

# THOMAS CROMWELL AND THE ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES

By Lawrence N. Crumb

## *Introduction*

The original inspiration for this article came from the vague recollection of an assertion that Henry VIII, having abolished the monasteries and seized their endowments, considered doing the same with the universities; and that he was dissuaded from doing so only by the intercession of his last queen, Catherine Parr. Although there is some truth to this notion,<sup>1</sup> the greatest threat to the English universities came not at this time (1545-46) but during the course of the previous decade – the decade of the 1530s, which corresponded almost exactly to the ascendancy of Thomas Cromwell.

## *The Medieval Background*

The universities of Oxford and Cambridge were founded in the High Middle Ages and developed during the pre-modern centuries which followed; looking back on their role in English life on the eve of the Reformation, one scholar has gone so far as to say that “no institution was more medieval than they.”<sup>2</sup> This means that, “above all,” [they] ... owed their first allegiance to the medieval church.”<sup>3</sup> The chancellors were originally representatives of the local bishops (Lincoln, for Oxford; and Ely, for Cambridge), since only bishops could grant licenses to teach; as ecclesiastical administration became more centralized in the late Middle Ages, they came to be seen as representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and, eventually, of the pope. However, as papal power grew, so did royal power; and the church-state conflicts of the late Middle Ages were not without their reflections in the English universities, which derived certain privileges and liberties from the Crown and thus acknowledged its authority in some areas. A classic example came in 1411, when Henry IV forced Oxford to renounce direct papal control and accept a visitation by the Archbishop of Canterbury – a precedent for Archbishop Laud’s controversial claim to metropolitan rights of visitation over 200 years later. The fifteenth century also saw the emergence of a new type of university chancellor: a non-resident official with tenure for life, chosen from the influential members of the royal court; such a person was not only a guardian of university interests, but also an agent of royal power. Thus, the ultimate breach with Rome completed an existing process of changing university relations with church and state.<sup>4</sup>

The universities were also typically medieval in the prominent role played by the religious orders. Rather than consisting primarily of colleges for undergraduates, as in modern times, the universities were essentially collections of halls and inns for graduate students; and most of these graduate students were monks and friars, proceeding toward graduate degrees in theology and canon law.<sup>5</sup> Of the 65 Benedictine abbeys and priories in England, 38 sent monks to Gloucester College, the Benedictine hall at Oxford, as well as some to Cambridge; a total of 213 Benedictines attended Oxford alone in the years 1449-1538. During the same period, there were 67 Franciscans, 53 Dominicans, 52 Cistercians, 32 “Austin” (i.e., Augustinian) friars, and 12 Carmelites.<sup>6</sup> In a sense, the

degree of monastic involvement in the universities represented an adaptation to changing financial circumstances, for in the late Middle Ages, “both universities attracted gifts and endowment in a profusion which could be matched only by the benefactions bestowed on the monasteries of an earlier age ....”<sup>7</sup>

### *The Immediate Background*

The immediate background to Cromwell’s ascendancy was that of his patron, employer, and mentor, Thomas Wolsey. Wolsey had begun to receive royal appointments in both church and state in the last years of Henry VII, and the favors multiplied rapidly in the early years of Henry VIII. In 1514, Wolsey was named Archbishop of York, the second-ranking position in the English hierarchy, and the following year he was created cardinal. Although he was frustrated by Archbishop Warham’s longevity in his desire to succeed him at Canterbury as Primate of All England, he did succeed him as Lord Chancellor in 1515; three years later, he managed to outrank Warham by obtaining appointment as papal legate *de latere*.<sup>8</sup> From 1518 until his fall in 1529, Wolsey thus combined in his person the authority to rule both church and state. Although Cromwell never inherited his master’s titles, he managed to exercise the same two-fold authority while holding lesser titles and maneuvering skillfully behind the scenes.

