from your Majesty, which, as usual, they appear to desire before they will enter into the discussion of the main points. It is quite possible, therefore, that they may break off the negotiations for this reason....
In spite of Parma's delaying tactics, however, and his inability to produce the authority which would permit him to conclude a peace, the English commissioners were prepared to settle down at the conference table.

Before the Commission was ready to confer with the Spanish—in fact, before it had even arrived in the Netherlands—a preliminary, and totally unauthorized meeting had already occurred between the Spanish and Sir James Croft. Writing to the Queen on February 16, Croft had intimated that he intended "to have this colloquy hastened," because he was "throughly [sic] persuaded that he [i.e. Parma] greatly desireth peace." When the Commission departed for Ostend on February 26, Croft was not present, having been, as he said, "detained at Dover by an accident and then by the weather." In consequence of the wind, he had sailed for the Spanish-held town of Dunkirk, where he had been received by the Governor, royally entertained, and sent to rejoin his colleagues two days later. While at Dunkirk, Croft had been feasted by the Spanish, "... with manifest tokens of their desire to have a peace," and had, no doubt, been convinced even further of his beliefs in this regard. The rough weather, which necessitated a landing at Dunkirk, appears most fortuitous for Croft, particularly considering his previously declared intention of meeting with the Spanish to hasten the peace negotiations, and his actions must have angered his fellow commissioners.

In fact, Croft's high-handed behaviour continued to be a source of annoyance to his colleagues, particularly as he appeared to think of himself as the only one capable of producing a peace formula. Robert Cecil, writing to his father, noted of Croft's arrival in Ostend from Dunkirk that "Mr. Controller is in his health but crazy, though not sick, this having proved a cold journey for his old years." It is important to remember that Croft was, in 1588,
seventy years old, a fact which might explain, if not excuse, some of his unusual actions. Through March and April, reports continued to be sent by other of the commissioners to Burghley and to Elizabeth, complaining of Croft's uncooperativeness and his overbearing manner. On April 17, Elizabeth was forced to write to Derby and Cobham to order them to let Croft "... understand how greatly we are offended with this his manner of dealing," and to tell him "to forbear to use any singular courses; but join with you in common concurrency according to your instructions...." Complaints made against Croft included that he had termed the governor of Ostend, Sir John Conway, a fool, that he had licensed members of the garrison to meet with the enemy, and that he had meddled in the government of the town. Sir James had managed to offend the other commissioners by threatening to charge his colleagues if the peace did not go forward, and had boasted that "... if he had the dealing of this peace alone, it had been concluded." Elizabeth's admonitions to Croft leave no doubt that his efforts were unappreciated in England, and that he was considered more of a hindrance than a help to the commissioners. However, his increasingly common references to the advantages which would accrue if he carried on the negotiations by himself, and the increasingly belligerent tone he was adopting towards his colleagues, make his subsequent action easy to foretell. On April 28, the commissioners, with the exception of Croft, signed a letter to the Privy Council reporting that "Mr. Controller is this day (of his own voluntary will) gone to the Duke of Parma," where he intended to propound his own terms of peace to the Duke.

