

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE IN MID-TUDOR ENGLAND, 1547-1569

THESIS

**Presented to the Graduate Council of
Southwest Texas State University
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements**

For the Degree

Master of ARTS

By

Clarissa E. Hinojosa, B.A.

**San Marcos, Texas
May, 2002**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my thanks and indebtedness to my graduate advisor, Dr. Eugene J. Bourgeois II. His knowledge, guidance, encouragement, and good humor have been invaluable, and have helped me to produce a work far superior than would otherwise have been possible. I am grateful also to Dr. Elizabeth Makowski and Dr. Kenneth Margerison for their instructive comments in the reading of this thesis, and to Dr. William Liddle, who graciously offered comments on the first chapter. On a personal note, I wish to thank my father, Dr. R. R. Hinojosa-Smith, my sister, Karen L. Hinojosa, my brother and sister-in-law, Robert and Kathi Huddleston, and my friends, Rebecca Kirsch, Rebecca Kosary, Jill Meier, and Katherine Walters, all of whom supported me through the process of writing this thesis with words of wisdom, kindness, clarity, and the occasional application of chocolate.

In Memory of my Mother
Patricia L. Sorensen
1940-1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION: THE HISTORIOGRAPHY AND STUDY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION IN MID-TUDOR ENGLAND.....	1
II. METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS: COMMISSIONS OF THE PEACE AND THEIR RELATION TO THE CENTER AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL.....	17
III. METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS: COMMISSIONS OF THE PEACE AND THEIR RELATION TO THE CENTER AT THE LOCAL LEVEL.....	33
IV. CONCLUSIONS.....	63
APPENDICES: INTRODUCTORY.....	66
APPENDIX 1: Careers of Individual JPs.....	67
APPENDIX 2: Careers of Individual JPs (by county).....	101
APPENDIX 3: Careers of JPs by Reign.....	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1. Total number of men commissioned, by date and by monarch.....	21
Table 2-2. Number of men who received commissions in 1547 (uncorrected), 1547 (corrected), and 1554, with percentage of decrease.....	24
Table 2-3. Number of men who received commissions in 1554 (uncorrected), 1554 (corrected), and 1562, with percentage of decrease.....	28
Table 2-4. Numbers of men commissioned early in Elizabeth's reign.....	31
Table 2-5: Number justices of the peace (non-dignitaries only) on the commissions in 1562 (adjusted), and 1569.....	31
Table 3-1. Numbers of Norfolk JPs in 1547(uncorrected), 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	37
Table 3-2. Numbers of Suffolk JPs in 1547 (uncorrected), 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	43
Table 3-3. Numbers of Suffolk JPs in 1554 (uncorrected), 1554 (corrected) and 1562 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	45
Table 3-4. Numbers of Cambridgeshire JPs in 1547 (uncorrected), 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	48
Table 3-5. Numbers of Hertfordshire JPs in 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	52
Table 3-6. Numbers of Hertfordshire JPs in 1554 and 1562 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	53
Table 3-7. Numbers of Hertfordshire JPs in 1562, 1564, and 1569.....	53
Table 3-8. Numbers of Kent JPs in 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	55
Table 3-9. Numbers of Kent JPs in 1554 (corrected) and 1562 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	56
Table 3-10. Numbers of Kent JPs in 1562 and 1564 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	57
Table 3-11. Numbers of Kent JPs in 1564 (corrected) and 1569 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	57
Table 3-12. Numbers of Surrey JPs in 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.....	59

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>CPR</i> , Edward	<i>Calendar of the Patent Rolls for Edward VI</i> , Vol: 1 Edward VI Part III. Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1970 (PRO 1924-1926).
<i>CPR</i> , Mary	<i>Calendar of the Patent Rolls for Philip and Mary</i> , Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I. Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1970 (HMSO 1936-1939).
<i>CPR</i> , Elizabeth [a]	<i>Calendar of the Patent Rolls for Elizabeth I</i> , Vol. 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X. Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1976 (HMSO 1939-1986).
<i>CPR</i> , Elizabeth [b]	<i>Calendar of the Patent Rolls for Elizabeth I</i> , Vol. 5: 13 Elizabeth Part III. Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1976 (HMSO 1939-1986).
HMSO	Her (His) Majesties Stationary Office
PRO	Public Record Office

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: THE HISTORIOGRAPHY AND STUDY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION IN MID-TUDOR ENGLAND

Justices of the peace (JPs) were the most important local officials in sixteenth-century England. Over the previous two hundred years, the office had acquired a wealth of duties. JPs were relied upon to enforce laws, to muster men, to oversee trade and wages, and for a host of other obligations.¹ The JPs' judicial duties and activities were among their most significant, to both the localities and the center. Indeed, JPs were a critical liaison between the central administration and the localities. JPs served both crown and community by sitting, four times a year, in Quarter Sessions, hearing cases and meting out justice. Although judges in the assize courts heard the most serious crimes and most felonies, JPs nonetheless usually had very full calendars, so much so that they began to sit in petty sessions outside the Quarter Sessions.² This chapter is part of a thesis that represents an initial nationwide study of the commissions of the peace and their personnel for the mid-Tudor years.

Records of the men who served as JPs exist in several forms. Although JPs did not receive a formal salary, they were eligible to be reimbursed by the Crown for per diem wages during quarter sessions. The lists of wages claimed – and thus, of the men who attended the quarter sessions – are entered on the pipe rolls. However, certain

¹ G. R. Elton, *England Under the Tudors* (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 59-60. JPs' duties are further enumerated in William Lambard's *Eirenarcha, Or, of the Office of the Justices of Peace* (1581); in Elton, *The Tudor Constitution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), esp. pp. 138, 453-456, and 457-458; and in Alison Wall, *Power and Protest in England 1525-1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), esp. pp. 59, 102, 104, 106-7, and 120.

categories of men were not eligible to claim reimbursement: peers, serjeants-at-law, and assize judges would not have been able to claim reimbursement, and therefore their attendance cannot be determined based on the pipe rolls.³ The pipe rolls are, further, limited in their availability; for that reason only, this study will not incorporate them.⁴ Also limited in their use are records of the King's Bench, where cases transferred to it by the quarter sessions may be located.⁵ The indictments in the King's Bench sometimes list the JPs of the referring court, but originals only exist in the Public Records Office, effectively making them inaccessible for this study. Similarly, estreats of fines, records sent to the Exchequer of financial penalties levied, list the names of JPs in attendance at sessions but survive only in fragmentary form.⁶ They are equally inaccessible at present.

More accessible sources exist, and it is these primary sources upon which many of the arguments in this thesis are drawn. The most important of these sources are the *Calendars of Patent Rolls*. The patent rolls are organized lists of the men who received commissions of the peace. The extant rolls for the period covered in this chapter are from 1547, 1554, 1562, and 1569; the first is from Edward's reign, the second from Mary's, and the latter two are from Elizabeth's. The commissions of the peace were listed county by county, and each man was listed individually, along with any titles he may have had. The patent rolls also give subtle clues about the structure of the local hierarchies and the social relationships of the JPs themselves. The order in which men appeared on the rolls

² Frederic A. Youngs, Jr., "Towards Petty Sessions: Tudor JPs and Divisions of Counties," in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G.R. Elton from his American friends*, ed. Delloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna (Cambridge: The University of Cambridge Press, 1982), pp. 201-216.

³ See Eugene J. Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire: Continuity and Stability in County Government* (Unpublished manuscript), Chapter 2, p. 17.

⁴ The Pipe Rolls, found in the Public Records Office (London) in class E 372, are available only as originals; none have been transcribed and printed for the years considered here.

⁵ S. J. Gunn, *Early Tudor Government: 1485-1558* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), pp. 74-76.

reflected their prestige and influence relative to one another, and also determined the places in which they sat on the bench for Quarter Sessions.⁷ Unfortunately, the rolls are not perfect. The patent rolls from 1562 do not have any data for Hampshire. Far more serious are the deficiencies of the 1569 rolls: most dignitaries were omitted from the rolls, and there is no data extant for seventeen out of the forty-three counties.⁸ Nonetheless, the 1569 rolls still provide useful data for the majority of counties. Less well known than the patent rolls, and far fewer in number, are the *libris pacis* or books of the peace. They too are lists of JPs; they represent central copies of rosters of JPs, typically for use by central officials, and are found in the Lansdowne Manuscripts. Unfortunately, these data too are not fully extant. The *libris pacis* are only scattered remains from scattered counties.

The data from the patent rolls (and the *libris pacis*) capture state of the commissions as they were on a single date. However, commissions of the peace were commonly altered far more often than once a year.⁹ It is believed that much of the original data have been lost. Thus, the patent rolls and *libris pacis* are best thought of as snapshots rather than complete pictures in themselves. Nonetheless, they provide an excellent guide. Further, they can be usefully supplemented by other sources, including the *Calendars of State Papers*, Mary Bateson's collection of letters from bishops to the

⁶ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500-1600* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 36-37.

⁷ Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, pp. 71-73.

⁸ The counties are: Hampshire, Norfolk, Northamptonshire, Northumberland, Nottinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Rutland, Shropshire, Somerset, Staffordshire, Suffolk, Surrey, Sussex, Warwickshire, Westmoreland, Wiltshire, Worcestershire.

⁹ Hassell Smith believed that, at least for Norfolk, new lists of commission personnel were reissued every time a man was removed from the commission (through either death or dismissal), added to the commission, or when a man's position on the list changed. A. Hassell Smith, "The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace, 1554-1564: A Reconsideration." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 22 (1977): p. 304, footnote 8.

Privy Council listing JPs by religious affiliation,¹⁰ and a variety of local studies that will be discussed in greater detail below.

Historians who have dealt with the subject of JPs fall roughly into four categories according to their approach. Historians who study the whole or most of the Tudor period comprise the first group. They place JPs within a national context, usually emphasizing JPs' roles only in limited situations. G. R. Elton, in *England Under the Tudors* (1st edition 1955), discussed the rising importance of JPs, but did so in support of his argument that Henry VII restored good government. He further argued that Thomas Cromwell used JPs extensively in policing the reforms of the 1530s in *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (1972). Penry Williams, in *The Tudor Regime* (1979), discussed JPs in terms of administration and of the regulation of trade and industry. S. J. Gunn traced the medieval development and subsequent growth of the office in *Early Tudor Government 1485-1558* (1995). John Guy examined the development of the office, primarily in the Elizabethan era, in *Tudor England* (1988). Most recently, Alison Wall called into question some long-standing beliefs regarding the JPs in *Power and Protest in England 1525-1640* (2000), particularly by relating office-holding to patterns of politics nationwide.

Historians who study JPs as part of a broader examination of Tudor legal and constitutional history comprise the second group. In *Tudor Government: Structures of Authority in the Sixteenth Century* (1997), David Loades traced not only the development of the office, but its place in the administrative machinery. In *The Tudor Revolution in Government* (1960), *Policy and Police*, and *The Tudor Constitution* (1972), G. R. Elton

¹⁰ Mary Bateson (ed.), "A Collection of Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council, 1564," *Camden Miscellany* IX (CS New Series, LIII, 1893).

made a massive contribution to modern understanding of the Tudor legal system, and to the place of JPs within it.

The third group is those historians who specifically study the JPs. Modern analyses of the office began with Charles Austin Beard's *The Office of Justice of the Peace in England*, first published in 1904. Begun in 1898, Beard wrote *Office* because he discerned "the need of a better historical foundation" than existed at the time.¹¹ His work, characteristically thorough, analyzes the development of the office from its medieval roots through the end of the Tudor period. Although now rather out of date, the structure he provided is still useful for a general understanding of the office. What Beard did not do – or even attempt to do – was to provide an understanding of the nature of the JPs themselves.

Bertha Haven Putnam's well-regarded *Early Treatises on the Practice of the Justices of the Peace* followed in 1926. As its title suggests, *Early Treatises* analyzed the contemporary handbooks written for JPs, such as *The Boke of Justices of Peas* (author unknown; 1506?), Anthony Fitzherbert's *The Newe Boke of the Justices of the Peas* (1538), and the most famous text, William Lambard's *Eirenarcha: Or, of the Office of the Justices of Peace* (1581). Bertram Osborne's extensively researched and charmingly written *Justices of the Peace 1361-1848: A History of the Justices of the Peace for the Counties of England* appeared in 1960.

¹¹ Charles Austin Beard, *The Office of Justice of the Peace in England in Its Origin and Development* (New York: AMS Press, reprint 1967), p. 5.

The book that has set the standard, however, is John L. Gleason's "later *Eirenarcha*,"¹² *The Justices of the Peace in England 1558-1640*, published in 1969. Gleason's work was the first acknowledged national study of justices of the peace, and it has been tremendously influential. It has become the foundation, both directly and indirectly, for a number of important works: Guy used it as one of the bases for his description of JPs in *Tudor England*,¹³ and Gunn followed Guy in *Early Tudor Government*.¹⁴ J. R. Lander's examination of late fifteenth-century and early sixteenth-century JPs, *English Justices of the Peace 1461-1509*, published in 1989, is closely patterned after Gleason, especially his categorization of JPs.

Although there had been studies of JPs between Osborne's and Gleason's works, most were incomplete, limited to chapters in other books. Of the studies of JPs that preceded his own, Gleason wrote:

Too much of this literature shares a common flaw. Generalizations are based upon narrow data; doubtless, few statements are without foundation, but so often an illustrative example has been elevated into a uniformity [p. 3].¹⁵

Ironically, much the same can now be – and indeed, is being – said of Gleason's own work. There is a serious question as to whether it can in fact be called a 'national' study. As Alison Wall has recently pointed out, it is not actually representative of all of England:

[Gleason] sampled only six counties in five individual years between 1562 and 1636, which obscures the extent of change; moreover,

¹² J. H. Gleason, *The Justices of the Peace in England, 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 1. The title of Gleason's first chapter is "A Later *Eirenarcha*." He writes: "...an adaptation of the title in another, very different, book about the justices of the peace is not inappropriate."

¹³ John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 477, footnote 70.

¹⁴ Gunn, *Early Tudor Government*, p. 217, footnote 10.

¹⁵ Gleason, *The Justices of the Peace in England*, p. 3.

he used composite lists of men who had been JPs at some stage of a year, but not necessarily all of it.¹⁶

In other words, Gleason's work has three critical flaws. First, the study is so limited as to be non-representative of the whole of England. Second, because he did not closely examine the commissions under Edward VI and Mary, it is difficult if not impossible to track any politically, religiously, or policy-motivated changes. Third, Gleason used a surprisingly limited number of sources; he relied chiefly on the *libris pacis* from the Lansdowne Manuscripts, to the exclusion of the patent rolls, the *State Papers*, and the bishops' letters edited by Bateson. The patent rolls in particular are a generous source of data. Each of these problems will be discussed in turn.

Gleason's work is quite limited in its breadth, which belies its reputation as a national study. He analyzed data from only six counties: Kent, Norfolk, Northamptonshire, Somerset, Worcestershire, and the West Riding of York. Gleason's argument that his study was actually representative of all of England was that each of the six counties possessed unique characteristics, including geography, industry, and national character, which made them accurately illustrative of the counties he did not study. By extrapolation, then, he argued that the men appointed to commissions in these counties could be expected to be representative of their peers nationwide. Therefore, "The rosters of their commissions of the peace should include examples of all types of men who were J.P.s."¹⁷ In other words, Gleason contended that that biographical sketches or "case studies" of JPs in only 2.7% of England's counties could accurately represent the nature of the office and its relation to the center for the whole of England. However, studying fewer than three percent of any given body cannot possibly reveal accurate statistics

¹⁶ Wall, *Power and Protest*, p. 190, footnote 2.

about the whole. A much larger sampling is required – preferably as close to one hundred percent as is possible. But even case studies of several JPs from every county would still be faulty. True, a man's personal history likely factored into whether he was appointed to or dismissed from a commission of the peace. However, biography does not reveal any of several critical factors: the intent of the central administration in making appointments or dismissals, any patterns or trends in appointments or dismissals, and the extent of those patterns or trends. Thus Gleason's approach, although generally descriptive of sixteenth-century gentry, does not in fact guarantee accurate representation of which men were appointed to commissions of the peace, or how and why they were selected or omitted.

The difficulties inherent in studying such a limited number of counties are compounded by the time span that Gleason chose to study. Whether one argues that the mid-Tudor era was characterized overall by polity or by severe political and governmental disruption, it remains as fact that three monarchs reigned in quick succession, and that these monarchs had contrasting political and religious agendas that they attempted to incorporate on a national level. Thus, in order to accurately determine the extent of change (if any) in appointments and dismissals under Elizabeth, the commissions under her siblings must also be studied. Otherwise, it is nearly impossible to tell whether appointments or dismissals in Elizabeth's reign were in fact motivated by politics, religion, administrative policy – or by anything else.

Both of these difficulties are further compounded by the fact that Gleason severely limited the sources on which he based his study. It is true that relatively few data from the sixteenth century are still extant. This, however, is not an argument in favor of limiting sources – if anything, the number of sources must be expanded as much as

¹⁷ Gleason, *The Justices of the Peace in England*, p. 6.

possible. Additionally, since JPs did not necessarily serve full terms – especially in counties riddled with factional politics and infighting – discovering continuity within a single year can be significant.

Gleason's interpretation of his sources – his methodology – is problematic as well. The most serious problem is his over-extensive categorization of JPs, which obscures many revelatory points. Apparently following Osborne, Gleason pigeonholed JPs into six categories (the model later followed by Lander): courtiers, lawyers, merchants, dignitaries, clerics, and gentry. Each JP was assigned to a single category, and no provision was made for overlap. This approach gave even Gleason difficulty, as many men could qualify to fit into more than one category. However, an individual's office or career alone had little bearing on whether he was appointed or dismissed from a commission. When Elizabeth's secretary William Cecil, for example, began his campaign to reduce the numbers of JPs throughout England, he did not selectively target lawyers as opposed to courtiers –or any other group. And since so many men could fall into more than one category there is, as M. L. Zell pointed out, little relevance in making these distinctions: "To ask whether Baron John Hales of the Exchequer or Sir Thomas Moyle were gentlemen *or* office holders is *une question mal posée*."¹⁸

A question better posed is the distinction now gaining popularity: to distinguish between dignitaries and non-dignitaries. Following Bourgeois and Fritze, "dignitary" in this sense refers only to *ex officio* officeholders.¹⁹ "Non-dignitary" means working, resident or otherwise local JPs, regardless of the particular man's station in life. Even this far less cumbersome model is subject to some problems, as not all resident JPs were

¹⁸ M. L. Zell, "Early Tudor JPs at Work," *Archaeologia Cantiana* 93 (1977): pp. 125-143.

equally diligent in their efforts to carry out the duties of their office. Further, some men who were working, resident JPs in their home counties also received *ex officio* appointments in other counties. This notwithstanding, the dignitary/non-dignitary approach is useful precisely because it avoids descent into unhelpful minutiae that detracts from the real issue: changes in commission size, and what those changes represent.

The problems that Gleason encountered in deciding into which category a JP should be placed are all but eliminated when the dignitary/non-dignitary approach is utilized. This also has the effect of making the data much more manageable – and more comprehensible. Gleason himself appears to have misread the data: in his treatment of Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby, Gleason noted that, “With a short interruption – removal and restoration were not uncharacteristic – Hoby served for nearly forty years.”²⁰ Although Hoby served in the later Elizabethan and early Stuart period, and thus technically outside the range of this study, the parenthetical remark is telling. The question that demands to be answered is, was any there relevance to the “removal and restoration?” Specifically, can it be correlated to a change in monarch, politics (local or national), or policy? These questions are particularly pertinent given Hassall Smith’s observation that removal from the commission was a disgrace, and potentially a public scandal.²¹

The solution to all of these problems, analytical and methodological, is to conduct a truly national study that incorporates as much data as possible from as many counties as possible from the reigns of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I.

¹⁹ See Zell, “Early Tudor JPs at Work,” pp. 130-131, and Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2, pp. 1-3.

²⁰ Gleason, *The Justices of the Peace in England*, p. 42.

²¹ Hassell Smith, “The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace,” pp. 301-312.

The fourth group of historians is made up of those who do local studies. Each of these works is doubly valuable. Each analyzes the role of JPs in both their counties and in their relationship to the center. Equally important, each provides a wealth of local, county data. Among the most important of these is A. Hassell Smith's seminal work, *County and Court: Government and Politics in Norfolk 1558-1603*, published in 1974. This thorough, detailed work (in combination with an article published in the *Huntington Library Quarterly*) was one of the first to challenge the prevailing ideas about JPs set down by Gleason. It is significant that he came to different conclusions than did Gleason after studying one of Gleason's 'typical' counties. A handful of other studies provide equally important data: Diarmaid MacCulloch's examination of Norfolk's 'sister' county, *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in and English County, 1500-1600* (1986), Eugene J. Bourgeois's forthcoming study, *The Ruling Elite of Sixteenth-Century Cambridgeshire: Continuity and Stability in County Government*, and Jeffrey R. Hankins's master's thesis, "Tudor Local Government and Administration in the County of Hertfordshire, circa 1520-1580" (1998). These studies do not by any means come to the same conclusions. It is the differences these historians have found that make a collected analysis of them so necessary, because they highlight the fact that the central administration did not behave as though each county were identical to every other, or even to its near neighbors. This revelation about the central administration is absolutely necessary, for it gives ground to the assertion that royal policy was not composed merely of blanket edicts but was tailored to each county. Without these local studies, a truly national study could not be made.

Historians have long been interested in tracking local government personnel for the Tudor era as a mechanism by which to measure the effectiveness of legislation and

policies promulgated by the central administration. Indeed, a central theme of Tudor government has long been defined as tension between the central government and local officials and leaders. Simply put, this argument contends that the central government, newly coalesced by Henry VII and enlarged by Henry VIII, struggled against petty local rulers for control in the counties. It is within this context that scholars strive to understand the depth with which the Reformation, the Counter-Reformation, and much other legislation was accepted and enacted throughout the nation.

Of course, the situation was not nearly as simplistic as that: both the men of the central administration and the men in the localities needed one another. Neither “side” could do without the other. The central government needed men in the localities to enact and enforce legislation; and the men in the localities depended upon the central government to give legitimacy to their claims of local power. The two “sides” were connected by a system of patronage that was itself dependent upon

. . .the services of minor courtiers, frequently younger sons, who sought excitement and fortune on the fringes of the Court rather than accept their humble status at home. These men provided the contact, so vital to Elizabethan administration, between courtiers who were anxious to enhance their prestige by dispensing patronage and ambitious gentry whose success depended on receiving it.²²

Particular attention has been paid to the mid-Tudor years: the reigns of Edward VI (1547-1553), Mary I (1553-1558), and the first few years of Elizabeth I (1558-69). The period is usually seen as problematic, although this view is by no means universal. Whether there was indeed a ‘mid-Tudor crisis’ at all is a matter of some debate. The long-standing view is that the era was marked by a disruption of the peace and stability created by Henry VII and maintained by Henry VIII. This argument is made in part

because the reigns of Edward and Mary were quite short in comparison to the reigns enjoyed by the other Tudors. Although brief reigns in and of themselves might not necessarily cause strife, especially in the case of successive monarchs from the same family, the mid-Tudor period witnessed great changes in policy from monarch to monarch, particularly religious policy. G. R. Elton argued quite passionately in *England Under the Tudors* that from the death of Cromwell on, good governance suffered and the Tudor dynasty went into a decline, very nearly coming to grief entirely under Mary. Professor Elton apparently softened his views on the near-critical state of the state under Mary, according to W. R. D. Jones, but Jones, like Elton before him, argued in *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1539-1570* (1973) that the mid-Tudor years were a time of political, financial, and governmental instability and danger for the monarchy. In marked contrast, David Loades questioned Jones's (and others') acceptance of the idea that the period was characterized by crisis. In *The Mid-Tudor Crisis 1545-1565* (1992), he called for a reexamination of that theory, and argued that continuity and polity better depict the period. That the debate exists at all is due in part to the attempt to understand the local impact of the Reformation. The legislation that brought Protestantism to England was begun under Henry VIII, radicalized under Edward, reversed under Mary, and returned to under Elizabeth (although the Elizabethan Settlement tried to accommodate radical and conservative religious sympathies alike) in under a single generation.

The office of the justice of the peace is particularly well-suited for tracking Crown-country relationships, and local impacts of central policies and national events. By the mid-Tudor period, the JP stood as the most important local governmental

²² A. Hassell Smith, *County and Court: Government and Politics in Norfolk, 1558-1603* (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 66-67.

institution. Having accrued a plethora of local administrative duties during the previous two centuries, particularly through statutes, in addition to judicial duties that culminated in courts of Quarter Sessions, the JP served as a most necessary link between the center and the locality. Thus, appointments to a commission of the peace and tenure in office, particularly during the mid-Tudor years that witnessed so much change, represent a kind of litmus test for political acceptance and local power. That this “litmus test” is valid is supported by the body of literature, which strongly suggests that the appointments of justices of the peace were quite deliberately, rather than haphazardly, determined.

Indeed, the central government appears to have exercised careful and thoughtful control over commissions of the peace, making deliberate changes to reflect political, governmental, and religious changes at the center. However, the existing literature lacks an in-depth nation-wide survey of commissions of the peace in these contexts. Historians writing national histories often rely on existing county and local histories, which have been done for a handful of English counties.