Wolsey’s first significant contact with the universities after attaining high office – he had been successively junior and senior bursar of Magdalen College, Oxford, in his early career – came in 1518, when Oxford surrendered its statutes to him to be altered at his pleasure; Cambridge followed suit in 1524. Meanwhile, in 1520, Wolsey paid a visit to Cambridge, where he had just declined the proffered chancellorship – an office that Cromwell would eventually hold. A high point among the ceremonies attending Wolsey’s visit came when he and the new chancellor, Bishop Fisher, presided over the burning of Luther’s books. (A similar book-burning was conducted by others at Oxford about the same time.) Whether Cromwell was among the large train of attendants Wolsey took with him wherever he went is not recorded, at least by the historians of the university; however, the event would surely have become known to him, whether or not it later served him as a conscious precedent for the parallel treatment by his agents of the books of Duns Scotus. On the other hand, the example of how to deal with the universities which Wolsey bequeathed to Cromwell was not all harsh, for the cardinal (in his legate capacity) declined a request to appoint a commission of enquiry into the meetings of Cambridge’s “Little Germany” (i.e., Lutheran-minded) group at the White Horse tavern.<sup>9</sup>

But Wolsey’s most important contact with higher education was his grand design for his namesake Cardinal College at Oxford. The building of what was intended to be by far the largest college of the university began in 1524 on the site of St. Frideswide’s Priory, whose endowment (together with those of several other small religious houses that had been suppressed for the cause) were transferred to the new college. The act was not exactly unprecedented – Jesus and St. John’s colleges at Cambridge had been founded in 1497 and 1511, respectively, with endowments of a convent and two hospitals – but nothing before had been done on such a large scale; perhaps only a Wolsey could have procured a papal bull permitting the suppression of an unspecified number of religious

houses. In all the suppressions and transfers of endowment connected with the founding of Cardinal College, Cromwell was Wolsey's agent; surely in this case, Cromwell filed away the precedent for future reference.<sup>10</sup>

### *The Ascendancy of Cromwell*

The major events of the 1530s – the royal divorce, the royal supremacy in the Church, and the complete break with Rome – all involved Oxford and Cambridge, and thus represented a tightening in the existing interrelationships between church, state, and university. What has been said of the 1500s in general is thus especially true of the decade of Cromwell's ascendancy:

Westminster and Canterbury kept a close eye on the universities and had many methods, direct and indirect, of making their power felt. This influence was natural, inevitable, in a society in which Church and State were so intimately connected.<sup>11</sup>

Cromwell's first concern in regard to the universities, on the eve of this eventful decade, had been the saving of his former master's pet project, Cardinal College; and it may have been through his intercession that the king assured its continued existence (although not on so grand a scale as the cardinal had intended).<sup>12</sup> But as Cromwell's importance grew as agent (and, to a great extent, as shaper) of the royal will, his attention turned to more significant matters.

The burning issue at the time of Wolsey's fall – indeed, the cause of Wolsey's fall – was “the king's matter,” his desire for a divorce from Catherine of Aragon. In the spring of 1530, the University Senate at Cambridge pronounced against the validity of the marriage while remaining silent on the related question of the pope's dispensing power; after some pressure, the latter was also denied on an *ad hoc* basis, but without removing the proviso that Catherine's prior marriage to Prince Arthur (Henry's older brother) had been consummated.<sup>13</sup> Also at Cambridge in 1530, the statutes of St. John's College were revised to include Greek lectures, a legacy of Chancellor Fisher which Cromwell would not only retain but extend to other colleges, including those of Oxford, as well.<sup>14</sup>

The real turning-point for the universities came in 1533 with the passing of the Act in Restraint of Appeals, which had been drafted by Cromwell. Far from being a tentative testing of the waters, the Act

proclaimed a doctrine whose consequences, primary and secondary, bore as heavily on the universities as on any institution in the realm. Formerly Oxford and Cambridge had acknowledged the joint authority of pope and king but owed their chief allegiance to the Pope, now they passed under the sole jurisdiction of the king .... This transference of power meant a profound change in the nature of the controls and influences which would foster, guide, and condition the development of the universities. For one thing supreme power, being now vested in only one authority, was unimpeded by conflicting policies at the top .... For another thing,

the new controlling authority differed from the old in the purposes and interests it served. It owed much, for instance, to the awakening of national feeling and to the heightening of anti-clerical impulses and emotions. Such differences portended fundamental changes in the relations of the universities with the other institutions of English society.<sup>15</sup>

From this point, it was but a short step to the Act of Supremacy, also emanating from Cromwell's pen, which was passed in the following year and cut the last thread connecting the English church (including its universities) to the papacy. Both Oxford and Cambridge subscribed to the Act, although some individuals at Oxford were deprived of their fellowships for not doing so, and at Cambridge the prior of the "Black Friars" (Dominicans) was removed from his post when Archbishop Cranmer complained to Cromwell about the prior's objections.<sup>16</sup>

