

Oxford University in the Reign of Mary Tudor

**A Thesis submitted for examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Oxford**

Thomas Carpenter

Keble College

Abbreviations

<i>BRUO</i>	A.B. Emden, <i>A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford, A.D. 1501 to 1540</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974)
<i>CPR</i>	A.E. Stamp (ed.), <i>Calendar of Patent Rolls: Philip and Mary</i> (4 vols, London: Public Record Office 1936-1939)
<i>CRP</i>	Thomas F. Mayer (ed), <i>The Correspondence of Reginald Pole</i> (4 vols, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002)
<i>CSPS</i>	P. De Gayangos, G. Mattingly, M.A.S. Hume and R. Tyler (eds), <i>Calendar of State Papers: Spanish</i> (15 vols, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1862-1954)
<i>CSPV</i>	R. Brown, C. Bentick and H. Brown (eds), <i>Calendar of State Papers: Venetian</i> (9 vols, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1864-98)
<i>CyP</i>	J.I. Tellechea Idígoras (ed.), <i>Fray Bartolomé Carranza y el Cardenal Pole : un navarro en la restauración católica de Inglaterra (1554-1558)</i> (Pamplona : Diputación Foral de Navarra, Institución Príncipe de Viana, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1977)
<i>Foxe</i>	John Foxe, <i>The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online</i> or <i>TAMO</i> (1583 edition) (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). [http://www.johnfoxe.org , accessed January 2012-July 2013]
<i>HUO</i>	J.I. Catto (ed.), <i>The History of the University of Oxford</i> (9 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984-1994)

<i>L & P</i>	J.S. Brewer, R.S. Brodie and James Gardiner (eds), <i>Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII</i> (2 nd edition, 37 vols, London: Public Record Office, 1965)
<i>ODNB</i>	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> , Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn [http://www.oxforddnb.com , accessed September 2010-July 2013]
<i>Statuta</i>	Strickland Gibson (ed), <i>Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931)
<i>Wood</i>	Anthony Wood, <i>Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford; To Which Are Added the Fasti, or Annals of the Said University</i> (4 vols, London, 1813-1820)

Summary

This thesis addresses a significant, though largely unexplored, part of the Marian Counter-Reformation. Queen Mary and her ministers expected the University of Oxford's contribution to the success of their plans for the English Church to be decisive. From her letter to the University in August 1553, only weeks after her accession, in which she announced her intention of laying the foundations of her ecclesiastical policy in Oxford, the academy underwent a transformation. After decades of trauma which had left the University poor, empty and (literally, in some parts) crumbling, Mary's reign gave the University a purpose, something which had been difficult to discern since the Dissolution of the Monasteries had deprived it of a large proportion of its students and lecturers. Mary and, after November 1554, Reginald Cardinal Pole undertook an extensive programme designed to reform and restore the University, a programme which was willingly and tirelessly taken up by those sympathetic to it in the University. This had its theological, ecclesiastical, liturgical and architectural elements, each of which will be considered in this thesis. Its central claim is not just that the existing picture of Mary Tudor's Church is incomplete without the inclusion within it of the restoration of Catholicism in Oxford, but that it is in Oxford, and perhaps only there, that all the different elements of her religious policy can be seen for what they are: a consistent whole, conceived and executed with one purpose: the reintegration of the English Church into the universal Catholic body.

Introduction

The Historiographical Context

The historiographical context into which this thesis fits has two parts: one is the narrow section of writing about the history of the University in Mary's reign; the other is much broader, and has been formed by the changes in accounts of the English Reformation over the past quarter-century.

The first part, focussed on the University, has of course been formed in the light of the second, but a combination of the distinct loyalties of institutional historians, and the personalities of some of those who have studied Marian Oxford have prevented these accounts from being dominated by broader controversies. For example, Anthony Wood, the seventeenth century antiquary, was in the grip of a style that 'has', in the words of Graham Parry, 'the characteristics of the perpetual note-taker: dry, brusque, and factual. In addition, the censorious tone that often accompanies his personal memorials can give an acrimonious edge to his prose.' This, in combination with his idiosyncratic loyalty to the Church of England, makes him as fair a chronicler of University in the Reformation as one has a right to expect.¹ A century later, John Pechell, who leaves the reader in no doubt about the iniquities of Catholicism, was nevertheless prepared to acknowledge in his *History of the University* that the Queen 'viewed the University with a favourable countenance.'²

Turning to the twentieth century, this trend of more positive assessments of the effect of Mary's reign being made in relation to Oxford than in the context of national assessments continues. For

¹ Graham Parry, 'Wood, Anthony (1632–1695)', *ODNB*.

² John Pechell, *The history of the University of Oxford, from the death of William the Conqueror, to the demise of Queen Elizabeth* (Oxford: W. Jackson & J. Lister, 1773), p. 209.

example, I.G. Philip drew attention in 1955 to the 'ruinous' state of the Schools before Mary's benefaction to Oxford.³

More recent studies of Oxford in the period, undertaken by scholars who were not writing such institutional histories, are fairly easy to situate in the context of the historiography current as they wrote. Elizabeth Russell's 1985 article 'Marian Oxford and the Counter-Reformation' made a positive assessment of Marian Oxford, concluding that it was the success of the regime's policy towards it that meant 'men trained at Oxford under Mary were a continual threat to the stability and security of the Elizabethan settlement.'⁴ In this summary she reflects the shift that took place in the 1980s towards a more positive assessment of the Queen's reign, at this stage largely because of the work of Jennifer Loach.⁵ Claire Cross's article, 'Oxford and the Tudor State' appeared a year after Russell's. In it the impact of an emerging new approach to Mary's reign can be seen as she concludes that 'by 1558 Oxford had been re-established as a catholic university' helped by the fact that 'protestants indeed formed a very small minority.'⁶ In 1996 this more positive assessment was echoed by James McConia, who wrote that 'for the University as a whole the reign of Mary Tudor was restorative.'⁷

³ I.G. Philip, 'Queen Mary Tudor's Benefaction to the University', *The Bodleian Library Record* 5 (1954), p. 31.

⁴ Elizabeth Russell, 'Marian Oxford and the Counter-Reformation', in C.M. Barron and C. Harper-Bill (eds), *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society. Essays in Honour of F.R.H. Du Boulay* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1985), pp. 212-29, at p. 228.

⁵ For example, Jennifer Loach, 'Conservatism and Consent in Parliament, 1547-59', in Jennifer Loach and Robert Tittler (eds), *The Mid Tudor Polity* (London: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 9-28.

⁶ Claire Cross, 'Oxford and the Tudor State from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary' in *HUO*, III, pp. 117-150, at pp. 148, 144.

⁷ James McConia, 'The Catholic Experience in Tudor Oxford' in Thomas M. McCoog (ed.), *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the early English Jesuits* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1996), pp. 29-64 at p. 48.

Another, more recent, study of the Marian University appears in a volume devoted to the career of Bartolomé Carranza in England. In 'Carranza and the English Universities' Andrew Hegarty relates the significance of the universities to the Marian project and, although I have questions about the extent of Carranza's direct involvement in affairs at Oxford, Hegarty's essay is an important example of the recent broadening of Marian studies to include the important, but neglected, Spanish influences.⁸

Diarmaid MacCulloch has described the last fifty years of English Reformation history as a quest to 'go to stages both greater and smaller' than that event was thought to have been played on.⁹ Recent writings on Marian Oxford, treating events within their institutional context, and exploring the question of continental influences, conform to MacCulloch's description.

But what of the second, larger, context? It is useful to consider this broader question because Elizabeth Russell was the last historian to write solely on the whole of Marian Oxford. Cross has written of it and Cambridge together and Hegarty on one element of the Oxford scene. Since Lady Russell's 1985 article, the emergence of Revisionism has shifted perspectives significantly.¹⁰

⁸ Andrew Hegarty, 'Carranza and the English universities', in Ronald Truman and John Edwards (eds), *Reforming Catholicism in the England of Mary Tudor: the Achievement of Bartolomé Carranza* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006) pp. 153-172.

⁹ Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Changing perspectives on the English Reformation: the Last Fifty Years', *Studies in Church History* 49 (2013), pp. 282-302, at p. 298.

¹⁰ For accounts of the nature and impact of revisionism see Christopher Haigh, 'Recent Historiography of the English Reformation', in Christopher Haigh (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 19-33; Patrick Collinson, 'The English Reformation' in Michael Bentley (ed.), *The Companion to Historiography* (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 323-347; Ronald Hutton, 'Revisionism in Britain', in *ibid.*, pp. 377-394.

Mary's reign has only recently begun to attract monographs, that is to say, the major revisionist shift in our understanding of her reign was contained in works which treated the reformation as a whole: inevitably, Mary's reign was written about in this broader context.

In attempting to explain the revisionist movement in English Reformation studies, two quotations from a dominant influence on them are, I think, revealing. In 1955 Geoffrey Elton's *England under the Tudors* took a profoundly negative view of the Marian regime: 'positive achievements there were none', 'the decline of good government was accentuated by Mary's preference for a large council' and she lacked the 'Tudor secular temperament' and 'cool political sense.'¹¹ These are criticisms directed at the way in which Mary carried out her political agenda. Thirty years later, in *Reform and Reformation*, Elton was prepared to accept that 'the professionals in Mary's council...worked hard at improving it' and that Mary's administrators were 'quietly continuing' Tudor political reforms.'¹²

How can we explain the difference between these assessments? Perhaps we can see the influence of Elton's doctoral students who were the first of the revisionists of the English Reformation. Jennifer Loach had argued that the relationship between Crown and Parliament had been characterised not by discord but by productivity and unity of purpose.¹³ David Loades had done much to present a more positive take on the regime's administrative competence.¹⁴ Christopher Haigh had argued that the Henrician Reformation was not welcomed in large parts of the Kingdom,

¹¹ G.R. Elton, *England under the Tudors* (2nd edition, London: Methuen, 1974), pp. 214, 222.

¹² G.R. Elton, *Reform and Revolution: England 1509-1558* (London: Arnold, 1988), pp. 389, 351.

¹³ Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

¹⁴ David Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor* (2nd edition, London: Heinemann, 1979).

and that Mary was more popular than has been assumed.¹⁵ Jack Scarisbrick crystallized the revisionist thesis in 1984: 'English men and women' he claimed 'did not want the Reformation.'¹⁶ And, in relation to Mary's reign: her task, and that of Cardinal Pole, was that 'the old order was to be put back as it used to be, exactly as possible.'¹⁷

Elton's students made new and significant claims about the popularity of the late Medieval Church, but not perhaps about the political process that brought about its end. Indeed, they buttress Elton's claims about the administrative sophistication of the Henrician government since it came to be seen as having dislodged not a crippled religious system, but a vital one. As he wrote in *England under the Tudors*, England was a nation which 'abhorred heresy and prided itself on its orthodoxy.'¹⁸ Duffy acknowledges his indebtedness to Elton's pupils in the preface to *Stripping of the Altars*, 'the assumptions' of a declining English Church before the Reformation 'have already been vigorously challenged by historians like Jack Scarisbrick and Christopher Haigh.'¹⁹

The effect of Revisionism in relation to the Marian Counter-Reformation has been concisely summarised in the Introduction to a collection of essays from 2005:

We no longer believe that the traditional Church was deeply and widely unpopular by 1547, or that significant numbers of people were simply waiting for Edward's council to sweep it away. Nor do we believe that Mary made herself so unpopular that the entire country greeted Elizabeth's accession with a huge sigh of relief. Measured against the upheavals and religious

¹⁵ Christopher Haigh, (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

¹⁶ J.J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 1.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

¹⁸ Elton, *England under the Tudors*, p. 110.

¹⁹ Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400 - c. 1580* (2nd edition, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), p. 6.

violence of Edward's reign, or the contradictions and uncertainties of religious policy in Elizabeth's early years, the Marian Church no longer looks straightforwardly ineffectual.²⁰

What is most noticeable about this is that the changes described are all, to one degree or another, about 'effectiveness': Catholicism was 'popular' not 'unpopular', Mary's Church was not 'ineffectual' and so on. What has not changed is historians' conceptions of what the Marian regime sought to accomplish. In other words, the assumed nature of the Queen and Cardinal's agenda has remained constant while the extent to which that agenda was successfully implemented and its popularity among the laity have been reversed.

At the turn of the millennium a new - ideological - front opened up in the debate about the Marian project. Lucy Wooding's *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* constituted a bold attempt to refute the assumptions upon which historians, both sympathetic and unsympathetic to the regime, had undertaken the altercation I have just described. In Wooding's estimation

the Marian Church has always been misunderstood. Attempts to place it within the context of late medieval Catholicism have been as unsuccessful as those who place it within a Counter-Reformation context and end up criticising it for a lack of post-Tridentine fervour. The Marian Church belonged to neither of these traditions...the ideology it propounded had its roots in Christian humanism, its view of the Church drew heavily on Henrician Catholicism, and its objectives were not so much reactionary as evangelical and reformist.²¹

Wooding's thesis, unsurprisingly, has not gone unchallenged. Leaving aside C.D.C. Armstrong's somewhat intemperate review of the book, the first historian to address the bearing of Wooding's argument on the assessment of Mary Tudor's Church was William Wizeman. In *The Theology and Spirituality of Mary Tudor's Church*, published in 2006, Wizeman deprecates the suggestion that the Marian Church represented a 'via media between the theologies of Cranmer and Fisher' and queries

²⁰ Eamon Duffy and David Loades (eds), *The Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. xiii.

²¹ Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 114-5.

whether a non-papal Catholicism is one which makes ‘as much sense as Lutheranism without justification by faith’ in an argument which re-states the Counter-Reformation credentials of the regime’s ecclesiastical policy.²²

The implications of Wooding’s thesis are addressed most succinctly by Professor Duffy in the concluding chapter of *Fires of Faith*:

Dr Lucy Wooding has argued that Marian Catholicism was founded on an essentially Henrician humanist framework, and that it had ‘no particular place for the papacy’, an institution that she thinks Marian Churchmen viewed as an administrative convenience rather than an article of faith. The harder, starker values of counter-reformation Catholicism would therefore be embraced by Elizabethan Catholics only when they had completed a painful transition away from the moderate and insular humanism that they had, to some extent, shared with their Protestant opponents...It has been the contention of this book, by contrast that the spirit of the counter-reformation was in fact alive and well in Marian England.²³

In this thesis, I try to address the question of what *kind* of Catholicism the Marian regime articulated. Only when its agenda is securely established can discussion move on to its success in implementing it. In this respect I suppose I am adopting something of the method of ‘post-revisionism’, which has since the late 1990s moved discussion about the Reformation away from the success or failure of particular regimes to the wider question of how England came to be transformed from a Catholic to a Protestant country. It began with Nicholas Tyacke’s introduction to the volume he edited in 1998, entitled *England’s Long Reformation*. Since it is interested in the gradual process of transformation in the entire period of the Reformation, and indeed, longer than that, Mary’s reign stands outside the post-revisionist focus.²⁴ Tyacke’s claim is encapsulated in this

²² C.D.C. Armstrong ‘English Catholicism Rethought?’ *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 54 (2003), pp. 414-428; William Wizeman, *The Theology and Spirituality of Mary Tudor’s Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 5-8.

²³ Eamon Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 189-90.

²⁴ Nicholas Tyacke, ‘Introduction: re-thinking the “English Reformation”’, in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *England’s Long Reformation, 1500-1800* (London: UCL Press, 1998), pp. 1- 32.

section of his introduction to his 2001 work *Aspects of English Protestantism*: ‘revisionists usually couch their accounts of the English Reformation in terms of the history of parliamentary legislation, yet this produces a very distorted picture... there is an underlying trajectory of evangelical activity from the 1520s and though into the 1550s.’²⁵ Writing about what she has called the ‘reformation of landscape’, Alexandra Walsham describes herself as ‘firmly embracing the model of a “long Reformation”’, the implication of this approach is the adoption of ‘a broad chronological framework.’²⁶

Perhaps because it is difficult to absorb a singular five-year project into a ‘broad chronological framework’ debate about the Marian Counter Reformation still takes place along revisionist lines. It is nevertheless valuable to consider it with an eye to this reaction against the perceived effect of revisionism in reducing the study of the English Reformation to the detection of the successes or failures of different monarchs and their ministers.

It is at this point that we arrive at the justification for this thesis being presented for examination in the Faculty of Theology. The ramifications of the matter here at stake cut to the heart of the theological study of the Church and in particular the question of the identity and legitimacy of the Church of England. What is encountered in Wooding’s argument - and why I think that argument is important - is an idea with precedents in the divergent reappraisals of the English Reformation which were provoked by the Oxford Movement. What has obscured this aspect of the Oxford Movement from view is that it claimed its authority not on the thought of the Reformers but instead on that of the Church Fathers, as Pusey made plain in 1840 when he wrote of ‘the Antique Church,

²⁵ Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), p. 41.

²⁶ Alexandra Walsham, *The Reformation of Landscape: Religion, Identity and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 10.

instead of the Reformers, as the ultimate expounder of the meaning of our Church.²⁷ The inevitable concomitant of this was that the Movement exhibited a certain squeamishness about engagement with the history of the English Reformation, an aversion it bequeathed, with not altogether happy results, to its successors.²⁸

At the fringes of the Movement, however, a different method was adopted, which found its fullest articulation in the work of Walter Farquhar Hook, sometime Vicar of Leeds and correspondent of Dr Pusey. In his massive *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, Hook seeks to locate the Marian Counter-Reformation within the context of English reforming thought. Cardinal Pole, although ‘in discipline a papist’ was theologically ‘thoroughly, though unconsciously, Protestant.’²⁹ Hook’s target in this characterisation is the idea that the papacy is an article of the Christian faith, rather than a merely administrative entity the usefulness of which is a matter of local circumstance. In diminishing the role of the papacy in the theology of the Marian Church, Hook draws it into the embrace of the Church of England. For him, as for Wooding in a later era, the Reformation was a common enterprise, the product of the labours of those who have posthumously (and, in his view, inaccurately) suffered alienation from each other on the basis that they were ‘Protestant’ or ‘Catholic’. Thus Hook could assert, against his own Protestant opponents, that ‘we do not rest on any Reformation carried out in the reign of Henry VIII or Edward VI’ but rather on a

²⁷ Quoted in Peter Benedict Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1766-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 127.

²⁸ Diarmaid MacCulloch, ‘The Myth of the English Reformation’, *Journal of British Studies* 30 (1991), pp. 1-19; Paul Avis, *Anglican Orders and the Priesting of Women* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1999), pp. 14-15.

²⁹ Walter Farquhar Hook, *The Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (12 vols, London: R. Bentley, 1861-1884) 3, pp. 157, 181.

settlement which, although finally made in 1662, preserved within itself Catholic and Protestant elements.³⁰

It is evident that those who have sought to assert the Catholicity of Anglicanism have a vested interest in the down-playing of the continuities between the Marian Church and the Counter-Reformation just as those who reject its Catholicity have a powerful motivation for emphasising them. At this point in the history of Christendom, when the question of the Catholicity of Anglicanism has returned to centre-stage in the aftermath of the erection of the Personal Ordinariates to accommodate Anglicans who have come to doubt that Catholicity, the implications of the theological and ecclesiological orientation of the Marian Church have attained a significance which is not, as I see it, fully apprehended even by those most nearly concerned in this re-alignment. Not for nothing does the first chapter of a recent, tolerably partisan, pamphlet on the subject begin with the claim that ‘the one holy Catholic Church must be Petrine if it is to be apostolic.’³¹

Answering the question ‘who owns the Church of Mary Tudor?’; in other words, whether its natural successor is found in those of the baptised in full communion with the See of Rome or the See of Canterbury, is not the task of this thesis. But that the question is posed by recent developments in the stance of Western Christendom toward Anglicanism, and indeed *vice versa*, and that the answer which is given must supply some corroboration in the religious history of England between 1553 and 1558 are the twin assumptions upon which the thesis is grounded and to which its argument is addressed.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 4, p. 144. For further examples of Hook’s thought on the canonicity for Anglicanism of the whole period of the Reformation see William Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Walter Farquhar Hook* (London: R. Bentley & Son, 1885), especially pp. 256, 275, 310, 582.

³¹ Aidan Nichols, *Catholics of the Anglican Patrimony: The Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2013), p. 1.

Sources

Elizabeth Russell began her article on Marian Oxford with the assertion that the

surviving evidence is more suggestive than conclusive...[t]he type of evidence which makes the story of religious conflict in the universities in the latter part of Elizabeth's reign so vivid simply does not exist. The period of large collections of private papers, personal recollections and reflections post-dates Mary's reign.

Russell's article uses three main sources: the Register of Congregation and Convocation; Anthony Wood's narrative of the academy's history; and central archives to piece together an outline of the Marian period in Oxford.³²

In this thesis I have used what Cerianne Law describes in her thesis as the 'four broad categories' of documents available to historians of the early modern university.³³ These categories include the records of the central government, those of the central University administration, those of the colleges and a more diverse collection of printed material and bibliographical registers.

The first category is represented in this thesis by such documents as the copy of the Queen's letter to the University when she first came to the throne, her 'Instructions' for those who would advise the Cardinal on his arrival, and domestic and diplomatic correspondence in which the disputations and trials of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley are referred to. In addition to these, manuscripts held in the National Archives and the British Library illustrate the determined and consistent interest which the Queen, her Cardinal and her ministers took in the University and the fashion in which they proposed to reform and restructure it.

³² Russell, 'Marian Oxford,' p. 227.

³³ Cerianne Law, *Religious Change in the University of Cambridge, c. 1547 - 84* (unpublished Phd Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2013), p. 32.

The second category is dominated by the Register of Congregation and Convocation with its record of promotions to degrees and copies of some of the correspondence between the regime and the University. But the central archives of the University also turn up copies of Cardinal Pole's articles of Inquiry, material relating to the Queen's benefaction to the University, the dispatch by which the University was officially reconciled to the Catholic Church under Cardinal Pole's auspices in 1555 and the Register of the Chancellor's Court.

The third category of documents: those held in college archives, is the basis for much of the final section of the thesis, which discusses the foundations of Trinity and St John's and the liturgical changes effected in the college Chapels. The archives of Trinity contain a considerable amount of material relating to its founder, Sir Thomas Pope, from which I have tried to make deductions about his intentions for his foundation. From the archives of other colleges I have extracted evidence from accounts and entries in the college registers. These are of use in attempting to find out how the priorities of the regime and its agents in the University affected the lives led by those who studied there. This not confined to how they worshipped God, and with what, but also how they taught or were taught and how their lives were ordered.

Evidence from the fourth category has mainly been used to fill in the gaps left by the previous three. Anthony Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*, which contains two volumes of narrative history of the University figures prominently in this.³⁴ Since Wood wrote only a century or so after the events of Mary's reign and includes in his narrative of events, like the 1556 visitation, details that are not in the surviving sources, we can assume he had access to such that are not in the archives, probably since some would have been oral. Also in this category of evidence is John Mere's narrative of the

³⁴ Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford; To Which Are Added the Fasti, or Annals of the Said University* (4 volumes; London, 1813-1820).

visitation of Cambridge, a crucial resource since there is no equivalent for that which took place at Oxford. Also in this category is the volume of Emden's *Biographical Register* that covers the early part of the sixteenth century.³⁵ This has provided a quick way of establishing the earlier Oxford careers of some of its key figures in the Marian period.

This division of the categories of evidence is of course artificial and is not intended to suggest that each category is the only, or even the most important, source for the institution from whose archives it comes. For example, documents that contain important evidence of the regime's attitude to the whole University turn up in college archives, and some very specific references to the internal affairs of colleges are found in central administrative sources. It is also to be remembered that the University's constituent institutions held overlapping functions, for example in the area of discipline, and so more general indications of levels of misbehaviour can be found in college archives and very specific complaints about individual scholars in the archives of the University.

³⁵ A.B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford, A.D. 1501 to 1540* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974).

Chapter 1: The University in Context

On 20 August 1553, just over a month since the successful assertion of her right to the throne, Queen Mary wrote ‘to the hole universitie of Oxford.’ Her letter began by lamenting the state in which the University found itself: beset during the previous two reigns with ‘divers...mysorders brought in and set forth’, of which

one of the greatyst and the occasion of manye of the said mysorders is that withowt sufficient autoritie only upon the sensuall myndes and rasshe determynacions of a fewe, the statutes fundacions and ordinances of the whole universitie, the colledges and other places of students have been mucche altered, broken and almost utterlie subvertid.

Her objective was to reverse this drift towards academic anarchy:

Wee therefore knowing it our bounden dutie to almightie god, bi whose onlie goodnes we acknowledge ourselfe callyd and placid in the roiall estate of this realme, to travers by al the waies wee maye that his glorie and Hollye will being trulie declarid to all our subjects, he maye of all sorts in their severall vocations be reverentlie fearyd, servid and obaid, have thought good for a beginning to wishe that the examples hereof maye first beginne in our Universities, where yong mene and alsorts of students, joyning godly conversation with their studies in learning may after as well by ther doings, as by preachyng instruct and confirm the rest of our subiects both in the knowledge and feare of almightie god, in ther dewe obedience towards us, our laws and all other there superiors, and in their charitable demainor towards all men.¹

To understand the assumptions that lay behind the Queen’s stance towards the University and why it was a preoccupation in the exercise of her ‘roiall estate’ from the outset, it is necessary to account for the changes which had occurred in the University in the reigns of her brother and father, in which the ‘mysorders’ she identified had been suffered to take hold.

In the estimation of Anthony Wood, writing only a century or so after the events he describes, the reigns of Henry and Edward had had a deleterious effect on Oxford. Of all these vicissitudes,

¹BL Add. MSS 32, 091, f. 145. See also Elizabeth Russell, ‘Marian Oxford and the Counter-Reformation’, pp. 214-229; R.H. Pogson, ‘Reginald Pole and the Priorities of Government in Mary Tudor’s Church’, *Historical Journal* 18 (1975), 3-20 at p.14.

the most dramatic was ‘the dissolution of Religious Houses’ which ‘did so much to discourage Scholars, that fearing the utter ruin of learning betook themselves to other employments.’²

The loss of the Religious Houses

Indeed, the most significant and yet most easily overlooked change to have come upon the University since Henry VIII’s reign was this loss of its Religious element. In the period before the dissolution of the monasteries the Universities and the Religious Orders were mutually dependent. For the Orders, and in particular for the mendicant Friars, a studium in Oxford constituted an assertion of credibility. Of Pope Benedict XII’s reforming legislation (1335-9) one of the most important planks was the requirement for Benedictines, Cistercians and Augustinian Canons to establish a presence in the universities. Among the Religious Orders in England prior to the Reformation only the Carmelites and the Canons of St Gilbert of Sempringham had their main studium outside Oxford, in London and Cambridge respectively; for the rest, their principal house of study was at Oxford.

At Cambridge, the religious life was a much less prominent contributor to life of the University. The solitary Benedictine house of studies, which later became Buckingham College, was established only in 1428 and did not even have an exclusive claim on the loyalties of that order in East Anglia, as the papal provision in 1481 for the monks of Norwich Cathedral Priory to be sent to live in Gonville and Trinity Halls suggests. Gonville also served as a domicile to those of the Austin Canons who were sent to Cambridge, where the Augustinians rented an *honesta camera* for their use. The Franciscan presence in the University is for the most part accounted for by the potential audience supplied there for their preaching, rather than the educational opportunities it offered the

² *Wood*, 2, pt 1, p.80.

Friars and, although their main task was contemplative, the contact of the Carmelites at Newnham with Cambridge was it seems rather for the benefit of the latter than the former.³ As James McConia has written, 'it is just conceivable that the dissolution of the religious houses in Oxford may have left lingering resentments more deep-seated than those at Cambridge.'⁴

Quite how significant the establishment of such a house of study was to the orders is glimpsed in the repeated efforts made by the Cistercians to erect one in Oxford. The initial attempt was made in 1280 when Rewley Abbey was established as a studium, but the Abbey failed to establish itself as an educational centre. It was not until 1400 that there were enough Cistercian students in the city itself for a renewed attempt to be made. These men were living on Trillock's Hill, now New Inn Hall, and in 1411 the Bishop of Lincoln gave license for divine services to be celebrated there for a period of five years. In 1437 an appeal was made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Henry Chichele, to establish a studium, for which purpose were acquired a series of properties, later to become the Cistercian St. Bernard's College, with William Bramley of Fountains Abbey as Principal. This college entered into its most grandiose phase under the abbacy of Marmaduke Huby of Fountains between 1484 and 1526, with the result that by 1540 there were sixty-seven Cistercian students in Oxford.

The motive for this Cistercian campaign might well have lain in the ample provision made by the Benedictines for their students at Oxford. Two large houses of black monks, Durham and Canterbury, had their own colleges but in addition, Gloucester College on Stockwell Street existed

³ Damian R. Leader, *The History of the University of Cambridge* (4 vols; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988-2004), 1, pp. 48-58; Patrick Zutshi, 'Introduction' in Patrick Zutshi (ed.), *Medieval Cambridge: Essays on the Pre-Reformation University* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993), pp. 1-6; H.C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1972), pp. 9-15.

⁴ McConia, 'The Catholic Experience in Tudor Oxford', p. 41.

to provide for the whole of the Order in England. That it fulfilled this role admirably is obvious from the statistic that forty major benedictine houses sent members to Gloucester on a regular basis from 1370 to the dissolution. This extensive provision in Oxford led to remarkably academically qualified Benedictine communities. Among the sixty-six monks who surrendered Durham Abbey to the King's visitors in 1539 there were five Doctors and nine Bachelors in addition to several of their brethren who had spent years of study in Oxford or were still engaged upon them. In 1440 Abbot Thomas Hooknorton of Osney left another definite stamp of Benedictine influence on Oxford in the construction of a two storied range of ten arts schools in Schools Street. As one historian has remarked of this phase in their history 'more significant [than anything else in the century after 1350 for the Black monks] was their emergence as a major scholarly presence in the university.'⁵

This disappearance from Oxford at the dissolution of Gloucester College, Durham College and Canterbury College for the Benedictines; S. Bernard's College for Cistercians; S. Frideswide's Priory and St Mary's College for Augustinian Canons; Greyfriars and Blackfriars for the Franciscans and Dominicans respectively surely constituted one of the most significant and concentrated deprivations effected by that event.

The changing role and significance of the colleges

The second momentous change to have come upon the University in the preceding decades was a steadier process, and a good deal more ambiguous in its effect. Wood records that by 1546 'learning' was 'very sensibly declining, the number of Scholars was very much decayed. Of

⁵ James G. Clark, *The Religious Orders in Pre-Reformation England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002), p. 4; R.B. Dobson, 'The Religious Orders 1370-1540' in *HUO*, I, pp. 581-633, at pp. 539-579; Stephen C. Ferrulo, *The Origins of the University: the Schools of Paris and their critics 1100-1215* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1985); W. A. Pantin, *Oxford Life in Oxford Archives* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1972), p. 35.

hundreds of halls that tradition and record tell us have been in this university, but eight now inhabited by students were remaining.⁶ In the medieval period, halls provided accommodation and financial support for what would today be called undergraduates, those young men who were present in Oxford some with the intention of acquiring a Mastership of Arts, others with less specific aspirations, who might stay for a few years before leaving without having supplicated for a degree. Colleges, on the other hand, were for the most part graduate communities where those who had already achieved a first degree would apply themselves to the 'higher' faculties of Law, Theology or Medicine. The foundation of Merton College in 1264 is an example of a stereotypical 'graduate' college.⁷

The drift towards the situation which was described by Wood as pertaining in the middle of the sixteenth century (when the halls had largely disappeared) began with the foundation of New College in 1379. Although it was not a fully-formed undergraduate college, William of Wykeham's statutes were the first to make provision within a college for undergraduates and this met a demand for continuous accommodation and provision for students who were judged capable of progressing from a first degree to the higher faculties. The teaching of the undergraduates who were to be accommodated in this manner was provided for by the 100 shillings which were set aside to pay fellows or scholars for teaching the younger members of the college. According to its statutes, scholars of New College were to be non-graduates, aged between fifteen and twenty, and to have been educated for at least one year at Wykeham's other foundation, Winchester College.

When Magdalen College was founded in 1458, the statutes of New College served as a model. Forty scholars were entirely supported by the foundation and were expected to be ordained to the

⁶ *Wood*, 2, pt 1, p. 80. These were: St. Edmund's Hall, St. Alban's Hall, New Inn Hall, Hart Hall, St Mary's Hall, White Hall, Broadgates Hall and Magdalen Hall.

⁷ A.B. Cobbam, 'Colleges and Halls 1380-1500', in *HUO*, II, pp. 586-629.

priesthood. The thirty other students were supported by half stipends, and consequently came to be known as ‘demies’, and would apply themselves to the study of Grammar, Logic and Sophistry.

Magdalen was the first college to provide for undergraduate commoners, and a change in the status of the commoner was thereby effected. Commoners were those students who were not maintained by the revenues of a college but by money from another source, either their family or a patron. Previously, colleges had acquired money from graduate commoners, lawyers or theologians who hired a room.⁸ By the time the colleges of Brasenose, Corpus Christi and Christ Church were founded in first half of the sixteenth century, what had at New and Magdalen been innovations had become the norm.

The contrivances for the institution known successively as Cardinal College (1525-1529), King Henry VIII College (1532-1545) and Christ Church (1546-) provide an illustration of the institutional reconfiguration we have been discussing. Wolsey’s original plan was for a self-contained community with 100 fellows (or canons), thirteen chaplains, twelve clerks, sixteen choristers, a teacher of music and (presumably) an extensive domestic staff. In addition, there were to be places for at most twenty undergraduate commoners. Sixty of the canons were to hold Bachelor of Arts degrees and to proceed during their canonries to the M.A. before joining one of the senior faculties. There were to be three professors in the higher faculties of Theology, Law and Music and four of the canons were to be the college lecturers in Sophistry, Logic, Philosophy and Humanity, which would contribute to the achievement of Wolsey’s ambition that his college be the first capable of teaching all the disciplines of the University. The creation of these lectureships attracted the admiration of the humanist scholar Erasmus, who wrote to the Cardinal in the following obsequious manner:

⁸ James McConica, ‘The Rise of the Undergraduate College’ in *HUO*, III, pp. 1-68.

The study of the humanities, hitherto somewhat fallen, is rebuilt; the liberal arts, still struggling with the champions of ancient ignorance, are supported by your encouragement, protected by your power, gilded in your reflected glory, and nourished by your magnificence, as you offer princely salaries to attract outstanding scholars of every kind, you rival Ptolemy Philadelphus himself, who owes his fame to this even more than his crown. The three ancient tongues, without which all learning is handicapped, are revived among us by you, for I regard the generous benefactions now offered to the famous university of Oxford a blessing to the whole of Britain...I see, I see a kind of golden age arising, if once that spirit of yours enters a certain number of princes.⁹

It might seem obvious to conclude from this that Wolsey's plans were conceived as a reaction against the scholastic method of the medieval University but, as Peter Gwyn argues with reference to the scholastic titles chosen for the three planned college lectureships and the fact that the new professor of theology was still to lecture on Duns Scotus, the Cardinal's blueprint had its conservative features.¹⁰

After Wolsey's fall in 1529, the new foundation of the King's College maintained this shape as a surviving draft of the Henrician statutes and the Edwardian statutes, approved by the King's visitors in 1549, conform to this model. A letter from John ab Ulmis in 1550 suggests that by this date many of the public disputations of the University had been relocated to the hall of Christ Church, a claim which is corroborated by Anthony Wood and which points to a rapid acquisition of importance by the college.¹¹

The development that was effected by housing the undergraduate community of the University in colleges, rather than halls, contributed to the increase in the status of the colleges to the

⁹ Quoted in Peter Gwyn, *The King's Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey* (London: Pimlico, 1990), p. 342.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 342. See also, Neville Williams, *The Cardinal and the Secretary* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1975), p. 102; John Newman, 'Cardinal Wolsey's collegiate foundations' in S.J. Gunn and P.G. Lindley (eds), *Cardinal Wolsey: Church, state and art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 103-115.

¹¹ McConica, 'The Rise', pp. 29-42; *Wood*, 2, pt 1, p. 113.

diminishment of that of the halls. Although the undergraduates were still required by the statutes to attend University lectures and disputations, the emergence of the colleges as teaching centres undermined the Regency system which had hitherto been the mainstay of University teaching. Under the Regency system, all new Masters or Doctors were obliged to teach in the University for a period of two years from their graduation, delivering university lectures. A.B. Cobban concludes that

The evolution of tutorial and lecturing facilities in the halls and colleges had made the undergraduate population less reliant upon the ordinary lectures of regent masters. As a result the regency system, which had been the core of University teaching from the inception of English Universities, gradually fell into abeyance.¹²

The increase of provision for teaching in the colleges and halls, and the decline of the regency system during the same period, is clearly suggestive of a causal relationship. It is not difficult to appreciate that college lectureships, for example those supplied by the foundation statutes of Magdalen, which were permanent, meant a higher standard of teaching was provided than that supplied for a period of two years by recent graduates under the regency system.

Of the three types of institution which served to make up the University - the central University, the colleges and the halls - the second was poised by the middle of the sixteenth century to take over entirely the functions of the first in teaching and the third in providing accommodation for undergraduates. We have already observed the decline in the number of halls in the city over the period, which had resulted, by the time of Queen Elizabeth's visitation in 1566, in over twice as many students resident in colleges than in halls. The decline of the University Schools was just as dramatic. Only two of the schools were used in 1540, and none at all by 1542. Instead, as Wood records, in Henry VIII's reign the common area between the schools 'and the east end of the

¹² A.B. Cobban, 'Colleges and Halls', p. 617.

Divinity School was in the same King's reign converted into a garden plot, and the schools themselves used by Glovers and Laundresses to dry their skins and linen in.'¹³

Constitutional changes

The rules determining the government of the University were not immune from the alterations which affected its constituent institutions during the sixteenth century, and in order to interpret those changes accurately it is necessary to account for the constitution it inherited from the medieval period. By 1350 the three assemblies which constituted the principal executive organs of the university until the start of the Tudor period were in fairly well defined existence. The Congregation of Regent and Non-Regent Masters was the oldest of the three, and had in its earliest form simply been called *Universitas*. This body had the right to determine matters relating to the University chests, payments, fines, what might loosely be called the curriculum and the peace of the University. In addition, the power to enact statutes and to elect the Chancellor lay with this body.

The 'Non-Regent' masters were those who had completed the period of their regency and thus ceased to lecture but still resided in the colleges and halls of the University, for example as 'pensioners', having vacated their fellowships without leaving their rooms. In the Congregation of Regents and Non-Regents a majority of the votes were held by the older, necessarily less active, senior members of the University. A separate congregation composed solely of regents came into existence around a century later, and swiftly annexed to itself those functions which had previously been the preserve of the latter body, such as the elections of the Chancellor, proctors, bedels, and other officials, the taking of administrative decisions and the oversight of the curriculum. Crucially, however, while the interpretation of statutes became the preserve of this new assembly the power to

¹³ *Wood*, 2, pt 2, pp. 762-3.

enact new ones remained the exclusive competence of its parent body. This is demonstrated in a comparison of the register entries for each body. Whilst the Congregation of Regents and Non-Regents ‘stated’ and ‘ordained’ the Congregation of Regents merely ‘ordained.’¹⁴

In addition to these congregations, another Congregation is likely to have existed, composed of the regents of the Faculty of Arts, called the Black Congregation. This assembly, unlike that of all the Regents of the University, was limited in its deliberations to the scrutiny of proposals which were to be brought before the Congregation of Regents and Non-Regents. The earliest reference to its performance of this function occurs in an ordinance of 1325.

By the end of the fourteenth century, the Congregation of Regents and Non-Regents had become known as ‘Convocation’ and that of Regents alone had acquired exclusive use of the name Congregation. A gradual encroachment of this latter institution is discernible in the fifteenth century. In a statute of 1427 the Congregation was given absolute control over the use of the University seal in the Vacation.

By the outset of the sixteenth century the emergence of the Congregation as the most powerful legislative body in the University is apparent from its acquisition of the right to use the verbs ‘to state’ and ‘to decide’, previously enjoyed only by Convocation, in place of the less authoritative ‘to ordain’.¹⁵

In 1534 the University’s opinion was sought by the Henrician regime on papal supremacy. The record of the proceedings is entitled ‘Articles proposed in the venerable congregation of Regent

¹⁴ *Statuterunt* and *Ordinaverunt*.²⁷

¹⁵ *Statutum et decretum est* or *statuit et decrevit*.

Masters to be transacted, discussed and determined in the greater congregation of Regent and non Regent Masters.’¹⁶ From this it is evident that Congregation had by this point appropriated to itself the right to determine the agenda to be set before Convocation in respect of matters in which the policy of the whole University was to be determined, and secondly that it had taken over the preparatory function which had in the earlier period been the preserve of the Congregation of Artists. So complete was its accretion of the functions of the Black Congregation that there is only one reference to the continued existence of the latter in the sixteenth century, which referred articles pertaining to the commemoration of Cardinal Wolsey in the University ‘to the black Congregation, then to the Congregation of all Faculties.’¹⁷ If by the ‘Congregation of all Faculties’ it denoted the Congregation of Regents (with which *Congregatio* had become synonymous by this period) then that Congregation, rather than Convocation, had by this point become the higher assembly, the agenda of which the Black Congregation was responsible for preparing.

Part of the reason for the decline into obsolescence of the Black Congregation was that its meeting place was in St. Mildred’s Church. St Mildred’s, situated on Turl Street, described as a chapel in 1142 at the time when its advowson was disputed,¹⁸ was suppressed and partly demolished in 1427 so that the newly-founded Lincoln College might be erected on the site. As the promulgation of the proposed legislation by the Black Congregation took place here, before the

¹⁶ *Articuli propositi in venerabili congregatione magistrorum regentium tractandi, discutiendi, et determinandi in maiore congregatione magistrorum tam non regentium quam regentium. Statuta*, pp. 335-37 at p. 335. I am grateful to Dr Gregory Klyne for his help with the Latin translations.

¹⁷ *ad congregationem quandam nigram, deinde Congregationem omnium facultatum. Statuta*, p xxxii.

¹⁸ *VCH Oxfordshire*, 4, p. 369-412; Charles Mallet, *History of the University of Oxford* (3 vols, London: Methuen, 1924-1927), 1, p. 177; Vivian Green, *The Commonwealth of Lincoln College 1427-1977* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 6-7.

meeting of the Congregation and Convocation in the University Church, it is easy to see how this stage of the process could be subsumed into the larger meeting.¹⁹

In contrast, the permanent seats of Congregation and Convocation were in the University Church: Congregation sat in the Congregation House and Convocation met in the choir. Attendances at the legislative bodies of the University in the medieval period have proved difficult to determine with any precision. A meeting of Congregation attended by sixty Regents is recorded in the Register for 1462, and an entry in the Merton College Register for 1492 records the presence of eighteen doctors and fifty Regents.²⁰ In the sixteenth century, attendance at Congregation declined markedly. In 1506, in twenty-two meetings of the Congregation, the average number of attendees was seven, from 1505 to 1544 the maximum number of Regents in attendance was twenty. However, attendances at Convocation remained fairly high, with seventy-three Regents and Non-Regents present at a meeting in 1576.²¹ The lower total of those attending Congregation is not irreconcilable with the evidence which suggests a burgeoning in its authority over the same period; on the contrary, a smaller body of enthusiastic legislators might be thought a more likely place for power to reside.

¹⁹ An account of the legislative process of Convocation at the end of the fifteenth century suggests that it was composed of three stages. First, the promulgation of the proposals at St Mildred's by the Black Congregation, then the meeting of the Masters in St Mary's where first the scrutators were elected, second the assembly divided into smaller groups, third the Bedels called the faculties to deliberate independently of each other, then the declarations of the decisions. The non-Regents operated together as a separate 'faculty'. Although at first the consent of all four faculties was required, in 1313-14, majority voting was introduced. The faculties of Theology and Canon Law claimed precedence, followed by that of Civil Law, with the Medics occupying the lowest place. Mallet, *History of the University*, 1, pp. 178-9. It seems probable that the meetings of the Congregation took place in the same manner but, necessarily, without the presence of the non-Regents.

²⁰ Mallet, *History of the University*, 1, p. 178; H.E. Salter (ed.), *Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), p. 155.

²¹ *Statuta*, p. xxxv.

Statutory changes

Given the extent of the changes which had occurred over the previous century, it was apparent by the early sixteenth century that the University statutes had reached a degree of superannuation which made reform inevitable. Wolsey had initially been approached, on the basis of his involvement in the affairs of the University, to produce a new set of statutes in 1518. After appointing a committee to be responsible for the revision in 1524, it was not until 1527 that Wolsey requested a copy of the University's statute book and the project fell with Wolsey in 1529. In 1545 a committee was appointed by Convocation, but it immediately disappears and there is no evidence of its having met or produced any work. It was not until 1549 that a new set of statutes was delivered to the University at the climax of the visitation of Edward VI. These were a provisional code, and in the preface refer to a committee 'which we have commanded in our name to consider the state of the academy of Oxford, and examine and weigh the laws, statutes and customs of our students in that place.'²² As a provisional code, their most significant effect was to suppress the ancient religious observances of the University. For example they limit the celebration of the holy communion to one at the start of each term. In its other provisions the Edwardian code places an obligation to the new class of college lecturers to perform their duties, and lays out the times when these are to be performed and the responsibilities of the officers of the University and the systems by which they are to be elected.²³ As there was no similar attempt to reform the statutes of the colleges, the suppression in the Edwardian code of the religious observances they required created an anomalous situation by which rites commanded by the foundations of the constituent institutions of the University were prohibited in those of the wider body. Although the universities were exempted from the Chantries Act of 1547, a large part of the work of the colleges was devoted to

²² *intueri, nostro nomine, Oxoniensis academiae statum iussimus, ac leges, statuta, mores nostrorum in illa scholasticorum inspicere ac perpendere. Ibid.*, pp. 341-2.

²³ *Statuta*, pp. 341-360. The statutes of the University are discussed further in Chapter 3.

the saying of mass for the repose of the souls of their founders and benefactors. At a number of colleges this duty continued to be discharged throughout Edward's reign, as, for example, at Lincoln where in 1549 'syngyne breed' and wine were acquired for 'the tyme we had masse.'²⁴ At Balliol, the requiem masses were euphemistically renamed 'gaudies' and continued to be held.²⁵

Religious change

By the mid 1530s, the shifts and decisions which were made inevitable by the assertion of the Royal Supremacy were confronting the University. The visitation of 1535 had as its principal objective the collection of the submissions of the University to the Royal Supremacy over the Church, but also a subsidiary purpose in furthering the campaign of Thomas Cromwell against traditional theology.

This subsidiary purpose contained both constructive and destructive aspects. In the case of the former, the visitors established lectures in Latin and Greek at all colleges able to support them.

Richard Layton,²⁶ Cromwell's notorious henchman and the chief visitor, reported that 'in Magdalen Colege we fownde stablisskede one lecture of divinitie two of philosophie one morale an other naturale ande one of Laten tonge...to thes we have adionede a lecture in the greke that is the grammer in greke perpetually to be rede there.' Similar work was done at other colleges: at 'New Colege' where 'we have stablisskede two lecturs publique one of greke an other in Laten', at All Souls, Queen's and Merton where, if a public lecture in either or both these languages did not exist, the visitors established them. Attendance at these public lectures was made compulsory for those poorer colleges whose foundations could not support such lectures.

²⁴ Green, *Commonwealth of Lincoln*, p. 89.

²⁵ Bod. MS Top. Oxon e. 124/9, f. 72.

²⁶ Peter Cunich, 'Layton, Richard (c.1498–1544)', *ODNB*.

Of the destructive aspect, the letter offers ample evidence. Layton related the result of the visitation to Cromwell on 12 September, describing how ‘we have sett dunce in bocardo and have utterly bannished hym [from] oxforde for ever withall his blinde glosses and is now made a comon survant to everie man, faste nailede up upon postes in all comon howses of easment.’ Later, ‘the seconde tyme we came to New colege after we had declarede your injunctions we fownde all the gret quadrant Court full of the leiffs of dunce the wynde blowing them into everie corner and ther we fownde one Mr Grenefelde a gentilman of buckynghamshire gethering up part of the saide bowke lieffs (as he saude) there to make hym sewells or blawnsherrs to kepe the dere within the wode there to have the better time with his howndes.’

The destruction of traditional aspects of the teaching of the University was not confined to scholastic texts, an equally significant task for the visitors was the suppression of the teaching of Canon Law. Layton reported that ‘we have also in place of the canon lectyre fowede a civel lectyre to be rede in everie Colege hale.’ In a further attempt to suppress ancient institutions, religious students were banned from setting foot in the houses of the town, with a further stipulation that Layton relates with the tiresome innuendo that it is much lamented ‘specially of their Laundes that now may note ouse [use] entrie within the gaitt much less within their chambers wereunto they were ryghtwell accustomed I doubt not.’²⁷

In colleges where reformist ideas were in the ascendent the work of the visitors was welcomed. On 9 September 1535 the fellows of Magdalen wrote to Cromwell to asseverate their gratitude to him for the reformation of their studies:

Whereas beforetyme our youthe hath bene browght uppe very corruptlie and led in ignoraunce for the lacke of the greke tonge and have had moreover their principles of Logike so blindelie and in such

²⁷ BL, Cotton MS Faustina C/VII, ff. 210-211. *L&P*, 9, no. 350.

confusion taught them that nother they cowld tell where abowght they went when they learnid it nor what profitt they had gotten by it after their long continuance in itt to their grete losse of tyme and utter hinderaunce in all things that they were sett to besides.

The letter goes on to assure Cromwell that he

will see they shall in a few yeris this towne that before tyme hath bene reiected and that worthilie as the place that hath mayntained no learning nor profited litle to the publick weale of the Realme shall bringe forthe those that shall be able to do that service to the uttermost both in private matters of their prince and in common affayres of the commonalitie besides.

Hearing that the visitors had at some colleges found it necessary to suspend some of the statutes in order to facilitate the suppression of scholasticism and the erection of lectures in Latin and Greek, the fellows plead with Cromwell 'not to give eare to the sinistrall information of such as we think shall be sent to you in this behalf.' The statutes of Magdalen, they assure him, are in need of no such amendment providing as they do for 'a lectur of greke to be rede by the companie as the abolishment of their sophistrie duns and such like stuffe yow so appoynting who knoweth what ye do in this thinge better then the contrarye that would stop it.' If in other colleges this exchange of Duns for Greek and Latin does not take place, they warn, then the benefits of Cromwell's visitation will not be felt. In this part of the letter there is a certain amount of self-service. As a college, indeed the first, which provided from among its fellows for public lecturers whose disquisitions were intended to be heard by students of the entire University, Magdalen's prestige would be enhanced by compulsory attendance at lectures there in Greek, and they entreat with Cromwell for the provision of a stipend for such a lecturer.²⁸ In this scheme the visitors, as we have seen from Layton's letter to Cromwell, acquiesced.

John Tregonwell, who, with Layton, had been responsible for the conduct of the visitation wrote to Cromwell on the same day as Layton informing him that 'Mr doctor Leyton will bryng unto you all the professions of Oxforde, from the bodye of the universiye under ther seall. And from every

²⁸ SP, 1/96, ff. 104-104v; *L&P*, 9, no. 312.

college...undre ther collegial seall.²⁹ These were the declarations by the heads of house and, in the case of the former, the fellows of these institution which submitted them to the royal supremacy. That of Corpus Christi College, dated in 9 September 1535, is typical. It announces that the President and fellows will henceforth refuse obedience to any foreign prince or give support to any attempt to reinstatement of the papal supremacy, but will draw the attention of the King any communications from the ‘bishop of Rome.’³⁰

Scholasticism, Humanism and Protestantism

The changes to which the University was subjected in the sixteenth century were not simply confined to, or indeed eclipsed by, those religious alterations brought about by the reformations of Henry VIII and Edward VI. The growth in number and changing role of the colleges and the developments consequent upon this: the diminishment of the halls, the decline of the regency system, the reconfiguration of the government of the University and the demand for a new code of statutes in the light of these mutations: all these preceded the break with Rome and could plausibly have be expected to occur without the incursion onto the scene of the Reformation.

Nevertheless, evangelical theology had made its present felt in Oxford by the time the Break with Rome came. On 8 March 1521 William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of the University, wrote to Wolsey regretting the ‘infection’ of the University by Lutheranism. Although the reformers were only a small number of ‘incircumspect fools’ it was to be lamented that they threatened the reputation of Oxford as void of heretical teaching. On behalf of the University he went on to request from the Bishop of Rochester (John Fisher) a list of Lutheran

²⁹ SP, 1/96, f. 138.

³⁰ *L&P*, 9, no. 306; BL Lansdowne MS 989, f. 134.

writers whose works were to be avoided.³¹ The capacity of the University authorities to defend its doctrinal integrity against the threat of reforming doctrine was put to an even sterner test in 1528 when Thomas Garrett, curate of All Hallows, Honey Lane, had used a visit to Oxford at Easter, on the pretext of studying to improve his Hebrew and Greek, to disseminate among a Protestant coterie gathered around John Clarke, a canon of Cardinal College, a number of seditious texts.³²

Before attempting to discuss the effect of state-sponsored Protestantism on Oxford in the reigns of Henry and especially Edward, it will be useful to identify and account for the particular role played by Universities in the ideas and priorities of the reformers.

Lewis Spitz, in an article on the universities as the culture which spawned the Reformation, writes that ‘the magisterial Reformation was a university movement in its inception and early development.’³³ The system of University teaching and the theological content and implications of that teaching were, Spitz argues, its essential provocation. Luther himself furnishes us with the most succinct summary of what he was reacting against and why the scholastic teaching of the University was responsible for most of it:

Everything the papacy has instituted and ordered serves only to increase sin and error. What else are universities, unless they are utterly changed from what they have been hitherto, than what the book of Maccabees calls *gymnasia ephedorum et graecae gloriae*? What are they but places where loose living is practiced, where little is taught of the holy scriptures and Christian faith, and where only the blind, heather teacher, Aristotle, means more than Christ? In this regard my advice would be that Aristotle’s *Physics, Metaphysics, Concerning the Soul and Ethics*, which hitherto have been thought to be his best

³¹ *L&P*, 3, pt 1, no. 1193.

