

THE PAGET TOMB

by Christopher Harrison

In 1577 a monument to the memory of William, Lord Paget (d.1563), his eldest son and heir, Henry (d.1568) and their respective wives was erected in Lichfield Cathedral. This monument, along with many others in the cathedral, was destroyed by a combination of military action and sectarian iconoclasm during the Civil War.¹ Hitherto, it has been known only through brief notice in two local histories and it has been ignored by national historians.² The discovery amongst the Anglesey Manuscripts in the Stafford County Record Office of documents relating to this monument makes possible a partial reconstruction of the history of this tomb. This new evidence shows that the Paget Tomb was one of the more remarkable monuments of its age and, in certain important respects, unique.

Who were the people commemorated? William Paget, whose origins were obscure and almost certainly humble, entered government service in the 1520's and came to political prominence in the last years of Henry VIII's reign. Power brought reward and in 1546 he acquired the lands and site of Burton Abbey and a sizeable part of the Staffordshire estate, centred on Cannock Chase, of the Bishops of Coventry and Lichfield. He continued to thrive under Somerset whose coup d'état he in part engineered. For a while he survived Somerset's downfall, being made Baron Paget of Beaudesert at the end of 1549 but he then lost Northumberland's favour and went into the political wilderness. He recovered political power under Mary, becoming Lord Privy Seal in 1556. His political career came to an end with the accession of Elizabeth. Paget was a great survivor, the archetypal Tudor politique; he was a conservative in foreign policy and a re-actionary in domestic politics. Aside from his political activities, his principal concern was the securing of his family's fortunes and in purely financial terms he succeeded. His widow, the Lady Anne and his nine surviving children were all provided for through settlements and annuities or by marriage. Although his principal house was at Beaudesert, on the edge of Cannock Chase, his favoured country residence was at West Drayton in Middlesex. (A man of his political interests would not want to be too far from the centre of power!) There he died in June 1563 and was buried in the parish church.³ He left instruction in his will for the erection of a monument.⁴

The Pagets of Beaudesert

William, first Lord Paget = Anne Preston
(d. Feb. 1587)

Henry, second Lord Paget =₁ Katherine Knyvett₂ = Sir Edward Carey
(d.s.m.p. Dec. 1568) (d. Dec. 1622)

Thomas, third Lord Paget = Nazereth Southwell
(d. 1590) (d. 1583)

William, fourth Lord Paget

Charles Paget
(d. 1612)

six surviving daughters

William was succeeded to the title by his eldest son, Henry who was no politician, his principal claim to fame is as a man of letters.⁵ He seems to have spent quite a time abroad, in Venice and France, possibly to escape the difficulties of conformity to the reformed religion. He did not long survive his father, dying in December 1568, leaving a widow and an infant daughter and, thus, the title passed to his brother Thomas. Henry, like his father, was buried at Drayton.⁶ It was Henry who, in his will, ordered that a tomb, to commemorate himself, his father and his mother, should be constructed (at Drayton).⁷ The responsibility for carrying out this instruction fell upon his widow, the Dowager Lady Katherine and his brother and heir, Thomas. Soon after Henry's death, his widow re-married. She and her new husband, Edward Carey came into conflict with her brother Thomas over payments due under the jointure. The dispute was to be a bitter one and lasted many years.⁸ In these circumstances, collaboration on any project between brother and sister seems unlikely; all that emerges from the Paget estate material is a reluctance on the part of Lady Katherine and her new husband to pay their half of the construction charges.⁹ The evidence and common sense indicate that it was Thomas Paget who organized and oversaw the project. Was Thomas indulging in this conspicuous expenditure merely to establish (or confirm) his social standing or was it an expression of filial and fraternal piety? No doubt both motives played their part but a third is at the least possible. Thomas was an ardent Catholic who was to be imprisoned for his beliefs and later driven into exile. Did he not see the construction of the monument, in part at least, as a fulfilment of a religious obligation, an act of spiritual significance, albeit inadequate and incomplete? I believe so, and, as we shall see, the location of the tomb gives some credence to this suggestion.¹⁰