The year 1534 also saw the establishment of the Cambridge University Press, in the sense that a royal license was granted "to appoint three stationers and printers or booksellers ... to print and sell such books as shall be approved by the said chancellor or his viceregent and three doctors,"<sup>17</sup> although it was several years before the terms of the license were actually implemented. It was also in 1534 that Alexander Alane, a Scots reformer and disciple of Melanchthon, visited Cambridge at the joint invitation of Cromwell and Cranmer – a foretaste of the several foreign reformers who would visit the universities during the next reign.<sup>18</sup>

By the time of Cranmer's complaint about the Dominican prior at Cambridge, Cromwell had become chancellor of the university.<sup>19</sup> This election, which took place early in 1535, was possible because of the deprivation and imprisonment of the former chancellor, Bishop Fisher, who had refused to accept the Act of Supremacy. Although Fisher had not yet been executed for treason, we now know that his doom was already sealed in Cromwell's mind when he assumed the office.<sup>20</sup> A double irony lies in the fact that in 1534 Cambridge had given Cromwell the post of high steward, an office in which his immediate predecessor was that other great Henrician martyr, Thomas More. With its two brightest lights not only deprived and in prison, but likely candidates for the block, "the university made Cromwell chancellor to save itself."<sup>21</sup>

But it was not in his role of chancellor of Cambridge that Cromwell was destined to leave his mark on higher education in England. The Act of Supremacy gave Henry complete control over the English church, and he delegated this authority to Cromwell as his "vice-gerent, vicar general and special commissary."<sup>22</sup> It was in the exercise of this office that Cromwell appointed agents to make a visitation of the universities (as he also did for the monasteries, cathedrals, and parish churches) and issued injunctions to the universities, whose compliance the visitors were charged with enforcing. The "Royal Injunctions of 1535" required

- 1) subscription to "the king's succession" (i.e., Princess Elizabeth), obedience to any statutes "for the extirpation of the papal usurpation and for the assertion and confirmation of the king's jurisdiction, prerogative, and preeminence";

- 2) that each college and hall establish daily lectures in Greek and Latin;
- 3) that lectures should not be given on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, and that “all divinity lectures should be upon the Scriptures ... according to the true sense thereof, and not after the manner of Scotus, etc.”;
- 4) that students be permitted to read the Bible and attend lectures on it;
- 5) that there be no more study or degrees in canon law;
- 6) that ceremonies and observances that “hindered polite learning” be abolished;
- 7) that students be instructed in “logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, geography, music, and philosophy, and should read Aristotle ... Melanchthon ... etc., and not the frivolous questions and obscure glosses of Scotus ... etc.”;
- 8) that any existing statutes contrary to the above be void;
- 9) that “all deans presidents, wardens, heads, masters, rectors, and officers ... be sworn to the due and faithful observance of these articles.”<sup>23</sup>

Perhaps the wording of these injunctions was the inspiration for Archbishop Laud’s controversial “Etcetera Oath” a century later!

The emphasis on the Bible – both in private reading and public lectures – comes in the very year that Cromwell persuaded the king to permit publication of Coverdale’s translation, and a year before the first draft of injunctions (implemented in 1538) requiring that a copy be set up in every parish church.<sup>24</sup> The favorable mention of the Lutheran Melanchthon suggests Cromwell’s desire for England’s alliance with the Lutheran states of Germany – a scheme which led to the unsatisfactory royal marriage to Anne of Cleves, the occasion for Cromwell’s downfall. The unfavorable mention of Scotus, on the other hand, led to the famous destruction of his books by Cromwell’s visitors to Cambridge, the leaves strewn through the quadrangle of New College and “the wind blowing them into every corner”<sup>25</sup> -- an ironic sequel to the burning of Luther’s books at Cambridge by Wolsey, fifteen years earlier. The downfall of Scotus was not only “the downfall of scholasticism in England” but also “the line that in university history divides the mediaeval from the modern age.”<sup>26</sup>

