

University of Oxford

Faculty of History

**‘NOT INFECTED WITH THE VENIME OF THE TIMES’: THE  
RUMP PARLIAMENT AND PLACES OF LEARNING, 1649-53**

Alex Beeton

New College

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Michaelmas Term 2022

## Acknowledgements

My greatest thanks are to my supervisor, Sarah Mortimer, who has offered an enormous amount of advice, guidance, and help over the previous four years of postgraduate studies.

I have accrued debts to many scholars during the writing of this thesis. The following all offered much-appreciated advice or suggestions: John Adamson, Simon Brown, Mordechai Feingold, Jeremy Fradkin, Alasdair Grant, Crawford Gribben, Sundar Henny, Deni Kasa, Anthony Milton, Eric Newton, Gary Rivett, Adam Rose, Karie Schultz, Vasileios Tsakiris, and Elliot Vernon. I am grateful to Simon Brown, Richard Foster, and Jeremy Fradkin for kindly sharing unpublished papers with me, to the History of Parliament Trust for allowing me to see and reference a number of articles in draft, and to the archivists of Trinity College, Cambridge, who generously provided me with a transcript of A.H.F. Boughey's *History* of the college. Stephen Anderson, Rodewald Lecturer in Classical Languages at New College, was remarkably generous with his time and gave me tutorials, *pro bono*, in Latin to improve my reading ability. I am very thankful to him and also to Jon Parkin for all the advice and help he has given me since my undergraduate days.

The nature of this thesis has meant that I have been to many archives, especially in Oxford and Cambridge. Due to the number of individual archivists to whom I am indebted, I hope I will be forgiven for using a general acknowledgement to recognise all the help I received from the staff of the institutions listed in my bibliography, particularly some exceptionally kind acts during the challenging circumstances of the Covid pandemic.

Several brave souls read various drafts of chapters or related pieces including Sophie Aldred, Eli Bernstein, Ellen Paterson, and Will White. David Scott was remarkably kind and read the entire thesis in draft. Hannah Lee deserves special thanks for being a consistently insightful and supportive friend during our doctorate studies, reading and commenting on numerous drafts and offering suggestions in a diplomatic manner. I am very grateful to them all and any mistake are my own.

Shuttling between archives in Cambridge, London, Oxford, and Winchester has left me indebted to many hosts, especially in London. Thank you to the Hugo family, and Katie and Fernando who put me up several times. For the easy walking distance to Lambeth Palace and Westminster Abbey Libraries they provided, I am particularly grateful to Hugh, Ronny, and George. One of the joys of travelling to Cambridge was the excuse to see my father's family more often, especially my grandparents Ken and Julie Beeton.

I would also like to use these acknowledgements to celebrate two weddings which happened during the final stages of my thesis. The first, in May 2022, was the marriage of two old friends, Ștefan Dascălu and Andreea Itu. The second, in July, was that of my brother, James Beeton, to El Pickering. These were happy reasons not to think about the Rump Parliament.

On another personal note, I am very grateful to several people without whom I would not have been able to produce this thesis. My parents, Danny and Su Beeton, have been

supportive throughout my undergraduate and postgraduate studies and always enthusiastic about my research plans. Writing a thesis can be a miserable experience and I have been lucky to have had their encouragement and also that of a wonderful partner. Emily Kent, while writing her own thesis, has endured over three years of hearing me talk about obscure parliamentary committees and read hundreds of thousands of words about them. Her patience is remarkable, and I could not have done this project without her support and love.

This thesis is dedicated to my grandfather, Medhat Lutfi, and my late grandmother, Joy Lutfi.

## Contents

<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Short Abstract.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Long Abstract .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Abbreviations and Conventions .....</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>Introduction ‘Moses and his Myrmidons’: The Rump Parliament, Committees, and Places of Learning .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 1 ‘Some useless Courts and Committees’: The Role of the CRU.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Chapter 2 ‘The real beginning of state aid to education’? The Funding and Material Improvement of Educational Institutions .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Chapter 3 ‘Stopping ‘the mouthes of vaine men’: The Learned Ministry in Commonwealth England.....</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Chapter 4 ‘A shame to bee out of a prison, or in a Felloship’: Cooperation and Education.....</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>Chapter 5 ‘Work half done’? Republicanism, Dissent, and Places of Learning .....</b>	<b>216</b>
<b>Chapter 6 ‘Promoting learning and piety in those poor rude and ignorant parts’: Propagation and Education in Commonwealth England .....</b>	<b>266</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>309</b>
<b>Appendix 1: A Calendar of Attendance at the CRU .....</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>Appendix 2: A Summary Calendar of Attendance at the Committee and Board of Governors of Westminster School, April 1649-April 1652 .....</b>	<b>326</b>

**Appendix 3: A Summary Calendar of Attendance at the CPM, April 1651-April 1653**

.....330

**Bibliography**.....337

## Short Abstract

This thesis explores the role of the parliamentary state in places of education during the period of the Rump Parliament (1649-53) by focusing on the committee for regulating the universities (CRU). Although there are many studies devoted to education and its reform during this period, the role of the state in this sphere is largely overlooked. This thesis addresses this oversight, demonstrating that the Commonwealth government and the regimes of the 1640s and 1650s more widely were important agents in educational matters and were deeply involved in places of learning. The Rump's priorities for schools and universities are analysed and it is shown that the government wished to work inside the traditional structure of educational institutions rather than to overhaul them.

This thesis also offers a fresh approach to the Commonwealth government and period. Historians often examine the Rump through its legislation and events at Westminster which results in a depiction of the government's life as characterised by infrequent spasms of activity. The study below challenges this interpretation and argues that the regime ought to be analysed through the workings of its committees, like the CRU, and the implementation of its rule in institutional or local contexts. As is demonstrated, it is necessary to look at both the centre and the localities when discussing the Rump. This thesis thus focuses on both the members of government and those of educational establishments, examining the agency of the latter group and illustrating the widespread existence of cooperation and consensus in the period. To achieve its aims, this thesis adopts an archive-based approach and uses the records of numerous places of learning, including many not often included in histories of the period or education. New perspectives on both the Rump and key Commonwealth issues, including the ministry and propagation, emerge as a result.

## Long Abstract

This thesis revises the understanding of two major historiographical topics: the history of education during the British civil wars and Interregnum, and the English Commonwealth (1649-53). It addresses these subjects by investigating the work of the Rump Parliament in educational institutions through its committees, especially the committee for regulating the universities (CRU). Ultimately, it argues that the Commonwealth government can only be understood by looking at the work of its committees. Such an analysis reveals that the parliamentary state exercised a dominant influence over educational reform and educational institutions, and furthermore that there were important trends of cooperation and consensus in Commonwealth England which are easily overlooked.

There has long been energetic debate about the relative merits and failures of the Rump Parliament. Although traditionally depicted in a predominantly pessimistic manner, historians in more recent decades have drawn attention to the successes of the government and its vitality. However, the idea of the Rump as characterised by indolence punctuated by sudden bursts of activity at the instigation of events or external pressure groups such as the New Model Army continues to hold sway. This thesis contributes to revisions of the Commonwealth's reputation by challenging this characterisation, although it largely avoids the much-discussed topics of the government's strengths and flaws. Whereas previous studies have traditionally focused on the evidence of the government's legislation and developments at Westminster, this study concentrates on the implementation of the Rump's rule in local and institutional contexts through its committees and the motivations underlying their work. The result is a fresh image of a government that was active continuously

throughout the period, driven by identifiable concerns beyond its own survival, and arguably more confident in wielding its ecclesiastical and executive powers.

Education is shown to have been a priority of the Rump. Traditionally, the governments of the 1640s and 1650s are depicted as marginal figures in the history of education. Since the Second World War, it has become increasingly common among historians to depict educational reform in those crucial decades as dominated by extra-parliamentary individuals or groups, especially the Hartlib Circle. Compared to these innovative and well-known figures, the regimes of the time are seen as conservative, unimaginative, and apathetic to the renovation of learning. In other words, they are depicted as unwilling to intervene bar for purely political reasons, such as the removal of political enemies, as well as willing to allow educational institutions to continue unchanged. This thesis challenges these views and their implicit equation of a conservative approach with apathy. It is shown that education was a critical issue for the parliamentary state, not least because of its desire to continue producing a university-educated ministry.

The Rump was heavily involved in places of learning and attempted to act within the pre-existing structure of these institutions, especially through its committees. Its approach was essentially pragmatic, conservative, and uninterested in innovation. However, that is not the same as lacking an agenda; as is demonstrated, the Rump stood within a long-standing Puritan reforming tradition. The government showed little concern with changing what was learned or transforming places of learning into seminaries of republicanism. However, the goals of state intervention were clear: to restore places of learning to a position of administrative and financial stability after the chaos of the 1640s; to return some measure

of autonomy to them after their personnel had been suitably purged or shown to accept the authority of Parliament on a *de facto* basis; to ensure that traditional educational practices were rigorously executed; and to improve the morality of the institutions. This thesis demonstrates the need to take the Rump's agenda for education seriously and to place the parliamentary state at the centre of the history of education in the revolutionary decades.

This study also shows the necessity of looking beyond the work of the Rump at Westminster to understand the Commonwealth period. This thesis pays as much attention to the educational institutions and individuals within them as it does to the government, arguing that it is crucial to analyse the relationship between centre and locality when explaining the rule of the Rump and developments inside places of learning. One result of this attention to the localities is to demonstrate the agency of individuals and communities outside Westminster. As is shown repeatedly, the Rump's rule of educational institutions was a two-way street with the ruled often determining events as much as the rulers.

The study of those people inside places of learning also allows this thesis to challenge perceptions of the Commonwealth as a fractious period marked by segregation along denominational and political lines. Such hostility did exist, but only alongside widespread trends of cooperation and consensus. It is common to believe that the universities and schools were split between those opposed and those in favour of the Commonwealth, a characterisation promoted especially fervently after the Restoration. However, this study's granular approach, focusing on how places of learning were actually managed and how issues such as dissent were handled, exposes a very different image. Specifically, it is revealed that educational institutions in this period relied on the willingness of different

political or confessional allegiances to cooperate in the quotidian affairs of institutional business. Cooperation was a prominent theme in Commonwealth places of learning as was pragmatism, with many proving willing to trim their sails or overlook evidence of disaffection in favour of the successful continuation of places of learning.

It is shown that underlying this aforementioned trend of collaboration was a broad consensus over education. By this is meant the need to promote education and defend the existing educational structure in England for reasons rooted in tradition, especially the training of the English ministry. The evidence of widespread areas of agreement over matters relating to places of learning undermines notions of a Commonwealth society fiercely divided amongst itself and helps to explain their readiness to cooperate. The willingness of diverse individuals to work together over educational issues is demonstrated to have been present as much among MPs as scholars, with the committeemen of the CRU shown to have represented a wide spectrum of Rump opinions. By highlighting this consensus and cooperation in Commonwealth England, this thesis contributes to recent historiographical trends revealing these same tendencies and furthermore the continuity connecting the Interregnum with the wider course of seventeenth-century British history.

To achieve its dual focus — on both Westminster and multiple educational institutions — this thesis makes extensive use of archival materials held by, or relating to, the universities and constituent colleges of Cambridge and Oxford, the colleges of Gresham, Manchester, and Sion, and the schools of Eton, Westminster, and Winchester. These eight institutions, and the university colleges, were not chosen randomly but rather due to the fact that all were given to parliamentary committees: seven were within the remit of the CRU

while the eighth, Westminster, was ruled by a parliamentary committee then a board of governors. These institutions therefore form a coherent set of examples with which to examine the relationship between the parliamentary state and places of learning. This thesis also emphasizes the importance of treating these places of learning as a group linked by contemporary ideas about the advancement of learning and piety, as influenced by national concerns regarding educational reform.

The protagonist of this thesis is the CRU. Although never before researched in any depth, the committee was the Rump's most important body for educational matters and possessed a wide remit. Alongside its responsibilities in education, it also played a role in ecclesiastical matters, directing the work of the trustees for maintenance of preaching ministers. The CRU's lifespan, May 1649-April 1652, largely overlaps with that of the Rump and so acts as a useful case study for investigating the government's relationship with education. This thesis does also look beyond the Commonwealth period to discuss the role of the parliamentary state during the 1640s and 1650s in the sphere of pedagogy more widely. However, this study maintains a focus on the CRU and offers the first sustained analysis of its work, agenda, and personnel.

This thesis is structured thematically rather than chronologically. An introduction sets out its themes and arguments and establishes the necessary historical and historiographical background, explaining how historians have marginalised the parliamentary state within the history of education and perceive the Rump in largely negative terms based on its legislative record. Chapter one explores the role of the CRU in places of learning, arguing that it acted as an influential external authority. A study of its

work highlights the widespread difficulties facing places of learning following the 1640s, the Rump's involvement in educational affairs, and their essentially conservative attitude toward educational institutions. The government wanted to restore autonomy to places of learning and wished to work through institutional authorities. As the problems caused by the wars dissipated and governance was devolved, the need for such a committee dissipated, contributing to its demise. Chapter two details the CRU and Rump's vigorous efforts to address the common material and financial problems facing places of learning. The work by those outside Parliament to address the same issues is also discussed, revealing the broad consensus over many aspects of education and the ability of those in the localities to influence events. Chapter three examines the issue of ministerial education in Commonwealth England and emphasises the connections between developments in education and in the English church during the Interregnum. The contextual importance of producing an educated ministry is discussed, where it is shown that notions of what constituted a minister changed during the Commonwealth to emphasise the importance of a learned minister who could carry out the ministry of the word over other considerations. The production of the learned ministry was key to the Rump, and this concern is shown to have influenced their approach to educational reform.

The next two chapters alter the focus of the thesis to analyse those who sat on the parliamentary committees and those who filled the academic establishments. Chapter four investigates the management of places of learning, both among the MPs sitting on the CRU and among university, college, and school officials. Through reconstruction of the calendars of attendance for the CRU, the committee for plundered ministers, and the committee/board of Westminster College, it is shown that there was far more collaboration between individuals of different political or denominational allegiances in these years than previously

thought. The implicit pragmatism beneath this cooperation is made more explicit in chapter five, which examines dissent and republicanism inside places of learning. It is argued that the Rump did not attempt to impose an ideological uniformity inside these institutions, nor did they desire to turn them into fountains of republicanism which would see them cracking down on all dissent. Instead, disaffection was overlooked within certain circumstances.

The final chapter of this thesis demonstrates how several of the themes identified inside places of learning were also evident in the wider country. By analysing the issue of Commonwealth propagation, the chapter reveals the breadth of consensus within republican England over educational matters. It also offers a revision of the current understanding of propagation, showing it to have been more popular than previously thought. Propagation was pursued in the localities as well as at Westminster and was furthermore considered in an international rather than solely British or trans-Atlantic context. It also is demonstrated that education was integral to many evangelical schemes.

Since education is a topic which overlaps with so many other key themes of the revolutionary decades — including the church and its ministry, the powers of the magistrate, and republicanism — this study has implications which extend beyond the four years of republican rule. Therefore, although its focus is on a relatively brief window, this thesis not only offers a fresh perspective on the Commonwealth and the Rump Parliament's relationship with education, but on some of the major issues in Interregnum Britain.

## Abbreviations and Conventions

### Abbreviations

<i>A&amp;O</i>	<i>Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-60</i> , ed. C.H. Firth & R.S. Rait (3 vols, London, 1911)
BL	British Library
Bodl.	Bodleian Library
Burrows, <i>Register</i>	<i>The Register of the Visitors of the University of Oxford, from A.D. 1647 to A.D. 1658</i> , ed., M. Burrows, Camden Society, 133 (London, 1881)
CA	College Archives
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Journals of the House of Commons</i>
CPM	Committee for Plundered Ministers
CRU	Committee for Regulating the Universities
CUL	Cambridge University Library
ECR	Eton College Records
GL	Guildhall Library
<i>HJ</i>	<i>The Historical Journal</i>
HP	The Hartlib Papers, University of Sheffield
HRO	Hampshire Record Office
<i>HLQ</i>	<i>Huntington Library Quarterly</i>

<i>JBS</i>	<i>Journal of British Studies</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>The Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>LJ</i>	<i>Journals of the House of Lords</i>
LMA	London Metropolitan Archives
LPL	Lambeth Palace Library
MCA	Mercers' Company Archives
<i>ODNB</i>	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i>
OUA	Oxford University Archives
<i>P&amp;P</i>	<i>Past and Present</i>
Reinhart, <i>Oxford</i>	T.E. Reinhart, 'The Parliamentary Visitation of Oxford University, 1646-1652' (Ph.D. thesis, Brown University, 1984).
TNA	The National Archives
<i>TRHS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>
Twigg, <i>Cambridge</i>	J. Twigg, <i>The University of Cambridge and the English Revolution 1625-1688</i> (Woodbridge, 1990).
WAM	Westminster Abbey Muniments
WCA	Winchester College Archives
Wood, <i>Annals</i>	A. Wood, <i>The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford...</i> , ed. J. Gutch (2 vols, Oxford, 1796).

Worden, *Oxford*      B. Worden 'Politics, Piety, and Learning: Cromwellian Oxford', in his *God's Instruments, Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford, 2012), 91-193.

Worden, *Rump*      B. Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653* (Cambridge, 1974)

### **Conventions**

Original spelling has been maintained, except that the use of u/v has been modernised and the contractions 'y' for 'th', 'ym' for 'them', 'yt' for 'that', and '&' for 'and' have been silently expanded. Dates are given in the Old Style, though the year is taken to begin on 1 January.

## Introduction

### 'Moses and his Myrmidons': The Rump Parliament, Committees, and Places of Learning

In late 1649 and early 1650, John Houghton, a fellow of Brasenose College in Oxford, wrote two letters to the college's former head, the royalist Thomas Yates.<sup>1</sup> Describing life under the newly intruded college master, the parliamentarian Daniel Greenwood, Houghton emphasized his own misery. He had been 'layd aside as uselesse' by the new master and fellows whom he labelled 'Moses and his Myrmidons'.<sup>2</sup> As the nickname suggests, Houghton believed the changes wrought in Oxford by the parliamentary state which had triumphed in the civil wars were to the university's detriment. Predictably, parliamentarians disagreed. Several years later, the Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell would paint a very different picture of the universities under Parliament, praising them and stating his belief 'that God hath, for the Ministry, a very great seed in the youth in the Universities'.<sup>3</sup> Cromwell and Houghton's opinions were different, but they both indicate how perceptions of parliamentary rule of educational institutions were gestating as early as the Interregnum itself. Parliament's victory in the British civil wars had given it control of places of learning and, as Houghton found, the regimes of the Interregnum made use of this new authority. This thesis examines the relationship between Parliament and educational institutions during the time of the English Commonwealth (1649-53). Its overarching point is to show that the Rump Parliament cannot be understood without analysing the work of its committees, using its work in the sphere of education as an important case study.

---

<sup>1</sup> For Brasenose in the period and Greenwood's rule, see J.M. Crook, *Brasenose: The Biography of an Oxford College* (Oxford, 2008).

<sup>2</sup> Brasenose CA, GOV 6 B1 Juramenta (Folder 21), letter of John Houghton to Thomas Yates, 11 January 1649/50.

<sup>3</sup> *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, ed. T. Carlyle (4 vols, Leipzig, 1861), iii, p. 422.

To make its argument, this thesis is largely focussed on a single parliamentary body, the committee for regulating the universities (CRU).<sup>4</sup> This group, which was created in May 1649 and dissolved almost exactly three years later in late April 1652, was the Rump's major educational committee and one of the most important and powerful bodies dealing with the issue during the Interregnum. The CRU is the protagonist of this study, receiving its first in-depth study, but the intention of this work is to use it as a means to explore the Rump's actions and its rule in institutional contexts at a quotidian level. This thesis shows that the parliamentary state was a major influence in English education during the time of the Rump but is intended to be a two-way study, examining those inside places of learning as well as at Westminster. The relationship between centre and locality during the Commonwealth period is a recurring theme within this thesis and the actions of college officials and individuals are thoroughly examined.

A study of the parliamentary state in education is also a means to investigate several other important topics in the revolutionary decades. Education was an issue which touched on some of the most pressing questions of the Interregnum including the formation of a new republican culture and the role of the civil magistrate in spiritual matters. An analysis of developments inside pedagogical establishments therefore offers a new perspective on these issues and the Rump's handling of them. In particular, it sheds light on the English Church and its ministry. Contemporaries of the Commonwealth understood education and religion to be inextricably linked. It was in schools and universities that students were introduced to Christian orthodoxy and, importantly, where ministers were trained. As the Cambridge

---

<sup>4</sup> The CRU was known by several other variations, the most common of which were: reforming the/reformation of/regulation of the universities.

college head Herbert Palmer warned the Parliament in 1643, they needed to ‘Secure youth in the Universities, and Schools, with the utmost of care...The young ones are the hopes or the bane of the Church and State in the next 20, or 10, or 7 years.’<sup>5</sup> Any study of education during the Commonwealth is therefore also a study of church history and a chance to see how notions of the ministry changed. However, an examination of the Commonwealth years necessarily starts *in medias res*. The remainder of this introduction therefore establishes the context for the subsequent chapters, including the state of the historiographical field on educational reform and the Rump, the themes and source base of the thesis, and a chapter outline. Before these sections, however, it is necessary to situate this thesis and the role of the CRU through a historical sketch.

---

<sup>5</sup> Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 110.

## **I: To ‘Purge the Fountains of Learning’: Parliamentary Educational Reform and the Creation of the CRU**

The Rump continued rather than began a process of educational reform. Since the beginning of the 1640s, Parliament had sought the right to police and alter places of learning. In the Grand Remonstrance they had called for the king to allow reform of the universities and themselves pledged to ‘reform and purge the fountains of learning, the two Universities’.<sup>6</sup> Later peace proposals, such as Newcastle and Newport, had similarly called for the king to allow the Parliament to carry out reforms of the universities and several schools.<sup>7</sup> During the first half of the 1640s, several institutions which fell under Parliamentary control were visited by government agents. Cambridge, Eton, and Westminster all received significant attention from Parliament before the end of the first civil war, and all underwent a similar type of reformation.<sup>8</sup> Personnel considered politically malignant by Parliament were ejected, more amenable persons appointed, and perceived Laudian innovations were removed.<sup>9</sup>

As the 1640s wore on, Oxford and Winchester fell under Parliamentary control. They experienced similar changes to their peers. Winchester was visited by the committee for Hampshire with the aim of removing any political or religious malignants.<sup>10</sup> Thanks to the

---

<sup>6</sup> *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660*, ed. S.R. Gardiner, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn (Oxford, 1906), p. 230.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 293; *LJ*, x, p. 526.

<sup>8</sup> There are multiple references to the three institutions together in the journals of the Commons and Lords. For ordinances see, *A&O*, i, pp. 371-2, 758, 803-5, 830-1. See the bibliography for institutional histories.

<sup>9</sup> There had been ordinances in the 1640s for removing Laudian innovations or unwanted aspects of the Caroline church, *A&O*, i, pp. 265-6, 425-6, 582-607, 755-7. See also, *ibid.*, p. 1009 for an ordinance disabling those who had borne arms against Parliament from holding office.

<sup>10</sup> *WCA*, 445. See also, *WCA*, 430 (letter addressed to Lord Commissioner Lisle).

college having several important friends on the county committee, its members survived *in situ*.<sup>11</sup> The largely royalist membership of Oxford did not enjoy such an escape. Although many individual members avoided ejection thanks to parliamentary friends, the visitation of the former royalist capital was far more stringent. A board of visitors with a London-based committee of appeal was established by Parliament in 1647.<sup>12</sup> Urged on by preachers like Henry Wilkinson, who also served as a visitor, to purge the ‘Augean stable’ of Oxford, the Parliamentary commissioners oversaw a very thorough purge of royalist members in 1648.<sup>13</sup> New appointments were made to fill the many new gaps with a number of candidates coming from already reformed Cambridge.<sup>14</sup> The effect of the Oxford visitation was certainly felt to be enormous. One contemporary pamphlet described it as like a world after the flood, while a satirical poem, *Rustica Academiae Oxoniensis*, discussed the need to search for ‘Oxonium *in* Oxonio’.<sup>15</sup> There is good reason to take this royalist lament with a pinch of salt, as is shown later in this thesis. Nevertheless, the belief that significant changes were made by the Long Parliament was widespread and justified. By the dawn of the Commonwealth, the institutions named in the peace proposals had all been reformed by Parliament in some way. All had undergone a similar type of reform aimed at removing politically or religiously malignant personnel or practices, though the effectiveness of these changes varied.

---

<sup>11</sup> Bodl., MS J. Walker C. 2, f. 138r; WCA, 445. See also, T.F. Kirby, *Annals of Winchester College, from Its Foundation in the Year 1382 to the Present Time* (London, 1892), pp. 334-41, and A.F. Leach, *A History of Winchester College* (London, 1899), pp. 347-9.

<sup>12</sup> For the ordinances relating to the visitation of Oxford see, *A&O*, i, pp. 925-7, 995-6, 1001-2, 1143.

<sup>13</sup> H. Wilkinson, *Miranda, Stupenda...* (London, 1646), p. 27. Wilkinson’s namesake, the Henry Wilkinson who was sometime principal of Magdalen Hall, used equally harsh rhetoric. In 1648, in a sermon preached in the university church, he urged the visitors to ‘make a thorough reformation, not to leave any thinge of Baal, not the stumpe of Dagon, that they leave neither roote nor branch of the old stocke.’ (Bodl., MS Wood F.35, f. 333v).