³² They included such important early Lutheran and non-Lutheran reforming texts as *Farragines Lutheri, Pomeranum [Bugenhagen] super Epistolas Pauli, Lambert de Vocatione, Enchiridion Precationum, Hegendorfius in Lucam and Super Epistolam Petri ad Hebraeos, Pomeranum super Deuteronomia and Uniones Dissidentium*. *L&P*, 4, pt 2, no. 3968.

³³ Lewis Spitz, ‘The Importance of the Reformation for the University’ in James M. Kittelson and Pamela J Transue (eds), *Rebirth, Reform and Resilience: Universities in Transition 1300-1700* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984), pp. 42-65, at p. 46.

books, should be completely discarded along with all the rest of his books that boast about nature, although nothing can be learned from them about either nature or the Spirit...I dare say that any potter has more knowledge of nature than is written in these books. It grieves me to the quick that this damned conceited, rascally heathen has deluded and made fools of so many of the best Christians with his misleading writings. God has sent him as a plague upon us on account of our sins.³⁴

It is difficult, writing from the perspective of an age in which the authorities used in the academy are so numerous and methodologies likewise so varied, to convey satisfactorily the sway held by Aristotle over the teaching of arts in the medieval universities. His works and commentaries upon them constituted the reading matter with which the study of philosophy was concerned. In Natural Philosophy, lectures on the first and second books of the *De Anima*, the first, second and third books of the *Meteora*, books one to four of the *De celo et mundo* and other works of Aristotle were the most frequently prescribed for students studying for the M.A.³⁵ The introductory manual *Libellus sophistarum ad usum Oxoniensium* which was published in England between 1497 and 1530 for the use of those engaged in study for the M.A. provided them, with the aid of four diagrams in addition to the text, with a basic introduction to the Aristotelian system. Studies in Moral Philosophy continued to be divided, as Aristotle himself had divided them, into ethics, politics and economics. In the study of Metaphysics, Aristotle's work of the same title provided the basis for the scholars' exertions.

Beyond these observations, it is difficult to talk with precision about the curriculum followed by students in this period. Even concerning the following century there is a debate about the nature of the it. Mordechai Feingold, writing about the University in the 1600s, claims that the 'most perverse misconception' about the course of studies in that century 'is that it survived and flourished as a relic of medieval scholasticism.' Whatever deductions are made below about a revival of

³⁴ Luther, *Leges collegii facultatis liberalium artium, quas philosophia continet* (1545), translated from the Latin in Sachiko Kusukawa, 'Law and Gospel: the importance of Philosophy at Reformation Wittenberg', *Journal of the History of Universities* 11 (1992), pp. 33-57 at p. 33.

³⁵ Examples taken from W.A. Pantin and W.T. Mitchell (eds), *The Register of Congregation and Convocation: 1448-1463* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), pp. 76, 183, 247-9.

scholasticism in Marian Oxford, it must be bourn in mind that this revival was, according Feingold's detailed analysis, defunct by end of its Elizabethan successor.

One cause of the uncertainty about the curriculum in mid-Tudor Oxford, and indeed of that concerning the seventeenth century University, is that the statutes do not supply us with the kind of information we would expect. As James McConia has observed 'the "statutory curriculum" of the Tudor University is in many ways a very hypothetical concept.'³⁶ For J. M. Fletcher writing about the Faculty of Arts

a comparative examination of the northern faculties of arts in this century shows clearly the significant feature of the history of the Oxford Faculty: the complete absence of any serious attempt to modify its structure or curriculum by radical statutory change.³⁷

Why should this be so? One possibility is that the way of studying practiced at Oxford placed an unusual emphasis on that which was conducted privately by the student. Feingold identifies 'the prevailing idea of scholarship' in Oxford as containing

certain presuppositions concerning the proper means of acquiring learning. One such assumption was that beyond the introductory level the acquisition of learning was accomplished not so much by passive attendance at lectures as by private industry on the part of students.³⁸

This would certainly explain the taciturnity of the statutes on the subject of the curriculum. It has another effect on research into the Tudor University too. If a significant part of students' academic work was undertaken privately, then the books provided for this assume a new significance in the attempt to work out what those studies were. In the the third and the fourth chapter of this thesis books: the suppression of heretical ones and the provision of orthodox works, are seen to have

³⁶ James McConia, 'Studies and Faculties' in *HUO*, III, pp. 151-56 at p. 152.

³⁷ J. M. Fletcher, 'The Faculty of Arts' in *Ibid.*, pp. 157-200 at p. 159.

³⁸ Mordechai Feingold, 'The Humanities' in *HUO*, IV, pp. 211-357 at 226-27.

occupied the attention of the regime, colleges and benefactors to the University. Perhaps this is because the University provided an unusually free environment for students to undertake unsupervised reading.

It is no accident that one of the principal pedagogical devices of the scholastic method should be the disputation. In the registers of Merton College, there is a record of some of the questions which were posed in the disputations for bachelors, for example in ethics, ‘whether happiness consists in works of virtue’, ‘whether happiness consists in an act of the will or in an act of the intellect’ and ‘whether the contemplative life is preferable to the active.’ In Natural Philosophy and Metaphysics, the debt to Aristotle is equally evident in questions like ‘whether the intellect, united to the body, understands the universal before the singular’, ‘whether being and essence are really the same’ and ‘whether the substantial forms of elements remain formally in mixtures’.³⁹

The texts from which lectures were delivered were rarely the actual works of Aristotle himself. As Damian Riehl Leader, in a study of the teaching of Philosophy in medieval England, remarks, ‘students approached the subjects through textbooks organised into *questiones* that were adapted from and useful for disputation in the schools.’⁴⁰ Such textbooks of special popularity in the medieval University were those of Joannes Canonicus, Master of Arts at Toulouse, *Quaestiones super VIII libros physicorum*, and Duns Scotus’ pupil Antonius Andreas’s *Quaestiones super XII libros metaphisicae*.

³⁹ John M. Fletcher (ed.), *Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis 1521-1567* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), pp. 253, 259, 264, 270.

⁴⁰ Damian Riehl Leader, ‘Philosophy at Oxford and Cambridge in the fifteenth century’, *Journal of the History of Universities* 6 (1984), pp. 25-46 at p. 26.

In pursuit of the M.A. the scholars of the medieval University would have had to adapt themselves to an intellectual culture in which Aristotle was the remote God, Scotus, Aquinas and other worthy scholars his angels and the compilers of the *Questiones* his evangelists. The Church of this religion was the room in which its central ritual act, the disputation, with its dialectic approach to the analysis of propositions, took place.⁴¹

This way of going about study was especially appropriate for the teaching in the higher faculty of Theology. Here we see, in works like the sentences of Peter Lombard⁴² and the *Summae* of Thomas Aquinas the same dialectical method set to work in the ‘employment of the human reason in penetrating and explaining the truths of revelation, the supernatural truths of religion.’⁴³

In the early medieval period, those wishing to read for the BTh were obliged to spend seven years in residence. The first at least was spent hearing lectures from the Bachelors on the *Sentences*, then two years on the Bible, four more years of compulsory residence before their two years of

⁴¹ For Aristotle’s influence on the Renaissance, with particular reference to the Universities, see Kusakawa, ‘Law and Gospel’, p. 33-38; Charles B. Schmitt, *Aristotle and the Renaissance* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 1983), especially chapters 1 and 2; see also Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1974).

⁴² Peter Lombard (c. 1100-1160), of interest in this context for his *Sentences* (*Sententiarum libri quatuor*) which had become a basic text for theological education. Their suitability for this task was presumably a result both of its heavy dependence upon, and extensive quotations from, SS Augustine, Hilary and John of Damascus and its comprehensiveness can be appreciated from its organisation into four books dealing with The Trinity, Creation and the Fall, the Incarnation and the Virtues and the Sacraments and the four Last Things. However, during the fourteenth century the structure of the *Sentences* was almost universally amended by commentators upon him, who reduced the numbers of questions posed and treated them more fully, eventually abandoning the very fourfold structure of the *Sentences* which were probably the cause of its usefulness as a pedagogical text. See W.J. Courtenay, ‘Theology and Theologians from Ockham to Wycliffe’ in *HUO*, II, pp. 2-33, at pp. 5-6.

⁴³ David Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (London: Longmans, 1962), p. 88.

regency.⁴⁴ During the course of the fourteenth century the lectures on the *Sentences* were reduced in duration, taking up only three out of the four terms which went to make up the academic year. Progression from the BTh to the DTh was dependent on four more years of residence during which they would read the lectures they themselves had heard when reading for the BTh, attend disputations and preach in the University Church. The attack upon the material of scholastic study in the University by the Henrician visitors explored above was completed by the simultaneous removal from the statutes of references to work of Lombard and Scotus.⁴⁵

The positive corollary of the Protestant case against the scholastic ideal of a University is glimpsed in John Foxe's description of the town of Hadleigh in Essex during the Reformation. Foxe records that

a great number of that parish became exceeding wel learned in the holye scriptures, as well women as men: so that a man might have found among them many that had often read the whole Bible through...*The whole towne seemed rather a Universitie of the learned.*⁴⁶

The rhetorical aim of the passage is self-evident but it does hint at a distinctive role in the estimation of the reformers for theological education. A classic example of this division between Protestant thought and its opponents is found in Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*:

You find so little satisfaction in assertion that you would readily take up the Sceptic's position wherever the inviolable authority of Holy Scripture and the Church's decisions permit; though you gladly submit your judgement to these authorities in all that they lay down, whether you follow it or not...To take no pleasure in assertions is not the mark of a Christian heart; indeed one must delight in assertions to be a Christian at all.

⁴⁴ Those who were not MAs but wished to be incepted for the BTh were obliged to be resident and studying the arts for eight years and theology for nine. However, the residency requirement was not rigorously applied and many religious who were incepted did not fulfill them.

⁴⁵ *Statuta*, p. 50.

⁴⁶ *Foxe*, p. 1518, my emphasis.

‘What’, Luther goes on to ask rhetorically ‘can the Church settle that Scripture did not settle first?’ The justification for this emphatic affirmation of the importance of ‘assertions’ is found in the idea that

God and his Scriptures are two things; just as the Creator and his Creation are two things. Now, nobody questions that there is a great deal hid in God...[b]ut the notion that in Scripture some things are recondite and all is not plain was spread by Godless Sophists.⁴⁷

For the Reformers by its very nature Revelation is patient only of acceptance or rejection, not of dispute because it is the communication of God and that is of a qualitatively different kind to human discourse. For scholastic theologians, theological inquiry is possible because God has revealed things which are in principle discoverable by the employment of human reason. For the Reformers Revelation is the incursion into the world of something utterly alien which, if capable of elucidation, would cease to be Revelation at all.

Just how distinctive was this approach of the Reformers? Luther’s *De Servo Arbitrio* was written in opposition to Erasmus of Rotterdam, the most significant humanist of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, who numbered Thomas More and John Fisher, to say nothing of King Henry VIII, among his disciples. At this point, it will be useful to consider the ideas of humanists concerning theological education in order to make clear the intellectual context in which reforms to the University in the sixteenth century took place.

Maria Dowling, at the outset of her monograph on the humanist movement in England establishes that

humanism may be defined as the reappraisal of religious and secular thinking through examination of the literary bases of theology and philosophy: that is the Christian scriptural and patristic writings and the ‘acceptable’ pagan classics. Such a return to fundamentals necessitated the establishment of critical and authoritative tests, which in turn called for a developed knowledge of the classical and biblical tongues,

⁴⁷ Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will (De Servo Arbitrio)*, translated J.I. Packer and O.R. Johnson (London: James Clarke, 1957), pp. 66, 71.

Hebrew, Greek and Latin. From these primary concerns arose a number of auxiliary disciplines: concern with linguistic accuracy and the purification of Latin; translation of the texts into the vernacular for the benefit of laymen; and admiration for and imitation of the oratory and literary style of the ancient Greeks and Romans.⁴⁸

From this definition it is possible to perceive the continuities of approach between the humanist and Protestant positions. Mary Tudor's own education had been placed by Queen Catherine in the hands of Juan Luis Vives, a Spanish humanist according to whose tracts *The Instruction of the Christian Woman* and *The Plan of Studies for Girls* the Princess was schooled after 1523.⁴⁹ In his *On the Cause of the Corruption of the Arts* Vives laments the scholastic education of 'schoolboys' who

fell to asserting them [scholastic 'opinions'], with no knowledge of language, or books, or learning, instructed in 'cases' as subjects on which to talk nonsense... 'Every *a* is possibly *b*, and yet no *b* possibly is *a*' - things of that sort. And so we have countless doctrines and many dialectics: here that of Paul of Venice, there that of Heytesbury, elsewhere Peter of Mantua, Scotus, Thomas, Albert, Ockham, Pardi, Dullaert and this, forsooth, not in the part that deals with finding out probability or the judgement of argumentation, which one could tolerate, but in the knowledge and exposition and use of Latin speech, which is always the same and uncomplicated. And yet, though their inventions are so bizzare, they wonder that others do not understand...' ⁵⁰

Sir Thomas More, whose opposition to the royal supremacy endured to the scaffold in 1535, wrote a letter to the whole University of Oxford on 29 March 1519, in which he laid out the grievances nursed by the humanists toward the pedagogical reactionaries he suspected of poisoning the minds of students against the shibboleths of the new learning. More, staying in Abingdon after a

⁴⁸ Maria Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (London; Sydney; Dover, New Hampshire: Croom Helm, 1986), p.1.

⁴⁹ F. Watson, *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women* (London: Arnold, 1912).

⁵⁰ *hinc potest intelligi, quod ad ea asserenda veniebant pueri, sine lingua, sine libris, sine eruditione, instructi casibus tamquam quaestionibus hariolandi, quas pueri, unius noctis meditatione, sexcentas citius excogitant, quam viri graves sexcentis annis unam; omne a possibiliter est b, et tamen nullum b possibiliter est a; et eiusmodi: hinc infinita dogmata, et totidem dialecticae: haec Pauli, illa Hentisbari, alia Mantuani, Scoti, Thomae, Alberti, Ochami, Pardi, Dullardi, parcam nominibus viventium, et id quidem non in ea parte, quae est de invenienda probabilitate, aut de iudicio argumentationis, quod esset ferendum, sed in intelligentia, et explicatione, ac usu sermonis Latini, qui unus semper est, et simplex: et tamen quum talia sint eorum inventa, mirantur non intelligi ab aliis quae ipsi somniant...*Rita Guerlac (ed.), *Juan Luis Vives Against the Pseudodialecticians* (London, Dordrecht and Boston: D. Reidel, 1977), p. 149.

visit to the University, was driven to rebut the argument of a sermon recently preached in the University in which the preacher supposedly 'took as his text various old wives' proverbs in English' in 'an offence at the office of preaching which won the world over to Christ.' The nameless preacher opposed the teaching in the University of the 'Latin language', the 'Greek language' and the 'liberal arts' leaving Theology as 'the only subject he seems to allow.' In response to this More claims 'I do not see how he can pursue it [Theology] without any skill in either Hebrew, Latin or Greek.' More's argument in the letter is an eloquent denial that

theology, the venerable heavenly queen, is so pent up in those narrow limits that she does not also inhabit and dwell in the holy scripture as her proper home from which she makes her pilgrimage through all the cells of the oldest and holiest fathers, Augustine, I mean, Jerome, Ambrose, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Gregory, Basil and other men like them whose 'positive' writings, as they now call them with contempt, were the mainstay of theological studies for more than a thousand years after the passion of Christ, before those subtle problems which now now command almost exclusive attention were even invented.

'Can anyone fail to perceive' asks More, that in Theology and the 'other arts...the most original thinkers and the most diligent interpreters of their thoughts were Greek'?⁵¹

The impetuous argument of More in this letter represents an extreme view of scholasticism, and of its preoccupation with 'subtle problems' that is considered characteristic of humanism. It is tempting to see the action taken against the teaching of scholastic theology in Oxford in 1535 as representative of the decisive turn against it on the part of educated opinion. Indeed, this is how some historians have sought to argue that traditional theology was exhausted on the eve of the Reformation, in that a broad coalition, embracing Protestants (such as Luther and Peter Martyr Vermigli) and Catholic minded humanists (such as More and Bishop John Fisher) were ranged against scholasticism.

⁵¹ Clarence H. Miller and others (eds), *The Complete Works of St Thomas More* (15 vols, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1963-1997), 15, pp. 129-50.

Yet such a simplistic equation of humanism with radical anti-scholasticism cannot explain the much more positive account of scholasticism rendered by More and other leading English humanists, following Erasmus, when the Reformation controversies began in earnest. Erasmus had already written in his *Apology against the Dialogue of James Latomus* in 1519 that ‘I am not adverse to philosophy, provided the mixture is made with prudence and moderation.’ He was also deeply impressed by Aquinas, writing that

Thomas Aquinas, a man...not great in his own century only... was wholly worthy to have had the knowledge of languages and other equipment of the fine literature to grace him, since he used so skillfully the advantages offered by his own period.⁵²

More himself was to call Aquinas ‘that most learned and likewise most holy man.’⁵³ Richard Rex in his account of John Fisher’s theology makes plain the debt that theology owed to scholasticism, and the fundamentally sympathetic approach to scholasticism that Fisher pursued. Rex’s thesis ‘is that Fisher’s theology was marked by an individual and far from unsuccessful attempt to reinvigorate the old blood of the scholastics with the new blood of the humanists.’ Fisher ‘did not repudiate the scholastic tradition...indeed, in some respects he thought more highly of the scholastics than of the fathers.’ As Rex points out, it was not just in theological content that Fisher sympathised with the scholastics, but also adopted their method, writing his first book against the King’s divorce, the *Liber* in the time-honoured ‘question and answer’ format of the scholastic theologians.⁵⁴

⁵² Quoted in Edward Surtz, *The Praise of Pleasure: Philosophy, Education and Communism in More’s Utopia* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 105-107.

⁵³ Elizabeth Rogers (ed.), *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More* (North Stratford, New Hampshire: Ayer Publishing Company, 1970), p. 38.

⁵⁴ Richard Rex, *The Theology of John Fisher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

The theological case made by Thomas More against Lutheranism is just as evidently indebted to scholastic insights. Let us take the question of the sacramentality of marriage, pursued by More in his *Responsio ad Lutherum*. Luther argued that a sacrament signifies something hidden or secret, as matrimony is not hidden, it is therefore not a sacrament. More accuses Luther of a ‘lie in the minor premise’ in that he claims that a sacrament ‘signifies a thing hidden’, not that it ‘*is* a thing hidden.’ More replies that between the major and minor premises the verb changes from ‘to be’ to ‘to signify’ between which there is no semantic equivalence. Otherwise the false conclusion of the set of statements ‘every man sits, but Luther is not running, therefore Luther is not a man’ is actually valid.⁵⁵ Yet More’s borrowing from scholasticism in his argument against Luther is not confined to his method, as the literal borrowing by More of Aquinas’s conclusion on the sacramentality of matrimony in the *Summa Contra Gentiles* shows. In the seventy-eighth chapter of the fourth book of that work, Aquinas concludes

As in other sacraments by the thing done outwardly a sign is made of a spiritual thing, so, too, in this sacrament, by the union of husband and wife a sign of the union of Christ and his Church is made.⁵⁶

More summarises his argument against Luther on this point in exactly the same way:

For as Baptism of the body signifies washing of the soul, so matrimony signifies the union between Christ and his Church, which is a thing, I think, hidden and secret, although the sacrament, that is its sign, is sensible.⁵⁷

By the time he came to write the second volume of *The Confutation of Tyndale’s Answer* in 1523, More’s appraisal of scholasticism had shifted decisively. He lambasts Tyndale because

⁵⁵ Miller (ed.), *Complete Works of Thomas More*, 5, pt 1, p. 665.

⁵⁶ Joseph Kenny OP (ed.), *Contra Gentiles by Thomas Aquinas: On the Truth of the Catholic Faith* (New York: Hannover House, 1955-57), 4, ch. 78. Available at dhspriority.org/Thomas/ContraGentiles4.htm/78.

⁵⁷ *Nam sicut baptismus corporis, significat ablutionem animae: sic matrimonium significat coniugium, inter Christum et ecclesiam: quae res est, opinor, abdita et secreta: licet sacramentum, id est eius signum, sit sensibile.* Miller (ed.), *Complete Works of More*, 5, pt 1, p. 664.

he setteth so lytle by saynt Thomas, saynt Bonaventure, saynt Bernarde, saynte Anselme, and all such other men as haue wryten in the chyrche this .viii. hundred yere: he seeth yet well inough that the reason which he morketh was made by the holy doctour saynt Austayne foure or fyve yere byfore that and that the same holy man byelded thereuppon the selfe same byeldyng, that the catholyke chyrch repayreth and kepeth uppe now...

Here More hints at the motivation for the evolution of his thought in this matter as well as giving evidence of that evolution itself. For More, the great saints among the schoolmen are inheritors of the same Church and of the same preaching office as the fathers of the early Church. But it is not merely a strategic adaptation on More's part, the better to rebuff Tyndale's attack on the Church. Rather, as this passage indicates, it was the product of a deep appreciation of Thomas in particular:

Now the wretche rayleth by name uppon that holy doctoure saynt Thomas, a man of that lernyng that the greate excellent wyttes and the most connyng men that the chyrche of Cryste hath hadde synnes hys dayes, haue estemed and called hym the very floure of theology, and a man of that trewe perfyte fayth and chrysten luyng thereto, that god hath hym selfe testyfyed hys holynesse by many a greate myracle, and made hym honowred here in hys chyrche on earth.⁵⁸

At least one important question must be answered before the argument being made here can be accepted. If the most important humanist writers in their arguments against Protestantism can be said to have adopted a stance which owed much to scholasticism, both in its method and conclusions, then what is to be made of the earlier humanist critique of the schoolmen with which More in particular had been engaged with such vigour?

The critiques of mainstream humanists like Fisher and More of scholasticism were nuanced and grounded in an impression that certain of the followers of the schoolmen did not live virtuous lives, grounded in a sincere faith. It was in the realm of action, and not of theological discourse, that they were wanting. Erasmus summarised this critique concisely in a letter in which he wrote that 'I may say that, whilst I have known many of this school whom I should not like to call bad men, I have yet never to this day seen one who, in my opinion at least, could be termed a real and sincere

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 8, part 1, pp. 676, 713.

Christian.⁵⁹ Consequently, just as More could support the theological basis of the papacy, whilst at the same time desiring a Pope who would 'befit the Christian dignity of the apostolic office, so that freely spurning riches and earthly honours, they may breathe a wholly heavenly spirit' so his attack upon scholasticism in the letter to Oxford does not inhibit a deployment of scholastic method or a profound admiration for such a theologian as Thomas.⁶⁰

This section of this chapter might seem to be a diversion, but I think its conclusion - that scholasticism was not seen to be exhausted, or indefensible by the most vital Catholic thinkers of the early sixteenth century - is significant. For if scholasticism was not perceived to be exhausted, then its reintroduction in Oxford might not be evidence of an ideologically defensive and reactionary ethos in the Marian Church.

The Edwardian Reformation

Individual elements of the Edwardian regime's policy towards Oxford and their effect on the life of the University provide the specific context for the interpretation of the different elements which went to make up the Marian policies towards the University. Consequently discussion of, for example, the contents of the Edwardian code of statutes of 1549 must be deferred until later chapters. Nevertheless, certain features of Edwardian Oxford demand identification and discussion here, so as to provide a more general context into which the Marian Counter-Reformations's impact upon the University can be fitted.

⁵⁹ Quoted in Surtz, *Praise of Pleasure*, pp. 105-6.

⁶⁰ Miller (ed.) *Complete Works of More*, 5, part 1, pp 143.

The major characteristics of Edwardian Oxford were the arrival in the University of certain Reformers from mainland Europe, principally Peter Martyr Vermigli; the visitation of 1549 and the issuing of the new code of statutes and, which was the intent of both, the introduction into the worship, teaching and organisation of the University of a radical Protestant purpose and the simultaneous suppression of those traditional aspects of each which were inimical to the reformist ideology of the regime and its Oxfordian collaborators.

The last proved the most significant in the formulation of a Catholic response to the changes in the next reign and so it is to the attack upon traditional religion that we shall turn in the first instance. This attack had three elements, and the extent to which traditional theological and liturgical practices were suppressed depended much upon the character of the fellowship of each college, although their religious allegiance cannot always be deduced from it. At Magdalen where, as will be seen below, the fellowship was largely reformist, and from which the moderately conservative President, Owen Oglethorpe, was to be driven by an alliance between the reforming majority and the Privy Council in 1552, all the wall paintings in the chapel were painted over in 1547, the first year of Edward's reign. Two years later Church silver to the value of £163 8s 6d was sold and benefactions intended for the celebration of masses were given over to exhibitions on the order of the King's visitors.⁶¹

In 1551 many of the colleges acquired communion tables, to replace the stone altars on which the Mass had previously been offered. Conformity to the injunctions of the Edwardian visitors concerning the furnishing of the chapels does not necessarily mean that the fellows shared the agenda which underpinned these requirements. At Corpus Christi, where a new communion table was purchased for 7s in the year 1550-51 and where a copy of the book of common prayer was

⁶¹ MCA, Liber Computi (1543-59), ff. 42, 70v, 86, 98v, 99.

acquired at the price of 4s 4d in 1552, the conservatism of the President and fellows was a consistent irritant to the regime. In May 1551 ‘Doctour Morwen, President of Corpus Christi Colledge in Oxford and... Welch and Allen, Fellowes of the same howse’ were summoned to appear before the Privy Council where in June they were ‘committed to the Fleete for useng uppon Corpus Christi Daie other service then is apointed in the Booke of Service.’⁶²

In October 1551 it was reported to the Council that ‘one [William] Allen,⁶³ a fellowe of Oxforde, being committed there to close prison, was neverthelesse suffred to have conference with other, and did emonges other thinges translate a Supplication owt of Englishe in to Latten for Petro Paulo, an Italian.’⁶⁴

Two other conservative doctors from Oxford were reported to the Council for their subversiveness. In March 1550 ‘Doctour Chedsey was...called before the Counsaill tooching suche sediciouse preaching as he had preached at Oxford in the beginneng of this Lente, which, though he partelie denyed, was neverthelesse evident by testymonies in writeng of soundrie persones; wherefore he was committed to the Mershalsie.’⁶⁵ In November 1551, Dr Tresham, canon Prebendary of Christ Church, was summoned before the Council, which warned the man sent to collect him that he might have absconded to ‘Toyster [Towcester], where he is parson’ if he had warning of their arrival.⁶⁶

⁶² *APC*, 3, pp. 287, 305.

⁶³ William Allen (1532-1594). B.A. 1550 M.A. 1554. Oriel College 1547-1556. Fellow 1550. Principal, St Mary’s Hall 1556-1560. University of Malines 1563. Founder of the English College at Douai 1568 and later Archbishop of Malines and Cardinal.

⁶⁴ *APC*, 3, p. 384.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 429-30.

At All Souls' College the Visitors imposed a series of injunctions. As they do not show any sign of being tailored to the circumstances of that particular institution, it is probable they were prescribed for each of the colleges. Besides elements prescribing attendance at lectures; the banning of the speaking of English in hall and about the college in order to improve the competence of scholars in Latin, Greek and Hebrew and some exhorting the head of house, fellows and scholars to honest behaviour; the visitor's provisions are concerned with the imposition of religious change. This affected the teaching of Theology, as in the fourth injunction's stipulation that 'professors of theology in this house are not to read or interpret publicly without recourse to holy Scripture',⁶⁷ the dispensation of members of the college from all obligation to perform exequies, the abolition of the 'papistical offices of mattins and vespers' with the mass,⁶⁸ and their replacement with the services which carried royal authority. The nineteenth ordinance is the most iconoclastic: 'we wish no more than one altar, or rather one Lord's table, to be in the Chapel.'⁶⁹ Other altars, images, statues, tabernacles, organs and other superstitious and idolatrous monuments were to be removed.⁷⁰

According to Anthony Wood, the effect of the Edwardian visitation was not confined to the college chapels but extended to the holdings of the libraries of the University.

The ancient Libraries, a glory to the University as containing among them many rarities, the work of our own country men, besides many matters obtained from remote places, were by them or their appointment rifled. Many MSS, guilty of no other superstition than the red letters in their fronts or titles, were either condemned to the fire or jakes. Others also that treated of controversial or scholastical Divinity were let loose from their chains, and given away or sold to Mechanics for servile uses. I have heard it credibly reported from ancient men, and they while young from Scholars of great standing, that among such spoils brought out in public (in the Convocation House, say some)

⁶⁷ *Professores theologici in his aedibus nihil publice legant, nihil publice interpretentur, nisi sacras literas.*

⁶⁸ *papisticis matutinis et vespertinis officiis...*

⁶⁹ *Non nisi unum altare, vel potius unam mensam Domini, in sacello esse volumus.*

⁷⁰ *Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford with Royal patents of Foundations, Injunctions of Visitors and Catalogues of Documents relating to the University, preserved in the Public Record Office: All Souls' College* (London: J.H. Parker and Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1853), pp. 86-89.

several copies of the Greek Testament were of the number...as for those belonging to Colleges, they suffered the same fate almost as the public....From Merton Coll. Library a cart load of MSS...were taken away...New College also have many lost and others defaced...from the Library of Balliol Coll. no small number were taken away...the libraries of Exeter, Queens and Lincoln were with other purges...The works of the Schoolmen, namely P. Lombard, Th. Aquinas, Scotus and his followers, with Criticks also, and such that had Popish Scholias in them, they cast out of all College Libraries and private Studies...⁷¹

C.M. Dent queries Wood's account of the spoliation at Merton, on the grounds that in 1556 there were three hundred medieval manuscripts present in the library there and two hundred printed books 'many of which were less than twenty years old.' It is impossible, in the absence of a list from before 1550 - when Wood states that the removal took place - with which one could conduct a comparison with the 1556 list, to establish the extent of the alienation of material from Merton library. Against Dent's suggestion that an extensive removal did *not* take place one might well cite the presence in the 1556 list of only two (non-consecutive) volumes of Aquinas and none whatsoever of Scotus or Lombard. Since one would expect these books to have been in the original collection this indicates that an extensive, if not massive, deprivation took place.⁷²

The Edwardian reform of Oxford was not confined to such destructive measures, important though these were, and it is for the presence of Peter Martyr Vermigli in Oxford from his appointment as Regius Professor of Divinity in March 1548, a chair he combined with a canonry of Christ Church from January 1551, that it is principally remembered.

An Augustinian Canon by profession, Vermigli left the Order in 1542 in his forty-third year and took up the Chair of Old Testament in Strasbourg where he encountered the reformer Martin Bucer. His theological style combined close textual exposition and some asides, which were to become his notable 'Commonplaces'. After the victory of Charles V over the Protestant Schmalkaldic League

⁷¹ *Wood*, 2, pt 1 pp. 107-8.

⁷² C.M. Dent, *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 6-7; the Merton Inventory of 1556 is printed in the second appendix to N.R. Ker, 'The Provision of Books', in *HUO*, III, pp. 441-519 at pp. 487-497.

at Muhlberg in April 1547 he fled to England, lodging with Archbishop Cranmer until his appointment to replace Richard Smith in the Regius Chair of Divinity.

In 1549 there occurred two major disputations in Oxford which were occasioned by Martyr's preaching and lecturing. The most famous occurred in the Divinity School over four days at the end of May and the start of June, but another took place at Christ Church between the Dean and Chancellor, Richard Cox, and Richard Smith, Vermigli's conservative predecessor as Regius Professor of Divinity, whose own account of the disputation survives. Smith and his colleagues produced evidence from Chrysostom and other patristic writers in support of contention that the existence of purgatory and the efficacy of prayers for the souls therein contained was a part of the Apostolic deposit. Cox's argument, as Smith preserves it, although as John Strype remarks, it may well be produced 'disadvantageously', was that the Apostles also 'enjoined the Gentiles to abstain from blood, and strangled, as their Acts do shew. And yet that decree of theirs doth not bind us.'⁷³

The second disputation, also in 1549, was provoked by an incident in Vermigli's lectures when, commenting on 1 Corinthians 10.16-17, Vermigli 'at length proceeding to speak of the Supper of the Lord, which divers of the University had defended according to the old way, in writing, reading, preaching and disputing, they (particularly Dr Richard Smith his frequent Auditor) took especial cognizance of what he had said in that point.'⁷⁴

In order to refute Vermigli his opponents planned to spring a disputation upon him, putting up notices on 'every Church door' which announced that this event would be held the next day in the

⁷³ John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials' relating chiefly to religion, and the reformation of it, and the emergencies of the Church of England, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary the First* (3 vols, London: J. Wyatt, 1721), 2, pt 1, p. 326.

⁷⁴ Wood, 2, part 1, p. 88.

Schools when Vermigli was due to continue his lecture series. When Vermigli was challenged to dispute he replied that ‘he would frame himself for a disputation.’ At the conclusion of the lecture in which this challenge had been made ‘his adversaries, particularly Smyth, called upon him to dispute, but he excused himself.’⁷⁵ This confrontation ended, somewhat predictably, in chaos when supporters of Smith and Vermigli ‘began to make a tumult’ which was quieted by the intervention of Dr Wright, the Vice Chancellor, to the effect that an orderly disputation would take place at a future date. The negotiations over the questions to be posed in this disputation were conducted by Wright from his lodgings in the old Durham College, at which both Vermigli and Smith were accompanied by supporters, Henry Sydall and James Curthoppe for the former and Arthur Cole and Owen Oglethorpe for Smith.

Martyr said that it was equitable that he himself should observe the same order in confuting their Opinions in disputing, which he was wont to do in reading his lectures. Also he told them that he abhorred their strange terms (as well barbarous as ambiguous) commonly received and uttered in the Schools (for Smyth it seems was accounted by the reformed party more a Sophister than a Theologist), and therefore he would use only two, Carnaliter and Corporaliter, because the Scriptures in describing the Supper make only mention of the flesh and the body, not of the matter and the substance. Yet notwithstanding, least they should think to deceive him with any ambiguity, he said he would accept of them though they should be delivered in terms of Realiter and Substantialiter.⁷⁶

Vermigli’s disinclination to dispute with his opponents is susceptible to different explanations. First, it may have been the case that he was wary of a disputation which might end, like his lectures, in a disorganised slanging match. Yet on the other hand, in this account he seems to have expressed a preference for engaging with his opponents in the context of such lectures. Furthermore, his reluctance in Wood’s narrative is grounded not in anxiety about crowd control but is directed against the format and content of a traditional scholastic disputation.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 2, part 1 pp 88-9.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 2, part 1, p. 92.

As has already been suggested, reformed theology had an ambiguous stance toward the formal logical process of such a method and this incident is, I would suggest, a good example of the practical effect of this ambiguity on the working of the University. For the Reformers such disputations could not perhaps provide a neutral battleground on which opposing theological perspectives could be assessed. Rather, the disputation as a means of arriving at truth, or in any event of exposing false reasoning, was based on assumptions about theological method which were not entirely shared by the evangelical party. This is strikingly evident in Vermigli's deprecation of his opponents' 'strange terms', his assertion of the appropriateness of the scriptural terms 'flesh' and 'body' over such Aristotelian designations as 'matter' and 'substance'.

This being done there was a great hurrying and noise about the University, for those that were of the Popish party did all they could to assist them that were to dispute with Martyr with arguments and books, and these also of the other party, endeavored the like for Martyr. All people being full of expectation therefore of the visitors coming, that they might see the event of the matter, appeared at length these following, viz. Cox, the Chancellor, Holbeach, Bishop of Lincoln, Heynes Dean of Exeter, Neverson Doctor of Law and Moryson Esq. So that the Divinity School being made ready to receive them, they with the Vicechancellor and Bedells before them went from S Mary's to that place in decent order, and being seated Dr Will. Tresham, Canon of Chr Ch. and his assistants that were to carry on the work against Martyr, appeared and took their places. After that, Cox began with an oration relating to the business to be taken in hand...

The questions to be disputed, as agreed by Martyr and Cox were, firstly, whether 'in the sacrament of the Eucharist the bread and wine were not transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ', secondly whether 'the Body and Blood of Christ are not corporally and carnally in the bread and the wine or, as some say, under the species of bread and wine' and thirdly 'the Body and Blood of Christ are combined with the bread and the wine sacramentally.'⁷⁷ After the questions were put

⁷⁷ *I In Sacramento Eucharistiae non est panis et vini Transubstantio in Copus et Sanguinem Christi. II Copus et Sanguinis Christi non sunt Corporaliter aut Carnaliter in pane et vino, neque, ut alii dicunt, sub speciebus panis et vini. III Copus et Sanguis Christi uniuntur pani et vino Sacramentaliter.*

Martyr uttered a Proem,⁷⁸ and after that a short prayer; then Dr Tresham spake an oration, wherein he told the Academicians, that he willingly did put himself upon this Disputation in the place of Dr Smyth,⁷⁹ not by his desire but merely out of his own pleasure. That being done, Martyr opposed and Tresham answered, which was the work of the first day. The next, which was the 29 of May, Dr Will. Cheadsey of Corp. Chr. Coll. appeared, and after the usual ceremonies performed, learnedly answered in the same conclusions. The 30 day one Morgan Phillips,⁸⁰ commonly called Morgan the Sophister, Master of Arts and Principal of St Mary's Hall, opposed, and the next day Cheadsey opposed Martyr also; and so the disputation was concluded with an oration of the Chancellor's.⁸¹

Who won the disputation, or to adopt Wood's more picturesque phrase, 'to whom the Laurel was given' was a matter of private judgement. However, a clue to the question can be discerned in the concern of the regime for the regulation of disputations, witnessed in a letter to the university from the Council on 1 January 1549/50 which informed them of a

proclamation...agaynst those which doth dispute, argue, object or defyne certayne vayne and not necessarie questions concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and against all such as doth irreverently speake or preache upon the same, this is to signifye to you that it is not his Highnes myend to stop and interrupt thereby your common and wont disputations in divinity...But we do admonish and requyer you that both on that maiter and other such mysteries of God and his holy scripture, altho it may be lawfull in your disputations and problems to dispute on whither part you will, yet to do the same with such sobriety reverence and lowlynes of Spirit as becometh men of lernyng and knowledge.⁸²

It seems improbable that had Vermigli 'won' the disputation, the regime would have moved to suppress contentious disputations from occurring in the future. At the very least it is possible to conclude from Vermigli's initial reluctance to engage in a disputation; his insistence on strictly scriptural, rather than Aristotelian, terms being employed in the framing of the questions to be put before the disputants; and the regime's decision to restrict disputations on controversial topics such as those which Vermigli and Tresham had discussed that evangelical theologians like Vermigli, saw

⁷⁸ An Introductory speech.

⁷⁹ Smith was forced to flee from the University, first to Scotland then to Louvain.

⁸⁰ Morgan Philips, Principal of St Mary's Hall. Philips was presumably one of the 'Heads of Howses' who had, according to Wood, 'forbade their scholars from going' to the lectures whose indiscretions had provoked the disputation.

⁸¹ *Wood*, 2, pt 1, pp. 92-93.

⁸² *Ibid.*, pt 1, p. 94.

in the academic disputation as it had been inherited by the mid-sixteenth century University an impediment to the reformation upon which they were engaged.

From 1547-1553 the Edwardian regime and its supporters adopt a clear and distinctive policy towards the University of Oxford, belligerent in character though it may have been, with the aim of impressing upon it the imprint of Reform. This programme, like that it carried out on the rest of the English Church, was to be arrested suddenly by the events of the summer of 1553, to which I now propose to turn.

The beginning of Marian Oxford: Magdalen College

Next to the date in his register on 8 July 1553 Thomas Bickley, Vice-President of Magdalen College wrote 'Edward the sixth died.' We cannot know exactly what went through Bickley's mind as he made this stark entry, although anxiety about the immediate future would have been understandable, for the evidence suggests that he was a convinced Protestant. On Saturday 28 May 1547, shortly after the last death of a reigning monarch, it had been reported to the Council that Bickley

not dreading the Act of Parliament, nor the King's Majesty his Proclamation, on Whitsunday evin in the middle of Divine Service, presumed to go to the high Aulter in magdalen College, and then and there before the face of a great multitude most unreverently toke away the Sacrament, and broke it in peeces, to the great offence of a great number.⁸³

⁸³ 'The Effecte of the King's Majesty's Letters sent to the Universitie of Oxford' printed in John Rouse Bloxam, *A register of the presidents, fellows, demies, instructors in grammar and in music, chaplains, clerks, choristers, and other members of Saint Mary Magdalen College in the University of Oxford: from the foundation of the College to the present time* (8 vols, Oxford: W. Graham, 1853-1885), 2, p. 301.

A week later in 1553 the clouds over Bickley would seem to have lifted as he recorded that ‘Jane, daughter of the Duke of Suffolk, was entrusted by these [letters] with the name of Queen.’⁸⁴ Yet his hopes for the security of the progress of reform were dashed when, on 17 July 1553 he noted, in an ironically laudatory manner which would also serve to protect him that ‘the Lady Mary was proclaimed in queenship by the gentlemen of the county to universal acclaim.’⁸⁵ The campaign against President Owen Oglethorpe to which Bickley had been a prominent contributor had begun when he joined nine other fellows in petitioning the Council with a series of articles of accusation in 1550. This appeal, over the head of the President of the College, to the Lord President of the Council, the Duke of Northumberland, in the hope of support was a dramatic venture and demonstrates the dependence of the Edwardian reformers in Oxford on the momentum they gained from the regime. The dissipation of that momentum with Mary’s successful assertion of her right to the throne could scarcely have been more strikingly illustrated than by Bickley’s next entry which recorded that on ‘22 August the head of the Duke of Northumberland was despatched after rebellion.’⁸⁶ Five days later Bickley noted that Walter Haddon,⁸⁷ the President appointed by the Council in succession to Oglethorpe in 1552, was granted by unanimous consent of the fellows a whole month’s absence from the college; the next day that the college had received letters from the Queen ‘by which we are commanded to arrange for the observation of all the ancient injunctions and ordinances’ to the exclusion of ‘all brought forth since the death of her father King Henry the

⁸⁴ *Jana filia ducis Suffolcissiae his reginae nomine commendata*. MCA, Vice President’s Register, f. 6v.

⁸⁵ *D. Maria per generosos huius comitatus...in Regina ebuccinatur summis acclamationibus omnium*. *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ *22 die Augusti capite mulctatur dux northumbriae propter rebellionem*. *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ Haddon, in an effort to curry favour with the new regime, had composed some congratulatory verses for the Queen on her accession, which are printed in the ‘Catalogue of Originals’, *Strype Ecclesiastical Memorials*, 3, Appendix, pp. 6-7.

eighth.⁸⁸ After this the hand in the register changes, whether Bickley joined some of his fellow reformers in fleeing immediately or whether he stayed, it is not possible to establish. His next appearance is in the *Libri Computi*, the account book of the college, which records that after October 1553 he and nine of the ten signatories to the petition against Oglethorpe were paid twelve pounds between them following their deposition by Bishop Gardiner's Visitors.

In the history of Magdalen in the reign of Edward it is possible to establish the obstacles which stood before the effort to restore its Catholic life and scholarship. That Magdalen was deeply divided is obvious, but perhaps more significantly those divisions were not between reforming and conservative extremes but among presidents and fellows who were loyal to the regime of Edward yet who had opposing ideas concerning how that obedience was to be manifested. Even less promisingly, by the time of Edward's death the more radical members of the fellowship had seemingly won the battle and asserted their control.

In order to comprehend the way in which Mary's accession was greeted at Magdalen, it is necessary to turn to how this control had been gained, and to what effect. In this the campaign to unseat the President, Owen Oglethorpe, was crucial.

The campaign against Oglethorpe

The origins of the main campaign against Oglethorpe lie in a letter sent by eighteen of the fellows who were still loyal to him and signed by Oglethorpe himself to the Lord Protector on 8 November

⁸⁸ *adferuntur vobis literae reginae Mariae quibus iubemur statuta per omnia observare antiquatis iniunctionibus et ordinationibus omnibus in contrarium additis a morte patris sui henrici octavi.* MCA, Vice President's Register, f. 6v.

1548 in response to one sent by some dissident fellows to the Council in June of the same year.⁸⁹ In the letter Oglethorpe refers to ‘summe senor of the fellowes’ who have declared that ‘I the president did diswade the companie thereof from thaccomplishment of the tenor of your graces lettres...whereby your grace incited us to the redresse of religion.’ It goes on to refer to Oglethorpe and the fellows concerned as ‘men most ready to furder godly procedinges’ and the President assures the Lord Protector that he is ‘most ready to do that as shallbe comaunded by your grace and the high powers both for obediens sake and for that yorr knowledge and zeal to the trew religion is such that ye will commande nothing to be done but that which is godly.’ Far from impeding the progress of liturgical change, ‘I the president did not onely receyve and admit thordr of the communion withe service therunto apperteyning in the vulgar tonge as it is used in the kinges majestie’s chape...but also willingly ministered it myself and caused it to be used in place of the high masse.’⁹⁰

The campaign was resumed in 1550 when ten fellows of the college petitioned the Council against the President and attached to their petition articles of accusation against him. In the petition they made three allegations. The first concerns Oglethorpe’s disposition towards recent reforms, claiming that reformers in the college

have suffred great storms and enjuries at Mr President our Heade’s hands, for the setting forthe of the Kyngs Majesties procedyngs concernynge the reformation, which he so little favourethe that he stickes not onely to do the worste he can agaynst us, after suche sorte, that he hathe driven a greate manye away by his extremities.

⁸⁹ OUP WP/B/f. 24.

⁹⁰ NA SP 10/5, ff. 35-36.

Further, Oglethorpe had failed to act ‘agaynste abuses, supersticion, or errors, creptt into the Church by papistrie.’ Secondly, the President was guilty of impugning the motives of the King and the Council, ‘sayinge that all is for your owne lucre that you redresse’ and thirdly ‘as concernynge the Kings’s Majestie’s visitors, whom he settethe so lytle by, that what so ever they enjoyne to be done ether he contemnethe clean or else defacithe it by...craftie meanes.’⁹¹

The letter was signed by John Mullyns,⁹² Walter Bower, Thomas Bickley,⁹³ Robert Whitton, Robert Caynter, Michael Renniger,⁹⁴ Thomas Williams, Hugh Kirk, Laurence Humphrey⁹⁵ and Arthur Swall.

In the articles of accusation against Oglethorpe, which were annexed to the petition, they alleged that ‘notwithstanding’ his subscription to ‘the King’s Majestie’s boke concerning the servys’ he had on the feast of S. Mary Magdalen ‘sayd a superstitius collecte’; although he celebrated Mass in the new rite he ‘usithe to minister the communyon as popishlie as may be with beckings, dookings, and shewing hit unto the people.’ Indeed, according to his detractors, Oglethorpe admitted to the college

⁹¹ Printed in John Rowse Bloxam, *A register of the presidents, fellows, demies, instructors in grammar and in music, chaplains, clerks, choristers, and other members of Saint Mary Magdalen College in the University of Oxford: from the foundation of the College to the present time* (8 vols, Oxford: W. Graham, 1853-1885), 2, pp. 309-311.

⁹² John Mullins, Magdalen: BA 1542, MA 1545, BTh 1552, Fellow 1542, Lecturer in Moral Philosophy 1547, Dean of Divinity 1553, exiled in Zurich, Archdeacon of London 1559. Julian Lock, ‘Mullins, John (d. 1591)’ *ODNB*.

⁹³ Thomas Bickley, Magdalen: BA 1540, MA 1546, BTh 1552, DTh 1572 Fellow 1541, exiled in France, studying at Paris and Orleans, Warden of Merton College 1569, Bishop of Chichester 1586. Kenneth Carleton, ‘Thomas Bickley (c. 1518-1596)’, *ODNB*.

⁹⁴ Michael Renniger, Magdalen: BA 1546, MA 1546, DTh 1573. Fellow 1546. Lecturer in Greek 1548, Natural Philosophy 1551, Moral Philosophy 1552. exiled in Zurich. Archdeacon of Winchester 1575.

⁹⁵ Laurence Humphrey, Magdalen: BA 1549, MA 1552 DTh 1562, Fellow 1549. Lecturer in Natural Philosophy 1553, Moral Philosophy 1553. Exiled in Zurich. Regius Professor of Theology, 1560, President of Magdalen 1562.

‘suche as hathe nether lerning nor yeat towardness, as thoughe he requiryd no more but that he mought hath papysts’; concerning the reformers in the college he had ‘openlie promicyd that he hatithe us for our religion’s sake’ and scornfully called them ‘gospellers and doctors that follow the King’s Majestie’s proceedings.’ His aggressive prosecution of the reformers, threatening some with ‘the loss of their exhibitions, to some the loss of there lectures, to some that he can thrust them out of the house’ had meant that ‘wer as we were ones, the students that favouryd religion, in number xxv tie (and that is the least)’ they are now ‘scarce x’.

In his oversight of the usages of the Chapel Oglethorpe was suspiciously negligent as he ‘suffithe beades to be usyd in our Churche’, a practice directly ‘contrarie to the King’s Majesties Injuntions’. Whilst he was ‘commandyd to exhort his House and Colledge to the reading of the holly scripture’ he ‘deterrith us from hit al that he maye.’ Oglethorpe was also culpable of questioning the motives of the Council, ‘when he openly sayd that they sought more our possessions than our reformations.’

It was alleged that ‘in an open convent of the felows [the President] likened the religion that is now set furthe, to the coyne, saying, “ye know that there is a coyne that is always currant, and so there must be a religion.”’ What Oglethorpe seems to have meant was that the religion of the realm was akin to the money whose validity was dependent on the policy of the regime of the time, and subject to alteration as the occupant of the throne changed.⁹⁶

Counterintuitively, it is not their animus toward the head of their college which strikes the reader of the letter and the articles most strongly but the extent to which their authors present their hopes

⁹⁶ The comparison was particularly apposite, from Oglethorpe’s perspective, given the drastic debasements in the coinage which had taken place since 1526, in order to pay for Henry VIII’s somewhat aggressive foreign policy.

as pinned on the King and his Council. The President ‘slanderithe the King’s Majestie’s visitors’; he ‘boldelie pronouncyd that no Iniunctions contrarie to our Statuts ought to be recevyd’ and suggested that those ‘of us’ who ‘fynde faulte in any poynte withe the Statuts...might be deliveryd from the bonds of them by gyving over our places.’

Oglethorpe’s defence of his actions against these accusations is contained in three documents. The first is the copy of the articles of accusation which contains at the end of each accusation a line or two from Oglethorpe offering justification for his actions. These responses fall into two main categories. To some of the charges he simply protests his innocence. The so called ‘superstitius collecte’ was ‘translated from a volume’ Ogelthorpe claimed, although it is not clear what sort of defence this could have been, unless it was simply the act of changing it into the vernacular; to the accusation that he allowed beades to be used in the chapel he responds with one word: ‘calumny’; the suggestion that he slandered the King’s council is ‘pure calumny’ as is that that he abused those who followed the ‘king’s majestie’s proceedings.’

The second category of responses offered by Oglethorpe is composed of more detailed explanations of his actions. To the allegation that he was frequently absent from the college he responded that it was legitimate for him to be absent for three months, but that he had not been absent ‘unless on business of the college. For three whole months I have been present in residence since the count began.’⁹⁷ Oglethorpe had also held a canonry at Windsor since 1540, and it was in Windsor that he spent the time he was away from the college. To the accusation that he celebrates the new rite ‘popishlie’ he replies that ‘truly I do less than is allowed by the book.’⁹⁸

⁹⁷ *nisi in negotiis Collegii. Tribus integris mensibus praesens fui ab incepto computo.*

⁹⁸ Bloxam, *Register*, 2, pp. 313-316.

The second source for his defence is a letter written to the Council by Oglethorpe. In it he protests that he ‘did never preach or teach openly any thinge contrarye to ye doctryne and religion set furthe by the Kings Majestie, and autorysyd bye hys grace’s laws sythence ye makynge and publyshynge off the same.’ The reforms which had been enacted up to that point he thought ‘to be better and much neyer the useage of ye apostolicall and primitive Chyrce, than yt was before tyme.’ He then went on to specify in which respects he was persuaded that this was so. These were, ‘in prohibytinge that noyne shulde commune alone, in makynge the pepyll hole comuners, or in sufferynge theam to commune under bothe kyndes, in the catechisaten of younglyngs in the rudiments off our faithe, in having the commune praer in Englyshe [and] in settinge furthe the homelys and many other thyngs.’⁹⁹

There then follows an attack upon the doctrine of transubstantiation, which Oglethorpe describes as ‘the Scholish and latly receyvyd doctrynne concernynge the Sacrament.’ This ‘artikyll of transubstantiation, I do not like, and I thynk yt not consonant to ye Scriptures and auncient wryters.’¹⁰⁰

Perhaps such protestations could be regarded as a case of special pleading were it not for the evidence we have from other sources that suggests Oglethorpe’s religious opinions and affiliations are a good deal more nuanced than the picture of a bluff reactionary which the fellows were so anxious to paint for the benefit of the Council. Two years before the attempt to oust him, he had written to the Swiss reformer Henry Bullinger, informing him that ‘your illustrious reputation and singular learning, most accomplished sir, have for many years past excited in my mind a great regard for you.’ The occasion for his entering into correspondence with Bullinger was his hosting

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 318.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 318-19.

and patronage of itinerant young scholars as they made their way hither and thither across the continent, which was a particular feature of the Reformation. In this letter, Oglethorpe recalls Bullinger's kindness in his entertainment of Nicholas Partridge, 'a person most dear to me upon many accounts' when the latter had fallen ill on his way to Italy. Now, he writes 'John ab Ulmis, a young man of good hopes, has lately brought to me a salutation from you.' In return, Oglethorpe sends his letter with John Rudolph Stumphius, promising that 'if you will assist him in his studies, according to your exceeding kindness, there is no doubt but that he will some time or other be of great benefit to the state.' On the 28 May 1550, in a letter from Christopher Hales to Rudolf Gualter there is a reference to 'your friend Oglethorpe.'¹⁰¹ In 1549 the radical printer and former fellow of Magdalen, Robert Crowley, published a metrical Psalter which was intended to serve in a Reformed liturgical setting and the volume was dedicated to Oglethorpe. This dedication and these snatches of correspondence indicate that Oglethorpe's sympathy with reformers pre-dates his recantation of his 'former ignoraunce' at the preaching of Peter Martyr Vermigli, which John Foxe records as occurring in October 1552.¹⁰²

A letter from Walter Bower, a signatory to the petition against Oglethorpe of 1550, sent to Dr William Turner, chaplain and physician to the Lord Protector, at Somerset House on 20 January 1551, records that Oglethorpe was by then attempting to garner support among the fellowship, writing to them 'desyryng to know our mynde whether we wylbe content to take him for our hede and not complayne upon hym.' In an attempt perhaps to persuade the dissenting fellows that they were better stuck with the devil they knew, he wrote that 'he ys lothe he sayth that one besyde our foundation shuld com yn and thys his he wrytythe, for the love that he hathe to the collige.' Bower

¹⁰¹ Hastings Robinson (ed.), *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation written during the reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary chiefly from the archives of Zurich* (2 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846-7), 1, pp. 124-5, 187.