The most significant of the injunctions, however, was the one abolishing the study of canon law. For Henry, in whose name the injunctions were issued, this act may well have constituted a royal revenge on the profession that had failed him when he needed it most; for Cromwell, who actually wrote the injunctions, there was a wider significance. Cromwell was very much a man who would prefer to cut a Gordian knot rather than waste time trying to untie it. Whereas Wolsey had been content to let the royal divorce wend its serpentine way through the slow-paced courts of canon law, Cromwell must have sensed that a satisfactory solution lay not in more sophisticated arguments and larger bribes, but in the abolition of the entire system. The church of the late Middle Ages was a church of canon law: its rules dominated the daily lives of both clergy and laity; its study was the principal avenue to preferment, including the episcopate; and its administration was the chief bulwark of the papacy, which – apart from its judicial importance – was perched somewhat ambiguously at the head of a quasi-feudal network of semi-autonomous provinces. There was no more obvious or more effective way of reacting against the immediate past than by abolishing the profession of canon law. In

this, as in their promotion of Biblical knowledge, “Henry VIII and Cromwell ... used the injunctive power that properly belonged to visitors to secure compliance with their religious policies within Oxford and Cambridge.”<sup>27</sup> The immediate effect on the daily life of the universities can be imagined only when we remember that “the majority of those engaged in higher studies at Oxford and Cambridge spent their time in the study of canon law.”<sup>28</sup> Subsequent injunctions of 1536 and 1538 aided the universities by providing that “beneficed persons with sufficient income must support a scholar at a university or grammar school ...” and in 1539, when Cromwell was planning new bishoprics, he was “concerned that the new deaneries and colleges of prebends should have Readers of Divinity, Greek, and Hebrew ....”<sup>29</sup>

An even greater disruption was yet to come: dissolution of the monasteries. In a three year period beginning in 1538, over a dozen religious houses were closed at the two universities. One modern observer, however, asserts that “monks and friars had for long played only a minor part in university life, and their departure was no irreparable loss. Indeed, in the long run, the Dissolution may be supposed an advantage.”<sup>30</sup> The advantage, of course, was the creation of Trinity College, Cambridge and Christ Church, Oxford, out of the suppressed houses’ endowments. In addition, there were several more direct transfers: at Cambridge, Buckingham College became Magdalene, the Carmelite friary was acquired by Queens’ College, and the Franciscan, by Sidney Sussex. At Oxford, Canterbury College was absorbed into Christ Church, Durham College became Trinity (under Mary), St. Bernard’s (Cistercian) became St. John’s, Gloucester (Benedictine) eventually became Worcester, and the remains of St. Mary’s (Augustinian) were ultimately transferred to Brasenose (under Elizabeth). However, the same author who cites these transfers of monastic endowments as an advantage is also quick to point out “the harm inflicted on scholarship ... by the wholesale dispersal or destruction of books and manuscripts in monastic libraries.”<sup>31</sup>

Disappearing along with the monastic houses were the inns and halls, so much a part of medieval university life. There had been over fifty at Oxford in the fifteenth century, but only eight remained by 1558, and only one (St. Edmund’s) still exists today. Although we are not faced here with a change in curriculum, the change in student life was great:

If one change more than another characterized the passing of the medieval order in the University of Oxford, it was the supersession of the Halls by the Colleges as the predominant type of academical society for the residence of undergraduates.<sup>32</sup>

Like any good administrator, Cromwell was concerned with small matters as well as great, and the universities were no exception to this rule. He was frequently involved in correspondence regarding disputes between town and gown,<sup>33</sup> transfers of college properties,<sup>34</sup> and the appointment of minor officials.<sup>35</sup> He also received many letters simply requesting money. In 1532, the canons of Christ Church (as Cardinal College was now called) claimed that “without [your] help [we] will not be able to keep off hunger this Christmas”; two years later, a representative of the same college, citing “extreme need,” hinted at a speedy reply with the Latin epigram “qui cito dat bis dat” (he who

gives quickly gives twice). At about the same time, the king's scholars at Oxford sugared their request for money by flattering Cromwell that "you must have angels' wit and knowledge to prosecute and finish all such things as you take in hand ...."<sup>36</sup> Of course, such bread cast upon the academic waters was bound to return to Cromwell on occasion, as when his commissioner Dr. John Landon, acting as intermediary, writes, "I send you a pair of gloves, and £5 in gold in them."<sup>37</sup> The reason for Cromwell's being "always exercised over the state of both Universities" is obvious: "he needed sound seminaries to supply the clergy for his reformed Church and the intellectuals whom he meant to employ in the state."<sup>38</sup>

