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Considering the administrative, political and social impact of the common lawyers, it is surprising that the legal profession has only lately attracted the attention of historians. Their recent work, which has been commenced by E.W. Ives and W.J. Jones for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, is being continued into the next century by W.R. Prest and T.G. Barnes. Certain educational, professional and literary aspects of the Inns of Court have been examined by W.R. Prest, L.A. Knafla and M. Axton. Dr Prest has published the first comprehensive history of the legal societies, a sixteenth century study by W.C. Richardson will soon be in the press, and T. Evans has started work on the Restoration period.

Despite this surge of historical activity, not since R.J. Fletcher's cursory article in 1905 has consideration been given to the Reformation at the Inns. As the lawyers were largely responsible for implementing the religious policies of successive Tudor monarchs, the subject requires attention. Moreover the legal societies offer an excellent opportunity to study the effect of religious change upon the laity. As the Inns were so representative of the landed classes, it could be argued that any significant changes in their religious adherence reflected similar developments in those classes as a whole. In the past it has been assumed that, until mid-Elizabethan years, the lawyers were predominantly conservative. Yet after that time, lawyers of a puritan cast have been discovered in almost every corner of the realm. If both views are accurate, some explanation is necessary. Consequently this thesis does not limit itself to the reformation of tenure, chapel and clergy at the Inns, but is also concerned with accompanying changes in the religious composition of the legal societies, and the attempts which were made to reform their religious character. It is in fact an institutional study of the Reformation, with a biographical bias.
As a result the work is incomplete. Since members of the Inns were so pervasive, most manuscript collections, whether public or private, yield pertinent information. Given the deficiencies of many calendars and the dispersion of private records, a full survey could not be finished within practicable limits of time or space. My search has been restricted to the more obvious repositories, and further details could be obtained from inquisitions, law reports and private collections. As the History of Parliament Trust was unable to assist, parliamentary sources have not been used extensively, so that the considerable activity of lawyers in that area has been left for specialised study. Nor has it been possible to make a thorough religious analysis of those Elizabethan members of the Inns who were not benchers, though much of this work has been completed. In spite of these limitations, the known evidence is sufficient to support conclusions which further research should not invalidate, but merely expand.

Although this thesis is my own work, none of it being carried out in collaboration with anyone else, I am indebted to others for their assistance. Clare College paid all travel expenses, as well as my scholarship from the William Senior Fund. At the Inns of Court and all of the institutions mentioned in the bibliography, I was made most welcome, but the University Library has been my academic home. My friends of the Cambridge Seminar have provided insights which would otherwise have been missed, and valued advice has been given by L.A. Knafla, H.C. Porter, W.R. Prest and W.C. Richardson. However, the two most important influences on my life and work in Cambridge have been Professor G.R. Elton, who has been much more than a scrupulous supervisor of research, and my wife Alana, the least of whose contributions has been the biographical index. My wish is that this work will to some extent justify their trust.
EXPLANATION

For practical reasons this thesis assumes prior knowledge of the structure and working of the Inns of Court, as provided by W.R. Prest. The calendar year had been adjusted to start on 1 January, and for citation of wills both the witness and probate dates have been given whenever they differ. For original quotations, contractions have been expanded, 'u' and 'v' standardised, punctuation supplied where necessary for sense, and editorial interpolations placed in square brackets. In the footnotes, selected references for each lawyer have been collected together, and the corresponding number has usually been placed at the end of the relevant biographical passage in the text. Instead of giving a string of references for the careers of benchers at the Inns, summary charts have been appended (A5, I-IV). After the citation of certain original sources, helpful references to printed calendars have been placed in round brackets e.g. ITAB I, f.106v (1.113). The full publishing details of printed works have not been mentioned in the footnotes, but in the bibliography. In the following list of abbreviations, the page references at the end of various manuscripts relate to passages in the thesis where some useful comment has been made:

A. Appendix (followed by number)

Anonymous MS

Cotton Vitellius C.IX:

ff.314-18v: A 'devyse or fantasye' for the proposed royal Inn, n.d. (1539-40)

ff.319-23v: 'A Description of the form and manner how and by what Orders and customes the State of the fellowship of the Middle Temple is maintained, etc', n.d. (1539-40) (see p.11)
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Bentley MS

Guildhall MS 4249: A collection from the parish records of St Andrew's, Holborne, commenced in 1584 by churchwarden Thomas Bentley
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Two reports by Thomas Denton, Nicholas Bacon and Robert Carey on (1) the Inns of Court and (2) the proposed royal Inn, n.d. (1539-40), in Waterhouse, 539-46 (see p.7)
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SP12/118, ff.140-1: Gray's Inn recusant certificate, 1577 (see pp.225,328)
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Gray's Inn book of orders (Pension Book I), 1569-1669
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The Pension Book of Gray's Inn (Printed)
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ff.97-8: List of Inner Temple benchers and barristers, n.d. (1573) (see p.223n)
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A. Lansdowne MS 683, ff.64v-8.
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Two copies of a list of chief readers and barristers at the Inns of Court, with 'pa' and 'pro' marked on B., 1576 (see p.285)
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SP12/185, ff.130-1: 'The names of certen benchers and Baresters of the Innes of Coorte', a list of suspected recusants, n.d. (c.1578-81) (see p.226)

IPM

Index of Inquisitions preserved in the Public Record Office (Inquisitions post mortem)
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IT Cert. 1577 SP12/118, ff.136-7: Inner Temple recusant certificate 1577 (see p.225,328)
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JP Cert. 1564 Hatfield MS 235, ff.1-85: Certificates returned by the bishops to the privy council, classifying the attitudes of justices of the peace towards Elizabethan religious policy, 1564 (see p.202)

JP List 1573 SP12/93.ii: 'Liber Pacis de anno regni...1573'

JP List 1582 Lansdowne MS 35, ff.130-41: 'Booke of the Peace 1582'

JP List 1585 Harleian MS 474: 'A Booke of the Justices of the Peace and other Commissioners', n.d. (c.1585)

JP Return 1587 Lansdowne MS 52, ff.186-201, MS 53, ff.164-97: Certificates returned by the bishops to the privy council classifying the religious outlook of justices of the peace (incomplete), 1587

JP Sub. 1569 SP12/59,60: Certificates of subscription to the Act of Uniformity by sheriffs and justices to the privy council, November 1569-January 1570

LIAR Lincoln's Inn admissions books (Registers I-III), 1573-1605

LIBB Lincoln's Inn Black Books, I-VII, 1422-1660

LIBP The Records...of Lincoln's Inn: The Black Books (Printed)
LI Cert. 1577
SP12/118, ff.138-9: Lincoln's Inn recusant certificate, 1577 (see pp.225,328)

LP
Letters and Papers...of Henry VIII

MP List 1553
Bodleian MS e. Mus. 17: Anonymous list of members of parliament, with crosses marked against 'They which stode for the trewe religion', 1 Mary, 1553

MTAR
Register of Admissions to the...Middle Temple

MT Cert. 1577
SP12/118, ff.134-5: Middle Temple recusant certificate, 1577 (see pp.225,328)

MT Inter-
rogatories
IT Petyt MS 538/47, ff.342-3: Interrogatories addressed to several Middle Templars by Archbishop Parker and the privy council, c.1570-1 (see pp.213,219)

MTMB
Middle Temple Minutes of Parliament (Books A,D,C,B), 1500-24, 1551-1658

MTMP
Minutes of the Parliament of the Middle Temple (Printed)

PCC
Probate registers of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1532-1609

PPC
Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England, ed. Harris Nicolas

Segar MS
Harleian MS 1912: The Segar Manuscript, being a collection of historical and professional details from the early records of Gray's Inn until 1677, by Simon Segar, a butler and librarian of the society.
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Statutes of the Realm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>Tudor Royal Proclamations, ed. P.L. Hughes and J. Larkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valor</td>
<td>Valor Ecclesiasticus 26 Henry VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCH</td>
<td>The Victoria County History (for London unless otherwise specified)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitations</td>
<td>Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation, ed. W.H. Frere and W.P.M. Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike other institutions, the Inns of Court were not incorporate. As societies of pension-paying gentlemen they gathered no external revenue, sealed no documents and owned no land. Even the property on which clustered their courts, chambers, chapels and halls, they held as tenants of long standing, but tenants nonetheless.

From the early fifteenth century at least, the lawyers of Lincoln's Inn rented their southern section on Chancery Lane from the bishop of Chichester. The lease seems to have been held by one of the benchers, usually for ten marks or £6 13s 4d a year and probably on a short term basis. For the northern section, known as the conygarth or Cotterell's garden, the society paid nine shillings a year to the Hospital of Burton Lazars of Jerusalem, whose master was prior of St. Giles Hospital Without London.

During the same period Gray's Inn was also gained by the lawyers. From 1308 when Justice Reginald de Grey obtained his manor of Portepole, the property, which was known as Gray's Inn by 1370, passed through

1 DBC Reports, 543; Anonymous MS, f.319; LIBB VIII, f.361 (II.333).
2 For the early history of the Inns, see: Prest, 1-5; Thorne; Holdsworth, II.493-503; Williamson.
3 LIBB VIII, f.362 (II.334); Henry III's grant, 1228 (copy), Lansdowne MS 1, f.1; Chichester to Henry III, 1244, in Matthew Paris, IV.287; 'A view of all the four famous Col1edges or Inns of Court', Lansdowne MS 811, f.184v.
4 LIBB I, ff.36,68v,141,154,176v (I.8,18,40,47,53) and in annual pensioners' and treasurers' accounts from 1446 (I,f.67v (I.18) to 1537 (I, f.108 (I.252); Valor, I.293-4; WSRO Diocese of Chichester, Episcopal Accounts Ep. VI/4/1, ff.7v-71v. I am indebted to Steven Lander, formerly of Professor Elton's Seminar, for bringing the Chichester documents to my notice.
5 LIBB I, f.154, II.i, f.54, II.ii. f.41 (I.47,78,112) and in succeeding accounts from 1473 (II.i, 27v (I.56) to 1537 (IV, f.94 (I.248).
various hands. Without contemporary evidence it is impossible to prove the likelihood that lawyers resided there before the following century. Nevertheless it is clear that in 1516 the owners obtained a royal licence to alienate the manor and other property to the prosperous but exemplary House of Jesus of Bethabhem at Shene, which Henry V had founded as a Carthusian charterhouse. According to this licence, the Valor Ecclesiasticus and printed extracts from the missing minutes of Gray's Inn, the society rented their property for ten marks paid annually to the priory.

For the other two fraternities it is difficult to establish when lawyers settled at the Temple, or even whether they originally constituted a single society or two. Following the royal confiscation of Knights Templar possessions in 1307 and their gradual transfer by 1338 to the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England, but before 1381 when Wat Tyler's men sacked the Temple, lawyers moved into the inner and middle sections of the former Templar headquarters known as the New Temple. By the early sixteenth century the Inner and Middle Temples possessed a long term lease at an annual rent of twenty marks each, but the Hospital centred at Clerkenwell was responsible for repairs. Since the prior

---

1 GIPP, I.xv-xxiv.
2 Patent roll C66/626, p.3, m.33 (LP II.i.1778).
3 Dugdale, Monasticon, VI.29-34; Knowles, II.133-4,175,223,259.
4 Valor, II.53; Dugdale, OJ, 272.
5 CCR (1307-13), 13-14,48-9, (1313-18), 19-30; CPR (1313-17), 52; List and Index Society, Exchequer KR: Ecclesiastical Documents, II.2; CCR (1337-39),72-3; CPR (1338-40), 99; Parker, 98-103.
6 Walsingham, Historia Anglicana, I.457.
7 A seventeenth century account states that the lawyers first rented the Temple from the Hospitallers in 1347 (ITR XXXII, ff.1-5). On the site of the outer Temple, the bishop of Exeter built his house, which became Exeter Inn, then Exeter house of Lord Paget, and later Essex house (Lansdowne MS 811, f.181).
8 ITAB I, f.75 (I.67); MTMB I, ff.9,16,45 (I.17,30,74).
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was reluctant to act and complained that the lawyers resided there against his will, in 1521 it was agreed that the rent would be reduced to ten pounds apiece, leaving the societies to finance repairs with the residue.¹

As three of the Inns leased their property from religious orders, these traditional arrangements were affected by the dissolution of the monasteries. Though the Carthusians at Sheen were implicated in the treasonable prophecies of Elizabeth Barton,² and at first resisted the oath of supremacy, in 1534 they complied sufficiently to avoid the fate of their brethren at the London charterhouse.³ Despite continued reports of disaffection from Cromwell's confidants,⁴ the appointment of a compliant prior⁵ and the status of the community saved Sheen until 1539, when the priory was suppressed.⁶ The house was granted to Edward Seymour then earl of Hertford,⁷ but since the crown retained Gray's Inn, the society now paid its customary rent to the royal landlord.⁸

At the same time the Hospitallers in England were pressed to acknowledge the royal supremacy. In 1534 they were required to take the oath,⁹ a special clause was written into the Act for first fruits and

¹ ITAB I, f.75 (I.67).
² LP III.1149,1468, VII.138,287; Scarisbrick, 418-20.
³ LP V.1198,1794, VII.622; Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, VII.300.
⁴ LP VII.1090-1, VIII.610,959.
⁵ Henry Man, later the dean of Chester and bishop of the Isle of Man (LP X.22, XI.244; Machyn, 116; Dugdale, Monasticon, VI.30; Hendriks, 311-13.
⁶ Wriothesley, I.104-5; LP XIV.i.236 (pp.72-3).
⁷ Wriothesley, I.105.
⁸ Dugdale, Monasticon, VI.44; List of the lands of dissolved religious houses, Lists and Indexes, supplementary series, III.iv.16; extract from missing Gray's Inn records, in Dugdale, OJ, 272.
tenths in case any prior thought himself exempt from clerical taxation, and the wealth of the Order was assessed for this purpose. After repeated appeals to the king as their protector, in 1537 the prior gained a patent ostensibly guaranteeing certain liberties of movement and appointment, but actually binding the Order to crown policy. In the changing circumstances of the reformation, the knights clearly had difficulty in reconciling allegiance to the pope with obedience to the king. Consequently a specific statute utterly dissolved the Order in 1540, disbanded the knights and confiscated their possessions including the New Temple. In succeeding years Hospitaller property was largely granted away, but the Temple with its annual rent of ten pounds from each society was retained by the crown.

By this process of dissolution, the crown gained and retained possession of three Inns of Court - the Inner Temple, the Middle Temple and Gray's Inn. Since the property of Lincoln's Inn was not leased from a religious order, but from the bishop of Chichester and master of Burton Lazars, the situation was quite different.

In December 1535 a new indenture was sealed by Bishop Robert Sherburne and William Sulyard Esq., with confirmation by the dean and chapter of Chichester, whereby Lincoln's Inn was leased to Sulyard, his executors and assigns for ninety-nine years at the customary rent of ten pounds.

---

1 26 Henry VIII, c.3, (SR III.498).
2 Valor, I.403-6.
3 LP X.197,198, XII.i.205,206, XII.ii.192,411(25).
4 LP XII.i.192, XII.ii.579,580.
5 32 Henry VIII, c.24 (SR III.778-81); Wriothesley, I.118-9; LP XV.646.
6 Lists and Indexes, suppl. series, III.ii.194-94; Harleian MS 839, f.166.
7 Copied into the Chichester Chapter Book, WSRO Cap I/16/1, ff.139v-40.
8 WSRO Chichester Chapter Acts (White Act Book) Cap I/3/o, f.77v.
marks to the bishop. Though the document was sealed by Sulyard, a seventeenth century lawyer with access to a now missing Sulyard manuscript stated that this long-term lease was the climax of the lawyers' attempts over many years to obtain security of tenure. As a son of the previous lessee, a master of the bench and a most influential governor of the society, Sulyard evidently acted on behalf of the Inn which could not legally acquire property. On the other hand Bishop Sherburne, who had been specially admitted to the society in 1508 for a pipe of wine, seems to have been put under pressure in 1529 when the benchers suddenly required him to pay all pension money since his admission. Though there is little indication of why he relented, it seems likely that, while the government was busily pruning the church, even the suggestion that bishops should be deprived of their possessions would have convinced a conservative prelate that a long-term lease might benefit both parties.

Only seven months later the situation changed when Richard Sampson replaced Bishop Sherburne. In July 1536 Sampson conveyed the Chichester section and the conygarth to Sulyard, his brother Eustace and their heirs.

1 'A History of Lincoln's Inn', MT Brerwood MS ff.3-5, and confirmed by LIBB I, f.176v (I.53) which records an unsuccessful attempt to obtain a ninety years lease in 1472.

2 LIBB VIII, f.362 (II.334).

3 Following his admission to the Inn in 1512, Sulyard performed many financial and supervisory duties before promotion to the bench in 1525. As well as holding the usual bench offices of reader, auditor, and keeper of the black books, he was one of the four governors from at least 1527-8 and 1531-9 (LIBB III-IV, passim; A5, II.3). In this context the term 'bench' refers to the governing body of an Inn and not to the judiciary.


5 John Husee to Lord Lisle, 1533, SP3/5, ff.22-3 (LP VII.722); 'Thinges to be moved for the Kings highnes', n.d. (c.1534); Cotton MS Cleopatra E.IV, ff.207-8 (LP VII.1355); Chapuys to Charles V, 1534 (LP VII.1482); Cromwell's remembrances, 1539, LP XIV.ii.424; Stone; Elton, BIHR; Hembry, 1-2,59-62.
and assigns forever. Though no payment is mentioned in the Chapter Act Book, Sampson received £200 for this 'deed of inheritance', by which the Sulyards acquired the bishop's interest in the property and a reversion upon the lease. ²

Thus the Inn gained further security of tenure while the Sulyards and their heirs received the annual rent of £6 13s 4d from the society until 1580, ³ when Edward Sulyard finally sold their interest to nominees of the bench, this time for £560. ⁴ But in 1634, when the 1535 lease was due to expire, the bishop of Chichester decided to contest the legality of the deed of inheritance. ⁵ In a statement written for the benefit of Archbishop Laud, ⁶ he pointed out that, on the same folio of the Chapter Act Book, directly above the Sulyard grant, there was recorded another grant of the same premises bearing the same date of 1 July 1536. ⁷ The recipients were none other than Henry VIII, his heirs and assigns forever. On the preceding folio the relevant chapter order merely stated that on 6 July the dean and chapter had confirmed by seal the 'letters' of Bishop Richard entered on the other side. But to indicate which of the two grants was intended, the royal deed was crossed through.

---

1 WSRO Chichester Chapter Acts (White Act Book) Cap I/3/0, f.79. I have not ascertained how Sampson obtained the right to include the conygarth in this grant.

2 LIBB VIII, f.362v, VII, f.417 (II.335-6,322).

3 Pensioner's accounts, 1537-8 (LIBB IV, f.108 (I.252) and succeeding accounts.

4 LIBB V, f.308v (I.419-20).

5 The report on the hearing of Bishop Richard Montague before Charles I and the privy council (1635) has been used throughout this section (LIBB VIII, ff.361-63v (II.332-8)), as well as the Inn's report on evidences in 1634 (LIBB VIII, f.417 (II.321-3)).

6 SP16/274, ff.45-8.

7 WSRO Chichester Chapter Acts Cap I/3/0, f.79.
If the Inn had been originally granted to the crown, what were the circumstances of its conveyance to the Sulyards on the same day?

From the Chapter Act Book it seems that the grant to the king was engrossed on 1 July, sealed by Sampson, and sent to the chapter which confirmed the deed on 6 July, then sealed, recorded and probably returned it. In the meantime the king seems to have decided that the property should pass to the Sulyards. To this end the brothers undoubtedly pressed their claims, since Eustace was a gentleman usher of the king's chamber, while William, as a crown commissioner, a councillor in the court of requests and an attendant upon the court, was on his way to becoming justice of Chester by the following year. As counsel to Lord Lisle the deputy at Calais, and overseer at Lincoln's Inn to Lady Lisle's eldest son by a previous marriage, William possibly expected more than wine and quail for his services. Furthermore it seems that he had Cromwell's attention, and was well known to Sampson, a fellow councillor in requests. There may even be some truth in the accusation made by the bishop of Chichester a century later, that Sampson benefited the Sulyards for helping him to the bishopric. By some combination of these means the king was evidently moved to waive his claim to Lincoln's Inn.

1 Ibid.; LIBB VIII, f.362v (II.335).
2 LP X.580,670, XII.i.146,1091, XII.ii.911,958,1151; Leadam, Request, civ,cvi,cx,42-3, Star Chamber, II.312n; PCC 6 Alengert, 1540.
3 LP VIII-X passim, XII.i.272, XII.ii.298, Addenda I.i.609.
4 LP VII.1537, XV.398.
5 Leadam, Requests, civ,cv,cvi. According to Tony Knox of Professor Elton's Seminar, Sulyard and Sampson acted independently and together in the court of requests during the early 1530s, and were the most frequent signatories.
6 LIBB VIII, f.362v (II.335).
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From the Chapter Act Book it seems that the grant to the king was engrossed on 1 July, sealed by Sampson, and sent to the chapter which confirmed the deed on 6 July, then sealed, recorded and probably returned it. In the meantime the king seems to have decided that the property should pass to the Sulyards. To this end the brothers undoubtedly pressed their claims, since Eustace was a gentleman usher of the king's chamber, while William, as a crown commissioner, a councillor in the court of requests and an attendant upon the court, was on his way to becoming justice of Chester by the following year. As counsel to Lord Lisle the deputy at Calais, and overseer at Lincoln's Inn to Lady Lisle's eldest son by a previous marriage, William possibly expected more than wine and quail for his services. Furthermore it seems that he had Cromwell's attention, and was well known to Sampson, a fellow councillor in requests. There may even be some truth in the accusation made by the bishop of Chichester a century later, that Sampson benefited the Sulyards for helping him to the bishopric. By some combination of these means the king was evidently moved to waive his claim to Lincoln's Inn.

1 Ibid.; LIBB VIII, f.362v (II.335).
2 LP X.580,670, XII.i.146,1091, XII.ii.911,958,1151; Leadam, Request, civ,cvi, cx, 42-3, Star Chamber, II.312n; PCC 6 Alengr, 1540.
3 LP VIII-X passim, XII.i.272, XII.ii.298, Addenda I.i.609.
4 LP VII.1537, XV.398.
5 Leadam, Requests, civ,cv,cvi. According to Tony Knox of Professor Elton's Seminar, Sulyard and Sampson acted independently and together in the court of requests during the early 1530s, and were the most frequent signatories.
6 LIBB VIII, f.362v (II.335).
All this may be conjectural; but there is no doubt that the king or his minister ordered the second grant. The Chichester papers include an original instruction from Sampson to the chapter to seal an enclosed writing without delay, since it was 'the kinges will and pleasour' that the bishop should leave Lincoln's Inn to persons mentioned in the document - a clear reference to the Sulyard deed.

Therefore both grants were not engrossed on the stated date of 1 July. As it was common practice to antedate deeds, Sampson or his scrivener simply used the date of the first grant for the second. When Sampson's letter enclosing the second deed was received and confirmed at Chichester, the scribe crossed out the royal grant, but neglected to alter the date of the preceding chapter confirmation which otherwise applied equally as well to the second grant as to the first. This would account for the difference in handwriting between the two, and leave a fortnight before the reversion payment on 20 July. More conclusively it would explain why Sampson's letter and the chapter confirmation are both dated 6 July, when it is almost certain that the letter would not have been written in London, delivered to Chichester and confirmed by the chapter on the same day, even for Richard Sampson.

This explanation accounts for the Sulyard deed, but it does not explain the initial grant to the king. Though there is no conclusive evidence, the answer may be supplied partly from the circumstances of Sampson's elevation. As dean of the Chapel Royal, king's chaplain, pluralist, ambassador extraordinary, agent for the first two marriage dissolutions and author of a successful treatise in defence of royal

---

1 WSRO Chichester Chapter Papers Cap I/10, Box 8.
2 As stated by the recorder of London before the privy council in 1635 (LIBB VIII, f.362 (II.335)).
3 LIBB VII, f.417 (II.322).
supremacy, Richard Sampson had proved himself by 1535 to be one of the closest privy councillors and a thorough Henrician.\(^1\) Despite his somewhat conservative religious position,\(^2\) at this time he seems to have had both the support of Cromwell and the friendship of Norfolk.\(^3\)

Therefore Chapuys was probably correct when he intimated that although the dean had been promised further preferment, he was in despair.\(^4\) This statement most likely referred to the Hereford see which was granted to Edward Fox, but may be as equally applicable to Chichester. For Sherburne, who had been there since 1508, was lingering on at the age of eighty-one.\(^5\) Furthermore the evidence that this lordly prelate was both conservative in religion and dragging his heels over the supremacy cannot have endeared him to Cromwell or the king.\(^6\) Consequently Sherburne was asked to resign the bishopric in favour of Sampson, as appears by two letters, one from the bishop to Cromwell and the other from his steward to Lord Lisle.\(^7\) In return, Sherburne was granted plate and specialities to the value of 500 marks, or £333 13s 4d less the king's tenth,\(^8\) as well as a special statute assuring him of a £400 pension from the bishopric as agreed by Sampson, and dispensing with the Act of first fruits which specified that no pension could be given above the value of

\(^1\) LP VII-XI passim; DNB; Elton, TRG, 57,336-9,347-8, PP, 182-3.
\(^2\) LP VII.30,32, VIII.603,604,1106, IX.143,147; Elton, PP, 182.
\(^3\) LP VIII.603-4, X.345,753; SP3/14, ff.29-30 (LP X.1146).
\(^4\) 25 July 1535, LP VIII.1160.
\(^5\) Steer, l.
\(^6\) SP1/84, f.119 (LP VII.759); SP1/93, ff.69-73 (LP VIII.859); Cotton MS Cleopatra E.VI, f.269 (LP VIII.941); SP1/97 f.93 (LP IX.509); SP3/14, ff.14-15 (LP IX.583); DNB.
\(^7\) SP1/103, f.253 (LP X.817); SP3/14, ff.29-30 (LP X.1146). Cf. LIBB VIII, f.362v (II.335).
\(^8\) SP3/14, ff.29-30 (LP X.1146).
Thus Sherburne submitted in May 1536, but died three months later. Much of this would be superfluous if it were not apparent that the Lincoln's Inn grant was involved in the process. Though Sampson was elected on 3 June 1536, his warrant for restitution of temporalities was not made until 15 June, their patent was not delivered into chancery until 4 July, and the new bishop was not installed by proxy at Chichester until 5 August. Such was the haste with which Lincoln's Inn was granted away on 1 July that when the case was later reviewed by Charles I, the bishop of Chichester questioned whether Sampson had possessed the power to grant the property before the subsequent patent.

This suggests not merely that the grant was part of the bargain between Sampson, Sherburne and the king, but that for some reason the crown was eager to gain possession of Lincoln's Inn. As there appears to have been no legal impediment to a direct grant to the Sulyards and no other Chichester deed of a political nature, the king must have had some other purpose before pressure in favour of the brothers convinced him otherwise. To discover this motive it is necessary to examine two sets of papers which proposed nothing less than the reform of upper-class education.

---

1 28 Henry VIII, c.3 (SR II.492-9). Since the Valor put the bishop's income at £699 6s 11d, his pension was much more than a third (I.293-4).
2 LP XI.202(6); Handbook of British Chronology; DNB.
3 LIBB VIII, ff.361-3v (I.332-8).
4 Cf. The Acts of the Dean and Chapter of...Chichester.
In a fortunate appendix to Fortescutus Illustratus: or a Commentary on that nervous treatise called De Laudibus Legem (1663), Edward Waterhouse published the text of two reports which he had obtained from Sir Thomas Witherington. These are undated and the originals are unknown.

According to their preambles, the king had appointed three men to search the records at the Inns of Court and provide an account of their structure and function. This they did in the second printed report addressed to the king, lauding his zeal for the maintenance of education and describing the finances, degrees, exercises, festivities, government, officers and diet of the Inns. Having delivered this 'book of Articles' they were further commissioned to prescribe rules and exercises for 'an House of Students' which the king himself intended to endow. These were provided in the first printed report, complete with royal address praising Henry's 'most Princely purpose and godly zeal' followed by a detailed prescription for the incorporation, government, election, education, exercise and duty of the king's own students.

To these reports should be added two papers at the British Museum. Both are anonymous, charred and undated, but they are consecutive and in the same secretary hand. In the first the writer addressed himself to the king, having learnt of the 'moste godly and gracious enterprysed purpose tow[ards] the educacion of yonge wytttes in lernynge and knollege'.

1 DBC Reports; also published in English Historical Documents, V.563-73, and Bland 183-94. I cannot accept Bland's introduction in which he attributes the reports to Henry VIII's 'interest in education and culture', supposes that Robert Cary was a member of Lincoln's Inn, believes that the reports cannot be dated more accurately than 1534-47, states that there is no evidence of a connection between the reports and the dissolution, fails to relate them to the accounts by the anonymous writer (below), and gives a wrong-headed explanation of the whole affair (179-82). My reasons are set out below.

2 Anonymous MS. The second paper has been published in Dugdale, OJ, 193-7.
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Therefore he submitted his own "deuyse or fantasye" for the government, education, diet, election, building and exercise of the royal students. To substantiate his claim that this scheme would provide a better order than that of the Temple, he proceeded in the second paper to an exhaustive description of Middle Temple practice in government, education, finance, service, worship and dress.

Though there are differences between the two sets of documents, they are closely related not only in purpose, but also in philosophy, structure and detail, even including the item that the library be cleaned every week. Taking the Inns of Court as their pattern, both prescribed a curriculum to remedy certain defects of upper-class education. In particular the first written report lamented that "many good and gentle wits" had perished, partly because they had not been trained in "all kinds of good learning as well divine as prophane", but primarily because "most of them in their tender years, indifferent to receive both good and bad, were so rooted and seasoned as it were in barbarous Authors very Enemies to good learning". Similarly the anonymous writer required "all good scyences and knolages", but particularly rhetoric, to be encouraged in the new institution. To this end the "barberous" language of legal French was to be supplanted by exercises in "the pure and perfyt french tongue", supplemented by readings in the Latin authors and everyday conversation in Latin and French. Likewise the second written report demanded that all legal exercises be conducted in "good Latine" and "good French" in order to "banish the corruption of both tongues". At the same time it set out a weekly timetable, including lectures in "the true pronunciation of the French tongue" and readings in Latin and Greek selected from "some Orator or book of Rhetorick, or else some other Author which treateth of the Government or a Common-wealth, openly to all the Company, and to all other that will come for the knowledg of both the said Languages". But throughout Lent when the Latin lecture was to be suspended, the same
lecturer would deliver 'an open lecture of Scripture'.\(^1\) For recreation both plans prescribed various military activities and physical exercises.

All these pursuits, however, were ancillary to what the authors believed to be the predominant study, namely the exercise of law. Taking their pattern from the Inns of Court, they imposed the same 'cases', 'moots' and 'readings', the same degrees of 'inner barrister', 'utter barrister' and bencher, and the same year of 'term', 'vacation' and 'mean vacation'. But whereas the Inns were mainly intended for the education of lawyers and gentlemen, many of whom entered royal service, the second report emphasized that the primary purpose of the new foundation was the better service at home and abroad by the king's own 'students of the Law'. Consequently the king's students would normally be exhibitioners of at least twenty-two years of age. As they were to become experts in all affairs, one or two would accompany embassies overseas, others would record military activities, while for the perpetual remembrance of acts of state, two of the best would compile an absolutely impartial history of the imperial realm. For the education of a governing elite, the reformers proposed a superior institution patterned on the Inns of Court, but employing the best principles of civic and christian humanism.\(^2\)

---

1 Cf. the Lady Margaret divinity readerships at Oxford and Cambridge which were discontinued during Lent so that the reader and his audience could devote themselves to preaching (McConica, 78).

2 As the intention was to establish a superior house of court which would supply the royal service, it is misleading to call it 'a scheme for the education of statesmen' (Charlton, Education, 155) or for 'a kind of embryonic University of London' (Hurstfield, 27). More reprehensible is the statement that it was related to a plan 'to provide for those of the king's scholars studying law by amalgamating two Colleges at Cambridge and making similar dispositions at Oxford' (Simon, 207), when it is clear that the new foundation would be in London. Worst of all is the misconception of Gilbert Burnet (I.431) which is reproduced in the DNB (see Bacon, Nicholas) and embraced by historians (Curtis, 67; Simon, 207-8), that these plans were for a college of civil law. As shown in this chapter, the evidence is clearly to the contrary. When the word 'civil' is mentioned (DBC Reports, 542), it refers to those affairs of state in which the students should have experience. Moreover the preamble to the first report explicitly mentions the king's law. For this reason the reformers did not take Oxford or Padua as their model, but the Inns of Court. At the same time they used the opportunity to encroach on the customary ambassadorial role of the civilians.
Three persons had been appointed to plan this royal house. They were not prominent administrators, scholars or jurists however, but plain common lawyers. The first-mentioned appointee in both preambles of the reports was Thomas Denton, a bencher and treasurer of the Middle Temple by 1556, but probably a mere utter barrister until the late 1540s.\(^1\) Similarly Robert Cary, the last-named appointee, reached the height of his office at the same Inn during 1556 when he refused the bench call.\(^2\) The other appointee, who was Nicholas Bacon, was an utter barrister until 1550 when he was called to the bench of Gray's Inn.\(^3\) In other words, the three reformers were no more than barristers of their Inns and quite young for such a task, as Bacon was only thirty-one in 1540.

For this reason it is hardly possible that these men were commissioned before the late 1530's, and certainly not before early 1535, as both reports use the new royal style.\(^4\) But since the anonymous writer mentions that the Middle Temple rent was still paid to the Order of St. John, the project was planned before May 1540.\(^5\) The dating however can be determined more precisely by context.

Under the influence of continental humanists such as Castiglione, Erasmus and Vives,\(^6\) English scholars of the 1530's proposed to reform upper-class education for the public good. Most popular was Thomas Elyot's *The Boke named the Gouernour*, first published in 1531, which

\(^1\) MTMB II passim; A5, IV.37; APC V.146; CPR (1548-9), 136, (1547-8), 23, (1553), 415, (1553-4), 17,23,27,28; PCC 77 Noodles, 1557/8.

\(^2\) LP XXI.i.302(30); CPR (1548-9), 135, (1553-4), 18,28, (1560-3), 435; MTMB II, ff.1v,9,14,19v,20,29 (I passim).

\(^3\) Segar MS, ff.8,190v; A5, I.49; Jones, 31-6; DNB.

\(^4\) 26 Henry VIII, c.l (SR III.492) and proclaimed January 1535 (Elton, EUT, 136).

\(^5\) The Order was dissolved on 7 May 1540 according to Wriothesley (I.118-9).

\(^6\) Curtis, ch.3; McConica, 31-7; Simon, chs 2-4.
elaborated a comprehensive curriculum of 'pure and excellent learning',
comprising Latin and Greek, logic and rhetoric, cosmography and history,
combined with moral philosophy, music, painting and physical exercise.¹

After twenty-one years of private education, and certainly not before, the
prospective 'gouernour' would be sent to those peculiarly English finishing
schools, the Inns of Court, and there set to study the laws of the realm.
But this further education would not be conducted in legal French, which
Elyot condemned as 'so barbarous a language, that it is not only void of
all eloquence, but also being separate from the exercise of our law
onely, it serveth to no commoditie or necessary purpose, no man
understandyng it but they whiche have studied the lawes'. Instead
Elyot required English law to be brought 'to a more certayne and
compendious studie' by collecting and consolidating 'the pure mele or
floure syfted out of the best lawes of all other countrayes', and
composed 'either in englishe, latine, or good french, written in a more
clene and elegant stile'. At the same time legal exercises at the Inns
of Court and Chancery would be patterned upon the ideal form of ancient
rhetoric.²

To implement these reforms which Elyot believed would produce
outstanding statesmen, he appealed not to king or parliament, but to one
man:

And verily I suppose, if there mought ones happen some man,
haung an excellent wytte, to be brought vp in suche fourme
as I haue hythero written, and maye also be exactly or dely
lerned in the arte of an Oratour, and also in the lawes of this
realme, the prince so wyllyng and therto assistinge, undoubtedely
it shulde nat be impossible for hym to bring the pleadyng and
reasonyng of the lawe, to the auncient fourme of noble oratours;
and the lawes and exercise therof beyng in pure latine or doule

1 Elyot, book I.
frendche, fewe men in consultations shulde (in myne opinion)  
compare with our lawyers, by this meanes beinge brought to  
be perfect oratours as in whom shulde than be founden the  
sharpe wittes of logitians, the grave sentences of philosophers,  
the elegancie of poetes, the memorie of ciuilians, the voice and  
the gesture of them that can pronounce comedies, which is all  
that Tulli in the person of the most eloquent man Marcus  
Antonius, could require to be in an oratour.

At this time Elyot probably referred to Thomas More. But the man to  
whom he turned in later years as his counsellor, patron and friend was  
Thomas Cromwell.¹

Though Cromwell's reaction to the Gouernour is not known, he was very  
interested in a manuscript which proposed similar reforms in upper-class  
education. Thomas Starkey's Dialogue advocated several remedies for  
the ills of English society, including the foundation of royal  
institutions in which the nobility would be trained in virtue, good  
learning and military feats. For the service of the commonwealth,  
students would necessarily be admitted to the study of law. But Starkey  
agreed with Elyot that this should not be in 'this barbarous tongue, Old  
French, which now serveth to no purpose else'. For the benefit of both  
the professional lawyers and the nobility from which they derived, the  
'over-confuse' common law would be simplified, codified and composed in  
English or Latin, or perhaps supplanted by Roman civil law. Unlike  
Elyot, Starkey appealed to the king as the agent of reform, at the same  
time suggesting the financial means. If such institutions could not be  
new-built, some superfluous monasteries should be converted to royal  
houses where the nobility could learn 'the discipline of the common weal'.²

These proposals were read by Cromwell in 1536 after securing the  
writer's literary services for the government.³ During succeeding years

¹ Lehmberg, Elyot, 30,49-51,151,153-3,166-7.
² Starkey, Dialogue, 123,142-9,168-76. Cf. extracts from Starkey's  
letter to Henry VIII (Starkey, Life and Letters, xlvi-1xiii).
³ Starkey, Dialogue, 193-200; Elton, PBA, 167-72.
he provided similar employment for Richard Morison who also considered the problem of legal education. In his lengthy letter to Henry VIII, he was particularly concerned about codification of the common law. But being a man of many digressions, he took the opportunity to consider the content of legal education. Because of the affinity of all knowledge, Morison believed that lawyers had to be learned in the "other sciences and arts liberal", including logic, rhetoric, philosophy and divine law. To this end he appealed to the king to foster 'good letters' among the common lawyers, for if they were compelled to study the codified law in Latin, they would soon attain all that knowledge necessary for the better service of king and commonwealth, not only at home but also as ambassadors abroad.

Considering Cromwell's interest in the new learning, his personal contact with these men and their employment during succeeding years in the planning, elaboration and justification of government policy, there is every reason to believe that their counsel concerning upper-class education was well received. Given Cromwell's influence with the king, combined with his increasing control over government policy, it would seem that change was at hand. But during the mid 1530's the government was probably far too committed to immediate affairs of state, from the royal supremacy to the Pilgrimage of Grace, to undertake educational reform on any scale.

1 Royal MS 18.A.L for Morison's letter and 11.A.XVI for the accompanying Latin treatise on the law of property; Elton, PBA, 177-80.
2 Royal MS 18.A.L, ff.7v-12.
3 Dickens, ER, 39,167; Elton, RR, ch.2, Simon, 155-6.
4 Elton, PBA, 167-72, RR, ch.3; Zeeveld, passim.
Such a project might have been broached during the more settled years of 1537-8, but the court of augmentations was barely established and the persons commissioned to prepare the plans were quite inexperienced. More likely the government first made known its intention in 1539 when the wealth of religious houses could be diverted to such a purpose. Believing that the basic structure would be taken from the Inns of Court, some Middle Templar who was well read in current educational theory addressed his proposals to the king, appending the description of his own house. This probably influenced the appointment of Denton, Bacon and Cary, who were seemingly selected by Cromwell. As Denton and Cary were both Middle Templars, it is likely that one of them was the anonymous petitioner, and that each was well known to the other. Though this would account for their appointment, they possibly had some influential connexion with the government, to which they seem to have been known in 1539 - Denton as a sewer of the chamber and Cary as the recipient of twenty shillings by Cromwell's command. For his part Bacon was first brought to Cromwell's attention by Cranmer in October 1538, when the archbishop strongly recommended him for the town clerkship of Calais, but he seems to have been reserved for higher office. There is no indication that he had any prior association with the other two, but possibly he was already known for the advanced views on higher education which he disseminated throughout his life. Thus Bacon was included in the committee which probably produced the first report in 1539 and the

1 Augmentations office misc. book E26/256, f.64 (LP XIV.ii.782). As Denton's name also appears on a draft confession of Elizabeth Barton (1533), he was possibly engaged by the government in this case (SP1/80, f.135v (LP VI.1468).

2 Exchequer TR misc. book E26/256, f.64 (LP XIV.ii.782).

3 SP1/137, f.261 (LP XIII.ii.675).

4 Charlton, 98,155; Simon, 227,235,341,349; Collier; Hurstfield, 24-7.
second by early 1540. Mindful of what might be acceptable to the government, they drew upon the Inns of Court, the accounts by the anonymous writer, and the whole school of contemporary theory concerning upper-class education. In December 1539 Denton was granted the under-stewardship of lands late belonging to the abbey of Abingdon in Berkshire, perhaps in recompense, while Bacon was appointed solicitor of Augmentations in March 1540, possibly in recognition of his services and to help administer the very property which would be used to finance the new institution.

If this reconstruction is accurate, the plan to establish a royal house was directly related in time and origin to other reforms. When Patrick Barnewell, King's Serjeant in Ireland, wrote to Cromwell in April 1538, for the second time he stressed the need for what he called a 'house of Chaunsery' in Dublin. By 1539 the Irish judges, serjeants and legal officers had settled in the suppressed house of Blackfriars, obtained a twenty-one years lease from the royal commissioners and there established the King's Inn. Though their action was largely spontaneous and more

1 As the second report ends abruptly without dealing with some items, including officers of the new house, it is possibly incomplete.

2 SPI/136, f.182 (LP XIII.ii.378); Augmentations office misc. book E315/235, f.11v (LP XV.1032 (p.539).

3 Richardson, Augmentations, 331-2.

4 State Papers: King Henry VIII, III.570-72. I am grateful to Rev. Brendan Bradshaw of Professor Elton's Seminar for bringing this aspect to my attention. On Barnewell, see Ball, I.204-5.

5 State Papers, III.321-2,374-6; Sullivan; Kennedy.
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the response to practical need than educational theory, it seems that Cromwell encouraged this development. In the same year he and Cranmer planned to use monastic revenues to staff cathedral colleges with readers in Greek, Hebrew, Latin, medicine and civil law as well as divinity.¹

At the same time Cromwell, who had long deplored the shortcomings of the legal system² as highlighted by Starkey and others,³ commenced a parliamentary campaign to reform the law itself.⁴ But since the latter projects and the proposed royal house depended on the direction of the king's minister, their sudden collapse may be attributed to Cromwell's downfall in June 1540.

To this immediate reason for the failure of the reformers to establish the royal house should be added the effect of conservatism and perhaps resentment of the legal societies. They had been long treated as places of privilege, where even the King's writ was enforced only by consent. Yet here were three upstart barristers planning a superior house which would not only restrict the benchers' access to the best government positions, but also impose structural changes upon the Inns themselves. Even if the reformers did not attempt to reshape the Inns themselves at this time, once the royal institution was founded, the Inns would have been forced to change. Yet considering Cromwell's acumen and the conviction of the reformers, the next stage would surely have been to restructure the Inns, by modifying the curriculum, purifying the language and founding a divinity lecture, by administrative changes including a permanent governor, fewer benchers and incorporation of the societies, and by providing better facilities such as well stocked libraries, more

¹ McConica, 213; Simon, 183-4; LP XIV.1189. Cf. Cromwell's role in founding Regius professorships in 1540 (Kearney, 21).

² Cotton MS, Titus B.I, f.159v (LP IX.725); SP1/102, f.5 (LP X.254).

³ Starkey, Dialogue, 112-18; Ives, UBHJ.

⁴ Elton, RR, ch.6.
wholesome chambers and a country retreat from recurring epidemics. Most of these reforms the Inns might have wished upon themselves; but if implemented by the crown they constituted both a threat to their autonomy and an amplification of royal authority.

Given this evidence of the government's design to reform upper-class education in the late 1530s, it is not too fanciful to suggest that, as chief administrator of the realm, Thomas Cromwell recognized not merely the importance of the Inns to the crown, but that possession enhanced control and facilitated reform. During the compilation of the Valor in 1535 and the early campaign to reduce the religious houses, Cromwell with his knowledge of the law and connexions at the Inns most likely realized that the crown could readily acquire three of the properties by pressure on their ecclesiastical landlords or even through dissolution. But Lincoln's Inn, for which existed a long-term lease protected by the law was more of a problem. Therefore when Sampson bargained for the bishopric in 1536, Cromwell probably induced him to forfeit the property to the king. But Henry who was at best a dabbler in educational reform, was convinced that the Sulyards had priority by virtue of their existing lease and personal service. Thus Lincoln's Inn passed from the king, while the other three houses became crown property.

1 DEC Reports; Anonymous MS.

2 Scarisbrick, 664-70.

3 In Mary's reign, both Sheen priory and the Order of St. John were restored, but the Elizabethan Act which reannexed the religious houses in 1559 ensured that the Temple and Gray's Inn were retained by the crown. Though the lawyers tried to obtain possession of the Temple later in the reign, they did not succeed until the royal charter of 1608 (Report of the Commissioners (1855), Appendix B, 207).
On entering Temple Church from the south porch, the visitor experiences the uplift of the Early English choir, with its lancets of coloured glass, clusters of slender columns and vaults of ribbed stone. Once past the tombs of prominent lawyers and into the earlier round church, the movement is again upwards, from the pointed arches of the main arcade, to the triforium of interlaced semi-circles and the clerestory windows above. Nevertheless the newcomer may be more moved by martial effigies recumbent on the bare floor, emaciated but evocative of the baronial era. Then might he believe that this was the church of crusading knights and canny lawyers.

Yet before the Reformation and successive restorations, the Temple Church was rather different. On the south side stood an earlier vestry, as well as a small chapel dedicated to St Ann. The upper storey connected with the choir, and the lower with the round. This chapel was apparently linked to the hall by cloisters through the chapel of St Thomas. Though nothing is known about the latter, it was possibly a mere alcove outside the hall door containing an altar of St Thomas Becket, the patron saint of English crusaders. However the state of the church itself can be partially reconstructed from a royal inventory of Templar possessions, which was taken in 1307-8 before Edward III transferred the New Temple to the Order of St John.

Since the round church had been consecrated to the virgin Mary in 1185, the high altar, which stood on a platform at the east end of the choir, was presumably dedicated to her honour. The inventory reveals

1 Cal. Misc. Ing., II.362-3; CCR (1337-9), 72-3; CPR (1338-40), 99; Baylis, 8-9; Williamson, 70-2; Parker, 24,49-50.

2 Exchequer (LTR) enrolled accounts misc. E358/20, m.3; trans. Baylis, 131-46.

3 Temple clerk's book, ITR XXII, f.35; ITAP, II.xcvii. The doorway over which the ancient dedication was inscribed was not destroyed until 1695 (Williamson, 11).
that it was once endowed with two silver censers, cruets and ewers, a silver-gilt chalice, an ivory pix for the host, a pewter chrismatory for unction, six metal candlesticks, a metal cross with a banner, and a pair of corporals to cover the sacred elements. Some covering was provided for the altar, as well as a frontal or hanging, and five carpets for the floor. The inventory also lists the usual ornaments for two side altars, one dedicated to St. Nicholas and the other to St. John, in addition to numerous service books and a coffer of church goods. Similar ornaments are mentioned for the altar in St Ann's chapel, which may have contained a shrine. In a lengthy list of plate, cloths, vestments, banners, coffers and relics which were stored in the vestry, the inventory possibly includes items from the chapel of St. Thomas.

Many of the goods of this richly endowed church had no doubt disappeared by the early sixteenth century, when only organs, censers and a clock are mentioned in the Inner Temple records. Some were sold in 1307-8; others were probably plundered by the rebels under Wat Tyler and Jack Cade.

Nevertheless the Temple Church for which the Hospitallers assumed responsibility, apparently retained the same features and similar ornaments until the Reformation.

In comparison with the great church of the templars, the original chapel at Lincoln's Inn was less complex, though amply endowed. As part of the early thirteenth century residence of the bishop of Chichester, it was included with the premises leased to the lawyers. From the early

1 The inventory refers to this chapel as the church of St Mary.
2 ITAB I, ff.43,69v,139 (I.45,56,182).
3 Walsingham, Historia, I.457; LP IV.iii.6043(8); Baylis, 39.
4 P.2 above; Descriptive Cat. of Ancient Deeds, I.166.
5 Baildon, TSPES.
financial accounts of the Inn, it is evident that the chapel had a west
door with steps leading into the nave and a north door into the choir,¹
as well as a clock, a bell and various desks.² Though there may have been
wainscotting,³ the walls were plastered and whitened, and the floor was
paved with tiles.⁴ To supplement the glass windows, two 'standers' or
weighty torches of wax were provided.⁵ The large stone altar,⁶ which
might have incorporated alabaster relief,⁷ was equipped with the ornaments
necessary for divine service,⁸ and there were possibly other altars. The
records refer to a certain 'Pety John', which was probably an image of
the saint,⁹ in addition to painted images of the virgin Mary and St
Richard,¹⁰ the bishop of Chichester from 1245 to 1253, whose elaborate
shrine at that cathedral became one of the most popular places of
pilgrimage.¹¹ Consequently Lincoln's Inn chapel was referred to by the
lawyers as both 'the chapell of our Lady' and 'the Chapel of St Richard'.¹²
Since the pension books of Gray's Inn are missing before 1569, it is
more difficult to reconstruct the appearance of their chapel prior to the
Reformation. Nevertheless its origin as a chantry for the Grey family,¹³

¹ LIBB III, ff.27v,28v, IV,ff.258v,261v, V, f.141 (I.156,158,302,379).
³ LIBB V, f.141 (I.379).
⁴ LIBB III, f.27v (I.156).
⁵ E.g. LIBB II.ii, f.73v (I.134).
⁶ LIBB IV, f.351, V, f.139 (I.327,378).
⁷ A small section of an alabaster carving, possibly depicting the
Annunciation, was found below the chapel during excavation in 1882,
and is now displayed in the cabinet outside the library.
⁹ LIBB III, f.40v (I.166).
¹⁰ LIBB III,ff.42v,85, IV, f.280 (I.167,188,310-11).
¹¹ Duncan-Jones, S. Richard.
¹² LIBB I, f.144v, II.ii, f.48 (I.41,116).
¹³ CCR (1500-9), 276; GIPB, I.xvi; Dugdale, OJ, 283.
and its description as a 'sacellum' (sic)\(^1\) indicate that it was quite small, while other references suggest that it had a belfry and clockhouse.\(^2\) Furthermore certain features of the interior can be deduced from later records. Whereas the only mentioned doorway was in 'the nether end',\(^3\) light entered by means of a 'louver' or glass turret in the roof,\(^4\) and through windows, in one of which Thomas Becket was 'gloriously painted'.\(^5\) As well as the stalls, there was a 'partition' or screen which evidently separated the choir from the nave, supported the organ and possibly carried a rood loft.\(^6\) For ceremonial purposes the chapel was equipped with a desk for the priest, a little brass sanctus bell and a brass holywater stock. Ornaments for the altar apparently included a chalice, cruets, candlesticks, some cloths and a frontal.\(^7\) In keeping with its origin, function and size, the chapel at Gray's Inn was simply but adequately furnished.

In addition to these chapels, the parish churches catered for the lawyers. Since the Inns of Chancery did not have private chapels, special provision was made for their members, many of whom progressed to the Inns of Court, while others who were fellows of the senior Inns acted as their readers and principals. At St Clement Danes, specific pews were allotted to Clement's, New and Lyon's Inns,\(^8\) while Clifford's Inn was possibly associated with St Dunstan's in the West.\(^9\) Since a financial account for

---

1. GIPB I, f.26v (I.13).
2. E.g. GIPB I, ff.18v, 34v, 65v (I.470).
3. GIPB I, f.25v (I.12).
4. GIPB I, f.34v.
5. Dugdale, OJ, 283, from the missing Gray's Inn records.
6. GIPB I, ff.1v, 25v (I.3,12); Bentley MS, f.227v; Dugdale, OJ, 284.
7. Dugdale, OJ, 284
8. MT Brerewood MS, ff.71, 76v.
Clement's Inn from 1547 to 1548 stated that their principal paid 13/4 for a new bell in the chantry, 4/- for wax before Christ's image in the church, and 3/4 to the churchwarden, it can be assumed that the other Inns made similar contributions. However the church which had the closest connection with the lawyers was St Andrew's, Holborn. According to a summary of lost parish accounts compiled by Thomas Bentley, an assiduous Elizabethan churchwarden, Barnard's, Furnival's, Staple and Thavies Inns not only had their own pews, but customarily paid a mark every year 'for the mayntenans of a chantry priest that sang masse at the iiiij altars before the seats or pues of every house'. Furthermore Gray's and Lincoln's Inns seem to have used private chapels at St Andrew's, while members of both the Inns of Court and Chancery contributed regularly as individuals and societies to the upkeep of the church. For special celebrations members attended St Paul's, but during vacation and plague, when many left for the counties, they returned to their home churches. For members of the Inns of Court, the London churches apparently complemented their own services. Since the chapels at Gray's and Lincoln's Inns were small and could not provide the same rich tradition of medieval ritual and ceremony as the Temple Church, those societies looked to their parish church of St Andrew. Yet judging by the burials at the churches of St Clement, St Andrew and St Dunstan in particular, even the templars looked beyond the services of their own church. This association between the lawyers and their parish churches partly reflects the legal, local and family connections outside of a particular Inn; in

1 Computus by Anthony Gell, principal of Clement's Inn, for 1547-8, HMCR X.ii.385. I was unable to find the original among the Gell MSS at Hopton Hall or the Record Office, Derbyshire.

2 Bentley MS, f.222.

3 Fletcher, 151; GIPP, I.xxi,xxvi; Bentley MS, ff.221-30; LIBB I, f.154. II.ii, ff.50,57v, III, f.38 (f.47,119,123,164).

4 MT Brerwood MS, ff.71-81; Bentley MS, f.239v; Stow, III.248-9,257-8.
part it reveals the strong pull of the London parish, which drew residents to services, festivals and celebrations, as well as plays, drinkings and shooting matches; but it also resulted from the instability of membership at the Inns. Because of the shortness of the term, the occurrence of infection, the turnover of students, and the demands of the profession, residence or even attendance at the Inns was often erratic. Consequently the connection between members and their chapels could be brief, intermittent, and not necessarily a substitute for membership of a parish church.

Though the chapels may not have played an exclusive role in the religious lives of individual members, they were more than appendages to the Inns. Whenever members were in commons, they were expected to contribute to divine services by monetary subscription and regular attendance. At Gray's and probably Lincoln's Inn, the mass was celebrated daily, while according to the anonymous reporter on the Middle Temple, the lawyers 'have every day ii masses said one after the other, and the first masse dothe begun in the morning at seven a Clok or theraboutes: the festyvall dayes they have Matyns and masse solemnly sung and during the matyns singyng they have iiij masses saide'. Members were buried in the chapels, and propitiatory rites were performed for the

1 E.g. Bentley MS, f.222v.
2 See Prest, 10-16, regarding the later period.
3 Chs 3, 5, 6 below.
4 Augmentations office misc, book E315/93, ff.47v,194v.
5 Anonymous MS, f.322v.
6 LIBB II.ii, f.61,III, ff.100v,123 (I.126,196,205); Machyn's Diary, 156-7; Bentley MS, f.227v,229v; PCC 40 Noodes, 1558 (Robert Urmeston of GI), PCC 6 Spert, 1541/2 (Francis Browne of GI), Bentley MS f.228 (Richard Allington of LI), PCC 27 Bodfield, 1524 (Richard Sutton of IT), Dugdale, OJ, 173-83, ITR XXI.
dead. At Lincoln's Inn, John Nethersole bequeathed forty marks in 1505 on condition that a requiem mass be said every Friday, from 1517 Sir Robert Drury maintained a second priest to pray for his soul, and in 1550 both John Hynde and John Harris left a pound for similar prayers. At the same Inn the penance imposed on a wenching butler and a dicing parson was to set wax tapers before the image of the virgin Mary, but there is no indication that the same penalty was imposed on the students.

Although the chapels were centres of private devotion and communal ceremony, they played a varied role. Until a council chamber was built at Lincoln's Inn during the early sixteenth century, the chapel was normally used for council meetings and general business. Similarly the Temple Church was the traditional meeting place for conferences between the Inner and Middle Temples. Regular learning exercises were conducted in the chapels, as well as private legal transactions. According to an indenture of 1508, widow Alice Say and her son were bound to complete the purchase of a manor by annual payments made in the chapel of Lincoln's Inn. Such was the activity at Temple Church, that the anonymous reporter complained for educational reasons, that the lawyers 'have no place to walk in and talke and confer ther lerninges but in the

1 LIBB II.i,ff.77, III, f.72v, IV, ff.234,273 (I.136,182,295,308); PCC 29 Bucke,1550/1.
2 LIBB III, ff.42v,85 (I.167,188).
3 LIBB I, ff.17v,33,46v,144v,147, II.i,ff.27,48, III, f.25 (I.3,8,13,41,43,99,116,154).
4 "The Church is the antient ordinarie meeting place of Committees appointed by either house, as a place of most indifferencie betwene those neighbour houses, when they haue occasion of conference of inter course eache house with other" ('The answere of the Middle Temple...to the Master of the Temples articles', (1631) MT MS Micklethwaite papers, f.4).
5 MTMB II, ff.30,32v (I.121,124); LIBB IV, ff.266,299 (I.305,316).
6 CCE (1500-9), 339.
Church, whiche place all the terme tymes hathe in it no more quyetness than the pervyse [parvis or porch] of Pawles by occasion of the confluens and concourse of such as are suters in the Lawe'.

2

When English monarchs refashioned the medieval church after their own image, the fabric, form and function of religion at the Inns underwent certain change. Nevertheless it is difficult to plot the progress of reform. Even if the bench minutes of Gray's Inn and the Middle Temple were extant for all of this period, as well as the accounts for those Inns and the Inner Temple, we should probably be little the wiser. The remaining records of Lincoln's Inn and the Inner Temple yield only fragments concerning chapel alteration and liturgical reform. As a result it might be concluded either that the Reformation made slow progress at the Inns, or that changes were implemented without debate.

Either conclusion would be rash. Often chapel expenditure is not fully itemised in the accounts, and bench minutes do not include every decision, but only those administrative, financial and disciplinary details which were necessary for practical purposes. At the best of times conflict and debate were not recorded, so that during those years

1 Anonymous MS, f.321v. For Richard Lister's appointment with Lord Lisle in St. Paul's (1540), see LP XV.1030(45).

2 There are no minutes for the Middle Temple from 1525 to 1551, and none for Gray's Inn before 1569. Nor are there any accounts for the Temple before the seventeenth century, or for Gray's Inn before 1568. The deficiencies of the Gray's Inn records are partly remedied by the Segar MS and Dugdale, OJ. Prest provides a useful summary of Inns' records (239-41).

3 'The Reformation...has left so little mark upon our records that it would hardly appear to have been recognised within our walls' (ITAP, I.xliii).
of controversy, religious pronouncements cannot be expected. As the governing bodies met but a few times during term, many matters were settled at informal meetings, or handled through more permanent officers, especially the readers, treasurers, pensioners, clergy and particular benchers who were appointed to supervise chapel affairs. It cannot be supposed from the paucity of evidence either that the Reformation had little impact, or that it was automatically imposed.

Nor can it be simply presumed that government policy was implemented at exactly the same pace as elsewhere. Since the Inns evolved as voluntary and self-governing societies whose property was originally owned by ecclesiastical lords with special liberties, they were recognised as privileged places. In criminal proceedings, whether civil or ecclesiastical, the authorities had no right of entry, though members who committed serious offences could be surrendered by the benchers. In ecclesiastical matters, the Inns were considered to be exempt from episcopal visitation. In fact there seems to have been little attempt to bring them within the ordinary ecclesiastical structure until 1645, when parliament ordained that the four Inns, the Chapel of the Rolls, and the two Serjeants' Inns would constitute two classes within a single province. Such was the reputation of the Temple Church that when the recorder of London examined the parties to a clandestine marriage, they replied that they thought it to be a 'lawless churche'. Because of the

1 APC X.94; SP16/254, f.107; ITAB II, f.122 (II.83); MTMB III, f.80 (II.588); GIPB I, f.381v (I.294); The Seconde Parte of a Register, II.184; Hooker, Works, II.676.

2 LIBB II.ii, ff.47v-8, VII, ff.209v-10 (I.71, II.272-4); ITR XXXI, 15; Lander, 156-7.

3 APC X.94; Lansdowne MS 72, f.118v; SP16/231, f.154v; SP16/355, ff.352-3.

4 Lords' Journal, VIII.50.

5 William Fleetwood to Lord Burghley, 13 August (1575), Lansdowne MS 20, f.20v.
extra-parochial status of the Inns, it cannot be supposed that they were bound to implement every article of reform, or that change was effected at the same pace as in the parish churches.

Nevertheless some assumptions may be usefully applied. In the first place it can be presumed that since all subjects were bound to obey proclamations, acts and injunctions concerning religion, the lawyers were obliged to acknowledge the royal supremacy and to implement reform. Though some benchers might have delayed particular alterations, or have argued that certain articles were not applicable to the Inns because of their privileged status, conformity would generally be ensured by the overlap in personnel between the authorities and the Inns, the special responsibility of the judges for their good government,¹ and the inbred bias of lawyers towards the rule of law. Secondly it can be assumed that despite their privileges, the Inns were obliged to observe the orders of the bishop of London. In 1539 the second Act of Suppression brought all churches and chapels of religious houses under the jurisdiction of the ordinary of their diocese,² so that during later years the privy councillors and lawyers alike recognised the bishop of London as the ordinary of the Inns.³ Thirdly it can normally be accepted that furnishings which were provided for the chapels during Mary's reign approximated those which had been removed beforehand, whereas certain items which were not restored were probably still intact. Lastly it can be presumed that, because of personal connections between benchers of the

¹ Rotuli Parliamentorum, I.431; LIBB III, f.32 (I.161); ITAB I, f.49 (I.142); TPP, I.371-2; APC X.94. See Prest, 73-4, regarding judges orders of the Inns.


³ LIBB V, f.112 (I.371); ITAB I, ff.181-2 (I.252-4); GIBB I, f.52v (I.22); MTB IV,f.180 (II.859); SP12/177, f.174v.
four Inns, frequent communication between their governing bodies, and their general desire to act in concert, certain changes which were effected in one Inn were usually implemented at the others. By careful use of these assumptions in conjunction with the Inns' records and evidence concerning reform elsewhere, it is possible to determine the process, pace and progress of religious change at the Inns.  

Throughout the Reformation of Henry VIII and his heir, the fabric of the chapels remained intact. But anything which was thought to be associated with idolatry and superstition was removed. Unlike the priory church of St John at Clerkenwell which was partially demolished, when the Temple Church reverted to the crown in 1540 it was apparently considered to be of some ecclesiastical value. Nevertheless the contents of St Thomas' chapel were probably removed in 1539 following the dismantling of his shrine at Canterbury and official condemnation of the Becket cult in the preceding year. The chapel of St. Ann possibly continued for some time; but since there was little use for a secondary chapel which had been deprived of its function and probably its ornaments during the campaign against hagiolatry, it became a storehouse for fine office records.

1 Since an examination of London parish records is beyond the scope of this research, for comparative purposes this section draws mainly on contemporary chronicles supplemented by Bentley's MS for St Andrew's, Holborn, inventories of church goods, the VCH and LP.

2 King and Luke, 111,264; LP XV.646.

3 32 Henry VIII, c.24 (SR III.778-81).

4 LP XIII.i1.133,1171; Visitations, II.42; TRP, I.275-6; Wriothesley, I.86,89; Davis.

5 Visitations, II.5,38; LP XIV.i.466, XVI.712,1233,1258,1262; Wriothesley, I.83,88; 'Two London Chronicles', 11-13; VCH, I.267-72.

6 SP16/355, ff.252-3; Baylis, 54-5.
The altars may have been removed from the choir during the early years of the Reformation, but more likely they remained until the general dismantling of altars throughout London between 1550 and 1552.

If the chapels had contained rood lofts, these were taken down during these years. However, the screen was not removed from Gray's Inn chapel, though the organ was sold in 1552. Bishop Ridley's injunctions of 1550 may have been responsible for this sale. But since the removal of organs was not general throughout London, the action possibly resulted from reformed feeling within the society.

Whereas the windows of St Andrew's church were taken down in 1547, at Lincoln's Inn little seems to have been spent on new glass, and nothing is known about the Temple Church. But at Gray's Inn the pension ordered a bencher to remove their Becket window, replacing it with another 'in memory of our Lord praying in the Mount'. This action resulted from 'consideration being had of the King's command, that all the Images of Thomas Becket, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, in any windows, either of Churches or Chappels, should be obliterated', which probably refers to the proclamation of December 1538 rather than the preceding injunctions. But whereas the windows at St Thomas Acres were removed in 1538, and Miles Coverdale complained in March 1539 that a Becket

---

1 'Two London Chronicles', 11-13; VCH, I.289,294.
2 Dugdale, OJ, 284.
3 Visitations, II.235; Grey Friars Chronicle, 75; Church goods (St Andrew's, Holborn) 1552, Ell7/4/93, f.5; Parkyn's Narrative, 74-5.
5 Dugdale, OJ, 283.
6 Wriothesley, I.86-7; LP VII.626.
window still remained at Henley, the benchers of Gray's Inn did not act until May. Apparently they felt bound to obey the royal command, but not sufficiently obliged to act without delay.

Though all the chapels probably contained images, the only known examples were at Lincoln's Inn. There the images of St Richard and St John were quite likely removed in 1539, following Cromwell's injunctions and the dismantling of St Richard's shrine at Chichester late in 1538. The image of the virgin Mary possibly remained in the chapel until the Edwardian campaign against images between 1547 and 1550. But despite the iconclasm of London folk and the royal commissioners, the image was apparently kept safely out of sight.

Likewise most ornaments disappeared from the chapels after their use was no longer permitted or required. In 1552 the pension of Gray's Inn ordered various utensils to be sold, including the holywater stock and the little brass bell. The first was made redundant by proclamation in 1548, and the second by the 1547 royal injunctions and Ridley's injunctions of 1550. But whereas Gray's Inn and many London churches sold their superfluous ornaments at this time, the Inner Temple kept 'two payre of sylver sensers' in safe custody.

1 LP XIV.i.444. Cf. 1053.
2 Visitations, II.36-7; LP XIII.ii.1049,1103,1280, Cf. Wriothesley, I.88; LP XIV.i.466. This was probably the cause of the decrease in the annual sum paid for chapel wax in the same year (A1).
3 Visitations, II.126,240; Wriothesley, I.185, II.1; Stow and Howes, 290-1; Parkyn's Narrative, 66; 3 & 4 Edward VI, c.10 (SR IV.110-11); VCH I.289-90.
4 Two tabernacles were replaced in 1554-5, but only one image (LIBB IV, f.291 (I.313)).
5 Dugdale, OJ, 284.
6 Visitations, II.124,184,242.
7 Walters, chs II,IV.
During the same period, the practice of burning tapers in honour of the saints and setting lights before the altars and roods was discontinued. In 1552 Gray's Inn decided to sell their candlesticks.\(^1\) At Lincoln's Inn the wax for the St John's or midsummer light was not purchased for the hall during Edwardian years.\(^2\) However a better barometer of change is provided by the annual payments for chapel wax, made by the treasurer of the same Inn.\(^3\) Whereas the average payment between 1520 and 1538 was almost a pound, in 1539 it dropped to about half that sum, until 1551 to 1553, when payments ceased. As these variations cannot be explained by evidence of payments from other accounts or by contemporary economic fluctuations, they were undoubtedly related to changes in religious observance. More significantly they coincide with official pronouncements. The decrease in 1539 follows hard upon the royal injunctions of 1538, which forbade the use of candles, tapers and wax representations before any picture or image.\(^4\) Payment continued at this lower level while it was still permitted to burn lights at the altar.\(^5\) But following Ridley's injunctions of 1550 which condemned even this practice, payments shrunk and finally ceased.\(^6\) Apparently these were not mere coincidences, but prompt responses to official policy.

---

1 Dugdale, OJ, 284.
2 LIBB IV, ff.187v,196.
3 Al.
4 Visitations, II,37,38; 'Two London Chronicles', 14.
5 Visitations, II,38,116; LP XVI,712; Parkyn's Narrative, 66.
Of all the changes, none was as central to the old religion as the removal of the altar and its ornaments. Though many London churches acted precipitately, altars were more generally dismantled following Ridley's exhortation, the example of St. Paul's, and the privy council's order of 1550. The abolition order applied to 'everie church or chappell as well in places exempted as not exempted'. Consequently the altar was removed from Gray's Inn before November 1552. As the Temple Church was so eminent, its high altar was presumably dismantled by this time. But though the altar was taken down at Lincoln's Inn, the great stone remained at hand.

In this way the medieval chapels were largely stripped of their rich ornamentation. Their alteration, which was well underway before the death of Henry VIII, quickened with the accession of his son, and reached its height during his last years. But this reformation was not simply a change in the fabric of religion at the Inns, but a transformation of its traditional form.

Two years after the crown had gained Gray's Inn, the court of augmentations decreed that divine services could continue there as before. Similarly the Act dissolving the Order of St. John specified that the Temple clergy should perform their customary duties. But already the form of worship was changing in response to royal declaration.

1 Visitations, II.244; APC III.68-9; Cardwell, I.89-90; Grey Friars Chronicle, 67,75; Wriothesley, II.41; "Two London Chronicles", 22; Parkyn's Narrative, 75; Bentley's MS, ff.227,228; VCH I.294; Dugmore, 150-7.

2 Dugdale, QJ, 284.

3 No payment was made for the removal of the altar stone at this time, or for its restoration in 1553-4, but in 1549-50 tiles were laid where the altar had been (LIBB IV, f.232v).

4 Augmentations office misc. book E315/93, ff.47v,194v.

5 32 Henry VIII, c.24 (SR III.780).
episcopal pronouncement, reformed feeling and continual pressure, culminating in the Edwardian Acts of Uniformity which finally abolished the mass and ordered the exclusive use of the prayer book.\(^1\) According to Robert Parkyn the priest, by June 1549 'tholly masse was utterly depossised through this realme of England & other the kyng's dominions'.\(^2\)

Unfortunately very little can be gleaned from the Inns' records concerning liturgical changes or their theological significance.\(^3\) As mentioned already, this may be attributed to the nature of the records. But it also stems from the fact that those who were expected to implement the various declarations and formularies of the faith were not the lawyers, but their clergy.\(^4\) There can be little doubt that in such public places the clergy generally discharged their responsibility, so that by the end of Edward's reign, the pattern of religious observance at the Inns was as fully transformed as elsewhere. But since the benchers were responsible for the oversight of chapel affairs, including expenditure on goods necessitated by the new form of worship, these items appear in the extant records.

There is no evidence of when the Inns first introduced communion in both kinds, removed the sacrament and pix from their altars, or replaced the daily mass with communion on Sundays. Nevertheless it is apparent that shortly after 1550 the ornate altars were supplanted by simple communion tables. At Lincoln's Inn the treasurer paid seven shillings for 'the Communyon Tabyll' between November 1550 and the devaluation in

---

1 2 & 3 Edward VI, c.1, 5 & 6 Edward VI, c.1 (SR IV.37-9,130-1); Davies, ch.5; Dugmore, chs 6-7.

2 Parkyn's Narrative, 117.

3 Visitations, II preambles.
July 1551. As this was apparently in response to Bishop Ridley's activity and the privy council's order of 1550, similar tables were probably provided by other Inns at the same time. In fact an inventory of goods remaining in the chapel of Gray's Inn in 1552 describes the only notable piece of furniture as 'A table'. In keeping with the privy council's order, it can be assumed that the communion table was set in the choir and simply covered with a cloth. But whereas some London churches including St. Andrew's melted down their chalices to make larger communion cups, Gray's and Lincoln's Inns retained their old chalices, so that there were possibly few communicants. At the Temple, however, a 'cuppe of sylver and gylt and graven with a cover', which the privy council ordered to be delivered from the custody of the master of the rolls to the Inner Temple in 1552, may have been for church use.

Similarly it is not known when the Inns ceased their ceremonies for the souls of the dead. Though the dissolution of chantries was ostensibly justified by condemning such practices as superstitious, as late as 1550 Lincoln's Inn received a pound from the executors of John Hynde for prayers for his soul, and Sir Robert Drury's chaplain continued

1 LIBB V, f.248v (I.298).
2 Visitations, II.242-4; Grey Friars Chronicle, 67; Wriothesley, II.41; APC III.68-9. Cf. Bentley's MS, f.228; VCH 1.294; Davies, 364-5.
3 Dugdale, OJ, 284.
4 APC III.68-9; 'Two London Chronicles', 22; Parkyn's Narrative, 75; Davies, 102 plate 7.
5 Church goods (St Andrew's, Holborn) 1552 Ell7/4/93, f.7; VCH I.294; Davies, 366.
6 Dugdale, OJ, 284; LIBB IV, ff.274,280,291,195 (I.308-9,310-11,313-14.)
7 APC IV.82.
8 1 Edward VI, c.14 (SR IV.24).
at the Inn almost to the end of the reign.¹ Since prayers for the dead were not strictly forbidden until 1552,² it seems that the clergy at Lincoln's Inn performed their propitiatory function until then.

At the same time there is no evidence that sermons were provided at the Inns. Other London churches had their original pulpit or built anew in response to reformed feeling and official pressure.³ At St Andrew's in 1534-5, the churchwardens replaced the old pulpit of Henry VII's day, and paid preachers in 1547.⁴ Though the Temple Church probably had a pulpit, for the other Inns there is no evidence before Elizabeth's reign that a pulpit was erected, or that licensed preachers were employed. During the period the clergy possibly pronounced the requisite royal declarations, and preached the stipulated quarterly sermons, but since most of them were probably unlicensed, it is unlikely that sermons were delivered very often.⁵ If homilies were insufficient, the parish churches were nearby. Therefore it seems that the closest the lawyers came to establishing a preaching ministry was in 1539-40, when the second report of Denton, Bacon and Cary proposed an open divinity lecture during the Lent season.⁶

Though information is also lacking concerning the fate of the former service books, the decorative but presumably defaced manuals were apparently removed from the chapels by 1552.⁷ Consequently it was the

---

¹ P.63 below.
² Parkyn's Narrative, 76.
³ Visitations, II.37,115-6,126; TRP I.275; Wriothesley, I.30,74; Elton, PP, 231-2.
⁴ Bentley's MS, f.227.
⁵ See ch.3 regarding the quality of the Inns' clergy. There was quite likely preaching by the master and others at the Temple.
⁶ DEC Reports, 541.
⁷ For early service books at Lincoln's Inn, see LIBB I, ff.100, 174v (I.28,52).
The benchers' task to provide the newly printed books of the Reformation. Nothing is known about the Temple Church, but according to the 1552 inventory of goods at Gray's Inn, their chapel contained 'a Bible of the largest Volume', a psalter and 'a Book of Service'.¹ This divulges little regarding the origin of the bible and psalter, except that the former would have been the Great Bible first published in 1539,² while the latter was possibly a Sternhold and Hopkins edition of the metrical psalms.³ The service book was possibly the 1549 English prayer-book. However, the first Act of Uniformity permitted those who understood other languages to conduct services in the appropriate tongue, and the second Act ordered the new English book to be used after 1 November 1552, only a little before the date of the Gray's Inn inventory.⁴ Therefore the Inn could have possessed any of the three editions, but more likely either the Latin version of 1551 or the second prayer-book.

This conclusion is reinforced by the action of Lincoln's Inn. In 1551-2 the treasurer paid four shillings for a new book of common prayer.⁵ As the financial year ended on 1 November and there had been difficulty in publishing the second book by the same date,⁶ either the Inn acted in hurried obedience to the second Act, or it purchased the Latin edition. This raises the question of whether the Inns had provided the first English prayer-book. Without further evidence it is difficult to tell; but since the Lincoln's Inn records are likely to have mentioned any previous purchase or donation, it seems that the book of common prayer was not used at Lincoln's Inn and possibly Gray's Inn until 1551-2.

¹ Dugdale, OJ, 284.
² STC 2068-76; Dickens, ER, 183-96; Bruce, ch.6.
³ STC 2149-24; Davies, 384-6.
⁴ 2 & 3 Edward VI, c.1, 5 & 6 Edward VI, c.1. (SR IV.38,130-1).
⁵ LIBB IV, f.261v (I.303).
⁶ APC IV.131; Jordan, Edward VI, II.350-2.
Such a conclusion is not surprising, as there had been considerable contention over the first book, and many London churches went unprovided during Bishop Bonner's tenure. Furthermore Gray's and Lincoln's Inns, in common with London churches, did not purchase all of the other required books. At Lincoln's Inn the treasurer refunded fifteen shillings to the chaplain for a bible, a book of homilies and a desk in the chapel. As payment was made early in 1548, this purchase was apparently influenced by the 1547 royal injunctions, which ordered all ecclesiastical persons to furnish their churches with a bible of the largest volume and the newly published homilies. Despite the insistence of preceding injunctions, and the example of most London churches, this was apparently the first bible provided by the Inn. The same injunctions also instructed the clergy to purchase the newly translated paraphrases of Erasmus, which was done at St. Andrew's and other churches. But this book was not bought by Lincoln's Inn, nor does it appear in the Gray's Inn inventory. In common with other London churches, both Inns provided no more than three of the required texts. Nevertheless the form of religion, as well as its fabric, was altered almost beyond recognition before the death of Edward VI. Gone were the rich ornaments and elaborate rites which had accumulated during medieval centuries. In their place stood the reformed religion, which to so many members must have seemed as bare as the Gray's Inn chapel.

1 Jordan, Edward VI, 342-5; Davies, 194-201; Dugmore, 137-57.
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3 Visitations, II.117,128-9, cf. 244; Davies, 228-32.
4 Visitations, II.9,35-6; LP XIV.ii. ap.6, XVI.819; Wriothesley, 1.74; TRP I.296-8; VCH I.288.
5 Visitations, II.117-18, cf.244; Bentley's MS, f.227; Church goods (St Andrew's, Holborn) 1552 E117/4/93; VCH I.288.
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1 Jordan, Edward VI, 342-5; Davies, 194-201; Dugmore, 137-57.
2 LIBB IV, f.209 (I.288).
3 Visitations, II.117,128-9, cf. 244; Davies, 228-32.
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Though this transformation was well under way by the end of Henry VIII's reign, most of the reforms which struck at the core of the old religion were effected during the few Edwardian years. In contrast with the periodic iconclasm which afflicted London churches, there is no sign that popular action affected the chapels. The possibility is remote. In fact there is little evidence that the Inns acted in advance of established government policy. Though adherents to the rule of law, the benchers appear to have somewhat reluctantly implemented reform in response to authority.

Throughout the period there seem to be certain limitations to reform which were facilitated by the privileged status of the Inns. The templars took the censers from their church, but instead of disposing of them, put them safely away. At Lincoln's Inn the benchers replaced the Becket window, but only after some delay, and did not destroy their image of the virgin Mary. Though the same Inn purchased the communion table quite promptly, the altar stone was not destroyed. Gray's Inn removed the organ and possibly a rood loft, but did not take down the screen. Both Gray's and Lincoln's Inns provided some but not all of the requisite books, and whereas prayers for the dead continued to the end of the reign, preaching did not become a central part of public observance. Though the Reformation had made evident headway, there were several limitations.

Because of the deficiencies of the Inns' records, some of these qualifications may be more imagined than real. Others may reflect practical motives, as it was generally easier and more profitable to

1 Dugdale, C. J., 284; Davies, 38-9, 128-9, 355-6 on the simplicity of reformed religion.
remove the past than to build anew. But taken as a whole, most represent tenets which were central either to the old religion or the new. Indeed they suggest that within the Inns, the appearance of reform was greater than the reality.

In July 1553, such was the excitement and relief at the accession of Queen Mary, that London went wild, with choirs singing, organs playing and bells ringing in the churches, and night-time bonfires, food and wine on the streets. Almost immediately the Latin mass was resumed in various churches, and quickly spread throughout the realm under encouragement of the royal proclamation.

Much of this early restoration was spontaneous. Robert Parkyn believed that 'all thenglishe service of laitte uside in the churche of God was voluntarilie layde away and the Lattin taken upp agayne (nott only with mattynge, masse and evin songe, but also in mynistration of sacramenttes)'. In confirmation of this Yorkshire priest, Thomas Bentley, an Elizabethan churchwarden, lamented that in the first year of Mary's reign, the parishioners at St Andrew's were 'so ready...to maynteyn idolatrous service and forward to further Supersticyon in so short a space that it is wonderfull to reade or here and shal contempe the coldnes and slacking of som now in the tyme of the gospell'.