Firstly, Thomas determined that the monument should be erected not at Drayton, as his brother Henry had willed, but in Lichfield Cathedral. This is not surprising: Beaudesert and Burton and the main estate lay close to the cathedral; the Pagets had taken a personal and direct interest in the political fortunes of the city which they had, in a sense, adopted; the monument was to be of such a size that only the largest of churches could conveniently house it; prestige dictated that the grandest of churches possible should be used.¹¹ It looks as though the Dean and Chapter did not welcome the proposal—as we shall see, the monument when erected must have dominated the east end of the cathedral. Thus, Thomas, despite his local standing, had to solicit the Queen's support for the project and the faculty was not granted until the Queen's 'pleasure' was made known.¹²

It was natural that Thomas should chose the cathedral as the location for the family tomb; thus far he followed the conventions of his age. It was in his choice of tomb-maker that he deviated from the norm. Instead of employing the local alabaster workers at Burton or the London-based refugees from the Low Countries, he ordered the tomb from abroad from a man called Jan Carlier.¹³ Carlier built the monument in or near Bruges and accompanied it to Lichfield where he supervised its erection in 1577.¹⁴ Why Thomas should have chosen either Carlier or Bruges is not known. Thomas's correspondence reveals contact with neither man nor place. It may be that Henry, who had travelled extensively on the continent, first made the contact and that it was Carlier whom he had in mind when he made his will. We may never know the reason for Thomas's choice, but this does not lessen its significance. Thomas is the only Elizabethan nobleman known to have looked abroad for both tomb and tomb-maker, indeed, the Paget tomb is one of only two Elizabethan funeral monuments positively known to have been imported. (The other, Roger Mainwaring's of Nantwich, Cheshire, was imported from Ireland.)¹⁵ As we shall see, there were other aspects of this monument which were equally innovatory.

The tomb was a large structure and, hence, had to be transported in pieces, the heaviest of which weighed about one ton.¹⁶ The history of the tomb's journey is of some interest, illustrating as it does the relative costs of sea, river and road transport in the sixteenth century.¹⁷ The tomb was shipped from Bruges to London at a cost of about £12 0s. 0d., then transhipped from London to Gainsborough (north-west of Lincoln) via the east coast, the River Humber and the River Trent at a further cost of £6 0s. 0d. The last part of the journey was, in many ways, the most difficult. First it had to be unshipped then re-loaded into boats which took it from Gainsborough to Nottingham.

There it was placed in nine wains ("carryges") supplied by the tenants of Thomas's younger brother, Charles who carted the pieces to Sawley (just north of Castle Donnington). There the pieces were ferried across the Trent where a further ten wains, also supplied by Charles's tenants, were waiting to convey the tomb to Burton. There Thomas's tenants took over for the final haul to Lichfield. (One can see from this the organisation necessary for such a special load.) The cost of this part of the journey was just over £8 0s. 0d., reflecting the relatively high cost of road transport at that time. The total cost of transportation was £26 0s. 0d.¹⁸ (This figure should be compared with the cost, £10 0s. 0d., of bringing the corpses of William and Henry from Drayton in Middlesex to Lichfield.)¹⁹

The exact location of the monument has still to be determined. It lay somewhere to the east of the choir screen and to the west of the Lady Chapel. The faculty granted to Thomas describes the location thus:

in quodam loco intermedio inter orientalem et sup[re]am parietem summi chori dicte ecclesie et infimam atq[ue] occidentalem partem capelle nu[n]cupat[e] Capelle Beate Marie in eadem eccl[es]ia.²⁰

According to Harwood, it lay between the choir and the Lady Chapel, towards the north, near the monument ascribed to Bishop Stretton. It is difficult to see, given the size of the monument, how it could have fitted into either of the side aisles at the end of the cathedral. The best contemporary description of the location that we have comes from Symond's Diary for 1645 under the general heading 'Lichfield Cathedral':

"In the middle of the cross yle was a faire and lofty monument, not long since erected for the memory of the family of Paget, but now pulld a pieces and the statues throwne about."²¹

It would seem then that the monument stood in the middle of the cross aisle, immediately over the area which had once housed the shrine of St. Chad. It is worth a pause to consider the implication of this location. A Catholic lord buried his father and his brother and erected a tomb over the desecrated shrine of a saint. One cannot but believe that his motive in part at least was religious. In all probability the monument lay east-west with the kneeling figures facing the Lady Chapel. It must have dominated the east end, for it was very large, even by the standards of the day. The base was fifteen feet by nine feet and, if the engraving and drawing are to be believed, it was taller than it was long. It was probably this combination of size and location which fostered the Dean and Chapter's resistance to the tomb's erection. A vault

was constructed at the southern end of the monument; presumably the structure was too heavy to allow the digging of a vault beneath it.²² Monument and vault were protected by iron railings, the iron for which coming from the Paget ironworks on Cannock Chase.²³ They can not have been of very high quality since as early as 1583 they were being replaced with a new set.²⁴ However, it is not the home produced railings but the foreign produced monument which here concerns us.