¹⁰² Foxe (1563), p. 1347.

estimates that 'XV would have Mr president be desynd to tary for the safegard of the college, viii other sayd planely yt they were lothe to hynder hym.'¹⁰³

The controversy was ended by the intervention of the King in his appointment as President of Walter Haddon, a signatory to the letters against Oglethorpe. An agreement was drawn up between Haddon and Oglethorpe on 4 August 1552 'in consideration of tow sondrie letters sent to the coledge by the Kings Majestie in the favour of the said Walther Haddon for hiis prefermente into thoffyce of the Presiidentship ther.' In the ten articles of agreement, Haddon undertook to 'restore the said Owyn Oglethorpe to suche credit and honest reputation with the Kyngs Majesties most honourable councell as he was', before the wrongful complaints were made against him. He was to be suffered 'quietle to occupie his office and roome untill ye next audit be finnishid.' Nor was he to be harassed to release the lands which he had procured for the college's benefit which were still in his possession, or be sued for non-residence or for the costs incurred in defending himself.'¹⁰⁴

This survey of the conflicts between Oglethorpe and the reformist fellows aided by the regime, as Bower's correspondence with Lord Protector Somerset's servant shows, gives us an outline of the context into which the developments which took place in Mary's reign in Oxford can be placed. Its most important part is the remarkable success of the Protestants in the University in establishing control. That Oglethorpe was not a one-dimensional refusenik and yet was still harried from his office by evangelical fellows aided and abetted by the regime shows quite how strong the grip of Protestantism had become on the college. That grip was however based on the disposition of the regime which in the events of the summer of 1553 was to change radically.

¹⁰³ SP, 10/13/f.9.

¹⁰⁴ Bloxam, *Register*, 2, p. 320.

The Number of Students.

Before proceeding to the main part of the thesis, which tries to give an account of the regime's attempt to give these aspirations concrete expression, it might be useful to provide a figure for the number of students who were present in Oxford in the Marian period. This is not an easy task. A manuscript, entitled the 'Epitome Chronographica Collegiorum Oxon', puts the figure in 1568 at 1,764 students. Among this number were 204 from Magdalen and 152 from Christ Church, the largest colleges.¹⁰⁵ However, this figure does not accurately reflect the number which were present a decade earlier. In the decade after the Queen's death seventy-one fellows and scholars left New College, most for religious reasons.¹⁰⁶ Indeed, by the end of the academic year 1558/9, the number of fellows and scholars at the College was ten fewer than the previous year's total.¹⁰⁷ Without these deprivations, the number of students at New during Mary's reign would have been comparable to those at Magdalen and Christ Church in 1568, when the 'Epitome Chronographica Collegiorum Oxon' was compiled.

This hemorrhaging of Catholics reflected in the 1568 total obscures one of the most momentous achievements of the Marian policy towards the University, the rapid increase in the uptake of places during the reign. Let us take Christ Church as an example. In the intake of 1551, there were four theologians, the same number in the first cohort of philosophers, six in the second and thirteen 'discipuli'; a total number of twenty-seven admitted. In 1552, the figures were two theologians, only seven philosophers and sixteen pupils; a total of twenty-five students. In September 1553, two months after Mary's accession, there were six theologians, seven philosophers in the first cohort,

¹⁰⁵ Printed Gerard Kilroy, 'The Queen's Visit to Oxford in 1566: A Fresh Look at Neglected Manuscript Sources', in *Recusant History* 31 (2013), 333-375 at 370-371.

¹⁰⁶ See the Conclusion below.

¹⁰⁷ NCA, Accounts Rolls, 221, 222.

eight in the second and thirteen pupils; a total of thirty-four. In 1554 there were four theologians, a full complement of twenty philosophers in each cohort and forty-four pupils, divided for the first time into two cohorts; a total of sixty-eight students. In 1555, the last year of Mary's reign for which a record of those admitted survives the figures were seventeen theologians, nineteen philosophers in the first cohort, twenty in the second and forty six pupils; a grand total of 103 students. In 1561, however, the next year for which numbers are provided, they were of Edwardian slenderness with only six theologians, ten philosophers in the first cohort, nine in the second and twenty pupils; a total of just forty-five students.¹⁰⁸

The number of students in Marian Oxford was, then, like the University's religion, statutes and its constituent institutions, in a state of flux. However, the rapid growth in that number which occurred and the massive scale of the departures after 1558 are testament to the significance of what took place there during the reign. In the light of the Queen's ambition for the University to take in more students in order that it might churn out more priests for the English Church, this increase in intake is a notable, quantifiable, success.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have sought to delineate the principal features of the life of the University at Mary's accession and the way in which the regime initially sought to address them. The situation was one of remarkable fluidity. An uncommitted observer of the scene in mid-sixteenth century Oxford would have experienced a sensation akin to that described by eye-witnesses of an earthquake: nothing was stable. The loss of the Religious Houses, which removed from the life of the academy a large number of students, and a significant fund of theological expertise; the eclipse

¹⁰⁸ CCA, Chapter Book, ff. 19v-30.

of the halls, as the undergraduate college became the main source of its constituent students; the decline in the central Schools of the University as their teaching functions were progressively annexed by the colleges; the growing power and assertiveness of the Regent Masters, whose legislative organ annexed to itself more and more authority to act independently of its parent body; the obsolescence of the ancient statutes and the erection in their place of a code which inflicted upon the University a radical new religious settlement: all this before the religious Reformation *per se* has even been considered.

The previous two monarchs and their governments had failed to stabilise the situation or even to recognize the existence of many of the causes of its instability. For Mary and Cardinal Pole, religion provided the basis of their diagnosis: disorder, disobedience and division were the inevitable result of heresy. To reconnect the University to the Catholic faith would solve its problems and provide the stability upon which any recovery of the situation would depend. In this they were not naïve, as we shall see below. The reconstruction of the University around the twin pillars of traditional religion and traditional theology, according to a blue-print in which Oxford would come to supply a re-Catholicised England with its ecclesiastical and political elite, provided the University with a much-needed justification for its existence on the basis of which the mess of its institutional, statutory and financial situation could be untangled.

Chapter 2: Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley

That bishops Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer met their deaths in Oxford on 18 October 1555 shortly followed by Thomas Cranmer on 26 March 1556 has cast an air of inevitability over the time they spent in Oxford from March 1554, when they were sent to the Bocardo prison from the Tower of London by the Privy Council. If their deaths were inevitable when the Privy Council sent them to Oxford in 1554, then the disputation which was the ostensible reason for doing so becomes, even in the eyes of an historian sympathetic to the regime, a ‘staged...trial.’¹

In this designation, Eamon Duffy builds on foundations laid by David Loades’ *The Oxford Martyrs*, first published in 1970. For Loades, the disputation was the result of ‘the impasse over the question of the Supreme Headship’, although he confusingly acknowledges that the Queen could have proceeded with her own heresy proceedings on that authority. ‘Instead’ Loades argues ‘it was decided as an interim measure to discredit their [the embryonic martyrs’] intellectual pretensions by means of a public disputation’ which was in reality ‘a show trial, and the paper thin academic proprieties deceived no one.’² This estimation, as its taking up by Duffy suggests, is the enduring conclusion historians have come to about the disputation. Claire Cross argued in 1986 that ‘the government obviously saw this as a way of publicly reversing the results of the disputations which had been staged...in the former reign.’³ Diarmaid MacCulloch’s 1996 biography of Thomas Cranmer supports the claim that the disputation was ‘not exactly a trial’ but was intended to

¹ Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, p. 103.

² David Loades, *The Oxford Martyrs* (2nd edition, London: Headstart History, 1992), p. 129.

³ Cross, ‘Oxford and the Tudor State’ in *HUO* III, pp. 142-3.

‘provide material for a subsequent heresy trial.’⁴ Mary’s most recent biographer claims that she was ‘determined to punish as severely as possible her old adversary’ and that the disputation was staged due to the temporary obstacles faced by her desire to have him ‘die as a heretic.’⁵

In this chapter the decision taken in March 1554 to send Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley to Oxford, the disputation held there upon their arrival in the April, the subsequent hiatus and their eventual executions are scrutinised in the context of the University. In this it differs from foregoing accounts which have shown these events almost entirely in relation to the central government, and in particular the Queen’s supposed pathological desire to wreak revenge on Cranmer. This narrative, compelling as psychodrama, has served to obscure the role the University played in the disputations and trials of the three bishops and the inferences which can be drawn about the role of the University in the Marian Counter-Reformation from the evidence these events left behind.

In this chapter I propose to look at the disputation held in April 1554 on its own terms, and in particular at those neglected features that suggest that it was what it purported to be: a serious academic exercise. Two of these features in particular : the theological themes explored in it, which were different from those that dominated the later trials, and the location of the disputation, in the Divinity Schools rather than the University Church, indicate that it may be a mistake to collapse this earlier process into the later penal one.

⁴ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 563-565.

⁵ John Edwards, *Mary I: England’s Catholic Queen* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), p. 263.

The persecution

In the introduction to this thesis it was claimed that the University of Oxford acted as a crucible for Marian Catholicism from which many of its distinctive ideas and programmes emanated, yet also one in which all the elements which went to make up the English Counter-Reformation were present. The execution of those convicted of heresy who were unrepentant of their errors - the 'burnings' - is no exception to this rule. Yet the trials and executions which took place in Oxford in this period were hardly typical. Each of the three men who died had been bishops, and their executions were the only ones to take place in the diocese of Oxford during the reign.

As the burnings have come to define her reign, it is startling to note that as *sole Queen*, that is, before her marriage and the inauguration of her joint reign with Philip and the arrival in England of Cardinal Pole, and indeed for a short while after these events (a period from July 1553 to the February of 1555) not one person was executed for the crime of heresy in England. Some of those most associated with the previous reigns, like the Protestant fellows of Magdalen College who have already been discussed, left England shortly after Mary's accession. However, a number of leading Protestants had remained, among them Bishops Latimer and Ridley and Archbishop Cranmer.

No full and convincing explanation has been offered by historians for the significant delay between Mary's accession and the start of the campaign against the Henrician and Edwardian heretics. In the case of Cranmer, it has been suggested that his status as *legatus natus*, conferred on him by the papal bull which ratified his appointment to the archiepiscopate of Canterbury in 1533, made his trial impossible until it was reversed. This would clearly have constituted an insuperable obstacle to the inauguration of legal processes against *him* but it does not explain why Latimer and

Ridley, Edwardian bishops whose deprivation and replacement was accomplished by the Queen in the first year of her reign, should also have had to wait so long to be tried or indeed why processes were not begun against the less distinguished clerical radicals, still less lay Protestants, until 1555. A clue to answering this conundrum lies in the dates of the first trials and executions: February 1555, when Bishops Latimer and Ridley, Hooper, and John Rogers were all found guilty of heresy and released into the custody of the secular power, by whom they were burned.

The Queen's concern at the beginning of the reign for the observation of the Henrician statutes and the detailed interim statutes drawn up for Oxford, which will be discussed in the next chapter, could be said to justify the description of the Marian regime as 'legalistic'. This is not meant as a reproach. If we designate the regime's governing principle by recourse to this adjective we may be intimating a perverse and self-defeating concern for conformity to the literal meaning of statutes. On the contrary a regard for, even a preoccupation with, the precise legal situation in which the monarch and the Church found themselves was an essential pre-condition of the restoration of Catholicism. The failure to proceed against Protestants 'on her own authority' was not, in the first instance, a matter of 'scruple', as Loades claims, but of doctrine and precedent.¹

On 1 December 1554 Cardinal Pole announced before Parliament that 'We, by the apostolic authority granted to us, you and each one of you and the whole realm and you and the lords of it, we absolve and free from any heresy and schism, and from all the sentences and censures presently in force.'² After this date until well into the new year, Pole issued specific absolutions to each of the bishops not appointed by Edward and who consequently maintained their sees.³ After their own

¹ Loades, *Oxford Martyrs*, p. 128.

² *CRP*, 998.

³ For example, Cuthbert Tunstall was absolved on 27 January 1555. *Ibid.*, 1045.

absolution the Bishops were charged with the reconciliation of all those under their authority, ordained and lay, on the pre-condition of their repentance and performance of suitable penance. That this mercy was extendable even to cases such as those of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley is demonstrated in the absolution of Nicholas Shaxton, Edwardian Bishop of Salisbury, dated 20 March 1555, in which the Cardinal recites his crimes: consenting to the supreme headship, marriage, association with heretics before he, on the basis of his repentance and putting away of his wife, proceeds to absolution and permission for Shaxton to use his orders as a suffragan bishop in another diocese.⁴ It is difficult to imagine that, had Latimer and Ridley, and possibly even Cranmer, made their repentance and performed their penance at this stage, that they would have suffered the fate they did.

Only after the formal submission of Parliament, Pole's promise of absolution and the initiation of the massive process of individual absolution had begun could the Queen and the Cardinal turn their attention to those convinced Protestants who, finally, were distinguishable in law from their Catholic colleagues. On 28 January 1555 the Bishop of Winchester Stephen Gardiner was granted a commission by the Cardinal to 'sit upon, and order...all such preachers and heretics as were in prison'. A day later he was granted the first of the mandates which allowed the Bishops to reconcile their flocks. However, according to John Foxe's chronology, it was a week earlier, on 18 January, that 'all the council went unto the Tower, and there the same day discharged and set at liberty all the prisoners of the Tower, or the most part of them.' Then on the twenty-second,

all the preachers that were in prison were called before the B. of Wincher, L. Chancellour and certain other, at the bishops house at S. Mary Oueries. From whence (after communication beyng asked whether they would conuert and enioy the Queenes pardon, or els stande to that they had taught: they all aunswered that they would stand to that they had

⁴ *CRP*, 1137.

taught) they were committed to straiter prison then before they were, with charge that none should speake with them.⁵

It was only after this, on 23 January 1555 that ‘all the bishops with all the rest of the Conuocation house were before the cardinal at Lambeth, where he willed them to repaire euery man where his cure and charge lay’ to the communion of the Church.⁶

By this point Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley had been removed to Oxford, but the events in London provide a satisfactory explanation for the delay between Mary’s accession to the throne and the start of proceedings against heretics, that is that without the reconciliation of the entire population being accomplished by the Cardinal on authority received from the Pope, it was impossible to bring ecclesiastical charges against any individual.

Once the Church had embarked upon the process of reconciling all the population, those who refused such reconciliation and the obedience due to the See of Rome and the doctrine of the Catholic Church which was its price could be prosecuted on the authority of Canon Law. If convicted they could be handed over to the civil authority which now had recourse to the revived

⁵ Foxe (1583), p. 1506.

⁶ *Ibid.*

statutes against heresy, whose repeal had been reversed by the Parliament of November 1554.⁷ It was thus *only* in early February 1555 that the English Church was, in the eyes of the law, in a position to try its members for heresy.

No evidence survives which gives the identity of the person responsible for the decision to transfer the three bishops to Oxford, or when it was taken. A letter was, Foxe records, sent to the Lieutenant of the Tower to this effect on 10 March 1554 and they began their journey, via Windsor, a month later on 10 April.

Bishop John Hooper, appointed Bishop of Gloucester in 1551 and then of Worcester in 1552, was detained in London (despite his support for Mary in the crisis of her accession) from 1 September 1553 until he was sent to Gloucester to be executed at the beginning of February 1555. John Rogers, prebendary of St Paul's, was imprisoned in Newgate in London until his own execution at the same time as Hooper. That both these notable Protestants were detained in London, while those subsequently known as the 'Oxford martyrs' were not, is perplexing.

⁷ A Bill reviving the statutes against heresy had been defeated in the Parliament of April 1554. See Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 97-100, 115. The defeat of this Bill, orchestrated by Lord Paget, is mysterious. Had it been passed, it is possible that proceedings could have been brought sooner against Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley. The most likely explanation for the defeat of the Bill is found in Renard's report that Bishop Gardiner had sought to introduce a bill 'concerning religion and the Pope's authority, establishing an Inquisition against heretics, setting up again the power of the bishops and dealing with the Pope's authority.' *CSPS*, 12, no. 216. Gardiner was not therefore attempting to re-introduce the penalties against heresy independent of a return to the Roman obedience, but was rather engaged on the attempt to pre-empt Pole's arrival by accomplishing the reinstatement of both. The easy passage of the Bill reintroducing the heresy statutes at the Parliament of November 1554 suggests that it was the reluctance of Parliament to proceed without the Cardinal Legate and the resolution of the question of Church Property, which lay behind the original bill's defeat. *Ibid.*, nos 221, 230, 251, 220, 228, 230, 251, 140.

In the case of Ridley, the answer may lie in a ‘conference’ in which the former Bishop of London took part ‘at the Lieutenant’s table in the Tower.’ Ridley’s account of the conference, though undated, evidently belongs to the period before his removal to Oxford, at which Ridley’s interlocutors were Dr Feckenham and John Bourn, Secretary to the Council. The question which formed the basis of the conference was posed by ‘Master Thomas of Bridges’ [Sir Thomas Brydges, Deputy Lieutenant of the Tower]: ‘I pray you, Master Doctors, for my learning, tell me what an heretic is!’ After Bourn divested himself of the unanswerable opinion that an heretic was ‘one whose stubbornly and stiffly maintaineth an untruth’, Feckenham, perhaps in attempt to establish common ground with Ridley, attempted to answer with reference to St Augustine’s maxim, ‘*qui adulandi Principibus vel lucri gratia, falsas opiniones gignit, vel sequitur, hereticus est*’⁸ to which Ridley replied ‘Sir, I ween St Augustine addeth a third member, which is *vel vanae gloriae causa*.’⁹ This Feckenham accepted, all the participants in the conference being in agreement on the question of St Augustine’s definition.

Feckenham then attempted to move the discussion on to what he no doubt assumed to be more controversial ground thus: ‘whoso doth not believe that the Scripture affirmeth, but will obstinately maintain the contrary, he is *haereticus*’. For an example, Feckenham chose the contested arena of sacramental theology:

the sacrament of the altar, Matthew doth affirm there to be Christ’s body, Mark doth affirm it, Luke doth affirm it, Paul affirmeth it, and none denieth it: therefore to hold the contrary is heresy. It is

⁸ Whoever brings forth or follows false opinions for the sake of flattering rulers or profit is a heretic.

⁹ or for reason of vainglory.

the same body and flesh that was born of the virgin: and this is confirmed by unity, antiquity and universality.¹⁰

Bourn then invited Ridley to speak: ‘preadventure Master Ridley doth agree with Mr Fecknam, and then there needs not much debating of the matter.’ Before replying, Ridley sought to establish whether his interlocutors ‘be (as I understand) the Queen’s commissioners here, and if ye have commission to examine me in these matters, I shall declare unto you plainly my faith; if ye have not, then I shall pray you either give me leave to speak my mind freely, or else hold my peace.’ The Secretary assured Ridley that ‘there is none here that doth not favour you’ and ‘how glad they would be of agreement.’¹¹ Tellingly, Bourn did not provide Ridley with the reassurance he sought, that he did not possess a commission to examine him, as Ridley acknowledged when he prefaced his response with the explanation that ‘at the last I was contented to take it for licensed and so began to talk.’

His argument to the company was that, in the case of the Gospels’ narrative of the Last Supper, Feckenham had ‘taken their words’ but had disregarded their meaning. Feckenham challenged him that the words ‘*Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur*’ were patient of no other meaning than that which their plain sense conveyed, to which Ridley responded that ‘the next sentence’ supplied the meaning by which they were to be interpreted ‘*hoc facitis in meam commemorationem*.’¹²

¹⁰ Henry Christmas (ed.), *The Works of Nicholas Ridley, DD.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843), pp. 155-6. See also Ruth Ahnert, ‘Imitating Inquisition: Dialectical Bias in Protestant Prison Writings’ in Mary C. Flannery and Katie L. Walter, *The Culture of Inquisition in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013), pp. 146-163 at p. 153.

¹¹ *Works of Ridley.*, p. 156.

¹² This is my body, which will be given up for you. Do this in remembrance of me.

Turning from this matter, Bourn sought Ridley's opinion about the ecclesiological basis for determining the orthodoxy of theological propositions, 'what say ye of the universality, antiquity and unity that Master Fecknam did speak of?' This provoked from Ridley a prolonged discourse in which he accepted the principle of unity ('before God I do believe and embrace it') and antiquity ('I am persuaded to be true that...that first is true').

On the principle of Universality, however, Ridley equivocated and delineated two contrasting meanings of the word. First, that 'to understand that to be universal which from the beginning and in all ages hath been allowed; another to understand universality for the multitude of our age, or of any other singular age.' Here, Ridley reports 'we did not agree', as Bourn was adamant that these alternatives were in fact always in agreement with one another. Ridley and his examiners then embarked on an argument concerning the unanimity or otherwise of the patristic witness to the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament which ended, after the intervention of Sir Thomas Pope, later to found Trinity College, with a brief discussion of the significance of the See of Rome in determining orthodoxy. 'Forty years ago' reflected Feckenham in the context of the Eucharistic controversy 'all were of one opinion in this matter'. Ridley's riposte ('forty years ago all held that the Bishop of Rome was supreme head of the universal Church') moved the discussion onto this new ground. Bourn attempted to claim that this was 'a positive law' and 'not counted an article of our faith.' But Ridley asserted, on the basis of papal decrees of Boniface VIII and other authorities, that the supremacy of the Roman See was indeed counted by them a proposition to be believed on pain of damnation. This argument had the effect of dividing Ridley's interlocutors, with Roger Chomley attempting to deny that papal authority was binding on the English Church, before being 'answered out of his own fellows.' The interview concluded with Bourn promising Ridley recourse to his books.¹³

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 163-66.

Taking into account the presence of the Secretary to the Council at this hearing and the disagreement evident between those who opposed Ridley, it is not inconceivable that the solution of moving Ridley and others to Oxford, there to dispute with the academics of the University should have occurred to the Queen and Council at this point. Whether as a solution to the differences the opposition to Ridley aroused among the Council, as seen in the disagreement between Chomley and other members present, or in order that he should be publicly refuted, or both, it is at least possible that this discussion was the occasion for the removal of Ridley, with Cranmer and Latimer to Oxford in the early part of 1554.

I have set out in detail the conversation that took place at the Tower because I think it contains a number of important clues to aid the attempt to determine why the bishops were removed to Oxford, and what was planned for them there. The most important of these is the significant attention that was paid in the conference to the Eucharist and to the nature of catholicity. These were to be the themes of the disputation and trials respectively.

This decision to send the bishops to Oxford was entirely consistent with the government's policy towards heresy. In her proclamation at the start of her reign the Queen had explicitly prohibited discussion of controversial doctrine outside the Universities and the 'Instructions' issued at Pole's arrival had made a priority of the presentation of heretics with opportunities for persuasion and repentance and identified the evangelistic tool afforded to the Government by the spectacle certain to surround such discussions and, where unsuccessful, the punishments of unrepentant Protestants.

Disputations

In early 1554 when the regime faced the dilemma of what to do with those Protestant bishops who had not repented of their errors who posed, by their refusal to go into exile and consequent presence in the realm and in London, a symbolic threat to the Marian project. A staged scholastic disputation between Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley and the conservative theological elite of the two Universities, at Oxford, fitted the bill perfectly. It would win time, until the formal reconciliation of the English Church to the papacy which would occur at the arrival of Cardinal Pole was enacted, it would remove the three bishops from London: it might force them, by the power of the arguments ranged against them, into retraction and repentance and if not, their defeat in the disputation would provide a propaganda coup for the Queen and her ministers.

The planning of the disputation began on the same day, 10 April 1554, that the three bishops arrived in Oxford. The Register of Congregation and Convocation contains copies of a letter from the University of Cambridge to that of Oxford and Oxford's reply from the period before the Disputations. The two letters, which have not been subject to much discussion, represent the understanding held by each institution of the intention of the disputations.

The letter from Cambridge, dated 10 April 1554, begins by claiming that the University was 'retaining the same unity of Spirit with the Catholic Church of Christ' and acknowledges 'the articles which at the latest Synod of London were agreed between the princes of our Church'.¹⁴

¹⁴ *Nos proinde eandem spiritus unitatem cum Catholica Christi ecclesia retinentes, articulos de quibus postremo Synodo Londoniensi inter ecclesiarum nostrarum proceres conveniebant.* Reg. I, f. 142.

The reference to the ‘last Synod of London’ is worthy of comment. The ‘synod’ actually refers to the first Convocation of Canterbury of the reign in 1553. This Convocation, after a disputation convoked by the Queen, in which Hugh Weston was to play a significant part, affirmed in a series of articles the doctrines of the Real Presence, Transubstantiation and the Eucharistic Sacrifice.¹⁵ It was entirely appropriate, therefore, that these articles should be adopted as the basis for those to be disputed in Oxford, concerning as they did this central issue of theological contention. The delegates sent from Cambridge were seven men, John Young, the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, William Glyn, Richard Atkinson, Cuthbert Scott, Thomas Watson, Alban Langdale and Thomas Sedgewick.

Some evidence survives in Cambridge of the selection of these men, for which the University Grace book records permission being granted ‘for the defence of true and Catholic faith.’¹⁶ The matter had already been touched upon by Gardiner, in a letter of April 1554, which referred to the ‘solempne acte to be don at Oxford.’¹⁷

Now, had the disputations been a mere show trial; not a serious academic exercise, it is unlikely that the senate of Cambridge University would have invested such effort in selecting its candidates for the disputation.

The Cambridge letter began by acknowledging that the three bishops had been at Cambridge University, but now ‘we, grieving, write stubborn patrons of a false and corrupt doctrine’. The letter

¹⁵ Foxe (1583), pp. 1434-1441.

¹⁶ *ad propugnandam veram et catholicam fidem*. Cambridge University Archives, *Grace Book A*, p. 100, quoted in Law, ‘Religious Change’, p. 79.

¹⁷ Cambridge University Archives, Collect.Admin.5, fo. 128r, quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 78.

goes on to express hope for their repentance, since ‘whoever does not have [the Church] for his mother, he will not be able to have God as a father.’¹⁸

The last phrase is from S. Cyprian’s *De Unitate ecclesiae*. It was Cyprian who in the aftermath of the Decian Persecution had insisted on the firm treatment of those who had lapsed. The parallels with the situation faced by the Church in England in 1554 are striking and perhaps reveal the extent to which, in the academic world of Marian England, the current controversies were set in a patristic context. The emphasis on the witness of the Fathers to theological statements was a familiar ground of controversy in the Reformation, but it ought not to be assumed that Catholics and Protestants approached this authority in identical ways. For reformers, the statements of the Fathers could serve as proof texts containing as they did interpretations of biblical texts which seemed to qualify, or even contradict, the scholastically codified orthodoxy of the Church. A prime example of this is seen above in Ridley’s deposition before the members of the Council at the Tower.

For Catholics, the Fathers’ teaching and, more significantly the canons of General Councils, in a way serves the same function. If a Protestant could be refuted by reference to statements by, say, Augustine to which he himself appealed, then the rhetorical advantage was obvious. However, the Fathers and the early Councils also served as witnesses, for the Catholic, to the authority of the Church to distinguish orthodoxy from heresy. The quotation from S. Cyprian in this letter is a prime example of this tendency in Catholic thought.

The teaching of the faith and the defence of Christ’s Church was a part of the individual vocation of the men who were engaged in preparing for the disputations with Cranmer, Latimer and

¹⁸ *quod nos dolentes scribimus, falsae et corruptae doctrinae contumaces patronos...Quam quisquis non habuerit matrem suam, is Deum patrem habere non poterit.* Reg. I, 142v.

Ridley. It is the legacy of Foxe's martyrology that we have come to place a greater emphasis on the Marian martyrs' defiance of expediency in the cause of theological truth. But accountability for the advancement of the truth was at the level of one's own accountability before Christ for those who were inquisitors as much as for those who were the subject of their interrogation.

To Cambridge, after the arrival of the men, Oxford's reply was exultant. 'We rejoice' they wrote 'very much in this repetition of the Christian faith, that great argument of the Church, which is collected from the common agreement of men between themselves and the agreement of all antiquity. In these doctrines and pieties, as if houses, Oxford and Cambridge live.'¹⁹

In the light of the subsequent interpretation of the disputation as a 'show trial' the absence of any indication that it was conceived in this way by either University is impressive. There is, of course, an acknowledgement of the serious error into which the three bishops had fallen: errors which, in the words of the Oxford letter, have meant their departure from the Church. Nevertheless, there is no implication in either letter that the process was conceived as a penal one. It is indeed to persuade them that the six 'pious and erudite' men were sent from Cambridge.²⁰

Indeed, insofar as the argumentative nature of the disputation to take place is tackled in the correspondence emphasis is placed exclusively on the case to be made by the academics of each institution, with its grounding in the consensus of the Councils and of Antiquity. The purpose for which Cambridge sends these leading lights, an effort it may well be thought entirely

¹⁹ *Vehementer sane gaudemus in hac Christianae fidei instauratione, summum illud Ecclesiae argumentum, quod ex mutua hominum inter se et omnem antiquitatem consensione colligitur, in his doctrina ac pietatis quasi domiciliis Oxonia et Cantabrigia extitisse. Ibid.*, f. 143.

²⁰ *pios et eruditos viros. Ibid.*

disproportionate to that required for a nominal dispute followed by an inevitable condemnation, is both pastoral and evangelistic.

In considering the articles of inquiry for the visitation of the University in 1554 I will argue that they had a precedent in the Queen's 'Instructions', in the compilation of which Bishop Gardiner is likely to have been important. In these instructions, we find that the Universities' dual pastoral and evangelistic conception of their task in the disputation mirrors that of the regime for dealing with heretics more generally. In the Instructions the Queen writes that

Touching the punishment of hereticques me thinketh it ought to be donne without rashnes, not leaving in the mean while to doe Justice to such as by learning would seeme to deceive the simple. And the rest soe to bee used that the people might well perceive them not to be condemned without iust occasion, whereby they shall both understand the trouth...and especially within London I would wish none to be burnt without some of the Councells presense and both there and everywhere good sermons at the same.²¹

Now, although the disputation planned for Oxford was not strictly a part of the penal process against the three bishops, nevertheless this section of the instructions shows that dealing with heretics was an issue of evangelism and pedagogy in the mind of the regime and the same theme is picked up in the correspondence between the Universities. With regard to heretical theology it is a pastoral necessity to protect the 'simple' from exposure to error, and its refutation as a chance for repentance for those who advance it and for demonstrating that 'the Church's argument' to quote from the Oxford letter, has a claim on their acceptance.

The Articles

According to John Foxe, the articles which were to form the basis of the disputation at Oxford were those approved by the first Convocation of the southern province of the reign in 1553 for the

²¹ Cotton MS Titus CVII, f. 120.

purpose of establishing the orthodoxy or otherwise of those exposed during the preceding reigns to Protestant preaching. Foxe records that they were approved for use in the disputation by the Congregation of Regent and Non-Regent Masters of Cambridge on 7 April, but there is no record of their acceptance by Oxford. The three articles are concerned with Eucharistic theology. The first asked ‘whether the natural body of Christ be really in the sacrament after the wordes spoken by the priest or no?’, the second ‘whether in the Sacrament after the wordes of consecration, any other substance do remayne, then the substance of the body and bloud of Christ?’ and the third ‘whether in the Mass be a sacrifice propitiatory for the sines of the quicke and the dead.’²²

That the content of the articles was concerned with the Eucharist is corroborated by an account, known as Cranmer’s *Recantacyons*, a narrative of the archbishop’s imprisonment, examination, trial and execution written from a Catholic perspective. The *Recantacyons* supplies the Latin text of the articles in which they were written and in which they were supplied to the three Bishops. The first we might translate as enquiring whether ‘there is contained the truth of the flesh of Christ in the forms of bread and wine?’²³ There is no mention here of the words ‘verum and naturale’ which, according to Foxe, were the bone of contention for Cranmer in his first hearing before the Commission. Perhaps Cranmer had misunderstood the article put to him, or had taken exception to an explanatory gloss which had been put upon the article, although Foxe does not record Weston making any use of the words in his opening speech.

The second article in the *Recantacyons* also reads differently to Foxe’s version. It asks whether ‘the bread [is turned] into flesh, the wine into blood, not by use but by change to the nature.’²⁴ Even

²² Foxe (1583), p. 1452.

²³ *contineri veritatem carnis Christi panis et vini specie. Cranmer’s Recantacyons*, p. 18.

²⁴ *panem in carnem, vinum in sanguinem, non usu sed natura mutari. Ibid.*

in the third article we find a distinction between the two copies of the articles. For Foxe's 'whether the mass be a sacrifice propitiatory for the sinnes of the quicke and the dead' we have whether 'the mass is a sacrifice by which God may be restored more propitiously to the race of men, not only of living men but also of the dead.'²⁵ which seems to imply that the benefits of the Eucharist were applicable not only to those present (which was evidently seen by the compliers of the articles as common ground) but which also for the benefit of the dead.

There are three possible explanations for this contradiction. Either Foxe has inaccurately transcribed or translated the articles, or the articles were put to the Bishops in the English version Foxe presents. The second would seem unlikely, since Cranmer makes a point of asking what is meant by the word 'verum' in the Latin, implying that this was the language in which they were put, although it must be admitted that the word does not appear in the version in *Recantayons*. This might suggest that a third (latin) version, containing the word 'verum' existed. A simpler explanation though would be that either Cranmer had misheard 'veritatem' or that his reply itself had been misheard or mis-transcribed. The second explanation is, I would suggest, more likely as it gives a more convincing account of the subtleties of the scholastic ideas about transubstantiation and the Eucharistic sacrifice than Foxe's version.

Having surveyed the articles and established what they contained, before proceeding to the answers Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley gave to them, it is opportune to ask why they were posed, and what theological disagreements between the Marian theologians of Oxford and Cambridge and the three bishops were intended to be exposed by them.

²⁵ *Missam esse sacrificium quo deus hominum generi, non viventium modo, verum etiam mortuorum propitius reddatur. Ibid.*

The position of the bishops had been laid out most fully by Cranmer in his *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Christ*, written against the Bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner, in 1550. The second chapter of the third book contains thirteen ‘comparisons’ between Cranmer’s position and that of the ‘papists’. These are instructive in that they disclose the soteriological agenda which inspired and dominated his Eucharistic theology. The first three counterpositions make the point admirably,

For they teach, that Christ is in the bread and wine: but we say, according to the truth, that he is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine. They say, that when any man eateth the bread and drinketh the cup, Christ goes into his mouth or stomach with the bread and wine, and no further: but we say, that Christ is in the whole man, both in the body and the soul of him that worthily eateth the bread and drinketh the cup and not in his mouth or stomach only. They say, that Christ is received in the mouth, and entereth in with the bread and wine: we say, that he is received in the heart and entereth in by faith.²⁶

Each of these assertions makes plain the dependence of the Protestant sacramental theology on that primary claim of justification by faith alone. The problem for Cranmer with any understanding of the change undergone by the Eucharistic species which allows that the unbeliever receives the body and blood of Christ, and who thereby shares in eternal life, is that it reintroduces by the sacramental door what justification by faith alone had excluded from the soteriological one; justification is reinserted into the realm of what is achievable by human agency.

That this is what lies behind Cranmer’s sacramental theology is evident from the fact that his argument about the Eucharist is perhaps not what it claims to be. The *True and Catholic Doctrine* does not deal with the actual scholastic doctrine of the sacrament but erects an Aunt Sally, against which can be shied a series of sarcastic brick-bats. To take an example, this from the seventeenth chapter of the first book:

²⁶ John Edmund Cox (ed.), *Miscellaneous writings and letters of Thomas Cranmer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846), p. 124.

They say that the very natural flesh and blood of Christ, which suffered for us upon the cross, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is also really, substantially, corporally and naturally, in or under the accidents of bread and wine...But the true Catholic faith grounded upon God's word teacheth us, that our Saviour Christ (as concerning his man's nature and bodily presence) is gone up into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of his Father...And although Christ in his human nature substantially, really, corporally, naturally and sensibly, be present with his Father in heaven, yet sacramentally and spiritually is here present.²⁷

As Cranmer knew, no scholastic theologian could ever have claimed that at the consecration of the Eucharist, Christ is brought down from heaven onto the altar. If this were the case, what was consecrated would not have been a sacrament at all. Cranmer acknowledges this when he writes that 'our English papists' in this matter 'speak more grossly herein than the Pope himself, affirming that the natural body of Christ is naturally in the bread and wine'. In effect, Cranmer is admitting that he cannot find the argument he wishes to refute in the writings of Catholic theologians, or even in the teaching of the Pope, but has rather to summon up anonymous 'English papists' distinguished from the rest of Christendom by reason of their propensity for superstition.

Cranmer's confusion, real or pretended, concerns the question of how the body of Christ with its bones, nerves, organs and so on, can at once be present in heaven and on the altar. That this apparent contradiction is susceptible to resolution and that the means by which it had in fact been resolved by scholastic theologians was the orthodox teaching of the Church at the time Cranmer was writing, goes unacknowledged.

The answer of Aquinas to this conundrum is that the body of Christ is present substantially, not in its dimensions: 'the dimensions of Christ's body are not in the sacrament as a result of the effectiveness of the sacramental sign...this is clear from the fact that it is only the substance of bread which passes away at the consecration, but the dimensions of the bread remain.' In answer to the question, 'is the body of Christ present in this sacrament locally?' Thomas returns a negative

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 78-79.

answer, on the grounds that ‘Christ’s body is not in this sacrament in the normal way as an extended body exists, but rather as if it were purely and simply substance...the body of Christ is not under the dimensions of the bread locally.’²⁸ Christ is present in the bread by means of the efficacious sacramental sign, he is in heaven in another fashion entirely, ‘the substance of Christ’s body or of his blood is in the sacrament as a result *of the sacramental sign*.’²⁹ It is truly possible, for Aquinas, for the whole Christ to be in different places, as we see in his account of the three days following the crucifixion. Simultaneously, the whole Christ was in heaven, in the tomb and in hell, simultaneously too, the whole Christ can be in heaven and, by means of the efficacious sacramental sign, be present on the altars of the Church.

In the choice of the doctrine of the Eucharist, the adversaries of Cranmer and his colleagues were undoubtedly attacking on their opponents’ weakest ground. That weakness would, at length, yet fleetingly, cause the author of their common position to surrender it.

The Initial Hearing

The disputation held in Oxford, beginning on the 14th April 1554 was the purpose for which Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley were sent to the city from the Tower of London where they had been held since the beginning of the reign for their part in the usurpation of the throne by Queen Jane. Foxe records that on 10 April they were at Windsor before moving on ‘to the Universitye of Oxford, there to dispute with the divines and learned men of both the Universityes, Oxford and Cambridge, about the presence, substance and sacrifice of the Sacrament.’³⁰ The Register records that on 14

²⁸ *ST*, 3a. 76, 4-5.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 3a. 76, 2. My emphasis.

³⁰ Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (1583), p. 1452.

April John Young, John Seton, William Glyne, Richard Atkinson, Thomas Watson, Cuthbert Scott, Thomas Sedgewick and Alban Langdale, Doctors of Sacred Theology of Cambridge, were incorporated into the University of Oxford at an equal place and grade.³¹ These individuals, chosen by the Convocation of Cambridge, were joined by Drs Weston, Tresham,³² Cole, Oglethorpe, Pie,³³ Mr Harpsfield³⁴ and Mr Feckenam³⁵ from Oxford.

The brief examination of all three Bishops held on Saturday 14 April yields much evidence about the attitude taken by each of them to the disputation and its ostensible subject. Cranmer asked

what they meant by these terms *verum* and *naturale* i.[e.] true and natural. Doe you not mean, sayth he, *corpus organicum*, a sensible body? Summe answered, *idem quod natus est ex virgine* i.[e.] the same that was borne of the virgine: and so confusedly, some said one thing, some an other.³⁶

What was the nature of the confusion of those who were examining the three Bishops? Above, I suggested that the scholastic idea being defended at the disputation was that the body of Christ, as born of the Virgin, is present as substance in the consecrated Eucharist, by means of the effective sacramental sign, not that Christ is brought down from heaven in the mode in which he sits at the right hand of the Father in glory and put on the altar. It seems likely that any dispute that there was

³¹ Reg. I, f. 141r.

³² William Tresham, Merton: BA 1515, MA 1520, BTh 1528, DTh 1532. Originally a fellow of Merton, he was made a canon of King Henry VIII's College in 1529 until (when it had become Christ Church) he was deprived in 1560. 'Cancellarius natus' for 1553, 55 and 56.

³³ William Pye, Oriel: BA 1529, MA 33, BTh 44. Fellow of Oriel 1530-44, Principal of St Mary's Hall 1537-43, Canon and Prebendary of St George's Chapel, Windsor 1557.

³⁴ Nicholas Harpsfield, New: 1519-1575, BCL 1543, DCL 1554, New College Scholar 1535, Fellow 1537-1553. Fled abroad under Edward to Louvain, where he matriculated in 1551. Archdeacon of Canterbury 1554-1559.

³⁵ John Feckenham, Gloucester: BTh 1538, DTh 1556 incepted, monk of Evesham Abbey c1520-1540. Fellow of Gloucester College in final list of 1540. Canon and Prebendary of St Paul's 1554-1556, Abbot of Westminster 1556-1559. Confessor and Chaplain to the Queen.

³⁶ *Foxe*, (1583), p. 1453.

among Cranmer's examiners was concerned with the effective communication of this idea. Foxe does not narrate Cranmer's response but does set down his response to the other two articles: that they were 'false and against God.'

Ridley and Latimer denied all three articles 'saying: they were all false.'³⁷ That the disputation was of signal importance for the Bishops' interlocutors is suggested by the attention given during this initial hearing to the question of whether the three were willing to enter into such a disputation, and the provision of such resources as they might need to participate. It was at this point that Hugh Weston, under whose aegis the disputation had been placed, intervened.

Weston, in his seventeenth and final year as Rector of Lincoln College, had behind him a lengthy career in Oxford. Educated at Balliol and then at St Mary's Hall, he had become a fellow of the College he was subsequently to govern in 1532, and sub-rector six years later. A year after becoming rector he attained the exalted rank of DTh and from 1542 to 1551 occupied the Lady Margaret Chair in Divinity. In September 1549 he was arrested and consigned to the Fleet Prison on account of his conservative theological views. It was, ironically as it turned out, into Archbishop Cranmer's custody that he was released in the hope that he might succumb to persuasion. This attempt failed and Weston publicly challenged the forty-two Articles of 1552.

In all probability this preliminary hearing at Oxford was the first meeting of the two men since their situations had been exactly reversed five years before. It was possibly by reason of his previous contact with Cranmer that Weston was elected prolocutor of the lower house of the convocation of Canterbury in the proceedings of the synod at which the questions for the disputation were agreed. This, as events transpired, would allow him to direct the disputation on

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1454.

behalf of the Convocation.³⁸ That the Crown was instrumental in this election is a plausible conclusion to draw from his appointment on 14 September 1553 as Dean of Westminster, in addition to his role as the Queen's Chaplain, to which he had been collated upon her accession. Weston's behaviour in the Saturday hearing could be expected to demonstrate the hopes of the Convocation and the regime as to what could be accomplished in the course of the disputation itself.

After Cranmer's denial of the truth of the articles

the Procutor [Weston] first willing him to write his minde of them that night, sayd moreover that he should dispute in them and caused a copy of the articles to be delivered to him...offering moreover into him, to have what bokes he would occupy, and he should have them brought unto him.³⁹

Ridley was asked 'whether he woulde dispute or no?' and answered that 'as long as God gave him life he should not only have his hart but also his mouth and penne to defend his truth, but he required time and bokes.' In view of which he was given until the Thursday and assured that 'he shoulde have bokes.' Latimer, after his denial of the articles claimed 'that he was almost as meet to dispute as to be a captayne of Calice: but that he woulde (he sayd) declare his mind whether by writinge or by worde.'⁴⁰

Before the disputations proper began, Master Say and Master White,⁴¹ two of the four notaries, went from college to college to procure assent to the articles for disputation, confirming that the event was conceived primarily, but not exclusively, by the participants as a University event. Indeed, not just a University event but an academic one. Is it likely that a 'show trial' should have been attended by such exertions on the part of their opponents in order to provide the three Bishops

³⁸ C.S. Knighton, 'Hugh Weston' in *ODNB*.

³⁹ *Foxe* (1583), p. 1453.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1454.

⁴¹ John White (Bishop) BA 1529, MA 1534, BTh 54, DTh 55. New College Scholar 1525, Fellow 27-35. Warden of Winchester College 1542-54, Bishop of Lincoln 1554-1559.

with books? Is it probable if that were the case that at the initial examination of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, their examiners should have been so anxious to determine that they should engage in disputation, to the extent of providing them with copies of the articles under discussion? In the immortal words of the Angelic Doctor it would seem not, for even at this preliminary stage we can perceive the shape of the disputation as it was conceived by the protagonists. It displays all the signs of being a genuine academic exercise, with the participants being given the opportunity to avail themselves of the books of the University.

The disputation itself

The disputation lasted from Monday 16 to Wednesday 18 April, and the examination of Cranmer supplies the most evidence about the arguments of the representatives of the University and offers the most interesting insight into the nature of the orthodoxy which was being defended, and it is to this cross-examination that we shall turn first.

The form of the disputation consisted for the most part of the proposition and discussion of a series of syllogisms and even the most general denunciation of Cranmer's position was set out in this manner. For example, William Chedsey⁴² began by stating, 'your opinion differeth from the scripture. Ergo, you are deceiued.' Cranmer responded by saying 'I deny the antecedent.'

Chedsey was another examiner who had crossed swords with Cranmer and other celebrated reformers in the past, principally as a participant in the disputation into which Vermigli had been forced. A fellow of Corpus Christi from 1533 and a DTh from 1546, he had made a name for

⁴² William Chedsey BA 1530, MA 34, BTh 42, DTh 46. Corpus Christi College Fellow 1533-1551, President 1558-9 Christ Church canon and prebendary 1557-1559. Prebendary of St Pauls 1554-1559.

himself as an aggressive opponent of reform. In a letter from Cranmer to Cromwell it was alleged that he had ‘saide that iff he saw any scholer have a new testament in his hande he wolde burne it.’⁴³

Chesdey’s main argument against Cranmer was stated next ‘Christ when he instituted his last supper, spake to his Disciples: Take, eate, this is my body, which shall be geuen for you. But his true body was geuen for vs: Ergo, his true body is in the sacrament.’ What Chesdey appears to be trying to do here is to ground a traditional interpretation of what had happened to the Eucharistic elements after the consecration on a firmly Scriptural basis. The use of the passage in this context was not, of course, new. Cyril of Alexandria, that adamantine figure in the defence of orthodoxy, quoted in this connection by Thomas, made precisely the same point ““this is my body which is given for you”...do not doubt the truth of this, but take our Saviour’s word in faith: he is truth itself, he does not lie.’⁴⁴

Chesdey returned to Scripture for his next salvo, the drawing of an analogy between the truth of Christ’s ‘testament’ for the Church and that of a ‘wise householder’. The point is that the wise householder brings out treasures old and new, as does the Church in her conservation and setting forth of the apostolic deposit of doctrine. Cranmer responded ‘you[r] reason is drawne out of the affaires of men, and not taken out of the holy scriptures.’⁴⁵

That Chesdey sought in this exchange to present his argument as authentically scriptural, and thereby prevent Cranmer from portraying himself as the only defender of the right of Scripture to

⁴³ SP 1/137, f. 143.

⁴⁴ ST 3a. 75, 1.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1457.

exert the definitive role in doctrinal formulation is shown by a later exchange after Chedsey had suggested, tellingly, that the Scriptures (and specifically ‘Mat. 26. Mark. 14. Luk. 22’) affirmed that Christ gave his ‘natural body’ in the Eucharist. Cranmer responded

To your argument I aunswer: If you vnderstand by the body natural (organicum) that is, hauyng such proportion and members as he had liuyng here, then I aunswer negatiuely. Furthermore, concernyng the Euangelists, thus I say and graunt, that Christ tooke bread and called it hys body.⁴⁶

Now, as has already been shown, if Chedsey’s intention had been to argue that the presence of Christ in the sacrament was in the proportions which his body possesses in heaven then he would have been contradicting not merely Cranmer, but the very tradition he was seeking to defend. Instead, Chedsey argued that

The text of the Scripture maketh agaynst you: for the circumstaunce thereto annexed doth teach vs, not only there to be the body, but also teacheth vs what manner of body it is, and sayth: The same body which shall be geuen.⁴⁷

Chedsey does not seek to defend the idea that the body of Christ in the Sacrament has the same properties which properly belong to the body which Christ had on earth and which was then resurrected and which has ascended into heaven.

Chedsey uses the sense of the Scriptural passages to which he refers to argue for the truth of the statement that the consecrated bread *is* the Body of Christ in respect of its substance, a position formulated explicitly four centuries before by Thomas, and subsequently consistently advanced by the Church’s theologians.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1456.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

In the course of Cranmer's examination before Chedsey, the question of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist was raised by the Archbishop in connection with the substance of the consecrated elements. Chedsey made the argument that 'the thing is here contained, that is given for us. But the substance of bread is not given for us. Ergo, the substance of bread is not here contained.' To this Cranmer replied that if by contained, Chedsey meant 'really', then I deny your major.' But, Chedsey countered, the major premise is the text of Scripture, how then could it be denied without denying the authority of Scripture? Cranmer responded that

I graunt, he sayd it was his body that should be geuen, but he sayd it was not his body which is here conteyned: but the body (sayth he) that shall be geuen for you. As though he should say: This bread is the breaking of my body, and this cup is the sheading of my bloud. What wyll ye saye then? is the bread the breakyng, and the cup the sheddyng of the bloud really? If you so say, I deny it.⁴⁸

At the start of this section, it was suggested that the soteriological assumptions of the reformers lay behind their Eucharistic theology. If the fruits of the Eucharist were not dependent upon the faith of the recipient, then the doctrine of justification by faith alone was undermined. This is particularly apposite in connection with the Eucharistic sacrifice. The traditional conception of the mass focusses on the appearance of Christ in bread *and* wine. As ritual sacrifice consists of the separation of blood from the body, the presence of Christ under the signs of this separation means that the mass is sacrificial in character yet not a fresh sacrifice, the body and blood of the Lord are not being separated again. As the sacrifice of Christ was of infinite value, because of the infinite worth of the victim, it produces, for want of a better word, surplus benefits; it is these fruits which are applied by the celebrating priest to individuals or causes for which the sacrifice is offered, and for the good of the whole Church. It is this mechanised applicability of the Mass which Cranmer is here opposing on soteriological grounds.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

It was in the examination by Owen Oglethorpe (in this context a censor appointed by the Prolocutors of Convocation) that discussion shifted slightly. Oglethorpe, reinstated President of Magdalen had, as we have seen, a somewhat more ambiguous theological record than one might expect from an individual who recovered his position in the Marian University. He was not perhaps therefore best placed, given his flirtation with continental Protestantism, to marshal the arguments of the Catholic Church against Cranmer. Nevertheless, he exposed another problem with Cranmer's position. To call the Bread of the Eucharist the 'Body' is, according to Oglethorpe, to predicate of it the substance of the Body of Christ. But, he went on you do not predicate substance 'denominatively'⁴⁹, so that to call the bread Christ's body is 'essentiall predication.' In other words, you call something what its substance is, not what it may resemble or be made to resemble. To call the Eucharistic bread 'the body of Christ' refers to its substance. To this Cranmer replied that 'substantia may be predicated denominatively', but failed to produce any examples. Oglethorpe's cross-examination ended with a telling exchange which indicates the difference in theological method between himself and Cranmer:

Ogle. Your iudgement is disagreeyng with all Churches.

Cran. Nay, I disagree with the papisticall Church.

Ogle. This you do through the ignorance of Logike.

Cran. Nay, this you say through the ignorance of the Doctours.⁵⁰

In a conscious rebuttal of this accusation, the next stage of the disputation involved the interpretation of the Church Fathers' writings on the subject, principally those of SS Hilary and John Chrysostom, before it was ended at two o'clock.

⁴⁹ i.e., demonstrably.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 1457.

The Disputation of Ridley and Latimer

Ridley in his disputation, which took place the next day, pursued a similar line of argument to Cranmer. After the three articles were put to him he gave his opinion of ‘the error and falsenes of the proposition, after the sense of the Romish Church and the scholemen...in that they affirm the bread to be transubstantiated...which they have devised by a certaine number of woordes, and cannot be found in scripture.’ The echoes here of Luther’s attack upon scholastic theology and his advocacy of its inferiority to the power of assertion and the scriptural are striking. Of the case advanced by Richard Smith, the Regius Professor of Divinity, he responded ‘there should be no doctrine which dissents from God’s word. This doctrine is such. Ergo it should not be maintained’ and went on to enumerate seven problems with the case: that it was contrary to scripture, that it varied from the ‘Ancients’, that it destroyed the institution of the Last Supper, that it made precious things common, that it maintained miracles without proof, that it approved the heresy of Nestorius and that it thereby falsifies the Fathers’ testimony.

There followed an argument on the very point of contention which had arisen earlier between Cranmer and Chedsey. Ridley asserted that every natural body must be contained in one place and that it logically follows that if Christ is naturally present in heaven then he cannot be also ‘naturally’ present in the Eucharistic elements. Here we see Ridley, as Cranmer before him, railing against an account of the Eucharist which was not actually being defended. Against this Smith responded that Christ was ‘seene on earth after his Ascension.’ Ridley responded by differentiating between the mode of Christ’s presence on earth after he ascended and that by which he is present in heaven, they are, he claimed ‘after divers manner and respect.’ This was precisely the formulation of Christ’s presence in the consecrated elements which was the scholastic account, and no response

was offered by Smith. Ridley went on: Christ could be said to have taken up ‘true and corporall substance’ at the Incarnation and left ‘the same’ but ‘in mysterye to the faithful.’