1 Grey Friars Chronicle, 80; 'Two London Chronicles', 27.
2 Wriothesley, II.102,105; 'Two London Chronicles', 29; Grey Friars Chronicle, 84; Parkyn's Narrative, 78-9; VCH I.298; TRP II.5-8.
3 Parkyn's Narrative, 80.
4 Bentley's MS, f.228.
Sampson, in a letter from overseas to his former parishioners, cried
'Oh London! London, London, is this the gospelling fruit, to be the first
that, against laws, shall give the example of stumbling to all England?'1
But to ensure that the former worship with all its paraphernalia was
fully restored, in 1553 to 1554 parliament dismantled the legislative
framework of the Reformation, the Queen proclaimed the new liturgical
requirements, and the bishops imposed the law, particularly Edmund
Bonner in London.2

As a result, many of the London churches were soon refurnished.3
Thomas Bentley wrote of St Andrew's that the parishioners set up 'al
manre of Supersticious things agayne in the church not long before pulid
down', including the rood with Mary and John, the gilded image of St
Andrew and the paschal lights.4 But elsewhere all was not well.
According to the visitation records for Lincoln in 1556 and Canterbury
in 1557, many churches were still without the requisite altars, ornaments
and service books, and some did not even possess any.5

At the Inns the chapels were largely restored during the first two
years. In April 1554 the two Temples proposed to share the cost of
'bokes for the syngyng of the quire',6 and in the following year the
Inner Temple treasurer returned the silver censers for church use.7 The
first measure possibly resulted from the current pressure upon churches

1 In Hughes, II.194.
2 Mary st.2, c.2, 1 & 2 Philip and Mary, c.8 (SR IV.202,246); Davies,
134-5; Visitations, II.322-72; Wriothesley, II.113,122; Machyn, 50.
3 VCH I.298-300.
4 Bentley's MS, ff.228-9.
5 Hughes, II.236-9.
6 ITAB I, f.133 (I.173).
7 ITAB I, ff.138,139 (I.181,182-3).
to provide the necessary service books, while the second coincided with Bonner's injunctions which specified that every church should possess censers before Christmas 1555. ¹ Though nothing else is mentioned concerning the restoration at the Temple Church, when this evidence is related to information concerning the other chapels, it is evident that the church was largely refurnished during these years.

Thanks to the indefatigable William Dugdale, the expenditure of Gray's Inn for the restoration of chapel goods has been reproduced from the missing pension book.² In addition to vestments and a desk for the priest, the Inn paid for a new oak altar with a 'Super-Altare' or small consecrated slab. As ornaments, the Inn provided two cruets, three cloths, a corporal, and 'a painted cloth' or hanging for the altar. All of these were purchased during the first year of the reign.

At Lincoln's Inn, the accounts show that nothing was paid for restoration before at least October 1553.³ Consequently it is unlikely that their chapel performed the traditional ritual before official sanction. But during the succeeding year the treasurer purchased two 'great portuasses' or breviaries for divine service and a missal for the mass, as well as a holywater stock, a holywater sprinkler, and a pix for the sacrament with a canopy, bracket, cord, weight and cloth.⁴ In the same year payment was resumed for chapel wax,⁵ so that during 1554-5, when tabernacles were provided for a new image of St Richard and the old but newly painted image of St Mary,⁶ the charge for two torches, a link of pitch and flax, and tapers amounted to twenty seven shillings. As

¹ Visitations, II.327-8,365; VCH I.300.
² Dugdale, QJ, 284.
³ LIBB IV, ff.268-9 (I.305-6).
⁴ LIBB IV, f.280 (I.310-11).
⁵ Al.
the St John's lights were once more hung in the hall,\(^1\) during the rest of the reign the average annual cost of ceremonial wax was almost fifty shillings. However the restoration at Lincoln's Inn may be dated more precisely by a donation which was made before 3 May 1554. The black books record that during Easter term, one of the benchers not only paid for gilding five knobs of the canopy over the sacrament, but also 'gave towards the furnishing of the Alter in the Chapell in the house a great Image or picture in a Table of the taking down of Christ from the Cross, and too Curtens of greane and yellowe Sarcenet [a soft silk material] for to hang at the endes of the same Alter, and also a clothe of grene and yellowe Sarcenet lined with canvas to hang before the sayd Altar'.\(^2\) Therefore the return to the old religion at Lincoln's Inn took place between October 1553 and April 1554.

From this evidence of the early restoration of the chapels, it seems that, by the officially proclaimed date of 20 December 1553,\(^3\) the Inns had readily returned to the traditional pattern of religion, which at the Temple was referred to as 'masse, matens, evensongs & c as heretofore hath bene used'.\(^4\) Likewise the chapels resumed their services for the dead. In February 1554 the benchers of Lincoln's Inn applied to Sir Robert Drury's heir for payment of the former stipend to a priest already appointed by themselves, who would continue to pray for the family's souls.\(^5\) In April of the same year the benchers agreed that the generous donation of altar furnishings was worthy of a collect to be said before the epistle and at the end of each mass by every priest, for the

---

1 LIBB IV, f.291 (I.313).
2 LIBB IV, f.274 (I.308-9).
3 Machyn, 50.
4 ITAB I, f.143 (I.191).
5 LIBB IV, f.273 (I.308).
souls of the donor, his family and friends, presumably including the bencher themselves. At the same time the public veneration of saints was resumed, certainly at Lincoln's Inn where the images of their patron saints were set up following Bonner's order to observe their feast days, yet well before his explicit command to erect their images.

However, restoration of the chapels was apparently incomplete. In comparison with the ornaments which Bonner's injunctions prescribed for all London churches by Christmas 1555, the records of Lincoln's Inn make no reference to any chalice, cruets, censers, chrismatory, sanctus bell, candlesticks or cloths, while the Gray's Inn purchases do not include a service book, chalice, pix, censer, chrismatory, sanctus bell, candlestick, sprinkler or stock. Yet there is no evidence that the refurnishing of their chapels was continued beyond the first two years. As Gray's Inn must have had some service books, it is possible that Dugdale's list is not complete, though he probably included all of the significant purchases from the original records. Moreover Lincoln's Inn is likely to have had candlesticks, and both Inns certainly would have provided a chalice. Consequently there must have been some chapel goods, including the image of the Virgin and the Temple censers, which survived the Reformation. Yet Gray's Inn had already disposed of their bell, stock and candlesticks, and Dugdale gives no indication that they replaced these, or any organ, window or loft. Furthermore a bencher of the Inner Temple bequeathed five pounds 'to be employed towards the renewing of thornamentes of the churche' as late as September 1557. Therefore these chapels, in common with many parish churches, were not fully restored.

1 LIBB IV, f.274 (I.308-9).
2 Wriothesley, II.122,134.
3 Visitations, II.365-6.
4 Nicholas Hare, PCC 46 Wrastley, 1557.
This failure was probably related to the fact that the chapels did not need all the furnishings of an ordinary church. In addition it possibly reflected the reluctance of the benchers to spend at the best of times, and the declining popularity of the new regime. But it also derived from the lasting influence of reformed opinion. At Lincoln's Inn the reading desk which had been provided with the bible and homilies was not removed, nor a seat installed for the priest, until late 1554 to 1555. Furthermore, care was taken to hang a devotional picture above the altar, depicting a subject which was central to both the old and new religion. At the Inner Temple there was apparently some difficulty over the censers. According to the draft of an unusual memorandum by the treasurer, on 31 November 1555 he delivered the 'two payre of sylver sensers belonging to the Church to the Master of the Temple to kepe safely to the use of the Churche'. To this he added that 'this was by the assent and agreement of the benche', which was changed in the final copy to the more usual endorsement that this was 'by the Commandyment of the benche'. As well as being a rather late provision for the church, the statement reveals that the treasurer wished to legitimate an action over which there was or could be some disagreement. In the same way the benchers of Lincoln's Inn ordered perpetual chapel prayers for the family and donor of altar furnishings, but in the rarest of utterances they declared that 'hit is at this present councill graunted and agreed by the hole consent of all the Masters of the bench of lyncolnes Inn present at this councill'.

Thus the old form of religion was readily returned to the Inns, at a time when many members undoubtedly treated this not as a restoration of

1 LIBB IV, f.295 (I.314).
2 ITAB I, ff.138,139 (I.181,182-3).
3 LIBB IV, f.274 (I.308-9), with underlining supplied.
the past, but as the return to normality after a brief aberration. Nevertheless some of the usual ornaments were apparently not provided. Though this may be accounted for by practical considerations, it is likely that the continuing existence of reformed opinion within the Inns was not without effect.

5

In the first confused year of Elizabeth's reign, Londoners indulged in an orgy of idol bashing, which reached its peak in August 1559, following the Act of Uniformity and the appointment of ecclesiastical commissioners. ¹ Of this frenzied destruction, Sir John Hayward later wrote that 'the orderes which the Commissioneres sett wer both embraced and executid with great fervency of the Common people; especially in beating downe, breakinge, and burning images, which had been erected in the churches, declaring themselves noe lesse dissordered in defacing of them then they had been immoderate and excessive in adorning them before'. ² Those relics of supposedly popish superstition which were not destroyed through popular excess, were removed by authority within the next year, ³ so that Thomas Bentley proudly wrote of St Andrew's that 'in the fyrst and second yere of hir Majesties reyne all the alters and superstitious things in the church set up in Queen Maryes tyme now agayne to gods glorye pulde downe and litle and litle al the reliques of Rome vtterly turned out of the church'. ⁴

¹ Elizabeth I, c.2 (SR IV.355-8); Visitations, III.1; Machyn, 203; Stow and Howes, 347-8; Wriothesley, II.145; CSPF (1558-9), 781; CSPV (1558-80), 71,77.
² Hayward, 28.
³ Visitations, III.9,16; VCH I.306-7; Haugaard, 135-54.
⁴ Bentley's MS, f.229v.
For the Inns of Court the evidence is lamentably scant. Though mob action would not have been tolerated, Lincoln's Inn's records show that the result was virtually the same. Before October 1559 the pensioner of the Inn paid 'for mending of the pavement and carrying away of the Rubbishe after the alter taken downe in the chappe'.\(^1\) As there is no payment for its dismantling, it is possible that this was carried out by officers or members of the Inn. During the same year the treasurer's expenditure on ceremonial wax dropped considerably, and in succeeding years nothing was spent, which undoubtedly reflects the removal of the altar, images and candlesticks.\(^2\) There is no record concerning the fate of ornaments at the other Inns, excepting the inevitable Temple censers, which were once more removed from the church in 1559.\(^3\) In the light of this evidence, the insistence of the government, and the pattern elsewhere, it can be accepted that during the first two years of Elizabeth's reign, the chapels were stripped of their Marian apparel.

At the same time the benchers were obliged to provide the necessities for reformed observance.\(^4\) Though communion tables are not mentioned until 1567-8, when the pensioner of Lincoln's Inn paid for suitable linen, these no doubt replaced the altars during 1559, when the new form of worship was introduced.\(^5\) At Lincoln's Inn the new service was observed after 4 June, being the day on which the benchers ordered their treasurer to provide without delay 'suche bokes as shalbe requysite

1 LIBB IV, f.341 (I.327).
2 Al.
3 ITAB I, f.168v (I.229).
4 See statute 1 Elizabeth I, c.2 (SR IV.357); Visitations, III.10,19, 27-8.
5 LIBB V, f.82 (I.361); Davies, 364-5.
to serve for the Chaplayn of this house to say such service in the chappell as of late is appointed by the statute in that behalf made and provided.\(^1\) Consequently the treasurer paid fifteen shillings before October 1559 for the new prayer-book, a bible, and other books which probably included the paraphrases and homilies.\(^2\) Since the Act of Uniformity required all churches to observe the new form of worship by 24 June, Lincoln's Inn and the other societies apparently conformed by that date.

Despite the general alacrity with which the reformed religion was re-established at the Inns, there were delays. The Act of Uniformity was passed in April 1559, and many London churches had implemented the new order by May.\(^3\) But Lincoln's Inn did not act until early in June. Because of reformed feeling and the need for larger communion cups, many London churches replaced their chalices within the first two years;\(^4\) yet this was not done until 1563 at the Temple, 1570-1 at Lincoln's Inn, and, regardless of general episcopal orders, as late as 1584 at Gray's Inn.\(^5\) In spite of the 1559 royal injunctions which prescribed monthly

\(^1\) LIBB IV, f.341 (I.326).
\(^2\) LIBB IV, f.354v (I.327).
\(^3\) Hayward, 13; Wriothesley, II.142-3,145; Machyn, 197; CSPV (1558-80), 71,77; CSPP (1558-60), 781.
\(^4\) Bentley's MS, f.229; VCH I.307; Davies, 366-7.
\(^5\) ITAB I, ff.167v,168v (I.225,227); LIBB V, ff.145,163v (I.379,383); GIPB I, f.182 (I.488). Cf. Visitations, III.303. In May 1563 the Inner Temple parliament ordered that a conference be held with the Middle house 'touching the provdyngle of some convenient cuppe to ministre the communion'. Consequently an act was passed on 16 May that twenty pounds for a cup be recouped from a debt which the society owed to one of the benchers. This cup must have been a handsome piece, particularly if the Middle Temple paid likewise. In 1570-1 Lincoln's Inn sold its chalice for £2 13s 4d, and in the following year the treasurer refunded £7 15s 9d to the chaplain for a silver gilt chalice, commonly called 'A communion cupp', which had been bought by order of the benchers. In 1584 Gray's Inn refunded £7 12 4d to the butler 'for a comunyon Cuppe and for other things'.
sermons and 'a comely and honest pulpit' in every church, this was not obeyed until 1569 at Gray's Inn and 1570-1 at Lincoln's Inn. Furthermore the records indicate that the Inns retained some of their former chapel goods well into the new reign. Not until 1563 did the Inner Temple benchers order their treasurer to confer with his counterpart of the Middle Temple 'touching a payer of sylver sensares belonging to the Temple churche which Mr. Hone of the Myddle Temple late Threasourer of the same house toke into his custodye owt of the same churche'. Nor was the floor of Lincoln's Inn chapel repaved and the wall wainscotted where the altar had been, or the great altar stone finally sold for five shillings until 1570-1. Some of these limitations reflect financial considerations and the chapels' peculiar status. Others reveal an understandable caution during early years of uncertainty. Yet again they demonstrate that reformed religion was restricted by deeply rooted custom.

Nevertheless the pattern of observance, which had been re-established so quickly at the Inns, soon developed its own tradition. The medieval ornaments and ritual were things of the past. In a comparatively bare chapel, the minister conducted early morning matins, evening prayer in the late afternoon, and occasional Sunday communion. As the years passed, the old chapel books were replaced by fresh editions. At Lincoln's Inn new communion linen was purchased in 1567-8, presumably to supersede the

2 ITAB I, f.168v (I.229). William Hone was treasurer in 1558-9 (A5, IV.51).
3 LIBB V, ff.139v,141 (I.378,379).
4 GIPE I, ff.156v,329 (I.236); MTMB II, f.154, III, f.107v, IV, f.50 (I.253, II.609,767); MT MS'Md concerning Temple church', 16 April 1630; LIBB V, f.374, VI, f.630, VII, ff.173,387, VIII, ff.376v,368 (I.438, II.187,259,311,339).
5 LIBB V, ff.105,180v,201v,275,366v,478 (I.367,387,397,413,435, II.27); GIPE I, ff.18v,65v,69v; GIL, ff.32v,421v.
former altar cloths. Though the 1559 royal injunctions forbade the removal of choir screens,\(^1\) in 1570 Gray's Inn shifted theirs from the middle of the chapel to the west end.\(^2\) All of the chapels were at length provided with communion cups instead of chalices, and pulpits were installed in preparation for a preaching ministry. No doubt most of these measures were products of necessity. The cloths and books were dilapidated. Rising admissions, regular sermons and compulsory attendance increased the need for larger cups and extra pews. But even that necessity reflected the consolidation of reformed religion during Elizabethan years.

Throughout this transformation of traditional religion, the Inns rarely acted in advance of official policy. Though there is little evidence of direct government or episcopal interference, they generally responded, sooner or later, to whatever was decreed by church and state, out of reverence for authority, stability and the law. Nevertheless the fact of general compliance to external authority obscures significant developments within the Inns. Whatever the religious policy of the government, the Inns evidently had sufficient freedom as self-governing societies and privileged places to modify the operation of that policy within their walls. This in itself reflects a degree of independence, if not resistance. At the same time they exercised an enhanced degree of responsibility for their collective religious life.

---

1 Visitations, III.108-10; Davies, 364.
2 GIBP I, ff.1v,2,25v (I.3,5,12).
Because of the deficiencies of the early records, it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which the Inns controlled their own religious destiny before the Reformation. The Lincoln's Inn records, however, indicate that their council exerted its authority over all corporate activity, including religious observance.\(^1\) As well as imposing religious penalties on the wenching butler and the gambling parson,\(^2\) they ordained 'that noo ffelowes of the howse except he be a bencher doo Sytt in the thre upper settes of the Chapell And to suche as doo monyclic shalbe gyffen them to remove'.\(^3\) Likewise the benchers of the Inn were largely responsible for the state of their chapel. By the mid-fifteenth century one of their number, who became known as the dean of the chapel, was periodically appointed by the council to supervise chapel affairs.\(^4\) Though payments were no doubt made by his authority and advice, generally he did not collect or disburse money himself. Instead the butler was appointed as collector of chapel money, to receive one shilling from each new member, and to transfer the annual proceeds to the treasurer. This 'chapell Sylver' as it was known, was levied for the lights,\(^5\) and generally amounted to less than one pound. A member of the society was also appointed as the escheator or fueler to collect four pence from his fellows for providing coal in the hall during Christmas festivities, and for replenishing the two weighty torches in the chapel.\(^6\) A barrister called the pensioner was appointed to collect the termly pension or fee to defray the standing charges of the Inn, including the chapel. Fuel

\(^1\) Since the following section is mainly based on the annual accounts of Lincoln's Inn, it is not possible to footnote the sources in full.

\(^2\) LIBB III, ff.42v,35 (I.167,188).

\(^3\) LIBB III, f.162v (I.219).

\(^4\) LIBB I, f.38 (I.22).

\(^5\) LIBB I, ff.17v,38v, III, f.57, IV, f.71 (I.3,9,175,241).

\(^6\) LIBB II.ii, f.73v, III, f.125 (I.133-4,206).
and pension fees were collected in the same way as commons and contributions for any extraordinary demand. The butler listed all members in commons on a parchment roll, so that on payment of a levy, the appointed officer would cut the member's name from the roll, possibly giving him the portion as a receipt. Though these collectors disbursed the money they received, they submitted annual accounts to the council, and transferred surpluses to the treasurer. Consequently most items of chapel expenditure appear in the annual accounts, which reveal that whereas the treasurer paid for wax, wine, bread and the maintenance of ornaments, the pensioner provided for general upkeep, the chapel goods and the ordinary priest. From the records of the other Inns it can be inferred that they had developed similar means for exercising responsibility for their chapels. In 1519-20 the Inner Temple raised money by roll for church goods, including an organ and a clock, while at Gray's Inn a dean of the chapel was the customary supervisor of chapel affairs.

Nevertheless there were restrictions on the independence of the Inns, particularly at the Temple. In 1519 when the Inner Temple wanted a clock 'that should strike every houre as was accustomed', and masses to be said at the same time in vacation as in term, it was necessary for the lawyers to seek the permission and probably the contribution of their cleric, the Master of the Temple, who was appointed by their landlord, the prior of St John. In fact any improvements to the premises, including the church, were not the traditional responsibility of the lawyers, but of the prior. Since he was reluctant to maintain his

2 ITAB I, ff.43v,69v (I.45,56).
3 Ibid.
4 The Knights Hospitallers in England, 202,218; MTMB I, ff.9,16 (I.17,30).
property to the lawyers' satisfaction, in 1521 they assumed responsibility for repairs, in return for a rent reduction. But the cost of capital improvements continued to be shared by the prior and the Inns. By 1534 the difference between repair and improvement had become a matter of dispute. John Hawkins, a London carpenter, appealed to Cromwell as principal secretary and master of the rolls, to obtain payment of a nine years debt for which chief baron Richard Lister of the Middle Temple had merely referred him to the lord of St John's. Nothing is known about the relationship between Gray's Inn and Sheen Priory, but at Lincoln's Inn, where the lawyers seem to have assumed greater responsibility for their property over the years, a similar problem had developed. In the 1535 lease of the Inn to William Sulyard, a special clause which stated that the tenant would be liable for maintenance of the premises was struck from the indenture, most likely at the instance of Sulyard and the Inn.

During the Reformation, however, tenurial changes were largely responsible for the removal of these restrictions upon independence. At Lincoln's Inn the grant to the Sulyards in 1536 severed the link with the bishop of Chichester. Gray's Inn lost its tie with Sheen Priory in 1539, and gained the right to nominate its own chaplain. Though the crown remained the landlord of the Temple until 1608, and continued to

1 ITAB I, f.75 (I.67).
2 MTMB I, f.45 (I.74); ITAB I, f.85 (I.74).
3 SP/88, f.79 (LP VII.1640).
4 LIBB I, ff.67v, 153v (I.18,46).
5 WSR Chichester Chapter Book Cap I/16/1, ff.139v-40.
6 P.67 below.
7 'A note of the state of the Churche of the Temple', Harleian MS 830, f.166; MTMB II, f.167v (I.268).
appoint its master, the templars no longer had to contend with the prior of St John. The Inns were free from former ecclesiastical ties and more liable for their own well-being.

As a result the societies found that it was their sole responsibility to implement the religious policies of succeeding governments. At Gray's and Lincoln's Inns much of the work was probably left to deans of the chapels. Likewise the Inner Temple, and probably its neighbour, appointed churchwardens in the 1540's, who, as guardians of church goods, most likely acted as the agents of reform. According to an Inner Temple order of 1546, the churchwarden with three utter barristers and their counterparts of the Middle Temple were to 'make a trew Inventory of all the goodes and ornamentes of the church and bryng it to the thezaurers'. As this prelude to the disposal of church goods follows the Chantry Act of the previous year and the appointment of royal commissioners, it was possibly the outcome of government prompting. Similarly the list of goods remaining in Gray's Inn chapel in 1552, might have been compiled by the dean for the Edwardian commissioners. Yet the traditional immunity of the societies from direct intervention and the strict supervision of officers by the benchers ensured that they alone possessed the overall responsibility for implementing the Reformation.

Without the accounts for Gray's Inn and the Temple, it is difficult to learn how the benchers financed this additional charge. Nevertheless the records of Lincoln's Inn give some indication. When chapel lights ceased, the fueller no longer provided torches for the chapel, but devoted his levy to coal, while the admission fee continued to be received by the collector of chapel money until 1550, and then by the dean. However the

1 ITAB I, ff.123v,48v,53,57,58 (I.135,136,141,142,149,155).
2 ITAB I, f.48v (I.142).
payments for chapel alterations were not made by these officers, but by the pensioner and treasurer, who simply added the new items to their usual chapel expenses. There seems to have been little change until 1547-8, when the pensioner's charges for the chapel suddenly increased to at least eight times as much as previous totals, and again in 1550-2 when the treasurer purchased the communion table and prayer book. During the Marian restoration, the pensioner's payments included miscellaneous items such as vestments, the chapel seat, and a sprinkler, while the treasurer provided the more costly service books, ornaments, vestments and images. Following Elizabeth's accession, the treasurer paid for the new service books, but the pensioner kept more to his usual role of chapel maintenance, including cleaning up after the dismantling of the altar. Thus Lincoln's Inn, and probably the other societies, were able to cope with the demands of successive religious settlements by adapting their normal financial structure, assisted by the abolition of ceremonial wax, the sale of church ornaments, and donations by individual members.

At the same time the Inns accepted that it was their sole responsibility to maintain the chapels as centres of corporate life. All of the chapels were ancient structures, upon which their absentee landlords had probably spent as little as possible. Nor is there any evidence before the Reformation that the lawyers lavished their pence on renovation. Such was the state of Temple Church that shortly after the property passed from the prior of St John, the Inner Temple parliament ordered the treasurer and four benchers to confer with their counterparts of the Middle Temple regarding the repair of the church and bridge (1541). Though churchwardens possibly made some repairs during the 1540's, it is not apparent until the early 1550's that members were contributing to

1 ITAB I, f.118 (I.129).
church repairs by means of a special roll. For the collection of money at the Middle Temple, in June 1558 their parliament ordered that a churchwarden be elected annually. In the same month the Inner Temple elected a 'Surveyour of the workes of the Churche'. After that there is no record of appointment or details of restoration, but sufficient work was done to last for many years. On the other hand the chapels of Gray's and Lincoln's Inns were not renewed until the years between 1569 and 1580, when the benchers tackled the decay of centuries and the haphazard alterations of the Reformation. Both Inns employed the pensioner's receipts to restore their chapels, with particular attention to the doors, windows, roofs and floors. At the same time they completed the transformation of the interiors, Lincoln's Inn by removing the altar stone and repairing its former site, Gray's Inn by shifting the screen and installing more pews, and both Inns by erecting pulpits. But whereas the cost of implementing the Reformation was largely imposed upon the Inns by external events, the initiative for the restoration of their chapels derived from within.

In this way the religious responsibility of the Inns was enhanced during the Reformation. Accepting their larger role, the benchers implemented reform, renovated their chapels and reinforced the Elizabethan religious settlement. This does not mean that the chapels were treated with any greater reverence than before. Where the ritual and ornaments of the medieval church did not produce awe, the simplicity of reformed religion was unlikely to succeed. Until the seventeenth century, little notice was taken of the conversations, conferences and chicanery which

1 ITAB I, ff.63,36 (I.160,176); MTMB II, f.20 (I.105).
2 MTMB II, f.27v (I.117).
3 ITAB I, f.146v (I.198).
filled the chapels, or the chambers and shops which blocked windows and weakened walls. It could be argued that such an attitude represented a secularisation, or even a profanation, of religion; but surely it reflected the close contemporary relationship between religion and reality. Since religion was so closely related to existence, the reformed chapels continued to function variously as centres of corporate legal life.

1 One exception was the Gray's Inn order of 1571, that those living above the chapel were to relinquish their chambers 'for that their being their is dangerouse to the chapell besides the noise and other inconvenience in the said chambers used to the truble of godes service' (GIFB I, f.22 (I.6)).
From the Inns' records, it would seem that the medieval clergy were distinguished mainly by their anonymity. At Lincoln's Inn, John the chaplain sold some pictures in 1441, and Gawin, late chaplain received a gratuity in 1500. In 1521-2 Thomas Whitacre, William Brugges and Thomas Machy gained allowances. Richard Skoos, rector was reimbursed for repairs in 1530-1. But their period of service and the names of other incumbents are not apparent. For Gray's Inn the record is even more deficient. Because of the missing pension book, only John Westly is known, as the priest who gave money late in Henry VIII's reign for the belfry of St Andrew's, Holborn. Not until 1555 does the Inner Temple act book name the master of the Temple as 'Mr doctor Arnested'. As far as the domestic records are concerned, the early clergy were officers of the Inns, rather than individuals.

Though any attempt to reconstruct the succession of medieval priests may be futile, the clerical structure at the Inns is comparatively clear. At the time of suppression in 1307-8, the Temple supported a master and lay brothers, as well as six chaplains and their four clerks. When the hospitallers finally gained possession, in 1338 their prior reported that whereas the templars had at one time a prior, thirteen secular chaplains, and a clerk of the church, he now maintained a brother chaplain and eight

1 LIBB I, ff.40v, II.i, f.58 (I.10,124).
2 LIBB III, ff.113v,114 (I.202).
3 LIBB IV, f.18v (I.231).
4 Bentley's MS, f.221v.
5 ITAB I, f.138 (I.181).
6 Exchequer (LTR) enrolled accounts misc. E355/20, m.3; trans. Baylis, 131-46.
seculars, and later a keeper or guardian of the church. In succeeding years the number of clergy was further reduced, so that by the sixteenth century the prior paid a total of £37 6s 8d to the keeper or master of the Temple, four priests and a clerk. As for the lawyers, the anonymous middle templar reported that 'their charges towards the salary, or mete and drynke of the Priests, is none, for they are found by my Lord of St. Johns'. Therefore the societies probably had little say in the appointment of their clergy.

In contrast with the well-staffed church at the Temple, Gray's Inn chapel was evidently tended by two priests. When John de Grey founded his chantry at Portepole manor in 1315, he endowed the augustinian priory of St Bartholomew at Smithfield with thirty acres of land, two acres of meadow and ten shillings in rent, for the perpetual support of a chaplain. After lawyers occupied the manor the priory paid the chaplain's allowance to the society. According to the Valor this amounted to £6 13s 4d from proceeds of £10, with an additional pound paid to the society for some unspecified purpose. Nevertheless the Grey family retained their right of appointment until 1507, when the advowson passed by sale of the manor to Hugh Dennys, then by transference with the property to Sheen priory (1516). Thus the private chapel at Gray's Inn

1 The Knights Hospitallers in England, 202, 218.
2 'Registrum munimentorum...prioratus hospitalis S. Johannis Jerusalem in Anglia', 1442, Cotton MS Nero E.VI, f.26v. The lands assigned to the master were 'ffilkeysfeld' and 'Cottrelles gardeyn', the latter probably passing to the bishop of Chichester and then Lincoln's Inn (p.1 above).
3 ITAP, I.xxi; Williamson, 126.
4 A summary of clerical income has been set out in A3.
5 Anonymous MS, f.332v.
6 Segar MS, f.1; Dugdale, QJ, 271; Webb, I.146-7.
7 Valor, I.407-8; Dugdale, Monasticon, VI.207.
8 CCR (1500-1509), 276-7.
9 Patent roll C66/626, p.3, m.3 (LP II.1.1778).
was provided with a chantry priest, appointed by the carthusians and supported by the augustinians, but serving the lawyers. The origin of the second priest is obscure, since the only known reference appears in 1550 when Walter Hendley bequeathed 'to every of the ij preestes of Greyes Inne-vjs viijd to pray for my soule'. However, the subsequent elimination of the office suggests that he too was a chantry priest.

Whereas clergy at Grey's Inn and the Temple were maintained by religious orders, Lincoln's Inn provided the stipend for its ordinary chaplain, who was answerable to the benchers for his behaviour. Therefore it is likely that he was nominated by either the benchers or their dean of the chapel. But since there is no record of appointment, this right possibly remained with their landlord, the bishop of Chichester. In that event, the lawyers probably exercised the same degree of control as they possessed over the appointment of their second chaplain. In return for the special admission of his son in 1517, Sir Robert Drury, a bencher of the Inn and formerly a speaker of the commons, provided for a chantry priest. After Drury's death in 1536, his son William continued the stipend. When the office was vacant in 1538, the benchers recorded that Sir William Drury would 'admytt and nominate a Chapelyn to synge in Lyncolns Inne'. But at the same time they ordered that 'he shall be presentyd to the awncyentes of the benche for the acceptacion of hys hablyte'. Thus Lincoln's Inn had greater control over their chaplains. But on the whole the medieval clergy at the Inns were appointed and maintained by external means, so that the benchers exercised a limited degree of responsibility.

1 PCC 10 Coode, 1550.
2 LIBB I, f.67v (I.18).
3 E.g. LIBB III, ff.85,129 (I.188,208).
4 LIBB III, ff.72v,76, IV, f.273 (I.182,184,308).
5 LIBB IV, f.100v (I.251).
During the Reformation, these traditional provisions were disrupted. At the dissolution of the greater monasteries in 1539, the crown gained not only the property of Gray's Inn from Sheen, but also the obligation of St Bartholomew's priory to support the chaplain. Most of the priory's lands, including John de Grey's endowment, passed to the former prior for life, but in November 1541 the court of augmentations recognised that the monastery had 'tyme out of mynde' provided for the chaplain. Therefore it deducted the additional pound from its award, which stated that the treasurer and fellows of Gray's Inn 'shall have yerely of the kynges highnes for the fyndynge of the seid Chaplanye during the Kynges pleasure' the lesser figure of £6 13s 4d and arrears out of the priory's revenue, which was paid in subsequent years. When Queen Mary deprived Sir Richard Rich of his priory and established the Blackfriars there in 1555, payment may have reverted to the original arrangement. But the Elizabethan act which reannexed the religious houses in 1559 ensured that the chaplaincy was financed by the crown from the exchequer. Yet there was little attempt to rationalise procedure. After the dissolution, the society continued to receive exactly the same sum for their chaplain as they paid to the crown in rent, so that the only gain went to the clerks and tellers who handled the transactions. According to the Inn's accounts for 1568, the pensioner paid a mere 1/8 in

1 LP XIV.ii.391; Wriothesley, I.108; Webb, I.147,244,501-2.
2 LP XVI.1500; Webb, I.258-9.
3 Augmentations office misc. book E315/93, ff.47v,194v; Richardson, Augns, 428; Webb, I.261.
4 Augns office misc. book E315/250, f.15; 251, f.57; 252, f.40; 253, f.36; 254, f.43v (LP XVII.258, XVIII.i.436, XIX.i.368, XX.i.557, XXI.i.643).
5 Knowles, III ch.23; CPR (1558-60), 310; Webb, I.261,277,285,502-23.
6 Elizabeth I, c.24 (SR IV.397-400); annual pensioner's accounts, GIPB and GIL.
exchequer fees for receipt of half the annuity. By 1578 this amounted to sixpence for a debenture, 2/- to the teller, and eightpence for his clerk. But in 1597 the fees for half a year totalled 4/10, comprising sixpence for the debenture, eight pence to the clerks' office, 3/4 for the teller, and four pence to his clerk who entered the debenture and receipt in his book for signature by the pensioner of the Inn.¹ In this way the obligation to provide for the chaplain of Gray's Inn passed from St Bartholomew's priory to the crown. But though the allowance remained fixed at its customary rate, its value was increasingly eroded by clerical fees as well as inflation.

The dissolution of the religious houses produced a similar rearrangement at the Temple. When the Order of St John was suppressed in 1540, the act specified that 'William Ernestede clerke, Maistre of the Temple in London, Walter Lymsey and John Wynter, chapleins there, and everie of them, shal have receive and enjoy during their naturall lifes all such mansion houses, stipendis and wages and all other profittes of money in as large and ample a manor as they or anny of them nowe lawfully have the same without lett or interrupcion'.² As a result the master received the customary allowance for all the clergy from the treasurer of augmentations. Though Queen Mary returned the Temple to the restored order in 1557,³ the Elizabethan Act of annexation declared that the wages usually paid to the clergy there 'out of the Possessions and Revenues of Hospitall and House of St Johns Jerusalem in Anglia, shall bee from hensforthe contynued and payde forever, as hathe been heretofore in the last yere of Kinge Edwarde the Syxte'.⁴ Thus the master once more received the traditional sum of

¹ GIPB I, ff.17,97v, CIL, f.46 and intervening pensioner's accounts.
² 32 Henry VIII, c.24 (SR III.778-81).
⁴ 1 Elizabeth I, c.24 (SR IV.397-400).
£37 6s 8d from the exchequer, the societies paid their £20 for rent to the royal landlord, and the clerks collected their usual fees. ¹

As Lincoln's Inn was held by the bishop of Chichester and then the Sulyards, the dissolution had no parallel effect. Both chaplains continued to be paid, one by the society and the other by Sir William Drury. Though it is not clear how the benchers appointed the ordinary chaplain at this time, in 1571 their council ordered the dean of the chapel to 'provide a good and convenient Chaplin fytt for this howse.'²

In later years chaplains were employed by personal recommendation and college certification of 'honestie and sufficiency'.³ Therefore similar means were probably used by the benchers throughout the sixteenth century. During the Reformation the council also assumed responsibility for nominating the Drury priest, whose fortunes fluctuated according to current religious policy. Despite the chantry acts of 1545 and 1547, the priest continued to receive board allowances until 1553,⁴ when he apparently left the Inn. But with the restoration of catholicism in 1553, the benchers promptly appointed another chantry priest for the new year, at which time they informed Sir William Drury. More to the point, their letter asked him 'to resume payment of the stipend.'⁵ Since both chaplains were paid board allowances from 1554, while only one of them received wages from the Inn, Drury evidently cooperated, but not for long. From 1558 only the ordinary chanlain received board wages, evidently because of the new government and the act of 1559, which reannexed chantry foundations to the crown.⁶ Consequently Lincoln's Inn maintained only one chaplain during succeeding years.

¹ 'A note of the state of the Churche of the Temple', n.d. (Late Eliz. I) Harleian MS 830, f.166.
² LIBB V, f.129 (I.366-7).
³ LIBB VI, ff.455,455v (II.135).
⁴ Annual treasurer's accounts until 1552-3 (LIBB IV, f.269v).
⁵ LIBB IV, f.273 (I.308).
⁶ 1 Elizabeth I, c.24 (SR IV.397-400).
At Gray's Inn much less is known about the appointment of their chaplains. One of the priests mentioned by Walter Hendley in 1550 probably lost office later in Edward's reign, as there was only a single priest in Elizabeth's time. The advowson of the Sheen chaplaincy was presumably transferred to the crown in 1539 with the priory, but there is no evidence that the government exercised this right. Though the exchequer paid the chaplain's allowance, the records of the society indicate that the benchers made the appointment and regulated conditions of service, including the salary actually paid.¹

In this way both societies assumed greater responsibility for their own chaplains. But whereas the crown relinquished its right to present the clergy to Gray's Inn, at the Temple it retained control. In 1540 when the Temple clergy were relegated to the status of royal servants, the act which dissolved the Order of St John also stated that 'uppon their reasonable sutes and petitions [they] shall have sufficient lettres patentis of the said severall yerely annuities, pensions, mansions, stipendes and other profittes of money'.² The clergy certainly continued to receive their allowances. Though the act mentioned only two priests, between 1540 and 1546 the treasurer of augmentations paid the annuity to the master for himself, a clerk and four priests, and the 1559 act of reannexation repeated the formula. But there is no evidence that a patent was granted to William Ernsted, who continued as master.³ Not until Richard Alvey's appointment in 1560 was the grant made which provided the pattern for succeeding appointments.⁴ In the first place,

¹ Annual accounts, GIPB and GIL.
² 32 Henry VIII, c.24 (SR III.778-81).
³ A summary of clerical tenure at the Inns has been set out in A2.
⁴ Patent roll C66/949, p.2, m.18 (CPR 1558-60), 280.
Alvey was appointed for life by letters patent. Secondly, the patent conferred on the master or keeper the power to rule, govern and administer the house and church of the New Temple as fully as any previous master. Thirdly, he was granted the same allowances, including the clerical annuity of £37 6s 8d from the exchequer. And lastly, the master was given sole authority to provide a single priest, presbyter or minister for the church, as well as a clerk or sexton. Thus the crown preserved the medieval continuity of the mastership and retained the right of appointment, while reducing the clergy to a number more appropriate for a reformed church which served the legal societies and not a religious order. But since the lawyers wished to control their own property and personnel, a memorandum was prepared late in Elizabeth's reign, which summarised the existing financial arrangements and presented the lawyers' proposals for official consideration. In return for the property of the Temple, together with the annual rent, 'and the donacion of the said ministers [i.e. master's] place after the decease of the present Incumbent, with the iurisdiccion thereto belonging', they offered to discharge the Queen of her obligation for the master's allowance, and 'to allowe for theire preacher, mynister and clerke which they shall hereafter place, at the leaste as much as they nowe have, from her maiestie, and the saide Societyes'. The offer was apparently shelved for some time, possibly because of royal and episcopal opposition. Even when the societies finally gained their property by charter in 1608, the mastership and rectory were emphatically withheld by the crown.

1 'A note of the state of the Churche of the Temple', n.d., Harleian MS 830, f.166.

2 ITAP, II frontispiece; trans. in The Report of the Commissioners, Appendix B. The original charter is kept locked away by the treasurers of the societies.
Thus events during the Reformation altered customary clerical provisions at the Inns. The externally-paid allowances remained constant, but at the Temple and Gray's Inn, the crown assumed responsibility for payment. At all of the Inns the number of clergy was reduced. Though the templars were unsuccessful in their bid to buy the mastership from the crown, when the government made an appointment their preferences were considered. As Lord Burghley remarked to Archbishop Whitgift in 1584 while corresponding about a prospective master, 'If he come not to the place with some applause of the Companie, he shalbe weary thereof'.

Though increasing the crown's role at the Inns, these events also removed the residue of ecclesiastical control over clerical appointments, so that the responsibility of the lawyers for their own clergy was enlarged. But whether the Inns discharged their enhanced function in a more responsible manner remains to be seen.

For the sixteenth century it is difficult to determine how well the Inns provided for their clergy. The basic cash allowance, which was constant for lengthy periods, was paid retroactively at regular intervals according to the quarterly festival days. In addition there were various supplementary benefits. Several of these are stated in the records, since they were rewards for regular services such as keeping the clock, payments for new gowns, or gratuities during sickness, old age, and death. But

2 Christmas (25 December), Annunciation (25 March), Nativity of St. John the Baptist (24th June), and Michaelmas (19 September).
most are not mentioned including some services, such as burials, which were quite contingent. For other monetary allowances, which were raised by roll from members, the number of contributors or sum collected is not usually stated. Generally the clergy were allowed their diet or commons in the hall, and perhaps a 'boyer' or daily quantity of bread and beer from the buttery. Since it was usual to pay weekly 'board wages' when commons were disbanded during Christmas and epidemics, some calculation may be made for the whole year. But it is not known how often the clergy availed themselves of commons, or whether their servants were freely included. Though they were generally allowed lodgings at the Inns, these were granted only when suitable chambers were available, and even then their value is not mentioned. Given these deficiencies in the records, it is not possible to evaluate clerical allowances exactly. Nevertheless there is sufficient evidence to give an impression of their worth, and to indicate developments during this period.

Before the Order of St John was suppressed, the master of the Temple received only £8 for himself, while £6 13s 4d was paid to each of four priests, and £2 13s 4d to the clerk. But the clergy were provided with their own establishment, which probably comprised the ancient hall, kitchen and lodgings of the Templar chaplains, and was known as the master's house. In addition the master was allowed twenty-two loads of wood every year from St James' Wood. Apart from each lawyer's contribution of eighteen pence from eighteen offering days a year, the clergy lived at the expense of the prior. Therefore the mastership of the Temple was probably worth several times the stipend provided, and the other offices somewhat less.

---

1 ITAB I, ff.14v,27,55 (I.3,22,151); Richard Alvey to Lord Burghley, n.d (1579), Lansdowne MS 10?, ff.2-3; ITAP, I.xxi-xxii,xliv; Anonymous MS, f.332v.

2 Anonymous MS, f.332v.
After 1540, when the same stipends were continued by the crown, the entire allowance of £37 6s 8d for the clergy was paid to the master. But since the four priests were replaced by a single minister in 1560, the master's portion was effectively increased. If, as seems likely, the salaries of the minister and clerk remained much the same, Richard Alvey retained almost £28, a gain of £20.

At the same time the benchers enforced the payment of offerings to the master. Though the 1540 act of dissolution ordered the continuation of profits to the Temple clergy, members were not contributing their full share. Consequently the Inner Temple parliament ordered in 1557 'that every Felowe of this house beyng in Commons or lyeing in the house shall from tyme to tyme observe and kepe xvij offering daies in the year accordyng to the aunycyent laudable Custome of this house'. In 1559 the same parliament tightened up the procedure by enacting 'that every man shall offer thaccostable offering dayes which with ijd to be payd att Easter dothe amounte vnto xvijd yerelye, and that at euery offeringe daye he that offerreth doo take up a token at the offering, and he that can not shewe a Token that he hathe offered, To payeto the Butler his offeringe dewe immedyatlye uppon Request there of to the use of the Master of the Temple'. However, the means which both houses used in later years were implemented after 1564. Each term the steward collected four pence by roll from every member in commons, with an additional two pence at Michaelmas, so that the traditional offerings became a termly tax. From this source the master gained £31 a year by the 1630's.

1 ITAB I, f.143 (I.191).
2 ITAB I, f.149 (I.201-3).
3 ITAB I, f.169 (I.230); MTMB II, f.176v (I.279).
that time he also collected 'communion money', which enabled him to
purchase the wine and bread, and to pay allowances to his clerical
assistants and the officers of the Inns. The surplus which was probably
used for charitable purposes, amounted to £28, and he received a further
£20 in contingencies.¹ But there is no indication how much any earlier
master gained from these sources.

In 1540 the act of dissolution also permitted the clergy to retain
their lodgings at the Temple for the term of their lives. Since
Ernested gained control of an establishment which was more than sufficient
for his needs, in 1542 he leased the premises to Sir John Baker for a
mere forty shillings.² As Baker was the King's attorney and a prominent
governor of the Inner Temple,³ some pressure was probably applied, not
merely on his own behalf, but for the provision of extra chambers at the
Inns. In 1549 the crown sold the reversion expectant on the termination
of both Baker's lease and Ernested's parliamentary grant for £40 to
Robert Freke, another member of the Inn, and John Berwick. As a result
the property passed by grant to Robert Kelway, by inheritance to his
daughter, by marriage to Sir John Harrington, then by sale to Sir John
Roper.⁴

¹ 'The answer of Doctor Micklethwaight' to the Lords' propositions, 1634,
MT Micklethwaite MS. For this chapter, information has been included
from the voluminous papers which were produced during the series of
clashes between the templars and Dr Paul Micklethwaite, their master
from 1628 to 1639. These contain historical detail regarding the
powers, profits and privileges of the mastership, as well as other
information about the Temple, which is not found elsewhere. This
tortuous episode, which involved legal officers, privy councillors
and the monarch, has been described by Prest, 199-201, ITAP, II.
lxxxi-xcv, and Williamson, 384-96.

² IT Book of Evidences, in ITAP, I.xliv. Unfortunately the original
book was war-damaged and discarded. Other items appear in ITAP, I.466-8.

³ A5, III.6.

⁴ Patent roll G66/825, p.2, n.2 (CPR, 1549-51, 139-40); ITAP, I.xliv, lvi;
'The Title of the Temple Church and the Two Temples', ITR XIX, f.3;
'A Breviate between the Houses and the Doctor', MT Micklethwaite MS,
ff.5,12.
Though the masters lost their mansion house, they were allowed chambers at the Inns, and their commons with either society. For some time the exchequer paid the master an allowance in lieu of wood, but this ceased at the appointment of Alvey, who asked Lord Burghley for £30 compensation in 1579 on the legal advice of two middle templars, chief justice James Dyer and baron George Freville. After twenty years at the Temple, Alvey was still doing his utmost to improve the value of the mastership. Judging by two letters which he wrote to Burghley in 1582 and an inquiry made by the Middle Temple in the preceding year, he had tried for some time to regain the master's house, not for his own benefit, but for his successors, as it was unworthy for the societies 'to have no howse to entertayne and herbour the Maister in'. Dyer had offered £200 for the house before his death including £40 of his own, and Alvey now tendered £160. But since the owner expected more, Alvey petitioned Lord Burghley and the privy council for an impartial evaluation and composition. Settlement was finally reached in 1585-6, whereby the societies and not the master gained possession on payment of £240 to Sir John Roper. By that time Alvey was dead, but later documents reveal that in 1582-3 he had secured an agreement signed by sixteen benchers of

1 Hatfield MS 12, f.95; SP12/157, ff.13-14; 'The answer of the Socysties of both Temples to the propositions of his Majesties Attorney general', MT Micklethwaite MS.

2 'The particulers wherein the Master of the Temple findes himself greived', MT Micklethwaite MS; 'MS Concerning the Temples', n.d. (c. 1635), ITR, XXXI.4,7.

3 Lansdowne MS 107, ff.2-3.

4 Hatfield MS 12, f.95; SP12/157, ff.13-14; MTMB II, f.147v (I.245).

5 ITAP, I.467-8; ITAB I, ff.228,228v (I.336,337); MTMB II, f.175 (I.277); MT MS Book of Deeds, 1-4,13.
both societies, by which they retained the right to admit members into chambers of the master's house, but the rents collected would be paid to the master.¹ Though these amounted to £80 11s 4d by the 1630's, there is no record of how much Alvey received from this source.

If rent and communion money are excluded, it seems that during Alvey's tenure the value of the mastership possibly increased to almost £100. Nevertheless this improvement took place over many years. Even the attempts to secure the lawyers' traditional contribution, which was but a fraction of the fees paid for commons,² were not made until the late 1550's. Therefore it is not surprising that the value of the lesser clerical offices at the Inns increased even more slowly.

Following the dissolution, the four priests at the Temple were each paid their £6 13s 4d from the crown by William Ernsted. This stipend was supplemented in 1557, when the Inner Temple ordered 'that every knyght beyng felowe of thysh howse shall paye every terme towards the syngyng mens wages xxd, every bencher xijd a terme, and every felowe under the benche iiiijd every terme at the leaste, and thysh order to contynewe for one hole yeare and no longer'. Four months later the other society did likewise.³ At Alvey's appointment in 1560, the stipend of his appointed minister probably remained the same. But since this amounted to £10 by the 1630's, with other allowances as well, it was quite likely improved during his tenure. However, a substantial increase was made in 1594-5, when each society agreed to provide an additional

1 Summary concerning the mastership, 1633, SP16/231, 154-5; 'The answer of the Societies', and 'The Temple's answer to Dr Micklethwaite's propositions' by the attorney general, MT Micklethwaite MS; ITAB I, ff.218v,228v (I.318,337).

2 In 1539 the middle templars paid £6 10s Od for masters' commons and £5 4s Od for clerks' commons (Anonymous MS, f.322).

3 ITAB I, f.144 (I.193); MTMB II, f.26v (I.114-15).
£5, 'at the request of Archbishop Whitgift by the means of Dr Balguy then master who was then great with him, and was much of the House deserving well of it'. ¹ As for accommodation, when Ernested leased the master's house in 1542, he ensured 'that the four priests of the Temple should have two honest chambers within the said mansion'. ² After 1560 the minister was probably granted board and lodgings by the societies, but the payment of a £2 chamber allowance in the 1630s suggests that he might also live in the town. By that time the minister's income totalled £32 excluding commons and contingencies. Nevertheless it seems that before the 1590's the lawyers did very little to improve the value of an office which, including commons, contingencies and a chamber, was possibly worth £20 to £25.

Before 1558 the ordinary chaplain at Lincoln's Inn received a meagre stipend of £2 13s 4d, usually by annual payment from the pensioner, while the Drury priest gained only £3 from his patron. ³ Both chaplains kept commons at the Inn, in lieu of which they often received board wages from the steward, at the low rate of eighteen pence a week. ⁴ An additional two shillings was paid to one of them for keeping the clock, ⁵ and both seem to have had lodgings at the Inn. ⁶ Therefore the chaplaincies were probably worth several times the actual stipends.

In later years the single chaplain's salary was twice increased, to £5 in 1558, and to £8 when a new minister was appointed in 1571. Though

---

¹ 'MS concerning the Temples', ITR, XXXI.5. Cf. ITAB II, f.20 (I.383).
² IT Book of Evidences, in ITAP, I.xliv.
³ LIBB IV, f.273 (I.308).
⁴ LIBB III, f.129 (I.208); annual steward's accounts to 1548, and succeeding treasurer's accounts; LIBB IV, f.171 (I.273).
⁵ E.g. LIBB IV, ff.232v,258v,259v,295 (I.295,302,303,314).
the clock-keeping was probably taken over by a butler, the chaplain probably retained a chamber, was allowed commons with the barristers in later years, and received increased board wages at the weekly rate of 2/6 from 1557-8, and 3/4 after 1577-8. Since vestments had been provided in former times, the society also paid for the chaplain's gown in 1546-8, and in 1558 it was established that he would have 'a gowne at Christmas next and so every seconde yere hereafter a gowne clothe', for which forty shillings was usually provided. However, a more substantial improvement was made in 1565, when the benchers agreed that the chaplain 'shall have and Receyve of every fellowe of this howse iiiijd to be levied in Easter Terme next and so yerely every Easter Terme'. As a result of these measures, the value of the chaplainship at Lincoln's Inn was probably increased to £20 to £25, including commons, chambers and contingencies.

Because of the missing pension book, little is known about the economic circumstances of the chaplain at Gray's Inn before 1568. But since the first recorded stipend was only £4, which was substantially less than the allowance paid by St Bartholomew's priory and then the crown, it seems that the society provided commons and a chamber. As the chaplain was also paid from 1568 for keeping the clock, he probably received an

1 LIBB V, ff.83,107,226,239 (I.362,403,404).
2 LIBB VII, f.56v (II.225).
3 LIBB IV, ff.336v,346, V, ff.10,10v,80,239,254,255,261v.
4 LIBB I, f.111, IV, ff.280v,295 (I.33,314).
5 LIBB IV, f.207 (I.288).
7 LIBB V, f.21 (I.344).
8 GIPB I, ff.15,18v,29,33,66v.
extra 6/8 from this source, plus contingencies. Therefore the chaplaincy was possibly worth slightly more than that at Lincoln's Inn.

In 1572-3 the chaplain lost his clock money to the second butler. Nevertheless he retained a chamber, took commons with the barristers in later years, and received a periodic gown allowance of £3 6s 8d. His board wages, which were initially paid at the weekly rate of 2/6, were raised to 3/- in 1575, and 3/4 in 1590, which brought them into line with the Lincoln's Inn allowance and the cost of living. Furthermore the society made a positive contribution. In 1577 the benchers ordered every member to pay an Easter duty to the chaplain, which was set at two pence a year. This was for Paul Bushe, the new minister in 1574. Yet at this time the society also supported Jeffrey Evans, their old chaplain. As two other ministers were awarded for temporary services between 1572 and 1574, Evans was possibly incapacitated. Nevertheless the society continued to pay his full stipend, even after a permanent minister was appointed. In addition he was awarded weekly board wages at the unprecedented rate of four shillings. Since both payments ceased in 1583, Evans had apparently died, but his wife received a further 12/6, and 10/- was paid 'for Evans his Sonne at Cambridge'. Such was the immediate saving to the society, that Bushe's salary was raised to equal the exchequer allowance of £6 13s 4d. By these means the value of the chaplaincy at Gray's Inn was increased to about £20 to £25, which was similar to that paid by Lincoln's Inn and the Temple.

1 Annual accounts from 1572, GIPB.
2 E.g. GIPB I, f.16 (I.472).
3 GIPB I, ff.166,295v-6, 351v,362,388 (I.56,198-9,261,305).
4 GIPB I, ff.179v,180,197,206v,221,243,259 (I.63,85,95,120,162).
5 GIPB I, ff.7,26,43,49v,157v,161v (I.8,19,20,21); GIL, ff.2v,161v,187v, 199,208,213v,245,261.
6 GIPB I, f.76.
7 GIPB I, f.43 (I.19); annual treasurer's accounts, 1573-1583, and admission accounts, 1582-4, GIPB.
8 GIPB I, ff.323v-4 (I.483-4).
Whether Gray's or Lincoln's Inn employed a chapel clerk during the sixteenth century is not clear from their records. There was certainly a clerk at Gray's Inn some years before 1620, but during the previous century, routine duties were most likely performed by the chaplain, domestic officers, and particularly the dean who, at Lincoln's Inn, was once known as the clerk of the chapel. At the Temple, however, a clerk had been traditionally employed. During Alvey's mastership the customary salary of £2 13s 4d, which was supplemented by burial and communion fees, was possibly increased. The clerk also received board wages at the weekly rate of 2/6, and was probably provided with a chamber when necessary. Furthermore both societies augmented his income in 1585, when each gentleman in commons was ordered to pay four pence every Easter term.

For most of the century the Temple clerks are anonymous servants of the master. But though the office was probably worth less than £12, appointees could be men of some enterprise. In 1581, Richard Baker, who had been appointed two years before, was licensed to build a shop, perhaps a stationer's, between the two doors of the Temple Church. This was completed by May, when both societies granted his petition for life tenure of what was described as a little house, providing he lit a lantern.

1 GIBB I, f.332v (I.239).  
3 ITAB II, ff.25v,26,37v,58,58v (I.391,419,451, II.3).  
5 ITAB I, ff.226v-7 (I.334); MTMB II, f.177 (I.279).  
6 E.g. ITAB I, f.169 (I.230).  
7 'A note of the Clerks of the Temple Church since the year 1579', ITR XIX, f.55.  
8 ITAB I, f.209v (I.302-3).
there every night from Michaelmas to the Annunciation. Though the licence forbade the building to be used as a family dwelling, in November 1592 the Inner Temple parliament ordered him to remove his family and forfeit his house until further notice. But since Baker had also become the minister at the Temple, he promptly negotiated a sale of the premises to Thomas Middleton, the new clerk. Because of disagreement concerning terms, in 1593 the transaction was brought to the notice of the benchers. From their findings it is evident that 'the clerkes howse' comprised a dwelling and shops, for which Baker had already obtained £20. The benchers 'disliked suche buyinge and selling of the clerkeshippe', but they settled the dispute by ordering Middleton to pay another £20. Though it is not possible to estimate the exact profits of the clerk, since so much depended on the person involved, his office evidently increased in value, so that by the 1630's it was worth £16 18s Od excluding commons, chambers and contingencies.

By these means the value of clerical offices at the Inns was somewhat improved during the sixteenth century. Yet there is no evidence that religious change had any immediate effect. In fact nothing extraordinary was done for the clergy during the early Reformation. Though there is no information for Gray's Inn, the first attempt to improve the lot of the clergy at the Inns appears to have been made late in Mary's reign. The orders concerning roll money for the priests of the Temple and offerings for the master were passed in 1557, and at Lincoln's Inn the chaplain's stipend was increased in May 1558.

1 ITAB I, f.216v (I.314); MTMB II, f.146v (I.243-4).
2 ITAB II, f.21 (I.384-5).
3 ITAB II, f.21v (I.386).
4 ITAB II, f.24 (I.389); MTMB II, f.230v (I.334).
After this effort, the other measures spread themselves over the next forty years, particularly the sixties and seventies. Throughout the period, continuity and gradualness are more apparent than rapid change.

Nor can it be claimed that the lawyers exhibited much enthusiasm for benefiting their clergy. John Baker and others took the opportunity to deprive the master of his lodgings. But for Alvey's efforts, successive masters would have gained little profit from their premises. Likewise the act requiring roll money for the priests probably derived more from special clerical pleading, or even external pressure, since it was so emphatically restricted to a single year. Other measures reflect the lawyer's desire not to be bound by customary allowances, but to preserve their independence of action at the expense of the clergy. At Gray's Inn, the order for Easter duties had been initiated by the chaplain, who was expected to make his claim every year before collection would be allowed. The benchers of Lincoln's Inn declared that payment of their Easter duties was simply 'durante bene placito and not be be doen in president' [precedent], and the Inner Temple specified that the clerk's allowance was to continue only 'during the will and pleasure of the bench'. However the best example is provided by that society's orders concerning payment of the master's customary offerings. Apparently the first two attempts to ensure payment in 1557 and 1559 did not have the desired effect. Therefore the benchers decided in 1560 to confer with the Middle Temple treasurer 'for the order of the better payment of thofferings'. Since a similar directive was passed in 1561, 'to the intent that bothe the houses may make an acte for the true payment there of', the Inner Temple was evidently keen to supplement the master's stipend. The nevertheless nothing definite appears until 1564, when their parliament unilaterally decreed that the master would have his eighteen pence 'to be

1 ITAB I, ff.153v,158v (I.206,213).
paid and levied by one of the masters of the temple clerkes or servantes
in maner and forme followinge, viz, in Ester terme iiiijd the pece,
Trynytye Termes iiiijd the pece, Michelas terme vjd the pece and Hillarie
Termes iiiijd the pece'. 1 Nevertheless the Middle Temple refused to
support the tax, possibly because they disapproved of Alvey or disagreed
with a measure which gave control over collection to the master.
Consequently the Inner house was compelled to suspend the order until
further conference.2 When the offerings were finally converted into a
termly tax, they were collected by the stewards of the Inns, and could
be withheld from the master.3 Though this procedure probably increased
the master's yield, some members avoided payment and the stewards deducted
poundage, so that he generally received less than his due.

Thus the lawyers really failed to exercise their enhanced
responsibility for the economic circumstances of their clergy. Though
the Inns were freed of tithes and mendicant friars,4 these savings were
not used to benefit their regular ministers. If the clergy had been
already well paid, such improvement would not be expected. With commons,
lodgings and contingencies, the mastership of the Temple was worth
considerably more than the average London benefice. But less than £28
of this could be claimed by right. For the rest of the clergy, the value
of their offices, even including benefits, was somewhat lower than the

---

1 ITAB I, f.169 (I.230).
2 ITAB I, f.169v (I.231-2). Cf. 'MS Concerning the Temples', ITR,
XXXI.5.
3 MTHB II, f.176v (I.279). In the next century, roll money was
withheld from Thomas Master and Paul Micklethwaite.
4 In 1485-6 the treasurer of Lincoln's Inn disbursed 6/8 to the
carmelite friars and to those at Ludgate in reply to certain letters
(LIBB I, f.63v (I.85). The Middle Temple parliament in 1557 ordered
every member to pay a penny each term whenever the blackfriars
demanded it 'accordyng to the awncyent custome heretofore therin used'
(ITAB I, f.142v (I.191).
London average. As the century progressed, the discrepancy widened, so that they, with unendowed vicars and curates in peculiaris, fared the worst.1 Certainly they gained more than many former monks and London curates.2 But if less than £30 was considered inadequate in the 1580's they were poorly maintained.3 Therefore the societies did little to improve the value of their clerical offices, either in relation to other London livings, or the increasing cost of living.4 Perhaps that was one reason why Richard Haydon, a bencher of Lincoln's Inn, bequeathed his gown, hangings, bedstead and great coffer from his chamber to 'Sir John Herman chapelyn'.5

In these circumstances, the clergy could only supplement their stipends by undertaking additional duties. At Gray's and Lincoln's Inns the chaplains were paid extra for keeping the clock. When commons were disbanded they received board wages, not simply in lieu of meals, but for them to remain with other officers to protect the premises.6 In 1595 the benchers of Gray's Inn appointed Paul Bush as 'overseer of all the officers and provisions for the house'.7 Richard Baker was both clerk and minister at the Temple for some time before early 1593.8

2 Dickens, EHR, 412, 416; Owen, JSH, 69.
3 Seaver, 147.
4 Cf. C. Hill, 93, 112.
5 PCC 31 Tashe, 1553/4; A5, II.20.
6 E.g. LIBB III, ff. 99v, 162, V, f. 475v (I.195, 219); GIPB I, f. 49v, 208 (I.21, 96-7).
7 GIPB I, f. 217 (I.110).
8 ITAB II, ff. 21, 21v (I.384-5, 386).
Since these opportunities were limited, the alternative was to hold another office outside of the Inns. From 1562 until resignation in 1579, Jeffrey Evans of Gray's Inn was also the rector of St Giles in the Fields, which had formerly served the leper hospital beyond Holborn. Henry Warde and 'Mr Style', who were possibly appointed to assist Evans between 1572 and 1574, were both described as ministers. Though there is no record of Warde's living, a James Style was rector of St Margaret Lothbury from 1573 to 1575, and a Christopher Style was rector of St Nicholas Acon from 1573 to 1579. In 1574 the chaplaincy was granted to Paul Bushe, who held office until his death in 1603. From 1596 Bushe was also curate of St Botolph's, Bishopsgate Street, and permanent curate of St Botolph without Aldgate from 1597. But in 1583-4 Gray's Inn granted him 4/6 'to bestowe in his parishe'. Therefore Bushe held the chaplaincy with some unknown office from at least the early 1580's. In 1579 archdeacon John Louthe informed John Foxe that Robert Cooke, a chaplain at Lincoln's Inn during three reigns, was supported by an influential person who was apparently still living. Therefore he may have been the 'Mr Cooke' whom Archbishop Parker mentioned as chaplain to the earl of Sussex in 1574. In 1560 John Morgan, chaplain of the same Inn from 1569 to 1571, evidently held two

---

1 Hennessey, 173; Newcourt, I.611; CPR (1560-3), 242; Gomme, V.117-18,127-8.
3 Hennessey, 144,345; Newcourt, I.505; Venn, I.iv.181-2. Seaver combines details for both James and Christopher Style without explanation (210-11,356).
4 Hennessey, 106,110.
5 Dean of the chapel's account, 1583-4, GIPB I, f.324 (I.484).
7 Harleian M3 6991, ff.82-3; Parker Correspondence, 458.
benefices in the early 1560s. His successor until 1593 was William Davis, the vicar of St Olave Jewry during those years. For the other chaplains, there is no information. Though it cannot be presumed that none of the earlier incumbents held further office, this seems to have been more characteristic of the Elizabethan years. With increasing prices, devalued stipends and probably families to support, the later clergy could hardly afford to confine themselves to the Inns.

For this reason most of these men were not mere assistant curates. Nevertheless their careers were humble enough. Before Elizabeth's reign none can be identified from academic records. In fact their common title of 'Sir' suggests that they were not university scholars. For the later period, when records are more adequate, the situation was but a little better. Richard Alvey's earlier nominees at the Temple are unknown, but Richard Baker was hardly well qualified. Thomas Evans, a son of the Gray's Inn chaplain, was at Cambridge in 1561-2, where he took his MA before ministering at Lichfield and Suffolk, but there is no evidence that Sir Jeffrey was similarly educated. Apart from Thomas Maddocks, who spent only a term at Lincoln's Inn, and perhaps John Morgan, none of the chaplains are recorded as holding a degree. At best they matriculated, generally from Cambridge. Nor were they necessarily

1 SP12/76, f.6v.
2 Hennessy, 357; CPR (1569-72), 361. In 1564 Davis was granted a dispensation for holding two unnamed benefices (SP 12/76, f.38).
3 Cf. Prest, 183.
4 The known academic qualifications of the clergy have been summarised in A4. Recent comments on the inadequacies of early university registers have been made by Knafla in TMI ed. Slavin, 264.
5 Oxford English Dictionary.
6 Al. Cantab. The family relationship can be assumed from coincidental dating, and Thomas' birth in St Andrew's parish in about 1562.
appointed straight to the Inns. Paul Bushe matriculated in 1563-4, but served a decade later. Thomas Maddocks, who graduated in 1565, was chaplain in 1569. William Davis matriculated in 1564-5, but was not appointed until 1571. This suggests that they came to the Inns after serving elsewhere. But Evans and Bushe obtained other livings after their appointment to Gray's Inn, while Davis gained his at the same time, and the tenure of all three was terminated by death. Therefore the chaplaincies were most likely intermediate in clerical status, between the lowly curacies and poorer benefices, but staffed by clergy who lacked the education and patronage to proceed much further.

Only the mastership of the Temple, with its better allowances, security, and status, could attract clergy of some standing. After studying abroad, William Ernested was incorporated MA at Oxford in 1527. Later in the year he supplicated for BD, and before 1553 he gained his doctorate. In 1533 he became the rector of Fryerning or Ging hospital in Essex, but resigned in the following year. Since the advowson of the hospital belonged to the prior of St John's, Ernested had quite likely been appointed master of the Temple by 1534. To this office he added a prebend of St Paul's Cathedral in 1539, the rectory of Kislingbury in Northamptonshire in 1542, and a prebend at the College of Windsor Castle in 1544, all of which he held until his death in 1558. From 1545 to 1550 he was also vicar of All Saints', Northampton, and of Brystall in Yorkshire from at least 1547. He was mentioned as the

1 Al. Oxon.; CPR (1553-4), 73-4.
2 Newcourt, II.277.
3 Le Neve, I.v.50.
4 Al. Oxon.
5 CPR (1553-4), 329, (1558-60), 255.
6 Al. Oxon.; CPR (1548-9), 152.
canon residentiary of St Paul's in 1547,\(^1\) the chancellor of the cathedral and president of the chapter in 1553,\(^2\) and a royal chaplain in 1555.\(^3\) In addition he was described as a master in chancery in 1547 and 1558, which suggests that he also held that office for many years.\(^4\) Altogether he did quite well for himself by 1558, when he paid £700 18s 3d at the exchequer for ex-monastic property.\(^5\) Thus Erneste was a capable but ambitious cleric, for whom the mastership of the Temple was simply one of several sources of income.

After Erneste's death in October 1558, the office was held briefly by John Houseman.\(^6\) Though his educational record is obscure, he was evidently a university-trained lawyer, since he referred in his will to 'my scoole hood lyned withe silke', 'my booke of devinitie and Law ecclesiasticall', and his civilian friends at the Arches.\(^7\) He was almost certainly the John Houseman who appears in 1548 as a twenty-three year old clerk of St Sepulchre's chapel adjoining York Minister.\(^8\) Five years later he described himself as a deacon there from about 1543 to 1550.\(^9\) After such lowly beginnings, he was ordained at London in the same year, and became the curate of Bilbrough near York.\(^10\) In 1554 he

---

1. CPR (1548-9), 152.

2. CPR (1553-4), 75. According to Le Neve (I. v.19) and Newcourt (I.185), Thomas Baghe or Williams was chancellor from 1530 to 1558 (from Bonner's Register, f.474). Since Erneste was described merely as a canon before and after 1553, he was possibly the acting chancellor in that year.


4. CPR (1548-9), 152, (1557-8), 224.

5. CPR (1557-8), 224; Harleian MS 608, ff.6v-7v.

6. The case for Houseman's tenure at the Temple is argued below.

7. PCC 25 Rutland, 1588.

8. The early details of Houseman's career have been published by Dickens in YAJ.

9. SP15/7, ff.55-6 (CSPD Addenda, 1547-65, 431); Dickens, YAJ.

10. Frere, Marian Reaction, 263.
was presented to the mastership of Martin hospital in Nottinghamshire near Bawtry, but he was apparently non-resident.\(^1\) In that year the later master of the Temple was appointed vicar of Canewdon in Essex,\(^2\) where he gained a lease of the rectory in 1555 providing he repaired the ruinous chancel and tithe barn,\(^3\) and in 1557 he secured a chancery award which reserved the £2 12s 2d residue from an obit for the parish poor.\(^4\) As Houseman held this vicarage, the hospital mastership, and possibly other livings until late in life, the mastership of the Temple provided only a portion of his profit.

Richard Alvey, the master from 1560 until death in 1584, also derived income from other sources. During the 1530's and 1540's, he graduated MA and BD at Cambridge, was a fellow of St John's College, and held various livings in Essex, before becoming a canon of Westminster in 1552. During Mary's reign he lived in exile, but on his return in 1558 he regained the rectory of Thorrington in Essex, which he held until 1565. After receiving the mastership in February 1560, he was restored in June to his prebend in the refounded collegiate church at Westminster. In 1566 he was collated to the rectory at Burstead Parva in Essex, which he resigned in 1576, possibly because of old age.\(^5\) Therefore Alvey derived income from a prebend and a benefice as well as the mastership.

Ermested, Houseman and Alvey were well educated and established clerics, who added other offices to the mastership of the Temple. As clergy of some wealth and influence, they kept several servants,\(^6\) dined

---

1 Patent roll C66/865, p.2, m.8 (CPR, 1553-4, 44).
2 Newcourt, II.119-20.
3 Patent roll C66/892, p.12, m.26 (CPR, 1554-5, 244).
4 Benton, 111-12.
5 DNB; Al. Cantab.; Garrett, 71-2; LP XIV.ii.905(6); CPR (1558-60), 397.
6 In 1556 Ermested kept five household servants and 'the childe of the kytchen' (PCC 50 Welles, 1556/9). Alvey had several clerks and servants at the Temple in 1564 (ITAB I, f.169 (f.230).
with the benchers, and were treated with respect. In contrast, the lesser clergy, who held office at the pleasure of their masters and were paid accordingly, were looked upon more as servants of the Inns than ministers of God. At Gray's and Lincoln's Inns they received much the same allowances as the chief domestic officers, and during the 1570's the chaplain of Lincoln's Inn shared his chamber with the butler. Sometimes they were handled in the same brutal manner. In 1400 the chaplain of Gray's Inn was the plaintiff in a case of assault and battery, to which the defendant replied that he had been provoked by the prior attack of the chaplain. A member of Lincoln's Inn was expelled from commons in 1505, but readmitted on pain of 3/4, for drawing his dagger on the chaplain. In 1523 the benchers of the same Inn ordered a barrister to pay ten shillings 'for his yeldemeyner agenst Sir Thomas Whythacre Chappelen of the said place for the hurtyng of hym with his dagger'. Some of the fine was to recompense Whitacre, but the rest was 'for the payment of the surgeyn for his labor in heylyng of the Chaplyn'. Probably Whitacre was not blameless. He was most likely 'le parson' who was ordered to do penance in 1518 for illegally playing at dice and cards in chambers. He was in strife again in 1524 when ordered to 'take no more meiles tyll he have spoken with my Masters of the bench'. After 1527, when he was allowed four shillings during illness, he

1 Annual pensioner's accounts, GIPB and LIBB.
2 LIBB V, ff.107,226,239; LIAR II, miscellanea, December 1573.
3 Barton, 16.
4 LIBB II.ii, f.76v (I.136).
5 LIBB III, f.120 (I.204).
6 LIBB III, f.85 (I.183).
7 LIBB III, f.129 (I.203).
8 LIBB III, f.159v (I.217).
disappears from view, probably done for by a dirty dagger. Such priests cannot be treated as typical since their cases appear for the contrary reason. In later years the clergy were treated with greater respect, possibly because of a general decline in interpersonal violence,¹ and a better appreciation of clerical services, as well as some success in attracting men with a greater sense of vocation who no longer kept clocks or barred doors. Nevertheless these early incidents convey an extremity of action and attitude which partly derived from the low social status of the lesser clergy.

Though the Reformation produced only gradual change in the status of the clergy, the same cannot be said of their religious function. When John de Grey endowed St Bartholomew's priory, he provided for a chantry priest to celebrate daily for his soul, and those of his ancestors and all christians.² After lawyers occupied the manor, the chaplain was obliged to 'synge and say masse and other divine service every day yerely at and in the Chapell at Greys Inne besides Holborne nygh London for the studyentes, gentilmen and felowes of the same house'.³ At Lincoln's Inn the priests were especially bound to pray for the souls of members. John Nethersole's grant in 1505 specified 'that the present and every future chaplain of the Inn celebrating mass and other divine services there, shall celebrate every Friday forever a requiem mass for the soul of the said John Nethersole, and that the said chaplain shall, at the

¹ Cf. Prest, 95-100.
² Segar MS, f.1; Dugdale, C.J., 271.
³ Augns office misc. book E315/93, ff.47v,194v.
time of the said mass, before the first washing or rinsing, for the soul of the said John, say the Psalm de Profundiis with the prayers and collects as the said manner is'. In fulfilment of this duty, the benchers agreed to bind the chaplain and his successors by solemn oath. Sir Robert Drury's chaplain was appointed in 1517 not merely for 'sayeng Masses and other dyvyne services', but also 'to praye for his soule and all crystien Soules'. Consequently the benchers assured his son in 1554 that if he continued the stipend, the priest would include him as well. More explicitly, they agreed to the request of their fellow who refurnished the altar, 'that at all tymes hereafter every prest that shall serve in this chappell shall in every of his masses that he shall says at the sayd Alter saye in the begynnyng of the Masse beforethe Epystill and in the ende of the Masse a Collect' for the souls of the donor's wife and all their parents, kinsfolk and friends, 'and also in every of the sayd Massys Remember the same Soules in the Memento pro Mortuis'. At the Temple the main function of the priests had been to celebrate divine service for the souls of English monarchs and members of the orders. But with the advent of the lawyers they said daily masses and other offices for the societies, including requiem services, for which there remains a detailed prescription in the will of William Ermested:

1 LIBB II.ii, f.77 (I.136).
2 LIBB IV, f.273 (I.308).
3 LIBB IV, f.274 (I.308-9).
4 Exchequer (LTR) enrolled accounts misc. E355/20, m.3; trans. Baylis, 134; The Knights Hospitallers in England, 202,218.
5 Anonymous MS, f.332v.
I do give and bequeathe to iiiij Prests and the Clarke singing and serving in the Temple Churche ny London to singe Placebo Dirge and Masse of requiem for my soule and all christen soules at the day of my buriall, or as ngyhe that daye as the Conveniently canne or maye, to every of them fyve iijs iiijd and to the Clarke more ijs to hyer Ringers to rynge the belles there, And for Tapers of wax of iiiij li wax every taper at xd the pounde wax - xiijs iiiijd and to iiiij poor men to holde the Tapers all service tyme ijs. ¹

At the Temple most of these offices were probably performed by the priests rather than the master, who acted more as the governor of church property, procedure and personnel. ²

When the government established the reformed religion, the clergy were responsible for implementing the new liturgy of the Inns. Instead of elaborate rites and ceremonies, they conducted daily prayer, occasional communion, and burial services according to the prescribed pattern. Therefore their function was radically changed. But their role remained much the same. Whereas they had sung the mass before, they were now readers of common prayer, particularly the minister at the Temple, who was virtually a curate. One ritual simply replaced another - except for the master. Though Ernesteved had lost the master's house, Alvey used lodgings at the Temple. ³ During Communion he served both societies, the inner templars on the south side and the middle templars to the north, assisted by the minister and the clerk. ⁴ On Sunday mornings in term, the festival days, and two Sundays during vacation when

¹ PCC 50 Welles, 1556/9.
² E.g. ITAB I, ff.43,138 (I.45,181).
³ Hatfield MS 12, f.95v.
⁴ 'Touching the Master of the Temple', ITR XXXII, f.6; MTNB II, ff.156v-7 (II.647-8); 'The usual forme of Administring the Holy Sacrament in the Temple Church', Temple clerk's book, ITR XXII, ff.45-6v.
legal readings were held, he preached in the church. Thus Alvey was evidently the first of the new-style masters, who established a more functional relationship with the lawyers.

How readily did the clergy adjust to their reformed function? The priests at the Temple experienced particular difficulty. Though four of them ministered there before the dissolution, the act of 1540 continued the services of only two - Walter Lymsey and John Wynter. But when the exchequer made its first allowance for the Temple clergy in 1540-1, four different priests were paid, namely Robert Bagge, Thomas Abbott, Christopher Smith and Henry Crosse. Unless there was some mistake or an awful visitation, the former priests gave up their jobs during the dissolution, probably for religious reasons. Both Gray's and Lincoln's Inns lost one of their singing priests, and the chaplaincy of the latter society evidently passed through a somewhat unsettled period during the 1550s, but no personal cause can be distinguished.

Most of the clergy, however, managed to reconcile principle with circumstance. Though the fluctuations of religious policy most likely produced alternating hope and confusion, none of the priests seems to have troubled his superiors at the time. But such was their character that some were no doubt as bewildered as Sir William Appleforth, a curate of Newington and not of the Inns. There is no telling whom he had visited in Michaelmas 1561 when he and Sir John Hill, the parson of St Olave's in Silver Street, went from the Temple down Fleet Street to St Bride's corner. According to his account, there an unknown person informed him that a man had been imprisoned for saying that 'her grace should nott lyve vntil chrysmas' and 'the olde lawes shoulde upp agayne in despyte of all that wolde say naye'. At home before the fire,
Appleforth related the news to others in the presence of Sir John, 'thinkin [sic] therein no harme'. For his trouble he was gaoled in the Gatehouse. At secretary Cecil's direction, Bishop Edmund Grindal sent for Sir John Hill, who denied any talk concerning the Queen or religion.

Moreover no other person had been in their company, except John Lentalle, a cook of St Olave's parish, who had accompanied them to an alehouse near Fleet Street bridge. But Sir William had already confessed the gist of their conversation, as well disclosing his own mental confusion:

Whereas I sayde that an archebysshop is above a quene, I have hard it spoken of larned men in the olde tymes to be trewe; also where I spake of tempeestous wether death and syckenes, I dyd rede it in the prognostycatyon of the yere last past; and where they sayde that I doe not love nether the quenes grace nor yet her lawes, it is of a trewh that I doe praye for her dayeslye and hourslye and also do reade the collect for her both at morninge praer, lastanye, at the holy communyon at byddyan of beddes and eveninge prayer, and therein let the parysshoners be witnes; yf this be not trewe...let me be hanged drawen and quartered.¹

As the clerical standard at the Inns was little better, the response of some priests to religious change was probably much the same. For example, Jeffrey Evans served at Gray's Inn long before their existing records of 1568. Though he continued on the payroll until 1583, he was usually referred to by his old title of 'Sir Jeffrey the prest'.² In 1574 he was pensioned off, probably because of senility. He had lost the key to the door at the chapel stairs in 1571-2, and his surplice had to be mended three times.³ During succeeding years he was often distinguished from the new minister as 'the Olde prieste'.⁴ Therefore he was replaced mainly because of his physical incapacity, but probably

¹ William Appleforth's confession, endorsed by Cecil and forwarded to Grindal, n.d. (1561), SP15/11, ff.85-6; articles and answers of John Hill, 1562, SP12/21, ff.8-11.

² E.g. GIPB I, ff.147v,171v.

³ GIPB I, ff.33,34v.