Considering the favours shown to Croft previously by the Spanish, Croft might well have believed his plan had some chance of success, but it was extremely naive not to realize that Parma may just have been using him to stretch
out English hopes for an early peace. Croft, of course, had no authority to
conclude a peace treaty with Parma, but that did not stop him from putting for­
ward a list of articles he considered necessary before talks could begin with
himself and the other commissioners. These included a sight of Parma's com­
mission from the King to conclude a peace, a cessation of arms, a toleration
of protestantism within Holland and Zeeland, and ten other points referring
to such considerations as trade and hostages. Ignoring his fellow com­
missioners completely, and not even telling them what he had been doing,
Croft reported directly to Burghley that he had seen Parma's authority to
conclude a peace, signed by Philip, and "... giving ample authority to do
everything as if the King were there in person, and to ratify all that is
past [sic]." Parma had indicated that he was willing to accept Croft's
proposals "as things to be considered of," but Champagney, one of the chief
Spanish negotiators, wrote to Burghley of Croft requiring evidence that Sir
James had the Queen's approval of his actions. On May 4, Croft, in a letter
to Elizabeth, asked for her mercy "... for presuming to go to the Duke of
Parma without her direction," but excused himself by saying that he had
feared the treaty would be completely overthrown if he had not acted speedily,
and that he had gone to impress Parma with the sincerity of the Queen's inten­
tions. The Commission, still at Ostend, was understandably skeptical of
Spain's sincerity, because, as Cobham wrote on May 4, "... their actions dif­
fer from their negotiations." Nevertheless, they showed admirable restraint
in writing to Burghley, as both Derby and Dr. Dale did, excusing Croft and
hoping that his dealings with Parma would "... qualify H. M.'s displeasure for
his dealing alone which, for ought I can gather, was well meant by him." Elizabeth, however, was furious:
We cannot forbear to let you, Mr. Controller, understand what cause of offence you did give to us, besides some discountenance to our commissioners and others in that you took upon you alone without any warrant from us or any determination of the rest, to repair to the Duke of Parma to treat with him alone as you dare do in sundry places and in secret manner, assuring you that such an extraordinary attempt . . . may be drawn to a further reproof than can be either answered or well endured.36

On May 21, Croft was ordered to return to England to explain to the Queen why he had felt it necessary to deal with Spain without any direction from her, and without letting his colleagues know what he was doing.37

Elizabeth's anger was, however, short-lived, and Croft's return to England to answer her charges was delayed a few months. Using a form of writing to which he was well accustomed, Croft begged that "... he may be allowed by remaining to repair his errors being so affected by her displeasure that his aged limbs have not force enough, without present death, to put in practice her command."38 His illness may not have been feigned, but there is little doubt that Croft realized into what bad graces he had fallen, and that his reprieve was purely a temporary one. Nevertheless, by the beginning of June, he had again resumed his place in the negotiations,39 and, nothing daunted, wasted no time in continuing his complaints against the other commissioners. On June 7 he criticized Dr. Dale for "not making him privy to any letters either received or sent, concerning this cause,"40 and on the 18th was intimating to Burghley that the proposals Croft had made privately to Parma earlier were much more acceptable to the Spanish than the ones being proposed by the commissioners.41 It was fairly obvious by this time that further negotiations for peace were futile, notwithstanding Croft's continual optimism, and that Parma was fully occupied with preparations for war. By the end of June, the commissioners were prepared to return to England, after five
months of fruitless effort, which had included scarcely a month of actual negotiations. On July 18, it was reported that they were leaving from Ostend.

The negotiations had proved a failure, in that the stated intention of achieving a peace settlement had not come to pass, but Elizabeth had gained much valuable information and possibly some time. Failure of the Bourbourg peace talks showed that war was inevitable, however little the Queen relished the idea, and that preparations to meet the Armada would have to be made. However, the commissioners could not be blamed for failure of the talks, and Elizabeth had no intention of punishing them for their efforts. Croft, however, was in a different position. He had directly contradicted the Queen's orders, had been uncooperative with his colleagues, and had made a general nuisance of himself while in the Netherlands. He obviously anticipated the trouble which lay in store for him, when he wrote to Walsingham shortly before returning to England, reminding Walsingham that he had "done his uttermost to further her [i.e. Elizabeth's] service." Although he continued as a functioning member of the Privy Council for several weeks after his return, on August 24th the Council recorded that "This daie Sir James Crofte, knight, Comptroller of her Majesties Household, was by their Lordships, uppon her Majesties commandement [committed] to the prison of the Fleete." The reasons for Croft's imprisonment were not stated, but chief among them must have been his disobedience. The punishment was not severe, however, and by the beginning of 1589 Croft was once again fulfilling his duties as a Councillor, having apparently experienced no disgrace other than his short term in prison.