Of the Sacrament itself Ridley was prepared to grant that ‘he worshippe[d] Christ in the Sacrament: but not because he is included in the Sacrament: like as I worship Christ in the Scriptures: not because hee is really included in them.’ Consequently, in Ridley’s disputation we discern once again that the question of nature in relation to Christ’s presence in the Eucharist was central to disputation and that the three Bishops were capable only of refuting the proposition that the body of Christ in the Sacrament was identical with that in heaven, present by means identical to his presence in heaven.

Latimer’s disputation is of significance because of the opportunity it afforded him to protest against the disputation itself. After submitting a lengthy text he was asked whether he ‘refuse[d] to dispute’ by Weston. Throughout his disputation he cited the sense of scriptural and biblical proof-texts in his defence, or simply protested his ignorance, as when Smith produced a syllogism drawn from the writings of Hilary which concluded that the unity of Christ with the Father was true and substantial, to which Latimer stated that ‘I understand you not.’

Harfsfield’s disputation

An important event occurred on the third day of the disputation. According to the statutes of the University it was necessary for the conferral of the DTh for the candidate to undergo a disputation. Nicholas Harpsfield’s doctoral disputation, as narrated by Foxe, has a two-fold significance. Firstly, it yields valuable information about how Theology was done in the Marian University, but in the context of the interpretation of the disputations with Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley which has been

advanced above it is further evidence that the purpose of that disputation was academic and not penal. Foxe records that during Harpsfield's disputation, on 19 April, 'the Archb. of Cant. was brought forth, and permitted among the rest to utter an argument or two, in defence of his cause.'⁵¹ It is almost inconceivable that if the disputation had constituted a trial of whatever nature such a privilege would have been afforded to Cranmer. It is no more likely than a murder trial at the Old Bailey being suspended for the afternoon in order that the defendant be allowed to sit in the public gallery at Uxbridge Magistrates' Court so that he might see what he made of a hearing in connection with the non-renewal of a dog license.

Harpsfield began by admitting

what a weighty matter it is, to entreat of the whole order and trade of the scriptures: and most hard it is to, in the great contention of Religion, to shew the ready way, whereby the scriptures may be best vnderstanded. For the often reading of them doth not bring the true vnderstanding of them. What other thing is there then? Verily this is the redy way, not to folow our owne heads and senses, but to geue ouer our iudgement vnto the holy catholike Church, who hath had of olde yeres the truth, and alwayes deliuered the same to their posteritie: but if the often readying of scriptures, and neuer so paynefull comparing of places should bring the true vnderstandyng, then diuers heretikes might preuaile euen agaynst whole generall Councils.⁵²

The conception of orthodoxy offered here by Harpsfield is closely related to the arguments of the preceding three days and also serves to demonstrate the common currency which discussions about orthodoxy in these changed circumstances, in which the authority of the Church was in dispute, had come to represent in the University. For Harpsfield, the Church, particularly in this respect the canons of General Councils, acts as the arbiter of the truth of theological statements. It was precisely to protect the scriptural basis of doctrine that the isolated use of scriptural texts to undermine doctrinal formulations derived from a holistic reading of the Bible was to be opposed.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1484.

⁵² *Ibid.*

Harpsfield's disputation thus moves the discussion with Cranmer on somewhat, from the clash between syllogisms and biblical and patristic proof texts, to wider ecclesiological terrain.

Harpsfield's disputation proper began with an argument between himself and Weston over whether Christ could be said to be present in the sacrament. Weston challenged the real presence on the basis of John chapter 6 in which Christ said

I speake the truth vnto you: It behooueth me that I go away from you. For vnlesse I do depart, that comforter cannot come, &c.
Vpon this I will make this argument.
Christ is so gone away as he did send the holy Ghost.
But the holy Ghost did verily come into the world:
Ergo, Christ is verily gone.

Harpsfield and Weston's discussion continued in such a vein, with the weighing of patristic and biblical texts in pursuit of a satisfactory definition of mode of Christ's presence in the sacrament. It was into this altercation that Weston 'offered maister Cranmer to dispute.'⁵³ Cranmer's questions focussed on the very issue of the natural body of Christ which had proved so central to his own disputation, asking Harpsfield 'howe you place hym there, sithence you will haue a naturall body.'⁵⁴ Which is to say, that if Christ's can be 'placed' in the consecrated bread then it must be by means of a natural presence. That Cranmer was present at this disputation and invited to contribute on the opposing side to the doctoral candidate, a position which would otherwise have had to be played entirely from dummy by Weston, is the most significant piece of evidence which can be presented in the advancement of the case of this chapter that the disputation was an academic exercise, designed to persuade the bishops out of their heresy.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1484.

The ‘Condemnation’

On 20 April, in a passage of his narrative which has coloured historians’ estimation of the disputations which took place over the previous three days, Foxe records that the three Bishops were ‘condemned’ by the commissioners. The precise meaning and force of this ‘condemnation’ is not clear. Foxe’s presentation of the disputation is of the ‘show trial’ that his successors have joined him in seeing in the disputation. Yet in this section I have sought to argue that the disputation fulfilled an academic function and have suggested that the absence of any mention of an ulterior motive from the correspondence between the Universities, the manner of the disputation and the presence of Cranmer at Harpsfield’s doctoral disputation as evidence of this theory.

The ‘condemnation’ Foxe narrates as follows:

Then were they all called together, and sentence read ouer them, that they were no members of the Church. And therefore they, their fautors and patrones were condemned as heretiks: and in reading of it, they were asked, whether they would turne or no, & they bade them read on in the name of God, for they were not minded to turne. So were they condemned all three.

It is important to comprehend that the assertion that one side of an academic disputation was heretical was the logical outcome of the unsuccessful defence of a theological case. Here the evidence of Harpsfield’s disputation is crucial. That disputation (a normal academic process) was interrupted at one point for Weston to admit that ‘you haue satisfied me with your answers, in doying the same learnedly, and catholically. But now to an other argument.’⁵⁵ Had Harpsfield failed to convince Weston that this argument was ‘Catholic’, the logical expectation is that he would have called it un-Catholic or heretical. Yet Harpsfield was not on trial for that offence. Although this summing up of the outcome of the disputation can be read as a quasi-judicial conclusion, its

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1484.

resonances of the lexicon of the academic disputation, as well as its difference from the judicial sentence which *was* ultimately pronounced over the three bishops, suggest that this may not be so and that, as I have intimated in this chapter, it is probable that the disputation did in fact constitute an academic process, aimed at the persuasion and repentance of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, that was its ostensible form.

After the Disputations

At the conclusion of the disputations, the University's involvement in the cases of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley entered into a new phase. Obviously, the presence of such notorious heretics in the city cannot have failed to exert an influence over the atmosphere of the University during their imprisonment, which for Latimer and Ridley lasted until the September of 1555 and Cranmer's until the following March. Nevertheless, in the light of the extent to which the imprisonment, trials and executions of the three bishops have overshadowed the history of the reign in Oxford, these events have left precious little trace in the archives of the University. Whereas in the case of the disputation the correspondence with Cambridge, the ratification of the articles to be put to the bishops by the colleges, the use of the Divinity School - the normal place for theological disputations - and the participation in it of the luminaries of the Oxford Theology Faculty all served to make it a University event. The subsequent handling of the three bishops was to a far lesser extent impinged upon by the academy.

It was the Council which took the initiative in the search for a solution. On 3 May 1554, in the period immediately after the disputation, it was

ordered by the Lords that the Mayor of Oxford should bring in his bill of allowances for the charges of Doctor Cranmer, Doctors Ridley and Latimer, and should have a warrant for the same; and further it

was resolved by their Lordshippes that Judges and the Quenes Heghnes Learned Counsayll shuld be called together and their opynyons demaunded touching the cases of the said Cranmer, Rydley and Latymer, being all redye by bothe the Universyties of Oxforde and Cambridge judged to be obstinate heretickes, whiche matter is the rather to be consulted upon for that the said Cranmer is already attaynted.⁵⁶

When England had been reconciled by the Cardinal, and the convictions and executions of unrepentant rejectors of this reconciliation began in February 1555, it could perhaps have been expected that similar processes would be initiated against, at least, Bishops Latimer and Ridley. The report of the Privy Council meeting on 2 February 1555 seems explicitly to rule out any suggestion that the three bishops would be brought before the law in the immediate future resolving as it did to dispatch

a lettre to the Thresourer giving him to understand that it is resolved here that the late Maiour and Bailiefes of Oxforde shall have for the charges due unto them for Doctours Cranmer, Latymer and Rydley, and their servauntes three poundes every weke, praieng him to give ordre that they be paide after that rate for somouche as is due unto them.⁵⁷

By setting the rate at which the mayor and bailiffs would be reimbursed for the costs expected to be accrued by the continuation in custody of the three bishops, the Council was giving a clear indication that their detention was unlikely to be over, at least for the time being.

Loades offers an explanation for the delay between the start of the executions in the country and those of the Oxford prisoners, namely the ‘tricky problem of Cranmer’s rank. In spite of his attainder and the decision of the commissioners, neither Pole nor Mary would take further action against him until he had been judicially condemned.’⁵⁸ Loades’ meaning is not entirely clear. The action which was available to the Queen and Cardinal was the pursuit of a judicial condemnation (by which I take it Loades means the condemnation by an ecclesiastical court, of the kind presided

⁵⁶ *APC*, 5, p.17.

⁵⁷ *APC*, 5, p. 233.

⁵⁸ Loades, *Oxford Martyrs*, p. 214.

over by Bonner that had already condemned Bishop Rogers). Cranmer's rank did constitute a stumbling block to the judicial process, but one which was at this stage benefiting from the regime's attention, since on 8 March 1555, Pole wrote to Cardinal Morone about the deprivation of the then Archbishop and the provision to be made for his successor.⁵⁹ Ridley and Latimer, however, fell under Pole's legatine authority and could be pursued immediately. But they were not.

The question of precisely why they were not may be answered with reference to the involvement of the University which, although not explicit and formal as it had been in the case of the disputations, was still in evidence. During the time of their imprisonment Latimer and Ridley had written two 'conferences.' The first was concerned with the question of the Mass which had been the subject of their disputation. In it, Latimer wrote that 'if we deny unto them the corporeal presence and transubstantiation, their fantastical adoration will (by and by) vanish away. Therefore be strong in denying such a presence and ye will have won the field.' Against whom was Latimer urging Ridley to stand firm? From a letter written in the period by Ridley to Hugh Weston, asking for a copy of the notaries' transcription of his disputation, and from the second of the conferences, it would appear possible that the task of attempting to persuade the bishops out of their error had not ceased after the disputation.⁶⁰

The Conference consists of Ridley and Latimer's answers to a series of objections put by an imaginary figure, the Antonian. The Antonian must be Bishop Stephen Gardiner, since his *Confutation*, published in Paris in 1552 and dealing with questions of sacramental theology, was issued under the pseudonym Marcus Antonius. However, the similarities are not exact, and the questions seem to have been deliberately tailored to the circumstances in which Latimer and Ridley

⁵⁹ *CSPV*, VI, 22.

⁶⁰ *Works of Ridley*, p. 337-342.

found themselves in the period between the disputation and their trials. For example, the first objection of 'the Antonian' is that 'all men marvel greatly, why you, after the liberty which you have granted unto you, more than the rest, do not go to mass, which is a thing, as you know, now much esteemed of all men, yea, and of the queen herself.' The second objection queries 'whence cometh this new religion upon you? Have not you used in times past to say masses yourself?' The third objection deals with the ecclesiological implications of their actions in the context of their own ideas about schism; 'but you know how great a crime it is, to separate yourself from the communion or fellowship of the Church, and to make a schism or division. You have been reported to have hated the sect of the Anabaptists, and always to have impugned the same.' The remaining eleven objections continue in this vein and pursue the nature of the bishops' actions in the context of the communion of the Church from which, in the eyes of the 'Antonian' they had separated themselves.⁶¹

Now, as the questions directed to Latimer and Ridley in these conferences seem to relate very closely to their conduct whilst in prison and its implications, and to ecclesiological matters, rather than the strictly sacramental ones, which had formed the main part of the disputations, it seems distinctly possible that in the Conferences we have important evidence of a continuing role exercised by the theologians of the University in attempting to persuade the Bishops out of the errors into which they had, from these theologians' perspective, fallen. Could the availability of the crème de la crème of the Church's theologians and their evident willingness to argue with the prisoners in the attempt to obtain their repentance explain the delay in the setting in motion of judicial processes against them?

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 97-179.

The trials

On 30 September 1555, Latimer and Ridley were examined by Pole's commissioners in the Divinity Schools. The Bishop of Lincoln, in receipt of Cardinal Pole's legatine commission to persuade the Bishops Latimer and Ridley to recant and failing this to hand them over to the civil authorities, remarked on 1 October in University Church that

Maister Latimer, although we had instructions geuen vs determinately to take your aunswere to suche Articles as we shoulde propose, without any reasonyng or disputations, yet wee hopying by talke somewhat to preuayle with you, appoynted you to appeare before vs yesterday in the Diuinitie Schole, a place for disputations...⁶²

In its immediate context, this was Lincoln's response to Latimer's attempt to argue that between Rome, which had persecuted Christ's flock, and that flock itself, the true Church was to be identified with the second.⁶³ Latimer's response, that there had been opportunity afforded to him and Ridley to dispute in the University Schools on the first day of their examination, suggests that this second process was seen to be sufficiently different from the disputation which had taken place in the April, and that a second disputation was justified.

Pole's commission, sent on 28 September 1555, gave John White, Bishop of Lincoln, Dr Brookes, Bishop of Gloucester and Doctor Holiman, Bishop of Bristol, powers to examine Latimer and Ridley 'for dyuers and sundrye erroneous opinyons, whiche the sayde Hugh Latymer, and Nicholas Ridley, dyd holde and mayntayne in open disputations had in Oxford, in the Monethes of Maye, Iune, and Iuly, in the yeare of our lorde 1554. as longe before in the tyme of perdition and sithen.'⁶⁴

⁶² *Foxe* (1583), p. 1790.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1781.

While the commission makes mention of the disputations, the inclusion within it of the whole of the two bishop's careers suggests that the trial constituted a distinct process. This inference gains support from the central importance that the question of the role of the papacy in the government of the Church was to play in the trials. Foxe correctly identifies that the reason for this second process against the bishops was that the judgement of heresy passed against them at the conclusion of the disputation, and their subsequent return to the custody of the mayor and sheriffs of the city, was 'voyd in law' because the authority of the Pope over the English Church had not yet been re-established.⁶⁵ However, this is not the whole truth. If the first process represented a trial of the bishops, it would be expected for it to have taken the form of such a trial, whereas as I have argued above it follows closely the format of an academic disputation. When Cranmer came to be cross-examined by Dr Martin in March 1556 the following exchange illustrates this distinction between the processes:

10. Inter. Item that in the sayd City of Oxforde, he dyd openly mayntayn his heresie, and there was conuicted vpon the same.

Auns. He defended (he sayd) there the cause of the Sacrament, but to be conuicted in the same that he denyed.

11. Inter. Item, when hee perseuered still in the same, hee was by the publicke censure of the vniuersitie, pronounced an hereticke, and his bookes to be hereticall.

Auns. That he was so denounced, he denyed not: but that he was an hereticke, or his bookes hereticall, that he denyed.⁶⁶

It is possible in this instance that the commissioners were attempting to invest the earlier process with the authority to condemn the bishops, an authority Cranmer was understandably anxious to deny.

In the initial hearings concerning Bishops Latimer and Ridley on 30 September two particularly significant features are in evidence. The first is the emphasis on the role of the Papacy which was

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1895.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1901.

placed in both cross examinations, the second is the desire of the commissioners to confine disputation to this point alone, and not to allow discussion of the questions of sacramental and soteriological theology to occupy the time they had at the disputations in April. Nevertheless, this hearing took place in the Divinity School, the proper location for a disputation and not in the University Church, where the Bishops were later to be moved for the trials.

It must be conceded that during the hearings on 30 September neither Ridley and Latimer were permitted extensive recourse to disputation. Ridley was informed by the Bishop of Lincoln that ‘we haue certayne instructions, accordinge to the whiche we muste proceede, and came not hyther to dispute the mater with you, but onely to take youre aunsweres to certayne Artycles.’⁶⁷ During Latimer’s cross examination the bishop announced that ‘they came not to dispute with M. Latimer, but to take his determinate aunsweres to their Articles.’⁶⁸ These interruptions must however be seen in the light of the Bishop of Lincoln’s statement the next day, to the effect that this hearing in the Divinity School, the place for disputations, was held in order to give the Bishops a chance to make their case on the subject of the papal office, a chance which had not been given in the very different context of the disputations in April.

This provision at the outset of the process for disputation before the trial proper began adds further weight to the suggestion that the process of April 1554 had an academic and not a penal focus. The need to provide time for a further disputation on account of the distinction between the theological subjects on which each were to turn (the mass in April 1554, the papacy in September and October 1555) necessitated a new opportunity for the Bishops to make their case. Moreover, the provision for a disputation indicates the seriousness with which the commissioners took their

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1783.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

responsibility for attempting to procure the Bishops repentance before they were subject to trial, a provision which was in no way demanded in law.

Latimer's cross examination on 30th September was focussed on the question of the authority of the Papacy. Invited to respond to the appeal by the Bishop of Lincoln to turn away from his errors or face handing over to the civil authorities, Latimer replied:

Your Lordshyppe gentlye exhorted mee in manye woordes, to come to the vnitie of the Churche. I confesse (my Lorde) a Catholicke Churche, spread throughout all the worlde, in the whiche no man may erre, without the whiche vnitie of the Churche no man can be saued: but I knowe perfectly by Gods woorde that this Churche is in all the worlde, and hath not his foundation in Rome only.⁶⁹

Previously, at the mention of the name of the Pope and Cardinal Pole, his legate, in the reading of the commission on 30th September, Ridley 'put on hys cappe.' Not, he assured the bishops, because he doubted the Cardinal's nobility and learning but 'in that he is Legate to the Byshop of Rome (and therewith put on his cap) whose vsurped supremacy, and abused authoritie, I vtterly refuse and renounce, I may in no wise geue any obeysaunce, or honour vnto him...'⁷⁰

In opening his oration the Bishop of Lincoln linked the commission he and the other Bishops had received to pardon Ridley and receive him back into the Church on three conditions. First, that he 'receae the true doctrine of the Church which first was founded by Peter at Rome immediately after the deathe of Christe', second that 'you will be content to renounce your former errores, recant your hereticall and seditious opinion' and third that he should be 'content to yelde your selfe to the vndoubted fayth, & truthe of the Gospell.'⁷¹ Ridley's refusal, on the basis that it was the faith Peter professed, not the person or Peter himself that was the 'rock' on which Christ's Church was

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, p. 1786.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1781-2.

built and that the Pope was the anti-Christ, was predictable. However, Ridley's defence of his position was on the grounds of jurisdiction within the Church, which suggests that it was this, rather than the theological controversies over sacramental theology and justification that he had apprehended as the focus of the trial. He argues that the relationship of the See of Rome to that of the rest of the episcopate was analogous to the 'preeminence, as we here in England say, that all the Byshoprickes in England, are subiect to the archbishopricke of Caunterbury and Yorke.'⁷²

Both cross examinations in the Divinity Schools on 30 September made reference to these questions, but the articles which were put to them were closely related to the questions which had formed the basis of the disputation in April 1554 and in the bishops' statements thereafter, corroboration perhaps that the bishops had been visited by the theologians of the University, as was suggested above.

The first article concerned the affirmation made by Ridley and Latimer that the body of Christ was not truly in the sacrament of the altar 'in this high Vniuersitie of Oxford. Anno. 1554. in the monthes of Aprill, May, Iune, Iulye', but also 'in many other tymes and places besides'.⁷³ The accusation, then, related not just to the answers given at the disputation but to the entire careers of the two bishops, and during the whole duration of their stay in Oxford, as the next three articles beginning with the words 'that in the yeare and monthes aforesayde...' suggests.⁷⁴ The second article accuses the two bishops of claiming that the substance of the bread remains in that element after the consecration, the third of claiming that that Mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice and the fourth that these assertions were found to be heretical by 'Doctor Weston Prolocutour then of the

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 1784.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

conuocation house, as also by other learned men, of bothe the Vniuersities.⁷⁵ This explicit reference to the disputation should be put in the context of the claim of article one that the opinions for which the bishops were being asked to recant were those advanced during their careers and principally during their time in Oxford, not just during the disputation.

The contrast between proceedings on 30 September and those on 1 October is seen not just in the location, the move from the Divinity Schools to the University Church, but also in the narrow focus of the commissioners at that second hearing. The Bishop of Lincoln began with an exhortation to Ridley ‘to submitte your selfe to the determination of the vniuersall Church, and I for my part moste earnestly exhort you (and therewith he put of his cappe) not because my conscience pricketh me as you sayde yesterday, but because I see you a rotten member and in the way of perdition.’⁷⁶ After a brief discussion over the meaning of St Augustine’s assertion that that authority of the Roman See extends *totum mundum*,⁷⁷ Lincoln concluded ‘as for that, M. Ridley, you ought to be iudge of no man: but by this your reasonyng you cause vs to stretch and enlarge our instructions. We came not to reason, but to take your determinate aunsweres to our Articles.’⁷⁸ Upon being asked whether he now accepted or refused to accept the first article, Ridley attempted to answer from a paper written beforehand, at which point he was induced to hand it to the commissioners who, having ‘secretly communicated’, refused to have it read out on the basis that it contained ‘wordes of blasphemie’.⁷⁹ Ridley was permitted the forty words to explain his opposition to the articles which he had been promised the previous day, ‘but before he had ended halfe a

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1788.

⁷⁷ *To all the world.*

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 1789.

sentence, the Doctours sitting by cryed and sayd, that his number was out, and with that he was put to silence.⁸⁰

The conclusion of the trials and the executions of the two bishops on 15 October 1555 lie outside the scope of this thesis because they were not University events or academic processes. Nor, were members of the University actively involved in their course. Where the University was involved, most clearly in the disputations of April 1554 and in visits to, and attempts to persuade, the bishops in their aftermath, the task which was set for it, and embraced with enthusiasm by its members, was the attempt to persuade Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley out of their heresy. The process brought against Cranmer was even less a University occasion; its origins were in Rome.

The Trial of Cranmer

The process against Cranmer, which took place in September 1555 shared the characteristics of those against Latimer and Ridley, and in Foxe's account we find more evidence of the differences between them and the disputation of the previous April. The process against Cranmer, unlike that against Latimer and Ridley, was not carried out on Pole's legatine authority as this did not extend to the prosecution of one who was, by virtue of his holding of the see of Canterbury, a legate too. Instead, the process was initiated in Rome by the Inquisitor General, Jacobo Cardinal Puteo, who appointed James Brooks, Bishop of Gloucester, to investigate the charges.⁸¹ These were contained

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 1790.

⁸¹On 8 March 1555, in a document referred to above, Pole had written to Cardinal Morone in which letter he makes reference to a dispatch from England to Rome concerning the deprivation of the Archbishop and the application for a special commission to this effect. Therefore, although the process was initiated in Rome, it was at the request of the Queen and Cardinal that this was so. *CSPV*, 6, 22.

in sixteen separate articles, probably drafted by Puteo and contained accusations of the propagation of heresy, his marriage, and with his abnegation of the papal authority.

While Dr Brooks, the Bishop of Gloucester, represented the Pope, Drs Storey⁸² and Martin⁸³ represented the Crown. Brook's opening speech drew a distinction between the disputation and the task of the commissioners which was not 'to dispute with you, but to examine you in certayne matters' before giving him up to the civil powers.⁸⁴ It was to the academics of the university that the commissioners turned to gather the evidence to convict Cranmer on the charge of having broken the oath he had sworn on his appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury. Dr Weston, Dean of Christ Church, Dr Smith the Under-Commissary and Dr Tresham were among those who were called upon to give evidence under oath regarding Cranmer's heresy, which presumably they were thought to have witnessed during his stay in Oxford.

The trial of Cranmer in the September of 1555 was conducted on the basis of the Roman charges by the papal delegates and the impact of the University upon it was confined to these witnesses. Where the University did take over was in a renewed attempt to argue with Cranmer. The opportunity for this was created by the focus of the trial which was concentrated on the role of papacy in governing the Church. Cranmer's exchange with Dr Martin, the most significant of the trial, was taken up with the controversy over the status of Canon Law. This question, discussed in Chapter 1, was an essential dividing line between Protestants and Catholics. For Cranmer and those like him, laws enacted by the 'imperial' crown of England were the only statutes which had any

⁸² John Story BCL 1531, DCL 1538. Hinksey Hall 1530-37, Principal of Broadgates Hall 1537. 1st Regius Professor of Civil Law. Chancellor of Oxford and London dioceses. M.P.

⁸³ Thomas Martin BCL 1547, DCL at Bourges 1554, incorp. Oxford 1555. New College scholar 1538, Fellow 1540-1554. Archdeacon of Berkshire, Chancellor to Gardiner and Bishop of Exeter. One of Queen's Commissioners for heresy and the University.

⁸⁴*Foxe* (1583), p. 1897.

claim on the obedience of the subject. The right of foreign legislators, kings, or in this case the Pope, to impose legislation on those subjects by their own authority had been repudiated in the Reformation Parliament, which made the King supreme head of the Church, thereby giving legal expression to this principle. This headship was questioned by Martin, and Cranmer replied that ‘the King is head and governor of his people, which are the visible Church.’ In that case, Martin enquired, was Nero head of the Church? Cranmer replied that he was ‘that is, in worldly respect of the temporal bodies of men.’ Martin seized his chance: ‘then he that beheaded the heads of the Church, and crucified the apostles, was head of Christ’s Church; and he that was never a member of the Church, is head of the Church by your new found understanding of God’. At this, Foxe records, the audience ‘began to murmur against him’.⁸⁵

The trial concluded on Friday 13 September and its findings were reported to Rome, to the Consistory by Cardinal Puteo on 30 November. On Wednesday 4 December Cranmer was deprived and delivered by the Consistory to the secular power. Two weeks later a General Congregation of Cardinals before the Pope resolved to send to England the mode of deposing and degrading the Archbishop.⁸⁶

At the end of the trial in September, the domestic legal process against the archbishop having been concluded, the University’s theologians re-entered the fray. On October 26 1555 Pole wrote to the papal nuncio at Brussels, the Archbishop of Conza, concerning Fr Pedro de Soto, a Spanish Dominican, who was present in Oxford and shortly to be provided with a chair in Theology from the endowment of the vacant chair in Hebrew. Pole had, he wrote,

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ *CSPV*, VI, 295, 303, 319.

received letters from Rev P. Soto, dated from Oxford, acquainting me with what he did with those two heretics after their condemnation, one of whom would not deign to speak with him; with the other he spoke but it profited nothing, as it is easily understood that none can save those whom God has rejected; and thus, according to report, the sentence was carried out, the people looking on not unwillingly, as it was known that nothing had been neglected pertaining to their salvation. The late Archbishop of Canterbury, whose sentence of condemnation from Rome is now expected, is not so obstinate and desires to speak with me: if it is possible for him to be brought to repentance, the profit derived by the Church from the salvation of that single soul will not be negligible.⁸⁷

What this letter suggests is what was asserted at the beginning of this chapter: that Latimer and Ridley's refusal to engage with the academic disputation of April 1554, compared with Cranmer's more forthcoming participation made Cranmer a far more promising subject for the persuasive skills of the theologians of the University.

Whereas Latimer and Ridley had refused Soto's counsel, or rejected it once offered, Cranmer's case was different. On 11 December 1555 he was moved from the Bocardo to the house of the Dean of Christ Church, Richard Marshall, witness at his trial in the September and Professor of Divinity. Marshall's confidence in his own argumentative skill had led him, as has already been said, to challenge Peter Martyr to a disputation in the previous reign.

During his two months at the Deanery, Cranmer was visited by Juan de Villagarcia, a Spanish Dominican and Regius Professor of Divinity. The purpose of using Villagarcia's time in conversation with Cranmer was directed towards procuring his repentance. Their discussion began in the same way as that of Cranmer's trial in September - the papacy - but this swiftly changed to the question of purgatory. On New Year's Day 1556, Villagarcia returned from his afternoon lecture with an unidentified text of Augustine whose implications Cranmer admitted to not having considered. The fact that the Dominican returned with this text after a lecture, and given the custom of scholars questioning and disputing with the lecturer after it had been delivered, it is not

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 256.

inconceivable that this text and its implications had been pointed out to Villagarcia by a student.⁸⁸

The enterprise of procuring Cranmer's recantation could therefore be said to have encompassed the whole academy.

The crucial moment in Cranmer's time at Christ Church came as the discussion moved to the issue of General Councils. In the course of the debate, Cranmer sought to isolate the first General Councils from a corrupting association with papal authority. If, he asserted, the Council of Nicea of 325 had taken place under papal authority, 'I will then openly affirm the Pope to have been and to be now head of the Church.'⁸⁹ Villagarcia then prevailed upon Cranmer to sign a declaration that if this could not be proved the Regius Professor would be proved to be a liar.⁹⁰

The next day Villagarcia returned to Cranmer with quotations from a number of patristic texts, including from the *Tripartite History*, which suggested that General Councils did indeed derive their legitimacy from papal sanction. It is from this event that Diarmaid MacCulloch traces Cranmer's capitulation. This was expedited by the intervention of Nicholas Woodson into whose care Cranmer was put during Villagarcia's absence in London, presumably to consult the Queen and Cardinal. Woodson was not an academic, but an Oxford tradesman, albeit a bedell of the University, and resided at this point in the Abbot's lodging of Rewley Abbey. However, from Foxe and the *Recantacions* it seems clear that his friendship and occasional deployment of a well-meaning sort of emotional pressure were what finally drove Cranmer to follow through with the recantation which had been logically, if not psychologically, inevitable from the moment he lost the crucial

⁸⁸ *Cranmer's Recantacions* p. 55.

⁸⁹ 'Papam ecclesiae caput et olim fuisse et nunc esse aperte asseverabo.' *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁹⁰ *Ego Tomas Cranmer dico non posse ostendi concilium Nycaenum fuisse congregatum auctoritate Sylvestri Papae: quod si ostendatur, fatebor quemcunque Petri successorum esse ecclesiae caput: fintminus, Joannes frater pro mendace habebitur.* *Ibid.*, p. 60.

argument with Villagarcia. The reason for linking his recantations to the argument with Villagarcia is that they are concerned with just these questions of ecclesiology. In the first recantation Cranmer was content to 'submit' to the papal authority on the basis that it had been reintroduced through Parliament, the subsequent articles of recantation project this conclusion onto a wider theological background, with the fourth declaring that 'I believe unfeignedly in all points as the said Catholic Church doth teach.'⁹¹

Cranmer's disgrading from the sacerdotal state by the papal delegates Bonner and John Harpsfield had already been scheduled for the 14 February. This occasion was used by Cranmer to launch an appeal to a General Council, which he claimed was 'above the Pope'. This appeal on the part of Cranmer represented a regression from the capitulation into which he had been manoeuvred by Villagarcia and Woodson. That Villagarcia had made a success of his previous work is indicated by Bonner's decision to co-opt him into the work Harpsfield and he had embarked upon, that of persuading Cranmer to recant. Under Villagarcia's direction, and faced with the prospect of his execution, Cranmer was prevailed upon to write another recantation, witnessed by Villagarcia and Henry Syddall,⁹² Vice-Dean of Christ Church, in which he acknowledged the papal authority, the Pope's status as Vicar of Christ on earth, the doctrine of transubstantiation, the seven sacraments and purgatory.⁹³ This represented a triumph for the University, but one which was to be eclipsed by subsequent events.

⁹¹ Cranmer, *Writings*, 2, p. 363.

⁹² Henry Syddall d. 1572. BA 31, BcL BCnL 35, DTh 52. Christ Church Canon 47-1572.

⁹³ Cranmer, *Writings*, 2, pp. 363-4.

The Execution of Cranmer

As with those of Latimer and Ridley, Cranmer's execution and the events surrounding it were not, despite their location, University occasions. Their impact upon the history of the University is limited to the intangible realm of the reactions of its witnesses. The effect (at least on the morale of the University) would have been much greater had not the Queen proved a shrewder judge of Cranmer's character than Villagarcia, de Soto and those theologians who thought they had obtained his recantation. The Queen was determined that Cranmer's repentance was feigned, that his crime of heresy was greater in its malign effect upon her realm than that of any other and, as Cranmer's actions on the eve of his execution and on the day itself proved, she was right.

In which direction Cranmer was facing as, tied to the stake, he burned for his heresy is not recorded. Had he been facing east along the ditch, immediately on his left would have stood Trinity College. Here, the monastic buildings destroyed in large by his activities in the reign of Mary's father were being restored as a new college. It is thus possible that Cranmer's last vision was the reversal in bricks and mortar of the faith for which he died. In the University Catholicism was gaining a new lease of life as its most successful opponent lost his nearby.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have tried to look at the disputations and trials of the three Bishops in their University context. Whereas previous accounts have understandably had a different focus, this section has noted their tendency to collapse the disputations into the trials. It has attempted to show that the evidence for this interpretation of the disputations as show trials, a means of marking time while the judicial process was being prepared, is not conclusive.

On the contrary, it has found an integrity to the academic disputations which, however they were intended by the regime, were entered into by their University participants with the genuine intention of procuring the repentance of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley. In attempting to see what can be made of the process on its own terms it has been necessary to adopt a more narrative structure than has been attempted in the rest of this thesis. In particular, this structure has allowed the disjunction between the disputations and the strictly penal process to be shown.

The execution of unrepentant heretics, the ‘burnings’, remains the most widely known part of the Marian Counter-Reformation, despite a quarter of a century of historical revisionism, it affects how every individual and institution prominent in the reign is seen. This chapter has sought to argue that in University there was at least a genuine attempt on the part of some to procure the conversion of the three most famous victims of the persecution and thus to save them from the fires and the win for the regime notable converts.

The Regime's Policy towards the University: the Visitation of 1556 and Pole's new Statutes

In this chapter I propose to examine the policy of the Marian regime towards the University. It suggests that this is seen most clearly in two events: the visitation of 1556 and the issuing of a new code of statutes for the University by Cardinal Pole in response to what the visitors reported of the life and work of the scholars of Oxford. It argues that the agenda that is thus discovered was transformation of the University into an institution that would produce erudite yet pious and intellectually capable yet pastorally energetic servants for the restored English Church and State. First, however, it will be useful to look in detail at the influence in Pole's policy of the work of Bishop Stephen Gardiner.

Bishop Gardiner and Oxford

This thesis considers in detail the Queen and Cardinal Pole's involvement in the affairs of the University, but it is important that the role of Bishop Stephen Gardiner in them at the start of the reign is not neglected. Two constants in Gardiner's career were the universities (especially Cambridge) and theological controversy. It was at Trinity Hall in Cambridge, to which he first went in 1511, that he became Master in 1525, when he was between 27 and 30 years of age. While carrying out his duties he was spotted by Cardinal Wolsey and his rise began. It was as Bishop of Winchester, an office he held from 1531 that he made his mark on Henrician politics, after a hesitant start, coming to defend the Royal Supremacy. Gardiner attended the Imperial Diet at Ratisbon in 1541, where he disputed with Martin Bucer. In 1540, after the fall of Thomas Cromwell, he became Chancellor of Cambridge, a position in which he was active in pursuit of his

academic ideas, moving to suppress John Cheke's new type of Greek pronunciation in the 1540s. Imprisoned under Edward, and deprived of the Chancellorship, he wrote works arguing against the Oxford Professor Peter Martyr Vermigli and a response Archbishop Cranmer's *Defence of the True and Catholique Doctrine*, called *An Explication and Assertion of the True Catholique Faith*, which defended the doctrine of transubstantiation, and which was discussed in the last chapter.¹ One piece of evidence from the time of his imprisonment indicates his enduring involvement in the academic life of both Universities. In a letter to the Duke of Somerset from January or February 1548, in which he intended to 'open the matter plainlie, how many lerned men I know, and how often to my remembra[nce] I have spoken with them my selfe', he names four Oxford men (Drs Smith, Weston, Cole and Master Oglethorpe), but only 'too by name' in Cambridge.² It was not then from a state of ignorance that Gardiner would approach the University if, by a miracle, he was restored to power.

Gardiner's release, restoration to his See and his Cambridge Chancellorship, and appointment as Lord Chancellor all took place in August 1553, with the accession of Queen Mary. In office, he continued the theological and academic concerns that were so significant throughout his career. Although detained with the process of repealing the legislation that had reformed the Church, and grappling for seniority with Lord Paget, his contemporary at Trinity Hall, half of his surviving letters from Mary's reign relate to his role as Chancellor of Cambridge.³

¹ C. D. C. Armstrong, 'Gardiner, Stephen (c.1495x8–1555)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/10364>, accessed 2 Oct 2014].

² James Arthur Miller (ed.), *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933), p. 431.

³ Glyn Redworth, *In Defence of the Church Catholic: the Life of Stephen Gardiner* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), pp. 302-3, 319.

In this brief section, I will look at the evidence of Bishop Gardiner's involvement with the two Oxford colleges of which he was Visitor where there is enough evidence from the Marian period of his activities to make worthwhile deductions, before making reference to his influence over the plans for the 1556 visitation, and comparing his conduct at Oxford to his second period as Chancellor of Cambridge.

Gardiner's Visitation: Magdalen

In October 1553, according to John Pechell

for the better facilitating the Queen's resolution of re-establishing the Roman idolatry in the University Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester...sent delegates or commissaries to visit all the colleges in Oxford subject to him, as a local visitor, viz. Corpus Christi College, Christ Church and Magdalen. The principal of these visitors were Sir K Mead, Dr Walter Wright, Archdeacon of Oxford, who expelled some from New College whilst others voluntarily quitted it. ⁴

The quickest of the Protestant fellows of Magdalen to leave after Mary's accession was the President, Walter Haddon, who was granted a month's absence by the fellows on 27 August. Haddon's presidency, the product of so much intrigue among the fellows and the result of the government's intervention, had lasted just over a year. The reformist fellows to whom he owed the office were quick to follow. On 27 September John Mullins was granted six months leave. On the same day Walter Bower was granted the same length of absence. In the same month Lawrence Humphrey and Master Bolden also departed with Robert Caynter, Hugh Kirk, William Overton,⁵

⁴ Pechell, *The History of the University*, p. 210.

⁵ Overton (1524/5-1609), having kept a low profile in Mary's reign, was swiftly promoted under Elizabeth to series of prestigious livings. He was appointed Bishop of Coventry in 1580 due to the patronage of the Earl of Leicester, whose protégé he was. His death in 1609 brought to end an episcopate characterised, as his entry in the *ODNB* admits, by 'corruption, venality and nepotism.' Rosemary O'Day, 'William Overton', *ODNB*.

‘Master Slythurst’ and Arthur Swall who were also granted leave to depart.⁶ So, by the end of September six of the fellows who had petitioned the Council against Oglethorpe, and the president with whom they had replaced him, had left the College.⁷

That these departures began at the end of August and not, as one might have expected, immediately upon the Queen’s accession is significant. Whilst the tenor of the Queen’s religious policy was to become clear over the following months, at this point she had confined herself to a statement of tolerance and to the prohibition of controversy. As was announced in a proclamation from Richmond on 18 August 1553 ‘she doth signify unto all her majesty’s said loving subjects that of her most gracious disposition and clemency her highness mindeth not to compel any her said subjects thereunto.’ The proclamation went on to charge her subjects ‘to live together in quiet sort and Christian charity, leaving those new-found terms of papist or heretic.’⁸

Of more immediate concern to the Protestant fellows of Magdalen were the activities of Bishop Gardiner. His restoration to the see of Winchester, in place of the reformer John Ponet, about 23rd August, made him once again Visitor to the college. If Gardiner’s restoration was the cause of the fellows’ departures, and the fact that they chose to leave then, rather than when the Queen acceded to the throne indicate that it was, then his influence on the situation in Oxford was perhaps more significant than has been acknowledged. For example, Elizabeth Russell’s article makes no reference to Gardiner’s role in these departures.⁹

⁶ Which Slythurst is not specified. Both Thomas Slythurst and his brother Robert were fellows of Magdalen at this time. Given that Thomas was to be appointed the first president of Trinity and Robert was not deprived at the same time as the reforming fellows, it is difficult to believe that either was among their number. The most likely explanation was that this grant of leave, not unusual in the summer vacation, was not connected to the reformers’ flight.

⁷ MCA, Vice President’s Register, f. 6v.

⁸ TRP, 1, p. 4.

⁹ Russell, ‘Marian Oxford’, p. 219.

The immediate visitations of Magdalen by Gardiner's emissaries and of the other colleges for which he exercised this responsibility have left very little mark on the records of each institution. At Magdalen it is not recorded in the Vice-President's register, but it is possible to piece its main outline together from other sources.

The mandates for the visitation were issued on 2 October and began on 26 October.¹⁰ Heading the visitation were Dr Walter Wright, Archdeacon of Oxford and Sir Richard Read. The only evidence that relates directly to the outcome of this visitation is in the Magdalen College account book, the *Liber Compti* which records a payment of £12 to be shared between nine fellows: Bickley, Mullins, Bower, Bentham, Sawle, Williams, Kirke, Paley and Morwent. These men, apart from Morwent and Paley, were all signatories to the petition against Oglethorpe.¹¹ Of their fellow signatories, Humphrey remained in his fellowship until he was deprived due to his lengthy absence in 1555 and Renniger, although not paid with the others, must have either resigned or been deprived of his fellowship, for he was in Zurich by the spring of 1554.¹²

Whether these fellows attempted to disguise their reformist sympathies we cannot tell. Certainly, their actions in the unseating of Oglethorpe during the previous reign would have been known to the visitors. The only record of the cross-examination of one of their number is Wood's narration of the process against the Dean, Thomas Bentham, who 'averred before them that he would not heap sin upon sin, adding further that he esteemed it not equal to punish that in others which he himself had willingly and knowingly committed, and thereupon was turned out of his fellowship.'¹³ As a

¹⁰ *Wood*, 2, pt 1, p. 120.

¹¹ Morwen's absence over the summer would seem to have been unconnected with the upheavals.

¹² Robinson, *Original Letters*, pp. 751-2.

¹³ *Wood*, 2, pt 1, p. 121.

result of Gardiner's restoration and his visitation of the College the Protestant faction in the College had departed.

Restoration: the re-election of Oglethorpe and letters to Bishop Gardiner

The news of Owen Oglethorpe's re-election to the presidency was conveyed to Bishop Gardiner by Richard Slithurst who, as senior fellow, the office of vice-president being vacant, was responsible for the conduct of the election.¹⁴

The customs for the election of a president according to the statutes of William Waynflete, the founder of the college and Gardiner's august predecessor, were then read and a solemn mass of the Holy Spirit was celebrated. Slithurst and Robert Caynter seem to have acted as tellers in the election. The result of the nominations for the secret ballot was twelve votes for Oglethorpe; eleven for Thomas Slithurst; nine for Robert Morwent; seven for John Sommer and one for John Orford. The closeness of the numbers of nominations each received shows that Oglethorpe's re-instatement as President was not simply an imposed reversion to the *status quo ante*. It expressed, rather, that the confidence in him that certain of the fellows had shown during the campaign against him had been retained, despite his absence after that campaign's successful conclusion.¹⁵

Oglethorpe had returned to the college by 10 December 1553 when a letter was sent to Gardiner on behalf of the college concerning the outcome of the visitation. In indicating that 'everything of our Father's institution, the orders, customs and privileges, kept in books, neglected at times, after a

¹⁴ MCA, Leger E, f. 31.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

long interval they may resume, and settle finally in the paternal and ancestral rule.’¹⁶ the letter demonstrates the relief with which Mary’s first letter to the University, instructing the observance of the rule in force at the death of her father, had been greeted by the orthodox fellows who now looked forward to new beginning. That, the fellows wrote, what ‘Waynflete instituted, you may restore.’¹⁷

This focus, on the primacy of worship, the building up of the Church and the restoration of the college serves as a manifesto for all that followed in the college and the wider University during Queen Mary’s reign.

Christ Church

Bishop Gardiner’s Visitation of the colleges in 1553 was much narrower in scope than that of the whole University three years later. Nevertheless, Gardiner had every reason to be satisfied with the work they had accomplished in the removal from those institutions of the figureheads of Protestant dissent and in particular, as we have seen, the restoration of Oglethorpe to the presidency of Magdalen.

Gardiner had continued his close involvement with the affairs of the colleges after the visitation, moving swiftly to counter the merest hint of disobedience. On 11 September 1554 he wrote a letter entitled ‘to the Students of Christe Church in Oxforde’. In the letter he announced that he was ‘credeblie enformed of your willfull disobedience towarde your deane & subdeane there

¹⁶ *omnia denique nostri Parentis instituta, ordines, consuetudines, et privilegia, retenta libris, remissa temporibus, longo iam intervallo intermissa revocarint, et in patrio demum et ante regno collacarint. Ibid.*

¹⁷ *quod Waynfletus instituerit, tu restitueris. Ibid.*

in refusing to observe their lawfull & honest Iniunctions...to the empyring of goode and decente ordre in that whole universitie.’ Gardiner ‘as your visitor in that I am Chancellor of Englande...requyre & charge you and every of you duly and furthwith to receyve and obey suche lawfull & honest iniunctions as your deane & in his absence your subdeane shall requyre you to observe.’ The nature of the misbehaviour is not laid out in the letter, or in any other surviving source. It is improbable, had there been a serious ideological motive behind it, that Gardiner would have neglected to counter it with his characteristic robustness. The most convincing explanation of this disobedience is suggested in the penultimate paragraph of the letter, in which he admonishes the students ‘to kepe and obsirve as statutes’ any ‘other decrees made by the deane and Chappiter...until suche tyme that it shall please the kynge and the cardinal’s highnes to sende you statutes indented according to the foundations of that Church.’¹⁸ The statutes under which Christ Church was then governed were only drafts, Henry VIII having died in January 1547 only two months after the college, in this particular incarnation, was founded. The lack of properly signed and sealed statutes to obey would explain a certain confusion around the authority of those who were charged with implementing them and, in the absence of any other evidence, the most satisfactory explanation of the students’ obstreperousness.

In the evidence of his involvement in the affairs of Magdalen and Christ Church, Bishop Gardiner is seen to have been a strong and feared exponent of the traditional religion. He was also the first to use a number of different strategies to advance it, and to address some of the constitutional and administrative difficulties in which the University found itself at the start of the reign.

¹⁸ CCA, D&C i.b.1, f. 289; for Gardiner’s role as visitor in the context of his entire career, see James Arthur Muller, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction* (Octagon Books, New York, 1970), pp. 259-60.

Comparison: Gardiner at Cambridge

At Cambridge, Gardiner's position was different. There, from his restoration in August 1553, he was the Chancellor, and his influence was not confined to colleges of which he was Visitor. Consequently, in his actions there, it is possible to see Gardiner's ideas about the Universities enacted on a broader scale, in which his actions were not constrained by being limited to a few, albeit significant, of its institutions.

Doctrinal conformity was Gardiner's main priority as Chancellor of Cambridge: he wrote in 1545 to Matthew Parker, then Vice-Chancellor, that enforcing orthodoxy was 'the special pointe of my charge' in the Chancellorship.¹⁹ The means by which he brought this about in Marian Cambridge was the replacement of the heads of the Colleges. 'Nothyng' he wrote to the Fellows of St. Catharine's College in January 1554, whose previous master had been expelled because of his marriage, was more necessary 'than to have goode and discret heades in the Colledges.'²⁰ Gardiner recommended candidates for the headships of the colleges at St Catharines, Peterhouse and Trinity, although his preferred candidate for the second was not elected.

Nevertheless, the means by which Gardiner sought to impose his will on Cambridge were different from those he adopted at Oxford, where a visitation was held, as described above. The fact that there was not a formal visitation of Cambridge does not mean that Gardiner did not seek to appraise himself of the latest state of the University, as he wrote to the University on 25 August 1553, immediately after his restoration to the Chancellorship, sending his

¹⁹ Corpus Christi College Cambridge Archives, MS 106, ff. 440-1, quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 34.

²⁰ St Catharine's College Cambridge Archives, College Register (XL8), f. 41r, quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 75.

Chaplain, Thomas Watson, a fellow of St John's in Henry's reign, to investigate.²¹ And on 25 September 1553, the month after his restoration, he wrote to King's College, that a 'specyall visytacyon amonge yow' might be held, 'yet trustynge in your conformity [he] wyll forbere.'²² That a formal visitation was not conducted in Cambridge does not disrupt the continuity between Gardiner's actions at both Universities, once the informal visitation by his Chaplain and this threat of a formal visitation to the fellows of Kings is taken into account.

Conclusion: Gardiner's influence on Oxford

Bishop Gardiner left something of a pattern to which the later involvement of the government in the University conformed, which I propose briefly to summarise. The clearest evidence of the transmission of his agenda for the Universities to his successors is found in a text issued by the Queen to members of her Council in the period immediately after Pole's arrival. These 'Instructions' stipulated that:

such as has commission to talke with my Lord Cardinall at his first coming touching the goodes of the Church should have recourse to him, at least once in a weeke, not only for putting those matters in execucion as much as may be before the Parliament, but also to understand of him which way might be best to bring to good effect those matters that have bine begonne concerning Religion. Both touching good preaching I wish that may supplie & overcome the evill preaching in tyme past. And also to make sure provision that none evill bookes shall eyther be printed, bought, ot sold without iust punishment. Therefore, I think itt shold bee well done that the Universities and Churches of this Realme shold be visited by such persons as my Lord Cardinall with the rest of you may bee well assured to be worthy & sufficient persons to make true and just accompte thereof remitting the choyse of them to him and you.²³

This is the first reference to a plan for the general visitation of the universities and it is possible that Gardiner's knowledge of the situation at Oxford, gleaned from his visitations of

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

²² King's College Cambridge Archives, KCAR/3//3/1/1 f. 356v, quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 74.

²³ BL, Cotton MS Titus cvii, f. 120.

1553 and his continuing involvement in affairs at Christ Church, in addition to his knowledge of the state of affairs at Cambridge where he was Chancellor, lay behind the plans for the visitation.

Cardinal Pole's use in 1556 of a Visitation at Oxford is only one example of Gardiner's posthumous influence at Oxford. Two of Pole's visitors were men with a connection to the Bishop. Gardiner made James Brooks, the chief visitor, his chaplain and almoner on his restoration in 1553 and Walter Wright, another visitor in 1556, had led Gardiner's visitation in 1553. Also, Gardiner's theological work was help shape the case against the Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley at their disputation and trials.²⁴

Cerianne Law, in the section of her admirable thesis that deals with Marian Cambridge, says that there Pole 'may have been building upon the solid work of his predecessor.'²⁵ Although at Cambridge, the fact that both prelates held the office of Chancellor invites a closer comparison than do their respective roles at Oxford, something similar could be said of their work there. The elements of the Catholic restoration in Oxford: the removal of its heretical officers, the reassertion of liturgical and doctrinal conformity, and the means by which these were initially pursued through visitations, were all present first in Gardiner's policy towards Oxford before they were taken on a wider and deeper way by Pole with the additional authority he enjoyed as Chancellor of the University.

²⁴ See Chapter 2.

²⁵ Law, 'Religious Change', p. 104.

The Visitation of Oxford in 1556

Unlike the visitations of the early Stuart period, the way in which those of the Tudor period were conducted is not a subject which has attracted a great deal of scholarly attention. Among the few historians to address the way in which visitations were conducted, rather than merely the results they yielded, was Patrick Collinson, who wrote of episcopal visitations in this period that:

the published visitation articles and injunctions - containing as it were the agenda: the articles for the visitation itself and the injunctions for its sequel - are...informative...But the most significant part of the visitation, seen as an occasion for taking the pulse of a diocese or for strengthening its morale, must have been the exchange of civilities between bishop and clergy, the sermons preached *ad clerum*...the 'charges' which these bishops may have delivered, and the matters discussed over dinner.²⁶

Both Professor Collinson and Kenneth Fincham, who edited the most recent collection of early Stuart Injunctions, use Articles of Inquiry to deduce the agenda of a visitation, Fincham sees them as 'recommendations of good practice, in and outside divine worship.'²⁷

Another way of determining the objectives of those on whose authority a visitation was to be carried out is to investigate the evidence of an individual Bishop's (or, in the case of the Universities, a Chancellor's) career and to use evidence of his allegiances and opinions to reconstruct his agenda for the diocese or institution which was to be visited. This is the method preferred by Anthony Wood who, in the seventeenth century, composed the most detailed extant account of the visitation of Oxford in 1556. For Wood, the purpose of the visitation was for the teaching of Catholic doctrine to supplant that of the Protestants. 'It was thought fit by the Queen and Cardinal Pole, that some active and able men of the R[oman] Catholics should be sent

²⁶ Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), p. 67.

²⁷ Kenneth Fincham, 'Introduction' in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* (2 vols, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), 1, pp. xiii-xxvi at pp. xiv, xxiii.

thereto, to strive all manner of ways to undo and contradict all what the martyr [Peter Vermigli] had done.’²⁸

The date of the visitation of Oxford

It is impossible to determine with any precision the date of the visitation. Wood claims that the visitors ‘began their visitation about the 20 July and the next day Ormanet was incorporated a Doctor of Civil Law.’²⁹ In this connection, Wood refers the reader to the verso side of folio 161 in the Register of Convocation and Congregation, which records the decision

to dispense that venerable man, Dr Nicholas Ormanetto, doctor of civil law in the university of Padua, that he may be able to hold the same status and grade in this University of Oxford...³⁰

But there is no evidence in the register to suggest that the visitation had begun the day before. This does not necessarily prove Wood wrong; he presumably had sources of information available to him which are not afforded to his successors since he conducted his research only a century after the events here described.

As the visitation consisted for the most part of visitors descending on each college in turn, it might have been expected that the archives of those colleges might record when this occurred, even if only in the record of the cost of entertaining them. Yet in only a small number of them is this the case, and when it is the references are scarcely any help in establishing precise dates. From the account scrolls of Merton College, it is clear that the visitors were present between August and

²⁸ *Wood*, 2, pt 1, p. 127.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

³⁰ Reg. I, f. 161v.