<sup>14</sup> Wood, *Annals*, p. 634.

<sup>15</sup> [J. Allibond,] *Rustica Academiae Oxoniensis Nuper Reformatae...* [London, 1648]; [J. Cleveland,] *Midsummer-Moone, or, Lunacy Rampant...* (1648), p. 4.

However, a number of people both inside and outside Parliament felt that the institutions had not been fully corrected, that changes still needed to be made, and the state's involvement in education reform needed to be continued. In April 1649, some inhabitants of Oxfordshire presented a petition to the Parliament urging further reformation in both the city and the university of Oxford and calling for the regime to ensure the visitors were well-affected to reform.<sup>16</sup> John Hall, an Oxford scholar, aptly noted in a 1649 petition to Parliament that the reforms of the Long Parliament to education 'reached no further then Politicall aimes', such as the purge of royalist personnel, and 'medled not at all with a view or reformation of those fundamental constitutions'.<sup>17</sup> It was also clear that ejections had not succeeded in creating harmoniously parliamentary places of learning. Throughout the 1650s, college members, like John Beardmore of Clare College, Cambridge, noted 'a kind of feud' between 'the old and the new Fellows', and although this thesis challenges the idea of institutions being segregated along political loyalties there was evidently much ill-feeling within them.<sup>18</sup> Beyond the success of the ejections, Hall was also pointing to a fundamental concern with educational reform: that it ought not to be limited to the replacement of malignants, but should involve lasting improvements to the practices of institutions. Thomas Goodwin, master of Magdalen College, Oxford, in the 1650s, described this desire for real change when he wrote: 'In this University of Oxon we have had puttings out and puttings in, but where is putting off the old nature and putting on the new?'<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> OUA, NEP/supra/23.

<sup>17</sup> J. H[all], *An Humble Motion to the Parliament of England Concerning the Advancement of Learning, and Reformation of the Universities*, by J.H. (London, 1649), p. 5.

<sup>18</sup> Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 120.

<sup>19</sup> Quoted in S.P. Fienberg, 'Thomas Goodwin, Puritan Pastor and Independent Divine' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1974), p. 278.

The Rump showed its commitment to further educational reform early in its reign. The primary proof of this interest in continued reform can be seen in the creation of a new committee, the CRU. The committee was formed abruptly on 4 May 1649. The House was considering a petition from the fellows of Gonville and Caius for William Dell, an army chaplain, to become their master. The Commons granted their wish and then, seemingly with the business of Cambridge in their minds, decided to refer the regulation of Cambridge and Winchester College to the pre-existing committee for regulating Oxford University.<sup>20</sup> The decision appears sudden, an impression strengthened by the laconic style of the *Commons' Journals*, but it ought to be understood within the longer story of 1640s educational reform. Not only did it demonstrate the Rump shared the same concerns in the matter as its predecessor, but there were direct links between the CRU and earlier bodies. A committee of the same name had existed under the chairmanship of Sir Robert Harley in the early 1640s before seemingly lapsing in 1642.<sup>21</sup> The new CRU, as mentioned above, was essentially an expansion of the Long Parliament's committee for regulating Oxford University and the existing chairman, Francis Rous, continued in his post.<sup>22</sup>

These points of continuity are important to note because, as shown throughout this thesis, the CRU did not represent a Commonwealth desire to overhaul places of learning. Rather, it was intended to continue the work of the 1640s and make improvements: to

---

<sup>20</sup> *CJ*, vi, pp. 200-1, 219.

<sup>21</sup> For Harley being in the chair, *CJ*, ii, pp. 92, 126, 318. An indication that the original CRU was moribund by 1642 may be seen by the attempts to revive it in June 1641, and in February and March 1642 [*CJ*, ii, pp. 167, 425, 478].

<sup>22</sup> Rous, provost of Eton since 1644, seems to have brought with him the clerk for the CRU, Robert Needler, from the school. Needler was a junior clerk at Eton under Rous, being paid to copy out the audit books in the late 1640s and for providing a new register book in 1652-3 and then remembered in Rous's will. [K. Dexter, *'A Good Quire of Voices': The Provision of Choral Music at St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, and Eton College, c.1640-1733*, p. 15. For Rous' will, TNA, PROB 11/287/260. For Needler writing the audit books and other duties or charges at Eton, during the Commonwealth and before, ECR, 62/10, ff. 229, 271, 308, 429, 463-4. See also *ibid.*, f. 381.

‘reform [the] reformation’, in the words of the antiquarian Anthony Wood.<sup>23</sup> Like the committee for Oxford, the CRU was supposed to act as a court of appeal to boards of university visitors who would carry out the day-to-day business of reform with powers to adjudicate all matters relating to the ‘Laws and Statutes of this Realm’ or ‘the Customes of Statutes’ of the institution.<sup>24</sup> The committee was given a wide remit — in May 1649 Eton was added to its purview, joined in May 1651 by the colleges of Gresham, Manchester, and Sion — but not a new purpose and so was designed to pursue the same type of changes Parliament had overseen in the 1640s, dealing with troublesome individuals and removing egregious faults but essentially working within the existing educational structure.<sup>25</sup> The largely pragmatic approach of the committee was mirrored by the identities of its frequent attendees. James Chaloner, Michael Oldisworth, and Francis Rous appeared most often at the committee and all were at various points its chairmen.<sup>26</sup> Although Chaloner had links to the Rump’s republican faction via his brother, Thomas, all three were essentially political conservatives and their political leanings, as will be explored throughout this thesis, were representative of the committee’s focus on preserving the traditional system of education.<sup>27</sup>

While not a revolutionary body, the CRU was a significant indication of the continued parliamentary enthusiasm for reforming educational institutions. The extent of the committee’s remit was vast and its powers were increased when it received authority over the trustees for maintenance of public ministers in June 1650, effectively giving it control

---

<sup>23</sup> Wood, *Annals*, p. 634.

<sup>24</sup> *A&O*, i, pp. 925-7. The visitors for Oxford sat throughout the CRU’s lifespan. Much less is known about the Cambridge visitors than their Oxford peers, due in part to the seeming loss of their register book. In September 1649, the Commons issued a commission under the great seal for the visitation of Cambridge [*CJ*, vi, p. 295] and that the visitors sat for some of the Commonwealth is certain as college account books record contributions to a tax for their upkeep [e.g., King’s CA, GBR/0272/KCAR/4/1/1/29, Michaelmas 1649-Michaelmas 1650, necessary expenses, Annunciation term].

<sup>25</sup> *CJ*, vi, pp. 219, 577.

<sup>26</sup> See chapter four and appendix one.

<sup>27</sup> Worden, *Rump*, p. 218.

of church revenue and wealth in England.<sup>28</sup> Nor was it the only governmental body dealing with educational matters. In September 1649, a board of governors for Westminster School was named which met regularly.<sup>29</sup> New committees for propagating the gospel policed schoolmasters alongside clergymen as did pre-existing bodies such as the committee for plundered ministers (CPM).<sup>30</sup> Educational reform preceded the Rump but in no sense was it considered completed. As the establishment of the CRU early in the government's life demonstrated, desire for further state intervention was shared by the new republican regime. Yet, the role of the state in education during this period has been increasingly marginalised by historians in recent decades. To understand why this is the case and the importance of this thesis, it is necessary to outline historiographical traditions about the state's role in Interregnum education.

---

<sup>28</sup> For the creation of the trustees and the naming (in April 1650) of the CRU to be the consultative body see *A&O*, ii, pp. 142-8, 152-5, 200-5, 369-78. The CRU's powers over the trustees only began in June.

<sup>29</sup> *A&O*, ii, pp. 256-77. See also appendix two.

<sup>30</sup> For the CPM see, W.B. Bidwell, 'The Committees and Legislation of the Rump Parliament, 1648-1653: A Quantitative Study' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Rochester, 1977), esp. pp. 273-85; *Minutes of the Committee for the Relief of Plundered Ministers and of the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers; Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire 1643-1660*, ed. W.A. Shaw, The Record Society for the Publication of Original Documents Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire, 28 & 29 (2 vols, 1893-6), esp. the introduction to the first volume; S.K. Roberts, *History of Parliament Trust*, London, unpublished article on 'The Committee for Plundered Ministers', for the 1640-60 section.

## II: The State and Education: An Historiographical Sketch

That it would be necessary to defend the importance of the state in matters of learning would have surprised contemporaries of the Interregnum. Those debating the reform of education had all believed it to be a matter of national importance deserving the care of the government. As Oliver Cromwell said at Oxford in 1649, all ‘knowe noe Com[m]onwealth would flourish without learninge, and that they [the Rump] (w[ha]tever the world said to the contrary) meant to’ secure it.<sup>31</sup> The writer John Milton commented in 1644 that educational reform was noble ‘and for the want whereof this nation perishes’.<sup>32</sup> Charles Hoole, a schoolteacher, explained the importance of teaching and so learning when he wrote *There is no calling more serviceable to Church and Common-wealth, then this of a Schoole-Master*.<sup>33</sup> With learning being such an important concern, it is unsurprising that so many plans for educational reform called on the civil magistracy in the kingdom to oversee change. The prominent educational reformers John Dury and Samuel Hartlib argued that it was the duty of the magistrate ‘towards the Young ones...to Order the Meanes of their Education aright’.<sup>34</sup> Likewise, the influential Independent cleric Hugh Peters described the advancement of learning and reform of the universities as one of the duties of the magistrate.<sup>35</sup> Even William Dell, master of Gonville and Caius and a figure noted for his radical views on learning, said in his treatise on educational reform that ‘I conceive it meet, that the Civil power, or chief Magistrates, should take great care of the education of youth, as one of the greatest works that concerns them’.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Bodl., MS Wood, F. 35, ff. 341r-v.

<sup>32</sup> J. Milton, *Areopagitica and Other Writings*, ed. W. Poole (London, 2014), p. 85.

<sup>33</sup> C. Hoole, *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole...* (London, 1660), ‘To all favourers of good learning, but more especially to the Teachers of Grammar’.

<sup>34</sup> *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, ed. C. Webster (Cambridge, 1970), p. 123.

<sup>35</sup> H.[ugh] P.[eters], *Good Work for a Good Magistrate...* (London, 1651).

<sup>36</sup> W. Dell, ‘The Right Reformation of Learning’, in his *The Tryal of Spirits...* (London, 1653), p. 26.

Yet, from the 1640s onwards a narrative emerged which depicted the parliamentary state as negligent, indeed hostile, to education. During the civil wars, royalist scholars and pamphleteers helped create the myth of parliamentarians as barbarians, eager to annihilate learning in the kingdom. Motifs of violence and destruction were frequently employed by royalist pamphleteers to describe Parliament's visitations of educational institutions such as Oxford with one writer lamenting, 'The whole University resembles Greece over-run by Turkes, or Italy Goth'd and Vandald'.<sup>37</sup> As another commentator put it, '*The Danes and Normans Visite thus*' and so 'the Presbyterian and Independent [are] agreed against the poore Christians of *Oxon*'.<sup>38</sup> Even in manuscript form such hostile characterisations circulated. A parody proclamation now held in the archives of University College, Oxford, satirised the parliamentary visitors and vice-chancellor, discussing the 'Insipidissimi Procuratores' and 'Indoctissimi Doctores' now at Oxford.<sup>39</sup> The correspondence of George Stradling, a royalist fellow of All Souls College, mocked 'those solecisms, which the recent reformation brought into the university'.<sup>40</sup> There were of course dissenting voices on the parliamentary side which praised the effects of Commonwealth rule in places of learning. For instance, John Owen, vice-chancellor of Oxford, in 1657 rejoiced that university was 'safe and sound — nay, almost beyond belief — fitted together at the joints with greater strength than usual'.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Cleveland, *Midsummer-Moone*, p. 4.

<sup>38</sup> [T. Barlow], *Pegasus or the Flying Horse from Oxford...* (Mongomery [i.e. Oxford, 1648]), unnumbered page.

<sup>39</sup> University College CA, UC:MA30/3/MS/69.

<sup>40</sup> Bodl., MS Add. B 109, f. 136r/151r.

<sup>41</sup> *The Oxford Orations of Dr. John Owen*, ed. P. Toon (Callington, 1971), p. 40.

However, it was royalist impressions of the Interregnum which dominated after the return of the monarchy. In Restoration Oxford it was joked that a ‘Doctor that could not read’ must have been created in 1648 by Parliament.<sup>42</sup> The earl of Clarendon famously described the Interregnum rule of the universities as one of ‘stupidity and negligence’, ‘malice and perverseness’ which only by a miracle had not ‘extirpate[d] all...learning, religion, and loyalty’.<sup>43</sup> Other works in the later seventeenth century followed suit, such as John Fell’s *Life of Richard Allestree* which characterised the intruded fellows at Oxford as an ‘illiterate rabble, swept up from the ploughtail, from shops and grammar schools, and the dregs of the neighbour University’.<sup>44</sup> Affection to learning was clearly not expected of roundheads in royalist literature, but a few Restoration authors did note some good features of intellectual life during the Interregnum. Anthony Wood, for example, reported that regular academic exercises were studiously performed while Clarendon commented on how Oxford ‘yielded a harvest of extraordinary good and sound knowledge in all parts of learning’.<sup>45</sup> However, the partisanship of Restoration authors meant that it was not the Interregnum governments who received credit. Instead, the decades after the Restoration saw authors align learning with the royalist cause and disruption and ignorance with Parliament.

These early attacks on the educational reforms of the Interregnum governments prompted a reaction in the Victorian era and early twentieth century. Often explicit in much of what Wood and other royalists had written had been hostility towards parliamentarians and Puritanism. Major studies of Interregnum governments in the nineteenth and twentieth

---

<sup>42</sup> Bodl., MS Wood E. 32, f. 29r.

<sup>43</sup> E. Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England...*, ed. W.D. Macray (6 vols, Oxford, 1888), iv, p. 259.

<sup>44</sup> J. Fell, *The Life of Richard Allestree* (London, 1848), p. 9.

<sup>45</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F.31, f. 17v; Hyde, *History of the Rebellion*, iv, p. 259.

century, more sympathetic to Parliament's cause and Puritanism (which they closely associated), responded to this by disagreeing with Wood. A succession of influential historians of education began to argue that the Puritans of the revolution were far from the 'Vandals' portrayed by Restoration authors. Instead, parliamentarians were friends to learning. An enormously influential author in this vein was the great Victorian historian of the parliamentary visitation of Oxford, Montagu Burrows. Burrows produced an edition of the visitors' register preceded by a lengthy introduction which he used to extol the moral fibre and efficiency of the commissioners, and the wider Puritan party they represented.<sup>46</sup> As he closed his introduction,

We must at least admit that no other Visitation or Commission during the whole long and eventful history of Oxford University ever had such a task to accomplish. Perhaps it is not too much to say that none, if we consider the circumstances of the times, ever did the work entrusted to them better.<sup>47</sup>

Burrows represented a desire among some Victorian authors to praise the Puritan attitude to education as part of a sympathetic appraisal of Puritanism and the parliamentary cause. Arthur Leach, a crucial figure in the historiography of English education, wrote, in characteristically acerbic tones, that the old royalist portrayal of ignorant roundheads was fundamentally mistaken.<sup>48</sup> In his history of Winchester College, Leach explained that

The Troubles troubled not, nor were likely to trouble, the School...The Parliamentarians, Puritans or otherwise, were far more given to learning than the Royalists...Yet writer after writer of school history, no matter what the school, seems to assume that it is only by special Providence that his particular school escaped destruction by the wicked Roundheads; it does not seem to have occurred to them as odd that the special Providence was practically universal.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Burrows, *Register*. The introduction is pp. xi-cxxxiii. For Burrows on a specific college, see, M. Burrows, *Worthies of All Souls: Four Centuries of English History: Illustrated from the College Archives* (London, 1874).

<sup>47</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. cxxxiii.

<sup>48</sup> For Leach's wider importance to the history of English education, especially medieval education, see J.N. Miner, *The Grammar Schools of Medieval England: A.F. Leach in Historiographical Perspective* (Montreal, 1990).

<sup>49</sup> Leach, *Winchester College*, p. 339.

If the Puritan parliamentarians were sympathetic to learning, then it logically followed that the governments of the Interregnum would be friends to education. In a seminal essay at the beginning of the twentieth century, Foster Watson offered an extremely positive interpretation of the interest of Interregnum regimes in education, arguing that the ‘impulse towards the ‘reformation’ of schools, parallel in some degree to that of religion...appears in its full vigour in the age of Cromwell, 1640-1660’.<sup>50</sup> Margaret James warmly agreed with Watson several decades later, writing in 1930 that ‘under the Commonwealth, came the climax of a growing enthusiasm for education, which was one aspect of the popularization of Renaissance ideals.’<sup>51</sup> In 1950, William Vincent in his work, *The State and School Education, 1640-1660*, also concurred with Watson that ‘the remarkable instances of state intervention in the field of learning witnessed to the Puritan belief that it was the duty of the government of the country to provide free and popular education for its children.’<sup>52</sup> Interested in rebutting earlier hostile characterisations, these authors helped create a new picture of the Interregnum as a time when educational reform was embraced by Puritan governments expressly sympathetic to learning.

However, just as royalists had been keen to depict the Puritans as one homogenous rabble, so the defenders of the revolutionaries tended to overlook differences within the parliamentary alliance. By 1959 one doctoral thesis had noted this tendency towards conflation when stating that, ‘[t]he claim has often been made that an understanding of Puritanism is basic to the study of the development and character of Anglo-Saxon higher

---

<sup>50</sup> F. Watson, ‘The State and Education During the Commonwealth’, *EHR*, 15:57 (1900), pp. 58-72.

<sup>51</sup> M. James, *Social Problems and Policy during the Puritan Revolution, 1640-1660* (London, 1966), p. 314.

<sup>52</sup> W.A.L. Vincent, *The State and School Education, 1640-1660, in England and Wales: A Survey Based on Printed Sources* (London, 1950), p. 22.

education.<sup>53</sup> The various proposals, petitions, and projects which emerged in the Interregnum were seen by the authors as outbursts from the same community showing the same investment in learning. It was also common to emphasize the modernising attitude of the Puritans to learning and see the Interregnum as a staging post to the twentieth-century ‘democratisation of education’.<sup>54</sup> Such sympathetic portrayals made sense given these authors were reacting against the Restoration caricature of Puritans. However, in the later twentieth century a growing interest emerged in differences amongst Puritans, including their attitude to education reform.<sup>55</sup> Increasingly, it became commonplace to draw a distinction between educational reformers and the parliamentary state. The division that appeared was due, in part, to two historiographical trends which downplayed the role of the parliamentary regimes in the history of learning and came to prominence in the decades following 1950.

One of these two trends emphasized the importance of the laity and radicalism in Interregnum educational reform. This work, associated especially with the path-breaking research of Richard Greaves and Christopher Hill which drew on the enormous pamphlet literature of the period, emphasized calls for reform occurring from ordinary men and women and the links between education reform and social change.<sup>56</sup> Anti-professionalism

---

<sup>53</sup> D.J. Maitland, ‘Three Puritan Attitudes toward Learning: An Examination of the Puritan Controversies over a Learned Ministry, 1640-1660, and the Consequences of this Struggle for Puritan Concern about the Reformation of Learning’ (Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University, 1959), p. iii.

<sup>54</sup> Watson, ‘State and Education’, p. 64.

<sup>55</sup> Maitland’s thesis mentioned above in n. 53 is an interestingly liminal example of this growing interest in intra-Puritan divisions — while drawing distinctions between ‘Sectarian’, ‘Conservative’, and ‘Moderate’ Puritan attitudes to learning he still concluded ‘that Puritanism was definitely not inimical to learning’ [Maitland, ‘Three Puritan Attitudes’, pp. i-ii, 242].

<sup>56</sup> R.L. Greaves, *The Puritan Revolution and Educational Thought, Background for Reform* (New Brunswick, 1969); C. Hill, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution – Revisited* (Oxford, 1997), esp. pp. 3-14 and ‘Appendix: A Note on the Universities’, pp. 268-81; idem, ‘The Radical Critics of Oxford and Cambridge in the 1650s’, in J.W. Baldwin & R.A. Goldthwaite (eds), *Universities and Politics, Case Studies from the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period* (London, 1972), pp. 107-32; *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Harmondsworth, 1975; repr. Harmondsworth, 1991), esp. pp.

emerged as a key theme in these studies, with the historical subjects being shown to mistrust the clergy's monopolisation of religious knowledge — an issue highlighted in the learned-minister controversy — and the wider hierarchical society church and universities supported.<sup>57</sup> As one pamphleteer, Thomas Collier, wrote in 1651, if the apostles 'who are said to be illiterate or unlearned men' could act as ministers without ordination or learning, why could not 'the Saints now?'.<sup>58</sup> A mistrust of the state church and educational institutions was matched by a desire for a democratisation of knowledge and for learning to be 'a utilitarian instrument for the relief of man's estate'.<sup>59</sup> The universities themselves were depicted in this historiographical trend as backward, intellectually stagnant, and intertwined with the existing hierarchical society of England, offering an outdated knowledge with little benefit for the frustrated populace. The real intellectual hub of England, in Hill's eyes, lay in London where Gresham College acted as the beating heart of a dynamic community of lay intellectuals.<sup>60</sup> Given how education reform in the period challenged existing norms, Greaves and Hill emphasized its links to wider social reform and how the reformers, in the words of Richard Schlatter, 'advocated educational revolution as a part of the general revolution which they wanted.'<sup>61</sup>

---

300-5. See also, R.L Greaves, 'The Ordination Controversy and the Spirit of Reform in Puritan England', *JEH*, 31:3, (July 1970), pp. 225-41. Many of the contemporary pamphlets on which they drew are listed in the bibliography of this thesis and referenced at various points in its chapters.

<sup>57</sup> J. F. Maclear, 'Popular Anticlericalism in the Puritan Revolution', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 17:4 (1956), pp. 443-70; R. Schlatter, 'The Higher Learning in Puritan England', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 2 (1954), pp. 167-87; L. Solt, 'Anti-Intellectualism in the Puritan Revolution', *Church History*, 25:4 (1956), pp. 306-16. For the learned-ministry controversy, see also B. Lewalski, 'Milton on Learning and the Learned-Ministry Controversy', *HLQ*, 24:4 (1961), pp. 267-81; Twigg, *Cambridge*, pp. 206-33.

<sup>58</sup> T. Collier, *The Pulpit-Guard Routed...* (London, 1651), p. 25.

<sup>59</sup> Schlatter, 'Higher Learning', p. 172.

<sup>60</sup> See especially Hill, *Intellectual Origins*, pp. 15-76.

<sup>61</sup> R. Schlatter, 'Foreword', in, Greaves, *Puritan Revolution*, p. viii.

This branch of historiography saw the state's role in education in negative terms. If reform was really about empowering the individual and overthrowing rigid hierarchies which monopolised knowledge and power through institutions, then the parliamentary state was necessarily on the side of conservative order and opposed to radical reforms. As the historian Hugh Kearney wrote in 1970, the attacks on the universities in the Nominated Assembly represented the high-water mark of radical influence in educational reform.<sup>62</sup> The Rump Parliament and later the Protectorate — which marked the 'establishment of dictatorial government and a conservative Church policy' in the words of Joan Simon — represented the triumph of reactionary forces.<sup>63</sup> An effect of such arguments was to marginalise the state's role in reform as the drive for change was depicted as emerging from outside the political or intellectual establishment in the cities and among individuals. The state became seen as part of an establishment opposed to intellectual reform due to its connotations with wider social reform. The change in attitudes from earlier accounts of the Puritan governments is striking. Perhaps due to its provocative nature, the work of Greaves and Hill has been substantially challenged in the intervening decades, especially its characterisation of the universities as moribund. Significant works have revised the role of the universities in intellectual growth demonstrating that they were vivacious communities of thought.<sup>64</sup> However, while this and other aspects of the argument have been criticised, the hostile attitude to the state's role has not received a similar rebuttal.

---

<sup>62</sup> H.F. Kearney, *Scholars and Gentlemen: Universities and Society in Pre-Industrial Britain, 1500-1700* (London, 1970), p. 119.

<sup>63</sup> J. Simon, 'Educational Policies and Programmes', *The Modern Quarterly*, new series, 4:1 (1948-9), p. 162.

<sup>64</sup> M. Feingold, *The Mathematician's Apprenticeship* (Cambridge, 1984); N. Tyacke, 'Science and Religion at Oxford before the Civil War,' in D. Pennington & K. Thomas (eds), *Puritans and Revolutionaries, Essays in Seventeenth Century History Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 73-93; Roy Porter, 'The Scientific Revolution and Universities,' in H. de Rieder-Symoens (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe, Volume II: Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 531-62.