Croft's conduct as a commissioner had been eccentric, to say the least, and he was extremely fortunate that his punishment was such a minor one. Just
what it was that prompted him to revolve "in an orbit of his own," as one writer puts it, is difficult to decide. Probably the most likely explanation is that he suffered from an excess of zeal, which, combined with an inflated idea of his importance and ability, and a desperate belief that peace should be secured under any event, caused him to act unwisely and extremely rashly. His desire for peace was certainly sincere, but, in spite of his being in Spain's pay, there was no suggestion made that he had been in any way treacherous. Indeed, if he had, Elizabeth would have taken far more drastic measures against him than merely imprisoning him for a few months. Although there is a possibility that Croft may have been acting in secret under the Queen's orders, and that his dealings with Parma were therefore authorized, this does not seem likely considering Elizabeth's obvious anger at his actions, and the sentence handed out later by the Council. It is true that Croft was a soldier and not a diplomat, but he had negotiated successfully before, with both the Irish and the Scots, and was not such a neophyte that he would ordinarily be so uncautious. One has to fall back, eventually, on the explanation that Croft acted as he did because of his age and waning faculties. As mentioned previously, in 1588 Croft was seventy years old, which, in an era when few lived to that age, was considerable. His signature is certainly that of an old man, and he was considered past his prime by such as Robert Cecil, who had termed him "crazy." Parma, writing to Philip, had described Croft as a "weak old man of seventy with very little sagacity," and there are constant references in letters to his ill health and poor constitution. The above reason for Croft's actions do not excuse him, but do provide an explanation. They may also have been the reason why Elizabeth, realizing Sir James was a man who would probably not live much longer, kept him in prison such a short time, and why he maintained his positions as
Comptroller and Privy Councillor, in which, if he could not be of great use, at least he could do little harm.

With the exception of one bizarre incident, Croft's connection with the peace commission was over by the end of 1588. In an unusual display of filial devotion, Croft's eldest son, Edward, decided that his father's imprisonment could be blamed on the machinations of the Earl of Leicester, and, to revenge his father, he hired a conjurer named Smith to accomplish Leicester's death. Why Leicester should be selected is difficult to imagine, particularly as he was a kinsman who had previously shown favours to Sir James, but apparently Edward Croft had given Smith a list of the Council members, and Smith had decided that "the Earl of Leicester was Sir James Croft's great enemy." Unfortunately for Edward, on September 4, after a short illness, Leicester died. This event occurring so soon after Smith had declared that "he had muzzled the great bear," Edward Croft was brought to trial, but the results are not known. He indeed had reason to declare, upon his father's imprisonment, that "he and all his were undone except he had help," as not only he, but also his brother James and a cousin named John, had been employed by Sir James while he was commissioner in the Low Countries. The incident throws an interesting light on the beliefs of even the well-educated in witchcraft and sorcery, besides showing how important it was for Croft's children that their father should hold a position of influence in which he might aid them.

For the remaining years left to him, Sir James Croft continued to hold the positions he had obtained before going to the Netherlands. He was again elected as senior member from Herefordshire in the parliament which met from November 12, 1588, to March 29, 1589, although this was the last session he
was to attend. On April 21, 1589, it was noted that "Her Majesty defers the
pardon of the two Crofts,"⁵⁴ which would certainly refer to Edward Croft, but
not necessarily to his father. As noted above, Sir James had been readmitted
to the Privy Council at least as early as the beginning of January, 1589,
which indicates that he was already back in the Queen's good graces by that
time. Also, on January 1 Croft had presented Elizabeth with the customary New
Year's gift, and had, in return, been given "guilt plate" of equivalent value
to that given other knights who attended the Court.⁵⁵ Possibly the Queen's
charity can be explained by sympathy for Croft's age and waning faculties, but
no doubt her generosity and magnanimity were increased by the overwhelming
success the English had achieved over the Spanish fleet some months previously.