Appointment to commissions of the peace was very prestigious and demand for appointments was high. Justices of the peace had to meet a variety of requirements, the most important of which was independent income, preferably landed, of £20 annually, although lawyers were usually exempted from this provision. The criterion of £20 freehold income was established very early on in the development of the office. Both Hassell Smith and Wall have found that men with less than £20 freehold income were considered unsuitable for office, implying that the same wealth criterion still being applied two hundred years after it had been set down. Lambard, apparently polemicizing, noted in *Eirenarcha* that the provision for £20 was, by his own standards, out of date:

Now although this portion of twenty pounds a yeare, be not at this day in account aunswerable to the charge and countenance fitte for a Justice of the Peace, yet who knoweth not, that at the making of this Lawe, it was far otherwise; And I do not doubt, but as the rate of all things is greatly risen since that time, so is there good care taken, that none be nowe placed in the Commission, whose livings be not increased in proportion.²³

Justices of the peace were appointed by the Lord Chancellor in concert with the monarch's Council, meaning that they were essentially local agents of the central government. The Crown and Council had the power to dismiss or to appoint JPs, and used that power for a variety of administrative, political, and religious reasons.²⁴

The need for systematic examination of England's commissions of the peace, however, is not based merely on the deficiencies in Gleason's work. Rather, the need is clear when various county studies are explored for their conclusions regarding commission personnel and religious or political sympathies. For example, A. Hassell Smith argued that the appointments to commissions of the peace in Norfolk, Sussex, and Northamptonshire were closely related to the religious affiliation of both the monarch and the men who received commissions of the peace.²⁵ Men who were commissioned in the last year of Mary's reign systematically and in significant percentages failed to be commissioned again in the first year of Elizabeth's reign. Furthermore, after William Cecil and the Council began efforts to cut the numbers of men commissioned throughout England in 1561, Marian appointees who remained under Elizabeth again lost a significant percentage of their commissions. But Eugene J. Bourgeois has demonstrated that very much the opposite was true for Cambridgeshire. There, Elizabeth first added

²³ Lambard, *Eirenarcha*, p. 35.

²⁴ Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 3, p. 1.

²⁵ Hassell Smith, "The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace," pp. 301-312.

men to the Cambridgeshire commission, but not at the expense of Marian appointees.

When Cecil cut by almost a third the number of JPs for Cambridgeshire,

The reduction came largely at the expense of the local JPs recently appointed in 1558-9 and is not interpreted on any politico-religious grounds, as occurred elsewhere.²⁶

Thus, what was true for Norfolk, Sussex, and Northamptonshire was not also true for Cambridgeshire. This contradiction is important, because it strongly suggests that there was neither a single pattern nor a single reason for appointments nationwide. The localities differed in terms of commission membership and turnover in personnel. This in turn supports the contention that there is a genuine need for a nationwide survey of changes in the personnel of commissions of the peace.

²⁶ Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 3, pp. 12-13.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS: COMMISSIONS OF THE PEACE AND THEIR RELATION TO THE CENTER AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

The mid-Tudor years, encompassing the reigns of Edward VI (1547 to 1553), Mary I (1553 to 1558), and the first few years of Elizabeth I (1558-69), have traditionally been characterized as problematic, standing in sharp contrast to the social order and domestic stability created by Henry VII, maintained by Henry VIII, and later restored by Elizabeth I. One of the strongest cases for this view was made by G. R. Elton, who in *England Under the Tudors* contended that the dynasty began to decline as early as 1540, with the execution of Henry VIII's able but out of favor administrator Thomas Cromwell. Elton argued that the situation worsened after Henry's death and Edward's accession in 1547, as court factions struggled for power around a boy king whose advisors were merely "playing at grown-ups" with him.¹ Edward's brief, turbulent reign was followed by an attempted usurpation and then an incompetent queen whose regressive religious and administrative policies were nearly fatal to good governance. However, recent scholarship has questioned whether the era is truly characterized by instability, based in part on the observation that the bureaucracy crafted by earlier Tudor administrations continued to function. David Loades, in *The Mid-Tudor Crisis 1545-1565*, reexamined the traditional theory and argued that the period is better depicted by continuity and polity. The nation did not fall apart; the Tudors remained in power despite an attempted coup and the machinery of government continued to operate.

¹ G. R. Elton, *England Under the Tudors* (London: Routledge, 1991, third edition), p. 208.

The debate stems in part from the attempt to understand whether, and to what extent, the administrative, political, and religious policy changes made at the center during the years 1547-1569 affected governance in the localities. An effective mechanism by which to gauge the effects of the central government's policies is to track changes in centrally-appointed local personnel, particularly in the commissions of the peace. Justices of the peace were the most important local officials for most of the sixteenth century, as they were a critical link between the central administration and the localities. JPs were relied upon to enforce laws, to muster men, to oversee trade and wages, and for a host of judicial duties and activities.²

One question that must be answered, then, is the extent to which policy changes promulgated by the central administration affected the selection of JPs. This chapter will examine appointments and dismissals of JPs on a national level. It will attempt to aggregate numbers of men commissioned at the national level in order to determine whether increases or decreases correlate with disruptions at the center: changes in monarchs, councilors, and central religious and administrative policy. This data will be used to attempt to discern trends and patterns in appointments and dismissals, and relate them to continuity or discontinuity at the center. A good starting point is to focus on the national level, in order to determine whether there are significant trends and patterns. For example, numbers of JPs increased over the sixteenth century, but this trend is punctuated, especially during the mid-Tudor period, by noticeable reversals or halts.³ The

² JPs' duties are enumerated in William Lambard's *Eirenarcha, Or, of the Office of the Justices of Peace* (1581). For modern discussions or interpretations, see: S. J. Gunn, *Early Tudor Government, 1485-1558* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995); John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); and Alison Wall, *Power and Protest in England, 1525-1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 106-107 and *passim*.

³ Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite of Sixteenth-Century Cambridgeshire: Continuity and Stability in County Government* (Unpublished manuscript), Chapter 2, p. 3.

following chapter will examine the same questions on the local level, in order to see if the central policies were pursued in the same manner in various counties or whether the central administration responded to local conditions when implementing policies.

In surveying cases nationwide, it has in some cases not been possible to discern whether a dignitary who was appointed to several commissions met the criteria for either subcategory. In these instances, they were counted as *ex officio* officeholders for all but their home counties, if known. The commissions of JPs in the *Calendars of Patent Rolls* are in order of social rank. A man's place on the commission determined where he sat on the bench and reflected his standing in his local community.⁴ Men with national importance such as peers and bishops, the men most likely to have honorific appointments, appeared at the top of the lists, followed by law officers such as serjeants-at-law and then local men by descending order of importance.⁵ This does not mean, however, *ex officio* officeholders can be identified merely by enumerating the nobles and law officers listed at the start of a commission roll.⁶ Unfortunately, because of the unavailability of sources, particularly those of quarter sessions or the pipe rolls, there are at this stage in this research limited options. Given the difficulties presented by correctly identifying *ex officio* officeholders, the question is better studied in the specific rather than in the general; thus, the case studies in the next chapter will more formally discuss how dignitaries and non-dignitaries fared during personnel changes, with the exception of

⁴ See Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, pp. 71-73.

⁵ Gunn observed in *Early Tudor Government*, p. 34, that "Such ranking was visibly demonstrated to local society when one sat ahead of the other on the JPs' bench, and mattered enough to provoke Tudor gentlemen to heated argument and even fisticuffs when called into dispute."

⁶ See Zell, "Early Tudor JPs at Work," pp. 130-131; Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, pp. 71-73; and Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*. Chapter 2, p. 3.

the discussion of changes in commissions of the peace between 1562 and 1569. This is because, as will be discussed below, the data for 1569 excludes dignitaries.

As discussed in the previous chapter, records of the men who served as JPs exist in several forms: the pipe rolls, records of the King's Bench, and estreats, all of which are unfortunately unavailable. The primary sources relied upon in this study are the *Calendars of Patent Rolls*, in which are found copies of commissions of the peace, by county, listing by social rank the men appointed to the commissions and any titles he may have had. As noted, the data are not fully extant: the patent rolls for the period covered in this chapter are single lists from individual years.⁷ It is believed that much of the original data have been lost. Nonetheless, the patent rolls provide an excellent guide for an initial survey such as this one. In the next chapter, they will be further supplemented by other sources, including a collection of letters from bishops to the Privy Council listing JPs by religious affiliation,⁸ and a variety of local studies.

Justices of the peace were appointed and dismissed by the monarch, but selection usually rested with Lord Chancellor in concert with the monarch's council.⁹ Local men, some prominent, sought to obtain and keep appointments to commissions of the peace, sometimes in the face of local factional politics or excess demand.¹⁰ Appointment was

⁷ The years are: 1547 (*CPR*, Edward, Vol. 1 Part I, Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1970, pp. 80-92); 1554 (*CPR*, Mary, Vol. 1 Part I, Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1970, pp. 16-26); 1562 (*CPR*, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1976, pp. 433-444); and 1569 (*CPR*, Elizabeth [b], Volume 5: 13 Elizabeth Part III, Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1976, pp. 222-226).

⁸ Mary Bateson (ed.), "A Collection of Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council, 1564," *Camden Miscellany* IX (CS New Series, LIII, 1893).

⁹ Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, p. 61; Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 170-1; and Wall, *Power and Protest*, p. 46.

¹⁰ MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, p. 233; Gunn, *Early Tudor Government*, p. 100; Wall, *Power and Protest*, p. 46; and Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2, p. 10.

prestigious; dismissal was correspondingly dishonorable.¹¹ There is also evidence that the Lord Chancellor and the council accordingly employed a measure of control over the commissions of the peace, and exercised care with regards to personnel.¹² Although the dearth of evidence makes it difficult to be certain, it appears that commission makeup was not static. Historians generally believe that JPs, once appointed, remained on the bench until death or retirement.¹³ However, the extant evidence strongly suggests that tenure in office was frequently interrupted, at least during the mid-Tudor period.¹⁴

This study will attempt to answer to what extent policy changes promulgated by the central administration affected the selection of JPs. The data support the contention that trends in appointments to and dismissals from commissions of the peace can be correlated with significant administrative, political, and religious changes at the center. The most obvious upheavals occurred almost concurrently with the accession of a new monarch.¹⁵ Despite overall upward trend in numbers of JPs through the whole of the sixteenth century, there was a steady decline of numbers of men appointed to commissions between 1547 and 1562, as Table 2-1 shows.

Table 2-1. Total number of men commissioned, by date and by monarch.

Edward 26 May 1547^a	Mary 18 February 1554^b	Elizabeth 11 February 1562^c
1,585	1,221	1,153

^a CPR, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92.

^b CPR, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

^c CPR, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

¹¹ Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, pp. 61-73; and Elton, *England Under the Tudors*, p. 60.

¹² Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, p. 76; and Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2, p. 5.

¹³ Hassell Smith, "The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace, 1554-1564: A Reconsideration," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 22 (1977), p. 304.

¹⁴ Wall, *Power and Protest*, especially pp. 43-55, and *passim*. Oddly, Zell, in "Early Tudor JPs at Work," p. 126, still maintained that JPs held their offices until death or resignation, despite his own figures for Kent.

¹⁵ Wall, *Power and Protest*, p. 48, observed that "A new monarch, or a new minister, changes in policy and the shifting religious requirements of the Tudor reformations all led to alterations in the counties as at the centre. Some wholesale purges occurred, with many justices dismissed at once."

The greatest decline in the number of men commissioned took place between the reigns of Edward and Mary. Fully three hundred sixty-four appointments to commissions of the peace made in 1547 were not made again in 1554, a decrease of almost twenty-three percent. However, that percentage decrease cannot be attributed entirely to the change of power between Edward and Mary. There are three additional factors that must be considered: the power struggle between Protector Somerset and the Duke of Northumberland; natural mortality; and the unavailability of data. Each will be considered in turn below.

A power struggle between Edward VI's advisors preceded Mary's accession; indeed, Elton saw the "revival of faction" as an indicator of poor governance under the young king.¹⁶ That power struggle pitted two of Edward VI's uncles against one another: Edward Seymour, Lord Protector Somerset, and John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland. Somerset lost; in 1552, under Northumberland's administration, Somerset was charged with and executed for treason.¹⁷ This is significant to calculating the number of appointments to commissions of the peace because Somerset and two other nobles, John lord Russell and William lord Paulet, each held *ex officio* appointments to every commission of the peace in England. Given that Somerset was executed, it seems rather ingenuous to say that he lost his appointments to commissions of the peace as well. Nonetheless, Somerset's blanket appointments must be subtracted from the initial figure, as Mary's administration was not responsible for Somerset's fall. Both Russell and Paulet survived the transition of power between Somerset and Northumberland. Russell was the only one of five Henrician advisers who "emerged unscathed from the infighting of mid-

¹⁶ Elton, *England Under the Tudors*. "Edward VI and the Revival of Faction" is subchapter heading 2 in Chapter 8, "The Crisis of the Tudors, 1540-58."

century politics;”¹⁸ he died in 1555. Paulet’s career flourished under Northumberland, Mary, and Elizabeth;¹⁹ he was Lord Treasurer until his death in 1572,²⁰ and as the marquess of Winchester, regained many of his honorary appointments under Elizabeth.²¹ This creates an intriguing problem: Paulet’s and Russel’s continued political successes, combined with the lack of extant data, makes it difficult to ascertain whether they kept their blanket appointments under Northumberland or whether they were dismissed by the Marian administration. This is significant, because the blanket appointments of Somerset, Russell, and Paulet account for fully one-third of the three hundred sixty-four appointments that were not made again under Mary. Additionally, without supplementary data, it is impossible to tell whether Northumberland made any alterations to the commissions of the peace. The choice, then, is whether to err by ascribing too much or too little responsibility for dismissals from commissions under Mary. Until more data become available, the best choice is to err on the side of caution, and to assume both that Paulet and Russell were dismissed from the commissions during Edward VI’s reign, and that Northumberland did not make extensive alterations to commissions of the peace outside of the *ex officio* appointments of Somerset, Russell, and Paulet. Therefore, the numbers of men appointed to commissions of the peace under Edward must be modified downward before they can be compared to the Marian data.

The second problem in reckoning the numbers of men who were appointed to commissions of the peace is that of natural mortality. Men died in the seven years from

¹⁷ Penry Williams, *The Tudor Regime* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 434.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 343.

¹⁹ Elton, *England Under the Tudors*, p. 209, footnote 1.

²⁰ Sybil Jack, “The Exchequer,” in R. H. Fritze, ed., *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England, 1485-1603* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), p. 190.

²¹ For Paulet’s appointments to commissions of the peace under Elizabeth, see *CPR*, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

1547 and 1554, the dates from the surviving lists of commissions of the peace.

Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive record of those who died during that period.

Working from the local studies that cover the time period, a minimum number of twenty-seven men died between the dates of the surviving commissions in 1547 and 1554, three from Hertfordshire, eleven from Suffolk, and eight from Norfolk and five from Cambridgeshire.²² Without the pipe rolls or other sources, it is not possible to know whether these men were replaced on the bench, and whether Mary's administration kept any replacements. Also, with such a small data sample it is not possible to extrapolate possible mortality figures for the whole of England. Thus, at this stage only the twenty-seven men can be subtracted.

The third factor that must be considered is that data is extant for Cheshire in 1547 but not after. This gives the 1547 data a false positive value. The forty-four men appointed to the Cheshire commission of the peace must therefore also be subtracted. Table 2-2 below shows the corrected figure; all calculations from this point will be made using the corrected figure.²³

Table 2-2. Number of men who received commissions in 1547 (uncorrected), 1547 (corrected) and 1554, with percentage of decrease.

1547 (uncorrected)^a	1547 (corrected)^b	1554^c	Percentage decrease from 1547 to 1554
1,585	1,393	1,221	12.34

a. CPR, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92.

b. Minus the number of men who lost appointments to commissions through death or dismissal.

c. CPR, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

²² For Hertfordshire, see Jeffrey R. Hankins, "Tudor Local Government and Administration in the County of Hertfordshire, circa 1520-1580," Appendix 1, Master's thesis, Southwest Texas State University (1998); for Suffolk and Norfolk see MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, Appendix I; and for Cambridgeshire, see Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Appendix 1. Although I am unable to find a reference to an epidemic, 1549 seems to have been a particularly bad year: seven of the nineteen (two from Hertfordshire and five from Suffolk) died that year.

²³ The raw data is drawn from the CPRs, but a summary can be found in Appendix 1: Careers of Individual JPs.

As Table 2-2 shows, there was a dramatic decrease in the numbers of men appointed to the commissions of the peace between the beginning of Edward's reign and near the beginning of Mary's, even with the revised figures. Nationwide, just over twelve and one third percent of the men who were JPs under Edward did not serve again under Mary. As will be discussed in the next chapter, twelve percent is not a consistent figure for each county: some counties saw a higher rate of decrease, some a lower rate.

Nonetheless, the nationwide decrease is large enough to suggest a wider purge. Local data seem to support that conclusion. Twenty-two JPs were dismissed from the Suffolk commission and eighteen from the Norfolk commission under Mary. Both counties lost sixteen men in 1553 alone, and the remainder the following year.²⁴ In Cambridgeshire, the number of men on the bench fell from twenty-six in 1547 to eighteen in 1554.²⁵ In Kent,²⁶ the number of JPs fell from forty-seven to thirty-seven, and in Surrey, the number fell from thirty-two to twenty.²⁷ The motivation for these dismissals is discussed briefly below, and in more detail in the following chapter.

The Suffolk and Norfolk benches underwent a "systematic remodeling" in 1553 that was both politically and religiously motivated.²⁸ After Edward VI's death in 1553, the duke of Northumberland had abortively attempted to place his own daughter-in-law, Lady Jane Grey, on the throne; after her accession Mary restored Catholicism as the state

²⁴ MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, Appendix III, p. 416. One man, Edward Grimston, who was dismissed from the Suffolk commission in 1554, was apparently re-appointed in the intervening years, as he was dismissed a second time under Mary in 1558.

²⁵ Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2, p. 6.

²⁶ Zell, "Early Tudor JPs at Work," p. 127.

²⁷ William Robison, "The National and Local Significance of Wyatt's Rebellion in Surrey," *Historical Journal* 30, 4 (1987): p. 773.

²⁸ MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, pp. 231-232.

religion.²⁹ The majority of JPs dismissed from the Suffolk, Norfolk, and Cambridgeshire benches were either supporters of Northumberland or Edwardian appointees who were religiously questionable. Eleven of the sixteen Suffolk JPs and twelve of the sixteen Norfolk JPs were either or both, and seven of the eight dismissed Cambridgeshire JPs were initially appointed under Edward.³⁰ The ten JPs in Kent were dismissed slightly later, in 1554, following a second abortive coup attempt, Wyatt's Rebellion.³¹ The Surrey JPs were apparently dismissed between the two coup attempts; of the twelve dismissed JPs, nine were either Protestant or supporters of Northumberland.³²

Further evidence of a nationwide purge is revealed by closer examination of individual JPs. As this analysis of the data shows, of the 982 JPs in 1547, fully 451, or forty-six percent, served only under Edward; they were not again appointed to commissions of the peace under either Mary or Elizabeth. This emphasizes the importance of differentiating between the numbers of men appointed to commissions of the peace and the actual persons who were appointed. Although the relative size of commissions may have decreased only slightly, commission size does not necessarily reflect the makeup of the bench. The Kent commission of the peace is again instructive. Zell noted that the Kent bench "regained its former number during the remainder of Mary Tudor's reign, although the period saw a heavier than usual turnover in personnel."³³

²⁹ David Loades, "Mary I," in Fritze, *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England 1485-1603* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), pp. 327-328.

³⁰ MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, pp. 232-233.

³¹ Zell, "Early Tudor JPs at Work," p. 127.

³² Robison, "The National and Local Significance of Wyatt's Rebellion," p. 773, footnote 13. Interestingly, several of the JPs, including Thomas Cawarden, twice arrested for suspected involvement in Wyatt's Rebellion, were later re-appointed to the bench under Mary. The possible significance of this will be discussed in the next chapter.

³³ Zell, "Early Tudor JPs at Work," p. 127.

There was, however, some continuity in office, even in the face of the dramatic change in personnel circa 1553-54. Fifty-two percent of Edwardian JPs served again under Mary. Some Edwardian JPs may have been religious conservatives, who were quite acceptable to the Marian regime. Additionally, some Protestant JPs supported Mary against Northumberland or Wyatt or both, thus gaining political favor.³⁴

All of this is not to suggest, however, that Mary's regime was unusual in manipulating commissions of the peace. There was another striking, even larger, decrease in the numbers of men appointed to commission of the peace between the beginning of Mary's reign and the first few years of Elizabeth's reign.

Once again, natural mortality between the reigns must be calculated. Men died in the eight years from 1554 and 1562, the dates from the surviving lists of commissions of the peace. Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive record of those who died during that period. Working from the local studies that cover the time period, a minimum number of seventy-eight JPs died between 1554 and 1562: fifteen from Hertfordshire, twenty-eight from Suffolk, twenty-six from Norfolk, seventeen from Cambridgeshire, and an additional seven scattered across the England.³⁵ The number of deaths is considerably higher than in the interim between 1547 and 1554 because of an influenza epidemic. The epidemic began in 1555 and lasted until 1559; around 200,000 people, six percent of England's population, died as a result of the epidemic.³⁶ The great preponderance of

³⁴ For Protestant support of Mary against Northumberland, see Loades, "Mary I," in Fritze, *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England*, p. 327; for Protestant support of Mary against Wyatt, see Robison, "Wyatt's Rebellion," in Fritze, *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England*, p. 550-2.

³⁵ For Hertfordshire, see. Hankins, "Tudor Local Government," Appendix 1; for Suffolk and Norfolk (1554-59) see MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, Appendix I; for Norfolk (1560-62) see Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, Appendix 1; and for Cambridgeshire, see Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Appendix 1. For the other seven JPs, see P.W. Hasler, *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1558-1603*, HM Stationery Office, London, 1981, Vols. 1, 2, and 3, *passim*.

³⁶ Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 30-31.

deaths of JPs from 1554-1562 occurred in 1559 and 1558, respectively, suggesting that at least some of the JPs were victims of the epidemic. It also seems likely that JPs in other counties died of influenza, but without the pipe rolls or other sources, it is not possible to know how many. It cannot be determined whether these men were replaced on the bench, but they may have been, likely during 1558-1562, if not during Mary's reign. Once again, however, the most conservative course seems wisest; at this stage only the seventy-eight men can be subtracted.

Another factor that must be considered is that data is extant for Hampshire in 1554 but not after. This gives the 1554 data a false positive value. The thirty-four men appointed to the Hampshire commission of the peace must therefore also be subtracted.

Table 2-3 below shows the corrected figure.³⁷

Table 2-3. Number of men who received commissions in 1554 (uncorrected), 1554 (corrected), and 1562, with percentage of increase.

1554 (uncorrected)^a	1554 (corrected)^b	1562^c	Percentage increase from 1554 to 1562
1,221	1,109	1,153	3.81

a. *CPR*, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

b. Minus the number of men who lost appointments to commissions through death or dismissal.

c. *CPR*, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

At first glance, the figures in Table 2-3 would appear to indicate a slight increase in the appointments of JPs between 1554 and 1562. However, when actual personnel are studied, evidence of another purge emerges: of the 731 men who served as JPs in 1562, 369 of them, or forty-nine and one half percent, served only under Elizabeth. Although more JPs than are calculated for doubtless died as a result of the influenza epidemic, which nationally took six percent of the population; it cannot be reasonably extrapolated, then, that flu deaths account for the entire amount of JPs who were not re-appointed

³⁷ The raw data is drawn from the *CPRs*, but a summary can be found in Appendix 1: Careers of Individual JPs.

under Elizabeth. This pattern is consistent on the local level as well as the national level. Twenty-six men were dismissed from the commission of the peace in Suffolk between Elizabeth's accession in 1558 and the issuance of the 1562 commission rolls; twenty-eight JPs were dismissed in Norfolk.³⁸ This was apparently not atypical; Wall noted, "At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, half the justices for Norfolk were dismissed and replaced, and the same happened in Sussex and Northamptonshire certainly, and probably elsewhere."³⁹

The gross figures presented hide two concurrent phenomena: a sharp rise in the number of dignitaries, and a decrease of almost one-quarter of non-dignitaries. The numbers of dignitary JPs rose overall, from forty-two under Mary to ninety-four under Elizabeth, an increase of nearly one hundred twenty-four percent. In the absence of a known, specific policy for so greatly increasing the number of dignitary JPs, it is not possible to explain the phenomena with complete certainty. However, there are two possibilities. The increase in dignitary JPs may reflect Elizabeth's impulse for economy. Since justices of the peace were not remunerated, and since being a JP was an honor, the rise in *ex officio* appointments may mean that Elizabeth regarded them as an inexpensive gift. This is consistent with Elizabeth's well-documented frugality. Guy noted, "Although Elizabeth was not ungenerous with her friends, especially during the 1560s, she gave little land away."⁴⁰ The second possibility is that Elizabeth and her council may have been less comfortable with scores of non-dignitary JPs who harbored Catholic sympathies at a time when religious policy was being somewhat reversed. This possibility appears to be supported by the turnover among high-ranking members of the

³⁸ MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, Appendix III, pp. 416-417.

³⁹ Wall, *Power and Protest*, p. 49.

clergy. Of the eleven bishops and archbishops who were appointed to commissions of the peace in 1562, five replaced prior occupants of the sees, and four held posts not given in 1554. Only one man appears to have retained his position and been named a JP.⁴¹ The Christian name of the bishop of Carlisle in 1554 is illegible in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, so whether John, the bishop of Carlisle in 1562, was a replacement or kept his position is unclear. This turnover correlates to the massive change in episcopal appointments that occurred during 1559-61, when Elizabeth had to appoint twenty-five (of twenty-six) new bishops and archbishops.⁴²

In contrast to the rise in numbers of dignitaries, the numbers of non-dignitaries dropped in 1562 by almost a quarter. This drop, however, is likely the result of administrative policy developed by Elizabeth's principal secretary, William Cecil. Cecil was apparently unimpressed with the majority of the non-dignitary JPs, and felt that they were more a hindrance to good government than a help.⁴³ The center's sustained efforts to restrict appointments to commissions of the peace and to reduce the size of local government began in 1562.⁴⁴ Despite Cecil's efforts, however, the numbers of non-dignitary JPs continued to creep upward.⁴⁵ This will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter for the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, Surrey, and Kent.