The continued marginalisation of the state's role in education is due in large part to another historiographical strand. This trend, associated particularly with the work of Charles Webster, also argued that plans for the advancement of learning flourished outside of Parliament and attempted to locate a reforming urge in a specific section of society.<sup>65</sup> Webster's educational reformers were defined by their religious nature: building on the work of Robert Merton who argued the 'values of the Puritan ethic stimulated interest in science', Webster argued that Puritan millenarianism acted as a spur for intellectual advancement.<sup>66</sup> The Interregnum was a period where this millenarian interest in science reached its peak, exemplified, in Webster's work, by the Hartlib Circle. The Hartlib Circle was a loose collection of individuals linked through the correspondence networks of Samuel Hartlib, engaged in the advancement of learning. The dominant figures of the circle — Hartlib, John Dury, and Jan Amos Comenius — had already received scholarly treatment before Webster and historians had noted that their ideas were largely not implemented by Parliament.<sup>67</sup> However, authors such as Hugh Trevor-Roper had still argued that the likes of the Hartlib Circle were representative of the wider parliamentary movement in a way which recalled earlier arguments about a Puritan sympathy for learning.<sup>68</sup>

Webster's research, however, helped to marginalise the state's involvement in educational reform. Webster did not depict the Interregnum Parliaments as antipathetic to

---

<sup>65</sup> C. Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-60* (New York, 1975); idem, 'William Dell and the Idea of University', in M. Teich & R. Young (eds), *Changing Perspectives in the History of Science* (London, 1973), pp. 110-26. See also his edition of the writings of Hartlib and John Dury, *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*.

<sup>66</sup> R.K. Merton, 'Puritanism, Pietism, and Science', *The Sociological Review*, 28:1 (1936), p. 2.

<sup>67</sup> George Turnbull's research in the first half of the twentieth century was especially important for future studies of Hartlib and the Hartlib Circle [G.H. Turnbull, *Samuel Hartlib: A Sketch of His Life and His Relations to J. A. Comenius* (London, 1920); idem, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers* (London, 1947)].

<sup>68</sup> H. Trevor-Roper, *Religion, the Reformation, and Social Change and Other Essays* (New York, 1967), pp. 219-72.

reform, but his work emphasized their lack of contribution to the advancement of learning. Compared to the heroes of *The Great Instauration*, the revolutionary governments were inactive. As Webster wrote, 'it is somewhat surprising that neither Hartlib nor Dury obtained university preferment or induced any significant measure of university reform'.<sup>69</sup> As fellow Puritans, Interregnum governments shared similar sentiments about the importance of knowledge with the Hartlib Circle, but education was far down on their list of priorities. As a result, Webster argued, they were often an obstructive presence for the likes of Hartlib and did not provide the support or help their schemes demanded. Because the Hartlib Circle were the heart of reform, the Parliament's apathy to them was taken as a sign of apathy to education reform in general. As mentioned above, Webster was not the first to discuss the importance of the Hartlib Circle and nor was he the first to note the lack of support they received. However, his work, more than any other author perhaps, did help create the image of energetic extra-parliamentary intellectuals being foiled or ignored by statesmen.

Webster's thesis has not been accepted wholesale. Indeed, it proved controversial almost immediately and has continued to attract criticism until the present day. Lotte Mulligan criticised its loose definition of Puritanism, arguing that religious characteristics such as millenarianism were far more ubiquitous than Webster alleged.<sup>70</sup> Others have argued that some of the Hartlib Circle, such as John Dury, ought not to be described as millenarian at all.<sup>71</sup> Still others, such as John Morgan and Mordechai Feingold, have illustrated that Puritanism was not a catalytic influence on modern science as proponents of the Puritan

---

<sup>69</sup> *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, p. 26.

<sup>70</sup> L. Mulligan, 'Puritans and English Science: A Critique of Webster', *Isis*, 71:3 (1980), pp. 456-69.

<sup>71</sup> K. Gibson: 'John Dury's Apocalyptic Thought: A Reassessment', *JEH*, 61 (2010), pp. 299-313; M. Ostler, 'Millenarianism and the New Science: The Case of Robert Boyle', in M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, & T. Raylor (eds), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 137-48.

science thesis argued.<sup>72</sup> As these authors argued, Puritan attitudes to earthly knowledge were far more sceptical than Webster suggested and the Reformed tended to reject the idea that human endeavours, such as learning, could help produce the Apocalypse or salvation. As Feingold argued, '[f]or the vast majority of commentators, the establishment of an earthly paradise owed little, if anything, to human agency'.<sup>73</sup> The Hartlib Circle, the works of those like Feingold showed, therefore did not have the specific motivation and belief system that Webster depicted. *The Great Instauration* had been keen to equate 'millennialism with modernity' but in the decades following its publication, many of its central tenets have been undermined.<sup>74</sup>

However, in many ways Webster's work has remained enormously influential to the present day. Aside from debates about the role of millenarian thought or Puritanism, the argument that education reform was dominated by intellectual circles outside of Parliament, and the Hartlib Circle in particular, has continued to resonate.<sup>75</sup> The English state has continued to be seen as scarcely more than a reactive presence in the period and plays little role in studies of learning in the revolutionary decades. As one doctoral thesis, largely focused on the Hartlib Circle, from 2001 on the topic argued, '[s]tate intervention in educational reform remained sporadic throughout 1640-60'.<sup>76</sup> A monograph on the same topic from the 2010s stated that, bar a financial grant, 'no other specifically educational

---

<sup>72</sup> M. Feingold, "'And Knowledge Shall be Increased": Millenarianism and the Advancement of Learning Revisited', *The Seventeenth Century*, 28:4 (2013), pp. 363-93; J. Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning and Education, 1560-1640* (Cambridge, 1988); idem, 'Puritanism and Science: A Reinterpretation', *HJ*, 22:3 (1979) pp. 535-60.

<sup>73</sup> Feingold, 'Millenarianism and the Advancement of Learning', p. 375.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 371.

<sup>75</sup> The classic collection of essays on the Hartlib Circle is, M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, & T. Raylor (eds), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, 1994). For a recent study which dwells on the group see H. Hotson, *The Reformation of Common Learning: Post-Ramist Method and the Reception of the New Philosophy, 1618-1670* (Oxford, 2021), esp. pp. 203-301.

<sup>76</sup> E.S. Daigre, 'Teaching Revolutions: Literature, Literacy, and Education in the English Civil War Period, 1640-1660' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 2001), p. 82.

achievements were made by this Parliament [the Rump] before its dissolution in 1653.<sup>77</sup> From being depicted as a period when the revolutionary regimes were friends to education to being seen as one where the state was a reactive and obstructive body, there has clearly been a significant change in how historians think about educational reform in the Interregnum. For good reasons, scholars have broken away from the all-encompassing depictions of Puritans and looked for differences and nuances. However, in the process, it has become common to think of educational reform as an issue driven by those outside of the parliamentary state and specifically by those in intellectual networks such as the Hartlib Circle. The danger of this new consensus is that it has replaced what was too large with something that is too narrow and effectively written the state out of educational reform. Indeed, within this new consensus it is dangerously easy to assume that the English state had absolutely no agenda for educational reform and all intellectual energy resided within the circles of the *intelligentsia*.

The marginalisation of the Interregnum state from educational reform overlaps with opinions about the Rump Parliament. The Commonwealth government is traditionally seen as an inept reforming government, a result of inherent problems with its membership and nature. The push for reform is largely believed to have come not from within Parliament but from outside, especially from the New Model Army. This negative portrayal can be traced back to contemporary discussion of the Rump and its dissolution in April 1653. Oliver Cromwell, through his speeches to the Nominated Assembly and Protectorate Parliaments, particularly contributed to the idea that the Rump were an ungodly body averse and unable to carry out necessary reforms. In these addresses, he discussed how the army had come to

---

<sup>77</sup> A. McGruer: *Educating the 'Unconstant Rabble': Arguments for Educational Advancement and Reform During the English Civil War and Interregnum* (Newcastle, 2010), p. 150.

believe that the Rump would throw away God's providence through their actions and that 'if we had but miscarried in the least, all our former mercies were in danger to be lost'.<sup>78</sup> Edmund Ludlow, an army officer and MP, remembered in his memoirs that, during the Rump, Cromwell pretended to be a friend to the reformers telling them that all the government wished to do was 'support the corrupt interests of the clergy and lawyers...they would use all means to perpetuate themselves'.<sup>79</sup> Through such rhetoric, Cromwell contributed to the idea of a government opposed to godly, domestic reform and of a drive for reform existing outside of Parliament in the army.

Historians following on from Cromwell have largely concurred with his understanding of the Rump. The great twentieth-century works on the Commonwealth, by David Underdown and Blair Worden, both argued that the Rump was a poor reforming government which changed little.<sup>80</sup> The reason for this fundamentally lay in the nature of the Parliament as a stop-gap institution following the Regicide. Shocked by the execution of the king, beset by internal and external enemies, and concerned with social revolution, the MPs Underdown and Worden described were not likely radicals, nor able to formulate a legislative programme, nor did they have the necessary support in the localities to implement such reforms. An additional obstacle for any radical changes was the divided nature of the Rump itself. The government was a small body but still split between different ecclesiastical or political outlooks and able to agree on little. These deep-rooted problems within the Commonwealth made it an easy target for an army which did want further and dramatic reforms and eventually led to a deep mistrust between the Parliament and the officers.

---

<sup>78</sup> *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, iii, p. 148.

<sup>79</sup> E. Ludlow, *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow...*, ed. C.H. Firth (2 vols, Oxford, 1894) i, p. 345.

<sup>80</sup> D. Underdown, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1971); Worden, *Rump*.

Ultimately, the diagnosis of the Rump which emerged from these seminal works was largely pessimistic. They were an uneasy expedient, factionalised, bad reformers, and poor legislators. In Sean Kelsey's summary of these and other works on the Rump, the image of the Parliament which emerged was of 'a feckless, shallow and unconvincing expedient, committed to little more than blindly obstructing the goals of progressive reformers.'<sup>81</sup>

Although Kelsey's description was strong, it did capture the negative characterisations of the Rump in many twentieth-century studies. Work on individual strands of domestic reform during the Commonwealth frequently highlighted the stagnation of reforming efforts inside the Commons and the desire for change outside it. Perhaps the flagship example of such studied negligence under the Rump was law reform. As multiple historians have argued, the drive for reform was frequently obstructed by a clique of lawyer MPs in Parliament itself and radicals in the army hoped the dissolution of the Rump would allow necessary alterations.<sup>82</sup> Efforts like the Hale Committee produced feasible and thoughtful recommendations which the government failed to implement.<sup>83</sup> Other issues such as poor reform similarly stalled in the House, with the Parliament occasionally discussing but never resolving the issue.<sup>84</sup> Trade was one area which did receive attention from the Rump, leading to the famous Navigation Act, but the republic's social and economic policies tended to be undermined by the innate conservatism of the government and its deference to vested interests.<sup>85</sup> The same frustrating malaise was apparent in religious reform. Having to balance an uneasy coalition of Presbyterian and Independent interests, the republic had little

---

<sup>81</sup> S. Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic, The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth 1649-1653* (Manchester, 1997), p. 1.

<sup>82</sup> See, for example, D. Veall, *The Popular Movement for Law Reform, 1640-1660* (Oxford, 1970).

<sup>83</sup> M. Cotterell, 'Interregnum Law Reform: The Hale Commission of 1652', *EHR*, 83:329 (1968), pp. 689-704.

<sup>84</sup> J.P. Cooper, 'Social and Economic Policies under the Commonwealth', in G. Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-60* (London, 1972), pp. 121-42.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*

success in settling the ecclesiastical or confessional issues created by the collapse of the Caroline settlement.<sup>86</sup> Religious legislation tended to be piecemeal and passed in reaction to specific political pressures. For instance, the Adultery Act was passed to appease Presbyterians in May 1650 and the Toleration Act to satisfy the army following Dunbar.<sup>87</sup> These works on domestic reform have tended to support the arguments of Underdown and Worden while general histories of the Interregnum in the later twentieth and early twenty-first century largely continued the negative portrayal of the Rump. Historians such as Clive Holmes, Ronald Hutton, and Austin Woolrych have continued to see the Rump as a stop-gap government, hamstrung by ‘internal divisions and innate inertia’, composed of inadequate reformers and legislators, and widely loathed by a reform-minded army.<sup>88</sup>

This historiographical homogeneity has been challenged in recent decades. An especially important strand has sought to re-evaluate the Rump’s activity and its desire to embrace the executive powers it received post-Regicide. Sean Kelsey and Sarah Barber in the 1990s attempted to show the agency of the Commonwealth MPs. Kelsey looked at Commonwealth culture to show ‘how members of the republican regime shaped their own politico-theatrical environment rather than merely serving their turn’ on the political stage.<sup>89</sup> Barber, meanwhile, looked at a more specific group of radical MPs to show the attachment

---

<sup>86</sup> For religious life during the Rump and the lack of a confessional or ecclesiastical settlement see, C. Cross, ‘The Church in England, 1646-1660’, in G. Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (London, 1972), pp. 99-120; A. Hughes, ‘“The Public Profession of these Nations”: The National Church in Interregnum England’, in C. Durston & J. Maltby (eds), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 93-114. See also, A. Milton, *England’s Second Reformation: The Battle for the Church of England, 1625-1662* (Cambridge, 2021), pp. 293-334.

<sup>87</sup> Worden, *Rump*, pp. 232-4, 238-9. See also K. Thomas, ‘The Puritans and the Act of 1650 Reconsidered’, in, D. Pennington & K. Thomas (eds), *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 257-83.

<sup>88</sup> A. Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford, 2002), p. 515. C. Holmes, *Why Was Charles I Executed* (London, 2006), pp. 121-46; R. Hutton, *The British Republic 1649-1660* (Basingstoke, 1990), esp. pp. 18-19, 24-5.

<sup>89</sup> Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic*, p. 10.

to creating a new republican regime of some within Parliament.<sup>90</sup> More recently, Jonathan Fitzgibbons has disputed the idea that the Rump was an unintended expedient following the Regicide, challenging ideas that there was little enthusiasm for republican rule.<sup>91</sup> Historians in recent decades have grown more sympathetic to the idea of the Rump as an active government embracing its new powers and trying to create a distinct culture. The last aspect, of a new culture emerging in the 1650s, has been discussed with particular enthusiasm. The vigour of the ‘republican prose and poetry’ which flourished in the Interregnum has been demonstrated by David Norbrook; Jonathan Scott has pointed to republican ideas and principles being moulded during the Commonwealth thanks to its martial prowess; and Bernard Capp, in his excellent work from 2012, has shown how a new republican culture was being created and permeating through society in the Interregnum decades.<sup>92</sup>

These various works have helped challenge assumptions that the Rump was a lethargic body, uncomfortable with its powers, and that the Commonwealth years were a stale period of conservatism. Yet, many of the key assumptions about the Rump are unchallenged by these works. There is little to question the idea that the Rump were divided on many major issues, nor that these divisions and various contextual pressures acted as major obstacles to legislation or domestic reform, nor indeed that domestic reform was largely something driven by those outside of Parliament. Nor have ideas of a vivacious new culture presided over by energetic republican governors been accepted wholesale with some

---

<sup>90</sup> S. Barber, *Regicide and Republicanism: Politics and Ethics in the English Revolution, 1646-1659* (Edinburgh, 1998).

<sup>91</sup> J. Fitzgibbons, ‘Rethinking the English Revolution of 1649’, *HJ*, 60:4 (2017), pp. 889-914. The classic negative interpretation of attachment to republican principles by the Rump is by Blair Worden [‘Republicanism, Regicide and Republic: the English Experience’, in M. van Gelderen & Q. Skinner (eds), *Republicanism: a Shared European Heritage* (2 vols, Cambridge, 2002), i, pp. 307-27].

<sup>92</sup> B. Capp, *England’s Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (Oxford, 2012); D. Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 14; J. Scott, *Commonwealth Principles: Republican Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 2004), esp. pp. 254-68.

arguing that ‘the regime failed to secure its own cultural authority or even significantly to undermine the culture of kingship’.<sup>93</sup> Even if the Rump is now not seen as embarrassed by its own existence, many of the criticisms levelled against its efficacy or nature as an expedient remain unaddressed.

How the Rump is perceived also has implications for how historians see its role in education reform. If domestic reform was a weakness of the government, then it is likely they were not actively involved in the advancement of learning. Current perspectives on the Rump therefore may be seen to reinforce the marginalisation of the state set out in the work of those like Webster. The reverse is also true: the notion that the Rump played little role in changes to learning helps support the idea that the government had a poor record in domestic reform. The historiographical trends outlined in this sketch have contributed, therefore, to a negative conclusion about the role of the state in education reform. Change was not driven by the government and especially not by the Rump, a regime whose inherent problems and divisions made it ineffective in domestic policies such as the advancement of learning. In the remainder of this introduction, we will see how this thesis challenges these perceptions and makes new contributions to our understandings of the Rump Parliament and the role of the state in the advancement of learning.

---

<sup>93</sup> K. Sharpe, *Image Wars, Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (Yale, 2010), p. 388. Even before Kelsey there were many works arguing for the failure of Puritan cultural reform. See, for example, C. Durston, ‘Puritan Rule and the Failure of Cultural Revolution, 1645-1660’, in C. Durston and J. Eales (eds), *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 210-33; D. Hirst, ‘The Failure of Godly Rule in the English Republic’, *P&P*, 132:1 (1991), pp. 33-66; A. Hughes, ‘The Frustrations of the Godly’, in J. Morrill (ed.), *Revolution and Restoration England in the 1650s* (London, 1992), pp. 70-90; K. Sharpe, ‘“An Image Doting Rabble?” The Failure of Republican Culture in Seventeenth Century England’, in K. Sharpe & S. Zwicker (eds), *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetic and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution* (London, 1988), pp. 25-56.

### III: Sources, Methodology, Themes, and Chapter Outlines

This thesis examines educational reform during the Rump Parliament with new materials. The main source base used in this work is the archives of, or relating to, educational institutions. The methodology of this thesis is to use these archives to examine how the parliamentary agenda was drawn up at the centre and then how parliamentary rule was enforced by committees and experienced on the ground in local, institutional contexts. The source base used in this thesis offers a means to interrogate existing ideas about the Rump Parliament from a different perspective, especially their effectiveness as educational reformers and involvement in places of learning. As explored in the historiographical sketch above, debates about the Commonwealth period largely focus on the evidence of the government's legislation to discuss questions of its success and failures. Studies of individual committees have taken place in previous decades, but the recent work of the History of Parliament Trust has breathed new life into the study of extra-cameral parliamentary bodies and individual MPs.<sup>94</sup>

Building on this recent trend, this thesis will show the value of investigating a period of parliamentary rule through a focus on committees and their daily work, rather than the decisions of Parliament in the House of Commons. Such a method of analysis is not designed to answer questions of whether the Rump was more or less successful, but to reveal patterns of activity and the motivations beneath it, especially in the sphere of education. The seminal studies of the Rump by Blair Worden and David Underdown emphasised the piecemeal

---

<sup>94</sup> The Trust's volumes on the House of Commons, 1640-60, are expected to be published in 2023 and will contain articles on the major executive committees of the Long Parliament and Rump.

nature of Rump rule and characterised the government as engaging in spurts of activity after long fallow periods, a judgement based largely on the evidence offered by legislation, and this is a method which subsequent historians have often employed. The analysis of this thesis is based instead on a study of the CRU and offers an alternative picture of a Commonwealth government revealing previously overlooked strands of continuity and activity at a committee level and the interactions, in both directions, between parliamentary authorities and those in the localities.

Developments inside educational institutions also offer a means to see links between education and the ministry and changing attitudes to both in the Commonwealth. Schools and universities were never only sites of scholarship in the seventeenth century. They were also the training grounds of the ministry and had wider connections to the ecclesiastical sphere, not least owing to the number of bishops who acted as visitors for schools and colleges. The links between education and the church are brought up frequently in this thesis. The common themes between them are explored, especially the influence the republican government exerted within the two spheres through committees like the CRU. How the regime intervened in education to shape the training of the ministry is an important element of this study and one which allows a reappraisal of how the Rump handled their new ecclesiastical powers. Bishops had traditionally wielded enormous influence over places of learning. Still more powerful had been the monarch and so this thesis also examines how the republican regime wielded its new royal powers at a committee level. The role of the government in education and ecclesiastical issues is an indication of the connections between the two areas and this study makes clear that there were significant changes taking place in both ideas of education and ideas of the ministry in the period for similar contextual

reasons. In both cases, the changes tended to emphasise the importance of learning in general and university education in particular.

An analysis of events inside educational institutions and the CRU's work relies on delving into institutional archives. The CRU's interventions in institutions often left only small pieces of evidence, such as single committee orders. On their own, these individual pieces of evidence are hard to analyse, nor is it easy to draw conclusions from them. Compounding this problem of limited evidence, the survival rate of material from the 1640s and 1650s is patchy at best. Record-keeping practices of institutions often fell into disuse during the civil wars and many order or audit books were lost or irregularly filled for the Interregnum. Nor do all the institutions contain materials related to the CRU. As explored below in chapter five, the colleges of Gresham, Manchester, and Sion were given to the committee without it ever really intervening in their affairs. An historian of the CRU, keen to see what its orders and motivations were, is therefore faced with a fragmentary and often limited source base. This problem, however, can be overcome by looking at a large number of institutional archives together rather than in isolation, including those of schools, universities, and university colleges. Fragments can be compiled, and trends of action identified. The work of the Rump in the field of education, as shown through the CRU, is recreated in this thesis through such a process of collation.

To track all of Parliament's interventions in English education is beyond the scope of this thesis and so eight institutions are used as a sample body: the universities of Cambridge and Oxford, the colleges of Gresham, Manchester, and Sion, and the schools of Eton, Westminster, and Winchester. Seven of these were within the remit of the CRU while

Westminster was controlled by first a committee and then from September 1649 by a parliamentary board of governors. All eight institutions shared the common experience of being ruled, at least nominally, by parliamentary bodies making them a valid group for comparison. The archives of all the institutions, and those of the individual university colleges, have been researched for this thesis and add unfamiliar faces and institutions to historiography. Gresham College and the universities are well-known to historians of seventeenth-century learning, but Manchester College or schools such as Westminster, Winchester, and Eton are less often discussed.

The use of such a sample group and the focus on the CRU, however, does introduce necessary temporal and geographic restrictions to this thesis. The eight institutions analysed were all English with seven falling in a fairly small southern area. Large areas of England and the entirety of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland are not represented by these places of learning and cannot be covered here to the same degree of detail, though this absence is softened by the existence of a recent and thorough doctoral thesis on Irish and Scottish universities during the revolutionary period by Salvatore Cipriano.<sup>95</sup> Temporally, the CRU offers a small window for analysis, lasting as it did from May 1649 to April 1652, in effect acting as a case study of the Rump and their involvement in educational matters. Although the thesis largely confines its focus to the Commonwealth years, its intention is to use the committee to analyse wider revolutionary trends and so relevant or comparable examples outside of the republican years are occasionally brought into the analysis.

---

<sup>95</sup> S. Cipriano, 'Seminaries of Identity: the Universities of Scotland and Ireland in the Age of British Revolution' (Ph.D. thesis, Fordham University, 2018).

This thesis attempts to treat places of learning as a group rather than individually. In this it differs in intention, while still making use of, the vast body of exceptional institutional histories which have already been written. Institutional history is a venerable genre which shows little sign of going out of fashion. This thesis has been fortunate to draw upon a range of brilliant school, college, and university histories to make its arguments, all of which are listed in the bibliography. Two relatively recent histories of the universities have been especially useful: Blair Worden's study of Cromwellian Oxford and John Twigg's monograph on Cambridge.<sup>96</sup> Whereas many previous institutional studies have focussed on their subject in relation to the wider political nation, this study analyses institutions in relation to one another and argues that they can be understood as an interconnected group. Schools and universities were connected in a literal sense in terms of personnel: scholars progressing to their undergraduate degrees; university graduates moving to schools or between universities. They were also understood in a more general sense of seminaries of learning, linked by their mission to educate the young.

By looking at institutions as a group and developments inside them, this thesis also offers an analysis of those inside places of learning. More particularly, this thesis investigates the actions of those inside places of learning and offers a study of the interactions between the centre and localities in the republican years. The response of those we might expect to be disaffected to the regime is examined alongside those who supported it, as is the relationship between the two. In recent decades, historians have become increasingly interested in how people responded to political or religious changes at a local

---

<sup>96</sup> Twigg, *Cambridge*; Worden, *Oxford*. For the universities, see also C.E. Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford* (3 vols, London, 1924-7); J.B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge from the Election of Buckingham to the Chancellorship in 1626 to the Decline of the Platonist Movement* (3 vols, Cambridge, 1911); Reinhart, *Oxford*; G. Tatham, *The Puritans in Power: A Study in the History of the English Church from 1640 to 1660* (Cambridge, 1913).

level, especially in the parish.<sup>97</sup> In looking at how the government interacted with places of learning this thesis can present another context in which to examine how individuals responded to the vicissitudes of the revolutionary decades and the actions of the centre. What emerges is not primarily a story of disaffection or hostility between different factions depending on their political or ecclesiastical opinions, but far more examples of pragmatism and cooperation than might be anticipated. These insights contribute to a recent trend of analysis, associated in recent years with Ken Fincham, Anthony Milton, Stephen Taylor, and Elliot Vernon which has begun looking at cooperation and centripetal trends during the Commonwealth.<sup>98</sup> However, whereas those historians were primarily concerned with clergymen, this thesis approaches the issue by looking at learning and scholars.