In 1535, Cromwell had intervened on behalf of the University of Cambridge in a town-gown controversy in order to win favor with both Catholic and Reformed elements before going ahead with his planned injunctions and visitation.<sup>39</sup> By 1539, the spirit of reform which Cromwell had fostered had gone too far for the growing apprehension of conservative churchmen, just as many in the political arena felt he had gone too far in matters of state. In Lent of the latter year, a rash of conspicuous fast-breaking at Oxford gave further ammunition to Cromwell's conservative opponents, and similar offences at Cambridge led to indictments for Lollardy and public penances.<sup>40</sup> Although the controversy over fasting did not precipitate a crisis, it contributed to the undermining of Cromwell's position and was symptomatic of the rising tide of conservative reaction. In the following year (1540), Cromwell fell from power, just as his mentor had done exactly a decade earlier. Unlike Wolsey, however, Cromwell did not have the good fortune to die of natural causes *en route* to judgment, and in possession of at least some rank of distinction. Insult was added to injury, as the man who had, in effect, ruled England for a decade was not only relieved of all offices in church, state, and university, but also stripped of his recently acquired earldom (and his slightly older barony). This might have led to the commoner's fate of hanging, but he was granted the nobleman's luxury of beheading – one final crumb of comfort to fall from the royal master's table.<sup>41</sup>

### *Epilogue*

In the year of Cromwell's death, several Regius professorships, including Greek, Hebrew, and Divinity, were established at both Oxford and Cambridge. By this time, the conservative Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, had succeeded Cromwell in the Cambridge chancellorship; the new chairs, however, clearly represent a culmination of forces set in motion by Cromwell rather than a reaction against his regime.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, the funds with which the king so generously endowed his namesake professorships came from the endowments which Cromwell had been instrumental in seizing from the monasteries – one of the few cases in which a portion of that vast spoliation was put to an appropriate use. It is significant that no attempt was made to revive the professorships of canon law, even in Mary's reign, although there were a total of five applications for the degree in the years 1555-1556.<sup>43</sup> Another legacy of Cromwell's monastic suppressions was the Chantries Act of 1545, which included mention of the universities and their colleges, thus inspiring the alarmed appeal to Queen Catherine Parr mentioned above. However, the king repeated his assurances, first given when the monastic suppressions had caused academic apprehension, and his death shortly afterward precluded any

betrayal of the promise.<sup>44</sup> The universities, as re-shaped by Cromwell, were safe, but the spirit of reform which he had fostered there passed from the scene, however briefly, with his fall; we are told of Cambridge that “until Henry’s death in 1547, [it] was quiescent ... the Six Articles drove ‘Lutheranizing’ dons to cover ... heresy burrowed underground ....”<sup>45</sup>

The reign of Edward VI (1547-53) saw the passage of a second Chantry Act (1547), in which the university colleges and hostels were specifically exempted.<sup>46</sup> It also saw a return of the reforming spirit to the universities, and the arrival of foreign reformers as visiting lecturers, following the precedent of the Scottish Reformation in the previous decade. These included the German Martin Bucer, made Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and the Italian Pietro Martire Vermigli (commonly called Peter Martyr), who held the corresponding post at Oxford.<sup>47</sup> The former is now remembered as an influence on Cranmer’s *Book of Common Prayer*; the latter’s legacy lies with the remains of his wife, which displaced those of St. Frideswide in the tomb of Oxford’s patron saint during the heyday of Edwardian Protestantism, were displaced by the saint under the Marian reaction, and finally mixed with the latter as a grisly but now amusing embodiment of the Elizabethan compromise.

The equally brief reign of Mary I (1553-58) saw reaction, confusion, and the self-imposed exile of former leaders in the universities as well as in the parish churches. Her Lord Chancellor and right-hand man, Bishop Gardiner, had already (1542) used his chancellorship of Cambridge to insist on a return to the old pronunciation of Greek, an attempted set-back to the advance of humanistic studies begun there by Erasmus under Fisher’s patronage.<sup>48</sup> More significantly, three Cambridge dons who had become reforming bishops – Latimer, Ridley, and Archbishop Cranmer himself – were burned for heresy at Oxford; of these, Latimer had been Cromwell’s agent at Cambridge,<sup>49</sup> and Cranmer, of course, his colleague in promoting a moderate reformation patterned after Lutheran Germany.<sup>50</sup> The burning of a lesser figure, John Hullier, at Cambridge provided an equally chilling example of the new regime’s policy for the scholars of that university. We should, however, take with some allowance for exaggeration the statement of the Elizabethan courtier, Roger Ascham, that under Mary the “two fair groves of learning ... were either cut up, by the root, or trodden down to the ground and wholly went to wrack.”<sup>51</sup>