⁴⁰ Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 380.

⁴¹ William, bishop of Exeter, replaced John; Edwin/Edmund, bishop of Worcester, replaced Nicholas; Edmund, bishop of Peterborough, replaced John; Thomas, bishop of St. Asaph, replaced Robert; and James, bishop of Durham, replaced Cuthbert. The new JPs John, bishop of Hereford; Matthew, archbishop of Canterbury; Gilbert, bishop of Bath and Wells; and Thomas, archbishop of York. The man who apparently stayed in place was Edmund, bishop of London. *CPR*, Elizabeth [a], 4 Elizabeth Part X, Volume 2, *passim*, and Bateson, "A Collection of Original Letters," *passim*.

⁴² Elton, *England Under the Tudors*, pp. 275-276.

⁴³ Smith, *County and Court*, p. 51 and especially p. 78.

⁴⁴ Wall, *Power and Protest*, p. 48.

⁴⁵ Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 386.

Continuing with the national survey to 1569, we find that the number of justices of the peace appear to have fallen significantly; only 602 justices of the peace are found in the patent rolls on 4 November 1569 (see Table 2-4 below).

Table 2-4. Numbers of men commissioned early in Elizabeth's reign.

Elizabeth 11 February 1562^a	Elizabeth 4 November 1569^b
1,153	602

a. *CPR*, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

b. *CPR*, Elizabeth [b], Volume 5: 13 Elizabeth Part III, pp. 222-226.

However, this number is deceptively low, because of deficiencies in the evidence. Data is not extant for seventeen counties, and dignitaries were not included on the lists, although Hassell Smith believed that, at least for the counties he studied, it was likely that dignitaries retained their positions.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, an analysis can be made by comparing 1562 data from only those counties for which data is extant in 1569, and by including only the figures for non-dignitaries.

Table 2-5: Number justices of the peace (non-dignitaries only) on the commissions in 1562 (adjusted), and 1569.

Elizabeth 1562^a	Elizabeth 1569^b
405	602

a. *CPR*, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444, less the seventeen counties for which there is no data extant in 1569.

b. *CPR*, Elizabeth [b], Volume 5: 13 Elizabeth Part III, pp. 222-226.

As Table 2-5 shows, by 1569 there was a marked increase in the number of non-dignitary JPs appointed to commissions of the peace. This is due at least in part to the difficulty Cecil faced in limiting the number of justices on the various benches.⁴⁷ It is also possible that the higher figure reflects greater confidence on the part of Elizabeth and her council in the religious soundness of the local men. On 17 October 1564, the Privy

⁴⁶ Hassell-Smith, "The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace," p. 304, footnote 8: "In a study of justices during Elizabeth's reign I have found no case of a nobleman, once appointed to a commission of the peace, being removed before his death."

⁴⁷ Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 386.

Council sent letters to all the bishops in England, asking them to report whether local JPs in their dioceses were religiously trustworthy.⁴⁸ By 1569, many JPs noted as “adversaries” or “hinderers” remained in office; many but not all signed the Act of Supremacy, which restored Protestantism.⁴⁹ The proportion of religious conservatives who remained on commissions of the peace during Elizabeth’s reign will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter.

The mid-Tudor years, particularly from 1554 through 1562, stand in sharp contrast to the rest of the sixteenth century. The years from 1547 through 1558 saw three quick changes in monarchs, in contrast to the long rules that bracket those years. Further, and also in contrast to the rest of the sixteenth century, commission membership declined steadily. The greatest downward trends are concurrent with the accession of a new monarch in both 1554 and 1558. Further, the changes in administrative, political, and religious policy promulgated by successive administrations strongly suggest that these downward trends were deliberate purges initiated by the center. This should not be surprising; the power that justices of the peace had steadily accrued over the past few centuries meant that in order for the center to control the localities, it was necessary to control the commissions of the peace. At this stage, it is difficult to make any definitive statement about whether the mid-Tudor period is best characterized by polity, as Loades argued, or by disruption and discontinuity, as Elton contended. Paradoxically, there is strong evidence for both arguments. The next chapter will examine, on the local level, the extent to which the policies disseminated by the central administration affected commissions membership and makeup.

⁴⁸ The bishops’ replies are the letters collected and edited by Bateson in *Camden Miscellany*.

⁴⁹ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” p. iv.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS: COMMISSIONS OF THE PEACE AND THEIR RELATION TO THE CENTER AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

In the previous chapter, patterns and trends in appointments to and dismissals from commissions of the peace in mid-Tudor England were examined on the national level. Overall, it was determined that the mid-Tudor years, particularly from 1553-54 through 1562, stand in sharp contrast to the rest of the sixteenth century. Three monarchs reigned in quick succession; in particular, the brief reigns of Edward VI and Mary stand in sharp contrast to the long reigns of the other Tudor monarchs. Simultaneously, commission membership declined steadily nationwide; this is also dissimilar to the rest of the sixteenth century. The greatest downward trends were concurrent with the accession of new monarchs in both 1553 and 1558, and appear to be deliberate purges initiated by the central administration. This chapter will examine, on the local level, the extent to which the policies disseminated by the central administration affected commissions membership and makeup. Six counties will be examined in detail: Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire (all East Anglian counties), Hertfordshire, Kent, and Surrey. Original interpretations of the data from the patent rolls and the bishops' letters to the Privy Council will be supplemented by local studies. Further, specific mortality statistics will be incorporated in an effort to determine whether reductions in commission size or differences in commission personnel were the result of manipulation by the center or from disease, and to what extent. It must also be noted that, beginning in 1562, Elizabeth's principal secretary, William Cecil, made a determined effort to reduce the

size of commissions of the peace nationwide. At least in part, this administrative effort was done to better control the local elites and to root out the storied corruption of the benches.¹ This policy, however, was within a few years unsuccessful, and the size of the commissions began steadily to rise again.² Finally, in 1564 the Privy Council (which was, in concert with the Lord Chancellor, technically responsible for the selection of JPs),³ sent a letter to the bishops in England requesting that they report on the religious leanings and activities of the JPs in their dioceses. The bishops all responded, but not with anything approaching uniformity of system or method.⁴ Some men, such as Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, refused to list the religious affiliations of the men in his diocese, for reasons that will be considered later in the discussion. Others, such as John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, made only a few entries rather than a full catalogue; further, Parkhurst took the additional step of separating himself from the accuracy of the report he made. This too will be examined in closer detail. In short, the bishops' letters are of uneven reliability; some men were thorough, others were not. Thus, the data for each county must be considered independently, and the evidence judged as trustworthy, representative, or useful separately from all the others. The bishops' letters, of course, comprise only a small part of the data; the balance of the information comes from central sources such as the patent rolls.

Analyzing commission personnel and personnel changes demands differentiating the men who actively governed locally from others who served in honorific or *ex officio*

¹ Alison Wall, *Power and Protest in England, 1525-1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 48.

² John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 386.

³ A. Hassell Smith, *County and Court: Government and Politics in Norfolk 1558-1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), p. 61; Guy, *Tudor England*, p. 170-1; and Wall, *Power and Protest*, p. 46.

⁴ The bishops' responses have been collected in Mary Bateson (ed.), "A Collection of Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council, 1564," *Camden Miscellany* IX (CS New Series, LIII, 1893).

capacities. It also necessitates identifying known policies about JP selection followed by the central administration. Distinctions between JPs are made below; the center's policies on the selection of JPs will be addressed chronologically within the text.

Following Zell and Bourgeois, two categories of JPs are employed to make this distinction more clearly: non-dignitaries and dignitaries. The second category is divided further between those who received merely honorific appointments and active JPs.⁵ Non-dignitaries were frequently appointed to commissions of the peace in only a single county, that of their primary residence. Nevertheless, some sat on adjacent counties' benches, or where they had a meaningful landed presence.⁶ Thus they were local men, and although most were untitled or held a rank no higher than knight, frequently they had a degree of local influence or prestige.⁷ It was these men on whom the actual burden of work fell.⁸

As mentioned above, dignitaries are best divided into two subcategories. Some men received *ex officio* appointments; members of the peerage, highly placed administrators, clerics, and law officers such as serjeants-at-law were often appointed to commissions of the peace as a matter of form, obligation, or prestige. They did not necessarily reside or even have landed or other interests in the counties to which they were appointed; indeed, some men received 'blanket' appointments to every county in

⁵ See M. L. Zell, "Early Tudor JPs at Work," *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 93 (1977): p. 130-131, and Eugene J. Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire: Continuity and Stability in County Government* (Unpublished manuscript), Chapter 2, pp. 1-3.

⁶ See MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500-1600* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 10-12, for a discussion of intercommissioning.

⁷ See A. Hassell Smith, *County and Court: Government and Politics in Norfolk, 1558-1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), pp. 71-73, for a discussion of the importance of appointments and placement in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* (and hence on the bench) to local prestige.

⁸ See Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2, p. 3; Smith, *County and Court*, p. 48; Lander, *English Justices of the Peace, 1461-1509* (Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1989), p. 20; and Robison,

England.⁹ These men commonly had little local influence and infrequently if ever attended quarter sessions in a county where they did not reside. However, Lander suggested that the appointment of *ex officio* JPs nonetheless had significance to local JPs, both dignitary and non-dignitary: *ex officio* officeholders were the central government's representatives in the localities.¹⁰ The other subcategory of dignitaries is comprised of working dignitaries. Their appointments were not merely honorary, and in some respects they had more in common with their non-dignitary opposite numbers than with men whose appointments were purely *ex officio*. Working dignitaries were members of the peerage and other high-ranking men who were appointed to commissions of the peace in their home counties and who were deeply involved in the process. Like their non-dignitary counterparts, they often had a degree of local prestige and influence. Some of these men were appointed to more than one commission of the peace, but multiple appointments do not necessarily imply that some of the appointments were *ex officio*. Lord North, for example, had both great influence and residences in two counties: Cambridgeshire and in West Suffolk. It cannot be maintained that either of his appointments was merely honorary, but he concentrated his efforts in Cambridgeshire.¹¹

"Justices of the Peace," in Ronald H. Fritze, ed., *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England 1485-1603* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), p. 282, for evidence relating to the distribution of actual work.

⁹ See, for an example, the appointments of Protector Somerset and others in the *CPR*, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92; and of Nicholas Bacon in *CPR*, *CPR*, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

¹⁰ Lander, in *English Justices of the Peace*, p. 32, wrote, "An occasional aristocratic descent – or the threat of it – may well have helped to keep the local establishments in line."

¹¹ See MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, p. 239-40; Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2, pp. 3, 17.

Norfolk

The pattern of appointments to and dismissals from commissions of the peace in mid-Tudor Norfolk mimics the national trend. The numbers of men on the bench fluctuated, sometimes sharply, and usually concurrently with the accession of a new monarch. Moreover, actual turnover in personnel was sometimes even greater than the numbers alone would suggest, which indicates that thorough-going purges and reconstructions were used as a deliberate means of controlling specific localities.

As can be seen in Table 3-1, there was a sharp reduction in the numbers of men on the Norfolk bench between 1547 and 1554: twenty percent, or just over one and a half times the national average for this period. The percentage of turnover in personnel is more than double that rate.

Table 3-1. Numbers of Norfolk JPs in 1547(uncorrected), 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1547 ^a (uncorrected)	1547 (corrected)	1554 ^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel ^c
54	44 ¹²	35	20	43

a. CPR, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92.

b. CPR, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

c. Between 1547 (corrected) and 1554.

Natural mortality played a part in lowering the numbers of Edwardian appointees on the bench between 1547 and 1554. In addition to Protector Somerset, John Lord Russell, and William Lord Paulet, who lost their blanket appointments to the commissions of the peace as a result of the power struggle between the Dukes of Somerset and Northumberland, seven more men are confirmed to have died, for a

¹² There were fifty-four JPs appointed to the Norfolk bench in 1547. For purposes of calculation, however, it must be remembered that Protector Somerset, John lord Russell, and William lord Paulet all lost their blanket appointments to commissions of the peace during Edward's reign, as is discussed above. Another seven men died in the interim: Edmund Grey, 1548; Richard Gresham, 1549; Thomas Paston, 1550; Edmund Knyvet, John Heydon, 1551; Francis Lovell, 1552; and Edmund Bedingfield and Roger Townshend, 1553. An additional five JPs appointed after 1547 (and so not in the calculation) also died

reduction of about nineteen percent. Mary reduced the bench even further, to thirty-five men. However, turnover in personnel was higher than the numbers suggest. Of the forty-four Edwardian JPs who were still alive and eligible to serve, nineteen were not re-appointed in 1554, a reduction of forty-three percent. This decrease must have been administratively initiated, and essentially amounts to a purge. Nonetheless, there was continuity between the reigns. Twenty-one men Edwardian JPs served again in 1554, and those twenty-one make up the majority of the Marian bench. Only fourteen new men were appointed to the Norfolk bench, five of whom served under Elizabeth as well.¹³

In order to calculate the differences between the Marian and Elizabethan regimes, it is necessary to once again establish the number of men on the Marian bench whose dismissal from the commission of the peace cannot be attributed to Elizabeth's administration. It is more difficult for this period, principally because of an influenza epidemic which raged through England between 1555 and 1559, peaking in 1558-9. The epidemic killed some 200,000 people, about 6 percent of the English population.¹⁴ Norfolk was hit hard by the epidemic. Twelve Marian JPs died between 1555 and 1559, most likely from the flu.¹⁵ Other men were undoubtedly appointed to replace those who died, and a few more besides: Hassell Smith figured that there were forty-two JPs on the Norfolk bench by the end of Mary's reign, of whom nearly half were dismissed in 1558-59 at Elizabeth's accession, although the overall number of JPs on the bench dropped only to thirty-five.¹⁶ This pattern of limited reduction overall in concert with high

during this period. MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500-1600* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 395-413.

¹³ See Appendix 3: Careers of JPs by Reign.

¹⁴ Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 30-1.

¹⁵ Another seven men who had been JPs under Edward but not under Mary also died during this period.

¹⁶ A. Hassell Smith, "The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace, 1554-1564: A Reconsideration," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 22 (1977): p. 306.

turnover in actual personnel is also indicative of a purge, one more likely based on political associations than on religious affiliation. However, this is difficult to determine, partly because of the overall religious conservatism of the Norfolk elite and partly because of fractious local politics, which will be discussed below. Another sharp drop occurred in 1562, when the number of men on the Norfolk bench fell to twenty-four.¹⁷ In this case, however, the reductions are most likely due to administrative policy – that is, Cecil’s efforts to control size of commissions of the peace.

Another factor makes it difficult to determine the extent to which national policy played a part in shaping the makeup of the Norfolk bench. As Hassell Smith demonstrated, county politics in Norfolk were fractious, a matter of personal animosity and “private quarrels.”¹⁸ Although the majority of Hassell Smith’s examples of politically directed dismissals occurred in the middle Elizabethan period, and thus technically out of the range of this study, the beginnings of conflict can be found in the mid-Tudor period, as can be seen in the example below.

Thomas Howard, (fourth) Duke of Norfolk, was one of the leading men in the county, and after Elizabeth’s accession controlled as much as possible the commissions of the peace in Norfolk. He was close to the peak of his local influence in 1564, even “pack[ing] the Norfolk Bench with his clients,” although he was not able to maintain a monopoly over patronage.¹⁹ It is hardly surprising, then, that Norfolk was one of the men

¹⁷ *CPR*, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

¹⁸ Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, p. 181. The title of Chapter IX is “Private Quarrels and County Government.”

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 32-3.

consulted by the Bishop of Norwich when the Bishop was asked by the Privy Council to report on the religious affiliations of JPs.²⁰

But county politics were so muddy that John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, took the extraordinary step in his letter of 17 November 1564 to the Privy Council of separating himself from the opinion of the local dignitaries whom he consulted. The Bishop of Norwich listed four men, based on the advice of Norfolk and the others, as religiously suspect: Sir Thomas Lovell, Sir Thomas Tyndall, Edmund Beaupre, and “Mr. Gybon of Lynne.”²¹ The Lovells were political rivals of Norfolk’s, and the family saw its fortunes increase, albeit not without strife, after the Duke’s execution in 1572.²² Norwich appears to have been aware of the rivalry: of Lovell and the others, he wrote that although they were “not thought by common fame to be so well bent as the other, yet I assure your honours, I know not of my part nor yet can lerne by anie probable meane, of anie fact that anie of them are to be charged with, and so leve it to your honourable consideracions.” He also appears to have resisted any politicking the Duke may have done on behalf of his clients, reporting that the number of JPs already on the bench was “sufficient for this Shire.”²³ Hassell Smith believed that the failure of Parkhurst, a zealous Protestant, to recommend that the religiously conservative members of the bench be removed was because most of them were associated with the Duke, and that “the Duke’s dictates mattered more than Protestant principles.”²⁴ But MacCulloch characterizes

²⁰ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” pp. 58-9. The other five men were: Sir Edmund Windham, Sir Christopher Heydon, Sir William Buttes, Sir Thomas Woodhouse, and Sir Nicholas (Le)Strange.

²¹ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” p. 58.

²² Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, pp. 182-192.

²³ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” pp. 58-9.

²⁴ Hassell Smith, *County and Court*. The full discussion is on pp. 34-5; the quote is from p. 35. Oddly, Hassell Smith says that Parkhurst “alone” (p. 35) failed to disclose the religious affiliations of the JPs in his diocese, but Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, also balked, as will be discussed in greater detail below. Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” p. 81.

Parkhurst as “a hopeless administrator and a poor judge of subordinates” who “for many years would allow himself to be hamstrung by the local political situation... in his diocese.”²⁵ Given the combination of the Duke’s power and the Bishop’s poor administrative skills, it seems more remarkable that Parkhurst distanced himself from the Duke’s recommendations than that he included them.

Despite the murkiness of local politics, a few patterns are still discernable. The exclusion of Marian JPs at the expense of Elizabethan appointees increased further still. There were by 1564 twenty-seven men on the Norfolk bench. Of these, ten were Marian appointees. Another thirteen Marian JPs were still alive and still eligible to sit on the bench, but were excluded.²⁶ The other seventeen men on the bench were Elizabethan appointees. Hassell Smith believed that the Marian JPs removed during this era were dismissed for religious reasons, and that the “changes in the personnel of the commission of the peace in the early years of Elizabeth’s reign... were of sufficient magnitude to warrant the use of the word ‘purge’ to describe them.”²⁷ This is a direct contradiction of J. H. Gleason, who believed that removal from and restoration to the bench was merely typical, and not indicative of purges or manipulation by the center.²⁸

It is rather more difficult to reckon changes to the bench between 1564 and 1569. This is due to an unfortunate dearth of data. Thirteen men are confirmed to have died in this time span, in numbers limited enough to suggest that all the deaths were from natural mortality: there are no distinct clusters that would suggest either a plague or a series of

²⁵ MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, pp. 184-5. The diocese of Norwich encompassed both Norfolk and Suffolk.

²⁶ Hassell Smith, “A Reconsideration,” p. 311. Hassell Smith notes in footnote 41 on that page that the figures for the 1564 bench are taken from P. R. O., C. 66/998.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 311-12.

²⁸ J. H. Gleason, “The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace, 1554-1564,” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 18 (1955): pp. 169-177.

executions. These men were undoubtedly replaced. Hassell Smith noted that there were twenty-eight men on the bench on 1 June 1564; at the next available date for which data is extant, *circa* November 1573, there were twenty-nine men on the bench. The Duke of Norfolk had died the previous year; it is conceivable that the bench saw another reshaping as Norfolk's clients' careers waned, and their rivals' waxed. Without fuller data, this tantalizing question cannot be answered. More certain, however, is that Cecil experienced a considerable degree of success in limiting the number of men on the Norfolk bench for at least a decade.

One striking factor in all of the changes during the period 1547-1569 is that although there was drastic turnover in personnel, it does not appear to have been at the expense of the local ruling elite as a whole. Inherent in Hassell Smith's careful deconstructions of factional politics in Norfolk is the fact that the factions were made up of members of the local elites, and that as a group they were not displaced by *ex officio* officeholders or elites from other counties.²⁹

In summary, the pattern of appointments to and dismissals from the Norfolk commissions of the peace is similar to the national trend, although to a greater extreme than was played out nationally overall. Although appointments and dismissals were generally done for the same reasons locally as nationally, the attempts by various royal administrations to control the Norfolk bench were complicated by factional infighting between rival groups at the county level who attempted to influence national policy. That the factional infighting was limited to members of the local ruling elite suggests that the various royal administrations may have used the rivalries to their own advantage without having to resort to outsiders to establish a politically sound bench.

Suffolk

The pattern of appointments to and dismissals from commissions of the peace in mid-Tudor Suffolk resembles both the national trend and the trend in Norfolk (discussed above). The numbers of men on the bench fluctuated, sometimes sharply, and normally in tandem with the accession of a new monarch. However, there is at least one significant difference: the Suffolk bench apparently suffered more from natural mortality than from deliberate manipulation early in Elizabeth's reign. The comparison of Suffolk to Norfolk is a useful one: there was overlap in personnel on East Anglian commissions of the peace, most particularly Suffolk and Norfolk, and some of the same men were influential in both counties.³⁰

As can be seen in Table 3-2, there was apparently only a small increase in the numbers of men on the Suffolk bench between 1547 and 1554. There were fifty-five men on the bench at the outset of Edward's reign, and only one more at the outset of Mary's, an increase of two percent. The percentage of turnover in personnel is dramatically higher.

Table 3-2. Numbers of Suffolk JPs in 1547 (uncorrected), 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1547 ^a (uncorrected)	1547 (corrected)	1554 ^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel ^c
55	42 ³¹	56	2	52

a. *CPR*, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92.

b. *CPR*, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

c. Between 1547 (corrected) and 1554.

²⁹ Hassell Smith, *County and Court*, *passim*.

³⁰ For a thorough discussion of intercommissioning, see MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, pp. 10-13.

³¹ There were fifty-five JPs appointed to the Suffolk bench in 1547. For purposes of calculation, however, it must be remembered that Protector Somerset, John lord Russell, and William lord Paulet all lost their blanket appointments to commissions of the peace during Edward's reign, as is discussed above. Another eleven men died in the interim: Christopher Glenham, John Spring, and Walter Wadland, 1549; Robert Ashfield, 1550; Thomas Lord Burgh, Thomas Tyrrell, and Thomas Lord Wentworth, 1551; John Sone and Anthony Wingfield, 1552; and Edmund Bedingfield and Lionel Tollemache, 1553. An additional seven JPs appointed after 1547 (and so not in the calculation) also died during this period. MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, pp. 352-392.

Natural mortality played a significant part in lowering the numbers of Edwardian appointees on the bench between 1547 and 1554. In addition to Protector Somerset, John Lord Russell, and William Lord Paulet, who lost their blanket appointments to the commissions of the peace as a result of the power struggle between the Dukes of Somerset and Northumberland, eleven more men are confirmed to have died, for a reduction of about twenty-four percent. As already noted, Mary restored the bench to its previous size, to fifty-six men. However, turnover in personnel was higher than the numbers suggest. Of the forty-four Edwardian JPs who were still alive and eligible to serve, twenty-three were not re-appointed in 1554, a reduction of fifty-two percent. This decrease must have been administratively initiated, and essentially amounts to a purge. Consequently, continuity between the reigns was more limited than in Norfolk. Twenty-one men Edwardian JPs served again in 1554, although those twenty-one were vastly outnumbered bench by Marian appointees. Thirty-five new men were appointed to the Suffolk bench, nine of whom served under Elizabeth as well. But, as in Norfolk, the Marian administration apparently purged the bench and staffed it with men deemed trustworthy.

In order to calculate the differences between the Marian and Elizabethan regimes, it is necessary to once again establish the number of men on the Marian bench whose dismissal from the commission of the peace cannot be attributed to Elizabeth's administration. It is more difficult for this period, principally because of the influenza epidemic that hit Suffolk was as hard as Norfolk: there, too, twelve Marian JPs died between 1555 and 1559, most likely from the flu.³² Another five Marian JPs died

³² Another nine men who had been JPs under Edward but not under Mary also died during this period.

between 1560 and the publication of the commission dated 1562.³³ As can be seen in Table 3-3, the deaths of those seventeen Marian JPs left thirty-nine men on the bench in 1562.

Table 3-3. Numbers of Suffolk JPs in 1554 (uncorrected), 1554 (corrected) and 1562 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1554 ^a (uncorrected)	1554 (corrected)	1562 ^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel ^c
56	39	39	0	54

a. CPR, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

b. CPR, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

c. Between 1554 (corrected) and 1562.

The natural reduction men on the Suffolk bench may have coincidentally corresponded with Cecil's nationwide campaign to lower the numbers of men on the commissions of the peace. At any rate, Elizabeth's administration apparently made no attempt to further lower the number or otherwise adjust the number of men on the bench. However, there was apparently a massive turnover in personnel. Only eighteen JPs who served under Mary served under Elizabeth in 1562, half of whom had first been appointed under Edward. This is a reduction of fifty-four percent. This number is dramatic enough to suggest a purge. The reasons for a purge may have been as much political as religious: Mary had personal estates a loyal following in East Anglia,³⁴ and as a result Elizabethan officials may have wanted to seat men they deemed more trustworthy on the bench.

Another similarity between the Suffolk and Norfolk benches is the effect, or near lack thereof, of the local bishop's report to the Privy Council on the religious affiliations

³³ The causes of death of these men are uncertain, but it may have been a local resurgence of the epidemic. Another three men who had been JPs under Edward but not under Mary also died during this period. See Appendix 2: Careers of Individual JPs by County, which includes dates of death where known.