This thesis therefore suggests that places of learning were sites of cooperation and pragmatism. As shall be demonstrated, the cooperation taking place in such institutions suggests that learning, as a set of ideas and preconceptions, provided points of consensus during the Interregnum. A diverse group of scholars were willing to work under parliamentary authority in places of learning; noticeably similar rhetoric was employed by those of different outlooks when discussing issues pertaining to education. It is also notable that so much of the rhetoric was based on very traditional or broad ideas about for whom and for what education ought to be provided, such as the need to advance learning and piety or to educate ministers. This common rhetoric helps explain why so much collaboration took place, but it also marks a point of continuity. Historians have become increasingly aware in

---

<sup>97</sup> For example, see Milton, *Second Reformation*, pp. 283-6. See also, Hughes, 'Public Profession'

<sup>98</sup> K. Fincham & S. Taylor, 'Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity 1646-60', in J. McElligott & D. Smith (eds), *Royalists and Royalism in the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 18-43; '...both centripetal and centrifugal forces co-existed in these years' [Milton, *Second Reformation*, p. 368]; Elliot Vernon discusses how London Presbyterians came to cooperate with congregationalists under the Protectorate to defend 'Reformed orthodoxy' and 'to establish a confessional foundation' [*London Presbyterians and the British Revolutions, 1638-64* (Manchester, 2021), p. 242].

recent years of the points of continuity between the Interregnum and the periods preceding and following it.<sup>99</sup> Attitudes to learning emerge in this thesis as another area dominated by continuity and help explain the Rump's essentially traditional approach to educational reform. Many of the developments inside places of learning were about protecting and reinforcing the existing educational structure in England and its practices. It is important, however, not to see this as business carrying on as usual. Instead, emphasis on tradition and custom was an active process driven by particular contextual pressures and with nuances very specific to the context of the Commonwealth period.

Although this thesis investigates approaches to learning and educational institutions, it is not intended to be a work on the history of scholarship. There is already an enormously rich literature on educational reform, practices, and advances in learning during the seventeenth century.<sup>100</sup> While this thesis pays attention to these topics, they are not its primary focus. Sources relating to them, such as archival materials relating to academic pursuits, generally are used only when they pertain to the subjects of the thesis. As a result, several figures who have featured heavily in previous works on Interregnum educational reform receive far less attention, especially members of the Hartlib Circle. Yet, the benefit of focusing on the state and its relations with educational institutions is to introduce new characters and themes which can challenge but also complement these previous studies. The

---

<sup>99</sup> E.g., '...even when religious institutions and forms were removed, the perpetrators often insisted on presenting their actions in terms of continuity with the pre-war church and with past Reformations' [Milton, *Second Reformation*, p. 2].

<sup>100</sup> For histories of education in general during the early modern period, see H. Jewell, *Education in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1998); R. O'Day, *Education and Society, 1500-1800: The Social Foundations of Education in Early Modern Britain* (London, 1982); L. Stone, 'The Educational Revolution in England, 1560-1640', *P&P*, 28:1 (1964), pp. 41-80. For a recent work on educational practices around the time of the Interregnum, J. Gianoutsos, 'A new discovery' of Charles Hoole: Method and Practice in Seventeenth-Century English Education', *History of Education*, 48 (2019), pp. 1-18.

customary emphasis on educational practitioners and pioneers of reform can be softened while new important figures, like the committee men and Rump MPs, can be incorporated.

This thesis is divided into six chapters and a brief conclusion. The first three chapters explore what parliamentary authorities like the CRU did in places of learning as well as the motivations that can be identified from their actions. Chapter one offers an overview of the CRU and explores its role in educational institutions. As is shown, the committee acted as a powerful external body for the schools and universities within its jurisdiction and appears to have been designed by the Rump to help return the academic foundations to stability following the turmoil of the 1640s. Once some tranquillity had been restored, the committee intended colleges and schools to be self-governing and aimed to reduce its own role to that of a court of appeal. When the CRU came into existence, there had been a great need for an interventionist external authority because many of the educational establishments were incapable of, or denied, self-governance due to serious problems caused by the civil wars. By analysing how the CRU fulfilled its duties in this role, its capabilities and energy are much more clearly demonstrated as is the Rump's extensive involvement in educational institutions. However, the need for such a powerful extraneous authority dissipated as the various difficulties engendered by the 1640s faded. The chapter will analyse the end of the committee and will show how it became redundant by 1652, an obsolescence compounded by several contextual issues.

Chapter two details the CRU's considerable work in the area of educational funding and the material improvement of places of learning. It is shown that the CRU, and Parliament more widely, paid close attention to financial and material difficulties inside the schools and

universities. These institutions had experienced severe hardship in the civil wars and parliamentary bodies such as the CRU worked diligently to address many of these problems, feeling the work to be a duty of government. Motivations for educational funding are explored and are shown to have been largely based on traditional ideas of the purpose of education and whom it was intended to serve. These principles motivated parliamentary bodies, but also a number of those inside places of learning as well as private individuals who intervened to improve the material situation of the schools and universities. The efforts of those outside Parliament, especially those inside the colleges and schools, are analysed and shown to demonstrate not only the concord around many key ideas about learning, but also the agency the institutions themselves held in determining their fate during the Commonwealth.

The relationship between education and the ministry during the Commonwealth is explored in chapter three. During the Rump, the learning of the ministry emerged as of enormous importance due to contextual issues, particularly heretical thought, the rise of lay preaching, and the absence of a universally accepted method of ordination. By using committee orders and evidence from institutional archives, it is shown how ideas about the ministry changed in the period with greater emphasis being placed on attributes commonly believed to be necessary, including university education. It is also shown that the Rump, via its committees, was far more heavily involved in ministerial matters during the period, including the approbation of ministers. This indicates that they upheld the notion of a learned ministry vetted by the civil authority. Concerns with producing an educated ministry influenced the Rump's reform of the universities, and accordingly this chapter explores the government's status as an educational reformer. In contrast to depictions of it as a reactionary or uninterested body, it is suggested that they were indeed deeply interested but

also acting within a Puritan reforming tradition which was less interested in academic novelty than with the improvement of morality and the increasing of zeal for studies.

The following two chapters consider the personnel at Westminster and inside the academic establishments and the relationship between supporters and non-supporters of the Rump. In chapter four, cooperation over the management of places of learning, both among the MPs of the CRU and among members of colleges, is analysed and shown to have been far more common than previously thought. The evidence for this is based on the reconstruction of calendars of the CRU and two related parliamentary committees, the CPM and board of governors for Westminster School. The cooperation taking place at a committee level is testament to the widespread consensus in the Commonwealth around educational matters. Cooperation is also shown to have been taking place inside colleges. Due to works produced in the decades following the post-Restoration, it is common to think of the colleges as fiercely divided during the Interregnum between supporters and opponents of the post-Regicide regimes. By reconstructing what was happening inside the institutions, this characterisation is challenged, and it is instead shown that cooperation was common.

Chapter five explores republicanism and dissent in places of learning. It is shown that there was a level of willingness among many parliamentarians, including those sitting on the CRU, to overlook dissension in certain circumstances. Apathy or even opposition to the Commonwealth could be brooked in a private setting but not in a public one. Any threat to the security of the republic could not be tolerated, as is demonstrated by studying the fates of Gresham, Manchester, and Sion colleges during the Commonwealth. The CRU did not attempt to turn the universities and schools into seminaries of a new Commonwealth culture,

despite the evident republican fervour of some within the colleges. This chapter thus challenges the notion of the Rump period as being dominated by ideological tests such as the Engagement and the predominance of such tests as evidence when judging issues of loyalty during the Commonwealth.

The final chapter of the thesis uses a study of Commonwealth propagation to show how several themes and developments in places of learning were also evident in the wider country. Education is shown to have been more important to propagation than previously thought, a conclusion which revises existing notions of Commonwealth evangelism. This is especially evident after the analysis of several educational initiatives, both English and international, the results of which demonstrate the importance of looking beyond the evidence of legislation when discussing propagation. This also shows the popularity of evangelism, the consistent use of education to achieve its aims, and the global context in which contemporaries understood it taking place. The case studies show more activity by the Rump than is sometimes thought, but also far more agency in evangelical matters in the localities where educational projects were often initiated. They also reveal the breadth of the Commonwealth consensus about the need to advance learning and piety.

As the above outline suggests, education was a crucial issue to the Rump whose importance has not hitherto been realised. As a topic, it also offers insights into the Commonwealth's attitude to many vital questions including the ministry, republicanism, obedience, the civil magistrate's powers in spiritual matters, and the government's relationship with the localities. By examining how committees like the CRU worked and implemented the government's rule, a new perspective of how the Rump approached these

questions is created and a more nuanced image of the government itself emerges, not necessarily more successful or more confident, but with clearer motivations, more consistent concerns, and, if nothing else, more active.

## Chapter 1

### 'Some useless Courts and Committees': The Role of the CRU

Despite being the republic's chief body for educational institutions, the CRU has received little attention in studies of academic foundations. To historians like Montagu Burrows or Thomas Reinhart in their studies of Oxford, the committee was simply the 'London Committee', a distant presence which played little active role in the university's story.<sup>1</sup> This chapter corrects this historiographical deficit by introducing the committee and its role in educational institutions: that of an external executive authority. As will be demonstrated, its responsibilities shifted during the course of its three-year existence from resolving crises engendered by the 1640s to acting as a court of appeal. Investigating what duties the committee performed not only helps to detail the history of the body, but also to explain its relationship with, and agenda for, educational institutions. As will be shown, the committee's priority was to return autonomy to places of learning once they had been stabilised, not transformed, under the Commonwealth. Their activity helps explain why the committee was eventually dissolved: once places of learning were secured and self-governing, the pressing need for a London-based committee disappeared.

A focus on the CRU and its role in places of learning introduces several themes of this thesis. This chapter explore the implementation of Rump rule through its committees, testing ideas about the government's handling of monarchical powers during the period and its activity in educational affairs. The relationship between the centre and localities is also placed at the forefront of discussion in this chapter, revealing the extent of the agency

---

<sup>1</sup> Burrows, *Oxford*; Reinhart, *Oxford*.

possessed by colleges and those within them during the republican years. This chapter also tests ideas about the Rump's attitude to educational reform. As we shall see, how the CRU interacted with places of learning reveals much about its status as a conservative or radical reformer. The image of the CRU, and Rump, which emerges below is of a body which was not an educational innovator, but instead a committee eager to work through existing educational structures and traditions and whose very success removed the need for its existence.

## I: The CRU and the Crisis of the Civil Wars

To understand the CRU's role in places of learning it is necessary to understand the contextual issues which confronted it at the time of its creation. As mentioned in the introduction, the committee was established in the first months of the new republic, on 4 May 1649, when the pre-existing committee for regulating the university of Oxford was given the responsibility of regulating Cambridge and Winchester College, with Eton being added to their responsibilities later that month.<sup>2</sup> The decision of the Rump to give a number of educational institutions to a single committee reflected, as this section explores, the common and serious administrative problems resulting from the civil wars which affected them. As will be shown in the later sections of this chapter, the CRU was not created solely to address these contextual problems and had other, more routine, responsibilities. Yet, this section will discuss the extent to which various issues resulting from the civil wars dominated much of the CRU's work, especially in the first year of its life. During that period, an external parliamentary committee was necessary to address such difficulties because the institutions themselves were incapable of resolving them. By their nature, however, these problems began to dissipate with time as the wartime situation which had created them faded into the past.

When the CRU was created there were still issues affecting colleges which demanded the attention of a standing committee. Problems thrown up by the civil wars, such as the retrieval of college goods, were often beyond the ability of colleges to solve, impairing

---

<sup>2</sup> *CJ*, vi, pp. 200, 219. In the latter Commons order, the CRU were required 'to nominate Visitors for Regulating' Winchester and Eton, presumably to create the same system by which the committee, at London, acted as a court of appeal and overseer of visitors at Oxford (and, at some points, Cambridge).

the running of the institutions. Items such as administrative records or materials were taken out of many colleges during the civil wars, often with serious results. A lost college seal could prevent the authorisation of transactions or legal decisions, forcing those to whom it happened — such as Corpus Christi, Oxford — to commission a replacement.<sup>3</sup> However, some materials were not so easily replaced. At a number of colleges, disgruntled royalist fellows fled with college documents, such as Thomas Yates of Brasenose who left with the college statute book.<sup>4</sup> Loss of such objects not only affected the management of colleges but undermined the legitimacy of the new parliamentary heads and fellows. Yet colleges alone often lacked the means to locate lost objects or enforce their return, as the University of Oxford discovered when searching for university goods stolen by ejected royalists.<sup>5</sup>

In such cases, the assistance of a standing parliamentary committee was required. Jesus, Oxford, was one college which needed the help of Parliament's agents to retrieve college objects, in its case from the ejected head, Francis Mansell. Mansell had retained the keys and seals of the college after his removal and the matter was taken up by his successor, Michael Roberts, before both the university's visitors and the CRU. In March 1649, the visitors ordered Mansell to hand over the objects and a mention in the college audit book suggests a petition concerning the erstwhile head was presented to the CRU by the college.<sup>6</sup> The decision by Roberts to pursue the issue at both a committee and visitor level suggests a degree of obstinacy by Mansell but also how important parliamentary authority could be in overcoming resistance in these issues. Roberts and the fellows lacked the ability to recover the objects on their own and few alternatives to parliamentary help were apparent. The

---

<sup>3</sup> Corpus Oxford CA, C/1/1/10, f. 59r.

<sup>4</sup> J.M. Crook, *Brasenose: The Biography of an Oxford College*, (Oxford, 2008), p. 65.

<sup>5</sup> Oxford's search for university materials including the staves of their beadles rumbled on for several years [OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, ff. 74, 83, 112; Reinhart, *Oxford*, pp. 428-9].

<sup>6</sup> Jesus Oxford CA, Bu:Ac:Gen:1, f. 186. Burrows, *Register*, pp. 222, 228.

visitors and committee had the power to compel cooperation from truculent individuals: as seen in the 1648 visitation of Oxford, the parliamentary authorities were comfortable using soldiers and imprisonment to enforce their will.<sup>7</sup> Not possessing the legal teeth or military muscle of the committee, colleges like Jesus were dependent on such help.

As well as aiding colleges, there was also a need for an external authority to resolve difficult questions of law thrown up by the wars, such as land rights. Educational institutions had always been major landholders with many tenants, and the vicissitudes of the 1640s affected this aspect of college life. One tenant of Lincoln College, Richard Grenvile, captured the consequences of collegiate turmoil on business in a letter of July 1648. Grenvile, in Oxford to renew a lease with Lincoln, wrote to his uncle of the protracted negotiations taking place, shrewdly dissecting the divisions within the college. Some ‘younge Fellowes’ who were ‘very compliant w[i]th the visitors’ and so ‘in noe danger of beinge turned out’ wanted to impose ‘a great Fine’ on tenants. By contrast, the ‘old ones’ were in danger of ejection and ‘out of that feare are willinge to make reasonable abatem[en]t, to gett money into their Pockett, before they be ousted’. Having noted that the older fellows were their best chance of a good deal, Grenvile suggested speedily concluding negotiations, as ‘if wee stay till more of the old Fellowes are ousted, and nowe complyeing men put in their roomes, wee shall renew upon much more difficult termes’.<sup>8</sup> Grenvile’s observations on Lincoln are an unusually detailed insight into how the changes of fellowships could affect college business. Yet, the question of Grenvile’s lease was a fairly straightforward case of

---

<sup>7</sup> The visitors had been empowered in 1647 to summon and imprison university members [*A&O*, i, pp. 1001-2]. The use of force in the visitation was not without its critics and possibly counter-productive. One royalist student of the time, Philip Henry, remarked later ‘that milder methods might have done better’ [H. Matthew, *An Account of the Life and Death of Mr Philip Henry...* (London, 1698), p. 19].

<sup>8</sup> Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies, D104/76, Richard Grenvile to his uncle, 23 July 1648.

tenants seeking the best deal. In other incidents, changes of fellowship and land dealings combined to create complex issues requiring the adjudication of a parliamentary committee.

One such case occurred at Brasenose College in 1649. A messuage and tenement in Barford, Oxfordshire, in the possession of the college was under dispute for reasons rooted in the civil war, as a committee order preserved in the Wood MSS at the Bodleian illustrates. The document, dated 4 October, explained that a previous tenant, John Newman, had been moved out of his lease, despite there being two years remaining while Oxford was garrisoned by the royalists. A new lease was then made by the college with one Abell Makepeace. Parliament had declared in 1646 that all leases made while Oxford was garrisoned were void and so Makepeace had no right to the tenement. Instead, the committee ordered that Newman's son, Paul, be admitted as tenant on reasonable terms in consideration 'of his great losses, and sufferings for his good affection to the state'.<sup>9</sup> A later CRU order, copied into the Brasenose register, suggests that the college resisted the committee, likely wishing to make a new, profitable lease. Although knowledge of the dispute is limited since several of the orders in between the two which survive are missing, the result is known — the committee rejected Brasenose's appeal, refusing to 'alter their former order' in favour of Newman.<sup>10</sup>

The Barford case was one which needed the attention of a committee like the CRU to be resolved. The dispute was caused by complicated questions of legality stemming from the vicissitudes of the 1640s and outside the usual wrangling between colleges and their

---

<sup>9</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 352r.

<sup>10</sup> Brasenose CA, Gov 3 A1/2, 1594-1710, f. 73r.

tenants. According to Parliament's order of 1646, Makepeace had no right to the land and John Newman's eviction was illegal. It is likely, though the relevant evidence has not survived, that Paul Newman had petitioned the CRU arguing that he was the rightful owner of the tenement. His pursuit of justice at the committee suggests how they were viewed, since he apparently believed they were the most suitable authority to resolve collegiate land disputes as well as intra-institutional business. However, their position in the matter was uncertain, as the pushback by Brasenose suggests. The college likely complained, before the committee definitively rejected their arguments, that the right to make leases rested with them and that they could make a settlement more beneficial to the college. The entire debate was caused by the confusion and out-of-the-ordinary issues stemming from the civil war period, illustrating the need for a standing committee. The situation was complex enough to need a specific body to hear the issue and resolve it but also, since it involved laymen as well as scholars, a group which was outside of the usual university structure.

The committee orders also illustrate how issues like Barford could dominate the CRU's agenda but leave little evidence. The evidence relating to the land case has obvious gaps. Alongside the two orders which do remain, it is clear the CRU issued at least one other relating to Barford which did not. The last order, held at Brasenose, rejecting the college's appeal, is dated 8 November 1649 but references a preceding one of 18 October, a fortnight later than the initial order of 4 October. Preceding the first order were documents supporting Newman's case and likely a petition while the college must have prepared its own case to present to the committee. In the event, only the two orders have remained and for different reasons. Brasenose kept the final order, likely so as to have a record for their administrative purposes. The initial order, however, was possibly preserved for pro-royalist reasons. Thomas Barlow, who appears to have been responsible for its survival, wrote on the back of

the document that it was ‘An unjust’ order. Given Barlow’s own sympathies, he perhaps had in mind the dispossession of Makepeace by the committee and preserved the document as evidence of the CRU’s illegitimate activity. Alternatively, Barlow may have been angered by the rights of a college being ignored and considered that the injustice. In any case, the chance survival of a few orders is a sign that the CRU’s level of activity has not left a corresponding body of evidence in the historical record.

Land cases like Barford are also indicative of how short-lived many problems created by the civil wars were. Although the repercussions of the wars would still be felt long after the end of the Commonwealth, many individual cases caused by the conflict, such as Barford, could be resolved quickly. The removal of royalists was another area in the post-war settlement which the CRU and the visitors oversaw in 1649-50, and which also consisted of swiftly settled specific incidents. The handling of New College, Oxford, is a case in point. The master, Henry Stringer, had been elected by the fellows in 1647 without Parliament’s approval and even after the imposition of George Marshall as head in January 1649, the college continued to offer resistance.<sup>11</sup> A steady stream of CRU and visitor orders over the first half of 1649 were concerned with cracking a college described in March as ‘yet very much unsettled’.<sup>12</sup> In April and May the committee passed orders for the ejection of any recalcitrant fellows and the choosing of replacements.<sup>13</sup> Additions were made to a pre-existing university delegation investigating the college in June, followed shortly after by a

---

<sup>11</sup> For Stringer’s ejection, Burrows, *Register*, pp. 220-1. New College has drafts of letters written by Stringer concerning his election, including a petition to the parliamentary committee for regulating Oxford [New CA, 5072]. His election was likely especially irritating to the Fiennes family. A letter written by Nathaniel Fiennes to John Harris of Winchester in 1647 mentions that he and his father, Viscount Saye and Sele, had recommended that the college elect Mr. White, presumably John White of Dorchester, which advice appears to have been ignored [WCA, 449].

<sup>12</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 226.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 229-34.

CRU order dismissing various servants of the college for failing to submit to Parliament.<sup>14</sup> Even after this bout of activity, some tensions within the college remained visible. One fellow, Daniel Vivian, was at the heart of events at least twice. First he accused two others of royalist sympathies — they were exonerated by the visitors — and then caused enough trouble to necessitate soldiers guarding his room.<sup>15</sup> Despite these signs of internal strife, it is noticeable that the committee's workload relating to the college rapidly diminished after the immediate frenzy of orders and removals.<sup>16</sup> The college occasionally caused concern, but there was a logical pattern to the CRU's involvement: thorough intervention early on to remove the royalist fellowship followed by a step back once the college could govern itself.

The same pattern is visible in the case of Winchester College. Parliament and local authorities were aware of the royalism of the school's warden and fellowship, something discussed later in this thesis. Due to the political opinions of the institutional authorities, a visitation of the school was established by the CRU, taking place over winter 1649-50 and conducted by a mixture of MPs, local gentry, and the warden of New College, George Marshall.<sup>17</sup> The investigation was unlikely to have been too rigorous as the warden had powerful friends among the commissioners.<sup>18</sup> As a result, the college did not suffer the same turnover of personnel as its sister foundation of New College. It did, however, undergo a similar process. Like with New, the CRU soon after its creation decided that Winchester's personnel posed a problem. Activity followed as measures were taken to address the issue,

---

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 239, 241-2.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 244-5. New CA, 4207, 1649-50, 'Custus ad Extra'.

<sup>16</sup> Though this does not mean the problems had been conclusively settled. See Reinhart, *Oxford*, p. 503.

<sup>17</sup> For the establishment of the visitation see, Burrows, *Register*, p. 231; *CJ*, vi, p. 219; WCA, 395-7. See also WCA 445-7 for three letters written to Harris by the MP Nicholas Love which touch directly or more tangentially on the visitation.

<sup>18</sup> See esp. WCA, 445: '[B]y the meanes of Mr Love Natt. Fiennes and other w[i]th who[m] the Dr [John Harris] pr[e]servd an interest' the school escaped punishment or ejections. See also chapter 5.

in Winchester's case by establishing a visitation. A resolution was reached by early 1650 and thereafter the committee took a back seat, largely leaving the school to its own devices. The cases of the sister foundations were comparable to other items of the CRU's work in 1649-50: neither were systemic problems requiring a permanent committee. They were specific issues which could be resolved — by finding the college object, adjudicating the land dispute, ejecting the royalists — and dealt with quickly. Noticeably, all the cases analysed in this section are from the relatively narrow period of 1649-50. Rather than a coincidence, this reflects the brevity of the need for an external authority to resolve the extraordinary problems facing places of learning. As cases like New and Winchester Colleges show, outstanding problems from the 1640s had been largely cleared up or had dissipated by the beginning of the 1650s.

The duties of the CRU in 1649 therefore were largely impermanent, determined by the context of widespread institutional confusion. An example of this point can be seen with an unusual petition addressed to the committee — unusual as it appears to have been never delivered and abandoned half-finished. The document in question was a request by Oxford's bedels, university administrative officials, to the CRU for an increase in their maintenance.<sup>19</sup> The appeal began with a recognition that the committee had lately requested the table of fees for the university. The petitioners argued that their pay was reliant on the fees of proceeders who had been more numerous when the table was set during the 1630s. Due to the 'yet unsettled condition' of the university and the realm, the number of the proceeders was unlikely to rise, leaving the bedels with an insufficient income, especially given their pains

---

<sup>19</sup> The petition is undated but mentions a recent CRU request for the table of fees. The account book for Cambridge lists charges in writing up a table of the university's fees in the financial year ending November 1649 which was likely from the same order [CUL, GBR/0265/UA/U.Ac.2/1, f. 752].

and troubles. Yet, having established the premises the precise details of what the bedels wanted are unknown: the petition stops abruptly before articulating their demands.

It is fortunate, however, that this draft survives as otherwise the involvement of the CRU would be lost to history. Evidence relating to the bedels' request remains in Oxford's records, but the committee is absent from these materials. Indeed, were it not for the draft petition, it would appear that the issue of the bedels was dealt with entirely in-house, by the university itself. From the university's register, it is known that the petition of the bedels was being considered by the delegates in September and October 1649, and an act for their augmentation was eventually agreed by convocation in November.<sup>20</sup> The only role the CRU played in the matter came a full two years later in November 1651 when the committee agreed to continue the augmentation for another two years.<sup>21</sup> Thanks to the chance survival of the petition, the fact that at some point the bedels considered appealing to the committee is known. It seems likely that they began drafting the petition to present to the CRU then stopped before submission, deciding that the issue would be best settled through the university's governing bodies.