⁴ E.g. GIPB I, ff.43v,71v,172.
the society required a less conservative chaplain. Yet Evans had
conformed sufficiently to remain in office until then, and had evidently
taken the opportunity to marry some time before 1562.1

Other clergy adapted to the changing circumstances with some agility.
According to John Louthe's reminiscences, 'one Cooke, chapleyn in
Lincolnes Inne' had been 'a detestore of the masse' during Edward's
reign.2 In Mary's time Louthe met Cooke at George Zouch's lordship of
Benefield in Northamptonshire. On finding that the chaplain was 'hyred
now to say masse', Louthe took him to task for his apostasy, even though
'Cooke had on hys syde a great man'. Since Sir John Harnam was the
Drury priest in 1551-2, with Sir Thomas Tudball as the ordinary chaplain
from at least 1552 to 1556, Cooke's tenure at the Inn was not continuous.
But a later record reveals that Robert Cooke was certainly a chaplain
there in the last year of Mary's reign, when the council ordered payment
of 20/- for repairs to his gown.3 In 1558 he vanishes once more, leaving
the single chaplaincy to Sir Henry Alleyn, who took the oath before the
commissioners in the following year.4 Nevertheless Cooke reappears
during the epidemic of 1563-4, after which he was paid £4 for his commons
and labours, in addition to the usual chaplain's wage. There he continued
until Michaelmas 1568, apparently in favour with the benchers, as he not
only gained the extraordinary Easter roll of four pence per member in
1565, but in 1568-9 he finally received the gown allowance which had been
awarded a decade before. Throughout the religious changes of three
reigns, Robert Cooke proved himself capable of some fancy footwork.5

1 P.77 above.
2 Narratives of the Reformation, 58.
3 LIEB V, f.104 (I.367).
4 Mullins, Thesis, 139,250.
5 For the sequel see p. 208 below.
The masters of the Temple made the most of their Marian opportunity. William Ermested, who established his career in Henry's reign and weathered the Reformation, accumulated his clerical honours in the Marian spring of 1553-4. As he had such a long association with St. Paul's and was a member of the commission which restored Edmund Bonner to the bishopric of London, he was probably advanced by the bishop. Ermested's adherence to the restored religion is clearly expressed in his will dated in December 1556, when he committed his soul to the Trinity, together with 'the blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Christe', and 'the blessed and glorious Company of Angelles, to the holly Patriarches and prophettes, Apostelles, Martyrs, Confessors and virgins'. As well as prescribing requiem mass at the Temple, he willed his body to be buried at St. Paul's, specifying 'that at my buriall be sonnge and sayd Placebo dirge And masse of Requiem and all other suffrages and prayers for the deade as the Catholique Churche dothe vse'. The four great tapers were to be two pounds heavier than at the Temple, and payments would be made to the dean, canons, clergy and poor men for their attendance. Furthermore his legacies included 40/- 'to the covent of the Graye fryers at Grenewhiche', whom the Queen had restored in the previous year. Though no codicil was added concerning the monastic property which he purchased from the crown in June 1558, the land commissioners stated that 'he promyseth to gyve the lande to the churche'.

Perhaps Ermested would have adjusted to the Elizabethan church. He was obviously attached to the ancient ceremonies and traditions. But

1 CPR (1553-4), 75,121-2.
2 PCC 50 Welles, 1556/9.
3 Pp.90-1 above.
4 Grey Friars Chronicle, 94; Knowles, III.439.
5 Harleian MS 608, f.7.
the lengthy religious preamble to his will shows that he held most dearly to the common meets of christianity. Faced with the possibility of death, his whole desire was to 'be occupiéd and myndfull of the most excelent mercy and goodnes of gode which he hathe shewed unto all mankynde and especiallye unto truly repenting Synners through the deathe and most precious bloude of his derly beloved Sonn Chryst Jesus our Redeemer and Saviour'. For this reason he believed 'by godes mercy at the great daye of iugement to obteyne the inestimable and incomprehensibill fruicion and sight of his immortall majestie and devine godhede'. Since Ermested died in October 1558 he did not have to adapt to the Elizabethan settlement. However these sentiments suggest that the clergy could adjust to external religious changes, provided there was sufficient common ground between their cherished beliefs and the reformed theology.

In 1553 John Houseman, who also took advantage of Mary's accession, complained to the Queen that Archbishop Robert Holgate of York had expelled him from his living some three years previously. Though he had proceeded in holy orders, the archbishop had apparently refused to admit him to the priesthood, or to enable his ordination by another bishop. Houseman claimed that Holgate, who was soon to be deprived for marriage and other causes, had objected to him 'because he was so sore againste the mareage of preistes'. Consequently he requested some recompense for his losses. Such a timely petition by the not so humble deacon of York produced a rash of preferments in 1553-4. As he was ordained in London and collated to Essex by Bonner, he was evidently patronised by the bishop. At St Mary Magdalen hospital, to which he was presented by letters patent, he replaced Dr William Clayborough, the

1 PCC 50 Welles, 1556/9; Al. Oxon.
2 SP15/7, ff.55-6; Dickens, YAJ.
3 Dickens, Robert Holgate.
4 Pp.86-7 above.
deprived master. At Canewdon he supplanted Bernard Sandiford, a married priest and an unrepentant protestant, who had been sequestered by Bonner. At the Temple he succeeded Ernestsed after the master’s death in October 1558, presumably by Bonner’s influence and the Hospitallers’ appointment.

In Elizabeth’s reign, however, Houseman not only conformed, but died professing protestantism. While master of the Temple in 1559, he took the oath of supremacy with the London clergy. As the married parson of Canewdon in Essex and Englefield in Berkshire, he bequeathed his soul to God by whose merits he trusted ‘to have remission of all my sins and nott by any of my owne works or deedes’. But according to his Essex parishioners, whose opinion was recorded in the puritan Register, Houseman was ‘sometime a turnbroach [spit-turner] in the court, made a masse priest, a persecutor in Queen Maries daies, now he hath 2 Benefices, a verie careless man, and one that cannot preach sincerelie the truth’.

Thus the clerical offices at the Inns were held by conforming conservatives when Elizabeth commenced her reign. The Temple with its four priests was governed by John Houseman; Lincoln’s Inn had lately appointed Sir Henry Alleyn; Gray’s Inn was served by Sir Jeffrey Evans. Their religious sympathies were little different from those of most clergy. In 1559 Richard Cox complained that the whole body of the clergy remained staunchly catholic, while Edmund Grindal lamented the ‘great dearth of godly ministers’. Nevertheless it was during their tenure
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that the rich interior and liturgy of the churches were finally altered almost beyond recognition. But despite external appearances, at Gray's and Lincoln's Inns there seems to have been little change in the religious composition of the clergy for many years. Not until 1574 did Gray's Inn employ Paul Bushe, the new 'minister', in place of their old priest. At Lincoln's Inn the unsettled period continued through the sixties. After several years, Alleyn was succeeded by the perennial Robert Cooke, and then three short-term chaplains before 1571, when William Davis took office. One of his first tasks was to provide the larger communion cup, followed by a new book of common-prayer and two books of homilies in the next year.¹ During the sixties both chaplains had witnessed the confirmation of English protestantism. They were both appointed in the seventies when the benchers were busily restoring chapels and building pulpits,² and they remained in office, at the Inns and elsewhere, until their deaths many years later. Therefore William Davis and Paul Bushe were not merely clergy who conformed, but they represented an advanced but belated stage in the consolidation of reformed religion at Gray's and Lincoln's Inns.

Though this development took place much earlier at the Temple, with the appointment of Richard Alvey, the circumstances were quite peculiar. According to his patent of February 1560, the preceding master was Ernesteed and not Houseman.³ Nor is Houseman mentioned in the Temple records. But following Ernesteed's death in 1558, a successor was certainly officiating by May 1559, when the Inner Temple tried to ensure payment of the offerings 'to the use of the Master of the Temple'.⁴

¹ LIBV V, ff.163v,180v (I.383,387).
² Pp.25-6 above.
³ Patent roll G66/949, p.2, m.18 (CPR, 1558-60,280).
⁴ ITAB I, f.140 (I.201).
That this was John Houseman is evident from the Elizabethan pardon roll and the London subscription list both of which mention his office in 1559.¹ Twenty years later, Alvey himself remarked to Lord Burghley that Houseman, as Ernsted's 'successor', had received the exchequer allowance for the 'dewtres belonging to the Master of the temple'.² Therefore he was master from late 1558 until shortly before Alvey's appointment early in 1560. Since he took the oath of supremacy, retained other clerical office, and even gained royal nomination to the seventh prebend at Canterbury (1559),³ why did he relinquish the mastership of the Temple?

Because of the status of the master, the prominence of his church and the nature of his ministry, the new government could hardly afford to leave Bonner's protege in control. Consequently Houseman was most likely forced to resign in favour of a more suitable master. For similar reasons his presentation to Canterbury, of which only an undated draft remains among the state papers, does not seem to have materialised. Instead the Queen appointed John Butler, whose patent of May 1559 referred to the deceased Hugh Glasier as the former prebendary.⁴ Houseman apparently lost both the mastership and the prebend because of his Marian sympathies, but his conformity enabled him to retain minor clerical

¹ Supplementary patent roll C67/68, p.2, m.14 (CPR, 1558-60, I.211); Mullins, Thesis, 139,250.
² Lansdowne MS 107, ff.2-3.
³ SP12/1, f.49 (CSPD, 1547-80, 119). As the undated nomination was made by Queen Elizabeth, it was drafted before Parker became archbishop in December 1559, but not before late 1558, since the will of Hugh Glasier, the former prebendary, was dated 4 October and proved 16 December (PCC 17 Welles, 1558). But Glasier was paid for the whole of 1558 (Canterbury Cathedral Chapter Archives, misc. accounts 40), and the next appointment was in May 1559 (below). Therefore Houseman was nominated between late 1558 and May 1559.
⁴ CPR (1558-60), 103. Butler's name appears in the records at Canterbury, but since the accounts are missing for 1559-60, they cannot be used to verify Houseman's deprivation.
Since he owed his mastership to a previously dissolved order, it could be argued that Ermested was the former incumbent. Thus Houseman was deprived, Alvey preferred, legality preserved and the authorities satisfied.

The cleric whom the government favoured was well chosen. His protestant pedigree was unblemished. At Cambridge during the early Reformation, Alvey attended St John's College, a seminary of protestantism. He gained his prebend in the reformed cathedral at Westminster from Edward VI. Following his deprivation in 1554, he and his wife resided in Frankfort with like-minded exiles, until their return after Elizabeth's accession. Such a man was known for his religion and learning, and deserved a place in the reformed church. But Alvey's quality which was most remarked upon by contemporaries was his preaching. In Mary's reign Thomas Wats, a linen draper and martyr of Essex, testified before Bonner that he had learnt his sacramental beliefs 'by preaching of on Master Alvey, and others whose names he remembered not; which Alvey, he said, did preach the word of God truly and sincerely'. Henry Machyn the diarist, who was hardly a religious radical, was sufficiently impressed by Alvey's delivery at Westminster Abbey in 1561 to record that he 'mad a godly sermon ther; and grett audyense'. In 1577 a letter from the privy council ignored his clerical titles, and simply referred to 'Richard Alvey, a godly preacher'.

1 PCC 25 Rutland, 1588; APC VIII.271; Strype, Aylmer, 78; p. 87 above.
2 Porter, 82,95-6.
3 P.87 above.
4 Foxe, VIII.121.
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6 APC X.59-60.
Therefore it is not surprising that an anonymous person of some influence included him amongst 'The names of certen godlie preachers which have utterly forsaken Antichriste and al his Romishe rags'. On this list of twenty-eight 'preachers of the Gospel', which included such protestant stalwarts as Miles Coverdale, John Foxe, Thomas Sampson, William Whittingham and Laurence Humphrey, Alvey was placed third. The author believed that these men deserved to be preferred instead of 'the Lord Bushops and others' who imitated the papists. The list, which was apparently composed in the early 1560s, was submitted to the consideration of Lord Robert Dudley. Since many were promoted during those years when Dudley was closest to the Queen, he possibly assisted Alvey. However, the master's few remaining letters reveal that he was much favoured by the privy council generally and by Burghley in particular, his 'verye good Lord', to whom he forwarded his requests.

Early in the reign, when the government was especially concerned about the allegiance of the clergy, Alvey gained livings commensurate with his learning and ability, including the mastership of the Temple.

Without Alvey's sermons or writings, it is difficult to evaluate his reforming role. Nevertheless the nature of his ministry is indicated by other evidence. As a member of the Frankfort committee for revision of the Edwardian prayer-book in 1555, he was one of the exiles who signed two letters to John Calvin concerning the rift between the Knoxian extremists and the Coxian moderates. Though he did not play
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1 Magdalene College, Cambridge, Pepys MS 2503, f.701.
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any conspicuous part in these squabbles, he sided with the moderates who adhered to the basis of the prayer-book, while believing that certain practices such as kneeling and surplices could be omitted as things indifferent. There are later indications that he was more radical than these letters suggest. The remembrance written for Dudley emphasised that Alvey and his fellow preachers had utterly forsaken papistry and superstition, thereby implying their distaste for at least some of the things indifferent. These included vestments, which Alvey and others objected to in 1565 when they petitioned the ecclesiastical commissioners to respect their conscientious practice. Moreover Richard Hooker, who was Alvey's successor at the Temple, noted that whereas communicants kneeled in most churches of the realm, at the Temple they sat. Despite these preferences, Alvey apparently conformed to the established pattern of worship without troubling the hierarchy. With regard to doctrine, he was a convinced Calvinist, who would not tolerate the propagation of unorthodox belief. According to Archbishop Parker, the master approached him in 1574 for advice on how to deal with Antonio del Corro, the preacher, 'for affirming free will, and speaking not wisely of predestination, and suspiciously uttering his judgment of Arianism'. Alvey's views concerning ecclesiastical government are not known, but at the Temple he tried to impose more effective religious discipline. In 1582 he pressed the benchers to implement a directive obtained from the privy council, which urged the appointment of church overseers to report absentees and

1 Garrett, 71-2.


3 'Mr Hooker's Answer to the Supplication that Mr Travers made to the Council', Hooker, Works, II.675.

4 IT Petyt MS 47, f.23; Parker Correspondence, 476.
collect alms. Though the societies provided an alms box instead, they permitted Alvey to employ two overseers from each house, who would report absentees to him for private admonition, followed by any necessary bench action. Hooker was probably right in ascribing this design to Walter Travers, the presbyterian preacher at the Temple. But since Alvey was responsible for implementing the scheme, he apparently favoured stricter ecclesiastical discipline of the puritan kind. With regard to his character, there is no reason to discredit Isaak Walton's testimony, that he was 'a man of strict life, of great learning, and of so venerable behaviour, as to gain so high a degree of love and reverence from all men, that he was generally known by the name of Father Alvie'.

These are mere fragments of Alvey's ministry. Yet altogether they establish that his tenure was exceptional. Whereas the clerical composition at Gray's and Lincoln's Inns changed gradually in response to religious change within, at the Temple the government deliberately appointed a confirmed protestant, who would do what he could to convert his charges. Whether Alvey succeeded has yet to be considered. But if Walton's testimony is correct, he did gain the wholehearted respect of the societies, not so much for his particular stance on contemporary issues of church doctrine, ceremony or government, but because of his personal example. To complete Walton's account:

And at the Temple reading, next after the death of this Father Alvie, he the said Archbishop of York [Edwin Sandys] being then at dinner with the judges, the readers and benchers of that society, met with a general condolence for the death of Father Alvie, and with a high commendation of his saint-like life, and of his great merit both towards God and man; and as they bewailed his death, so they wished for a like pattern of virtue and learning to succeed him.

2 MTMB II, ff.153v-4 (I.252-3); ITAB I, f.220 (I.320-1).
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It can be accepted that members of the Inns were basically religious, though some were certainly would-be gallants who devoted themselves more to city delights than the welfare of their souls. The apocryphal tales about young Roger Cholmley, William Cecil and Christopher Hatton have already been told.\(^1\) In his comfortable old age, Sir William More, the Surrey administrator, recalled his youth at an Inn of Chancery during the 1530's, where he not merely indulged in cards and dice, but was also 'greatlye provoked to whoredome ine the Cytye bye mye lewd companyons'.\(^2\) More did not succumb, but 'the greate repayre of sundrie woemen unto the gentlemens chambers', not to mention the nearby 'stews', resulted in frequent disciplinary action.\(^3\) At times members descended into the underworld of superstition. Edward Underhill, an Edwardian extremist, recorded how he provoked the wrath of young lawyers at the Temple for busting a sorcerer's ring which included 'Gastone the lawyare' and his lodger Allen, 'a cunninge mane' who could do wondrous things.\(^4\) Therefore it is not surprising that one of the objects found during excavation at Lincoln's Inn was a small leaden tablet which invoked the spirits of the moon to curse Ralph Scrope, a bencher from 1558 to 1572.\(^5\)
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5. Baildon, PSA, 140-7; Thomas, 508-9; A5, II.44.
Some members neglected their religious duties for the continuous round of professional practice at Westminster, in London and abroad. As Walter Norton of Gray's Inn explained in 1569, for two years 'sins he hath byn a pratcitioner he hath but seldom resorrtyd to the Church by reason of his busines and clientes causes'. Others such as Richard Allington, a barrister of Lincoln's Inn, were so engrossed in the worship of mammon that there was no time for meditation. Having extorted some £120,000 during a lifetime of 'abominable usury', he fearfully confessed before his deathbed audience not to have 'uside my selfe to prayere as I was wonte to do, nor never wentte to churche atte tyme of commone prayere'. Some members were even accused of atheism.

According to the anonymous charges against George Gascoigne, the poetical member of Gray's Inn from 1555 to 1567, he was 'a notorious Ruffianne and especiallie noted to be bothe a spie, an athiest and a godless personne'. In similar vein, an informer declared that Richard Cholmley 'saith and verely belevethe than one [Christopher] Marlowe is able to shewe more sounde reasons for Atheisme then eny devine in Englaude is able to gwe to prove devenitie'.

After four religious settlements in less than thirty years, some healthy scepticism might be excusable. But within the context of sixteenth century religious expression, such sentiments were mere aberrations. Regardless of differences in dogma or the degree of personal conviction, members of the Inns adhered to a common religious

1 Prest, 218.
2 EC Abstract 1569, f.204.
3 Eyston MS, Hendred House.
4 Segar MS, f.34v; GIPB I, ff.7v,22 (I.3); Prouty, 17-25,32-4,63.
5 SPL2/86, f.235.
6 Harleian MS 6348, f.190; LIBB IV, f.367v.
philosophy. Almost to a man they affirmed their belief in an omnipotent God who controlled the destiny of man, while mercifully providing a means of escape from sin and certain death to life everlasting. For the individual, this theocentric view had practical consequences. As a true Christian he would fear, worship and obey the Almighty. But religion was more than a matter of personal commitment for the lawyer. He was particularly conscious that the common law was not independent, but inherently related to the superior law of God. This fundamental truth was impressed on generations of students who used Christopher St German's Doctor and Student as a legal text, and was repeated by William Fleetwood of the Middle Temple in a well circulated manuscript (1571-2).

However, its most eloquent exponent was Christopher Yelverton, who devoted thirty-seven years to the study of law at Gray's Inn. In the traditional farewell oration of a new serjeant-at-law (1589), he stressed the majesty of the law as 'the devine gitfe and invention of god, and the profound determinacion of wise men without which the Magistrate cannot stand'. But 'as mens lawes are so many lines drawne to live by; so the very centre of all is the lawe of God'. Therefore Yelverton

---

1. The following comments derive from a biographical study of over a thousand members of the Inns, including more than two hundred wills.

2. In the words of John Harris, who was promoted from Lincoln's Inn to serjeanty in 1540, he bequeathed his soul to almighty God, 'beseeching the good lorde my maker and redeemer of his mercy and grace, and for the bitter passion that Jehu Christ our lorde suffered for the redemption of us myserable synners, that my soule after this transitorie lyf and separacion from the bodye may be with Christ our lorde and to have lyf ever lasting' (PCC 29 Bucke, 1550/1; A5, II.12).

3. Gilbert Gerrard, a bencher of Gray's Inn for forty years and an Elizabethan master of the rolls, repeated this daily prayer: 'O Lord God heavenly father, directe me nowe in all my thoughtes, wordes and deedes, that I maye doe those things that shalbe exceptable in thie sight and to the glorye of thy hollye name' (PCC 30 Neville, 1593; A5, I.52).

4. St German, chs 1-4 (published 1530-1); Prest, 144.

5. 'Itinerarium ad Windsor', e.g. Bodleian MS Tanner, ff.201-17, Harleian MS 168, ff.1-8, 6234, ff.10-25; A5, IV.64.
exhorted his audience 'to be more forward in the hearing of the word, more earnest in the Profession of the gospell, and more zealous in the furtherance of religion, for it is the very undoubted, and certaine knowledge howe to serve God, the sterne of the common weale, and the ladder to climbe up to heaven by'. 1 That many lawyers agreed is apparent from the elaborate religious preambles in their wills, 2 and the contents of their libraries. 3 However, such a philosophy, which bound law to religion, had professional implications. As explained to the new serjeants in 1603 by chief justice Sir John Popham, a Middle Temple bencher from 1568 to 1592:

Yet ons againe I do most hartelye desier you, yea and require you: first in the name of God of whom we have our beginning, our being here, and at whose pleasure we shall ende; secondaryelie in the name of our soffaraynge lord the kinge whose goodness hathe alwaies endeved the preservation and wealth of this his realme, the execution of justice, and supplantings of vice, and setting forthe of vertue; thirdlye for the love ye bare unto your countrye, that ye remembre uprighlitle to do your office, and to be vertuous that other may take example by you, to use truthe, and to sett fourth your clyentes causes without delaye, and not to prolonge them for lucer, to minister Justice accorginge to your office and authoritye, and so doinge I doubt not but God which abundantly usith to rewarde those that dothe well, shall give you an inestimable rewarde, which no tonge can expresse, no hart can thinke, that is the inheri tance of heaven.... I praye God give you of your promotion long continuance therin wythe much increase of honor and vertu. 4

---

1 Copybook of speeches made by Christopher Yelverton during his legal career, Additional (Yelverton) MS 49109, ff.12-14; A5, I.80.

2 PCC wills are used throughout this and the final chapter. I have assumed from sheer detail and internal evidence that they were generally composed by the lawyers themselves. Some were obviously written in haste, particularly William Whorwood's, which was inscribed on a bedside cupboard by his servant (SP1/212, f.114 (LP XX.i1.1033). Cf. John Cowper, Robert Shute, George Wyott). Other wills, such as John Lennard's, which was forwarded to William Cordell, incorporated the advice of legal friends (Essex R.O., Barrett-Lennard MS Ch3/1/5, pp.49-52). But many were explicitly written by the deceased (E.g. Richard Blackwell, Thomas Carus, Roger Cholmley, Thomas Gawdy, John Goodman, Robert Howell, William Price, Anthony Roper, John Southcote).

3 Whether the inventory of Thomas Kebell (1500) or the will of William Bone (1574) is examined, we find that religious works formed a major part of lawyers' libraries (Ives, LQR; PCC Pyckering, 1574/5; A5, IV.51. Cf. Schoeck, Manuscripta; Browne, TEGAS, 223-4).

4 Harleian MS 361, f.85v; A5, IV.68.
The only matter which Popham omitted was the contrary, that those who were not diligent administrators of the law would be examined by God and judged accordingly.  

If lawyers maintained the sanctity of law and religion as the foundation of society, they also stressed, and indeed embodied, the qualities of obedience, loyalty and service to their prince, even to the extent of overriding individual conscience. In 1539 Edward Hall, the chronicler and bencher of Gray's Inn, stated in parliament the divine precept of 'Obey your king'. Consequently he preached that as loving subjects they were bound to observe everything that their prince set forth 'to be observed or believed'. Or as James Morice explained in 1579 before Middle Temple students who attended his lectures on the royal prerogative, 'according to the Word of God and Perfect Reason (whereupon the lawes of this Realme are chiefly grounded), the king is thonly sole immediate Governour under God, and that in all causes and over all persons'. Therefore the lawyer's creed, as expressed by John Gostwick, a perfect civil servant and a member of Gray's Inn, was to 'be true to God, the king and your frend'. But if the friend disclosed any secret crime, Gostwick instructed his heir to inform the authorities, 'for the longer you kepe it the worse it is for you, and the more daunger toward God and the Kingses Majestie'.

---

1 As mentioned by Thomas Elyot, Book II, ch.1 (pp.3-4).
2 Foxe, V.504-5; A5, I.28.
3 Egerton MS 3376 and Additional MS 36081 (both incomplete); A5,IV.84.
4 In Dickens, BURLSP, 45. Cf. James Downes' will (PCC 17 Chaynay, 1558/9), Peter Osborne's advice to his son, 1570 (Lansdowne MS f.219), and William Fleetwood in parliament (Cotton MS Titus F.I, f.142v).
In ecclesiastical matters the lawyers were mostly determined to maintain national unity, in accordance with the law established and even at the expense of personal independence. The example of Thomas More, formerly a bencher of Lincoln's Inn, is well known, not to mention Edward Hall, a member of the London commission which enforced the Six Articles' Act. But concern for national unity was expressed by simpler men. In the Lincoln's Inn black book for 1547, the keeper prayed that the new king 'maye bryng us his graces lovyng and obeydent subjectes to an uniformyte in all Godlines and theryn to persever with all pure affection which undowededly shalbe to the safegarde both of our bodies and sowles to the great tranquullyte and quietnes of this realme'. To this end William Barley, a member of the Middle Temple, planned to compile a legal concordance, so that puritans and papists alike would be reconciled to the church of England. Otherwise they 'sholde be hanged on the Jebett of Haman'. Even those parliamentary lawyers who demanded some latitude in church ritual required lip-service to the national church.

Such innate conservatism did not necessarily characterise their attitude towards ecclesiastics. As stewards of church property, keepers of bishopric courts, counsel to clerics, and members of ecclesiastical commissions, the lawyers worked closely with the clergy. At times they

1 LP XVI.494; A5, II.115, I.28.
2 LIBB IV, f.182 (I.283-4).
3 'A Table concernyng divers Concordances to bee made', SP12/123/14, ff.10-11; MTMB II, ff.31v,34 (I.123,127).
4 E.g. Neale, I ch. 3.
5 John Boys I, Thomas Colby and John Boys II were stewards to Archbishops Cranmer, Parker and Whitgift respectively. Anthony Wayte, whose correspondence from the Inner Temple survives in the Little collection, was Bishop Sherburne's steward (SP3). James Hales was counsel to Cranmer. On ecclesiastical employment, see Ives, Thesis, ch.VIII.
showed considerable respect for ecclesiastical authority. Another of Edward Hall's arguments was that the clergy had consented to the Six Articles' Act, whereas 'far the greater part of us laymen are unlearned in the Scriptures and ancient doctors'. Similarly John Walsh, a Marian bencher of the Middle Temple, marvilled that young Bartlett Green of the same Inn could contradict all the learned men of the realm. Nevertheless there were frequent signs of conflict. At times legal principles and clerical privilege were at stake, as in the case of Richard Hunne, the merchant tailor whom Hall portrayed as the victim of clerical malice and foul-play. In later years the lawyers measured the procedure of church courts by their own common law standard. Francis Windham reportedly declared at Norfolk sessions 'that the ordynarye could not cyte men to appere pro salute anime to awnswer upon oathe', a claim which was developed into a campaign by James Morice, Nicholas Fuller and Robert Beale. Sometimes this conflict was more a matter of rivalry between two professions which asserted their authority to overlapping areas. In 1535 when the question was considered by several common and civil lawyers, Richard Pollard claimed that the judges should have jurisdiction over all causes formerly handled by ecclesiastics, so that there would be a single legal system. A few years earlier, St German's student had quashed the doctor's contention that the goods of certain persons were subject to ecclesiastical authority, and in 1581, chief

1 Foxe, VII.735.
2 Hall, I.129-42.
3 Nathaniel Bacon, Official Papers, 186; A5, II.70.
4 Collinson, and Neale II, passim.
5 SP1/95, f.121 (LP IX.119); Elton, RR, 133. Apart from Richard Pollard, who wrote from the Middle Temple, the common lawyers were Thomas Rush ton, a bencher of Lincoln's Inn, Henry Polsted of the Inner Temple, and Anthony Bury of the Middle Temple. Polsted and Bury were later benchers.
6 St German, chs 29,36.
justice Sir Christopher Wray curtly informed the bishop of Chester that 'your Lordship's [ecclesiastical] Commission is to deal with matters of Religion, but not with the execution of mens Testaments touching the disposition of their Bonds or goods'.

In parliament the lawyers were largely responsible for debating this issue of jurisdiction at various levels, ranging from the simple grievance against ecclesiastics acting as church stewards (1529), to the more elevated claim that spiritual authority was subject to parliament and the common law. At other times, when lawyers such as Simon Fishe, John Parkins and William Fleetwood attacked clerical abuse, their criticism derived from what they believed to be the true spiritual function of clergy. But this conflict frequently reflected personal prejudice. William Barley firmly believed that, if the clergy were not subject to a single legal code, 'those ecclesiastical men mighte exalte themselves above others, or trymphe to muche amongst subjectes'. After all, no one liked probate or mortuary fees, particularly when they were thought excessive, and the payment of tithes had long been a sore point. Despite the cooperation between lawyers and ecclesiastics in administration, for personal and professional reasons, members of the Inns developed a somewhat anticlerical bias.

1 Bodleian MS Tanner 79, f.53 (copy); A5, II.46. Wray continues: 'If any man devise land to good and godlie uses there is sufficient remedy by law, to compel them to performe the same'.
2 Hall, II.166.
3 Neale, I-II passim. Cf. John More's statement to Cromwell in 1535, 'that an acte of parliament made in this Realme for the comen welthe of the same ought rather to be observed within the same Realme then any general Counceill' (SP1/92, f.69 (LP VIII.592 (3); Elton, RR, 67.
4 Foxe, IV.659-64; Elton, SC8, ch. I; Neale, II.79-80.
5 SP12/123/14, f.8.
6 E.g. the commons grievances, 1529, Hall, II.165-7.
7 Dickens, ER, 134-7; and lawyers' wills which include provisions for tithes 'forgotten'.
8 Only this prejudice could account for the lawyer's pun about the bishop, 'whose when the kinge asked whether he would have the乙shoprike of Bathe or of Welles, Answered he would have Bathe meaning Bothe' (William Watson to Mr. Whichcot, 1591, IT Misc. MS 30, no.32).
Except for legal emphasis, these characteristics were common to the landed class to which most members of the Inns belonged. If the small percentage of honorific admissions is disregarded,1 a large proportion of members were well-born young men who had no intention of entering the legal profession, or found that law was not to their liking.2 Though most of these gentlemen remained for only a couple of years, their purpose could be serious enough. As young Bassingbourne Gawdy wrote to his father, the Norfolk sheriff and a former Inner Templar himself (1579):

> For my being here I trust in God shall be for the best, many kinds of ways; as to occupie my selfe in studiing of the lawe, and to gett acquaintance with honest gentlemen, to the intente that I may use there frendshippe hereafter if occasion shall serve; and alse to learen how to behabe my selfe towards all men, and in everie companye that I shall come in.3

As well as catering for transient members, the Inns attracted more serious students, such as Thomas Egerton, who made law their life,4 so that perhaps a mere quarter of all members were practising lawyers.5 Most of

---

1 Prest, 9-10 for the later period.
2 Ives, Thesis, 29-32; Prest, 9,11,21-4.
3 Additional MS 36989, f.1. Further letters by Bassingbourne and Philip Gawdy to their parents are in Add. MS 27395-99 and Egerton MS 2804. Philip's letters have been largely published by Jeayes.
4 See the additions to A Discourse upon the Exposition and Understanding of Statutes, attributed to Egerton during student days by S.E. Thorne: A5, II.39.
5 The following figures are obtained from a census of the Inns for May 1574 (SP12/95, f.201):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benchers</th>
<th>Barristers</th>
<th>Gentlemen</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. Edward Coke's estimate for the early seventeenth century of at least 20 benchers, about 60 barristers and 160 to 180 gentlemen at each Inn (Prest,47). See Prest, 16, for further comments.

Though there is little evidence that these proportions changed significantly, the percentage of gentlemen was possibly smaller in the early sixteenth century.
these also derived from the landowning class, and many were eldest sons. However, there was a fair proportion of younger sons and others of professional and middle class origin who had to make their own way upwards, primarily by means of practice, purchase and promotion. Some failed, such as William Barley who was 'snarled with Innumerable troubles'. But as professional members of the propertied class, the lawyers were so eminently acquisitive that they were especially criticised by contemporaries for their avarice. The acquisitiveness of members of the Inns, as well as their attitudes towards religion, the prince, the church and the clergy, conditioned their response to the Reformation.

In 1536 the rebels declared whom they blamed for religious change. As well as several bishops, they cited certain lawyers and administrators. Apparently this attribution was quite common, for during the following year a James Macock of Northamptonshire also spoke against the dissolution by 'men of law'. What contemporaries did not explain, was just how fully the lawyers were involved in the early Reformation.

1 Though Prest's analysis of social origin is for 1590 to 1639 (29-32), the same conclusions probably apply to the earlier period.
2 SP12/123/14, f.12.
3 Ives, 'The Reputation of the Common Lawyers', UEHJ. Cf. Archbishop Parker to William Cecil, 27 August 1563 concerning the proposal of Roger Manwood of the Inner Temple for the founding of Sandwich grammar school (Lansdowne MS 6, f.172): 'This rare example of so godlie foundacion in Mr Manwood a man of his vocation who be comonlie judged rather to employe all ther habilities to their owne posterities then to suche common respectes: And he beinge not without issue (and is dailie like to have more) might have followed the common example in leaving the gaynes of his tyme to his ofspringe. And therfore I wolde wishe his purpose wer favored, bothe for example to others, as also to put awaye the common judgement whiche runneth upon suche as be of his callinge'.
4 LP XI.585,714,1246,1319.
5 SP1/127, f.149 (LP XII.ii.1269).
Amongst the principal offenders were Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Audley. Though Cromwell’s association with Gray’s Inn remains almost as obscure as the man himself, according to Segar’s manuscript he was admitted in 1524, having practised as a solicitor. Since he became an ancient utter-barrister, he possibly attended learning exercises, and certainly maintained connections with senior members. Whereas Cromwell was largely responsible for directing royal policy, Chancellor Audley was more involved in its implementation, with notable loyalty to Cromwell and the King. However, it was as a bencher of the Inner Temple, attorney of the duchy of Lancaster, and groom of the chamber, that he was chosen speaker of the Reformation Parliament in 1529, that revolutionary assembly which included so many prominent lawyers.

Though Cromwell and Audley severed their professional association with the Inns, Christopher Hales apparently continued as a bencher of Gray’s Inn until his death in 1541. As attorney-general from 1529, he

---

1 Segar MS, ff.24,164.
2 LP IX.862, XIV.i.200.
3 Though Segar states in his biographical summary that Cromwell became an ancient in 1534 (f.164), his ancients’ list gives the date of 1528 (f.193v) which seems more accurate.
4 E.g. Christopher Hales, Robert Wrothe and Walter Hendley (below).
7 A5, I.15. Hales wrote to Cromwell from his chambers until at least 1537, possibly because Cromwell kept possession of the Rolls residence (LP XII.11.873; Elton, TRG, 128).
preferred the praemunire charge against Wolsey, investigated the nun of Kent case, and conducted the state trials against Thomas More, John Fisher and Anne Boleyn. Having succeeded Cromwell as master of the rolls in 1536, he continued to work closely with the minister, and was particularly active in Kent, where he dissolved monasteries, refounded Canterbury Cathedral, and gained monastic property.¹

As well as employing the services of legal officers, Cromwell consulted practising lawyers, including Robert Wrothe and Robert Catlin. Until his death in 1535, Wrothe was on good terms with the minister, who gained his best grey gelding and the wardship of his heir. As a bencher of Gray's Inn, attorney of the duchy of Lancaster, and a member of the Reformation Parliament, Wrothe acted on several commissions including the evaluation of ecclesiastical livings in London (1535).² Robert Catlin, a young lawyer of the Middle Temple, evidently worked for John Gostwick and then Cromwell from at least 1536, and was favoured by both. During the dissolution he gave evidence for the crown against the abbot of Woburn, and later gained chantry property and the stewardship of Walsingham.³

Several agents who visited the monasteries and sat on ecclesiastical commissions were common lawyers. Richard Pollard, a general surveyor of crown lands, the King's remembrancer and Cromwell's servant, was admitted to the Middle Temple where he had his office above the gate.⁴ For Richard Southwell, a tutor to Cromwell's son, receiver of augmentations and executive of the court of survey, the only evidence of his membership

¹ LP IV.5634, VI.1148, IX.717,756, XI.17, XV.378; DNB; A5, I.15.
² PCC 36 Hogen, 1535/6; LP IV.6043(2), V.1428,1692, VIII.129(1-2), 291(10), XI.946(6); Somerville, 407-8; Leadam, SC, 202n; A5 I.19.
³ LP XI.381B, XII.i.i.1151 (2-3), XIII.i.1423, ii.1280, XIV.i.913, ii.527; AFO III.283; DPR (1549-51), 403; A5,IV.32.
⁴ MMIB I, ff.26v,34,37v (I.47,59,62); LP VII Ap.37, VIII.538, IX.342, XII-XVII passim; Richardson, Augns, 78,276.
is that he was admitted to Lincoln's Inn in 1526. Other agents were more active members. Henry Polsted, one of Cromwell's legal staff, his deputy steward of augmentations, and a purchaser of ecclesiastical property, became a bencher of the Inner Temple. Robert Southwell, a bencher of the Middle Temple, was Cromwell's servant in 1535. Consequently he was appointed solicitor and then attorney of augmentations, and was admitted to the king's ordinary council, before becoming master of the rolls and a master of requests (1542). As a dissolution commissioner in this reign and the next, he profited greatly from monastic land. Walter Hendley, a solicitor of augmentations in 1537, was a Gray's Inn bencher until his death in 1550. Nevertheless many of the commissioners who dissolved religious foundations and took possession of church goods were more local men. Richard Fates of Lincoln's Inn was under-steward of Cirencester Abbey, a chantry commissioner for Gloucester, and a heavy speculator in dissolved lands.

For Edward's reign, further examples can be mentioned. Before admission to the judiciary and privy council, Edward Montague and Thomas Bromley were benchers respectively of the Middle and Inner Temples. James Hales of Gray's Inn became an influential judge and ecclesiastical

1 CPR (1548-9), 139; Richardson, TCA, 319,365,459; Augns, 12,43,50, 81-2,230; DNB; LIBB III, f.154.
2 LP IX-XIV passim; CPR (1547-8), 280-1, (1548-9), 60,135,282; Elton, TRG, 104-5; Richardson, Augns, 222; TTAB I, f.108v (I.115); A5, III.45.
3 LP XI-XXI passim; CPR (1548-9), 135,142, (1550-3),355; Elton, TRG, 214-5; Richardson, Augns, 42-4; TCA, 319,459; A5, IV.26.
4 LP X,721, XIII-XXI passim, Add. I.i.569; CPR (1547-8),135,157-60, (1548-9),159; Elton, TRG, 215; Richardson, Augns, 81-2,43n,141n,301; A5, I.23.
5 LP XIX.i,1036(p.643), XXI.i.302(30); CPR (1548-9),136; Browne, TRGAS, 203-8; Fuide, Thesis, III.261; A5, II.75. Cf. John Pakington in Wales.
6 Pp101,10 below; A5, IV.108,III.18.
For legal counsel, the government used the professional services of Richard Goodrich and John Gosnold of Gray's Inn, as well as John Cock of the Inner Temple. Goodrich was promoted from the attorneyship in the court of wards to that of augmentations in 1547, followed by various Edwardian commissions concerning heresy, chantries, church goods and ecclesiastical law, with considerable gain from dissolved lands. Gosnold was solicitor of augmentations and an active commissioner in ecclesiastical causes, including proceedings against the conservative bishops, before appointment as solicitor-general in 1553.

For his part, John Cock, a receiver in the court of general surveyors, became a master of requests. He also judged the bishops, dissolved religious foundations, and purchased chantry property.

The extent to which the lawyers mortgaged themselves to the Reformation is better illustrated by the personnel of the courts which dealt largely with ecclesiastical persons and property. John Gostwick, a household officer and frequent auditor, acted as the treasurer of spiritual first fruits and tenths from 1535 until his death in 1545. As Cromwell's confidant and a true servant of the king, he prospered from office and land. Since he entered Gray's Inn quite late in his career, the admission was probably honorific.


2 Sagar MS, f.35; Machyn, 283; LP XXI passim; CPR (1548-53) passim; APC III.368-9, 382, IV.46, 51, 125; Richardson, Augns, 141, 155, 384-6.


4 LP XXI.i. Ap.13, XXI.i.302(30); APC II.410, III.397, 436-7; CPR (1548-9), 135, (1549-51), 223, (1550-3), 353, (1553), 93, 413; A5, III.31.

5 LP VI-XX passim; Finberg; Richardson, TCA, 337-41.
Baker, who joined the chancellorship of the newly founded court of first fruits and tenths with that of the exchequer in 1540, was one of the most influential benchers of the Inner Temple until his death in 1558. As a member of the Reformation Parliament, recorder of London and solicitor-general, he had already proved his loyalty. Under his leadership, the first Edwardian parliament dissolved the chantries and passed the Act of Uniformity.1 John Carrell, attorney of the same court from 1540 to 1543 and then the duchy of Lancaster,2 followed by Robert Chidley,3 were also prominent benchers of the Inner Temple. Of the court for the general survey of crown lands, Richard Pollard the general surveyor, Richard Southwell who replaced him in the newly amalgamated court of augmentations and revenues (1547), and John Cock the receiver, have already been noticed. Thomas Moyle, the other general surveyor, and William Stamford the attorney, were both benchers of Gray's Inn who continued in the new court until its dissolution in 1554. For his diligence in surveying various monasteries and acting as a special commissioner, Moyle was well rewarded with monastic property.4 Stamford, who was also employed about the dissolution, became one of the Edwardian commissioners for church goods and canon law reform.5

1 LP IV.6043(2), XI.202(18), XIV-XXI passim; DNB; Manning, Speakers, 196-9; Richardson, Augns, 452-3; Somerville, 408; A5, III.5.

2 LP XVI.580(26), XIX-XX passim, XXI.i.302(30); CPR (1548-9), 137,219, (1550-3), 354; APC III.382,397; Hatfield MS 201, f.66; Abbott, 43-7; Manning, Sussex, 250; Richardson, TCA, 343,489; Simpson, LGR, 97-9; Somerville, 408-9; A5, III.25.

3 LP V.672, XIV.i.763, XVI.494, XVIII.802(41); APC III.397, V.359; Machyn, 26,290; CPR (1553), 417; Leadam, SC, II.199n; A5, III.13.

4 LP XII-XIV passim; APC I.328, III.397; CPR (1550-3), passim; DNB; Richardson, Augns, passim; A5, I.27.

5 LP XVIII-XXI passim; APC III.382; CPR (1550-3), 354, (1553), 417; DNB; Richardson, Augns, 129,258; A5, I.39.
The court which was primarily established to administer the dissolution and was almost exclusively directed by the lawyers was that of augmentations. Between 1536 and 1554 the chancellorship was held successively by Richard Rich, a bencher of the Middle Temple, Edward North, a successful barrister of Lincoln's Inn, and Richard Sackville, a reader of Gray's Inn who migrated to the Inner Temple. Though these lawyers were also privy counsellors, they remained associated with their Inns. All were devoted royal servants who used office and influence to profit from the religious houses. Richard Pollard, Richard Southwell and Thomas Myle were general surveyors and senior officers of the reorganised court. The attorneyship was held successively by John Onley (1536), Robert Southwell (1537), Walter Hendley (1540) and Richard Goodrich (1547). John Onley, a bencher of the Inner Temple, was an established lawyer who owed his promotion to Cromwell and Audley. The solicitorship was also held by members of the Inns. Robert Southwell (1536), Walter Hendley (1537), Nicholas Bacon (1540), and John Gosnold (1547) have already been mentioned. Further down the scale were the regional receivers of augmentations. Leonard Beckwith, the receiver for Yorkshire from 1536 to 1546 and then a councillor in the north, was a bencher of Gray's Inn. John Danaster, an active governor of Lincoln's

1 LP IV.4937, VI.1383(8-9), VIII-XI passim, Add. I.ii.1131; Elton, TRG, 213; DNB; Richardson, Augns, 61-70; A5, IV.12.
2 LP XV-XX passim; Richardson, Augns, 65-6,71,155,189-90; LIBB III, ff.117,161, IV, ff.243,243v,277 (I.203,218,299,304,311).
3 CPR (1548-9), 135; DNB; Richardson, Augns, 189-91,248; A5, I.21, III.51.
4 LP V.1455, XII.ii.1160, Add. I.ii. passim; Elton, TRG, 214-5; Richardson, Augns, 12,42,273; A5, III.15. Southwell and Goodrich have been mentioned above.
5 P.14 regarding Bacon.
6 LP X.721, XI-XXI passim; APC IV.223; CPR (1550-3), 133, (1553), 546,416, (1553-4), 434, (1557-8), 97; Dickens, ER, 223; Reid, 492; Richardson, Augns, 50,58-60; A5, I.33.
Inn, was the receiver for Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire until appointed baron of the exchequer in 1538. In Surrey and Sussex John Mores of the Inner Temple bench was receiver from 1536 to 1540. For administration of the dissolved lands, Henry Polsted of the Inner Temple was Cromwell's deputy-steward north of the Trent. On his master's attainder in 1540, he was succeeded by John Lucas, the deputy to Audley until 1544 and a bencher of the same Inn. During Edward's reign Lucas was another of the crown's legal servants, a master of requests, and a commissioner for causes including church goods and canon law. Similarly Nicholas Hare, a prominent governor of the Inner Temple until his death, was the duke of Norfolk's deputy south of the Trent. As a speaker of parliament (1539) and a hard-working master of requests, he too was a diligent royal servant. Other lawyers, such as Thomas Denton, and William Whorwood of the Middle Temple, were employed as stewards for individual monasteries. Needless to say, most were efficient agents of the dissolution and adherents to the royal supremacy who enriched themselves at the expense of the religious houses.

Nevertheless there were some signs of reluctance. Sir Anthony Fitzherbert, a conservative judge of common pleas, reportedly bound his children never to deal in monastic lands. A similar attitude was taken

1 LP IX.4, XIII passim, XIV.i.290(1),1355, Add. I.i.1185,1218; Richardson, Augns, 49,81-2,290; Somerville, 455; A5, II.4.
2 LP VII.15,22,622,1090, XII.i.744,829, ii.67, XIV.ii passim, XV.840; Richardson, Augns, 50; A5, III.8.
3 LP XII.ii.1160, XVII.258(f.39), XIX.i.442(6), XXI.i.836; CPR (1547-8), 317-8, (1550-3), 50,353,354,391-2, (1553), 226,434,416; APC I.464, III.138,273,382,397,436-7; Richardson, Augns, 222-3,494; A5, III.30.
4 LP IV.6043(2),6510, XIV.i.651(22), XV-XXI passim; APC I.176; DNB; Richardson, Augns, 494; A5, III.16.
5 P. 14 above; A5, IV.37.
6 LP XVII.258; A5, IV.23.
7 Gillow, II.276-7. Cf. Elton, PP, 32-3 regarding Fitzherbert's speech against heresy, 1534.
by William Roper, who was a bencher of Lincoln's Inn. John More was questioned by Cromwell for consulting Bishop Gardiner about the binding force of the Act of Supremacy. He not only showed that he had some difficulty in reconciling his own conscience, but also that this issue was 'soche spoken of in the parliament house and taken amongst many there to be a doubt'. Some lawyers were also accused of disaffection. In 1536 two 'men of law' were stated to have withheld information of treasonable speech against the dissolution. In the following year Francis Brown, a bencher of Gray's Inn, was imprisoned on a charge of treasonous words.

These accusations were possibly exaggerated and even false. Yet there were members of the Inns who rebelled against the government. In March 1537 Thomas Moyne, the recorder of Lincoln and a bencher of the Inner Temple, was hanged for leading a rebel band during the Lincolnshire insurrection (1536). In Yorkshire Robert Chaloner, a bencher of Gray's Inn and a councillor in the north, surrendered Pontefract Castle to the pilgrims, took their oath, and became a leader of the revolt. But he was included in the re-established council of 1537. William Stapleton was a member of the same Inn who had been about to return for Michaelmas term when he was made a captain of the commons. Shortly before the

1 Pp. 26, 339. below; A5, II.15.
2 SP1/92, ff. 68-71 (LP VIII.592(3).
3 SP1/104, f. 300 (LP X.1264). Possibly James Hadley, a Middle Temple bencher (A5, IV.10), and Guy Crayford, a governor of Lincoln's Inn (A5, II.6).
4 SP1/122, f. 186 (LP XII.ii.196); LP XVII.1154(20); Elton, PP, 350-1; A5, I.10. The identification is proved by his will, which mentions Rutland, Gray's Inn and his son Anthony (POC 6 Spert, 1541/2).
5 Lincoln City Minute Book, II/1/1/1, ff. 224v, 254, 258v; Wriothesley, I.61; LP XI-XII passim; Dodds, I.97, 100, 127, II.150-2; A5, III.22.
6 LP VIII.754, X.721, XI-XXI passim, Add. I.i. passim; CPR (1547-8), 92, 130, (1548-9), 136; Reid, 137-41, 150-1, 252; A5, I.11.
7 LP XX.i.392; Dodds, I.50, 146-8, 151-63, 270.
rebellion he had dined with Anthony Curtis, another member of Gray’s Inn who acted as the messenger between Lincolnshire and the north. But the chief renegade was one-eyed Robert Aske, a friend of Stapleton, a relative of Curtis, and a practising lawyer of their common Inn. He had been en route to London for the term when he became involved. For his treason he suffered the extreme penalty.

How much passed between these men beforehand is not known. Their actions probably derived more from circumstance than conspiracy. Nevertheless their cases suggest that there were members of the Inns who opposed the supremacy, dissolution and innovation, in thought if not in deed. In comparison with those who served government policy, or at least acquiesced, they were no doubt a minority. But whether the lawyers who accepted the supremacy and profited from the dissolution also adopted the new religion, is a different matter altogether.

Situated between London and Westminster, with ready access along the river, the Inns were receptive to whatever was in the wind. From parliament, palace, St Paul’s, city, court and country, the lawyers returned to their chambers with any item of gossip, every tidbit of news, all the fads of the day. Not for them the solitude of a rural university or the isolation of a country house. Instead, the termly round of consultation, cases, argument, exercises and ceremony. Always activity and communication.

1 Segar MS, f.23v; LP XI.827(2),842(3),996,1104,1120, XII.i.392,581,591; Dodds, I.79-80,288-9, II.252.

2 Segar MS, f.7; LP, XI passim, XII.i.900-1,1224; Hall, II.277,279; Wriothesley, I.57,63,65; Dickens, TC, 98-100; Dodds, I.49-55; Notes and Queries, ser. XI, iii(1911), 441-2; Reid, 133; DNB.
Yet the Inns developed an existence of their own. They were not of the city, but were on the fringe, where they maintained their own ritual, tempo and *esprit de corps*. During term and certain vacations, most members lived, worked and worshipped in a kind of legal ghetto centred on Chancery Lane. Within small societies of like-minded gentlemen, where everyone was well known, members continued former associations, found new friends and shared common interests.

The character of individual members was largely formed beforehand. They were admitted from all over England, Wales and even Ireland, some straight from home with their tutor, others with or without a degree from university, a few with fellowships, several already in office or service, and many commencing at an Inn of Chancery before advancing to a superior Inn. But most were youths aged between sixteen and twenty, who had their first taste of manhood in a novel world of diverse people, strange sights and stimulating ideas. That was why young John Petre paid sixpence 'to one that brought me up to the toppe of Pawles Steple' when he was first admitted to the Middle Temple (1567).

Therefore it is not remarkable that the Inns were receptive to religious influences of the early Reformation. Already John Brocket of Lincoln's Inn had cast down 'Pety John' in the chapel during mass (1512).

---

1 Prest, 10-16 regarding residence and attendance during the later period. Many senior members also kept households in London and Middlesex.

2 P.112 for numbers at the Inns.

3 Prest 32-7. The Irish contingent deserves better treatment than given by Bedwell or Prest.

4 Knafia in Slavin, TMI, 233-64.

5 Prest, 129.

6 Prest, 9.

7 The accounts of John Petre, son of Sir William, at the Middle Temple, 1567-1570 (Essex RO. D/DP, A1?).

8 LIBE III, ff.85,186 (1.188,203).
His isolated case and the later antipathy of James Bainham towards Becket (1531), suggest that Lollardy had some belated influence at the Inns.¹

More pervasive than these outbursts, were the concepts of Christian humanism which had infiltrated the universities and the city itself.² The ideals of a coherent education, a purified church and a devout clergy were absorbed into the religious philosophy and anticlerical outlook of the lawyers. This process is reflected in the proposals for reform of upper-class education by the anonymous Middle Templar and in the reports of Denton, Bacon and Cary.³ Another indicator is the will of Randall Cholmley, a bencher of Lincoln's Inn and recorder of London before promotion to serjeant-at-law in 1559. He particularly requested that Sir William Chester, a prominent merchant and later mayor of London, be given 'all the bookes of Erasmus which he gave me and that which I boughte also of Erasmus writinge'.⁴

Needless to say, the exemplar of these ideals was Thomas More, the son of a conservative judge, a successful lawyer and a governor of Lincoln's Inn. From 1496 until at least 1517 when he entered the royal service, More was a member of his Inn, excepting four years of spiritual exercise at the Charterhouse (1499-1503). After this digression he became a member of parliament in 1504 and was married a year later. According to his son-in-law, he thereafter applied himself to his profession, 'never the more discontynewinge his study of the lawe at Lyncolnes Inne but applieng still the same, until he was called to the bench, and had read there twice', in 1511 and 1515. Outside of the Inn

---

¹ P.137 below.
² McConica, 76,92,104-5,124-5; Clebsch, 257; Porter, chs 2-3; Kearney, 22-3.
³ Pp.11-19 above.
⁴ PCC 23 Chayre, 1563; A5, II.36; DNB (Chester).
he was under-sheriff of London from 1510 to 1518, when he was admitted to the King’s council. Though there is little to distinguish his early career from that of other prominent lawyers, from university years he also developed an enthusiasm for the new learning and a critical attitude towards church and society which led to his intimacy with the leading exponents of Christian humanism. As a young law student he first became the friend of Erasmus; he wrote Utopia while he was a bencher (1516).

More’s professional career and his humanist practice went hand in hand.1 If that were all, More could be dismissed as a flash in the pan. But a man of his quality naturally attracted others. His circle of relatives, friends and scholars has been considered elsewhere.2 Nevertheless the connection between this circle and the Inns has hardly been mentioned.

Thomas Elyot, the son of a judge himself and a Middle Templar until at least 1521, was one of More’s friends from about 1510 to 1530. For his humanist classic on upper-class education, he drew on the inspiration of his friend and the works of ‘the famous Erasmus’. As well as encouraging his prospective governor to study the bible, Elyot was critical of the way in which children were raised in superstitious practices.3

John Rastell, the lawyer-printer who was so eager for

1 Roper; Harpsfield; Ro. Ba., ‘The Life and Death of Sir Thomas More’, Bodleian MS Add. A.112; Chambers; Jones, 27-8; McConica, 36-42, 51-3; Schoeck, UTQ; DNB; A5, II.115. Schoeck’s evidence for More’s continuation at Lincoln’s Inn after 1517 or 1518 is doubtful. The ‘More’ who was master of the revels in 1528-9 was probably not the chancellor, and it was not uncommon for dignitaries to attend readings and ceremonies after they had ceased to play any active role in the government of their Inns.

2 Reed; Chambers.

3 Ch. I; MTMB I, ff.18, 40v (I.34, 68); Chambers, 275; Elton, BB, 2, 14; Elyot, Bock I, ch. 4 (pp.30-1), II (pp.73, 94-5); Lehmburg, Elyot, 14-20, 166-7; McConica, 121-3, 196, 198-9.
reform in the 1530's, was formerly connected with More's father. Before
1504 he married Thomas More's sister, and was thereafter a member of the
family circle. His son William entered the printing business before
1529, when he began working on his own. Though he was not of More's
household, he became closely attached to the lawyer and married the
daughter of John Clement, one of More's distinguished disciples(126,59),(859,114). Such
was the family influence that Rastell not only published legal collections
and contemporary plays, but also the controversial works of his mentor.
Having entered the More family Inn in 1532, he discontinued publishing
when the former chancellor was in trouble (1534), and devoted himself to
the law with such success that he later became a bencher of Lincoln's Inn
and a Marian judge. Yet Rastell was not simply a practitioner. When
his books were impounded in 1563, only half were legal texts.
Significantly enough, the remainder included a bible on parchment, a
French testament, a Greek dictionary (probably Elyot's), a Greek psalter
and Erasmus' new testament in Latin and Greek. One of his fellows at
Lincoln's Inn was William Roper, a prothonotary of the king's bench from
1523, an associate bencher from 1535 and a most influential governor for
twenty-five years. Since his father, John Roper, was a bencher of the
Inn and a friend of John More, William entered Thomas More's household
at about the same time as he was admitted to the Inn. The family
connection was strengthened in 1521 when he married Margaret More, an
accomplished scholar herself, a later translator of Erasmus, and her
father's darling. At Lincoln's Inn, Roper experienced a similar
spiritual crisis to that of his father-in-law, from which he was
eventually restored to the catholic faith by More's influence.

1 P.128 below.

2 LP VII.149; CPR (1555-7), 281-2, (1557-8), 457, (1558-60), 65;
CSPD (1547-80), 107; Wriothesley, II.34; Chambers, 29-34; DNB;
McConica, 128,131,133,271-3,285; Reed, ch.III; Schoeck, ND;
AS, II.29.
Consequently his biographical sketch reflects his acceptance of the philosophy and devotion of his father-in-law.\(^1\) For the description of More's trial, Roper relied on the eye-witness report of Richard Heywood, another member of the Inn who later shared his prothonotaryship and chambers. John Heywood, the brother whose plays were published by William Rastell, married the printer's sister and also moved in the More family circle.\(^2\) A closer kinsman was John Pilbarough, a contemporary of Roper at Lincoln's Inn and his brother-in-law. Pilbarough's kinship, his legal association and a later treatise indicate that he was also influenced by the More connection.\(^3\)

In the 1530's, when More's execution and the royal reformation meant the defeat of christian humanism as a reform programme, these lawyers were forced to take their stand. William Roper stayed at Lincoln's Inn, an uncomfortable catholic until his death in 1578. William Rastell, who abandoned printing for the law, found that he could not compromise with protestant policy, and twice went into exile. Thomas Elyot attached himself to Cromwell, accepted the supremacy and dissolved Oxfordshire monasteries. Yet he was suspected of conservative sympathies and could not fully commit himself to the new order. On the other hand, John Rastell and John Pilbarough put their confidence in Cromwell, as the one who could refashion church and commonwealth in accordance with their ideals.

Considering Cromwell's religious sympathies, his legal connections and the preferment which he dispensed, it is not remarkable that his policies attracted the support of literary lawyers.\(^4\) Though Christopher

---

\(^1\) LP IV.6043(2), VII.287,576,5924; Chambers, 174,177-8; Harpsfield, 3-6,78,83-90,93; Roper; Somerville, 431-2; DNB; A5, II.15.

\(^2\) Reed, 32-3; Chambers, 33,275.

\(^3\) P.129 below.

\(^4\) Elton, RR, chs II-III.
St German, an ancient barrister of the Middle Temple, wrote independently, his treatises belittled clerical privilege while justifying the royal supremacy and parliamentary jurisdiction. Richard Taverner, who studied law in the early 1530's and was a member of the Inner Temple until at least 1561, appealed to Cromwell for assistance (1532). Consequently he secured employment as one of the minister's scholars, and published several reformed works, including a revised version of the Matthew Bible (1539). Other appeals to Cromwell were not so successful. John Rastell drafted various schemes for approval, ranging from legal reform to free religious literature. As he informed the minister, he also devoted his publishing to 'compiling diverse books concernynge the fortherauns of the Kyngs causes and oppressing of the Popes usurpyd sactoricitie, and thereby gretly hyndered myn own bysynes'. Despite his attachment to Cromwell and the royal cause, he apparently died in poverty (1536). Likewise John Parkins, the barrister who poured out plans for the reorganisation of universities, secularisation of ecclesiastical property and punishment of rebels, seems to have gained little reward for his verbosity.

For these men, law was secondary to their zeal for reform. In fact their association with the Inns probably became quite nominal. There were two lawyers, however, who made their contribution as professional members.

1 MTAR, I.3; MTMB I, ff.1v,20 (I.2,37); LP VII.1008, XII.i.1151(2), XIV.i.1349; Baumer, Kingship, passim, AHR; DNB; Elton, PP, 173-4, RR, 74-6; McConica, 112. As the St German who corresponded with Cromwell in 1539 mentioned that he had left the Middle Temple some time before, he can surely be identified as the barrister of the Middle Temple records.

2 SPL/73, ff.143,145; ITAB I, ff.109v,130,157v (I.116,169,213); DNB; Dickens, TC, 86,120-1; Elton, RR, 61-2; McConica, passim; Zeeveld, passim.

3 MTMB I, f.1v (I.2); Ellis, Letters, ser.III.i.308-12; Elton, RR, 62-3, 139,144-5; Reed, ch.1; DNB. The only identifiable Rastell appears to have been a barrister of the Middle Temple (1501), and not of Lincoln's Inn.

4 SPL/115, ff.31-2,95-102,107-12 (LP XII.i.211,261-70); Elton, SCS, ch.1.
Edward Hall was no doubt a scholar, a parliamentarian and a friend of Cromwell's; but above all he was a lawyer. After some years in Cambridge, he spent the rest of his life at Gray's Inn, where he read in 1534 and again in 1541. He was not only a prominent bencher and a practising lawyer, but also a busy legal official of London. After two years as common serjeant, he was elected an under-sheriff in 1534, and in the following year he became the secondary of a compter. Hall died in 1547, probably in his late forties and apparently possessing little more than the contents of his chamber at Gray's Inn. But that contained an incomplete manuscript of his 'cronycle late made' which he bequeathed to Richard Grafton the printer. This work, which was published in 1548, was hardly a piece of official propaganda. Yet Hall was so enthralled by his King that he provided historical justification for Henrician policy, particularly the royal supremacy.¹

The other lawyer was John Pilbarough, a double reader and governor of Lincoln's Inn, who became baron of the exchequer only two years before his death in 1547.² Seven years previously, a hitherto unidentified John Pilbarough had published a treatise entitled A Commemoration of the inestimable Graces and Benefits of God, dedicated to Cromwell by his 'humble and faythfull servant'.³ That this author was the lawyer, and not simply a country gentleman of Essex,⁴ is evident from a letter of

¹ LP IV.6043(2); SP1/77, ff.126,127 (LP VI.741,742); LP VI.910, Add. T.i.663; London Chronicle, 7,10; PCC 36 Alen, 1546/7; Elton, RR. 16; Al. Cantab.; DNB; A5, I.28.
² LIBS IV, f.180 (I.281); LP XXI.i.836; PCC 2 Populwell, 1546/8; Foss, V.317; A5, II.11.
³ SEC 20521. I am indebted to St John's College, Cambridge, for allowing me to see this rare tract (A.16.17.2). For his theme, Pilbarough uses the song of Zachary or Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist (Luke 1:68-79).
⁴ McConica's account is marred by other inaccuracies (92-3). This tract can hardly be termed a pietistic work, nor is it the only record of Pilbarough's bond with Cromwell.
November 1539 by Jane Roper to the minister. Hearing that the King was soon to marry Anne of Cleves, she urged him to appoint Pilbarough as the Queen's attorney. In passing she referred to her son-in-law as 'your servant'.

Like so many Henrician tracts, this work has few redeeming graces. Taking the song of Zacharias as his pattern, Pilbarough reiterated a single theme throughout twenty-eight effusive pages. 'Our godly Josiahs', the 'holy enoynted, immediate minyster and vicar', had received 'the boke of the law of god' from the hands of Cromwell, 'his right vertuous scrive Saphan'. Even as John the Baptist, the King went ahead 'declaring the true difference betwene the very ryght and pryncypall thynges perteynynge to our salvation, and thaccidentall laudable ceremonies and rites, not perteynynge necessarly to our salvation'. Such was the grace of God, that four hundred years of ignorance, darkness, danger and thraldom were dispelled by this 'specyal visytation and redemption, through the light of goddes most holy worde'. Gone was the usurped authority of the pope who 'hath long dissumuled with us, foodynge us forthe with vanities: As pardons, pilgrimagis, bulls never right calved, supersticions, counterfeit relygion, feyned relyques, and suche other innumerable sort of trashes, haberdashery ware, and all for money'. In place of this 'pope holy relygion', God had mercifully provided the English nation with the true knowledge and understanding of salvation through Christ, 'the only remytter and pardoner of sinne'. For such spiritual enlightenement and the restoration of true government it behoved God's peculiar people to praise Him and obey the King, 'beinge repentant and detestyng that we have ben so longe mysbelevyng of the word of god, shewed and set forthe unto us by goddis holy doctours and prechers, whom the Sathan of Rome hath dyvellishly tormented, burnt and slayne, to kepe us faithles, and make us dumbe, that we shulde not blowe out his errours and abuses, nor

1 SF1/154, f.172 (LP XIV.ii.529). Robert Chidley obtained the post (p.118 above.).
kings and temporal rulers shulde be lerned of their godly auctorities over their subiectes (whyche the same Sathan had usurpid').

The text might suggest that Pilbarough was one of Cromwell's inner circle of propagandists.\(^1\) It came from the press of Thomas Berthelet, the King's printer, and the dedication referred to the minister as one whom the author had always esteemed as 'a gracious favorer of all honest and holy purposes, and my very good lorde'. Yet Cromwell was asked to amend 'the grosse handlynge of so fyne a matter'. Furthermore the author's name had been listed in Cromwell's papers as one of those who was not to be allowed in the minister's household without cause or command (1538).\(^2\) Therefore the treatise was more likely written independently, but sent to Cromwell for approval and promotion. Unfortunately for the lawyer, his patron hardly survived its publication.

As exponents of government policy, these lawyers adapted humanist tools and principles to the Henrician context. In particular, Taverner, Rastell and Pilbarough expressed confidence in the official assumption that the church could be renewed through the universal application of scripture. Despite their zeal, the Henricians also failed, and the Reformation faltered. In the meantime the initiative at the Inns passed from moderate reformers to doctrinaire protestants.

With the increasing circulation of lutheran books during the 1520's,\(^3\) it is not surprising that the lawyers assimilated new doctrine. Judging by Nicholas Harpsfield's account, William Roper was one of the earliest devotees before he was rescued by Thomas More.\(^4\) Like Luther himself, his

---
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religious discomfort originated in 'a scruple of his own conscience'. He too wearied himself with immoderate fasting and many prayers. However his spiritual plight and intellectual curiosity prompted him to obtain Luther's writings, which first became available in 1519. By 1521 he was 'fully persuaded that faith onely did justifie, that the workes of man did nothing profite, and that if man could once beleive that our Saviour Christe shedd his pretious bloud and dyed on the cross for our sinnes, the same onely beleefe should be sufficient for our salvation. Then thought he that all the ceremonies and Sacramentes in Christes Churche were very vaine'. Such was the convert's fervour that he was not content to keep it secret, but thirsted very sore to publishe his newe doctrine and divulge it, and thought himself very able so to doo, and it were even at Paules Crosse'. Estranged from his family and the church, the young law student spent Sunday poring over his Lutheran bible and associated with the heretical merchants of London. In their company he was convented before Cardinal Wolsey, who merely discharged him with 'a friendly warning' because of his relationship to More. Though there is no sign of activity at Lincoln's Inn, where he obtained a chamber and study in February 1521, much of his open talk was no doubt heard by fellow students.

Another young member who crossed Wolsey's path was Simon Fishe, whose escapade attracted the attention of John Foxe. According to his account, a play was written for Gray's Inn by Master Roo, who included some material against the cardinal. When none dared play the part, Fishe volunteered, with such consequences that he was forced to flee

\[1\] LIBB III, f.100 (I,198).
overseas to Tyndale. This interpretation, which has been swallowed whole by historians, suggests that Wolsey was deliberately insulted for reason of religion. But Edward Hall tells a very different tale. He summarizes the play, correctly assigns it to Christmas 1526 and gives John Roo his proper status of serjeant-at-law. Contrary to Foxe, he mentions no religious connotation, does not even refer to Fishe, and explicitly denies that the chancellor was even satirised.

As Hall was then a barrister of Gray’s Inn and evidently an eye-witness, his interpretation should be more reliable than the other, which was written by an outsider thirty years after the event. Moreover the

1 ‘The authority of the bishop of Rome, and the glory of his cardinals were not so high, but such as had fresh wits, sparkled with God’s grace, began to espy Christ from Antichrist; that is true sincerity from counterfeit religion: in the number of whom was the said Master Simon Fish, a gentleman of Gray’s Inn. It happened the first year that this gentleman came to London to dwell, which was about A.D. 1525, that there was a certain play or interlude made by one Master Roo, of the same inn, a gentleman, in which play partly was matter against cardinal Wolsey; and when none durst take upon them to play that part which touched the said cardinal, this aforesaid Master Fish took upon him to do it. Hereupon great displeasure ensued against him, upon the cardinal’s part insomuch that he, being pursued by the said cardinal the same night this tragedy was played, was compelled by force to void his own house, and so fled over the sea to Tyndale’ (Foxe, IV.656-7). There is no apparent admission record for Fishe, though the family is listed for 1587 to 1674 (Segar MS f.31).

2 E.g. Clebsch, 241; DNB.

3 ‘This Christmas was a goodly disguising plaied at Greis inne, which was compiled for the moste part, by master Jhon Roo, serjant at the law xx. yere past, and long before the Cardinall had any authoritie, the effecte of the plaie was, that lord governaunce was ruled by dissipation and negligence, by whose misgovernance and evil order lady Publicke wele was put from governaunce; which caused Rumor Populi, Inward grudge and disdain of wanton sovereigntie to ryse with a great multitude, to expell negligence and dissipation, and to restore Publike welth again to her estate, which was so done. This plaie was so set furth with riche and costly apparell, with strange divises of Maskes and Morishes that it was highly praised of all menne, sawynge of the Cardinall, which imagined that the plaie had bene devisd of hym, and in a greate furie sent for the said master Roo, and take from hym his Coyfe, and sent hym to the Flete, and after he sent for the young gentlemen, that plaied in the plaie, and them hyghly rebuked and threatened, and sent one of them called Thomas Royle of Kent to the Flete, but by the meanes of frendes Master Roo and he were delivered at last. This plaie sore displeased the Cardinall, and yet it was never meante to hym, as you have harde, wherefore many wysemen grudged to see hym take it so hartely, and ever the Cardinall saied that the kyng was hyghly displeased with it, and spake nothyng of hymselfe’ (Hall II.79).
same attitude was taken by Archbishop Warham, who heard of the incident from Henry Gold, his chaplain. In reply he regretted 'that such a matter of play should be taken in earnest'. Furthermore two of the offenders who were imprisoned do not look like radicals. John Roo had been a serjeant for sixteen years, and Thomas Moyle later proved himself to be a circumspect royal servant. Therefore Foxe was probably wrong to suggest that part of the play attacked Wolsey personally, an action which would not have been tolerated by senior members of the Inn. What Roo apparently presented was a Tudor spectacle which personified the evils of any misgoverned commonwealth.

On the other hand, Hall had little sympathy for the cardinal, while favouring his fellows including Moyle, who was his exact contemporary at the Inn. Moreover Foxe stated that his information derived from Mrs Fishe, whose husband later declared the chief cause of clerical evils to be that the lord chancellor was always an ecclesiastic, 'who hath ever such an inordinate love unto his own kingdom, that he will maintain that, though all the temporal kingdoms and commonwealths of the world should therefore utterly be undone'. In fact, Fishe was an outright extremist who had obtained early copies of Tyndale's new testament from Richard Herman, an Antwerp merchant, and was distributing them in bulk by late 1526. Though there is no evidence of this activity at Gray's Inn

1 SPL/40, f. 25 (LP IV. 2854).
2 Roo joined with Cromwell and others for leadmining in Devon (1533) and was later a councillor in the west (1539). He continued as a serjeant-at-law until at least 1545 (LP VI. 1176, 1457, XIV. i. 743, XX passim).
3 Pp. 118, 133 above, 161 below.
4 A5, I. 27, 28.
5 'A Supplicacyon for the Beggers', 1528/9 (Foxe, IV. 664).
6 Robert Necton's confession, LP IV. 4030, in Slavin, HREE, 69-72 and Strype, Memorials, i. ii. 65-9. It seems likely that Fishe went into hiding more for his bookselling than his part in the play.
in the light of his subsequent association with Tyndale and the publication of his rabidly anticlerical *Suplicacyon*, he was obviously fully committed to spreading the protestant word. When he had the opportunity to act before the members and their distinguished guests, he probably interpreted the play in accordance with his own ideology. Whereas Hall and other more conservative lawyers could accept the interlude as an inoffensive mixture of entertainment and philosophy, Fishe and Wolsey himself regarded it as a political satire on the cardinal's misgovernment. Since other members had apparently refused to take part for this very reason, those who shared Fishe's sentiments no doubt interpreted the play in the same way. Thus the episode reflects the growth of religious radicalism within the Inn, as well as the attempt by one member to score a protestant point.

Though it is doubtful whether Fishe went overseas before early 1528, he apparently left Gray's Inn and employed himself in the protestant cause until summer 1530, when he died of the plague. In London he associated with other radicals evidently including James Bainham, a practising lawyer of the Temple. Not content with merely assisting the godly, Bainham became a member of the secret congregation

---


2 The following details are mainly from Foxe, who based his account on the London episcopal registers (IV.697-705). He described Bainham as 'a man of virtuous disposition and godly conversation, mightily addicted to prayer, an earnest reader of Scriptures, a great maintainer of the godly, a visitor of the prisoners, liberal to scholars, very merciful to his clients, using equity and justice to the poor, very diligent in giving counsel to all the needy, widows, fatherless and afflicted, without money or reward; briefly a singular example to all lawyers'. Since a 'Baynam' is mentioned for the Inner Temple (1519-22), but not the Middle house, Foxe probably confused the Inns. Interestingly enough, this Baynam was readmitted to the Inner Temple in 1522 by royal command, following unspecified offences in the Temple (ITAB I, ff.43,75r (1.45,68).
which met in a warehouse on Bow Lane. Furthermore he quickly married widow Fishe, who had connived at her former husband's trafficking, and would not permit friars into her house unless they said their gospels in English.\footnote{Foxe, IV, 658.} Therefore it is not surprising that Bainham was arrested late in 1531 during a campaign against heretics.\footnote{TRP, I, 181-2, 193-7; LP, V, 1094; Hall, II, 177-8; Grey Friars Chronicle, 35, 36; Clebsch, 258-61.} More remarkable is the role of the chancellor, whom the lawyer later accused of being both his accuser and his judge. For Sir Thomas More was responsible for having Bainham arrested at the Temple, for confining him at Chelsea and for racking him in the Tower. These proceedings may be explained partly by the fact that More, as chancellor, had temporal oversight of all the Inns. But the action was also related to the nature of Bainham's offence. According to Foxe, 'he would not accuse the gentlemen of the Temple of his acquaintance, nor would show where his books lay: and because his wife denied them to be at his house, she was sent to the Fleet, and their goods confiscated'. Apparently More had good reason to suspect that heresy at the Temple had spread beyond Bainham. He also knew that the lawyer possessed illegal books. Possibly these belonged to Bainham's private collection; but considering his connections and concealment, they might well have been for circulation. Therefore More used his authority in order to stamp out heresy at the Temple.\footnote{Chambers defends More's actions against heretics (262-70).}

As the chancellor failed to elicit further information, in December 1531 Bishop Stokesley examined Bainham at Chelsea concerning his doctrine. On the next day the lawyer submitted and was transferred to a London prison. In February he abjured before the consistory court, did penance
at St Paul's with a faggot on his shoulder, and was dismissed. Such was his disquiet that within a month he recanted his recantation before the Bow Lane congregation and from his pew at St Austin's. In April he was apprehended, examined by the chancellor as well as the vicar-general, sentenced as a relapsed heretic, and burnt.¹

In this tragedy, an arrant heretic was removed from the Temple. Perhaps many legal souls were saved. But More could hardly eradicate the new religion. So many different strands were matted together, as Bainham himself illustrates. Being the son of an enlightened Gloucestershire knight, he had been trained in humanist learning. From 'an olde history' he accepted the Lollard tradition that Becket was no saint, but 'a Traitor, and was damned in hell yf he repented not'.²

During his study of Latin and Greek literature, he acquired the tools for a critical understanding of scripture, which he maintained was the only word of God. Consequently he was convinced that 'the truth of holy Scripture was never, these eight hundred years past, so plainly and expressly declared unto the people, as it hath been within these six years'. He alluded to Tyndale's new testament, which he believed should be allowed to everyone. But he also mentioned Hugh Latimer and Edward Crome, who had both recanted, as the only clergy who 'preached the word of God sincerely and purely and after the veine of Scripture'. Though preaching and scripture were so germane to Bainham's development, he was also influenced by protestant polemics.³

As he informed the bishop, he

¹ Clebsch, 281-2 and DNB summarise the case in greater detail. Chester questions the reliability of the Foxian MS which describes Latimer's visit to Bainham in Newgate (82-3). That information can be reconciled with Foxe's printed account, but it was repetitious, and hardly complimentary to the martyrs (Harleian MS 422, f.90; LP V, Ap.30; Latimer, 221-4; Strype, Memorials, III.1.372-5).

² Harleian MS 422, f.90v (Latimer, 223). Cf. Foxe IV, 702,705; Davis, 11-12.

³ LP V,1094 and Clebsch, 258-9 refer to the circulation of protestant books at this time.
possessed several illegal texts, including four by Tyndale, one by John Frith and another by George Joye. Therefore Bainham denied the necessity of many traditional beliefs, including celibacy, confession, invocation of saints, transubstantiation, extreme unction, purgatory and prayers for the dead. His church was not a visible body governed by a worldly pope, but an invisible congregation of saints ruled only by the word of God. Thus the case of a single lawyer shows not only that the legal societies were open to a wide variety of religious influences, but also that protestantism reached maturity at the Inns before the royal reformation.

In the 1530's when Henry VIII aroused protestant hopes by eliminating the pope and refashioning the church, the Inns became more susceptible to the new religion. This is reflected in the correspondence of Anthony Wayte, Bishop Sherbourne's steward, who wrote frequently from the Inner Temple to Lord and Lady Lisle at Calais. Though his letters mainly concerned business matters, he also commented on the religious climate of London. In late 1535 he mentioned that there were many preachers, 'but they come not from one Maister for, as yt ys Reported their messages be dyvers'. For this confusion, many blamed Latimer, but Wayte, who was quite traditional in religion, wrote that he preached 'very godly and well'.

---

1 Wayte was admitted in 1533, is mentioned at the Inn until 1540, and died in 1559. (ITAR, 1.41; ITAB I, f.116 (T.126); PCC 26 Chayney, 1558/9; WSHO White Act Book, Cap I/3/0, ff.45,72,88v,92; SP1/81, f.20 (LP VII.99); LP VIII-IX passim).

2 SP3/14, f.14 (LP IX.583). In a following letter Wayte was more explicit: 'We have no newes but that it is preached here that pristes must have wifves, and that we shuld receyve the sacrament of thaultier in the espece [sic] bothe of bred and wyne lyke as the pryst doth, but as concernynge purgatorie some prechith to be trybulytions of thys world, other ponishementes in a nother world, and some saith there is none'. Knowing his man, Lisle thanked him for the news concerning priests, 'wiche I wold a ben glader of xxtie yere gon that I myght a made on prest cockold' (SP3/14, f.731 (LP IX.812(1-2)).
These letters reveal that even conservative members of the Inns attended protestant sermons, were engaged by preaching and were aware of advanced opinion. But for those who progressed beyond awareness to knowledge, scripture remained the key. According to Robert Plumpton, a resident at the Inner Temple, 'the gospel of Christe was never so trowly preached as it is nowe'; but 'the trewe Gospell of God, spoken by the Holy Ghost' was the new testament, the only rule of living by which man might find favour with God. For this reason Plumpton wrote at least two letters in the mid 1530's to his mother in Yorkshire, forwarding a new testament with the bearer, mentioning another which he had evidently sent to his father, and urging her to acquire the requisite knowledge of scripture.¹ To dispel her fears, the young convert guilelessly said, 'I write not this to bring you into anie heresies, but to teache you the cleare light of Goddes doctrine'. Yet the translation which he forwarded, including a much-praised prologue, was by William Tyndale, a decade after the first edition. Plumpton sent this in the firm belief that 'everie man or woman that it shall please God to sende knowledge in the Scriptures is bounde to instructe their brethren in the lovinge of the Gospell'. Whether he extended this doctrine to his fellow students is not known. But obviously he possessed both opportunity and inclination.

Throughout these years of revolutionary idealism and doctrinal confusion, when government policy comprehended many who would otherwise have been treated as heretics, relatively little heed was paid to unorthodoxy. But with the clarification of doctrine from the late 1530's and a shift in the balance of political power, the authorities conducted a campaign against nonconformity, aided by parliament and proclamation.