³⁴ David Loades, "Mary I," in Fritze, *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England 1485-1603* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), p. 327.

of Suffolk JPs.³⁵ The diocese of John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, encompassed Suffolk as well as Norfolk, and Suffolk endured an even more complex and fractious local political scene.³⁶ Parkhurst dealt with the situation in Suffolk much as he did in Norfolk. He listed only two men who were “not so well bent unto the advancement of the godlie proceedings of this Realme in cawses ecclesiasticall as other Justices of that Shire be;”³⁷ one of them, Sir Clement Higham, remained on the bench apparently until his death in 1570,³⁸ suggesting that the central administration placed little faith in Parkhurst’s evaluations. This is not too surprising, since Parkhurst listed only another six men as suspect but distanced himself from the veracity of the reports. Further, MacCulloch reported that by as early as 1561, Cecil was well aware of Parkhurst’s limitations as an administrator.³⁹ It is conceivable that Cecil placed limited trust in Parkhurst’s reports.

It is rather more difficult to reckon changes to the bench between 1564 and 1569. This is due to an unfortunate dearth of data. Nine men are confirmed to have died in this time span, in numbers limited enough to suggest that all the deaths were from natural mortality: there are no distinct clusters that would suggest either a plague or a series of executions. These men were undoubtedly replaced. MacCulloch noted that there were forty-five men on the bench in June 1564, suggesting that even at that early date, Cecil was having difficulty limiting the number of men on the Suffolk bench. The next date for

³⁵ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” pp. 47-8.

³⁶ MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, p. 95.

³⁷ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” p. 48.

³⁸ MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, Appendix I, p. 381.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

which data is extant, December 1569, MacCulloch estimated that there were forty-one men on the bench.⁴⁰

One striking factor in all of the changes during the period 1547-1569 is that although there was drastic turnover in personnel, it does not appear to have been at the expense of the local ruling elite as a whole. Inherent in MacCulloch's deconstruction of factional politics in Suffolk is the fact that the factions were made up of members of the local elites, and that as a group they were not displaced by *ex officio* officeholders or elites from other counties.⁴¹

In summary, the pattern of appointments to and dismissals from the Suffolk commissions of the peace is similar to both the national trend and the trend for the Norfolk bench, at least for the period 1547-1554. Appointments and dismissals appear to have been made for the same reasons in Suffolk as in Norfolk and nationally during this time. However, the reduction in numbers of JPs on the Suffolk bench between 1554 and 1562 appear to be largely the result of natural mortality, an occurrence that was accepted by the central administration, although they significantly altered the makeup of the bench if not its size. There appears to have been relatively little change in the remaining makeup of the bench, possibly because of a stalemate in local factional politics.

⁴⁰ MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, p. 390.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

Cambridgeshire

Although also an East Anglian county, Cambridgeshire was notably different from Norfolk and Suffolk. While those two counties were both characterized by bitter factional infighting, Cambridgeshire remained free from similar quarrels. Instead, Cambridgeshire's ruling elite were a tightly-knit group bonded by kinship connections that transcended religious differences.⁴²

In some respects, Cambridgeshire was quite typical of mid-Tudor counties. The overall numbers of JPs grew nationally over the course of the century, with brief reversals at Mary's accession and again during the early years of Elizabeth's reign.⁴³ Cambridgeshire followed this pattern.⁴⁴

Table 3-4. Numbers of Cambridgeshire JPs in 1547 (uncorrected), 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1547^a (uncorrected)	1547 (corrected)	1554^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel^c
31	23	18	22	

a. CPR, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92.

b. CPR, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

c. Between 1547 (corrected) and 1554.

At first glance, the Edwardian bench appears to have suffered a severe reduction under Mary's administration. However, natural mortality played a part in lowering the numbers of Edwardian appointees on the bench between 1547 and 1554. In addition to Protector Somerset, John Lord Russell, and William Lord Paulet, who lost their blanket appointments to the commissions of the peace as a result of the power struggle between

⁴² For factionalism in Norfolk, see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, *passim*, and Hassel Smith, *County and Court*, *passim*. For Suffolk, see MacCulloch, *Suffolk and the Tudors*, *passim*. For a discussion of the relative harmony in Cambridgeshire, see Eugene J. Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapters 2 and 4, *passim*.

⁴³ Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2., p. 3.

⁴⁴ There were thirty-one men appointed to the bench in 1547 (CPR, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92), eighteen in 1554 (CPR, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26), thirty-one again in 1558 (Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2, page 8), and nineteen in 1562 (CPR, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.).

the Dukes of Somerset and Northumberland, five more men are confirmed to have died before Mary's accession.⁴⁵ Mary reduced the number of men on the bench even further, by five men, or almost twenty-two percent. This figure is more than one and a half times the national figure for this period, twelve and one half percent. Further, "new men found places on the bench" despite the reductions in personnel.⁴⁶ This suggests that even in religiously conservative Cambridgeshire, Marian officials felt the need to consolidate power by manipulating the makeup of the personnel on the bench. As Bourgeois demonstrated, however, this consolidation of power was not done at the expense of local men, which speaks to the depth of the local pool from which JPs could be drawn.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, the dramatic decrease in personnel and corresponding appointments of new men to the bench is strongly suggestive of a purge; at the very least, it indicates that the government acted with planning and forethought.

By 1558, the numbers of men appointed to the Cambridgeshire bench had again climbed, reaching proportions identical to those of the early Edwardian years, although not all of the Edwardian appointees regained their seats. However, by 1562 the number of JPs had once again fallen sharply, to levels nearly identical to the Marian years. In this case, however, the reduction is most likely the result of a combination of natural mortality⁴⁸ and Cecil's efforts to lower the number of JPs nationwide. Bourgeois found that dismissals tended to be based more on tenure than on religious affiliation: men who

⁴⁵ The five men are: Robert Lockton, 1550; John Hinde and Robert Peyton, 1551; and John Frevile and Thomas Hutton, 1552.

⁴⁶ Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, chapter 2, p. 6.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, Chapter 2, *passim*.

⁴⁸ Six men who sat on the bench in 1554 died between 1558 and 1561: Thomas Chicheley, 1558; Philip Paris, 1559; Thomas Wendy, 1560; and William Bill, Thomas More, and Richard Ward, 1561. Two additional JPs not listed in the CPRs also died during this period, although they are not counted in the calculations.

had been appointed most recently were the first dismissed, regardless of faith.⁴⁹ This is confirmed by the letter of Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely, to the Privy Council, dated 6 November 1564.⁵⁰ The religious affiliation of twelve men is noted. Of these twelve, nine were either “good” or “conformable,” and three were “misliked.” However, there is little direct relationship between the men’s religious affiliations and the monarch(s) under whom they served. Two examples highlight this. The Bishop of Ely “misliked” Sir Giles Alington’s religious affiliation, but Alington, a Marian appointee who was also a JP in 1562 and 1564, was still a JP in 1569. Similarly, John Cotton, an Edwardian appointee who also served under Mary, was listed as “conformable,” but was no longer a JP in 1569.

Similar to the national trend, the mid-Tudor years in Cambridgeshire show simultaneous stability and volatility. Of the fifty men who served as JPs between 1547 and 1562, thirty-one (sixty-two percent) served under Edward. But of those thirty-one men, seventeen (fifty-five percent) served *only* under Edward. Put another way, fully one-third of JPs between 1547 and 1562 served only under Edward, and were not re-appointed by either of his sisters’ administrations. The greatest change took place at Mary’s accession, and although Elizabeth’s administration pursued a very nearly identical policy of reductions, the motivations behind it were strikingly different.

Notwithstanding the apparent volatility in membership, Bourgeois has used evidence of quarter-session attendance and activity in out-of-session business to differentiate further the ruling elite of mid-Tudor Cambridgeshire. Significant continuity in office and, therefore, stability in the ruling elites’ composition has been detected; a

⁴⁹ Ibid., Chapter 2., p. 8.

⁵⁰ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” pp. 23-25.

core group of intricately connected resident JPs, who shred a wealth of communal, social, political, and kinship bonds, dominated membership on the bench. Wider changes in commission personnel masked this rather stable pattern of politics.⁵¹

⁵¹ Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2, *passim*.

Hertfordshire

Hertfordshire is in many ways a prime example of the necessity of conducting intensive, localized studies. On the surface, it would appear that there was relatively little change on the Hertfordshire commission of the peace after Mary's accession: the number of men remains constant, as can be seen in Table 3-5.⁵²

Table 3-5. Numbers of Hertfordshire JPs in 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1547 ^a	1554 ^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel
29	29	0	55

a. *CPR*, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92.

b. *CPR*, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

However, an examination of the personnel on the Hertfordshire bench reveals a large turnover. Of the twenty-nine men on the bench in 1554, only thirteen had served under Edward; the other sixteen were Marian appointees. In other words, over half of the Edwardian JPs, fifty-five percent, had been dismissed and replaced. This is nearly four and one half times the national average, and strongly suggests that the new administration felt the need to consolidate its power by controlling the local bench, as happened elsewhere.

Similarly, as can be seen in Table 3-6, the number of appointees to the bench under Elizabeth rises by only eight men, or twenty-seven percent. However, only ten men remained from the Marian bench, so that the overall number of Elizabethan appointees increased by seventy-three percent.⁵³

⁵² There were thirty-four JPs appointed to the Hertfordshire bench in 1547. For purposes of calculation, however, it must be remembered that Protector Somerset, John lord Russell, and William lord Paulet all lost their blanket appointments to commissions of the peace during Edward's reign, as is discussed above. Further, two men died before Mary's accession (Sir Thomas Seymour in 1549 and Richard Lister in 1553). Therefore, the base number of twenty-nine is used instead of thirty-four.

⁵³ Including three Edwardian JPs who had not been reappointed under Mary.

Table 3-6. Numbers of Hertfordshire JPs in 1554 and 1562 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1554 ^a	1562 ^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel
29	37	27	73

a. *CPR*, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

b. *CPR*, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

In this case, however, natural mortality may have played as much as role as politics. Sixteen Marian JPs are confirmed to have died between 1555 and 1560,⁵⁴ most likely from the influenza epidemic that swept through England during those years.⁵⁵ This does suggest, however, that the six Marian JPs who were not on the bench in 1562 and are not confirmed to have died were dismissed and replaced.

The data from the early Elizabethan period appears to confirm the customary picture, as can be seen in Table 3-7. The reduction of numbers of JPs from thirty-seven in 1562 to twenty-five in 1564 likely reflects the early success of Cecil's efforts to reduce the numbers of men on commissions of the peace nationwide, as is discussed above.

Table 3-7. Numbers of Hertfordshire JPs in 1562, 1564, and 1569.

1562 ^a	1564 ^b	1569 ^c
37	25	29

a. *CPR*, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

b. Bateson, "A Collection of Original Letters," p. 30, p. 61.

c. *CPR*, Elizabeth [b], Volume 5: 13 Elizabeth Part III, pp. 222-226.

There slight increase of numbers of men on the bench in 1569, which can be probably attributed to the difficulty Cecil encountered in maintaining the reduced benches, although the number of men had not risen to 1562 levels, indicating that Cecil had some measure of success. Once again, however, numbers do not tell the entire story.

⁵⁴ For the mortality data, see Jeffrey R. Hankins, "Tudor Local Government and Administration in the County of Hertfordshire, circa 1520-1580." (Master's thesis, Southwest Texas State University, 1998), pp. 119-136. An additional three JPs not in the *CPRs*, and therefore not part of the calculations, also died during this period.

⁵⁵ For the influenza epidemic, see Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 30-1. One man, John Brocket, who served under Edward but not Mary also died, probably from the flu, in 1558. See Appendix 2: Careers of Individual JPs by County.

Although there were four new places on the bench, nine men had been dismissed since 1564. However, it cannot be assumed that the bishops' letters to the Privy Council were the sole reason for the dismissals.⁵⁶ That is, there is little direct correlation between whether a man's religious leanings were judged favorable and whether he stayed on the bench. Of the eight men listed as "Hinderers" of Elizabethan Protestantism, only three were dismissed, two from the diocese of London and one from the diocese of Lincoln. Of the two men listed as "Indifferent," both from London, only one was dismissed. Of the twelve men listed as either "Favorable" (in London) or "Earnest" (in Lincoln), five were dismissed, all from the diocese of London.⁵⁷ It is difficult to discern any significance from this unusual pattern; it may be that the Lord Chancellor and the Privy Council, who technically oversaw the appointments and dismissals of JPs, may have been more influenced by court politics than by the advice of the bishops.

In many respects, then, the Hertfordshire bench is quite typical of mid-Tudor commissions of the peace. There was a vast but hidden turnover in the makeup of the bench after Mary's accession, one most likely initiated by the center for politico-religious reasons, and an even larger reduction early in Elizabeth's reign, due in large part to natural mortality and, to a lesser extent, politico-religious motivations.

⁵⁶ Hertfordshire fell within two dioceses: that of Edmund Grindal, Bishop of London, and that of Nicholas Bullingham, Bishop of Lincoln. See Bateson, "A Collection of Original Letters," p. 84.

⁵⁷ For a breakdown of religious affiliations, see Appendix 2: Careers of Individual JPs By County.

Kent

The Kent commission of the peace highlights why no one county can be imagined to be representative of the whole of England. While Kent shares aspects in common both with the national trend and with other counties being considered in this chapter, it also saw more stability and continuity in the early Elizabethan period compared to the nation and the other counties.

As with Hertfordshire, an accurate analysis of the Kent commission of the peace requires in-depth look at the personnel on the bench. At first glance, it would appear that the Kent bench saw only a moderate reduction in the numbers of JPs appointed to the bench: the number fell from forty-eight to forty-two, once correction is made for men known to have been removed from the bench under Edward or who died before Mary's accession. This precisely coincides with the national average decrease for this period, twelve and one half percent. But the surface appearance is deceiving: of the surviving forty-eight Edwardian JPs, only sixteen found a place on the bench under Mary's administration. This is an actual decrease of two-thirds, as can be seen in Table 3-8.

Table 3-8. Numbers of Kent JPs in 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1547 ^a	1554 ^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel
48 ⁵⁸	42	12.5	66

a. *CPR*, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92.

b. *CPR*, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

This is the largest change in personnel studied in this chapter, and it emphasizes Zell's point that the Kent bench under Mary Tudor "saw a heavier than usual turnover in

⁵⁸ There were fifty-three JPs appointed to the Kent bench in 1547. For purposes of calculation, however, it must be remembered that Protector Somerset, John lord Russell, and William lord Paulet all lost their blanket appointments to commissions of the peace during Edward's reign, as is discussed above. Further, two men died before Mary's accession (Sir Thomas Seymour in 1549 and Richard Lister in 1553). Therefore, the base number of forty-eight is used instead of fifty-three.

personnel.”⁵⁹ As in Cambridgeshire, the appointments of new men to the bench under Mary did not come at the expense of the ruling elite; as for Cambridgeshire, Kent apparently had a large pool of local men from whom the new appointees were drawn. For this reason, Zell stressed continuity rather than crisis.⁶⁰ The heavy turnover in personnel certainly indicates a high degree of instability that allowed some members of the elite to influence county politics at the expense of their neighbors.

Kent continued to be the scene of upheaval between 1554 and 1562, although, as Zell points out, some of the attrition is due to mortality, probably from disease.⁶¹ Two Marian JPs are confirmed to have died in the years 1558 and 1559.⁶² As can be seen in Table 3-9, the numbers of men on the bench had risen significantly by 1562, from forty to fifty-six, and increase of forty percent.

Table 3-9. Numbers of Kent JPs in 1554 (corrected) and 1562 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1554 ^a	1562 ^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel ^c
40	56	40	52

a. CPR, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

b. CPR, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.

c. Of Elizabethan appointees.

Once again, however, the actual turnover in personnel is masked; thirteen Marian JPs were not reappointed under Elizabeth. Thus more than half the men on the bench, fifty-two percent, were appointed under Elizabeth. While it is possible that actual mortality among JPs between 1555 and 1559 is higher than research indicates, in any event the Elizabethan administration significantly increased the number of JPs on the

⁵⁹ M.L. Zell, “Early Tudor JPs at Work,” *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 93 (1977): p. 127.

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 128-9.

⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 127-8. For the influenza epidemic, see Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 30-1.

⁶² Another two men who served as JPs under Edward but not Mary also died during this time, probably from the flu.

bench, which suggests that they may have been stacking it with men who were more politically acceptable to the center.

By 1564, the number of JPs on the Kent bench had fallen by eleven, nearly twenty percent, as can be seen in Table 3-10.

Table 3-10. Numbers of Kent JPs in 1562 and 1564 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1562^a	1564^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel
56	45	20	30

a. *CPR, Elizabeth [a], Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X, pp. 433-444.*

b. Bateson, "A Collection of Original Letters," p. 58.

The reduction is most likely the result of Cecil's efforts to control the size of commissions of the peace nationwide. However, the reduction was not accomplished solely at the expense of recent appointees. The majority of Elizabethan appointees, two-thirds, retained their places on the bench at least through 1564, and quite a few through 1569. The next change in commission size is a small increase, seven percent in 1569, as can be seen in Table 3-11.

Table 3-11. Numbers of Kent JPs in 1564 (corrected) and 1569 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1564^a	1569^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel
45	48	7	14

a. Bateson, "A Collection of Original Letters," p. 58.

b. *CPR, Elizabeth [b], Volume 5: 13 Elizabeth Part III, pp. 222-226.*

This increase of numbers of men on the bench probably represents the difficulty that Cecil had in limiting commission size nationwide. It is difficult to determine the religious leanings of the men on the Kent bench, since Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, resisted categorizing the JPs in his diocese by religion. Instead, he claimed that the JPs were "outwardly... conformable and not chargeable... of any grete

extremities.”⁶³ It is difficult to speculate on Parker’s motivations for not listing religious affiliations, although his letter to the Privy Council concerning JPs in the dioceses of Landaff and Oxford provides a clue. In that letter, Parker merely provided a list of names and flatly refused to speculate on religious affiliation, saying “what these be & what others be, your honors of the councell knowe moche better than we can enforme youe, and as for myself, I know them not and somtyme enformers serve ther own turne & gratifie ther frendes.”⁶⁴ Parker may have had similar concerns about Kent, although Zell found relatively little political infighting.⁶⁵ At any rate, Parker apparently delayed in writing to the Privy Council, and claimed that his reason for doing so was that his instructions were not clear enough.⁶⁶ This seems rather an ingenuous response, as most of the other bishops who answered had little difficulty in understanding what the Privy Council wanted. In any event, there was no thoroughgoing purge of the Kent bench between 1564 and 1569. Of the forty-five JPs on the bench in 1564, one man died before 1569, and only six others, whose dates of death are unknown, lost their places on the bench. The continuity of the Kent bench that Zell stressed may have been due, in part, to Parker’s reluctance to play ecclesiastical informant.

In summary, while the Kent bench share characteristics similar to both the national trend and to other counties, its unusually high degree of stability during Elizabeth’s reign makes it peculiar. Part of this stability may be due as much to the reluctance of the Archbishop of Canterbury to deeply inquire into the religious leanings of the JPs in his diocese and jurisdiction.

⁶³ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” p. 57.

⁶⁴ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” p. 81.

⁶⁵ Zell, “Early Tudor JPs at Work,” p. 129.

⁶⁶ Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” p. 57.

Surrey

The Surrey bench, like the Kent bench, is at once typical and atypical. It saw a reduction of the number of JPs on the bench at Mary's reign, as did the other counties studied. However, the Surrey commission of the peace was massively restructured after Elizabeth's accession, to a far greater degree than any other county studied here. Unfortunately, the relative lack of data after 1562 makes it next to impossible to determine whether the bench stabilized after that date.

An examination of the Surrey commission of the peace for 1547-1554 reveals a reduction of twenty-one percent; seven places on the bench were eliminated under Mary's administration.⁶⁷ However, these places do not correspond exactly with the actual number of men who were dismissed, as can be seen in Table 3-12.

Table 3-12. Numbers of Surrey JPs in 1547 (corrected) and 1554 with percentages of change in commission size and turnover.

1547 ^a	1554 ^b	% change in # of personnel	% turnover in personnel ^c
29	27	21	41

a. CPR, Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part III, pp. 80-92.

b. CPR, Mary, Vol. 1: 1 Mary Part I, pp. 16-26.

c. Of Edwardian appointees.

Twelve Edwardian appointees, forty-one percent, lost their places on the bench. Robison believed that the JPs were still on the bench at Mary's accession, but that she had them removed prior the Wyatt's rebellion.⁶⁸ That only five were replaced suggests both that Mary's administration was as interested in controlling the size of the bench as well as its makeup. This is not entirely unusual: Bourgeois noted that evidence from other

⁶⁷ There were thirty-four JPs appointed to the Suffolk bench in 1547. For purposes of calculation, however, it must be remembered that Protector Somerset, John lord Russell, and William lord Paulet all lost their blanket appointments to commissions of the peace during Edward's reign, as is discussed above. Further, two men died before Mary's accession (Robert Curson in 1551 and Richard Lister in 1553). Therefore, the base number of twenty-nine is used instead of thirty-four.

counties, including Cambridgeshire and Kent, “indicat[ed] the Marian government successfully pursued a policy of reduction widely at least at the beginning of her reign.”⁶⁹ Alternatively, after the abortive rebellion, Marian officials may have doubted the loyalty of Surrey men; despite the county’s small size, it had quite a large population.⁷⁰ There may have been as wide a pool from which to select JPs as in Kent.

Between 1554 and 1562, the number of JPs on the bench increased from twenty-three to thirty-two, or just over eighteen percent. In the interim, four Marian JPs had died, probably during the influenza epidemic of 1555-1559.⁷¹ However, not only were these men replaced, but new men were added at the expense of other Marian appointees. Of the thirty-two men on the 1562 commission of the peace, seventeen were first appointed under Elizabeth, and four others had previously served under Edward but not Mary. In other words, the vast majority of surviving Marian JPs on the Surrey bench were replaced in 1562. This apparently indicates a purge of breathtaking proportion, far greater than occurred in any other county yet studied. If it was indeed a purge, it may indicate that the Marian administration had a high degree of success in placing men loyal to it on the bench.

The data for Surrey for the remainder of the period being studied are woefully inadequate. Although Robert Horne, Bishop of Winton, responded in 1564 to the Privy Council’s request to report the religious affiliations of the JPs in his diocese, he listed

⁶⁸ Robison, “The National and Local Significance of Wyatt’s Rebellion in Surrey,” *Historical Journal* 30, p. 773.

⁶⁹ Bourgeois, *The Ruling Elite in Cambridgeshire*, Chapter 2, page 7.

⁷⁰ E. A. Wrigley and R. S. Schofield, in *The Population History of England, 1541-1871: A Reconstruction* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), p. 42, estimated that for the period 1540-1640 Surrey generally had “double the national proportion” of population. This made it one of the four most densely populated counties in England.

⁷¹ See Guy, *Tudor England*, pp. 30-1, for the influenza epidemic.

only twelve men, who were categorized as either “Ffavorers” or “Indifferent.”⁷² It is unlikely, even considering Cecil’s attempts to reduce the number of justices of the peace nationwide, that the Surrey bench was reduced to only twelve men. Horne appears to have deliberately left off any “mislikers” of the queen’s religion. In his letter to the Privy Council, Horne claimed that he did not use the advice of local men, because of his “smale continuance and lacke of acquayntaunce there,” and instead relied only on his own knowledge. He appears to have been reluctant, in the manner of Matthew Parker, to rely on “enformers” who might serve their own, rather than the Crown’s, ends.⁷³ The result of this is, unfortunately, to present only a partial picture of the bench in 1564, which makes comparison next to impossible. Further, data is not extant for 1569, so no comparison can be made between those two dates. The best that can be said about the 1564 data is that it confirms that nine men present on the bench in 1562 retained their places in 1564, and that three additional men found places. However, whether these men replaced deceased or dismissed JPs, or enlarged the bench, cannot be speculated.

The surviving data for the Surrey commission of the peace paint an intriguing picture. Dramatic manipulation of the bench by the center occurred at least twice, early in the reigns of both Mary and Elizabeth. In both cases, the central administration may have been responding to perceived political or religious threats from the local gentry. However, without additional data for later in the Elizabethan period, at this stage it cannot be determined whether or not the upheavals on the bench were aberrations.

⁷² Bateson, “A Collection of Original Letters,” p. 56.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

Conclusion

Taken together, the county case studies reveal an even greater upheaval on commissions of the peace than is indicated by the overall national trend. Although each of the counties is characterized by factors that make it unique, what they share in common strongly implies that the Marian government carefully and deliberately worked to reshape the benches in each county to ensure appointment of men loyal to it, and by extension accepting of the political and religious changes that Mary was expected to make. This should not be surprising, since justices of the peace had steadily accrued power in the localities over the past few centuries. Therefore, in order for the center to control the localities, it was necessary to control the commissions of the peace.

Similarly, although not uniformly, the benches were again reshaped after Elizabeth's accession, although in some counties the extent to which the benches were manipulated was far greater than in others. Finally, in counties for which there is useful and usable data deriving from the bishops' letters to the Privy Council concerning the religious affiliations of JPs, many of the reporting bishops expressed reluctance to rely on any but their own knowledge. Even in cases in which the advice of local dignitaries was sought out, men such as Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, and Robert Horne, Bishop of Winton, preferred to rely on their own knowledge of the justices of the peace in question, and were hesitant to accept the advice given to them. It may be that many felt, as Matthew Parker did, that the information might not be reliable in light of political infighting between rivals and rival families within the counties.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS

The thesis is built on two interrelated arguments. The first is that tracking local government personnel in the Tudor era as a mechanism by which to measure the effectiveness of legislation and policies promulgated by the central administration. The second is to demonstrate the efficacy of this method by studying appointments to and dismissals from the commissions of the peace on both a nationwide and local level. This is because justices of the peace had become the most important local officials by the mid-Tudor era, and had acquired a plethora of powers and duties. As a result, the demand for a place on the bench was high, and the historiographical evidence strongly suggests appointments of justices of the peace were quite deliberately, rather than haphazardly, determined by the central administration. Although the data sources used in this study are well known, this is the first time that they have been used in a truly national study based on statistical analysis rather than biographic case study.