The petition raises the question of why the bedels initially thought of the CRU. The answer appears to be that they were not certain where to seek help for their pay. Their confusion about who would be able to assist them was well-founded: not only was Oxford in a 'yet unsettled condition', but there were signs of the committee taking into consideration the fees of the universities. As the bedels mentioned, the committee had recently requested

---

<sup>20</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, ff. 73, 74, 80-1.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 154-5.

a table of university fees, likely in order to make any necessary alterations. The bedels may have concluded that a standing parliamentary committee considering university finances was more likely to fix their problem than the university itself. If so, their situation reflected the confusion inside places of learning in the early days of the Rump about what powers still lay with the institutions. While the university was unsettled and beset by serious difficulties it was natural to turn to the external authority for aid and assume it would address all of Oxford's problems.

But ultimately the CRU were not involved. The problem of Oxford's bedels was settled by the university itself, not a parliamentary body. The course of events suggests that Oxford was not as powerless as the bedels initially suspected and possessed the ability to address some internal problems. Considering their other work, the CRU likely wanted the issue to be resolved by institutional authorities. The bedels' uncertainty about who to approach reflected the wider confusion inside places of learning, especially immediately following the committee's creation. That they eventually appealed to the university itself is a reminder that the CRU were not replacing institutional authorities despite being very active in those early months. The complicated situation necessitated the committee's involvement, but this period was not supposed to be a precedent for future relations between the external and internal authorities. The draft petition therefore captured a liminal moment between the start of the CRU and the cementing of its role *vis a vis* the academic institutions. As is shown in the following section, after playing the role of crisis-firefighter in 1649, the committee increasingly became a reactive external authority.

## II: Breaking the Rules: The CRU as an Executive Authority

Having shown above how the CRU's early work was dominated by issues relating to the civil wars, this section moves on to examine the role the committee played in managing places of learning. By doing so, this section demonstrates how the Rump's rule might be examined through its committee work and proceedings in local, institutional settings. As seen in the introduction of this thesis, the republican regime is traditionally seen as only intermittently interested in the matters of educational institutions and its confidence in exercising royal powers is debated. Such perceptions can be tested by examining two aspects of the CRU's work: their performance of duties previously executed by the monarch in places of learning and their regular duties as an external court of appeal. Both parts of the CRU's role demonstrate how they were acting as the executive authority in places of learning. This is not to say they were the only parliamentary authority involved in educational institutions: related bodies like the visitors of Oxford who operated throughout the committee's lifespan were important in their own right.<sup>22</sup> However, as will be shown, the CRU possessed the final say — bar Parliament — in decisions relating to places of learning and took over many of the responsibilities and powers previously held by the monarch.

The CRU's assumption of regal powers was symbolised by their performance of duties previously carried out by the monarch in institutions such as Trinity, Cambridge. Trinity had 20 bedesmen — charitable positions which had been established by Henry VIII

---

<sup>22</sup> The visitors and CRU clashed over their respective degree of authority in Oxford [Worden, *Oxford*, pp. 100-1].

— with the king and his successors reserving a royal right to nominate ten of the places.<sup>23</sup> With Charles I dead, the CRU had to take over the appointments of these places. In March 1650 the master and senior fellows of the college appointed George Feach and John Styles to two vacant places at the request of the CRU with the committee filling places ‘belonging to the late king[es] donation’.<sup>24</sup> The parliamentary governors of Westminster College had to perform a similar role with places at that almshouse attached to the school, fielding petitions for places.<sup>25</sup> In that institution’s case, the authority had previously resided with the dean and chapter rather than the king; however, in both institutions the relevant parliamentary authority enacted royal or ecclesiastical power and continued the traditional mechanisms of rule. In the words of one historian of Cambridge, a similar CRU admission of a student to a scholarship at King’s showed that the committee claimed ‘an authority in elections to scholarships not inferior to that formerly exercised by the Crown’.<sup>26</sup>

Alongside a literal assumption of royal duties, the CRU was also taking over royal powers over places of learning. The royal power over appointments and ability to impose an individual by *mandamus* was well-known and was a power utilised frequently by the CRU in filling fellowships throughout their tenure. The same authority allowed them to, on occasion, ride roughshod over statutory requirements for their appointments. Just as the monarch had held the ability to make exceptions for certain scholars, so the committee too would alter the rules for their own favourites, such as Thomas Horton, head of Queens’, Cambridge, and professor of divinity at Gresham College. Gresham’s statutes specified that professors could not be married and so Horton, who celebrated his wedding in 1651, was

---

<sup>23</sup> C.H. Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge* (5 vols, Cambridge, 1842-52), iii, p. 420.

<sup>24</sup> Trinity Cambridge CA, Conclusion Book, 1607-1673, f. 213.

<sup>25</sup> WAM, 5273, 5275-7, 5341, 5364.

<sup>26</sup> J.B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge from the Election of Buckingham to the Chancellorship in 1626 to the Decline of the Platonist Movement* (3 vols, Cambridge, 1911), iii, p. 379.

technically disqualified from his position.<sup>27</sup> However, when called before the governing committee of Gresham in March 1652, Horton was able to produce a certificate from the CRU ‘for his continuance in his place...notwithstanding that he is married’.<sup>28</sup> The end of the committee in April threw his position into doubt as Gresham’s governors renewed their attempts to remove him, but the manner in which he had initially been relieved showed the power over college places and rules which the CRU wielded.<sup>29</sup> As Parliament’s standing committee for education they were in a position to make such exemptions for favoured individuals such as Horton just as Cromwell as lord protector would do for the same married professor when Gresham tried again to expel him in 1656.<sup>30</sup>

The committee used the same powers when awarding degrees contrary to the usual rules of the institutions. The registers of the universities show the CRU recommending individuals for degrees despite not having fulfilled the statutory requirements of time. The number of such cases in some ways reflected specific problems thrown up by the wars. Many students, such as William Harrington of Gonville and Caius, had spent time away from their studies due to the conflict of the 1640s. Fortunately for Harrington, his absence was for the respectable pursuit of serving in Parliament’s army for two years providing a good basis on which to petition the CRU. Harrington argued that had he spent that time in college he would have proceeded to the degree of doctor in civil law. The CRU agreed with his arguments and ordered the vice-chancellor of Cambridge to admit him to the degree.<sup>31</sup> Cases like Harrington’s or Horton’s reveal how the CRU were using their executive authority. Both

---

<sup>27</sup> MCA, MC/1/9/A/1/1/2, f. 127. For Horton in general, see S. Wright, ‘Thomas Horton’, *ODNB*. For Horton at Gresham, see J. Ward, *The Lives of the Professors of Gresham College...* (London, 1740), pp. 65-6.

<sup>28</sup> MCA, MC/1/9/A/1/1/2, f. 129.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 129, 131.

<sup>30</sup> TNA, SP 25/77, f. 348.

<sup>31</sup> CUL, Grace Book H, ff. 99-100.

decisions showed the authority of the committee and their ability to make changes to places of learning. But both decisions were on a person-by-person basis and did not change the existing system, suggesting the committee's willingness to work within the system and uphold it in general. Harrington's case also hints at how the use of executive power by the committee could be more routine than would be apparent in Horton's case. Harrington was only one of many who received exemptions for degrees from the committee. His case, and those like it, show that just because the CRU did not use their powers to effect radical change, they could still be using that power.

Another area in which the CRU routinely used their extensive powers was as a court of appeal. College visitors, often bishops or the monarch, had previously been the adjudicators of internal collegiate disputes. The committee replaced them, being empowered by the Parliament to hear appeals against the decisions of the board of visitors inside the universities.<sup>32</sup> In reality, the CRU seems to have had a far wider remit than simply dealing with the visitors' contested decisions. As a notoriously vitriolic case involving the master and fellows of Peterhouse illustrated, the CRU was effectively the ultimate court of appeal for all collegiate disputes. Some evidence of their activities survives in their orders and a few pamphlets, such as those relating to the Peterhouse case. In that incident, a fellow of the college, named Charles Hotham, attempted to use the committee as a site to air his extensive grievances about the conduct and powers of the head, Lazarus Seaman.<sup>33</sup> Thanks to Hotham's detailed pamphlets, the production of which cost him his fellowship, an enormous degree of detail about his case and the committee's examination of the case survives and has

---

<sup>32</sup> *A&O*, i, pp. 925-7.

<sup>33</sup> C. Hotham, *Corporations Vindicated in their Fundamental Liberties...* (London, 1651); idem, *The Petition and Argument of Mr. Hotham...* (London, 1651); idem, *A True State of the Case of Mr. Hotham, Late Fellow of Peter-House* (London, 1651).

received due attention in historical studies.<sup>34</sup> The animosity in Hotham's case helped ensure the college was recorded for posterity and the few other well-known examples of appeals to the committee seem to have had similar resentment underneath them. Yet, such famous cases can be misleading. Not all college disagreements were fought with such belligerence as Peterhouse's and not all appeals engendered pamphlets or lived long in the memory. Prioritizing only a few high-profile incidents can create a misleading impression. From Hotham's case, the CRU might appear a distant authority, a body appealed to when the usual university or collegiate system broke down irrevocably and therefore involved only rarely and in extraordinary circumstances.

However, the CRU, although an external body, was part of the institutional system, regularly hearing appeals. By looking at a variety of fragmentary sources usually held in college archives it is possible to see that the committee was hearing far more cases than is usually thought, many of which would otherwise be unknown. At Gonville and Caius the college accounts for 1651 reveal that the master and fellows of the college spent £22 in several journeys to London to attend the CRU.<sup>35</sup> They appeared before the committee to defend the college against Abner Coes, a fellow who had been expelled for breaking college statutes and had gone to the CRU to appeal.<sup>36</sup> The master and fellows seem to have convinced the committee and Coes did not reappear but the sparsity of evidence relating to the issue is noticeable. The materials relating to the case have not survived and neither side thought it worthwhile, or perhaps advisable considering what later happened to Hotham, to produce a printed work. All that remain of the incident are passing references in the records

---

<sup>34</sup> Twigg, *Cambridge*, pp. 164-5; T.A. Walker, *Peterhouse* (London, 1906), p. 115.

<sup>35</sup> Gonville & Caius CA, BUR/F/88/20, Annunciation to Michaelmas 1651, 'Pro Expensis Superioris...'.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. For Coes being expelled, see Gonville & Caius CA, GOV/03/01/02, f. ?2. For Coes, see also J.A. Venn & J. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1922-1954) i, part 1, p. 364.

of Gonville and Caius. Yet, although the source base is limited, when placed in the context of other financial records it still shows the committee to be acting as a court of appeal in a way which can be described as routine and not the extraordinary, distant authority suggested by the Hotham case. The trip of Gonville and Caius members to London was just one of many by colleges and schools to see the committee, either seeking decisions or orders. These journeys and the widespread purchase or reception of CRU orders demonstrates that famous cases like Hotham's are merely the tip of the iceberg.<sup>37</sup> The committee was a regular part of institutional life throughout the period.

By assembling the evidence relating to the committee that does remain, it is possible to see the types of functions the CRU fulfilled and how they performed their duties. Whereas the Commonwealth government is often seen as a relatively uninterested party in educational matters and uneasy about the performance of royal duties, the CRU's work shows how the Rump was an active presence in places of learning, wielding executive power, and carrying out the duties previously incumbent on the monarchy. This section therefore showed how investigating Parliament's committees and their work in local settings can produce a different image to the episodic Rump, only infrequently stirred to action, which dominates so much literature. As the next section demonstrates, a study of the Rump in action through its committees also allows the relationship between centre and locality during the Commonwealth to be investigated.

---

<sup>37</sup> For purchases of committee orders, Jesus Oxford CA, Bu:Ac Gen:1, f. 186; Christ's Cambridge CA, B.1.10, f. 156; Sidney Sussex CA, MR.61, ff. 486, 496; St Catharine's Cambridge CA, L/26, f. 197r; St John's Cambridge CA, SJAR/3/2/4/6, f. 25v (1650). For examples of journeys to London to see the CRU, Gonville & Caius CA, BUR/F/88/20, Annunciation 1651 – Michaelmas 1651; St John's Cambridge CA, SJAR/3/2/4/6, ff. 406r, 20v (1650); Trinity Cambridge CA, Senior Bursar's Audit Book, 1637-1659, f. 14v (1650).

### III: A ‘free election of fellows’: Self-Governance and Statutable Rule

It might be thought that the relationship between educational institutions and the external parliamentary authority explored above was tense. Blair Worden, for example, has analysed the degree to which Oxonians resented outside interference in university business and that desire influenced the university’s petitioning to Parliament in 1652 for a second board of visitors.<sup>38</sup> However, while it is true that the relationship between Parliament and educational institutions was often fraught, this section reveals the previously underexamined attempts by the CRU to empower places of learning and diminish the committee’s involvement in their affairs. As will be shown in this section, the committee rarely used their powers to overhaul the places of learning. Instead, they showed a willingness and desire to return educational institutions to a position of autonomy with their traditional practices, according to statutes, upheld. The committee’s work also suggests a wider point about the relationship between centre and locality in the period: rather than it being perennially antagonistic, the CRU’s work implies it was more of a partnership with the government willing to allow a great degree of agency to local institutions and with the committee usually acting at the initiative of institutional authorities.

However, in some cases, it was parliamentary authorities who took the lead in efforts to restore autonomy in places of learning, something seen with the resumption of the chancellor’s court in Oxford. This court, presided over by the vice-chancellor, represented the university’s independent jurisdiction over its own affairs but had lapsed during the civil wars. Notably, the drive for the court to resume came from the visitors of Oxford, who in

---

<sup>38</sup> Worden, *Oxford*, p. 124.

September 1649 ordered the vice-chancellor to resurrect the court, although it was only in July 1650 that it began sitting again.<sup>39</sup> The court's revival was significant, in part, because of its nature as a tool of self-governance. Its resumption was an important step in the return to institutional autonomy after the disruption of the 1640s, a point borne out by glancing at the work of Cambridge's university court. That body was involved in matters of punishment and student discipline such as in June 1649, when it heard a case relating to the drinking of healths to the king at a Midsummer Fair.<sup>40</sup> Three members of St John's were the defendants. Witnesses deposed that they heard the scholars toasting to Charles II and to the 'confounding of Tom: Fairefax' or 'black Tom' (i.e. Thomas 3<sup>rd</sup> Lord Fairfax, commander-in-chief of the New Model Army from 1645-1650).<sup>41</sup> When they were told to 'pray for your enemies' the scholars 'answered wee wish that he [Fairfax] may dye without repentance, that he may be damned.'<sup>42</sup> The court heard the evidence and then punished the scholars, fining two and expelling the third.<sup>43</sup> As the punishments demonstrated, the court was a mechanism for Cambridge to police itself and so one which did not need the intervention of an external authority or a board of visitors. The revived chancellor's court at Oxford was therefore an important step towards a return to the *status quo ante bellum* and a theatre in which university business could be aired.

Generally, however, it was not usual for the parliamentary authorities to take the initiative in restoring autonomy to educational institutions. Instead, it was far more common for the institution in question to take the initiative and petition the committee or visitors for a change in their favour, a point evidenced by the return of free elections to colleges.

---

<sup>39</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 262; Wood, *Annals*, p. 636.

<sup>40</sup> CUL, GBR/0265/UA/VCCt.I 61, ff. 74v-5v.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 74v.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 74v-5r.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 75v.

Parliament in the 1640s had barred many colleges from electing heads, fellows, and scholars due to political malignancy or a paucity of numbers. However, several colleges or institutions appear to have sought the CRU's permission to resume free elections, such as St John's, Cambridge, which spent over £3 in a journey to London to procure a 'free election of fellows' in late 1649.<sup>44</sup> St John's, which appears to have won back its right to elect fellows by April 1650, is an indication of how important the colleges themselves were in determining whether the committee acted.<sup>45</sup> The CRU was fundamentally an external court of appeal; daily business relied on their assistants, the university visitors, but also the colleges themselves. It is notable, for example, that Oxford and Cambridge had very different experiences of choosing new chancellors in the early 1650s because of their willingness to petition parliamentary authorities. When Oxford's chancellor, the earl of Pembroke, died in 1650, the university petitioned the CRU, leading the committee in December 1650 to reverse an earlier decision and allow Oxford a free election.<sup>46</sup> In comparison, when the earl of Manchester was ousted at Cambridge over the Engagement, no effort seems to have been made by the university to influence the choice of his successor and they had Oliver St John imposed on them by order of the CRU as a result.<sup>47</sup>

Yet, although the committee was largely reactive, it is still possible to see a trend in their decisions towards returning autonomy to colleges to make elections. That is not to say the process of returning votes to institutions was linear. Instead, it was very piecemeal to the

---

<sup>44</sup> St John's Cambridge CA, SJAR/3/2/4/6, f. 427v.

<sup>45</sup> There is a college reference to fellows being elected on 1 April 1650 [St John's Cambridge CA, SJAR/5/1/15/1/1, f. 279v].

<sup>46</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/ Reg T, f. 120. The chancellorship was contested between three men in particular, John Bradshawe, Oliver Cromwell, and Bulstrode Whitelocke [*The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675*, ed. R. Spalding (Oxford, 1990), p. 254].

<sup>47</sup> CUL, Grace Book H, f. 98. Some expenses relating to the change of chancellor at Cambridge, including 'for hyre of a horse to carry' the CRU's 'Letter to the Lord Manchester' (presumably to announce his ejection), are recorded in CUL, GBR/0265/UA/U.Ac.2/1, ff. 772-3 with the quote on f. 772.

extent that those within the institutions, like Gerard Langbaine, were uncertain in which cases the committee would actually exercise its powers. When Oxford's librarian, John Rouse, was near death in March 1652 and an election seemed likely, Langbaine reported in a letter to the MP John Selden that there was considerable uncertainty whether the CRU would 'take upon them[selves] to dispose of it' or allow the university to make an election.<sup>48</sup> However, although uneven, free elections did return to places of learning under the Rump. Whereas two out of eighteen Oxford colleges held the right to free elections in 1649, by 1652 it was eleven.<sup>49</sup>

The return of free elections is indicative of the CRU's attitude to the return of self-governance. Although reactive, the CRU's response to institutional appeals was usually positive. In April 1650, the committee declared that it would not recommend people to fellowships or scholarships in either university where there was a competent number of fellows to elect according to statutes.<sup>50</sup> This order seems to have been in response to a petition by the delegates of Oxford university from the preceding month requesting such freedom of election.<sup>51</sup> The incident, again, captures the dynamic of the relationship between the institutions and the committee but also hints at the CRU's wider intention for the institutions. The committee was consistently willing when it deemed suitable, and when petitioned, to restore free elections to colleges. This broad trend indicates that the CRU did not see its role as to watch over the running of the institutions permanently or to change them but to help guide them to a position where they could rule themselves. That the committee did not attempt to use its powers to effect change is noticeable and suggests a

---

<sup>48</sup> Bodl., Selden Supra 109, f. 465r. In the end, the university was allowed to elect the librarian and chose Thomas Barlow.

<sup>49</sup> Reinhart, *Oxford*, p. 426.

<sup>50</sup> Hotham, *True State*, p. 91.

<sup>51</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, f. 101.

deeper point about their attitude towards places of learning: namely a desire to restore rather than remodel them and a willingness to preserve their structure and practices.

Proof for the committee's conservative approach can be shown by their respect for institutional statutes. The committee could occasionally act against the traditions of the institutions when choosing fellows or scholars such as approving Robert Wood for a fellowship at Lincoln, 'not w[i]thstanding his incapacitie thereunto by Statute in regard of County'.<sup>52</sup> Yet, it is noticeable how much they attempted to ensure appointments fulfilled statutable requirements, examples of which are apparent in college register books such as that of Brasenose. A college fellowship reserved for a native of Herefordshire had been filled by a Cheshire man, Mr Ridgeway. In September 1650, the committee ordered Ridgeway to be moved to a void Cheshire fellowship and John Carpender, a Herefordshire man, to replace him.<sup>53</sup> Carpender was elected in early November and the incident indicates a desire by the committee to ensure college rules were followed with a comparable case occurring the following year at University College. Several orders by the CRU in 1651 appointing new fellows explicitly mentioned the need for places to be filled according to the college rules governing each position, like a fellowship left vacant following the death of Richard Washington. The committee filled his place with Edward Farrers, stating that he was a suitable candidate, not least because 'of his fittnes for the said place as being a Northerne man'.<sup>54</sup> Presumably, the candidates at both Brasenose and University College had petitioned the committee, though any such documents are now lost. In any case, how the committee

---

<sup>52</sup> Lincoln CA, LC/R/2, f. 91r.

<sup>53</sup> Brasenose College Archives, Gov 3 A1/2, 1594-1710, f. 74v.

<sup>54</sup> University CA, UC:GB3/A1/1, f. 61.

responded and the rhetoric they employed suggests they perceived themselves to be a friend to statutory custom inside places of learning.

An example from another case in which the petition survives suggests those inside places of learning did appeal to the idea of the committee as a defender of tradition. In early 1651, ‘Severall Graduates and other Schollars of Queenes [Oxford]...borne in Cumberland and Westmorland’ petitioned the CRU, complaining that positions intended by the founder for natives of ‘the two poore Northern Counties’ had been filled by ‘meere strangers’.<sup>55</sup> They asked for the positions to be filled only according to the wishes of the founder and were met with a warm response by the committee: the two senior petitioners, John Dobson and Andrew Whelpdall, were elected to fellowships shortly afterwards by the committee.<sup>56</sup> Whether the Queen’s students actually believed the MPs sitting on the board were friends to collegiate customs is debatable but their petition does reveal how the committee was perceived. It suggests that the CRU were considered an external authority where arguments appealing to tradition could be mooted and used. Petitioners, it appears, believed that the body would be sympathetic to arguments based on statutes.

A detailed set of examples from Winchester College shows this perception of the committee was widespread. The college was the site of a protracted petitioning effort to the CRU regarding the following of statutable rule in early 1652. The background to the activity was a wave of ejections at New College in the preceding years which had disrupted the traditional channel of Winchester scholars to New College fellowships. The mass removal

---

<sup>55</sup> Queen’s Oxford CA, College Register H, f. 130. For the petition and its aftermath see, J.R. Magrath, *The Queen’s College* (2 vols, Oxford, 1921), ii, pp. 17-21.

<sup>56</sup> Queen’s Oxford CA, College Register H, f. 133.

of fellows from New College was followed by a multitude of intrusions, removing chances of promotion for Winchester scholars. Exasperated, the warden of Winchester, John Harris, wrote a furious letter to the MP Robert Reynolds. Harris had written before over the expulsions but complained ‘that above 30 forreiners have beene since that time thrust into that College’.<sup>57</sup> Harris urged Reynolds to intervene as the number of new faces reduced hopes for his scholars.

The disruption of these ejections led to problems affecting Winchester’s scholars in 1652. The cause of complaint was a fellowship at New College, void following the resignation of a fellow called William Hiccocks.<sup>58</sup> In December 1651 the committee declared that New College was not in a fit state for elections and placed William Staughton into the vacancy.<sup>59</sup> Staughton’s promotion was to the detriment of Winchester scholars as, by statute, the next elected scholar from the school ought to have filled the place. The scholar in question, James Sacheverell, subsequently petitioned the CRU saying that the fellowship was his by right.<sup>60</sup> Sacheverell was supported by Harris and petitions were prepared on behalf of the school to both Cromwell and the committee with Sacheverell eventually gaining his wish and proceeding to a fellowship at New College in 1651.<sup>61</sup> The issue concerned more than one scholar’s career for Staughton’s promotion could be a precedent to overturn the usual cycle of elections. The school’s petition reiterated the demands for Hiccocks’ place to be filled according to the statutes but also requested that resignations of

---

<sup>57</sup> WCA, 424.

<sup>58</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 170; T.F. Kirby, *Annals of Winchester College, from Its Foundation in the Year 1382 to the Present Time* (London, 1892), pp. 342-3.

<sup>59</sup> WCA, 402.

<sup>60</sup> WCA, 403.

<sup>61</sup> WCA, 407. For Sacheverell going to New College, see T. Kirby, *Winchester Scholars: A List of the Wardens, Fellows, and Scholars of Saint Mary College of Winchester, near Winchester, Commonly Called Winchester College* (London, 1888), p. 181.

fellows be handed into the warden of New College to prevent the corrupt practice of outgoing persons helping friends to their places.<sup>62</sup> As in the case of the petition from Queen's college, Sacheverell and Harris were scholars treating the CRU as the defender of tradition and customs in places of learning, utilising a rhetoric which stressed statutable rule.

Also like at Queen's, the outcome of their efforts suggests the pair were correct in their understanding of the CRU. An order of 22 January was passed by the committee stating that all void places at New were to be filled by scholars from Winchester and the case of Staughton was not to be a precedent.<sup>63</sup> This was followed by an order of 19 February which commanded all fellows of New to hand their resignations into the warden and fellows, so avoiding potential corruption in the trading of fellowships.<sup>64</sup> Cases like Winchester and Queen's show that there was a strong current of rhetoric in both places of learning which emphasised the importance of statutory government and that its ideals were believed to be shared by those sitting at the CRU. The issue of statutes shows more, however, than only a desire to follow pre-existing rules. How the CRU responded to the petitions of various scholars reveals a respectful attitude towards institutional customs and practices.

The respect for educational tradition explains why the committee used their power to rationalise rather than transform the existing system. The 1650 cycle of proctors for Cambridge was a case in point.<sup>65</sup> The two university proctors, annually chosen according to a cycle of the colleges, were senior officers who played a prominent role in the university's

---

<sup>62</sup> This corruption was common at New College and All Souls, see, H. Rashdall & R.S. Rait, *New College* (London, 1998), pp. 178-9.