¹ Plumpton Correspondence, 231-235; Dickens, LPDY, 131-7; ER, 108.
Among those who were presented from St Andrew's parish in 1541, were two young gentlemen of the Inns of Chancery. According to Foxe, 'Master Gallis of Bernard's Inn' was presented 'for withstand ing the curate censing the altars on Corpus Christi even, and saying openly that he did naught'. With his companion, 'Master Pates of David's [or Thavies] Inn', he was also charged with 'vexing the curate in the body of the church, in declaring the king's injunctions and reading the Bishop's Book so that he had much ado to make an end'.

Gallis may be recognised as Richard Gallis, a fellow of King's College before migrating to London. His companion was no doubt Richard Pates, who was later known as 'an aunecyent professor of the gospell'. Both culprits were young men in their mid-twenties. But whereas Gallis apparently discontinued at the Inns, Pates was admitted to Lincoln's Inn later in 1541, and became an important lawyer in Gloucester and Wales. Though Foxe does not record the result of their presentment, their actions indicate that they had adopted advanced beliefs in doctrine and practice.

The authorities were more concerned with those who denied the sacramental teaching of the church. Chief among these was Anne Askew, whose womanly defiance and wretched torture aroused the sympathy of contemporaries and historians alike. But much of the inspiration of this circle derived from John Lascells, a Nottinghamshire gentleman, a sewer of the King's chamber and a member of Furnival's Inn. His

1 Foxe, V.444.
2 Al. Cantab; Cooper, I.561-2. In later years Gallis became mayor of Windsor and an Elizabethan member of parliament.
3 SP12/110, f.23. This incident has been omitted from Browne's biographical article on Pates.
4 P.116 above; A5, II.75.
5 Foxe, V.550; John Louthe, in Narratives of the Reformation, 43; Wriothesley, I.169. On the basis of this evidence, coincidental dating and characterisation, it is most unlikely that the following details refer to any other John Lascells.
refutation of transubstantiation drew on a variety of theological sources ranging from the German reformers to John Frith and Andreas Carlstadt. He had exhibited reformed sympathies for some time. In 1538 he was listed as one of Cromwell's servants, but was not to be permitted in the minister's household without cause or command. Two years later he referred to the fallen councillor as the favourer of 'God's holy word', and advised his companions at the court not to be too rash in maintaining scripture. For if the duke of Norfolk and Bishop Gardiner were given sufficient time, they would overthrow themselves. As these words were passed on to Nicholas Hare, the duke's lawyer, Lascells declared himself to the privy council. In 1541 he further antagonised the conservative faction by informing the archbishop of Queen Catherine Howard's premarital conduct, at whose trial his sister was a principal witness. Finally he was brought before the privy council in May 1546, 'because hym self boosted abrode that he was desirous to be called to the Counsell and he would aswver to the Prynce'. The cause of this bravado was Edward Crome, the popular preacher who had declined to recant an erroneous sermon on Lascells' advice. This time the strategy failed. Under examination Lascells divulged the extent of his heresy. He remained 'mery and cherefull in the Lorde', but for denying the sacrament of the altar he was burnt in July with a priest, a tailor and a woman.

1 Foxe, V. 551-2; Dickens, LPDY 33-4, ER, 269-70.
2 LP XIII.ii.1184(3).
3 LP XVI.101.
4 LP XVI.1320,1334,1336,1430.
5 SP1/218, f.45 (LP XXI.i.790).
6 LP XXI.i.790,823,848,1013.
7 Foxe V. 550; Grey Friars Chronicle, 51; Hall, II.360; Wriothesley, I.169.
Though Lascelles was of Furnival's Inn, there is no record of his legal connections. Nevertheless, he was most likely known to another member of the Inns who also attracted attention in 1546. According to the Grey Friars Chronicle, three other heretics were sentenced but pardoned for the same offence, including Christopher White of the Inner Temple.¹ His mother was Elizabeth Fayrey, a widow at least twice, who had some connection with Thomas Bromley, a former Inner Temple bencher, then a serjeant-at-law.² With the assistance of her son Anthony and Otwell Johnson, a related businessman,³ she continued to run the affairs of her husband, 'a mercer and merchante of the Staple at Calleys'.⁴ As Christopher was raised in a community notorious for its reformed sympathies, he was quite likely baptised into protestantism. If he also associated with radicals such as Lascelles, he was confirmed in heresy. In June 1546, at the height of the campaign against unorthodoxy, the authorities discovered that he had attempted 'an erroneous book'. On finding that he held the contrary opinion of the sacrament, the privy council committed him to Newgate.⁵ Three days later he declared, 'That after the wordys of consecration duly spoken by the preste uppon the host and the same nott sattion, there is not in the sacrement of the auler the very pure ymmortalle body, fleshe and bludd of our Saviour Jesu Criste; but a figure of hit. And that thing that is so consecrated by the preste accordinge to the wordys of Criste, uneaten and put in the

---

¹ Grey Friars Chronicle, 51. The others were Nicholas Shaxton, the bishop of Salisbury who had resigned over the Six Articles' Act, and an obscure Mr Black.

² Mrs Fayrey left Bromley a gold ring by her will (PCC 26 More, 1553/5).

³ The business details are disclosed in the letters of Otwell Johnson to his brother in France (LP XVIII-XXI passim, Add. I.ii.1541).

⁴ John Fayrey's will, PCC 36 Alenger, 1540/1.

⁵ LP XXI.1.1093.
Though Lascells was of Furnival's Inn, there is no record of his legal connections. Nevertheless he was most likely known to another member of the Inns who also attracted attention in 1546. According to the Grey Friars Chronicle, three other heretics were sentenced but pardoned for the same offence, including Christopher White of the Inner Temple.¹ His mother was Elizabeth Fayrey, a widow at least twice, who had some connection with Thomas Bromley, a former Inner Temple bencher, then a serjeant-at-law.² With the assistance of her son Anthony and Otwell Johnson, a related businessman,³ she continued to run the affairs of her husband, 'a mercer and merchaunte of the Staple at Calleys'.⁴

As Christopher was raised in a community notorious for its reformed sympathies, he was quite likely baptised into protestantism. If he also associated with radicals such as Lascells, he was confirmed in heresy.

In June 1546, at the height of the campaign against unorthodoxy, the authorities discovered that he had attempted 'an erroneous book'. On finding that he held the contrary opinion of the sacrament, the privy council committed him to Newgate.⁵ Three days later he declared, 'That after the wordys of consecration duly spoken by the preste uppon the [h]ost and the same natt eatton, there is not in the sacrament of the aulter the very pure ymmortalle body, ffleshe and bludd of our Savyour Jesu Criste; but a figure of hit. And that thing that is so consecrated by the preste accor dinge to the wordys of Criste, uneaten and put in the

---

¹ Grey Friars Chronicle, 51. The others were Nicholas Shaxton, the bishop of Salisbury who had resigned over the Six Articles' Act, and an obscure Mr Black.

² Mrs Fayrey left Bromley a gold ring by her will (PCC 26 More, 1553/5).

³ The business details are disclosed in the letters of Otwell Johnson to his brother in France (LP XVIII-XXI passim, Add. I.ii.1541).

⁴ John Fayrey's will, PCC 36 Alenger, 1540/1.

⁵ LP XXI.i.1093.
pix and reserved there, is not the very pure ymmortalle body of Criste, is only to be receyved in our soules and than it is the body that the holy gost said it shulde be. At his arraignment before Chancellor Wriothesley and the King's council, he confessed his heresy and was sentenced to burn with the others. But according to Otwell Johnson he soon renounced his opinion, possibly under Bromley's influence.

Though there was probably some connection between White and Lascells, there is no indication that they caused controversy amongst the lawyers. But those who were fired with the conviction of their faith were not likely to keep it to themselves, particularly in societies which offered such evangelical opportunity. Though John Louthe, the later archdeacon of Nottinghamshire, was not a member of the Inns, his reminiscences show that he did his best to spread protestant doctrine at Lincoln's Inn. At Winchester and Oxford, where he was influenced by John Philpot, the martyr, and John Frith's book on purgatory, he became a good latinist and an even better heretic. As tutor to Richard Southwell, the illegitimate son of Sir Richard, Louthe accompanied him from Cambridge to Lincoln's Inn, where his pupil was present in late 1546. Louthe was with Lascells on the day before execution; at Smithfield he cried vengeance upon the councillors; during the night he left the bedside of his pupil to confer with William Morice, who was confined to Southwell's

1 Christopher White's pardon, 17 July 1546, Patent roll C66/790, p.5, m.7 (LP XX1.i.1383(71)).

2 Ellis, Letters, ser.II.ii.172. Cf. Wriothesley, I.167. Nothing is known of White's later life, but he possibly died before 1553, when four sons, excluding Christopher, were mentioned in their mother's protestant will.

3 Louthe's career is examined by Merchant, CUL, 147-57, PCODY, 131-6, 308-9.

4 Narratives of the Reformation, 7-8,15,46,55.

5 Ibid., 44-6; DNB (Richard Southwell). Apparently Southwell II was not formally admitted until February 1647 (LILB IV, ff.189,327 (1.323)).
house for religion. But he also discoursed with members of the Inn on the burning issue of the sacrament. Consequently Louthe recorded that a Mr Allington 'confessed to the benchers of Lincoln Inne that I hadd lessoned with hym abowte the sacrament, and namely touchyng the sense of hoc est corpus meum'. When three of them set out to apprehend him, they first sought the goodwill of Sir Richard Southwell, who retorted that he knew no such thing of Louthe, his faithful servant. So Louthe went his heretical way unmolested. In the meantime he ensured that young Richard was 'of good religione'.

The benchers evidently found that certain religious manifestations required their attention. Bainham was taken from the Temple by a serjeant-at-arms, which was only possible by assent of the bench. White's erroneous book was quite likely discovered in his chamber, and the rooms of miscreant members were undoubtedly searched by authority. Louthe was threatened by masters of the bench. These were cases of external significance which required domestic action. At the end of the reign there were also manifestations of a more internal nature which demanded attention.

In midsummer 1546, the members of Lincoln's Inn beheld a most peculiar sight in their hall. Someone had replaced the traditional light of St John with the ridiculous head of a horse. Three members were charged by the benchers. Two who refused to confess were expelled from the house and imprisoned in the Fleet by the chancellor, Thomas Wriothesley, and Sir Roger Cholmley, the chief baron and a former...

1 Narratives, 41, 44-6.
2 No doubt Richard Allington, the usurer (p. 105).
3 Narratives, 46.
bencher. The other culprit, who confessed and made humble suit to the bench, was merely excluded from commons. After inevitable petitions, all were forgiven 'their said lewd and noughtie myddeamenours', and presently remitted.

What looks like a student prank was obviously taken seriously. In fact both the benchers and the member who confessed, agreed that it was done 'in dyspite of the sainte, as yt cowde not by commen presumpcion be otherwyse entendyd, to the very perilouse ensample of other, as yt was evydentlye proved upon Examinacion therof by the confession of the said Eldrington'. Yet Thomas Elrington was hardly good Reformation material. In November following his readmission, he was again put out of commons for 'making a ffrey' on a Mr Ranwyk at the gate, as well as 'hurlyng butter abowght the house and att the saied Ranwykes heade'. In this exploit one of his noble companions was William Smith, who was fined £5 and excluded from commons in 1549 and again in 1550 'for kepying of naughty women in hys chamber'. Another of Elrington's accomplices in both misdeeds was Edward Harrington, who was later suspected of smashing William Roper's window. The other culprit, who refused to confess his part in the horse's head episode, was William Berners, a chamber-fellow of Richard Pates, our earlier curate-baiting friend. Later in November, when 'a byll of pasquillus' or lampoon against the benchers was exhibited

1 P. 169 below; A5, II.l.
2 LIBB IV, f.124.
3 LIBB IV, ff.218v, 236v (I.291,296).
4 LIBB IV, f.239 (I.297).
5 LIBB IV, ff.157v,163; P. above. Berners was probably a son of William, the crown auditor, special commissioner and dissolution agent (LP passim; CPR (1547-60), passim; PCC 6 Welles, 1558; Richardson, Augme, 55-6,221).
at the Inn, four of the ten suspects were Pates, Berners, Elrington and Smith. Pates and Smith denied the charge, but no retraction is recorded for the other two. 1

For this insubordination, youth and high spirits were partly to blame. 2 A further cause was the unrealistic attempt to confine professional opportunity to the benchers. On the advice of the chancellor and judges, the King proclaimed in June 1546 that no person except he hath read in [an inn of] court shall be admitted nor suffered to be a pleader in any of his highness' honorable courts at Westminster unless he be thercunto admitted and appointed by the said Lord Chancellor and two Chief Justices with the advice of two of the benchers and ancients of either of the four houses of court. Even for local assizes and sessions, others could only be appointed by the judges when readers were not available. 3 The failure of this reform was admitted in the following year, when another proclamation permitted all who had been fellows of their Inn for at least eight years to plead in any court except common pleas. 4 As Pates, Elrington and Harrington became barristers, and Smith remained a member until at least 1551, they were not mere sojourners, but students of the law who were excluded from early practice by this reform. 5 But judging by the significance of the horse's head episode, and the coincidence of unrest with the official campaign against heresy, religion was also involved.

1 LIBE IV, f.176 (I.275-6).
2 The five principals were evidently young men who had been admitted in the early 1540's (LIBE IV, ff.124,128v,131,149v,157v).
3 TRP, I.371-2.
4 TRP, I.408-9. The court of common pleas was the traditional precinct of serjeants-at-law.
5 A5, II.75; LIBE IV, ff.203,285,247v (I.287,314). Berners does not appear in the black books after November 1546.
At this time, such insubordination might have been more characteristic of Lincoln's Inn. At the Inner Temple there is little evidence of friction, apart from the act of May 1546 'that the gentilmen of this company schall reforme them selves in ther cutt or disguised apparell, and schall not have longe berdes'. 1 Because of the deficiency of records for the other two houses, nothing can be concluded. However the same cannot be said for the unrest which afflicted the Inns during Queen Mary's reign.

In August 1556 the gentlemen of the Temple openly defied authority. After the lord mayor had dined at the Middle Temple, members of both houses forcibly held down his sword of office until he reached the outer gate. Though fourteen were imprisoned by the privy council and twenty subsequently appeared before the star chamber, punishment was referred to the benchers, who expelled the offenders. 2 It is not clear whether the

1 ITAB I, f.49 (I.142).
2 'This yeare in the moneth of August Sir William Garrard Maior of London (being invited) dined with the Reader in the middle Temple, from whence when the Mayor departed, certaine Gentlemen of the younger sort, as well of that house, as of the inner Temple, by force put and helde downe the sword, before the Maior, till hee came to the utter gate next the streete, for the which fact within few dayes after, the two Readers with all the Companies, of both houses were sent for to the Rolles in chancerie lane, where sate the Marquesse of Winchester, Lord Treasurer, assisted by 11 other of the Queenes privie Councell. These commanded the two Readers, to deliver the names of the principall doers in the foreexpressed acion, the which if they refused to do, themselves should bee committed. Whereupon (consulting a little) they presented the names of twentie, whereof the Lordes committed foureteene to the Flaste, and tocke bondes of the rest to appears in the Starre chamber the first day of the next Tearme: at the which day appearance being made, as well by those committed as the other that were in bondes, through humble intercession of all the heades and chiefes learned men of every Bench and Barre in the foure Innes of Courte, there punishment was referred to the discretions of the Benches of those houses, where the faultes were committed, and so all the rest discharged, which notwithstanding were after for the most part expell'd their houses, till upon great submission, and longe suit, they were restored by degrees and times' (Stow, Chronicle, 330-40). Cf. Grey Friars Chronicle, 97-9: 'Item the xviii day of August the mayor dynned at the rederes denner at the Tempelle, and at the after-none whanne he was goynge the swerde was willed to be borne done in the closter'. The final clause was inserted for 'torne from hym', and the clause 'but the swordberer would not', which had originally been inserted, was deleted. Foss had the wrong year, reader and mayor (V.352). In autumn 1556 the Inner Temple reader was George Wall (A5, III.48).
culprits objected to the mayor himself, or solely to his symbol of magistracy. Nevertheless at least twenty younger members from both houses physically registered their resentment against authority.

As far as the Middle Temple minutes are concerned, nothing untoward occurred at this time. But in November 1556 the Inner Temple parliament recorded that divers gentlemen had been called before the bench during the past reading vacation. For their contemptuous bearing and 'late mysdememors and dysobdyens', eight principals had been imprisoned in the Fleet and expelled from the house. Despite the gravity of their offence, all were remitted after the usual 'humble suite and submission'. Four who can be identified with confidence were committed to the new religion. Thomas Norton, the later playwright, parliament man, and son-in-law of Archbishop Cranmer, was known for his reformed sympathies in Edward's reign. Thomas Copley, the Elizabethan exile, was at this time a convinced protestant. Richard Onslow and Thomas Lucas, who were later called to the bench, were noted protestants early in the next reign. At the same parliament another act asserted the prerogative of benchers to call students to the bar, since the utter barristers had lately expropriated this power. There is no indication that the same eight members were involved. But clearly rebellion was in the air.

1 ITAB I, ff.140v,141 (I.186-7,188).
2 DNB; Camden, Annals, 254-5; Zurich Letters, I.339-42.
3 CSPS (1568-79), 50; Copley, XX-XXI; DNB; Neale, EHC, 177-8.
4 Ch. 7; A5, III.57,74. The other four were Leyson Price, — Wycliffe, — Carpenter and Robert Bedell. Though no names are mentioned for the Middle Temple, John Popham, who was readmitted in November 1546, was quite likely another offender (NTHB II, f.21 (I.107); A5, IV.68).
5 ITAB I, f.141 (I.187-8).
Though little can be learnt of Gray's Inn, at Lincoln's Inn there were also signs of unrest. In 1553 George Haydon was excluded from commons for mocking and irreverent singing at the revels. A year later there was 'a gret fray betwix the Lord Warden's servands of Kent and the Ines of...Gray's inn, Lynkolne's inn, and sum slayn and hurt'.

In 1555 a protestant bencher by the name of James Downes, aided by barrister Middleton, 'toke opon hym at the Benche to be prolocutor for all the gentylmen of the Howse under the Benche, when this order of the Justices was declared unto them to cutt of ther berdes'. Since an act forbidding beards was also passed at the Inner Temple, this order applied to all of the Inns. However, the first set of orders governing apparel was promulgated in June 1557, having been 'ordeyned by an universalle assiente of all the fower houses of Court'. As well as regulating exercises and admissions, they forbade such frivolities as light-coloured garb, double cuffs, feathers, Spanish cloaks, and beards. These orders, which were so obviously directed against the fashions of younger members, were published before the societies and forwarded to the Inns of Chancery. From this evidence it appears that there were considerable differences between benchers and other members during the last Marian years. These were partly matters of age and authority. But once again religion was apparently involved.

1 LIBB IV, f.270v (I.306).
2 Machyn, 65.
3 LIBB IV, f.283v (I.312); A5, II.34; p.174 below.
4 ITAB I, f.137 (I.179).
5 LIBB I, ff.317v-8 (I.320-1); ITAB I, ff.143v-4 (I.192-3); MITB II, f.24 (I.111-2); Prest, 93-4.
During Edward's reign when advanced protestantism became the law of the realm, the new religion consolidated its position at the Inns. Some committed members, such as William Cecil and Thomas Wrothe, were taken into government service. However, their places were filled by others, such as John Bradford, the martyr, and Francis Walsingham, the Elizabethan minister. But with the return of catholic policy and yet another campaign for national orthodoxy, some members went overseas, several joined the rebels, others were caught.

Of the exiles, Thomas Bowyer of the Middle Temple escaped to Frankfort, having endangered himself by warning protestant friends of impending writs. Thomas Copley of the Inner Temple was imprisoned for his parliamentary speech in favour of Elizabeth's inheritance, before leaving England for religious and business reasons (1558). Richard Gripps, who became a member of Knox's congregation, was quite likely a fellow of the same Inn. But most of the identifiable exiles were of Gray's Inn. Francis Walsingham and Roger Carewe, who had only been admitted from university in the early 1550's, left primarily for reason of religion, but had connections with the rebels.

1 Segar MS, ff.19v,167v,192v; DNB; Read, I,24-35. It has apparently escaped notice that Cecil was a professional member. According to Segar, he became a barrister in 1541, the pensioner in 1545, and an ancient utter-barrister in 1547.
2 Garrett, 344-5; Fudge, III.354-5.
3 Bradford and his friend Thomas Sampson, the later divine, were admitted in 1547. He resided at the Temple, but under the influence of Sampson and Latimer, he commenced divinity studies at Cambridge in the following year (ITAB, I.57; ITAB I, f.53v (I.149); Bradford, II.1-21; Chester, 165-6; DNB).
4 Segar MS, f.77v; DNB; Garrett, 319-20; Read, Walsingham, I ch.1.
5 Manning, Sussex, 265-7; A5, IV.81.
6 P.148 above.
7 Segar MS, f.24; Garrett, 120.
8 P.160 ; Segar MS, f.19; Fudge, Thesis, III.64-5; Garrett, 108,104.
Richard Bunny and Thomas Wrothe were older members, who had committed themselves to the Edwardian reformation. As treasurer of Berwick, Bunny was charged with fiddling the accounts and dismissed from office. 1 Wrothe, the chief gentleman of Edward's bedchamber, was involved in Suffolk's conspiracy. 2 Others who became implicated in rebellion, but did not go into exile, were unlikely protestants. John Bowyer was the duke's secretary before entering the Inner Temple. Though he confessed his role in assisting his master, in 1558 he was imprisoned, interrogated again, expelled from his Inn and finally pardoned. 3 A more influential lawyer was John Pollard, a bencher of the Middle Temple and the speaker of Mary's first parliament. For his knowledge of Henry Dudley's conspiracy, he was arrested and indicted, but probably died before further proceedings. 4

Of those who were troubled for religion, Robert Neale of the Inner Temple was committed to the Marshalsea by the privy council 'upon suspicion that he made a lewde booke whiche was founde in his chamber' (1554). The result is not recorded, but Neale reappears in the 1570's, as an imprisoned Inner Templar, demanding justice against an enemy who had persecuted him during two reigns. 5 At Lincoln's Inn, James Dalton, the later bencher and parliamentarian, was expelled in 1558 'for Suspicion

---

1 Segar MS, f.17; LP XXI.i.1538 (f.175v); Garrett, 99-100; Richardson, Augus, 49,262,281.
2 P.154; Garrett, 344-5; Fuidge, Thesis, III.354-5.
3 ITAB I, f.146v (I.198); SP11/3, ff.49-52; SP11/13, ff.59-62; APC VI.331-2, VII.20; CPR (1558-60), 60; IPH II.45.
4 SP1/136, ff.182-3 (LP XIII.i.i.378); LP XVIII-XXI passim; G Hat. MSS, I.126; CPR (1549-51),211-2,228; (1550-3), 7; (1553-4),61; (1554-5), 41, (1555-7), 468,469, (1557-8), 89; FCC 37 Wrastley, 1557; Machyn, 104,148,335; Abbott, 56-7; Loades, 20,212,223,228; DNB; Read, I.107-8; Somervi11e, 432; A5, IV.49; p.189 below.
5 ITAR, I.61; APC V.14, VIII.310,334, IX.82; SP12/48, f.203.
of heresy', but 'upon his reconciliacion and humble submission' to the
bench, he was restored to his chamber and ancieney. The most tragic
case, however, was that of Bartlett Green. Since Green's parents favoured learning, he was well educated before
entering Oxford, where he studied various subjects, including divinity,
and gained his degree. There he was converted by the lectures of Peter
Martyr, the Edwardian professor. Though he became a practicing lawyer
at the Middle Temple, he continued to study divinity and stayed firm in
the new faith, even during Marian years. And so he might have remained,
if he had not written to Christopher Goodman, his former Oxford friend in
exile. In reply to Goodman's question about a rumour that the monarch
had died, Green stated that 'the queen is not yet dead', as well as
mentioning the circulation of certain printed papers. Since the letter
was intercepted, he was examined by the privy council, who discovered the
extent of his heresy. During further questioning by Bishop Bonner, he
admitted not to have heard mass during the reign, but to have twice taken
communion with two other university men, including Goodman. Furthermore
he denied the sacrifice of the mass, the sacrament of the altar and the
unity of the catholic faith. His church was not that of Rome, or even
England, but 'one holy and universal church throughout all the world',
professing 'the true doctrine of Christ' and distinguished by 'the true
administration of the sacraments', namely baptism and the Lord's supper.
For this he was burnt with six companions - two craftsmen, a minister,
a woman, a man and a maid. He was indeed the reincarnation of James
Bainham.

1 LIBB IV, ff.286,328v (I.323); Neale, I-II passim; A4, II.73.
2 NMB II, ff.10v,12v (I.89,92); DNB; Foxe, VII.681,715-8,731-46. Religion was possibly involved in the case of Robert Eyre of Gray's
Inn and two others who were bound to yield themselves prisoners into
the Fleet in 1558 (APC VI.572).
3 DNB (Goodman).
Thus another period of religious repression coincided with a further spasm of unrest at the Inns. Once more there was some restriction of professional opportunity. Those chosen for any post, from commissions of the peace to offices of the crown, would be required to demonstrate loyalty to government policy, whether secular or ecclesiastical. For members who were catholic in belief or adaptable to circumstance, there was little difficulty. But others, whose actions were governed by their protestant convictions, were excluded from office. Therefore the limitation of professional opportunity probably contributed to the unrest which was evident during the late years of both Henry VIII and Mary Tudor. Whether a direct connection existed between the new religion and this unrest depends largely on the strength of protestantism at the Inns.

From the 1520's to the 1550's, a variety of influences determined the religious character of the legal societies. Members derived their basic beliefs from home and university. During formative years in London, their spiritual horizons were broadened by contact with new publications and the prophets of the day. At the Inns and abroad they rubbed shoulders with men of differing character and experience. Thus the Inns reflected each change in religious tempo and every ism of personal belief. As a result, protestantism gained a sure foothold before the royal reformation. During the revolutionary 1530's and the years of Edwardian grace, the new religion evidently became entrenched. In the late years of Henry VIII and his daughter, when the authorities tried to extirpate heresy, some members were in trouble. But these were either the extremists who could not keep their convictions to themselves, or those who were caught by change. Other protestant members were more discreet, or had the protection of providence.

1 E.g. Sir William Petre's advice to the Queen, Additional MS 48035, ff.147v,156.
The lawyers were not isolated, however, but were quite gregarious. In their profession they lived, worked and dined together. Those who were fired by their new-found faith, naturally sought to share their experience with others. Though the information may be scanty, there were circles of protestant influence. Thomas More believed that one centred on Bainham at the Temple. Richard Pates of Lincoln's Inn was probably the linchpin of a less pietistic association. At Gray's Inn, which was possibly the most protestant society, Nicholas Bacon, Richard Goodrich and William Cecil were most likely members of another. Bacon and Goodrich were officers of augmentations and good friends. Cecil, who attended the Inn for at least seven years from 1540, was well known to Bacon and to Peter Osborne, a protestant member of Lincoln's Inn. As he was the student and son-in-law of John Cheke, it is not surprising that the reformer was admitted in the same year, though nothing is known of his role at the Inn. Other members who might have related to the same circle were Thomas Wrothe, Richard Bunny, John Walpole and Nicholas Hussey.

This evidence merely suggests the existence of protestant connections. But in the case of Bartlett Green, there can be no doubt. Several friends visited him at Newgate just before his death, to whom he gave 'sundry godly exhortations', as well as comforting letters written into their books. From Foxe's account it seems that most were lawyers. But Green recognised his particular friends of the Middle Temple in an epistle addressed to them all, affirming that true friendship such as

1 Goodrich's will, PCC Streat, 1556/62; p.19 above.
2 Read, I.24-35; DNB (Bacon, Cecil, Osborne); A5, II.57.
3 Sagar MS, f.20.
4 Pp.151 above, 163167 below: Hussey's will, PCC 32 Bucke, 1551.
5 Foxe, VII.742-4,731-2.
theirs was not measured by distance, but by 'the unity of faith, in the bond of peace, which is love'. Therefore he requested each of them by name to do all they could for several deserving prisoners, thereby performing 'the friendship which we began in our life, that unity may increase until God make it perfect at our next meeting together'. Most were young lawyers of no more than barrister status. Though some were nonentities, others distinguished themselves in later life. William Ruswell, Robert Bell and William Fleetwood became prominent benchers and Elizabethan servants, George Goring, who declined to read, became a Sussex justice, a member of Parliament and an indebted receiver of the court of wards. More significantly, all were noted for their strong protestant sympathies from early in Elizabeth's reign.

Whether these circles are identified as 'protestant cells' is largely a matter of interpretation. However, there is no evidence that any well-disciplined group organised meetings, gained converts or acted cooperatively within the Inns. For these spiritual ends, members evidently participated in non-legal associations outside of the societies, either in private communion or secret congregations. Whereas faith and knowledge were classless professions in the new religion, at the Inns, members were tied to a pattern of family, professional and personal relationships, which did not necessarily have any common religious thread. Therefore it is more accurate to talk about circles or spheres of protestant influence than groups or cells.


2 Pp. 295-6 below; A5, IV.61,64,65.

3 MMB II, ff.4,40 (1.82,132); APC V.73; CPR (1560-3),443, (1563-6), 143,226; CSPD (1591-4), 513; F Hat. MS, IV.497,501,508, XIII passim; JP Cert. 1564, f.7; JP Return 1567, f.164; JP Sub. 1569, f.51v; Fudge, Thesis, III.147-8; Hurstfield, 208-9.

4 The term has been applied to the Inns by Dickens, ER, 137 and Prest, 218 without documentation.
The same pattern of relationships affected the nature of all associations at the Inns, including the More and Cromwell connections. We know of a handful of individuals who happened to receive official or biographical attention. Beyond recall are the more numerous members who held similar views, but were not as influential, articulate or committed. Consequently the religious character of the Inns could be represented as a structure of many inter-locking and ever-changing spheres of influence. Their size and composition would be determined not only by personal and theoretical considerations, but also by external circumstances, especially changes in ecclesiastical policy.

For this reason, periods of religious repression did not merely affect individuals. When some members were removed and others coerced, the vibration was felt throughout the Inns. Established connections were disrupted and new alignments formed. Suspicion and insecurity pervaded the societies. When this unsettling influence interacted with problems of jurisdiction, opportunity and behaviour, the result was sporadic unrest. Nevertheless these problems were mere symptoms of a more general malaise - the failure of communication and understanding between the masters of the bench and the gentlemen of the Inns. Those who were denied power, promotion and fashion, and showed their contempt for authority, were the younger members. Since nearly all the noted protestants were also young gentlemen, was there a similar division in religion? Was protestantism the creed of the young?

Unfortunately it is not possible to give a statistical answer. Even if every member could be listed, the religious outlook of most would be unknown. As far as the younger members are concerned, we have to rely on example and impression. Evidently the new religion was widely adopted, but it remained a minority movement, particularly during repression, when most members were cautious, conforming and conservative. On the other hand the benchers can be treated more quantitatively. Their names are mentioned in minutes; most held office outside the Inns; many of their
actions are recorded; some left written evidence. If the religious composition of the bench can be ascertained, it should be possible to understand better the nature of adherence to the new religion.

The records of the Inns provide an almost complete list of benchers from 1530. By correlating these records with supplementary material, it is possible to establish the tenure of most benchers, as this was terminated by discontinuance, promotion or death. Each bencher can then be scrutinised for evidence of his religious convictions. This analysis could be carried out for any interval of time. But since each reign produced its own religious settlement, the terminal years will be 1547, 1553 and 1558.

Forty-one benchers of Gray’s Inn have been identified for the period before 1547. By 1530 two had died, and seven had most likely discontinued. The religious position of twelve others has not been established. Of these, Roger York became a serjeant-at-law in 1531 and Francis Noone was a new reader in 1546, so that they are not really important. There is no indication that William Grey, John Culpepper, 

---

1 A5, I-IV. A serjeant-at-law departed from his Inn with great ceremony, but other officers remained, including a solicitor-general, attorney-general, baron of the exchequer, master of the rolls, master of requests, speaker of parliament and town recorder.

2 A5, I.2,9. George Harebrowne and Richard Hewkith left traditional wills (PCC 26 Bodfisde, 1524 and 3 Maynwaryng, 1520).

3 A5, I.3,4,5,11,13,17,18. Robert Chalonier’s duties in the north probably kept him there much of the time. From his involvement in the Pilgrimage, it seems that he was conservative in religion (p.121 above). George Whetenhall of Kent, Essex and London, who appears from 1554 until death in 1573/4, would probably have been too old to be the lawyer. (CPR (1554-5),139, (1558-60), 422, (1560-3), 604; LPM II,383). As there are no minutes until 1569, it is difficult to establish tenure.

4 A5, I.12,40. 5 A5, I.20.

6 A commissioner in Kent and possibly Sussex, who married the sister of John Hales, son and heir of Sir Christopher (LP XVI-XXI passim; CPR (1547-8), 141, (1548-9), 167, (1553-4), passim, (1554-5), 273-4; A5, I.24).
John Southwell,\(^1\) and Nicholas Townley\(^2\) continued at the Inn after their readings, though the first three names occur later in different contexts. The other six are more unfortunate casualties as they were benchers for a span of significant years. John Petyt, a baron of the exchequer in 1532, later stated that he had obtained the office from Cromwell, but apart from the information that he was of the Reformation Parliament and his wife was accused of incontinency, nothing else is known.\(^3\) Humphrey Collas, a Devon commissioner and under-steward of the duchy of Exeter, apparently had a catholic son, but his own views remain obscure.\(^4\)

Anthony Missenden is known only from a description of the King's visit to Lincoln in 1541 where, as recorder and serjeant-at-law, he twice cried 'Jesus save your grace', and gave the reading.\(^5\) When William Yelverton died in 1587, he must have been almost ninety. About 1569 he was referred to as 'a man expert in law and a common bier of broken matters and feynid Titles', but since he does not appear in the minutes, he had probably discontinued before that year. His father died in mother church, but his own attitude remains hidden.\(^6\) Following Leonard Beckwith's

---

1 A commissioner and feodary in Suffolk, who took the deposition of a person for saying the Becket service in 1539 (LP XIII.1.384(64), XX.ii.496(39); CPR (1553), 358, (1554-5), 216, (1566-9), 1691; A5, I.31).

2 A5, I.32.

3 \( \text{LP IV.6043(2), V.1499, XI.1485-6; A5, I.7.} \)

4 Though there seem to have been at least two persons of the same name, the bencher was quite likely the one who had been counsellor to the marquess of Exeter before death in about 1539 (LP V.166(?), XIV.i.109; A5, I.14). Cf. \( \text{LP XVI-XXI passim; CPR (1555-72) passim; IPM I.56; PCC 24 Holney, 1566/71.} \)

5 \( \text{LP XV.942(12), XVI.1088; A5, I.29.} \)

6 \( \text{LP XV-XXI passim; CPR (1553-4), 454; IPM II.399; DNB (Christopher); A5, I.30.} \)
reading in 1540, he was probably so engrossed in northern affairs that his membership became quite nominal. Finally, Edmund Grey, a commissioner in Norfolk and other counties, died without further trace.

Of the remaining twenty, Edward Hall was certainly a protestant, but a cautious lawyer who kept in step with Henrician policy. Though he spoke in favour of passing the Six Articles' Act and sat on the London commission, he did so as an obedient subject, not as a supporter of the measure itself. At Gray's Inn he was chosen to remove the Becket window in 1539; his Chronicle extolled William Tyndale; in his will he simply yielded his soul 'to her maker and Redeemer by whose passion and not by my deserties I trust onely to be saved, for he hath washed away my synnes I doubted not by his precyouse blode' - a clear statement of justification by faith alone. Another protestant was James Hales, the Edwardian judge who drowned himself after denying his faith before Marian bishops. According to Foxe, he had been a true gospeller for many years. To these may possibly be added John Gosnold, William Coke and Richard Sackville, who did not declare themselves during this reign, but appear as protestants later. Gosnold will be considered below. Coke was a counsellor to Cambridge university and recorder of the city before becoming an Edwardian judge. He died early in Mary's reign, leaving a will in which he simply bewailed his sins, 'trusting through the merits

1 P.119 above; A5, I.33.
2 LP XX.1.622(314-5); CPR (1547-8), passim; IPM I.300; A5, I.35.
3 P.129 above; Foxe, V.504-5; Dugdale, Origines, 283; Hall, II.266-7; FCC 36 Allen, 1547; A5, I.28.
4 P.116 above; Foxe, VI.710-15. Cf. Thomas Lover to Henry Bullinger in 1554, referring to Hales as 'a pious lawyer' (Zurich Letters, I.154), and Latimer's earlier opinion, that he was the foremost 'godly man of the law in the realm' (Sermon, 428).
5 P.163 below; A5, I.34.
of Christes passion to be saved, and have Joye, peace and liff everlasting". In the Scholemaster, Roger Ascham eulogised his patron, Sir Richard Sackville, as "that earnest favorer and furtherer of God's true Religion". Therefore the lawyer was possibly influenced by protestantism during this reign. However, his Marian record suggests that he moved with government policy and not in advance, so that he was probably more politique than protestant. At Gray's Inn, therefore, only two protestants can be identified, with the possibility of another three.

The other fifteen Henrician benchers were somewhat conservative in religion. Some left evidence of their attitudes during the reign itself. Of these, William Walsingham, a London under-sheriff and the father of Francis, used the traditional formula in bequeathing his soul "to almightie god, our blessed Lady Saint Marye and to all the holy companye of heven", thereby affirming his faith in purgatory and intercession by saints. Though Robert Wrothe was Cromwell's friend and a London commissioner for the Valor, he not only invoked the same heavenly company, but also left a pound to "the fraternitie of our blissed lady". In 1542 Francis Browne, the Lincolnshire justice earlier imprisoned on suspicion of treasonous words, simply bequeathed his soul to God. Nevertheless he required four tretntals for his soul and those of his friends, and after that a priest to sing for the same throughout twenty

1 CPR (1548-9), 136, (1549-51), 223, (1550-3), 113-4, 268, (1553-4), 3, 284; IPR, I.280; PCC 19 Tashe, 1553; Al. Cantab; A5, I.38.
2 P.119 above; Ascham, 179; Camden, 2; A5, I.21.
3 LP IV.464, 2639, 5330, 6516, V.909(36); SPL/235, f.163 (LP; Add. I.i.494); PCC 11 Hogen, 1534; DNB (Francis); Read, Walsingham, I.8-11; A5, I.22.
4 P.115 above; PCC 36 Hogen, 1535; A5, I.19.
years. In the following year John Boys I, who was a member of the Reformation Parliament, Cranmer's steward and attorney of the duchy of Lancaster, committed his soul to the whole heavenly band. More influential was Humphrey Wingfield, a client of Wolsey, a legal member of the King's council in 1526 and a speaker of the Reformation Parliament. He also bequeathed his soul to the whole company of heaven, adding 'where I have good hopes it shall remaine eternally by their especiall grace when it shall be ther pleasure and will'. Thomas Moyle, a loyal servant to four Tudors, was active against Kentish protestant ministers in 1543, and forwarded information to Bishop Gardiner which reflected against Cranmer's administration. When he died early in Elizabeth's reign he left a strong catholic will.

Since few benchers would have altered their convictions late in life, the outlook of some can be inferred from subsequent reigns. These include John Hynde and Edmund Molyneux who died as judges in Edward's reign. Hynde had a splendid burial at St Dunstan's in the West, having provided for his traditional month's mind in the country and prayers for his soul at Lincoln's Inn. He was a safe man to trust with the apprehension of the bishop of Ely's servants for publishing 'a sedicious epistle of Melancthon's' (1540). Though Molyneux eschewed any religious preamble in his will, he instructed his children to pray 'for my soule and for their kynde mother soule and all Christen soules'.

1 P.128 above; PCC 6 Spert, 1541/2; A5, I.10. If he died in London, Browne wished to be buried in Gray's Inn chapel with his grandfather. A trental comprised thirty successive daily masses.
2 LP IV.6043(2), XIV.i.106, XVI passim; PCC 4 Pynnyng, 1543/4; Somerville, 408; A5, I.37.
3 LP IV.6510, Add.67, XIV.i.1325; PCC 23 Alen, 1543/6; DNB; Somerville, 427; A5, I.6.
4 P.118 above; PCC 55 Mellersh, 1560; LP, XVIII.i.346; A5, I.27.
5 LIBB IV, f.234 (I.295); APC I.33; LP IV-XXI passim; PPC VII.97-8,104; Machyn, 2; DNB; Hurstfield, 223; Reid, 491; Al. Cantab.; A5, I.8. Hynde probably provided for obsequies at his own Inn as well.
6 SP1/127, f.15 (LP VII.761(38),806; CPR (1548-9), 145, (1553), 416; PCC 31 Powell, 1552; DNB; Reid, 492; A5, I.25.
religious outlook of Walter Hendley, Thomas Harlakenden and Robert Urmeston can also be inferred from their later wills. When Hendley died in 1550, he spurned 'pomp and pryde', but beseeched the whole company of heaven to pray for him, made provision for his month's and year's mind, and left money to the priests of Gray's Inn to pray for his soul. When Hendley died in 1550, he spurned 'pomp and pryde', but beseeched the whole company of heaven to pray for him, made provision for his month's and year's mind, and left money to the priests of Gray's Inn to pray for his soul.\textsuperscript{1} Harlakenden, a commissioner and escheator of Kent, included the traditional formula and set aside £10 for 'diriges, masses and dedes of charite', as well as providing for a priest to sing for the souls of his family for three years.\textsuperscript{2} Urmeston, who was most likely the under-clerk of parliament and London weigher of wool, also died in 1558, leaving his soul to the whole heavenly company and £1 6s 8d to Gray's Inn for burial expenses and prayers for his soul.\textsuperscript{3} William Stamford and Thomas Darrell, who showed conservative sympathies at a later date, will be considered below.\textsuperscript{4} To these may be added Christopher Hales, the master of the rolls,\textsuperscript{5} and his relative John Hales, the father of James and a baron of the exchequer.\textsuperscript{6} Foxe referred to Christopher as 'a mighty papist' in the early 1530's. Despite the lawyer's friendship with Cromwell and

\textsuperscript{1} P. 116 above; PCC 10 Coode; A5, I.23.

\textsuperscript{2} LP XVII,46 (p.14), 379(14), XXI.ii.773(p.424); PCC 39 Noodes, 1558; A5, I.16.

\textsuperscript{3} LP XIX.i1.166; CPR (1553-4), 11, (1557-8), 223; PCC 40 Noodes, 1558; Pollard, 145-8; A5, I.36. Despite Pollard's doubts, lawyer Urmeston was most likely the clerk and weigher. His connection with the wool trade is shown in his will, where he charges the father of his godson 'to bring him upp in feare of all mightie gode, and to kepe him to Scole, but if he cannot keep him at study of law, to apprentice him to a merchant of the Staple'.

\textsuperscript{4} Pp. 164, 167 below; A5, I.39,41.

\textsuperscript{5} P. 114 above; LP VI.1499, IX.789, XII.i1.488; HMC IX.i.152; DNB; Foxe, V.366; A5, I.15.

\textsuperscript{6} LP, IV-XVI passim, IX.789; DNB; A5, I.1.
Cranmer, he and his cousin were reported to favour the Observants as late as 1535. Their actions suggest that, though they moved with the times, their sympathies were traditional. Thus the Henrician bench of Gray's Inn was overwhelmingly conservative.

For Edward's reign, twenty-eight benchers have been distinguished including twelve newcomers.¹ No evidence of religion has been found for eight, which includes the two Greys, Culpepper, Yelverton, Southwell and Beckwith, who perhaps continued from the preceding reign.² The other two were Thomas Stanley, who died during his reading,³ and Osmond Gay, a bencher throughout this period.⁴ Of the remainder, two showed their protestant colours. One was Nicholas Bacon, whom Cranmer had recommended to Cromwell for his learning and religion.⁵ The other was John Gosnold, counsellor and solicitor-general to the government, whom Latimer referred to as a foremost 'godly man of the law'.⁶ To these may be added two others who showed protestant leanings in Mary's reign, presumably the outcome of previous experience. One was William Coke, who has been mentioned already.⁷ The second was John Walpole, a prosperous lawyer of Norfolk and apparently a friend of Bacon. Though

¹ This excludes those for whom there is no evidence of continuation.
² A5, I.20,24,30,31,33.
³ A5, I.50.
⁴ A5, I.43.
⁵ SP1/137, f.261 (LP XIII.ii.675); A5, I.49. Cranmer recommended Bacon as one 'whome I knowe enterly to be both of suche towardnes in the Lawe and of so good judgement touching christes religion, that in that stede he shall be habile to do godde and the kinges right acceptable service'.
⁶ P.117 above; Latimer, 428; A5, I.34.
⁷ P.159 above; A5, I.38.
he was closely associated with Thomas Thirlby, the conservative bishop of Ely, he is mentioned as one of the few who stood for 'trewe religion' in the first Marian parliament, and his will was non-traditional.1 As Francis Noone, George Browne and John Birch adhered to the Elizabethan settlement, they possibly held protestant views in Edward's reign.2 Thus the protestant tally for Gray's Inn comprises only two certainties, two probabilities and three possibilities.

Of the ten remaining benchers, nine showed conservative sympathy in later reigns, but probably conformed at this time. Of these, Harlskenden, Moyle and Urneston continued from the previous period.3 Thomas Darrell, Nicholas Powtrell and Henry Ward will be considered in the next.4 Two others were Edwardian servants who profited from the Reformation and became serjeants-at-law, but reached their peak in Mary's reign as members of parliament, judges and knights. One was William Stamford, who died a professed catholic,5 and the other was William Dallison I, who required burial 'with masses, diriges, blacks, lights and exequies' according to his degree.6 But Dallison's will contained

1 CPR (1558-60), 138, 329; MP List 1553; PCC 6 Noodles, 1557/8; Harvey, 14-15; Jessopp, 21; Machyn, 156; Shirley, passim; A5, I.46. Walpole bequeathed his soul 'unto the holy and blessed Trinitie, three personas and one god' and his body to be buried 'where it shall please myn executours'. As a result he was buried in grand style at St Dunstan's, attended by the judges, serjeants and 200 lawyers, 'with ij whytt branchys, xij staff torchys and iij grett tapers, and prestes and clarks, and the morow the masse of requiem'.

2 P. 167 below; A5, I.40, 42, 51.

3 A5, I.16, 27, 36.

4 P. 167 below; A5, I.41, 44, 47.

5 Harleian MS 6064, f. 80v; APC V. 202, 225; CPR (1553-4), 10, 163, (1558-60), 103; Machyn, 172, 366; Foss, V. 390-2; A5, I.39. According to Machyn, his burial included 'ij dogen torchys and tapers'.

6 LP XVIII. ii, 449(68), XX-XXI passim; APC V. 228; SPLO/7, f. 117 (GSPD, 1547-80, 45); CPR (1553), 416, (1553-4), 436, (1555-7), 114, (1555-60), 65; Lincoln's Inn City Minute Book II/1/1/2, f. 98; PCC 9 Chayney, 1559; Abbott, 115-19, Foss, V. 478-9; Al. Cantab.; A5, I.45.
a protestant-looking preamble, in which he bequeathed his soul 'unto God almighty, my onely Saviour and Redemer, by the meryttes of whose death and passion and by his great mercy I trust to be saved and to be a member of his electe in the kingdome of heaven'. Likewise Robert Flynt, a friend of Urneston and Ward, included an explicit protestant preamble in his will, declaring his wish to avoid 'all pompe and supersticion', but in the same breath requiring 'all suche serymonyse moste godly sett forth by the Catholike Churche to be ministred and observed'.

As both were written in 1559, they were possibly influenced by the change in government. That their authors more likely adopted these views during the earlier Reformation is indicated by Walter Hendley, whose Edwardian will also contained a mixture of old and new religion. But whereas Dallison and Flynt omitted any reference to the virgin or holy company, Hendley clung to his saints. Contrary to historical belief, there were

1 PCC 3 Mellershe, 1559; A5, 1.48. In his will, Flynt commended his soul 'to all mightie god the father, creautor and maker therof, and to Jesus Christe my savior the only redeemer therof, and to the holly goste the preserver, and only comforter therof havinge in this moste holly and blessed glorious trinitie, a suer faith and stedfaste belief that through my saviour Jesus Christ and that onlie by him and for his sake all the multitude of my wretched and greuous synnes committed againste god be clerely remitted, and forgiven. For he of his great abundante mercie like a moste mercifull saviour tooke my sinnes withall the synnes of the unversall worlde uppon him and so went laden to the Altar of the crosse and there most cruellie was crusififfed, and willfully he shed his most prescous bludd, as well for my redemption as for all those that beleve yn hym and his moste sacred worde'.

2 P. 162 above; PCC 10 Coode, 1550; A5, 1.23. In his will, Hendley bequeathed his soul to the Trinity, beseeching mercy and pardon, 'havinge perfytt feythe that by the onely glorious passyon of our savyour Jesus Chryste my maker, savyour and redemer and by the shedynge of his most precouys blood he hath washed away my synnes, trustynge by the same and nothynge by my desertes to be saved, and also with true feith and hope I trust after this mutuall lyff to aryse with the electe and to have the eternall lyff and the fruyicion of the god heade accordynge to my firme fath and undoubted belief in that behalfe; and I beseeche that blessed and holy virgyn our ladye Saynt Marye and all the holye companye of heven to pray for me; to whose I beseeche allmightie god I maye be assocyate in the kingdome of Heaven'.

---

1 PCC 3 Mellershe, 1559; A5, 1.48. In his will, Flynt commended his soul 'to all mightie god the father, creautor and maker therof, and to Jesus Christe my savior the only redeemer therof, and to the holly goste the preserver, and only comforter therof havinge in this moste holly and blessed glorious trinitie, a suer faith and stedfaste belief that through my saviour Jesus Christ and that onlie by him and for his sake all the multitude of my wretched and greuous synnes committed againste god be clerely remitted, and forgiven. For he of his great abundante mercie like a moste mercifull saviour tooke my sinnes withall the synnes of the unversall worlde uppon him and so went laden to the Altar of the crosse and there most cruellie was crusififfed, and willfully he shed his most prescous bludd, as well for my redemption as for all those that beleve yn hym and his moste sacred worde'.

2 P. 162 above; PCC 10 Coode, 1550; A5, 1.23. In his will, Hendley bequeathed his soul to the Trinity, beseeching mercy and pardon, 'havinge perfytt feythe that by the onely glorious passyon of our savyour Jesus Chryste my maker, savyour and redemer and by the shedynge of his most precouys blood he hath washed away my synnes, trustynge by the same and nothynge by my desertes to be saved, and also with true feith and hope I trust after this mutuall lyff to aryse with the electe and to have the eternall lyff and the fruyicion of the god heade accordynge to my firme fath and undoubted belief in that behalfe; and I beseeche that blessed and holy virgyn our ladye Saynt Marye and all the holye companye of heven to pray for me; to whose I beseeche allmightie god I maye be assocyate in the kingdome of Heaven'.
more than two faiths. By Edward's reign the religious composition of
the bench had become quite complex, with several protestants on the left,
a few more conforming conservatives on the right, and at least three to
the right of centre.

For Mary's reign, twenty-six benchers of Gray's Inn have been
identified, eight of them newcomers. No evidence of religion has been
found for seven, including Culpepper, Yelverton, Southwell, Beckwith
and Gay, who had possibly discontinued. Nor is anything known about two
new benchers, namely Francis Soone, a Suffolk commissioner, and Richard
Forsett, who had purchased college property in 1549. Of the other
nineteen, eight were conservatives, including Harlakenden, Moyle, Urnston
and Flynt, who have appeared before. Henry Ward, whom Cromwell had
unsuccessfully recommended for the town-clerkship of Norwich, used the
traditional formula in his will, as well as requesting burial 'withall
dyvyne service necessary by thorder of the holye Catholicke churche', and
all christian people to pray for him. John Ramsey, who also died in
1557, beseeched both the trinity and 'our blessed Ladye Saynt Marye' to
pardon his sins, while requiring catholic burial, charity for his soul
and a month's mind. Two others showed their conservatism in the next

1 Though William Rugg was dean of the chapel, there is no indication
that he was also a benchter, as the later deans were (A5, I.57).
2 A5, I.24,30,31,33,43.
3 LP XIX.i.610(p.385); CPR (1557-8), 364, (1558-60), 271; IFM II.328;
AMCR (Var. Col.) IV.275; A5, I.53.
4 Strype, Memorials, III.i.42; A5, I.58.
5 A5, I.16,27,36,48.
6 SPL/150, f.101 (LP XIV.i.721); LP XX.i.622; CPR (1547-8), 359,
(1557-8), 3-4; IFM II.369; PCC 12 Wrastley, 1557; A5, I.47. Ward
wrote his will 'nowe beinge sicke in Greys Inn'. His 'gentill
gossip' was Robert Flynt.
7 CPR (1548-9), 152, (1550-3), 355; PCC 12 Wrastley, 1556/7; A5, I.56.
reign. One was Thomas Darrell, a bencher since Henry's time and a justice in Kent, who was noted as one of the 'myslykers of religion and godlye procedinges'.

The second was Nicholas Powtrell, an Edwardian chantry commissioner and Elizabethan serjeant-at-law, whose religion was twice complained of to the privy council in 1564.

Of the other eleven benchers, three remained protestant, including Nicholas Bacon. But whereas Bacon apparently conformed, John Gosnold and John Walpole were noted to have stood for 'trewe religion' in Mary's first parliament, and the former is reported to have laboured for the release of John Rogers, the martyr. To these may possibly be added three who accepted the Elizabethan settlement. Francis Noone, the Suffolk justice, subscribed to the Act of Uniformity in 1569. George Browne, an Edwardian chantry commissioner, Marian serjeant-at-law and northern councillor, became an Elizabethan ecclesiastical commissioner for York province. In the same reign, John Birch, who gained early promotion to serjeanty and the exchequer, was reportedly an adherent of the new settlement. Birch was quite likely a protestant, but Noone and

1 LP IV.6516(7), XVIII.1.436(f.41), XX passim, XXI.i.302(30); CPR (1547-8), 85, (1548-9), 135, (1553-4), passim, (1558-60), 178; JP Cert. 1564, f.77; PCC 14 Stonarre, 1567; A5, f.41.

2 LP XXI.i.302(30); CPR (1558-60), 65; IPM II.283; JP Cert.1564, ff.73, 105; A5, f.44. Powtrell and Hastell were the assize judges complained of by the bishop of Carlisle in 1564, as 'only making a good face of Religion in gevinge of the charge, in all other their talkes and dooinges shewe them selfes not favourable towards any man or cause of Religion which the people moche marke and talke of' (JP Cert.1564, f.105).

3 P.163 above; MP List, 1553; Foxe, VI.591-612. According to Rogers, 'Master Gosnold also, that worthy man who is now departed, laboured for me, and so did divers other worthy men also take pains in the matter'. In his will, Gosnold simply left his soul to God, and his body to be buried in the parish where he died, 'but with as lytell pompe as may be' (PCC 11 More, 1554).

4 CPR (1553-4), 24, (1560-63), 442, (1563-6), 141, 222; JP Cert. 1564, f.45; JP Sub. 1569, f.172v-3; A5, f.40.

5 CPR (1548-9), 135, (1560-3), 94; JP Cert. 1564, ff.70v,82; A5, f.42.

6 SP10/8, f.87; CPR (1558-60), 65, (1563-66), 445; JP Cert. 1564, f.54v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.158v-9; PCC 24 Darcey, 1581; A5, f.51.
Browne are more suspect, particularly the latter who was described differently in two reports as favourable and not favourable to Elizabethan policy. Likewise there is little Marian evidence for the religious views of Gilbert Gerrard, Anthony Thorold, Thomas Seckford, Laurence Meeres and Nicholas Barham. But from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign they proved to be staunch supporters of the new settlement. This suggests that, as young men during the early Reformation, they had formed protestant sympathies which were suppressed in Mary's time. Therefore if a roll call had been taken at the end of Mary's reign, it would probably have recorded that the bench of Gray's Inn was almost equally divided between conforming protestants and catholic conservatives.

For Lincoln's Inn, thirty-two Henrician benchers have been listed, four of whom left little evidence of their religion. William Honeychurch, a member of the Reformation Parliament, and Richard Burnell, a counsellor at York, probably discontinued. In Edward's time, Richard Haydon left a non-committal will in which he bequeathed the contents of his chamber to the Inn's chaplain. Giles Towneshend, the brother of Robert and a purchaser of monastic property, was the keeper of the Black Book at the beginning of Edward's reign who prayed for uniformity.

---

1 Ch. 7; A5, I.52,54,55,59,60.
2 In 1558, Harlakenden, Hoyle, Urmeston, Darrell, Powtrell and Flynt were conservatives, while Bacon, Birch, Gerrard, Thorold, Seckford, Meeres and Barham were probably conforming protestants - a total of thirteen out of seventeen identifiable benchers.
3 LIBB II.ii, f.76v (I.136); LP IV.6043(2); A5, II.117. In 1505 Honeychurch drew his dagger on the chaplain.
4 LP XVI.875(7); A5, II.32. Burnell may not have accepted the bench call.
5 LP XIV.i.109; PCC 31 Tashe, 1553/54; A5, II.20.
6 P.109 above; LP XVIII.ii.529(3); XIX. 1544; Durham, 21; A5, II.27.
None of them was a likely Protestant. Another eight benchers showed little of their personal belief, except obedience to the will of the monarch. Chief among these was Roger Cholmley, serjeant-at-law in 1531 and servant to four Tudors,¹ William Sulyard, counsellor to the Lisle family and a judge in Wales,² and his friend John Danaster, baron of the exchequer and adviser to the Lisle.³ Lesser officials of the crown were William Haydon, an active associate bench and clerk to the duchy of Lancaster,⁴ and John Corbet, who was one of the King's legal servants and an Edwardian commissioner for church goods.⁵ In the provinces, Tudor policies were implemented by Robert Towneshend, chief justice of Chester,⁶ and Ralph Rokeby I, a northern councillor.⁷ Both left the Inn as serjeants-at-law, and died in 1556. Lastly, Richard Smithley, an escheator and counsellor in the north, demonstrated his loyalty during the Pilgrimage by refusing to join the rebels and afterwards acting as one of their examiners.⁸ Since John Danaster, William Sulyard and

¹ LP V-XXI passim; CPR (1548-66), passim; Foxe, VII.606-11,718,747, VIII.530-41; PCC 24 Morris, 1565; DNB; A5, II.1; JP Cert. 1564, f.60v. In 1564 he was reportedly 'Indifferent' to the Elizabethan settlement.

² P. 7 above; PCC Aleneger, 1540; A5, II.3.

³ P.119 above; PCC 5 Aleneger, 1540; A5, II.4.

⁴ IPM, I.119; Somerville, 413; A5, II.13.

⁵ LP XII.ii.864, XX.ii.707(3), XXI.1.1519; CPR (1548-9), 18-19, (1553), 416, (1555-7), 215; IPM II.92; A5, II.31.

⁶ APC I.176; LP XVII.220 (87), XIX passim, XX.1.836, XXI.320(30); CPR (1548-9), 158, (1553), 46, (1555-4), 324,441, (1555-7), 468; IPM I.347; Durham, 19; A5, II.8.

⁷ CPR (1548-9), 137, (1555-7), 17-18,54, (1555-7), 524; IPM I.333; Rokeby, 'Oeconomia', 173; DNB; Reid, 493; Somerville, 452; A5, II.28.

⁸ Escheators, 194; LP XII.ii.201,392, XVI.875(7), XIX.1.1035(97), XX.1.622(f.314); A5, II.116.
Richard Haydon avoided any reference to saints or services in their wills, they were probably influenced by religious change. Yet the careers of all these men suggest that they were loyal servants who kept in step with crown policy, while remaining fairly conservative at heart. None can be claimed as a committed protestant.

The other twenty-two benchers showed some explicit sign of religious conservatism. Of the four who died during Henry's reign, Henry See, a solicitor of York and former chamber-fellow of William Roper, acknowledged himself 'to be a detestable synner in the sight of our mercyfull Saviour, and yet a shepe of the unyversall flock and churche of Christ by the mercyfull medytacion of the bitter dethe and Cruell passion of our said Saviour, and the holy and blessid intercessioin of his holy mother our lady Saynct Marye, and with the devoute intercessioin of the clene and pure Appostle Sainct John the Evangeliste, and all the blessid conversacion of Sainctes in hevin'. Thomas Rushton, one of the lawyers who conferred with civilians regarding legal reform, and a later serjeant-at-law, bequeathed his soul to the whole heavenly company and required burial with staff torches and requiem mass. Less ritualistic were the wills of Thomas Lane, the recorder of Gloucester, who simply requested the cathedral clergy to pray for his soul, and William Cholmley, who invoked the heavenly company, but wished to be buried 'withoute anye pompe or pride of the worlde'. Six other benchers were firm catholics who gained their opportunity in Mary's reign, and will be considered below. They were William Roper, Edward Griffin,

1 LIEB III, ff.31v,117 (I.205); LP IX.705, Add.I.ii.1134; PCC 12 Dyngeley, 1539; A5, II.14. See was connected with the Ropers, as he was admitted by John Roper, entered William Roper's chamber, and named the latter as a supervisor of his will.

2 LP IX.119; LPM I.196; PCC 24 Spert, 1543; A5, II.7.

3 LP XV.282(7,35), XX-XXI passim, XXI.i.476(17); PCC 29 Pynnyng, 1544; Browne, TEGAS, 208-9; A5, II.9.

4 LP VI.977(ii), VII.372, XIII.ii.1280(f.2); PCC 7 Alen, 1544/6; A5, II.26. He was perhaps cofferer to the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth.
Clement Heigham, William Forster, William Rastell and William Bendlowes.¹

To these should be added Richard Morgan, who was promoted to serjeancy in 1547. In Edward's reign he was imprisoned for hearing mass with Princess Mary; shortly after his accession he became chief justice of the Queen's bench and a privy councillor; and when he died he wished 'to have the holye and blessid Sacramentes of the true and Catholike Church to be ministred unto me according to the Juste and true institucion of the same'.²

The religious outlook of another ten benchers of Lincoln's Inn, who continued beyond Henry's reign, can be inferred from later evidence. Robert Meynell, a servant at York to four Tudors, was known for his catholic influence in the north during Elizabeth's reign.³ William Tankard, the recorder of York from 1537 to 1573 and a northern councillor from 1566, performed his duty irrespective of religion; but his family was catholic, and in Elizabeth's time he was much suspected.⁴ The others showed conservative attitudes in their wills. In Mary's reign, Henry Haydon, a former receiver in augmentations, bequeathed his soul to the whole company of heaven.⁵ Thomas Atkins, common serjeant of London in

1 P.176 below; A5, II.15,16,19,24,29,30.

² LP XIII.i.891, XIV.i.377, XV.109, XXI.i.1538(f.206v); APG III.239,270; CPR (1555-4), 65, (1554-5), 221; CSPS (1550-2), 248; PCC 8 Ketchyn, 1552/6; Grey Friars Chronicle, 69; Chronicle of QJ and QM, 3-5; Machyn, 106,335; A5, II.23. In this reactionary will, which Morgan composed in 1552, he also asserted that he would 'end life in the confession of the true and Catholique fethe of our savour Christe, not doubtinge or denying any one poynt to be beleved of a Christen man. And in the feare and love of god, not devidinge my selfe from the knott of peace and unitie, wether from the hole bodye of the Churche by schisme and divesion, nor from any particular member thereof by hatred and debatte'.

³ LP VIII.696, XII.i.1045, XVI.875(7), XXI.i.302(30); CPR (1547-8), 92, (1553), 414, (1560-3), 187-8, (1563-6), 7; IPM II.240; SP12/20, f.11-12; Reid, 492; Aveling, CR5,x; A5, II.10.

⁴ LP XII.i.1011, XVI.875(2), XVII.556(20), XX.i.534; CPR (1555-7), 54; SFL5/21, ff.195,178,191v,237; JP Cert. 1564, ff.70v,72,83; Wills (Richmond), 255-9; Aveling, CR5Y, 40,341; Reid, 494; A5, II.10.

⁵ LP XXI.i.1280(ff.43,46); CPR (1548-9), 147; PCC 12 Chaynay, 1558/9; A5, II.25.
1545 and under-sheriff at his death in 1551, not only committed his soul to the same company, but also wished his body to be buried 'according to the Catholique and ancient ordre of christes churche'. In 1556 John Harvy, who was dean of the chapel from 1533 to 1544, used the traditional formula in his will, as did his successor, Robert Curson, whom Henry VIII nominated as a baron of the exchequer for his 'honestie, lerning and integritie'. Not to be outdone, Thomas Hemming, dean of the chapel for most of Edward's reign and an exigenter in common pleas, provided for 'convenient masses songe wythe as many prystes as dothe come' to his burial and month's mind, for his wife to keep a chantry priest in her house, and for four paupers to pray every Sunday before his grave for the souls of himself, his family and all christians.

With similar extravagance, George St Paul, the Henrician recorder of Lincoln and counsellor to the duke of Suffolk, desired a priest to pray for his family's souls for twenty years, to sing three weekly masses in the chapel where his parents were buried, and to say dirige for their souls on the eve of St Thomas. Needless to say, the latter were Marian wills. Nevertheless John Harris, whose will was dated in 1550, gave a pound to the members of Serjeants' and Lincoln's Inns 'to pray for my soul and all christen soules', and Guy Crayford, a London heresy

1 LP XIII.i.910, XX.ii.910(6); Hatfield MS 150, f.34; PCC 3 Powell, 1551/2; Wriothesley, I.162. Not to be confused with the later town clerk, member of Parliament and attorney in the Marches, though both were of Gloucester. A5, II.22.

2 LP IV.901, XIV.i.76; PCC 23 Ketchyn, 1556; A5, II.2.

3 APC II.33-4; LP IV.6043(2); CPR (1547-8), 182; PCC 18 Goode, 1550; A5, II.5.

4 LP XVII.1258, XVIII.i.981(42); CPR (1557-8),460; Escheators, 12; PCC 4 Chaynay, 1557/9; A5, II.17.

5 LP XX.i.643(f.62); Lincoln City Minute Book II/1/1/1/2, ff.44v,135v,141; CPR (1548-9), 154; APC V.243; PCC 43 Welles, 1558/9; Hill, Lincoln, 51,63; Richardson, August, 223; A5, II.21.

6 P. 28 above; LP VII.576, XIV.i.763,913, XIV passim; PCC 29 Bucke, 1550/1; A5, II.12.
commissioner in 1541, left gifts for his family, 'for a remembrance to pray for me', as late as January 1553.¹

The interloper would seem to be John Pilbarough.² As well as supporting the supremacy and denouncing the papacy, his tract stressed the bible as the source of regeneration. In his own words, God had dispelled ignorance 'with his holy word, whereby we have perceyved Christ the auctour of our lyght, and our onely Saviour to be as it were newly come and incarnate for us, and that through the fayth whiche we have in hym we be (as Paule sayth) reputed justified as was our father Abraham'. Pilbarough had obviously adopted much of the protestant creed, including justification by faith and the concept of a covenant. Yet when he composed his will in 1546, he bequeathed his soul 'to almightie god, his blissid mother Saint Marye the virgyn and to all the Blissid companye of heven. And my bodye to be buried in Christen buria ll'. Perhaps he repented his protestant folly after Cromwell's fall. More likely he was another of those lawyers who combined the old with the new. Though the Henrician bench of Lincoln's Inn was solidly conservative, there were probably several others who absorbed protestant doctrine into their religious philosophy.

In Edward's reign, twenty-six benchers have been distinguished at Lincoln's Inn. Robert Meynell and Richard Morgan, who had received writs to become serjeants-at-law, did so after Edward's accession. John Pilbarough died in the same year,³ Richard Burnell does not appear to

¹ SP1/104, f.300 (LP X.1264); LP XVI.494, XIV.ii.435(3); PCC 5 Tashe, 1553; A5, II.6.
² P.129 above; PCC 2 Populwell, 1546/8; A5, II.11.
³ A5, II.10,11,23.
have accepted his call to the bench, and William Rastell left for Louvain in the middle of his treasurership.¹ Seventeen others who continued have been previously identified as conservatives.² There were only four newcomers, including two more conservatives. Richard Catlin, who died in 1556, left a will in which he not only gave £40 to the poor 'to pray for me, my frendes and all Christen soules', but also affirmed his belief in the efficacy of good works.³ In Elizabeth's reign, Henry Payne, a justice of Suffolk, was noted to be quite backward in religion.⁴ The other two new benchers had evidently adopted protestant principles. James Downes, who was suspected of lampooning the benchers in 1546 and then defended the right of younger members to wear beards, wrote a will late in Mary's reign in which he commended his soul 'to almighty god the father of heaven, my onely maker and redeemer in whom my onely trust is to be saved by the onely meryttes of the passion of his deare sonne Jesus Christ'. He made no provision for priests or prayers, but simply instructed his wife to 'kepe a scoilemaister and bringe upp my childern in vertue and lernyng in the feare and love of god and obedience of the prynce and parentes'.⁵ The other was Randall Cholmley, an escheator of

---

¹ A5, II.32,29; LIBB IV, ff.217,225 (I.293). Rastell, who was allegedly ill in autumn, 1549, was fined £10 in February 1550 for leaving the realm without permission from the governors of the Inn.

² Harvy, Curson, Crayford, Roper, Griffin, Hemming, Tankard, Heigham, Haydon, St Paul, Atkins, Forster, Haydon, Townshend, Rokeby, Bendlowes, Corbet.

³ CPR (1548-9), 136, (1553), 416; AEC VI.28,283; Machyn, 27; PCC 18 Ketchyn, 1556; A5, II.35. 'ffirste and before all things, I comende my soule to Almighty god, Jesus Christe, through whose merites and passion, and grace to beleve in hym, and to have a good and diligent inclynation in workinge and observinge his preceptes and commaundementes, I trust and am in parlyte beleve to be savyd'.

⁴ P.278 below; A5, II.33.

⁵ CPR (1554-5), 108; LIBB IV, ff.176v,283v (I.276,312); PCC 17 Chaynay, 1558/9; A5, II.34.
Kent and Middlesex in 1546, a member of the first Edwardian parliament, and a commissioner for church goods in 1553. Though he received Marian promotion, early in Elizabeth's reign he became a serjeant-at-law and ecclesiastical commissioner. As well as mentioning books by Erasmus in his will, he committed his soul 'to Allmyghtie god my redeemer and Saviour Jesus Christe trustinge assuredly by the merittes of his moste blessed deathe and passion to be one of the number of the Saved'. Furthermore he specified that his body was to be buried 'in suche goode and godlie use accordinge to the Laudable custome of the Churche of England'. In 1563 his burial at St Dunstan's was attended by two hundred members of the Inns, who heard the sermon by Gabriel Goodman, the dean of Westminster. Though no more than two protestants can be identified, the benchers mostly accepted the new order. Some acted as government servants. Richard Catlin, a commissioner for chantry dissolution and church goods, became a serjeant-at-law in 1552. Edward Griffin, the previous king's solicitor-general, was appointed attorney-general in the same year, and became a commissioner for church goods. Under Edward's rule, the benchers of Lincoln's Inn remained predominantly conservative, but they conformed nevertheless.

In Mary's reign there are twenty-four benchers to consider. Of the ten newcomers, Robert Coke of Norfolk, and Ambrose Gilbert, the

1 CPR (1553), 417, (1554-5), 108, (1555-7), 281-2, 396, (1557-8), 74-5, 457 (1558-60), 28, 65, 118-9 (1560-63), 279, 611; Escheators, 74; Mackyn, 306-7; Pcc 23 Chayre, 1563; Fudge, Thesis, III.80-l; A5, II.36.

2 P.174 above.

3 P.177 below.

4 CPR (1553-60), 138; IPH II.84; A5, II.45.
recorder of King's Lynn, left no apparent indication of their religious position. But George Rithe, the escheator for Hampshire and Wiltshire in 1549, stood for 'trewe religion' in the first Marian parliament, and left a will in which he bequeathed his soul to the Trinity, 'trusting in the merrittes of my savior and Redemer Jesus Christe to be saved and to inherit the kingdome of heaven prepared by god for all true penitent belevers in his mercies'. Likewise Robert Kempe, John Newdigate and Richard Kingsmill, who proved to be early adherents to the Elizabethan settlement, most likely adopted protestant views during the early Reformation. These newcomers with Randall Cholmley, now recorder of London, and James Downes, apparently conformed during this period, but retained their protestant sympathies. On the other hand, four of the new benchers showed themselves to be somewhat conservative in religion. They were William Cordell, who became solicitor-general, master of the rolls and privy councillor to Queen Mary, John Bowyer, a former steward of dissolved lands, Ralph Scrope, a member of parliament, and Christopher Wray, a parliamentarian with conservative connections.

Apart from Cordell, whose offices made him one of the most important benchers, the hard Marian core at Lincoln's comprised conservatives from preceding years. Though William Tankard probably discontinued, his place was taken by William Rastell, who returned from exile in 1553 with his manuscript for More's English Works. He dedicated this work to the Queen in 1557, believing that it would 'much helpe forwarde youre
Majesties most godly purpose in purging this your realm of wicked heresies'. At Lincoln's Inn he promptly readorned the altar, for which the benchers ordered each priest at mass to remember the souls of 'Wenefred Hastell, wyff to the sayd William, and all their parentes, kynsfolkes and fryndes'. For his learning and religion, Hastell was rapidly promoted from serjeant-at-law in 1555 to judge of the Queen's bench three years later. The bench who had most responsibility for refurbishing the chapel was William Bendlowes, treasurer of the Inn from 1550 to 1554. After a brief parliamentary career, he too became a serjeant-at-law in 1555, and later founded a chantry for the souls of his monarchs, family, friends and the faithfull departed. In parliament he was associated with Clement Heigham, a dedicated catholic who served the government as a speaker of parliament, privy councillor and chief baron of the exchequer. In the same reign, William Roper returned to parliament, founded a chantry at Canterbury, contributed towards the restoration of Sheen priory, and acted as an energetic heresy commissioner. Therefore it is not surprising that he was one of the benchers who tried to apprehend John Loute in 1546 for disseminating heretical notions of the sacrament. The others were Edward Griffin, Edward Griffen,

1 Pp. 46, 126 above; More, C.ii; A5, II.29.
2 CPR (1557-8), 91-2, (1558-60), 242; SP12/254, f.62; JP Cert. 1564, f.63; PCC 10 Brudnell, 1584/5; Abbott, ch. 3; DNB; A5, II.30. Bendlowes conformed during Elizabeth's reign, but such was his superstitious piety, that 'evere tearme at his goinge from the barre he made a Crosse upon the Barre: And with a solemn kneelinge kist the barre prayenge that once more, if it pleased god, he might come thither ayegne' (SP12/254, f.62).
3 APC V.106, VI.85; CPR (1554-5), 50, (1557-8), 60; Chronicle of QJ and GM, 3-5; Mosley, Foxe, 199; A5, II.19.
4 P.126 above; CPR (1553-4), 121, (1554-5), 225, (1555-7), 24, 218, 402, 476; Foxe, VII.341-2, 605-714, 734-5; Frere, Marian Reaction, 63, 170-1; A5, II.15.
5 P.143 above.
the Marian attorney-general and keeper of wild beasts and woods in
Northamptonshire, and William Forster, who was nominated serjeant-at-law
in 1558. With Thomas Hemming, George St Paul, Henry Haydon, John
Corbet and Henry Payne of earlier years, these were the senior benchers
who dominated Lincoln's Inn during the Marian revival. In contrast
with Gray's Inn, the bench of this society comprised a few conforming
protestants and a solid phalanx of conservatives.

For the Inner Temple, thirty-eight Henrician benchers have been
listed, nine of whom have yielded little evidence of activity outside
the Inn. Though two were unimportant and two probably discontinued,
five held office for many years. Four others have left more detailed
information, but it is difficult to learn of their religious views.
John Baldwin, an influential lawyer and member of the Reformation
Parliament, became a serjeant-at-law in 1531, and was a later chief
justice of common pleas. Richard Hassall was the King's solicitor in
Wales, and then his attorney, before acting as a judge and councillor in
the Marches. As a commissioner he took possession of chantries and
church goods, but was removed from office in 1555 because of infirmity.
John Chamond, a monastic steward and sheriff of Cornwall in 1536, was able

1 CPR (1550-3), 336, (1553-4), 240, 282, (1555-60), passim; Narratives
   of the Reformation, 207; A5, II.16.
2 CPR (1558-60), 165; PCC 3 Martyn, 1573/4; A5, II.24. Forster might
   have been the Suffolk justice whom Foxe described as 'in continual
   hatred against the truth and the professors of the same' (Foxe VII.
   371-2; CPR (1555-7), 139). But his principal residence was in
   Berkshire.
3 A5, II.17, 21, 25, 31, 33.
4 A5, III.1, 2, 4, 11, 14, 23, 24, 26, 27.
5 DNB; A5, III.106.
6 LP VI.83, VII.1455, XII-XXI passim; XXI.1.718(12); CPR (1548-9), 137,
   (1550-3), 394, (1553), 416, (1553-4), passim, (1554-5), 278; Hatfield
   MS 151, ff.127-32; A5, XIII.108.
to obtain select pieces of ecclesiastical property. And John Cock, the receiver of augmentations served both Edward and Mary as a master of requests. These Inner Templars were probably traditional in religion, except John Cock perhaps.

Of the twenty-five remaining benchers, eighteen were somewhat conservative, including six who died in Henry's reign. Thomas Audley, who was promoted to serjeanty in 1531, was no papist, but he showed traditional preferences during his later career. Thomas Noyne's position may be deduced from his involvement with the Lincolnshire rebels. The others left appropriate wills. In 1534 Henry White, a friend of William Walsingham and a fellow under-sheriff, declared his faith in the Trinity and 'all that holy Church holds and believeth as a feithfull man shulde do'. Therefore he beseeched the virgin and all the saints to intercede for his salvation. John Onley, the attorney of augmentations and another under-sheriff, committed his soul to the whole heavenly company as well as providing a year's pension for 'oon prest of good and honest conversacion' and ten shillings to the four orders of London friars to pray for him. John Mores, the receiver of augmentations, left a liberal £10 for seven years to an 'honest prest' who would sing for his soul and teach children, so that every child would be rewarded 'that dothe say before the blessyd Sacrament there in the

1 IP XI.1217(23), Add.1.1.1260; IPM I.24; Rowse, 198; A5, III.21.
2 P.117 above; APC IV.9,305,308,311, V.103,110; CPR (1553-4),279,453, (1557-8), 61-2; Machyn, 26,38,150; A5, III.31.
3 P.114 above; Lehmburg, in Slavin, TMI, 27-9; A5, III.10.
4 P.121 above; A5, III.22.
5 PCC 26 Hogen, 1534/5; A5, III.107.
6 P.119 above; PCC 17 Dyngeley, 1537/8; A5, III.15.
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tyme'.

William Coninge
prothonotary of commi-
simply bequeathed
for ten years.  

The other twelve shou-
Edward's reign, John Tawe of .
as 'a popishe justes', whose wife
'the hoote gospellar' forremoving a
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were nominated serjeants-at-law by the King were prominent in succe

---

1 P.121 above; PCC 14 Alenger, 1536/40; A5, III.8. Interestingly
each Moses provided 4d for 'every man child', but 8d for 'every
maide child'.

2 LP IV.5666, XII.i.1310(3), XV.290; Hall, II.303-4; PCC 13 Alenger,
1540; Wriothesley, I.116; Bellawes, 214-17; DNB; Somerville, 408;
A5, III.3.

3 Narratives of the Reformation, 160; LP XX.i.623; A5, III.29.

4 LP IV.6045(2), X.903, XVIII.i.226(26), II.327(9), XX-XXI passim;
PCC 17 PopulweIl, 1547/8; A5, III.9. The annotated 'Hours of the
Virgin Mary', which belonged to the Latton family, is available at
Oxford (Barlow MS 33).

5 LP XVI.305(40), XVI-XXI passim, XXI.i.302(30); CPR (1548-9), 137,153,
(1550-3), 336; PCC 17 Tashe, 1549/53; Leadam, 36, II.191n; A5, III.19.
heryng of one honest man, three pater noster, three aves and one Crede
for my soul, my wives and Robert Whites, and all christen soules at one
tyme'.

William Coningsby, a judge of the King's bench, formerly
prothonotary of common pleas and attorney of the duchy of Lancaster,
simply bequeathed his soul to the Trinity, but required a priest to sing
for ten years.

The other twelve showed their conservatism during later life. In
Edward's reign, John Tawe of Middlesex was referred to by Edward Underhill
as 'a popishe justes', whose wife and other women would have murdered
'the hoote gospellar' for removing a pix from their altar at Stepney.

In the same reign, John Latton, a member of the Reformation Parliament
and a justice in Berkshire, set aside rents for an obit 'for my sowle and
the soules of my father and mother that Jesus have mercy on us'.

Henry Bradshawe, the solicitor and attorney-general of Henry VIII, was appointed
chief baron of the exchequer in 1552, but died a year later. He
bequeathed his soul to the whole company of heaven, but left his
obsequies to the discretion of his executors. The three lawyers who
were nominated serjeants-at-law by the King were prominent in succeeding

---

1 P.121 above; PCC 14 Alenger, 1536/40; A5, III.8. Interestingly
enough Mores provided 4d for 'every man child', but 8d for 'every
maide child'.