There are known to have been *three* drawings of the tomb. All of them seem to have been inspired by Sir Christopher Hatton who, foreseeing the approaching Civil War and consequent iconoclasm, persuaded Sir William Dugdale to make copies of monuments, epitaphs, and arms in various churches. This Dugdale did with the aid of an Arms' Painter, William Sedgwick. A number, probably the majority of these drawings are to be found in Dugdale's 'Collection of Monuments in various counties, 1640, 1641'.²⁵ Included in this magnificent volume is a partially coloured drawing of the Paget Tomb.²⁶ Another copy, on vellum, was made at the same time and almost certainly by the same person, and was at Beaudesert in the late eighteenth century. It was this drawing that Stebbing Shaw used for his engraving, reproduced in Plate I.²⁷ There is said to be a third drawing of it in Dugdale's 'Visitation of Staffordshire' in the College of Heralds.²⁸ This account is based upon the drawing in Dugdale's 'Collection . . .' and the engraving in Stebbing Shaw, referred to hereafter respectively as drawing and engraving.

The colouring of the drawing leaves one in no doubt that the monument was constructed in marble. This is a very early use of marble for such a purpose and may be one of the reasons why Paget looked abroad for tomb and tomb-maker. (Of course, marble had been imported into England before 1577, for example, in October 1559, Sir Thomas Gresham arranged the shipping of '16 littel pillars of marbill for a gallery' at Burghley House, Northamptonshire.)²⁹ The Paget Tomb either set or quickly followed a fashion in the use of marble in funeral monuments. Three different coloured marbles were used: black (no doubt Tournai) marble for all the columns, the panels against which the arms are set, a thick ribbing round the memorial legend, the architrave of the platform supporting the Paget crest, and the animal itself; a pale pinky-red marble, the exposed indented faces of the four pedestals supporting the columns, the exposed indented faces of the pedestals on the columns supporting the platform with the crest, and the balls (shown as coronets? in the engraving) on the tops of the four main columns; white marble, the rest of the structure. In the drawing neither the arms nor the figures are shown as painted or gilded but we know

from documentary evidence that either, probably both had been so treated.³⁰ It is unlikely that the painting and gilding would have worn off in less than seventy years and this suggests that Dugdale/Sedgwick did not have time to complete this drawing.

Turning from the material to the style of the monument, one can see that the tomb-chest is relatively simple and plain. There is no attempt here to represent the numerous children of the first Lord Paget. (Such representations, of course, were common on later Tudor tombs.) In the engraving, the arms in the centre are those of Paget, those in the two adjacent panels those of Paget crossed with Preston. (The first Lord's relict, Lady Anne was the daughter of a Lawrence Preston of Lancashire.)³¹ In the drawing, the arms in the centre are those of Paget crossed with Preston, in the left-hand panel are nineteen quarterings and in the right-hand panel even more. The difference between the drawing and the engraving may merely reflect the engraver's need to simplify. (Both drawing and engraving show the same face.)

On the tomb-chest are two pairs of kneeling figures: the right-hand I take to be the older couple, William and Anne, the left-hand pair Henry and Katherine.³² (Interestingly, both women were still alive when the monument was erected. I wonder what they felt when they viewed it! Neither was buried at Lichfield, although provision for further interments was made in the faculty granted by the Dean and Chapter.)³³ This is an early, perhaps the earliest use, in England, of kneeling figures on a tomb-chest, the contemporary English custom was to portray recumbent effigies.³⁴ May it not be that here the Paget Tomb set a new fashion? In one respect it did not, for whereas these figures all look in one direction, later Tudor examples were usually "shown praying on either side of a fald-stool" on a wall monument.³⁵ Why this unusual arrangement in this case? If, as I suspect, the tomb was set up east-west then the figures would have been facing east. If so then the disposition of the figures would have had a religious significance. The figures were almost certainly painted and gilded as, in all probability, were other parts of the monument.³⁶ However, the dominant feature of the tomb (apart from its sheer size) was not the kneeling figures but the memorial legend which was housed in its own canopied structure. There is little doubt where the tomb-maker and his patron intended the eye to fall. The legend, transcribed in Harwood and translated in Stebbing Shaw, consists of a summary and panegyric of the first Lord Paget's career.³⁷ In the final analysis, the tomb was to the greater glory of the Pagets, which is not to deny its religious significance.