<sup>63</sup> WCA, 423.

<sup>64</sup> WCA, 404.

<sup>65</sup> Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 165.

disciplinary life. In 1650, the CRU was petitioned by members of Emmanuel and Sidney Sussex to alter the process for nominating proctors and some other university officers.<sup>66</sup> These colleges had been founded after the existing cycle of nominations had been established and therefore did not have influence over the appointments. Members of the two colleges called on the CRU to reform the cycle by including all of the colleges and found the committee sympathetic. An initial CRU order was produced on 1 August 1650 asking the vice-chancellor to call a convocation and announce the CRU's opinion that the recently founded colleges ought to be given powers to nominate the officials similar to those of the older colleges.<sup>67</sup> The convocation was called and eventually a new cycle was produced, and ratified by the committee, despite the protests of Trinity and St John's — the two colleges trying to preserve their privileged position.<sup>68</sup> The CRU resolved in favour of the reformers and ordered the new cycle to be enforced at Cambridge, allowing Emmanuel, Sidney Sussex, and a third college — Magdalene — to elect.

The significance of the new cycle outweighs its actual impact. The alteration to the rota of university officials was an important development at Cambridge, as the resistance of Trinity and St John's suggests. That such a change took place was a sign of the CRU's authority and position as chief power in places of learning, but it is important to note how the result of the order was an improvement of the existing system rather than a transformation. Emmanuel, Magdalene, and Sidney were added to the cycle, diminishing the power of other colleges, but the system was fundamentally unchanged. Instead, it had been updated to reflect the existence of the newer colleges. The change was a rationalisation

---

<sup>66</sup> Magdalene Cambridge CA, B/422, f. 15.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.* See also, CUL, Grace Book H, ff. 70-2.

<sup>68</sup> Magdalene Cambridge CA, B/422, f. 16.

rather than revolution, tweaking what was already there. The presence of petitioning is also significant. As above, the new cycle relied on the colleges appealing to the committee. The petitioning indicates how the CRU functioned — as a reactive body. The reactivity, however, can be seen as stemming from a willingness to let the colleges run themselves and appeal when necessary to the London-based committee. Although the CRU's decisions were piecemeal, they were also based on similar principles which are identifiable when the individual orders are examined in conjunction.

Considering what has been seen of the committee's attitude to learning, it is likely more than coincidence that life in the institutions began to return to its pre-war nature during the Commonwealth. Major academic events such as the Act and Commencement resumed having been suspended due to fears of security in the first years of the Rump, and annual election of scholars to the universities resumed a more regular course.<sup>69</sup> In part, the return of normality was a natural development as the conflict of the 1640s receded into the past, but it also owed something to the unwillingness of the committee to change very much and their light-touch approach to rule. Not only did the CRU avoid change, but they seem to have actively supported the resumption of the usual academic calendar. A CRU order from 1650 commanding vacant places at Trinity, Cambridge, to be filled by scholars from Westminster School according to tradition seems to have been part of the committee's efforts to ensure the rights of the Westminster scholars and the results of the election were taken seriously, much as they had done at Winchester following the school's petitioning.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Wood, *Annals*, p. 646. Trinity Cambridge CA, Box 29 CIV, no. 475. Winchester, for example, began to elect scholars for New College again, having been barred from doing so in 1649 [Burrows, *Register*, 233]. The accounts for Winchester list a trip in early or mid-1650 to London concerning the election of scholars to Oxford. Possibly this was to receive the consent of the CRU to hold the event [WCA, Bursars' Book, 1644-1671, September 1649-September 1650, 'Custus Necessariorum cum Donis'].

<sup>70</sup> Trinity Cambridge CA, Box 29 CIV, no. 470.

The order was an attempt to keep Trinity from ignoring the results of the election and is another example of the committee trying to keep institutions run according to their own rules.

If life in 1650s Cambridge was similar in some ways to that of the 1630s it was not due to chance but to the priorities and work of a parliamentary committee which trusted in the structure and practices of educational institutions. As has been seen in this section, the CRU's attitude to the issue of autonomy was indicative of their attitude to the reform of educational institutions more widely. How the committee responded to the petitions of those inside places of learning demonstrated that they did not intend to transform the structure of traditions of the institutions but to reform them and restore them to a position where they could govern themselves according to their statutes and customs. The agency held by those inside educational institutions, seen in this section, is brought up frequently in this thesis. The extent to which the committee was willing to envisage self-governing institutions suggests that the relationship between Parliament and the localities in the period was less a struggle for supremacy than is sometimes believed, but more of a partnership with the centre willing to work with empowered groups in the localities. However, as seen below, the more the CRU returned power to the institutions, the more they diminished the need for their own existence.

#### IV: The End of the CRU

If the CRU played such an active and important role in educational affairs, then why did it end? The answer is that the pressing need for a body performing its duties had greatly diminished by 21 April 1652 when the CRU was dissolved. A standing parliamentary committee had been necessary in 1649 to resolve problems lingering on from earlier in the decade. Once these urgent contextual problems were addressed, the committee retreated into the role of an external executive authority and, as seen above, proved willing to restore self-governance to the educational institutions. Ultimately, the committee was a victim of both its own success and the natural passage of time. As the most urgent issues of the 1640s dissipated or were resolved, the need for the committee lessened. By 1652 there was little extraordinary business requiring the authority of an external body and the CRU increasingly became seen as obsolete, its usefulness outweighed by other contextual concerns.

The dissolution of the CRU was several months in the making. In December 1651, the Commons resolved to transfer the committee's powers to non-parliamentary commissioners as part of a wider Rump trend of dissolving or putting into commission its executive committees in order to lessen the burden of routine government work on the small band of MPs and free them to focus on the business of the House.<sup>71</sup> The Commons only returned to the CRU's future the following April and then deviated from its original intention. In a series of votes on 21 April, the original question of transferring the committee's powers was replaced by a motion to dissolve it immediately.<sup>72</sup> An effort to

---

<sup>71</sup> *CJ*, vii, p. 50.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 124.

insert a clause to delay its disbanding, probably in order to secure a transfer of duties, was defeated. Instead, a vote was held for the question of dissolution to be put. This was an important step: under parliamentary procedure if the motion succeeded the vote of dissolution would have to be held without further debate, therefore the CRU's survival would be determined by an immediate decision.<sup>73</sup> The vote passed, and so, subsequently, did the decision to abolish the CRU. The termination of the committee was sudden but, as mentioned above, the reasons behind its end were longstanding. By late 1651, the need for a body like the CRU, fulfilling the duties it did, had greatly diminished.

Diminished rather than disappeared, though, for theoretically several aspects of the CRU's role could have continued indefinitely. There was always need for a court of appeal and there could always be use for an executive authority to resolve differences and govern the institutions. An awareness of the continued importance of these functions influenced the petition of Oxford to Parliament in summer 1652 for a new board of visitors. The petition, presented in June, called on a new internal board to be named to take up the work of the CRU and earlier visitors, including acting as a court of appeal, altering statutes, and pursuing reformation.<sup>74</sup> The university's petition, which resulted in the second board of visitors, hints at the resentment an external committee had caused in Oxford, but also shows how much of the committee's role could be continuous. Reform could always be pursued, and appeals could always be heard.

---

<sup>73</sup> H. Scobell, *Memorials of the Method and Maner of Proceedings in Parliament...* (London, 1656), pp. 27-9.

<sup>74</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 366r; *CJ*, vii, p. 141. See also Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 367r; OUA, SP/E/4, ff. 53r-v, 57r; Wood, *Annals*, pp. 650-2; Worden, *Oxford*, pp. 124-5. Following the end of the CRU, the visitors ceased working, unsure of whether their authority had expired with the committee [Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 366r].

Yet, in important ways, much of the immediate need for the CRU had all but ceased by 1652. The crises in academic foundations caused by the civil wars, which had dominated so much CRU work and necessitated an independent committee, had largely been addressed by then. All the institutions under the committee's remit had been visited or purged and, although pockets of royalism persisted throughout the Interregnum, they had all been reduced to a state of *de facto* obedience. It is true that the Engagement, which was overseen by the CRU and visitors in places of learning, was a sign that extraordinary business could occur throughout the committee's life.<sup>75</sup> So too was the brief revival of the CRU in June 1652 to make a report — which was never delivered — to the house on their earlier decision to eject Charles Hotham, a fellow of Peterhouse who had complained to the House, from his fellowship.<sup>76</sup> Yet, although *ad hoc* issues of this nature could happen, the type of pressing business which had dominated the CRU's early life had eased. Indeed, there are suggestions from the time that some believed the CRU was drifting into irrelevance. As Oxford's 1652 petition mentioned, the committee had been dissolved 'in regarde of the other weightie affaires of Parliamt', indicating a shift in the priorities of the government and the Commonwealth trend in placing executive committees in commission.<sup>77</sup> A dismissive attitude to the committee was certainly shown at the time of its end in the weekly journals. While *Several Proceedings* baldly stated that, for the relevant week, 'The House passed votes for dissolving of some Committees', the *Weekly Intelligencer* was blunt, writing 'That which this week is most remarkable, is, Some useless Courts and Committees put down by order of Parliament.'<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> *CJ*, vi, p. 307.

<sup>76</sup> *CJ*, vii, p. 141.

<sup>77</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 366r.

<sup>78</sup> *Several Proceedings in Parliament*, 134 (15 April, 1652), p. 2089; *Weekly Intelligencer*, 70 (20 April, 1652), p. 438. *Mercurius Politicus* contains the most direct reference: 'It was resolved by the Parliament; That the Committee for the Universities, and the Committee of Indemnity shall sit no more. And that on Friday come fortnight, they will consider of supplying the house with Members.' *Mercurius Politicus*, 98 (15 April, 1652), p. 1552.

The comments of the newssheets suggest a degree of apathy which may have been shared by some of the committeemen. Noticeably, the two tellers for dissolving the committee, Sir Arthur Hesilrige and Henry Marten, were both MPs who had played some type of role in it. Neither were frequent attendees of the committee, but each had at times taken part in its work with Marten attending meetings less than a fortnight before the dissolution.<sup>79</sup> Hesilrige was the less frequent attendee of the two, but he had some links with the committee's work. Thanks to an intra-college dispute at Lincoln in 1650, remarks of Thankful Owen, later President of St John's, Oxford, were recorded in depositions. In a summary of contemptuous statements about the CRU made by Owen, it was alleged that he had said 'That a Committee mans Testimonium is as good as nothing' when the witnesses were discussing how 'S[i]r Arthur Hazelridge gave testimony of a gentleman'.<sup>80</sup> Hesilrige was certainly not a regular attendee of the committee, but the remarks suggest he was known to have some business with it and considered a 'Committee man'. Both he and Marten took some part in the CRU's work and their involvement as tellers in the vote might suggest that even those inside the committee felt growing indifference towards it.

Any feelings of apathy toward the CRU were likely compounded by other 'weightie affaires' of Parliament at the time, such as the First Anglo Dutch War. War was declared in May 1652, following a confrontation between the fleets of the two nations, but had been looming for months in advance. Tensions had simmered throughout 1651, especially over economic concerns, reinforced by hostile popular polemics in both countries.<sup>81</sup> The fighting

---

<sup>79</sup> Peterhouse CA, N.1.33 (from back), f. 20.

<sup>80</sup> OUA, SP/E/4, f. 44r.

<sup>81</sup> Worden, *Rump*, pp. 299-300.

began officially in May 1652 but in the words of one historian, before that date '[b]oth sides were armed to the teeth, imbued with deep hatred for the other, only waiting for a spark to ignite a war'.<sup>82</sup> So heated had this cold war become that in 1651 126 Dutch ships or ships carrying Dutch cargo were seized by the English as opposed to the 22 in 1649.<sup>83</sup> The signs of the coming war were all too visible in April 1652 when the CRU was dissolved. It was, after all, the same month that the Dutch admiral, Maarten Tromp, set out to sea with orders to protect Dutch shipping from the English. An awareness of the coming conflict likely reinforced any doubts within Parliament about the need for the CRU. If its role and importance was fading, then would it not be more suitable for the committeemen to be freed from their duties to pay greater attention to the war?

The decreasing importance of the CRU and awareness of greater concerns likely threw into sharper relief several problems with the committee. One of the CRU's primary roles was to handle the management of augmentations and direct the work of the trustees for maintenance of ministers, as discussed in a later chapter, yet there are signs that the partnership ran into many difficulties. After the committee's abolition, the trustees left a memorandum concerning their relationship with it. They described how 'Revenues hath mett with severall difficulties in the managem[en]t thereof by reason of the severall Acts of Parliament crossing each other, and diverse defects in them, til at length, with some paines, it hath been brought into and now is an orderly way of receipt and disbursement.'<sup>84</sup> Nor do the CRU seem to have been efficient administrators with 'very many' cases not reviewed

---

<sup>82</sup> S. Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650-1668* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 69. See also *ibid.*, pp. 58-69.

<sup>83</sup> S. Groenveld, 'The English Civil Wars as a Cause of the First Anglo-Dutch War, 1640-1652', *HJ*, 30:3 (1987), p. 561.

<sup>84</sup> LPL, MS 1104, f. 35. The attempts by the CRU to impose order on the business of augmentation may be seen by a series of orders they passed establishing rules for the trustees LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, ff. 732-4.

till ‘the latter end of that Com[m]ittee’s sitting and many not reviewed at all’.<sup>85</sup> Problems with the CRU were only part of the wider issues affecting the entire administration of augmentations stemming from the division of responsibilities between the CPM, CRU, and trustees. One frustrated minister, who ended up bounced between all three in pursuit of his arrears, described the experience as being turned ‘from *post* to *pillar* to no purpose’ and likely others faced similar frustrations.<sup>86</sup> The dissolution of the CRU and eventual handing of the trustees to the CPM may have been an attempt to streamline what had become a byzantine system by removing an increasingly ‘useless’ committee.<sup>87</sup>

Along with augmentations, wider debates about the future of the church may have directly influenced the CRU’s demise. Ecclesiastical and theological reforms were being hotly discussed following the establishment of a committee to consider the propagation of the gospel in February.<sup>88</sup> This was the latest of a number of groups established to deal with the issue, prompted in this case by the presentation of *The Humble Proposals*, a collection of suggestions for church reform, by a group of Independent divines led by John Owen.<sup>89</sup> At the end of March, the committee, with the consultation of the ministers, was debating these proposals along with suggestions ‘by other godly Persons, Ministers, and others’.<sup>90</sup> The CRU was included in the plans which emerged from this latter, anonymous group and

---

<sup>85</sup> LPL, MS 1104, f. 35.

<sup>86</sup> W. Knight, *The Case and Vindication of William Knight...* (London, 1653), p. 25.

<sup>87</sup> The empowerment of the CPM in augmentations did not take place till February 1653 [*CJ*, vii, p. 255].

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86. For the efforts to pass a general propagation bill by the Rump see W.B. Bidwell, ‘The Committees and Legislation of the Rump Parliament, 1648-1653: A Quantitative Study’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of Rochester, 1977), pp. 201-2.

<sup>89</sup> J. Owen *et al.*, *The Humble Proposals of Mr. Owen, Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, and Other Ministers...* (London, 1652). For the proposals, see S. Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 196-204.

<sup>90</sup> Owen, *Humble Proposals*, title page.

so it appears the committee was part of the discussion of the time.<sup>91</sup> In these additional proposals, it was suggested that the CRU play a leading role in the control of the ministry. All gathered churches were to tell the CRU, or an alternative committee, who they chose as their pastor with the committee having the power to judge if they were suitable or not. The CRU were also to keep a record of all the churches of England and, presuming they maintained their power of augmentation, it appears they were being made a pre-eminent committee for ministerial matters in England.<sup>92</sup>

This centralised, committee approach was at odds with the suggestions of the Independent ministers. They had been for a more devolved approach, similar to the system of ejectors which eventually emerged during the Protectorate, but also clearly based on the regional propagation schemes in Wales and the northern counties. The divines had called for officers to be appointed in each county to judge and approve potential ministers and commissioners to go round the country in six circuits ejecting unfit ministers and approving new ones.<sup>93</sup> The difference from the CRU-based proposals was stark and markedly similar to the propagation schemes. Like those, the emphasis was on local authorities with the centre playing little role. The debates at the committee for propagation of the gospel were a sign of how varied thought about the future of the church was, with the CRU a more relevant topic than might initially be thought.<sup>94</sup> In the eyes of some, a centralised approach to reform was needed which would require a body like the CRU to function. For others, the regional

---

<sup>91</sup> Proposals from the anonymous group are sometimes misidentified as part of the *Humble Proposals* of the Independents [E.g., A. Milton, *England's Second Reformation: The Battle for the Church of England, 1625-1662* (Cambridge, 2021), p. 305].

<sup>92</sup> Owen, *The Humble Proposals*, pp. 1-3.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>94</sup> The campaign against the Humble Proposals has been discussed before, especially in a seminal article on the topic by Carolyn Polizzotto, 'The Campaign against the Humble Proposals of 1652', *JEH*, 38:4 (1987), pp. 569-81. See also, Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, pp. 200-3.

authorities used in Wales and the northern counties were an example to follow and the need for a London-based authority was limited. Did, then, the end of the CRU represent the victory of this latter perspective?

There is no conclusive evidence for seeing the dissolution of the CRU as an issue to do with church reform, but such an interpretation is compatible with the tellers of the vote. For the question of whether the question should be propounded the tellers were: Sir Arthur Hesilrige and Henry Marten for the yeas, Cornelius Holland and Philip Skippon for the noes. As mentioned above, under parliamentary procedure this vote's passage in the affirmative would mean the question had to be asked without further debate or alteration. The intention of asking it, then, seems to have been to shut down any efforts to save the CRU by requesting it be put into commission or dissolved after a delay and also to weaken the voting strength of the noes. The noes in divisions had to exit the chamber and, since there was no abstention, those MPs who were opposed to the main question (the dissolution of the CRU) but were unwilling to leave the chamber over the question being put were counted as yeas, thus making support for the main question appear stronger than it was in reality and discouraging the supporters of the committee from trying to force another formal division over the dissolution rather than allowing the speaker to decide on the basis of voices.<sup>95</sup>

The involvement of Hesilrige and Marten as tellers for the yeas makes sense if we accept that the vote was in some way about church reform. Hesilrige was firmly aligned with the propagation schemes, having been involved in the propagation of the gospel in the four

---

<sup>95</sup> Scobell, *Memorials*, pp. 24-5.

northern counties.<sup>96</sup> As a teller, he may have hoped that abolishing the committee would open the door to a similarly devolved type of propagation throughout the nation. Marten, not known to be an ally of Cromwell or the Independent divines, is a more complex figure but it is possible that his vote was a case of different interests briefly meeting. Several days after the events of 21 April, the House would vote on whether to abolish tithes.<sup>97</sup> Marten would be a teller for their abolition, alongside Cromwell's godly friend Sir Gilbert Pykeringe. Taken in conjunction with his actions on the 21st, Marten's cooperation with the allies of the Cromwell and Owen on matters of godly reform would suggest his own interests had aligned with theirs. Marten is unlikely to have been a member of Cromwell's coterie, but he may have believed the dissolution of the CRU and introduction of new proposals offered a chance for the type of reform he himself desired, starting with the removal of tithes. The Humble Proposals lacked any detail of church finance and, as the role of Pykeringe suggests, there is little sign of its proponents or their allies being tied to the continuance of tithes. Marten may or may not have been interested in the type of regional church administration which perhaps enticed Hesilrige. However, the Proposals were about reform more widely, including finance. If abolishing the CRU allowed further reformation along a yet undecided path, Marten may have felt it worth helping it out the exit.

The possibility of the vote for the CRU standing in for a vote on the future of church reform also makes sense when looking at the opposition tellers: Philip Skippon and Cornelius Holland. Two men more different in matters of religion were unlikely to be found. Whereas Skippon was renowned as a man of great piety but also as suspicious of heterodoxy

---

<sup>96</sup> See, D. Scott, *History of Parliament Trust*, London, unpublished article on Hesilrige, Sir Arthur (1601-1661), for the 1640-60 section.

<sup>97</sup> *CJ*, vii, p. 128.

and the connection between liberty of conscience and ‘mischief’, Holland was one who called for wider toleration.<sup>98</sup> Their partnership on the vote was possibly because both saw it as opening the door to a type of church reform neither wanted. Skippon may have perceived the removal of an existing aspect of church management without first transferring its responsibilities as reckless and imperilling the maintenance of the clergy, nor would he have been impressed by the broad liberty for tender consciences proposed by the Independent divines. Holland may also have seen the Humble Proposals in highly critical terms for different reasons. The suggestions had sparked a wave of ire among many sectarians who scorned the involvement of the magistrate in religious affairs and limitations on matters of conscience.<sup>99</sup> Holland’s sympathies, like Henry Marten’s, were historically aligned with the Levellers. Unlike Marten, Holland may have shared the sectarians’ grievances and decided to stymie the progress of the magisterial independents.<sup>100</sup> He may also have been opposed to the wider intention of the Owenite clique to support and maintain a national clergy as, in the same year as the vote, Holland was reported by the preacher Robert Bacon to have professed his judgment ‘*that this Name and Title of Vicar may be in the Land wholly at an end, as indeed it is high time it should*’.<sup>101</sup>

Ultimately, there likely was no one single reason why the CRU was dissolved rather than preserved or put into commission. Rather, there appear to have been multiple contextual factors which were all compounded by the growing apathy towards the CRU. There was the

---

<sup>98</sup> *The Diary of Thomas Burton*, ed. J.T. Rutt (4 vols, London, 1828), i, p. 218; J.T. Peacey, ‘Cornelius Holland’, *ODNB*.

<sup>99</sup> Polizzotto, ‘Humble Proposals’, pp. 569-81.

<sup>100</sup> Holland may have been motivated by some type of personal investment in the future of the universities. In July 1652 he asked Cromwell to request Oxford give his son a BA, despite being one term short of the qualifying period [*The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, ed. W.C. Abbott & C.D. Crane (4 vols, Cambridge MA, 1937-47), ii, pp. 565-6]. A month earlier he had been named to the committee to consider Oxford’s petition for a new board of visitors [*CJ*, vii, p. 141].

<sup>101</sup> R. Bacon, *A Taste of the Spirit of God...* (London, 1652), p. 14.

possibility that some wanted to abolish it to improve the war effort, or improve management of augmentations, or open the door to further church reform along the lines promoted by the Humble Proposals. However, underpinning any outcome for the CRU was an awareness that there was no longer a pressing, urgent need for its existence. By April 1652 it had succeeded in addressing many of the problems caused by the civil wars and restored places of learning to a position of autonomy. Although it still had a role as an executive authority, the immediate need had all but disappeared, weakening any justification for retaining it in the face of greater concerns.

## Conclusion

The end of the CRU was a sign of its success and activity. If, as this chapter's study of the committee's role as an external court of appeal and executive authority suggests, the CRU was attempting to restore places of learning to a position of autonomy following the difficulties of the 1640s then they succeeded. Yet, their achievement meant there was increasingly less need for an external parliamentary committee to govern educational institutions. The return of institutional self-governance is a sign of the committee's achievements and their activities and should not be attributed to the natural course of events alone. Although many problems caused by the civil wars were alleviated by the passage of time, the process of improvement was speeded by the work of the CRU. The nature and extent of the committee's work can only be appreciated by recovering evidence from institutional archives, illustrating once more how the experience of the Rump's rule and understandings of the government can be analysed by their work in institutional contexts. An appreciation of the level of activity of the CRU helps support the central argument of this thesis — that the state was a major agent in education and places of learning during the revolutionary period.

This chapter also introduced another characteristic of the CRU which is frequently referred to in future chapters: their essentially conservative approach to educational reform. The committee governed places of learning with a respect for their practices and traditions, seen most clearly by their reputation as defenders of institutional statutes. As the executive authority over places of learning for three years, the CRU and Rump more widely had the opportunity to make changes to the universities and schools. They consistently failed to do

so and what alterations were made tended to be on an individual basis rather than systemic. The Commonwealth's lack of interest in the revolutionization of education was matched by a desire to work within the existing system of English education, not to overhaul it.

The CRU's role in institutional life also brought to the fore the relationship between the Commonwealth government and the localities. The CRU did not attempt to control events at the universities from London. Instead, they were consistently willing to empower those on the ground and it was usually those inside educational institutions who took the initiative and set events in motion. This was a show of trust in places of learning, but it also was part of the Rump's wider method of governance. The CRU's interactions with places of learning were more complex than that of the centre trying to impose its will on an unhappy locality and appear closer to a partnership, albeit not one the educational institutions enjoyed. The agency of those inside institutions and the Commonwealth's conservative approach to educational matters emerged in this chapter by studying the roles the CRU performed in places of learning. Both of these themes emerge again by examining further the motivations and aims of the committee's work, as shown in the next chapter on the financing and material improvement of academic institutions.

## Chapter 2

### 'The real beginning of state aid to education'? The Funding and Material Improvement of Educational Institutions

In his final oration to the university as vice-chancellor in 1657, John Owen happily remarked on the healthy state of Oxford. 'Professors' salaries, lost for many years, have been maintained and paid', the rights and privileges of the university defended, and the treasury increased 'tenfold'.<sup>1</sup> However, such a position of plenty would have been hard to predict in 1649 when the finances of educational institutions, like their administration, were still devastated by the civil wars. In this chapter, efforts to improve the material state of educational institutions under the Rump Parliament are examined. The various initiatives undertaken show that there was far greater interest in the issue than previously thought, both inside Westminster and the provinces with educational institutions possessing the means to lobby the government effectively. Many of the efforts to improve the financial or material circumstances of places of learning are shown to be rooted in tradition and broad ideas about the advancement of piety and learning rather than a new revolutionary agenda.