2 LP IV.5666, XII.ii.1310(3), XV.290; Hall, II, 303-4; PCC 13 Alenger,
1540; Wriothesley, I.116; Bellewes, 214-17; DNB; Somerville, 408;
A5, III.3.

3 Narratives of the Reformation, 160; LP XX.i.623; A5, III.29.

4 LP IV.6043(2), X.903, XVIII.i.226(26), II.327(9), XX-XXI passim;
PCC 17 Populwell, 1547/8; A5, III.9. The annotated 'Hours of the
Virgin Mary', which belonged to the Latton family, is available at
Oxford (Barlow MS 33).

5 LP XVI.305(40), XVI-XXI passim, XXI.i.302(30); CPR (1548-9), 137,153,
(1550-3), 336; PCC 17 Tashe, 1549/53; Leadam, 86, II.191n; A5, III.19.
years. Thomas Bromley I, a serjeant in 1540, was placed on Edward's council of regency, and became Mary's chief justice of common pleas. Though he forwarded Edwardian policy and included a protestant-looking preamble in his will, he instructed his friends 'to pray unto Almighty godd to be mercifull unto me, and to receave my soule into the eternall glorye'.¹ David Broke who married Mary's wet-nurse,² and John Whiddon,³ both became serjeants in 1547 and received special favours from Queen Mary. Their immediate promotion as chief baron of the exchequer and justice of the Queen's bench respectively, followed by knighthoods soon after, indicates that they adhered to the same faith. A more important lawyer was John Baker, chancellor of the exchequer and privy councillor to Henry, Edward and Mary. Though he implemented early Reformation policy, he was an active Marian commissioner for heresy, and left an elaborate will, complete with saints, masses, prayers, obits and priests.⁴ Nicholas Hare, John Carrell and John Beaumont were also Tudor officials and members of catholic families. In Henry's reign, Beaumont was recorder of Leicester, a dissolution agent and receiver-general of the court of wards. In 1552 he was forced to resign as master of the rolls for lining his pockets from the receivership, but he remained at the Inner

¹ LP XII.i.2770, XV.942(9); APC III.159-60,162,382; CPR (1547-8), 347-8, (1550-3), 354, (1553-4), 64; PCC 34 More, 1552/3; DNB; Jordan, Edward VI, I.57; A5, III.18. In his will, Bromley bequeathed his soul'unto the mercyfull handes and power of allmightie godd Trusting assuredly by the merittes of the bloode and passion of our Saviour Jehu Christe my Redemer and Savior to have remyssion and forgiveness of my synnes and to enjoye the eternall glory in heven'.

² LP XVI.947(78), XXI.i.302(30); CPR (1548-9), 136, (1550-3), 54,111, (1553), 416, (1553-4), 446, (1554-5), 201, (1558-60), 157; HMC R III.46; Nachyn, 335; Foss, V.358-9; A5, III.17.

³ LP XVIII.i.226(30); CPR (1550-3), 43, (1553-4), 71, (1558-60), 65; Nachyn, 342; PCC 57 Pyckering, 1576; CRB XIII.129; JP Sub. 1569, s.113v-4; DNB; A5, III.12. Whiddon conformed during Elizabeth's reign, and died leaving a protestant will.

⁴ P.119 above; CPR (1553), 416, (1553-4), 435, (1555-7), 24-5; APC IV.393; Foss, VII.287-306; PCC 24 welles, 1558/9; A5, III.6.
Nicholas Hare, who continued as an Edwardian master of requests, reached the peak of his career in the following reign as master of the rolls, legal councillor and heresy commissioner. In his will he commended himself to the whole heavenly band, disbursed charity for the sake of his soul, and gave £5 to his Inn for reornamenting the Temple church. John Carrell, who continued as attorney of the duchy of Lancaster until his death in 1566, was an active commissioner in Edward's time, but refused to subscribe to the 1549 prayer book. In the following reign, the Queen would have made him chief justice, but he remained a legal adviser to the crown and a bencher of the Inn. Two more benchers revealed their conservatism in Elizabeth's time. They were Richard Ward, formerly an exchequer of Oxfordshire and Berkshire and a gentleman of Henry's household, and Thomas Saunders, solicitor to Anne of Cleves and King's remembrancer from 1545 to 1558.

The other seven Inner Templars showed some commitment to the new religion, but only one during Henry's reign. John Croke, a friend of Cromwell, translated selected psalms into English verse for his wife. In 1549 he became a master in chancery, but his translation probably belongs to the late 1520's or early 1530's when he was one of the six clerks. Perhaps he subscribed to no other principle than free access to

1 LP X.1191, XII.ii.6,800,1280(f.22v), XIII.i.78, XIII.ii.706, XXI.i.362(50); CPR (1548-9), 152; DNB; Hurstfield, 199-203; A5, III.20.
2 P.120 above; LP XVI.101; APC II.355,358, IV.393, V.65,66,115,118,225; CPR (1550-3), 284, (1553-4), 269,440, (1555-7), 67-8,281-2, (1557-8), 231-2; Foxe, VII.38-9,341-2; Machyn, 156-7,159; PCC 46 Wrastley, 1557; A5, III.16.
3 P.118 above; APC III.382,397, IV.382, V.115,120,138; CPR (1548-9), 137, 219, (1550-3), 354, (1553), 415, (1553-4), 90, (1554-5),310, (1555-7), 464, (1557-8), 74-5; IPM II.97; Machyn, 26-7; A5, III.25. Though Carrell became a serjeant-at-law in 1555, he was evidently exonerated.
4 A5, III.7,32; p.287 below.
vernacular scripture. But in the absence of contrary evidence, he may be tentatively removed from conservative company. Three others showed their commitment in later years. John Pakington, a diligent Welsh councillor and judge, who profited greatly from the dissolution, omitted any reference to saints or ceremonies in his will, where he committed his soul to the mercy of God, 'wherby and by the merits of the passion of his only sonne Jesus Christe our lorde, I truste to be saved and to be amonges the nombre of his electe'. Likewise, John Lucas, the legal servant to Audley and Edward VI, left a Marian will in which he simply bequeathed his soul to God's mercy, 'trusting that by this grace and the mercy of Jehu Christ his moste precious deathe and passion, I have and shall have full and clene remission of all my synnes'. Thomas Gawdy I, who became a serjeant-at-law in 1552 and served on several Edwardian commissions for ecclesiastical causes, was noted as an adherent to 'trewe religion' in Mary's first parliament. Furthermore his will included a markedly protestant preamble. To these four may be added three who

1 Stowe M3 956, Additional M3 30981, Bodleian M3 Eng. hist. c.313, published by the Percy Society, XI (1844); Lansdowne M3 163, ff.143-4; All Souls' College M3 139, f.134v; LlBB IV, f.179 (I.278-810); CPR (1553-4), 453, (1554-5), 309; Croke, Genealogical History, 393-407; DNB; Elton, TRG, 260n. Croke can be identified as a member of the Inner Temple until 1547, when he was apparently the 'Mr Croke of the said Inner Temple' who became a serjeant-at-law, which suggests that he was also a bencher (A5, III.109). Since this promotion was not mentioned on his burial plate, he was possibly exonerated to become a master in chancery. It has been thought that the Stowe M3 was the small volume which Anne Boleyn held on the scaffold.

2 LP IV.6510, V-XXI passim; CPR (1548-9), 137, (1549-51), 211-2; PCC 30 Bucke, 1551; DNB; A5, III.5.

3 P.120 above; APC IV.322,305,308,311; PCC 20 Ketchyn, 1556; A5, III.30.

4 CPR (1550-3), 284, (1553), 416, (1553-4), 443; MP List, 1553; PCC Ketchyn, 1553/6; A5, III.34. 'First I bequeath my Soule to the everlyving god, having a firme hoope to be savid throughe and by the shedinge of Chrystes moaste hollie blode and his deathe, Beaseaching moaste humblie theverlyvinge god to give me grace to dye in his fathe feere and love, and to be a partaker of his deare somnes deathe and shedding of his blode, And that I may come to his everlastinge kindeome, and that yt will please hym to have mercye upon me accordinge to his moaste greate mercye'. In conclusion, Gawdy wished all his friends 'good and godlye lief and to die and likewise agayne with chirste, and that we may all meete to gether in the everlasting kingdom of god. Amen'.

183
were favourers of the Elizabethan settlement. Robert Chidley, the attorney of first fruits in 1543 and a frequent commissioner until his death in 1577, and Anthony Stapleton, a fellow justice in Middlesex, were possibly protestants in Henry's reign. The same might be said for Robert Kelway, a friend of John Croke, legal servant to the duke of Somerset, surveyor in the court of wards and liveries and one of the two principal chantry commissioners. His Edwardian career, which suffered with the fall of his patron, revived after the accession of Elizabeth. Thus only three protestants and four possibilities can be discovered for Henry's reign.

For Edward's period, thirty-two benchers have been distinguished at the Inner Temple. John Whiddon and David Broke, who had been summoned to serjeancy by Henry VIII, did so after Edward's accession, while John Pakington apparently discontinued because of his duties in Wales. No evidence of religion has been found for John Boisse, John Oteley and John Cock, or for Richard Randall, one of the thirteen new benchers. Four newcomers may be added to the nine continuing conservatives. They include William Symonds, a member of the

---

1 P.118 above; CPR (1547-8), 86, (1553), 417, (1553-4), 78, (1557-8), 74-5, (1560-3), 523, (1563-6), 531,931,1237; A5, III.13; p.283 below.

2 LP IX.895; CPR (1553-4),22, (1563-6), 130,151,503; HCOR, IX.296; A5, III.28; p.289 below.

3 LP XX.1.622(p.316),768, 11.648(62), XXI.1.1165(40), 11.648(11); CSPD (1547-80), 9,47; CPR (1547-8),93,232,238,417, (1548-9),57,136, 154, (1553), 413; APC I.386-8, II.408, III.272-4,452,460-1; ITAB I, f.137 (I.178); DNB; Hurstfield, 233-4; Richardson, Augus, 174; A5, III.33; p.289 below.

4 A5, III.12,17,5.

5 A5, III.23,26,31,39. Randall was in Antwerp in 1552, when he reported seeing four suns and two back-to-back rainbows (Wriothesley, II.67-8).

Reformation Parliament, whom Mary made her councillor, attorney and judge in Wales, before nominating him as a serjeant-at-law. He was evidently the lawyer of Windsor whose brother was reportedly a popish prebendary in the mid-thirties, and whom Foxe portrayed as a malicious enemy of early protestants. Judging by John Prideaux's quick promotion to serjeant-at-law in 1555 and Queen's serjeant in 1557, he also belonged to the conservative camp. In Elizabeth's reign, James Smith and John Fuller were noted as acting unfavourably towards the religious settlement. The other eight newcomers showed some commitment to the protestant religion, including two who did so before Edward's death. George Willoughby, the King's attorney in Wales from 1546, omitted saints and services in his will, but included a preamble whereby 'havinge full hope and truste in the promyses made to us to be saved by the death and blode sheddinge of Christe', he committed his soul 'to his mercyfull ordynaunce and appoyntment'. In 1539 Henry Polsted urged his master to deliver the imprisoned mayor of Rye, 'a man of moche sobrietie, good judgement and ffavor Discretely the worde of God'. The implied protestantism of this statement is verified by his Marian will, in which he shunned tradition, merely bequeathing his soul to God and his body to be buried 'withoute any Maner of pompe in any wise'.

1 LP IV.6043(2), XXI.i.734; SPL/95, f.25, l/105, f.291, l/106, f.22 (LP IX.121, XI.291,325); APC V.44, VI.350; CPR (1555-7), 469, (1558-60), 65; Escheators, 186; Foxe, V.464-97; PCC 36 Kellershe, 1559/60; A5, III.37.

2 SPL/2, f.27-30 (GSPD, 1547-80, II.57); APC VI.414, VII.6; CPR (1548-9), 135,258, (1555-7), 108, (1557-8), l, (1558-60), 19; A5, III.42.

3 A5, III.38,40; pp.287,288.below.

4 LP XXI.i.718(13).ii.471(11); CPR (1548-9), 137,167, (1549-51), 299; Escheators, 186; PCC 20 Coode, 1550; A5, III.35.

5 P.116 above; SPL/135, f.1 (LP XIV.i.546); PCC 6 Ketchyn, 1555/6; A5, III.45.
a friend of John Lucas, made a similar bequest, and in the following year George Wood, the Welsh judge, included a protestant preamble in his will. Richard Blackwell and Thomas Gawdy II, who were strong protestants during Elizabethan years, reportedly stood for 'the trewe religion' in Mary's first parliament. Two others, who showed support for the Elizabethan settlement, were possibly protestants during Edward's reign. They were John Charles, a Devon justice, and Richard Harper, the later judge. But the latter, who left a protestant-looking will, also proved acceptable to the Marian government and was listed as a catholic sympathiser in 1574. If these eight are added to five continuing benchers, in Edward's reign there were at least eight protestants and a further five possibilities, as opposed to more than thirteen conforming conservatives.

Thirty-five Inner Templars have been identified for Mary's reign. Henry Bradshawe died three weeks after her accession, and John Oteley had

---

1 APC III.358, IV.322; CPR (1553-4), 411; PCC 40 Wrastley, 1557; A5, III.47. Wade was possibly the son of a merchant tailor, a master of the company, and secondary of the Wood Street compter (Machyn, 91,151).

2 CPR (1554-5), 59,278, (1557-8), 311; PCC 36 Noodes, 1558; A5, III.46. 'ffirst I bequeathe my soule to Almighty God, trustyng by the merites of his passyon and the Sheadynge of his bloode to be washed from myne iniqyties and cleansed from my Synnes, and praying with the prophet David that he will not remember thoffences and Iniqyties of my Youthe, have perfect hope to have the fruyction of his Deytie and Lief everlastynge. And my body to be buryed after a Crystian sorte withoute vayne glory or pompe in suche place as it shalbe moste convenyent'.

3 MP List 1553; A5, III.36,43; pp.287,288.

4 A5, III.41; LP XX.1.622; CPR (1560-3), 16, (1569-72), 7; JP Cart. 1564, f.70v.

5 CPR (1557-8), 457, (1558-60), 65, (1566-9), 332; CRS XIII.135; JP Cart. 1564, f.80; JP Sub. 1569, ff.117v-8; Abbott, 122-52; PCC 9 Daughtry, 1576/7; A5, III.44. In his will, Harper invoked the Trinity, 'in whom I do stedfastly believe, and that by the merittes and death of his only Sonne our Saviour and Redeemer and his infinite mercies my Synnes shall not be imputed unto me'. His desire was that God 'will thorowe and by his unspeakeable mercies accept me as of his Elected flock and receive my Soule unto his handes'.

a friend of John Lucas, made a similar bequest,¹ and in the following
year George Wood, the Welsh judge, included a protestant preamble in his
will.² Richard Blackwell and Thomas Gawdy II, who were strong
protestants during Elizabethan years, reportedly stood for 'the trewe
religion' in Mary's first parliament.³ Two others, who showed support
for the Elizabethan settlement, were possibly protestants during Edward's
reign. They were John Charles, a Devon justice,⁴ and Richard Harper,
the later judge. But the latter, who left a protestant-looking will,
also proved acceptable to the Marian government and was listed as a
catholic sympathiser in 1574.⁵ If these eight are added to five
continuing benchers,⁶ in Edward's reign there were at least eight
protestants and a further five possibilities, as opposed to more than
thirteen conforming conservatives.

Thirty-five Inner Templars have been identified for Mary's reign.
Henry Bradshawe died three weeks after her accession, and John Oteley had

¹ APC III.358, IV.322; CPR (1553-4), 411; PCC 40 Wraatley, 1557; A5,
III.47. Wade was possibly the son of a merchant tailor, a master of the
company, and secondary of the Wood Street compter (Machyn,91,151).

² CPR (1554-5), 59,278, (1557-8), 311; PCC 36 Noodes, 1558; A5, III.46.
'Tfirst I bequeathe my soule to Almighty god, trustynge by the merites
of his passyon and the Sheedyng of his bloode to be washed from myne
iniquities and clesed from my Synnes, and praying with the prophet
David that he will not rememba thoffences and Iniquities of my Youthe,
have perfect hope to have the fruycion of his Deytie and Lief
everlastynge. And my body to be buryed after a Cristian sorte
withoute wayne glory or Pompe in suche place as it chaube moste
convenyent'.

³ MP List 1553; A5, III.36,43; pp.287,288.

⁴ A5, III.41; LR XX.i.622; CPR:(1560-3), 16, (1569-72), 7; JP Cert. 1564,
f.70v.

⁵ CPR (1557-8), 457, (1558-60), 65, (1566-9), 832; CRS XIII.135; JP
Cert. 1564; f.80; JP Sub. 1569, ff.117v-8; Abbott, 122-32; PCC 9
Daughter, 1576/7; A5, III.44. In his will, Harper invoked the
Trinity, 'in whom I do stedfastly believe, and that by the meurittes
and death of his only Sonne our Saviour and Redeemer and his infinite
mercies my Synnes shall not be imputed unto me'. His desire was that
God 'will thorow and by his unspeakeable mericies accept me as of his
Elected flock and receive my Soule unto his handes'.

a friend of John Lucas, made a similar bequest, and in the following year George Wood, the Welsh judge, included a protestant preamble in his will. Richard Blackwell and Thomas Gawdy II, who were strong protestants during Elizabethan years, reportedly stood for 'the trewe religion' in Mary's first parliament. Two others, who showed support for the Elizabethan settlement, were possibly protestants during Edward's reign. They were John Charles, a Devon justice, and Richard Harper, the later judge. But the latter, who left a protestant-looking will, also proved acceptable to the Marian government and was listed as a catholic sympathiser in 1574. If these eight are added to five continuing benchers, in Edward's reign there were at least eight protestants and a further five possibilities, as opposed to more than thirteen conforming conservatives.

Thirty-five Inner Templars have been identified for Mary's reign. Henry Bradshawe died three weeks after her accession, and John Oteley had

1 APC III.358, IV.322; CPR (1553-4), 411; POC 40 Wrasley, 1557; A5, III.47. Wade was possibly the son of a merchant tailor, a master of the company, and secondary of the Wood Street compter (Machyn, 91, 151).

2 CPR (1554-5), 59, 278, (1557-8), 311; PCC 36 Noodes, 1558; A5, III.46. 'first I bequeathe my soule to Almighty god, trustyng by the merits of his passyon and the Sheadynge of his bloode to be washed from myne iniquitez and clenced from my Synnez, and praying with the prophet David that he will not remember thoffences and Iniquities of my Youthe, have perfect hope to have the fruyccion of his Deytie and Lief everlastynge. And my body to be buryed after a Crystian sorte without vayne glory or pome in suche place as it shalbe moste convenyent'.

3 MP List 1553; A5, III.36,43; pp.287, 288.

4 A5, III.41; LR XX.i.622; CPR-(1560-3), 16, (1569-72), 7; JP Cert. 1564, f.70v.

5 CPR (1557-8), 457, (1558-60), 65, (1566-9), 332; CRS XIII.135; JP Cert. 1564, f.80; JP Sub. 1569, ff.117v-8; Abbott, 122-32; PCC 9 Dauntry, 1576/7; A5, III.44. In his will, Harper invoked the trinity, 'in whom I do stedfastly believe, and that by the meirittes and death of his only Sonne sure Saviour and Redeemer and his infinite mercies my Synnes shall not be imputed unto me'. His desire was that God 'will thorow and by his unspeakeable mercies accept me as of his Elected flock and receive my Soule unto his handes'.

probably discontinued.¹ Nothing of religious import has been found for John Boisse, John Cock and Richard Ocke.² The eight newcomers.³ Of these, William Williams, John Bousie, John Cock and Richard Ocke have been justices of the peace who at least continued for but their position at this time is unknown. Thomas Williams showed in later years that he were protestant for some time.⁴ George Wall, a Henrician augmentations in South Wales, was chosen serjeant-at-law by As he made no religious statement in his Elizabethan will, he was likely conservative or indifferent.⁵ Richard Sackville, who had transferred his allegiance from Gray's Inn, remained a member of the privy council. According to Camden, at this time he was of the same religion as the Queen.⁶ Thomas Bishop, a Henrician clerk of the crown in Sussex and a client of Sackville, left an early Elizabethan will in which he made no secret of his conviction. As well as requiring services for the comfort of his soul, he made bequests for the 'maintenance of the Catholicke faith', and provided part of an exhibition for 'a catholicke student of divinitie within the Kinges College in Cambridge'.⁷ When these three benchers are added to the

¹ A5, III.19,26.
² A5, III.23,31,39.
⁴ P.268 below.
⁵ LP XXI.1.302(30),1280(f.23); CPR (1553), 375,415, (1557-8), 457, (1558-60), 65,184,205; Eschentors, 186; PCC 19 Mellershe, 1559/60; A5, III.48.
⁶ P.160 above; Camden, 2; A5, III.51.
⁷ LP XIII.i.190(40); CPR (1553-4), 306, (1555-7), 227, (1558-60), 430; Eschentors, 168; PCC 50 Mellershe, 1558/60; Strype, Annals, I.1.70; A5, III.54.
probably discontinued.1 Nothing of religious significance has been found for John Boisse, John Cock and Richard Randall,2 or for four of the eight newcomers.3 Of these, William Pole and James Rivett were justices of the peace who at least conformed during Elizabeth's reign, but their position at this time is unknown. Of the other four, only Thomas Williams showed in later years that he had been a committed protestant for some time.4 George Wall, a Henrician receiver of augmentations in South Wales, was chosen serjeant-at-law by Queen Mary. As he made no religious statement in his Elizabethan will, he was quite likely conservative or indifferent.5 Richard Sackville, who had transferred his allegiance from Gray's Inn, remained a member of the privy council. According to Camden, at this time he was of the same religion as the Queen.6 Thomas Bishop, a Henrician clerk of the crown in Sussex and a client of Sackville, left an early Elizabethan will in which he made no secret of his conviction. As well as requiring services for the comfort of his soul, he made bequests for the 'maintenauce of the Catholicke faith', and provided part of an exhibition for 'a catholicke student of divinitie within the Kings College in Cambridge'.7 When these three benchers are added to the

1 A5, III.19,26.
2 A5, III.23,31,39.
4 P.288 below.
5 LP X XI.1,302(30),1280(1.23); CPR (1553), 375,415, (1557-8), 457, (1558-60), 65,184,209; Escheators, 186; POC 19 Nellershe, 1559/60; A5, III.48.
6 P.160 above; Camden, 2; A5, III.51.
7 LP XIII.1,190(40); CPR (1553-4), 306, (1555-7), 227, (1558-60), 430; Escheators, 168; POC 50 Nellershe, 1559/60; Strype, Annals, 1.1.70; A5, III.54.
eleven who continued, the conservatives of the Inner Temple outnumber
the twelve possible protestants who were forced to conform. 2

At the Middle Temple, thirty-three Henrician benchers have been
listed. For six of these there is no evidence that they continued for
any significant time. 3 Nothing of religious importance has been
discovered for seven of the remaining twenty-seven. Four of them were
Henrician servants, namely William Saunders, the receiver of
augmentations for Surrey and Sussex, 4 Edward Warner, a commissioner in
various counties, 5 Thomas Holte, the attorney and councillor in Wales, 6
and Anthony Bury, a member of the committee for legal reform. 7 None of
these appears to have been protestant. The same might be said of
nineteen others who were evident conservatives. Edmund Knightley, a
serjeant-at-law whom Audley described as 'full of fonde Invencion',
cannot have endeared himself to Cromwell by recommending that Gatesby
nunnery should stand because of its perfect order. 8 Seven showed

1 Baker, Ward, Hare, Beaumont, Carrell, Tawe, Saunders, Symonds, Smith,
Fuller, Prideaux (A5, III.6,7,16,20,25,29,32,37,38,40,42).

2 Lucas, Blackwall, Gawdy II, Polsted, Wood, Wade and Williams probably
retained their protestant sympathies, and possibly Chidley, Stapleton,
Kelway and Charles. Harper was possibly more conservative (A5, III.
30,36,43,45,46,47,49,13,28,33,41,44).

3 John Hussey, John Fitzwilliam, John Fitzjames, John Palmer, John More,
Robert Bradbury (A5, IV.6,9,22,27,29,30).

4 LP 6043(2), XII.ii.1269, XIII.ii.1184(3), XVI.92,93(2), XXI.i.302(30),
ii.332(42); CPR (1547-8), 90; A5, IV.7.

5 LP XX.i.622(pp.315,319); Escheators, 102; Leadam, SC, II.309n; A5, IV.
8. Not to be confused with the Elizabethan lieutenant of the Tower.

6 LP IV.6043(2), VII.758,1455,X.14,820,1191(2), XI.176, XII-XXI passim,
 XV.398; LPM I.124; A5, IV.13.

7 LP IV.6044(2), IX.119, X.487; CPR (1555-7), 116; A5, IV.20. The other
three are John Orange, John Jenour and Henry Babthorpe (A5, IV.1,4,11).

8 Cotton MSS Titus E.I, f.409, Cleo, E.IV, f.209 (LP XII.ii.305, X.358); 
A5, IV.107.
conservative attitudes in their wills. They include Amias Paulet, steward for the bishopric of Bath and Wells, who provided ten obits for his soul. Robert Broke, the recorder of London, an Edwardian serjeant-at-law, Mary's chief justice of common pleas and a known catholic, mentioned money for lights and a chantry priest. And Nicholas Luke, a baron of the exchequer who served four Tudors before his death in 1564, bequeathed his soul to the Trinity, 'trusting assuredly by the merittes of Christes passion to be partaker of the hevenly glory, and by the intercession of the gloriouse Virgine Mary the mother of our saviour Jesus Christ and of all the holly company of heaven'. The outlook of another two is suggested by their connections. William Whorwood, the solicitor and attorney-general, was an executor to John Stokesley, the conservative bishop of London. When Robert Browne, a baron of the exchequer, died in 1559, he merely bequeathed his soul to God and his body to christian burial. But he admitted two future recusants to the Middle Temple in 1552, and in Elizabeth's reign his house continued to be used for mass. Four benchers showed their conservative colours during Mary's reign. John Pollard, the speaker of Mary's first important parliament, bequeathed £5 to a clerical kinsman 'to pray for

1 James Hadley (PCC 3 Dyngeley, 1537), Thomas Matston (26 Alenger, 1540/1), John Edmunds, (16 Pynnynge, 1544), John Sewster (14 Alen, 1546), and the three below.

2 LP XVI.107(25); BACR, Wells, II.209; PCC 18 Dyngeley, 1538; DNB; Hembry, 46-7; A5, IV.3.

3 LP XVI.494; APC III.383, IV.382; CPR (1548-9), 153, (1550-3), 354, (1553), 416, (1554-5), 221, (1556-8), 459; Bodleian MS Ashm. 854, f.230v; PCC 54 Noodles, 1558; Wriothesley, I.162; Somerville, 427; DNB; A5, IV.28.

4 LP XV.616(16), XV-XXI passim; CPR (1553-4), 65, (1558-60), 103, 224; PCC 31 Stevenson, 1563/4; A5, IV.18.

5 P. above; LP IV.6043(2), XIV.ii.133; XVI.305(18); SP1/212, f.114; Leadam, EC, 227n; A5, IV.23. The other executors were John Baker and Roger Cholmley, also conservatives.

6 CPR (1549-51), 167, (1553-4), 71, (1555-7), 295; PCC 2 Chavney, 1558/9; CRB, XIII.227; A5, IV.14. The recusants were John Pinkin and Richard Crompton. The CRB wrongly assumes that Browne was alive in the 1570's.
me in every his Masses to almightie god', and stipulated 'that there be
a Sermon preached at my buriall and on other at my monthes mynde, by a
Catholyke Doctor or bachelor of Divinitie'.

Though Richard Rich
accommodated himself to any ecclesiastical policy, his energetic
restoration of catholicism and suppression of heresy in Essex surely
reflects his personal preference.

William Portman, who became Mary's
chief justice of the Queen's bench, was so orthodox in religion that he
was chosen to persuade James Hales to recant. In 1555, Edward Saunders
tried to reform his brother's error 'in the opinion of the most blessed,
and our most comfortable sacrament of the altar'. Saunders's belief was
that the judgement of two or three holy fathers carried more weight 'than
three hundred of the Zuinglians, or as many of the Lutherans, can or
should do'. Laurence Saunders was burnt, but his brother was knighted
and succeeded Portman as chief justice. Another five benchers left
wills which ignored the traditional formula and did not refer to specific
ceremonies. They merely committed their souls to God, either in a few
words or in lengthier preambles which mention everlasting life through
the death of Christ. These statements were evidently affected by
Reformation ideas and events. But since the same kind of committal was
made by Richard Rich, William Portman and Edward Saunders, they can hardly

1 P.151 above.

2 P.119 above; CSPD (1547-80), 157; APC V.104,141,148; PCC 12 Babington,
1567/8; DNB; Foxe, VII.118-23,270-1,628-38; A5, IV.12.

3 CPR (1553-4), 66, (1554-5), 301; HMCR X.ii.262; Foxe, VI.714; Machyn,
125-6; Narratives of the Reformation, 60-8; PCC 5 Wrastley, 1557;
A5, IV.15.

4 LP XII.ii.1269, XIII.ii.1184(3); APC II.25; CSPD (1547-80), 61;
CPR (1548-9), 136, (1553-4), 71, (1558-60), 58,233; Foxe, VI.635-6;
Machyn, 81,82; PCC 41 Carew, 1576; DNB; A5, IV.25.
be identified as protestant. All were loyal crown servants - Lewis Fortescue, a dissolution agent and Henrician baron of the exchequer, Robert Southwell, the augmentations' official and master of the rolls to Henry and Edward, Richard Lister, chief baron of the exchequer and chief justice of common pleas under the two monarchs, Edward Montague, chief justice of common pleas at the same time, and Francis Morgan, a Marian justice of the Queen's bench. Their careers suggest that they were fairly conservative in religion. Therefore the only likely protestant

1 Rich piously bequeathed his soul to God ' and to his infinite mercy and to the merites of his most blessed passion whereby I trust to be saved'. Fortescue did likewise, 'trusting by the merites of Christes passion to come to the fruycion of the everlasting Lyffe whereunto is all my hope'. Saunders did the same, 'not doubting but that as he of his great goodness hath created it and with his precious blood hath redeemed it, so of his infinite mercy he will save it amongs his saintes in his glorious kingdome'.

2 Fortescue prayed God 'to take my soul to his inestymable mercye and pitye that it may enioye his inheritance in hevy-n, for the which he created the same and dyd Redeeme it by and with his most bitter passion'. He instructed his family to bury him 'without pompe or pryde and after a honest sorte'.

3 Southwell included a lengthy religious preamble in his will, thanking God for great benefits, beseeching pardon for his heinous sins, committing himself wholly to His will, and beseeching hope of everlasting life. He asked to be buried 'without pompe or pryde', but with 'such ordre and obsequies' as his executors thought fit for a person of his estate.

4 Lister committed his soul to God, 'trusting in his mercye and thereby by the merites of his passion to come to everlasting lyffe and glory'. His body was to be buried without any great solemnitie, but to have 'suche divyne service as is ordeyned for the buriall of Christen men with alms to be given to the pore and other dedes of charitie'.

5 Montague merely bequeathed his soul to the Trinity and his body 'to be buried in Christian buriall and that it be done without grete pompe or grete solemnitie'.

6 Morgan commended his soul to God, 'most humblie beseeching hym to accept and take the same into his godlie hands and protection'.

1 Rich piously bequeathed his soul to God 'and to his infinite mercy and to the merites of his most blessed passion whereby I trust to be saved'. Fortescue did likewise, 'trusting by the merites of Christes passion to come to the fruycion of the everlasting Lyffe whereunto is all my hope'. Saunders did the same, 'not doubting but that as he of his great goodness hath created it and with his precious blood hath redeemed it, so of his infinite mercy he will save it amongs his saintes in his glorious kingdome'.

2 Fortescue prayed God 'to take my soul to his inestymable mercye and pitye that it may enioye his inheritance in hevy-n, for the which he created the same and dyd Redeeme it by and with his most bitter passion'. He instructed his family to bury him 'without pompe or pryde and after a honest sorte'.

3 Southwell included a lengthy religious preamble in his will, thanking God for great benefits, beseeching pardon for his heinous sins, committing himself wholly to His will, and beseeching hope of everlasting life. He asked to be buried 'without pompe or pryde', but with 'such ordre and obsequies' as his executors thought fit for a person of his estate.

4 Lister committed his soul to God, 'trusting in his mercye and thereby by the merites of his passion to come to everlasting lyffe and glory'. His body was to be buried without any great solemnitie, but to have 'suche divyne service as is ordeyned for the buriall of Christen men with alms to be given to the pore and other dedes of charitie'.

5 Montague merely bequeathed his soul to the Trinity and his body 'to be buried in Christian buriall and that it be done without grete pompe or grete solemnitie'.

6 Morgan commended his soul to God, 'most humblie beseeching hym to accept and take the same into his godlie hands and protection'.

---

1 Rich piously bequeathed his soul to God 'and to his infinite mercy and to the merites of his most blessed passion whereby I trust to be saved'. Fortescue did likewise, 'trusting by the merites of Christes passion to come to the fruycion of the everlasting Lyffe whereunto is all my hope'. Saunders did the same, 'not doubting but that as he of his great goodness hath created it and with his precious blood hath redeemed it, so of his infinite mercy he will save it amongs his saintes in his glorious kingdome'.

2 Fortescue prayed God 'to take my soul to his inestymable mercye and pitye that it may enioye his inheritance in hevy-n, for the which he created the same and dyd Redeeme it by and with his most bitter passion'. He instructed his family to bury him 'without pompe or pryde and after a honest sorte'.

3 Southwell included a lengthy religious preamble in his will, thanking God for great benefits, beseeching pardon for his heinous sins, committing himself wholly to His will, and beseeching hope of everlasting life. He asked to be buried 'without pompe or pryde', but with 'such ordre and obsequies' as his executors thought fit for a person of his estate.

4 Lister committed his soul to God, 'trusting in his mercye and thereby by the merites of his passion to come to everlasting lyffe and glory'. His body was to be buried without any great solemnitie, but to have 'suche divyne service as is ordeyned for the buriall of Christen men with alms to be given to the pore and other dedes of charitie'.

5 Montague merely bequeathed his soul to the Trinity and his body 'to be buried in Christian buriall and that it be done without grete pompe or grete solemnitie'.

6 Morgan commended his soul to God, 'most humblie beseeching hym to accept and take the same into his godlie hands and protection'.

---
during Henry's reign was John Hawdeley, a Somerset commissioner, who bequeathed his soul to God 'trusting onely in his mercie and by faith and hope in christes merites of his glorious Death and passion and resurrection to have the fruition of his glorious Maiestie'. Though his will was written in 1570, he probably adopted protestant tenets much earlier in life.¹ Thus the Middle Temple bench was overwhelmingly conservative under Henry's rule.

Of the twenty-five benchers distinguished for Edward's reign, six can be eliminated. John Pollard, who was elected serjeant-at-law by Henry VIII, was admitted after Edward's accession.² William Lord Windsor, Henry Lord Stafford and John Lord Mordaunt held bench chambers, but seemingly in keeping with their personal status rather than any legal office.³ Though William Wheatley and William Barne were posthumously referred to as masters of the bench, they were apparently associates who had been fined for not reading.⁴ In addition no evidence of religion has been found for two continuing benchers and three newcomers.⁵ At least three other new benchers may be added to the five continuing conservatives.⁶ They include Alan Horde, who had been admitted in 1511 at the instance of St German. In 1539 when his brother Edmund, the prior of Hinton charterhouse, showed some resistance to the dissolution, Horde

¹ P. 294 below.
² A5, IV.19.
³ A5, IV.31,41,48.
⁴ MMIB II, ff.96v,186v; 11,94 (I.179,289;91,176). There is no record of them acting as benchers during their lifetime. Wheatley was chief prothonotary of common pleas by 1571.
informed him 'off the kynges hye displeasure and my lorde prevye sealles'.

But when Horde died in 1554, he not only bequeathed his own soul to the whole heavenly company, but also proposed to bestow his deceased brother's money on any restored charterhouse, and to deliver 'a little Chalice of silver and gilt, and a Crosse of silver which is in my study at Ewell, and a pax of silver and gilt, and a Crosse of silver and gilt with relics therin, and a littyll cofere with Reliques, and a vestement with an albe of clothe of bewdckyn'. These had evidently been withheld from the King's commissioners and horded throughout Edward's reign. ¹

Another newcomer was Thomas Denton, now steward of Abingdon and a commissioner for church goods. In keeping with the enlightened tone of his Henrician reports on upper-class education, he bequeathed his soul to God 'and to our Saviour Jesus Criste his onely sonne, verily trustinge and belevinge to be redeemed, Justified and saved by the merittes of his moost happie and blessid passion'. Yet his late Marian will also left directions for burial between the altars of his parish church, for curates 'to saie masse and to pray for me that daye', and for the traditional month's mind. ² The third new bencher was Edmund Windsor, the brother of Lord Windsor and a former attorney of Lord Lisle. Early in Elizabeth's reign he was an evident conservative. ³ Of the other five newcomers, James Dyer, a serjeant-at-law in 1552, the speaker of Edward's

last parliament and Elizabeth's chief justice of common pleas, was

¹ MTMB I. f.20 (I.37); LP XIV.i.145,637, XV.1032, XVI.632; Cotton MS Cleo. E.IV., f.270 (LP XIV.i.269; Ellis, Letters, ser.II.i.130-2); CPR (1554-5),9; PCO 7 More, 1554; Elton, PP, 107-8; A5, IV.41. The only evidence of Horde's office is that he held a bench chamber in 1553 (MTMB II, f.13v (I.93). The Carthusians returned to the hospital of the Savoy and to Sheen priory in 1555 (Knowles, III.439).

² P. 14 above; CPR (1547-8), 23, (1548-9), 136, (1553), 415, (1553-4), 17,23,27,28, (1555-7), 192,212; APC V.146; PCO 77 Moods, 1557/8; Richardson, Augns, 292; A5, IV.37.

³ LP VI.814,1339, VII.350,773; CPR (1553-4), 17,28; A5, IV.35; p.321 below.
undoubtedly protestant in sympathy. One of his friends was Edmund
Sture, a Devon commissioner, who left a plain protestant will in 1560. Robert Catlin, who rose from Cromwell’s service to become Elizabeth’s chief justice of the Queen’s bench, also left a protestant will, as did
Reginald Corbet, her appointee to the same court. Lastly, Thomas
Daniel, a Suffolk justice, was another supporter of the Elizabethan settlement. Yet considering the belated nature of this evidence, and
the fact that Dyer, Catlin and Corbet were also favoured by Queen Mary, they cannot be claimed as doctrinaire protestants. Corbet was even listed as a catholic sympathiser in 1574. Therefore it can only be said
that, whereas at least eight of the Edwardian benchers were conforming conservatives there were possibly six protestants of varying degrees of
commitment.

Nineteen Middle Templars have been identified for Mary’s reign, including seven newcomers. Edmund Plowden, a deputy chief steward to
the duchy of Lancaster and a member of Marian parliaments, was on the
threshold of a career which marked him as a firm catholic, a most

---

1 CPR (1553-4), 162, (1555-7), 64, 363, (1557-8), 244, (1558-60), 58, 64; PCC 28 Tirwhite, 1582; Abbott, ch. 5; DNB; A5, IV. 46.
2 IP Add.I.ii.1735; CPR (1553-4), 18, 28, (1554-5), 108; PCC 19 Mellershe, 1560; A5, IV. 45; p. 294 below.
3 P. 115 above; CPR (1555-7), 361, 457, (1558-60), 59, 103, 213; POC 5 Pyckering, 1574/5; Seconde Parte of a Register, 1.112-4; DNB; A5, IV. 32. Catlin committed his soul to God, ‘trustinge that by the mercytes of Jhesus Chryste his onely sonne my onely Redeemer and savioure that the same shalbe receaved into his blessed kyngedome’.
4 CPR (1548-9), 137, (1553), 190, (1557-8), 310, 417, (1558-60), 18, 65, 105, 331, (1566-9), 869-87; Hatfield MSS 151, ff. 172-32, 235, f. 42; CRs, XIII. 135; HMSCR XV. 13; PCC 1 Stonarde, 1565/7; Williams, 346-7; DNB; A5, IV. 45. In his will, Corbet asked forgiveness of all men, but especially of God for ‘all my offences and the punishment that I have deserved for the same, ffaithfullie believing that by the death and passion and by thy promise I have remisssion of my synnes and shall inherit the kingdoome of heaven’.
5 A5, IV. 34; p. 294 below.
6 The protestant tally includes the five newcomers and John Mawdeley.
influential bencher and the foremost jurist of his day. More active during this reign, particularly against heretics in Essex, was Anthony Brown, a staunch catholic who quickly became Mary's chief justice of common pleas, but was demoted by Elizabeth. Three other conservatives, who were later elected serjeants-at-law by the Queen, became Elizabethan judges. One was John Walsh who attended Bartlett Green's examination as a legal consultant. Though he expressed regret for the younger member's trouble, he upheld the authority and unity of the catholic church. Another was Thomas Carus whose wife and family were Elizabethan recusants. In 1571 he reportedly dined with the bishop of Ross and one of Norfolk's agents. When he died he bequeathed his soul to the keeping of the Trinity, 'of our blessed lady Saint Mary the Virgin, and of all the holy celestiall company of heaven'. The third was John Southcote who raised a recusant son and a cloistered daughter. Though he adhered to the Elizabethan settlement for many years, in 1584, he refused to sentence a priest and retired until his own death in the

---

1 Hatfield MS 151, ff.127-32 (I.126); CPR (1557-8), 467; HMC R.409; DNB; Somerville, 432; Sullivan; Axton, Thesis, 28-54; Abbott, ch.VI; A5, IV.54.

2 Hatfield MS 6, ff.53,98v, 201, f.66 (I.542,557,238); APC IV.220,338, V-VI passim; CPR (1550-3), 168, (1553), 414, (1555-7), 47,487, (1557-8), 69,225,459,461, (1558-60), 59,64,236; Lansdowne MS 254, ff.185-98; PCC 20 Stonarde, 1565/7; Foxe, VI.722-9, VII.118-23; Narratives of the Reformation, 212; Levine, 94-5, chs 7-9; A5, IV.47.

3 P.110 above; APC V.67,122, VII.319-20; CPR (1553-4), 269, (1557-8), 457, (1558-60), 65,105,245, (1560-63), 469; Hatfield MS 151, f.127, 235, f.64; CRS, XIII.134; PCC 18 Daper, 1572; Foxe, VII.724-6; Fudge, Thesis, III.350-1; A5, IV.50. 'I promise you', quoth he, 'I have read all Peter Martyr's book and Cranmer's and all the rest of them, and have conferred them with the contrary, as Roffensiis, and the bishop of Winchester, etc., and could not perceive but that there was one continual truth, which from the beginning had been maintained; and those that at any time severed from this unity, were answered, and answered again'.

4 CPR (1553-4), 447, (1557-8), 257, (1558-60), 21,65, (1560-63), 280-1; Lansdowne MSS 19, f.41, 24, f.196; Hatfield MS 6, f.98v (I.557); PCC 33 Holney, 1569/71; DNB; Gillow, I.415-6; A5, IV.52; p.293 above.
following year.¹ Even Richard Weston, an Elizabethan judge who actively implemented the new settlement, retained his reputation as a catholic persecutor.² When five continuing benchers are added to these six newcomers, we have a decided conservative majority.³ Of the eight remaining, two did not divulge their beliefs,⁴ and five of those previously identified as possible Edwardian protestants no doubt conformed, including Robert Catlin and Reginald Corbet who were elected serjeants-at-law.⁵ Apart from John Mawdeley, the only likely protestant was William Hone, a newcomer who left a decidedly partisan will in the following period.⁶ In Mary's reign, the benchers of the Middle Temple remained overwhelmingly conservative.

Above all this survey reflects the extraordinary diversity of religious attitudes during the Reformation. Even if every bencher were well documented, any classification would produce individual distortion. Therefore the figures themselves cannot be treated as exact. Nevertheless they do show that the new religion infiltrated the bench of every Inn, either by personal commitment or ideological influence. Some benchers accepted the protestant creed, others merely modified traditional belief. During Henry's reign, several may be identified as protestants, but most retained conservative views. Therefore it is not remarkable that there

¹ CPR (1548-9), 158, (1549-51), 53, (1557-8), 457, (1558-60), 28, 65, 118, 189 (1560-63), 279, 469, (1569-72), 3093; SP12/5, ff. 43-80; SP12/60, f.90v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.148v-9; Harleian MS 360, f.45; DNB; Morris, I.365-4, 384-5; A5, IV.53.
² LP IV Add. 67, 6043(2); CPR (1555), 145, (1557-8), 65, (1558-60), 18, 59, 104, (1569-72), 3093; JP Sub. 1569, f. 148v-9; CRS XIII.135; PCC 26 Daper, 1572; Foxe, VI.118-20; DNB; Strype, Memorials, III.1.440; A5, IV.49.
⁴ John Hadley and Alan Wood (A5, IV.33, 42).
⁵ John Mawdeley, Robert Catlin, Thomas Daniel, Edmund Sture and Reginald Corbet (A5, IV.17, 32, 54, 43, 45).
⁶ P.294 below.
was some delay in removing the Becket window at Gray's Inn, or that religious protest was confined to younger members of the Inns. There was indeed a rift in religion between the benchers and young protestants which contributed towards tension during the last years of Henry VIII. Yet the two were probably closer together during this reign than any later period. Some lawyers objected to the fragmentation of the church and the dissolution of the monasteries. A handful were prepared to die for their cause. But the majority ignored the papacy, acknowledged the supremacy, accepted the scriptures and served the government, while gradually blending some personal proportion of catholic and protestant belief. Consequently most of those who acted as agents of government policy also exhibited signs of religious conservatism. After all, compromise was the keynote of the Henrician settlement.

During Edward's reign there is evidence of increased protestant influence among the benchers, particularly at Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple, and to a lesser extent at the Middle Temple. This is indicated by the larger number of likely protestants and the increasing use of protestant-looking wills by conservatives. Nevertheless the latter still predominated at each of the houses, especially at Lincoln's Inn which remained solidly conservative. This helps to explain why there was some reluctance to implement the Reformation at the Inns, including the retention of the image and altar-stone at Lincoln's Inn, the hording of censers at the Temple, the keeping of the Gray's Inn screen, the continuation of prayers for the dead, and the delay in providing appropriate service books. The conservative-dominated societies only accommodated themselves to the letter of the law and the pressure of more advanced members. However, the lawyers did more than merely conform.

1 P.33 above.

Conservatives and protestants alike helped to impose Edwardian policy throughout the realm. No doubt dissent would have entailed the end of office, profit and security. But lawyers were tied to their monarch by strong bonds of obedience, and bound to the established order by their worship of the law. They had already gone so far in the royal reformation that one step more was natural progression. If, as the evidence suggests, they also accepted that the church of England continued to maintain the fundamental teaching and practice of christianity, only the most dogmatic lawyer needed to ex-communicate himself. Therefore the lawyers did not enforce one royal policy and then another because they put expediency before principle, but because their whole philosophy of life, law and religion dictated their actions, even when they personally preferred a different policy.

After Mary came to the throne, the protestant element was not eliminated, but was appreciably strengthened, since members who had been influenced by the new religion during their formative years worked their way to the top of the societies. This is particularly apparent at Gray's Inn, where perhaps half of the Marian benchers were protestant, and at the Inner Temple to a lesser degree. Therefore it is not surprising that the Queen drew so many of her legal officers from the other two benches which were overwhelmingly conservative, especially Lincoln's Inn. These developments account for the rapid restoration of chapel goods at that Inn, the comparatively niggardly effort of Gray's Inn, and the previously noted deference which was shown to reformed opinion by the benchers as a whole.1 They also help to explain the rash of insubordination which appeared in late Marian years. Whereas formerly there had been a division in religion between the benchers and young protestants, there was now a hiatus within the bench, between the older conservatives and

1 Pp. 45-8 above.
the younger protestant sympathisers. 1 But because of their seniority and external status, the senior benchers retained effective control, at a time when the others could hardly afford to parade their protestant tendencies. Since the new religion had also strengthened its hold on members below the bench the religious rift widened between younger members and effective authority at the Inns. Even without external repression, the Reformation created tensions within the societies which contributed to domestic unrest. At the end of Mary's reign the Inns remained conservative, but relatively so.

1 Quite likely there had always been some friction between old and new benchers. In 1540 the council of Lincoln's Inn 'condiscendyd and agreyd by the hoole benche that admonyshion shuld be gyffen unto the yonger masters of the benche better to do there duties unto there auncientes of the benche within the house and other places' (LIBB IV, f.121v (I.255).
From Henry's divorce to Elizabeth's accession, the most striking religious changes at the Inns were external. But despite the apparent transformation of chapel and ceremony, there was remarkable continuity in personnel, whether lawyers or clergy. Though radical protestants were disciplined during the last years of Henry and Mary, there was no religious purge. Nor did Edwardian authorities attempt to alter the conservative character of the Inns.

This does not mean that there were no controls at all. The lawyers were expected to take the Henrician oaths and to attend church in accordance with the law. Nevertheless it is difficult to determine the extent to which religious observance was regulated at the Inns. In 1557 the Inner Temple ordered all members to attend such divine services 'as hertofore hathe bene used'. Though they were expected to keep the customary total of eighteen offering days a year, attendance could be 'from tyme to tyme'. Since the offering system was tightened up in

1 In 1534 the lawyers were undoubtedly among those of city and country who took the oath of succession implicitly renouncing the pope and acknowledging the supremacy (SR III.474; SP3/5, f.95 (VII.522); Wriothesley, I.24; Elton, PP 222-7). In addition, office-holders were required to swear the more specific oath of supremacy from 1536 (SR III.655-6; Elton, PP, 227-30).

2 After some Edwardian complaint about church absenteeism (e.g. SP10/8, ff.63-70; SP10/13, ff.62-3), the second Act of Uniformity enjoined all persons to attend church every Sunday and holyday 'upon pain of punishment by the censures of the Church'. Those who used any form of worship except that prescribed by the second prayerbook were liable to imprisonment by the secular courts (SR IV.130-1). Mary declared that 'she meaneh gracieusly not to compell or constreyne other mennes consciences otherwise then God shall (as she trusteth) putt in their harts a perswasion of the truthe that she in in' (APC IV.317-8, 423; TRP II.5-8). Nevertheless the London clergy were ordered to certify non-communicants in 1554 (VCH I.299), and they were later instructed by Bonner's injunctions to ensure that every person attended church (Visitations, II.366-7). Not content with mere clerical censure, the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity added a shilling fine for each absence (SR IV.355-8), while the royal injunctions required chosen parishioners to admonish absentees and report persistent offenders to their ordinary (Visitations, III.22).

3 ITAB I, f.143 (I.191).
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1 P.71 above.

2 Foxe, VII.738.

3 SP12/60, ff.202-4; Huntington Library, Ellesmere MS 276, f.23.

4 Neither the Inns orders of 1557 nor the judges orders of 1559 mentioned religion (p. ); LIBB IV, ff.345v-6 (I.328-9).

5 Gleason, HLQ, 172; A5, II.24, IV.54.

6 LIBB IV, f.356, V, f.51v, VI, f.32v (I.353, II.50); CR8, LIV.125-6; Rutland MS VI, ff.134-5,148-9; PGC 83 Woodhall, 1600/1. Valence, who was admitted to Lincoln's Inn in 1560 and became an associate bencher in 1597, also spent the summer of 1564 in the Tower. When he died in 1601 he left a protestant-looking will. Nevertheless John Jackson, an intending scholar to the English college in Rome (c.1603), testified that some years previously he had made the acquaintance of 'Mr Valence', a catholic of Lincoln's Inn, who was a great help in religious matters.

7 CPR (1558-60), 202, (1560-63), 440, (1563-6), 131; JP Certificate 1564, f.32; IC List (1578-81); MTMB III, ff.80,303v (I.161,411); A5, IV.59.
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8 SP12/24, ff.69,72; APC VII.126.
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1559 and replaced by a roll tax after 1564, members evidently avoided both attendance and contribution. Bartlett Green of the Middle Temple testified in 1555 that he had not heard mass during Mary's reign. In 1569 members of the Inner Temple and Lincoln's Inn confessed to have seldom attended church since Elizabeth's accession. Yet there is no sign of any effort to enforce religious observance at the Inns or to coerce the legal profession as a whole.

During the first Elizabethan decade, the national campaign against nonconformists was not particularly rigorous. Nevertheless it was sufficiently widespread to affect several members of the Inns. William Forster's nomination for serjeanty was not renewed by Elizabeth, the perennial William Roper was removed from the commission of the peace, and Edmund Plowden lost both positions. In 1562 Thomas Valence and Francis Saunders were prisoners in the Tower. Two years later Edmund Saunders and Anthony Partridge of the Inner Temple were released by bond from continual attendance on the privy council. Though their offence is

1 P. 71 above.
2 Foxe, VII. 738.
3 SP12/60, ff. 202-4; Huntington Library, Ellesmere MS 276, f. 23.
4 Neither the Inns orders of 1557 nor the judges orders of 1559 mentioned religion (p. 9). LIBB IV, ff. 345v-6 (I.328-9).
5 Gleason, HLQ, 172; A5, II. 24, IV. 54.
6 LIBB IV, f. 356, V, f. 51v, VI, f. 32v (I. 353, II. 50); ORS, LIV. 125-6; Rutland MS VI, ff. 134-5, 148-9; PGC 83 Woodhall, 1600/1. Valence, who was admitted to Lincoln's Inn in 1560 and became an associate bencher in 1597, also spent the summer of 1564 in the Tower. When he died in 1601 he left a protestant-looking will. Nevertheless John Jackson, an intending scholar to the English college in Rome (c. 1603), testified that some years previously he had made the acquaintance of 'Mr Valence', a catholic of Lincoln's Inn, who was a great help in religious matters.
7 CPR (1558-60), 202, (1560-63), 440, (1563-6), 131; JP Certificate 1564, f. 52; IC List (1578-81); MTMB III, ff. 80, 303v (I. 161, 411); A5, IV. 59. As a justice of Northamptonshire, Saunders was noted as 'indifferent' towards the Elizabethan settlement. In 1567 he shared chambers with George Gascoigne (p. 105), and his name appears on a later list of suspected catholics at the Middle Temple.
8 SP12/24, ff. 69, 72; APC VII. 126.
9 APC VII. 167.
not mentioned, Saunders belonged to a conservative Surrey family, and Partriche was associated with suspected catholics. More significant is an episode which can be pieced together from several later confessions. Thomas Bawde, Robert Atkinson and Thomas Greenwood of the Inner Temple revealed that the ecclesiastical commissioners had compelled them to receive communion in about 1560 to 1561. Moreover Mark Oglethorpe of Gray's Inn denied that he had attended catholic worship 'sins that time that the bishop of London and other commissioners called certaine gentlemen of thinnes of Court for hering of masse'. In view of government policy and the lack of further comment, it seems improbable that Grindal attempted any wholesale reform of the Inns. More likely he uncovered a catholic conventicle or acted against individual members for attending mass. Altogether these cases indicate that, while other institutions were given some attention, the authorities paid little heed to religion at the Inns.

1 ITAR I.93; CPR (1563-6), 2928; Gabriel, Thesis, 187-8. Though Edmund Saunders conformed, his father Thomas was a conservative bencher (pp.182,287), and other relatives included Walsingham Saunders, who was expelled for recusancy (ITAB I. ff.188v-9 (I.266-7), Nicholas Saunders, a seminary priest (Anstruther, SP, 298-300), and Erasmus Saunders, a persistent recusant (SP12/159, f.105; SP12/187, f.105, SP12/25, f.118; Lansdowne MS 28, f.212).

2 ITAR, I.105,119. For Partriche's admission in 1561, his pledges were Gerard Maryn, a catholic fugitive in the 1570's (ITAB I, ff.188v-9 (I.266-7); CRS, XIII.124) and Richard Bird, a suspected catholic in 1577 (IT Certificate 1577, f.137).

3 EC Abstract 1569, ff.202,202v,204.

4 In 1559 the Act of Uniformity imposed the oath of supremacy on clergy, officials and scholars. During succeeding years the ecclesiastical commissioners apprehended those who would not submit (SP12/5, ff.43-80; Additional MS 48023, f.354v; SP15/11, ff.81-4; SP12/16, f.135; CPR (1560-3), 279-80). The Marian bishops and other clergy who rejected the oath were soon deprived. Though few scholars were immediately ejected by royal visitors, the universities were progressively reduced to conformity during the first decade (Swan, Thesis, chs I-II; Curtis, 167-70; SP12/4, f.22). At the same time the most obvious conservatives were removed from the commission of the peace (Gleason; A.H.Smith), and the privy council used the bishops to certify information about the response of justices to the Elizabethan settlement (JP Certificate 1564, ff.1-85; Trimble, 24-46). Moreover the judiciary was restructured at the beginning of the reign so that the conservative element was not as preponderant. In 1559 Edward Saunders and Anthony Brown were replaced as chief justices by Robert Catlin and James Dyer. Brown continued as a justice of common pleas and Saunders supplanted Clement Heigham as chief baron of the exchequer. Edmund Plowden and William Forster, who had been nominated serjeants-at-law by Mary, were not summoned by Elizabeth, who added William Symonds and Nicholas Powtrell.
As the first decade progressed, the Elizabethan government became increasingly concerned about the adherence of the legal profession. When the Queen's smallpox caused confusion amongst the privy council, the Spanish ambassador reported that a small conservative group urged delay while the legal experts, who would be catholic, examined the rights of claimants to the throne (1562). Two years later Bishop John Best of Carlisle complained to the council that the assize judges, 'which, only making a good face of Religion in giving of the charge, in all other their talkes and dooinge shewe them selfes not favourable towards any man or cause of Religion, which the people moche marke and talke of'. Likewise Archbishop Thomas Young of York informed the Queen that the 'inconstancie and murmuringe of the people' was chiefly because of 'the tryfflynge and late remisse dealinge of the judges and lawiers of your Maisties courte called the kinges Benche (who make and wreste the Lawes at theire pleasur) with Mr Bonner late Byshoppe of london and Doctor Palmes' (1565). Such was the lawyers' reputation that, when the irrepressible John Hales recommended George Bromley as attorney to the duchy of Lancaster, he informed Cecil that many downhearted protestants would be encouraged 'if they may heare a protestant lawyer beareth som authoritie in Westminster hall' (1569). If the privy council needed any further reminder of legal conservatism, this was provided by the constitutional issue concerning the legality of the Elizabethan episcopate, which was not settled until the bishops gained statutory recognition in 1566. The problem became critical when Bishop Edmund

1 CSPS (1558-67), 263; MacCaffrey, 108.
2 JP Certificate 1564, f.46. The judges for the northern circuit were William Rastell and Nicholas Powtrell (SP12/25,f.105: A5, II.29, I.44).
3 SP/15, f.195.
4 Lansdowne MS 9, f.15; A5, III.56.
5 'An Act declaring the making and consecrating of the Archbishops and Bishops of this realm to be good, lawful and perfect', 1566 (SR IV. 484-6).
Bonner refused the oath of supremacy in 1563, and claimed by the counsel of Edmund Plowden, Christopher Wray and William Lovelace that Bishop Horne of Winchester had not been lawfully consecrated before tendering the oath. The judges ruled that Bonner could plead his case in court, and proceedings had to be stayed. In 1564, when the privy council considered the dangerous state of the country, Cecil noted that 'the bishops do complain that they dare not execute the ecclesiastical laws... for fear of the praemunire, wherewith the judges and lawyers of the realm, being not best affected in religion, do threaten them and in many cases let not to pinch and deface them'. Therefore the council specified that the judges 'might be sworn to the Queen's majesty according to the laws of the realm and so they should for conscience sake maintain the Queen Majesty's authority'.

Yet the government had already tried to secure the allegiance of the legal profession. In 1563 parliament extended the obligation to swear the oath of supremacy to graduates, parliamentarians and schoolmasters, as well as the whole legal profession. Nevertheless the act was sparingly applied, probably because the Queen disagreed with the severe penalties of praemunire for the first refusal and treason for the second. At the

---

1 O'Sullivan, 14-16; F.W. Maitland, in The Cambridge Modern History, II. 586; Birt, 538-9; Strype, Parker, II.168.
2 Cotton MS Caligula B.X, ff.301-8, in Read, I.323.
3 The act 5 Elizabeth I, c.1 (1563), which most likely originated as an official measure, applied to 'all maner of person and persons that have taken or hereafter shall take anny Degree of Learning in or at the Commen Lawes of this Realme, aswell utter Barresters as Bencheres, Readers, Auncientes in any Howse or Howses of Courte and all pryncypall Treasourers and suche as bee of the Grande Company in every Inne of Chauncerye, and all Attourneys, Prothonotaries and philizers towards the Lawes of the Realme, and all manner of sherriffes, Escheatoures and Foedaries, and all other person and persons which have taken or shall take upon him or them, or have been or shalbe admitted to any Ministrye of Office in or at or belonging to the Commen Law or any other Lawe or Lawes'. Mere students and gentlemen at the Inns were not included (SR IV.402-5; Neale, I.116-21; Read I.270; Trimble, 22-4).
Inns, there is no evidence that the oath was imposed at this time.

Though the attempt to coerce the lawyers was a failure, the government had some success against the abettors of seditious books. In 1564 when the privy council considered the state of the realm, the open circulation of 'lewd, seditious and unlawful books' was another of the problems which Cecil listed for remedy.¹ Two years later the councillors and ecclesiastical commissioners issued a joint decree against such works, authorising the stationers' company to search for publications and to deliver suspects to the commissioners.² As there were objections to applying the rigour of the law against purveyors, the lord keeper attacked those arguments with a much-reported speech in the star chamber before councillors, bishops, judges and gentlemen. Since the distribution of these works was malicious, intentional, derogatory and dangerous to the state, Bacon declared that 'whatsoever the lettre of the lawe be, the meaninge of the lawe was and is clene contrarye to the libertie of theise doinages'. Therefore he denounced any who winked at such disorder, and directed his audience to execute the law against offenders.³ No wonder the council reacted on learning that funds were being collected in London to maintain exiles at Louvain who wrote against the government. In 1568 premises were searched, suspects examined and subscribers imprisoned.⁴ One of those apprehended was Thomas Copley, the

¹ P.204 above; Cf. Bishop James Pilkington of Durham to the privy council (JP Certificate 1564, f.67v); McGrath, 59-63.

² 'Ordinances decreed for reformation of divers disorders in printing and uttering of Bookes' (contemporary copy), 29 June, 1566 (Bodleian MS Tanner 50, ff.207-8). This copy has not been noticed by Blagden.

³ Bodleian MS Tanner 50, ff.96-7. Cf. SP12/44, ff.109-10; SP12/45, ff.2-3, Corpus Christi College (Oxford) MS 196, 171; Harleian MS 398, ff.7v-8. The speech is dated 29 November 1566, 1567 and 1568, of which 1567 seems most likely.

⁴ SP12/46, ff.101,105; Strype, Grindal, 472-3; Trimble, 39-40.
Inner Templar who reverted to catholicism in 1562-3, when he is last mentioned at the Inn. Another was William Roper who cleverly defended his substantial contributions as charity for needy subjects. Both lawyers were fined and dismissed by the council, but Roper was recalled to make a submission. The Spanish ambassador believed that he consulted the duke of Norfolk, who persuaded him to make a partial subscription. Nevertheless the original submission, which Roper signed in a very shaky hand, shows that he fully confessed his fault and promised faithfully to obey the ecclesiastical laws without assisting any exile or religious offender.

Despite Bacon's declaration, the government was obviously reluctant to use extreme measures. But by early 1569 it was sufficiently moved to seek judicial opinion concerning those who distributed or received seditious books. On 9 February a majority of the judges and chief baron resolved that, in accordance with the act of 1563, the distributors but not the receivers were offenders. The latter came under danger of the law only when they conferred with others, commended the contents, or influenced someone else. Thus the government failed to gain full legal sanction for the suppression of seditious books. For these reasons extra-judicial means were used against offenders, including John Stow the annalist, whose catholic books were inventoried by order of the

1 Copley, xxiii-xxiv; CSPS (1568-79), 50, 52, 68.
2 CSPS (1568-79), 50, 52, 58.
4 Bodleian MS Tanner 50, f.136. Cf. 'The effect of the statute of Anno 5 touching the tender and refusall of the oath', MS 91, f.150. As well as extending the application of the oath, statute 5 Elizabeth 1,c.1 imposed the penalties of praemunire or anyone who upheld the jurisdiction of Rome (SR IV. 402-5).
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Despite Bacon's declaration, the government was obviously reluctant to use extreme measures. But by early 1569 it was sufficiently moved to seek judicial opinion concerning those who distributed or received seditious books. On 9 February a majority of the judges and chief baron resolved that, in accordance with the act of 1563, the distributors but not the receivers were offenders. The latter came under danger of the law only when they conferred with others, commended the contents, or influenced someone else. Thus the government failed to gain full legal sanction for the suppression of seditious books. For these reasons extra-judicial means were used against offenders, including John Stow the annalist, whose catholic books were inventoried by order of the

1 Copley, xxiii-xxiv; CSPS (1568-79), 50, 52, 68.
2 CSPS (1568-79), 50, 52, 58.
4 Bodleian MS Tanner 50, f.136. Cf. 'The effect of the statute of Anno 5 touching the tender and refusal of the oath', MS 91, f.150. As well as extending the application of the oath, statute 5 Elizabeth I, c.1 imposed the penalties of praemunire or anyone who upheld the jurisdiction of Rome (SR IV. 402-5).
council to Bishop Grindal. But the most significant case at this time was that which was later copied into a miscellaneous collection of star chamber decrees for Thomas Egerton. In February 1569, nine persons were committed to the Fleet, expelled from office and fined 'for their contempte in receivinge, buyinge, redinge, kepinge, commendinge, and sendinge abrode sedicious bookes set forthe beyonde seas in the name of Hardinge, Dorman, Staphilus, Stapleton, Saunders, Smith, Rastall and others, enemies to Goodes truthe and the quiet goverment of the Queene, in maintenence of the usurped iurisdiction of the Papisticall See of Rome. Not receivinge the Communion sithens the Quenes Rayne, and heringe of Masse contrarie to the Lawes'. Two of the culprits have not been traced. But the other seven were all members of Lincoln's Inn. Most had catholic connections and were later troubled for religion. Thomas Roper, a barrister of the Inn, was as determined as his father, and succeeded him as prothonotary of the Queen's bench. Another barrister was William Weston, one of the pledges for Thomas Ward, who was himself admitted in 1560. The others were younger members also. Henry Maior or Mayo of Wiltshire was admitted in 1560, John Smithson of

1 Strype, Grindal, 516-9; Stow, ed. Strype, iv; TRP I.312n. Stow was also in trouble with the ecclesiastical commissioners in 1570.
2 Huntington Library, Ellesmere MS 2768, f.23.
3 Edmund Standen and John Hethe. The former was possibly Edmund Standen of the Rolls, whose son was admitted to the Middle Temple in 1585 (MTMB II, f.179v (I.181).
4 LIBB IV, f.279, V.ff.5,38 (I.339,350); SP12/96, f.132; Harleian MS 360, f.3v; LI Certificate 1577, f.138.
5 LIBB IV, ff.267v,286,311,347,353,356 (I.329); APC VIII-IX passim; Harleian MS 360, f.12; SP12/199, f.136; LI Certificate 1577, f.138. Not to be confused with the seminary priest.
6 LIBB IV, f.356.
7 LIBB IV, f.367v,377v; SP12/117/26; SP12/142, f.120; LI Certificate, f.138.
Yorkshire in the following year, and Rowland Leigh in 1563, possibly after graduation from Clare College. The remaining offender, who headed the list as 'Robarte Cooke clerke' looks remarkably like our versatile chaplain of the society, who was still imprisoned in 1572 when his brother petitioned Burghley for some relief. What the privy council uncovered was an active catholic circle at Lincoln's Inn. Thus it was this incident which the proclamation prohibiting seditious books referred to in March as 'some mild example' made in the star chamber 'in correction of certain persons found faulty in secret dispersing, buying, and allowing of sundry of the said seditious books'.

Within the context of increasing concern about the circulation of unlawful books and the allegiance of the legal profession, it is hardly surprising that the government finally acted against the Inns of Court. Early in 1569 Cecil's 'short memoryall' proposed not only to remedy seditious works but also to reform the lawyers. As a result the privy council wrote to the readers-elect on 28 February, repeating the terms of the 1563 act, acknowledging ignorance of its observance, and requiring

---

1 LIBB IV, f.374; APC VIII-IX passim; Additional MS 48029, f.123; LI Certificate 1577, f.138. Not to be confused with the priest and servant of Cardinal Allen (Anstruther, SP, 323-4).
2 LIBB IV, f.8; Al. Cantab.
3 P.94 above. Cook disappears from the Inn's records in the same year.
4 Hatfield MS 159, f.68 (II.101).
5 TRP I.312-3. Cecil thought this proclamation important enough to include in his memorial of events - with the correct date (Harleian MS 36, f.352v).
6 Hatfield MS 157, f.8B; Read, I.437-9, 494 n20. Probably written in February 1569. Cecil's proposal concerning the legal profession has been torn:

'Ageynst the decaye of obedience in cyvill policy.
the lawyers of the realme reforme[d]
the obedyence and execution of the [lawes]
The boke of Justices of peace renewed
The Counsellors in wales reformed'.

them to ensure that the oath be taken accordingly. This was but the first stage of what became a prolonged but intermittent campaign to reduce the Inns to conformity.

The next step, which was most likely directed by the privy council, involved the ecclesiastical commissioners. Before mid-April they summoned at least twenty-two members of the Inns, including several who had been disciplined in 1560-1. Eight failed to appear. The others were examined on three interrogatories concerning attendance at church, frequency of communion and practice of catholic rites. In reply to the first, none of the fourteen members admitted absenting themselves altogether. Five seldom attended church, including Thomas Greenwood, 'but he saith his prayers pryvatly in his chamber'. Three usually went to the Temple church where, in the words of Richard Palmer, they 'walketh there about the Roundell as others doth'. The remainder normally attended services at the Inns and elsewhere. They had more difficulty in answering the second interrogatory. Arden Waferer and Andrew Gray did not receive communion during the Queen's reign. Richard Palmer and Richard Godfrey communicated only once, as did Thomas Bawde and Thomas Greenwood who had been previously coerced by the commissioners. Robert Atkinson and Gerard Lowther received communion twice. Though Walter Norton and Mark Oglethorpe did so earlier in the reign, they

1 LIBB IV, f.111 (1.370). Though this is the only remaining copy, it can be assumed that the other Inns were instructed likewise.


3 P. 207 above.


5 Atkinson, Greenwood, Bowne, Norton, Godfrey.

6 Bawde, Waferer, Palmer.

abstained in later years. Henry Harper communicated more frequently, while Roger Corham and Thomas Egerton brought certificates from their curates. John Bowne referred himself to the parson of St Andrew's, but produced no certificate. The last interrogatory, concerning catholic service and confession, caused the greatest difficulty combined with forgetfulness and equivocation. Four lawyers claimed that they were not bound to answer since a penal statute was involved. Thomas Bawde and Robert Atkinson stated that they had not offended since their previous examination. Six others had heard mass formerly, but believed that they were not within danger of the law. Only Andrew Gray and Thomas Egerton denied any offence. In fact Gray, who quickly resolved his scruple of conscience, promised to communicate, as did Richard Palmer. But Egerton was so circumspect that it is impossible to read his mind. Though there was some good reason for his convention, he claimed to attend services and sermons 'most commonly', and was able to produce a communion certificate for 14 April. Most of his companions were 'church papists' who proved to be obdurate catholics in succeeding years.

Having examined the lawyers, the commissioners forwarded an abstract to the privy council. On 20 May 1569 their case was considered in star chamber when Cecil summarised the result on the last page of the abstract. He probably composed, and certainly corrected, the draft of a letter to

1 Waferer, Greenwood, Corham, Godfrey.
3 EC Abstract 1569.
4 The point summary, which is in Cecil's spiky hand, contains the same matter as the letter ultimately sent to the Inns (below). Unfortunately the acts of the privy council are missing from 3 May 1567 to 24 May 1570.
the Inns which embodied this decision,\(^1\) and sent a copy to Bishop Grindal for ratification. Grindal immediately replied that he liked the letter very well, but wished to add 'a commawndement to the Benchers off Everie howse: thatt in callynge aney to the Benche or Barre, they reiecte all those thatt are notoriouslye knowne or vehementlye Suspected to be adversaries to true Religion, untill they have sufficiently purged themselves therin'. At the same time he mentioned having written to that effect in 'the Copie of the Letter which I delivered to you yesterdaye'.\(^2\) This description fits an undated copy in Cecil's papers addressed to Lincoln's Inn from the star chamber. After castigating benchers of the Inns for admitting and promoting all members without distinction, it ordered them not only to reject religious suspects until judgement by higher authority, but also 'to be faithfull furthers and favourers of this received religion, and of the faithfull professors thereof there'.\(^3\) Within the context of catholic policy at the Inns and abroad, the council was unlikely to have required the Inns to regulate admissions and promote the godly at this time. Moreover the name of the arbitrating authority was not inserted, and there is no evidence that the letter was sent. If this was not the copy which Grindal forwarded to Cecil on 19 May, it certainly expressed his views. However, this letter was not adopted in the star chamber on the following day. The official decision was embodied in Cecil's draft. Nevertheless Grindal's

---

1 Lansdowne MS 109, ff.9-10. Since the draft, with corrections by Cecil, does not include a clause which was inserted in the final letter (below), it was apparently written at this stage.

2 Lansdowne MS 11, f.124.

3 Lansdowne MS, 109, ff.11-12; printed in LIBP, I.452-3. This copy follows Cecil's draft letter in the collection.
insistence ensured that his suspects clause was written into the final letter which the councillors signed on the same day and sent to each of the Inns. ¹

Apart from Grindal's clause, the Council's letter was particularly directed against those lawyers who had been examined by the commissioners. Since they 'of longe tyme misused themselves in contempt of the Lawes' by not attending church or communion and used prohibited rites, they were to be excluded from commons, practice and pleading until they reconciled themselves before the bishop. Those who remained obstinate were to be expelled forever. Since others had not presented themselves to the commissioners, they were to appear shortly or suffer likewise. In conclusion the benchers were instructed to publish this decree in their halls as a warning to all members, who would be ordered 'according to theyr defectes'.

Though the government did not endorse Grindal's solution in entirety, it recognised the need to exclude offending lawyers from their profession. Such was the official eagerness to purge the Inns, that the star chamber accepted the evidence of the commissioners and treated all suspects, including Egerton, as offenders. ² The use of executive power and the demand for subscription marked a radical step in government policy towards the Inns. Yet this was not simply the result of external crises. ³

---

¹ Apart from Cecil's draft, which does not include Grindal's clause, there are at least four copies of the letter. Only part of it remains in the Inner Temple act book (ITAB I, ff.181v-2 (I.252-4). Copies in the Petyt and Yelverton collections are complete (IT Petyt MS 538/47, f.47; Additional MS 48064, ff.205v-6). The Lincoln's Inn copy has been printed (LIBB V, ff.111v-2v (I.370-2).

² I have found no evidence that the suspects were haled before the privy council (Prest, 175).

³ Cf. Prest 175.
The apprehension which developed after Mary's arrival in 1568 made a
conformity drive more likely at that time, particularly if the Queen and
conservative councillors were to be persuaded. The northern rebellion,
papal bull and Ridolfi plot no doubt ensured that the effort would be
continued into the 1570's. But these events had no bearing on the
earlier stages. The change in government policy derived more from
increasing concern over two specific problems, namely the allegiance of
the legal profession and the circulation of seditious books.

2
Having adopted the new strategy, the government expected enforcement by
the benchers and commissioners. The latter were not remiss. Early in
1570 the privy council instructed Grindal and his assistants to
interrogate several students of the Temple about hearing mass at the Inns
and elsewhere, attendance at communion, possession of agnus dei, unlawful
books, letters from exiles and bulls of absolution, and dissemination of
these goods. According to John Strype, some members were then committed
to the Fleet.1 In June 1570 Lincoln's Inn referred to its already
expelled members as well as 'all other whiche have been called before
the sayd buishoppe and other Judges in Causes Ecclesiasticall for
suspicion of their sinceritie in Religion, or there offences in those

1 There are two sets of interrogatories placed together in the Petyt
collection and endorsed in a third hand as 'The Councelles letters with
interrogatories, and the Archbishopes for removing Papistes owt of the
Inner Temple', 1569 and 1571 (IT Petyt Ms 538/47, ff.342-3). The
first set, which was evidently Archbishop Parker's, belongs to 1571
and is addressed to certain Middle Templars (below). As the second
set fits Strype's description (Grindal, 224) and specifically refers
to papal bulls, it probably belongs to early 1570. Therefore the
two sets should not be treated together (Cf. Prest, 179n). There was
evidently a council letter with the second set, but it has not been
found.
matters'. Though additional offenders are not named for three of the Inns, the Inner Temple act book mentions eleven members who were summoned by the commissioners in about 1569-70 but failed to appear. Several had catholic connections, including Walsingham Saunders of the Surrey family, Francis Waferer, brother of the already blacklisted Arden, and Gerard Maryn, an associate of Anthony Partriche. Maryn went into exile and Waferer became a Rhemish priest. In 1575 Simon Egerton bequeathed his gold ring to Robert Atkinson, the recusant lawyer, and left money to the poor to pray for him. James Braybrooke, who wrote a catholic will in 1590, proved to be adamant recusant, as did Henry Everard, whose relationship to the Gawdy clan was not sufficient to save him from continual trouble. Most had been 'vehemently suspected' before convention by the commissioners. Therefore they suffered the same fate as their predecessors.

1 LIBB V, f.113 (I.372).
3 P.202m; ITAR, I.108; CRS, XIII.138.
4 ITAR I.135; Anstruther, SP, 368.
5 ITAR I.95,105; CRS, XIII.124; p.201 above.
6 ITAR I.77A; CPR (1566-9), 578; PCC 29 Pyckering, 1575; IPM II.122.
7 ITAR I.74,77A,135; APC XIII.106, XIV.249-50; SP12/117/17; SP12/130/43; SP12/159, f.109v; SP12/183, f.56; PCC 32 Drury, 1590.
8 ITAR I.62; APC X.313; HMCX X.ii,7,11; IPM II.126; Hatfield MS 2, f.21v; Cotton MS Titus B.III, f.69; Lansdowne MS 55, f.64; Egerton MS 2713, f.72; Bodleian MS Tanner 241, ff.8,8v,10; SP12/126/39; SP12/131, ff.167-8.
9 They were listed again in IT Certificate 1577.
Though detailed evidence may be lacking, the workhorse of this campaign against the Inns was apparently Bishop Grindal. He had dealt with the early conventicle of lawyers before negotiating the new policy with Cecil, and was then responsible for its execution. Therefore the evident loss of impetus from mid 1570 to 1571 may be partly attributed to his translation to York.  

But Archbishop Parker put most of the blame elsewhere. On 17 June 1571 he complained to Burghley that the Inns 'doe nowe of late growe againe verye disordered and licencious, in over bold speaches and doinges touchinge religion usyd by some of the same houses without controllment'. This was because the former star chamber order had not been 'so effectuallye and sincerely considered of by the Auncenantes and governors of the same houses as were convenient'. Therefore he desired Burghley to obtain a letter from the privy council to the ecclesiastical commissioners for 'some better order and reformacion therin to the furtheraunce of religion'. To this end he used the same technique as Grindal, by enclosing a ready-made letter for Burghley's convenience. This was evidently the undated copy of a letter from the council to the commissioners which remains with the minister's papers. It stated that the star chamber order had been reasonably executed at the time, but that former disorders had now increased because of neglect by the benchers and commissioners. After a lesson on the importance of obedience at the Inns, the letter required the commissioners to summon some of the senior members from each society and inquire regarding the alleged disorders. For speedy redress, the commissioners were to confer with the lord keeper and chief justices, and thenupon 'to reforme or

1 Grindal was translated to York on 22 May 1570. His replacement was Edwin Sandys, who was nominated on 1 June and confirmed on 13 July.

2 Lansdowne MS 13, f.196; Parker Correspondence, 384. Prest confuses the two letters (175).
otherwise correcte the parties offending, and to lymtt som good orders for the due servyce of God in those howses, and to staye and reforme the rest from the entry of lyke offences', wherein the whole realm would profit.

Since Parker relied on secondhand sources, it is difficult to assess the accuracy of his report. Only two incidents stand out from the records. After John Felton brazenly posted a papal bull on the bishop of London's gates, all suspected places were searched including the Inns. A second copy was apparently found in the chambers of a Lincoln's Inn student. He confessed having obtained it from Felton, who was apprehended, racked, arraigned and then hanged in August 1570. The lesser culprit was Robert Johnson of the same society. In February 1571 the benchers agreed to commit him to examination by the recorder of London 'touchinge the not puttinge of hys cappe when the Quenes maiestie passed by comynge from the royall exchaunge'. Such an omission possibly reflected his attitude, as he was later in trouble for not receiving communion. These episodes hardly add up to Parker's charge of unbridled disorder at the Inns. Yet his was not the only cry for reformation. On 7 April 1571 during the first reading debate on the treasons act, the redoubtable Robert Snagge of the Middle Temple suddenly moved 'the Reformacion of the universities, of private Schoolemasters in Gentlemen howses, and of the Innes of Courte'.