By September 10, 1590, Sir James Croft had died, and his last recorded
attendance at a meeting of the Privy Council had occurred on June 28th of the
same year.⁵⁶ Although the circumstances of his death are unknown, his age and
ill health, which were frequently alluded to, cannot have made it a surprise.
The earliest mention of this is rather ironic, as it was referred to by Sir
Thomas Shirley in a letter to Burghley, in which he requested Croft's job:

He has heard that Mr. Comptroller, Sir Jas. Crofts, is dead. Solicits his [i.e. Burghley's] influence to obtain that office
for him, and his thankfulness shall be 500 l. to Burghley. Hopes no evil opinion of ambition will be cast upon him, as
those who do not offer themselves in this world are seldom advanced.⁵⁷

The latter sentiment is, no doubt, one in which Sir James would have concurred,
his life having been devoted to the "offering of himself" in the hope of ob­
taining positions of influence and importance. Although he had achieved con­
siderable success, one wonders if the strain and worry were really worth the
small amount of glory. In a lifetime of hard work, he had been falsely accused
of treachery, imprisoned, castigated for the efforts he had made, forced to accept money from Spain because of the Queen's penuriousness, and had succeeded in ruining his health to such an extent that his last appearance on the world's stage had caused him to be referred to as "crazy" and "a weak old man" of "little sagacity." It is no wonder that his health was broken, and a surprise that he had succeeded in staggering through to a ripe old age. And yet, there is little doubt that Croft relished his position, in which he could be an intimate at Court of the great men of the country, could dispense favours to his friends and relatives, and could be considered the leading figure in his home county. The causes of ambition are impossible to define, but in his desire to achieve success Croft had, in his own small way, been successful, and had carved out for himself a niche in the gallery of those remarkable administrators and servants of the Crown who helped to make the age of Elizabeth remembered as one of the greatest in the history of England.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Few readers would dispute the necessity of biographical studies of such sixteenth century giants as Cardinal Wolsey, Protector Somerset, or Lord Burghley. Obviously, it can be considered important to discover facts about the major individuals in history, whose backgrounds and personalities may have had direct bearing on actions which affected the course of events. However, no such distinctions can be claimed for James Croft, and it is not an exaggeration to state that the course of history in sixteenth century Britain would have been very little changed if Croft had never existed. However, the same claim could not be made if figures of a type similar to Croft were not in existence. It is his importance as a type of individual, rather than as a particular individual, that justifies a study of this kind. Seen against a background of particular problems and trends which appeared in Tudor England, and which have been raised by modern historians, an examination of the life of Sir James Croft helps put the century into a clearer perspective.

Although there are aspects of Croft's career which do not fit a clearly definable pattern, in the broad outlines his life was typical of that of many an aspiring Englishman. To begin with, his background and family connections placed him as a member of a certain class, and his career and intense efforts at raising his position are worth examining to see whether he qualified as a member of that much-examined and controversial group, the rising gentry. As all aspects of Croft's life illustrate, by far the most important way to raise one's position was to have important contacts at Court, the centre of all political and social activity in England. Without patronage, Croft's chances of
becoming an important figure in the nation were nil, and without being important in London, one's chances of becoming a leading figure in one's county were significantly lessened. Croft's career also illustrates the precariousness of Court life, and its drawbacks as well as its rewards. In an age where religion has been considered one of the most important problems, it is significant that religion played a very minor role in Croft's life, and that, although he was attacked many times, it was never ostensibly for religious reasons. In this, as in other aspects, Croft was typical not of the entire century particularly, but of a generation which came to power at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign after serving under three monarchs before her. Finally, the necessity of using a biographical approach to history at all should be considered; for, in an age when history is generally examined in its social or economic aspects, rather than as a study of personality, a justification of this approach seems called for.

Exactly what constituted a member of the gentry has long been a matter of dispute. Sir Thomas Smith's definition of a gentleman as a man who spends his money like a gentleman is vague, but wisely so. Attempts to give limits to the class of gentry are almost impossible. Professor Tawney identified its members as landed proprietors above the yeomanry and below the peerage, together with well-to-do farmers, some professional men, and the wealthier merchants. Lawrence Stone has concurred with Tawney's definition, and identified it more closely. Of the upper group of gentry, who were distinguished by "wealth, political influence, and style of living," Stone had this to say:

They are the men who controlled county politics under the patronage of the local nobleman, who provided the M.P.s and Deputy Lieutenants, and who dominated the bench of Justices. In a large southern county they seemed to have comprised about 20 to 25 families, the total being perhaps about 500 in the whole country.
This description could apply almost word-for-word to James Croft, and would seem to place him squarely in the centre of the gentry. In County politics he obtained a wide variety of positions, ranging from membership on the Commission of Musters to a seat on the Council of the Welsh Marches. He himself was a Member of Parliament for over twenty-five years, and had caused numerous of his relatives to be elected. In addition, he sat as a Justice of the Peace for the county, thus fulfilling all of Stone's requirements but that of Deputy Lieutenant, and it is even possible that he held this office. It is unlikely that there would be twenty families in Herefordshire equal to Croft's, the county being isolated and sparsely populated, and Croft would certainly qualify as a member of Stone's five hundred leading English gentry, while not yet achieving a position as member of the aristocracy.

However, it is a problem whether Croft can be considered a "rising" member of the gentry. If one can include the gentry as members of the middle class, it can easily be questioned that Croft was a member of a "rising" middle class family. It is true that he had had to work his way up through the army and minor administrative posts before he eventually was given an important job, and that his father was a good example of the rusticated country land-owner, but examination of Croft's prior antecedents tell a different story than that of the rising gentry. Members of the Croft family had been Members of Parliament and important figures in county politics, had been granted lands for meritorious service to the Crown, and had held important positions at Court at various times over the preceding five hundred years. Croft's great-grandfather, Sir Richard, for example, had been Sheriff of the county and a Member of Parliament, and, for a short time, had even been Treasurer of the King's Household. His grandfather, Sir Edward, had held posi-
tions of almost equal importance, and only his father had broken the long tradition of service. However, Richard Croft had not squandered the property which had accumulated over the years, but was satisfied with a quiet, country life. James Croft, therefore, had simply returned to the pursuits which his family had followed, as a rule, throughout the preceding centuries. His way of life qualifies him as a member of the gentry, and even of the middle class, but it is difficult to see his life as an example of the rise of such a class.

Unless one were willing to live a purely rural existence, ambition in Tudor England could be satisfied in only one way, and that was through the Court. As Anthony Esler has stated, "The court was the living heart of the English government," and "the most important political institution of early modern times." The monarch had in his power an enormous amount of patronage which was dispersed either personally or through members of the inner circle of the Court. Anyone who wanted to obtain a lease of land, for example, or a wardship, monopoly, or charter, had to compete with other suitors at the Court. Obviously, the closer one could come to the privileged inner circle, the more likely one would be to obtain royal favours, and the greater one's influence would become. J. E. Neale defines membership of the inner ring of the Court to "... those officials and courtiers--not excluding the ladies of the Court--whose place or friendship gave them the Queen's ear." Considering the terrific competition for Court position, the chances of ever becoming a member of the inner circle were very slim. The most ambitious, and talented, members of the aristocracy had relatively little difficulty, and the opportunities given to such men as the Duke of Norfolk in 1560 would not have been available to the majority of suitors for placement, who were generally ambitious members of the gentry. Esler states that the basic qualifications for membership were
"birth, education, and a considerable amount of wealth," but, of these, by far the most important must have been birth. Relationship, however tenuous, with somebody who already had a Court position made admission there immeasurably more easy than if one was merely well educated and wealthy.

The life of James Croft illustrates the importance of the Court in sixteenth century England, and shows not only the rewards but also the disadvantages and precariousness of Court life. Of Esler's three qualifications for membership at Court, Croft was deficient in two, being neither well educated nor particularly wealthy. However, the generation Esler is describing is the one of 1560, while the older generation, characterized by Lord Burghley, who was born in 1520 and was thus a contemporary of Croft, did not necessarily share the same qualifications for Court membership with members of the younger generation. Education, for example, was much more important in 1575 than it would have been in 1535. Wealth, however, was essential at Court in any era, and the disadvantages of not having a sufficient income can be seen by Croft's many requests for favours, and by the necessity of his having to accept money from Spain. His success in becoming a member of the inner circle is a tribute in part to his tenacity, but also illustrates the importance of connections, particularly family connections, in obtaining Court position.