The decision in this chapter to use the broad category of 'material improvement' is deliberate. It has been chosen because it allows strands of historiography and sources of evidence to be brought together which are usually treated separately. Historians of the Commonwealth or of education in the revolutionary decades have long discussed state aid, educational grants, and other attempts reliant on legislation. To Foster Watson and Margaret James the various parliamentary efforts hint at a forward-thinking attempt to place education

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Oxford Orations of Dr. John Owen*, ed. P. Toon (Callington, 1971), p. 45.

under the state's control.<sup>2</sup> Another strand of historiography, however, less concerned with the role of the state, has instead focussed on institutions themselves, and the mixture of charity and donations which attempted to support places of learning.<sup>3</sup> These different approaches, the one focussing on the centre, the other on the localities, have not been treated together before, partly because the source bases involved are so different. Whereas Interregnum governments addressed problems of educational finance through legislation, those in the localities or institutions used private means, such as donations and bequests. However, by thinking of educational funding broadly as the desire to improve the material situation of academic institutions, it is possible to assemble different types of sources and to investigate developments at local and governmental levels together rather than separately.

A focus on the material improvement of educational institutions allows this chapter to develop themes discussed previously in this thesis and to introduce several new ones. As in the previous chapter, the daily work of parliamentary committees in places of learning is investigated using institutional archives to test existing ideas about the Rump Parliament and their involvement in places of learning. The relationship between the centre and localities also features prominently in this chapter and the study of it is shown to be necessary to understand how the Rump's rule was implemented and to illustrate the degree of agency outside of Westminster. New themes, however, are introduced below, particularly

---

<sup>2</sup> M. James, *Social Problems and Policy during the Puritan Revolution, 1640-1660* (London, 1966), esp. pp. 322-6; F. Watson, 'The State and Education during the Commonwealth', *EHR*, 15:57 (1900), esp. pp. 65-72. See also, J. Simon, 'Educational Policies and Programmes', *The Modern Quarterly*, New Series 4:1 (1948-9), p. 162.

<sup>3</sup> The classic work on charitable bequests for, amongst other causes, education is W.K. Jordan, *Philanthropy in England, 1480-1660: A Study of the Changing Pattern of English Social Aspirations* (London, 1959). For a more recent study focussing specifically on bequests by Londoners, see J.P. Ward, *Culture, Faith and Philanthropy: Londoners and Provincial Reforms in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 2013), e.g., 'Education [i.e. founding and managing provincial grammar schools] was a central concern of those [Londoners] who sought to bring provincial communities out of ignorance and superstition' [ibid., p. 79].

the consensus and cooperation which is evident in places of learning and the importance of traditional motivations, rather than innovation, in explaining developments affecting them.

## I: Parliament, Committees, and the Funding of Education, 1642-53

To understand the issue of educational finance during the Commonwealth it is necessary to set out its context. This section demonstrates that parliamentary activity was driven by the chaotic pecuniary state of academic foundations and then examines Parliament's response. Before analysing the Rump, however, it is important to detail how parliamentary interest in the material wellbeing of academic foundations long predated the Regicide. From the early 1640s, the Long Parliament had shown an interest in the matter, ordering in October 1642 that the committee for the king's revenue ensure the revenues and payments of Christ Church in Oxford, and Eton, Westminster, and Winchester were not affected by the sequestration of rents belonging to the bishop, dean, and chapter lands.<sup>4</sup> Various exemptions for educational institutions from parliamentary taxes followed over the course of the decade, the intention being to protect them from the worst exactions of the wartime government.<sup>5</sup> The Rump's predecessor also occasionally considered augmenting the salaries of college heads, an idea mooted by Cambridge's chancellor, the earl of Manchester, in November 1644.<sup>6</sup> Although there was no immediate response to this, in March 1647 the Commons did settle £150 on the master of Clare Hall.<sup>7</sup> The new stipend at Clare does seem to have been part of a general plan for Cambridge colleges: in April 1647 the master of Peterhouse asked the college fellows for a certificate of what income was attached to his position. As he explained, he intended to send it on to a committee of

---

<sup>4</sup> *CJ*, ii, p. 827.

<sup>5</sup> For example, exemptions were passed in June 1647 and February 1648 excusing the three schools and both universities from taxes for the Parliament's army [*A&O*, i, pp. 958-84, 1072-1105]. Initially, debates about the June 1647 exemption saw the proviso rejected on 3 December 1646 suggesting some disagreement on the issue [*CJ*, iv, p. 736]. Cambridge received several exemptions for an overview of which, see Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 141.

<sup>6</sup> Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 136.

<sup>7</sup> *CJ*, v, p. 131.

Parliament appointed to consider an augmentation of masterships, though nothing seems to have come as a result.<sup>8</sup>

Even with the attention they received in the Long Parliament, places of learning were in serious financial difficulties by the time of the republic. For a variety of reasons, the wars had been ruinous for nearly all places of learning in the CRU's remit.<sup>9</sup> Common factors affecting most were disruptions to rents and the burden of heavy taxation. With the weight of the fiscal-military state and lost revenues from the wars, many tenants of college lands were unable to pay their usual dues. As was the case with Eton College — which let land in 1651 to one tenant at a generous rate 'because she was a poor widow and because of the Taxes' — many institutions were forced to be lenient.<sup>10</sup> Sometimes, it appears tenants were only too happy to take advantage of this goodwill. A memorandum of 1649 in the lease book of Magdalen, Oxford, explains that fines were let 'much under the value because of ssuffrings and other speciall considerations and the untrue suggestions of some'.<sup>11</sup> Beyond tax, war, and fraud, college revenues were also affected by the growing controversy of tithes — an issue discussed below. Improprated rents were the basis of much college income, the 'fairest part of our Colledge revenues', as St John's, Oxford termed it. As the governing body of that college sadly explained in a letter of May 1649, it could be easily guessed 'how negligent men are in paying Ecclesiasticall dues [i.e. the rents due to St John's] now tithes are gen[er]ally decried by such as take more care to save their purses then their soules'.<sup>12</sup> As

---

<sup>8</sup> Peterhouse CA, N.1.33, f. 27. Nearly a year later, the committee for the University of Cambridge was requested to consider ways of maintaining college heads [*CJ*, v, p. 548].

<sup>9</sup> See, J. Twigg, 'College Finances, 1640-1660', in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 773-802. See also., for a discussion of the civil wars' effect on schools, W.A.L. Vincent, *The State and School Education, 1640-1660, in England and Wales: A Survey Based on Printed Sources* (London, 1950), pp. 39-45.

<sup>10</sup> ECR, 60/06/01/01, f. 21r.

<sup>11</sup> Magdalen Oxford CA, LCD/4.

<sup>12</sup> GL, CLC/L/MD/B/003A/MS34010/007, f. 313v.

the comments by the officers of St John's indicated, there was little college authorities could do about many of the financial problems facing them. College governing bodies, especially at the beginning of the republic when their membership was only recently settled or understaffed, were not in a fit position to enforce their claims against those who 'decried' their legitimacy or to unravel who had made 'untrue suggestions'. As a result, college authorities were faced with manifold problems with their finances which they lacked the power to overcome.

Some remedial actions, however, did remain in their power. One common expedient, adopted, for example, by Corpus Christi, Cambridge, in 1652, was to keep a fellowship vacant with 'regard to the poverty of the college from taxation, etc'.<sup>13</sup> Many colleges embraced the same approach, concluding that it was preferable to have a smaller fellowship and fewer salaries to pay.<sup>14</sup> The use of the measure was not without some risk as college officials, such as at Trinity, Cambridge, could find themselves accused of avarice. Thomas Hill, the master, was forced to refute the allegation of the 'profitts thereof [from the vacancies] goeing onely to the residue [of fellows]' before the CRU.<sup>15</sup> Hill's defence was successful, but the accusation suggests not all claims of poverty were convincing or believed, to the frustration of college officers. The governing body of St John's, Oxford, was similarly touchy on the subject of vacant positions, explaining they were not led by 'any desire of enriching our selves by vacancies (w[hi]ch we much abhorre)'.<sup>16</sup> The frequency with which colleges resorted to such expedients signifies that some courses of action

---

<sup>13</sup> Corpus Christi Cambridge CA, CCCC01/C/2, f. 233.

<sup>14</sup> For example, in March 1650, the visitors of Oxford allowed Exeter, following their request, to have six fellowships left vacant on account of 'the great debts' [Exeter CA, RG1/02, f. 44r]. See also the college account book for a payment concerning a journey to London about the college's void fellowships in April 1652 [Exeter CA, RA2/02, November 1651-2].

<sup>15</sup> LPL, MS 804, f. 42r.

<sup>16</sup> GL, CLC/L/MD/B/003A/MS34010/007, f. 378v.

remained open to colleges, but of a short-term and immediate nature. By the time of the Commonwealth, financial problems were still endemic in places of learning, despite the Long Parliament's attention. The need for parliamentary help which could offer more permanent and effective solutions was great.

The Rump's intervention came in two different ways, both involving the CRU. One was an attempt to improve the income of selected college heads. In a series of acts between 1649-50, the government settled the sale of dean and chapter lands and established a new act for maintaining the preaching ministry.<sup>17</sup> Much like during the Long Parliament, the various acts showed a desire to protect educational institutions. What was new, however, was the opportunity for Parliament to turn its sympathy into action thanks to the money raised from the sale of church lands.<sup>18</sup> As an anonymous pamphlet from 1649 suggests, there was an awareness that Parliament would suddenly find itself in possession of extensive resources following the sales.<sup>19</sup> The author of the pamphlet remembered being 'encouraged...further' by Cromwell in a scheme for the universities to petition Parliament for £1000 from dean and chapter lands with Lord Fairfax, likewise, being 'very forward to second this businesse'.<sup>20</sup> As will also be seen when discussing propagation in chapter six, the collapse of the Caroline Church created resources which could be recycled for the benefit of education.

---

<sup>17</sup> *A&O*, ii, pp. 81-104, 142-8, 200-5, 369-78. See also, LPL, MS 1104, ff. 27-9, 35-41.

<sup>18</sup> For the sales themselves, I. Gentles, 'The Sales of Bishops' Lands in the English Revolution, 1646-1660', *EHR*, 95:376 (1980), pp. 573-96.

<sup>19</sup> See also, HP, 9/11/10A-11B for a letter by a fellow of All Souls in May 1649 discussing rumours of £20,000 being 'laid apart for incouragement of learning, and of that 2. thowsand particularly for Oxford' [9/11/10B].

<sup>20</sup> R.W. & D.M., *Some Few Proposals for the Reducing of Both Universities...* (n.d), p. 4.

Even before Cromwell's intervention, the Parliament was considering educational grants using their new revenues. In May 1648 the committee for the University of Cambridge was ordered to consider how to settle the expected windfall of the sales for the maintenance of learning and piety.<sup>21</sup> The objective remained the same under the Commonwealth and the terms of an act abolishing dean and chapter lands the following April specified that any revenues used for the upkeep of grammar schools, scholars, or almshouses were to be continued to be collected and that the universities, Eton, Westminster, and Winchester were to be exempted.<sup>22</sup> Then, an act passed in June concerning the maintenance of ministers ordered that £20,000 was to be set aside from the sale of the lands. £18,000 was to be given to preaching ministers and schoolmasters while £2000 was to be used specifically to increase the maintenance of the masterships of university colleges.<sup>23</sup> Trustees were named to handle the money from the sales and pay the augmentations, control of whom was eventually, in April 1650, vested in the CRU.<sup>24</sup>

There is a danger of misreading the significance of these augmentations. As mentioned above, some historians have been quick to label the new stipends given to college heads as an example of state funding in education — ‘the real beginning of state aid to education’ according to Joan Simon — and as a signal of the republic's special interest in learning and desire to set academic institutions on new and firmer ground.<sup>25</sup> Yet, the novelty and cohesiveness of the endeavour should not be overstated. The augmentations were not an attempt to change the foundation of collegiate finances permanently as, say, new endowments or the replacement of impropriated rents would have been. The stipends were

---

<sup>21</sup> *CJ*, v, p. 548.

<sup>22</sup> *A&O*, ii, pp. 81-104.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 142-8.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 369-78.

<sup>25</sup> Simon, ‘Educational Policies and Programmes’, p. 162.

an innovation but were intended to help individual college heads rather than the entire college. Nor were all heads of houses included: the augmentations were intended for the poorer foundations and not all colleges ended up receiving stipends.<sup>26</sup> It is also clear that the foundation of the augmentations was brittle. They had been established by the Rump for an indefinite period rather than settled in perpetuity in the manner of an endowment. Their continuance beyond the government was therefore uncertain, and it is likely no coincidence that after the government fell in 1653 payment slipped into arrears, possibly due to the trustees' confusion about whether the augmentations ought to be continued.<sup>27</sup> Although the stipends marked an important intervention by the Commonwealth in academic institutions, they did not represent a new state control or systemic overhaul of finance.

The augmentations are better understood within the Rump's efforts to empower college heads.<sup>28</sup> As shown previously in this thesis when discussing the CRU's role in educational affairs, the Parliament wanted to rule through academic institutions. The Rump's approach to management of education was therefore one dominated by concerns about personnel and the need to ensure institutional authorities were both trustworthy and capable of governance, a suggestion reinforced by the CRU's handling of augmentations. The new stipends benefitted the college head, securing their position and authority in houses still racked by endemic problems. The salaries also tied the masters closer to the parliamentary regime. The augmentations were not distributed in one go, but in waves over the course of several years, and the CRU seems to have occasionally been prompted by the

---

<sup>26</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 246 and n. a.

<sup>27</sup> TNA, SP, 18/70, f. 119.

<sup>28</sup> Henry Langley, master of Pembroke, Oxford, gave his augmentation to the educational reformer Samuel Hartlib, wishing that '[t]he god of wisdom prosper all your endeavours, for the advancement of learning' [HP, 15/3/1A]. See also Langley's letters to Hartlib in the Hartlib Papers cited in the bibliography and also LPL, COMM VIa/2, ff. 32, 493, 497; Sion L40.2/E16, f. 392.

petitions of college heads. Such lobbying is hinted at by a cryptic entry in Exeter College's accounts for a payment to John Wilkins, warden of Wadham College, 'for his expences about the augmentations of the headships'.<sup>29</sup> Since the augmentations were only being settled on some and since lobbying likely played a part, the awarding of money became a way of tying the heads still closer to the government and forcing them to acknowledge the authority of the committee and demonstrate a willingness to work under it. Heads may also literally have had to acknowledge the authority of Parliament: one CRU order of December 1650 specified that the trustees were only to pay augmentations to ministers who had subscribed the Engagement.<sup>30</sup> Whether this extended to the masters is uncertain but possible. Nevertheless, the result of the augmentations was to simultaneously tie a head of house closer to the regime while also giving them greater authority and means inside their own college, an indication of the type of partnership between parliamentary and institutional authorities which is evident in so much of the Rump's approach to education.

The piecemeal character of the augmentations is replicated in Parliament's other main type of intervention in educational funding. Via the CRU or university visitors, the Rump addressed problems on a case-by-case basis, such as at University College. To help alleviate the college's debts, 'w[hi]ch are alleadged to bee very greate', the CRU in July 1651 ordered the profits of a fellowship to be paid for two years in satisfaction of the money owed.<sup>31</sup> The limited scale of this remedy is notable as the committee did not address the root

---

<sup>29</sup> Exeter CA, RA2/02, November 1650-November 1651. Wilkins's interest in the case may explain why the archives of Wadham College contains an order from the trustees for maintenance of ministers (as far as I am aware, the only one of its kind in a college archive) with details about the augmentations for college masterships from both universities dated 5 December 1651 [Wadham CA, 4/101].

<sup>30</sup> LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, f. 732.

<sup>31</sup> University College CA, UC:GB3/A1/1, f. 61. The CRU also appointed a sub-committee of Oxford officials in 1651 to investigate and resolve the college's financial difficulties [University College CA, UC:S8/MS1/1].

of the foundation's problems, which were Byzantine and longstanding.<sup>32</sup> Instead, their solution was pragmatic and relatively short-sighted based on the hope that issue would be solved by a brief vacancy. A sign of the failure of this approach can be seen in the records of the university's chancellor's court where only a few months after the CRU's order the college, likely in desperation, attempted to call in large debts, including against the ejected bursar, John Elmehirst.<sup>33</sup> The committee's order was therefore in keeping with the conservative approach it often adopted to educational issues in not attempting wider change. It is also indicative of the committee's wider relationship with places of learning. The body was external to the university and so essentially reactive, responding to a pre-existing problem when it became too serious to ignore. The solution they suggested demonstrated their authority, as they authorised the vacancy, but also the limits of their involvement in college life as their order was essentially a one-off.

How the CRU dealt with individual financial cases also helps reveal the role of the colleges. Very often, the committee or the visitors were reacting to a petition from a college when discussing a financial matter. Such was the case with Queen's, Oxford, one of those colleges attempting to save money by leaving fellowships vacant.<sup>34</sup> In November 1651 the visitors, on the recommendation of the CRU, decided to elect James Rich to a fellowship made empty by the death of Edward Wilkinson.<sup>35</sup> The college immediately pleaded poverty as a reason to keep the fellowship void or, failing that, that the place would be filled by a

---

<sup>32</sup> R. Darwall-Smith, *A History of University College, Oxford* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 173-5.

<sup>33</sup> OUA, HYP A 43, ff. 13r-v; CC Papers 1651, 1651/38:1, 39:1. Elmehirst defended himself in a letter to the college head the following year saying he would 'undertake that whats owing to mee would very neare double the discharge of all sum[m]es that can be demaunded of mee' [University College CA, UC:S7/C1/4].

<sup>34</sup> The college head, Gerard Langbaine had noted the desire of many of the fellows in February 1651 to leave places vacant for financial reasons, arguing 'that the present State of the Colledge consider'd wee are not able to mainteyne any more fellowes' [Bodl., Selden Supra 109, f. 335r].

<sup>35</sup> Queen's Oxford CA, College Register H, f. 138. For an overview of Rich's election and the following events at Queen's, see J.R. Magrath, *The Queen's College* (2 vols, Oxford, 1921), ii, pp. 21-4.

member of the college.<sup>36</sup> They were met with a sympathetic response by the university visitors. Although Wilkinson's place was eventually filled by John Robinson, a member of Queen's, the college succeeded in attaining an order of the visitors that, upon consideration of their debts, the next fellowship to fall vacant would be unfilled for a year.<sup>37</sup> The case is instructive of the relationship between the college and the committee. The college had the better knowledge of their financial problems and were able to devise a solution and petition the committee. Most of the action of dealing with the issue therefore took place at Queen's. Yet, the college still had to seek the permission of London to leave the place vacant, signifying that the final say in the college's governance, including financial matters, lay outside of Queen's.

The committee's actions at Queen's and University College were not intended to transform the foundation of educational finance. As mentioned with University College, the committee's orders were small, practical actions intended to address specific financial problems, often as the result of petitioning. Their scale seems a sign of an essentially conservative approach to education and a lack of desire to use large or structural changes as a cure. Many of the decisions which the parliamentary authorities made were little more than attempts to help specific individuals in colleges. The stipends given by the CRU to two fellows of Gonville and Caius in 1651 helped the two men but not the wider college.<sup>38</sup> The committee's focus on individuals may not have always been effective, and nor was it always popular. In some cases, their decisions seem to have led to disgruntlement as a wider college body disagreed with decisions benefitting one person. Jesus, Oxford, was one of the colleges

---

<sup>36</sup> Queen's Oxford CA, College Register H, f. 136.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 139.

<sup>38</sup> Gonville & Caius CA, GOV/03/01/02, f. 3.

in the deepest financial distress during the Commonwealth.<sup>39</sup> To help alleviate problems the visitors ordered the master, Michael Roberts, to be allocated £40 for his travel expenses.<sup>40</sup> However, Roberts was an unpopular master at odds with many of the college fellows and his new stipend was resented by the fellows who queried whether the sum ought to be allowed to him.<sup>41</sup> The ill-feeling in the college eventually grew into deep divisions and Roberts' acrimonious departure, and the original decision to help one individual in a college mired with financial problems appears to have been a staging post on the road to a collegiate civil war rather than a successful parliamentary intervention.<sup>42</sup>

Questions of success and scale aside, Parliament's work in educational funding shows their interest in the matter. The small individual cases all exemplified an attentive committee approach with the visitors or CRU ready to hear petitions and make decisions. The awarding of the augmentations was similarly based on detail and committee work as becomes apparent when decisions inside institutional contexts are examined. In Oxford, the visitors ordered the heads of colleges to produce certificates of the value of their headships and a report was assembled for the CRU.<sup>43</sup> A similar order occurred in Cambridge where around this time a statement of the annual values of the colleges was drawn up with proposed augmentations.<sup>44</sup> After the visitors, with the help of the colleges, had assembled their reports, a fresh wave of activity took place at the committee in London. As an order in their register of augmentations shows, the committee was working hard to ensure payments were made

---

<sup>39</sup> For a discussion of Jesus's financial problems, see T. Richards, *The Puritan Visitation of Jesus College Oxford and the Principalship of Dr. Michael Roberts* (London, 1924), pp. 41-2, 45-55

<sup>40</sup> Jesus Oxford CA, Bu:Ac:Gen:1, f. 187.

<sup>41</sup> Jesus Oxford CA, PR Roberts A:10.

<sup>42</sup> For Roberts's eventual removal, see E.G. Hardy, *Jesus College* (London, 1998), pp. 117-20.

<sup>43</sup> Burrows, *Register*, pp. 246, 251.

<sup>44</sup> Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 186. One example from Cambridge is Richard Love who drew up an account of the value of his mastership at Corpus, Cambridge, in December 1649 [Corpus Christi Cambridge CA, CCCC02/M/24/10]. At least one CRU augmentation order, a joint one for the Cambridge colleges of St John's and Emmanuel, references using the valuations sent by the visitors [LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, ff. 42-3].

efficiently, convening a meeting with members of the committee for the revenue and some of the trustees in April 1651 to consider how ministers and university heads of houses could best receive augmentations.<sup>45</sup>

Alongside evaluating headships, the CRU also diligently attempted to prevent possible misuse of funds. Some college heads held church livings alongside their masterships. The profits from these additional incomes presumably removed the need to receive an additional augmentation from the CRU and so, as a document in the Winchester College Archives shows, the committee took steps to correct this problem. An order from 27 June 1650 established that ‘noe Head of any Colledge or Hall’ within either university receiving an augmentation from the committee should enjoy an ecclesiastical living outside the boundaries of the universities.<sup>46</sup> As another document at Winchester — apparently in the handwriting of the CRU clerk, Robert Needler — detailed, not all college heads were able to live by this rule. The document, embellished with ‘Examples of Pluralities kept by Parliamentary Ministers with approba[ti]on’, detailed three university heads who all enjoyed a living alongside their augmentation.<sup>47</sup> These exceptions notwithstanding, the CRU’s original order, and the efforts to ensure appropriate augmentations were distributed, indicates the commitment of the CRU to funding the universities in the best manner possible.<sup>48</sup> Although the Rump did not drastically change how education was financed or the state’s involvement in educational finance, committee actions show that the government was an active and important presence in institutional life.

---

<sup>45</sup> LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, f. 734.

<sup>46</sup> WCA, 400. A similar order was made by the Council of State in April 1654 [Twigg, *Cambridge*, pp. 186-7].

<sup>47</sup> WCA, 419. See also WCA, 424 for the document having come from Needler.

<sup>48</sup> For the augmentations falling into arrears, see Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 186; TNA, SP 18/70, f. 119. Twigg convincingly argued the Protectorate government withheld payments to enforce residence in college.

The committee's diligence mixed with their conservative approach explains why their work in institutional finances proved more successful than other government efforts at ecclesiastical reform. Educational financing was understood as an ecclesiastical matter, overlapping with, though distinct from, clerical maintenance. Although separate, the link between the two had been apparent by the CRU's role as the Rump's standing committee for both education and the augmentations arising from the sale of dean and chapter lands as well as the sharing of officials between educational committees and the trustees for maintenance.<sup>49</sup> Any reform of educational finance took place within the wider context of ecclesiastical reform and as historians such as Ann Hughes, Rosemary O'Day, and Alex Craven have helped to show, there were plenty of efforts during the Rump to change ecclesiastical administration and finance.<sup>50</sup> Most famously, a survey of livings of 'all' counties and cities of England and Wales 'for providing both for Preaching, and for Maintenance' was undertaken in 1650 with hopes of an extensive redistribution of parish

---

<sup>49</sup> Nor were they the only educational committee handling augmentations. The governors of Westminster School held the authority to direct the trustees to pay the preachers and lecturers of Westminster Abbey [LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, ff. 598-9]. The CRU's sister committee the CPM, which had some duties involving scandalous ministers, also handled augmentations arising from sequestrations and impropriated rents [A&O, ii, p. 391].