1 Parker had been 'credeblye enformed' about the state of the Inns. Though the sources of his information are not known, William Fleetwood was possibly involved (See IT Petyt MS 538/47, f.342).
2 McGrath (101) apparently obtained the story from the DNB (John Felton). I have been unable to trace the source beyond Lingard (VI.225), but the student was possibly William Mallowes (APC VII.373, IX.28).
3 LIBBE V, ff.130,200 (I.377,398); LI Certificate 1577, f.138v. Not to be confused with the seminary priest (Anstruther, SP 190-1).
Considering the urgency of these demands, the background to compulsion and the sense of national danger, it is not remarkable that Burghley responded with commendable alacrity. On the same date as Parker's letter, the councillors addressed instructions to the Archbishop, Bishop Edwin Sandys of London and other commissioners. They stripped Parker's model of its philosophical verbiage, but largely retained his method of procedure. After perusing the former star chamber order of 1569, the commissioners were to use the assistance of those benchers who were 'fittest and best affected in religion' to inquire into its implementation. They were then to reform anything to the contrary, and whenever necessary 'to make muche further ordre and ordres, against the corrupte and obstinate sorte, bothe in the said howses of courte, and also in the houses of chauncerie'. Though this task was left to the commissioners without the aid of the judiciary, the letter assured them of the council's ready assistance whenever required.¹

Unfortunately there is no record of the inquiry. However, the commissioners certainly executed their disciplinary function. A later recusant certificate for Lincoln's Inn listed no less than twenty-three members who were summoned by Bishop Sandys before he was translated to York in 1577. All were called 'for suspicion herd of their religion', and the first sixteen, who had not communicated, were expelled.² Four of them, who had been punished in 1569 for peddling seditious books, were

¹ Lansdowne MS 15, f.158. Strype (Annals, III.i.44-6) and LIBP (I.454-5) print the letter with the wrong date. The council minutes for 17 June 1571 do not record this decision (APC VIII.30-1).

removed at last. After more than fifty important years at the Inn, William Roper was finally expelled some time before his death in 1578, as well as his eldest son Thomas, who failed to retain the prothonotary's office at the Inn and was troubled for religion until his death in 1598. A similar fate attended the other son Anthony, who was clerk of the papers in Queen's bench, Anthony Wright, sometime servant to William and an attorney of the same court, and William Dawtry, a grandson of the elder Roper. Most of the others whom Sandys disciplined had catholic associates at the Inn and were known as recusants in later years. They included Richard Tremayne, a Cornishman who was implicated in the later papal bull case with Cuthbert Mayne (1576-7), and Theobald Green, an obdurate catholic who died in the Marshalsea.

As the ecclesiastical commissioners would hardly have concentrated on a single Inn, the other societies no doubt came under official scrutiny. The compilers of their later recusant lists did not identify convented lawyers. However, many members who were listed as expelled or reconciled before 1577 were evidently disciplined by the commissioners

1 Thomas Roper, William Weston, Henry Mayo, Robert Smithson (p.207).
2 LIBB V, f.94; A5, II.15.
3 P.207 above; LIBB V, ff.244v,247v,248,267,272,281 (I.405,413); APC XIII.148,158-9,196,225; SP12/120/26; SP12/191, f.125; SP12/193, f.17; Lansdowne MS 55, f.164v; PCC 33 Lewyn, 1598.
4 LIBB IV, f.369, V, ff.171v,179v,200,249v,274 (I.388,398); Lansdowne MS 55 55, f.164v; CRS, XIII.99; PCC 103 Cobham, 1595/7.
5 LIBB V, ff.7v,29v,106v.
6 LIBB V, ff.8v,22v,26,200 (I.346,398); Manning, Sussex, 248-50. Though Dawtry was not mentioned on this list, he was either removed then or discontinued under pressure.
7 LIBB V, f.64v; APC IX.87,145-7, X.6-7, XIII.61-2; Rutland MS V, f.28; SP12 passim; Rowe, 346-9,352,362,371,378.
8 LIBB V, ff.76v,117v; Harleian MS 360, f.51; Guildford Muniment Room, Loseley MS 1085/11/1; SP12/140/40; SP12/159, f.116; SP12/169, f.56; Hatfield MS 138, f.241v; PCC 11 Brudenell, 1584/5.
including at least nine of Gray’s Inn, one of the Inner Temple and eight of the Middle house. To these cases should be added five Middle Templars for whom Archbishop Parker composed interrogatories in 1571.

Each suspect was to answer two questions concerning the frequency of his attendance and communion at Temple church, followed by personal articles. Mathew Shaftoe of Durham bishopric was questioned about his legal services to the earl of Northumberland, his residence during the northern rebellion and his knowledge of contributions for fugitives and of publications concerning the Scottish title. Though mere initials were used to designate the other suspects, their names can be established from internal and biographical information. John Stone of Staffordshire was particularly examined about his association with William Tempest, an already expelled member whose father was implicated in the rebellion, and with Walter Stanley, a likely recusant who disappears from the Middle Temple records in 1571. Stone was also suspected of holding nocturnal meetings in his chamber, where members ‘notoriously known to be perverse in Religion’ heard readings from a libel entitled ‘A knacke to knowe a knave’. T.P., the under-treasurer to Mathew Smith, was

1 Edward Meggs, Nicholas Aylmer, William Hungate, Nicholas Tirwhitt, William Almon, Henry Chetham, William Hillyard, Richard Culpepper, John Wyburne (GI Certificate 1577); Robert Routh (IT Certificate 1577); Thomas Churche, Edward Persell, Anthony Rudd, Henry Hussey, John Hedworth, Thomas Dyke, John Scawen (MT Certificate 1577). The documentation for each case is too detailed to be included.

2 P.213n above.

3 MTMB II, ff.58v,98v,116v (I.146,183,206).

4 MTMB II, ff.53v,129 (I.142,221); MT Certificate 1577; Lansdowne MS 64, ff.170-1.

5 P.203n above; MTMB II, ff.81,84v,95(I.163,167,178); EC Abstract 1569, f. 202v. His father, Robert Tempest of County Durham, and brother Michael of the Inner Temple, were exiles after the rebellion (ITAR I.19; Lansdowne MS 683, f.35; SP12/21, f.37; CSPD Addenda (1566-79), passim.

6 MTMB II, ff.87,94v,98v,100 (I.169,177,182,184).

7 The libel seems to bear little relation to A most Pleasant and merie new Comedie, Intituled A Knacke to knowe a Knave (1594), STC 15027.
Thomas Paget, a later bencher of the Inn. His interrogatories included whether he took the oath before office, separated doctrinal from moral matters in sermons and prevented protestants from obtaining chambers.

Edmund Plowden, the former treasurer who was suspected of having assisted Paget to office, had previously been convented before the commissioners. Considering his earlier treatise in defence of the Scottish title, it is not surprising that he was interrogated about seditious books. George Horde, who had been imprisoned in the Fleet once before, was also examined concerning the libellious book. In addition he was accused of talk against married priests, knavish preachers and the commissioners for whom he cared 'not a rushe'. Unfortunately there are no extant replies.

Nevertheless Stone, Paget and Horde were expelled for backwardnes in Religion. But Shaftoe evidently satisfied his examiners, while Plowden proved as elusive as ever. Though there is insufficient detail to determine the exact timing and extent of action against the lawyers, from 1571 to 1577 the commissioners exercised their charge to reform the Inns. Moreover at the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn they tackled two of the entrenched conservative circles.

Since the commissioners were authorised to make further injunctions for the Inns, it is tempting to ascribe to their influence the religious provisions contained in the first comprehensive set of government orders. At the end of May 1574 the privy councillors signed four copies of the

1 MTMB II, f.93 (I.175); A5, IV.93.
2 Levine (Succession, passim) and Axton (Thesis, 33-54) have used one copy of Plowden's treatise (Harleian MS 849), but have missed that which Plowden's son presented to James I with an important dedicatory epistle (Bodleian MS Don.c.43). There is also another copy at the Bodleian Library (Rawlinson MS 1.124). Plowden's contribution of 1566-7 was known to the government in 1571 (Hatfield MS 6, ff.53,98v (I.542,557)).
3 MTMB II, ff.34v,84v (I.128,167). Horde was probably one of those imprisoned by Grindal in 1570 (p.213 above).
4 MT Certificate 1577, f.135.
'Orders necessarie for the government of the Innes of Coourte established by commandment of the Queenes Majestie, with thadvyse of her Privey Counsell and the Justices of her Bench and the Common Place in Westminster'.

As well as prescribing residential, professional and educational qualifications, these restricted expansion of the Inns, thereby facilitating order and control. Furthermore no members were to possess chambers, share commons or pleade any case who 'upon publicke admonicion ones given by any Reader, Bencher or Utter Barrester doth not come and remaine at the usuall prayers in the churches or chappels of the same Howse'. The religious provisions not only gave formal recognition to the policy adopted in 1569, but also obliged the Inns to enforce it.

Much of the incentive for these orders derived from the government. In 1572 when Burghley listed 'Certen thynges necessary to be better ordred', one was reform of the legal profession. Another was 'The houses of Court and Chancery to be visitted, and the abuses reformed, wherby no such confluence of unmett persons gyven to ryott, sedition, and such misrule, may be permitted'. Burghley's conviction was no doubt reinforced in 1573, when several Irish students were imprisoned by Bishop Sandys for hearing mass with the Portuguese ambassador. More significant was the clash over promotion which occurred at the Inner Temple later in the year. Though an objective summary in Burghley's papers is undated and anonymous, the facts can be verified from domestic records.

---

1 APC VIII.246-8.
2 Lansdowne MS 104, f.27.
3 Lansdowne MS 16, f.54; APC VIII.110,124.
4 'The state of the cause towching the callinge of benchers in the inner Temple', n.d. (early 1574), Lansdowne MS 106, f.102; ITAB I, ff.191v,192 (I.271,272,273).
fellows, a verbal message was delivered from the privy council to the same effect as the star chamber order, 'that no person eyther convented or suspected for papistrye shulde be called eyther to the benche or to the barre'. At parliament on 15 November a majority obediently chose three suitable benchers.¹ As some masters were displeased that four senior barristers had been passed over for suspicion of religion,² it was agreed that if they provided recommendations from the privy council they too would be called. On 19 November parliament respited the call for a week, when the case was to be reviewed. As none of the suspects produced any testimony, the original call was confirmed, but the candidates were still kept from their places. By January 1574 one bencher had died and another was seriously ill. Therefore the four suspects were called contrary to the official order. But since the bench was so full, some attempt was made to satisfy everyone by permitting an appointee from each call to take his place immediately.³ The episode shows the new policy in action. If the star chamber order referred to in Burghley's summary was that promulgated in 1569, its meaning had been

¹ Robert Buxton, John Bullock, William Wilcockes (A5, III.79-81). In May 1579 there was another attempt made by privy councillors to influence elections. Bedford, Walsingham and Mildmay instructed Gray's Inn to ensure that they chose ancients who were known 'for sowndnes in good relygion and sufficiencie in all other respectes'. For the same election, Burghley recommended a former tutor of Bacon's sons, desiring the Inn to 'have especiall and principall regard to the placing of suche whose sowndnes in relygion, sufficiencie in learnynge and honestie in conversacione maie deserve suche a degree of preferment' (GIPB I, f.86v (I.36-7). No doubt there were other verbal and written messages which have not been recorded.

² Nicholas Hare, Andrew Gray, George Wyott, Humphrey Smith (A5, III.82-5).

³ John Bullock and Andrew Gray.
extended by privy councillors to include both convented and suspected members. Though this injunction had been contravened, the government does not seem to have interfered. But the incident no doubt influenced the orders of May 1574.

Despite official concern for the Inns, the religious provisions were evidently added as an after-thought to an earlier draft of the orders. A copy which is filed with the state papers was prepared beforehand. There are several corrections, blanks remain for completion and the orders are prefaced by a statistical summary of members and chambers. Except for some refinements, the temporal provisions are identical to those of the final orders. Yet there is not a word about religion.

For this reason it seems unlikely that the orders derived from any charge given to the ecclesiastical commissioners in 1571. At that time Parker wanted the commissioners to work with the lord keeper and chief justices in providing religious orders for the Inns, but the privy council was evidently unwilling to commit itself. Therefore regulation was left to the commissioners. During the intervening years, further reform of the legal profession became an official priority. Consequently the government required a survey of the Inns and a set of regulations. In view of normal procedure and the professional tone of the original copy, these were quite likely provided by the lord keeper and justices after

---

1 'A survey of Chambers and societies of all the Innes of Courte together with certaine devises for the goverment of the worthie necessarie sorte and for the exclusion of the unworthie and unnecessarie number and sorte therof. - Maie 1574' (SP12/95, f.201). Lists of benchers and barristers at Lincoln's Inn and the Inner Temple, which were evidently compiled in 1573, probably relate to these documents (Lansdowne MS 106, ff.90-1,97-8).

2 In the final orders the Middle Temple was permitted to convert its former hall into chambers, solicitors were allowed to attend learning exercises at the Inns, and reformation of the Inns of Chancery was referred to the benchers.
some consultation with the benchers, all of whom side-stepped the religious issue. Parker and Sandys probably insisted that a religious qualification be written into the final orders. But considering Burghley's concern for conformity at the Inns, the larger problem of national security and the protestant bias of the privy council, it would seem that the government needed little prompting.\(^1\) Therefore the religious provisions probably derived more from the councillors themselves. Nevertheless the test which they imposed was church attendance and not communion, possibly in deference to the Queen.

Having issued standing orders for the Inns, the Council once more left conformity to the benchers and commissioners. As already mentioned, suspects continued to be convented and expelled, with communion being used as a better test of religion. Yet the reported increase of catholics and activity of priests throughout the realm was such that the government was soon forced to reconsider its recusant policy. In June 1577 John Aylmer, the newly appointed bishop of London, admitted the failure of internment to secretary Walsingham, and by the advice of Parker and other colleagues proposed that the shilling penalty for non-attendance should be replaced by a heavier fine for not communicating.\(^2\) Consequently the privy council appointed a committee of councillors, clergy and lawyers,\(^3\) whose recommendations included that the bishops be

---

1 Those listed as present at council on 31 May 1574 were Burghley, Lincoln, Howard, Arundell, Warwick, Leicester, Knollys, Croft, Smith and Walsingham. All except Howard signed the copy sent to Lincoln's Inn, in addition to Bacon, Mildmay and Sussex (LIBB V, ff.181v-2 (I. 391-2)).

2 SP12/114, f.39.

3 Walsingham to Aylmer (July 1577, SP12/45, f.11. The full committee was listed on the dorse of Aylmer's letter (above). The lawyers included William Cordell, the master of the rolls, Gilbert Gerrard, the attorney-general, Thomas Bromley, the solicitor-general, and Peter Osborne. They were all benchers of their Inns.
required to certify the names of recusants in each diocese, who could then be apprehended, fined and either reduced to conformity or dealt with according to the law.¹ On 15 October the council ordered a national census of all who refused to attend church.² In the following month the Inns of Court and Chancery were added to the survey, 'which two places [are] greatlie infected with Poperie'. Since the Inns were privileged societies, the former were committed to lord keeper Bacon and the latter to chief justice Wray, who were to obtain certificates from well-affected members. As well as listing the names and values of recusants, the lord keeper was to certify which of the previously expelled members had since conformed and which not, so that the obstinate ones could be prosecuted with all the other offenders.³

According to Wray's return of the same month, he could find no recusants at Clement's and Lyon's Inns, and only twenty-five at the remaining Inns of Chancery.⁴ The other certificates, which were signed by two senior members from each Inn of Court, listed 182 names comprising 73 church absentees, non-communicants and further suspects, as well as 109 others who were described as expulsions, reconciliations, discontinuers or exiles.⁵ During the succeeding years of anti-recusant

1 SP12/45, ff.62-3. In 1572 Parker suggested to Burghley that the names and qualities of catholics should be certified (Lansdowne MS 15, f.82). But Burghley merely proposed a survey of recusant office-holders in each county (Lansdowne MS 104, f.28).

2 The form of the letter is preserved in the state papers (SP12/116,f.57).

3 APC X.94-5.

4 SP12/118, ff.95-6. The others were Barnard's, Clifford's, Furnivall's, New, Staple and Thavies Inns. Strand Inn had been pulled down by Protector Somerset for his house.

5 GI Certificate 1577 (Gilbert Gerrard, Christopher Yelverton; A5, I.52,80); LI Certificate (Richard Kingsmill, John Packering; A5, II.43,82); IT Certificate (George Bromley, Edward Flowerdew; A5, III.56,71); MT Certificate (William Fleetwood, John Popham; A5, IV.64,68). Prest's totals are slightly different (165-6). Though protestant recusants might have been included, these men and the privy council concentrated on catholics. The significance of the survey is considered below (p.328 ).
activity, the privy council carried out its threat against many of these persons who defied the efforts of lesser officials to reduce them to conformity. Their names recur throughout council minutes, prison lists and recusant levies. Most of them were caught within the nation-wide net and not by any action against the societies. However, there was another check on the Inns in Michaelmas term 1580. According to anonymous set of accusations against Edmund Plowden, Bishop Aylmer wrote to the Middle Temple for a certificate of papists, enclosing the copy of a privy council letter with his request. Though the names of eighty members were presented to the bench, the writer believed that Plowden used his malevolent influence to ensure that none were certified. Perhaps these figures were correct. But there is an undated state paper which possibly resulted from the inquiry. It simply lists thirty-six benchers and barristers of the Inns at some time between 1578 and 1581, including Plowden and sixteen of his house, most of whom can be recognised as convented or suspected catholics. At the bottom a different hand added the reminder, 'To make a yerely book of the utter baresters'. Even if the two documents are not related, they show that the authorities remained actively concerned about conformity at the Inns.

During the early 1580's the government was in fact deeply troubled by the threat of foreign invasion, jesuit infiltration and catholic resurgence. For this reason the parliament which reassembled in January

1 Though biographical information has been collected for each member on the 1577 lists as well as others who were troubled for religion before 1590, it cannot be presented here.

2 SP12/144/45-6.

3 'The names of certen bencheres and Baresters of the Innes of coorte', n.d., IC List (1578-81). The dating can be established from professional details. Rowland Hinde of the Inner Temple was not called to the bar until June 1578 (ITAB I, f.204v (I.294)), whereas Richard Lone of the same Inn and others died in 1581 (A5, III.61). I have not found that a barristers' register was kept in subsequent years.
1581 was entrusted with the task of curbing the papists. Consequently the commons 'bill for religion', and the lords 'Bill of Cominge to service', both included strict provisions against catholics at the Inns. These clauses were largely reproduced in the joint draft 'for reteyning the Queens majesties subjectes in ther obedience to her Maiestie'. Any member of the legal profession who refused communion or abstained from church and then declined to take the oath was not only liable to pay heavy recusant fines, but also to lose office, practice and pleading. Furthermore all members of the Inns, including students, were obliged to take the oath on pain of expulsion. These provisions might have procured conformity. But since they were removed from the final act, probably by intervention of the Queen, the government could only rely on former measures. Walsingham was clearly dissatisfied with the results. In about 1582 one of his priorities was 'the reformation of the Inns of coorte'. A year later Burghley once more required the 'Inns of Court and Chancery to be visited, and all recusantes removed from thence', as well as 'no lawyers to be permitted to gyve Counsell in law that do not profess conformite in religion'. In 1584 he elaborated these requirements in yet another memorial on the dangerous state of the realm. The product of this official discontent was a set of orders for the Inns which was signed by the councillors and promulgated by the judges in

1 Neale, I.382-92.
2 SP12/147, ff.92-4,96-9.
3 SP12/147, ff.121-2.
4 SP12/148, ff.51-4.
5 'The manner of proceedinge with the recusantes', (1582), SP12/157, f.119.
6 'Memoryall of matters of counsell', 1 December 1583, SP12/164, f.3.
7 'The Daungerouse state of the realme in matter of religion', (1584), Lansdowne MS 104, f.129; Read, I.293-4.
January 1584.¹ But this was simply a repeat of the 1574 orders, except for an injunction regarding pleaders which the council had imposed in 1580.² There was nothing new which affected religion but the judges' preamble, which enjoined the benchers to make regular reports to the chief justice on how the orders were being obeyed.

As far as the Inns are concerned the government had lost the initiative. In 1569 laissez-faire was replaced by intermittent control. At times when catholicism looked particularly menacing, the authorities acknowledged the need for tougher measures and directed some action against the Inns and the legal profession. But in the end the effort to impose conformity was restricted by the Queen, whose toleration of conscientious belief was greater than that of her councillors. Being denied the legal means to achieve that goal, they repeated the same tired formulae and relied on the benchers and commissioners for enforcement.

The bishops and their colleagues were certainly active against offenders, but they needed the cooperation of the Inns and the authority of the council to impose conformity on those privileged societies. Since success depended to such an extent on the Inns themselves, what was their response?

³

Not until May 1569 did the benchers of Lincoln's Inn consider the privy council's demand of the previous February, that the oath be taken in accordance with the act of 1563. Even then they postponed any decision

---

¹ GIPB I, f.443 (I.60-2).
² GIPB I, f.142v (I.43); ITAB I, f.210v (I.304); MTMB II, f.139 (I.234).
until the following council in order to confer with the other societies. ¹

Nothing is known of the immediate result since none of the Inns referred to the issue again until May 1570, when the black book finally recorded that no person called to bench or bar could take his place without swearing the oath according to the law. ² There was probably some evasion and much casuistry. In 1571 the privy council suspected that Thomas Paget had not taken the oath on becoming under-treasurer of the Middle Temple. With John Stone of the same Inn, Paget was questioned concerning advice given on the oath to newly-called barristers contrary to the law. ³ Nevertheless it can be assumed, even without direct evidence, that from 1570 the oath became part of the standard procedure for promotion. ⁴

After receiving the star chamber order for the punishment of those convented by the commissioners in May 1569, the benchers obediently sequestered the culprits and expelled those who refused to conform, ⁵ but not without some prevarication. Though details are lacking for two of the societies, Lincoln's Inn did not enter this letter into the black book until May 1570, nor that concerning the oath, ⁶ and their members were given at least a year to reconcile themselves. ⁷ The Inner Temple recorded the order at the time and apparently discussed the matter on 22

₁ LIBB V, f.96v (I.366).
₂ LIBB V, f.109 (I.369).
₄ This practice is mentioned, however, from the late 1570's (e.g. GIPB I,f.86 (I.36); ITAB I, ff.219,223v,224v,234 (I.319,327-8,329,346).
₅ GI-MT Certificates 1577; LIBB V, f.113 (I.372); ITAB I, ff.188v-9 (I.266-7).
₆ LIBB V, f.111 (I.369-72).
₇ LIBB V, f.113 (I.372).
until the following council in order to confer with the other societies. 1 Nothing is known of the immediate result since none of the Inns referred to the issue again until May 1570, when the black book finally recorded that no person called to bench or bar could take his place without swearing the oath according to the law. 2 There was probably some evasion and much casuistry. In 1571 the privy council suspected that Thomas Paget had not taken the oath on becoming under-treasurer of the Middle Temple. With John Stone of the same Inn, Paget was questioned concerning advice given on the oath to newly-called barristers contrary to the law. 3 Nevertheless it can be assumed, even without direct evidence, that from 1570 the oath became part of the standard procedure for promotion. 4

After receiving the star chamber order for the punishment of those convented by the commissioners in May 1569, the benchers obediently sequestered the culprits and expelled those who refused to conform, 5 but not without some prevarication. Though details are lacking for two of the societies, Lincoln's Inn did not enter this letter into the black book until May 1570, nor that concerning the oath, 6 and their members were given at least a year to reconcile themselves. 7 The Inner Temple recorded the order at the time and apparently discussed the matter on 22

1 LIBB V, f.96v (I.366).
2 LIBB V, f.109 (I.369).
4 This practice is mentioned, however, from the late 1570's (e.g. GIPB I,f.86 (I.36); ITAB I, ff.219,223v,224v,234 (I.319,327-8,329,346).
5 GI-MT Certificates 1577; LIBB V, f.113 (I.372); ITAB I, ff.188v-9 (I.266-7).
6 LIBB V, f.111 (I.369-72).
7 LIBB V, f.113 (I.372).
May, but the relevant folio was torn from their act book.\(^1\) The contents of the page were quite likely considered embarrassing. For when the offenders were finally expelled as late as November, 1572, it was recorded that they had originally been excluded in Trinity term 1570, but that these orders had been omitted from the book.\(^2\)

There is no sign of similar tactics against the 1574 government orders. They were mainly professional measures which were probably drafted after consultation with the Inns. Moreover enforcement was left mostly to the societies themselves. Therefore the orders were quite well received. Three of the Inns copied them into their minute books,\(^3\) and they were no doubt published in the communal halls. At Lincoln’s Inn the council immediately passed several resolutions to ensure their implementation, including a check on church attendance.\(^4\) Though the other Inns do not seem to have responded as enthusiastically, in 1580 the Middle Temple parliament declared that the official orders were to ‘be observed in all poyntes uppon payne of disgradinge from the Barre’.\(^5\)

The evidence suggests that at least two of the Inns were at first reluctant to impose conformity. They neglected to endorse the policy for some time and gave offenders as much leeway as possible. Nevertheless pressure from the privy council and ecclesiastical commission brought the Inns to heel. This was not simply a matter of coercion. The lead given

---

1 ITAB I, ff.181-2 (I.252). The missing page included minutes for 22 May and most of the privy council’s letter.

2 ITAB I, ff.188v-9 (I.266-7).

3 LIBB V, ff.181v-2 (I.291-2); ITAB I, ff.194-5 (I.276-8); MTMB II, f.112 (I.200-1).

4 LIBB V, f.182 (I.392-3). The separate register of admissions also derived from these resolutions.

5 MTMB II, f.138v (I.233).
by the government provided encouragement and opportunity for protestant members. Consequently official action combined with protestant initiative produced domestic attempts to regulate religious observance. The starting point was the 1574 set of orders which obliged members to attend common prayer in their chapels. As a result Lincoln's Inn instructed its butlers in June to certify 'yf there be anie person in Commens in this house that cometh not usuallie to the Chapell here in tymef of Common praier'.

Not content with this measure of conformity, the benchers four years later enjoined all members to receive communion once a year during term. The government orders probably prompted Gray's Inn to pass a similar act in June 1574 which required members to communicate once every Michaelmas and Easter terms on pain of expulsion from commons.

In 1582 this was extended to once each term, with a graduated scheme of penalties, as well as a shilling fine for not attending divinity lectures twice a week.

Though Gray's Inn acted ahead of the other Inns, advanced measures were also tried at the Temple. In 1580 the Middle house not only ordered members to communicate three times a year, but also decided that admittants would be required to do so by bond. At this time the butlers were expected to certify the benchers of those absent each Sunday and holyday, who would be fined for refusal.

---

1 LIBB V, f.182v (I.393).
2 LIBB V, f.248 (I.408).
3 GIPB I, f.41Bv (I.17).
4 GIPB I, f.160v (I.54). 'The first Default xld to be cast in Commons the same weeke, the second out of commons, the third losse of Chamber, the ffourthe tyme out of the house'. It is also possible that Gray's Inn required religious testimonies before admittance, since certificates for Thomas Walker and John Leveson were copied into the pension book in 1576. Otherwise these were suspects who had to clear themselves first, or else they provided testimonies of their own accord (GIPB I, ff.55,56 (I.23-4,25).
5 MTMB II, f.142v (I.239). Church attendance and communion were ordered to be written into the actual bond of admission in 1583 (MTMB II, f.164 (I.264).
not satisfied with these arrangements, in February 1582 he petitioned the house to appoint overseers. After an interval of several months, during which the Inner Temple was consulted, several joint church orders were issued in July. Alvey was allowed to appoint two overseers from each house, who would certify him of absentees from church and communion. If he could not reform them by private admonition, their names were to be forwarded to the benchers who would take appropriate action.

Judging by the differences in pace and form, the regulation of religious observance was largely a matter for each society. Nevertheless all of the Inns demanded stricter observance from their members, so that attendance at church and communion became obligatory.

If the Inns themselves required increasing conformity, to what extent was it enforced? Many disciplinary cases were handled outside of bench meetings and lesser officers performed much of the business. Therefore the examples which occur in the records are often incomplete. Yet they provide the only real guide. For the Middle Temple, which furnishes the least information, twenty-one religious expulsions are recorded between 1569 and 1584. Nearly all resulted from official proceedings outside of the Inn - four following the star chamber order in 1569, three from Parker's examination in 1571, and at least seven after further action by the commissioners. In addition John Hunt Jr and John

1 MTMB II, f.150v (I.248).
2 MTMB II, ff.153v-4 (I.252-3); ITAB I, f.220 (I.320-1). The Inner Temple did not enter the orders until January 1583.
3 MT Certificate 1577; EC Abstract 1569; p. 209 above.
4 Pp.219-20 above.
5 P.219 above. Of the remainder, Francis Brewning has not been traced and there is insufficient evidence for William Barnes, Edward Vavasour and Richard Johnson. John Cobden appears below.
Yate were expelled in 1571 because they were not deemed worthy members. Both had catholic connections and were imprisoned by the privy council for unspecified attempts against the state.¹ There is no evidence that any of these expulsions derived from spontaneous action by the Inn. Six other members including Plowden were listed as church absentees in 1577, and a further eleven suspects including five benchers were noted in about 1578-81.² Yet none of these seems to have been proceeded against by the Inn. In 1578, when John Stone once more purged himself before the commissioners, he was not merely readmitted, but also called to the bar.³ This was officially a reward for his reconciliation and learning, but some members probably interpreted it as a gesture of defiance to the authorities. In the following year Christopher Stone, who was simultaneously called to the bar, was ordered to be examined for certain misdemeanours, which apparently included religion. However his degradation 'remayne in suspence' until 1585 when he was reinstated.⁴ John Cobden was expelled for similar reasons in 1581, but not until his readmission in 1594-5 do we learn that this was mainly because of his nonconformity.⁵ Though the benchers provided for compulsory communion in 1580 and church surveyors two years later, the first survey of church

¹ MTMB I, f.96v (I.180). Hunt was the second son of John Hunt of Rutland and the Middle Temple, who was reportedly a 'greate hinderer of religion' (JP Certificate 1564, f.32v; MTMB II, ff.26v,80v; CPR (1558-60),243). Yate, who became a jesuit at Louvain, was the second son of John Yate of Berkshire, and brother of Edward of the Middle Temple, both of whom were recusants (MTMB II, f.77; JP Certificate 1564, f.36; APC XII.252; Harleian MS 360, f.4; Hatfield MS 235, f.36; SP12/60, f.132; SP12/117/17; SP12/140/36; SP12/159, f.110; Foley, I. 284-95). The exact cause of their imprisonment in 1571 is not known.

² MT Certificate 1577; IC List 1578-81. Francis Saunders, Peter Rosse, Richard Crompton, Matthew Smith, Edward Ameredith.

³ MTMB II, ff.129,131v (I.221,224).


⁵ MTMB II, ff.136v,147v,242v,245 (I.231,244,347,350).
absentees and non-communicants was ordered in 1583. Altogether it seems that the Middle Temple, which was comparatively slow to regulate religious observance, was also reluctant to expel members simply for reason of religion.

The Inner Temple expelled at least nineteen members for religion during the same period. All were excluded in 1570 and 1572 as a result of external proceedings - eight following the star chamber order of 1569 and eleven who later failed to appear before the commissioners. Three others discontinued their membership on receiving letters of convention, and another was disciplined in 1573, but there is no record of expulsion. In addition, twenty-three suspects were listed in 1577 and another eight appear on the 1578-81 list, including five benchers, yet none seems to have been coerced. Despite this apparent neglect, the benchers were strict about readmission of recusants. Those expelled by star chamber were expected to declare their reconciliation before the society. William Atkinson in 1573, Hugh Wyott in 1578 and John Lewis in 1580 were required not only to procure a conformity certificate from the bishop of London, but also to take the oath before the benchers and receive communion in the Temple church. In 1580 Wyott was kept from the bar

1 MTMB II, f.162v (I.263).
2 ITAB I, ff.188v-9 (I.266-7).
3 John Richardson, Robert Routh, [Nicholas or Walter] Roche (IT Certificate 1577).
4 John Netterville (ITAB I, f.192 (I.272).
6 Unsigned forms of submission for Thomas Bawde and Robert Atkinson remained with the treasurer's papers until at least 1594 (IT Misc. MS, l.2). These were probably copies of 'A forme of submission to be made by the gentlemen of the Innes of courte, which be sequestred from their practise and to be pronounced in the hall of theyr several houses', n.d. (1569) (Additional MS 28,571, ff.70-1; printed in LIBP, I.453). In this declaration, which was possibly prescribed by the ecclesiastical commissioners, the penitent offender confessed his offences against the law, promised to obey, and affirmed 'that the boke of common prayer and administracion of sacrametes now used in the church of Ingland is good and goodly and conteyneth holsome and sound christian doctryne'.
until he communicated, and four years later Atkinson was to satisfy Leicester and one of the benchers before he was called. In 1573 John Netterville, an Irishman, was also ordered to take the oath and communion. Three years later the same tests were imposed on Andrew Mallory who had been expelled in 1567, but not for any apparent religious reason. When Robert Atkinson sought readmission in 1572 this was opposed by some of the benchers. Though he reportedly submitted to the bishop and procured a royal letter commanding the chief justices, legal officers and reader of the Inn to restore him to the society, his expulsion for obstinate papistry was confirmed in November. Evidently the benchers were prepared to use strict measures against those convicted by the authorities or who sought readmission, but not to purge the Inn of their own volition. Furthermore the internal conflict over prospective benchers in 1573-4 reveals that they were also reluctant to treat religion as the criterion for legal promotion.

For Gray’s Inn only fifteen religious expulsions are recorded between 1569 and 1584. Five resulted from the star chamber order of May 1569, including that of Richard Godfrey who submitted to the bishop and was restored. Between November 1581 and February of the following year

2 ITAB I, f.192 (I,272).
3 ITAB I, ff.176v,196v (I.242,280-1); IT Certificate 1577; SP12/171, f.185; SP12/183, f.219v.
4 Lansdowne MS 15, ff.152-3; ITAB I, ff.188v-9 (I.266-7).
5 P. 221 above.
6 GI Certificate 1577. Mark Oglethorpe who appeared before the ecclesiastical commissioners in 1569 was most likely expelled (EC Abstract 1569, ff.203-4).
7 GI Certificate 1577, f.140.
he was given several chances to attend chapel and to signify his conformity to the benchers in the hall, but was finally expelled.  
William Hungate's expulsion in 1575 was probably the outcome of external pressure. In an anonymous communication to the lieutenant of the Tower, he was accused of 'trayerous speaches' and was examined by order of the privy council in 1575. For the other nine members, it is difficult to tell whether their exclusion derived from official or domestic action. The only evidence is that William Hillyard was watched for near the Charterhouse in 1570-1, that John Wyburne's exclusion 'for sundrye misdemourns' was confirmed in 1576, and that Thomas Braithwaite was restored by 1577. In addition thirty-seven suspects were listed in 1577, including at least ten who continued at the Inn for some time. There is little indication that they were coerced, except for John Smith, an ancient utter-barrister who fell foul of the benchers in 1579 'for his contempuous and approbrious wordes geven to the readers in this pension'.

1 GIPB I, ff.157,160,161 (I.52,53,54). Godfrey was listed as a recusant in 1576 and later (IC Lists 1567 and 1578-81).

2 GIPB I, ff.39,46v,50v; Lansdowne MS 97, ff.179-80; APC IX,45-6; Aveling, PILPS 227. According to the undated communication, 'William Hungate sayed that Bishop Jewells Booke was full of lyes and untruthes, and that he had of long tyme forborne to speake and argew of relygyone, but now he would take his bellyfull and would learne argumentes to dyspute with the prowdest protestant yn england. Also that whosoever sayed a papist was nott as honest a man and as good a subject as the best protestant yn england, he lyed in his throte lyke a vyllayne'. Though identification is not certain, others involved in the case were evidently members of the Inns, including Edward Nevill of the same Inn and two witnesses, Walter Raleigh of Lion's Inn and later the Middle Temple, and Edward Bacon of Gray's Inn.

3 GIPB I, f.29.

4 GIPB I, f.55 (I.23). Wyburne was apparently trying to gain readmission during vacation without recourse to the pension. He was certified as a recusant in 1588 and died in 1590-1 (Lansdowne MS 55, f.164v; IPM II.383).

5 GIPB I, f.43v; GI Certificate 1577, f.140.

6 GI Certificate 1577; IC List 1578-81.

He was not restored to commons until he openly confessed his offence and took the oath. After passing the 1582 orders for compulsory attendance at lectures and communion, the benchers immediately commanded Robert Williams and others unnamed to appear before them or be out of commons. Williams was a suspected recusant who was given respite several years later to receive communion. Yet he was not removed until 1601 when it was recorded that 'hee hath not of many Yeares resorted to the Chappell to heare Divine service nor by many Yeares past received the Communion in this society as himselfe Confesseth'. Though there is no evidence of immediate enforcement following the 1574 communion order, in the year 1583-4 the dean of the chapel collected ten guineas in communion fines, which suggests that amerciament had become a normal procedure. Since this represents at least sixty-three offences, the privy council had some justification for castigating the benchers in 1585 for not ensuring that the young gentlemen frequented divine service, sermons and communion, despite official letters to that effect. Consequently the benchers faithfully appointed annual surveyors and forwarded a certificate of names to the chancellor. Though it is difficult to interpret such miscellaneous evidence, it seems that Gray's Inn relied mainly on proclamation and amerciament rather than exclusion. The benchers responded to government orders and acted against obvious recusants, but there is little sign of severity. The numbers of suspects in 1577 and fines in 1584 suggest that there was some discrepancy between the Inn's advanced policy of conformity and its actual observance.

1 GIPB I, ff.86,87v (I.35-6); IC List 1578-81.
2 GIPB I, ff.161,187v,250 (I.54,71,152); IC List 1576.
3 Dean of the chapel's account, 1583-4, GIPB I, ff.323v-4. Cf. f.166v (I.56-7).
4 GIPB I, ff.27lv-2 (I.68-70); also copied into GIL, frontispiece.
5 GIPB I, f.87 (I.70-1); GIL, f.12.
At least thirty-four members of Lincoln's Inn were expelled for religion during the same period - a much larger number than that of Gray's Inn. All except two had offended against the law. They included the six lawyers who were convicted of 'Sedition' by the star chamber early in 1569 for circulating unlawful books, though four were later readmitted. ¹ Five members were expelled in compliance with the star chamber order of May 1569, of whom three submitted and were restored. ² Altogether twenty-three suspects, including the four readmitted, were convented by Bishop Sandys and sixteen of them expelled. ³ Another two were deprived in November 1581 'for that theye been noted faltye in greate crymes'. ⁴ One was John Pascall, the member of a recusant family and an associate of priests, who had been imprisoned. ⁵ The other was Thomas Pound, a perpetual prisoner and lay jesuit, who publicly justified the cause of Parsons and Campion in 1581. ⁶ Though these were political expulsions, Lincoln's Inn was capable of acting independently. Following the 1574 government orders and the Inn's inquiry into church attendance, ⁷ thirteen members who had not received communion were called before the bench. ⁸ No action was evidently taken against George Abbott, Philip

¹ LIBB V, f.95v (I.365); p.207 above. Weston, Roper, Mayo and Smithson were evidently readmitted.
² LI Certificate 1577; p.209 above. Lowther, Harper and Egerton were reconciled.
⁴ LIBB V, f.334v (I.424).
⁵ LIBB V, ff.170,203; Harleian MS 360, f.49v; Lansdowne MS 36, f.146; SP12/118, f.149; PCC 9 Darcy, 1580/1 (John Sr of Baddow, Essex); HMCR X.iv.477; CRS II.220, IV.11.
⁶ LIBB V, ff.355v,377; APC XIII.170,174; SP12/117/10; SP12/140/40; SP12/142, ff.66-70; SP12/178, f.166; SP12/203, f.40; Lansdowne MS 55, f.167v; Bodleian MS Rawlinson D.330, ff.1-28; Foley, III.568-657; R. Simpson, 172,223-32; Notes and Queries, Series 10, IV.184-5,268-72,472-4.
⁷ P.230 above.
⁸ An untitled, undated and misplaced list of offenders may be found among miscellaneous jottings in the admission book (LIAR II,f.189).
Skidmore and William Wye. Thomas Docton and Robert Barney promised to communicate, but Robert Peterson, Richard Gilbert and Philip Basset absented themselves from the society. Whereas Thomas Vicars was actually expelled for obstinacy, Anthony Roper, William Dawtry and Anthony Wright of the Roper circle were spared in order to confer 'for their better satisfaction of their conscience', provided they received communion in the meantime. At some stage the ecclesiastical commissioners also examined Thomas Roper, Anthony Wright, Robert Barney and Robert Johnson. The last two reconciled themselves, but the former were expelled.¹ As well as purging their society in 1575, the benchers dealt with individual offenders. As early as 1572 Edward Blackwell, a bencher for over ten years, was ordered to attend service, sermon and communion or be expelled, but death intervened.² Before readmission in 1574, Gerard Lowther had to provide confirmation of his penitence and conformity before the bench, as well as testimonies from Lord Burghley and Bishop Sandys.³ In 1581 a special order decreed that 'the soone of Mr [Thomas] Copleye who is fledde and remayneth beyonde the seas' would not be admitted without allowance of a council.⁴ Henry Harper, who had not received communion for two years, was expelled in 1584.⁵ During these years conformity also became a prerequisite for promotion. In 1574 Thomas Walmsley's bench call was deferred while the benchers considered 'yf the said Mr Wameslow for his zeal in Religion shalbe thought meete'.⁶ In 1579 two

¹ LIBB V, f.200 (I.397-8); LIAR II, f.189; LI Certificate 1577.
² LIBB V, f.151v (I.382); A5, II.51. P. 309 above.
³ LIBB V, ff.178v-9 (I.389-91).
⁴ LIBB V, f.334v (I.424).
⁵ LIBB V, f.358v (I.434).
⁶ LIBB V, f.183 (I.393); A5, II.84.
prospective barristers were ordered to satisfy the bench regarding their religion, and four years later another two were required to subscribe 'to suche articles as they that have already subscribed' in the hands of the preacher. These measures, their distinct protestant tone and the fact that only eight suspects could be listed in 1577, indicate that the benchers of Lincoln's Inn kept a careful watch on religious observance.

In this way Lincoln's Inn, which was loath to impose conformity in 1569, did so during succeeding years. Gray's Inn, which regulated religious observance in advance of the other societies, failed to enforce it with any consistency. At the Temple, where observance was not so strictly prescribed during the 1570's, there was reluctance to act severely. Despite official pressure, each society responded in a different way. Nevertheless all of the Inns were prepared to exclude convicted members and to establish their own religious regulations, though none was eager to expel offenders of its own accord. On the contrary, members were given every opportunity to conform. Even Lincoln's Inn hoped that Thomas Roper would ultimately reconcile himself, and maintained Hugh Charnock's right to his chamber in case he returned from overseas. Leniency and delay naturally appealed to conservative members. But to the protestants, conformity was not simply a matter of compulsion. It was also achieved by the use of persuasion.

1 LIBB V, ff.264,278,349 (I.412,414-6,430-1).
2 LI Certificate 1577.
3 P.239 above.
4 LIBB V. f.113 (I.372).
In 1559 a royal injunction prescribed 'a comely and honest pulpit' for the preaching of regular sermons in every church.\(^1\) At Gray’s Inn this was not implemented until June 1569, when a pension ordered 'that there bee a pulpit prepared in the chapell and that the perticion in the chapell be removed and stalles mad accordinge to the descretion of the deane of the chapell'.\(^2\) Sermons were probably infrequent at first. If Henry Ward and Mr Style acted as preachers and not as assistant ministers, Gray’s Inn was treated to six sermons between 1572 and 1574.\(^3\) William Charke, the preacher by June 1574, most likely preached quite often, though his role was not mentioned until two years later when the benchers agreed to continue his allowance.\(^4\) Charke probably remained there for several years, but Thomas Gataker Jr, a later preacher to the society, believed that 'the first settled constant Preacher' was Dr Thomas Crook.\(^5\) At his commencement in 1581 the dean provided a door for the pulpit, new forms on each side and an essential hour-glass.\(^6\) Members were ordered to pay a termly tax to the preacher’s roll which was collected by nominees of the bench and audited with the dean’s accounts.\(^7\) In return for two or three weekly lectures, the new 'Reader of Dyvinitie' gained a study, commons and coals as well as an annual stipend of a hundred marks.\(^8\)

---

2. GIPB I, f.1v (I.3).
3. P. 83 above; A2, n6-7. The tenure of preachers has been summarised in A2.
5. Gataker, 35. Gataker was preacher from 1602-11 (Seaver, 175-6, 199-200).
6. GIPB I, f.165v.
7. In April 1581 the preacher’s tax was set at the high termly rate of 3/4 for benchers, 2/- for ancients, 1/8 for other barristers, and 1/4 for gentlemen (GIPB I, f.156 (I.50). The audited accounts appear in the pension book from 1581-4 (GIPB I, ff.170-1, 323-4) and then the ledger book (e.g. GL, ff.7v-8, 15v-16, 17v).
8. GIPB I, f.160v (I.54). As Seaver has relied on the printed pension book, his calculation of Crook’s total income is much too low (151).
A similar stage was reached at Lincoln's Inn, where the pensioner provided twenty-five shillings for a pulpit in 1570-1. During the next decade the treasurer paid a dozen London preachers for sermons on two or more festival days a year, the most frequent being Richard Porder and Thomas White. Occasional sermons were discontinued in 1581 when a permanent preacher was appointed. After Laurence Chaderton and John Reynolds had declined office, the society engaged William Charke, established a preacher's roll, and paid £40 a year for at least two weekly lectures. Thus Charke was 'the first settled Preacher at Lincoln Inn'.

Because of its ancestry, the Temple church probably had a pulpit many years before the other chapels and certainly prior to 1571 when George Horde was accused of saying 'that Mr Alvey the Master of the Temple stoode in the pulpytt lyke a Crowkeper'. Alvey's reputation as a preacher and the purpose of his ministry indicate that sermons were regularly delivered, at least on Sundays and special occasions. However, Thomas Gataker believed that 'Father Lever' was 'the first settled constant Preacher'. Thomas Lever, the Edwardian preacher,

1 LIBB I, f. 141 (I. 379).
2 A2. The fee was ten shillings a sermon.
3 Lansdowne MS 106, f. 93; LIBB VI, f. 320v (I. 421).
4 A2.
5 LIBB V, f. 386v, and succeeding treasurer's accounts. The customary annual tax was 5/- per member (LIBB V, v. 508v (II. 39)).
6 LIBB V, ff. 357v, 476 (I. 432, II. 28-9).
7 Gataker, 35.
8 IT Petyt MS 538/47, f. 342.
9 P. 91 above; Prest, 189.
10 Gataker, 35.
Marian exile and Elizabethan nonconformist possibly gave lectures at the Temple. But since there is no corroborative evidence it seems that Gataker merely confused his patriarchs. According to the records, the first 'divinity reader' was appointed in 1571, when both societies established a preacher's roll and paid £20 each for three weekly lectures. Until 1578 the office was held by Antonio del Corro, followed by Laurence Chaderton in 1579 and Walter Travers in 1580.

In contrast with the regular clergy at the Inns, the preachers were men of some mark. Most had attended university where they gained degrees and even fellowships. Several of the occasional preachers of Lincoln's Inn were established clerics. Richard Porder, who died in 1574, held at least two benefices including St Peter's Cornhill. Henry Bedell, formerly the rector of St Pancras, Soper Lane, was the vicar of Christ Church, Newgate Street. Both had published a sermon before lecturing at the Inn. Some were more eminent London preachers. After several clerical posts, Robert Crowley was appointed to the vicarage of St Lawrence Jewry in 1575 and delivered lectures to various

1 Al. Cantab.; DNB; Porter, passim.
2 ITAB I, f.186 (I.261); MTMB II, ff.98v,131v (I.182,224). At the Inner Temple the termly preacher's tax was set at 1/- for benchers, barristers, practisers and attorneys, and 6d for other gentlemen. As the Middle Temple also agreed to pay £5 a term, the total salary was £40, and not £20 as stated by McFadden (Thesis, 398) and Hauben (57).
3 A2, n52-4.
4 A4.
5 Hennessey, 375; Al. Cantab; Cooper, I.325; SP12/76, f.40.
6 Hennessey, 125,311; Al. Oxon.; DNB.
7 To these may be added: (1) Mr Redman, who was probably Lionel Redman, the vicar of Bedfont, London, and Stanwell, Middlesex, rather than William Redman, the dean of Ely and later bishop of Norwich (Hennessey, 103,408; DNB; SP12/76, f.44v); (2) Mr Argall, who was most likely either John Argall, the vicar of Chalgrove, Oxford, or the perpetual curate of St Katherine's, London. (Al.Oxon.; DNB; Owen, Thesis, 598).
William Ashbold, the lecturer at St Dunstan's in the East, rector of St Peter Cornhill and a chaplain to Grindal and then Whitgift, became the rector and preacher at St Michael Cornhill. Thomas White, the vicar of St Dunstan's in the West, had already preached at Paul's Cross and is better known as the founder of Sion College. The others were ambitious clerics who lectured at Lincoln's Inn during an early stage in their careers. Thomas Blague, the rector of St Vedast, Foster Lane, and one of Parker's chaplains, afterwards gained several benefices, a royal chaplaincy and the archdeaconry of Rochester. After holding a prebend at Worcester, Dr Griffith Lewis became a prebendary at Westminster, the dean of Gloucester and a royal chaplain. Nicholas Bond, a later candidate for the Temple mastership by Whitgift's nomination, was vice-chancellor of Oxford in 1589 and president of Magdalen College. On the other hand the permanent preachers were less attached to the established church and devoted much of their time to duties at the Inns. Thomas Crook relinquished his Suffolk rectory for lectureships at Gray's Inn and St Mary Woolchurch. Walter Travers, who declined to hold clerical office, travelled abroad before accepting a

1 APC VII.315; Machyn, 215,229,269; Al. Oxon.; Brook, I.357-61; DNB; Hennessey, 38,72,267,376; Peel, JPHS; Seaver, passim.

2 SP12/76, f.11; Al. Cantab.; Hennessey, 332,375; Seaver, 197-8.

3 Al. Oxon.; DNB; Hennessey, 38,138,321; Maclure, 68,110,139,216; Seaver, 158.

4 SP15/23, f.176v; Seconde Parte of a Register II.132,161; Strype, Aylmer,19, Whitgift, 80-1; Hennessey, 433; Al. Oxon.; DNB.

5 Hennessey, 445; Al. Cantab.; Strype, Annals, II.ii.514-6,526, Whitgift, I.i.411.

6 Al. Cantab.; Al. Oxon.; DNB.

7 Al. Cantab.; DNB; Seaver, 151,358; Owen, Thesis, 629.
chaplaincy to the merchant adventurers at Antwerp and then the Temple lectureship.¹ William Charke refused the same chaplaincy and preferred to lecture in London.² In this regard the exceptions were Antonio del Corro and Laurence Chaderton, both of whom returned to academic life. Corro, a Spanish monk who had fled to Geneva, ministered to French and Flemish congregations and then to the Italian church in London. After lecturing at the Temple he moved to Oxford.³ Chaderton, a Cambridge preacher and fellow of Christ's College, became the first master of Emmanuel.⁴

Preachers of this calibre required better pay than the lowly chaplains of the Inns. But their salaries were quite extraordinary. If the London average in 1580 was only £16,⁵ the Inns afforded some of the most lucrative lectureships. As the societies were parsimonious at the best of times, their commitment to such a large and continuous item of expenditure indicates that preaching was at a premium. The lawyers were little different from Londoners at large. In the late 1560's various parishes founded lectureships, including nearby St Andrew's, Holborn. During the next twenty years the trickle became such a flow that the city was swamped with preaching.⁶ The main cause was the popular appetite for scriptural exposition in a nation which treated the word of God as its source of faith, arbiter of conduct and compendium of

---

¹ Knox, chs 1-3.
² Al. Cantab.; Brook, II,113-7; Pearson, 171-2; Seaver, 192-3,217-8,353.
³ McFadden, Thesis, chs 1-22; Hauben, 6-53; DNB.
⁴ Al. Cantab.; Dillingham; DNB; Porter, passim.
⁵ Seaver, 148-51.
⁶ Seaver, 123-9.
knowledge.  

'The very existence of a lectureship was in the most instances an indication of lay demand for a preaching ministry'. "Therefore it is not surprising that this development was reflected at the Inns. As early as 1539 a Lent lecture had been suggested for the proposed royal Inn by Denton, Bacon and Cary. During succeeding years, when there was apparently little preaching to the societies, members attended elsewhere. In 1535 the conservative Anthony Wayte heard Hugh Latimer, as did John Bradford thirteen years later. Roger Corham, who was expelled for religion in 1570, informed the commissioners that he attended sermons. Other lawyers expressed appreciation of preaching in their wills. In 1574 William Hone of the Middle Temple wrote out the theme for 'a learned and discrete man' to expound a week after the lawyer's death. Two years later justice Richard Harper, formerly an Inner Templar, provided for seventeen sermons at three parish churches within two years, 'and that the preachers be well satisfied for their pains'. In 1584 justice Thomas Meade, previously of the Middle Temple, required 'twoe discreete Preachers and learned' from Cambridge to perform in the morning and afternoon for the generous fee of fourteen shillings each. In this regard Peter Birchet, a student of the same house, was probably not an exception. According to his fellows, for several years before

1 Cf. Seaver, 129-32.
2 Seaver, 37.
3 P. 13 above.
4 Pp. 138, 150 above.
5 EC Abstract 1569, f. 203.
6 PCC 45 Pyckering, 1574/5; A5, IV. 51.
7 PCC 9 Daughtrey, 1576/7; A5, III. 44.
8 PCC 52 Brudenell, 1584/5; A5, IV. 62.
1573 he had been 'a diligent herer of sermons and lectures at Poules, and else where, being in such places never lightlie with out his tables, wher on he noted'. ¹

These snippets suggest that within the societies themselves, as in London abroad, there was an increasing demand for scriptural exegesis which played its part in the erection of pulpits and employment of preachers. On the other hand it is evident that this development coincided with official action against the Inns from 1569. Since it has recently been stated that the most striking feature in the nomination of preachers was the exceptionally important role of the authorities,² these appointments require further consideration.

₂ As Gray's Inn made provision for a pulpit shortly after action by the ecclesiastical commission and privy council in 1569, it is tempting to ascribe this to external events. Likewise the payment for a pulpit at Lincoln's Inn may be connected with Parker's campaign against the Inns in 1571, and with Bishop Sandys' visitation which inquired whether churches had 'a comely pulpit conveniently placed'.³ Official pressure probably had some effect. However, the accompanying order at Gray's Inn for the removal of their screen and the provision of stalls looks more like a spontaneous effort which was intended to increase the capacity of the

---

¹ Lansdowne MS 16, f.191v.
² Prest, 190-6. In concentrating on the official aspect of the lectureships, Prest has ignored internal developments and the London situation.
³ Visitations, III.304.
Moreover the fact that neither Inn supported a permanent preacher for some years, while the Temple had theirs as early as 1571, suggests that the lectureships resulted more from internal causes.

This was certainly true of Lincoln's Inn, which was content to employ occasional preachers from town and university during the first decade. Since their ten shilling fee was paid by special warrant to the treasurer, the benchers were most likely responsible for nomination. By choosing different preachers, ranging from the radical Robert Crowley to the conforming William Ashbold, they could cater for various tastes. Despite this advantage a bill was presented to the benchers in July 1581 for the appointment of Laurence Chaderton as a lecturer. They agreed 'that meanes shalbe used to Mr Chatterton to Reade at Mychelmas Term exte'. When he declined, advances were made to others including John Reynolds, the later president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Not until November did they decide that William Charke should be approached by a delegation comprising James Dalton and Thomas Weeks of the bench as well as John Tindall of the bar, all of whom were strong protestants. When Charke accepted, the benchers resolved to gain the approbation of Bishop Aylmer their ordinary, possibly because of the preacher's presbyterian sympathies. Aylmer commended their choice, but thought that final approval should rest with the privy council. For this reason the benchers wrote to Michael Hickes, one of Burghley's secretaries, an ardent protestant and a former member, explaining how they had been 'of longe tyme desirous to have a preacher in our howse, like as is in other

1 The actual cost of moving the screen to the end of the chapel was met by Walter Strickland, a member of the Inn (GIPB I, f.25 (I.12).

2 LIBB V, f.320v (I.421).

3 LIBB V, f.334v (I.424); A5, III.73,78,96; pp.303,305.
howses of Courte', and requesting his assistance. Burghley had a good opinion of the preacher already. In 1572 when Charke had been suspended from Cambridge for preaching against ecclesiastical government, the councillor unsuccessfully advocated his reinstatement, believing that he would become a profitable member of the church. Therefore it is hardly surprising that the council wrote to Aylmer in January 1582, fully confirming the choice in 'greate hope of good to be done by suche meanes in those places and understanding the habilitie of Mr Charke sufficientlye for your purpose'. Thus the authorities endorsed an appointment for which Lincoln's Inn was responsible.

The early development of the lectureship at Gray's Inn is obscure in comparison. Nevertheless it seems that Charke's services to that Inn were first obtained without official approval. In 1576 the benchers agreed that he could continue as their preacher only 'if it be not other-wise myslyked by the privie councell or archbishopp of canterbury or the bishopp of London'. Such a procedure would hardly have been adopted if he had already had the sanction of those authorities. Yet there is evidence that they affected the choice of his successor in January 1581. On learning that the benchers intended to provide for a resident preacher, Burghley wrote as a previous member of the society to inform them that Aylmer had persuaded Dr Thomas Crook to accept office. Since

1 Lansdowne MS 106, f.93; see above. Though this copy has not been addressed, dated or signed, its location, content and the clause 'as we do still accompt you one of us', make Hickes the likely recipient. He entered Burghley's service in 1573, and was his secretary by 1578 (Smith, Thesis, 122).

2 Brook, II.113-7; Porter, 139,141,179-80; Strype, Annals, III.i.78-80.

3 APC XIII.310; Lansdowne MS 106, f.94 (copy). Seaver wrongly states that the council forced Aylmer to accept Charke (217).

4 GIPB I, f.52v (I.52).
Crook was eminently qualified, Burghley urged them to reward him accordingly.¹ Possibly the benchers would have elected him of their own volition. He was well educated, a diligent preacher and an associate of Charke. Moreover he was one of those already under consideration. But in a society which was sensitive to official opinion, Burghley's recommendation ensured that Crook was chosen. At the same time the decision to provide for a permanent lectureship did not derive from the authorities, but from the society itself. For this reason Gray's Inn made such eager preparations for its preacher.

Unfortunately the circumstances of Antonio del Corro's appointment are not well documented. The only certain details were provided by Corro himself in an epistle addressed to both the Temples. He stated that he had been chosen in 1571 'by Gods providence and (as I believe) calling, and by your voices together, with the confirmation of the right Reverend father in God, the lord Edwine Sandes Bishop of London'.² At first sight this appears to be a straightforward domestic appointment which was ratified by the ordinary of the Inns. On the other hand Corro's record would hardly have recommended him to either the benchers or the master of the Temple. His theological wrangling with the French church in London and his intemperate behaviour before a special ecclesiastical commission resulted in his suspension from ministerial office in 1569.³ Therefore some outside influence most likely effected his nomination. Corro himself indicated the source. The English edition of his Theological

¹ Burghley to Gray's Inn, 30 January 1581 (copy), GIPB I, f.149v (I.48-9).
² Corro, Theological Dialogue, A.i, published in Latin (1574) and translated into English (1575).
Dialogue was dedicated to the earl of Leicester as his chief patron and constant defender, a role which the earl performed from the Spaniard's arrival in 1567 until later in life. Since Leicester was also the protector and 'chief governor' of the Inner Temple, he probably secured office for his protege. But Corro also had the favour of Burghley, Parker and Huntingdon. As the authorities were particularly concerned about the Inns in 1571, did they establish the lectureship to counteract catholicism?

If this were true we would expect some sign of similar activity at Gray's and Lincoln's Inns. Yet neither established a settled lectureship until 1581. Moreover Corro stated that he had been chosen a 'full three yeeres agoe'. Since this epistle to the Templars was dated on 31 May 1574, he was evidently elected before the renewed effort against the Inns which followed Parker's letter to Burghley on 17 June 1571. Therefore the appointment was more likely a private affair in which Leicester wished to provide suitable employment for an awkward client. Corro himself treated the matter quite personally. To the Templars he said that 'You on the one side called me: and I on the other side wished some fit meanes to ridde away the misreportes that were spred abrode of mee...and to wipe away the spottes of imfamie that were sprinkled upon me'. Nevertheless Corro would hardly have succeeded if there had not been some internal

1 Corro, Theological Dialogue, I.iii-vii. On Leicester's clerical patronage, see: Collinson, 61-4,92-3; Cross, Supremacy, 107-8; Hauben, 62-4; MacCaffrey, 93-5,162-3.
2 ITAB I, ff.161v-3v,200 (I.215-9,286-7). Leicester's influence at the Temple has been examined by McFadden, (Thesis, 406) and Axton, (HJ).
4 Corro, Theological Dialogue, A.i.
5 P.215 above.
6 Corro, Theological Dialogue, A.vii.
demand for a divinity reader. Since preaching had been a feature of the Temple for some time, it was more likely that an endowed lectureship would have been first established there than at the other Inns, particularly if Leicester allied himself with protestant members. Therefore it is improbable that preaching was imposed upon the societies by external authority. ¹

Though Corro testified that he had 'never led a meryer or happier lyfe nor continued in my studies with more cheerfulness' than at the Temple, ² by 1576 he was angling for advancement. After initial resistance by both universities which questioned his orthodoxy, in Michaelmas term 1578 he became a lecturer in theology at Christ Church, Oxford. ³ During these negotiations Corro neglected his duties at the Temple. As a result the Inner house withheld his salary until April 1578 when the benchers agreed to pay a whole year's contribution, but decided to discuss his continuance with the other society. The outcome was recorded by the Middle Templars in May. They politely decreed 'that Corano shalbe licensed to departe', but were so disgruntled that they refused to grant 'any Contribution, Reward or testimoniall of the Contynewance of his pencion in the tyme of his sylence and not prechinge & c'. ⁴

---

¹ This interpretation conflicts with: (1) McFadden's supposition that Corro's appointment was probably the outcome of some hypothetical discussions between the benchers and Parker in summer and early autumn 1571 (Thesis, 405); (2) Prest's idea that it was an official 'experiment' to combat catholicism at the Inns (193); (3) Hauben's assumption 'that it must have been well known that Corro had been brought to the Inns of Court precisely to "root out the dregs of Popery"'. Contrary to his assertion, there is nothing in the dedication to the Theological Dialogue which makes it abundantly clear that Corro was 'called in to combat this tendency, and that Sandys and Leicester set up Corro's "election" with the benchers' (57,61,76,n80).

² Corro, Theological Dialogue, A.viii.


⁴ ITAB I, ff.202,214 (I.289,293); MTMB II, f.129 (I.221).
If there were any further difficulties, these were settled by the new year when Laurence Chaderton was appointed. Though nothing is recorded about his election or continuance, his Cambridge ties and nonconformist sympathies suggest that his nomination derived from protestant support within the societies. However, the case of his successor shows how complicated an appointment could be. In November 1580 the Middle Temple parliament decided to provide for a new preacher, presumably after conference with the other house. At the same time it ordered that, during the lifetime of Richard Alvey, the preacher would be chosen 'by thellectyone of three of the hie Commyssyoners and the Master of the saide Temple'. An unnamed preacher was officiating by January 1581 when the Inner house agreed to confer with their neighbours about his continuance. This was confirmed in the following month, but since it was made conditional upon 'comendacions (of his gude havyor) either from the bushoppe of London or els from other too bushopps whatsoever beinge of the high commission', it is unlikely that the original order had been strictly obeyed. What seems to have happened is that Alvey took advantage of the vacation to promote his own candidate, who was Walter Travers. At some stage the preacher was recommended by Bishop Aylmer, who later stated in a letter to the Inner Temple benchers that 'upon the good report of some of my frendes I Commendid Mr Travis unto you to be your reader, a man otherwise unknowen to me, and therfore so much the more doubtfully'. Though no names are mentioned, the principal

1 MTMB II, f.143 (I.239).
2 ITAB I, f.214v (I.311).
3 ITAB I, f.215 (I.312).
4 IT Misc. MS 30, no.5. Since Aylmer's preceding letter is missing, it is difficult to know when he first recommended Travers, who also referred to two letters in his later supplication to the privy council (Hooker, Works, II.659-60).
confidant was most likely Lord Burghley, who befriended the preacher's return from Antwerp in 1580, and aided him in London. Following a brief trial, the Inner Temple insisted upon his confirmation, probably for their own security and to satisfy criticism. Consequently Travers secured the necessary testimony at June 1581, when Aylmer urged the benchers 'to continue your good lik and favor towards him, as he shall continue his good behavior, and crea with you'. Therefore Alvey and the authorities were responsible for Travers' appointment. Nevertheless his lectureship derived from internal causes. After the master's death in 1584, the Inner Temple twice recorded that the preacher was employed 'at the request of Mr Alveye to supply his weaknes'. Thus the immediate reason for Travers' appointment was the master's inability to preach during his advanced years. But since the bench also ordered him to lecture 'too other dayes wekelye besides the Sondaye and the Sondaye att his owne pleasure', the underlying cause was the demand from the lawyers themselves for a regular diet of divine instruction.

Altogether the evidence indicates that the means used to appoint preachers were quite diverse. Though the benchers were ultimately responsible, they could delegate authority to others and were influenced by the recommendations of patrons, members and officials. More is known about official support than private preference since it had a better chance of survival in the records. But there were many moves behind the scenes.

1 Knox, 55,57,64,67,79-80; Read, II.298.
2 IT Misc. MS 30, no15.
3 ITAB I, f.226v; cf. f.225v (I.333,331). This raises the unanswerable question of whether Corro and Chaderton were appointed for the same immediate reason.
4 ITAB I, f.215 (I.312).
confidant was most likely Lord Burghley, who befriended Travers on the preacher's return from Antwerp in 1580, and aided him thereafter.\(^1\) Following a brief trial, the Inner Temple insisted upon official confirmation, probably for their own security and to satisfy internal criticism. Consequently Travers secured the necessary testimony in June 1581, when Aylmer urged the benchers 'to contynue your good liking and favor towards him, as he shall contynue his good behavior, and credit with you'.\(^2\) Therefore Alvey and the authorities were responsible for Travers' appointment. Nevertheless his lectureship derived from internal causes. After the master's death in 1584, the Inner Temple twice recorded that the preacher was employed 'at the request of Mr Alveye to supply his weaknes'. Thus the immediate reason for Travers' appointment was the master's inability to preach during his advanced years.\(^3\) But since the bench also ordered him to lecture 'too other dayes wekelye besides the Sondaye and the Sondaye att his owne pleasure',\(^4\) the underlying cause was the demand from the lawyers themselves for a regular diet of divine instruction.

Altogether the evidence indicates that the means used to appoint preachers were quite diverse. Though the benchers were ultimately responsible, they could delegate authority to others and were influenced by the recommendations of patrons, members and officials. More is known about official support than private preference since it had a better chance of survival in the records. But there were many moves behind the scenes.

---

1 Knox, 55, 57, 64, 67, 79-80; Read, II.298.
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3 ITAB I, f.226v; cf. f.225v (I.333, 331). This raises the unanswerable question of whether Corro and Chaderton were appointed for the same immediate reason.

4 ITAB I, f.215 (I.312).
which can hardly be discerned. This is best illustrated by the later case of Thomas Gataker Jr. According to his Discours, he was in London in 1602 when the preachership became vacant at Lincoln's Inn. A member who had heard him preach elsewhere together with Richard Stock, a well known lecturer and mutual friend, urged him to apply, in the belief that he could readily succeed by the mediation of chief justice Popham. The matter was expeditied by Dr James Montague, Gataker's former master at Sidney Sussex College, who was visiting Popham on college business. At his request the chief justice immediately sent his secretary to the benchers. After a trial sermon, Gataker was promptly appointed.  

Personal initiative, internal support, influential patronage and official confirmation were primary ingredients of a preacher's appointment during this period. But without the initial desire for lectures at the Inns, external means were unlikely to succeed.

The most important feature therefore was not official intervention, but the internal desire for preaching. This is not to deny that the authorities took the opportunity to ensure the employment of suitable candidates. In differing ways Leicester, Burghley and the bishops influenced the appointment of Corro, Crook, Travers and Charke. Nor does this negate the argument that the civil and ecclesiastical authorities encouraged protestant preaching at the Inns and elsewhere as a principal weapon against catholicism.  

Burghley believed that the papists could easily be reduced 'by means of carefull, and diligent Preachers in every Parish to that end appointed'. When the government proposed to

1 Gataker, 33-5.
2 Prest, 192-3; Read, II.294-6; Seaver, 121-3.
3 'An Excellent Treatise against Papists' (copy), Lansdowne MS 213, f.2.
reorganise London preaching in 1581-2, it hoped to supply 'a more sufficient number of learned preachers hable to confute th'enemies in matters of Religion'. At the same time the privy councillors confirmed Charke's appointment at Lincoln's Inn, 'in greate hope of good to be done by suche meanes in those places'. After Alvey's death they commanded the Inner Temple to continue Travers' stipend principally for 'his publique Labors and paynes taken againste the Common Adversaries, impugners of the state and the Religion under her Maiesties gratiouse governmente'. In the official campaign against catholicism, compulsion was complemented by persuasion. But to treat the development of lectureships at the Inns as the result of government policy would be to attribute an unwarranted degree of design to the authorities and to ignore the internal demand for preaching.

For this period nothing is known about the sermons of any preacher at the Inns except Corro, whose desire to vindicate himself ensured that his lectures were published. From his appointment in 1571 until 1573 he gave his interpretation of the epistle to the Romans, which was reproduced in 1574 and 1581 as a Latin dialogue between St Paul and a Roman christian and translated into English in 1575. In the introductory address to the

1 APC XIII.307.
2 APC XIII.310.
3 IT Misc. MS 30, no.12. Travers' subsequent troubles at the Temple are fully examined by Knox (chs 4-5) and Prest (193-4).
4 STC 5784-6. All references are to the first English edition. The original lectures were delivered in Latin.
Templars, Corro expounded his method of teaching which was based on Paul's letter to Timothy. As a faithful steward of God's truth, he refused to stand in awe of 'ambitious teachers' or to discuss any contentious issues. Instead he endeavoured to 'set forth and observe a true method or order of teaching, taken out of the holy writers and fashioned like to the pattern and practise of the sermons of the Prophets'. This approach comprised two main parts, the law and the gospel. As the prophets of old, the preacher was to prepare the hearer for heavenly doctrine by rooting out false and common opinion, and then to emulate the apostles by preaching repentance and amendment of life to the forgiveness of sins. Since the epistle to the Romans expressed 'the summe of our Christian religion', Corro chose this for his first lectures at the Temple, and published them in dialogue form as a true reminder of his teaching. For those absent from his readings, he concluded with a lengthy confession of 'The articles of the Catholike fayth which Anthonie Coranus Spaniarde Student of Divinitie professeth and always hath professed'.

At the beginning of his Dialogue, Corro stated that the theme of the whole epistle was 'to shewe all men indifferently the two chief points of Religion, namely the doctrine of faith and the doctrine of good conversation proceeding out of fayth, bycause that all the thinges which are conteyned in the holie scriptures may easily be referred to those two'. In other words, religion was but a matter 'of believing rightly and doing well'. Since works were useless without faith, Corro first elaborated right belief. Because man was evil by nature and subject to punishment

1 2 Timothy 2: 15. Corro, Theological Dialogue, A-B.
2 ff.139v-55.
3 f.3v.
4 ff.4-106.
by divine law, no one could attain salvation unless he were enlightened by the heavenly gift of faith which God mercifully granted to those who sought remission from sin. Therefore justification was 'the way whereby men knowing themselves to be gilte and enemies of God, may nevertheless recover his favour and repayre his good will'; election meant that 'all mankinde may without difference enjoy this benefite of attonment and Gods favor by the force of faith'; and the gospel was the power of God which brought salvation to all believers. This divine power was responsible for kindling faith in man by degrees. But it also produced the Christ-like 'holiness of life' that God required of the justified and by which they were assured of election. Therefore faith and virtue were gifts of the spirit of righteousness which God imparted to man through Christ.

For this reason Corro devoted much of his preaching to the works of a godly life. In the Dialogue he berated the traditional sins ranging from murder to malice. The baptised who walked 'in newnesse of life' would shun sin, follow divine law and exercise christian virtue. In the church they would replace 'confused disorder' with peace and judgement. In the commonwealth the needy would be relieved by charity. In government the authorities ordained by God would be obeyed regardless of how they acted. Peace, order, love and moderation were remedies for every ill.

---

1 ff.4-6,24-7v.
2 ff.6,27v,105v.
3 f.9.
4 ff.55-76.
5 ff.106-21.
However, Corro's prescription for virtuous living was given more fully in another series of Temple lectures on the book of Ecclesiastes. In 1579 this lengthy paraphrase of Solomon's sermon was published in Latin and largely translated by one of the preacher's Oxford students in 1586. After stating the proposition that every living creature naturally sought pleasure and avoided hurt, Corro considered four main opinions of what constituted human happiness. Since knowledge, pleasure, honour and wealth were but transitory vanities of man, he then elaborated Solomon's conclusion that true felicity could only be found in 'the religious and godly feare of almightie God'. One of its effects was wisdom which 'teacheth what to fly, what to follow; and taketh heede that in the election and choice of good things we erre not, nor be deceived'. Therefore Corro expounded Solomon's precepts including regard for a good name, the daily remembrance of death, acceptance of admonition, avoidance of slander and the lawful use of wealth. The other effect of godly fear was justice which showed 'our duty towards God, towards our neighbours, and towards ourselves'. The duty of religious justice included the acknowledgement of God, to think reverently of him and to worship his justice, goodness, wisdom and providence. Corro had already indicated how this should be expressed. In an earlier passage he castigated 'the superstitious fooles' who offered 'sacrifices,

1 STC 2762-3. References are to the English edition, except for the original Latin dedication which was not reproduced.

2 Corro, Solomon's Sermon, A.i.

3 pp.14-110.


5 pp.112-124.

6 pp.112,126-201.
oblations, burnt offerings or sweet incens'. As God was a spirit, he was more delighted by inner godliness than external rites. These were to be used only as tokens of 'our puritie of faith, certaintie of trust, stedfastnesse of hope, and withall might appeare our obedience, studie and readiness of mind to follow and fulfil his word and pleasure'.

Since Corro addressed a congregation of lawyers, his following section on human justice stressed the need for a certain mitigation or mean to be used rather than rigour in the law. At the same time he returned to the themes of mutual obligation between ruler and subject, enjoyment of honest pleasures instead of excess, and charity for the poor. Because wisdom and justice, the two attributes of godly fear, comprehended 'the summe of al religion, godlines, and happiness too', the preacher finally urged his audience to fear God and keep the commandments of him who rewarded everyone according to his deeds. The wicked would undergo eternal torment, 'but the godly, and those which have constantly persevered in the fear of God and well doing unto their lives end, he recompenceth with blissful felicity and life everlasting'.

As Corro stated that every preacher should carefully consider the nature of his audience and the timing of his delivery, he apparently believed that the lawyers needed a basic course on protestant theology and practical morality. He probably had some success. In the epistle to the Templars he suggested that his ministry had been fruitful. From his dedication of Solomon's sermon it is clear that he was on terms of

---

1 pp.74-80.
2 pp.131-4.
3 pp.144-69, 195-201.
4 pp.113, 202-19.
5 Corro, Theological Dialogue, B.ii.
6 Ibid., B.viii.
friendship with Thomas Bromley, the chancellor in 1579, and his brother George, both of whom were influential benchers of the Inner Temple during the preachership. On the other hand Corro's emphatic doctrine of good works, combined with his relative neglect of predestination, was bound to cause agitation amongst the guardians of Calvinist orthodoxy. His confession of faith properly affirmed that no man merited salvation since God had predestined the saints from eternity. Yet his God was not the awful Jehovah of Calvinism, but a God of grace and mercy whose righteousness was imparted to all believers who lived the virtuous life through Christ. According to his confession, these were the elect. But in his lectures he largely ignored predestination and taught that God would 'show singular mercy and living kindness to such as stand in awe of him and worship him, and give everlasting life to such as seek honor and mortality by continuing and holding out in well doing'. Therefore it is hardly surprising that some of his audience objected to this teaching. In 1575 Parker informed Grindal at York that 'Mr Alvey came unto me to have my counsel how to deal with Coranus reader in the Temple whom his Auditory doth dislike for affirming free will, and suspiciously uttering his judgement of Arrianism, for the which I heare some wise of his sayd Auditory to forsake him'. In the same year William Barlow, an ordained minister who attended Corro's lectures, reported to Josiah Simler in Zurich that the preacher was 'learned and eloquent', but complained that

1 Corro, Sapientissimi regis Salomonis concio, A.2-7, dedicated to Chancellor Thomas Bromley in July 1579; A5, III.56,62.

2 The character and development of Corro's theology has been fully examined in McFadden's thesis.

3 Corro, Theological Dialogue, ff.152-4.

4 f.12. Cf. The final quotation from Solomon's Sermon in the paragraph above.

5 IT Petty MS 538/47, f.23; Parker Correspondence, 476. Since Parker believed that Corro's doctrine was quite sound, Alvey probably gained little by his visit (Strype, Parker, II.402-3).
'he inveighed against the men of our age, some of whom wish to be called Lutherans, other Calvinists & c. though neither Calvin nor Luther died for us, but we are saved, he said, by the blood of the Lamb slain "for the sins of the world", whereas in the text it is, "from the beginning of the world". Besides criticising Corro for not expounding the text in a predestinarian manner this letter reveals the preacher's characteristic contempt for human authority in spiritual matters. Though Corro was not a profound theologian, he was an independent thinker who was influenced by many teachers but subservient to none. Therefore he believed that the message of salvation which he delivered at the Temple was 'a pure and sounde doctrine drawn out of the fountaynes of the holy Scriptures'.

No doubt the other preachers held the same opinion of their own teaching. But since the Dialogue and Solomon's Sermon are the only known texts of all the sermons delivered at the Inns, the attitudes of these preachers can only be established from other works. Their principal goal was ostensibly the glorification of God, but their main concern was the salvation of man as revealed in scripture. Most maintained the doctrine of predestination, particularly Laurence Chaderton and Walter Travers who not only defended the dogma against the heterodox opinions of Peter Baro and Richard Hooker respectively, but also taught that those chosen by God could gain full assurance of their election. In due course God called the elect whom he justified through

1 Zurich Letters, II.261-2. Barlow added, half in jest: 'I wish he had stayed at Compostella!'.
2 Cf. p.257. above.
3 Corro, Theological Dialogue, B.iv.
4 The full titles of the printed works on which the following section has been based, are listed under the preachers' names in the bibliography.
5 Chaderton, Sermon (1578), C.vii, D.iii, D.viv, G.iii; Porter, 376-8; Dillingham, 5-6; Travers' supplication to the privy council, 1586, in Hooker, Works, II.662-3; Knox, 74-5. Cf. Blague Sermon, E.8; Charke, Reply, A.iii; White, Sermon (1576), 61-2, Sermon (1586), C.2v.
his son. Therefore the only way to salvation was by faith in Christ.¹ Yet those who possessed justifying faith would also exhibit fruits of the spirit which could never merit salvation in themselves, but were the essential products of faith.² As Thomas White put it, 'After sayth, workes'.³

For this reason the preachers taught the gospel, but they also applied the law. On occasions they were particularly troubled by the state of public morality. Two years before his first sermon at Lincoln's Inn, Richard Porder spent almost three hours at St Paul's in delivering A Sermon of Gods fearefull threatenings for Idolatrye, miring of religion, retayning of Idolatrous remnaunts, and other wickednesse (1570).⁴ Every vice, vanity and superstition was calendared in such pungent language that even a modern audience would have endured the first hour.⁵ Since these evils augured divine retribution, Porder urged the public reformation of religion and manners by the magistrate. Seven years later Thomas White denounced similar ills in a sermon at Paul's Cross. He also treated the plague as God's fearful judgement for manifest evils, including the playhouses which were 'schooles of vice, dennes of Theeves and Theatres of all lewdnesse'.⁶ In the following year Laurence Chaderton warned the same auditory that a nation which did not show the fruits of the gospel would incur the wrath of God. Therefore he commended a public fast and

1 E.g. Crowley, Deliberate Answere, A.2v; White, Sermon (1576), 62.
2 Bedell, Sermon, A.iiiv; Chaderton, Sermon (1578), B.ii,vii, C.vii; Charke, Answer, A.iv, Reply, A.iii; Travers, Supplication, in Hooker, Works, II.663; White, Sermon (1576), A.iii, Sermon (1586), passim.
3 White, Sermon (1576), 3.
4 The sermon was preached inside St Paul's and not at the Cross because of rain. It is not mentioned by Maclure.
5 Porder's villains included 'these yong Roysters and vaine frizled Noddies with bumbasted breeches' (19).
all other good works. At the Temple in 1581 Walter Travers told his audience 'to forbear the next lecture day, it was appointed for the House of Commons for fasting and prayer'.