November, when the college paid for wine and food for the visitors.³¹ At this point Merton had three bursars, each of whom accounted for a third of the year. The expenses were recorded sequentially and this entry occurs at the top of the list for the period of August to November. Therefore, it can be stated with some confidence that the unnamed visitors were present at Merton in the early part of August 1556. On 10 September, at Magdalen a servant of the Bishop of Gloucester was paid 3s 4d for the consecration of the altars.³² The Bishop of Gloucester, James Brooks, was the principal visitor and this entry dates the visitation of Magdalen to a month or so after that of Merton.

We can be sure that the visitation ended before 6 November 1556, when the temporary statutes, which were the regime's response to the reports of the visitors, were sent to the University.³³ At Cambridge the visitation, which had begun on 11 January 1557, was completed on the 17th of February when

Mr Yale fet [fetched] the bookes from the vysytors. It. theur ente [sic] for Baxter and Mrs [Masters] Chapman and Rust came to them...After this the Vic [Vice-Chancellor] wente to my L. of Chychester and cownted with hym for the vysytors charges and coste that thuniversitie must pay...³⁴

Thirty-seven days had then elapsed since the beginning of the Cambridge visitation. Given the similar number of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge it is plausible to assume that the visitation of the former took a comparable length of time. If we assume the correctness of Wood's date for the

³¹ Merton College Archives, 3914.

³² MCA, Draft Liber Computi 1556, f. 111v.

³³ *Statuta*, pp. 363-375.

³⁴ 'Queene Mary's Visitation. By J. Mere present', John Lamb, *A collection of letters, statutes and other documents from the M.S. Library of Corpus Christi College: illustrative of the History of the University of Cambridge, during the period of the Reformation A.D. MD-MDLXXII* (J.W. Parker, London, 1838), p. 224.

start of the visitation, and that it was of a similar duration to that of Cambridge, it would have concluded in late August 1556.

Between this date and the delivery of the temporary statutes on 6 November the visitors were evidently engaged in the collation of their reports and were joined by witnesses from the University, for in the accounts of New College for this year is contained a payment of 14s 5d to Master Bullock for expenses incurred in traveling ‘for examination concerning the commission of the Cardinal’s visitation.’³⁵

The Visitors

The visitors of the University sent by Cardinal Pole ‘by the Legatine authority he did enjoy’ were James Brooks, Bishop of Gloucester, Nicholas Ormanetto, Robert Morwent, Henry Cole and William Wright.³⁶

James Brooks had been admitted to Corpus Christi College as a scholar at the age of 16 in 1526, becoming a probationary fellow in 1532 and a full fellow the following year. He occupied the office of Bursar from 1538 to 1541 and that of dean from 1541 to 1543. On his restoration to the see of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner made Brooks his chaplain and almoner. Presumably it was his traditionalism which appealed to Gardiner, for in 1535 Brooks and three other fellows of Corpus Christi had been reported to the regime for their obstruction of the ‘extirpyng of ungodly and papisticall doctrine.’³⁷ Brooks had been consecrated Bishop of Gloucester on 1 April 1554, but for a

³⁵ *ad inquirendum de commissione visitationis cardinalis*. New College Archives, Account Rolls 219.

³⁶ *Wood*, 2. pt 1 p. 127; *Strype. Ecclesiastical Memorials*, 3, pt 2, p. 28.

³⁷ *L&P*, 13, pt 2, no. 218.

year afterwards remained in his previous post as Master of Balliol College, an office to which he had been promoted in 1547. His conservative theological disposition had not been an impediment to him continuing in office during the Edwardian period, or indeed his serving as Vice Chancellor in 1552.

It was a peculiar mark of Brooks's career that its most significant episodes occurred outside whichever institution he was responsible for at any given time. As Master of Balliol he made his name by his preaching in London. In November 1553 at St Paul's Cross he lamented the effect of two decades of Protestantism on the religion of the country, and in Lent 1554 he preached before the Queen at the Cathedral itself. As Bishop of Gloucester, and as was discussed in the last chapter, he was commissioned to interrogate Bishops Latimer and Ridley and represented the Pope at the examination of Cranmer in Oxford.³⁸

Little evidence survives of Brooks's mastership of Balliol. For almost all the years in which he held the office the register of the college contains few entries of any significance. One of these is a copy of a decree passed on 7 November 1554 which records strict measures concerning the payment of battels.³⁹ As has been suggested elsewhere, a move towards greater financial soundness in the affairs of the colleges was a feature of the Marian University and this admonition serves to show that in Brooks' mastership of Balliol he was part of this trend.

The Accounts of Balliol for his period as Master reflect the emphases identified throughout the University. At Christmas 1553, three shillings were spent on ivy, hinting at a return to a less sombre celebration of the Nativity than had been the case in the reign of Edward. In 1554 twelve

³⁸ Caroline Litzenger, 'Brooks, James (1512-1588)', *ODNB*.

³⁹ Balliol College Archives, Latin Register I 1514-1678, f. 78.

pence was paid for the costs incurred in keeping the ‘feast of the translation’; judging from its place in the accounts this may be taken to refer to the feast of the translation of the relics of Edward the Confessor, kept in October. Further on in 1555 accounts is found a payment of 3s 4d ‘for a wooden image of Christ in the Chapel.’ An interesting entry for the same year records the receipt of 6s 8d ‘from Dr Nedham for the Bible in English.’ If this, as is implied, records the sale of this ambiguous text rather than its destruction or concealment then we can add a certain fiscal ingenuity to the list of the characteristics of Balliol under Brooks’s mastership.⁴⁰

Of his character there are conflicting estimations. Anthony Wood was no friend of the visitors, discerning in Ormanetto nothing ‘more notable than his intolerable arrogance’, yet he found in Brooks enough virtue to praise him as ‘a man for Literature not vulgar, for Eloquence not to be contemned, for his manners and curtesy to be beloved and respected.’⁴¹ Whereas for John Jewel, in a letter of 20 March 1560, Brooks was ‘a beast of most impure life and still impurer conscience.’⁴²

Robert Morwent’s career in Oxford was divided between two of its most significant institutions in the Tudor period: Magdalen and Corpus Christi. He had been admitted a Fellow of Magdalen in 1510 and had served three terms as Bursar, two as Lector in logic and one as Junior Dean of Arts. In 1517 he was nominated by Bishop Foxe to the office of Vice-President of Magdalen, and still held this position when he was appointed President in 1537. Morwent and a number of other fellows of his college had been sent to the Fleet Prison in 1551 on suspicion of having failed to use the text and rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer in the college’s celebration

⁴⁰ Bodleian Library, MS Top. Oxon e. 124/9, ff 73-79.

⁴¹ *Wood*, 2, pt 2, p 131.

⁴² *bestia impurissimae vitae et multo impurioris conscientiae*. John Ayre (ed.), *The Works of John Jewel* (4 vols, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1845-50), 4, p. 1199.

of its Patronal Festival in that year.⁴³ In 1554 he was appointed a prebendary of Gloucester; the Cathedral, by the time of the visitation, of James Brooks. In both of the colleges with which he was associated, Morwent was a contemporary of Cardinal Pole, who had been admitted to Magdalen in 1512 and vacated in 1519, Pole's nomination to a Fellowship at Corpus, like that of Morwent to the Vice Presidency, was the initiative of Bishop Foxe. However, any personal relations between the two would have taken place at Magdalen, as Pole was abroad for the duration of his fellowship of Corpus.

In Henry Cole, the third of the visitors, we find another Churchman whose career was inextricably linked with that of Cardinal Pole. Admitted a scholar of New College in 1521, Cole proceeded to the fellowship in 1523 and was made Sub-Warden in 1538 and elected Warden four years later. In addition to his Bachelor and Doctor of Civil Law degrees, awarded in 1530 and 1540 respectively, Cole attained the equivalent statuses in Theology in 1551. In the same year, however, he was forced to resign his Wardenship in order to be replaced by the evangelical Ralph Skinner in a coup which was to be re-enacted at Magdalen a year later. Like Owen Ogethorpe, the President of Magdalen, Cole's theological position is ambiguous. He was a close associate of Pole's, accompanying him on the first stage of his abortive legation to England in 1537, only parting from his company in Paris. He was sufficiently close to the future Cardinal that in December 1543 he was arrested on the basis of that association and his acquaintance with Pole's English agent Michael Throckmorton, for which offences he was granted a full pardon the following April. Despite this association with Pole, and in the same month as he was pardoned, Cole had written a treatise denying the Pope's authority to be head of a Council of the Church, writing that it would be easier 'to make a new head than reform the old.' Nevertheless, he was considered sufficiently sound in his religion to be made Archdeacon of Ely in October 1553. His appointment as a visitor to Oxford, and

⁴³ Mihail Dafydd Evans, 'Morwen, Robert (1486?–1558)', *ODNB*.

his crucial intervention in the condemnation of Archbishop Cranmer place him at the centre of ecclesiastical power in Mary's Church.⁴⁴

The details of Nicholas Ormanetto's early career are difficult to establish. It seems probable that he entered Pole's service when the Cardinal was at Maguzzano on Lake Garda, where Pole arrived in July 1553, when he was appointed papal legate to England on the death of Edward VI. From the outset of the second phase of Pole's career in England, Ormanetto had been at his side, a station from which he was to be closely involved, as was discussed in the last chapter, in the condemnation of Archbishop Cranmer, with the Synod of London in 1556 and in repelling the papal attempt to have the Cardinal recalled to Rome in 1558.⁴⁵

Walter Wright, the last of the visitors, had been admitted as principal of Peckwater Inn in September 1533, a position he still held in 1538. By 1540, he had taken possession of the vacant buildings of Durham College, which he used as a hall. A civil lawyer, he was admitted to the Bachelor and Doctor degrees in 1547 and 1550 respectively. He was vice-chancellor of the University between 1547 and 1551, while Archdeacon of Oxford, a position he held from 1543 to 1561. He had participated in Gardiner's visitation of the colleges under his authority, most notably at Magdalen, in late 1553.⁴⁶ John Pechell's account of the visitation of Corpus Christi College at that time recounts a meeting which between Wright as visitor and Morwent as President of Corpus. On 6 October the visitors had been to Magdalen and

⁴⁴ T. F. Mayer, 'Cole, Henry (1504/5–1579/80)', *ODNB*.

⁴⁵ See Thomas F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole: Priest and Prophet* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 43-5, 316-18, 330-7.

⁴⁶ John Pechell, *The History of the University of Oxford from the death of William the Conqueror, to the demise of Queen Elizabeth* (London: W. Jackson and Lister, 1773), p. 210; *Wood*, 2, pt 2, p.120.

proceeded next to Corpus Christi College, whose president, Robert Morwen and the senior fellow Henry Walsh, dean of the college, to testify their attachment to the Roman faith, showed the sacred vestments, pillows, silver vessels, candle sticks, and other ornaments of their profession, carefully repositing and preserved.⁴⁷

This incident, interesting in itself, serves to show quite how interconnected the careers of the visitors had been. All had a connection to Oxford, and apart from Wright each had personal experience of working with or for Cardinal Pole.

It has been argued that Bartolome Carranza, a Spanish Dominican, and later Archbishop of Toledo, was one of the visitors, in the section of the Conclusion devoted to Spanish influences in Marian Oxford, this argument is queried. At this stage it is necessary only to say that it is unlikely Carranza was a visitor, and probable that he was not present in Oxford for the duration of the visitation.

The Authority for the Visitation

In the absence of evidence capable of determining conclusively the authority on which the visitation of Oxford was carried out it is necessary to proceed by deduction. It could not have been carried out on the authority of the Bishop of Oxford, Robert King who, unlike the early Bishops of Lincoln, had no jurisdiction over the University. It was not conducted by Pole in his capacity as Chancellor of the University, a position to which he was only elected on 2 November 1556. We are then left with two alternatives. First, that the visitation was legatine and second that it was a Royal visitation of the kind that had been conducted on the authority of Edward VI and would be during her reign by Elizabeth.

⁴⁷ Pechell, *The History of the University*, p. 210.

Against the last possibility stand a number of facts: first, that in the contemporary sources the visitors are regularly designated as ‘the Cardinal’s visitors’ and never as those of the King and Queen. Second, although no evidence concerning the writs for the visitation at Oxford survives, a contemporary account of the visitation at Cambridge records that ‘a citacyon from my Lord Cardynall for the visitacyon to be xi Januarii [was] red openly by the Orator.’⁴⁸ Third, that the articles of Inquiry were addressed by the Cardinal to Bishop Brooks of Gloucester, the principal visitor. Furthermore, it was to the Cardinal and not to the monarchs that the visitors reported their findings. Consequently, it is with some certainty that it can be concluded that it was on Pole’s authority as Legate that the visitation of the University was carried out. This, and the close personal connection many of the visitors had to the Cardinal, mean that the Visitation must be considered the Cardinal’s project.

The Articles of Inquiry

In the introduction to this section I referred to the use that historians have made of Articles of Inquiry in their attempts to reconstruct the agenda of those who conducted them. It might be useful at this point to suggest how this can be done. When, for example, Bishop Ridley’s 54th article for the visitation of the diocese of London in 1550 asks whether ‘any minister useth wilfully and obstinately any other rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner of Communion, Mattins or Evensong, ministracion of Sacraments, or open prayers, than is set forth in the Book of Common Prayer?’ it is apparent that he is not just seeking information, but revealing his purpose in commissioning the visitation. So, Bishop Ridley is hoping to discover if any of the parishes in his Diocese have failed to employ the Book of Common Prayer in their services. Identifying parishes which have not provides the opportunity for action to be taken against those responsible for their continuing use of

⁴⁸ John Lamb, *Collection of Manuscripts*, p. 189.

the old liturgy, but it was also possible that in their investigations the visitors could make the expectation of conformity clear and show what specifically is in need of reform. It is in such a way that the Articles of Inquiry contain, in the term of Professor Collinson referred to above, the agenda.⁴⁹

But articles have a another use for the historian: a list of questions concerning an institution, such as a college, to which it is the visitors' task to provide the answers, may also enable tentative conclusions to be drawn as to how the visitors would have set about their task. If, for example, one section of the articles refers to the running of the college, and another to the furnishing of the chapel, it would not be unreasonable to conclude that the visitors would have been expected to interview the head of house and to visit and inspect the chapel.

The articles of inquiry can, then, be used to deduce the agenda behind a visitation, and yield up some clues as to the course it was intended to take by those who initiated it.

There are two identical copies of the articles for the Oxford visitation in the Bodleian, in different volumes of the Twyne MSS: one in a sixteenth century hand and another in a seventeenth century hand.⁵⁰ The thirty articles are addressed to James Brooks, the Bishop of Gloucester, as principal visitor. Each is in the form of a question to be put by the visitors, some to the officers of University or colleges, others to the scholars.

The articles are concerned with four issues: the observation of the statutes, the University's patrimony, religion and the honesty of its officials and honest behaviour of the students.

⁴⁹ Walter Howard Frere and William Kennedy, (eds), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation* (3 vols, London: Longmans and Green, 1910) 2, p. 230.

⁵⁰ Bodleian Library, Twyne MS 7 ff. 84-5; Twyne MS 3 ff. 155-156.

The Observance of the Statutes

Those that deal with the first question are at the top of the document, so the first article asks:

Whether the foundations, statutes and other laudable customs of the university and each College and Hall are observed by all and singular people in all things they touch upon.⁵¹

And the second:

Whether any of the statutes are from the time of schism, or have been introduced by use, which obviate the established canons, or remove the ancient foundations, statutes, privileges and customs.⁵²

Other surviving sets of articles and injunctions from the reign display a similar concern to establish, at the outset, whether the government of institutions is being carried out in accordance with its statutes and to endorse such obedience. For example, the first of Bishop Bonner's injunctions for the Diocese of London demands that all 'within the diocese and jurisdiction of London shall observe, keep and perform accordingly (as it concerneth every one of them) with all diligence to the uttermost of their powers, all and singular laws, statutes, ordinances, constitutions and commandments' that had been made since the accession of the Queen to the throne.⁵³

The reference in the second article to 'the time of schism' is testament to the development which had taken place in England since Mary's first communication with the University, in which she had demanded the observation of the statutes in force at her father's death. This change can be

⁵¹ *An fundationes, statuta et laudabiles consuetudines universitatis et singulorum Collegium et Aularum ab omnibus et singulis quod ea tangunt observentur...* Twyne MS 3 f. 155.

⁵² *An tempore scismatis aliquid et alterum sit vel usu introductum fuerit quod Canonicis obviat institutis et antiquis foundationibus statutis, privilegiis et consuetudinibus deroget.* Twyne MS 3, f. 155.

⁵³ *Visitation Articles*, 2. p. 360.

put down to the influence of Pole. On 15 November 1553, Mary had written to the Cardinal telling him that the Church had been restored to its state ‘at the time of the death of King Henry, our father of most pious memory’. Pole had written on 2 December to Thomas Goldwell that Henry should not be honoured by affording him this title.⁵⁴

For Pole, the illegitimate ordinances were not just those of Edward, but those made during a ‘time of schism’ from which he (Pole) had delivered the English Church and which stretched back not to the death of Henry VIII, but to enactment by Parliament of the royal supremacy over the Church in his reign. The instructions to Magdalen in the first weeks of the Queen’s reign that they were to obey the statutes in force at Henry’s death and the identification here in the articles of the entire period from Henry’s assertion of the Supremacy as ‘the time of schism’ demonstrate this shift.

Another statutory duty that the articles ask about is the performance of public disputations. The regime was keen to ensure that theological disputation remained confined to the University, as is seen in the Queen’s proclamation on uniformity issued immediately on her accession to the throne. Concern regarding the carrying out of disputations, according to the statutes, forms the basis for article 15 which enquires whether ‘the public disputations and scholastic exercises are held and whether they are performed at fitting places and times for the use of the scholars.’⁵⁵

There are three possible reasons for this query. Firstly, it may be a simple request for confirmation that the disputations are being carried out, since perhaps it was feared that in the disputatious atmosphere of the preceding years, caution had prevailed, especially in public

⁵⁴ *CRP*, 2, 757, 767.

⁵⁵ *An disputationes et scholastica exercitia publica celebrentur et an congruis locis et temporibus pro utilitate scholarium exerceantur*. Twyne MS 3, 155v.

disputation of theological matters. Secondly, that since the traditional scholastic theological method was so bound up with the performance of disputations, the visitors were intended to encourage their observation. The third explanation is that since the regime planned for the University to supply the Church with its clerical elite, and that those men would be ministering in a Church which had so recently fallen into theological error, they would benefit from the practice in argument provided by regular attendance at, and participation in, disputations.

The University's Patrimony

Three articles are concerned with the safe-keeping of the University's money and possessions. The eighth enquires 'whether the common goods and public treasure of the University and colleges are kept well and safely. And whether by the diligence of the governors they are augmented or by carelessness diminished.'⁵⁶ The ninth article asks 'whether any estates, demesnes, lands, houses or buildings are lost by debt, or for many years let for rent to the loss of the University itself and the colleges.'⁵⁷ The eleventh article asks 'whether the common chests, monies and keys of the same are faithfully kept.'⁵⁸

The benefaction of 1554, and the detailed plans put in place for the assignment of the money it afforded the University indicate the tight control that the regime was keen to exercise over the financial affairs of the University, a tendency which is illustrated by the concern shown in the Queen's letter to the University of August 1553 that the University buildings had decayed due to the

⁵⁶ *An bona communia et Thesaurus publicus universitatis et collegiorum bene et tuto conserventur. Et an diligentia gubernatorum augeantur vel incuria diminuuntur. Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *An aliqua praedia, Dominia, terrae, domus vel aedificia fuerint alienata, vel ad multos annos ad firmam dimissa in damnum ipsius universitatis et collegiorum. Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *An communes cistae ac pecuniae et claves eorundem fideliter conserventur. Ibid.*

lack of adequate funds for their repair. This enquiry after the safe keeping of the University's money, and in particular the safe keeping of the keys, are an articulation of this selfsame preoccupation with financial probity. It may perhaps have been hoped that a reappraisal of the rent yielded by the University's lands might provide an increase in revenue for the institution, as the Queen had already lamented that in the recent past the University's 'public treasury [was] plundered, its ornaments carried off and its revenues reduced to almost nothing.'⁵⁹

Probity

The articles' concern for proper management is not confined to the money and possessions of the University: two articles are devoted to the behaviour of its officials. The fifth asks

Whether the Chancellor or Vice Chancellor, presidents of the colleges and halls, proctors, bedells and any other officials and ministers, as well of the said University as of the colleges and halls, select, assign and appoint in due and proper time and mode and form, and without any stain of reward or favour, but according to conscience and otherwise rightly and properly according to the statutes and laudable customs of the University, colleges and halls.⁶⁰

In carrying out the functions of their offices, these officials were responsible for all aspects of the University's life and any changes that the regime sought in the University: to its finances, its disciplines or to its teaching, were dependent upon their probity. For Mary and Pole, in their actions as much as in their words, their task was the restoration of 'peace'. The word came frequently to the lips of both, most profoundly in the Cardinal's address to Parliament on 28 November 1554 when Pole had referred to himself as 'I who represent the act of the pontiff for spiritual peace.'⁶¹ The

⁵⁹ *C.P.R. Philip and Mary*, 1, 165.

⁶⁰ *An Cancellarius sive vice cancellarius, presidentes collegiorum et aularum, procuratores, Bedelli, et alii quilibet officiales et ministri tam dictae universitatis quam collegiorum et aularum, debito tempore et modo et forma, et absque aliqua labe pretii vel favores, sed secundum conscientiam et alias rite et recte iuxta statuta et laudabiles, universitatis, collegiorum et aularum consuetudines eligantur, deputentur et constituantur.* Twyne MS 3, f. 155.

⁶¹ *CRP*, 999.

implication of this is that the most important characteristic of the previous two decades was conflict borne of disobedience. The remedy was obedience to the authority of the Church and to that of the Crown which, though the former was repudiated under Henry and the latter grievously misused by Edward, had never ceased to bind the consciences of their subjects. Obedience to the law was then the starting point for everything the Marian Church aimed to accomplish, and it was therefore necessary to establish the trustworthiness of officials.

The behaviour of members of the University was also to be subjected to scrutiny: the twenty-sixth article seeks to ascertain ‘whether there are nocturnal fights, quarrels or contentions between the scholars themselves or between the scholars and townspeople.’⁶²

Religion

Important though the scrutiny of the statutes, the book-keeping and the discipline of the University were, most weight in the articles is given to matters with a direct connection to religion. The implications of religious change for teaching in the University were broad. For example, the third article bound the visitors to investigate:

Whether ordinary lectures, founded of old, either in Theology, or Canon and Civil Law, and the other sciences and arts, are held.⁶³

The status of Canon Law in the University as in the realm at large had been thrown into confusion by the events of the preceding reigns. John Barton, in his account of the work of the

⁶² *An sint pugnae nocturnae, rixae, aut contentiones inter ipsos scholares seu inter scholares et oppidanos.* Twyne MS 3, f. 155.

⁶³ *An lectiones ordinariae ab antiquo fundatae tam in Theologia quam in iure Canonico, Civili, et reliquis scientiis et artibus habeantur...* *Ibid.*

Faculty of Law in this period acknowledges that ‘it is perhaps debatable whether it be strictly correct to say that [Canon Law] was abolished, for contemporaries appear to have thought that the study was merely suspended.’⁶⁴ A series of commissions were set up by statute in both Henry and Edward’s reign for the examination of Canon Law and the 1549 statutes of Edward’s visitors had provided for limited lectures on ecclesiastical law. Nevertheless, this branch of jurisprudence, the teaching of which had been a central feature of the medieval University had ceased by 1535 when all Canon Law prejudicial to the royal supremacy was abrogated.⁶⁵

The theological justification for the observance of Canon Law is that the Church possesses its own legislative integrity, according to which legislation is enacted by virtue of the authority granted by Christ to the Apostolic college, with Peter at its head, to govern the Church. The reintroduction of the teaching of Canon Law in the University would be essential in the training of clergy and statesmen in a new, Catholic dispensation in which the Henrician conflation of secular and spiritual government had been repudiated.

Similar reasoning lay behind the reversion to the old liturgy which was made binding upon the University and the colleges by the Queen’s letter of August 1553, and it was in order to establish the extent of this reversion that the fourth article asks whether ‘anniversary masses, processions and other divine offices and and almsgivings, and others to which the University and every college are bound, are celebrated, completed and happen.’⁶⁶ This suggests that the visitors seek evidence of the return to the ceremonial observances of the Catholic Church. But this requirement is also closely

⁶⁴ John Barton, ‘The Faculty of Law’ in *HUO*, III, pp. 257-283 at p. 257.

⁶⁵ *Statutes of the Realm* iii. 25 Henry VIII, ch. 19 sections 1, 2 and 7.

⁶⁶ *An missae anniversariae, processiones, et alia divina officia et eleemosynae et alia quaelibet ad quae universitas et singula collegia tenentur debite celebrentur. exigentur, fiant.* Twyne MS 3, f. 155.

associated with the concern of the first and second articles for the observation of the foundations of the colleges and University and is prefigured in the Queen's letter of 1553 in which she lamented that by their non-observation the 'last willes of manie good men have binne broken.'⁶⁷ It also reflects a desire for such masses to be said, following the provisions in the Queen's Benefaction of 1553 for masses for herself and her parents.⁶⁸ Ensuring observation of ceremonies, as will be seen below, was a significant aspect of the Visitors' work.

In her 'Instructions' Mary had laid particular emphasis on the importance of the residence of priests in parish Churches, fearing that the absence of priests meant that there would not be a practical example of piety for the laity to follow, asserting that

I verelye beleue that manye benefices should not be in one mans hands but after such sort as euery Preist might take his owne charge and remayne resident there. Whereby they should have but one bonde to discharge towards God, whereas now they have many which I take to be the cause that in most partes of this Realme there is overmuch want of good preachers (who will instruct) not only by their preaching, but also by their good example without which in myne opinion their sermon shall not soe much profit as I wish.⁶⁹

The University was an important strategic target for the desire to fill benefices with priests, due to the patronage that it exercised over parish Churches and in the seventh article we find a telling resonance of the this desire for an increase in the number of priests to do so. It asks

Whether in Churches united and impropriated of the University, or of the colleges, there are continuous vicars instituted, who may laudably exercise the cure of souls, and may celebrate the divine offices and may somehow sustain their duties.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ BL, Add MS 32091, f. 145.

⁶⁸ OUA, WPB/B/25v.

⁶⁹ BL, Cotton MS Titus CVIII, f. 120.

⁷⁰ *An in Ecclesiis unitis et impropriatis universitatis seu collegiorum sint vicarii perpetui instituti qui laudabiliter curam animarum exercent et divina celebrent officia, aliqua onera sustineant.* Twyne MS 3 f. 155.

The fourteenth article focusses on the preaching role of the clergy in asking whether ‘for advancement to a degree of Theology, they hold and celebrate each his own assemblies, for the form of the thing, either in the Academy or at Paul’s Cross in London.’⁷¹

Cardinal Pole’s attitude towards preaching has been the subject of a U-turn on the part of historians in the last quarter of a century. This owes much to the work of Eamon Duffy. Professor Duffy, in an article published in 2005, took apart the earlier assessment of Rex Pogson that Pole had failed to ‘quell all people’s developed taste for preaching and restore in them the half-forgotten confidence in Rome simply as a means of good order.’⁷² The main piece of evidence which Duffy offers for rejecting Pogson’s assessment is a letter to Bartolomé Carranza in 1558 in which Pole (with reference to London) wrote that

From daily experience I learn how corrupt and diseased is the state of that body, I find that wherever the Word most abounds, men least profit from it, when it is misused...Of course I do not on that account deny the necessity of preaching the Word, but I do say that the Word can be more of a hindrance than a help, unless it is proceeded or at the same time accompanied by the establishment of Church discipline...⁷³

Although Pole’s attitude to preaching was, in the words of his most recent biographer, ‘cautious’, it certainly occupied an important place in his agenda for the English Church as it did in that of the Queen.⁷⁴

The eighteenth article is concerned with the existence of heretical books in the University. The Queen had in her memorandum on Pole’s arrival insisted that ‘none evill bookes shall eyther be

⁷¹ *An promoti ad Theologiae gradum, suas quisque conciones pro forma rei tam in Academia quam ad crucem Paulinum Londonii, tenent et celebrent. Ibid.*

⁷² Rex H. Pogson, ‘Reginald Pole and the priorities of Government in Mary Tudor’s Church’, *The Historical Journal* 18 (1975), 3-20, at 19.

⁷³ Quoted in E. Duffy, ‘Cardinal Pole Preaching’, Loades and Duffy (eds.), *The Church of Mary Tudor*, pp. 176-200, at p. 181.

⁷⁴ Mayer, *Pole*, p. 247.

printed, bought or sold without iust punishment.’ It was this instruction that was followed by the phrase ‘therefore, I thinke itt should bee well done that the Universities and Churches of this Realme shold be visited’. The nineteenth article continues the concerns raised in its predecessor. It asks if ‘chiefly in philosophical lectures and disputations doctors teach impiety and deviate from true doctrine and whether theological matters are thus reverently treated.’⁷⁵ The twenty-first asks ‘whether in the University there are any heretical persons or persons suspect with regard to the faith.’⁷⁶ These articles seek to cast a net over Oxford in order to catch heretics, whether by their possession of heretical books, by their lectures or even by reputation.

The conduct of the visitation

Rather as the executions of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley have tended to occlude the rest of what transpired in Marian Oxford, so the exhumation of the bones of Peter Martyr Vermigli’s wife has cast a shadow over the visitation of 1556. Foxe reports that:

when Brokes Bishop of Gloucester, Nicholas Ormanet Datary, Robert Morwen, President of Corpus Christi College, Cole and Wright, Doctors of the Civil Law, came thither as the Cardinalls visitors, they among other things had in Commission to take up this good woman out of her grave and to consume her carkas with fyre....And to make a start that they would do nothing disorderly, they called al those before them that had any acquayntance with her or her husband. They ministered an oathe unto them that they shoild not conceale whatsoever was demaunded. In fine, ther answeare was that they knew not what religion she was of, by reason they understood not her language.

To be shorte, after these visitours had sped theyr busines they came for, they gat them of the Cardinall agayn, certifying him that upon due inquisition made, they could learn nothing upon which law they might burn her. Notwithstanding the cardinall did not leave the matter so but wrote down his letters a good while after to Marshall, the Deane of Frideswides [Christ Church] that he should dig her up...because she was intered nigh unto S. Frideswides relicks...Doct. Marshall like a prety man calling his Spade and mattockes together in the evening, when he was well whited caused her to be taken up and buried in a dunghill.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ *An in lectionibus et disputationibus maxime Philosophicis doctores qui impietatem doceant et a doctrina vera deviant et an res Theologicae ita reverenter tractentur.* Twyne MS 3 f. 156

⁷⁶ *An in universitate sint aliquae personae haereticae seu de fide suspectae.* *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ Foxe (1583), p. 1992.

Some aspects of this story are relevant to the wider context of the visitation. The first is the role of the testimony of the townspeople in the events leading to the exhumation of Vermigli's wife. Their memories of the sermons preached by graduates in the University Church in the preceding years would surely have been a valuable source for the visitors, as they would not have been as invested as their academic sources in presenting the recent past with a self-justificatory, or rather a self-preserving slant. Their opinions on town/gown relations were in any case to be investigated on the basis of the twenty-fourth article of Inquiry.

Secondly, that this burning took place in a manner consistent with this account should not perhaps be dismissed on the basis of Foxe's own agenda. Were it merely a figment of the fevered Protestant imagination we might expect the townspeople to have testified to that lady's virtue and learning, rather than the language barrier which prevented them from understanding her. However, Foxe may simply be inviting the reader to laugh along at a patently false 'I didn't see nothing, officer' response, designed to prevent her disinterment. This is certainly the interpretation Wood places on Foxe's narrative, recording that 'they pretended they did not understand her language.'⁷⁸ The decision to proceed with the exhumation is likely to have been supported, if not directly instigated, by those like the Dean, Richard Marshall who, on account of his dual role in college and the Cathedral, had been forced to endure the corruption of its most important relics by the insertion into an adjacent place of those of the wife of a notorious Protestant. That this reading of events is plausible is evidenced in the fate of the bones which, after the accession of Elizabeth to the throne in 1558 were recovered from their temporary resting place and mixed in with those of St Frideswide.

⁷⁸ *Wood*, 2, pt 1, p. 132.

Wood's account of the year 1556 contains more details of the visitors' activities than that of Foxe, which is closely followed by John Strype. Here again though, as will be seen, there are discordant elements to the story. Wood records that

Those persons that were active and forward in the late times, those they ejected. All the English Bibles also that they could find, and all the Commentaters on it in the same language, which were for their number almost infinite, they burnt in the common market place, in the doing of which Cole, one of the visitors, showed himself very zealous. All books also that made for the Protestant Religion were, if not in libraries, cast out, if in scholars' studies, or in the houses of lay persons, burnt, and they that retained they severely punished or, if scholars, expelled.⁷⁹

The use of Bibles in English was never prohibited by the regime and I would venture to suggest that the evidence on which Wood draws for this aspect of his narrative may have been coloured by subsequent Protestant embellishment. James Brooks, the principal visitor had as we have seen, sold Balliol College's copy in 1554 rather than have it destroyed. Vernacular commentaries are certainly a more likely candidate for destruction than the Bibles themselves, as they would have contained Protestant exegesis, and it may be that Wood, or his sources, has conflated the fate of both types of text. Another feature of this part of Wood's account which is significant is the role that the visitors had in investigating and punishing the activities of the lay people of the town. As was shown in the section of this thesis devoted to the Protestant University and the legacy of Vermigli, the outreach of the University to the people of the town in pursuit of the Protestant cause was one of the after effects of the Edwardian policy towards the University which was in most pressing need of reversal.

The visitation itself has left very little trace in the University archives, and only slightly more in those of the colleges. Those records which do survive relate mainly to the cost of housing the visitors and supplying them with what they required for their work. Balliol's accounts for 1556

⁷⁹ *Wood*, 2, pt 1, p. 132.

record that 7s 15 d was paid for food and drink at the time of the visitation including 12d for 'wine for a notary'. 6d was spent on 'parchment at the time of the visitation', which was probably used for the writing of the inventories. 13s 4d was paid in the same year to the bedells for the Chancellor in the time of the visitation.⁸⁰ At Trinity 34s 9d was paid 'for other provisions for the visitors of the most Reverend Cardinal Pole.'⁸¹ At All Souls, three pounds was spent on the 'clerics and servants' for the visitation, 12d to 'Thomas Harvys' for procuring provisions for the visitors and 'six shillings for the provision of parchments at the time of the visitation.'⁸² At New College £6 11s 8d was spent on feeding the visitors.⁸³

The expenses incurred by the colleges by the visitation did not end with the departure of the visitors, however. Also found in the account roll of 1556 at New College is an entry recording the 13s 5d awarded to those traveling to 'meet the Cardinal's visitors.'⁸⁴ At Balliol, the Master went on four journeys on college business in 1556. Whether all were related to the visitation or not is not recorded, however it is reasonable to suppose, given what is established from other sources, that at least some of these were connected with the visitation and that part of the £13 10s 11 1/2 d spent by him in the course of these journeys was attributable to the visitation. The sums here enumerated were not high enough to threaten the solvency of the colleges. Even at a small institution like Balliol the effect of the additional expenses incurred by the visitation did not endanger the financial position of the college. In the year 1556 the college's receipts exceeded its expenses by £13 16s and

⁸⁰ Bodleian Library, MS Top. Oxon e. 127/9 ff. 85-85v.

⁸¹ Trinity College Archives, Accounts 1556 f. 5.

⁸² All Souls College Archives, Account Roll 1556.

⁸³ New College Archives, Account Roll 1556.

⁸⁴ NCA Account Roll 1556.

1/2d.⁸⁵ At New College, where £6 11s 8d was spent solely on feeding the visitors, receipts exceeded expenditure by £26 9s 11d.⁸⁶

In contrast to the paucity of evidence of the Oxford visitation, that of Cambridge is the subject of a very full account written by John Mere, a bedell of that University. Given the similarity in the structure of the two institutions it is probable that they followed roughly the same course. In using Mere's account of the visitation at Cambridge to assist the re-construction of that of Oxford, this section summarises Mere's narrative and attempts to discern which were the elements most likely to have been common to the visitation of both Universities.

The first interesting element of the Cambridge visitation for our purpose is the early and informal way in which it began. On 27 November 1556, before the formal opening of the visitation on 11 January, Mere records that the Senior Proctor 'demawnded of us [the Congregation of Regents and Non-Regents] whether we wolde submitt owr selves to the statutes and thereuppon took pen and inke and called a scrutiny of regents.' There was also a series of investigations of the security of the colleges' money. On the 29th of November, after a sermon by the Bishop of Chester, to be the principal visitor, 'Mr Clayton and I wente to the scholes and perused the state of trinitie hutch and fownde all even.' On 1 December the 'Vic[e Chancellor] herde bothe divinitie lectures.' The next day the Vice Chancellor 'with Drs Yonge and Segewyk and the proctors moved and exhorted them [the first and second year regents] to com to lectures.' Later 'the acownte of the common hutche was agayne got in hande with, the Vic[e Chancellor] Dr Harveye, Mrs Swynborne, Maptyd and Yale beinge audytors and contynued at it with candle lyght untill it was very dark.' On 3rd December 'we sate agayne on the cownte of the common hutche from one of the clock untill by

⁸⁵ Bodleian Library, MS Top. Oxon e. 127/9 f. 80.

⁸⁶ NCA Account Roll 1556.

candle lyght and yet left it unperfyte.’ On 4th December the Vice Chancellor had the ‘keyes and Indentures of trinitye and darlington hutches delivered’ and on the 5th the ‘keyes of Fen and Byllingforthe hutches were browght to the Vic. and so by hym delivered unto the kepers.’

These entries suggest that many of the central enquiries which the visitors were to make on the Cardinal’s authority were pursued in this initial period before the visitation had formally begun. There is no direct evidence that this happened at Oxford, as the small degree of evidence we have of the visitors’ activities there is confined to the period after the writ for the visitation was issued. However, the possibility of some preparatory work being carried out cannot be discounted.

By 9th December the Bishop of Chester and three of the visitors were dining together in Cambridge, two days before the ‘citacyon from my L. Cardynall for the visitacyon to be xi Januari red openly by the Orator’ which was ‘sett upp on a borde at S. Marye’s Churche doore, and Watson’s stall under the Vic. seale agaynst the visitacyon.’ On 28 December ‘the Vic[e Chancellor] D. Harvy, Mrs. Swynborne, Maptyd and the Proctors went to the common hutche to searche owt muniments and intytled them in the paper booke ther.’

The close contact between the visitors and the regime is discernible in Mere’s entries for the next few days which record the arrival of messages for public declaration from the capital. One concerning the market on 23 December and another on Christmas Eve ‘that the visitacyon charges shuld be borne by thuniversite and Colleges, and that no M[aste]r of any college suffer any of the fellowes scholeres or mynysters to go furthe **if** the towne but to returne before the visitacyon.’⁸⁷

⁸⁷ ‘Queen Mary’s Visitation’, pp. 184-236 at pp. 188-195.

If the visitation at Oxford was indeed preceded by such an informal period of inspection then it is probable that this period included a series of informal surveys of the accounts and chests of the University and Colleges and exhortations to obedience in matters such as the attending of lectures which were the emphases of the articles of inquiry. The most likely explanation for the disclosure of the articles at this early stage is that the Bishop of Chester, the principal visitor, had arrived in Cambridge before these informal inspections begin. If, like the Bishop of Gloucester, the principal visitor at Oxford, the Cambridge articles were addressed to him, the Bishop of Chester might well have felt at liberty to make known the content of the articles before the formal start of the visitation.

At Cambridge the simultaneous exhumations of Bucer and Fagius would seem to have occupied far more of the visitors' time than that of Peter Martyr's wife at Oxford. On 12 January Mere records that 'at one the Heddes' of the colleges and halls 'met in scholes where and by whom it was concluded that for as myche as BUCER had byn an arche herytycke teachynge by his life tyme many detestable heresies and errors sute should be made unto the Visitors by thuniversity that he myght be taken upp and ordered according to the law and lykewyes P. FAGIUS.' On the 17th the Vice Chancellor 'had with him at Peterhowse at ii Doct[ors] Yonge, Sedgewycke, Bullock, Cosyn, Tayler, Parker, Redman, Whytlock, Mytch &c for to conferre and testufye of BUCER'S heretical doctrines.' On the 16th of January, when a citation from Pole had been set up, the 'condemnation of BUCER and FAGIUS for Hereytkes' was read out in the Congregation of Regents and Non-Regents.⁸⁸ What survives of Mere's account does not include any mention of the actual exhumation, which presumably took place between where the diary in its current form stops on 3rd March and its resumption on 11 May, since it is unlikely that Mere would have omitted such an event from his account.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 205, 210, see also p. 209.

At Oxford, the investigation of heretics was demanded by the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth articles of inquiry. That the visitors were zealous in fulfilling this task is evident from Wood's report that

such a close and strict enquiry made they after Hereticks, as they called them (of which some were yet remaining in the University) that they were forced either to dissemble or fly into corners. I have heard that the house of Garbrand Herks, a Dutchman (drove out of his country for Religion sake), now or lately called Bulkley Hall in St Mary's Parish, was a recepticle for the cheifest of the the Protestants, where for their privacy they exercised their religion in a large cellar belonging thereunto.⁸⁹

The possibility of the University being infected by Protestantism from the town was a clear danger to the regime's aspirations for the University.

Besides the prosecution of heresy, three other aspects of the Cambridge visitation aid the attempt to re-construct that of Oxford. The first is the freedom given to members of the University to report to the visitors those features of its life which might be of interest to them. Mere records that 'at iii' on the 11 January, 'the Vysytors came all to Scholes...and all the Regents and non Regents without their Copes, where first my Lorde of Chester had a short proposition moving all men that had any thyng to say eyther privately or openlie to speke it, and they should be herd.'⁹⁰ It would not be surprising if a similar invitation had been made by the visitors to Oxford.

At the same time as this request for information, an examination was made of the registers to establish who was present at this outset of the visitation.

My Lorde of Chester and the Datary upon the Vic[e-Chancellor] at thupper end of the house and My Lord of Lyncoln and D. Cole at the nether ende with a nother Register upon the senior Proctor. That all who were cyted and named in the certificate and absent were excommunicated or declared contumacious by my Lorde of Chesters mowght.

⁸⁹ *Wood*, 2, pt 1, p. 132.

⁹⁰'Queen Mary's Visitation', p. 201.

Given the provision that was made for the Proctors to release members of the University from residence for periods of the Visitation by granting a licence, for example that obtained by ‘D. Hatcher...to be away vii dayes’, the absence of members of the University from the start of the visitation without such a licence was thus construed by the visitors as evidence, whether the cause of the absence was religious or not, of unfitness to remain in the University.⁹¹

The second element of the Cambridge visitation as recorded by Mere, which is likely to have been paralleled at Oxford, is the manner in which the visitors made their way around the colleges.

The visitation of individual colleges in Cambridge was, as Mere narrates it, a confusing process, but it is possible to determine the method which was used. It would seem that a number of colleges were visited simultaneously as the visitors divided the labour between themselves. For example, the visitations of Trinity College and King’s College overlapped with visitations of Christ’s College, of which the two later colleges in turn overlapped with those of Magdalen and Queens’. Only a general sense of the geographical progress of the visitation of the colleges can be discerned, but it would seem to have progressed in clusters of colleges with Trinity, King’s and Christ’s College between 11 and 19 January, moving to St John’s, Benet’s, Catherine and Pembroke Halls as the main focus between the twentieth and the twenty-sixth, with Peterhouse and Clare Hall as the focus until 8 February before Catherine, Gonville, Clare and Trinity Halls came under scrutiny in the period preceding the gap in Mere’s narrative from 21 February.

Mere includes descriptions of the ceremony accompanying the visitation of individual colleges, a ceremony which was probably performed at Oxford. The fullest description of this

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

ceremonial welcome is given by Mere of the visitation of Queens' College in Cambridge on 18 January.

It. the vysytors came to the QUEEN'S COLLEGE half houre before vii, and in the gate howse a forme sett with carpet and cushyns, were fyrst the President received them wth holywater and sensings in a cope and all the company in surplusses with crosses and candlestycks. After that they went to the Chapel processionaliter and had masse of the Holy Ghost songe.⁹²

This liturgical display would have provided ample proof that the college concerned was conforming itself to the traditional pattern of worship.

The third feature of the Cambridge visitation which was directly paralleled at Oxford was the investigation of the arrangements made for the security of the chests, in which the monies of the University and colleges were kept. This, as was shown above, was the subject of the eighth article of enquiry for Oxford.

At Cambridge, Mere records that on the 15 January 'at 8 congregatio regentium et non and whyle the Vic[e Chancellor] went to the visitors D. Younge declared the cause to be for taking furthe our muniments owte of thuniversitie hutch and a grace graunted concerning the same.' And with respect of the colleges, on 30 January the visitors 'continued at trinitie Coll. and made an ende of the visitation there and sent to all colleges to bring in their inventaryes in parchment under their seales by munday at nyght.' On the 1st February:

all the kepers and aydytors of hutches were commawnded to be there agayne at ii of the clocke. At what time they caused all the Hutches to be opened and perused the state of them by thaccounts and indentures and caused the Register Marshall to take certen notes and founde many fawtes saying that there was mych deceyte and crafte used.⁹³

⁹² 'Queen Mary's Visitation', p. 205.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

The safety of the college chests was integral to the Cardinal's ambition to improve the financial probity of the University. It is possible to be fairly certain that such an assessment of the security of the chests took place in Oxford as in the accounts from 1556 for Balliol, in entries immediately after those concerning the visitation, it is recorded that 2s 6d was paid for 'mending the great chest in the Master's chamber' and 16s for 'a key and lock for the great chest.'⁹⁴

The fourth aspect of the visitation of Cambridge which we can be sure featured in that of Oxford is the investigation by the visitors of books which were present in the colleges. On 4th February the Cambridge visitors 'sent for the Master of St. Johns who broeght with him thynventaries of all the fellowes and scholares bokes.'⁹⁵ Similar inventories were prepared for the visitors at Oxford. In the archives of Merton College is an inventory of books drawn up for the benefit of the visitors. It contains a list of liturgical books and another of books which were held in the college library.⁹⁶ N.R. Ker, in his introduction to the inventory, writes that it was 'drawn up no doubt in 1556 for the commissioners of Cardinal Pole who visited Oxford in that year.'⁹⁷ The following entry in the register of the college, not cited by Ker, would seem to confirm his hypothesis: 'the same day [1 August 1556] after being sealed with the common seal the inventory indenture was handed to the visitors who were at that time in the academy, whose names were the Bishop of Gloucester, named Broxus, the illustrious Ormanetto, Datary, Dr Cole, Dr Wryghtus, Master Morwen, president of Corpus Christi College.'⁹⁸

⁹⁴ Bodleian Library, MS Top. Oxon e. 127/9 f. 85v

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 215.

⁹⁶ Printed in N.R. Ker, 'Merton College Inventory' in *HUO*, III, pp. 487-497

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 487.

⁹⁸ MertCA, Register, p. 156.

The fifth common feature of the visitation of both Universities was the inspection of the college chapel. Mere records, on the 29 January, ‘my Lorde of Chester’ and the other visitors went to the altar of Trinity College ‘where they fownd fawte that there was neyther light nor coles to sense the sacrament.’⁹⁹ That comparable inspections were made during the visitation of Oxford is evident from the accounts of certain colleges. At both New College and Magdalen, tabernacles were acquired in the same period as the visitation was known to be in progress.¹⁰⁰ At All Souls, a holy water sprinkler and a font [stoup] were acquired.¹⁰¹ Although there is no explicit mandate for the perustration of the college chapels in the articles of enquiry for Oxford, the enquiry of the fourth article was into the performance of ‘anniversary masses, processions and other divine offices.’¹⁰²

Another liturgical feature of the visitation of Oxford would seem to have been the number of altars which were consecrated by Bishop Brooks during its course. At Magdalen, ‘the servant of the Bishop of Gloucester’ was paid 3s 4d ‘for the consecration of the altars’ on 10 September 1556, at Trinity the Bishop ‘and his ministers’ were paid 12s 10d ‘for the consecration of the altars.’¹⁰³ At All Souls 3s 4d was paid to ‘the servant of the Bishop for the consecration of the altars’ in 1556.¹⁰⁴ The consecration of altars by the Bishop is puzzling. In this period, a priest was only able to celebrate the mass on an altar which had been properly consecrated by a Bishop. On what had the priests been consecrating the Eucharist before Brooks’ visits in which these blessings were carried out in 1556? The evidence, and it is only fragmentary, suggests that the original altars of the college chapels had been retained, as at Magdalen, and that immediately after Mary’s accession they were

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

¹⁰⁰ NCA, Account Roll 1556, MCA, Draft Liber Computi 1556, f. 100.

¹⁰¹ ASCA, Account Roll 1556.

¹⁰² Twynne MS, f. 85.

¹⁰³ TCA Accounts 1556, f. 5.

¹⁰⁴ ASCA, Account Roll 1556.

restored to their former position in the chancels. In the accounts which record payment to the Bishop of Gloucester for the consecrations, there is no mention made of such 'high altars'. Instead they refer simply to 'altars' [*altaria*] for which the most satisfactory account is that the altars which were consecrated by Brooks in the course of the visitation were the so called 'lesser altars' at which priests in the colleges could say their daily mass. If before the visitation only one altar was available for priests to perform this compulsory action, the provision of more consecrated altars would have represented an important practical benefit of the visitation.

From the surviving, albeit rather circumscribed, evidence of the visitation of Oxford and Mere's account of its parallel in Cambridge this section has attempted to reconstruct the priorities and activities of the Cardinal's visitors in the summer of 1556. In pursuit of answers to the questions asked in Pole's articles, the visitors seem to have conducted a thorough examination, the provision of books, the furnishing of the chapels, the state of the college finances and the presence within the University and City of heretics all evidently received thorough inspection. These elements of the visitation are those for which it is antecedently probable that evidence would survive in the accounts or registers of the colleges and the University, so the probability that other areas mandated to be investigated in the articles were carried out, such as attendance at lectures, is not lessened.

Pole's Statutes

This section situates the statutes of Cardinal Pole in the context of earlier attempts to reform the laws which governed the University in the Tudor period. It presents Pole's code of statutes as a temporary measure, conceived as an improvised solution, more acceptable than a reversion to the obsolete medieval statutes or the observation of those enacted under Edward. As such, they

concentrate the power to govern the University in the hands of Pole's nominee as Commissary (Vice-Chancellor), whom they also charge with responsibility for the production of a permanent replacement. In the statutes, much of the Cardinal's agenda for the English Church, set forth most clearly in his Legatine Constitution, is echoed.

Earlier attempts at reform

That the statutes governing the University were in need of amendment had been evident for four decades when Cardinal Pole issued his revision in 1556. The earliest concerted attempt at amendment had been made by his predecessor as Papal Legate to England: Thomas, Cardinal Wolsey. His perceived suitability to undertake a revision is most satisfactorily accounted for by his munificence toward the University, in the endowment of lectures and the founding of Cardinal's College. Indeed, such was his status in Oxford that he was regarded by Congregation not as a 'son' of the University, but as 'that most munificent father, great in honour, our first founder'.¹⁰⁵

In May 1518 the then Chancellor of the University William Warham wrote to the Congregation lamenting that his own suggestions as to the alteration of the statutes had evidently not been carried out, and warning of the dangers inherent in their proposal to allow Cardinal Wolsey to frame new ordinances for his recently founded lectures:

truly, if the authority is transferred to the Most Reverend Lord Cardinal to reform and revoke, to construct and destroy all statutes concerning the good use of letters, as you say, I cannot agree that it would be conducive to the expedience of the University...because all the statutes of the University together, either in themselves or in [other] respects, concern the good use of letters and scholastic studies. If all authority over the statutes is transferred to another from the University - that is, from the Chancellor and congregation of Regents and non-Regents-then I cannot see how it could be restored to the same.

¹⁰⁵ Henry Anstey, *Epistolae Academicae Oxon (Registrum F): a collection of letters and other miscellaneous documents illustrative of academical life and studies at Oxford in the fifteenth century* (2 vols, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1898), 1, p. 200.

This warning went unheeded as the Convocation on 1 June 1518, acknowledging that the original statutes had become ‘abused’ and ‘obsolete’, ‘conceded’ to Wolsey ‘the power of innovation [and] institution, not to destroy but to reform, to interpret, supplement, alter, renovate, discard, extirpate and to institute that which seems to him opportune.’¹⁰⁶

Wolsey’s revision was not, however, completed. In 1524 he summoned Roger Dingley, a fellow of All Souls admitted in 1511, and William Grise, who had particular knowledge of Magdalen College, to assist in the preparation of the statutes. But it was not until early 1527 that Wolsey requested the original statute book of the University, and on 27 February he replied promising to begin work on the revision when other more pressing matters had been dealt with.¹⁰⁷

There the evidence of Wolsey’s revision peters out and one is compelled to conclude with Gibson that ‘the University’s first scheme of general reform perished with the Cardinal’s fall and death in 1530.’¹⁰⁸

Apart from the appointment of a committee of five in May 1545, which then disappears from the sources, it was not until Edward’s reign that new statutes were again mooted. There is no evidence of how the statutes came to be drafted: neither is there correspondence like that between Wolsey and the Congregation, nor were they entered in any register of the University. The original manuscript has been lost, and we are dependent for the text on that contained in the Rawlinson manuscript collection.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 77, 79

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 199-200; 202-3.