The Paget Tomb was not the most expensive of its age, but

neither was it cheap.³⁸ Carlier was paid an initial fee of £189 0s. 0d. and a further £5 0s. 0d. for coming to England to supervise the construction. (He may have been paid a further £4 0s. 0d. whilst at Lichfield.) The cost of transporting the tomb to Lichfield was about £26 0s. 0d. The cost of transporting the corpses of William and Henry from Drayton to Lichfield was £10 0s. 0d. The faculty cost £10 0s. 0d. and, no doubt, there were other legal fees.³⁹ The gilding and painting cost £30 0s. 0d. and alterations to the figures cost a further £10 0s. 0d. The railings and vault and the erection of the monument cost about £30.0s. 0d. Thus, the complete project cost about £320 0s. 0d.⁴⁰ It is ironic that this costly monument was destroyed less than seventy years later by those popular forces which the first Lord Paget had spent so much of his working life suppressing. Its destruction left a lacuna in our knowledge of Tudor tombs which this paper has attempted to fill. What is clear is that the Paget Tomb was in certain important architectural respects unique and that it may have had a hitherto unsuspected influence on funeral monuments in later Tudor England. As important, it is further evidence of the continuing resistance of English Catholics to the Reformation.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The year of erection is supplied by the Paget estate material cited below, the period of destruction by Symond's Diary for 1645 (see below note 21) confirmed in Stebbing Shaw, *The History . . . of Staffordshire* (two vols., 1798 & 1801), i, 215.
2. Shaw, *op. cit.*, i, 215; Thomas Harwood, *The History . . . of Lichfield* (Gloucester, 1806), pp.53-4. There are no references to it in K.A. Esdaile, *English Monumental Sculpture since the Renaissance* (1927) or in her later works. There is no reference to it in Margaret Whinney, *Sculpture in Britain: 1530-1840* (1964) or in E. Mercer, *English Art, 1553-1625* (1962).
3. S.R. Gammon, *Statesman and Schemer: William, First Lord Paget—Tudor Minister* (Newton Abbot, 1973). His early letters are calendared in *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, most of his later letters are transcribed and printed in B.L. Beer & Sybil M. Jack (eds), 'The Letters of William Lord Paget of Beaudesert, 1547-1563', *Camden Misc.*, xxv, 1-141 ('Camden Soc.', ser. 4, xiii(1974)).
4. The will merely instructs that if William die within 40 miles of Drayton he should be buried there, or if within 40 miles of Burton-on-Trent, he should be buried there "with such manner of funeralles as to the dyscrecion of myne executor shall seem conueniente". P[ublic] R[ecord] O[ffice]., PROB. 11/46, quire 27 (P.C.C., 27 Chayre).
5. The author of *The Arte of English Poesie* (1558) included Henry Paget in his list of great English writers. (*Lib. I, cap. xxxi.*) None of Henry's literary work seems to have survived. I am grateful to Dr. Andrew Crozier for this reference. *Complete Peerage*, x, 280-1.
6. The instruction was contained in his will. P.R.O., PROB. 11/51 quire 11 (P.C.C., 11 Sheffield).
8. Recorded in his letters, see A.C. Jones & C.J. Harrison (eds). *The Letters and Papers of Thomas, Lord Paget* ('Camden', forthcoming).
9. They had still not paid their share in 1583. (See Doc. no.2)