Perhaps the best backdrop for such a study is the controversial mid-Tudor era, a period generally defined by the reigns of Edward VI, Mary I, and the first few years of Elizabeth I. This is because historians disagree sharply on whether the period is better characterized by crisis or by stability. Two works exemplify the claims. W.R.D. Jones argued in *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1539-1570* that the mid-Tudor years were a time of political, financial, and governmental instability and danger for the monarchy. By contrast, David Loades, in *The Mid-Tudor Crisis 1545-1565*, called for a reexamination of that theory, and argued that continuity and polity better depict the period. It would be

presumptuous in the extreme to hope that this thesis could in any way resolve the debate. However, a more modest goal may be attainable: to add another layer of complexity and depth to the argument.

The findings on the national and local levels are somewhat contradictory. Although both show reductions in membership in the commissions of the peace, the broader, and generally smaller, national statistics often belie greater turnover on the local in both numbers of justices of the peace and in personnel. This is not to imply that the debate can be resolved merely by contrasting national and local findings. Indeed, the findings from the counties often contradict one another. Some counties saw much greater restructuring of their benches than did others at Mary's accession; some were more affected by the influenza epidemic of 1555-1559; some saw much greater turnover in both numbers and personnel after Elizabeth's accession.

What the evidence supports, then, is neither continuity nor crisis but both. Nationwide, the statistics demonstrate a remarkable continuity: many JPs remained in office and had long tenures throughout the period. There was relatively little turnover. However, individual county studies show wide variation, contrasted to both the nation and each other. Some counties, such as Surrey, were characterized by a great deal of tumult apparently initiated from the center. Others, such as Norfolk and Suffolk, suffered more from internal factional infighting than from manipulation by the royal administrations. Still others, such as Cambridgeshire, saw a period of relative harmony in which there was little turmoil generated by either the center or the ranks of the local elites, even despite differences in religious loyalties and affiliations. These differences demand recognition of the fact that the religious, political, and administrative policies

promulgated by the various royal administrations were not uniformly received or enacted, and that the central administration itself was aware of differences between the counties and behaved accordingly. This in turn suggests that in order to achieve a truly nuanced understanding of the era, the best view to take may be that there was not one Reformation, Counter-Reformation, or Elizabethan Settlement, but rather that there were many individual events, because each movement was differently received in both national terms and among the counties.

APPENDICES: INTRODUCTORY

Following are Appendices 1, 2, and 3. Appendix 1, “Careers of Individual JPs,” is an alphabetical compilation of all the men nationwide who served as JPs as of five dates: 26 May 1547, 18 February 1554, 11 February 1562, *circa* 1564, and 4 November 1569. If a man served anywhere in the nation, the word “Yes” appears in the appropriate box; if he did not, the word “No” appears. Appendix 2, “Careers of Individual JPs by County,” is an alphabetical listing of all of the JPs who served in each of the six sample counties, for the same dates. The same system of notation is used. Appendix 3, “Careers of JPs by Reign,” is a breakdown of the numbers of men who served in each of the six sample counties.

Data from the Appendices are drawn from several sources. The predominate sources are the *Calendars of Patent Rolls*, which provide the information regarding commission makeup in the years 1547, 1554, 1562, and 1569. Although, as has been discussed previously, the data are not fully extant, the patent rolls are a reliable source. The information for 1564 comes from “A Collection of Original Letters from The Bishops to the Privy Council, 1564,” edited by Mary Bateson. The letters are, unfortunately, not as reliable as the patent rolls: when the Privy Council asked the bishops to report on the religious affiliations of JPs in their dioceses, it did not provide a formula or method for doing so. As a result, each of those who reported (Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, refused the Council’s request) used a different system, and not all JPs were listed. Therefore, a man’s absence from a list does not imply that he was not on the commission of the peace. The only men who were certainly *not* serving as JPs were those who had died prior to 1564.

Appendix 1: Careers of Individual JPs

JP Name	1547	1554	1562	1564	1569
Abrall, John, of Ingheston	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Acroft, James	No	No	No	Yes	No
Acton, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Acworth, George	Yes	No	Yes		No
Acworth, Henry	No	No	No	Yes	No
Adams, Nicholas, the elder	Yes	No	No		No
Adams, Stephen	No	Yes	No		No
Aderley, Ralph	No	Yes	Yes		No
Agmondesham, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Agmondesham, William	No	No	Yes		No
Alcock, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Aldern, Simon	No	No	Yes		No
Aldred, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Alegh, John	Yes	No	No		No
Alford, Lancelot	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Alford, Roger	No	No	No		Yes
Alington, Giles	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alleyn, Christopher	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Allott, Robert	No	No	Yes		No
Alredd, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Altham, James	No	No	No		Yes
Amydas, John	No	Yes	No		No
Amys, Roger	No	No	Yes		No
Andrewes, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Apowell, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Appleton, Roger	No	Yes	No		No
Apseley, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Ardern, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Armested, William	No	Yes	No		No
Arnold, Nicholas	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Arscote, John, the elder	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Arthure, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Arundel, John, of Llanherne	No	Yes	No		Yes
Arundell, John, of Treryce	Yes	No	No		No
Arundell, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Ascughe, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Ascughe, Francis	Yes	No	Yes		No
Ascughe, Hugh	No	No	Yes		No
Ascughe, William	No	No	No		Yes
Ashby, Thomas	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Ashfield, Edmund	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ashfield, Humphrey	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Ashfield, Robert, I d.1550	Yes	No	No	No	No
Ashfield, Robert, II	No	No	Yes		
Ashley,	Yes	?	?		?
Ashley, Henry	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Ashley, John	No	No	Yes		Yes
Ashley, Thomas	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Ashton, Edward	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Ashton, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Askeburnham, John	No	Yes	No		No
Aslaby, Francis	No	Yes	No		No
Astre, Ralph	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Aune, Martin	No	Yes	Yes		No
Awcher, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No

Awdeley, Edmund	No	Yes	No		No
Awdeley, John, lord Awdeley	Yes	Yes	No		No
Awdeley, Thomas d.1561	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Awdeley, George, lord Awdeley	No	No	Yes		No
Ayliff, William	No	No	Yes		No
Aylmer, John	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Baban, John	Yes	No	No		No
Babthorp, William e	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Babyntong, Roland	Yes	No	No		No
Babyngton, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Bacon, Nicholas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Bacon, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Baeshe, Edward	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bailes, Brian	No	No	Yes		Yes
Baker, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Baker, Richard	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bannester, Lawrence	No	No	No		Yes
Barantyne, William	Yes	No	No		No
Barentyne, Drew	No	Yes	Yes		No
Barham, Nicholas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Barley, Francis d. 1559	No	Yes	No	No	No
Barley, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Barnaby, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Barnarde, John	Yes	No	No		No
Barnehouse, John	Yes	No	No		No
Barners, William	No	Yes	No		No
Barney, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Barret, Edward	No	No	Yes		No
Barrington, Thomas	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Bartlett, William, of Stopham	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Barton, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Barton, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Bartye, Richard	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Barwick, Gabriel	No	No	Yes		No
Barwise, Anthony	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Baskavan, Hugh	Yes	Yes	No		No
Baskervile, James	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Baskervile, John	No	Yes	No		Yes
Baskervile, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Baskervile, Walter	No	No	No		Yes
Bassett, Arthur	No	No	No		Yes
Bassett, George	No	No	No		Yes
Bassett, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bayneham, Christopher	No	Yes	No		No
Bayneham, Richard	No	No	No		Yes
Baynard, Edward	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Baynton, Edward	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Beamond, Nicholas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Beamond, Richard	No	No	Yes		Yes
Beaumont, John	Yes	No	No		No
Beampre, Edmund	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bedford, Francis, lord Bedford		No	Yes		No
Bedingfelde, Edmund d. 1553	Yes	No	No	No	No
Bedingfelde, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bedingfelde, John, of Marsland	Yes	No	No		No
Bednell, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Bedon, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Bedyll, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Bere, John		Yes	Yes		Yes

Bekwith, Leonard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bell, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Bellasy, William	No	No	Yes		Yes
Bellingham, Alan	No	No	Yes		Yes
Bellingham, Edward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bellingham, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Bellowe, John d. 1559	Yes	No	No	No	No
Bendlowes, William	No	Yes	Yes		No
Benger, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Benson, William	Yes	No	No		No
Berkeley, Henry, lord Berkeley	No	No	Yes		No
Berkeley, Maurice	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Berkeley, Richard	No	No	Yes		Yes
Berkeley, William	Yes	No	No		No
Berners, William	Yes	No	No		No
Berwick, John	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Bery, Anthony	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bery, Edward	No	No	Yes		Yes
Bevell, John	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Beyer, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Bilby, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Bill, William	Yes	No	No		No
Billinge, John	No	No	Yes		No
Binge, Robert	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Birche, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bisse, James	No	No	Yes		No
Blackwall, Richard	Yes	No	Yes		No
Blackwall, William	No	Yes	No		No
Blage, George	Yes	No	No		No
Blake, Roger	No	Yes	No		No
Blanerhassett, John	No	Yes	Yes		No
Blanerhassett, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Blount, George	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Blount, John, of Grendon	Yes	No	No		No
Blount, Michael	No	No	No		Yes
Blount, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Blount, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Blount, Thomas, of Shillington	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Blount, Thomas, of Kidderminster d. 1568	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Blount, Walter	No	Yes	No		No
Bluett, Roger	Yes	Yes	No		No
Blunt, George	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Blytheman, Jasper	No	No	No		Yes
Bockinge, Edmund	No	No	Yes		Yes
Bodenham, Henry	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bodenham, Roger	No	Yes	No		No
Bolles, John	Yes	No	No		No
Bolling, Tristram	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bonham, John	Yes	No	No		No
Borlas, Walter	Yes	No	No		No
Boroughe, Thomas, lord Boroughe	Yes	No	No		No
Boroughe, William, lord Boroughe	No	Yes	Yes		No
Bosse, John	No	Yes	No		No
Bosseville, Godfrey	No	No	No		Yes
Bosseville, Ralph	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Boune, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Bourchier, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No
Bourchier, John, earl of Bath d. 1561	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Bourne, John	No	Yes	No	Yes	No

Bowcer, Ralph	No	No	No		Yes
Bowes, George	No	No	Yes		Yes
Bowes, John	Yes	No	No		No
Bowes, Martin d. 1566	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bowes, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bowes, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bowes, Robert	?	No	No		Yes
Bowles, Richard	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bowles, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Bowyer, William	No	No	No	Yes	No
Boyer, John	No	No	Yes		No
Boyes, Edward	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Boyle, James	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Boynton, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Boyse, William	Yes	No	No		No
Bradbourne, Humfrey	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Bradbury, Matthew	No	No	Yes		Yes
Bradbury, William	Yes	No	No		No
Bradshawe, Henry	Yes	No	No		No
Bray, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Braye, John, lord Braye	No	Yes	No		No
Brayn, Henry	No	Yes	No		No
Brayne, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Brayne, Robert	No	No	Yes		No
Brend, John d. 1561	No	Yes	No		No
Brente, John	No	Yes	No	No	No
Brente, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Brereton, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Browse, John	Yes	No	No		No
Bridgeman, Walter	No	No	No		Yes
Bridgeman, William	No	Yes	Yes		No
Bridges, Edmund	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bridges, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bridges, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bridges, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Henry, earl of Bridgewater	Yes	No	No		No
Briggs,	Yes	?	?		?
Bristowe, Nicholas	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Brocas, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Brocket, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Brocket, John, I d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Brocket, John, II	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Broke, David	Yes	Yes	No		No
Broke, Hugh	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Broke, Robert d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Brokesby, Robert	Yes	No	Yes		No
Brome, John	No	Yes	No		No
Bromley, George	No	No	Yes		No
Bromley, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		Yes
Bronker, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Brookes, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Broun, John	Yes	No	No		No
Browne, Anthony	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Browne, Christopher	No	No	Yes		No
Browne, Francis	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Browne, George	No	No	Yes		No
Browne, Humfrey	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Browne, Matthew	Yes	Yes	No		No
Browne, Nicholas	No	No	No		Yes

Browne, Robert d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Browne, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Browne, Valentine	No	No	No		Yes
Browne, Valentine	No	No	No		Yes
Browse, John	No	Yes	No		No
Broxolme, John	Yes	No	No		No
Brudnell, Edmund	No	No	Yes		No
Brudnell, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Bruerton, Urian	Yes	No	No		No
Bruerton, William	Yes	No	No		No
Bruges, Giles	No	No	No		Yes
Brunsopp, William	Yes	No	No		No
Bryan, Francis d. 1550	Yes	No	No	No	No
Brune, John	No	Yes	No		No
Bruse, John	No	No	Yes		No
Bukler, Walter	Yes	No	No		No
Bulkeley, Charles	Yes	No	No		No
Bulleyn, James	No	Yes	No		No
Bullock, Richard	No	No	No		Yes
Bullok, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Bulmer, Ralph	Yes	No	No		No
Bulstred, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Bunney, Richard	No	Yes	No		Yes
Burdett, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Burgavenny, Henry, lord Burgavenny	No	Yes	Yes		No
Burgoyne, Christopher	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Burgoyne, George	No	No	Yes		No
Burlacye, John	No	No	No		Yes
Burton, James	Yes	No	No		No
Bury, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Busshey, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Busshye, John	No	No	No		Yes
Busshop, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Bustard, Anthony	No	No	Yes		No
Butler, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Butt[es], William	Yes	No	Yes		No
Buttshed, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Byrkenhed, John	Yes	No	No		No
Byron, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Byron, John, the younger	No	No	Yes		No
Caldecott, William	No	No	Yes		No
Calthrope, Peter	Yes	No	No		No
Calybut, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cameswell, Michael	No	Yes	No		No
Capell, Edward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Capell, Giles d. 1556	Yes	Yes	No		No
Capell, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Carden, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Cardinall, William d. 1568	Yes	No	Yes		No
Carew, Gawain	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Carew, Peter	No	No	Yes		Yes
Carew, Roger	No	No	Yes		No
Carew, Thomas, of Haccombe	No	No	Yes		Yes
Carew, Wimond	Yes	No	No		No
Carill, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Carleton, Anthony	No	No	Yes		No
Carleton, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Carmynowe, John	No	Yes	No		Yes
Carnaby, William	Yes	Yes	No		No

Carne, Edward	Yes	Yes	No		No
Carneshewe, William	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Carons, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Carpenter, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Carre, John	Yes	No	No		No
Carre, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Carre, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cartwright, Hugh	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Carus, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Caterik, Anthony	No	No	Yes		No
Catesby, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Catesby, Thomas, of Wyshton	No	No	Yes		No
Catlyn, Richard d. 1556	Yes	Yes	No		No
Catlyn, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Cave, Ambrose d. 1568	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Cave, Antony	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cave, Brian	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cave, Francis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cavendish, John	Yes	No	No		No
Cavendish, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Cavendish, William, I d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Cavendish, William, II	No	No	Yes		No
Cecil, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Cecil, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Cecil, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Chaffyn, Thomas, of Mere	Yes	No	No		No
Chalcote, Walter	Yes	No	No		No
Chaloner, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Chaloner, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Chamberlain, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Chamberlain, Leonard	No	Yes	No		No
Chamberlain, Ralph	No	Yes	No		No
Chamberlain, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Chamond, Richard	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Champernowne, Arthur	No	No	No		Yes
Chantrell, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Charles, John	Yes	No	No		No
Charnoke, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Chaterton, John	No	Yes	No		No
Chauncey, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Chaworth, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Chekeley, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Chester, Robert	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cheverell, Christopher	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Cheyne, Henry	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cheyne, John, of Amesham	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cheyne, John, of Chesham Boyes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Cheney, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cherleton, William	No	Yes	No		No
Chetwyn, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Chichester, John	No	No	Yes		No
Chidley, Christopher	No	No	No		Yes
Chidley, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Chidley, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Chishull, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cholmeley, Hugh	Yes	No	No		No
Cholmeley, Ranulph	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Cholmeley, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		Yes
Cholmeley, Roger d. 1565	Yes	Yes	Yes		No

Chorlton, William	Yes	No	Yes		No
Chyverton, Henry	Yes	No	Yes		No
Clere, John d. 1558	Yes	No	No		No
Clerke, John	No	Yes	No		No
Clerke, George	No	Yes	No		No
Clerke, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Clerke, Walter d. 1555	No	Yes	No		No
Clifford, George	No	No	No		Yes
Clifford, Henry, earl Cumberland	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Clifford, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Clifford, Ingram	Yes	Yes	No		Yes
Clifford, James	No	No	No		Yes
Clifton, Gervase	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Clifton, William	No	No	Yes		No
Clinton, Edward, lord Clinton	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Clinton, Henry	No	No	No		Yes
Clinton, Thomas	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Clopton, Francis d. 1559	Yes	No	No		No
Cobham, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cobham, George, lord Cobham d. 1569	Yes	No	No		No
Cobham, William, lord Cobham	No	No	Yes		No
Cocke, Henry	No	No	No		Yes
Code, William	No	No	No		Yes
Coffyn, James	No	Yes	No		No
Coke, Anthony	No	No	No		Yes
Coke, John	Yes	No	No		No
Coke, William	Yes	No	No		No
Coker, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Cokesey, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Cokeyn, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Colbeck, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Coles, Humphrey	No	Yes	Yes		No
Colley, Anthony	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Collingwood, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Colshill, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Colte, George	No	Yes	Yes		No
Colthurste, Matthew	Yes	No	No		No
Combe, Bartholomew	No	Yes	No		No
Compton, Griffin	No	Yes	No		No
Compton, Walter	No	No	No		Yes
Conqueste, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No
Constable, John	Yes	Yes	No		Yes
Constable, John, of Constable Burton	No	Yes	No		No
Constable, John, of Droverby	No	No	No		Yes
Constable, Marmaduke	No	Yes	No		Yes
Constable, Marmaduke, of Wassand	Yes	Yes	No		No
Ralph Constable	Yes	No	Yes		No
Ralph Constable of Syente Pulchres	No	No	No		Yes
Constable, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Constable, William	Yes	No	No		No
Constable, William, of Sherborne	Yes	No	No		No
Conyers, Francis	Yes	Yes	No		No
Conyers, John, lord Conyers	Yes	Yes	No		No
Conyers, Robert, of Hutton	Yes	No	No		No
Conyers, William, of Maske	Yes	No	No		No
Conyngsbye, Henry	No	No	Yes		Yes
Conyngesby, Humfrey d. 1559	No	Yes	No	No	No
Cooke, Anthony	Yes	No	Yes		No
Cooke, John	No	Yes	No	Yes	No

Cooke, Richard	No	No	Yes		No
Cope, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No
Copledyke, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Copley, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Copley, William	Yes	No	No		No
Coppleston, Christopher	No	No	No		Yes
Coppleston, John	No	No	Yes		Yes
Corbett, Andrew	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Corbett, John	No	Yes	No		No
Corbett, John, the elder d. 1559	Yes	No	No	No	No
Corbett, John, of Lee	Yes	Yes	No		No
Corbett, John, of Walden	Yes	No	No		No
Corbett, Reginald	No	No	Yes		No
Corbett, Reynold	Yes	Yes	No		No
Corbett, Richard d. 1566	No	Yes	Yes		No
Cordell, William	No	Yes	Yes		No
Coren, Hugh	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cornewall, George	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cornewall, Richard	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Cornwallis, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cotton, Humfrey	No	Yes	No		No
Cotton, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Cotton, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cotton, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cotton, William	No	Yes	No		No
Courtney, James	No	Yes	No		No
Courtney, Peter	Yes	No	No		No
Covert, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Covert, Richard	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Crane, Robert d. 1550	No	No	Yes	No	No
Crayford, Guy	Yes	No	No		No
Crayford, Richard	No	No	Yes		Yes
Creswell, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Cripse, Henry	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cripse, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		No
Cristmas, George	No	No	Yes		No
Crofte, Edward	No	No	No		Yes
Crofte, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Croftes, James	No	No	Yes		No
Cromer, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Crooke, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Crumwell, George, lord Crumwell	Yes	No	No		No
Crumwell, Henry	No	No	No		Yes
Culpepper, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Culpepper, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Culpepper, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Culpepper, William	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Cuney, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Cupper, John	No	No	Yes		No
Cupper, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Curson, Francis	No	Yes	No		Yes
Curson, Robert d. 1551	Yes	No	No	No	No
Curtis, Griffin	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Curwen, Henry	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Cutler, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		No
Cuttes, Christopher	Yes	No	No		No
Dacombe, John	No	Yes	No		No
Dacres, Christopher	No	No	No		Yes
Dacres, George	No	No	No		Yes

Dacres, Leonard	No	No	Yes		No
Dacres, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Dacres, Thomas, the elder	No	Yes	No		No
Dacres, Thomas, the younger	No	No	Yes		No
Dacres, William, lord Dacres	Yes	No	No		No
Dacres, William, lord Dacres of Gillesland	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Dakyns, Arthur	No	No	No		Yes
Dakyns, George	Yes	No	No		Yes
Dallison, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Dalney, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Dalston, John	No	No	No		Yes
Dalston, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Dalton, Roger	No	No	Yes		Yes
Damsell, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Danby, Christopher	No	No	Yes		Yes
Danby, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Dannett, Leonard	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Danvers, Silvester	Yes	No	No		No
Danyell, Edmund	No	No	Yes		Yes
Danyell, Geoffrey	No	Yes	No		No
Danyell, John	Yes	No	No		No
Danyell, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Danyell, Thomas, of Sudbury	Yes	No	No		No
Darby, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Darcy, Arthur	No	Yes	No		No
Darcy, Henry, the elder	No	No	No		Yes
Darcy, George, lord Darcy	Yes	Yes	No		No
Darcy, John, lord Darcy	No	No	Yes		No
Darcy, John, lord Darcy of Chiche	No	No	Yes		No
Darcy, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Darcy, Thomas, of Tolsthunt	No	Yes	No		No
Darcey, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Darrell, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Darrell, George	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Darrell, Hugh	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Darrell, Paul	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Darrell, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Darrell, Thomas, of Skotney	Yes	No	No		No
Darrell, William	No	No	No		Yes
Darrington, Richard	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Daunsey, Ambrose	Yes	No	No		No
Daunsey, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Davell, William	No	No	No		Yes
Davers, George	No	Yes	Yes		No
Davye, Gregory d. 1559	Yes	No	No	No	No
Dawney, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Dawtre, Francis	Yes	No	No		No
Dawtre, John	Yes	No	No		No
Dawtre, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Daye, William	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
de la Lynde, George	Yes	Yes	No		No
Delariver, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
de la Vale, John	Yes	No	No		No
Delavere, John	No	No	No		Yes
Delves, Henry	Yes	No	No		No
Denny, Anthony d. 1550	Yes	No	No	No	No
Denny, Henry	No	No	No		Yes
Dennys, Hugh	Yes	Yes	No		No
Dennys, Martin	No	Yes	No		No

Dennys, Maurice	Yes	No	Yes		No
Dennys, Richard	No	No	Yes		Yes
Dennys, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Dennys, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Dennys, Walter	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Denton, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Denton, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Derbye, William	No	No	No		Yes
Dering, John	Yes	No	No		No
Dering, Nicholas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Dethick, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Devereux, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Deveroux, William	No	No	Yes		No
Dewporte, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Digby, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Digby, John	No	Yes	No		No
Digby, Kenelm	Yes	No	No		No
Digby, Reynold	Yes	No	No		No
Digby, Simon	Yes	No	No		No
Dighton, Edmund	No	No	No		Yes
Dighton, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Dingley, Henry	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Disney, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dockwra, Edmund	No	No	No		Yes
Dockwra, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dodd, John	Yes	No	No		No
Doddes, Gregory	No	No	No		Yes
Doddes, William	No	Yes	Yes		No
Dodgington, Christopher	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Dodgington, Giles	Yes	No	No		No
Done, John	Yes	No	No		No
Dormer, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Dormer, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Downes, James d. 1558	Yes	No	No	No	No
Dowrish, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Doyle, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Doyle, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Doyle, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Doyle, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Drake, John, of Musbury	Yes	No	No		No
Draner, John	No	Yes	No		No
Draycote, Philip	No	Yes	No		No
Druell, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Drury, Robert	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Drury, William, I d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Drury, William, II	No	No	No	No	Yes
Duckett, Anthony	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Dudley, Ambrose, earl of Warwick	No	No	Yes		
Dudley, Edward, lord Dudley	No	No	Yes		No
Dudley, John, earl of Warwick	Yes	No	No		No
Dudley, Lord Robert	No	No	Yes		No
Dudley, William	Yes	No	No		No
Duke, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Dunche, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dycons, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Dyer, James	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Dyer, Thomas	Yes	No	Yes		No
Dyllon, Henry	No	No	No		Yes
Dyllon, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No