The much longer reign of Elizabeth I (1558-1603) provided a return of equilibrium to the universities (as to other aspects of church and state) and saw their growth in both scholarship and practical usefulness to the nation. An Act of Parliament in 1571 incorporated the two universities and gave them new charters. Although the Act confirmed existing privileges and liberties, it did so only in reference to previous royal charters, indicating that the “very corporate existence of the two universities depended solely on royal grants and an Act of Parliament [and that they] had assumed the character of royal institutions of a sort significantly different from those brought under royal control only by Acts asserting the supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical affairs.”<sup>52</sup> Whether Cromwell had ever contemplated this pushing of his principles to the logical conclusion we cannot say, but the result would certainly have pleased him. Moreover, the



unusual precedent of Cromwell as lay chancellor of Cambridge was followed by Elizabeth when she appointed Sir William Cecil to the same position and Sir John Mason to the chancellorship of Oxford – a bold break with tradition reflecting “an almost jealous concern that in this sphere no ecclesiastical official should be in a position to rival her authority.”<sup>53</sup>

### *Conclusion*

The changes in the universities which were accomplished, or at least begun, during the ascendancy of Thomas Cromwell touched every aspect of academic life and left them – like the English church itself – a very different phenomenon in spite of an obvious and highly prized institutional continuity. In the area of instruction, there was the abolition of an entire faculty (canon law) and endowment of the Regius professorships. Greek was added to the arts curriculum – “the only significant addition” to that area<sup>54</sup> – and the scholastic textbooks of Duns (now “Dunce”) Scotus and Peter Lombard were replaced by the works of classical authors and their more recent humanistic commentators. An unfortunate corollary to the change of texts was the destruction of many books and manuscripts, especially in monastic libraries, the reduction of the Cambridge University Library to 175 volumes by 1556, and the complete extinction of its Oxford counterpart until the refounding under Bodley in 1602.<sup>55</sup>

During this period, the student body changed from one composed mainly of graduate students living in halls and inns to one composed mainly of undergraduates living in colleges. Gone was the “tonsured clerk destined for service of Church and state,” who had been the typical student until ca. 1540,<sup>56</sup> and in his place appeared candidates for the ministry or secular careers. This novel idea that a university education was appropriate for the ordinary parish clergy led to a rise in their status, but also to a loss of identification with most of their parishioners.<sup>57</sup> Indeed, the new concept of a “gentleman” as a university graduate led to the replacement of a graduated system of many social ranks, that had obtained in the Middle Ages, by a more rigid system of two basic classes. Thus, the sixteenth century saw the universities “transformed from being institutions geared to training for a particular profession into institutions which acted as instruments of social control.”<sup>58</sup>

In spite of all these changes, there was an essential continuity to university life. The individual colleges retained their religious character, since their statutes (unlike the new statutes for each university as a whole) still prescribed clergy as members and visitors, as they would continue to do until the late nineteenth century.<sup>59</sup> But even where things remained the same, they took on a new flavor, the flavor of nationalism. The ultimate legacy of the ascendancy of Thomas Cromwell was the “Englishing” of Oxford and Cambridge: he had turned the universities **in** England into the universities **of** England, just as he had turned the Church in England into the Church of England.<sup>60</sup>

### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Charles Fenno Hoffman, "Catherine Parr as a Woman of Letters," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 23 (1960): 360-61; Mark H. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition, 1550-1642* (Oxford, 1959), 5. See also James Kelsey McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford, 1965), 8; Joan Simon, "The Reformation and English Education," *Past and Present*, no. 11 (1957): 57; Damian Riehl Leader, *The University to 1546, A History of the University of Cambridge*, v. 1 (Cambridge, 1988), 344.

<sup>2</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 2.

<sup>3</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 19; Hugh Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen* (Ithaca, NY, 1970), 15: "Essentially the universities were the educational organs of a vast ecclesiastical corporation, looking to the Papacy as its head." See also C. H. Lawrence, "The University in State and Church," in *The Early Oxford Schools*, ed. J. I. Catto, *The History of the University of Oxford*, v. 1 (Oxford, 1984), 97-150.

<sup>4</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 20-23.

<sup>5</sup>Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen*, 16, 20; S. C. Roberts, *British Universities* (London, 1947), 13. See also James A. Brundage, "The Cambridge Faculty of Canon Law and the Ecclesiastical Courts of Ely," in *Medieval Cambridge: Essays on the Pre-Reformation University*, ed. Patrick Zutshi, *The History of the University of Cambridge: Texts and Studies*, v. 2 (Woodbridge, Eng., 1993), 21-45.