10. See below p.XX. Professor Stone makes no allowance for such a religious motivation in his discussion of the funerals and tombs of the nobility. Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* (Oxford, 1965), pp.572-81 & Appx. xxv.
11. C.J. Harrison, 'Lichfield from the Reformation to the Civil War', *Trans. of the S. Staffs. Arch. & Hist. Soc.*, xxii (1981-82), 122-9;
12. See the faculty, S[tafford County] R[ecord] O[ffice], D(W)1734/J1859; Doc.4
13. There is no reference to him in K.A. Esdaile, 'The Inter-Action of English and Low Country Sculpture in the Sixteenth Century,' *Journ. of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute*, vi(1943), 80-88. Thieme & Becker's *Allgemeines Kunstlexikon* gives biographies of half-a-dozen artists surnamed Carlier but none with the Christian name Jan. (I am grateful to H.M. Colvin Esq. for this information.) The same is true for the *Dictionnaire de Biographie Francaise*. A John Carlyer, from the dominions of the king of Spain, was granted letters of denization on 9 March 1562, W. Page (ed.), *Letters of Denization . . .* (1893), p.41. Is this the Jan Carlier of 1577 from Bruges?
14. Docs. 1, 2. He acknowledged receipt of £4 0s. 0d. additional payment in April 1577 "vppon the perfeict finishing off the tombe.". (S.R.O., D(W)1734/3/4/212, no.59)
15. The monument consisted of "Marbell Pillors and the greate tombstone of marble that came out of Ireland . . .". Cheshire County Record Office, the will of Roger Mainwaring of Nantwich, 18 April 1589 fo.15 r.
16. Doc. 3.
17. Docs. 2 & 3. See T.S. Willan, *The Inland Trade* (Manchester, 1976), chapter 1.
18. Doc. 2.
19. Doc. 1.
20. S.R.O., D(W) 1734/J1859.
21. Harwood, *op. cit.*, p.53; C.E. Long (ed), *Diary of . . . Symonds*, p.222 ('Camden Soc.', old ser., lxxiv(1859))
22. Doc. 2.
23. S.R.O., D(W)1734/3/3/211 fos. 21, 24v, 32.
24. Doc. 2.
25. The property of the Earl of Winchelsea and Nottingham, on loan to the British Library; Brit. Lib., loan 38.
26. *Ibid.*, fo.4.
27. Stebbing Shaw, *op. cit.*, i, 215 & Plate XVI.
28. *Ibid.*, i, 215, n.1.
29. *Journal of the Brit. Arch. Assoc'n*, xxxv(1879), 265. (I am indebted to H.M. Colvin Esq. for this reference.)
30. Doc. 2.
31. *Staffordshire Historical Collections*, ser. 1, III, ii(1883), p.122.
32. The engraving gives some indication of age, the drawing does not.
33. S.R.O., D(W)1734/J1859. Lady Anne was buried at Drayton, Lady Katherine at Aldenham. (*Complete Peerage*, x, 280-1.)
34. An early exception to the general rule of recumbent effigies is the Despenser monument at Tewkesbury where Edward le Despenser (*ob.* 1375) is to be seen kneeling in a little tabernacle on top of his chantry chapel. (A. Gardner, *English Mediaeval Sculpture* (Camb., 2nd edn, 1951), p.265 & fig. 517.
35. Whinney, *op. cit.*, p.12 & fig 10(A).
36. Doc. 2.
37. Harwood, *op. cit.*, p.54; Stebbing Shaw, *op. cit.*, p.215.
38. Stone, *op. cit.*, p.580.
39. A Dr. Awbrey received 10s. 0d. for perusing the faculty. (S.R.O., D(W)1734/3/4/212, no.16)
40. As the reader will appreciate, the evidence of the surviving documents is ambiguous. The tomb cannot have cost less than £300 0s. 0d.

DOCUMENTS

Document 1.

An Account of the Charges, 1577

(S.R.O., D(W)1734/4/6. This consists of a draft account (two folios) and notes (one folio). "To Hankin" and "fourre" added from the notes.)

To Carlier the workeman vppon his first bargaine	£189 0s. 0d.
To him for his paynes comminge into Staff to se the worke sett vp	£5 0s. 0d.
The price off a tonne off yron and v ^c yron vsed about the grate & tombe	£16 13s. 4d.
[To Hankin] for dyverse charges disbursed about the vault, and erecting the said tombe	£12 15s. 4d.
For the gilting and paynting off the said tombe and altering the [fourre] pictures	} £40 0s. 0d.
For drawing seuerall plattes for the said tombe	
Summa	[£263 8s. 8d.]
	[Summation by the editor]

Somes of money disbursed about the tombe and not demanded
viz.