¹⁰⁸ *Statuta*, p. xlix.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

The purpose and effect of the statutes upon the University is recorded by Wood as follows:

June 4 [1549] the Bishop of Lincoln, Cox, Heynes, Morrison and Nevenson, sitting in St Mary's Church again [the new statutes appear to have been read out in the course of the visitation of 1549] did then in the place of the old statutes of the University put new and therein allowed more liberty to all, especially to the juniors, and commanded that they be religiously observed of all, whereby...most of the customs relating to religion changed. And all things as the Roman Catholics thought turned topsy turvy.¹¹⁰

The confusion precipitated by the statutes was probably due for the most part to their omission of certain ancient public celebrations of the University. They provide, for example, for only one celebration of Holy Communion in each college at the start of the term.¹¹¹ The rest of its provisions are rather modest. The statutes begin by appointing the earl of Warwick, the bishops of Lincoln and Rochester, Sir William Paget, Richard Cocks, Simon Heynes and Christopher Nevinson, 'to consider, examine and weigh in our name the laws, statutes and customs in the University [and] if they are in need of correction, the same are to to correct and put in their place better statutes.'¹¹²

Wood's estimation of the effect that the Edwardian statutes had on the University is borne out by the first action that the Congregation took in Mary's reign for the reform of the statutes. On 28 April 1554

was celebrated Solemn Congregation of masters regent and non regent, in which were elected these venerable men: Mr. Doctor Tresham, Mr Smyth, Mr Warde, Mr Hyll, Mr Martiall and Mr Davys, to provide statutes for the academy, and to correct those which

¹¹⁰ Wood, 2, pt 1, pp. 100-101.

¹¹¹ *Statuta*, p. 350.

¹¹² *...intueri, nostro nomine, Oxoniensis academiae statum iussimus, ac leges, statuta, mores nostrorum in illa scholasticorum inspicere ac perpender; et si quae sint in illis corrigenda, eadem corrigere, et in meliorem statum redigere...Ibid.*, p. 341-2.

are unsuitable, especially those regarding exequies and the celebration of those masses which the whole University is obliged to keep.¹¹³

The desire of the Queen, expressed in her first communication with the University, that the ‘chancelour, and al others the heades and governours of the collidges, & other houses...cause all scollers, students, servaunts, ministers and others liuing under what sort, state or condition so ever they be to leve and frame theamselves, there apparell, studies, conversation and manner of learning in suche forme and order as by thancyent statutes, fundacions and ordinances...[is] appoyntyd’¹¹⁴ meant that the University very swiftly began to use the ancient statutes which had, as long ago as 1518, when the Queen was two, been found worthy of reformation.

Much has been made by Lucy Wooding of the afterlife of the Henrician Church in Marian Catholicism: ‘the ideology it propounded had its roots in Christian Humanism, its view of the Church drew heavily on Henrician Catholicism, and its objectives were not so much reactionary as evangelical and reformist.’¹¹⁵ But instances like the lifting of the obligation to observe the Edwardian statutes, in which the regime did not wait to replace what its predecessor had enacted, but rather insisted on an immediate return to the *status quo ante* give us grounds for suspecting Wooding of attempting to draw an ideological conclusion from a political reality. Mary’s claim to the throne was based on the simple proposition that the acts of a King who was a minor in altering the succession to the throne in Lady Jane Grey’s favour were *ultra vires*: it was on the third Succession Act of 1543 that Mary’s claim was founded. The abandonment of the Edwardian

¹¹³ *celebrata est solemnis convocatio magrorum etc In qua electi sunt hii venerabiles viri Mr Dr Tresham, Mr Smyth, Mr Warde, mr Hyll, Mr Martiall et Mr Davys ad statuta Academiae pervoluenda et ea prout illis commodum indebita corrigenda, maxime vero in iis quae prominent ad exequiarum et missarum celebracionem quibus interesse des Academiae aluminarum fide eidem persista tenere.* Reg. I, f. 144.

¹¹⁴ B.L. Add MS 32091, f. 145.

¹¹⁵ Wooding, *Reforming Catholicism*, p. 115.

ordinances of the University in Oxford, and more significantly the reversal of Edwardian religious legislation, were not merely the result of ecclesiastical prejudice but were essential to the existence of the regime itself. If the Edwardian statutes of the University, imposed by the King in his minority, were obeyed, just as if the Protestant religious legislation remained on the statute book, then the justification for the regime, and the considerable popular momentum behind it, would dissipate.

Seen from this perspective, the attempt to define a clear religious agenda from the Queen's actions on coming to power should not have occupied the space it has in recent scholarship on Mary's reign. She was guilty neither of ignoring 'the most important features of the immediate situation', nor to be lauded for a consistent theological program which began with the repeal of the Protestant religious legislation of the previous two reigns, starting with Edward's on a 'last in first out' principle, but rather of acting in the only way possible given the fact that her reign was itself a rejection of the authority of a King to enact legislation during his minority.¹¹⁶

Cardinal Pole's Election as Chancellor

While the visitation, described above, was conducted on Cardinal Pole's authority as the Papal Legate his statutes were issued in November 1556 under his authority as Chancellor, acquired in the previous month. It was not essential for Pole to be Chancellor in order for him to carry out his reform of the statutes: Wolsey had not occupied the position during his abortive attempt in Henry's reign.

¹¹⁶ David Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor* (2nd Edition, London: Heinemann, 1991), p. 96.

Sir John Mason had been made Chancellor in 1552. He was the first layman to hold the office and, even more pointedly, had been presented by the Crown to the deanery of Winchester in 1549, remaining in that position until he was replaced by a priest, Edward Steward, in 1554. It is tempting, therefore, to regard his resignation from the Chancellorship of Oxford as part of a broader reversal of Edwardian appointments of laymen to what were properly clerical positions. That Pole had been Chancellor of Cambridge following the death of Bishop Gardiner would not have made his appointment at Oxford inevitable as there was no recent precedent for the offices to be held by the same man.

The Register of Congregation records that on 26 October:

Solemn Congregation was celebrated in which was read a letter from that renowned man D. John Mason, knight, in which his resignation of the office of the Chancellorship of this celebrated academy of Oxford was placed in the hands of the doctors, masters and scholars that they might put another in his place. A letter was read concerning the election of the new Chancellor according to the statutes and laudable customs of the University. By the votes of all that great and noble man Reginald Pole, Cardinal, primate of all England, *legatus natus* and *latere* was placed in the office of chancellor and this was publicly declared and published.¹¹⁷

This letter, which has been lost, is likely to have been prepared by an official with knowledge of the precedents governing elections. Originally, the Chancellor was chosen from the doctors of theology and Canon Law and elected by the Regents. Nominations were made by the proctors, with one regent being nominated per faculty and the regent for whom the most votes were cast by his fellow regents was elected. Later, as a safeguard against conspiracy, the Congregation appointed two of their number to be in charge of nominations, reducing the proctors' role to that of

¹¹⁷ *26 Octobris celebrata est solemnis convocatio in qua lectae sunt litere a clarissime vir Ioanne Masone eq. aurato quibus resignavit officium Cancellariatus huiusque celebr. Academiae Oxon. in manus doctorum magistrorum et scholarum eiusdem ut possint alterum in ipsius locum sufficere. A lectione igitur literarum processe est iuxta laudabiles consuetudines et statuta universitatis ad electionem novi Cancellarii. Atque omnium suffragiis amplissime et nobilissime viro Reginaldus Polus Cardinalis, totius angliae primas, legatus natus et a latere in Cancellarius officium suffectus est et pub. Cancellarius universitatis Oxon. declaratus.* Reg I, f. 163v.

scrutinising the process. The Edwardian statutes had, in their provision for the election of the Chancellor, been anticipated in the election of Richard Cox in 1547; according to that ordinance the procancellarius, the proctors and a junior doctor of theology acted as ‘scrutatores’, the senior proctor announced the result and the instrument of election was given to the victorious candidate. The letter referred to in the register might well have been to remind Congregation of the earlier precedent which, with the removal of the obligation to observe the Edwardian statutes, they were now to follow.

Wood describes an election for the Chancellorship from the fifteenth century and it is this process that Pole’s election probably followed.

Four Masters in each Faculty (called in such affairs by the names sometimes of Doctors) were by the Chancellor or Commissary and proctors admitted into the public assembly; and this being so done, they for the election of two Astantes or Instantes did take the vote of all Non Regent Masters by scrutiny, three proclamations by the Beadle being in that time made, of which one was to alter or change (if any Master who before he had named pleased) which two Instantes after they were elected and lawfully admitted by the Chancellor and Proctors, they named four other Masters for the intrinsic election; which being finished, the said Astantes and the four Masters receded into some private place (I suppose in one of the Chapels of St Mary’s Church) where the Chancellor and the Proctors searching into the votes, one after another did at length pronounce him elected, to whom they found the most suffrages given.¹¹⁸

The Statutes

Prefacing his statutes, written to ‘our beloved in Christ Thomas Reynolds, dean of Exeter, doctor of Sacred Theology in the University of Oxford and our Commissary’, Pole writes that

Since in the visitation recently conducted on our instructions it was discovered that, among other things that seemed worthy of reformation, the statutes of this university were in no small need of improvement, seeing that some of them, which are not suited to the condition of the present times, need to be changed; that some, since they do not adequately provide for the contingencies for which they were drawn up, need to be

¹¹⁸ Wood, *Athenae*, p. 49; see also *Statuta*, pp. lxxii-lxxiii.

supplemented; and seeing that because many things have newly emerged which also require new remedies, some new statutes are to be newly added to them...¹¹⁹

Interestingly, Pole does not make the same claims about the existing statutes as were made at the time of Wolsey's abortive attempt at reform - that they were obsolete - but presents the novelty of the Edwardian reformation of the statutes as his justification. The evidence would suggest, then, that Pole in the construction of his new statutes had to navigate a difficult course. On the one hand, it was clearly intolerable that the Edwardian statutes should continue to be observed, yet a simple reversion to the situation as it pertained at Henry's death would reintroduce as basis to government of the University a set of rules which had been acknowledged as obsolete for half a century.

Pole's solution, and ingenious is surely not too strong a word to describe it, was to create a sound basis for the government of the University until a new edifice of statutes could be built. The Cardinal deputed:

two or three men from each faculty, distinguished by their piety and learning in the matters of the university to revisit and examine all the said statutes of the University thus altered. Under our pleasure they may correct, reform and amend; removing the superfluous, and changing those not in accordance with the present times, substituting concord for controversy; order for disorder and replacing the diminished; extracting, choosing and arranging a new construction of necessary statutes for the use of the University. So that, after the same amendment is made, they may be submitted to us.¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ *Cum in nuper ex mandato nostro peracta visitatione compertum sit statuta ipsius universitatis, inter alia que reformatione digna visa sunt, non modica indigere emendatione, utpote cum eorum aliqua, que presentium temporum qualitati non conveniunt, immutanda; quedam, cum in his negociis propter que condita sunt non sufficienter provideant, supplenda; et quia multa de novo emerunt, que novis etiam indigent remediis, alia nova statuta illis de novo addenda sint...Statuta, p. 363.*

¹²⁰ *committimus et mandamus quatenus, cum maiores congregationis consilio pariter et assensu, duos vel tres ex qualibet facultate viros pietate et doctrina rerumque istius universitatis cognitione ex experientia insignes, qui una tecum omnia dictae universitatis statuta hactenus edita diligenter revideant et examinent, eaque sub nostri beneplaciti reservatione reforment, corrigant, et emendent, superflua tollendo et presentibus temporibus non convenientia immutando, contraria ad concordiam et inordinata ad ordinem reducendo, diminuta supplendo, aliaque statuta, prout necessitas et utilitas ipsius universitatis suadebit, de novo condendo, eligas, deutes, et constituas; eaque, postquam sic emendata fuerint, as nos transmittas. Statuta p. 363.*

Until that time the government of the University was to be carried on ‘while the statutes themselves are being reformed’ according to ‘the following injunctions which we supply for the present necessity’ and those of ‘the previous statutes which you believe capable of being obeyed.’¹²¹ This was the same approach which Pole was ultimately to follow in his parallel injunctions to Cambridge written a year later at Christmas 1557, which could be said to be testament to their perceived success. The enthusiasm with which the University entered into the production of the new statutes is shown by the entry into the register immediately following Pole’s letter accompanying his statutes. ‘For the felicitous government of the University’ it begins

from the mandate of the Cardinal it was decided by vote of the congregation which doctors from every faculty who, with Dr Cole and Dr Reynold, may consider what has been done best and what has to be done.¹²²

Below this are written the names of those who had been elected.

For Dialectics and Philosophy	For Civil Law
Mr Randall Mr Marshall +Mr Cratford Mr Hargrasse and in his absence Mr Denys	doctor Aubrey Mr Saunders +Mr Smyth and Mr Pottel Mr Gervys
For Medicine	For Canon Law

¹²¹ *Interim autem statuta universitatis predicta, que servari posse et debere cognoveris, ac sequentes injunctiones, quas, ut presentibus necessitatibus donec statuta ipsa reformata fuerint, providemus...Ibid., p. 364.*

¹²² *Atque pro felice regimine istius academiae ex mandato Cardinalicio simul ac suffragio convocationis designatur quidam doctissimi viri ex unaquaque facultati qui una cum D. Colo, D. Raynoldo discipiant in unaquaque re quid factu optimum fuerit atque quid faciendum fuerint decernant. Reg I. f. 163v.*

For Dialectics and Philosophy	For Civil Law
Dr Fraunces Mr Barnes + D. Caudell Mr Smyth +Mr Slithurst	Dr Whyte Dr Wright
For Theology	
+Dr Marshall Mr Slithurst Mr Neele	Mr Smith and in his absence Mr Wright

Of the names which have been crossed out, Caudell (Caldwell) was a medic and senior student of Christ Church in 1547; he was ordained under Edward and became a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians in 1559. He was present at the trial of Cranmer. It is not clear why he should have been crossed out. ‘Mr Saunders’ presents another problem. The only likely candidate is Nicholas Sanders, who delivered the oration of welcome to the Cardinal. The list of those appointed certainly suggests that the task was undertaken seriously. Richard Marshall, sometime Vice Chancellor, was one of Cranmer’s adversaries at his disputation, John Smyth, Lady Margaret Professor, and Thomas Fraunces, Regius Professor of Medicine were certainly men who were distinguished by ‘their learning in the matters of the University’, as Pole had requested. The small cross next to one name on each list probably denotes the head of each Faculty’s delegation: only the two elected from each of the Law faculties are not distinguished between. The list of those chosen to draw up the new statutes is not limited to Marian diehards: many had occupied senior positions in the Edwardian University. Indeed, Denys, fellow of Queen’s and delegate for the Faculties of Dialectics and Philosophy, had been appointed Chaplain to Edward VI in 1547 and most would go on to occupy roles in the Elizabethan University and Robert Barnes, delegate for the Faculty of Medicine, would be chosen to dispute before Queen Elizabeth on her visit to the University in 1566.

Offices

The Commissary

Pole wasted no time after his election in dispatching Dr Henry Cole to the University with a letter written by him on 10 November. After assuring the Congregation that the cause of the University 'will be above other causes of ours [in] our zeal and desire' Pole writes

We send to you Dr Thomas Raynolds whom we have chosen as our Commissary, with Dr Cole. These are they whose task is now to institute what is necessary for the good and faithful rule of the University.¹²³

In the selection of Thomas Raynold as Commissary, or Vice-Chancellor, Pole was promoting one of the most diligent prosecutors of the Marian reforms in the University, a man who could be relied upon to enact the regime's agenda. Raynold, a Devonian by birth, had entered Merton College in 1524 and risen swiftly to prominence in the Henrican Church, becoming chaplain to the King in 1537, and by the time of his accession to Wardenship in 1545 had collected prebendal stalls in Exeter and Westminster. In many respects, Raynold was a perfect fit for a senior position in the Marian Church. In procuring an Act of Parliament in the first year of the Queen's reign for the incorporation of the college, he put an end to the doubts which had arisen as to its legal status. In 1549, Edwardian visitors had made off with a cart-load of manuscripts, mainly of Theology but also some concerning Mathematics and Astronomy and to recoup the loss of which, £70 of college plate was sold. In the same year, he secured for the college the right to make good the bequest of Thomas Linacre who in 1524 had endowed two permanent lecturers in Medicine for the University and for which Raynold's Merton was to provide a home. Allied to this financial and administrative ingenuity, Raynold's regime had maintained a somewhat subversive Catholicism during the reign of

¹²³ *Mittimus ad vos D. Thomam Raynoldum quem istuc Commissarium elegimus, et d. Henricum Colum. Hii quae nunc visum est pro tempore institui oportere ad istam universitatem bene ac feliciter regendam.* Reg I, f. 163v.

Edward, with masses being celebrated for the souls of departed benefactors throughout the reign and, indeed, in the first year of Elizabeth's.¹²⁴

The most notable feature of Pole's statutes is the determination with which they set about centralising power in the hands of the Commissary. Even the title of the office is significant. The description of the Chancellor's deputy in the University as the 'Vice-Chancellor' was an innovation of the Edwardian statutes and, presumably simply for this reason, it was not used by Pole. The office itself was first given a statutory basis in this Edwardian code which stipulated simply that he was to be elected annually by the regents and non-regents and to exercise the powers of the Chancellor when he was away. Given the temporary nature of Pole's statutes, and his appointment of Reynolds as Commissary without election, it is likely that this centralisation was a necessary precondition of the swift and decisive reform of the University that the Cardinal hoped to enact. This is particularly apparent from the connotations that the word 'commissary' would have held for the University. The other occasion in the statutes when Pole uses the word 'commissary' is to refer to 'Henry Cole, our commissary in the visitation of this academy'. Cole's task in the visitation was to represent the Cardinal, and the same term applied to Reynolds gives him, at least by implication, the same function. The powers with which he is endowed in the statutes are powers he is to exercise on the Cardinal's behalf. Reynold's administrative prowess, manifested in his occupancy of the wardenship at Merton, made him a particularly apt individual to exercise this central office.

The duties are, as one might expect from the above, wide-ranging and have dual focus on the doctrinal integrity of the University and the disciplines imposed upon its members. The Commissary is to ensure 'that the statutes and ordinances of the University itself, either thus far

¹²⁴ Kenneth Carleton, 'Raynold, Thomas', *ODNB*; George Charles Brodrick, *Memorials of Merton College: with biographical notices of the warden and fellows* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885), p. 48; Fletcher (ed.), *Registrum Annalium Colegii Mertonensis*, pp. 152-175.

brought forth or in the future to be brought forth, are inviolably observed.’¹²⁵ By the ‘old statutes’ what is probably meant in particular are those governing the colleges, rather than those governing the central University itself, as Pole’s interim statutes cover all aspects of the University’s government. These collegiate statutes too were something the University requested Pole supplement, as will be explored below.

The Commissary is given the duty of ensuring that the proctors and other officials carry out their duties properly, thereby giving Raynold licence to monitor these officials’ execution of the provisions concerning them made later in the statutes.¹²⁶ He is also given oversight of the campaign against heresy, which will be discussed below.

The Proctors

The second office to which Pole’s statutes give a prominent place in the government of the University is the Proctors. The role of the Proctors was an import from the University of Paris, and the first reference to them in the statutes was in 1252. They were to be two M.As, one from each ecclesiastical province, elected at the first Congregation of Regents after Easter. Their original function was to ensure that the masters and scholars were not overcharged either by those from whom they rented lodgings, or by local tradesmen. From this modest beginning their responsibilities multiplied and the medieval statutes give them a vast range of duties. In the two statutes which deal specifically with them they are held responsible for supervising scholastic acts, administering royal or papal privileges, informing the Chancellor of matters that required a meeting of Congregation, attending the licensing of bachelors and disputations of Masters, conducting

¹²⁵ *Ut statuta et ordinationes ipsius universitatis tam hactenus editae quam in futurum edende inviolabiliter observentur. Statuta*, p. 364.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

inceptions and administering oaths. To these were added myriad other obligations scattered around the rest of the medieval statutes, including the direction of liturgical functions, distributing relief to poor scholars and patrolling the streets at night.¹²⁷

The Edwardian statutes gave more general stipulations concerning the two proctors, according to which they were to attend all public disputations, preserve order and refer breaches of rules to the Chancellor. In total thirty one lines are devoted to the Proctors' responsibilities in the Edwardian code. Pole's statutes, however, contain 118 lines on the office.¹²⁸

Thus Pole gives the proctors a high status, as is seen in the strict qualifications on who might occupy the office: they were to be beyond reproach as far as their learning and conduct were concerned.¹²⁹ They were responsible for those elements of the University's life that had figured prominently as themes in the Visitation Articles: the suppression of heresy, the honesty of book-keeping and the monitoring of behaviour. Pole's statutes, then, restored the breadth of responsibilities the Edwardian code had narrowed, and at the same time gave them precise description, thus avoiding the confusion which arose from the medieval statutes.

¹²⁷ M.B. Hackett, 'The University as a Corporate Body', *H.U.O.* I, pp. 37-94. *Statuta*, pp. 66, 67.

¹²⁸ *Statuta*, pp. 348-9, 366-369.

¹²⁹ *Statuta*, p. 367.

Themes

Residence

The Articles of Inquiry did not address the residence of University officials at any great length, but in the Statutes, the point is pressed. The first statute *De residentia et officio commissarii* states that: ‘the Commissary may never withdraw from the University in times of lectures, except for the sake of the University, or another most necessary and urgent cause, approved by the Congregation of Regents and the Chancellor.’¹³⁰ This is also emphasised in relation to the principals of Colleges and Halls:

Let the principals of the halls reside in their own halls continually in times of lectures, unless any necessary impediment especially may arise, approved by the Congregation of Regents. Furthermore, they may not depart at the time of vacations without the permission of the Commissary. But whoever has obtained licence to depart for a time, let them provide some suitable substitute, approved by the Commissary, and let him fill their places.¹³¹

This concern with residence, evident throughout the statutes, is also a governing principle of Pole’s Legatine Constitutions, where in the third canon Bishops are instructed to ‘show their flock the presence that is due’, to which end, the Cardinal writes ‘we re-enact all ecclesiastical ordinances, as well ecumenical as those peculiar to this realm, which have hitherto been promulgated against non-residents.’ However, the exceptions granted by the Cardinal here and in the Constitutions are justified by appeal to the proceedings of the Council of Lyon in 1272.

¹³⁰ *Commissarius in terminis lectionum nunquam, nisi pro causa universitatis aut alia maxime urgenti et necessaria, a congregatione regentium et Cancellario probata, ab universitate discedat... Statuta*, p. 364.

¹³¹ *Principales aularum temporibus lectionum in aula sua perpetuo resideant, nisi aliquod ipsis impedimentum maxime necessarium a commissario et congregatione regentium probatum incidierit, tempore etiam vacationum sine licentia commissarii non discedant. Obtenta autem quocunque tempore licentia discendi, provideant de aliquo idoneo substituto, a commissario probato, qui eorum vices suppleat. Statuta*, p. 371.

It shall still be lawful for the ordinaries, according to the canon of Pope Gregory X, promulgated at the ecumenical council of Lyon to grant for a time the favour of a dispensation as reasonable or lawful grounds will recognise.

It cannot have harmed Pole's case that Gregory was the Pope who had, albeit briefly, succeeded in healing the great schism. 'But should anyone absent himself from his Church, his archdeaconry or his college, he must be fined by his superior in proportion to the time of his absence.' The reference to heads of colleges is reinforced by the injunction that 'heads of schools and colleges shall reside in their Churches and colleges.'¹³²

Patrimony

In the Visitation articles the management of the University's money was subject to special scrutiny, a theme that is taken up in the statutes. Detailed rules are given in the statutes concerning the administration of the communal chests, in which the money and muniments of the University were kept. The visitors had been instructed to enquire 'whether archives of the immovable goods...exist and if so let them be shown.' The next article of enquiry had asked 'whether the foundations, privileges, books, writings and other muniments of the university are safely conserved, and whether any have been destroyed in the time of schism'. It is likely that the detailed instructions on these matters in the new statutes reflects the report of the visitors on the condition of the chests. The relevant statute, 'Concerning the Proctors and other officials', states:

Let the Proctors arrange that all writings of the University that are at present in private hands are recovered within two months' time, to be reckoned from the publication of the present Injunctions, and put back in the common chest and that an inventory of all goods, movable or immovable, and

¹³² Gerald Bray (ed.), *The Anglican Canons 1529-1947* (2 vols, Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998), 1, pp. 95-6.

of the oaths and of the privileges, and of any other writings or muniments pertaining to the University itself, be made under the common seal of the University.¹³³

To ensure that the proctors' book-keeping is in order, 'in the presence of the Commissary and Regents let them make a computation and let them return an account of everything administered by them.' It is not permitted for proctors to spend 'more than ten shillings in one year without the license of the commissary and regents.'¹³⁴ These detailed directions suggest the Statutes were compiled on the basis of detailed reports from the visitors on the state of the University's finances. In their priorities they follow earlier stipulations very closely, for example, the Queen's instructions for the use to which her donation of 1553 was to be put, in which she had written that the letters and receivers of the revenues are yearly to make a 'throughe accompte before the chauncelor or vice chauncelor, hedes of colleges, doctors proctors and certayn of the the bachelars of divinite & masters of art.'¹³⁵ The regime's interest in the security of the chests at Oxford precedes even this: the Queen's letter of 2 May 1554 refers to the University's 'public treasury' being 'plundered.'¹³⁶

This concern for the good management of the University's accounts is the product of the investment made by the Queen in the University in 1554. It has been argued in an earlier chapter that this award of three rectories to the University represented a statement of the regime's interest in the cause of education, and a determination to reverse the perceived neglect of the University in the reign of her brother. The statute governing the activities of the proctors contains provisions for the

¹³³ *Curent procuratores ut infra duorum mensium spacium a presentium iniunctionum publicatione computandum omnes scripture universitatis que sunt in manibus privatorum recuperentur, et in cista communi reponantur, utque inventarium omnium bonorum, tam mobilium quam immobilium iurium, et privilegiorum, et quarumlibet aliarum scripturarum vel munimentorum ad ipsam universitatem pertinentium, sub sigillo communi universitatis conficiatur. Statuta*, p. 366-7.

¹³⁴ *in presentia commissarii et regentium, faciant computum et reddant rationem omnium per eos administratorum. Statuta*, p. 367.

¹³⁵ Oxford University Archives, WPB/B/f. 25.

¹³⁶ *C.P.R.P&M*, i,165.

management of this revenue. 'The money, which is from the fruits of the rectories given, for the appropriation of the university, by the serene rulers, let it stand deposited with the president of Corpus Christi College.' The president concerned, Robert Morwent, had been in that position since 1537 and would remain there until his replacement by William Chedsey in 1558. Morwent had been one of the Cardinal's visitors and could conceivably have been the source for the Cardinal's detailed financial proscriptions. To entrust to such an individual the task of administering the revenues from the three rectories would have made good sense. In 1554 the Queen had made the Dean of Christ Church, the Warden of New College, the President of Magdalen, the Rector of Lincoln and the President of Corpus Christi Colleges 'letters and receivers' of the revenues. Entrusting this task to only one of these could be said to represent an administrative simplification of the Queen's instructions.

The allocation of the money derived from the rectories specified in the statutes follows the Queen's instructions at the time of her donation in 1554: 'also we wish them in these ways to be expended, a hundred pounds each year for the building of the schools until they may be finished.'¹³⁷

In 1554 the Queen had instructed that 'grete parte' be used for the 'byld[i]nge of your scholes and byyng of the necessary ornamentes.'¹³⁸

¹³⁷ *Eas autem in hos usus expendi volumus:- centum libre singulis annis ad edificationem scholarum, donec complete fuerint. Statuta*, pp. 367-8.

¹³⁸Oxford University Archives, WPB/B/f. 25.

Religion

The heart of the Commissary's role is indicated in the first statute. The Commissary is to ensure that

The University be purged from heretics, and persons not rightly understanding the Catholic Faith, incontinent persons, and persons otherwise in any way living shamefully and badly; scandalous, conspiratorious, quarrelsome and useless persons and persons not proficient in the study of letters.¹³⁹

This intriguing link between heresy and ignorance hints at the cause of the Pole's preoccupation with the University in the conduct of his legation. Is it possible that the heresy into which England had fallen, so soon after its schism, was the product not of malice but of the decline of the Universities, the reversal of which the government had sought immediately after the Queen's accession with the grant to Oxford in 1553? It is a compelling explanation, even more so in the light of the argument of the first chapter that the persecutions were essentially pedagogical in nature.

The threat to Catholic learning in Oxford would come from two sources: heretical people, dealt with above, and heretical books which are the subject of the next injunction in which the Commissary is charged with ensuring, that

No one, in public or private, holds, reads or sells, or conveys into the University, books or writings of heretics or any other author through which right teaching of the faith and honest and good morals might be corrupted, and concerning this he should often and solicitously investigate.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁹ *Ut universitas sit purgata hereticis, et non recte de fide Catholica sentientibus, incontinentibus, et alias quodmodolibet inhoneste et male viventibus, scandalosis, conspiratoribus, rixosis, et inutilibus, atque in literarum studiis non proficientibus personis... Ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ *Ut nemo libros vel scripta hereticorum se quorumlibet aliorum auctorum, per que recta fidei doctrina et honesti ac boni mores corrumpuntur, publice vel privatim habeat, legat, vendat, vel in academiam importet, et de hoc sepe et sollicite inquiret. Ibid., p. 364.*

As has already been shown, guarding against heresy was among the Commissary's list of responsibilities, but it is present to a greater or lesser extent in the remaining statutes. The statute governing the proctors charges them to 'investigate with the greatest diligence' a list of offences, chief among them 'whether in the University there are any heretics or evil opinions concerning the faith.' This is elaborated below to include such matters as

Whether anyone speaks words in lectures, disputations or likewise in private conversations which smack of heresy, whether directly or indirectly, or which may admit contempt of the Church or her ministers, or which in whatever way may be a cause of offence to pious ears.¹⁴¹

Needless to say, this gives the proctors, under the Commissary, a broad mandate to investigate the most intimate of conversations in order to establish the existence of seditious opinions. Given that the statutes specify that without good morals and doctrine none be promoted to any degree, the statute affords the proctors significant authority in monitoring the discourse of the University. Next, they are charged with investigating whether any 'may have, read or sell books or writings of heretics or through which any any offence may be caused in doctrine or morals to someone.'¹⁴²

As lectures in Philosophy, in expounding ancient pagan literature, are likely to encounter accounts of such matters from a perspective other than that derived from Revelation, the statutes emphasise the importance of adhering strictly to orthodoxy as a corrective to such speculations, the statute continues

We admonish readers of Philosophy that as often as it touches upon them to handle questions concerning God, the eternity of the world, the immortality of the soul, and others of that sort, always, as far as it is possible to do, concerning these matters let them follow an opinion of them which will not deviate at all from Christian truth. But if otherwise the opinions of

¹⁴¹ *An in universitate sint heretici vel male sentientes de fide. An aliqui in lectionibus, disputationibus, vel quibuscunque etiam privatis colloctionibus verba effutiant, que heresim directe vel indirecte sapiant, qutein contemptum ecclesiae vel ministrorum eius cedant, vel quovis modo piis auribus sint offendiculo. Ibid.*

¹⁴² *An aliquis habeat, legat, aut vendat libros vel scripta hereticorum, vel per que aliquod offendiculum in doctrina vel moribus alicui afferi possit. Ibid., p. 368.*

philosophers may be at all in opposition to piety, let him admonish the scholars diligently concerning the frailty of human understanding towards those things to be learned, of which we have learned the truth from certain divine revelation, and let them strive to steer the souls of the young, as much as possible, always from every impiety and to be steeped in true piety.¹⁴³

The statutes, however, do not concern themselves solely, or even pre-eminently, with the acquisition of knowledge. As this sections shows, the inculcation of piety among the scholars is just as pressing a task. Cardinal Wolsey defined the genius of the University as lying in its dual focus on the training of clergy and statesmen, and the piety of both the clergy and laity was central to the Marian Counter-Reformation. In addition to their duties in observing the lectures, disputations and ordinary conversations and reading of the University for signs of heresy the proctors are also enjoined to investigate ‘whether any have improper lives’, and more particularly ‘whether there are any given over to ale, or who frequent taverns; gaming houses, or any who devote their lives to dishonest or scandalous pursuits.’¹⁴⁴ This concern of the regime has a precedent in Mary’s own ‘Instructions’ written at the time of Pole’s arrival which instruct that ‘the Bishops to set like order that in all place for the honest behauior of priestes, specially that they resort to noe Tavernes, Alehouses, and other suspect howses.’¹⁴⁵

This fear that clergy or ordinands might give themselves to licentiousness finds expression in the Legatine Constitutions. Bishops and other prelates are, according to the fifth decree, ‘to live

¹⁴³ *Lectores philosophie admonemus ut quoties tractare eis contigerit questiones de Deo, de mundi eternitate, de immortalitate anime, et aliis id genus, semper, quoad fieri poterit, eorum sententiam sequantur qui de illis rebus minus a veritate Christiana dissentiant. Quod si philosophorum opiniones pietati alioquin contrarie omnino fuerint, diligentur admoneant scholares de humani sensus et intellectus imbecillitate ad illas res percipiendas quarum veritatem ex divina revelatione certo cognovimus, studeantque adolescentium animos quam maxime ab omni semper impietate avertere et vera pietate imbuere. Ibid., p. 373-4.*

¹⁴⁴ *Statuta*, p. 368.

¹⁴⁵ BL, Lansdowne MS, f. 25r.

soberly, chastely and piously that their lives may be an example to others for piety and moral discipline.¹⁴⁶

Injunctions for the colleges

On 23 November 1556 Thomas Reynolds, the Vice Chancellor, wrote to Pole. He began by complimenting Henry Cole, a delegate for the visitation who in 1558 was to be appointed Visitor of All Souls since

at his being here with us to hys wisdom and great trobell and paynes [he] hath sete many thynges in good forwardness to the reformation of sundry disorders ... so that I am in good hope through the diligence of myne and other officers partes your grace shall little by little se a new face of the universitie as well in life as lernynge.¹⁴⁷

This suggests that the role of the visitors, as was argued above, was not confined simply to the investigation of the University, but also allowed them to enforce obedience to the old statutes where these were not followed. By applying himself ‘holy’ to ‘your expectation’ Reynolds claims he is ‘well assured that thereby I shall procure unto my selff a number of enemyes and hated incredible.’ Exactly why he should, in undertaking Pole’s work for the reformation of University, leave himself open to such a reaction is not expressed. If it relates to widespread and virulent opposition to Pole’s visitors, the Queen or the regime, then it is a sentiment which has left no other trace in the sources. It may also be that Reynolds is exaggerating the opposition to lend to his own efforts to carry out the Cardinal’s business the mantle of heroism. The most satisfactory explanation, in my view, is found in the second of the two ‘poyntes’ in which he seeks Pole’s ‘ayde’. ‘Where’ he writes, by ‘Acte of Parliament *anno septimo Regis Edwardi Sexti* it was most

¹⁴⁶ *Anglican Canons*, p. 107-9.

¹⁴⁷ S.P. 15/7, f. 148.

preudently ordeyned that in all oxforde there should be three wyne taverns' a further eight have now opened 'under the cloke of losse which they pretende to have susteined...'

The first point on which Reynolds seeks Pole's aid, however, is the one which concerns this chapter most closely, as he requests

that I maye have with expedition sigt of the Injunctions as are appoynted for the redresse of all abuses detected in the late visitation of all particular colleges and houses according to Mr Ormanetto his promise, without the whyche it wilbe impossible to have good rule and obedience abrode.

This request hints at a contemporary perception of the centrality of Pole's injunctions for the University for its reformation. If Pole did send directions to Oxford, they have escaped detention in its archives, but the statutes sent nineteen months later to Cambridge do contain instructions relating to the colleges. Perhaps, as the main statutes exhibit many similarities with those sent to Oxford so as to indicate that they are based on them, the Cambridge provisions for colleges are themselves copies of the missing instructions for Oxford colleges. Certainly, if a need for them had been established to the Cardinal's satisfaction, and given his keen attention to other matters of University business, it is difficult to envisage Reynolds' plea going unheeded.

Those statutes for the government of the Cambridge colleges are concerned with the same kind of regulation as the statutes governing the whole University of Cambridge, which were themselves modeled on the Oxford statutes of a year earlier. In them, we find the Cardinal, concerned as we have seen with the increase in the number of priests, ruling that

It shall not be lawful for heads, masters, or wardens of colleges, halls, or houses, even with the express consent of all the fellows, in any cause or pretext, even that of revenues being diminished, henceforth to decrease by their own authority the number of fellows, scholars, or officers, marked out by the foundations and statutes; nor to dismiss any one of the fellows for a

time from the university, even in account of dearness of provisions or in any other case, except in the time of plague.¹⁴⁸

Once again, the Cardinal's concern is in the first instance for obedience to the statutes. Given that this was the abiding concern of his Oxford statutes it does not require any great leap of imagination that this would have been his concern in the injunctions requested by Reynolds for the Oxford colleges, had they come to be written. This pre-occupation is much in evidence in Pole's instructions for the conduct of collegiate elections:

In all elections, both of scholars and fellows, and of the officers and ministers of a college or hall, the form of the statutes of that house shall be observed, and especially no one's election shall hold good, if he has not the qualifications required by the statutes.

Concerning these elections, Pole sought to enforce the same policy of egalitarianism which had featured in the plans for cathedral schools. 'The electors shall take particular care' he writes 'that the poorer, and more studiously addicted persons, be preferred in the college, all favour and human prejudice being set aside.'¹⁴⁹

In the twentieth and twenty-first statutes, the presence within the University of heads of colleges and, in the event that this is not possible, the provision of an adequate substitute, mirror exactly the same obligations imposed on central University officials in Oxford.

Where these Cambridge college injunctions are distinctive is in two prominent features. First, they go into much greater detail about the liturgical observances demanded of those present in the University. While the statement: 'masses, funerals and other religious services established by the founders of colleges, halls, or houses, shall be duly celebrated according to the form of the

¹⁴⁸ James Heywood (ed), *A Collection of Statutes for the University and the Colleges of Cambridge* (London: William Clowes and Sons 1840), p. 254.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 254-5.

foundations and statutes,' is to be expected, the elaboration is distinctive in the context of the regime's other statutes, 'first, the morning mass shall be celebrated, every day in every college in which there are three priests, exclusive of the principal, between the fifth and sixth hour of the day.' Likewise 'the prayers which are to be repeated in the college publicly or privately by the fellows and scholars shall by no means be omitted.'¹⁵⁰ This may of course have been spelled out too in statutes for Oxford colleges, houses and halls, but it may also be the product of circumstances specific to Cambridge.

One problem that receives ample attention in both the central Cambridge statutes and the ones governing colleges, but which does not appear in the Oxford statutes nor which seems from the evidence in other sources to have been a problem in Oxford, is immorality. The twenty-fifth statute governing the colleges demands that

No one not a graduate shall wander alone through the town, but go in company with a companion, and (if) two have been accustomed to walk together, whose intimacy has been in any way suspected, they shall be separated...and another companion shall be found for each of them.

It is not clear exactly what this refers to but, discounting widespread homosexuality, it probably seeks to prevent the kind of particular friendships so discouraged in the Religious life.

Preventing women from corrupting the scholars was however a priority in these statutes, which forbade them to dine in colleges or halls and, in the twenty-ninth statute, ruled that 'no women shall enter a college without express leave from the head, which shall not be granted except for a necessary reason.' We should be grateful, for sanitary reasons, that 'a laundress is excepted.'¹⁵¹

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp 258-9.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 262.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have drawn on two documents in order to show that the Visitation Articles and the code of Statutes which was presented in 1557 were consistent with the wider policies and priorities of the Marian Regime. These were Mary's 'Instructions' to her Council at the start of Pole's legation and Pole's Legatine Constitutions of 1557. The circumstances in which the Queen's Instructions were written have been discussed earlier in the Chapter, but the drafting of the decrees of the Legatine Synod is a harder process to pin down.

In discussing the Marian Church's theological and pastoral effectiveness, the judgement of A.G. Dickens that 'it failed to discover the Counter Reformation' has exercised a formative role in the debates of historians. Professor Duffy traces the legacy of this conclusion through, for example, John Bossy's assessment that Mary's Church belonged not to the Counter-Reformation, but to the 'posthumous history of medieval Christendom'; and of David Loades that 'it saw the future in terms of the past'.¹⁵² In *The Stripping of the Altars* a cogent defence is offered:

There is something intrinsically problematic about the notion of a Marian failure to 'discover' the Counter-Reformation, not least because, as yet, there was little that could be called the Counter-Reformation to be discovered. In 1553 the Council of Trent still had much of its important work still to do.¹⁵³

This is of course a true and fair judgement, but what it leaves unstated is precisely how the work of the earlier session of the Council of Trent which had already taken place was used in England in the mid 1550s. There is actually a close correspondence between the canons and decrees of the earlier session of Trent and those of Pole's Legatine Synod. To take, as an example, the fourth decree of the London Synod which mandates episcopal residence:

¹⁵² Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, pp. 1-2.

¹⁵³ Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, p. 525.

Therefore with the approval of this synod we enact that all the archbishops and bishops be required to undertake personally the duty of preaching the Word of God according to the command of Christ and the apostles, and the rule of the holy canons, and whenever any legitimate impediment shall occur to prevent them doing it, then, according to the decree of the ecumenical council, which commences ‘Among other things’ they shall choose fit persons to discharge properly the duty of preaching, rectors, vicars also and others having the cure of souls should either personally or through other fit persons, if they are legitimately hindered themselves, feed the people committed to them with the wholesome food of preaching, at least on Sundays and other Feast Days. But should anyone neglect this necessary duty of preaching, after one whole month’s failure in his duty after being warned by his superior, the same superior shall compel him to do it by ecclesiastical censures and other remedies of law, and a respectable stipend may be assigned from the revenues of the same Church to some other person who can discharge that duty for him, until the incumbent at some point repents and discharges his office.¹⁵⁴

This decree follows, almost word for word, the second chapter of the Decree on Reformation, enacted at the fifth session of the Council of Trent on 17 June 1546:

But seeing that the preaching of the gospel is no less necessary to the Christian Commonwealth than the reading thereof; and whereas the principal duty of bishops; the same holy Synod has resolved and decreed, that all bishops, archbishops, primates and other prelates of the Churches be bound personally-if they are not lawfully hindered-to preach the holy Gospel of Jesus Christ. But if it should happen that bishops, and the others aforesaid, be hindered by any lawful impediment, they shall be bound, in accordance with the form prescribed by the general Council [of Lateran], to appoint fit persons to discharge wholesomely this office of preaching. But if any one through contempt does not exercise this, let him be subjected to rigorous punishment. Archpriests, curates and all those who in any manner hold any parochial, or other Churches, which have the cure of souls, shall, at least on the Lord’s day, and on solemn feasts, whether personally, or if they be lawfully hindered, by others who are competent, feed the people committed to them, with wholesome words, according to their own capacity...if, after having been admonished by the bishop, they shall neglect this duty of the space of three months, let them be compelled by ecclesiastical censures, or otherwise, at the discretion of the said bishop; in such a way that even-if this

¹⁵⁴ *Idcirco cum huius synodi approbatione statuimus ut archiepiscopi et episcopi omnes praedicationis verbi Dei munus per se ipsos obire, iuxta Christi et apostolorum mandatum et sacrorum canorum normam, teneantur, et si quando legitimum aliquod impedimentum inciderit, quominus id facere possint, tum, secundum statutum felicis recordationis Innocentii Papae III in generali concilio editum, quod incipit ‘Inter cetera’, viros idoneos diligent ad huiusmodi praedicationis officium recte exequendum; rectores, item vicarii, et quicumque alii, curam animarum habentes, per se vel per alios idoneos viros, si legitime ipsi impediti fuerint, saltem dominicis et aliis festis diebus plebem sibi commissam salutary praedicationis cibo pascant. Quod si quis hoc necessarium praedicationis officium praetermiserit, postquam per superiorem monitus per unius mensis spatium muneri suo defuerit, per censuras ecclesiasticas et alia iuris remedia ad id ipse superior eum compellant, etiam aliquam honestam mercedem de fructibus ipsius ecclesiae alteri, qui id praestet, assignando, donec principalis quandoque resipiscens officium suum impleat.* *Anglican Canons*, p. 102.

seems to him expedient—a fair remuneration be paid, out of the fruits of the benefices, to some other person to discharge this office, until the principal himself shall fulfil his own duty.¹⁵⁵

This direct borrowing from those canons of Trent which were, by 1557, already ratified, is of real significance when we come to judgements about the Counter-Reformation credentials of Mary's Church for it shows just how fully integrated into the Universal Church Marian Catholicism was. 'When the Roman Church has a cold the rest of us catch double pneumonia' reflected Fr Colin Stephenson of the trials of Anglo-Catholicism in the 1960s: in the light of the evidence just discussed we can posit an equally close relationship between the English Church and the wider Catholic body in the mid 1550s.¹⁵⁶

For the purpose of this section of the thesis, the reflection in the University's visitation articles and the code of Statutes of the emphases of Pole's Legatine Synod is no longer of significance solely because it illustrates Oxford's integration into the rest of the *English* Church, but because it connects the restoration which took place there, albeit at one remove, with the crucible of Trent itself.

¹⁵⁵ *Quia vero Christianae Republicae non minus necessaria est praedicto Evangelii, quam lectio, et hoc est precipuum Episcoporum munus; statuit, et decrevit eadem sancta Synodus, omnes Episcopos, Archiepiscopos, Primates, et omnes alios Ecclesiarum Praelatos teneri per seipsos, si legitime impedimenti non fuerint, ad praedicandum sanctam Jesu Christi Evangelium. Si vero contigerit, Episcopos, alios praedictos legitimo detineri impedimento, juxta formam generalis Concilii, viros idoneos assumere teneantur ad huiusmodi praedicationis officium salubriter exequendum. Si quis autem hoc adimplere contempserit, districte subjaceat ultioni. Archipresbyteri quoque, Plebani, et quicumque Parociales, vel alias curam animarum habentes, Ecclesias quocumque modo obtinent, per sem vel alios idoneos, si legitime impedimenti fuerint, diebus saltem Dominicis, et festis solemnibus, plebes sibi commissas pro sua, et earum capacitate pascant salutaribus verbis... itaque ubi ab Episcopo moniti trium mensium spatio muneri suo defuerint, per censuras Ecclesiasticas, seu alias ad ipsius Episcopi arbitrium cogantur, ita et etiam, si ei sic expedire visum fuerit, et beneficiorum fructibus alteri, qui id prastet, honesta aliqua merces persolvatur, donec principalis ipse resipiscens officium suum impleat. The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent celebrated under Paul III, Julius III, and Pius IV, Bishops of Rome (London: 1687), pp. 35-36.*

¹⁵⁶ Colin Stephenson, *Merrily on High: an Anglo-Catholic memoir* (2nd edition, London: Canterbury Press, 2008), p. 174.

Chapter 4: The Colleges

Part 1: The Revival of Catholicism in the Original Colleges

The Liturgy

‘The liturgy,’ writes Eamon Duffy in *The Stripping of the Altars* ‘lay at the heart of medieval religion, and the Mass lay at the heart of the liturgy.’¹ The reintroduction of Catholicism into the University - and the rest of the kingdom - would be most visibly and defiantly expressed in the liturgical arena. However, such was the nature of what was to succeed it that it is this aspect of the Marian Counter-Reformation of which the least evidence survives and which, consequently, has not figured in a prominent way in historians’ account of the enterprise.

This is a shame, for its material aspect was that which left the most definite stamp upon the minds of those who witnessed it at first hand. For Robert Parkyn, as we saw in Chapter 1, the return to the accustomed liturgical practices and furnishings was the most impressive feature of Mary’s reign.² With the publication of the reconciliation of the English Church to the Holy See Julius II was to be called ‘as he awghtt of rightt’ the ‘wholly father the Pope’ and ‘so...all olde ceremonies laudabile usyde before tyme in wholly Churche was then revivyde.’³ For Parkyn the reintegration of the English Church into the wider Catholic body received its most important expression in this return to the old ways although, as will be seen, there were new and vital features of the liturgical landscape too. Isolated examples of surviving churchwardens’ accounts from different parts of the country have been used to examine the imprint this reversion made on the life of parishes but the archives of

¹ Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, p. 91.

² A.G. Dickens, ‘Robert Parkyn’s Narrative’, p. 79.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.

the Oxford colleges, principally, although not exclusively, their accounts allow a detailed picture to be built up of its effect in a single environment.

It was not apparent at the outset that this reintroduction of the liturgical customs of the past amounted to a ‘policy’ on the part of Mary and her ministers; Parkyn is clear that it was the activities of Catholic magnates which was responsible for the introduction of the old liturgy at a time when the Edwardian religious legislation had not been repealed and the commitment of the Queen was simply ‘not to compel any of her...subjects thereunto’.⁴ As has already been referred to, of the features of the Queen’s letter to the University of 20 August 1553 the most notable is her insistence on the observation by ‘all scollers, students, servants, ministers’ in the University of

the ancye[n]t statutes, fundacions and ordina[n]ces of that our universitie and the colledges and others...be inviolably kept and observid...notwythstanding any fundacions or newe ordina[n]ces made, set furthe or deliverid by any visitors or others sythens the deathe of our father of most worthie memorie kinge henrie the eight.⁵

The rationale for this stipulation was provided by the letter’s positing of a link between the ‘mysorders brought in and set forth’ and the introduction of ‘new’ statutes and ordinances, by which it must have meant the Edwardian statutes discussed in Chapter 3, ‘wherebie...the last willes of manie good men have binne broken.’⁶ This dual emphasis, on the inviolability of the old statutes and the obligation placed on the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and the heads of house to ensure that the requiem masses demanded by those statutes for the souls of the founders of the colleges and benefactors to the University was the occasion for the liturgical renewal of Oxford which began almost immediately thereafter.

⁴ *TRP*, 2, p. 6.

⁵ B.L. Add MS 32091, f. 145.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 145.

Cardinal Pole appreciated the importance of the liturgy in recapturing the minds of the English laity for the Catholic Faith. In his Legatine Constitutions of 1556, it was decreed that on St. Andrew's day, being that on which the reconciliation of 1554 had occurred, there was to be a 'solemn procession annually throughout the whole realm, in which the people should give thanks to God for the blessing of peace received.'⁷ The twelfth decree lays down the order for the investigation of the liturgical material of the parish Churches

Moreover, it should be investigated: whether everything necessary for the service of the altar and the performance of divine worship, is supplied, such as chalices, plates, vestments, books, and other articles, whether masses and other divine services are not only performed with solemnity and propriety, but also with piety and devotion, whether there is at least one minister in orders who performs the service of the mass in a clean and becoming surplice, whether the books and old writings and other documents and privileges of the Church are being carefully preserved.⁸

In the Cardinal's articles of inquiry for the visitation of Oxford in 1556, as we have seen, the liturgical life of the University and the Colleges was among those elements of their running to receive prominent attention. The Queen herself had already introduced new masses into the University calendar by her benefaction of 1554.

It was thus by restoring the ancient statutes of the University and Colleges to the force they had enjoyed before the reign of Edward and by the Queen's own provision for new masses to join those already stipulated by those statutes that the Queen and Cardinal arranged for the liturgy of Oxford to be moved in the direction they wished. Without yet having repealed the statutes which had erected the Protestant Edwardian Church and its vernacular liturgy, they had ensured that in Oxford, where the Queen was, in the words of her letter of August 1553, determined to make a beginning, the University was to recover the traditional expression of the Christian religion which Mary alone in England during her brother's reign had not abandoned.

⁷ *Anglican Canons*, p. 75.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 132-3.

Why should the Queen have made such a priority of the worshipping life of the University at the start of her reign? The answer lies in the unique place it occupied in her strategy for the Catholic recovery. To return once again to her letter. ‘We wisshe,’ she wrote,

that the examples [of a return to true religion] maye first begynne in our universitie where yonge men and all sorte of students, ioining godlie conuersation with ther studies maye also as well by ther doinge, as by there *preachyng* enstruct and confirm the rest of subiects, bothe in the knowledge and fear of almightie god, in ther due obedience toward us, our laws, & all other there supiours, and in ther charitable demainor towarde all men.⁹

The reference to the office of preaching indicates that the Queen is talking here of those within the University who would be proceeding to ordination to the sacred priesthood. To be sure, the Queen and her ministers were not ignorant of, or uninterested in, the careers of those for whom this was not the case and for whom a University education was a prelude to a life of service to the crown. However, it was the role of the University in the training of clergy which was its central task. Its ultimate responsibility in the eyes of the monarch was the provision of preachers who could expound the Catholic faith in which, according to her instructions issued to the council on the eve of Pole’s arrival in England, there was to be at least one in ‘everie deanerie.’¹⁰ The liturgy too was a powerful evangelistic weapon in the Catholic armoury. If the restoration of the English Church to its ancestral glory was dependent, as the Queen and later her Cardinal were each determined that to some extent it was, on the effective deployment of the rites of the Church and the reintroduction into the parish Churches of those traditional features exiled from it under Edward, then the revivification of the liturgy in Oxford was a central strategic objective.

⁹ Twyne MS 3, f. 145. My italics.

¹⁰ Lansdowne, f. 26r.

It is to the college accounts that we must turn in order to appreciate the determination of those in authority within the colleges to restore its capacity to worship in a traditional manner.

At Magdalen, on 28 October 1553, a mere three months since Mary's accession to the throne, and at the very start of the first term since that momentous event, Thomas Butler, with his boy, were paid for 'two days work for the restoration of the high altar'.¹¹ Three days later they were paid six shillings for 'covering the steps before the high altar.'¹² In addition to these works, 3s 4d was paid for 'latin psalters written on parchment.' Butler's work in the restoration of the high altar was to be complemented by 'hangings' which, with 'two vestments with one alb' were bought from Thomas Chambers for £16 2s. By the end of the financial year such purchases and payments had more than doubled the expenditure on the Chapel from the previous year, when only £12 5s 1d had been spent, to £30 13s 2d.¹³

Work on the altars began in each college for which accounts survive for 1553. At All Souls, labourers were paid 10s for five days work 'around the altars in the chapel.'¹⁴ At Corpus Christi eight pence was paid 'for halloyng the Aulters in wyne'¹⁵ At New College 7s 4d was spent on the 'restoration of the high altar' and at Balliol 5s was spent on such restoration.¹⁶

¹¹ *...pro restorationem summi altaris.*

¹² *pro vestitione graduum coram summo altare...*

¹³ Magdalen College Archives, Libri Computi, ff. 197v-198.

¹⁴ *circa altaria in templo.* ASCA, Computus and Expense Roll 1553.

¹⁵ Corpus Christ College Archives, C1/1/3 (Libri Magni III, 1546-1557), ff. 119-120.