Dymmock, Edward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Dymmock, Humfrey	Yes	Yes	No		No
Dymmock, Robert	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dyve, Lewis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Earnley, John	No	No	Yes		No
Eascourt, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Ecclesfeld, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Eden, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Edgecombe, Peter	No	No	No		Yes
Edgecombe, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Egerton, Philip	Yes	No	No		No
Egerton, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Egliamby, Edward	Yes	No	Yes		No
Egliamby, John	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Egmanton, Christopher	Yes	No	Yes		No
Ellerker, Edward	No	No	Yes		Yes
Ellerker, Ralph	Yes	No	No		No
Ellerker, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Ellys, John	No	No	No		Yes
Elmes, Edmund	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Eltoftes, Edmund	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Elyot, George	Yes	No	No		No
Engefelde, Francis	Yes	No	No		No
Engleby, William	Yes	No	No		No
Ennys, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Erlington, Richard	No	No	Yes		No
Erlington, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Essex, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Essex, William	Yes	No	No		No
Estofte, Christopher d. 1566	No	Yes	Yes		No
Eston, John d. 1565	Yes	Yes	No		No
Eveleigh, John	No	No	No		Yes
Evers, William, lord Evers	Yes	No	Yes		No
Eyer, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Eyerby, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No
Eyre, John d. 1562	Yes	No	Yes		No
Eyre, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Eyton, Thomas	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Fabian, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Fairfax, Nicholas	No	No	No		Yes
Fairfax, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Fairfax, William	No	No	Yes		Yes
Falconer, William	No	Yes	No		No
Fane, George ['Vane' in 1554]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fanshawe, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Farnham, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Fawnte, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Feldinge, Basil	No	Yes	Yes		No
Feldinge, William	Yes	No	No		No
Felton, George, of Pentlowe	No	Yes	No		No
Felton, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Fenner, John	Yes	No	No		No
Fermer, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Fermor, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Fermor, William d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Ferrers, George	Yes	No	No		No
Ferrers, Walter lord Ferres	Yes	No	No		No
Fetherston, Alban	No	No	Yes		No
Fettiplace, Alexander	Yes	Yes	Yes		No

Fettiplace, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Fettiplace, George	No	No	No		Yes
Fettiplace, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fines, Giles	Yes	No	No		No
Fines, Richard	Yes	No	Yes		No
Fishe, George	No	No	No		Yes
Fisshe, Francis	No	Yes	No		No
Fissher, Jasper	No	No	No		Yes
Fissher, John, of Pakington	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Fissher, Michael	Yes	No	No		No
Fissher, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Fitzalan, Henry, earl of Arundell	Yes	No	Yes		
Fitzgarret, Edward	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Fitzherbert, John	Yes	No	No		No
Fitzherbert, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Fitzhughe, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
FitzJames, James	No	Yes	Yes		No
Fitzwater, Thomas, lord Fitzwater	No	Yes	No		No
FitzWilliams, George	No	Yes	No		No
Fitzwilliams, John	No	Yes	No		No
Fitzwilliams, William	No	No	Yes		No
Fleetwood, John	Yes	No	No		No
Fleetwood, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fleetwood, William	No	No	No		Yes
Flemming, Francis	Yes	Yes	No		No
Fogg, John	No	Yes	No		No
Folyott, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Forde, Edmund	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Forest, Miles	Yes	No	No		No
Forest, Robert	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Forest, William	No	Yes	No		No
Forsett, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Forster, Humfrey	Yes	Yes	No		No
Forster, John d. 1559	No	Yes	No	No	No
Forster, William	Yes	No	No		No
Fortescue, Henry	No	Yes	No		Yes
Fortescue, John	No	No	No		Yes
Fortescue, Richard	No	No	Yes		Yes
Foster, Giles	Yes	No	No		No
Foster, John	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Foster, William	No	Yes	No		Yes
Foulkes, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Fowler, Brian	Yes	Yes	No		No
Fowler, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Foxe, Charles	No	No	Yes		Yes
Foxe, James	Yes	No	No		No
Frampton, John	No	Yes	No		No
Frauncis, John	No	No	No		Yes
Fremerton, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Freston, Richard d. 1559	No	Yes	No	No	No
Fretchwell, Peter	Yes	No	No		No
Frevile, George	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Frevile, John	Yes	No	No		No
Frobyser, Francis	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Frobyser, William	No	No	No		Yes
Fulford, John	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Fulford, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Fuljambe, Godfrey	No	No	Yes		Yes
Fuljambe, James	Yes	Yes	No		No

Fuller, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Fulmerston, Richard	No	No	Yes		No
Fynche, Herbert	Yes	No	No		No
Fynche, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Fynche, William	Yes	No	No		No
Fynderne, William	No	Yes	No		No
Gage, Edward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Gage, James	No	Yes	No		No
Gage, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gargrave, Cotton	No	No	No		Yes
Gargrave, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Ye		Yes
Garnans, John	No	No	No		Yes
Gascoigne, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Gascoigne, John, of Lesyngcroft	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gate, Henry	No	No	No		Yes
Gateacre, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Gates, Henry	Yes	No	Yes		No
Gates, John	Yes	No	No		No
Gawdy, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gawdy, Thomas, the elder d. 1557	No	No	Yes		No
Gaynsforde, Nicholas	Yes	No	No		No
Gayson, John	Yes	No	No		No
Gedney, Andrew	No	No	No		Yes
Gell, Anthony	No	No	Yes		Yes
Georges, John	Yes	No	No		No
Gerrard, Gilbert	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gerrard, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Gerrard, William	No	No	No		Yes
Gervys, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Gery, William	Yes	No	No		No
Gibbons, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Gifford, George	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gifford, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gifford, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Gifford, William	Yes	No	No		No
Gilbert, Anthony	No	Yes	No		No
Gilbert, John	No	No	No		Yes
Gill, George	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Gill, John	No	No	No		Yes
Gill'm, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gislington, Nicholas	Yes	No	No		No
Glemham, Christopher d. 1549	Yes	No	No	No	No
Glemham, Edward d. 1561	No	Yes	No	No	No
Godinge, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Godolphan, John, the elder	Yes	Yes	No		No
Godolphan, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Godsalve, John d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Goldinge, Henry	No	No	Yes		No
Goldinge, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Goldingham, Christopher d. 1560	Yes	No	No		No
Goldwell, John	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Goldwell, William	Yes	No	No		No
Gooderick, Henry d. 1556	Yes	No	No	No	No
Gooderick, Richard	No	No	Yes		Yes
Goodman, Gabriel	No	No	No		Yes
Goodwyn, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gore, Giles	No	Yes	No		No
Gorge, Edward	No	Yes	Yes		No
Goringe, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	No

Goringe, William	Yes	No	No		No
Gosnold, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gosnold, Robert	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Gosnold, Robert, the elder	No	No	Yes		No
Gouche, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Gower, Edward	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gower, Henry	Yes	No	No		No
Gower, John	Yes	No	No		No
Gower, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		Yes
Gower, Thomas, of Stytnam	Yes	No	No		No
Gower, Thomas, of Stainsby	Yes	No	No		No
Graceley, John	Yes	No	No		No
Grauntham, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Grauntham, Vincent	Yes	No	No		No
Gravener, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Gray, (Lord) John	No	No	Yes		No
Gray, Peter	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gray, Ralph	No	No	Yes		No
Gray, Reginald (Reynold)	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Gray, William, lord Gray of Wilton	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Greenfeld, Digory	No	No	Yes		No
Greenfeld, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Greenfeld, Richard	Yes	No	No		Yes
Grene, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Grene, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Greneall, Roger	Yes	No	No		No
Greneway, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Gresham, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gresham, Paul	Yes	No	No		No
Gresham, Richard d. 1549	Yes	No	No	No	No
Gresley, William	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Grevile, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Grevile, Fulk	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Grevile, John	Yes	No	No		No
Grevile, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Grey, Edmund d. 1548	Yes	No	No	No	No
Grey, Henry, marquess Dorset	Yes				
Grey, Lionel	Yes	No	No		No
Grey, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Grey, William	Yes	No	No		No
Greyswyke, Hugh	Yes	No	No		No
Grice, Henry	No	No	Yes		No
Griffin, Edward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Griffith, George	Yes	Yes	No		No
Grosvenour, John	Yes	No	No		No
Guldeford, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Guldeford, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Gunter, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Gurdon, Robert	Yes	No	Yes		No
Hadley, George	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Hales, Humphrey	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Hales, James	Yes	No	No		No
Hales, John	Yes	No	No		No
Hales, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hall, Edmund	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Halley, William	No	No	Yes		No
Hals, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Halswell, Nicholas d. 1564	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Hamond, Antony	Yes	Yes	No		No

Hamond, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hamond, Peter	Yes	No	No		No
Hamond, William	No	No	Yes		Yes
Hampden, Richard	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Hanchett, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hardes, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Harding, Nicholas	Yes	No	No		No
Hardwick, James	No	No	No		Yes
Hardwick, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hare, Michael	No	No	Yes		No
Hare, Nicholas d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Harecourte, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hargill, William	Yes	No	No		No
Harlakynnden, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Harley, John	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Harpour, George	Yes	No	No		No
Harpour, Richard	No	No	Yes		No
Harrington, James	Yes	No	Yes		No
Harrington, John	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Harrington, Robert d. 1564	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Harris, John	Yes	No	No		No
Harris, Robert	No	No	Yes		Yes
Harris, William	No	Yes	No		No
ap Harry, George	No	Yes	No		No
ap Harry, Hugh	No	No	Yes		No
Hart, Percival	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Harvy, Antony	Yes	Yes	No		No
Harvy, Edmund	Yes	Yes	No		No
Harvy, Francis	No	No	No		Yes
Harvy, Gerard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Haselwood, Edward	Yes	Yes	No		No
Haselwood, John	Yes	No	No		No
Hassall, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hasting, John	Yes	No	No		No
Hastings, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Hastings, Francis	No	Yes	No		Yes
Hastings, Francis, earl of Huntingdon	Yes	Yes	No		
Hastings, George	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Hastings, Henry, earl of Huntingdon	No	No	Yes		
Hastings, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Hatche, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Havard, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Hawtrey, William	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hemmingham, Anthony	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hendley, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Hendley, Walter	Yes	No	No		No
Heneage, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Heneage, George	No	No	No		Yes
Heneage, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Hennage, William	No	No	No		Yes
Henning, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Herbert, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Herbert, George	No	Yes	No		No
Herbert, John	No	No	Yes		No
Herbert, William	Yes	No	No		No
Herbert, William, earl of Pembroke	No	Yes	Yes		
Hercye, John	Yes	No	Yes		No
Walter, viscount Hereford	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Heron, William	No	No	Yes		No

Heydon, Christopher	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Heydon, Henry d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Heydon, John	Yes	No	No		No
Heydon Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Heymond, Ralph	No	No	No		Yes
Heynes, Simon	Yes	No	No		No
Higate, Reginald	No	No	No		Yes
Higate, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Highford, John	No	Yes	No		No
Higham, Clement	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Hikford, John	No	No	Yes		Yes
Hill, Robert	No	Yes	Yes		No
Hill, Roland	Yes	No	No		No
Hilliard, Christopher	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Hippisley, John	No	No	Yes		No
Hobby, Philip	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hobby, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Hogarde, George	Yes	No	No		No
Holcrofte, John	Yes	No	No		No
Holcrofte, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Holdiche, Robert d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Holland, Blaise	Yes	No	No		No
Holland, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Hollys, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Hollys, William	No	Yes	Yes		No
Holmes, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Honywood, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hooper, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Hoowe, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Hopton, Arthur d. 1556	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hopton, Owen	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Hopton, Ralph	No	No	Yes		No
Hopton, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Horman, Edmund	No	Yes	No		No
Horman, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Hornar, John	No	No	Yes		No
Horne, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No
Horner, James, the younger	Yes	No	No		No
Horner, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Horseley, Cuthbert	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Horseley, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Horsey, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Horsey, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Horton, Walter	No	No	No		Yes
Hotham, John	No	No	No		Yes
Howard, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thomas, viscount Howard of Binden	No	No	Yes		No
Howard, Thomas, duke of Norfolk	No	Yes	Yes		
Howard, William	No	No	No		Yes
Howard, William, lord Howard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Howard, William, lord Howard of Effingham	No	No	Yes		No
Hubaud, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hubbard, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Huddleston, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Huddye, William	No	No	No		Yes
Hughes, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Hull, John	Yes	No	No		No
Humfrey, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No

Hungate, William	Yes	Yes	No		Yes
Hungerford, Anthony	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hungerford, John	No	No	No		Yes
Hungerford, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Hunkes, Robert	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Hunninge, William	No	Yes	Yes		No
Henry, lord of Hunsdon	No	No	Yes		No
Hunt, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Huntley, George	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Hussey, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hussey, Nicholas	Yes	No	No		No
Hussey, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Hussey, William	No	No	Yes		Yes
Hutton, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hutton, Matthew	No	No	No		Yes
Hutton, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Huyck, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Huyck, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Hyde, William d. 1567	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Hynde, Francis	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Hynde, John	Yes	No	No		No
Iden, Henry d. 1568	No	No	Yes		No
Ingleby, William	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Inglefield, Francis	No	Yes	No		No
Ingram, Richard	No	No	Yes		No
Iresby, Lawrence	No	No	Yes		No
Iresby, Leonard	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Isaak, Edward	Yes	No	No		Yes
Isley, Henry	Yes	No	No		No
Isley, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Jackson, Charles	Yes	Yes	No		No
James, Edmund	No	Yes	Yes		No
Jeffreys, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Jenny, Francis	No	Yes	No		No
Jenour, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Jermyn, Ambrose	No	No	Yes		No
Jermyn, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Jermyn, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Jerningham, Henry		Yes	No		No
Jerningham, John d. 1560	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Francis, Jobson	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Jones, Lewis	Yes	No	No		No
Jones, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Josselyn, Thomas	Yes	No	Yes		No
Kaylway, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kekewich, George	No	No	No		Yes
Kelaway, William	Yes	No	No		No
Kempe, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Kempe, Robert	No	Yes	No		Yes
Kemsey, Simon	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Kene, Robert d. 1559	No	Yes	No	No	No
Kerll, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Key, Arthur	Yes	No	No		No
Keynes, John	No	Yes	Yes		No
Killegrewe, John	No	No	Yes		Yes
Kingsmill, John	Yes	No	No		No
Kingsmill, Richard	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Kingston, Anthony	Yes	Yes	No		No
Kinston, Matthew	No	Yes	No		No

Kinston, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Kirkeham, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Knifton, Matthew	Yes	No	No		No
Knight, John	Yes	No	No		No
Knightley, Valentine	Yes	No	No		No
Knighton, John	Yes	No	No		No
Knolles, Francis	Yes	No	No		No
Knyvet, Edmund d. 1551	Yes	No	No	No	No
Kychen, John	Yes	No	No		No
Kyme, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Lacye, Henry	No	Yes	No		No
Lacye, Marmaduke	No	No	No		Yes
Lacye, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Lambert, John	Yes	Yes	No		Yes
Lampleigh, Francis	No	No	No		Yes
Lampleigh, George	No	No	No		Yes
Lampleigh, John	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Lampleigh, Robert	No	Yes	Yes		No
Lane, Robert	No	No	Yes		No
Langdale, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No
Langston, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Lasselles, George	Yes	No	No		No
Lasselles, Roger	Yes	No	No		No
Lasselles, William	Yes	No	No		No
Latimer, John, lord Latimer	No	Yes	No		No
Latton, John	Yes	No	No		No
Laurence, Edward	No	No	No		Yes
Laurence, Oliver	No	Yes	No		No
Laurence, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lawson, Robert d. 1565	No	No	Yes		No
Layburn, Nicholas	No	Yes	No		No
Leder, Oliver	Yes	Yes	No		No
Ledys, John	Yes	No	No		No
Lee, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No
Lee, Henry	No	No	Yes		Yes
Lee, Humphrey	Yes	No	No		No
Lee, Nicholas, of Adington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Lee, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Lee, Roger	Yes	No	No		No
Lee, William	Yes	No	No		No
Leek, Francis	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Legh, Peter	Yes	No	No		No
Legh, William	Yes	No	No		No
Leigh, John	No	Yes	No		No
Leigh, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Leighton, Edward	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Leighton, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Leke, John, of Edmunton	No	No	Yes		No
Lennard, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lepton, Christopher	No	Yes	No		No
Leventhop, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Leweston, John	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Leyson, Griffin	Yes	Yes	No		No
Lewen, Robert	No	No	Yes		No
Leweston, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Lewknor, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Lewknor, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Ligen, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Ligen, William	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No

Lisley, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Lister, Michael	Yes	No	No		No
Lister, Richard d. 1553	Yes	No	No	No	No
Lister, William	No	No	No		Yes
Lister, William, of Midhopp	No	No	Yes		No
Littlebury, Humphrey	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Littlebury, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Littleton, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Littleton, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Locke, William	Yes	No	No		No
Lockton, Robert, of Sawston	Yes	No	No		No
Long, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Longvyle, Arthur	No	Yes	No		No
Losse, Hugh	Yes	Yes	No		No
Lougher, Robert	No	No	Yes		No
Lovelace, John	No	Yes	No		No
Lovelace, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lovelace, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lovell, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Lovell, Francis d. 1552	Yes	No	No	No	No
Lovell, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Lovett, Thomas	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Lowre, William	No	No	No		Yes
Lowther, John	Yes	No	No		No
Lucas, John d. 1558	Yes	No	No	No	No
Lucas, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Lucy, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Lucy, William	Yes	No	No		No
Ludlowe, George	Yes	Yes	No		No
Luke, Nicholas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Lumley, John, lord Lumley	No	No	Yes		No
Lunsford, John	No	No	Yes		No
Lutterell, John	Yes	No	No		No
Lygons, Roger	No	No	Yes		Yes
Lygons, William	No	No	Yes		No
Lyngen, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Lynne, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Lyte, John	No	Yes	No		No
Lytile, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Lytton, Rowland	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mackwilliam, Henry	No	No	No		Yes
Magnus, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Mainwaring, Ranulph	Yes	No	No		No
Mainwaring, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Makworth, Francis	Yes	Yes	No		No
Mallett, John	No	No	Yes		No
Mallett, Michael	Yes	No	No		No
Mallett, Roger	Yes	No	No		No
Mallett, William	No	Yes	No		No
Malory, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Malyverer, Edmund	No	No	Yes		Yes
Malyverer, Richard	No	No	No		Yes
Malyverey, William	Yes	No	No		No
Man, John d. 1569	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Manby, William	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Manners, Henry, earl of Rutland	No	Yes	Yes		
Manners, John	No	No	Yes		Yes
Mannock, Henry	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Manwaring, Arthur	No	No	Yes		No

Manwood, Roger	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mariawingfeld, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Markham, Ellis	No	Yes	Yes		No
Markham, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Markham, Richard	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Marrowe, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Marshe, John	Yes	No	Yes		No
Marten, Edmund	No	No	Yes		No
Marten, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Marton, Christopher	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Marton, David	No	Yes	No		No
Mason, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Massy, John	Yes	No	No		No
Mathewe, John	No	Yes	No		No
Maunsell, Rees	Yes	Yes	No		No
Mawdelyn, John	Yes	No	No		No
Mawdley, John	No	No	Yes		No
Maye, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Maynard, John d. 1556	No	Yes	No	No	No
Meade, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Medley, George	No	No	Yes		No
Mennill, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Meres, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No
Meres, Lawrence	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mervyn, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No
Mervyn, Henry	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Mervyn, James	No	No	Yes		No
Mervyn, John	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Meryng, Francis	Yes	No	No		No
Meryng, William	No	No	Yes		No
Metcalf, Christopher	Yes	Yes	No		Yes
Metham, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Metre, William	Yes	No	No		No
Meverell, Francis	Yes	Yes	No		No
Mewtas, Peter	Yes	No	Yes		No
Michell, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No
Michell, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Middlemore, George	Yes	No	No		No
Middlemore, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Middleton, Ambrose	Yes	Yes	No		No
Middleton, John	Yes	No	No		No
Middleton, John, of Middleton	No	Yes	Yes		No
Middleton, Oliver	No	No	Yes		No
Middleton, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Middleton, William	No	No	Yes		No
Mildmay, Thomas d. 1566	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Mildmay, Walter	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Mileton, John	Yes	No	No		No
Mileton, William	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Mille, John	Yes	No	No		No
Milsent, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Missenden, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Mitford, John	No	No	Yes		No
Mitton, Adam	Yes	Yes	No		No
Mitton, Richard	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Mohan, Reynold	Yes	No	No		No
Mohun, William	No	No	No		Yes
Molineux, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No
Molineux, Francis	No	No	Yes		No

Molineux, John	No	No	No		Yes
Mollens, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Anthony, viscount Montague		No	Yes		
Montagu, Edward, I d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Montagu, Edward, II	No	No	No	Yes	No
Monyn, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Mordaunt, Edmund	Yes	Yes	No		No
Mordaunt, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Mordaunt, John, lord Mordaunt	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Mordaunt, Lewis	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
More, Christopher	Yes	No	No		No
More, Roger	Yes	No	No		No
More, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
More, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
More, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Moreton, Rowland	Yes	Yes	No		No
Moreton, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Moreton, William	Yes	No	No		No
Morgan, Francis	Yes	Yes	No		No
Morgan, Henry	No	Yes	No		No
Morgan, Richard d. 1557	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Morgan, Robert	No	No	Yes		Yes
Moore, John	No	No	Yes		Yes
Morris, John	No	Yes	No		No
Morris, William	Yes	No	No		No
Morysen, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Moryson, Thomas	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Moulshoe, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Moulton, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Moundford, Osbert	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Mounson, George	No	No	No		Yes
Mounson, Robert	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mounson, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Mountepesson, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No
Mountjoye, James, lord Mountjoye	No	No	Yes		No
Movington, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Moyle, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Moyle, Walter	Yes	Yes	No		No
Moyle,	No	Yes	No		No
Mues, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Muncke, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Mundy, Vincent	No	Yes	No		No
Musgrave, Cuthbert	No	No	No		Yes
Musgrave, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Musgrave, Simon	No	No	No		Yes
Musgrave, William	No	No	No		Yes
Nawnton, William	Yes	No	No		No
Nedeham, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Neville, Anthony	Yes	Yes	No		No
Neville, George	No	No	Yes		No
Neville, Henry	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Neville, Henry, earl of Westmoreland	No	No	Yes		
Neville, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Neville, Ralph earl of Westmoreland	Yes	No	No		No
Neville, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Neville, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Newdigate, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Newdigate, Robert	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Newenham, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No

Newporte, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Newporte, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Newton, Alexander	Yes	No	No		No
Newton, John	Yes	No	No		No
Neyle, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Nicolls, George	No	No	Yes		Yes
None, Francis	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Norris, Henry	No	No	Yes		Yes
Norris, John	Yes	No	No		No
Norris, John	Yes	No	No		No
Norris, William	Yes	No	No		No
North, Edward, lord North	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
North, Roger	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Norton, George	No	Yes	Yes		No
Norton, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Norton, John, of Cluddrome	Yes	No	No		No
Norton, John, of Norton	Yes	No	No		No
Norton, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Norton, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Norton, Richard, of Norton	Yes	No	No		No
Nowell, Alexander	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Nowell, Andrew	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Norwood, Ralph	Yes	No	No		No
Ogle, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Ogle, Robert, lord Ogle	No	No	Yes		No
Ogle, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Okeden, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Oker, Ralph, of Oker	No	No	Yes		No
Onley, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Osborn, Peter	No	No	Yes		Yes
Onslowe, Humphrey	No	Yes	Yes		No
Onslowe, Richard	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Oteley, Adam	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Oteley, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Owen, George	Yes	Yes	No		No
Owerton, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Oxenbridge, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Pace, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Page, Richard d. 1549	Yes	No	No	No	No
Paget, William, lord Paget	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Paget, William, lord Paget of Beawdesert	No	No	Yes		No
Pakington, John	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Pakington, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Palmer, John	Yes	No	No		No
Palmer, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Palmer, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Palmer, William	No	No	Yes		Yes
Palmes, Francis	No	No	Yes		No
Pannell, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Parker, Henry d. 1551	Yes	No	No	No	No
Parker, Henry, lord Morley I d. 1555	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Parker, Henry, lord Morley II	No	No	Yes	No	No
Parker, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Parker, John, of Moulton	No	No	Yes		Yes
Parker, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Parr, William, marquis of Northampton	Yes	No	Yes		
Parry, George		Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Parry, Hugh		No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Parry, Simon		No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Parry, Stephen	Yes	Yes	No		No
Parry, Thomas d. 1560	No	Yes	No	No	No
Parrys, Philip	No	Yes	No		No
Paston, Thomas d. 1550	Yes	No	No	No	No
Paston, William d. 1555	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Pate, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Pateshall, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Paulet, Amyas	No	No	No		Yes
Paulet, George	No	Yes	No		No
Paulet, Hugh	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Paulet, John, lord St. John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Paulet, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Paulet, Thomas, lord Paulet	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Paulet, William	No	No	No		Yes
Paulet, William, lord Paulet	Yes	No	Yes		No
Pauncefote, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Payne, Henry	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Payne, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Paynell, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Paynell, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Payton, Christopher d. 1560	No	Yes	No	No	No
Payton, John	No	Yes	No		No
Payton, Robert	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pecke, John	Yes	No	No		No
Peckham, Edmund	Yes	Yes	No		No
Peckham, George	No	No	No		Yes
Peckham, Nicholas	Yes	No	No		No
Peckham, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Peke, Edward	Yes	Yes	No		No
Pelham, Anthony	Yes	Yes	No		No
Pelham, Nicholas	No	Yes	No		No
Pen, John d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Penkvell, Philip	No	No	Yes		No
Pennington, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Pennyston, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Penruddock, George	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Penruddock, John	No	No	No		Yes
Percy, Henry	No	No	Yes		Yes
Percy, Thomas, earl of Northumberland	No	No	Yes		
Perpoynte, George	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Peryam, William	No	No	No		Yes
Peryente, John	Yes	No	No		No
Persall, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Petre, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Petit, Ciriac	No	Yes	No		No
Phesaunt, Jasper	Yes	Yes	No		No
Phillippes, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Pigott, Francis	Yes	No	No		No
Pigott, Henry	No	No	Yes		Yes
Pigott, Henry, of Abington	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Pigott, Thomas, of Stratton	No	No	Yes		Yes
Pigott, Thomas, of Gronden	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Pigot, Thomas, of Cottesford	No	Yes	No		No
Pikering, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Polewhele, John	No	No	Yes		No
Poley, John	No	Yes	No		No
Pollard, Hugh	Yes	Yes	No		No
Pollard, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Pollard, Lewis	No	No	Yes		No