As a result the preachers devoted much of their time to practical instruction, including three of the themes treated by Corro. Thomas White upheld the necessity of subjection to God's agents on earth, namely the prince and the pastor. After praising 'mother' justice and her 'daughters' leniency and severity, he too urged the due execution of the law, but without cruelty. The problem which was most popular with the preachers, however, was that of the poor. White, Crowley and Chaderton all maintained that charity was the solution. Their common belief was expounded in A sermon exhorting to pitie the poore by Henry Bedell, who preached that charity was a principal work of faith. Consequently he denounced those who wasted their time and money on wanton pleasures instead of sharing their goods, especially with those of 'the household of faith' (1571).

Despite these godly exhortations, the preachers apparently had limited success. In 1584 Chaderton admitted 'suche a huge masse of olde and stinkinge workes, of conjuring and forswearing, prophaning of the Lords Sabbothes, disobedience to superiors, contempt of inferiours: murther, Manslaughter, robberies, adulterye, Fornication, covenant-breakers, falswitnesse bearing, liars with all other kindes of unmercifull
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1 Chaderton, Sermon (1578), F.i,iiiiv; Maclure, 211.
2 In Collinson, 218.
3 White, Sermon, 30-42.
4 Ibid., 50-3.
5 Chaderton, Sermon (1578), C.ii,i,iii,vii, Sermon (1584), 80-3; Crowley, The opening of the Wordes; White, Sermon (1589), 34-5.
dealing one with another'. Therefore it is not remarkable that the preachers stressed personal godliness as the solution, in spite of their doctrines of predestination and justification. In a sermon at the Charterhouse, Thomas Blague treated negative precepts for blessedness before affirming delight in the law of God and religious meditation. Against charges of 'puritanism', Robert Crowley defended a 'right precisenes and purenes of life' which comprised the observance of God's commandments, abstention from evil and delight in doing good. Richard Porder warned that true holiness was not to be sought outwardly, but 'in life, actes and purity'. The theological reason for such perfection was put succinctly by Thomas White at the burial of Sir Henry Sidney, the deputy of Ireland. The righteous were saved freely by faith. But since 'there is no other way to make our calling sure, than by adding vertue to our faith, therefore true faith is alwayes fruitefull, never idle nor wearie of good workes'. However the case was more fully argued by Laurence Chaderton. At Paul's Cross he scolded 'all counterfeit and hypocritical professors' who displayed their godliness while refusing to obey the divine will. Consequently he instructed his hearers to perform all the godly duties enjoined by the ten commandments in their broadest sense, and to ensure that these works proceeded from the gifts of the holy spirit through regeneration. For 'howsoever men do please and flatter themselves with a generall knowledge of the truth, with a light and unsettled opinion of salvation, with an external shew of

1 Chaderton, *Sermon* (1584), 83.
4 Porder, *Sermon*, 16.
5 White, *Sermon* (1586), C.2v-4v.
Christian religion, as sure as the Lorde lyveth, if they can not by their workes justifie this knowledge, faith and profession, they shal never do the Fathers will, nor enter the kingdom of heaven.¹

From these pronouncements it would seem that Corro was not the only preacher who subjected the lawyers to a strong dose of practical religion. In response to a seeming decline in public morality and catholic criticism of a doctrine which separated works from salvation, the preachers fostered godliness in life, thought and conversation. Nevertheless there were two issues which distinguished some preachers from others. The first was church reform. Corro explicitly avoided controversy in his lectures and cast his vote against contention in favour of peace and moderation.² Blague demanded action against the 'factious' who broke all good order in the church.³ Bedell had the temerity to include the bishops in his daily prayer.⁴ Ashbold declared that he had 'bene allwayes carefull to kepe and preserve the ancient constitutions of our Churche of Englane and the discipline therof and both doo now, and have alwayse preached both at poules crosse and els where as occasion served against all them who have gone about by schysme and other innovations to rent the peace therof, as men mysled by everie light occasion'.⁵ Such statements, as well as the careers of those men and of Griffith Lewis and Nicholas Bond, indicate that they were not reformers.⁶

1 Chaderton, Sermon, (1578).
2 P.257 above.
3 Blague, Sermon, A.7v.
4 In Bedell, Sermon. Cf. Travers, who objected to Hooker's practice of praying for the bishops (Hooker's answer to Travers' supplication, in his Works, II.674).
6 P.244 above.
Most of the other preachers were more radical men. In his sermon on idolatry, Richard Porder attacked all the remnants of popery, including surplices and crosses.1 Crowley was listed with Alvey amongst those 'godlie lerned preachers which have utterly forsaken Antichrist and all his Romishe rags'. In the mid 1560's he demonstrated his conviction by leading the anti-vestiarian cause against the bishops. At Paul's Cross, White praised Elizabeth, 'the branch of her royal father', for going further in religion than her predecessors and prayed that 'The Lorde leade her farther'. In his section on God's earthly deputies he mentioned 'pastors' who had spiritual authority over all men including princes, but ignored the bishops.2 After publication of the Marprelate tracts he admitted that reform was a worthy cause, but that action 'out of time, and Place, by importunitie and unlawfully, by false, or foolish Libels' could not be countenanced. Therefore he wished that Martin had been 'more sober, or more silent'.3 Laurence Chaderton, who openly criticised the 'whole swarmes of idle, ignorant, and ungodly' clergy and the governors of the church for neglecting their charge, accepted that 'impietie and ungodlines' would necessarily continue in the church until the coming of Christ. For this reason he condemned any who separated from the fold.4 But with Charke, Crook, Travers and other leaders of the classis movement he tried to implement presbyterian principles during the 1580's.5

1 P.263 above. Collinson, 48-9, 74-8; Seaver, 206-7; Crowley, A brief discourse against the outward apparell of the popish churche, 1566.
2 White, Sermon (1576), 30, 36-41.
3 White, Sermon (1589), 45.
4 Chaderton, Sermon (1578), C.iii, A.iii.
5 Collinson, passim.
Since the reformers were so convinced that their way was the will of God, it is difficult to believe that they did not propagate their doctrine at the Inns, particularly the presbyterians who monopolised their pulpits in the 1580's. Richard Bancroft believed that they 'thrust themselves forward by all the power of their frendes, to be as they terme it Readers, but I feare Seducers in the Innes of Courte', for by that means 'the flower of the Gentilitie of England' was trained in 'a disobedient mislikinge of the present estate of the Churche'.

Certainly Laurence Chaderton was outspoken enough. At Paul's Cross in 1578 he prayed for reform of the existing system of ecclesiastical discipline, which he believed was operated merely for money. Six years later his sermon was published which not only developed this theme, but argued that the ills of the church and commonwealth could only be reformed if the existing form of ecclesiastical government were supplanted by the scriptural pattern of pastors, doctors, elders, deacons and attendants on the poor. As for Charke and Crook, an anonymous critic of London clergy placed them amongst those who 'would be compted purer then the other, for they will receive no ecclesiasticall charg neither one benefice nor ij nor yet take their oth nor subscribe, but will preach and read lectures with frierly [sic] fast long praiers and sharp invectives against all other in the ministry and somtyme catechise privatly and publickly, somtyme one way somtyme another, neither keeping any staye'. According to Hooker it was Travers and not Alvey who engineered the appointment of lay overseers at the Temple to report church

1 Bancroft, Tracts, 57.
2 Chaderton, Sermon (1578), C.iii.
3 Chaderton, Sermon (1584).
4 'The distressed state of the Church of England by division', n.d. (1580's), SP12/93, f.62v.
absentees for admonition. He also believed that the benchers had thwarted Travers' efforts to make further changes, which included substituting ambulatory communion for the sedentary custom. Therefore it seems that the lawyers were quite aware of their lecturers' reforming zeal.

At the same time most of the preachers were far stronger in their condemnation of catholicism than Corro, who merely criticised 'superstitious fools' for placing their trust in religious paraphernalia. The occasional preachers at Lincoln's Inn were quite antagonistic. Porder's idolaters included the secret retainers of 'the Romish Baal'. Bedell prayed daily for preservation 'from Turke and Pope, and al popish power'. Blague placed catholics with 'Maltwormes', 'wantons' and 'swine'. Crowley attacked their doctrine in various tracts and persuaded the London council never to promote a catholic, 'for of all Sectaries the Papist is most contrary to Christ'. White denied 'the tyrannous usurpation of the Pope...whose harte and hande is full of innocent bloud'. But the supreme protagonists were Charke, Travers and Crook. When Walsingham noted 'The order of proceeding to be helde for the awnswering of the Jesuiste and other Popishe bookes', the committee
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2 Travers' role has been fully examined by Knox, 58-60.
3 P.259 above.
4 Porder, Sermon, 13-33.
5 In Bedell, Sermon.
6 Blague, Sermon, A.8v.
7 Crowley, Guildhall Sermon (1575), C.i, and his works listed in the bibliography.
8 White, Sermon (1576), 41.
appointed to consider appropriate works included the three preachers. Consequently Travers and Charke were two of the polemicists who refuted catholic propaganda in the early 1580's. The three preachers were again included among twenty-five clergy appointed to confer with imprisoned jesuits, priests and recusants.

For this reason the lawyers were most likely treated to frequent sermons and digressions which attacked the catholic church and its English vestiges. Furthermore the resident preachers were evidently active in reconciling members to protestantism. At the Temple, Travers evidently assisted Alvey to examine church absentees. In 1583 the prospective barristers of Lincoln's Inn were ordered to subscribe to certain unspecified articles in the hands of William Charke. When the privy council instructed Gray's Inn to search for recusants in 1585, they required obstinate offenders 'to be conferred with by your minister', a function which was presumably performed by Crook. Therefore another of the preacher's tasks, which is only implied by the records, was to assist the campaign against catholicism by conference and refutation.

Thus the preachers were obliged not merely to deliver a learned exposition of scripture, but to persuade the lawyers to accept protestant teaching, confirm their faith, and lead a godly life, in expectation of a better existence on earth and glorification in heaven. Their arguments

1 SP12/133/45.
2 See bibliography.
3 IT Petyt MS 538/47, f.18.
4 P.269 above; Hooker, Works, II.676.
5 P.240 above.
6 P.237 above.
can be examined in printed sermons. Their influence is indicated by other sources. But the immediate impact of their preaching, which depended so much on inspiration, can hardly be glimpsed. That was the gist of Chaderton's caveat to his readers:

But let no man thinke that the reading of this can be half so effectual and profitable to hym; as the hearing was, or might be, for it wanteth the zeale of the speaker, the attention of the hearer, the promise of God to the ordinary preaching of his word, the mighty and inward working of his holy spirit, and many other things which the Lord worketh most mercifully by a preaching of his glorious Gospel, which are not to be hoped for by the onely and bare reading of his worde, or the written sermons of his ministers...1

1 Chaderton, Sermon (1578), A.iii.
The internal efforts to ensure conformity at the Inns suggest that the predominantly conservative character of the lawyers was somewhat changed during the first twenty-five years of Elizabeth's reign. However, the accuracy of this impression and the degree of success which attended compulsion and persuasion can be established only by examining the progress of protestantism among members. Since the religious outlook of most cannot be ascertained, this analysis will concentrate on the benchers, who were primarily responsible for implementing the Elizabethan settlement within the legal societies. The terminal points will be 1569, when the conformity campaign began, and 1580.\(^1\)

At Gray's Inn, Henry Ward and John Ramsey died in 1557, as well as Thomas Harlakenden and Robert Urneston in the following year.\(^2\) Of the thirteen identifiable benchers who remained at Elizabeth's accession,\(^3\) Nicholas Powtrell left the Inn as a serjeant-at-law in 1559, and four others died before 1569, most of whom were conservatives.\(^4\) Seven proved to be advocates of the Elizabethan settlement. Three of them departed from the Inn before 1569, including Nicholas Bacon, the new lord keeper, and John Birch, a serjeant-at-law in 1559.\(^5\) Nicholas Barham, who became a serjeant in 1567, was classified as a zealous justice in religion by
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1 See A5 for bench lists.

2 A5, I.47,56,16,26; pp. 162,166 above.


4 Robert Flynt, Thomas Moyle, Francis Soone, Thomas Darrell (A5, I.48,27, 53,41). All were conservatives, except Soone perhaps, for whom evidence is lacking (pp. 161,165,166,167).

5 A5, I.49,51; p.167; In 1564 Bishop Robert Horne described Birch as one of the 'ffavorers' of religion (JP Cart. 1564, f.54v). When he died as a baron of the exchequer, he commended his soul 'unto allmightie god my maker and creator, and to his onelie sonne oure lorde and savior Jhesus Christe my onelie Savioure and redeemer, by whose deathe, merrites and passione, I surelie truste and hope to be an inheritor of the kingedome of heaven' (PCC 24 Davey, 1581).
Archbishop Parker (1564), acted as an ecclesiastical commissioner in 1572, and supported a petition to the archbishop in favour of a deprived preacher. When he died of gaol fever in 1577 he left a complete confession of reformed faith. Two others were devoted royal servants, ecclesiastical commissioners and evident protesters from the beginning of the reign. One was Gilbert Gerrard, who was immediately appointed attorney-general by the Queen and became master of the rolls (1581). In 1564 he was described by Bishops Horne and Grindal as a favourer of reformed religion, and he left a lengthy declaration of protestant belief.

1 JP Cert. 1564, f.57v; JP Sub. 1569, f.109; CPR (1569-72), 3093; Rutland MS V, f.20; Seconde Parte of a Register, I.115-6; PCC 46 Daughty, 1577; DNB; Fudge, Thesis, III.21-2; A5, I.60. 'ffirst I commit my soule to god most humbly by and through Christ assuringe my selfe by the merites and passion of the same Christ onely to obtaine cleare remission of all my offences committed or to be committed, acknowledging in my selfe nothinge towards the satisfaction of any of them but all my workes whatsoever to be unprofitable and merely insufficient to all respectes in judgment and justice of god, and therfore with an humble and penitent hart I altogether appeale unto the mercy of god for Christes sake which I most humbly do crave from the bottom of my harte and firmely doe beleve and trust to obtain thorough full faith had concerninge my justification in am by Christ onely..., my corrupted flesh alwayes bent to wickednes and never able to doe anye good thinge... I will the same nevertheless for the observation of the aunciente custome of the true church from the begininge to be conveniently committed to the earthe without all vayne and frivolus pompe of the earthe which nothing profittehe.'

2 APC VII.17,319-20; CPR (1558-60), 28,237, (1560-3), 279-80, (1569-72), 3093; SP12/5, ff.43-50, /187, f.101; Harleian MS 6994, ff. 184-5; Lansdowne MS 27, ff.46-7; JP Cert. 1564, ff.54v,60v; PCC 30 Neville, 1593; HMCR (Var. Coll.) IV.257,266; Parker Corresp., 308-9,325-6; Al. Cantab.; DNB; Jones, 37-8,47,60-1; A5, I.52. Gerrard commenced his elaborate preamble as follows: 'In the name of the Almighty most gracious and mercyfull Trynyte the father the sonne and the holye Ghoste three persons and one god by whom I Sir Gylbert Gerrarde knighte nowe Mayster of the Rolles of the highe courte of Chauncerye was created redeemed and sanctyfyed and in whom I doe assuredly truste and beleve to be one of his electe....'. He committed his soul to God, confessing that he was indeed 'a sinfull Creature' so that 'there is nothinge in any of my Workes or deedes whereby I can or may challenge or atteyne unto everlastinges life, yet beinge nowe by godes good grace penytente and hartely sory for all the offenses by me committed, I doe onlie appeale unto godes great and infinite mercie, and my assured hope and truste is and I doe perfectly beleve that by the onlie merites of the most bitter death and passion of my mercifull lord and saviour Jesus Christe the sonne of god my onlie saviour and redeemer that all my synnes and offenses shalbe forgiven and that my soule by his onlie mediation and intercession and through his bitter death and passion shalbe received into the everlastinges of kingdome of heaven there to remayne in glory with all the holie companye of heaven, accordinge to his good will and pleasure.'
The other was Thomas Seckford, a master of requests and surveyor of liveries, whom Grindal classified similarly. Anthony Thorold and Laurence Meeres were more involved in regional administration. Thorold, the recorder of Lincoln, Queen's attorney in the north, and later Burghley's deputy-lieutenant in Lincolnshire, was described by Bishop Nicholas Bullingham as earnest in religion (1564). He was a witness to clerical information for the puritan register, and wrote his will 'expecting dailye when it shall please Almighty god to call me forthe of this miserable worlde to be pertaker of the heavenly ioyes prepared for his electe and Chosen of whiche number I doe stedfastly and assuredly hope throughe Christes merittes and godes greate mercie onely to be one.' Laurence Meeres, another Lincolnshire justice who was similarly classified by the bishop, became a longstanding councillor in the north. The other bencher was Francis Noone, a Suffolk justice who at least conformed, since he was not listed as a 'mysliker' of ecclesiastical policy in 1564.

1 APC VII.7,17,19,163,172; SP12/5, ff.43-80; JP Cert. 1564, ff.60v, 63; CPR (1558-60), 19,28,118-9, (1560-3), 69,279-80,523; (1563-6), 503,931, 1237,2711, (1566-9), 857,3093; PCC 4 Rutland, 1587/8; Fuidge, Thesis, III.297-8; Hurstfield, 224; Moir, 15; Somerville, 427; Williams, 128; Al. Cantab.; A5, I.55. Seckford commended his soul to the Trinity, 'humble prayinge remission of all my Synnes by the sheddinge of Christe his bloud and by his sacrifice upon the crosse for all mankinde.'
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As all of the conservatives except Thomas Darrell departed early in the reign, during the 1560s Gray's Inn was principally governed by the continuing protestant benchers and fourteen newcomers. Three of the latter cannot be classified because of insufficient evidence, but at least nine supported the Elizabethan settlement. Three of these left the Inn before the conformity campaign in 1569, including John Jeffrey and William Lovelace, who became serjeants-at-law in 1567. Jeffrey was listed by Bishop William Barlow of Chichester as a favourer of religion and godly order (1564). Lovelace, who was Parker's steward of liberties, served as an ecclesiastical commissioner in 1559, was zealous in religion according to the archbishop, advised the city of Canterbury to subscribe voluntarily to the Act of Uniformity 'for the avoiding of suspicion of papistry' (1569), and trusted 'by the merites of the passion of Jesus Christe to be partaker of the heavenlie Joyes'. The third bencher was Robert Nowell, the attorney of wards and liveries from 1561 until his death at Gray's Inn in February 1569. Nowell referred to Cecil as 'my good master and freinde', and was the brother of Alexander and Laurence, the deans of St Paul's and Lichfield respectively after their return from exile. He acted as an ecclesiastical commissioner from 1559, was noted to be a favourer of godly religion by Bishop Grindal, left his considerable fortune to charity, and provided for sermons on his burial.

---

1 Edward Halsall, Richard Chisnold, Robert Shirburne (A5, I.64,71,73).

2 JP Cert. 1564, f.7; JP Sub. 1569, ff.51v-2; CPR (1558-60), 223,855; Foss, V.513-4; Fuidge, Thesis, III.187-8; Manning, Sussex, 242; A5, I.63.

3 JP Cert. 1564, f.57v; SP12/59, ff.164-7; PCC 15 Daughty, 1576/7; Strype, Annals, I.i.248; Parker, II.168; Fuidge, Thesis, III.212-3; Neale, I.210-1; A5, I.67.
day and two Sundays thereafter. His particular friend was Ralph Barton, the Queen's attorney in Wales and a protestant councillor in 1570, whose chief grace, according to Sir John Throckmorton, lay in scoffing. Barton's brother-in-law was William Gerrard, a cousin of the attorney-general, formerly the Queen's attorney in Wales, the vice-president of the Marches in 1562, and later the chancellor of Ireland and a master of requests. Though somewhat inconsistent in his policy towards recusants, he favoured the Elizabethan settlement and wrote a full confession of reformed faith. Francis Rodes and Robert Shute, who were both promoted to serjeanty in the 1570s, were well-affected judges in later years. According to Bishop Richard Cox of Ely, Shute favoured godly religion (1564). Rodes left no doubt of his conviction when he charged

1 APC VII.169; Hatfield MS, f.237; JP Cert. 1564, f.60v; CPR (1560-3), 6,279-80; WCR IV.406,411, XI.iii.94; PCC 13 Sheffield, 1563/9; Churton, passim; Grosart; Hurstfield, 225; DNB (Alexander and Laurence); A5, I.65. In his will Nowell bequeathed his soul 'to almightie god trusteinge and fullie believinge to be saved, and to be one of those that shall enherite the kinglydome of heaven by the deathe and passione of Jesus Christe his sonne, and my saviour and redeamor'.
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his children never to forsake 'the onely truthe and true Religion', on
which rested his hope of salvation. 1 Robert Alcock and Thomas Colby
were protestant members of parliament. Allcock also served as an
ecclesiastical commissioner and a justice in Kent. 2 Colby, who was
Richard Bertie's counsellor, a client of the earl of Bedford and Parker's
steward, supported a petition to the archbishop in favour of a deprived
preacher. 3 The only doubtful newcomers were John Kitchen, a wealthy
counsellor to the city of London, 4 and Richard Payton, a Cambridgeshire
Justice, who later conformed. 5

As a result, Gray's Inn was governed by sixteen identifiable
benchers in 1569, of whom at least ten adhered to the Elizabethan
settlement. 6 Some were apparently more ardent protestants than others.
Whereas the Gerrards, Anthony Thorold and Thomas Colby were strongly
influenced by reformed teaching, Thomas Seckford, Laurence Meeres, Ralph
Barton and Francis Rodes were more moderate men. However, some benchers
were preoccupied with business elsewhere, particularly William Gerrard,
Thorold and Meeres. Consequently the records indicate that there were
only nine active benchers in 1569, ranging from dedicated protestants to
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conformists, namely Gilbert Gerrard, Seckford, Barton, Kitchin, Allcock, Chisnold, Colby, Shirburne and Shute. ¹

Ambrose Gilbert and Thomas Hemming of Lincoln's Inn died shortly before Elizabeth's accession, and William Tankard was otherwise occupied at York. ² Of the twenty remaining benchers,³ Randall Cholmley became a serjeant-at-law in 1559, and six others deceased within the first three years of the reign. ⁴ John Newdigate and Henry Payne, who were justices of Middlesex and Suffolk respectively, also died before 1569. According to Bishop Grindal, Newdigate was a favourer of godly religion,⁵ but Bishop John Parkhurst of Norwich believed that Payne was not well-affected. Though he died fully trusting 'by the merits of Christ's passion to be one of his electe', he wished to be buried where an altar had stood in his parish church, and willed a yearly dole for prisoners to pray for him. ⁶ Christopher Wray, who left the society in 1567, joined himself to a catholic family, defended Bishop Bonner from praemunire proceedings, and was thought by Bishop Bullingham to be indifferent in religion. But as a serjeant and a later chief justice of the Queen's

¹ Statements regarding the benchers' participation in government of their societies are based upon details from the Inns' records, including period of tenure, offices at the Inns, attendance at bench meetings and membership of committees. Though the evidence is much too detailed to present, the method is mentioned in the introduction to A⁵.
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³ A⁵, II.15,16,19,21,24,25,31,33,34,36-8,40-7.
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conformists, namely Gilbert Gerrard, Seckford, Barton, Kitchin, Allcock, Chisnold, Colby, Shirburne and Shute.  

Ambrose Gilbert and Thomas Hemming of Lincoln's Inn died shortly before Elizabeth's accession, and William Tankard was otherwise occupied at York. Of the twenty remainingbenchers, Randall Cholmley became a serjeant-at-law in 1559, and six others deceased within the first three years of the reign. John Newdigate and Henry Payne, who were justices of Middlesex and Suffolk respectively, also died before 1569. According to Bishop Grindal, Newdigate was a favourer of godly religion, but Bishop John Parkhurst of Norwich believed that Payne was not well-affected. Though he died fully trusting 'by the merites of Christes passion to be one of his electe', he wished to be buried where an altar had stood in his parish church, and willed a yearly dole for prisoners to pray for him. Christopher Wray, who left the society in 1567, joined himself to a catholic family, defended Bishop Bonner from praemunire proceedings, and was thought by Bishop Bullingham to be indifferent in religion. But as a serjeant and a later chief justice of the Queen's
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bench, he maintained the Elizabethan settlement and showed severity against all who deviated to the left or the right. ¹

Of the nine Marian benchers who continued until 1569, seven were conservatives. William Roper did not re-enter parliament, was removed from the commission of the peace, and submitted to the privy council for supporting exiles at Louvain. Nevertheless he retained his prothonotaryship of the Queen's bench as well as his influence at Lincoln's Inn, where he was dean of the chapel from 1553 to 1566.² His friend Edward Griffin was replaced as the attorney-general, but continued as a justice in Northamptonshire. In that capacity he was classified by Bishop Edmund Scambler of Peterborough as one of the 'greate letters of religion'.³ Clement Heigham, who was supplanted as the chief baron of the exchequer, remained on the Suffolk commission of the peace. Bishop Parkhurst believed that he was 'not so well bent unto the advancement of the godlie procedinges of this realme in causes ecclesiasticall as other Justices', and in his will Heigham affirmed that the sacrament was 'the very bodie and bludd of ower Saviour Jehus Christe'.⁴ William Forster also retained commissions in Berkshire, but his Marian nomination as a serjeant-at-law was not renewed by Elizabeth. He stated that salvation was 'freelie offered to all as shall by faith, hope and charitie require the same', and hoped thereby to see the divine majestie
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bench, he maintained the Elizabethan settlement and showed severity against all who deviated to the left or the right.¹

Of the nine Marian benchers who continued until 1569, seven were conservatives. William Roper did not re-enter parliament, was removed from the commission of the peace, and submitted to the privy council for supporting exiles at Louvain. Nevertheless he retained his prothonotaryship of the Queen's bench as well as his influence at Lincoln's Inn, where he was dean of the chapel from 1553 to 1566.² His friend Edward Griffin was replaced as the attorney-general, but continued as a justice in Northamptonshire. In that capacity he was classified by Bishop Edmund Scambler of Peterborough as one of the 'greate letters of religion'.³ Clement Heigham, who was supplanted as the chief baron of the exchequer, remained on the Suffolk commission of the peace. Bishop Parkhurst believed that he was 'not so well bent unto the advauncement of the godlie procedinges of this realme in causes ecclesiasticall as other Justices', and in his will Heigham affirmed that the sacrament was 'the very bodie and bludd of ower Saviour Jehus Christe'.⁴

William Forster also retained commissions in Berkshire, but his Marian nomination as a serjeant-at-law was not renewed by Elizabeth. He stated that salvation was 'freelie offered to all as shall by faithe, hope and charitie require the same', and hoped thereby to see the divine majestie
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A close associate of these benchers was William Cordell, the master of the rolls, who served Elizabeth as diligently as the former Queen, though not as a privy councillor. Cordell adapted himself successfully to the new settlement, had many protestant friends, and finally declared his trust in salvation through the mercy of Christ alone. Nevertheless his elaborate confession treated the distribution of goods as a source of comfort for the soul, and affirmed that he would experience everlasting joy with Christ's 'mooste glorious mother the immaculate virgine oure Ladye St Marye, and with Abraham, Isaack and Jacob, and all the rest of the holie Compayne of heavenne'.

John Bowyer, a Surrey commissioner, died believing that he would be a 'partaker of the ioyes in heaven perpetually by the deathe and passion of Jehus Christe the son of God, Saviour and Redemer of all mankinde'. In 1546 he and William Roper had admitted Dr John Story, the Marian persecutor, to the Inn, and he apparently purchased the discarded communion cup in 1570. The other conservative was Ralph Scrope, a Buckinghamshire justice who was not only cursed by a fellow member, but also categorised by Bishop Bullingham as a hinderer of religion. Only two of the continuing Marian benchers were evident protestants. According to Bishop Scambler, Robert Kemp, the
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dean of the chapel from 1566 to 1569 and a justice in Essex and Norfolk, was 'Aged yeat religiouse'. ¹ His fellow was Richard Kingsmill, the member of a staunch protestant family, a client of Cecil and Bedford, a friend of Nicholas Bacon and James Pilkington, and later the attorney of wards and liveries (1577). He served as an ecclesiastical commissioner in 1559, was noted by Bishop John Jewel of Salisbury to be an earnest furtherer of God's truth, and helped to compile the recusant return for Lincoln's Inn (1577).²

During the 1560's the bench comprised these masters and twenty-four newcomers, five of whom cannot be classified.³ Another five were somewhat conservative in religion, including two associate benchers, Edmund Beaupre and Henry Chiverton. In 1564 Beaupre was removed from the Norfolk commission of the peace following Bishop Parkhurst's report that he was disaffected in religion.⁴ Chiverton, who had acted as a chantry commissioner in Cornwall, adapted himself to successive settlements.⁵ However, his mother was catholic, and his connections included Thomas Pound, the later Jesuit, and Edmund Blackwell, a new bencher who was later ordered to attend service and communion or be
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expelled (1572). Whereas Blackwell probably died unreconciled, Roger Wetherell and John Hooper conformed, but retained conservative sympathies. Wetherell, who was patronised by Christopher Wray, associated with Gerard Lowther and Henry Harper, the later recusants, and was described in 1576 as 'light headed' and 'yll of religion'. John Hooper, a justice and escheator of Wiltshire whom Bishop Jewel classified as neuter in religion, included Wetherell, Hugh Charnock and the Ropers among his friends, provided for a month's and year's mind in his will, and beseeched the Trinity to receive his soul 'into the fellowship of the holy and blessed companye of heaven'.

Fourteen newcomers, however, favoured the Elizabethan settlement. Five were associate benchers, including Peter Osborne and John Haydon who were longstanding members. Osborne, the treasurer's remembrancer and economic adviser to the government, had been admitted by John Pilbarough in 1543. He was a noted protestant from Edwardian days, a friend of Cecil, an ecclesiastical commissioner, and one of Parker's executors. As the under-steward of augmentations in Devon and Cornwall, Haydon had formerly purchased monastic property. He wrote his last will, 'having a speciall hope and confidence that my soul...shalbe partaker of the same ioyes by the benefiitte of the deathe of Jesus Christe by whose
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means and merittes I hope to be saved and by none other'. John Lennard, the custos brevium of common pleas, who was an active magistrate in Kent and the dean of Lincoln's Inn chapel from 1569 until his death in 1591, not only affirmed his faith in salvation by Christ alone, but also stipulated that 'nothing be done [by his executors] that maye seeme offensive to god but that onely done which maye stande with his sacred worde'. In 1564 Lennard and two Kentish associates were classified by Parker as zealous justices in religion. They were Robert Richers, a former chamber-fellow of Richard Kingsmill, and Ralph Bosville, the clerk of wards.

The other newcomers at Lincoln's Inn were full masters of the bench. John Salvin, who was an ecclesiastical commissioner in 1559, yielded his soul to God, 'the hollie ghost the Sanctifyer of all the elect, and chosen Children of god and to my lord and only Saviour Jesus Christe the Redeemer of me and all Nankynde'. One of his companions who had been suspected of breaking William Roper's window in 1551, was Robert Monson, a later serjeant-at-law and then a judge of common pleas until 1581, when his legal doubts about the severe sentence against John Stubbe, a fellow member, caused his imprisonment and resignation. Bishop Bullingham
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4 CPR (1557-8), 249,428, (1558-60), 176,271,392,421, (1560-3), 438,547, (1563-72), passim; CSPD (1547-80), 107; SP15/12, f.32, /18, f.161; JP Cert. 1564, f.57v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.140-1; IPM II.42; Hurstfield, 210, 223,236; A5, II.67.

5 CPR (1569-72), 1869; SP12/93, f.27v; PCC 12 Holney, 1570/1; Strype, Annals, I.i.248; Bayne, 637; A5, II.49. Salvin also wished to be buried 'as farre from pompe and outward shewe and withe as litle ceremonyes as order and conveniency will suffer and permitt the same'.

1 LP XXI.i.1538 (f.167b), ii.773 (p.430); HMCR (Exeter), 20-1,269; PCC 19 Rutland, 1588; A5, II.62.

2 LP XI.943(13); CPR (1550-3), 171, (1558-60), 190, (1560-3), 306,322,438; SP12/48, f.91; Lansdowne MS 7, f.183, MS 23, f.162; JP Cert. 1564, f.57v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.138v-9; Essex RO, Barrett-Lennard MSS (bibliography); PCC 27 Sainberbe, 1587/91; Barrett-Lennard, 1-150; A5, II.47.

3 CPR (1558-60), 190, (1560-3), 438; JP Cert. 1564, f.57v; JP Sub. 1569, f.109; PCC 25 Leicester, 1587/9; LIBB IV, f.158; LIAR II, f.9v; A5, II.64. Richers instructed his executors to bury him 'without any manner of pompe or vayne glorye', but with 'all divine service accustomed for the deade to be celebrate'.

4 CPR (1557-8), 249,428, (1558-60), 176,271,392,421, (1560-3), 438,547, (1563-72), passim; CSPD (1547-80), 107; SP15/12, f.32, /18, f.161; JP Cert. 1564, f.57v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.140-1; IPM II.42; Hurstfield, 210, 223,236; A5, II.67.

5 CPR (1569-72), 1869; SP12/93, f.27v; PCC 12 Holney, 1570/1; Strype, Annals, I.i.248; Bayne, 637; A5, II.49. Salvin also wished to be buried 'as farre from pompe and outward shewe and withe as litle ceremonyes as order and conveniency will suffer and permitt the same'.
believed that he was earnest in religion (1564), Walsingham advocated his continuance as an ecclesiastical commissioner in 1572, and in parliament he led the campaign for settlement of the royal succession. In 1566 this popular cause also involved William Thornton, the autumn reader, who was imprisoned following the Queen of Scots' formal objection to a disputation at the Inn which concluded that, as a foreigner, she would be debarred from the throne. Thornton was classified as 'good' in godly religion by Bishop Cox, he bequeathed his soul to the Trinity 'trustinge in the mercies of the father by thonelye merites of the Sonne onely and by the Assistaunce of the comforte of tholye Spirite to be salved', and he wished to be buried 'with as smale pompe, Ceremoneyes or other like toies as maye be'. One of his friends was Thomas Wilbraham, the recorder of London and then the attorney of wards, who acted as an ecclesiastical commissioner in 1572, and was parliament's spokesman to the Queen regarding the succession. Another active official was Ralph Rokeby II. As a member of the northern council in 1572, and later a master of requests and of St Katherine's, he was much employed in the examination of recusants, including members of the society. In 1566 Bishop James Pillington of Durham recommended him to Cecil as 'in religion honest and zelous'. One of Rokeby's fellow magistrates in the north was Thomas

---

1 APC XI.350; CPR (1558-60), 151, (1563-6), passim, (1569-72), 2161,2731, 2947, 3093; Harleian MS 5265; Hatfield MS 160, f.195, MS 198, f.121; Lansdowne MS 20, f.136; JP Cert. 1564, f.20v; IPM II.245; Camden, Annals, 236; DNB; Neale, I passim; A5, II.50.

2 CPR (1563-6), 151, (1569-73), 2242; JP Cert. 1564, f.16; PCC 35 Lyon, 1570; Chereul, 48; Murdin, 762; Neale, I.133; A5, II.52.


4 APC XIV.271-2, XV.3,122; CPR (1558-60), 271; SP12/172, f.103, /173, f.143, /176, ff.148-52, /178, ff.115-34, 15/11, f.18, /21, ff.191v-2; Executors' accounts for Rokeby's will, 1600, Huntington Library, Ellesmere MS 668; Lansdowne MS 171, f.234v; Reid, 494; Al. Cantab.; A5, II.53.
Calverley, whom Pilkington had brought to the government's notice in 1564. Following the uprising, during which Calverley was despoiled for resisting the rebels, Sir Thomas Gargrave testified to Cecil that the lawyer was 'knowne to favour Relygyon'. The other three newcomers were made serjeants-at-law in 1577. Edward Baber, who died in the following year, committed himself 'to the mercifull tuicion of Almighty god, my maker, Savioure, Redemer, and Comforter, trustinge assuredly to be saved only by the merittes, death and passion of my Savioure and Redemer our Lorde Jesus Christe'. William Ayloff and Francis Windham, who both became judges, were listed as protestants in an official classification of lawyers at the Inns. Ayloff was also described by Bishop Grindal as a favourer of godly religion, and in his will he rendered his soul 'unto the hands of allmightie god, trusting most assuredly by the deathe and passion of his deare Sonne my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, after this lief to enioye the lief and ioyes everlasting'. Francis Windham, who married a daughter of Nicholas Bacon, 

1 CPR (1569-72), 2171; SP15/17, f.131; Lansdowne MS 35, ff.133,137v; JP Cert. 1564, f.67v; Gleason, Justices, 228-9; A5, II.60.  
2 CPR (1563-6), 2769,2832; IPM II.17; PCC 8 Bakon, 1578/9; A5, II.69.  
3 IC list 1576. Two copies are known: A. 'The names of certayne lawiers in every of the foure Innes of Court June 1576' (Lansdowne MS 683, ff.64v-8); B. 'A view of the Chyfe Reders double and single and of the chyfe barresters for ther practise in the 4 Innes of courte' endorsed 1579 (SP12/111, ff.59-61; printed in ITAB, I.470-3). List A, which gives the correct date, is the same as List B, except for asterisks and the abbreviations 'pa' and 'pro' which appear to the left of the lawyers' names. As most of those asterisked were advanced within the next four years, the list was apparently compiled for promotion purposes (e.g. Francis Rodes, Robert Shute, Thomas Snagge, John Brograve, Robert Bell, John Popham, George Bromley, Thomas Bromley II, Francis Gawdy, Edmund Anderson, Edward Baber, Francis Windham). But whoever added the religious abbreviations was evidently an ardent protestant, since he classified several supporters of the Elizabethan settlement as papists (e.g. Laurence Meeres, John Popham, Edmund Anderson, Francis Gawdy). This does not mean that the list is useless. On the contrary, those marked 'pro' can generally be accepted as protestants, and the others may be considered in conjunction with other evidence. Consequently I disagree with the comments by Prest, who seems to misinterpret the purpose of the list (176n).  
4 CPR (1560-3), 437; JP Cert. 1564, f.63; IC List 1576, f.61v; SP12/132, f.165; PCC 38 Watson, 1584; DNB; A5, II.61.
not only made derogatory remarks about episcopal jurisdiction, but also advised Burghley confidentially against the appointment of two particular serjeants-at-law 'in respect of suspicyon of theyre religion'.

By 1569 the bench of Lincoln's Inn comprised thirty of these lawyers, including nine associates. Five cannot be classified in religion, but sixteen favoured the Elizabethan settlement. Except for William Roper and John Lennard, the associate benchers did not have authority to govern. Moreover Clement Heigham, John Palmer, Henry Pannell and Thomas Calverley had virtually discontinued. Consequently there were only nineteen active benchers in 1569. The conservatives were now outnumbered, since eleven were evident protesters. Some were zealous men, particularly Richard Kingsmill, Robert Monson, William Thornton, Ralph Rokeby and Francis Windham. Nevertheless there was still an influential conservative group, which consisted of three newcomers and five of the seven most senior benchers.

---

1 CPR (1569-71), 2638, 2940; Lansdowne MS 29, f. 31; JP Sub. 1569, ff. 4v-5; IC List 1576, f. 61v; PCC 61 Harrington, 1590/2; DNB; A5, II. 70; p. 110 above.


5 Kempe, Kingsmill, Lennard, Salvin, Monson, Thornton, Rokeby, Osborne, Wilbraham, Calverley, Ayloff, Haydon, Richers, Bosville, Baber, Windham (A5, II. 41, 43, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 57, 59-62, 64, 67, 69, 70).

6 LIBB V, f. 84 (I. 363).

7 Kempe, Kingsmill, Lennard, Salvin, Monson, Thornton, Rokeby, Wilbraham, Ayloff, Baber, Windham (A5, II. 41, 43, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 59, 61, 69, 70).

8 Blackwell, Wetherell, Hooper (A5, II. 51, 55, 58); Roper, Griffin, Forster, Bowyer, Scrope (A5, II. 15, 16, 24, 40, 44).
At the Inner Temple, Nicholas Hare I, John Beaumont, John Cock and Guy Wade died in 1557, and George Wood shortly before Elizabeth's accession.\(^1\) Fifteen of the twenty-one continuing benchers departed before 1569,\(^2\) including William Symonds, Richard Harper and George Wall, who became serjeants-at-law in 1559.\(^3\) Whereas they were most likely conservative in sympathy, Thomas Gawdy II, who gained similar promotion in 1567, was an advanced protestant.\(^4\) James Smith and Edward Allot evidently discontinued. Though little is known about the latter,\(^5\) Smith was a Lincolnshire justice whom Bishop Bullingham listed as indifferent in religion.\(^6\) The others were removed by death, including John Boisse, for whom there is no further evidence,\(^7\) and the conservatives John Baker and Thomas Bishop.\(^8\) Richard Ward used the traditional form of committal for his soul and hoped to procure prayers for its comfort in 1560.\(^9\) Despite John Carrell's known conservatism, he continued to hold local commissions until his death (1566),\(^10\) as did Thomas Saunders whom Bishop Bullingham described as indifferent in religion.\(^11\) Richard Sackville,
however, gave his support to the new government and left a will in which he commended his soul 'to almightie god my Creatour by whose passion and mercy onely I trust to be made one of the Inheritours of his kingdome'.

But the most elaborate confessions of reformed faith were provided by Thomas Williams, the speaker of the commons in 1563, and Richard Blackwell, a Derbyshire commissioner.

Of the six Marian benchers who continued until 1569, only John Fuller was noted as a hinderer of religion. Robert Chidley, who served on various royal commissions, was described by Bishop Grindal as a favourer of godly religion in 1564, and bequeathed his soul 'to almightie God'.

---

1 Pp. 160, 187 above; PCC 14 Crymes, 1566; A5, III.51.

2 CPR (1563-6), 115,224,1889; PCC 23 Crymes, 1566; DNB; Manning, Speakers, 223-9,224-8; Neale, I,97-100,125-6,134; A5, III.49. In his will, Williams wrote of the vanity and uncertainty of mortal life, as well as the nature of stewardship and preparation for death, before stating: 'I am at this present as I trust one of the lively members of the mystical body or temple of God united to Christe Jehu our head together with the faithful congregation of believing men and women by perfecte and the lively workinge faith'. He then expounded the reformed doctrine of salvation, from original sin to amendment of life, and wished to be buried 'withoute any funeral Pompe or Superstition'. He bequeathed his 'vertuous and godly Bookes' to his sons, 'to thentente that they by havinge the same may be the rather and better Instructed and learned in all godlie doctrine, knowledge and vertue and that they may lerne trulie and unfaynedlie to love and dreade god and doo their bounden duties to their Prince, Parent and others to the observation of the commandementes of god and to the perpetuall hatred and exchewing of all synne and vice'.

3 P.186 above; CPR (1553), 315, (1548-9), 162, (1558-60), 189, (1560-63), 435,448, (1563-6), 114-5,212,225; LP Cert. 1564, ff.41,41v; Escheators, 118; PCC 6,7 Babington, 1567/8; A5, III.36. In an effusive protestant preamble to his will, Blackwell expatiated on the mediation of Christ, forgiveness for heinous sins, election before birth, salvation through faith in the gospel, and everlasting life. There would be no black cloth at his burial, and most of his eighteen Derbyshire sermons were to be delivered by Anthony Gilby, the reformed preacher of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, on 'sound Doctrine specially of repentance towards god and faith the towards our lorde Jhesus Christ'. Finally he admitted that he had 'bin the longer in matters of divinitie ffor the comfort of my owne conscience.'

4 JP Cert. 1564, f.22; Lansdowne, MS 106, ff.97-8; A5, III.40.
god trustinge onelye that by the deathe of Jesus Christe my onelye
Saviour and redemour to be Partaker and Inheritour of the kingdom of
heaven'. 1 One of his fellow justices in Middlesex was Anthony
Stapleton, who was similarly classified by Bishops Grindal and Cox. 2
Robert Kelway, the surveyor of wards and liveries and a commissioner for
crown lands (1563), was also listed as a 'furtherer' in religion by
Bishop Jewel. He subscribed to the Act of Uniformity in 1569, delivered
the privy council's message for preventing suspected catholics from
joining the bench in 1573, and was noted to be a protestant on the 1576
list of lawyers. 3 Though little is known about William Pole 4 and James
Rivett, 5 who were justices of Devon and Suffolk respectively, they
conformed at the very least.

In the 1560's the Inner Temple was governed by these benchers and
fifteen newcomers, including three who cannot be classified. 6 Nine
others, who were prominent royal servants, adhered to the Elizabethan
settlement. In 1566 John Hales recommended George Bromley to Cecil for

---

1 P.184 above; APC VII.169, III.214; CPR (1560-3), 440,523, (1563-6),
130,531,931,2711,1237, (1566-9), 1482, (1569-72), 1847,1852,1858,1899;
Lansdowne MS 106, ff.97-8; JP Cert. 1564, f.60v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.108v-
9; PCC 20 Daunthy, 1575/7; A5, III.13.

2 Pp. 184, 184 above, CPR (1560-3), 440, (1563-6), 151,130,503, (1566-9),
1482,1877, (1569-72), 262,1852,1860,1870; HMCR IX.1.296; JP Cert. 1564,
ff.16,60v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.91v,110v; Lansdowne MS 106, f.102; A5, III.28.

3 Pp. 72, 184 above; CPR (1558-60), 118,146,335,337 (1560-3), 313,434,
623-4; SP12/6, ff.87-90; JP Cert. 1564, f.36; JP Sub. 1569, ff.132v-3;
IC List 1576, f.60; Lansdowne MS 106, f.102; PCC Darcy, 1580/1; A5,
III.33.

4 CPR (1558-60), 215, (1560-3), 435-6, (1563-72), passim; JP List 1573,
ff.8,8v; JP List 1585, ff.8v,9v; IC List 1576, f.60; JP Cert. 1564,
 f.70; A5, II.52.

5 CPR (1560-3), 442, (1569-72), 1856,1859,3050; JP Cert. 1564, f.45; JP
Sub. 1569, ff.172v-3; JP List 1573, f.26; JP List 1585, f.35; Lansdowne

Only Gynes was an active bencher.
the attorneyship of the duchy of Lancaster as 'one that for his Religion, and knowledge of the Law ought above many to be preferred'. After gaining this office and membership of the Welsh council, Bromley became a chief justice in Wales, where he was particularly active against recusants. At the Inn he befriended Antonio del Corro, the preacher, and helped to compile the recusant return in 1577. Richard Onslow, who also served on the Welsh council, was the clerk of the duchy of Lancaster, attorney of wards, and recorder of London, before appointment as the solicitor-general and speaker of the commons in 1566. Bishops Grindal and Horne described him as a favourer of religion, the Spanish ambassador called him a furious heretic, he showed sympathy for further ecclesiastical reform in his closing parliamentary speech, and his decidedly protestant will revealed his connections with Leicester, Burghley and Peter Osborne. Another friend of Onslow was Anthony Gell, formerly the principal of Clement's Inn, who became the longstanding feodary of Derbyshire. Bishop Thomas Bentham of Lichfield and Coventry believed that he favoured religion, and in the early 1580's Gell especially charged the Derbyshire grand jury to enforce the book of common-prayer, punish recusants and compel church attendance. One of the supervisors of Gell's will was Roger Manwood, Parker's steward of liberties, who became a serjeant-at-law in 1567 and was later a high-handed

1 Pp.225n, 261 above; APC XI.48, XIII.286-8; CPR (1558-60), 148, (1566-9), 112, (1569-72), passim; SPl2/155, f.102, /189, f.24, /118, f.24; Lansdowne MS 9, f.15; JP Cert. 1564, f.42; JP Sub. 1569, ff.143-4; IC List 1576, f.60; HMCR XV.x.20,22,22-3; Fudge, Thesis, III.48-9; Neale, Commons, 344-5; Williams, passim; A5, III.56.

2 CPR (1560-3), 237,442, (1563-72), passim; CSPS (1558-67), 583; JP Cert. 1564, ff.54v,60v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.158v-9; Bodleian MS Rawlinson G.134, ff.57,57v; HMCR (De L'Isle) I.323,333,350; PCC 14 Holney 1571; Manning, Speakers,230-5; Neale, I.134,171-3; Somerville, 414; Williams, 352-3; A5, II.57.

3 LP XXI.i.1157; CPR (1555-7), 372, (1560-72), passim; JP Cert. 1564, f.41; JP Sub. 1569, f.117v; HMCR IX.i.585-9; Derbyshire RO, Chandos-Pole-Gell MSS (Bibliography); PCC 40 Rowe, 1580/3; A5, III.58.
chief baron of the exchequer. In 1564 the archbishop referred to him as zealous in religion, and as a judge he maintained the Elizabethan settlement against nonconformists on either side. However, the magistrate who was noted for his rigour against protestant dissidents was Edmund Anderson, the chief justice of common pleas in 1582. He was promoted to serjeanty in 1577 with Francis Gawdy, a later chief justice, who was also well-affected towards the established church. Another protestant lawyer who supervised Gell's will with Bromley, Manwood and Anderson, was Thomas Bromley II, the brother of George and a patron of Corro, whose career from recorder of London in 1559 to lord chancellor twenty years later was furthered by Burghley, Leicester, Hunsdon, Bedford and Hatton. Other benchers also named him as their supervisor, including Barnard Randolph, the common serjeant of London and a commissioner in Middlesex and Sussex, as well as Edward Flowerdewe, a serjeant-at-law in 1580 before appointment to the exchequer. Though Bishop Grindal classified Randolph as indifferent in religion (1564), his will was decidedly protestant, he was related to Roger Manwood and Nicholas Fuller, and his friends included William Fleetwood, Gilbert

1 P.113n above; CPR (1560-3), 37,438,613, (1569-72), 3093; JP Cert. 1564, f.57v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.47v-8; SP12/118, f.72, /200, f.96; Lansdowne MS 20, f.15i; DNB; Foss, V.216-23; Neale, I.210,285; A5, III.59.

2 CPR (1566-9), 628; Lansdowne MS 82, ff.110-3; IC List 1576, f.60; DNB; Collinson, 205,211,220; Foss, V.51-5; Fuller, Worthies, 338; Strype, Annals, IV.367; A5, III.66.

3 CPR (1563-72), passim; SP12/155, f.66; Hatfield MS 170, f.54; JP Sub. 1569, ff.4v-5; IC List 1576, f.60; JP Cert. 1564, f.58; DNB; A5, III.60.

4 CPR (1563-6), 931, (1566-9), 511,2341, (1569-72), passim; JP Sub. 1569, ff.108v-9; IC List 1576, f.196; PCC 18 Spencer, 1587; Campbell, II ch.44; DNB; Dunkel, 61-2; Jones, 36-9; Neale, I.376-7, II.61-2,97; A5, III.62.
chief baron of the exchequer. In 1564 the archbishop referred to him as zealous in religion, and as a judge he maintained the Elizabethan settlement against nonconformists on either side. However, the magistrate who was noted for his rigour against protestant dissidents was Edmund Anderson, the chief justice of common pleas in 1582. He was promoted to serjeanty in 1577 with Francis Gawdy, a later chief justice, who was also well-affected towards the established church. Another protestant lawyer who supervised Gell's will with Bromley, Manwood and Anderson, was Thomas Bromley II, the brother of George and a patron of Corro, whose career from recorder of London in 1559 to lord chancellor twenty years later was furthered by Burghley, Leicester, Hunsdon, Bedford and Hatton. Other benchers also named him as their supervisor, including Barnard Randolph, the common serjeant of London and a commissioner in Middlesex and Sussex, as well as Edward Flowerdewe, a serjeant-at-law in 1580 before appointment to the exchequer. Though Bishop Grindal classified Randolph as indifferent in religion (1564), his will was decidedly protestant, he was related to Roger Manwood and Nicholas Fuller, and his friends included William Fleetwood, Gilbert

1 P.113n above; CPR (1560-3), 37,438,613, (1569-72), 3093; JP Cert. 1564, f.57v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.47v-8; SP12/118, f.72, /200, f.96; Lansdowne MS 20, f.151; DNB; Foss, V.216-23; Neale, I.210,285; A5, III.59.

2 CPR (1566-9), 628; Lansdowne MS 82, ff.110-3; IC List 1576, f.60; DNB; Collinson, 205,211,220; Foss, V.51-5; Fuller, Worthies, 338; Strype, Annals, IV.367; A5, III.66.

3 CPR (1563-72), passim; SP12/155, f.66; Hatfield MS 170, f.54; JP Sub. 1569, ff.4v-5; IC List 1576, f.60; JP Cert. 1564, f.58; DNB; A5, III.60.

4 CPR (1563-6), 931, (1566-9), 511,2341, (1569-72), passim; JP Sub. 1569, ff.108v-9; IC List 1576, f.196; PCC 18 Spencer, 1587; Campbell, II ch.44; DNB; Dunkel, 61-2; Jones, 36-9; Neale, I.376-7, II.61-2,97; A5, III.62.
Gerrard and Thomas Bromley. Flowerdewe, who was commended by Thomas Norton, a fellow member, as 'learned in lawe and knowne zealous' in religion, helped to compile the Inn's recusant return (1577), and prefaced his will with a fervent declaration of reformed belief. The three remaining newcomers were lesser men who quite likely retained conservative sympathies. Robert Wythe, a Worcestershire justice and member of parliament, Richard Lone, a prothonotary of common pleas, and Thomas Marriott, were suspected catholics in the 1570's. Marriott, who acted as a delegate to the Middle Temple regarding the continuance of both Corro and Travers, was one of the proposed serjeants-at-law whom Francis Windham complained of for being 'somewhat backwarde in Religion and I

1 CPR (1553), 386, (1553-7), passim, (1558-60), 151, (1563-72), passim; JP Cert. 1564, f.61; JP Sub. 1569, f.20v; JP List 1573, ff.20v,24; JP List 1582, f.135; Ellis, Letters, 1st ser., II.197; Escheators, 168; PCC 27 Butts, 1580/4; A5, III.67. In his will, Randolph commended his soul to the Trinity, 'Havinge in this most blessed and glorious Trinitie a most suer and stedfast belief that thorowe my onely Saviour Ihesus Christ (and that by him and for his sake) all the multitude of my grevious and wretched synnes commytted against God be clerely remitted and forgivenn, ffor he of his great and unboundant mercye...toke my synnes with all the synnes of the whole world uppon him, And so went laden to the Alter of the Crosse...as well for my redemption, as for all those that stedfastly beleve and put their trust in him, and his most sacred worde'.

2 P.225 above; CPR (1563-6), 1273, (1569-72), 216,222,421; SP12/177, ff. 175-5v; IC List 1576, f.60; HMCR IX.1.316-7; PCC 23 Windsor, 1583/6; DNB; Neale, I.379-81; Somerville, 432-3; A5, III.71. Flowerdewe commended his soul to the Trinity 'hopinge by the onelie merittes and bytter passion of the same Jesu god and man to be saved and to have full fruition of the unspeakeable ioyes of heaven withe the same holle trinitie'. He provided twenty nobles towards a new bell for his parish church at Hethersett, Norfolk, 'to be runge and used in extremities of the people of that parrishe in sycknes and to styrrre up the lyving to praye for them soe visited and to call them selves therby home to the consideration of their own mortall estates and by the knell therof to warne people to come and frequent the collations and sermons, the somme of twenty nobles, but concerninge the superstitious use of belles and ringinges of bells I utterlie condempne them in my Conscience'.

3 CRS XIII.131; JP Sub. 1569, f.59; JP List 1573, f.29v; JP List 1585, f.41; IC List 1576, f.60; SP12/133/11; PCC 3 Spencer, 1577/87; Fudge, Thesis, III.355; A5, III.64.

4 IC List 1578-81, f.130v; IT Cert. 1577, f.137; A5, III.61. Lone's eldest son Samuel was 'vehementlie suspected' at the Inn in 1577.
thynke at the last calle cleane omytted out of the bill for that caus\'e. ¹
Nevertheless all three benchers later conformed sufficiently to retain
office at the Inn and elsewhere.

As a result the Inner Temple bench consisted of eighteen members in
1569,² one of whom has not been classified in religion.³ Of the former
conservatives, only John Fuller remained. Richard Lone, Robert Wythe
and Thomas Marriott probably retained catholic sympathies, but they later
conformed. The other thirteen were mostly crown servants and firm
supporters of the Elizabethan settlement. Of these, George Bromley,
Richard Onslow and Edward Flowerdewe were more fervent men.
Consequently the nine benchers who were active in 1569 ranged from zealous
protestants to adaptable conservatives.⁴

John Pollard of the Middle Temple died in 1557, and Thomas Denton
not long before Elizabeth's accession.⁵ Fourteen Marian benchers
remained in office,⁶ but only four continued until 1569. Of the former
conservatives, Robert Brown died in 1559 and Nicholas Luke five years
later.⁷ Reginald Corbet, Richard Weston, John Walsh, Thomas Carus and
John Southcote, who departed as serjeants-in-law in 1559 and became
judges, transferred their services to the new government.⁸ The only

¹ ITAB I, ff.204,214v (I.293,311); IC List 1576, f.60; IC List 1578-81,
f.130v; ORD XIII.137; Lansdowne MS 29, f.31; A5, III.69.
² Chidley, Stapleton, Kelway, Fuller, Pole, Rivett, George Bromley,
Onslow, Gell, Gwyd, Lone, Thomas Bromley, Robert Wythe, Anderson,
Randolph, Gynes, Marriott, Flowerdewe (A5, III.13,28,33,40,52,53,56-8,
60-2,64,66-9,71).
³ Robert Gynes (A5, III.68).
⁴ Stapleton, Kelway, Pole, George Bromley, Onslow, Gwyd, Lone, Thomas
Bromley, Robert Wythe (A5, III.28,33,52,56,57,60-2,64).
⁵ A5, IV.19,37.
⁶ A5, IV.14,17,18,33-5,43,45,49,50-4.
⁷ A5, IV.14,18; p.189 above.
⁸ Pp. 195,196 above; A5, IV.45,49,50,52,53. All except Carus wrote
non-catholic wills.
conservatives to continue until 1569 were Edmund Windsor and Edmund Plowden. Windsor was a Buckinghamshire justice whom Bishop Bullingham classified as a hinderer of religion. He bequeathed his soul 'to Allmightie god my maker and redeamer, to our blessed Ladie Saint Marie and all the holie Companye of heaven desyring them to praie for me'.¹ Plowden, whose Marian writ for serjeanty was not renewed by Elizabeth in 1559, consolidated his influence as treasurer of the Inn (1561-7), acted as Bonner's counsel in the supremacy case, and defended the title of Mary Queen of Scots to the English throne. Nevertheless he attended church before the publication of the papal bull, and was not troubled for religion until 1569.² As Edmund Sture³ and Thomas Daniel⁴ died before 1569, the only continuing protestant benchers were John Mawdeley and William Hone. Mawdeley was a Somerset justice whose will was decidedly protestant.⁵ Hone, who was a judge at the Guildhall, elaborated the reformed doctrine of salvation in his will, provided the theme for a sermon one week after his death, and left all his 'bookes of Scripture and latine' to Sir Ralph Allen.⁶

¹ P. 193 above; LP VI.814, VII.390,773; CPR (1553-4), 17,18, (1560-3), 434, (1563-6), 109, 198; JP Cert. 1564, f.26; JP Sub. 1569, f.172; PCC 46 Martyn, 1565/74; A5, IV.35.

² Pp. 201, 204, 220 above; CPR (1560-3), 434, (1563-6), 110,215,223; JP Cert. 1564, f.36; JP Sub. 1569, ff.130-3; A5, IV.35.

³ P. 194 above; CPR (1558-60), 214,448; A5, IV.43.

⁴ P.194 above; APC II.60,65; CPR (1560-3), 442, (1563-6), 141, (1566-9), 44; JP Cert. 1564, f.45; A5, IV.54.

⁵ P.192 above; LP XVIII.i.100(32), XIX.i.390, XX passim; CPR (1553), 386, 1558-60), 423, (1563-6), 142; Escheators, 143; JP Cert. 1564, f.64; JP Sub. 1569, ff.154v-5; PCC 36 Peter, 1570/3; A5, IV.17.

⁶ PCC 45 Pyckering, 1574/5; Ingpen, 70; A5, IV.51. Hone commended his soul to the Trinity, 'by whose Dyyne power I was Created and had the fruic of this mortall lief besaching the same almightie god so to strenthen me in the right faithe by his Spirite that I may shew my self penitent in mortefyinge my flesshe makinge it apte to receyve the spirite of grace That Christ may dwell in me and I with hym that I may obteyne mercie and forgynenes of my synnes in this lief and after be partaker of the kingdome of heaven there to be placed among the electe with ioy for ever'.
After Elizabeth’s accession, the Middle Temple was governed by these Marian benchers and fifteen newcomers, of whom Thomas Andrewes and Thomas Nicholls cannot be classified. Only three newcomers showed conservative inclinations. Humphrey Cavell, who died early in 1559, left a Marian will with a protestant preamble, but included a codicil for the vicar of Acton in Middlesex 'to have every weke iiiijd during the terme of the yere to saie Requiem Masse for my sowle and for all cristen sowles'. Thomas Farmer of Norfolk was suspected to be a papist lawyer in 1576, and was expelled from the commission of the peace a decade later 'as a man shewing him self froward [perverse] in her majesties services, and one against whome many exceptions are made'. In 1583 he witnessed the will of Matthew Smith, a fellow bencher, who was himself suspected in the 1570's.

Nine of the other newcomers were government servants who gave their support to the Elizabethan settlement. William Ruswell, William Fleetwood and Robert Bell, the friends of the martyred Bartlett Green, were convinced protestants. Ruswell, who was almost immediately appointed solicitor-general but died in 1566, was termed a favourer of godly religion by Bishop Grindal, and composed a protestant will in which he left five pounds to be distributed to the poor by Alexander Nowell.

1 A5, IV.58,66.
2 PCC 36 Welles, 1557/9; Rowse, 92-3,290,300,303-4; A5, IV.56. 'furst I give and commytt my sowle unto the holy handes of almightie god everlastinge my onely Creatour sayvour and Redemer most humblie besechingis infinite mercye and goodnesse to pardone my synfull life and offences committed against hym and that frome hensforthe duringe my naturall lif he give me grace so to leade my lif that all myne actes and workes may be acceptable before hym to the advauncement of his glorie and honour'.
3 APC XIV.196; CPR (1569-72), 1732,1861,3240; IC List 1576, f.60v; SP12/133/13, f.167, f.160v; JP Return 1587, f.201; A5, IV.60.
4 P.219 above; CPR (1558-60), 154; IC List 1578-81, f.130; PCC 9 Butts, 1583; A5, IV.69.
5 P.155 above; APC VII.33; CPR (1558-60), 36, (1560-6), passim; SP15/13, ff.37-40; JP Cert. 1564, f.60v; A5, IV.61.
As an ecclesiastical commissioner from 1559, the escheator of Durham bishopric, a leading member of parliament, the recorder of London and a later serjeant-at-law, William Fleetwood did his best to advance reform and extirpate catholicism, in association with such stalwarts as Cecil, Pilkington and Norton.¹ Robert Bell, a Norfolk justice who died of gaol fever shortly after becoming a serjeant-at-law and chief baron of the exchequer (1577), also showed his protestant sympathies in parliament. With Robert Monson he led the campaign to settle the succession in 1566, and as the speaker in 1572 he endeavoured to redeem the bill concerning rites and ceremonies, stating to Burghley that 'yt seemed to me the greatest greff that was most generally allowed of was for that many preachers for readyng of a chapter at any tyme nott lymytted for that tyme by the book [of common-prayer] and for dyverse such lyke things wer indyted and grevosly vexed before the iustices of thassises by such as rather sought that advantage for malyce to relygion then for any other respect'.² George Freville, who was also promoted to the exchequer (1559) and advised Richard Alvey regarding the master's allowance, was certified to be 'good' in godly religion by Bishop Cox.³ Another protestant baron was Thomas Gent, an examiner of the suspected Christopher Stone and an ecclesiastical commissioner, who left the

¹ Pp. 155,225n above; CPR (1569-72), passim; SP12/20, f.11, /17, f.233; Hatfield MS 160, f.80; Lansdowne MS passim; Additional MS 48035, f.151v; JP Cert. 1564, f.26; JP Sub. 1569, f.171v-2; IC List 1576, f.60v; Leycester's Commonwealth, 79; Wriothesley, I.123; DNB; Gabriel, Thesis, 369-73; Harris; Levine, 71-5,79; Neale, I-II passim; Somerville, 433; A5, IV.64.

² CPR (1563-6), 133, (1566-72), passim; SP12/86, ff.198-215, 15/8, f.142; Lincolnshire AO, 7 Ancaster MS A6, ff.4,8,9,13 (Richard Bertie's accounts); JP Cert. 1564, f.58; IC List 1576, f.60v; Rutland MS V, f.20; HMCR XII.ix.158; PCC 35 Daughtyry, 1577; DNB; Neale, I passim; A5, IV.65.

³ SP1/143, f.100 (LP XLIV.i.318); CPR (1548-9), 136, (1553-4), 284, 468, (1557-8), 379-80, (1558-60), 31, (1563-72), passim; Lansdowne MS 107, f.2; JP Cert. 1564, f.16; Al. Cantab.; DNB; Somerville, 455; A5, IV.55.
society as a serjeant-at-law in 1584. Thomas Meade, who became a
serjeant in 1567 and then a judge of common pleas, composed a protestant
will which provided for burial sermons by two Cambridge preachers.
John Popham, a serjeant in 1578, was exonerated in order to serve as the
solicitor-general. In 1577 he was selected by lord keeper Bacon to
compile the society's recusant certificate, and he assisted the bishop
of Bath and Wells to make the return for Somerset. As a later legal
officer of the crown, he showed severity against all who deviated from
the established religion, so that Thomas Norton praised Popham in a
letter to Walsingham because the attorney-general was 'so zealous, a true
servant of God and her majestie' (1582). Popham was named as a
supervisor of the will of John Hippesley, a well-disposed Somerset
commissioner who advised the bishop regarding the religion of justices
in 1564. George Nicholls, an Essex justice and the first warden of
the Temple Church in 1558, was described by Bishop Grindal as a 'favouer,
learned in the lawe, and to be trusted'. The other newcomer to the
bench was Gabriel Chamber whose will was protestant in tone, except for
the gift of a gold ring 'with a dethes hed' to Edmund Plowden, who was to

1 IC List 1576, f.60v; SP12/132, f.180; Al Cantab.; DNB; A5, IV.70.
2 JP Sub. 1569, ff.148v-9; PCC 152 Brudenell, 1584/5; Al Cantab.; Foss,
V.524; A5, IV.62. Meade bequeathed his soul to the Trinity,
'faythfully and assuredly trustinge to be saved and Justifyed by godes
grace and mercy thorowe the Redemption which is in Christ Jesu, whose
death and passion is a sufficient Sacracyfe or propitiation for my
synnes and for the synnes of the faithfull and mortall synfull menn'.
3 APC XIV, 271-2; SP12/117/11,44, /153, f.115, /163, f.178, /179, f.18;
Harleian MS 361, ff.75-86; Lansdowne MS 68, f.43; IC List 1576, f.60v;
Al. Oxon.; DNB; Manning, Speakers, 245-50; Neale, I,375-7,413-14,
Commong, 344-5; A5, IV.68.
4 LP XIX.i.812(21); CPR (1563-6), 142,224; JP Cert. 1564, f.64; JP Sub.
1569, ff.154v-5; PCC 26 Holney, 1568/71; A5, IV.67.
5 CPR (1563-6), 120,226; IPM II,256; JP Cert. 1564, f.63; JP Sub. 1569,ff.
148v-9; IC List 1576, f.60v; MTMB II, f.27v (I.117); A5, IV.57.
ensure that Chamber's daughter received her legacy if his wife remarried. Since Plowden was also a supervisor for John Hippesley, this bequest probably did not imply any religious bond.

In 1569 the Middle Temple bench comprised fifteen of these members, including one who cannot be classified, and ten who favoured the Elizabethan settlement. Some were more zealous men, particularly William Hone, William Fleetwood and Robert Bell. Since all except John Mawdeley and John Hippesley were apparently active benchers at the time, the Inn was principally governed by protestants. Nevertheless the four conservatives possessed considerable authority, especially Edmund Plowden and Matthew Smith, whose influence was soon suspected by the authorities.

---

1 PCC Daper, 1572; A5, IV.63. 'ffirst I bequeath my soule to the holie trynitie thre persons and one god and I hope assuredlie by the deathe of Jesus Christ the second person of the trynitie to have remission of my synnes and lyfe everlastinge'.

2 Mawdeley, Windsor, Hone, Plowden, Freville, George Nicholls, Andrewes, Farmer, Chamber, Fleetwood, Bell, Hippesley, Popham, Smith, Gent (A5, IV.17,35,51,54,55,57,60,63-5,67-70).

3 Thomas Andrewes (A5, IV.58).

4 As the Middle Temple minutes do not specify bench attendance, it is possible that other benchers were relatively inactive.


6 Pp.219-20.
For the period between 1569 and 1580, twenty-eight benchers have been identified at Gray's Inn. Of the twelve newcomers, ten were protestant servants of the government. Some were local commissioners, including Richard Aunger, a wealthy Cambridgeshire justice, who was listed as a protestant bencher in 1576 and took the oath of supremacy three years later. His will, which included a protestant committal, recorded that he had been the youngest founding fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (1546), and allowed twenty shillings for a funeral sermon by either the preacher at the Inn or the parson of St Andrew's, Holborn. William Whiskins, a commissioner in Aunger's county, was described on the 1576 list as 'very lerned, pore, of smale fame for practice', but protestant. Richard Kempe of Suffolk, whose name also appeared, took the oath in 1579, and was suggested for the recordership of Thetford two years later when the protestant faction attempted to dislodge their conservative opponents from office. According to Bishop Grindal, William Cardinall, a justice of Essex who later served at York, was a favourer of godly religion. When Cardinall died he not only thought himself obliged to compose 'a full declaration of my ffaithe wherewith God of his infinit mercie to my inestimable Comforte hath by his holie speritt Imbued me', but also bequeathed lands to 'my dearlie belovid friend Mr Edmond Chapman Doctor of Divinitie and now precher and pastor in Dedham my native towne'. During the 1580's Chapman was the leader of

2 APC XXVIII.187; CPR (1560-3), 18, (1563-6), 121-2, (1566-9), 1449; SP12/133/13; Hatfield MS 53, f.45; JP List 1582, f.59; Al. Cantab.; A5, I.78. 'ffirst I commend my soule into the handes of Allmightie god my Creator and Redeemer trustinge and hopinge assuredlie with a stedfastf ffaithe by his mere grace favour and mercye onely and not by any good workes or deeds that I have done or can doe to attaine to Everlastinge salvation in the kingdome of Heaven'.
3 CPR (1566-9), 2386; IC List 1576, f.59; JP List 1573, f.31v; JP List 1582, f.133v; A5, I.79.
4 P.314 below; CPR (1569-72), 3048; SP12/153, f.97, /133/13; IC List 1576, f.59; JP List 1582, f.136; HMC IX.1.254; Al. Cantab.; A5, III.84.
the presbyterian classis at Dedham. Another later councillor in the north was Humphrey Purefey, a friend of the Earl of Huntingdon. In 1572 he was appointed dean of Gray's Inn chapel, he was noted to be a protestant lawyer on the 1576 list, his will commenced with a reformed committal, and after his death Archbishop Matthew Hutton of York described him to Robert Cecil as 'a very honest and godly gentleman who had served here longest of anye that be daily attendant'. One of those referred to was Edward Stanhope, the surveyor for the duchy of Lancaster in the north, whom Hutton commended to Cecil in the same year as 'verie forward in her maiesties service'. In 1581-2 Stanhope collected the first preacher's roll for Dr Crook, and his last will expressed his protestant conviction.

1 APC VII.26,44,163,172,174-5; CPR (1560-3), 94,437, (1563-6), passim; Hatfield MS 8, f.63; JP Cert. 1564, f.63; JP List 1573, f.12v; PCC 97 Lewyn, 1596/8; Al. Cantab.; Collinson, 223; Morant, I,141-2; Reid, 495; Usher; A5, I.82. William Cardinall was evidently the son of William of Great Bromley, and the brother-in-law of Edmund Chapman (b.1535). He bequeathed his soul to the Trinity, 'assuredlie belevinge that all my sinnes ar freelye pardoned and the giltiness of them Cleerlie washe awaie by and throughe the onlie deathe and most bitter passion of Jhesus Christ the sonne of God..., by beinge ordaind from ever­lastings...to be thonlie redivier and mediator of and for all mankynd that assurredlie belevinge in him, which my beleiffe, being thonlie hand­fast and apprehention of my Salvacion, I doe acknowledge to have receavd and to be settled in me by and throughe thonlie operacion and sanctification of the holie Ghost...whoe likewise worketh the same in all the electe Children of God the ffather throughe his onl ie grace and free mercie and not throughe or by any deserte that doth or can proced frome fleshe and bloode Conceved and borne in sine'.

2 SP12/268, f.120; Harleian MS 6997, f.167; Hatfield MS 30, f.70, MS 64, ff.11,15; IC List 1576, f.59; JP List 1585, ff.46,47v,49,50,51v; PCC 99 Lewyn, 1598; Al. Cantab.; Cross, Puritan Earl, 128,244,278; Gabriel, Thesis, 565-6; Marchant, CUL, 166, PCCDY, 167-8; Reid, 495; A5, I.85. Purefey committed his soul to the Trinity, 'most humbly rendring all thanckes, and prayse to the Allmighty for his blessinges, and favours (notwithstanding my vile deservinges) bestowed uppon me from my first entrance into the world unto this present hower, and assuredly trusting to be saved throughe the onlie grace and free mercie and not throughe or by any deserit that doth or can proced frome fleshe and bloode Conceived and borne in sine'.

3 SP12/71, f.22, /156, f.77; Harleian MS 6997, f.166; Hatfield MS 56, ff.36,45, MS 57, ff.46,63,94, MS 62, f.93, MS 64, f.11, MS 72, f.2, MS 74, ff.95,98, MS 89, ff.118-9; Lanadowne MS 16, f.84; Rutland MS V, ff. 101-2,168-9; HMSC (Bath MSS) IV.137,138,178,181; JP List 1573, f.18; JP List 1582, f.134v; PCC 16 Harte, 1603/4; Al. Cantab.; DNB; Reid, 495; Somerville, 446-7; A5, I.87. Stanhope rendered his spirit to God, 'nothing doubtinge but that for his infinite mercies set forth in the precious bloud of his dearely beloved sonne Jesus Christe our onely saviour and redeemer he will receive my soule into his glorie and place it in the companie of heavenly Angelles and blessed saints'.
John Brograve, the attorney of the duchy in 1580, also became an influential official during later years. In 1576 he was listed as a protestant lawyer who was 'very lerned, pore, smaly practised, worthie of great practise'. Eleven years later he was believed to be a sufficient justice of Lancashire in both wealth and religion. On the other hand, Thomas Snagge, Christopher Yelverton and William Daniel, who were promoted to the judiciary, were noted to be protestants of great wealth and practice in 1576. In his certificate of Bedfordshire justices, Bishop Bullingham described Snagge as 'earnest in religion and fyte to be trusted'. As a member of parliament in 1571, Snagge recognised that differences in ministration of the sacraments caused discord within the church. Nevertheless he spoke against the proposed bill for coming to church, mainly because anyone who absented himself would be fined only a shilling, whereas he would lose a hundred marks for attending a service which was not said according to the prescribed order. When Snagge became the attorney-general for Ireland in 1577, he carried a letter from his friend Francis Walsingham to lord deputy Sidney, commending him as 'a man so well choosen, both for iUdgement and bould spirit to countenance such of her maiesties causes as shall come to his handling, as hardlie all the howses of Court could yeld his like'.

Christopher Yelverton, the reader who was responsible for Francis Hastings' admission in 1571, helped to compile the society's recusant

---

1 SPL2/132, f.180, t.158, f.186; Hatfield MS 72, f.73; IC List 1576, f.59; JP Return 1587, f.178; Al. Cantab.; DNB; Gabriel, Thesis, 241-2; Neale, II.290-2,294; Somerville, 409; A5, I.83.

2 CPR (1563-6), 1787, (1569-72), 1877,1892; JP Cert. 1564, f.22; JP Sub. 1569, ff.34-5; IC List 1576, f.59; JP List 1573, f.5; Cotton MS Titus F.1, f.143; Kent AO, De L'Isle MS Ul475 C2/21; PCC 38 Nevell, 1591/3; DNB; Gabriel, Thesis, 603-4; Manning, Speakers, 256-9; Neale, I.198-217, II.201; A5, I.81.
return in 1577, and delivered several speeches at the Inn which expressed his religious ardour. As a popular parliamentary spokesman during the 1570's, he favoured further ecclesiastical reform and defended the right of the house to legislate for religion. 1 William Daniel, whom Archbishop Thomas Young classified as a favourer in 1564, was the only lawyer on the 1576 list to be actually described as 'religious'.

Though he gained the support of Burghley and Essex, his zeal and some rumoured connection with William Hacket, the fanatic, evidently delayed his promotion until much later. 2

The other two who became benchers of Gray's Inn at this time were both suspected. In 1564 Bishop John Scory of Hereford thought that Thomas Kirle was meet to be a justice of the peace 'for the favoure which he beare to this religion'. Nevertheless Sir John Throckmorton criticised him in 1576 for being 'light headyd, of smalle discretyon, accomptyd to be very covetous', and 'yll of religyon'. In the same year his name appeared on the list of lawyers as 'of grete lyvynge', but a papist. 3 William Allington, who was similarly classified in religion, was a younger brother of Richard the usurer, who was himself a conservative by association and confession. 4 Both Kirle and Allington

---

1 P.225m above; GIPB I, f.40B; IC List 1576, f.59; JP Sub. 1569, f.112; Additional MS 15,891, f.90, MS 48,109; Al. Cantab.; DNB; Lehmburg, Mildmay, 169; Manning, Speakers, 267-73; Neale, I-II passim; Pearson, 389-90; A5, I.80.

2 CPR (1569-72), passim; SP12/133/12, /191, f.102, /233, f.130; Lansdowne MS 59, ff.117-21, MS 76, f.24, MS 171, f.234v; JP Cert. 1564, f.72; IC List 1576, f.65; JP Sub. 1569, ff.174v-5; JP List 1585, f.39; Foss, VI.135-6; A5, I.86.

3 JP Cert. 1564, f.9v; SP12/60, f.59, /110, f.23; IC List 1576, f.59; Hatfield MS 160, f.144; HMCR (Var. Coll.) IV.130; TPM II.210; A5, I.76.

4 Pp. 105,143 above regarding Richard Allington; CPR (1555-7), 55-6; Harleian MS 1195, f.155; IC List 1576, f.59; A5, I.77.
probably took the oath on admission to the bench in 1570 and 1571 respectively, but Allington discontinued in 1573 and Kirle was an inactive bencher from 1574 until his death three years later. Apart from these newcomers, the only possible conservatives were six of the continuing benchers for whom there is limited information. However, Francis Noone, Edward Halsall and Richard Chisnold were inactive during the 1570's, Robert Shirburne died in 1572 and Richard Payton discontinued two years later. Moreover Payton was certified by Bishop Cox to be a 'conformable' justice in religion (1564), and Noone subscribed to the Act of Uniformity in 1569. John Kitchin, who was named as a wealthy papist on the 1576 list of lawyers, conformed sufficiently to act as a counsellor to the city of London, a dean of the chapel (1579-81), and an active bencher until 1587. By 1580 the conservatives had been virtually eliminated from the bench of Gray's Inn, where ten newcomers and ten continuing masters were convinced protestants. For Lincoln's Inn, fifty-two benchers including associates have been distinguished between 1569 and 1580. Sixteen of the twenty-two newcomers were evident protestants. James Dalton, who had been reconciled following his expulsion for suspected heresy in the preceding

1 Francis Noone, Edward Halsall, John Kitchin, Richard Chisnold, Robert Shirburne, Richard Payton (A5, I.40,64,68,71,73,75); pp. 274,275n,277.