¹⁶ *pro reaedificatione summi altaris.* NCA, Account Rolls 215; M.S. Top. Oxon e. 124/ 9, f. 73v.

But it was not just the altars which were restored, the colleges quickly set about acquiring the material needed for the performance of the traditional liturgy. At New College, eight pounds was paid from the chapel chest to Mr Garbrand for books.¹⁷

In addition to the acquisition of missals and the (re-) hallowing of altars the colleges were also engaged in 1553, as we have seen at Magdalen, in procuring the vestments needed for the celebration of the mass throughout the liturgical year. At University College the figures were 7s 6d for 1552-3; 29s for 1553-4.¹⁸ By the end the financial year at New College expenditure on the chapel had more than doubled from that of 1552 when only £12 5s 1d had been spent to £30 13s 2d.¹⁹

1554 is the only year for which the Churchwardens' accounts for the University Church survive, which show these efforts were not confined to the colleges. The first item in the accounts records that 40s was paid 'for a white cope of Damaske with another of redd velvatt with Images of golde.' Two other copes were also purchased for 19s 12d. Two candlesticks were acquired for 20s, and 3s 4d was paid to 'Thomas Edges for a payre of censers.' The most significant improvement undertaken in the year is divulged in the next three payments recorded by the wardens. 2s 3d was paid to 'henri Millar' for 'an alterstone', which the next entry, a payment of 6d 'to iiii laborers to help up with the alterstones' suggest complemented an existing stock, and a 'hundreth of bricke' was acquired for 2s 3d and a mason paid 3s 'for iiii days and a halfe for making the alters.' These altars were to become the lesser altars, at which priests might say their daily mass, answered by a

¹⁷ NCA, Account Rolls 215.

¹⁸ R.H. Darwall-Smith (ed.), *Account Rolls of University College, Oxford* (2 vols, Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, 2001), 2, p. 341.

¹⁹ NCA Account Rolls 214, 215.

server who was likely to have been a scholar of the University, another way in which the future clerical elite of Catholic England could be schooled in the liturgical life.

Other elements of Catholic liturgical practice were being restored too, with 13d expended ‘for the making of S. Thomas nose and the crosier staff.’ This would seem to refer to an image of the martyred archbishop of Canterbury, whose cult, emphasising as it did the independence of the Church from the state, had been suppressed in the previous two reigns. The restoration of his statue in the University Church which had been damaged either by iconoclasts or in being stored during the unhappy Protestant interlude must have made a powerful statement of the extent to which the Marian Counter-Reformation was expected to go. The Easter Triduum, the three days from Maunday Thursday to Holy Saturday, during which in the traditional cycle the institution of the Mass by Christ in the Upper Room, his betrayal at Gethsemane, his trial before the Sanhedrin and Pilate, his scourging and crucifixion before the triumph of the Resurrection on Easter Eve were reenacted, also makes its mark in the account roll. 8s was paid ‘for the paschale Judas light and the tapers’, for the liturgy of holy Thursday in which the Blessed Sacrament is carried in procession from the altar to the sepulchre to the strains of S. Thomas Aquinas hymn *Tantum ergo sacramentum*; 10d ‘for a planke and 4 studdes for the sepulchar’, on the repair of which 8d had already been spent, and where the Sacrament would repose until its consumption on Good Friday. The total sum spent by the University Church for the year 1554, much of it taken up with the restoration of the liturgy, was £11 11s 6d.²⁰

These accounts run from the Feast of St Mary Magdalen in 1553 to that of 1554, the Easter for which this investment was made must therefore have been the first of Queen Mary’s reign. In the

²⁰ ORC PAR 207/ 4/ F1/ 1.

space of only nine months the effects of destruction and upheavals of the reigns of Henry and Edward had been utterly reversed.

In the chapels of the University too 1554 witnessed a frenzy of construction, manufacture and acquisition. At All Souls, where the accounts ran from the solemnity of title, 1553-4 saw chapel expenditure rise from £22 6s 11d to £30 10s 5d. 16s 8d was paid to a workman called Johnson for work in the chapel, but for the most part the outgoings on the chapel were for furnishings and vestments. 5s 3d was spent on the obtainment of a cloth for the high altar, 13s 3d for ‘two censers or thuribles.’²¹ 11s 3d was used to buy corporals. The Warden and vice-Warden were the source of three vestments and were reimbursed for their expenses incurred in organising ‘repairs to books and other necessary repairs.’²² At Corpus Christi, where traditional vestments had apparently been preserved during the previous reign, they were repaired. 4s 6d was spent on six days work ‘mending the copes’, a craftsman called Raibonne was paid 12d for ‘mending ii cusshins’ and 8d for the restoration of a ‘black hanginge.’

The accounts also record that the revival of sacred music was deemed worthy of expenditure in the colleges. At Corpus Christi 13s 4d was spent on ‘mending the organe.’ And it was necessary once again to purchase the raw materials from which sacraments and sacramentals could be made, with 4d being used in the obtaining of ‘holly oyle’, 6s 8d on ‘wax for the paschall’ and 14s on candles for the year. 3s 4d was used to buy a ‘prick song boke’, to assist the singing of the latin mass and 6s 8d was expended on ‘paynting the roode.’ At Corpus Christi, in the Accounts for 1552-3, £8 18s had been spent on the chapel; for 1553-4 the figure was £18 6s 9d.²³

²¹ *pro duobus incensoriis sive thuribulis.*

²² *pro libris emendum et aliis necessariis emendum pro custodem et vice custodem.* ASCA, Computus and Expense Rolls 1554.

²³ CCCA, C/1/1/3 f. 119-120.

At New College, four albs were purchased for the sum of 18d along with two purificators for the high altar, costing 2s 8d.²⁴ Johnson, who as we have seen was also employed by All Souls, charged 16d for unspecified vestment repairs and 3s for repairs to a cope and tunicle. Copes and albs were acquired from Mr Holland for the sum of 31s and from Master Belfyne what must have been either a large number of copes, or a few of exceptional quality, for £20, along with 8s for a missal and 4s for clerical surplices from the same source.

Among the other expenditure on the chapel in 1554, which amounted to £124 9s 1/2d from a total expenditure of £228 19s 7d. Henry Bolton received 37s 8d for work on the altar. Further architectural repairs included a payment of 53s 4d for ‘the edification of the step and altar in the chapel.’²⁵ As at Corpus Christi, the organ at New College, recently installed after its medieval predecessor’s removal under Edward, received attention, in this case the purchase of new flutes for the sum of 12d. A touching restoration of the old religion is seen in the laying-out of 30s for forty roses for the day of the purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary.²⁶

In the accounts of Balliol College for the year 1554-1555, made on the 7 July, corroborate the evidence gathered in the University Church accounts for a revival in the cult of St Thomas of Canterbury. In a College where the total expenditure amounted to £98 13s 10d, the significant sum of 3s 2d was spent in celebrating the feast of the translation of his relics. Further evidence of the revival of this cult is obtained from the fact that from 1555 the accounts of the college run from the Solemnity of St Luke to that feast, rather than from St Luke to St Luke as it had before. In the same

²⁴ *pro compositione 4 albarum et 2 mapparum pro summo altari.*

²⁵ *pro edificati gradus et altaria in capella.*

²⁶ NCA, Account Roll 216.

year 3s 4d was expended on the acquisition of a wooden image of Christ for the Chapel. This image could have been used as the rood, or might have been the altar cross or indeed a separate image altogether.²⁷

For the year 1555 at Magdalen, the next for which the accounts survive, that expenditure had leapt to £85 19s 5d. Once again, this was spent on a combination of routine payments, new acquisitions and improvements to the fabric of the Chapel. One of the first payments was for the acquisition of chains for the thuribles. On 22 February a Mr White and his servant were paid 18s for two weeks' work and the 'stone' which they required to repair the gaps in the altars.²⁸ That this was itemised separately from the running repairs, which were usually carried out by Henry Bolton, suggests that this refers to major repairs to the parclose screens around the lesser altars, or perhaps their reredoses. This conclusion is strengthened by the subsequent payment of two of Henry Bolton's men for six days work on these screens.

Bolton next occurs in the recorded payment of 20s to him for 'the sculpting of an image of Christ crucified'.²⁹ Further payments to Bolton in this year were for 'images of the Holy Magdalen, and John the Baptist and of an angel, to be fixed to the entrance to the choir.'³⁰ The image of Christ crucified was probably to replace the rood, the large depiction on the screen which drew the attention of the congregation to the sacramental representation of that event which took place on the altar. In addition to these material alterations attention was also being given to the music of the

²⁷ MS Top. Oxon. e. 124/9, f. 78.

²⁸ *lapidis pro interstitiis altarium.*

²⁹ *pro sculptura Imaginis Christi crucifixi.*

³⁰ *pro sculptura tabernaculorum d'ne magdalinae et Iohannis Baptistae, et angeli ad ostendum chori affixi.*

chapel, with 13s 4d being payed to ‘Master Ball, for the writing of various masses with antiphons and other songs.’³¹

The history of the chapels in Marian Oxford is not confined to the acquisition of new objects or the repair of old ones but also encompasses the efforts made to ensure that the chapels were clean and fit for the performance of the liturgy. At Corpus Christi, in 1557-8, the chapel was washed at Christmas, the Annunciation, Midsummer and Michaelmas, with the windows of the chapel being cleaned and the candlesticks ‘scoured’ once, which brought the total sum (out of a total for the Chapel of £9 13s 11d) expended on maintenance to 13s 3d for the year.³²

Tabernacles

A term which has pursued Mary Tudor’s Church down the centuries is that of ‘reaction’, that the regime was attempting to turn back the clock on the Henrician and Edwardian reformations to the state of religion which prevailed in the medieval past, to recover that which was surely irrecoverable. Indeed, it might have seemed to a disinterested fellow of Magdalen, who had perhaps gone along with whichever changes the movers and shakers in the college had sought to implement over the previous two decades, that he was witnessing a reversion to the religion which was current early in the reign of Henry VIII. Indeed he was, to an extent, but reunion with the rest of the Western Church reconnected that of England with a living tradition which had not stopped developing during the years of schism and nor would it now as the reassertion and reformulation of the Catholic faith in the face of the Protestant threat, whose ascendancy in England had so recently been reversed, continued apace.

³¹ MCA, Liber Computi 1555. The folios relating to the Chapel for this year are not numbered.

³² CCCA C/1/1/4 (Libri Magni IV, 1557-1570), f. 2v.

There is no more appropriate example than that of the reservation of the Eucharistic elements. In England, as in the rest of the Church, the reserved sacrament had been kept in a pyx or a locked box or aumbrey either to the left or to the right of the high altar in Europe; in England in a hanging pyx, a small receptacle, appropriately veiled, suspended in front of the altar. The Counter-Reformation saw the reserved sacrament move from this position to the centre of the altar itself. Although this was to become normative in the post-Tridentine period, the setting up of tabernacles had precedents in late fifteenth century Tuscany, in the cathedrals of Volterra (1471), Prato (1487) and Siena (1506). Although tabernacles were associated with the reforms of St Charles Borromeo in his Archdiocese of Milan, Borromeo's aggressive promotion of them had an earlier precedent in the episcopal Constitutions of Gian Matteo Giberti, Bishop of Verona in which he wrote of Eucharistic reservation:

as the eyes of a maid to the hands of her mistress, so should be the eyes of those who stand around the table of the Lord, always with fear and trembling towards the most high and most precious sacrament, which is there on the high altar; they should weep for joy about it, and rejoice devoutly in their weeping, and they should see how sweet is the Lord.³³

It was surely in a conscious echo of such pastoral programmes that Pole's legatine constitutions contained the injunction that

We have also decided, by the authority of this council, that the punishment be renewed against priests who are negligent in the reservation of the Eucharist, and that it be retained in its full extent, adding that this tabernacle shall be prominently erected in the middle of the high altar, so as to be seen by all, and that it be so fixed that it cannot be easily removed by anyone.³⁴

³³ U. Michael Lang, 'Tamquam Cor in Pectore: The Eucharistic Tabernacle Before and After Trent', *Journal of the Institute for Sacred Architecture* 15 (2009), 32-34.

³⁴ *Anglican Canons*, p. 93.

These constitutions were given at Lambeth on 10 February 1556. In early April at Magdalen, Thomas Butler was paid 10 pence for a days work ‘an implement to be attached to the back of the altar for the tabernacle for the Eucharist.’³⁵ Henry Bolton was employed at Corpus Christi, for ‘mendynge the tabernacle’ for the price of 12s. That the tabernacle was recorded as being ‘mended’ rather than constructed suggests that an existing box might have been adapted for the purpose. It was, however, swiftly adapted for its new purpose with a payment to ‘Dolle’ for ‘giltyinke the tabernacle.’³⁶ At Magdalen, 18s was paid to Bolton for the acquisition of ‘a tabernacle for the pix.’³⁷ The absence of an explicit reference to the purchase of a tabernacle at All Souls for the year is puzzling, although I suspect it might have been included in the unusually high figure of £13 4s 12d spent on ‘diverse ornaments’.³⁸

The procurement of tabernacles at the colleges of the University in the immediate aftermath of the London Synod sets in clearer relief a central feature of Marian Oxford: it demonstrates the manner in which the University was integrated into the Catholic revival that a recent and novel development should have been seized on and implemented in such a short space of time after its inception. But it tells us something about the wider ecclesiastical picture too, both in Oxford and at the centre of power in London. The Marian Reformation was not a nostalgic moment in the history of the English Church, reactionary in a qualified sense (how could it have been entirely otherwise?) it may have been: blimpish it was not. The return of the provinces of Canterbury and York to the papal communion was a reversion to their previous state, yet the act of re-grafting made them once more part of a living, developing organic body and, in the instance of the tabernacles, we can see

³⁵ *in affigendo ferramento posticae altaris pro tabernaculo Eucharistiae*. MCA, Draft Liber Computi 1556, f. 98.

³⁶ CCCA, C1/1/3, f. 185.

³⁷ *pro tabernaculo ad pixidem*.

³⁸ *diversis ornamentis*. MCA Draft Liber Computi 1556, f. 98v.

how swiftly what was fed in at the root, both of the English Church and its wider parent body was transmitted to the extremities.

The Queen and the College Finances

The effect of increased expenditure on the part of the colleges, not least on the restoration and adornment of the chapels caused some to fall into financial difficulties. Foremost among them was New College where the swift and effective action of the Queen brought about a swift reversal of these difficulties and constitutes a persuasive case for the contention of this thesis that the regime kept a close and extremely benevolent eye on proceedings in the University. Having registered a profit of £206 for the year 1552-3, from its land and parishes, the next few years saw a steep decline until by 1555-6 total receipts only exceeded expenditure by £26. The cause of the decline in revenue, presumably the decline in the harvest consequent upon illness and bad weather which afflicted the Queen's subjects in this period need not detain us here, unlike the Queen's response. On 21 March 1555 a Patent, conceived to alleviate these difficulties, was issued. It granted to the college the rectory of 'Marshfield' in Gloucestershire, formerly part of the possession of Tewkesbury Abbey, and all the lands, tenements, house and tithes belonging to the rectory.³⁹ This munificent gesture on the part of the monarch helped to alleviate the college's difficulties, increasing its profit for the next year to £58.

New College was not the only recipient of Mary's generosity. In July 1556 immunity was granted to the farmers of land owned by Magdalen College to prevent their crops, animals and 'other victuals' from seizure by the purveyors of the royal household.⁴⁰ Unlike at Magdalen, where

³⁹ *CPR*, p. 69.

⁴⁰ *CPR*, pt 2, p. 277.

this royal benefaction represents a single incursion into the college finances, Christ Church was to benefit regularly throughout the reign. On 7 July 1554 the Dean and Chapter were granted the rectories and churches of Tring and Wigginton in Hertfordshire which had come into the possession of the crown by the attainder of Thomas Seymour.⁴¹ These amounted to a rental income of £10 per annum. This in addition to the yearly rent from the rectories of Chippenham and Chaletton in Wiltshire, Runcorn and Budworth in Cheshire, and the vicarages of Lathbury and Easton in Buckinghamshire, the value of which was £20 14s 10d per annum. To this income was added the £52 8s 6d which represented the sum owed to the crown in lieu of the first fruits and tenths to which it was entitled for the land.⁴²

In this way, just as the Queen used the crown's revenues to embellish the finances of the central University, as we saw in Chapter 1, she was also to deploy them in attempting to help the colleges to balance their books in the light of the investment they had made in their chapels in the face of dwindling revenues.

The Government of the Colleges: Magdalen College under Cole

A greater contrast between elections is scarcely conceivable than that between the re-election of Owen Oglethorpe in 1554 and his replacement by Arthur Cole in 1555, on Oglethorpe's nomination as Bishop of Carlisle. Cole was, the Vice-President's register records, chosen by the unanimous consent of the fellows then present in the University on 22 April 1555.⁴³

⁴¹ A letter from the Queen to the college informing them of this grant is in Christ Church Archives, Estates MSS Tring, f. 1.

⁴² *CPR*, p. 479-80.

⁴³ MCA, Vice-President's Register, f. 9v.

The most significant insight into Cole's presidency we gain is from a series of admonitions to the bachelors of the college, delivered on 13 October 1555. These bachelors, forming the nucleus of the college, are exhorted to a disciplined life appropriate to that state. The first instructs them to be disciplined in rising for the early offices, and correct in their behaviour in the chapel. The second admonition instructs that they should approach lectures diligently, and read the questions to be discussed accurately. The third relates to their attire, instructing them to wear clerical clothing and the fourth insists that conversations in hall be held only in Latin.⁴⁴

This emphasis on clerical discipline, consistent with similar admonitions which are found in other college archives in this period, is entirely characteristic of the aspirations of both Queen and Cardinal for a serious and disciplined clergy to carry out the re-evangelisation of the realm. These admonitions came only a few months before Pole's legatine synod, whose third canon explicitly stated that 'the beginning of Church reform should be made with those who have the cure of others'.⁴⁵

Similar exhortations were made again to those in their 'probationary year' on 6 October 1557 which admonished 'by Master Petypher, the vice president, Masters Day and Roke, deans of arts, all who are in the year of probation for the whole of that year to attend morning mass from the beginning to the end.'⁴⁶ The other admonitions concerned the use of Latin in conversation and the need to gain permission before spending time in the town.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ MCA, VP1/A1/1, f. 23v.

⁴⁵ *Anglican Canons*, p. 95.

⁴⁶ *perdurant missam matutinalem a principio usque ad finem interesse.*

⁴⁷ MCA, VP1/A1/1, f. 30v.

These exhortations to discipline of life addressed to the young were harnessed to strict disciplinary measures which the pages of the Vice-President's Register also record. For example, on 27 October 1555, 'Aldeworth was accused because he was refusing the work of singing.'⁴⁸ On 4 November seven scholars were given the same punishment for their absence from the morning mass.⁴⁹

Evidence of the imposition of punishments is susceptible of a variety of interpretations. A long list of punitive measures may indicate widespread defiance of the law or simply an efficient disciplinary regime; it might be read as constituting just the tip of the iceberg or reveal the entire extent of law breaking. I would suggest that the list of punishments in the Magdalen Vice-President's Register points to a minimum of offending dealt with by a remarkably well regulated disciplinary procedure on the basis of two features of the entries in the Register. Firstly, the triviality of the offences almost all of which involve one absence from a lecture, disputation or office. A system capable of monitoring the activities of members of the college, so that such absences are discovered, investigated and punished is unlikely to have missed anything more significant. Secondly, the absences tend to be the fault of a small number of individuals whose names crop up time and again, such as Master Atkinson and Dr Smallwood, who are frequently punished for individual absences from 1555 to 1558. The limited number of offenders also suggests a correspondingly limited amount of rule breaking which, had it been more widespread, would in all likelihood have been recorded in the register.

The links between the regime and the colleges was particularly strong in Magdalen's case, given that Cardinal Pole had been a member. On 18 January 1556, the president, fellows and scholars

⁴⁸ *accusatur dominus Aldeworth quod recusaret cantandi onus*. MCA, VP1/A1/1, f. 23.

⁴⁹ MCA, VP1/A1/1, f. 24.

wrote to the Cardinal a letter which bears eloquent testimony to the hope generated at his alma mater by his arrival in England. The letter opens by contrasting the state of the realm as it was in the time of schism with the new reality the Queen and Pole were to usher in, explaining as it did so the college's remorse for its complicity in that schism.⁵⁰

Part 2: The New Foundations: Trinity and St John's

The most significant and yet most easily overlooked change to have come upon the University since Henry VIII's reign was the loss of its religious element. In the period before the dissolution of the monasteries the Universities and the Religious Orders had a relationship of mutual dependence. For the orders, and in particular for the mendicant friars, a 'studium' in Oxford was an assertion of credibility. In Pope Benedict XII's reforming legislation (1335-9) one of the most significant planks was the requirement for Benedictines, Cistercians and Augustinian Canons to establish a presence in the universities. As was pointed out in the first chapter, among the Religious Orders in England prior to the Reformation only the Carmelites and the Canons of St Gilbert of Sempringham had their main studium outside Oxford, in London and Cambridge respectively; for the rest, their principal house of study was in Oxford.

Monastic Revival

Resurrecting the religious life in England was the most complex task facing Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole. The restoration of religion in the parishes and, as we have seen, in chapels, depended in the first place upon the popularity of the return to the traditional mass and thereafter upon the gradual acquisition and introduction into the churches of the objects by which the traditional liturgy

⁵⁰ MCA, Leger E, f. 96v.

was accompanied. Simply put, parish churches had continued to exist and to be used. Returning parish churches to their traditional function was easier than the re-introduction of the religious life, whose buildings had been abandoned two decades before after the forced ejection of their inmates and which, with their estates, were now the proud possessions of the magnates on whose good will the return of England to the barque of Peter depended.

A resolution of this seemingly intractable problem would depend on a papal dispensation to allow the ‘possessioners’ to keep their property. Mary had petitioned Pole in May 1554 to intercede with the Pope to this effect. Pole responded in August that he had been endowed with general powers and had sent a ‘learned man’ to the Pope to obtain specific powers in relation to monastic land. Pope Julius’ response to this request actually came before the Cardinal had informed Mary that it had been issued, for in June he had written to Pole to the effect that he did not want the question of property to be a barrier to the return of England to papal obedience.⁵¹

Pole himself was not the kind of Churchman who could willingly accept the permanent loss of the religious houses to the laymen of his class who, unlike him, had been complicit in the schism. He wrote in September to the Emperor that he could not give a general or particular dispensation without causing ‘great offence to God.’⁵²

Nevertheless, soon after Pole’s arrival, at Christmas 1554, the Legate conceded the right to the land of the possessioners but demanded the return of movable objects such as plate, vestments and ornaments to the parish churches and that the new owners make some contribution to the support of the clergy. Parliament responded by passing an Act recognising this dispensation and recording the

⁵¹ *CRP*, 870, 922, 896.

⁵² *CSPV*, 5, 947.

new owners' legal title to the land. This was confirmed by Julius III on 20 June 1555 in the bull *Praeclara*, by which the religious houses which had once defined the English landscape and culture passed into extinction.⁵³ This only occurred against the better judgement of Queen and Legate. At a stormy meeting with parliamentarians on Christmas Eve, Pole had demanded that the Church was the rightful owner of such property even if it was willing not to demand its return. At this the Queen turned to the lawyers present and told them that "they had understood what her cousin said and should believe it."⁵⁴

In the aftermath of their agreement, it was true, the possessioners held their property legally according both to Civil and Canon Law. Yet the obligation of those lay people to release the land or at any rate the income that they derived from it as a result of this regularisation was clear. On 17 January 1555 Simon Renard, the Imperial Ambassador, informed the Queen's cousin and father-in-law the Emperor that 'the Legate is urging the Queen to release the Church property at present held by the Crown. She has already agreed to give up money amounting to over 60,000 crowns of revenue.'⁵⁵

After this parliament and the bull *Praeclara* there were three ominous political facts confronting the regime and the higher elements of English society. They were: the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII, the lay acquisition of monastic property and the regularisation of this possession by a regime ideologically opposed to the theory behind that possession.

⁵³ Dom David Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England* (3 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 3, p. 423.

⁵⁴ *CSPS*, 13, 131.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 134.

In the re-endowment of the Church with the profits from formerly monastic property lay the best solution to a thoroughly grubby situation and it is in this process that I suggest the foundations of Trinity and St John's colleges in the University of Oxford during Mary's reign makes most sense.

First, both the founders were men whose hands were stained by the monastic property which had passed through them. The early career of Sir Thomas Pope, founder of Trinity, could in some respects serve as a template for that of a typically unscrupulous Henrician man on the make. As his first biographer concluded, 'it is remarkable that a person of his obscure family and inconsiderable fortune, should so soon recommend himself to public notice, and gain access even to royal favour.' Born in 1507, he attended Banbury Grammar School and Eton College, and in October 1533 he obtained the position of Clerk of Briefs in Star Chamber. In November 1534 he was appointed treasurer of the Jewel Tower, the previous occupant of which was the archetypal climber Thomas Cromwell. Two years later in 1536 he had risen still further, to the position of Treasurer of the Court of Augmentations, the body whose sole purpose was to sort out the monastic revenues by which the crown was being 'augmented.' Under Cromwell, Pope was appointed a commissioner for the dissolution and received the seal of St Alban's Abbey at its surrender on 5 December 1539.

But this was only one aspect of Pope's life. He was also a close friend and confidant of Sir Thomas More, by whom he had been helped to the office of Star Chamber clerk which served as a springboard for his later rise to prominence. It was he, More's 'singular and most intimate friend', who had informed the former Lord Chancellor of his impending execution, at which More had thanked him for his 'good tidings'. When Pope broke down at his mentor's impending death More admonished him, 'be not comforted; for I trust that we shall one day in heaven see each other full

merrily.' It was Pope's intervention on More's behalf that allowed his beloved daughter Margaret Roper to attend the execution. ⁵⁶

Although Pope had profited from the dissolution of the monasteries (by 1555 he had twenty-seven manors in seven counties) he would appear to have been out of sympathy with the more unambiguously reforming regime of Edward VI, and received no offices during that reign.

From these details of his career in the reigns of Mary's predecessors Pope emerges as an ambiguous figure, a close friend of the most famous of the opponents of the Royal Supremacy yet willing to profit from the monastic dissolution which flowed from it; a loyal servant of Henry's, but excluded from the regime of his son.

Sir Thomas White, founder of St John's, had had less to do with the central government during the previous two reigns. A trader, master of the Merchant Taylors' company, alderman, sheriff and then in August 1553 Lord Mayor of London, he had met the Queen at Newhall in Essex in July before she made her triumphal entry into the capital, and he was later to take an instrumental role in defending London against Wyatt's rebels. White's connection to monastic revenues is a good deal less incriminating than Pope's. He had been responsible for a £1,400 gift to the corporation of Coventry in July 1542, which allowed them to purchase monastic land in the city.

The second connection between the Marian foundations and the dissolved abbeys is the positions they occupied in, or rather just outside, the city. Of the religious houses at Oxford before the dissolution 'only St Frideswide's Priory and Canterbury College were within the city walls. All the

⁵⁶ Thomas Warton, *The Life of Sir Thomas Pope: founder of Trinity College Oxford* (London: 1780), p. 7.

others were arranged in an arc around the western and northern perimeters of Oxford.⁵⁷ There is very little evidence for what lay behind Pope's decision to found Trinity on the site previously occupied by Durham College. His earliest biographer simply records that 'on this ground sir Thomas Pope determined to found his intended college.' But it cannot be without significance that Warton, two pages previously, suggests that behind the foundation itself was a desire to make atonement for the riches which he had accrued from the dissolution.

His good sense and good disposition led him to reflect, that he could not bestow a competent proportion of those riches which he had so largely received with greater propriety, utility and generosity, than with the service of the public.⁵⁸

The choice of Durham College as the site for his own foundation made Pope's restoration of his ill-gotten gains to the Church to be the start of the resurrection of a part of the city which the extinction of the religious life in Oxford had quieted.

In the case of Sir Thomas White, the founder of St John's, there is clearer evidence of the intention which lay behind the situation of the new college. John Webster's 1624 work *Monuments of Honour* records that at some point (it was probably after July 1554) when White's mind seems to have turned towards the foundation of a college at Oxford,⁵⁹ he had a dream the outcome of which was that he should found his college where there were two trunks of a tree that sprang from one root. Initially he was convinced that he had found the tree at Gloucester College, a former Benedictine house. However, 'riding one day out at the north gate' he saw the tree on the site of St Bernard's College, the Cistercian house of study which had flourished for the first time just before

⁵⁷ R.B. Dobson, 'The Religious Orders 1370-1540' in *HUO*, II, pp. 539-579.

⁵⁸ Warton, *Life*, pp. 115; 113.

⁵⁹ It was on the 18th of that month that White, who had never before acquired property outside London, bought for £1,908, 16s the rectories of Kingston Bagpuize in Berkshire and Fyfield in Oxfordshire, along with the manor of Fyfield and those of Long Wittenham, Eaton (in Appleton), Frilford and Garford.

the dissolution.⁶⁰ The story of the dream and the discovery of the tree on the site of St Bernard's is corroborated by a number of different sources in the next decades and cannot simply be relegated to the realm of unsupported legend. Nevertheless, the choice was evidently between Gloucester College and St Bernard's College. White was determined that his college should be made to stand, like that of Sir Thomas Pope, on a monastic brown-field site.

The statement that was being made by the foundations on these sites is understood elsewhere too. In the Letters Patent for the founding of Trinity the location is referred to as 'the house commonly called Derham College' and St John's 'lately called Barnard College' and evidence from the University archives shows that the designation of the new colleges by the names of the monastic institutions they superseded continued throughout the reign.⁶¹

Statutes

Sir Thomas Pope and Sir Thomas White as founders of the two new colleges were also the authors of the statutes by which they would be governed. The issuing of statutes and, during their lifetimes, control over appointments of fellows and admission of scholars represented the most effective means by which a founder could shape the institution according to his own purpose. Pope, in his statutes, makes provision for their public recitation in the presence of the fellows and scholars and both founders devote parts of their statutes to providing the mechanisms by which disputes over the statutes might be resolved.⁶²

⁶⁰ William Henry Stevenson and H.E. Salter, *The Early History of St John's College, Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939), p. 387.

⁶¹ *CPR*, 2, pp. 90, 322-3.

⁶² *The Statutes of Trinity College, Oxford: printed by desire of the Commissioners* (London: George E Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1855), pp. 70, 75.

Pope's statutes for Trinity are original, and there is no reason to suppose that they were anything other than the product of his own ambitions for his college. In the case of White's statutes for St John's College, however, the statutes of Corpus Christi College served as a template which was followed almost to the letter. The detailed provisions of White's statutes do not allow us to deduce much about his own ideas, but the fact that the statutes were so closely modeled on those of Corpus Christi is worthy of comment. Corpus Christi had been established in 1517 by Bishop Foxe of Winchester. Foxe's original intention had been to found an institution, like the colleges of Durham and Canterbury, for the education of the Benedictines of St Swithun's Priory, his cathedral, but he was persuaded by Bishop Oldham of Exeter to alter its purpose to that of the education of secular clergy. John Hooker, uncle of the celebrated Richard Hooker and chamberlain of Exeter, admonished him thus,

What, my Lord, shall we build houses and provide livelihoods for a company of bussing monks, whose end and fall we may live to see? No, no! It is more meet a great deal that we should have care to provide for the increase of learning and for such as, by their learning, shall do good in Church and commonwealth.⁶³

A contemporary example of a reforming Catholic prelate's educational initiative is that of Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros, Archbishop of Toledo, from 1495. Only four years into his episcopate he began to plan for the establishment of a new university at Alcala, for the education of a devout and professional secular priesthood. The opening of its first college in 1508 in which scholastic Theology, Greek and Hebrew were taught was the first of the trilingual colleges which were soon to appear in Europe.⁶⁴ As this institution was the inspiration for Corpus Christi and

⁶³ Quoted in Thomas Fowler, *Corpus Christi* (London: F.E. Robinson, 1898), pp. 11-12.

⁶⁴ John C. Olin, *Catholic Reform: from Cardinal Ximenes to the Council of Trent* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1990), pp. 4-5; for an early modern assessment of Ximenes' career see Michel Baudier, *The History and Administration of Cardinal Ximenes, great minister of state in Spain* (London: 1671).

Corpus Christi's statutes used for St John's there is here a direct link between the early, humanist inspired, movement towards reform and the Marian Counter-Reformation

Such humanist assumptions were to work their way into the statutes which White was later to appropriate for his own college. For example, the introduction of a public lecturer in Greek was to create the first permanent office devoted to the instruction of scholars in the Greek language in England. In theology, the authorities to be studied were the Fathers of the Early Church, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Origen, Hilary, John Chrysostom and John of Damascus.⁶⁵

Corpus Christi was an exceptionally well-connected college. Cardinal Pole had been a fellow in the 1520s and Robert Morwent, fellow of Magdalen, had been its first vice-President. Perhaps most significantly, Juan Luis Vives, author of the tracts according to which the then Princess Mary was educated, was among its first professors. Although there were compelling motives on purely political grounds for using Corpus as a basis for the construction of the statutes of S John's, the choice can also be interpreted as a statement of the continuities of the educational enterprise of the Marian foundation with the earlier ideas which lay behind the shape taken by Bishop Foxe's college, and which White was to adopt.

The most significant difference between the statutes of Corpus and those of St John's lay in the status of the scholars. They were not divided, as at Corpus, between 'discipuli' and 'socii' (pupils and fellows) but, as at New College, were fellows immediately they were elected to the society although they could not participate in the decisions affecting the running of the college for a period of two years. In this way, the college's corporate identity, which could have been threatened by the

⁶⁵J.G. Milne, *The Early History of Corpus Christi College* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946).

variety of establishments with a connection to White from which the scholars were to be drawn, was given an explicit statutory basis.

At the centre of both sets of statutes lies a plain assertion of a traditional view of death. For both Pope and White, their colleges were there to pray for the soul of their founder and his family. Pope's statutes for Trinity contain a 'prayer for the departed founder' and a series of prayers to be used in masses said for his intention, both before and after his death. The 'prayer for the departed founder', is the most meaningful declaration we have about the pious intention behind his foundation. 'We humbly beseech you, O most holy and glorious Trinity' it begins:

in whose honour this college was founded that you may show mercy towards the soul of your servant Thomas Pope, knight, our late founder, and the souls of Margaret and Elizabeth his wives, William his father and Margaret his mother, and the souls of his kindred, affinity and friends, all departed in the faith of Christ, that in the day of judgement they may all stand not ashamed, and thence to the kingdom of heaven with joy they may depart, where you reign in perpetual felicity without end, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.⁶⁶

In White's statutes for St John's we find an injunction to pray for the founder inserted into the daily liturgical round of the college:

Let it be ordered that each day of the week, morning mass be completed before or around the sixth hour, in which special mention and prayers be made for the good estate of me and my wife Jane as long as we live, and after death for our souls.⁶⁷

Now, the stance of the Marian Church towards purgatory is rather more ambiguous than that of its medieval predecessor. The scarcity of explicit mention of the state where souls are purged from the venial sins committed during their lives, and which adhere to them now in death, in the religious

⁶⁶ *Statutes of Trinity*, pp. 36-7.

⁶⁷ *Dicatur singulis diebus profestis, hora matutinalis, finienda ante vel circuite horam sextam; in qua specialis mentio et oratio fiat pro bono statu meo et uxoris meae Joannae, quamdiu vixerimus, et post mortem nostram pro animabus nostris. Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford*, 3, p. 47.

literature of the reign has led some historians to question its significance in the teaching of Marian clergy and the practices of the laity. To Lucy Wooding, interest in purgatory was ‘peripheral’; to Ronald Hutton, ‘the abiding casualty of the preceding reformations.’⁶⁸ However, William Wizeman argues that the Marian approach to purgatory was defined by a ‘nuanced...careful restoration’ in which the focus lay not so much in discussions of ‘the nature of purgatory’ but through an elucidation of ‘the means to aid the dead...through good works and prayer, especially celebrating the Eucharist.’⁶⁹ It is surely in such a context that Pope and White’s stipulation that their souls be prayed for should be seen. Both White and Pope made provision for masses to be said for their souls after death. Praying for the dead serves no purpose unless it is to reduce the amount of time spent in purgatory, if the soul languishes in hell or enjoys the vision of God in heaven, prayer cannot alter the pain or joy of either state.⁷⁰

Only if the founders both believed in a state prior to heaven, in which for a period of time (which was capable of being lessened by the prayers of the faithful) holy souls were purged of their venial sins do their stipulations make sense. In this respect, there is a direct continuity between the Marian foundations in Oxford in the 1550s and the great system of pious patronage and benevolence by which the Church had been animated before the reformation.

⁶⁸ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, p. 177; Hutton, ‘Local Impact of the Tudor Reformations’, p. 131.

⁶⁹ Wizeman, *Theology and Spirituality*, pp. 219, 242. See also his ‘The Pope the saints and the dead: Carranza and the Marian Theologians’, in Truman and Edwards (ed.), *Reforming Catholicism*, pp. 115-137.

⁷⁰ A possible exception is found in the King’s Book of 1542. However this was a compromise which accepted prayer for ‘the dead’, from which the dead collectively were held to benefit but which denied the efficacy of prayer for an individual soul which a staging post on the way to a purely Protestant account of the Last Things that was to become the orthodoxy of Edward’s reign. See Alec Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 50-51. For an account which claims to discern a psychological, if not a logical, consistency in Henry’s stance on purgatory see G.W. Bernard, *The King’s Reformation: Henry VIII and the remaking of the English Church* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 285-88.

Prayers for the founder, his kith and kin, were only a part of the greater life of worship and prayer which the founders desired to establish. In both colleges the Sarum Use was to be employed.⁷¹ This Use, containing what we know as the Missal, Breviary and Ritual was the ancient one of the Southern Province and had been restored with the other rites indigenous to England by the Queen in her Injunctions of 4 March 1554.⁷² Both sets of statutes make the liturgy the centre of the colleges' life. White stipulated, in addition to the daily mass which 'all and singular' laymen in the college were to attend, and at which the founder would be prayed for, they were also to attend

on all these and singular Sundays and Feasts, we desire and command that the President, if he is present in the University and not legitimately impeded, in surplice and greek clothing (thus it is called), and other fellows, scholars and sacred ministers, not legitimately impeded in the judgement of the President, or in his absence the Vice-President, and in his of the Dean...⁷³

In addition, White

wished that on the feasts of the four doctors of the Church: Gregory, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine of Hippo together with Saint Augustine, Apostle of England, solemn mass of that day, as well as in other lesser doubles in the Chapel of our college, at the high altar, be celebrated by a fellow deputed for this by the Dean, this aforesaid all are to attend.⁷⁴

⁷¹ *Statutes of St John's*, p. 44; *Statutes of Trinity*, p. 43.

⁷² *Visitation Articles*, II, 322-29.

⁷³ *In his omnibus et singulis Dominicis et festis, volumus et mandamus quod Praesidem, si in Universitate praesens sit nec legitime impeditus, in suppellicio et graio amicio (ita appellant), et reliqui socii scholares et ministri sacelli, impedimento cessante legitimo, iudicio Praesidentis, aut eo absente Vicepraesidentis et sui Decani, eiusve locum tenentis, approbando. Statutes of St John's*, p. 44.

⁷⁴ *volumus, quod in festis quatuor Doctorum Ecclesiae, Gregorii, Ambrosii, Hieronymi, Augusti Hipponensis, ac etiam Sancti Augustinus Anglorum apostoli, missa solemnis de festo illius, sicut in aliis inferioribus duplicibus, in sacello nostri collegii, as supremum altare, per unum Socium ad hoc per Decanum deputatum celebretur; cui praedicti omnes intersint. Statutes of St John's*, p. 44.

At Trinity, the monastic custom of readings during meals was to be revived. ‘Let them have a reading from the holy bible every day at dinner’, Pope wrote, in the hope that mind as well as the body might be fed during the meal.⁷⁵ This concern with the development of the interior life of the members of the college is given eloquent expression further on in Pope’s statutes where he announces that ‘I wish them all in the bowels of Jesus Christ [to be] admonished that here all may live so that they may advance in character, embrace, and to the world commend, that sane, Catholic, and ancient teaching and religion.’ The cultivation of these virtues in order that their evangelism may be credible suggests that it was those of his students who were destined for ordination to the priesthood who were the main object of Pope’s expenditure of his energy and largesse. That these men would preach the gospel and administer the sacraments to a laity assailed by the threat of heresy, and so recently rescued from schism, is reflected in the effect of this ethos, that ‘truly they may shun and recoil from a schismatic, erroneous and heretical person.’⁷⁶

The reading of the Bible during dinner was also intended for scholars of St John’s by its founder, and preceding this statute are two which lay out in greater detail the stages by which scholars are to proceed to ordination. Each master of Arts, saving those in medicine, ‘within three years of the completion of his regency, should be raised to the priesthood’⁷⁷ although none are to be so promoted without the degree of Master or Bachelor of Arts. That all scholars are to wear clerical vesture demonstrates still further the orientation of the college toward the entry by its members into the sacred priesthood.

⁷⁵ *Statutes of Trinity*, p. 29.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁷⁷ *ad sacerdotium promoveantur.*

Disputations and lectures were naturally the means by which the scholars were to be taught. As at Corpus Christi, at St John's they were also to be pedagogical events for the entire body of the College. Bachelors of Art were to attend disputations for the purpose of hearing them and were also permitted to 'direct' the disputations. The Dean of Theology, of whom there was always to be one, was to attend theological disputations for the purpose of observing any tardiness or absence.⁷⁸

In addition, on one day of the week a disputation was to be held between the bachelors of the College then present in the University in which 'problems and doubts' might be 'disputed and solved logically'. Masters of Arts were then to respond to the disputation of the Bachelors, under the direction of the Dean. The process of these disputations in which the subject matter was unspecified was to be followed in the disputations of the theologians in the college. Jurists were to have a weekly disputation in the chapel on canon law in one week and civil law in the next.

The lectures with which St John's Statutes are most concerned are those in Greek rhetoric and logic, of which there were to be three professors, lecturing on a series of classical texts almost identical to those laid down for use at Corpus. All theologians in the college were expected to attend these lectures.

In the statutes which the founders provided for their colleges a number of different features emerge. The first, naturally, is a concern for learning, which owed much to humanism, but which was to be directed to the production of wholly orthodox Catholic priests and statesmen, who would constitute the secular and ecclesiastical elites of the England of Mary Tudor and her successors. The orthodoxy of the institutions Pope and White intended to found was grounded first and foremost in the liturgy, in exposing the scholars and fellows to the daily round of the offices and of the Mass.

⁷⁸ *Statutes of St John's*, p. 24.

Trinity College under Mary

Apart from documents relating to the foundation and the statutes, we have virtually no evidence of the history of St John's in Mary's reign. In the archives of Trinity, however, there is much that serves to paint a detailed picture of the life of the college before the death of the Queen, and the close supervision that was exercised over it in this period by its founder.

The foundation itself was celebrated on the vigil of the solemnity of the Most Holy Trinity in 1555 in the kind of triumphant public ceremony which was a peculiar mark of Marian Catholicism, and of which we have the account of the first President, Thomas Slythurst, preserved in the register of the college.

The first task was the administration of the oaths of office by Robert Morwent of Magdalen College on the authority of Sir Thomas Pope, whose letter conferring this authority he read. The oaths were taken in the chapel of the college by Slythurst, 'nominated and assigned first president of the College of the Most Holy Trinity' then by Stephen Marks, Pope's 'recommendation' for the vice President, then by the fellows: Yelard, the Philosophy lecturer, John Barwich, the Dean, John Richardson and John Petre, the Bursars and James Bell, the Rhetoric lecturer. After this Morwent handed over the seal of the college which had been committed by Pope to his care. Then, in the same Chapel, 'the President, Fellows and Scholars performed vespers for the solemnity of the Most Holy Trinity in chant.' The next morning the chapel was the setting for 'mattins and other divine hours', and the private masses of the priests were celebrated. Later, 'during the morning' there was a 'solemn mass at which a sermon from the President was delivered.' Only a short extract from this sermon has been preserved which makes reference to 'the surpassing munificence of our founder,

who restored the collapsing fame of this academy and the collapsed fortunes of good letters revived in stone' by his foundation of 'a new college.'

Profound though the effect upon the souls of those in attendance must have been; their bodies were not neglected. They were, records Slythurst, given a 'splendid and magnificent banquet' for which the food was provided by the founder and his friends, among whom Edward Love⁷⁹ donated forty-eight rabbits, three lambs, nineteen capons, three suckling pigs, fourteen goslings, sixty two pigeons, two fallow deer and one deer calf. Sir George Gifford, M.P. for Buckingham and Chamberlain of Anne of Cleves's household, donated twenty-four rabbits and twelve chickens. Two and a half gallons of wine, with strawberries, were given by Masters Irish,⁸⁰ Furse⁸¹ and Bridgman,⁸² but any impropriety consequent upon its consumption was presumably avoided by master Richard Arden's present of six shillings' worth of bread.⁸³ Arden had been Cranmer's jailor and his involvement in the foundation would have impressed upon the foundation the mark of civic approval.

It might have been excusable, having provided for the launching of his new college on such a wave of piety and conviviality, for Pope to have left his college to its own devices, but his involvement in the life and rule of the college defined both for the remainder of Mary's reign.

⁷⁹ A civil lawyer, fellow of New College 1516-17.

⁸⁰ Edmund Irish (d. 1556), Mayor of Oxford since 1554.

⁸¹ Thomas Furse or Fyrse, chamberlain of the City of Oxford 1549-56, Bailiff from 1556.

⁸² Possibly Nicholas Brigham, of whom Emden writes 'there is no record of any bearing his surname in contemporary registers' (*BRUO* p. 70.) in response to Wood's claim that he was an member of Hart Hall. He died in 1558.

⁸³ TCA Reg f. 2-3. For the extract from Slythurst's sermon see Warton, *Life of Pope*, p. 323.

In the first place, there are fourteen letters which form one side the correspondence between Pope and Thomas Slythurst, Trinity's first president. The subject on which Pope writes to Slythurst most frequently is, as one might expect, the statutes of his college. On 24 July 1557, Pope writes 'I pray yow with my herty commendacions to Mr Pert desier the same to use sped in my Statuts & I will not be forgetful of his pains.'⁸⁴ It would seem that this Mr Pert, a Bursar of the college, had been engaged to make a copy of its statutes, an undertaking that Pope was understandably keen to see completed swiftly. By 31 March 1558, this Mr Pert had written to Pope, arguing against the statutes he was engaged to copy. Pope writes to Slythurst that 'I think he be not well in his Witt. I pray yow tell hym I have sent yow a copie of his letters & I willed yow to know of him what he meaneth in that he fyndeth fault at my Statuts.' For Pope, the statutes could not be subject to negotiation and while he was keen for the President to find any others 'whom you shall perceyve to myslik the Statuts and understand what wored theym', nevertheless was confident that 'if he & all that be of his disposicion depart from my college, God will send others in their Romes' who would be content to live under them.⁸⁵

To this letter Pope appended the list of complaints that Petre had submitted, with his own, occasionally sarcastic, commentary on them. The list of ten complaints does not suggest any discontent with the ethos of the college under Pope's statutes, still less with its religious orientation. They are rather the kind of petty complaints and grouses that frequently occur in communities of precocious young men. The first complains that 'moche tyme' is 'lost' in the the attendance of a delegation of B.As, appointed by the President, Vice-President and Dean 'to goo unto the Rhetoricke Lecture among the Schollers from III-V' which 'mought better be employed upon their own studies.' The second that it was 'undecent to have a B.A. and Fellow of the Colledge to reade

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 15v.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 20.

the Bible and stande upp at the Table and declaime.’ Thirdly, Petre thought it ‘not reasonable that II Fellowes shal not walke...into the Feldes the space of a Myle but that they must first ask leave.’ The fourth complains that fellows cannot ‘recreate themseles also within the Grove with honest pastime but when, how and only solong as it shall please the president.’ The fifth complains that masters cannot ‘approve his cause after one.’⁸⁶ The sixth complains that B.As are advanced too quickly to the M.A., as they cannot within half a year of their grace being granted within the college be expected to have learnt to read ‘the Greke Tonge.’ The seventh describes it as a ‘pittie’ that ‘any Shipmans hoose shulde be in a colledge’.⁸⁷ The eighth complains that some B.A.s are being priested before M.A.s. The ninth protests that any Master accused of any wrongdoing ‘shall nether knowe his Accuser nor to stand to his proff thereof but without contradicition to receave punishment.’ The tenth complains about the severity of punishments available to the President to inflict upon those who do not arrive in the chapel in time for Mass.

The responses to these complaints which are found in the margins of the text sent by Pope to Slythurst indicate that he thought them to be personal gripes on the part of the individual. For example, in relation to the sixth complaint he writes that ‘the complaynant hath leisure enouue afore his tyme come to be admytted.’⁸⁸ In the few alterations Pope made to the statutes during Mary’s reign, only one can be interpreted as a concession to these complaints. They included provisions for forty shillings to be shared between the priests of the college each year; that the ‘organ player’ might be a fellow or a scholar, or a stranger if none could be found in the college and that the chaplains of the college may not all be absent at the same time. Only the alteration permitting the

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 22.

⁸⁷ An obscure insult, which is probably an accusation of ideological slipperiness.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 22v.

morning mass, for grave cause, to be said after six o'clock has any precedent in Petre's complaints.⁸⁹

As well as serving as evidence of Pope's intransigence in the case of the earlier petition, these additional statutes demonstrate the detailed involvement of the founder in the emerging life of his college, an involvement which extended even as far as the supply and encouragement of individual scholars. In order to improve the linguistic capabilities of a man named John Basford or Beresford,⁹⁰ Pope instructed that the fellows were to 'speak not any word of English to him.' In the same letter Pope writes to Slythurst, 'I pray yow speke with Mr Rudden to tech hym and to give hym Erasmus Epistels and Tullys Epistles which he shall lern to translate well.'⁹¹ Pope's concern with Basford's progress was due to his status as Pope's step-son, having been sent by Pope to the college in July 1557, requiring Mr Yelder 'so to instruct' him that he 'may profit in lirnyng' in the hope that he might, having achieved some competence in Latin, be able to return home and work as his step-father's secretary.⁹²

Many of Pope's letters inform Slythurst of gifts which he wished to bestow upon the college. For example, one letter informs the President of the gift of the advowsons of Dumbleton, Cuddesdon and Bradwell, worth between them one hundred and twenty pounds per year, as well as an indenture between Pope and the College granting it the rectory of Garsington. But most of the evidence of Pope's munificence in the letters relates to movable objects. The first, a letter of 23 November 1556

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, ff. 30-31.

⁹⁰ Pope's third wife, Elizabeth, was the widow Anthony Basford or Beresford. John Basford was their only son.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, f. 16v.

⁹² *Ibid.*, f. 12. Basford was a constant source of irritation both to the college and to his step-father, repeatedly desiring to leave the college. On another occasion Lady Pope was particularly put out by his refusal to lend his uncle a horse. f.28.

refers to 'Mr Rawes books which he intendeth to give to my college' before informing Slythurst that he shall receive 'II pair of Sensors of the one facion, II Cruetts, one stupp and one pax of Ivery' and 'V dozen of black chayns for the library...and as moche as it is evill carriage of my organs this Wynter Mr White at my request is content that you shall have his lyttel organs till the beginning of Sommer.'⁹³ This is the only reference I have been able to find to the two Marian founders in direct collaboration. Their previous careers, present positions and intentions for their colleges were different, but from this it is at least evident that they were in correspondence with each other.

In addition to this correspondence the archives of the college contain a number of indentures between Pope and Trinity which were copied into the register. The first, from 5 May 1555 'wytnesethe that the said president, fellowes and schollers have receavede of the said Sir Thomas Pope to the use of the said college suche bokes, parcelles of howseholde stuffe as hereafter followethe.'

The list of books is a remarkable collection of works, ranging from classical texts to the latest anti-reformation tracts. It is in a sense a literary arsenal with which the scholars of Trinity were to be armed in defence of the Marian settlement of religion. 'Suetonius and divers others in one volume', 'the second tome of Aristotle's works' in one volume, 'olde greke expositons' in one volume and 'Aristotle's works written down' in one volume form the classical selection. For scripture, there were the commentaries of Theophylact of Ohrid on the gospels, Clement's concordance of the gospels and his gloss on the Psalms and a book of 'interpretacions... on the olde and newe testaments' which took their place alongside 'the Bible in iii great volumes' and 'one olde bible.'

⁹³ *Ibid.*, f. 4v.

The works of the Church Fathers form the largest section, 'vii partes of St Augustines workes containede in xi volumes with a reportorie to the same', 'vii volumes of St Dionise workes', 'ii volumes of St Chrisostomes workes cont in vii tomes', 'St Ambrose workes in one volume', 'St Gregories workes in one volume', 'St Clemen and Ireneus in one volume', 'Cirilles workes in one volume', 'one volume of Gregor Nyse', 'Athanasius upon paules epistles', 'St Athanasius' workes written' in one volume, 'St Cyprianes workes' on one volume and 'St Augustine on the psalms and others' in one volume.

Yet there was not an exclusive focus on the fathers of the Church to the exclusion of the medieval period. There were two volumes of 'Gersons workes' and three of St Thomas, along with one of 'Barnardes workes', one volume, a commentary, 'uppon the gospelles of Luke and John', by Albert the Great and a volume of Anselm's works. Other texts from a later period seem to have been selected with an eye to countering England's recent schismatic episode, like that of Jean Gerson, who had, despite his leadership of the conciliarist movement, laboured to redress the great schism in the fifteenth century. His two most famous tracts *Trilogus in materia schismatis* and *De unitate Ecclesiae* were probably included in the selection from his writings presented to the college by Pope. Even more striking are the editions of the works by the leading opponents of Henry VIII's reformation presented by the founder; 'John Rofen. [Bishop Fisher of Rochester] againste Luther' and the translation of the life of 'Joh'es Mirandula' by Thomas More. This indenture also contains more functional items, such as 'xii sylver spones' and 'ii table cloths.'⁹⁴

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, ff. 5-6.