Polsted, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Poole, Francis	Yes	No	No		No
Poole, George	Yes	No	No		No
Poole, German	Yes	No	No		No
Poole, Giles	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Poole, Henry	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Poole, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Poole, William	No	No	Yes		Yes
Poore, Vincent	Yes	Yes	No		No
Pope, Thomas d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Popham, Alexander	Yes	Yes	No		No
Porte, John	Yes	No	No		No
Porter, Arthur d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Porter, Baldwin	Yes	No	No		No
Porter, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Portington, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Portman, Henry	No	No	Yes		No
Portman, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Potter, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Powell, Edmund	Yes	Yes	No		No
Powell, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Powell, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Powes, Edward lord Powes	Yes	No	No		No
Powle, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Pownsett, William	No	Yes	No		No
Powtrell, Nicholas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Powtrell, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Poynes, Matthew	No	No	No		Yes
Poynes, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Poynings, Adrian	No	No	Yes		Yes
Preston, John	Yes	No	No		No
Pridyaux, Humphrey	Yes	No	No		No
Pridyaux, John	Yes	No	No		No
Pryce, John	Yes	No	No		No
Pryce, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Pulvertofte, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Purefey, Michael	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Purefey, Ralph	Yes	No	No		No
Purfrey, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Purevey, George	No	No	No		Yes
Purevey, John	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Purevey, Michael	No	Yes	Yes		No
Pye, Edward	Yes	Yes	No		No
Pye, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Pylbarough, John	Yes	No	No		No
Pynchyn, John	No	No	No		Yes
Pynnok, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Pyrton, William	Yes	No	No		No
Quardringe, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Quarte, Francis	No	Yes	No		No
Radcliffe, Henry, earl of Sussex d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Radcliffe, Thomas, earl of Sussex	No	No	Yes		
Randolph, Barnard	No	Yes	No		Yes
Ratcliff, George	Yes	Yes	No		No
Ratcliff, Humphrey	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Ratcliff, Roger	No	No	Yes		Yes
Rawley, Simon	No	No	Yes		No
Rawley, Walter	Yes	No	No		No
Raynesford, John	Yes	Yes	No		No

Raynolde, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Raynolde, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Raynsforth, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Raynshawe, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Reade, William	Yes	No	Yes		No
Rede, John	Yes	No	No		No
Rede, Richard	No	Yes	No		Yes
Rede, William, the elder	No	Yes	No		No
Rede, William, the younger	No	Yes	No		No
Reppes, Henry	No	No	Yes		No
Resby, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Reskymer, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Reynoldes, Richard	No	No	Yes		Yes
Rich, Edward	No	No	Yes		Yes
Rich, Richard, lord Rich	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Rich, Robert	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Richers, Robert	No	No	Yes		Yes
Richmond, John	No	No	No		Yes
Ridgewaye, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Ridley, Nicholas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Rigge[r], Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Rithe, Christopher	No	No	No		Yes
Rithe, George d. 1561	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Rivett, James	No	No	Yes		No
Rivett, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Robertes, Edmund	No	Yes	No		No
Robertes, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Robertes, Walter	No	No	No		Yes
Robertes, William	No	Yes	No		No
Robertson, Nicholas	Yes	No	No		No
Robinson, William	No	No	Yes		No
Robsart, John	Yes	No	No		No
Roche, William	Yes	No	No		No
Rochester, Robert d. 1558	No	Yes	No	No	No
Rodes, Francis	No	No	No		Yes
Rogers, Edward	Yes	No	Yes		No
Rogers, George	No	No	Yes		Yes
Rogers, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Rokeby, James	Yes	No	No		No
Rokeby, John	No	No	No		Yes
Rokeby, Ralph	Yes	Yes	No		No
Rokeby, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Rokewood, Nicholas d. 1558	No	Yes	No	No	No
Rokewood, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Rolles, George	Yes	No	No		No
Roope, William	Yes	No	No		No
Rooper, Christopher	No	Yes	No		No
Roper, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Rosewell, William	No	No	Yes		No
Roskerok, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Rosse, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Rotheram, George	No	No	No		Yes
Rotheram, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Rottessey, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Roue, Anthony	No	No	No		Yes
Rowlett, Ralph	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Rowley, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Rowse, Edmund d. 1569	Yes	No	No		No
Rowse, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No

Roydon, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Rudley, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		No
Rudston, Robert	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rudston, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Russell, Francis	Yes	No	No		No
Russell, Francis, earl of Bedford	No	No	Yes		No
Russell, John, lord Russell d. 1555	Yes	No	No	No	No
Russell, John	No	Yes	No		No
Russell, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Sacheverell, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		No
Sacheverell, William	No	Yes	No		No
Sackville, John	No	Yes	No		No
Sackville, Richard d. 1566	Yes	No	Yes		No
Sackville, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Sackville, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Sadler, Ralph	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Sadler, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Salkeld, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Salkeld, Richard	No	Yes	Yes		No
Saltmarshe, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Sandes, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No
Sandes, Thomas, lord Sandes	No	Yes	No		No
Sandford, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Saunders, Edward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Saunders, Francis	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Saunders, Thomas	Yes	No	Yes		No
Saunders, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Saundon, William	No	Yes	No		No
Savage, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No
Savage, Francis	No	Yes	No		No
Sayre, John	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Sayvell, Henry	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Sayvell, Hugh	No	No	Yes		Yes
Sayvell, Nicholas	No	Yes	No		No
Sayvell, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Sayvell, William	No	No	No		Yes
Scott, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Scott, Reynold	Yes	Yes	No		No
Scott, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scrope, George	No	No	No		Yes
Scrope, John, lord Scrope of Boulton	Yes	No	No		No
Scrope, Henry, lord Scrope	No	No	Yes		No
Scrope, Ralph	No	No	Yes		Yes
Scryven, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No
Scudamore, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Scudamore, John, of Home	No	No	Yes		No
Scudamore, John, of Home, the elder	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Scudamore, John, of Home, the younger	No	No	No		Yes
Scudamore, John, of Kenchurche	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Seckford, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Sekford, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Sekford, Thomas, the younger	No	No	Yes		No
Seinberbe, Henry	No	No	Yes		No
Senior, John	No	No	No		Yes
Servington, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Seyborne, John	No	Yes	No		No
Seyborne, Richard	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset, Protector d. 1552	Yes	No	No		No

Seymour, Edward	No	No	Yes		No
Seymour, Henry	No	Yes	No		No
Seymour, John	Yes	No	No		No
Seymour, Thomas, lord Seymour of Sudeley d. 1549.	Yes	No	No	No	No
Shandos, Edmund, lord Shandos	No	No	Yes		No
Sharpe, John	No	Yes	No		No
Sharpe, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Sheffield, Edmund, lord Sheffield	Yes	No	No		No
Sheffield, John, lord Sheffield	No	No	Yes		No
Sheldon, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Sheldon, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Shelley, Edward	Yes	Yes	No		No
Shelley, John	Yes	No	No		No
Shelley, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Shelley, William	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Shelton, John d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Sherington, Henry	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Sherington, William	Yes	No	No		No
Sherard, George	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Shukborough, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Shurley, Edward	Yes	Yes	No		No
Shurley, Francis	Yes	Yes	No		No
Skarne, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
Skevington, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Skipwith, Henry	No	No	No		Yes
Skipwith, John, of Utterby	No	Yes	No		No
Skipwith, Leo	No	Yes	No		No
Skipwith, Thomas d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Skipwith, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Skillinge, Walter	Yes	No	No		No
Skinner, Anthony	No	Yes	No		No
Skinner, James	Yes	Yes	No		No
Skinner, John, of Rigate	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Skinner, Ralph	No	No	Yes		No
Skrimsher, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Skrimsher, William	Yes	No	No		No
Slingesby, Francis	No	No	No		Yes
Smyth, Christopher	No	No	Yes		Yes
Smyth, Clement	Yes	No	No		No
Smyth, Francis	No	No	Yes		Yes
Smyth, Gilbert	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Smyth, James	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Smyth, Laurence	Yes	No	No		No
Smyth, Richard	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Smyth, Thomas	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Smyth, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Smytheley, Anthony	No	No	Yes		Yes
Smytheley, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Snagge, Thomas	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Snell, Nicholas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Sneyde, William	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Snowe, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Soley, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Somerfeld, John	No	Yes	No		No
Somerset, George d. 1560	Yes	No	No	No	No
Somerset, Henry, earl of Worcester	Yes	No	No		No
Somerset, William, earl of Worcester	No	Yes	No		
Soone, John d. 1552	Yes	No	No	No	No

Southcote, John	No	Yes	Yes		No
Southcote, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Southwell, Francis d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Southwell, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Southwell, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Southwell, Robert d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Speake, George	No	No	Yes		No
Speake, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Specott, Edmund	No	Yes	No		No
Spencer, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Spencer, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Spring, John d. 1549	Yes	No	No	No	No
St. Aubyn, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
St. Clere, John	Yes	No	No		No
St. John, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
St. John, John, lord St. John	No	No	Yes		No
St. John, Oliver	No	Yes	No		No
St. John, Oliver, lord St. John of Bletso	No	No	Yes		No
St. Leger, Anthony	No	Yes	No		No
St. Leger, John	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
St. Leger, Warham	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
St. Lowe, John d. 1559	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
St. Lowe, William d. 1565	No	No	Yes		No
St. Pole, George	No	Yes	No		No
St. Pole, Matthew	No	Yes	No		No
St. Pole, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
St. Quentin, William	Yes	No	No		No
Stafford, Henry	No	Yes	No		No
Stafford, Henry, lord Stafford	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Stafford, Humphrey	Yes	No	No		No
Stafford, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Stafford, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stamford, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Stanhope, Michael	Yes	No	No		No
Stanhope, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Stanley, Roland	Yes	No	No		No
Stanley, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stanney, John	Yes	No	No		No
Staple, John	Yes	No	Yes		No
Stapleton, Anthony	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Stapleton, Brian	Yes	No	Yes		No
Stapleton, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Starkey, Hugh	Yes	No	No		No
Starnolde, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Staresmore, John	Yes	No	No		No
Steninge, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Stevens, Richard	No	No	No		Yes
Steward, Edmund	No	Yes	No		No
Stidolphe, John	No	No	Yes		No
Stokes, Adrian	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Stonour, Walter	Yes	No	No		No
Storye, John	No	Yes	No		No
Stoughton, Lawrence	Yes	No	Yes		No
Stoughton, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Stourton, Charles, lord Stourton	No	Yes	No		No
Stourton, William, lord Stourton	Yes	No	No		No
Stradling, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Strangwayes, Giles d. 1562	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Straunge, Nicholas	Yes	No	Yes		No

Straunge, Robert	No	No	Yes		Yes
Strelley, Anthony	No	No	Yes		No
Strelley, Nicholas	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Strickland, Walter d. 1569	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Strickland, William	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Stroode, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Stroode, William, the elder	No	Yes	No		No
Stroode, William	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Stukeley, Hugh	Yes	Yes	No		No
Stukeley, Lewis	No	No	No		Yes
Stumpe, James	No	No	Yes		No
Stumpe, William	Yes	No	No		No
Sture, Edmund	Yes	Yes	No		No
Style, Humphrey	Yes	No	No		No
Suede, William	No	Yes	No		No
Sulyard, John	No	Yes	No		No
Sutton, Hamond, the elder	Yes	No	No		No
Sutton, Hamund	No	Yes	No		No
Sutton, Henry	Yes	No	No		No
Sutton, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Sutton, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Swillington, George	Yes	Yes	No		No
Swinbourn, John, of Chopwell	No	No	Yes		No
Swinborn, John	No	Yes	No		No
Swyfte, Robert, the younger	Yes	No	No		No
Sybill, John	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Sydenham, John	No	Yes	No		No
Sydenham, John, the younger	Yes	No	No		No
Sydney, Henry	No	No	Yes		No
Sydnor, Paul	Yes	No	No		No
Symcottes, George	No	Yes	No		No
Symondes, William	No	Yes	No		No
Syselden, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Sysley, Clement	No	No	Yes		Yes
Taillard, Geoffrey	No	Yes	No		No
Taillard, Henry	No	No	No		Yes
Taillard, Lawrence	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Talbot, Francis, earl of Shrewsbury	Yes	Yes	No		
Talbot, George, lord Talbot	Yes	Yes	No		No
Talbot, George, earl of Shrewsbury	No	No	Yes		
John, Talbot	Yes	No	No		No
Tanfeld, Francis	Yes	No	No		No
Tankard, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Tatton, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Taverner, Richard	Yes	No	Yes		No
Tawe, John	Yes	No	No		No
Tay, John	Yes	No	No		No
Taylor, Edward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Taylor, John, dean of Lincoln	Yes	No	No		No
Tempest, Stephen	Yes	No	No		No
Thacker, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Tharold, Anthony	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Tharold, John	No	No	Yes		No
Tharold, William	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Thatcher, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Thistlewayte, Giles	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Thomas, William	No	Yes	No		No
Thompson, John	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Thornhull, William	Yes	Yes	No		No

Thornpe, Nicholas	No	No	No		Yes
Thorold, William	Yes	No	No		No
Thorpe, William	Yes	No	No		No
Threlkeld, Edward	No	No	No		Yes
Throckmorton, Clement	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Throckmorton, George	Yes	No	No		No
Throckmorton, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Throckmorton, Kenelm	No	No	Yes		Yes
Throckmorton, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		No
Throckmorton, Robert	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Throckmorton, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thruston, John	No	No	Yes		No
Thukborough, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Thwaytes, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Thwaytes, William	Yes	No	No		No
Thymolby, John	Yes	No	No		No
Thymolby, Richard	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Thynne, John	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Tildesley, William	Yes	No	Yes		No
Tirrell, Edmund	No	Yes	No		No
Tirrell, John	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Tirrell, Henry	No	Yes	No		No
Tirwhite, Marmaduke	No	No	No		Yes
Tirwhite, Philip	Yes	Yes	No		No
Tirwhite, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Tirwhite, Robert, the elder	No	No	Yes		Yes
Tirwhite, Robert, the younger	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tirwhite, Tristram	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tolemache, Lionel, I d. 1553	Yes	No	No	No	No
Tolemache, Lionel, II	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Tomworth, John	No	No	Yes		No
Tooke, John	No	Yes	No		No
Tooke, William	No	No	Yes		Yes
Toppes, Dennis	No	No	Yes		Yes
Torringham, Thomas	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Tottill, Geoffrey	No	No	No		Yes
Townshend, Giles	Yes	No	No		No
Townshend, Robert d. 1557	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Townshend, Roger d. 1553	Yes	No	No	No	No
Towney, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Tracye, John, the elder	No	No	No		Yes
Tracye, Richard	No	No	Yes		No
Traforde, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No
Tredneck, John	Yes	No	Yes		No
Treffrey, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Treffyre, John	No	No	No		Yes
Tregunwell, John	No	No	Yes		No
Trelawney, John d. 1563	No	No	Yes	No	No
Tremayn, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Trenchard, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Trenchard, Thomas, of Lychet	Yes	No	No		No
Trencreeke, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Tresham, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Trevanyon, Hugh	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Trevanyon, Richard	No	No	No		Yes
Tristram, Robert	Yes	Yes	No		No
Tunstall, Marmaduke	Yes	Yes	No		No
Turney, Anthony	No	No	Yes		Yes
Turpyn, George	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Tuston, John	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Twisden, Roger	No	No	No		Yes
Twynco, Edmund	No	No	Yes		Yes
Tychbourn, Nicholas	Yes	No	No		No
Tyre, John	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Tyrrell, Henry	Yes	No	No		No
Tyrrell, John, of Wardley	No	Yes	No		No
Tyrrell, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Tyrrell, Thomas, of Gipping d. 1551	Yes	No	No	No	No
Tyndall, John	No	No	Yes		No
Tyndall, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Umpage, John	Yes	No	No		No
Umpton, Alexander	Yes	No	No		No
Umpton, Edward	No	No	Yes		Yes
Upton, Hammond	No	No	Yes		Yes
Uvedale, Alfred	No	No	No		Yes
Uvedale, Henry	No	No	Yes		Yes
Uvedale, John	Yes	No	No		No
Uvedale, William d. 1569	No	Yes	No	No	No
Vachell, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Vane, Ralph	Yes	No	No		No
Vanpage, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Vaughan, Charles	No	No	Yes		Yes
Vaughan, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Vaughan, James	Yes	No	No		No
Vaughan, John	No	No	No		Yes
Vaughan, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Vaughan, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Vaughan, Walter	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Vaughan, Walter, the younger	No	No	No		Yes
Vaux, Nicholas	Yes	No	No		No
Vaux, Thomas, lord Vaux	No	Yes	No		No
Vavasour, Peter	Yes	Yes	No		No
Vavasour, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Venables, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Vere, John de, earl of Oxford	Yes	No	Yes		
Verney, Richard	No	No	Yes		No
Vernon, George	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Vernon, Henry	No	No	Yes		No
Vincent, Edward	No	No	No		Yes
Vincent, George	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Vowell, William	Yes	No	No		No
Vyne, Henry	No	Yes	No		No
Waddam, John, of Caterston	No	Yes	No		No
Wade, Armigill	No	No	Yes		No
Wadham, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Wadland, Walter d. 1549	Yes	No	No	No	No
Wake, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Walgrave, Edward	No	Yes	No		No
Walgrave, William d. 1555	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Wall, George	Yes	No	No		No
Wall, George, the younger	No	Yes	No		No
Walleye, Richard, of Dalbye	No	Yes	No		No
Wallop, John	Yes	No	No		No
Wallop, Oliver	No	Yes	No		No
Walpole, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Walpole, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Walpole, William	Yes	No	No		No
Walrond, Humphrey	No	No	Yes		No

Walsingham, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No
Walsingham, Francis	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Walsingham, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Walter, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Waltwyn, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Wansforth, Michael	No	No	Yes		Yes
Warcopp, John	No	Yes	No		No
Ward, Henry d. 1558	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Ward, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wareham, William	Yes	Yes	No		No
Warren, Ralph	Yes	No	No		No
Warnecombe, James	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Warnecombe, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Warneford, John	Yes	No	No		No
Warner, Edward	No	No	Yes		No
Warner, Robert	No	No	Yes		No
Warre, Richard	No	Yes	Yes		No
Warren, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Washington, James	No	No	No		Yes
Wastnes, George	Yes	No	No		No
Waterton, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Wattes, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Watton, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wayneman, Richard	No	No	Yes		No
Wayneman, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Webbe, John	No	Yes	No		No
Webster, William	No	No	No		Yes
Welby, Adlard	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Welby, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Weldon, Anthony	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Weldon, Thomas d. 1567	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Welles, Gilbert	No	Yes	No		No
Welles, Humphrey	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Welles, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Welsbourn, John	Yes	No	No		No
Welshe, John	No	Yes	Yes		No
Wendy, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Wentworthe, John	Yes	No	Yes		No
Wentworth, Thomas, lord Wentworth, I d. 1551	Yes	No	No	No	No
Wentworth, Thomas, lord Wentworth, II	No	Yes	Yes		
Wentworth, Thomas, of Bretton	Yes	Yes	No		No
Wentworth, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Wentworth, Thomas, of Wentworth	Yes	No	No		No
Wescote, Christopher	Yes	Yes	No		No
West, Nicholas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
West, Thomas, lord laWare	Yes	Yes	No		No
Weston, Henry	No	No	Yes		No
Weston, Hugh	No	Yes	No		No
Weston, Richard	No	No	Yes		Yes
Westwood, Hugh	Yes	Yes	No		No
Whalley, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Wharton, Gilbert	Yes	No	No		No
Wharton, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Wharton, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Wharton, Thomas, lord Wharton	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Wheteley, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Whiddon, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
White, John	Yes	Yes	No		No

White, Robert	No	Yes	No		No
White, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No
Whitehead, Alexander	No	No	Yes		No
Whitney, Robert	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Whittingham, Robert	No	No	No		Yes
Whynbourne, John	Yes	No	No		No
Wichcot, Hammond	No	No	Yes		No
Wightman, William	No	No	No		Yes
Wigston, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Wilbraham, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Williams, George	No	Yes	No		No
Williams, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Williams, Nicholas	No	No	No		Yes
Williams, Reynold	Yes	Yes	No		No
Williams, Robert	No	Yes	Yes		No
Williams, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Willington, William	Yes	No	No		No
Willoughby, Charles	No	No	Yes		No
Willoughby, Christopher	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Willoughby, George	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Willoughby, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Willoughby, William, lord Willoughby	Yes	No	Yes		No
Wilson, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes
Winchcombe, John, the elder	No	Yes	No		No
Winchcombe, John	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Winchcombe, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Windham, Edmund	No	Yes	Yes		No
Windham, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Windsor, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No
Windsor, Edmund	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Windsor, Edward, lord Windsor	No	No	Yes		No
Windsor, William, lord Windsor	Yes	Yes	No		No
Wingfeld, Richard	No	No	Yes		No
Wingfeld, Robert	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Winston, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Winter, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Winter, William	No	No	No		Yes
Wintershall, Robert	Yes	No	No		No
Wirley, William, the younger	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Witherington, John	Yes	Yes	No		No
Withipole, Edmund	No	No	Yes		No
Witney, James	No	No	No		Yes
Wodall, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No
Wogan, John	No	Yes	No		No
Wogan, William	Yes	No	No		No
Wolby, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Wollescote, William	Yes	No	No		No
Wolmer, Richard	No	Yes	No		No
Wombwell, William	No	No	Yes		Yes
Wood, Alexander	Yes	Yes	No		No
Woodcoke, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Woodgrave, William	Yes	No	No		No
Woodehall, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Woodhouse, Roger	Yes	Yes	No		No
Woodhouse, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No
Woodhouse, Thomas, of Wraxam	Yes	No	No		No
Woodhouse, William d. 1564	No	Yes	Yes		No
Woodruff, Francis	No	No	Yes		No
Woodruff, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No

Worseley, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Worteley, Francis	No	No	No		Yes
Wotton, Edward	Yes	No	No		No
Wotton, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wraye, Christopher	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wright, George	No	Yes	No		No
Wright, Robert	No	No	Yes		No
Wrothe, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Wroughton, William	Yes	No	No		No
Wrottesley, Walter	Yes	No	No		No
Wyat, Francis	Yes	No	No		No
Wyat, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Wybarn, William	Yes	No	No		No
Wye, Richard	No	No	Yes		Yes
Wye, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes
Wykkes, Richard	Yes	No	No		No
Hugh Wyrall	Yes	No	No		No
Wyseman, John, of Camfeld	No	Yes	No		No
Wyseman, John, of Felsted	Yes	Yes	No		No
Wyvell, Marmaduke	Yes	Yes	No		No
Yarde, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No
Yate, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Yelverton, William	Yes	No	No		No
Yelverton, William, the elder	No	No	Yes		No
Yonge, Roger	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Yonge, William	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Yonger, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		No
Yorke, John	Yes	No	No		No
Zouche, George	Yes	Yes	No		No
Zouche, George, lord Zouche	No	Yes	Yes		No
Zouche, John, lord Zouche	Yes	Yes	No		No
Zouche, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Appendix 2: Careers of Individual JPs (by county)

Cambridgeshire	1547	1554	1562	1564	1569	Notes
Thomas, Bishop of Ely	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	replaced under Elizabeth
Alington, Giles	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	"misliked"
Bacon, Nicholas	Yes	No	Yes		No	
Bill, William, master of St. John's College, Cambridge	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1561
Bromley, Thomas	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1555
Broun, Anthony	No	No	Yes		No	
Burgoyne, Christopher	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Bury, Richard	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1556
Catlyn, Robert	No	No	Yes		No	
Chester, Robert	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"good"
Chicheley, Thomas	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Coke, William	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1554
Compton, Griffin	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
Cotton, John	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	"conformable"
Cuttes, Christopher	Yes	No	No		No	
Dyer, James	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Fitzalan, Henry, earl of Arundell	No	No	Yes		No	
Frevile, George	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Barnet" "conformable"
Frevile, John	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Goldswell, John	No	No	No		Yes	
Goodrich, Henry	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1557
Griffin, Edward	No	Yes	No		No	
Hinde, Francis	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	"good"
Hinde, John	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1551
Holmes, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"good"
Huddleston, John	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1557
Hutton, John	No	No	Yes		Yes	"conformable"
Hutton, Thomas	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Lockton, Robert, of Sawston	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1550
Mallory, William	Yes	No	No		No	
Milsent, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	"misliked;" signed Act of Uniformity in 1569
Montague, Edward	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1557
More, Thomas	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1561
Morgan, Richard	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
North, Edward, lord North	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	"conformable"; d. 1564
North, Roger, lord North	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	"misliked"
Paris, Philip	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Peyton, Robert, I	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1551
Peyton, Robert, II	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"good"
Pigott, Henry, of Abington	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"good"
Paulet, William Paulet, lord St. John, marquis of Winchester	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Radcliffe, Henry, earl of Sussex	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Rudston, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1557
Russell, John, lord Russell	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1555
Ryvett, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes	
Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset, Protector	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
St. John, Oliver, lord St. John of Bletsoe	No	No	Yes		No	
Walpole, William	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1557
Ward, Richard	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1561
Wendy, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1560
Wilkes, Richard	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1556