<sup>6</sup>Sir David Oswald Hunter-Blair, "The Black Monks at Oxford University," *Dublin Review* 192 (1933): 19, 25; John Lawson, *Mediaeval Education and the Reformation* (London and New York, 1967), 59.

<sup>7</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 3. See also M. W. Sheehy, "The Religious Orders, 1370-1540," in *Late Medieval Oxford*, ed. J. I. Catto and Ralph Evans, *The History of the University of Oxford*, v. 2 (Oxford, 1992), 539-80.

<sup>8</sup>Dates are from *Dictionary of National Biography*; see also James Gairdner, *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1912), 65-66: Wolsey actually became Lord Chancellor on Christmas Eve, 1514 (if December 24 O.S., then same as January 3, 1515 N.S.).

<sup>9</sup>James Bass Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1873-1911), 1:542, 549, 571.

<sup>10</sup>Simon, "The Reformation and English Education," 55; Charles Edward Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford* (New York and London, 1968), 2:35

<sup>11</sup>Craig R. Thompson, *Universities in Tudor England* (Washington, DC, 1959), 6. The concept of Cromwell's initiative and Henry's acquiescence was stated by G. R. Elton in his *The Tudor Revolution in Government* (Cambridge, 1953) and defended, with modifications, in his *Thomas Cromwell* (Bangor, 1991), 21-22, 31-32; for contrary opinions, see G. W. Bernard, "Elton's Cromwell," *History* 83 (1998): 587-607 and *Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration*, ed. Christopher Coleman and David Starkey (Oxford and New York, 1986).

<sup>12</sup>H. C. Maxwell Lyte, *A History of the University of Oxford* (London and New York, 1886), 48. For Cromwell's appointment as "receiver-general and supervisor of the lands lately belonging to the Cardinal's colleges at Oxford and Ipswich" (1532), see *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII* (London, 1880-83), 5:337 (item 701).

<sup>13</sup>Lawrence K. Patterson, "The Reformation at Cambridge," *Catholic Historical Review*, n.s. 10 (1931): 52; Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 1:617ff.; see also H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1958), 49: implies a single act of the Senate.

<sup>14</sup>M. L. Clarke, *Classical Education in Britain, 1500-1900* (Cambridge, 1959), 32.

<sup>15</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 17.

<sup>16</sup>Mallet, *History of the University of Oxford*, 2:60; Patterson, "Reformation at Cambridge," 53; G. R. Elton, *Policy and Police* (Cambridge, 1972), 228; *Letters and Papers*, 7:238 (item 602), for Cambridge; 241 (item 617), for Oxford. For the stimulation of subscription by specially appointed proctors, see *Letters and Papers*, 7:224 (item 565).

<sup>17</sup>*Letters and Papers*, 7:400 (items 1026-27).

<sup>18</sup>Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 2:14-15.

<sup>19</sup>Patterson, "Reformation at Cambridge," 53.

<sup>20</sup>Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 2:1.

<sup>21</sup>Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 2:2 (quoting David Lloyd, *State Worthies*, London, 1766, 61).

<sup>22</sup>A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (New York, 1964), 120.

<sup>23</sup>Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 1:630; Mallet, *History of the University of Oxford*, 2:62, implying parallel injunctions for Oxford; but see Thompson, *Universities in Tudor England*, 23: "This scheme [lectures in Greek] does not seem to have been carried out at the time in more than a few colleges." See also F. Donald Logan, "The First Royal Visitations of the English Universities, 1535," *English Historical Review* 106 (1991): 861-88.

<sup>24</sup>Dickens, *English Reformation*, 131-32.

<sup>25</sup>Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 1:629; Lawson, *Mediaeval Education*, 97.

<sup>26</sup>Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 1:631. Another parallel to Wolsey's regime was the demand of Cromwell's heavy-handed deputy visitor, Dr. Thomas Leigh, that the universities hand over their charters to Cromwell, plus an inventory of moveable and immoveable property (2:9-10).

<sup>27</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 51.

<sup>28</sup>Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen*, 154-56.

<sup>29</sup>McConica, *English Humanists*, 160, 213-14.

<sup>30</sup>Lawson, *Mediaeval Education*, 96.