2 Aunger, Whiskins, Yelverton, Snagge, Cardinall, Brograve, Kempe, Purefey, Daniel, Stanhope (A5, I.78-87); Gilbert Gerrard, Thorold, Seckford, Meeres, Barton, William Gerrard, Alcock, Rodes, Colby, Shute (A5, I.52,54,55,62,66,69,70,72,74). Thorold and William Gerrard were not active during this period.

reign, displayed his protestant colours in parliament where he denied the title of the Scottish Queen to the English throne (1566), supported the unsuccessful bill for coming to church (1571), and demanded the deaths of Norfolk and Mary (1572). He was examined by the privy council for his speech on the succession, and imprisoned in 1581 for speaking against John Stubbe's sentence. Though Dalton was one of the benchers appointed in that year to treat with William Charke for the preachership, he proved to be a defender of the established church.  
He had many associates at the Inn, including Richard Davy of Norfolk, who was admitted to Dalton's chamber in 1557 and provided forty shillings in his will for two burial sermons.  
Another of Dalton's like-minded friends was William Lambarde, the lawyer, antiquary, Kentish justice and later master in chancery, who was gratuitously associated to the bench in 1579 because he 'deserved universallie well of his comen welthe and Contrie and likewyse of the fellowshipp and Societie of this howse and is like hereafter to wyn greater Credytt to hym selfe and the Societie of this howse'. Lambarde, who was admitted in 1556 by the surety of Dalton and Monson, learned his Anglo-Saxon from Laurence Nowell while the latter was staying with his brother at Gray's Inn, and was patronised by Parker and Burghley.  

---

1 P.151 above; SP12/41, ff.58-64, /233, ff.130-1, 15/13, f.85; Additional MS 48064, ff.118-29; Hatfield MS 155, f.30; Lansdowne MS 77, ff.98-9; IC List 1576, f.61v; CSPF (1566-8), 164; Ellis, Letters, 3 ser., IV.111; PCC 73 Woodhall, 1601; Al. Oxon.; Camden, 236; Fudge, Thesis, III. 106-7; Gabriel, Thesis, 325-6; Levine, 189-91; Neale, I-II passim; A5, II.73. Dalton was certainly outspoken on Elizabethan issues, but in ecclesiastical matters he was more of a strong protestant than a reformer, even in his early years.

2 LIBB IV, f.322v; LIAR, II.f.13; IC Lists 1573, ff.90-1; PCC 7 Windsor, 1585/6; A5, II.80.

3 LIBB IV, ff.300, 300v, 315, V, ff.86,265v, VI.33v,66; Hatfield MS 238, f.4; Lansdowne MS 54, f.172, MS 61, f.163, MS 65, f.191, MS 75, f.134, MS 171, f.234v; PCC 63 Woodhall, 1597/1601; HMQR IV.411; Seconde Parte of a Register, I.115; Al. Oxon.; DNB; Dunkel; Jones, 111; Knafla, HLG, 238; Lehmburg, Wildmay, 297; Lambarde, ed. Read; Neale, I.151-2; A5, II.88. In his will Lambarde commended his soul to Christ 'by whose onely blodsheeding and intercession (for without blood there could be noe propitiation for sinnes) I verelye assure me to have all my sinnes forgiven here, and afterwaerdes to joy with him everlastinges as well in bodie as soule amongst the saintes and servantes of God in the highest heavens'.
later chamber-fellow was Humphrey Windham, a justice of Suffolk. He was admitted in 1560 by the surety of Ralph Rokeby II and Francis Windham, was a friend of John Stubbe, and married the widow of Lambarde's brother. 1 Lambarde and Dalton were sureties for Thomas Weekes (1557), another delegate to William Charke in 1581, when Thomas Norton described Weekes as a 'learned and discreet and auncient' gospeller. 2 In 1558-9 he had been admitted to the chamber of John Clench, the later recorder of Ipswich, serjeant-at-law and judge, who favoured puritan ministers, frowned upon their traducers, and was married to a brownist. 3 John Puckering, Robert Clark and Thomas Owen, who also joined the judiciary in the 1580's, were protestant lawyers. Owen helped to found a lectureship at Shrewsbury in 1581, showed diligence in the examination of recusants, and wrote a strong protestant will in which he bequeathed a gold ring to Gabriel Goodman in gratitude for the virtuous education of his children. 4 Robert Clark, a justice of Essex, shared chambers with John Haydon in 1580-1, and acted sympathetically towards John Udall, the radical minister, at the Surrey assizes in 1590. 5

1 LIBB IV, f.356, VI, f.73; Lansdowne MS 12, f.217; IC Lists 1573, ff. 90-1; JP List 1582, f.136v; Dunkel, 30; A5, II.87.
2 LIBB IV, ff.315,350, V, ff.99v,334v (I.424); CPR (1558-60), 212; SP12/173, f.160, /177, f.175; IC List 1576, f.61v; Al. Oxon.; A5, II.76.
3 CPR (1569-72), 3050; IC List 1576, f.61v; Lansdowne MS 82, ff.110-13; Collinson, Thesis, 656-7; DNB; A5, II.74.
4 APC XIII-XV passim; IC List 1576, f.61v; PCC 15 Kidd, 1598/9; HMCRII.i.342, XV.x.18,21,22-3; Al. Oxon.; DNB; Williams, 191-3,352-3; A5, II.91. Owen bequeathed his soul to the Trinity and then stated: 'And I beleve to be justified freely by the grace of our Lord and saviour Jesus Christ, and that my sinnes which be great and greevious for the which I am hartelie sorrye are forgeven, and shalbe Covered and not ymputed unto me, by the Crosse, merites and bloude of my lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for as by the offence of Adam the fall came on all men to condemnacon, So by the Justifieng of Jesus Christ the benefitt abounded to all that beleive in Him to the Justificacion of life'.
5 LIBB V, ff.322,335; JP List 1582, f.133; JP List 1585, f.12; DNB; Foss, VI.105-7; A5, II.90.
officiated at the same trial, enforced the Elizabethan settlement against nonconformists, whether puritans or papists. In 1570 he entered the chamber of Richard Kingsmill, with whom he compiled the society's recusant return in 1577. Two years later Kingsmill, Rokeby II and Stephen Thimbély, a cousin of Anthony Thorold and the recorder of Boston and Lincoln, were specially appointed to examine Robert Wilford, a prospective barrister, regarding his learning, religion and conversation. Robert Rithe, the son of an early protestant bencher, was admitted to Kingsmill's chamber in 1557-8 and then his father's. George Kingsmill, who became a serjeant-at-law in 1593 and a councillor in Wales, entered his father's chamber in 1562, was classified as a wealthy protestant lawyer in 1576, and later shared quarters with James Dalton. Three other benchers were convinced protestants who served the government in Wales. Richard Pates, the recorder of Gloucester and a Welsh councillor, became an ecclesiastical commissioner in 1559, an adviser for the religious certification of justices (1564), a diligent agent for the government, but an inactive associate of the bench. In 1580 Francis

1 LIBB V, f.108; Hatfield MS 192, f.14; Lansdowne MS 32, ff.122-5, /76, f.24; LI Cert, 1577; IT Lists 1573, ff.90-1; DNB; Fuller, Worthies, 659; Jones, 44-9; Manning, Speakers, 250-6; Neale, II.26,115-6,247; Commons, 319-20; Strype, Annals, IV.197-202; Williams, 282-3,354-5; A5, II.82.

2 LIBB V, ff.68,278 (I.415-6); APC XI.288; SP12/188, f.177, /193, f.116; Lansdowne MS 12, f.117; Rutland MS VI-IX passim (HMCR XII.iV passim); JP List 1573, ff.18v-19,32; JP List 1582, f.134; Al. Cantab.; Matthews, Thesis, III.220; A5, II.79.

3 P.176 above regarding George Rithe; LIBB IV, ff.338v,341v,353,373v, VI, f.104; A5, II.85.

4 LIBB IV, f.356, V, f.15v; Hatfield MS 106, f.27; IC List 1576, f.61v; Foss, VI.163; Gabriel, Thesis, 463-4; Williams, 350-1; A5, II.83. Contrary to Foss and Gabriel, the Lincoln's Inn black book clearly states that George Kingsmill was the son of Richard, not his brother.

5 Pp. 116,140 above; APC XI.455, XIV.521; CPR (1558-60), 92,184, (1560-3), 177,437, (1563-72), passim; SP12/77, f.61, /86, f.139, /107, f.22, /110, f.23; JP Cert. 1564, f.49; JP List 1573, ff.13,15,24,30,31,32-6; Lansdowne MS 106, ff.90-1; HMCR (De L'Isle) I.323; Bayne, 637; Browne, TGBAS; Fudge, Thesis, III.260-1; Neale, Commons, 260-4; A5, II.75.
Windham urged Burghley to promote Richard Atkins, a judge in Wales, to serjeanty, as he was 'very well lerned, earnestly well affected in Religion and of good state of lyvinge'. Atkins, who had been admitted in 1559 by the surety of James Dalton, entered Thomas Calverley's chamber in 1561-2, and was later a trustee for John Stubbe. Henry Towneshend, the son of Robert and a councillor in the Marches himself, was highly recommended to the government by Sir John Throckmorton as not only 'an honest gentleman of good learninge and substancyall lyvinge', but also 'well lyked of all men and zelous in religion'. Humphrey Bridges served as a councillor at York and an escheator of the shire. In his protestant will he especially bequeathed 'my Calvine uppon Job' to an executor.

Though information is scarce for four of the six remaining newcomers, Christopher Jenney conformed sufficiently to continue as a bencher until the following reign. Judging by their connections at the Inn, the other three were likely protestants. Anthony Tallboys, a Yorkshire justice and member of parliament, was a chamber-fellow of Richard Kempe and then William Lambert. In 1555 he and Francis Windham were sureties for the

1 LIBB IV, f.339, V, f.1; CPR (1560-5), 363; Hatfield MS 71, f.75, MS 29, f.31, MS 32, ff.122-5, MS 89, f.4; Al. Cantab.; DNB (Edward Atkins); Pearson, 307; Williams, 342-3; A5, II.81.
2 APC XI.242; SP12/110, f.23, /133/11, /148, f.135; Williams, 140, 268-9, 358-9; Gleason, Justices, 210; A5, II.92.
3 LIBB IV, ff.311,322v; PCC 55 Harrington, 1591/2; Reid, 495; Escheators, 197; A5, II.77. Jean Calvin's Sermons upon the booke of Job were published in 1574, 1579, 1580 and 1584 (STC 4444-7). Bridges wrote his will 'expectinge the ende of this mortall lief and hopinge assuredlie for a farr better lief of the free mercie and pardonn in christe Jesu my onlie Redeemer and Saviour'.
4 A5, II.87.
5 LIBB IV, ff.285v,286,292v,303v, V, f.86; IC Lists 1573, ff.90-1; JP List 1582, ff.133,135,137v; JP List 1585, ff.48,50v; A5, II.71.
admission of George Stratford of Gloucestershire, who was Tallboys' contemporary at the Inn. Stratford entered the chamber of John Haydon in 1562-4, with whom he inventoried the possessions of Gerard Lwther, an expelled recusant (1570). Edward Sulyard, who was associated to the bench in 1574 because he was the landlord of the Inn, had been admitted in 1559 by the surety of William Ayloff, his brother-in-law, and Thomas Wilbraham. The only really doubtful newcomers were Thomas Egerton and Thomas Walmesley, who both came from catholic families but conformed sufficiently to gain promotion commensurate with their legal ability. Of those excluded from the Inn by the star chamber in 1569, only Egerton, who staked his future on a legal career, offered hope of conformity. In the following year the benchers agreed that if he produced a certificate of reconciliation from Bishop Sandys he would be called to the bar at the next moot. This evidently took some time, since he was not promoted until 1572. Only four years later he was described on the list of lawyers as 'very lerned, a younge practiser, very toward', and a protestant. As a legal officer of the crown in later years, he maintained the established church against papists and puritans alike.

In 1574 Walmesley's bench call was deferred while the masters considered his religious suitability. Before he was formally called to serjeanty in 1580, both Francis Windham and Thomas Norton complained to Burghley about his recusant family and backwardness in religion.

1 LIBB IV, f.285, V, ff.5,13v,113,128v (I.339,372,376); PCC 40 Darcy, 1581; A5, II.72.
2 LIBB IV, f.339v, V, ff.15,130,308v-9,333 (I.341,377,419); A5, II.76.
3 Pp.209-210 above; LIBB V, f.113v (I.372); IC List 1576, f.61v; LI Cert. 1577, f.138v; APC XIV.271-2; Additional MS 28,571, f.81v; Bodleian MS Rawlinson A.100, ff.203-5v; Lansdowne MS 74, f.202; Gerard, 66; DNB; Jones, 61-99; Knafla, HLQ, 221-40; Neale, II.328; Prest, 216; Thorne; A5, II.89. I am grateful to Dr L.A. Knafla for his comments on Egerton's religious position.
4 P. 239 above; Additional MS 48,064, f.68; Hatfield MS 185, f.68; Lansdowne MS 29, ff.31-3, MS 31, f.12; Rutland MS IV, f.249; IC List 1576, f.61v; DNB; Collinson, 406-7; Neale, II.294; Strype, Annals, III.i.280-1; A5, II.84.
Apart from Walmesley, the only possible conservatives were not newcomers but benchers of previous years. However, at least sixteen of these were protestants. Of five others for whom there is little information, two had virtually discontinued by 1571 and the others were inactive associates of the bench. The remaining nine were conservatives, but Edward Griffin, Clement Heigham, William Forster, John Bowyer, Ralph Scrope, Edward Blackwell and John Hooper all died within five years. Since Griffin and Bowyer subscribed as justices to the Act of Uniformity (1569), and they with Scrope and Hooper continued at the Inn until shortly before their deaths, they evidently conformed at the start of the conformity campaign in 1569. Forster, who also subscribed, and Heigham vanish from the Inn's records after 1568. Though there is no direct evidence that their religion was to blame, in the case of Edward Blackwell there is little doubt. After eight years of regular bench attendance culminating in the treasurership of 1568-9, he was present at only two of the eleven councils in 1570 and then one in 1572. At the last meeting the benchers ordered him to attend service, sermon and communion or be expelled, but they were apparently forestalled by his death in the following year. The two surviving conservatives

5 Llibb V, f.151v (I.382). 'Imprimis it is ordred that yf Mr Blackewell uppon Satterdaye nexte be not at service in the chappell here and uppon Sondaye nexte at the service and sermon in the chappell here and there decentlye behave hym selfe all the service while and Receyve the Communion here uppon Sondaye nexte That then he shall stand oute of Commens and forbear the benefit of his Chamber And unless he do Receyve the Communion here openlye some Sondaye this Tearme that then he shall be no fellowe of this howse And stand Expulsed from thensforth'.

were Roger Wetherell and William Roper. As Wetherell was an active bencher until his death in 1576, he evidently conformed or was protected by chief Justice Wray, his 'very good Lorde'. But Roper, who retained his chamber until his death in 1578, absented himself from council meetings after February 1569, was convicted by Archbishop Sandys in the early 1570's, and then expelled. His death marks the end of the influential Marian faction at Lincoln's Inn, a demise which was primarily the result of natural causes combined with the conformity campaign. By 1580 the society was dominated by twenty protestant benchers. But the protestant hegemony really dates from the early 1570's when the conservatives were on the run.

Between 1569 and 1580, forty-five members served as benchers at the Inner Temple. Of the twenty-seven newcomers, twelve were evident protestants, including three whose tenure is uncertain. Thomas Lucas, the recorder of Colchester, and William Leighton, a councillor in Wales,

1 P.282 above.

2 P.218 above; LIBB V, ff.248v,267,272 (I.409,413). The Lincoln's Inn black book is understandably silent about Roper's expulsion, which is not mentioned until the recusant certificate of 1577.


5 ITAB I, f.185, II, f.20 (I.259,383); APC IX.25; CPR (1563-6), passim, (1569-72), 1889; IT Misc. MS 30, no.38; JP Cert. 1564, f.63; JP Sub. 1569, ff.148v-9; JP List 1573, f.12; Essex RO D/DP/160; A5, III.74.

6 ITAB I, ff.190,210v (I.269,305); APC XI.193,242; CPR (1560-3), 34,396, 440, (1566-72), passim; JP Cert. 1564, f.10v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.143-4; SPL2/107, f.22, /110, f.23; JP List 1573, ff.32v,54v; JP List 1585, ff.55,56,57,58v,91; Williams, 89,350-1; A5, III.78.
who had been described as favourable justices in religion (1564), were termed benchers in later years. But both paid a fine in the 1570's to be discharged from office. Though Robert Buxton, a friend of the duke of Norfolk, was twice called to the bench, he does not seem to have taken his place. At the first call in 1573, he was one of the three barristers 'never convented nor suspected for papisterye' who were kept back while the benchers considered the claims of those already passed over for religious reasons. The other two were William Wilcockes and John Bullock, who both took their places. Bullock was classified as a protestant on the 1576 list of practising lawyers, as well as John French, who was appointed in the following year to discuss the continuation of Corro's salary with the Middle house. In 1579 French not only prefaced his will with a confession of reformed belief, but also charged his wife never to marry an idolater, 'which all papists are and that in the worst degree'. Thomas Smallman, the under-treasurer in 1562, and John Ford, the chief prothonotary of common pleas, also declared their protestant

1 APC VII.327; Fudige, Thesis, III.57-8; Matthews, Thesis, 30-1; A5, III.80.
2 P.221 above.
3 CPR (1555-7), 378,512; ITAR, I.196; A5, III.79.
4 CPR (1560-3), 449; IC List 1576, f.60; A5, III.81.
5 ITAB I, f.202 (I.289); IC List 1576, f.60; PCC 26 Bakon, 1579; A5, III.86. French commended his soul to the Trinity, 'by whom in the blood of Christ I am sanctified having an assured faith that my synnes are cleane wyped away and forgiven by the onely merittes and passion of Jesus Christ my saviouer and not for any merittes or workes of myne owne being not so much as once able to thincke a good thought of my self'.
6 ITAB I, f.165v (I.221); Hatfield MS 166, f.46v; PCC 19 Sainberbe, 1585/91; IPM II.322; A5, III.91. Smallman committed his soul to God, beseeching him to assist him 'that whether I live or die I may be and continue on of his flock and chosen children and partaker of his heavenlie kingdome which is prepared for all belevers thoroughe the onlie merittes of Christe our Saviour'.
7 ITAB I, f.212v (I.308); PCC 17 Butts, 1583; A5, III.97. Before committing his soul, Ford mentioned that he wished to settle his worldly affairs so that 'I maie the more quietlie call uppon God for the forgivenes of my synnes by the onelie mediacion and redemption of Jesus Christe my onelye Saviour'.
faith. Others were more prominent crown officials. Robert Halton, who was classified as a protestant lawyer in 1576, became a serjeant-at-law in 1580, and Edward Drewe, a later ecclesiastical commissioner, was a member of parliament and recorder of Exeter before similar promotion in 1589.

Edmund Walter, who practised in Wales before admission to the Welsh bench and council, was portrayed by Sir John Throckmorton as 'a man full of passion and rancour, a common drunkard and poore' (1576). However, he was noted to be a protestant in the same year, and four years later Francis Windham suggested to Burghley that he be substituted for one of the proposed serjeants who was suspected in religion.

In the 1580's, Ranulph Hurleston, whose patron was probably the earl of Huntingdon, served as a councillor at York and a northern justice. As a member of the 1586-7 parliament, he was imprisoned with Cope, Lewkenor and Bainbridge for promoting presbyterian reform. At the Inn, he was a delegate to the Middle house regarding the continuance of Corro and then Travers (1577-81), his permission was sought with that of Leicester for the readmission of the expelled William Atkinson (1584), and his opinion regarding the suspected religion of Thomas Walmesley was deferred to by Thomas Norton in his letter to Burghley (1581).

Thirteen of the other fifteen newcomers, most of whom had entered the Inner Temple during the 1550's, gave some cause for suspicion but conformed nonetheless. Four were involved in the disputed bench call of

1 IC List 1576, f.60; HMC R XIV.viii.256; IPM II.166; A1. Oxon.; A5, III. 75.
2 CPR (1558-60), 216; CSPD (1598-1601), 45-6; Hatfield MS 50, f.21; Lansdowne MS 171, f.234v; JP List 1582, f.132v; PCC 44 Lewyn, 1598; DNB; Gabriel, Thesis, 340; Hurstfield, 236; A5, III.93.
3 SP12/107, f.23, /108, f.89, /110, f.23v; IC List 1576, f.60; Lansdowne MS 29, f.31; Bodleian MS Rawlinson C.254, f.27; DNB; Williams, 140,273, 358-9; A5, III.73.
4 Pp. 235,308 above; ITAB I, ff.202,204,214v,224v (I.289,293,311,329); SP12/136, f.72, /189, f.112; Lansdowne MS 31, f.12; Hatfield MS 7, f.72; IC List 1576, f.60; Collinson, 306-11; Cross, Puritan Earl, 175; Gabriel, Thesis, 451-2; Neale, II.149,157,194; A5, III.76.
1573-4, including Andrew Gray, who had reconciled himself before the ecclesiastical commissioners in 1569. According to the 1577 recusant certificate, he 'sithens hath shewed good tokens of Conformitie and resorteth to the Church at convenient tymes'. Nevertheless his name reappeared on the 1578-81 list of suspected lawyers, and he was described on a later certificate of justices as 'a quarrelsom and contentious man and his wief even now presented a Recusant' (1587). George Wyott and Humphrey Smith were passed over in 1573 for being 'vehemently suspected for papistrye'. But whereas Wyott, who was evidently the brother of an expelled recusant, was also listed as a suspect in 1578-81, Smith took the oath in 1579, examined catholics in 1580, and left a protestant-looking will. The fourth suspect in 1573 was Nicholas Hare II, a nephew of Sir Nicholas and a justice of Norfolk, who 'hadde bene convented for papistrie' and was noted by Bishop Scambler in 1587 as 'suspected and reputed to be backwarde in religion'. Nevertheless he took the oath in 1579 and wrote a protestant will. His brother Ralph, the later clerk

1 P. 221 above.

2 P. 210 above; Lansdowne MS 106, f.122; IC List 1576, f.60; IT Cert. 1577, f.136; IC List 1578-81, f.130v; JP List 1582, ff.131v,133v; ORS XIII. 135; NMOR (Var. Coll.) III.65-6; Al. Cantab.; A5, III.85.

3 ITAB I, f.188v (I.267); ITAR, I.77A,103; Lansdowne MS 106, f.102; IC List 1576, f.60; IC List 1578-81, f.130v; Egerton MS 2804, f.23; PCC 73 Dixy, 1594; A5, III.84.

4 APC XII.211; SP12/133/12; Lansdowne MS 106, f.102; IC List 1576, f.60; JP List 1573, f.8v; JP List 1582, f.132v; PCC 70 Leicester, 1589; A5, III.85. 'ffirst I bequeath my soule to almighty god my maker trusting to be saved by his mercye and the merites of our saviour Jhesus Christe the only mediator betwene god and man and only redeemer of mankynde'.

5 ITAB I, ff.202,214v (I.289,311); CPR (1563-6), 1805; Lansdowne MS 106, f.102; SP12/133/13; IC List 1576, f.200v; JP List 1585, f.27v; JP Return 1587, f.200v; PCC 40 Cobhame, 1597; CRS XIII.137; Al. Cantab.; Gabriel, Thesis, 411; A5, III.82. 'ffirst I bequeath my soule to Almighty God havinge most assured and stedfast hope through his infinite goodnes and mercie to have remission and forgiveness of my sinnes and thorough the merites of the most bitter passion of his dearlie beloved sonne Jesus Christe my Redeemer and Saviour to enjoye eternall and everlastinge life'. 
of the crown, composed a similar preamble. However, both lawyers were listed as catholic sympathisers in 1574, with Richard Baker, the son of Sir John, who had been classified as a zealous justice in religion by Parker in 1564. Though Thomas Risdon and John Palgrave took the oath in 1579 as justices in Devon and Norfolk, they were suspected in 1578-81, and Palgrave was similarly classified by Bishop Scambler in 1587. Robert Golding, whose name also appeared on the 1578-81 list of suspected lawyers, was the recorder elected by the conservative faction of Thetford in 1582, when he was officially noted to be 'a man longe suspected not to favour the Ghospel', and 'an assister of Dominicke Vaughan a masse priest for his departure out of the Realme & c'. In the 1560's Valentine Pigott's associates included such expelled and suspected members as Robert Atkinson, Robert Powell, Thomas Colwell, James Braybrook and his relative, Francis Pigott. Francis and Henry Beaumont were the sons of the discredited master of the rolls, whose widow was 'a greate favorer of papystes'. Francis was admitted to the society in 1560 by the surety of Robert Atkinson and married into the conservative Pierpoint family.

1 CPR (1563-6), 1805; CSPD (1595-7), 257; CRS XIII.137; PCC 42 Woodhall, 1601; A5, III.89. 'First I bequeath my Sowle to Almightie god, assuredly trustinge by the preticous death of his sonne Jesus Christ and his great mercie, that I am and shall be one of the nomber of the elect written in the booke of life'.

2 CPR (1558-60), 222, (1563-72), passim; JP Cert. 1564, f.57; IC Lists 1573, ff.98-9; CRS XIII.99; A5, III.70.

3 SP12/133/12; IC List 1578-81, f.130v; JP List 1573, f.8v; JP List 1582, f.132; JP List 1585, f.8v; A5, III.72.

4 SP12/133/13; IC List 1576, f.60; JP List 1582, f.134v; JP Return 1587, f.134v; Al. Cantab.; A5, III.77.

5 P.299 above; SP12/153, f.97, /155, ff.22-7,147-8,156-7, /187, f.70; IC List 1578-81, f.130v; HMC IV.525, (Var. Coll.) VII.136,142; A5, III.87.


7 ITAR, I.96,107,110; SP12/167, f.59, /171, ff.108-9,120-3,128-30,189, f.47; Lansdowne MS 26, f.11; JP List 1582, f.134v; JP List 1585, f.22; JP Return 1587, f.190; PCC 42 Lewyn, 1598; Brooks, Hatton, 197; A5, III.90. 'first I give and bequeathe my soul to Almightie god hopinge to be saved, by the merittes and death and passion of Jesus Criste and by no other meanes'.
With Christopher Hatton he stood as a surety for the admission of his brother, who shared his chamber. As a councillor at York, William Hillyard had close relatives and friends among the most active northern catholics. Nevertheless Pigott and Henry Beaumont were classified as sufficient justices in religion (1587), Francis Beaumont became a judge of common pleas, and Hillyard was locally described as 'a man most mete, learned, wise and hable to serve and have the said office in these partes'.

There can be little doubt which faith these newcomers would have professed under a catholic monarch. But after 1569 they took the oath on entry to the bench and evidently conformed, as did William Hughes of Northamptonshire, and John Cowper, a Surrey justice, for whom there is no other information of religious significance. As for the four conservatives who remained from the preceding decade, John Fuller discontinued by 1574 and Richard Lone, Robert Wythe and Thomas Marriott, though suspected, conformed sufficiently to retain office at the Inn and elsewhere. Of the other fourteen continuers, eleven were protestant, and three whose religious outlook is not known, conformed at the very least. As a result the Inner Temple bench comprised twenty-seven identifiable benchers in 1580, of whom nine were apparent protestants and

---

1 ITAR, I.110; ITAB I, f.199; JP Return 1587, f.190; A5, III.95.
3 A5, III.94.
4 IC List 1576, f.61v; JP Cert. 1573, f.24; PCC 17 Dixy, 1591/4; A5, III.96.
5 A5, III.39,61,64,69; p.298,292 above.
7 William Pole, James Rivett, Robert Gynes (A5, III.52,53,69; p.293 above.
sixteen were conformists in some degree.¹ But since only three of the active benchers belonged to the former category, the Inn was largely governed by conformists.²

For the Middle Temple, thirty-one benchers have been identified between 1569 and 1580.³ Eleven of the fifteen newcomers were protestant. Richard Ingpen, a wealthy landowner, Hampshire justice and member of parliament, was thus marked on the 1576 list of lawyers.⁴ A more prominent parliamentarian was Miles Sandys, a clerk of the crown, coroner and attorney of the Queen's bench, and a councillor in Wales. He served on commissions for ecclesiastical causes, recusants and priests, and was most likely patronised by Francis Knollys and the earl of Bedford. His elder brother, Bishop Edwin Sandys of Worcester, classified him as one of the 'ffavorers of true religion' in 1564, Thomas Norton described him to Burghley as 'a knowen discreet man' (1581), and Bishop Edmund Freke thought he was 'verie wise, honest and religious' (1587). Their estimate of his zeal was confirmed by the declaration of faith which Sandys included

¹ Kelway, George Bromley, Gell, Randolph, Walter, Hurleston, Bullock, Smallman, Drew (A5, III.33,56,58,67,73,76,81,91,93); Lone, Wythe, Marriott, Risdon, Palgrave, Hare II, Gray, Wyott, Smith, Golding, Pigott, Hare, Francis Beaumont, Hillyard, Henry Beaumont, Ford (A5, III.61,64,69,72,77,82-5,87-90,92,95,97).

² At the end of 1580, the active benchers were George Bromley, Lone, Robert Wythe, Marriott, Risdon, Walter, Hurleston, Palgrave, Hare II, Gray, Wyott, Smith and Golding.


⁴ JP List 1573, f.25v; IC List 1576, f.60v; Fudge, Thesis, III.185; A5, IV.78.
Matthew Dale, who also acted as an ecclesiastical commissioner, was admitted to the society by William Fleetwood, whose son was his surety. In 1560 Dale entered the chamber of Thomas Bowyer, a Marian exile and Sussex justice, whom Bishop Thomas Bickley of Chichester referred to as 'a lawyer who is a great favorer of religion and the common wealth' (1587). Bowyer's protestant will mentioned his brother-in-law, baron John Birch, and his stepfather, Alexander Nowell, as well as his relatives, James Morice and John Agmondesham, who were both benchers. The latter, who was also Bowyer's chamber-fellow for several years, was classified as a favourable Surrey justice in religion (1564), was appointed to discuss Alvey's title to the master's house with the Inner Temple (1581), and left a complete confession of reformed faith headed 'Jesus Emanuel Christus'. Another intimate of Agmondesham was John

---

1 MTMB II, f.37v (I.130); APC XIV, 271-2, XV, 221; CPR (1558-60), 107, (1569-72), 2161,3093; CSPD (1595-7), 257; 8Pl2/177, f.175v; Harleian MS 474, f.86; Lansdowne MS 171, f.234v; JP Cert. 1564, f.3; JP List 1573, ff.5,29; JP List 1585, f.40v; JP Return 1587, f.192v; CPR 65 Woodhall, 1600/1; Al. Cantab. Fudge, Thesis, 585-6; Neale, I.337; Williams, 356-7; A5, IV.85. Sandys commended his soul to God, 'trusting and stedfastly through his grace and goodness believing that he will receive the same to dwell amongst the souls of his elect' and that he would 'have and enjoy everlasting blessedness onely by his free grace and through the mercie obtained by the death and meryttes of our Lord Jesus Christe my onely Saviour and Redeemer'.

2 MTMB II, ff.23,36 (I.109,129); Lansdowne MS 75, ff.128-9,136-7, MS 171, f.234v; IC List 1576, f.60v; Neale, II, 404-5; A5, IV.79.

3 P.150 above; MTMB II, ff.36,60v (I.129,148); APC XV, 160; Lansdowne MS 99, f.159; JP Return 1587, f.164v; PCC 30 Scott, 1590/5; Prest, 150-1; Manning, Sussex, 150-1; A5, IV.81. 'ffirst I commend my soule to Almighty god the father Almighty, my bodye to be buryed as yt shall please hym to appoynte, to attend the resurrection of the dead and by the only merittes of his deere sonne as one of the elect sanctified by the holy ghoste three persons and one god to enjoye life everlasting, Amen'.

4 MTMB II, ff.60v,76v,97,119,147v,169,175,180,192 (I.148,159,181,209,245, 269,277,282,295); CPR (1560-3), 440,443; JP Cert. 1564, f.54v; JP Sub. 1569, ff.158v-9; PCC 71 Lewyn, 1597/8; Gabriel, Thesis, 189-96; A5, IV. 86. After invoking the Trinity, Agmondesham commenced his peroration: 'For my Creation sanctification justification preservation and assured glorification I John Agmondesham of Roughe Barnes in the countie of Surrey Esquier doe beleive in the unitie and Trynitie as aforesaide...' He then elaborated the saving power of the Trinity, which had 'framed and mollifyed my stonie harte to a fleshy harte and my will to godly and holy workes pleasing god, a witnes of my faith and not for merittes or reward'.
Boys II, a steward and legal adviser to Archbishops Parker and Whitgift. He entered Fleetwood's chamber in 1580 and later gained that of James Morice, his deceased friend. Morice, who became the attorney of wards in 1589, is better known for his subsequent legal and parliamentary attack on the procedure of church courts. When he was under arrest in 1593, he informed Lord Burghley, his patron, that 'Least as where hearetofore we praid from the Tyranny of the Bishop of Rome good Lord deliver us, we be compelled to say, from the Tyranny of the clergy of Ingland good Lord deliver us'.

During the 1560's Morice shared chambers with Andrew Hemerford, a reader in 1577, and Edward Lewkenor, the prominent parliamentary presbyterian, who evidently left the society after a few years. Another bencher who was confined for his radicalism was Richard Stephens, a Gloucestershire commissioner and councillor in Wales, whom Sir John Throckmorton portrayed as 'a playne softe man, of no great wealth and sickely' (1576). Before the 1593 Parliament, Stephens met with Peter Wentworth and others in the Lincoln's Inn chamber of Humphrey Winch to plan their strategy for settlement of the succession. Four years previously, when Stephens corresponded with his widowed sister about

---

1 MTMB II, ff.119,142,169,175,192,220,264v (I.209,238,269,277,295,323,371-2); JP List 1582, f.133; JP List 1585, f.18v; Hatfield MS, 185, f.117; HMOR IX.i.157, X.iii.265; Parker Corresp., 452; Collinson, 417, 500n, Thesis, 1103; Gleason, Justices, 33-4; Neale, II.416; A5, IV.87.

2 P.103 above; MTMB II, ff.65,133v,150v,175 (I.151,227,248,432); CSPD (1547-80), 635; SP12/238, f.142; Additional MS 28,571, f.172; Hatfield MS 21, f.13, MS 170, f.53; Lansdowne MS 68, ff.104-124, MS 55, f.125, MS 56, f.127, MS 57, f.129, MS 59, f.133, MS 82, ff.148-51, MS 115, f.31; JP List 1573, f.13; Collinson, 443-4; Fuidge, Thesis, III.245-6; Hurstfield, 225; Neale, II passim; A5, IV.84.

3 MTMB II, ff.65,408 (I.151,432); A5, IV.83. Though nothing further is known of Hemerford, his associates are most likely indicative of his religious outlook.

4 MTMB II, ff.46v,65,408 (I.137,151,432); Al. Cantab.; Collinson, passim; Gabriel, Thesis, 489-91; Neale, I-II passim.
marriage negotiations with Sir William Bowes, he revealed his association with such divines as Thomas Cartwright, Walter Travers, Stephen Egerton and Dr John Hammond, his predilection for 'good exercises' in London, his estimation of 'godliness', and his inflexibility over matters of reformed doctrine and discipline. The other protestant lawyers were Edward Fenner, a wealthy chamber-fellow of Agmondesham, and William Peryam, a well-affected Devon justice, who were both promoted to the judiciary.

The five remaining newcomers to the Middle Temple bench were suspected in religion, but conformed sufficiently to retain office at the Inn and abroad. Henry Archer, an Essex justice until his death, and George Phetiplace, a councillor and judge in Wales, were marked as papists on the 1576 list of practising lawyers. Archer was specially admitted in 1554 at the instance of the catholic Anthony Brown, and Phetiplace was a counsellor to the conservative John Petre (1576-7). Both avoided any definitive religious statement in their wills, but simply trusted to be saved by the passion of Christ. Peter Rosse, a

1 CPR (1555-7), 6, (1569-72), 1890, 1702, 1703; SP12/110, f.23v; Hatfield MS 71, f.75; HMCR VI.345-6; IPM II.333; Neale, II.257-61; A5, IV.77. According to the Somerset Record Office, the MSS of Lord St Audries, which were transferred there in 1972, did not contain the original correspondence of Richard Stephens with Elizabeth Palmer of Parham, Sussex, and were in no condition to be examined (January 1972).

2 MTMB II, ff.39v,76v,97,119 (I.132,159,181,209); CPR (1569-72), 1710; SP12/287, f.23; Lansdowne MS 171, f.234v; IC List 1576, f.60v; Foss, VI.152-3; Neale, I.254; A5, IV.80.

3 CPR (1569-72), passim; SP12/259, f.248; Harleian MS 6996, f.52; Hatfield MS 65, f.98, MS 170, f.54; IT Misc. MS 30, no.4; Lansdowne MS 80, f.126; JP Sub. 1569, ff.113v-4; JP List 1573, f.8v; Al. Cantab.; DNB; Fudge, Thesis, 40; A5, IV.82.

4 MTMB II, f.15v (I.97); IC List 1576, f.60v; PCC 58 Brudenell, 1585; A5, IV.76.

5 CPR (1555-7), 92, (1563-6), 2142, (1569-72), 72,203,1702,1890; SP12/107, ff.22,28; Essex RO, D/DP/A18; JP List 1573, f.13; PCC 41 Daughtry, 1577; HMCR (De L’Isle), I.333; Williams, 348-9; A5, IV.71.
marriage negotiations with Sir William Bowes, he revealed his association with such divines as Thomas Cartwright, Walter Travers, Stephen Egerton and Dr John Hammond, his predilection for 'good exercises' in London, his estimation of 'godliness', and his inflexibility over matters of reformed doctrine and discipline. The other protestant lawyers were Edward Fenner, a wealthy chamber-fellow of Agmonesham, and William Peryam, a well-affect ed Devon justice, who were both promoted to the judiciary.

The five remaining newcomers to the Middle Temple bench were suspected in religion, but conformed sufficiently to retain office at the Inn and abroad. Henry Archer, an Essex justice until his death, and George Phetiplace, a councillor and judge in Wales, were marked as papists on the 1576 list of practising lawyers. Archer was specially admitted in 1554 at the instance of the catholic Anthony Brown, and Phetiplace was a counsellor to the conservative John Petre (1576-7). Both avoided any definitive religious statement in their wills, but simply trusted to be saved by the passion of Christ. Peter Rosse, a

1 CPR (1555-7), 6, (1569-72), 1890, 1702, 1703; SP12/110, f.23v; Hatfield MS 71, f.75; HMCR VI.345-6; IPM II.333; Neale, II.257-61; A5, IV.77.
According to the Somerset Record Office, the MSS of Lord St Audries, which were transferred there in 1972, did not contain the original correspondence of Richard Stephens with Elizabeth Palmer of Parham, Sussex, and were in no condition to be examined (January 1972).

2 MTNB II, ff.39v, 76v, 97, 119 (I.132, 159, 181, 209); CPR (1569-72), 1710; SP12/287, f.23; Lansdowne MS 171, f.234v; IC List 1576, f.60v; Foss, VI.152-3; Neale, I.254; A5, IV.80.

3 CPR (1569-72), passim; SP12/259, f.248; Harleian MS 6996, f.52; Hatfield MS 65, f.98, MS 170, f.54; IT Misc. MS 30, no.4; Lansdowne MS 80, f.126; JP Sub. 1569, f.113v-4; JP List 1573, f.8v; Al. Cantab.; DNB; Fudgie, Thesis, 40; A5, IV.82.

4 MTNB II, f.15v (I.97); IC List 1576, f.60v; PCC 58 Brudenell, 1585; A5, IV.76.

5 CPR (1555-7), 92, (1563-6), 2142, (1569-72), 72, 203, 1702, 1890; SP12/107, ff.22, 28; Essex RO, D/DP/Al8; JP List 1573, f.13; PCC 41 Daughtry, 1577; HMCR (De L'Isle), I.333; Williams, 348-9; A5, IV.71.
reader whose name appeared on both the 1576 and 1578-81 lists, was expelled in 1572 for calling members to the bar, but subsequently remitted to associate status. In 1589 Gilbert Lord Talbot urged Walsingham to request the earl of Huntingdon for Rosse's entry to the northern council, since the lawyer was 'very lerned, sounde in Religion, and a very honeste gentleman', but without apparent success. In the 1560's he was admitted to Henry Lord Stafford's chamber with Edward Ameredith, the treasurer in 1574-9, and a justice in Devon. Though the latter was employed by Huntingdon, whose brother Edward entered the same chamber in 1566, he too was listed as a suspected lawyer in 1578-81. The other newcomer was Richard Crompton, who published a letter to Leicester, his abettor from the 'cradel', advocating the execution of the Scottish Queen (1586), and then dedicated a treatise to Whitgift which justified her death. Though he exhibited commendable patriotism, he was no puritan. As a Staffordshire justice in 1582, he interrupted divine service to arrest the minister, whom he accused of refusing to wear the surplice, read the set order, or turn towards the east. Nor was he simply a stickler for legality. Bishop William Overton of Coventry and Lichfield informed Burghley that Crompton was reputed to be 'a papist in hearte, and a freind unto papistes, and a greate receiver of papistes to his house'. Therefore he thought that the justice had persecuted a conscientious minister 'for mallice to the religion'. Nevertheless Crompton remained a justice of the peace and a bencher at the Inn.

1 MTMB II, ff.63v,69v,103v,105,182v,190 (I.150,154,189,191,285,293); SP12/224, f.36; IC List 1576, f.66; IC List 1578-81, f.130; PCC 32 Daper, 1572 (John Gifford); A5, IV.73.
2 MTMB II, ff.48,64v,72v (I.138,150,156); CPR (1557-8), 468, (1558-60), 155; IC List 1578-81, f.130; JP List 1582, f.132v; JP List 1585, f.9; Cross, Puritan Earl, 32,97; Fudige, Thesis, III.5-6; A5, IV.74.
3 MTMB II, f.133v (I.227); Lamadowne MS 34, f.19; IC List 1578-81, f.130; JP List 1582, f.135; JP List 1585, f.31v; Crompton (bibliography); DNB; Rosenberg, 315-7; A5, IV.75.
Three of the four conservatives who continued from the preceding reign also showed signs of conformity. In his otherwise traditional will, Edmund Windsor required burial services to be said 'according to the lawe' (1565). Thomas Farmer took the oath as a Norfolk justice in 1579, and Bishop Scambler later certified that he was an 'observer of lawe and sufficiente', but had been put out of the commission. Matthew Smith was a justice in Somerset at his death in 1583, when he simply bequeathed his soul 'to Almighty god'. Likewise Thomas Andrewes, who cannot be classified in religion, was at least a conforming justice since he subscribed to the Act of Uniformity in 1569 and took the oath ten years later. The exception was Edmund Plowden, the senior bencher of the Inn and supervisor of the new hall. Though he objected to subscribing in 1569, and was listed as a recusant thereafter, he remained preeminent until his death in 1585, when he was buried in the Temple church.

According to the fellow lawyer who exhibited articles against him to the privy council in 1580, he had attended church until knowledge of the papal bull in 1570, 'and after that he hath utterly refused both service, sacramentes and every other meane to communicate with the church'. It might be supposed that Plowden escaped with nothing more than fines by means of circumspect behaviour, but his religious opinions were hardly disguised. His well-informed accuser stated that 'he hath openly lately said that the newe testament is a booke of Riddles and that the canonicall scripture is like a fooles capp and maye be set every waye'. Moreover he had the audacity not only to call King Henry a 'great Slouth' and a 'Bull in a comon', but also to oppose himself openly against those

1 P.193 above; A5, IV.35.
2 P.295 above; SP12/133/13; JP Return, 1587, f.201; A5, IV.60.
3 P.295 above; A5, IV.69.
4 JP Sub. 1569, f.111v; SP12/133/10; JP List 1585, f.35; Fudge, Thesis, III.7-8; A5, IV.58.
benchers who attempted to further the privy council's order for a full certificate of recusants. More seriously, Plowden's accuser showed how 'he applieth all his soorte and frendeshipp to suppress religion and the professors thereof and to preferre papistes and their superstition', so that the Middle Temple was 'festred with papistes' and not to be reformed without intervention by the council. ¹ Altogether nine of the benchers of that Inn were suspected during the 1570's, but eight apparently conformed. ² Another one, who has left little information, conformed at the very least. ³ On the other hand twenty-one were evident protestants, including ten who continued from earlier years. ⁴ By the end of 1580 the Middle Temple was governed by seventeen active benchers, comprising ten protestants, six conformists and a most influential catholic. ⁵

Since most of the Marian benchers departed from the Inns before 1569, the religious complexión of the governing bodies was primarily determined by the adherence of newcomers. At Gray's Inn, where about half of the

---

¹ Pp. 194, 226, 294 above; MTMB II, ff. 77v, 92, 111v, 139, 147v, 156, (I.159, 174, 199, 234, 245, 255, 256); SP12/60, ff. 160-3, /150, f. 179, /164, nos 45-62, 15/25, f. 118; IC List 1576, f. 60v; MT Cert. 1577, f. 134; IC List 1578-81, f. 130; A5, IV. 54.
³ Thomas Andrewes (A5, IV. 58).
⁴ Mawdeley, Hone, Freville, George Nicholls, Chamber, Fleetwood, Bell, Hippiestead, Popham, Gent (A5, IV. 17, 51, 55, 57, 63-5, 67, 68, 70); Stephens, Ingpen, Dale, Senner, Bowyer, Periam, Hemerford, Morice, Sandys, Agmondeesham, Boys (A5, IV. 77-87).
⁵ Nicholls, Popham, Gent, Stephens, Dale, Bowyer, Morice, Sandys, Agmondeesham, Boys; Farmer, Smith, Rosse, Ameredith, Crompton, Archer; Plowden.
benchers were inclined towards the reformed religion in 1558, the conservatives were largely replaced by 1569. At the Temple, which was dominated by catholics in 1558, the few conservatives who survived the next decade were supplemented by several like-minded fellows. But by 1569 they were well outnumbered by protestants in both societies. At Lincoln's Inn, where the benchers were overwhelmingly catholic in 1558, there were more protestants than conservatives by 1569. But though the conservatives had been practically eliminated at Gray's Inn and outnumbered in the other societies, at the Temple they were still influential, and they remained entrenched at Lincoln's Inn.

During the next decade, the religious character of the governing bodies continued to change in favour of the established religion. With the exception of Edmund Plowden, the former conservatives who had not left the bench through death, promotion or discontinuance either conformed or relinquished office during the early years of the conformity campaign. Those newcomers who gave cause for suspicion also showed some measure of obedience, including subscription to the oath of supremacy which they would have performed on admission to the bench. Consequently only a single nonconforming bencher can be found at the Inns by 1580. But

---

1 P.168 above.
2 Pp.188,196 above.
3 P.178 above.
4 In the analysis for 1558-69, the growing strength of protestantism amongst the benchers has probably been exaggerated slightly. During the 1560's, when the future of the nation was uncertain, religious divisions were not fixed, and there was relatively little pressure to conform. Therefore the line between conservative and protestant benchers was not as firm as this analysis would suggest. Furthermore the use of subsequent biographical evidence has most likely resulted in the misrepresentation of some lawyers whose religious views were not fully developed by 1569. Though the protestant trend is quite clear, the conservative element was probably greater than would appear.
whereas Gray's and Lincoln's Inn were almost exclusively governed by
protestants, the conformists dominated the Inner Temple and were a sizeable
minority at the Middle house, where Plowden continued unchecked.

Between 1558 and 1580, therefore, the conservative character of the
governing bodies was considerably changed, partly by the passage of time.
Death and confidence in the new order took their toll. The policy of
compulsion, which was adopted in 1569, was sufficient to coerce the
stragglers and oust most of the stubborn. Though there is little direct
evidence of the preachers' role, many of the benchers were fervent men
who fully accepted their reformed teaching. In the 1560's these lawyers
were influential not only at Gray's Inn, but also in the more
conservative societies, particularly Lincoln's Inn where the succession
question was openly disputed. In the following decade their number
increased significantly at both Gray's and Lincoln's Inn, which were not
merely protestant, but strongly so. Despite the large conformist
minority at the Middle Temple, they were prominent there, but at the
Inner house they were not as conspicuous. During these and later years,
several benchers also favoured further reform of the Elizabethan church,

1 Gilbert Gerrard, Anthony Thorold, Nicholas Barham, Robert Nowell,
William Gerrard, William Lovelace, Thomas Colby (GI); Richard Kingsmill,
John Lennard, Robert Monson, William Thornton, Ralph Rokeby II, Peter
Osborne, Francis Windham (LI); Richard Blackwell, Thomas Gawdy II,
Thomas Williams, George Bromley, Richard Onslow, Edward Flowerdew
(IT); William Hone, William Fleetwood, Robert Bell (MT).

2 Gilbert Gerrard, Anthony Thorold, William Gerrard, Francis Rodes,
Thomas Colby, Richard Aunger, Christopher Yelverton, Thomas Snagge,
William Cardinall, Humphrey Purefey, William Daniel, Edward Stanhope
(GI); Richard Kingsmill, John Lennard, Robert Monson, William Thornton,
Ralph Rokeby II, Peter Osborne, Francis Windham, James Dalton, John
(LI); George Bromley, Richard Onslow, Edward Flowerdew, Ranulph
Hurleston, John French (IT); William Hone, William Fleetwood, Robert
Bell, Richard Stephens, Thomas Bowyer, James Morice, Miles Sandys,
John Agmondesham (MT).
in its education, government ceremony or law. But others preferred the established form. Despite these variations, most were loyal members of the English church who sought the glory of God and the honour of their Queen.

These developments help to account for several features which have been noticed above. Considering the predominantly conservative character of the benchers in 1558, it is hardly surprising that there was some delay in implementing the Elizabethan settlement at the Temple, where the silver censers were retained until 1563, and at Lincoln's Inn, which was slow to provide service books and to remove the great altar stone. In the 1560's the government placed a reformed master at the Temple, but Gray's Inn maintained its former priest, and Lincoln's Inn employed Robert Cooke, who proved to be one of the purveyors of catholic books. Though the conservatives were outnumbered at Lincoln's Inn and the Temple by 1569, their considerable influence and intimate connections were largely responsible for the initial reluctance to impose conformity. But under firm pressure from the authorities, at a time when protestant members were on the ascendant, the opposition was soon overcome. Consequently the reformed bench of Lincoln's Inn at last removed the altar.

1 Anthony Thorold, Thomas Colby, Christopher Yelverton (GI); Francis Windham (LI); Richard Onslow, Ranulph Hurleston (IT); William Fleetwood, Robert Bell, Richard Stephens, James Morice (MT). No doubt there were more. But these are the only lawyers for whom I have found explicit evidence, and can therefore be called puritans in the reforming sense of the word. Consequently the modern concept of puritanism as a reform movement is not applicable to this analysis of the religious composition of the Inns.

2 Thomas Seckford, William Lovelace (GI); Christopher Wray, John Lennard, John Puckering, Thomas Egerton (LI); Robert Kelway, George Bromley, Anthony Gell, Roger Manwood, Francis Gawdy, Edmund Anderson (IT); John Popham (MT).

3 Pp.50-1 above.

4 Pp.93,94,100,203 above.

5 Pp.229-30 above.
stone in 1571 as well as repairing its former site, and both Gray's and Lincoln's Inns adopted a series of distinctively protestant measures, including the provision of pulpits, renovation of chapels, employment of new ministers, and foundation of preacherships. As the benchers of Gray's Inn were largely reformed before 1569, it is not remarkable that they regulated religious observance in advance of the other societies. Lincoln's Inn, which became just as protestant by the 1570's, showed greater enthusiasm for purging itself of suspected recusants. But since many of the Templars were conformists with conservative sympathies, their parliaments did little to regulate religion until the early 1580's, when the more protestant Middle house imposed strict orders for church attendance, and both societies appointed overseers. In particular the Inner Temple, which was dominated by conformists, showed itself to be seriously divided over the bench call in 1573-4, was more reluctant to accept Walter Travers as its preacher, and took several months longer to endorse the joint regulations for religious observance. Nevertheless all of the societies, including the Temple, were so strongly influenced by reformed teaching that they appointed lecturers, some of whom were well

1 P. 52 above.
2 Pp. 241 above.
3 Pp. 58-9 above.
4 P. 93 above.
5 Pp. 241-56 above.
6 P. 231 above.
7 P. 231 above.
8 Pp. 231-2 above.
9 Pp. 221 above.
10 Pp. 253-4 above.
11 P. 232 above.
known for their radicalism as well as their ability to preach. However, the concern of the benchers for legality and the conservative disposition of certain fellows was reflected in their desire for official confirmation of the preachers, and in the stipulation by both the Temples that communion be ministered 'in such order as the lawes and her Majestys iniuctions do prescrybe and allowe of and not in any other manner'. Therefore the external reformation of the Inns, which proceeded during these years, was the product of internal change as well as official policy.

Though the religious composition of the governing bodies was effectively changed, this need not mean that the other members followed suit. Only those called to the bar after 1569 were expected to take the oath of supremacy, and there was no religious test for admission until the 1580's. Consequently the attitudes of these members should be examined in their own right. Because of the impracticability of conducting an exhaustive survey, even if sufficient information were available, it is necessary to rely on the only comprehensive recusant certificate for the period.

In November 1577 two well-affected lawyers of each society provided lord keeper Bacon with a classified list of 182 recusant members, which may be tabulated as follows:

---

1 P. 268 above.
2 ITAB I, f.220v (I.321), cf. MTMB II, f.154 (I.253); p.248 above.
3 P. 208 above.
4 P. 231 above.
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1 P. 268 above.
2 ITAB I, f. 220v (I. 321), cf. MMB II, f. 154 (I. 253); p. 248 above.
3 P. 208 above.
4 P. 231 above.
**SUMMARY OF RECUSANT RETURNS FOR THE INNS OF COURT 1577**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INNS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray's Inn</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln's Inn</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Temple</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Temple</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Expelled</th>
<th>B Reconciled</th>
<th>C Dis-continuers</th>
<th>D Exiles</th>
<th>E Church absentees</th>
<th>F Non-communicants</th>
<th>G Suspects</th>
<th>H Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

These members can be grouped in two main classes. The first comprises 109 cases of recusancy which had resulted in expulsion, reconciliation, discontinuance or exile between 1569 and 1577. The second consists of 73 known and suspected recusants who remained at the Inns in 1577. As at least 1067 persons had been admitted since 1569, into societies whose total membership was 759 in 1574, about ten percent of members were named as recusants for both the period from 1569 to 1577 and the year of

1 GI-MT Certificates, 1577. Since the blanks indicate that those categories were not used by the compilers, the totals for categories C, E, F and G are incomplete. At least ten of the members stated to be discontinuers at the Inner Temple had actually been expelled (p.234 above). The only benchers were William Roper (LI: expelled), Andrew Gray (IT: reconciled), and Edmund Plowden (MT: church absentee). Thomas Egerton (LI: reconciled) joined the bench two years later.

2 Categories A to D.

3 Categories E to G.

4 Knafla, in Slavin, TMI, 160.

5 P.112 above. Since the annual membership of the Inns was probably much the same throughout the 1570's, the figures from the 1574 survey have been used for percentage calculations below.
the return. Such a concentration of potentially disaffected subjects was quite alarming, in societies which were regarded as the training schools for gentlemen and civil servants. Yet the actual proportion of members who retained conservative sympathies was probably higher than these figures suggest.

The lord keeper asked only to be certified of those members who refused to attend church, had been formerly expelled, or were reconciled. His confidants obediently listed expulsions and reconciliations, but their zeal was such that they also specified exiles for each of the Inns, and discontinuers for two. Though William Fleetwood and John Popham of the Middle Temple were content to list only those who refused to attend church, Gilbert Gerrard and Christopher Yelverton of Gray's Inn added 'such as come verye seldom and be reported to be backward in Religion'. For Lincoln's Inn, Richard Kingsmill and John Puckering used communion instead of attendance as their test of recusancy, and George Bromley and Edward Flowerdewe listed all of the Inner Templars who were seldom present at church.

---

1 Two calculations may be made:

(1) For 1569-77

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>1569-77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members in 1574 (759)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less 1569 intake (61)</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total membership</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total recusants</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) For 1577

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>1577</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members in 1574</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total recusants</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Prest presents literary evidence regarding the strength of catholicism at the Inns, but exaggerates the gap between the public image and reality in the 1570's, through misinterpreting the 1577 recusant return (176-80,186).
Since different criteria were used to classify members, it would not be valid to determine the relative strength of recusancy by comparing the proportion of known and suspected recusants at each Inn.\(^1\) Nevertheless some relevant conclusions may be derived from these returns. As all of the Inner Temple suspects were 'church papists' who attended services occasionally, there were evidently no members known to absent themselves altogether. The same was probably true of Lincoln's Inn, where the largest number of recusants had been disciplined in previous years.\(^2\) Even when the stricter test of communion was applied, only about five percent of its members were thought to be recusants in 1577. At the Middle Temple less than three percent of members were known to absent themselves. The only society with a significant proportion of recusants was Gray's Inn, where eleven percent of the members were named. Altogether only about five percent of the total number of members at the Inns were known to be recusants. Therefore the subordinate members outwardly conformed almost as completely as their benchers, though not necessarily in the same ratio for each Inn. But whether or not they reformed their religious attitudes is a different question. At Gray's Inn another six percent of members were listed as suspects in religion, and twelve percent were likewise classified at the Inner Temple. Though none were mentioned for the other two Inns, simply because their names were not requested, Bacon's agents could probably have listed just as many there. Even then it is unlikely that they could have listed every conservative. Detection was hindered by the shortness of the term, minimal attendance, the turnover in membership and amateur administrative methods. Consequently the recusant return of 1577 indicates that, while most rank and file members outwardly conformed, a much greater but

\(^1\) As Prest uses this method, his conclusions are misleading (175-6).

\(^2\) Pp. 238, 328 above.
unknown proportion than the calculable ten percent remained somewhat conservative in religion.

For this reason Thomas Norton, the former Inner Templar, provided Walsingham with a book of 'deuises' which included proposals for the further reformation of the Inns of Court and Chancery (1581-2). With considerable care, Norton combined most of the measures proposed since 1569 into a more rigorous policy, which would not merely secure allegiance and ensure conformity, but also establish the 'true religion' at the Inns. To this end he required the lord chancellor and judges in person, as well as the privy council in writing, to instruct the benchers in certain duties. These were of three kinds. The first included regulations which would fully reform the religious composition of the Inns by means of compulsion. Prospective members were to provide 'good testimonie of their religion', and all suspects were to be expelled until their purgation. For professional purposes, Norton believed that members should subscribe to an 'article' similar to that already imposed on the officials of London:

I doe confesse and declare before God and this Court that I am throughly perswaded in my conscience that the doctrine of religion taught in this realme by the Queenes Maiesties authoritie is good and sound doctrine agreyng with the word of God, and that the doctrine commonly called papistrie varieng from the sayd doctrine taught by hir Maiesties authoritie is false, blasphemous and hereticall.

Those members who refused to swear were to be put out of commons, and expelled if they refused to reconcile themselves within a month. Church attendance and communion were to be treated as tests of religion. At

---

1 The draft of Norton's 'deuises' was written while he was in the Tower (Additional MS 48,023, ff.26-59). The final copy remains with the state papers (SP12/177, ff.155-82). A later copy is bound with the Caesar papers (Lansdowne MS 155, ff.87-113v). The background to the imprisonment and composition has been presented already (Neale, I.404-6). In the state paper copy, the proposals for the Inns of Court appear of folios 174 to 175.

2 f.160v. Underlining supplied.
At the end of each term the butler would provide the bencher with a complete list of absentees and non-communicants, who were to be excluded from commons at the Inns and practice before the bar until examined by their ordinary or the benchers themselves. Any recusant who could not satisfy his examiners by the end of the following term would be expelled. The second main duty of the benchers was to further the reformed religion by maintaining preacherships. Norton required the already established lectures to be continued, the same to be founded at the other Inns, and similar opportunities to be provided for members of the Inns of Chancery, either by permitting them to attend sermons at the superior Inns or by establishing preacherships at their parish churches. The third main duty, which had been emphasised by Bishop Grindal in 1569, was to advance only the godly. No members were to gain promotion, office or favour unless they were 'well known sound in religion'. All who were 'zealous in religion' were to be assisted to become good students of the law. This duty applied not only to the benchers, but also to the judges and councillors, whom Norton urged to show continual favour to godly lawyers.

In terms of practical politics, Norton's reform programme belonged just as much to the sphere of pious speculation as the proposals of Denton, Bacon and Cary forty years before. In keeping with government requirements, members were not excluded from the Inns for what they believed, but because they showed by their actions that they would not obey the laws of the realm or the orders of their society. Lawyers who were merely suspected in religion, but conformed, gained promotion at the Inns and elsewhere. Even if such a policy of exclusion were desirable, the administrative structure of the Inns was hardly capable of sustaining a prolonged effort with the necessary consistency. What was achieved at the Inns of Court was not reformation, but conformity.
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### APPENDIX 1

**ANNUAL EXPENDITURE ON CHAPEL WAX**

**BY THE TREASURER OF LINCOLN'S INN 1520 - 1565**

(From the treasurer's accounts in LIBB, for each year generally ending 1 November)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>24/2</td>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(no account)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30/5</td>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>Wax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12/</td>
<td>Wax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19/4</td>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Wine &amp; Wax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24/6</td>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>Wine &amp; Wax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17/8</td>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16/3</td>
<td>Wine &amp; Wax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14/</td>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16/8</td>
<td>Bread, wine, wax &amp; hyssop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>14/</td>
<td>Lights &amp; Wax</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12/6</td>
<td>For the chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>20/4</td>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>Wine, bread &amp; laundry only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>16/4</td>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>17/-</td>
<td>Wax</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>14/2</td>
<td>Candles in hall &amp; chapel</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23/2</td>
<td>2 torches, 1 link &amp; taper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27/-</td>
<td>Wax incl. mid-summer lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49/5</td>
<td>Wax incl. mid-summer lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51/8</td>
<td>Wax lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36/8</td>
<td>Lights &amp; Wax</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47/4</td>
<td>Wax lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>18/9</td>
<td>Lights &amp; Wax</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24/-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>19/-</td>
<td>Lights &amp; Wax</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>20/-</td>
<td>Lights &amp; Wax</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>10/-</td>
<td>Lights &amp; Wax</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(no account)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>Lights &amp; Wax</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(no account)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Chaplains</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Chaplains</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.Hen.VIII</td>
<td>John Westly</td>
<td>1521m</td>
<td>Thomas Whitacre</td>
<td>S 1521m</td>
<td>John Blount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521m</td>
<td>-1527m</td>
<td>Thomas Machy</td>
<td>1542m</td>
<td>William Brugges</td>
<td>1540m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530-1m</td>
<td>Richard Skoos</td>
<td>1542m</td>
<td>Robert Fellowes</td>
<td>-0 1558d</td>
<td>Erneste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Sir Walter</td>
<td>1553-1m</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>-0 1558d</td>
<td>Thomas Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551d</td>
<td>Edw.VI</td>
<td>1557m</td>
<td>John Harnam</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>John Alleyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552m</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Thomas Tudball</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>Houseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564m</td>
<td>Temp.chap.</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>[Robert] Cooke</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>Richard Alvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568m</td>
<td>Jeffrey Evans</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>Thomas Harding</td>
<td>F 1584d</td>
<td>Robert Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568d</td>
<td>-1583d</td>
<td>-1569</td>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1 clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Henry Warde</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>-1569</td>
<td>William Maddocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573-4</td>
<td>Mr Style</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>mid 1579</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574m</td>
<td>Paul Bushe</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>William Davis</td>
<td>Mr 1585</td>
<td>Richard Hooker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603d</td>
<td>-1593d</td>
<td>-1591</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>Richard Hooker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Preachers</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Preachers</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Preachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 1569</td>
<td>Pulpit ordered</td>
<td>1570-1571</td>
<td>Pulpit purchased</td>
<td>e 1571</td>
<td>[Thomas] Lever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? -1574</td>
<td>Occasional sermons</td>
<td>1571-1581</td>
<td>Occasional sermons</td>
<td>e 1578</td>
<td>Antonio del Corro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l 1572</td>
<td>Henry Ward (2)</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>[Richard] Porder (2)</td>
<td>e 1579</td>
<td>[Laurence] Chaderton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573-1574</td>
<td>Mr. Style (4)?</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>[Richard] Porder (4)</td>
<td>l 1580?</td>
<td>Walter Travers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 1574m</td>
<td>[William] Charke</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>[Thomas] Blage (1)</td>
<td>1580?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 1576m</td>
<td>[William] Charke</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>[Lionel?] Redman (2)</td>
<td>1580?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1580?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Griffith] Lewis (2)</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>[Nicholas] Bond (1)</td>
<td>l 1580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>[John Argall] (1)</td>
<td>l 1580?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e 1581</td>
<td>Thomas Crook</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>[Thomas] White (5)</td>
<td>l 1586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1598</td>
<td></td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>[Thomas] White &amp; others</td>
<td>l 1586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jl 1581</td>
<td>[Laurence] Chaderton, John Reynolds and others approached</td>
<td>l 1581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l 1581</td>
<td>William Charke</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 (continued): NOTES

1 Clerical careers are discussed in chapters 3 and 6. Identification has been made from university, clerical and personal records. For the later clergy see Prest, 189.

2 The symbols d and m after the date designate death and a mention in the records. The months have been abbreviated before the date, with e and l meaning early and late in the year.

3 Two chaplains, 1515-58.

4 Bentley's MS. f.221v.

5 GIPB I, ff.15,177v,324 (I.470,483-4), and intervening accounts.

6 GIPB I, f.65v (I.486) It is not clear whether Ward and Style were assistants to Bushe or occasional preachers.

7 GIPB I, f.41Av (I.485) GIPB I, ff.43,71v,260v (I.19,165), and intervening orders and accounts.

8 LIBB III, ff.113v,159v (I.202,217).

9 LIBB III, ff.113v-14 (I.202).

10 LIBB III, f.114 (I.202).

11 LIBB IV, f.18v (I.231).


13 LIBB IV, f.250v (I.300).

14 John Louthe's reminiscences (1579), Narratives of the Reformation, 58.

15 LIBB IV, ff.258v,259v (I.302-3).

16 LIBB IV, f.280 (I.310).

17 Ibid. and f.323v.

18 LIBB IV, f.320 (I.310).

19 n.10; LIBB V, f.104 (I.367).

20 LIBB IV, ff.328v,336v,343v,351v,359; V,ff.17 (I.323,324,327,341).

21 LIBB IV, f.348v (I.330).

22 LIBB V, ff.10,18v,104v (I.340,342,367), and intervening pensioner's accounts.


24 LIBB V, ff.100,101 (I.100,101 (I.36-7).


26 LIBB V, ff.140,477v,486 (I.378; II,27,31), and intervening pensioner's accounts.
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27 William Apprice to Richard Druell, 19 September 1521, SP1/233, f.239
(LP Addenda I.i.349). Possibly BCL 1511, B Canon L 1515, and vicar of
Great Sampford, Essex, 1524 (AL.Oxon.).

28 32 Henry VIII, c.24 (SR, III.778-81); ITAB I, f.138 (I.181); PCC 50 Welles,
1556; AL.Oxon.

29 Supplementary pardon roll, 15 January 1559, C67/68, p.2, m.14, CPR (1558-60),
211; Richard Alvey to Lord Burghley, n.d. [1579], BM Lansdowne MS 107,
ff.2-3.

30 Patent roll C66/949, p.2, m.18 CPR, (1558-60), 280; ITAB I, ff.225v,226
(I.331,332).

31 ITAB I, f.226v (I.333); MTMB II, f.222 (I.325); DNB.

32 Augmentations treasurer's remembrances, 32 Henry VIII, Harleian MS 830,
f.161v-2.

33 I Elizabeth I, c.24 (SR IV.397-400).

34 'A note of the Clerks of the Temple Church since the year 1579', ITR XIX,
f.55; ITAB I, f.209v, II,ff.21,21v (I.302-3,384-6).

35 GIPB I, f.1v (I.3).

36 GIPB I, f.41B. 'Item it is ordred that Mr Walker shall repaye unto Mr
Charcke, all such money as he receavid of him for such chatels as he
Mr Charcke boughte of hime, or left their at his departure amowntinge to
ijli xs'. As there are no other Charke's on record, it seems that
William Charke was there in 1574.

37 GIPB I, f.52v (I.22).

38 GIPB I, f.156 (I.50).

39 LIBB V, f.141 (I.37-9).

40 LIBB V, f.163 (I.383).

41 LIBB V, f.175v (I.386-7).

42 LIBB V, f.205 (I.397).

43 LIBB V, f.220v (I.400).

44 LIBB V, f.243 (I.403).

45 LIBB V, f.261 (I.410-11).

46 LIBB V, f.284 (I.414).

47 LIBB V, f.313v (I.418).

48 LIBB V, f.332v (I.423).
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49 LIBB V, f.320v (I.421).

50 LIBB V, ff.334v,482v,476 (I.424, II,27,28).

51 Gataker, 35.

52 ITAB I, f.166 (I.261); MTMB II, f.129v (I.221).

53 MTMB II, f.131v (I.224).

54 MTMB II, ff.143,185 (I.239,287).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>THE TEMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MASTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1560</td>
<td>£37/6/8 allowance² (£8 his own)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16d per member (offerings)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542-58</td>
<td>£2 rent (master's house)⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560-84</td>
<td>£37/6/8 allowance⁵ (c.£28 his own)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1564+</td>
<td>18d per member tax⁴ + communion money⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582-3+</td>
<td>+ rents (master's lodgings)⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1560</td>
<td>£6/13/4 stipend² (for each of 4 priests)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560-84</td>
<td>similar (for 1 minister)⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. £5 IT allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£5 MT allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£10 stipend (Master)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2/10/0 communion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£7/10/0 additional (from Master)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2 chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£32 total⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBR Sons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1560</td>
<td>£3 stipend (Drury chaplain)¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>£2/13/4 stipend (ordinary chap)¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-81</td>
<td>£5 stipend¹⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>4d per member extra¹⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>£3 stipend¹⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-86</td>
<td>£40 stipend¹⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1618</td>
<td>£66/13/8 stipend¹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1610</td>
<td>10/- per sermon²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-1610</td>
<td>£40 stipend²¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3 (cont'd): NOTES

1 Excluding chambers, commons, gowns, gratuities and contingencies, unless specified. For 1590-1640, see Prest, 168.

2 Augmentations Treasurer's Remembrances, in Harleian MS 830, ff.161v-2; 'Temple breif, Doctor' and the Temples' answer to Dr. Paul Micklethwaite's claims to precedence, profit and jurisdiction, MT Micklethwaite MSS; Augmentations office misc.book E315/249, f.40; 250, ff.16-17; 251, ff.52-3; /252, f.36; /253, f.32v; /254, f.46; /255, f.69v (LP, XVI.745, XVII.258, XVIII.i.436, XIX.i.368, XX.i.557, XXI.i.643, XXI.ii.775).

3 Anonymous MS f.322v.

4 p.72 above.

5. Richard Alvey's patent, 13 February 1560, Patent roll C66/949, m.18, CPR (1558-60), 280.

6 From a summary concerning the Temple mastership, 28 January 1633, SP16/231, ff.154-5; 'The Clarke of the Temple his Book', ITR XXII, ff.40-50. Regarding the latter, which mainly concerns 1629-38, see ITAP, II.Ixxxviii-ix.

7 ITAB I, ff.226v-7 (I.334).

8 Temple Clerk's Book, f.50.

9 Ibid., ff.44,47,49.

10 GIPB I, annual pensioner's accounts.

11 GIPB I, f.76.

12 GIPB I, f.166 (I.56), and annual pensioner's accounts.

13 LIBB IV, f.273 (I.308).

14 LIBB, annual pensioner's accounts 1482-1558.

15 LIBB IV, f.328v (I.323).

16 LIBB V, f.21 (I.344).

17 LIBB V, ff.129, 158v (I.377) and annual pensioner's accounts.

18 MTMB II, f.98v (I.182).

19 GIPB I, f.171.

20 A2, n.40-8.

21 LIBB V, f.357 (I.432).
APPENDIX 4
QUALIFICATIONS OF CLERGY AT THE INNS OF COURT, 1558-90
(Primarily from Al.Cantab. and Al.Oxon.)

I CHAPLAINS AND MINISTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>IDENTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alleyn, Henry</td>
<td>Queens' C</td>
<td>Matric. (under 14)</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashdale, John</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'Sir'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Richard</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'Minister'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushe, Paul</td>
<td>Pembroke C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1563-4</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke, Robert</td>
<td>Christ's C</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1550-1</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peterhouse C</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1553-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinity Hall C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, William</td>
<td>St. John's C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jesus C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Jeffrey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'Sir'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding, Thomas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'chaplain'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddocks, Thomas</td>
<td>Brasenose O</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, John</td>
<td>Jesus C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1563-4</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style, Christopher</td>
<td>Caius C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>......, James</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'clerk'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warde, Henry</td>
<td>St John's C</td>
<td>Matric. (under 14)</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II MASTERS OF THE TEMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvey, Richard</td>
<td>Christ's C</td>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St John's C</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1528-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1531-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermested, William</td>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>pre 1553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseman, John</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>'clerk'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4 (continued)

#### III PREACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>IDENTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashbold, William</td>
<td>Magdalen C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1564-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peterhouse C</td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argall, John</td>
<td>Christ Church O</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedell, Henry</td>
<td>Corpus Christi O</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blague, Thomas</td>
<td>Queens' C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond, Nicholas</td>
<td>St John's C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1563-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1565-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED &amp; DD</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>1590-1605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaderton, Laurence</td>
<td>Christ's C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1564-5</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1567-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1568-77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>1584-1622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charke, William</td>
<td>Peterhouse C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1562-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1566-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corro, Antonio del</td>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lausanne</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christ Church O</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook, Thomas</td>
<td>Trinity C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1562-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>1577-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley, Robert</td>
<td>Magdalen O</td>
<td>Demy</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1541-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>IDENTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Griffith</td>
<td>Christ Church 0</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1562</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1565-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porder, Richard</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1562-3</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redman, William</td>
<td>Trinity C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----, Lionel</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travers, Walter</td>
<td>Christ's C</td>
<td>Matric.</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinity C</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1565-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinity D</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1594-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Thomas</td>
<td>Magdalen O</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

BENCHERS 1511-1590

Before the religious attitudes and actions of the benchers could be analysed, it was necessary to establish who the benchers were, their period of tenure and the extent of their influence. To this end, three sets of information have been compiled:

1 Master-charts
From records at the Inns, the names of benchers and personal details were entered by symbols on a series of twenty-six charts. The details for each bencher included professional progress, annual office, bench attendance, promotion and his last mention. Because of missing records, some details could not be included for the Middle Temple between 1525 and 1551 or Gray's Inn before 1569. Nor do the Middle Temple minutes provide bench attendance.

2 Biographical files
More detailed information, which could not be readily accommodated on a chart, was placed in the appropriate biographical file, whether that person was a bencher or another member. This was completed for manuscript and printed sources listed in the bibliography.

3 Summary charts
From the master-charts and biographical files, a chart has been completed for each Inn which summarises the tenure of benchers from 1511-1590. As these charts are the basis for parts of chapters 4 and 7, they have been included below. By using the date scale, it is possible to obtain a practically complete bench list for any year after 1530. But for finer detail and a more accurate assessment of individual participation at the Inns, these charts need to be used in conjunction with the master-charts and biographical files.
APPENDIX 5 (continued)

Symbols

--- tenure
→ possible continuation
← possible before
? doubtful
[ ended

Letters

A Admission
B Bar-call (utter-barrister)
G Ancient utter-barrister (Gray's Inn)
C Bench call
D Associate bencher
D Death (between years if placed on vertical line)
E Exonerated
G Governor (usually from Michaelmas)
J Judge
L Left (discontinuance)
M Mentioned (selected)
P Present at bench meeting (as a bencher)
R Reader (Lent or autumn vacation of that year)
S Serjeant-at Law (usually the year of departure)
T Treasurer (usually from Michaelmas)

Small letters have been used for sources other than the Inns' records or lawyers' correspondence.

CHARTS I-V follow.
A. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

For information about sources at the Inns of Court, see Prest, 239-41.

All Souls College, Oxford:


Belvoir Castle, Grantham, Lincolnshire:

Rutland MSS III-XII (1555-1593): Including correspondence between the earl of Rutland and various lawyers.
(By courtesy of the Duke of Rutland)

Bodleian Library, Oxford:

Western MSS.

British Museum, Department of Manuscripts, London:

Additional MSS
Burney MSS
Cotton MSS
Egerton MSS
Harleian MSS
Lansdowne MSS
Royal MSS
Sloane MSS
Stowe MSS.

Canterbury Cathedral Library and Archives:

a. Chapter accounts, new foundation, receiver (1541-99)
b. Miscellaneous Chapter accounts 40 (1541-76).
Derbyshire Record Office, Matlock:

Boxes 41/30, 44/2, 27, 47/15, 56/52, 58/12, 18, 66/66, 67/8, 10a, 11, 12, 16, 21, 25c, 27a, 28b: Correspondence and papers of Anthony Gell.

East Sussex Record Office, Lewes:

Rye Corporation MSS 47/6(3,16): Roger Manwood to Rye Corporation regarding the Birchett family, 11 November 1573, 9 January 1574.

Essex Record Office, Chelmsford:


Gray's Inn, London:

Admittance book I (1581-1650)

Book of orders (Pension Book) I (1569-1669)

Ledger A. Accounts (1584-1703).

Guildford Muniment Room, Surrey:


Guildhall Library Muniment Room, London:

MS 4249. Collections from the parish records of St Andrew's, Holborne by churchwarden Thomas Bentley, commenced in 1584 and continued after his death.

Hatfield House, Hertfordshire (British Museum microfilm):

Hatfield (Salisbury) MSS 1-129 & petitions. Papers and correspondence of William and Robert Cecil.
Hendred House, Wantage, Berkshire:

Eyston MS: The confession of Richard Allington made from his deathbed at Lincoln's Inn, 27 November 1561.
(By courtesy of Thomas M. Eyston, Esq.)

Huntington Library, San Marino, California:

Ellesmere MSS 668: Accounts of the executors for the will of Ralph Rokeby, 24 June 1600. 2768, f.23: Star chamber report of a case concerning seditious books, Hilary term 1569, in a collection of miscellaneous cases.

Inner Temple, London:

Acts of Parliament I-II (1505-1608)
Admissions to the Inner Temple to 1659, 2 vols, trans. from the war-damaged admission registers by L. Rees Lloyd (typescript)
Inner Temple Records (miscellaneous MSS volumes)
Miscellaneous MSS
Petyt MSS.

Kent Archives Office, Maidstone:


Leicestershire Record Office, Leicester:

Finch MS I (1537-1602).

Lincolnshire Archives Office, Lincoln:

7 Ancaster MS A/6: Accounts of Richard Bertie (1560)
LI/1/1/1-3: Lincoln City minute books.

Lincoln's Inn, London:

Admissions books I-III (1573-1605)
Black Books (Council records) I-VII (1422-1660).
Magdalene College, Cambridge:

Pepys MS 2503, f.701.

Middle Temple, London:

Minutes of Parliament, books A (1500-24), D (1551-1610), C (1610-26),
B (1626-58).

Brerewood MSS: a. History of the Middle Temple, b. History of
Lincoln's Inn, c. Legal Antiquities (1630's)

Miscellaneous MSS regarding the Temple Church and clergy (2 boxes).

Northamptonshire Record Office, Northampton:

Buccleuch and Queensberry MSS: a. Letters of the Montagu family
I (1537-1643), b. Letters to the Montague family I (1536-1747),
c. Letters to Edward Lord Montagu II (1553-1600).

Nottingham University Library:

Clifton Hall MSS Cl/C50,51,52: Letters from Lord Burghley to
Anthony Thorold, 1588.

Public Record Office, London:

C66/626,790,825,865,892,949: Chancery, patent rolls
C/67/68: Chancery, supplementary patent roll
E26/256: Exchequer, Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, miscellaneous
book
E 315/93,235,249-55: Exchequer, augmentation office, miscellaneous
books
E/358/20: Exchequer, Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer, enrolled accounts,
miscellaneous
PROB 11/25-114: Probate registers of the Prerogative Court of
Canterbury 1532-1609

SP1: State papers, Henry VIII

SP3: State papers, Lisle papers

SP10: State papers, Edward VI
SP11: State papers, Philip and Mary
SP12: State papers, Elizabeth
SP14: State papers, James I
SP15: State papers, addenda
SP16: State papers, Charles I.

Warwickshire Record Office, Warwick:

Newdigate MS C.R. 136: Newdigate family papers.

West Sussex Record Office, Chichester:

Diocese of Chichester records Cap I/3/0: Chapter book.
Cap I/10, box 8: Chapter papers including Bishop Richard Sampson's letter to the Dean and Chapter regarding Lincoln's Inn, 6 July 1536.
Cap I/16/1: Chapter acts (White Act Book).
Ep VI/4/1: Episcopal accounts.

B. PRINTED SOURCES


-----*A sermon preached at the charterhouse before the Kings Maiestie on Tuesday the tenth of May, 1603*. London: S. Stafford, 1603.


Calendar of Close Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office. London: HMSO, 1900-.


Calendar of Inquisitions post mortem. Henry III-VII. Record Commission. London, 1806-28, 1898-.


Calendar of Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office. Edward VI - Elizabeth I. London, 1924-.


Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs
existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, ed. Rawdon Brown

Camden, William. Annals, or, the Historie of the most renowned and
Victorious Princess Elizabeth, trans. R.N. Gent. 3rd ed. London:
Thomas Harper, 1635.


Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of the Honourable Society of the
Inner Temple, ed. J. Conway Davies. 3 vols. Oxford University Press,
1972.
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