To the deane and chapter off Lichefeld for a place wherin the tombe is erected	£20 0s. 0d
The charges off transporting the tombe from London by Ganesbiroughe by sea, and from thens by waynes to Lichefeld	£20 2s. 2d
The charges off translating the bodyes from Draiton to Lichefeld	[£10 0s. 0d.]
	[Added from the Notes]

Document 2.**An Account of the Charges drafted in November 1583**

(*S.R.O., D(W)1734/3/4/203; An unnumbered folio in a file of accounts.*)

Note off the reconing off CCC^{li} for the tombe d[elivere]d to M^r Carie 6^o No. 1583

To Carlier the workeman	£194 0s. 0d.
For transportacion of the tombe from Bruges to london, from thens to Ganesborough, & from thens by cart to lich. [i.e. Lichfield]	£26 0s. 0d.
To Carlier & other workemen for setting vp the tomb [and] making the vault	£16 0s. 0d.
For a grate [i.e. railing] of yro[n]	£14 0s. 0d.
For gilding & painting the tombe	£30 0s. 0d.
	<hr/>
	<u>£280 0s. 0d.</u>

Besides:

The charges for the newe grate of yron nowe in hand

To the deane & chapter off Lich. for the place in the church for the tombe

£20 0s. 0d.

The charges in translating the bodyes from draiton to lichefeld

Document 3.

Mathew Smythe's Charges, paid 25 March 1577, for transporting the tomb

(S.R.O., D(W)1734/3/4/212, no.40; part of a file of accounts. Smythe was Paget's steward at Burton-on-Trent.)

Money layde forthe ffor my Lorde by mathew Smythe
ffor charges of the tombe.

Payde ffor shewinges at Nottynnggam	4d.
Payde ffor mendyng my Lordes his Saddell at ganesborow w ^{ch} was broken	1s. 6d.
Pd ffor strawe to packe new the tombe at ganesborow	8d.
For ffreyght of the same ffrom London to ganesborow	£6 0s. 0d.
Bestowed of the botemen when I heyered them at ganesborow	6d.
Payd ffor ffreyght ffrom Ganesborow to Nottynnggam	£4 0s. 0d.
Geven in Rewarde at ij tymes to pore men that helped to hale vp the Bottes	1s. 0d.
Payd ffor the dynners of m ^r Pagettes tenanntes at Nottynnggam brydges w ^{ch} had ther ix carryges	8s. 0d.
Payde to the ffery man of Sawley ffor leyng vp Safe one tonne weght of the tombe & ffor fferyng hyt ouer the water	1s. 0d.
Pd ffor M ^r Pagettes tenanntes dynners at Borton w ^{ch} was x carryges	9s. 0d.
Pd ffor the heyer of a horse ffor Roger Collyor & his charges iij days	7s. 8d.
Pd ffor mendyng of a carte of one of M ^r Pagettes tenanntes at Borton	8d.
Pd ffor the Charges of ij of M ^r Pagettes tenanntes [^{at Borton} deleted] w ^{ch} went to lichefilde to sey the Carttes well dryven	1s. 4d.
Geven to x caryges of my Lordes tenanntes at Lichefilde ffor ther dynners ther	6s. 8d.
Payd ffor my owne goyng over the fferys at Sundry tymes	8d.
Pd ffor the charges of my Selffe & my horse xix days	£2 2s. 6d.
	<hr/>
	<u>£14 2s. 6d.</u>

ENDORSEMENT

25 Martij 1577

re[ceived] of the right honorable my Lord Paget (by the handes of William Warde) to the vse of Mathew Smith of Burton vppon Trente, in full payment of this bill the some of fourtene poundes two shillinges & ij^d. of lawfull English monie.

xiiiij^{li}. ij^s. ij^d. — Thomas Dutton

Document 4

**Sir Francis Walsingham from Leicester House, London to
Thomas, Lord Paget 23 March 1577.**

(Early Paget Correspondence, 1/4, fos. 30-31.)

My very good Lord, I will not fayle, according to your Lordship's desyer in your lettres of the xvijth of this present, to aduertise her Maiestie in how thanckfull and humble sorte you accepte her gratyous fauor in requyring at the dean and chapter's handes of Lichfield a conueniente place for your Lordship to set vp your father's tombe, which I am glad you haue obteyned at their handes. Me therefore have signified to them by my lettres that I will aduertice her Maietie of their dutyfull yielding to her request. Me meane, God willing, to perfourme yt accordinglie as occasion shalbe offered. Yf there be any other thing wherin your Lordship shall thincke I mey do you any pleasure or seruice, I shall desyer you not to spare me. In the mean tyme I committ your Lordship to the tuycon of almightie God. From Leyster Howse, the xxiiijth of Marche 1576.

Your Lordship's to commaund,
Fra. Walsyngham