<sup>31</sup>Lawson, *Mediaeval Education*, 97.

<sup>32</sup>A. B. Emden, *An Oxford Hall*, 1; quoted by Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 36. See also J. N. D. Kelly, *St Edmund Hall: Almost Seven Hundred Years* (Oxford, 1989).

<sup>33</sup>For Oxford, see (e.g.), *Letters and Papers*, 5:575 (items 133-32; 6:10, 84, 119, 121, 162, 434, 673 (items 21, 183, 266, 274, 344, 1016, 1670); 7:241 (item 617). Cromwell seems to have used the town-gown conflicts as a means of increasing his authority over both; see Carl I. Hammer, Jr., "Oxford Town and Oxford University," in *The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica, *The History of the University of Oxford*, v. 3 (Oxford, 1986), 91.

<sup>34</sup>*Letters and Papers*, 5:337, 568, 603 (items 701, 1309, 1423); 6:183 (item 399).

<sup>35</sup>*Letters and Papers*, 6:162, 379 (items 344, 868).

<sup>36</sup>*Letters and Papers*, 5:684 (item 1647); 7:9, 37 (items 16, 98).

<sup>37</sup>*Letters and Papers*, 6:126 (item 290).

<sup>38</sup>Elton, *Policy and Police*, 98.

<sup>39</sup>Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 2:5.

<sup>40</sup>Elton, *Policy and Police*, 99.

<sup>41</sup>Susan Brigden, "Popular Disturbance and the Fall of Thomas Cromwell and the Reformers," *Historical Journal* 24 (1981): 257-78; Robert Hutchinson, *Thomas Cromwell: The Rise and Fall of Henry VIII's Most Notorious Minister* (New York, 2007), 258. A lengthy but readable account of the period is Derek Wilson's *In the Lion's Court: Power, Ambition and Sudden Death in the Court of Henry VIII* (London, 2001).

<sup>42</sup>Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, 50; Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen*, 21.

<sup>43</sup>Mallet, *History of the University of Oxford*, 2:63, f. 4.

<sup>44</sup>Mallet, *History of the University of Oxford*, 2:77-79. For a detailed study, see Alan Kreider, *English Chantries: The Road to Dissolution* (Cambridge, MA, 1979).

<sup>45</sup>Patterson, "Reformation at Cambridge," 53.

<sup>46</sup>Simon, "Reformation and English Education," 58.

<sup>47</sup>F. L. Cross, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (New York, 1957), 204, 1055.

<sup>48</sup>Clarke, *Classical Education*, 25; Mallet, *History of the University of Oxford*, 2:80: "Gardiner's authority failed to suppress [the new method]." An interesting study in contrasts is provided by Diarmaid MacCulloch, "Two Dons in Politics: Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner, 1503-1533," *Historical Journal* 37 (1994): 1-22.

<sup>49</sup>Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 2:21.

<sup>50</sup>See, e.g., Thompson, *Universities in Tudor England*, 6; Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 2:14-15; Patterson, "Reformation at Cambridge," 53.

<sup>51</sup>Roger Ascham, *English Works* (ed. W. A. Wright), 280-81; quoted by Simon, "Reformation and English Education," 60; Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, 2:152. See also Claire Cross, "Oxford and the Tudor State from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary," in McConica, *Collegiate University*, 117-50

<sup>52</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 25-26.

<sup>53</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 25. See also Penry Williams, "Elizabethan Oxford: State, Church and University," in McConica, *Collegiate University*, 397-440; also C. M. Dent, *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford, 1983). For a brief survey of the period, see Elisabeth Leedham-Green, "Cambridge under the Tudors, 1485-1603," in her *A Concise History of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1996), 29-65.

<sup>54</sup>Thompson, *Universities in Tudor England*, 10.

<sup>55</sup>Lawson, *Mediaeval Education*, 97-98.

<sup>56</sup>Lawson, *Mediaeval Education*, 104.

<sup>57</sup>Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen*, 28-29; Rosemary O'Day, "Room at the Top: Oxford and Cambridge in the Tudor and Stuart Age," *History Today* 34, no. 2 (February 1984): 31-38.

<sup>58</sup>Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen*, 33.

<sup>59</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 30-32.

<sup>60</sup>Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge*, 49-50. For the general context of the period, see Claire Cross, "Oxford and the Tudor State from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary" and Jennifer Loach, "Reformation Controversies," both in McConica, *Collegiate University*, 117-50 and 363-96, respectively.