Exactly how much Croft relied on his friends and relatives for advancement is impossible to prove, but there is little doubt that they were overwhelmingly important. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, quite obviously gave assistance to Sir James, and referred to him as "my kinsman" even though he was only a distant cousin. Neale mentions "the ladies of the Court" as being members of the inner circle, and Lady Scudamore, lady-in-waiting to the Queen,
must have been of invaluable assistance. Friendships, too, were important, and the most remarkable contact that Croft could have made was with Elizabeth herself. Among Croft's friends who were held in high repute at Court were William Cecil, Lord Rutland, John Dee, and Sir Thomas Smith, and Croft probably cultivated their acquaintance as much for the assistance they could provide as for their intrinsic worth. Esler estimates membership in the inner group as being confined to, at most, one hundred men, who made up "the living heart" of Elizabeth's government:

It was a fairly homogeneous little group, many of them related by ties of blood or marriage. Most of them knew each other personally or by reputation; almost all of them must have been known to one or another of the Queen's chief ministers.10

As holder of the position of Comptroller of the Household for twenty years, and as an ambitious seeker of placement on the fringes of Court life for approximately twenty years before that, Croft must have known everyone of importance, and used whatever contacts he was able to take advantage of. His career illustrates the importance of such contacts, and the impossibility of carving a career for oneself at Court without them.

In a century when one of the most significant developments in England, if not the most significant, was the reformation of the Church, it might be considered impossible to have negotiated the religious intrigues and upheavals without taking a definite stand on religion. However, religion appears to have played a minor role in Croft's career, and there are no indications that he particularly favoured either Catholicism or Anglicanism. At various times he was referred to as a Catholic, by the Spanish, and as anti-Catholic, by informants of Cecil's. In Ireland, he followed the judicious policy of attempting to mollify the Catholic bishops, and was unsuccessful only because
his recommendations were overturned by Northumberland. His participation in Wyatt's rebellion does not, however, appear to have been prompted by fears that Mary would attempt to impose Catholicism on the country, but because he genuinely feared Spanish domination of England. It is true that Croft later accepted money from Catholic Spain, but this indicates his need for money rather than any religious feelings. In his attitude towards religion, as in temporal matters, Croft was a realist. He must have known that to become actively involved in religious controversy might be profitable for a short time, but that, considering the unsettled conditions of the time, an excess of religious zeal was more likely to lead to banishment or the block than to position and favour at Court. Croft's religious attitudes may not have been atypical, however, and many an aspiring courtier and position-seeker must have followed a similar, circuitous path to avoid becoming embroiled in damaging religious arguments.

The study of a man such as Croft does not, in itself, answer any of the important questions of the Tudor period, but, as I have tried to indicate, Croft is important as a type of individual. J. E. Neale has said that "... we cannot fully understand the nature and functioning of any human group without knowing about the individuals who compose it." Such knowledge, he continues, can only come from a series of biographies. Some of the problems which Neale feels might be solved by the biographical approach include that of clientage--"the political and social relationship of patron and dependant, which prevailed in the sixteenth century"--and that of the connections of local affairs with national politics. Although it would be presumptuous to suggest that this study of Croft solves either of Neale's problems, it does throw some light on both of them. Through a series of biographies which showed similar
relationships as those of Croft's to influential Court figures, or examined the links between important county personages and their roles in national government, one might be able to postulate some conclusions about English affairs of the Tudor period. It is difficult to imagine another approach than the biographical that would be able to answer Neale's questions. Neale explains that he has inherited, from A. F. Pollard, a prejudice against biographical writing in the conventional sense, but that biographical writing "... can be as exacting and searching a discipline as most types of history." His major prejudice "... is against young people writing of life before they have gathered sufficient experience to interpret it." To this complaint the writer has no defence, except to say that an examination of the life of James Croft, and of others similar to him, is overdue, and that the mature historians of our age, of whom Sir John Neale is one, have not found the time, or the interest, to make studies of these neglected figures of the sixteenth century.
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