Hertfordshire	1547	1554	1562	1564	1569	Notes
Thomas, bishop of Ely	Yes	No	No		No	
Edmund, bishop of London	No	Yes	Yes		No	d. 1569
Bacon, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		No	
Bacon, Thomas	No	No	Yes		No	
Baeshe, Edward	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Religion unknown
Barley, Francis	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Barley, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	"Favorer"
Barrington, Thomas	No	No	No	Yes	No	"Favorer"
Benger, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes	
Bowles, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes	
Bristowe, Nicholas	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	"Earnest"
Brocket, Edward	No	Yes	No		No	
Brocket, John	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Brocket, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Earnest"
Broke, David	No	Yes	No		No	
Broke, Robert	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Burgoyne, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	"Hinderer"
Butler, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Hinderer"
Capell, Edward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Indifferent"
Capell, Giles	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
Cavendish, William	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Chester, Robert	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Hinderer"
Cholmeley, Ranulph	No	No	Yes		No	
Cholmeley, Roger	Yes	No	No		No	d. 1565
Cocke, Henry	No	No	No		Yes	
Conningsby, Henry	No	No	Yes		Yes	
Dacres, George	No	No	No		Yes	
Denny, Anthony	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1550
Denny, Henry	No	No	No		Yes	
Dockwra, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Earnest"
Doddes, William	No	Yes	Yes		No	
Eliot, George	Yes	No	No		No	
Ferrers, George	Yes	No	No		No	
Fitzalan, Henry, earl of Arundel	No	No	Yes		No	
Fitzherbert, John	Yes	No	No		No	
Forster, John	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Gerrard, Gilbert	No	No	Yes		No	
Gery, William	Yes	No	No		No	
Gill, George	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	"Favorer;" d. 1568
Gill, John	No	No	No		Yes	
Hadley, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	"Hinderer"
Hanchet, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Hinderer"
Harrington, John	No	No	No		Yes	
Hemming, Thomas	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Heydon, Henry	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Horsey, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Earnest"
Henry, lord Hunsdon	No	No	Yes		No	
Hyde, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	"Favorer"
Knighton, John	Yes	No	Yes		No	
Kychen, John	Yes	No	No		No	
Lee, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	"Indifferent"
Leventhop, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes	
Lister, Richard	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1553
Lytton, Rowland	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Earnest"
Maynard, John	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
Nowell, Alexander	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	"Favorer"
Page, Richard	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1549
Parker, Henry, lord Morley, I	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1555 or 1556

Parker, Henry, lord Morley, II	Yes	No	Yes		No	
Parry, Thomas	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1560
Paulet, William, lord St. John, marquis of Winchester	Yes	No	Yes			
Pen, John	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Penruddocke, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Favorer"
Pervente, John	Yes	No	No		No	
Pope, Thomas	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Purvey, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Hinderer"
Raynshawc, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	
Reade, Richard	No	No	No		Yes	
Rich, Richard, lord Rich	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1567
Rowlet, Ralph	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	"Favorer"
Russell, John, lord Russell	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1555
Sadler, Ralph	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	custos in 1562, "Favorer"
Sadlier, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes	
Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset, Protector	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Seymour, John	Yes	No	No		No	
Seymour, Thomas, lord Seymour	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1549
Skipwith, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Smyth, Christopher	No	No	Yes		Yes	
Snagge, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes	
Southwell, Francis	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Taylor, Edward	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	"Hinderer"
Tooke, William	No	No	Yes		Yes	
Twynneo, Edmund	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Hinderer"
Walsingham, Francis	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	"Favorer"
Kent	1547	1554	1562	1564	1569	Notes
Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Matthew, archbishop of Canterbury	No	No	Yes		No	
J. Bishop of Rochester	Yes	No	No		No	
Alcock, Robert	No	No	No		Yes	
Alleyn, Christopher	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Appleton, Roger	No	Yes	No		No	
Ashley, Thomas	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Awcher, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No	
Bacon, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		No	
Baker, John	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Baker, Richard	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Barham, Nicholas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Beyer, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Binge, Robert	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Blage, George	Yes	No	No		No	
Borough, William, lord Borough	No	No	Yes		No	
Bosseville, Ralph	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Bowes, Martin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	d. 1566
Boyes, Edward	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Boyes, William	Yes	No	No		No	
Brente, John	No	Yes	No		No	
Brente, Robert	No	Yes	No		No	
Broke, David	No	Yes	No		No	
Broke, Robert	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Burgavenny, Henry, lord Burgavenny	No	Yes	Yes		No	
Cartwright, Hugh	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cheyne, Henry	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cheyne, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Cholmeley, Ranulph	No	No	Yes		No	
Cholmeley, Roger	Yes	No	No		No	d. 1565

Clerke, George	No	Yes	No		No	
Clifford, George	No	No	No		Yes	
Cobham, George lord Cobham	Yes	No	No		No	d. 1569
Cobham, John	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cobham, William, lord Cobham	No	No	Yes		No	
Cotton, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cripse, Henry	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Cripse, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		No	
Cromer, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Culpepper, John	Yes	No	No		No	
Culpepper, Robert	Yes	No	No		No	
Culpepper, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No	
Damsell, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Darrell, George	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	
Darrell, Hugh	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Darrell, Thomas, of Skotney	Yes	No	No		No	
Dennys, Martin	No	Yes	No		No	
Dennys, Maurice	Yes	No	Yes		No	
Deringe, John	Yes	No	No		No	
Doyle, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Draner, John	No	Yes	No		No	
Eyre, Robert	No	No	No		Yes	
George Fane	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	"Vane" in 1554
Fitzalan, Henry, earl of Arundell	No	No	Yes		No	
Fynche, Herbert	Yes	No	No		No	
Fynche, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No	
Fynche, William	Yes	No	No		No	
Gayson, John	Yes	No	No		No	
Gerrard, Gilbert	No	No	Yes		No	
Goldwell, John	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Goldwell, William	Yes	No	No		No	
Grene, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No	
Guldeford, John	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Guldeford, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes	
Hales, Humphrey	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Hales, James	Yes	No	No		No	
Hales, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Hamond, Peter	Yes	No	No		No	
Hamond, Ralph	No	No	No		Yes	
Hardes, Thomas	No	Yes	No		No	
Harlakynnden, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Harpour, George	Yes	No	No		No	
Harte, Percival	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Hendley, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No	
Hendeley, Walter	Yes	No	No		No	
Herbert, William, earl of Pembroke	No	Yes	Yes		No	
Honywood, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Howard, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Henry, lord Hunsdon	No	No	Yes		No	
Isacke, Edward	Yes	No	No		No	
Isley, Henry	Yes	No	No		No	
Isley, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Kempe, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lennard, John	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lister, Richard	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1553
Lovelace, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lovelace, William	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Manwood, Roger	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Meyney, John	No	No	No	Yes	No	

Monyn, Edward	Yes	No	No		No	
Moulton, George	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Moyle, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Moyle, Walter	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Norton, John	No	Yes	No		No	
Paulet, William, lord St. John, marquis of Winchester	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Payton, John	No	Yes	No		No	
Petit, Ciriac	No	Yes	No		No	
Potter, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes	
Richers, Robert	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Robertes, Gualterius	No	No	No	Yes	No	
Robertes, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Robertes, Walter	No	No	No		Yes	
Rokewood, Nicholas	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Rooper, Christopher	No	Yes	No		No	
Rooper, William	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Roydon, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Rudston, Robert	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Russell, John, lord Russell	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1555
Sackville, Richard	No	No	Yes		No	d. 1566
Sandes, Anthony	Yes	No	No		No	
Scott, Reynold	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Scott, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset, Protector	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Seymour, Thomas lord Seymour	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1549
Southwell, Robert	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1559
Stanley, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
St. Leger, Anthony	No	Yes	No		No	
St. Leger, Nicholas	No	No	No	Yes	No	
St. Leger, Warham	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Style, Humphrey	Yes	No	No		No	
Sybill, John	No	Yes	Yes		Yes	
Sydney, Henry	No	No	Yes		No	
Sydour, Paul	Yes	No	No		No	
Thwaytes, Edward	Yes	No	No		No	
Tooke, John	No	Yes	No		No	
Tuston, John	No	No	No	Yes	No	
Twisden, Roger	No	No	No		Yes	
Vane, Ralph	Yes	No	No		No	
Walsingham, Edmund	Yes	No	No		No	
Walsingham, Thomas	No	No	Yes		Yes	
Watton, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Webbe, John	No	Yes	No		No	
Weldon, Anthony	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Willoughby, Thomas	No	No	No		Yes	
Wotton, Edward	Yes	No	No		No	
Wotton, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	custos in 1562
Wyat, Thomas	Yes	No	No		No	
Norfolk	1547	1554	1562	1564	1569	Notes
Thomas, Bishop of Ely	Yes	No	No		?	
Thomas, Bishop of Norwich	No	Yes	No		?	
Audeley, Edmund	No	Yes	No		?	
Babyan, James	Yes	No	No		?	
Bacon, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		?	
Barney, Robert	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Beampre, Edmund	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	poss adv; d. 1568
Bedingfeld, Edmund	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552

Bedingfeld, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Bedingfeld, John, of Marsland	Yes	No	No		?	
Blanchhassett, John	No	No	Yes		?	
Bourchier, John, earl of Bath	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1561
Bromley, Thomas	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1555
Broun, Anthony	No	No	Yes		No	d. 1567
Bulleyn, James	No	Yes	No		?	
Buttes, William	Yes	No	Yes	prob	?	poss fav
Calibut, John	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
Calthrope, Peter	Yes	No	No		?	
Catlyn, Richard	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
Catlyn, Robert	No	No	Yes		?	
Clere, John	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1558
Corbet, John, the elder	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Davye, Gregory	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1559
Farmer, William	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Fitzalan, Henry, earl of Arundell	No	No	Yes		?	
Fitzwater, Thomas, lord Fitzwater	No	Yes	No		?	
Fremerston, Richard	Yes	No	No		No	
Fulmerston, Richard	No	No	Yes		No	d. 1568
Gawdy, Thomas, the elder	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1557
Gawdy, Thomas, the younger	No	No	Yes		?	
Gibbons, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes	?	poss adv
Godsalve, John	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Goodrich, Henry	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1557
Gresham, Paul	Yes	No	No		?	
Gresham, Richard	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1549
Grey, Edmund	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1548
Griffin, Edward	No	Yes	No		?	
Hare, Nicholas	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Heydon, Christopher	Yes	Yes	Yes	prob	?	poss fav
Heydon, John	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1551
Heydon, Richard	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1554
Hogard, George	Yes	No	No		No	d. 1567
Holdich, Robert	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Holleys, Thomas	Yes	No	No		?	
Howard, Thomas, 3 rd duke of Norfolk	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1555
Howard, Thomas, 4 th duke of Norfolk	No	No	Yes	prob	?	poss fav
Hubbard, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Knyvet, Edmund	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1551
Knyvet, Thomas	No	Yes	No		?	d. 1569
Lovell, Francis	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Lovell, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	d. 1567
Montague, Edward	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1557
Morgan, Richard	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
Moundeforde, Osbert	Yes	Yes	Yes		?	
Parker, Henry, lord Morley	No	Yes	No		No	d. 1555 or 1556
Paston, Thomas	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1550
Paston, William	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	d. 1555
Paulet, William, lord St. John, marquis of Winchester	Yes	No	Yes		?	
Radcliffe, Henry, earl of Sussex	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Radcliffe, Thomas, earl of Sussex	No	No	Yes		?	
Reppes, Henry	No	No	Yes		No	d. 1566
Robsart, John	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1554
Russell, John, lord Russell	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1555
Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset, Protector	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Shelton, John	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559

Southwell, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Southwell, Robert	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1559
Steninge, Thomas	No	No	Yes		?	
Straunge, Nicholas	Yes	No	Yes	prob	?	poss fav
Towneshend, Giles	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1554
Towneshend, Robert	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1557
Towneshend, Roger	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1553
Tyndall, Thomas	No	Yes	No	Yes	?	poss adv
Walpole, John	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Ward, Henry	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Wyndham, Edmund	No	Yes	Yes	prob	?	poss fav; d. 1569
Woodhouse, Roger	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1561
Woodhouse, Thomas, of Wraxam	Yes	No	Yes	prob	?	poss fav
Woodhouse, William	No	Yes	Yes		No	custos in 1562; d. 1565
Yelverton, William	Yes	No	Yes		?	
Suffolk	1547	1554	1562	1564	1569	Notes
Thomas, Bishop of Ely	Yes	No	No		?	
Thomas, Bishop of Norwich	No	Yes	No		?	
Ashfield, Robert, I	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1550
Ashfield, Robert, II	No	No	Yes		?	
Bacon, Nicholas	Yes	Yes	Yes		?	
Bedingfeld, Edmund	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1553
Bedingfeld, Henry	No	Yes	No		?	
Blanerhasset, John	No	Yes	Yes		?	
Bourchier, John earl of Bath	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1561
Breend, John	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1561
Browse, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		?	
Bromley, Thomas	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1555
Broun, Anthony	No	No	Yes		No	d. 1567
Broun, Robert	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Burgh, Thomas, lord Burgh	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1551
Catlyn, Robert	No	No	Yes		?	
Cavendish, Richard	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1555
Cavendish, William	No	No	Yes		?	
Chamberlayn, Ralph	No	Yes	No		?	
Clerke, Walter	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1555
Clopton, Francis	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1559
Colte, George	No	Yes	Yes		?	
Cordell, William	No	Yes	Yes		?	
Cornwallis, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Crane, Robert	No	No	Yes		?	
Cutler, Nicholas	No	No	Yes		No	d. 1567
Daniel, Thomas, of Sudbury	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	d. 1565
Downes, James	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1558
Doyle, Henry	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Drury, Robert	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1557
Drury, William	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Eden, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		No	d. 1567
Eyre, John	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1562
Felton, Thomas	No	Yes	Yes		?	
Fitzalan, Henry, earl of Arundel	No	No	Yes		?	
Forster, William	Yes	No	No		?	
Foster, William	No	Yes	No		?	
Fulmerston, Richard	Yes	No	No		No	d. 1568
Freston, Richard	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Gates, Henry	Yes	No	No		?	
Glemham, Christopher	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1559
Glemham, Edward	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1561
Goldingham, Christopher	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1560

Goodrich, Henry	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1557
Gosnold, John	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Gosnold, Robert	No	Yes	Yes		?	
Griffin, Edward	No	Yes	No		No	d. 1564
Gurdon, Robert	Yes	No	Yes		?	
Hare, Michael	No	No	Yes		?	
Hare, Nicholas	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Hennyngham, Anthony	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Higham, Clement	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	?	<i>custos</i> in 1562; poss adv
Honnings, William	No	Yes	Yes		No	d. 1568
Hopton, Arthur	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
Hopton, Owen	Yes	Yes	Yes		?	
Howard, Thomas, 3 rd duke of Norfolk	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1555
Howard, Thomas, 4 th duke of Norfolk	No	No	Yes		?	d. 1572
Jenny, Francis	No	Yes	No		?	
Jermyn, Ambrose	No	No	Yes		?	
Jermyn, John	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Jerningham, Henry	No	Yes	No		?	
Jerningham, John	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1560
Kene, Robert	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Lucas, John	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1558
Meres, Lawrence	No	No	Yes		?	
Montague, Edward	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1557
Morgan, Richard	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
Newton, Alexander	Yes	No	No	No	No	
None, Francis	Yes	Yes	Yes		?	
North, Edward, lord North	No	No	Yes		No	d. 1564
Paulet, William, lord St John, marquis of Winchester	Yes	No	Yes		?	
Payne, Henry	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	d. 1567
Peyton, Christopher	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1560
Pope, Thomas	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1559
Radcliffe, Henry, earl of Sussex	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Radcliffe, Thomas, earl of Sussex	No	No	Yes		?	
Raynolde, Robert	Yes	No	No		?	
Reede, William	Yes	No	No		?	
Rochester, Robert	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Rokewood, Nicholas	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1558
Rokewood, Robert	No	Yes	No		No	d. 1566
Rowse, Edmund	Yes	No	No		?	
Rowse, Thomas	No	Yes	No		?	
Russell, John, lord Russell	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1555
Ryvett, James	No	No	Yes		?	
Seckford, Thomas	Yes	Yes	Yes		?	
Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset, Protector	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Somerset, George	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1560
Sone, John	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Southwell, John	Yes	Yes	Yes		?	
Southwell, Robert	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1559
Spring, John	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1549
Sulyard, John	No	Yes	No		?	
Thruston, John	No	No	Yes		?	
Tirrell, John	No	Yes	No	Yes	?	poss. adv
Tolemache, Lionel, I	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1553
Tolemache, Lionel, II	No	Yes	Yes			
Tyrrell, Thomas, of Gipping	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1551
Wadland, Walter	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1549
Waldegrave, Edward	No	Yes	No		?	

Waldegrave, William	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1555
Wentworth, Thomas, lord Wentworth, I	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1551
Wentworth, Thomas, lord Wentworth, II	No	Yes	Yes		?	
Wharton, Richard	Yes	Yes	No		?	
Willoughby, William, lord Willoughby	No	No	Yes		?	
Wingfeld, Anthony	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Wingfeld, Richard	No	No	Yes		?	
Wingfeld, Robert	No	No	Yes		?	
Withipole, Edmund	No	No	Yes		?	
Surrey	1547	1554	1562	1564	1569	Notes
Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury	No	No	Yes			
Agmondesham, John	No	No	Yes	Yes		"Favorer"
Bacon, Nicholas	No	No	Yes			
Bedon, Richard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		"Favorer"
Birche, John	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Bowyer, William	No	No	No	Yes		"Favorer"
Boyer, John	No	No	Yes			
Bray, Edward	No	Yes	No			
Broke, David	No	Yes	No			
Broke, Robert	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Broun, Anthony	Yes	Yes	No			
Broun, Matthew	Yes	Yes	No			
Browne, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes		"Favorer"
Carden, Thomas	Yes	No	No			
Carill, John	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Cecil, William	No	No	Yes			
Cholmeley, Ranulph	No	Yes	Yes			
Cholmeley, Roger	Yes	No	Yes		No	d. 1565
Clinton, Edward, lord Clinton	No	Yes	Yes			
Copley, Thomas	No	No	Yes			
Curson, Robert	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1551
Doyle, Thomas	No	No	Yes	Yes		"Favorer"
Eston, John	Yes	Yes	No		No	d. 1565
Fitzalan, Henry, earl of Arundel	Yes	No	Yes			
Fogg, John	No	Yes	No			
Gage, John	Yes	Yes	No			
Gerrard, Gilbert	No	No	Yes	Yes		"Favorer"
Goodericke, Richard	Yes	No	No			
Gresham, John	Yes	Yes	No			
Heron, William	No	No	Yes			
Howard, William, lord Howard	Yes	Yes	Yes			custos in 1562
Lee, Nicholas, of Adington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		"Indifferent"
Leyson, Griffin	Yes	No	No			
Lister, Richard	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1553
Lumley, John, lord Lumley	No	No	Yes			
Mannoke, Henry	Yes	No	No			
Montague, Anthony, viscount Montague	No	No	Yes			
More, Christopher	Yes	No	No			
More, William	No	No	Yes	Yes		"Favorer"
Morgan, Richard	No	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1556
Onslowe, Richard	No	No	No	Yes		"Favorer"
Paulet, William, lord St John, marquis of Winchester	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Polsted, Henry	Yes	Yes	No			
Pope, Thomas	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Russell, John, lord Russell	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1555
Sackville, Richard	No	No	Yes		No	d. 1566
Sackville, William	Yes	Yes	No			

Saunders, Thomas	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		"Indifferent"
Saunders, William	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Scott, John	Yes	Yes	No			
Seymour, Edward, duke of Somerset, Protector	Yes	No	No	No	No	d. 1552
Skinner, James	Yes	Yes	No			
Skinner, John, of Rigate, the elder	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		"Indifferent"
Southwell, Robert	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	d. 1559
Steydol, Nicholas	No	No	No	Yes		"Indifferent"
Stidolphe, John	No	No	Yes			
Stoughton, Laurence	Yes	No	Yes			
Stoughton, Thomas	No	No	Yes			
Taverner, Richard	Yes	No	No			
Vyne, Henry	No	Yes	No			
Warner, Robert	No	No	Yes			
Weston, Henry	No	No	Yes			
Wheteley, Richard	No	Yes	No			
Wintershull, Robert	Yes	No	No			

Appendix 3: Careers of JPs by Reign

Cambridgeshire	Numbers of JPs	% of Total
Edward only	17	34%
Mary only	6	12%
Edward and Mary only	5	10%
Elizabeth only	9	18%
Edward and Elizabeth only	4	8%
Mary and Elizabeth only	4	8%
Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth	5	10%
Totals:	50	100%

Hertfordshire	Numbers of JPs	% of Total^a
Edward only	15	18%
Mary only	9	11%
Edward and Mary only	9	11%
Elizabeth only	35	42%
Edward and Elizabeth only	5	6%
Mary and Elizabeth only	6	7%
Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth	5	6%
Totals:	84	101%

a. Figures rounded to the nearest whole number, resulting in an artificially high final total of 101%.

Kent	Numbers of JPs	% of Total
Edward only	37	28%
Mary only	16	12%
Edward and Mary only	9	7%
Elizabeth only	53	40%
Edward and Elizabeth only	3	2%
Mary and Elizabeth only	12	9%
Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth	3	2%
Totals:	133	100%

Norfolk	Numbers of JPs	% of Total^a
Edward only	28	35%
Mary only	9	11%
Edward and Mary only	17	22%
Elizabeth only	11	14%
Edward and Elizabeth only	5	6%
Mary and Elizabeth only	5	6%
Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth	4	5%
Totals:	79	99%

a. Figures rounded to the nearest whole number, resulting in an artificially low final total of 99%.

Suffolk	Numbers of JPs	% of Total
Edward only	29	28%
Mary only	24	23%
Edward and Mary only	12	11%
Elizabeth only	17	16%
Edward and Elizabeth only	3	3%
Mary and Elizabeth only	9	9%
Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth	11	10%
Totals:	105	100%

Surrey	Numbers of JPs	% of Total
Edward only	12	18%
Mary only	7	11%
Edward and Mary only	11	17%
Elizabeth only	22	33%
Edward and Elizabeth only	4	6%
Mary and Elizabeth only	4	6%
Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth	6	9%
Totals:	66	100%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Bateson, Mary (ed.). "A Collection of Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council, 1564," *Camden Miscellany* IX, CS New Series, LIII: 1893.

Calendar of Patent Rolls for Edward VI, Vol. 1: 1 Edward VI Part I.
Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1970.

Calendar of Patent Rolls for Philip and Mary, Volume 1: 1 Mary Part I.
Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1970.

Calendar of Patent Rolls for Elizabeth I, Volume 2: 4 Elizabeth Part X.
Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1976.

Calendar of Patent Rolls for Elizabeth I, Volume 5: 13 Elizabeth Part III.
Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1976.

Secondary Sources

Books

Beard, Charles Austin. *The Office of Justice of the Peace in England in Its Origin and Development*. New York: AMS Press, 1967 (reprint).

Bourgeois, Eugene J. II. *The Ruling Elite of Sixteenth-Century Cambridgeshire: Continuity and Stability in County Government*. Unpublished manuscript.

Gunn, S. J. *Early Tudor Government, 1485-1558*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Guy, John. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Gleason, John. *The Justices of the Peace in England, 1558 to 1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Elton, G. R. *England Under the Tudors*, (third edition). London: Routledge, 1991.

_____. *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

_____. *The Tudor Constitution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

_____. *The Tudor Revolution in Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

- Hasler, P. W. *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1558-1603*. London: HM Stationery Office, 1981.
- Hassell Smith, A. *County and Court: Government and Politics in Norfolk, 1558-1603*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.
- Jones, W. R. D. *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1539-1570*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1973.
- Lambard, William. *Eirenarcha: Or, of the Office of the Justices of Peace*, 1581.
- Lander, J. R. *English Justices of the Peace, 1461-1509*. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1989.
- Loades, David. *The Mid-Tudor Crisis, 1545-1565*. 1992.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Suffolk and the Tudors: Politics and Religion in an English County, 1500-1600*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Osborne, Bertram. *Justices of the Peace 1361-1848: A History of the Justices of the Peace for the Counties of England*. Shaftesbury: The Sedgehill Press, 1960.
- Putnam, Bertha Haven. *Early Treatises on the Practice of the Justices of the Peace in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Oxford: 1926.
- Wall, Alison. *Power and Protest in England, 1525-1640*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Williams, Penry. *The Tudor Regime*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- Wrigley, E. A. and R. S. Schofield. *The Population History of England, 1541-1871: A Reconstruction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Articles

- Gleason, J. H. "The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace, 1554-1564." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 18 (1955): 169-177.
- Hassell Smith, A. "The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace, 1554-1564: A Reconsideration." *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 22 (1977): 301-312.
- Jack, Sybil. "The Exchequer," in R. H. Fritze, ed., *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England, 1485-1603*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991, pp. 187-190.
- Loades, David. "Mary I," in R. H. Fritze, ed., *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England, 1485-1603*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991, pp. 326-329.

Robison, William. "The National and Local Significance of Wyatt's Rebellion in Surrey," *Historical Journal* 30, 4 (1987): pp. 769-790.

_____. "Justices of the Peace," in R. H. Fritze, ed., *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England, 1485-1603*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991, pp. 280-283.

_____. "Wyatt's Rebellion," in R. H. Fritze, ed., *Historical Dictionary of Tudor England, 1485-1603*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991, pp. 550-552.

Youngs, Frederic A. Jr. "Towards Petty Sessions: Tudor JPs and Divisions of Counties," in *Tudor Rule and Revolution: Essays for G.R. Elton from his American friends*, Delloyd J. Guth and John W. McKenna, eds., Cambridge: The University of Cambridge Press, 1982, pp. 201-216.

Zell, M. L. "Early Tudor JPs at Work," *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 93 (1977): 125-43.

Thesis

Hankins, Jeffrey R. "Tudor Local Government and Administration in the County of Hertfordshire, circa 1520-1580." Master's thesis, Southwest Texas State University (1998).