The next indenture, from 5 May 1556, is concerned with items donated for use in the Chapel. The list comprises two chalices, 'a pixe of silver', a pax set with stones, 'a chappell cross of copper with Marys and John and a post to the same', a pair of copper censers, two 'pair of latten candlesticks for the alter', a 'holy water stocke' used for the asperges at the beginning of a high mass, a pint bottle made from 'twyne', 'a deske to laye a Masse booke uppon paynted grene', 'a lectern of wayscott for the quere', two 'fair antiphoners of parchmente lyned with gold', a 'fair legant of parchmente lymned with gold' (this was a collection of the lives of the saints), 'a ffaire masse booke of parchement lyned with gold', another of parchement covered with leather, a 'psalter for the quere printed with notes', a 'sute' of red vestments and three albs, two red copes, two yellow copes 'woven with scalopp shelles', a 'sute' of 'vestmentes of blewe velvet', a red cloth, a blue cope and a red cope, 'a cope of whyte damaske', 'a vestment of black velvet for a masse of requiem', another blue vestment with albs and stoles, a vestment of white satten and eight altar cloths including two 'for the alters in the bodye of the Chappile'.⁹⁵

The next indenture was witnessed on 20 January 1557 and contains a list of items and a declaration that the President, fellows and scholars of Trinity 'have borowed of the said Sir Thomas Pope such parcelles of plate and ornamentes of the Church as here followeth.' The list contains thirty three items, some of which seem to be those which Pope had presented the previous year, and the possession of which was now being regularised, but others are new. They include 'a Riche cloth or canapye to hange over the Blessed Sacrament of the Alter made of Cypers and pelted with gold and frynged with silver' and a 'ffair canapy to cary over the blessed Sacrament uppon Corpus Christi daye made of yallowe silke velvet and cloth of golde' with four 'painted staves to carry it.' Processions of the host on Corpus Christi day were of course the practice of the medieval Church, and their resumption under Mary made a defiant claim to the continuity of her Church with that of

⁹⁵ TCA, Reg, f. 6.

her Catholic predecessors. In the new religious environment created by the reigns of Mary's father and brother, these processions asserted the truth of the Catholic view of the sacrament, and the rejection of the novel proscription of it being 'carried about.' Bartolomé Carranza, in his testimony before the Inquisition gave the following account of the procession of the Blessed Sacrament through Kingston upon Thames on the solemnity of Corpus Christi in 1555:

The Lutheran heretics having been removed in England the processions which were customarily made for reverence and veneration of the Most Holy Sacrament,...And thus he [Carranza] organised, in Kingston upon Thames in the aforesaid year 55, a procession with all solemnity, having altars placed in the street, and preaching against what the heretics had done, by preventing the practice of such processions...in this way notable service was done to the Christian religion.⁹⁶

Although we have no evidence of similar processions in Oxford, the provision by Pope of the material necessary for a procession of the Sacrament suggests a desire that such a spectacle of piety and assertion of the claims of the Church should be undertaken by the members of his college.

Pope's provision of articles for use inside the chapel continued throughout the reign. The indenture which had provided the canopy for the procession on Corpus Christi goes on to record that Pope had decided to send 'a fair payr of organs', which he had been unable to send earlier. A 'bayson' which was to 'stande in the bodye of the chapell' arrived with them.⁹⁷ On the twelfth of April a further indenture was witnessed which provided more furnishings for the chapel. Along with two tunicles, a gospel book, a hearse cloth and various other vestments was 'a crucifixe to set at the entry of the qyre', 'an image of the Ressurrection paynted to sit upon the Altar at Easter' and 'a monstrance of silver gilt'.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ John Edwards, 'Corpus Christi at Kingston upon Thames, Bartolomé Carranza and the Eucharist in Medieval England', in Edwards, *Reforming Catholicism*, pp. 139-151 at p. 139.

⁹⁷ TCA, Reg., f. 17

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 18.

The later indentures, those for April 1557 onwards meant that these items continued to belong to Pope, who could recall them at eight days notice should he wish. The significance of this provision is difficult to establish. There is evidence, from sources such as wills, that benefactions to Mary Tudor's Church were occasionally accompanied by provisos for what should occur in the event of a change of religion and Pope, into whose care was entrusted Princess Elizabeth, would have had as good an idea as any of the direction religious policy would take if she succeeded her sister. Yet it is also possible that Pope desired to keep these items in his possession, as a security for his heirs, or in the event that his college would not survive.

It is also worth pondering where Pope had acquired such an array of ecclesiastical goods. Some may well have been commissioned by him, bought from the same sources as those with which Magdalen was embellished, acquired during the great dispersals of Edward's reign, or it is entirely possible that a good proportion came from the religious houses for whose dissolution he had been responsible in the 1530s. At this point, Cardinal Pole's warning to those such as Pope who held monastic land that the papal dispensation which allowed them to continue to do so did not apply to the Church plate and moveable goods which had come into their hands, which should be restored to the Church, may well serve as an explanation both of how Pope came into the possession of these items and his restoration of them to the service of the Church by donating or loaning them to the Chapel of his college.

In addition, then, to the valuable evidence provided by the sources relating to the foundations of Trinity and St John's, which cast much light on the attitude of their founders to learning, and their desire to equip Mary's Church with a literate and devout priesthood, the position of the 'new' colleges on the sites of their monastic predecessors, the pious intention that these institutions should pray regularly for the souls of their founders, together with the supply of Church plate and

vestments, which could well have been loot from the dissolved religious houses, suggest that in this part of Oxford atonement for the dissolution of the Monasteries was being offered.

Conclusion

In the Introduction to this thesis I claimed that it was necessary, before meaningful conclusions could be drawn about the success of Marian Catholicism, that the regime's agenda should first be established. Although the thesis has come to conclusions about the effectiveness of individual schemes and policies it has avoided passing comment on the overall success or failure of the project for Oxford. Two objectives that the evidence presented in the thesis suggests were held by all the main contributors to the government of Marian Oxford were the reconnection of the English Church to the ideas and practices of the Universal Church and the restoration of its traditional devotional life. In the light of this, evidence might be sought in the Wills of those who were members of the Marian University and in the direct influence of continental theologians on its life and teaching. In the conclusion I want to show that this evidence does indeed indicate a measure of success, but takes one only so far in the attempt to come to definitive judgement, before suggesting that in an event which took place in Elizabethan Oxford such an answer, albeit a paradoxical one, may indeed be possible.

The Evidence of Wills

The last wills of members of the University might be expected to contain evidence of their makers' religious ideas, and thus suggest how the Marian religious changes had been embraced by them. Here, I examine some of the wills of members of the University that are transcribed in the records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury for the period between the end of Mary's reign and 1570, twelve years into Elizabeth's. Although the testators whose wills were proved in the Court were necessarily the richer members of the University, its records are nevertheless a useful source since

there is no evidence that religious allegiance in the mid-Tudor University was dictated by an individual's wealth or lack of it.

The hope that the wills might, in their preambles, supply unambiguous evidence of the testator's theological commitment is quite quickly dashed. The preambles of these wills, both Marian and Elizabethan, are curt. For example, that of Thomas Raynold, Cardinal Pole's agent in the University, runs thus: 'ffurst and principallye I commende and bequethe my soul to almightie god, my bodye to be buryed in christen buryall.'¹ Since he was at the time days from death in the Marshalsea, where he was imprisoned for refusing the Oath of Supremacy, it is unlikely that he was dissembling.

A Marian will, that of Christopher Arundell of All Souls College, witnessed on 4 April 1557, opens with a preamble bequeathing his sould 'to Almightye God and my bodie to be buried in that church or Churchyarde wheare it shall please god I shall departe.' And yet contains the following unambiguously Catholic intention

that if I dye so that I buried within the saide colledge I give unto everye fellow and scoller, and servaunte, querister or ells being of the saied colledge sixten pence a peece, and the warden for the tyme beinge double being at my buriall dirige and masse. If my chaunce be not to be buried within the saied colledge, then I give unto the Warden, fellowes and servaunts, being at dirige and masse, to be songe ther for me twelve pence a peece, and to the warden double as before.²

There is then a two-fold problem that is encountered when trying to use the preambles to wills to determine the extent of support for the religious changes in her reign. First, as Professor Duffy identifies, the employment by 'orthodox Catholics' of phrases which express 'faithfulness to a Christocentric Gospel' involves them in no contradiction since, as Marian Catholics emphasised,

¹ PRO Prob.11/43B/703.

² PRO Prob. 11/46/148.

Christocentricity was not the monopoly of Protestants.³ The second problem is that one of the things that can distinguish a Catholic view of the Last Things - the efficacy of prayers and masses said with the intention of the departed's soul - can be confined to bequests. In the case of Christopher Arundell, writing his will in Mary's reign, the purpose of the bequest to the members of All Souls' College can be made explicit but it is not difficult to see how a Catholic writing in Elizabeth's reign could disguise a bequest for masses or prayers by leaving the purpose undefined.

Though such caution would be understandable, some Catholic members of the University nevertheless made open their traditional views in their wills during Elizabeth's reign. Thomas Cooke, a priest and 'one of Quenes Colledge' in his will of 4 January 1560 gave 20s

to be divided to the whole company in the Queen's Colledge in Oxford and vis viiid in gawds...And from the money given to the Queen's Colledge to have a dirge once a year for Thomas Cooke Robart Cooke and Ottewell Topping and our parents.⁴

A middle sort of provision for requiem masses could be made by making a bequest for dirges but indicating how the money given could be put to other uses if such masses were prohibited, as did the will of Thomas Slythurst, the first head of Trinity College, whose will leaves

to my brother Richarde Slythurste that one monthes mynde and xii monthes mynde maye be kepte for me in Trynitie Colledge or ells Magdalen College aforesayde yf the lawes of the Realme shall it permitte otherwise so muche money as shulde have been employed thereupon to be bestowed upon some good and godlye dede or deds by his discretion.⁵

In the preambles to these wills, difficult though they are to interpret, we can note the commitment of some of the leading protagonists of the Marian Counter-Reformation in Oxford to a traditional

³ Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, pp. 518-519.

⁴ PRO Prob. 11/44/326.

⁵ PRO Prob. 11/42B/707.

view of the Last Things and discern something of the hold it continued to exert on some of those influenced by it into Elizabeth's reign.

If the preambles offer hints the benefactions in the Oxford wills display certain other features of life in the University. One such is Christopher Arundell's gift of 'two sackering bells whiche I had out of Cicester Abbey' to his College.⁶ This present is explicit evidence of what was implicit in other evidence: that some of the liturgical objects restored to use in the chapels of the University had been obtained from the dissolved religious houses.

The wills also indicate the the testator's investment in University's teaching, not just in their handy function providing prayers and masses for the departed. Thomas Raynold's will provides for his nephews 'yf they procede in lerninge and comme to the universitie of Oxforde one hundreth pounce.' In the hope that they might advance in the University, Raynold lays down 'that my Scharlett gowne lyned with dousenett and the whode of the same to be safelye kepte and he of my Nephyes that firste precedeth doctor in anye facultye (as I so trustye some of theym will) to have yt.' Should the sum provided for them fail to be used up by his nephews, he willed 'the Residue be quarterly geven to suche poore scholars as were borne where my promociions laye.'⁷

These wills, as has already been indicated, are not easily interpreted and caution should be exercised in making any deductions on their basis alone. All that can be said of them is that they do not invalidate any conclusions drawn on the basis of firmer evidence elsewhere about the vitality and success of Marian Catholicism in Oxford and may perhaps, as in the case of Thomas Cooke,

⁶ PRO Prob. 11/46/148.

⁷ PRO Prob. 11/42B/703.

suggest that its impact continued to be felt in the very different circumstances of early Elizabethan Oxford.

Spanish Influences in Marian Oxford

The presence of Spanish theologians in Oxford during Mary's reign has been mentioned in the section on the trials of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, but it is also necessary to discuss the subject separately because it partly determines how we understand the entire Marian project for Oxford.

The presence of Spanish Dominicans in the University suggests both theological rigor and a certain cosmopolitanism; a suggestion that is relevant to a discussion of the nature of Marian Catholicism within and without the University.

Before considering what was accomplished by the Spanish Dominicans in Oxford it is perhaps worth first reflecting on what ideas were responsible for them being sent there. In December 1555 Pole wrote to the future Cardinal Archbishop of Travi concerning the 'intimate knowledge he has had' of Pedro de Soto and 'what is manifest to everyone with regard to his goodness and piety.' He was thus 'a very fitting instrument for the services of His Holiness and the Apostolic See.'⁸ De Soto came to England in May 1555, at the request of Bartolomé Carranza, to join the retinue of King Philip, whose Father's confessor he had been. There he found a third Spanish Dominican, Juan de Villagarcía. That both De Soto and Villagarcía had experience of Catholic universities, in the case of the former as a professor at the Catholic University of Dillingen in Bavaria and of the latter

⁸ *CSPV*, VI, pt 1, 317.

under Carranza at Valladolid, makes it probable that the King and the Cardinal intended them to work in the Universities.⁹

It is difficult to determine when Pole resolved to import foreign theologians into the Universities, or why Oxford should have been their destination, rather than Cambridge. Since de Soto arrived later than Carranza and Villagarcia it may be that this intention of the Cardinal was only made explicit after the arrival of the King in July 1554.

The decision to send them both to Oxford can I think be explained by two factors. First, a fear that the Catholic cause in Oxford, in the light of the three bishops' imprisonment there and the continuing process against Cranmer, might be in more immediate danger. Secondly, as will be seen, by a desire to found a Dominican house in an English university city, which would require a concentration, rather than a dispersal, of the members of that Order. This is made more probable by part of a dispatch sent by Giovanni Michel, the Venetian Ambassador, on 6 May 1555, which informs the Doge and Senate that de Soto 'has arrived here, called by their Majesties, by the advice of Cardinal Pole, to assist in regulating the affairs of the monasteries and religious institutions.'¹⁰

It is important to consider the intentions behind the dispatch of Villagarcía and de Soto to Oxford because their period there left little behind from which to work out their agenda. This is mainly because their time there was short. De Soto was in Oxford as a professor only for the ten months from October 1555, during which he was also occupied at the London Synod. Villagarcía, as Regius Professor of Theology, was therefore the only permanent Spanish Dominican active in a University

⁹ G. Scott Dixon, 'The princely Reformation in Germany', in Andrew Pettegree (ed.), *The Reformation World* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 152-159; John Edwards, 'Spanish Religious Influence in Marian England' in Loades and Duffy (eds), *The Church of Mary Tudor*, p. 209.

¹⁰ *CSPV*, VI, pt 1, 72.

teaching position after that date.¹¹ Even in his case the evidence is limited. The University Register records his incorporation as Bachelor of Divinity on 14 November 1555 and his taking the doctorate on 11 July 1558.¹² At Magdalen, where he was Reader in Theology from November 1555 until July 1557, the Vice President's Register contains only records of his appointment and replacement.¹³

Both de Soto and Villagarcía were placed in positions in which their lectures would be open to all members of the University, since the Readership in Theology at Magdalen was by the foundation of that college a public one and de Soto's lectures as Regius Professorship were also public. That Villagarcía only held office at Magdalen, while he lived up the High at Lincoln, indicates that these appointments were picked for their strategic importance in the attempt to influence opinion in the University.

The direction in which Pole sought to influence that opinion was, it would appear, toward a renewal of scholastic theology. On 26 October 1555, Pole reported to the King that de Soto found 'scholastic doctrine' was being neglected in the University.¹⁴ This term had technical meaning, since de Soto, Pole reports, suggested as a solution the appointment of a public interpreter of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, a role de Soto would take. The Regius Professorship of Hebrew, which had few pupils, was exchanged for this new position and de Soto is listed in the Dean's Register of Christ Church as occupying that position from October 1555 to August 1556.¹⁵

¹¹ Hegarty, 'Carranza and the English Universities', in Edwards and Truman (eds), *Reforming Catholicism*, pp. 158-159.

¹² Reg. I, ff 155r, 176r.

¹³ MCA, Vice-President's Register, ff 13v, 15v.

¹⁴ *doctrinam scholasticam*.

¹⁵ *CSPV*, VI, pt 1, 256; Hegarty, 'Carranza and the English Universities', in Edwards and Truman (eds), *Reforming Catholicism*, pp. 157-158.

There is a fragment of evidence of this scholastic agenda being pursued in the University in the correspondence between Carranza and Villagarcía. In a letter sent from Brussels on 28 August 1557, Carranza writes, presumably in response to a request from Oxford that ‘there are few copies of the parts of St Thomas, but on my return there [to Antwerp] I will seek them out. The small quarto copies that I had in London your reverence may give to a poor student.’¹⁶ This evidence, in addition to that of the acquisition of scholastic texts by Trinity College discussed in Chapter 4, indicate that the Cardinal’s plan to revitalize the study of scholastic theology in the University, through the work of de Soto and Villagarcía, was at least partially enacted.

Further support for this supposition is found in the evidence of Protestant frustration at the state of the University in the early part of Elizabeth’s reign. John Jewel, formerly public orator of the University and expelled from Corpus Christi College at the start of Mary’s reign, who served as notary to Cranmer and Ridley at their disputation, wrote on 22 May 1559 to Henry Bullinger that:

Our universities are so depressed and ruined, that at Oxford there are scarcely two individuals who think with us, and even they are so dejected and broken in spirit, that they can do nothing. That despicable friar Soto and another Spanish monk, I know not who, have so torn up by the roots all that Peter Martyr had so prosperously planted that they have reduced the vineyard of the Lord into a wilderness. You would scarcely believe do much desolation could have been effected in so short a time.¹⁷

It is odd that de Soto, whose tenure in Oxford was only 10 months should be remembered by name rather than Villagarcía, but perhaps this reflects their comparative influence on the University. Regardless, the contradiction that Jewel here acknowledges, between the influence of Peter Martyr and the effect of the Spanish theologians, is testament to the effect their efforts had.

¹⁶ *Pocas partes de Sto. Thomas ay; pero tornando alla, you las buscare. Las pequeñas de quarto que you tenia en Londres puede v. r. dar a algun estudiante pobre, que assi se lo dixen yo al Prior de San Bartholome. C y P, p. 263.* I am grateful to Mr Rich Rabone for his help with the Spanish translations.

¹⁷ Robinson, *Original Letters*, 33.

Although Carranza's direct influence on the course of events at Oxford was limited, as I have argued in relation to the Visitation, his correspondence with Villagarcía reveals that from a distance he did supply ideas, and champion schemes, that would further the Catholic agenda in Oxford. The correspondence reveals that for much of Villagarcía's time in Oxford, and under Carranza's direction, he was involved in the attempt to establish a permanent Dominican presence in the University.

Villagarcía's suitability for this role is expressed in a letter from Fray Melchor Cano to Carranza and Villagarcía, sent from Valladolid on 29 January 1556. Writing of his grief 'to see Father Fray Juan de Villagarcía out beyond the bounds of this College' he nevertheless hopes that 'you will find much benefit there, for although the Fathers who are here are most learned, they will not bring on pupils: you know what sort of talent is necessary to do so.'¹⁸ Carranza evidently thought that the Dominican house in Oxford would permit the Order to develop indigenous theologians, since he wrote to Villagarcía in September 1557 that:

if the cleric who was formerly a friar wishes to return, your reverence grant him the habit, and do likewise to others, should they come and seem of that sort; no more authority will be necessary for doing so than this, and that which the Cardinal will give to your reverence, or to whoever you think appropriate; for England cannot be peopled by friars from Flanders, though two have been offered to me.¹⁹

This specific case, relating presumably to a friar who had left the religious life at the Dissolution, and now wished to return, would have involved an older man, but we can see in Carranza's

¹⁸ *Al Padre fray Juan de Villagarcía me a pesade de ver fuera deste Colegio, aunque alla hara mucho provecho, le deseo en este lugar, porque aunque los padres presentados son muy religiosos y doctos, no sacaran discipulos, que ya v. p. vee qual a de ser el ingenio que los saque. C y P, p. 257.*

¹⁹ *Si el clerigo que fue fraile quiere tornar, v. r. le de el habito a esse y a otros si vinieren, pareciendo ser tales, y para esto no sera menester mas autohoridad de esta y la que el señor Cardenal dara a v. r. o a la persona que le pareciere, que de frailes de Flandes, qunque se me han ofrecido dar dos, no se puede poblar Ingalaterra. C y P, p. 265.*

response that he hoped the Oxford house might begin to attract younger English men. Carranza apparently appreciated the limits to what could be accomplished by Dominicans from abroad.

The attempt to establish a permanent Dominican presence in Oxford can only be learned about from the letters sent between Carranza and the University. It has left no trace in the archives of the University, nor in the those of the colleges, yet those who founded it believed it to be their most important contribution to the restoration of the University. Both significant and poorly documented, the project is typical of the Spanish contribution to the Marian Church. As John Edwards, who has done much to promote understanding of that contribution writes:

Until recently, it has largely been assumed by British scholars of Mary Tudor's reign that the Spanish churchmen who came to England with Philip played a marginal, or even non-existent, part in religious developments between 1554 and the queen's death.²⁰

Part of the reason that the Dominican house in Oxford has left no evidence of its existence in the Oxford archives is that it had a very short existence, and had thus not long established itself at the time of the Queen's death. It is only in a letter sent from London on 11 May 1557 that the first reference to the specific plan is found, as Carranza reports to Villagarcía that:

of the Oxford house, the Cardinal told me that authority was held by the Mayor who brought the case here, and that the sentence passed on him was that the University could put any scholars it wanted in the house, paying its tribute, which is small; and he says it is the University's privilege. Your reverence will have discovered the truth of the matter. The Cardinal says to purchase this authority from the Mayor. We will see what develops.²¹

From this letter some of the details of the plan emerge. The house, presumably the pre-Reformation Dominican house in Littlegate Street, was now under the control of the Mayor. Once recovered, it

²⁰ Edwards, 'Spanish Religious Influence' in Loades and Duffy (eds.), *The Church of Mary Tudor*, p. 201.

²¹ *De la casa de Oxonia me dixo el Cardenal que el dominio tenia el Mayre que traxo el pleyto aqui y que la sententia que dieron aqui contra el fue que la Universidad pudiese poner en ella los escolares que quisiese, pagando el tributo que tiene la casa, que es poco; y este dize ques privilegio dessa Universidad. V. r. abra sabido alla la verdad dello. Dize el Cardenal que este dominio se comprara al Mayre. Veremos lo que haran. C y P, p. 258.*

would serve as a hall, in which scholars could be housed while they pursued their studies in the University. In this it was to be like the old Religious houses in Oxford which had housed members of the respective orders before the dissolution, and which were discussed in the first chapter. Since the letter refers to ‘any scholars’, it may be that the house would also serve as a lodging for secular students.

Repairs to the house were evidently necessary, for on 13 June 1557 Carranza wrote to Villagarcía that ‘your reverence should see how the house is now, for it is in a better state, although the cost seemed great to me.’²² At the same time as the alterations an attempt was under way to found a female Dominican house in Oxford. In the July Carranza wrote again, reporting that ‘I spoke to the Cardinal yesterday and the order has been given in the [matter of] the Oxford convent, the master of the house has been called, the Chancellor will speak to him and he will be paid, and repairs will begin on the house at once.’²³ The ‘master’ referred to was presumably the owner of the house that was to be converted for the purpose. As for the financing of the restoration, Carranza reports that a gift was received from Francisco Lexalde. Lexalde is referred to in a letter from King Philip in 1576 as ‘the paymaster’, and his involvement in the royal finances in England is established by a reference to him organising the payment of Philip’s English archers in the aftermath of the Queen’s death.²⁴ That the money for the foundation of the Oxford Convent should have come from a member of King Philip’s retinue is evidence of the importance of Dominican revival to the Spanish section of the Court.

²² *V. r. a de ver la disposición de la casa que mejor lesta, aunque me pareció mucho el gasto que me dixo el Preside lincholniense. C y P, p. 260*

²³ *Yo hablé ayer con el Cardenal y ase dado orden en el convento de Oxonia y an llamado al dueño de la casa y hablarle a el Chanciller y sera pagado, y luego se començara a reparar la casa. C y P, p. 261*

²⁴ *C y P, p. 262; CSP Foreign: Elizabeth, 11, 971; CSPS 1558-1567, 1, 4.*

In the August of 1557 Villagarcía had withdrawn from Oxford to the estates of what Carranza refers to as ‘the Cardinal’s family’,²⁵ where he hopes Villagarcía will ‘recover lost strength and rest until beginning study.’ Carranza wrote to him again in September, informing him from Brussels ‘regarding the Oxford house, that possession has been taken of it, though it be with few friars; for, with the house now acquired, God will provide inhabitants for it.’²⁶ The newly restored house was not a sought-after posting for friars in England, however, as Carranza’s next letter refers to a ‘Fray Richardo’ who, if he ‘does not stay long in Oxford, the Cardinal will have to order him to do so.’ It was during Villagarcía’s recuperation that he was informed by Carranza that possession had been taken of the Oxford house in the same month.²⁷

Carranza sought to assist the foundation in January 1558 by sending Friar Bernardo de Celada, a ‘native of Seville, and by the good account I have had from other Fathers of his life and person, I thought him well suited and indeed necessary for your reverence’s company.’²⁸ De Celada was to remain in London until Villagarcía summoned him to Oxford. However, in March de Celada was ordered to stay in London, since Villagarcía apparently had all the colleagues he needed.²⁹ In the

²⁵ *Deseo mucho que quando esta llegase estuviere v. r. ya en fin con la familia de; señor Cardenal, porque en aquellos campos podra mejor cobrar las fuerças perdidas y descansar hasta el principio del estudio. C y P, p. 263.*

²⁶ *A esta hora recivi la carta de v. r. de siete deste y de las casa de Oxonia me plaze mucho que se tome la posesion, aunque sea con pocos failes; que, aviendo casa, Dios proveera quien la pueble. C y P, p. 264.*

²⁷ *Si fr. Richardo no perseverare en Oxonia, sera menester que el Cardenal se lo mande... C y P, p. 265.*

²⁸ *Aqui ha sucedido la venida deste Padre portador desta, natural de Sevilla, y por buena relación que he tenido de otros Padres, de su persona y vida, me parecio cosa conbeniente y necessaria para la compañía de v. r. C y P, p. 268*

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 271.

same letter Carranza declares himself ‘delighted to learn that the Oxford house is going well and is on such good terms.’³⁰

Concerning the Dominican house in Oxford, as with the work of the Spanish theologians in the University, there is then little evidence, and that which there is is fragmentary and contained in second hand reports. Nevertheless, it is possible to say that the Spanish theologians were at least partly responsible for the changes in the teaching of theology in Oxford during Mary’s reign and the successful erection of the Dominican house of study and the Convent constituted an investment in the programme that was being carried out there. With an eye cast towards the reparation of the damage caused by the dissolution of Oxford’s religious houses, and the other to the reassertion of scholastic theology, the Dominican project had much in common with the foundations of Trinity and St John’s colleges, which were considered in the fourth chapter.

Elizabethan Oxford

The transition from the reign of Mary to that of her sister is, as one historian has remarked ‘ill-documented and obscure’ and another ‘complicated and obscure.’³¹ Nevertheless, its main elements were given their fullest expression in the Parliament of 1559 which reestablished the royal Supremacy, repealed the Marian religious legislation, re-imposed a Protestant liturgy on the English Church and once again annexed the revenue from First Fruits and Tenths to the Crown and entitled it to the temporal revenues of episcopal sees in vacancy. And a good number were to find themselves in this state in the aftermath of the Parliament.

³⁰ *Mucho me plaze d saber que la casa de Oxonia vaya tan adelante y este en tan buenos terminos. C y P*, p. 270.

³¹ Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People*, p. 137; Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 234.

By the summer of 1559 all fourteen Marian bishops had been deprived for their refusal to swear the oath declaring the Queen ‘the only Supreme Governor of the Realm...as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal.’³² The two principal legislative ameliorations offered to Catholics; the imposition of the required vestments of the 1549 Prayer Book instead of those of the more radical book of 1552 and the incorporation of the two sentences of the earlier liturgy, which could be interpreted as affirming the real presence of Christ in the sacrament as it was administered were utterly inadequate once the papal supremacy had been denied. That Elizabeth was ‘forced to abandon the hope of persuading even the most *politique* of her Catholic bishops to endorse religious change’ is the greatest testament to the success of the Marian enterprise.³³

For the bench of bishops no longer could Catholicism be a matter of interpreting an ambiguous liturgy in as sympathetic a fashion as possible. In the reign of Edward only the Princess Mary had stayed in England and refused to adopt the new liturgy: in the period after her death fourteen bishops, 137 prebendaries and forty-three holders of high ecclesiastical office followed her example.³⁴ In the light of the claim in the introduction to this thesis that the Marian Counter-Reformation received its fullest expression in Oxford, it is worth examining if this pattern of defiance was found there.

The first stance adopted by the Catholics of the University was actually submission to the new Queen. On 22 November 1558 Dr Tresham, who had assumed the role of *cancellarium natum* on

³² 1 Eliz. I, c. I.11.

³³ Felicity Heal, *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 360.

³⁴ These figures come from Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, pp. 195-197. The prebendaries of whose response to the Elizabethan settlement evidence exists were 261 in number, the ecclesiastical dignitaries were seventy seven.

the death of Pole summoned Convocation and achieved its agreement for sending a congratulatory message to Elizabeth.³⁵ This was then delivered to her by Tresham, Raynolds, Wright and White, who formed the Marian elite of the Convocation and whose action in presenting the letter, accompanied by a present of gloves, drew from Elizabeth the promise to ‘be a future friend to the University.’³⁶ What transpired was hardly what they intended. In late June 1559 Visitors were sent by the Queen to the University, headed by Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely, who was assisted by such Marian conformists as Lord Williams of Thame, Sir John Mason, now restored as the Chancellor of the University, and Walter Wright, the Archdeacon of Oxford. No evidence of their commission, in the form of articles of Inquiry, survives but in the estimation of Anthony Wood its effect was the reversal of the Marian liturgical reforms, the alienation of senior Catholics from their posts and their replacement by those Protestants who had absented themselves at the beginning of the previous reign. ‘No sooner had they entered upon their visitation,’ Wood writes, ‘but they purged all College Chapels of such utensils as they thought superstitious.’³⁷

The statutes of King Edward ‘they brought into use’ as those of Cardinal Pole were ‘annulled.’

Richard Marshall, Dean of Christ Church, refused to acknowledge their authority and was removed to London for imprisonment; Tresham refused the oath of Supremacy and retired to his rectory in Northamptonshire; Richard Smith, also Canon of Christ Church, was expelled and made his way to Douai, where he was to die as Dean in 1563; Seth Holland, Pole’s friend and Warden of All Souls died in prison in 1559; Thomas Raynolds was imprisoned and died shortly afterwards in Exeter; William Cheadsey, President of Corpus Christi, was ejected and his Christ Church canonry filled by Robert Banks who had, in Mary’s reign, been dismissed on account of his marriage. William

³⁵ Reg. I, f. 175v.

³⁶ *Wood*, 2, pt 2, p. 139.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

Wright, President of Balliol; Thomas Slythurst, President of Trinity; George Etheridge, Professor of Greek and Juan de Villagarcia, Professor of Divinity were all removed from their previous perches.³⁸

Faced with submission or departure at Mary's accession, as has been seen, a number of Protestant fellows at various colleges left the University and went into exile. At Magdalen, fourteen Protestant fellows departed in 1553 before the arrival of Gardiner's visitors and Peter Martyr Vermigli left his chair at Christ Church, among other examples. But these departures were as nothing compared to the exodus which followed the Elizabethan settlement. According to Sewell's register of the members of New College, seventy one fellows and scholars left the college between 1558 and 1566. Among those who resigned were Thomas Stapleton, Nicholas Sander and John Fowler, all of whom were to pursue their careers as Catholic theologians on the continent, Fowler as the printer of the works of other Oxford exiles like William Allen and Stapleton and Sander themselves. Another interesting feature of the Register is the high number of fellows who were promoted to benefices in the immediate aftermath of the Queen's death. Between 1547 and 1553, the reign of Edward, only five fellows had taken this path, in Mary's reign the figure was one higher. However, in 1558-9 six fellows were promoted to benefices.³⁹ Without detailed knowledge of their subsequent careers it is impossible to know precisely what lay behind this rush to benefices, although it is not difficult to imagine that preparations akin to those necessary before a campaign of guerilla warfare were in progress.⁴⁰

³⁸ Gerard Kilroy, 'The Queen's Visit to Oxford in 1566: a fresh look at neglected manuscript sources', *Recusant History* 31 (2014), 331-374 at pp. 346-9.

³⁹ Maurice Bullocke, William Dalby, Thomas Davys, Robert Payne, Sextus Quarterman and Gabriel White.

⁴⁰ NCA, 9749, Registrum Protocollorum, 1553-8.

In support of this supposition is the number of expelled or resigning fellows who were ordained to the priesthood in the immediate aftermath of their departure. All six of the fellows of St John's College who departed were ordained to the priesthood soon after. One, William Wygss, was executed for being a 'seminary priest' in 1588. Two departing fellows of All Souls, Thomas Dorman and Thomas Dolman, were ordained. Thomas Ford, sometime Fellow of Trinity College, had been executed for the crime of being a seminary priest six years earlier, followed in 1583 by John Mundlin, a departing fellow of New College.⁴¹

Two of those departing from Corpus Christi College encapsulate the distinct, but equally loyal, courses of action available to Catholics. William Shepery, a linguist, departed for Rome, where his academic prowess made him 'eminent' in the eternal city.⁴² Another, James Fenne, was ejected for refusing to swear the Oath of Supremacy and made his home at Gloucester Hall, whose buildings were 'mostly replenished...with persons of his opinion'. To these he acted as Tutor and, after a time in Somerset, was executed at Tyburn for being a seminary priest in 1584. Like Fenne, George Etheridge remained in Oxford. He practiced medicine and taught Hebrew and Greek in a building known as George Hall, at the end of Cat Street. Here, just across the road from the University Schools in which he had taught officially in happier days, he instructed 'the sons of diverse Catholic gentlemen.'⁴³ Among his pupils was William Gifford, future Archbishop of Rheims. In the list of recusants, compiled in 1577, Etheridge's entry records that he 'commeth never to the Church nor his householde, he receiveth preystes in serving mens apparel disguysed, besides a great number of the towne and countrey that superstitiously resort to his house, to heare a masse.'⁴⁴

⁴¹ Kilroy, 'The Queen's Visit', pp. 346-9.

⁴² *Wood*, 2, pt 2, p. 146.

⁴³ *Wood*, *Athenae Oxoniensis*, 1, p. 547.

⁴⁴ Kilroy, 'The Queen's Visit', p. 346.

A feature of the recusants' pedigrees which is drawn out by Eamon Duffy in the conclusion of *Fires of Faith* is that they were more likely to have been Marian appointees. For example, of the holders of high ecclesiastical office who were deprived under Elizabeth only a fifth were men appointed before Mary's accession. The trend derived from the Register of New College, however, suggest an exception to this. Of the twenty-one fellows who were deprived for their religious beliefs by visitors, a list which does not include Stapleton, Sander or Fowler, and so is evidently not an exhaustive list of those papists who left the college for the sake of religion, only five arrived at New College before the autumn of 1554. All the rest arrived between 1547 and 1553, a statistic which indicates that the strike rate of the college in turning Protestant conformists into Catholic recusants was rather higher than the national average.

Where records were not as meticulously kept as at New College, departing Catholic fellows have left fewer traces. At University College the Register for May 1559 records that in this month the Percy Fellowship, the William of Durham Fellowship, one of the Skirlaw Fellowships and the Otho Hunt Fellowship were all filled. The previous occupiers of these positions had all departed. Indeed, three of the fellowships had only been filled in the previous eighteen months. In November 1562, further attempts were made fill two more vacancies in the fellowship.⁴⁵ The departure of members of the University on the scale indicated by this survey lends credence to Wood's assertion that by 1561 'the University became empty and Learning low.'⁴⁶

Yet in 1566 there was still to be one last, unsuccessful attempt, in the face of the seemingly inexorable tide of events, to save the Marian project and, in affirmation of the contention of this

⁴⁵ University College Archives, GB3/A1/1 ff. 10-11.

⁴⁶ *Wood*, 2, pt 2, p. 147.

thesis that this enterprise received its most clear and vital expression in Oxford, it was in that University that it took place.

The occasion for this attempt on the part of Oxford Catholics to turn back the tide was the visit of Queen Elizabeth in the late summer of 1566. The central event of the visit was a three day cycle of disputations in the University Church. On the first day of the disputation, Tuesday 3 September, Edmund Campion addressed the Queen and the Earl of Leicester, now the Chancellor of the University:

O Jupiter, preserve, I beseech you, these advantages for us: your majesty, your honour; you as a parent and you as our patron; you who thus advise us, you who carry out policy; you who have responsibility for these things and you who adorn our university; you who make us secure and you who make us blessed.

He went on to exhort the Queen to patronise philosophy and ‘the rest of the disciplines of the most prosperous arts.’ Another part of this charm offensive was the gift by Thomas Neale of a book, ‘a topography of the whole university, with genuine pictures of each of the individual schools and colleges, indicating their natural site and form. Bereblock of Exeter made these with his own pen.’ The book was, in short, ‘an extremely learned appeal brochure.’⁴⁷

For these men the University simply was Catholic. The recent history of the University was one of Protestant deprivation and Catholic restoration. In religion, as their subsequent careers show, Neale, Bereblock and Campion shared the Catholic faith, yet this was not the basis on which they appealed to the Queen. The University had become in the reign of Elizabeth’s sister a living assertion of the authenticity of that faith.

⁴⁷ Kilroy, ‘The Queen’s Visit’, pp. 347-8.

But the die was cast even as this appeal was being made. The last disputation, on the Thursday of the Queen's visit was the 'Divinitie' debate. Whereas, under the previous dispensation, 'divinitie' meant scholastic Theology, dominated by the interchange of careful and technical arguments and clarifications, in which the central mysteries of the Christian faith were painstakingly articulated, now the question was 'is it always illegal for a private man to take arms even against an unjust ruler?' The participants had all been incepted within the previous six months, all were members of Magdalen or Christ Church, the only two colleges which the Queen was to visit on account of their newly recovered Protestantism. The marginality of the question for the disputation, determined by the puritan President of Magdalen, Lawrence Humphrey, may well have issued from his understandable desire to avoid discussion on the question of vestments, the most contentious issue in the Church.⁴⁸

In the Autumn following the Queen's visit, the Bishop of Winchester's commissary was insisting on the use of the surplice at Magdalen, impounding forbidden books from the library at New College and expelling Catholic fellows from Corpus. But still some remained, enough to drive out the Protestant president Thomas Greenaway in 1568 and to force shut the gates to impede the entry of the Bishop of Winchester's equally reformed nominee to succeed him. At George Hall, Etheridge continued his lessons until his death in the mid 1580s, having become a figure to whom the nearest historical parallel must be the Japanese Imperial Intelligence Officer Hiroo Onoda who held out in the jungle until 1974, nearly thirty years after Hiroshima and Nagasaki.⁴⁹

In the memorable phrase of Onoda's Emperor, events had not transpired entirely in the interest of Catholics in Oxford, or in England. The Marian moment in the University of Oxford left little

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 353.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 349, 347.

trace of its existence as the institution developed a Protestant, then a less Protestant, and finally a secular identity. That is as it should be. That the theology, liturgy and personnel of the Marian University were of no use whatsoever once the English Church had separated itself from the rest of Christendom is testament first and foremost to their Catholicism. And in that lies Mary's real achievement.

Bibliography Primary Sources

1. Manuscripts

British Library

Additional MS 32, 091
Cotton MS Faustina C/VII
Harleian MS 444.
Lansdowne MS 989

National Archives, Kew

SP 1/137
SP 10/5
SP 69/5/286

Bodleian Archives

MS Top. Oxon e 124/9
Twyne MS vols 2 & 7

Oxford Record Centre

PAR 207/4/ F1/1

Oxford University Archives

Hyp/A/6
NEP/supra/Reg 1
WPβ/B/25
WPβ/M/22

All Souls' College Archives

Computus and Expenses Rolls 1553-1558
CTM, p. 303 nos. 23-24
CTM, p. 379 nos. 1-3

Balliol College Archives

First Latin Register 1514-1682

Christ Church Archives

Chapter Book, 1.

Estate Manuscripts, vol 12 (Tring)

Corpus Christi College Archives

C1/1/3 (Libri Magni III, 1546-1557)

C1/1/4 (Libri Magni IV, 1557-1570)

Magdalen College Archives

VP 1/A1/1 Vice-President's Register

Liber Computi 1547, 1548, 1550, 1551, 1553, 1555, 1558, 1559.

Draft Liber Computi 1556, 1557

Leger E.

New College Archives

Account Rolls 1553-1558.

Registrum Protocolorum

St John's College Archives

ADM 1A/1

MUN XC/1

Trinity College Archives

Miscellaneous Manuscripts, vol 1.

Register A

Computus 1556-7

Charters C/2-5

University College Archives

UC G B3/A1/A1

2. Printed

Anstey, H. (ed.), *Epistolae Academicae Oxon. (Registrum F): a collection of letters and other miscellaneous documents illustrative of academical life and studies at Oxford in the fifteenth century* (2 vols, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1898)

Bloxam, J.R. (ed.), *A register of the presidents, fellows, demies, instructors in grammar and in music, chaplains, clerks, choristers, and other members of Saint Mary Magdalen College in the University of Oxford : from the foundation of the College to the present time* (8 vols, Oxford: W. Graham, 1853-1885)

Bray, G. (ed.), *The Anglican Canons 1529-1947* (2 vols, Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1998)

-----, *Documents of the English Reformation: 1526-1701* (Cambridge, 2004)

Brodrick, G.C. (ed.), *Memorials of Merton College: with biographical notices of the warden and fellows* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885)

Brown, R., Bentick, C. and Brown, H. (eds), *Calendar of State Papers: Venetian* (9 vols, London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1864-98)

Christmas, H. (ed.), *The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D.: sometime Lord Bishop of London, martyr 1555* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843)

Darwall-Smith, R.H. (ed.), *Account Rolls of University College, Oxford* (2 vols, Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, 2001)

Dasent, J.R., *Acts of the Privy Council of England* (32 vols, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1890-1907)

Dickens, A.G., 'Robert Parkyn's Narrative of the Reformation' *English Historical Review* 62 (1947), pp.58-83

Fincham, K. (ed.), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Early Stuart Church* (2 vols, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994)

Frere, W.H. and Kennedy, W. (eds), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation* (3 vols, London: Longmans and Green, 1910)

De Gayangos, P., Mattingly, G., Hume, M.A.S., and Tyler, R. (eds), *Calendar of State Papers: Spanish* (15 vols, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1862-1954)

Gilby, T., (eds), *Summa Theologiae: Latin text and English translation* (61 vols, London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1964-1981)

Guerlac, R. (ed.), *Juan Luis Vives Against the Pseudodialecticians* (London, Dordrecht and Boston: D. Reidel, 1977)

Heywood, J. (ed), *A Collection of Statutes for the University and the Colleges of Cambridge* (London: William Clowes and Sons 1840)

Hughes, P.L. and Larkin, J.F. (eds), *Tudor Royal Proclamations* (3 vols, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1964-1969)

Kenny, J., OP (ed.), *Contra Gentiles by Thomas Aquinas: On the Truth of the Catholic Faith* (New York: Hannover House, 1955-57), 4, ch. 78. Available at dhspriority.org/Thomas/ContraGentiles4.htm/78.

Knighton, C.S. (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers of the Reign of Mary I, 1553-1558* (London, Public Record Office, 1998)

Lamb, J. (ed), *A collection of letters, statutes and other documents from the M.S. Library of Corpus Christi College: illustrative of the History of the University of Cambridge, during the period of the Reformation A.D. MD-MDLXXII* (London, J.W. Parker, 1838)

MacCulloch, D., *Vita Mariae Angliae Reginae of Robert Wingfield of Brantham*, Camden Miscellany XXVIII (London, 1984)

Mayer, T.F. (ed), *The Correspondence of Reginald Pole* (4 vols, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002)

Packer, J.I. and Johnson, O.R. (trans.), *Martin Luther, The Bondage of the Will (De Servo Arbitrio)* (James Clarke, London, 1957)

Pantin, W.A. and Mitchell W.T. (eds), *The Register of Congregation and Convocation: 1448-1463* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972)

Robinson, H. (ed.), *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation written during the reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary chiefly from the archives of Zurich* (2 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846-7)

Rogers, E., (ed.), *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More* (North Stratford, New Hampshire: Ayer Publishing Company, 1970)

Salter, H.E. (ed.), *Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923)

-----, *The Dean's Register of Oriel, 1446-1661* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926)

Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford with Royal patents of Foundations, Injunctions of Visitors and Catalogues of Documents relating to the University, preserved in the Public Record Office: (4 vols, Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1853)

Stamp, A.E. (ed.), *Calendar of Patent Rolls: Philip and Mary* (4 vols, London: Public Record Office 1936-1939)

The Statutes of Trinity College, Oxford: printed by desire of the Commissioners (London: George E Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1855)

Strype, J., *Ecclesiastical Memorials' relating chiefly to religion, and the reformation of it, and the emergencies of the Church of England, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary the First* (3 vols, London: J. Wyatt, 1721)

Tellechea Idígoras, J.I. (ed.), *Fray Bartolomé Carranza y el Cardenal Pole : un navarro en la restauración católica de Inglaterra (1554-1558)* (Pamplona : Diputación Foral de Navarra, Institución Príncipe de Viana, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1977)

Secondary Sources

Articles and Chapters

Barton, J., 'The Faculty of Law' in *HUO*, III, pp. 257-283

Cobbam, A.B., 'Colleges and Halls 1380-1500', in *HUO*, 2, pp. 586-629

Collinson, P., 'The English Reformation' in Bentley, M. (ed.), *The Companion to Historiography* (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 323-347

Courtenay, W.J., 'Theology and Theologians from Ockham to Wycliffe' in *HUO*, II, pp. 2-33

Cross, C., 'Oxford and the Tudor State from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary' in *HUO*, III, pp. 117-150

Dobson, R.B., 'The Religious Orders 1370-1540' in *HUO* I, pp. 581-633

Feingold, M., 'The Humanities' in *HUO*, IV, pp. 211-357

Haigh, C., 'Recent Historiography of the English Reformation', in Haigh, C. (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 19-33

Hegarty, A., 'Carranza and the English universities', in Truman, R. and Edwards, J. (eds), *Reforming Catholicism in the England of Mary Tudor: the Achievement of Bartolomé Carranza* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006) pp. 153-172

Hutton, R., 'Revisionism in Britain', in Bentley, M. (ed.), *The Companion to Historiography* (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 377-394

Ker, N.R., 'The Provision of Books', in *HUO*, III, pp. 441-519

Kilroy, G., 'The Queen's Visit to Oxford in 1566: A Fresh Look at Neglected Manuscript Sources', *Recusant History* 31 (2013), 333-375

Kusukawa, S., 'Law and Gospel: the importance of Philosophy at Reformation Wittenberg', *Journal of the History of Universities* 11 (1992), 33-57

Lang, U.M., 'Tamquam Cor in Pectore: The Eucharistic Tabernacle Before and After Trent.' *Journal of the Institute for Sacred Architecture* 15 (2009), 25-50

Loach, J., 'Conservatism and Consent in Parliament, 1547-59', in Loach, J. and Tittler, R. (eds), *The Mid Tudor Polity* (London: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 9-28

Loach, J., 'The Marian Establishment and the Printing Press', *English Historical Review* 101 (1986), 135-48

Mayer, T. F., 'The Success of Cardinal Pole's Final Legation, in Eamon Duffy and David Loades, eds., *The church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 149-175

McConica, J., 'The Catholic Experience in Tudor Oxford' in McCoog, T.M. (ed.), *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the early English Jesuits* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1996), pp. 29-64

-----'Studies and Faculties' in *HUO*, III, pp. 151-56

-----, 'The Rise of the Undergraduate College' in *HUO*, III, pp. 1-68.

MacCulloch, D., 'Changing perspectives on the English Reformation: the Last Fifty Years', *Studies in Church History* 49 (2013), pp. 282-302

MacCulloch, D., 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies* 30 (1991), pp. 1-19

Pogson, R.H., 'Reginald Pole and the priorities of Government in Mary Tudor's Church', *The Historical Journal*, 18 (1975), 3-20

Rex, R., 'Lady Margaret and her professorship, 1502-1559', in Collinson, P., Rex, R. and Stanton, G., *Lady Margaret Beaufort and her Professors of Divinity at Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 19– 56

Underwood, M., 'John Fisher and the Promotion of Learning', in Bradshaw, B. and Duffy, E. (eds.), *Humanism, Reform and the Reformation: the career of Bishop John Fisher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 25-46

Wizeman, W., 'The Pope the saints and the dead: Carranza and the Marian Theologians', in Truman, R. and Edwards, J. (eds), *Reforming Catholicism in the England of Mary Tudor: the Achievement of Bartolome Carranza* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 115-137

Books

Barron, C.M. and Harper-Bill, C. (eds), *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society. Essays in Honour of F.R.H. Du Boulay* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1985)

Bentley, M. (ed.), *The Companion to Historiography*, (London: Routledge, 1997)

Bernard, G.W., *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the remaking of the English Church* (Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2003)

Catto, J.I. (gen. ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford* (9 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984-1994)

Chapman, M. (ed.), *The Hope of Things to Come* (London: Mowbray, 2010)

- Clark, J.G., *The Religious Orders in Pre-Reformation England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002)
- Collinson, P., *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982)
- Dent, C.M., *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983)
- Dickens, A.G., *The English Reformation* (2nd edition, London: Batsford, 1989)
- , *Late Monasticism and the Reformation* (London: Hambledon 1994)
- Doran, S. and Freeman, T.S. (eds), *Mary Tudor: Old and New Perspectives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)
- Dowling, M., *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (London; Sydney; Dover, New Hampshire: Croom Helm, 1986)
- Duffy, E., *Fires of Faith: Catholic England under Mary Tudor* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009)
- , *The Stripping of the Altars* (2nd Edition, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005)
- and Loades, D. (eds), *The Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)
- Edwards, J., *Mary I: England's Catholic Queen* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011)
- Elton, G.R., *England Under the Tudors* (2nd edition, London: Methuen, 1974)
- Ferrulo, S.C., *The Origins of the University: the Schools of Paris and their critics 1100-1215* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1985)
- Fowler, T., *Corpus Christi* (London: F.E. Robinson, 1898)
- Green, V., *The Commonwealth of Lincoln College 1427-1977* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979)
- Gunn, S.J. and Lindley, P.G. (eds), *Cardinal Wolsey: Church, state and art* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991)
- Gwyn, P., *The King's Cardinal: The Rise and Fall of Thomas Wolsey* (London: Pimlico, 1990)
- Haigh, C., *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)

Harbison, E.H., *Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940)

Heal, F., *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Hook, W.F., *The Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (12 vols, London: R. Bentley, 1861-1884)

Kittelson, J.M. and Transue, P.J. (eds), *Rebirth, Reform and Resilience: Universities in Transition 1300-1700* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1984)

Knowles, D., *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (New York, 1962)

-----, *The Religious Orders in England* (3 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959)

Kristeller, P.O., *Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1974)

Leader, D.R., *The History of the University of Cambridge* (5 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988-2004)

-----, 'Philosophy at Oxford and Cambridge in the fifteenth century', *Journal of the History of Universities*, vol. 6 (1984) pp. 25-46

Loach, J., 'The Marian Establishment and the Printing Press' *English Historical Review* 101 (1986) pp. 135-148

-----, 'Mary Tudor and the Re-Catholicisation of England' *History Today* (November 1994) pp. 16-22

-----, *Parliament and Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1986)

Loades, D., *Mary Tudor: The Tragical History of the First Queen of England* (Kew: National Archives, 2006)

-----, *The Oxford Martyrs* (2nd edition, London: Headstart History, 1992)

-----, *The Reign of Mary Tudor* (2nd Edition, Heinemann, London, 1991)

-----, *Two Tudor Conspiracies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965)

MacCulloch, D., 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies* 30 (1) (January 1991) pp. 1-19

-----, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996)

-----, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: Allen Lane, 1999)

- Mallet, C., *History of the University of Oxford* (3 vols, London: Methuen, 1924-1927)
- Mayer, T.F., *Reginald Pole: Priest and Prophet* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Milne, J.G., *The Early History of Corpus Christi College* (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1946)
- Nichols, A., *Catholics of the Anglican Patrimony: The Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2013)
- Nockles, P.B., *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1766-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Olin, J.C., *Catholic Reform: from Cardinal Ximenes to the Council of Trent* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1990)
- Pechell, J., *The History of the University of Oxford from the death of William the Conqueror, to the demise of Queen Elizabeth* (London: W.Jackson and Lister, 1773)
- Platten, S. (ed), *Anglicanism and the Western Church* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003)
- Podmore, C., *Aspects of Anglican Identity* (London: Church House Publishing, 2005)
- Porter, H.C., *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1972)
- Prescott, H.M.F., *Mary Tudor: The Spanish Tudor* (2nd Edition, London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1952)
- Redworth, G., *In Defence of the Church Catholic: The Life of Stephen Gardiner* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990)
- Rex, R., *The Theology of John Fisher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Richards, J. M., *Mary Tudor* (London: Routledge, 2008)
- Scarisbrick, J.J., *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984)
- Schmitt, C.B., *Aristotle and the Renaissance* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1983)
- Stephens, W., *The Life and Letters of Walter Farquhar Hook* (London: R. Bentley & Son, 1885)
- Surtz, E., *The Praise of Pleasure: Philosophy, Education and Communism in More's Utopia*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957)
- Truman, R. and Edwards, J. (eds), *Reforming Catholicism in the England of Mary Tudor: the Achievement of Bartolome Carranza* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)

Warton, T., *The Life of Sir Thomas Pope: founder of Trinity College Oxford* (London: 1780)

Watson, F., *Vives and the Renaissance Education of Women* (London: Arnold, 1912)

Williams, P., *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995)

Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford; To Which Are Added the Fasti, or Annals of the Said University* (4 volumes; London, 1813-1820)

Wizeman, W., *The Theology and Spirituality of Mary Tudor's Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)

Wooding, L., *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

Zutshi, P. (ed.), *Medieval Cambridge: Essays on the Pre-Reformation University* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993)

Unpublished Thesis

Law, C., *Religious Change in the University of Cambridge, c. 1547 - 84* (unpublished Phd Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2013)