For examples of the officials, John Phelps, who was clerk for the trustees and at whose house they met, also at times acted as clerk for the CRU and was clerk of the CPM [LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, ff. 736, 738; *Minutes of the Committee for the Relief of Plundered Ministers and of the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers; Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire 1643-1660*, ed. W.A. Shaw, The Record Society for the Publication of Original Documents Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire, 28 & 29 (2 vols, 1893-6), i, f. 90.]. The CPM also sat at Phelps' house [BL, Stowe MS 185, f. 186r]. Adoniram Byfield and Robert Needler were also CRU officials frequently acting in the business of augmentations [LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, ff. 733, 735, 736, 738]. For Byfield, see also HP, 15/3/7A. Notably, the auditor for the trustees, 'Mr Squibb', was likely another official connected to an educational committee [LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, f. 736]. He was very likely one of the brothers John or Arthur Squibb who acted as receivers for the governors of Westminster School [WAM, 5336, 5380]. Arthur Squibb was the Fifth Monarchist and member of the Nominated Assembly of the same name [A. Woolrych, revised, 'Arthur Squibb', *ODNB*].

<sup>50</sup> A. Craven, 'Ministers of State: The Established Church in Lancashire during the English Revolution, 1642-1660', *Northern History*, 45:1, (2008), pp. 51-69; R. O'Day & A. Hughes, 'Augmentation and Amalgamation: Was There a Systematic Approach to the Reform of Parochial Finance, 1640-60?', in R. O'Day & F. Heal (eds), *Princes and Paupers in the English Church, 1500-1800* (Leicester, 1981), pp. 167-93.

boundaries.<sup>51</sup> Yet, whereas the pragmatic handling of educational funding achieved short-term results, a more wide-ranging scheme such as the redistribution of parish boundaries lay unfulfilled, eventually being picked up again by the Protectorate.<sup>52</sup> The issue of funding therefore stands as a reminder that inside places of learning are examples of an active Rump working through their committees which might be added to the less impressive picture presented by their legislation.

---

<sup>51</sup> *A&O*, ii, pp. 142-8 *CJ*, vi, pp. 335, 354, 359, 365. See also, *ibid.*, pp. 369-78 and A. Craven, *Ministers of State*; ‘Soe good and godly a worke’: The Surveys of Ecclesiastical Livings and Parochial Reform during the English Revolution’, in, F. McCall (ed.), *Church and People in Interregnum Britain* (London, 2021), pp. 41-64. On the survey of livings, see W.A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, 1640-60* (2 vols, London, 1900), ii, pp. 248-53.

<sup>52</sup> *A&O*, ii, pp. 1000-6; J. Owen *et al.*, *The Humble Proposals of Mr. Owen, Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, and Other Ministers...* (London, 1652), pp. 4-5.

## II: 'Poore, pious, and hopeful': Tradition and Educational Funding

As suggested above, the government's interventions in educational funding often appeared pragmatic. As this section shows, a conservative approach was in keeping with the motivations for educational funding which were cited by parliamentary authorities or by those in academic institutions. The need to fund places of learning raised the question of who and what education was for. As will be shown below, the reasons offered by parliamentary agents were often essentially traditional and appeared platitudinous. Like several other of the motivations explored in this chapter, one frequently cited, uncontroversial, reason to improve the material state of educational institutions had been at the heart of English education since medieval times: the need to teach poor scholars. Traditionally, places of learning were meant to provide free education for at least some students who could otherwise not afford their studies and so ensure the best students could make their way into the clergy.<sup>53</sup>

It is important to emphasise how established the ideal of educating poor scholars was in England and not to see it as an innovation of the Interregnum. There is a tendency in some strands of historiography to place demands for the education of poor students within calls for wider access to education, something often stimulated by radical thought. Some scholars, such as Richard Greaves, argued such calls were rooted in social radicalism.<sup>54</sup> Others, such as Charles Webster, instead emphasised the pedagogical and religious radicalism inspired

---

<sup>53</sup> For example, see Nicholas Orme's discussion of efforts during the Middle Ages to ensure scholars were given financial or material support to receive an education [*Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England* (New Haven, 2006), pp. 204-13].

<sup>54</sup> R.L. Greaves, *The Puritan Revolution and Educational Thought, Background for Reform* (New Brunswick, 1969), esp. pp. 48-62.

by apocalyptic religious thought present in plans like those of Jan Amos Comenius or Samuel Hartlib.<sup>55</sup> Certainly, some during the revolutionary period were thinking of sweeping changes to who ought to be educated or receive an education. Hugh Peters, for one, stated that it was the duty of the magistrate to ensure that ‘all such youth in anie place, or condition where wee finde them at plough or trade, which are godlie and tractable’ should be given training for the ministry.<sup>56</sup> However, there is a danger of conflating any call for the education of poor scholars with what tended to be more marginal opinions. The idea that talented students ought to be educated regardless of their wealth long preceded the revolutionary period and was the reason for many of the charitable endowments which had historically established free schools. Although some individual voices called for an entirely new approach to who could receive schooling, the notion of poor students deserving financial aid was rooted in custom and far more mainstream than might be thought.

Throughout the Commonwealth, parliamentary authorities attempted to help poor scholars for traditional reasons. A case in point came at Westminster School. Over what seems to have been several months in later 1649, students who had been elected as scholars to Cambridge and Oxford petitioned the governing body of the school. The authors of the petitions (three petitions survive) complained that it had always been the custom of the school to give a sum of money to the annually elected scholars to help provide them with books and other necessities for their studies at university.<sup>57</sup> Yet, as they complained, the annual allowance ‘hath been intermitted for some yeares last past to our great discouragement in the progresse of our studies’.<sup>58</sup> In the intervening time, the rents which

---

<sup>55</sup> *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, ed. C. Webster (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 50-60.

<sup>56</sup> H.[ugh] P.[eters], *Good Work for a Good Magistrate* (London, 1651), p. 6.

<sup>57</sup> WAM, 32455, 32479, 32489.

<sup>58</sup> WAM, 32455.

provided the allowance had been collected meaning that the money was held by the college authorities. The scholars, unsurprisingly, argued it would be better for the rents to be paid to them rather than gathering dust and emphasised that, in any case, the payment ought to have been made by custom, since the lands in question had been donated by Lord Burghley for the sole purpose of providing them with books and necessities.

The petition of the scholars reveals how ideas of funding were tied up with tradition rather than innovation. The students' allowance was rooted in a philanthropic endowment from decades previously, one bestowed owing to the belief that talented young students should be allowed to 'progresse' in their studies regardless of their wealth. The reasoning of the scholars was not based on their rights as citizens of the new republic, but on the traditions of Westminster School which had been 'intermitted'. Their arguments were persuasive — the committee members and governors for the school favoured the application and soon restarted the annual allowance.<sup>59</sup> Significantly, other parliamentary authorities or heads of houses were showing a similar attachment to the traditional idea of helping poor scholars. The CRU acted on such an ideal when specifying in September 1651 that the electors of Winchester College were to ensure that those scholars chosen as founders kin were to be 'poore, pious, and hopeful', as had been originally intended by the statutes.<sup>60</sup> College heads, too, were attached to the notion of altruism towards students. The master of Trinity, Cambridge, Thomas Hill boasted that under his governance 'very many great encouragem[en]ts have beene given to poore youths of all rankes out of the opinion of their piety and learning.'<sup>61</sup> At Jesus, in the same university, the master, John Worthington

---

<sup>59</sup> WAM, 32471, 32472, 43169, 43188.

<sup>60</sup> WCA, 21852.

<sup>61</sup> LPL, MS 804, f. 42v.

recorded in his diary one Eliot ‘a poor scholar’ being exempted from paying a weekly fee and being awarded some other financial help as he was ‘poor & studious’.<sup>62</sup> Although calls for the widening of the provision of education were sometimes driven by social or religious radicalism, it is also apparent that for many in government or institutions aiding poor students was a matter of respecting customs.

The same respect for tradition was evident when associating educational funding with the training of the ministry. For many, the fundamental purpose of places of learning was to ensure the ministry could be educated. As examined in detail later in this thesis, there was a great fear throughout the 1640s and Commonwealth period that no education meant no ministry. To this might be added the prefix that no money meant no education. One pamphleteer in 1652 shrewdly noted this link when writing that a full restitution of impropriations — which would affect schools and universities — would lead to ‘the dissolving of Collegiate Societies, which are the Seminaries & Nurceries of good learning’ and the ‘*Semen Ecclesia*’.<sup>63</sup> Without proper financing, educational institutions would quickly wither and with them the training of the ministry. It was this danger which Thomas Hill emphasised to Parliament in 1644. Hill, master of Trinity, Cambridge, warned them that the ‘*Schools and Universities* are much decayed’ where ministers might be trained. He called on them to ‘Improve your Parliament power, to *multiply builders in the Church*’ and ‘to cherish the *Seminaries of Religion, and Learning*, that many Candidates for the Ministry may bee trained up there’.<sup>64</sup> Hill’s concern was that a university starved of money would lead to a nation starved of the ministry.

---

<sup>62</sup> *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge...*, ed. J. Crossley (2 vols in 3, Manchester, 1847-1886), i, p. 41.

<sup>63</sup> R. Day, *The Humble Petition or Remonstrance of Rich: Day of Eton, neer Windsor...* (London, 1652), p. 3.

<sup>64</sup> T. Hill, *The Season for Englands Selfe-Reflection...* (London, 1644), p. 37.

The Rump's concern with educational finance therefore fitted into their wider concerns with the ministry. The desire to ensure ministers could receive an education was old, but as explored below, the Commonwealth was a period when the educational qualifications of the ministry assumed greater consequence. With the collapse of a universally accepted system of ordination and the concurrent rise in the importance of possessing a university degree for ministers, the need to ensure there was an educational system to produce a learned clergy assumed paramount significance. Although there was little new in wanting to protect the education of the ministry, the Rump's efforts to improve the financial situation of educational institutions was a sign of the changing idea of what made a minister. The sense of a call, the need for ordination, the spiritual separation from the laity were diminished during the wars and increasing emphasis was placed instead on the minister's learning. As the Cambridge fellow Joseph Sedgwick warned his audience in 1653, as calls against the university education of ministers reached a fever pitch, 'Doubtless, in this age Learning is necessary, when Atheisme begins to creep up in the Church and to out-face Christianity.'<sup>65</sup> Although the Parliament's concern with funding education was rooted in the customary idea of ministers needing universities and schools in which to be trained, it was also inflected by a particular concern with the ministry evident during the Commonwealth.

Alongside concerns with the ministry and poor scholars, Parliament's involvement in educational finance appears to have been driven by ideas about the honour of the nation. To an extent, new ideas of post-Regicide Britain certainly influenced these arguments as can

---

<sup>65</sup> J. Sedgwick, *A Sermon, Preached at S. Marie's in the University of Cambridge May 1st, 1653...Learning's Necessity to an Able Minister of the Gospel* (London, 1653), p. 53.

be seen by a letter written by the governors of Westminster School in 1654-5. The authors wrote to the executors of the recently deceased MP and scholar John Selden to request his library be deposited at Westminster College. The governors were unsuccessful, and the books were eventually settled in the Bodleian, but their plea was lengthy and detailed, seeking to show ‘that that desire of ours holds a cleare and close consistency w[i]th the Honor of the nation’. The placement of the books in the capital, the ‘Caput and Corona Anglicana’, would be a means to showcase the splendour and success of the nation to ‘the confluence of all p[er]sons’ who came to London. A well-stocked library in the city would create a match to the universities, ‘those great Escurialls of learning’, a ‘magazine of learning’ in a place ‘whither all men come’. ‘Ambasadors’, wits, scholars, MPs, and the students at the school, the ‘greatest seeds of future hopes’, would all be able to use the new resource. The fact that the students themselves seem to be relatively unimportant users of the library compared to the more impressive grandees hardly mattered in the overarching point the parliamentary governors were making: in the new England of the Interregnum, an impressive Westminster School would help London be a match for all the ‘gloryes’ of foreign cities, including the likes of ‘fflorence the faire’.<sup>66</sup>

However, even the linking of learning and national glory is not as novel as first seems. Flourishing institutions could easily be desired by those with a vaguer conception of governmental duty. When Cromwell spoke to the scholars of Oxford in May 1649, his words — all ‘knowe noe Com[m]onwealth would flourish without learninge’ and the government meant to secure the health of the university — were intended to calm scholars fearing a revolutionary government, not as a call to arms.<sup>67</sup> Cromwell meant that the Rump were

---

<sup>66</sup> WAM, 9827.

<sup>67</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 341r.

aware their reputation was intertwined with the state of educational institutions: either both would flourish together, or the government would be disgraced. Like the Westminster governors, his words showed an awareness that the material status of a place of learning could be to the glory of a government. However, the context and intent of Cromwell's words are a sign that ideas of honour were not only an indication of republican novelty. They also drew on much older and seemingly platitudinous notions of education — in this case, that a respectable government looked after it. The earlier committee for Westminster School, which preceded the board of governors and included some of its members, had explicitly referred to this principle at some point in the 1640s when discussing whether students ought to pay for their diet and tutorage. It was decided that the students ought not to, 'this Committee Esteemeinge it a Dishonor to the Parliam[en]t' for their education and food not to be free.<sup>68</sup> Honour, like poor scholars and the ministry, were motivations for funding rooted in tradition.

The motivations also shared a nebulous, malleable quality. Honour and glory were vague concepts which could be applied, albeit with different significances, in a monarchy, a republic, or a protectorate. The education of poor scholars and ministers could be supported by nearly all as these ambitions required support for the principles of altruism and the continuation of a ministry without the inconvenience of specific detail. The vagueness of these motivations shows how they stemmed from the equally imprecise ideals of the advancement of learning and piety. Just as with the reform of learning and propagation initiatives, the conceptions of education which are visible in discussions about its funding are noticeably devoid of details and often platitudinous. Despite their nebulous quality,

---

<sup>68</sup> WAM, 43162.

however, these ideals were still capable of prompting action, albeit in the piecemeal, conservative way analysed above. It is easy to assume that government action derived from a new programme or was purely reactive, but the evidence of educational funding exemplifies how indefinite and traditional principles could prompt action under the Rump.

The very nebulosity of educational ideals likely helped allow action. Unlike associated issues, like clerical maintenance, the funding of education was not hamstrung by controversy. The payment of the ministry, by contrast, was a divisive issue during the Commonwealth, especially the use of tithes.<sup>69</sup> Some critics argued that tithes, or a salary of any kind, tied the ministry to the earthly rather than spiritual realm and made them a ‘Hireling Ministry’, to quote the New England minister Roger Williams.<sup>70</sup> It would be best, Williams and William Dell argued, for tithes to be replaced wholesale by the ‘Christian, and spiritual’ method of voluntary contributions.<sup>71</sup> Despite the level of criticism, it has been recently demonstrated that tithe reform was a more mainstream issue than previously thought and frequently debated in the Commons.<sup>72</sup> Alongside calls for voluntary contributions were other plans for replacing tithes such as the creation of a ministry salaried by the state. However, these proposals languished just as much as parish reform. While action could be taken on an issue such as educational funding, there was never enough

---

<sup>69</sup> C. Hill, ‘The Radical Critics of Oxford and Cambridge in the 1650s’, in J.W. Baldwin & R.A. Goldthwaite (eds), *Universities and Politics, Case Studies from the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period* (London, 1972), pp. 107-32, esp. pp. 129-32; M. James, ‘The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution, 1640-60’, *History*, New Series, 26:101 (1941), esp. p. 6.

<sup>70</sup> R. Williams, *The Hireling Ministry...* (London, 1652), p. 7.

<sup>71</sup> W Dell, ‘The Right Reformation of Learning, Schooles and Universities...’, in his *The Tryal of Spirits...* (London, 1653), p. 30.

<sup>72</sup> A. Milton, *England’s Second Reformation: The Battle for the Church of England, 1625-1662* (Cambridge, 2021), pp. 298-9. For votes in the house about tithes, see, *CJ*, vi, pp. 211, 275; vii, p. 128. Bulstrode Whitelocke also mentions debates about abolition of tithes taking place without reaching a formal division [B. Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs...* (4 vols, Oxford, 1853), iii, pp. 16, 36]. See also, Worden, *Rump*, pp. 206-7 for debates about tithes in August 1649.

consensus, will, or opportunity to implement as large a reform as the replacement of tithes demanded.

The agreement about why education ought to be funded and the government's conservative approach meant action could be taken throughout the Rump. Even at times when the government was severely divided over other issues, and most business ground to a halt, efforts could still be made at a committee level to improve the material circumstances of educational institutions. The dissonance between support for learning and the more controversial aspects of the Rump can be seen by the timing of the grants of augmentations of university masterships, a significant number of which, especially for Oxford heads, were made on 26 September 1650, the day before the famous Toleration Act.<sup>73</sup> The act loosened the existing bonds of the national church, withdrawing the Elizabethan requirement for individuals to attend a parish church on the Lord's Day. Its passage following Dunbar represented a rare moment of Independent supremacy in the Rump as the New Model Army cashed in on its momentary favour and triumph.<sup>74</sup> It might be expected that the attention of the MPs who sat on the CRU would be diverted at this extraordinary political moment, yet regular committee work was unaffected. The near simultaneous granting of the augmentations to the Toleration Act suggests that, even while the Parliament was oscillating between the different wings of its coalition, at a committee level there was agreement about the need to fund places of learning. As we shall see below, there was similar consensus and activity outside of government among private individuals and inside places of learning.

---

<sup>73</sup> For the payments, LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, ff. 42-3, 390-2, 395-401, 446. See also, LPL, COMM VIa/2, ff. 31-5, 41, 43-5, 47, 50, 493-504. For the act, *A&O*, ii, pp. 423-5.

<sup>74</sup> Worden, *Rump*, pp. 238-9.

### III: Educational Finances and the Localities

In November 1652, a member of the Haberdashers' Company in London named Walter Boothby established a bequest.<sup>75</sup> According to the terms he devised, eight exhibitions, each of £5, were to be established for three Cambridge colleges. Three exhibitions were given to Emmanuel, three to Peterhouse, and two to Gonville and Caius.<sup>76</sup> There was nothing unusual about a Londoner associated with trade guilds donating money to places of learning, especially one with a deep personal religiosity.<sup>77</sup> Boothby, a prominent London Presbyterian, was certainly a devout attendee of preaching, collating a vast collection of sermon notes during his life.<sup>78</sup> However, although Boothby's bequest was far from unusual, Interregnum attempts by those outside of Westminster to improve the material state of places of learning have rarely been considered alongside those of the government. This section shows that the state intervention examined above is only part of the story. To gain a full picture of the issue of educational funding during the Commonwealth it is necessary to look outside of London, to the localities and places of learning themselves. The government were not the only ones involved in the material improvement of educational institutions, suggesting that they were part of a wider social trend and acting for similar reasons as others who expressed their interest through small, individual actions such as bequests, donations, fundraising, and private initiatives. As this section suggests, educational funding was a two-way street, in which both London and the localities played important roles.

---

<sup>75</sup> Peterhouse CA, O.2.23, ff. 19-20. See also, Peterhouse CA, N.1.33 [from back], ff. 26-7. Boothby had been an alderman of Bridge ward in 1652 [A.B. Beaven, *The Aldermen of the City of London, temp. Henry III-1908...* (London, 1908), p. 60].

<sup>76</sup> Peterhouse CA, O.2.23, f. 20.

<sup>77</sup> See this chapter, n. 3.

<sup>78</sup> A. Hughes, 'A Moderate Puritan Preacher Negotiates Religious Change', *JEH*, 65:4 (2014), p. 765 n. 12.

The actions of a schoolmaster like Francis Rous, provost of Eton, indicate that those inside places of learning could take action to address financial problems by themselves. Rous, also a prominent member of the CRU, explained in a letter from 1646 that the income from his position enabled him to carry out ‘an especial service to the church’ which was ‘to find out, and encourage yong schollers that wanted mayntenance’. Rous therefore was able to use his generous salary to provide for a large number of impoverished students, including one going to university ‘upon my charge’.<sup>79</sup> Nor was Rous alone in using his own wealth to help poor scholars. Warden John Harris of Winchester, according to an anonymous biography in the college archives, was happy to use the proceeds of his own income to help young scholars, including the son of a ‘minister of ordinary Quality’ who Harris ‘enterteyn’d...Gratis att his owne Table’.<sup>80</sup> The schoolmasters were addressing a problem which parliamentary bodies frequently faced: how to secure the education of poor scholars. It is easy to assume that Harris or Rous would have needed Parliament’s assistance to solve this problem, but their activities suggest that they were not passively waiting for the state to help resolve questions of money. Instead, like Boothby, they exemplify the interest outside of Westminster in the issue of educational finance and the existence of smaller initiatives taking place at a local level. To focus too far on the Parliament’s role is to risk obscuring a much deeper seam of interest in the issue of educational maintenance and ability to take some courses of action.

A focus on legislation also masks how widespread traditional attitudes to education and its financing were in the nation. Like Parliament, Boothby, Harris, and Rous referred

---

<sup>79</sup> ECR, Coll P 17/2.

<sup>80</sup> WCA, 452.

not only to ideas of charity, but also the need to train the ministry. The scholarships Boothby established were intended to help the ministry, with his instructions demanding that ‘the sonnes of poore Ministers who have been faithfull Labourers in the Lords Vineyard shall be preferred before others’. A concern with the ministry was further demonstrated in Boothby’s stipulation that in case Cambridge ‘or any of those Colledges should cease to bee’ the exhibitions would be given ‘to eight godly Ministers of London’.<sup>81</sup> Boothby’s concern with the ministry is an echo of the rhetoric being offered by Parliament to justify their own decisions in educational funding. Although bequests are not the same as augmentations, they showed the same concern with the material state of the educational institutions and their ability to function and train students. The similarity in justifications for funding is a sign that not only were those in the localities interested in the material state of places of learning, but they were thinking of their interest in the same vocabulary as those at Westminster. The same concern with the ministry is apparent at Eton where Rous explained that he was moved to his altruism by realising that ‘in these times of Distraction the want of ministers was Likely to bee greate by fayling of schollers both in schools and universities’.<sup>82</sup> Harris too, with his singling out of a minister’s son for charity, was like Boothby framing his help as an aid to the ministry more widely.

The common adherence to the traditional ideas about education helps explain otherwise strange trends in donations to places of learning. If gifts were made based on political ties or a new pedagogical programme, then it might be expected that benefactors would support colleges run by those of the same political outlook and so royalists would support royalists and parliamentarians support parliamentarians. An example, analysed in

---

<sup>81</sup> Peterhouse CA, O.2.23, f. 20.

<sup>82</sup> ECR, Coll P17/2.

detail in a later chapter, would be the royalist school of Winchester receiving donations from royalist families eager to send their sons there, such as the children of Lord Capell, the executed royalist commander.<sup>83</sup> Yet, it is clear from the donations to schools and universities that people often overlooked political allegiances. The motivations for giving money or books tended to be from the same broad ideals of advancing piety and learning explored above, notions which transcended politics. A royalist could donate to a college filled with parliamentarians and still feel that they were helping the institution and the cause of knowledge, not whoever dwelt there.

Brasenose was one college where donations were intended to support the college rather than its Interregnum rulers. Among the benefactors after the Regicide were some of the ruling roundhead members such as the college master, Daniel Greenwood, and new fellow, Richard Adams. But they were joined by John Prestwich, a fellow of All Souls who seems to have been part of the university's royalist and episcopalian network as well as Joseph Maynard who would go on to be a post-Restoration rector of Exeter College.<sup>84</sup> Another benefactor of the college who likely had little warm-feeling for Commonwealth Brasenose was Thomas Sixsmith who donated a quart decanter in 1650.<sup>85</sup> Sixsmith had been one of those Brasenose fellows who had initially tried to defy Parliament following the death of Dr Samuel Radcliffe, the college head, in 1648. A group of fellows decided to declare an election, in spite of the visitors' orders to the contrary, leading to a 'a Guard of souldiers' taking 'prisoners' including Sixsmith.<sup>86</sup> Following the incident Sixsmith, according to a

---

<sup>83</sup> WCA, Library Book of Donations, ff. 48-50.

<sup>84</sup> Brasenose CA, BT 1 G 2, ff. 6, 9-10. Prestwich in 1654 would subscribe to a fundraising scheme to raise money for Episcopalians and ejected fellows in financial distress [Jesus Oxford CA, PR. Mansell B.10].

<sup>85</sup> Brasenose CA, BT 1 G 1, f. 45r.

<sup>86</sup> Brasenose CA, PR I 1 A1/2. See also, PR I 1 A1/1. For an outline of the election of Yates, see J.M. Crook, *Brasenose: The Biography of an Oxford College* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 61-2. The defiant actions of the fellows

comment in a letter from another Brasenose contemporary written after the Restoration, was forced from his fellowship, being advised by Edward Reynolds, dean of Christ Church and vice-chancellor, to resign his place before the visitors removed him.<sup>87</sup> Sixsmith, pushed from his fellowship in 1648, would have been forgiven for bearing a grudge against the new rulers of the college but any personal animosity seems to have been lost in a wider willingness to improve the material state of Brasenose.

As Brasenose showed, royalists and parliamentarians could donate to the same institution. At Winchester, the names of the Capell brothers, Charles and Henry, sons of an executed royalist military commander, are recorded in the library's book of donations alongside others more obviously associated with Interregnum governments, such as Humphrey Ellis — a local minister at the cathedral church receiving a stipend from the trustees for maintenance — and Oliver Cromwell.<sup>88</sup> The benefactors of another library, the Bodleian, were similarly varied. Peter Turner had been ejected from his fellowship at Merton in 1648 by Parliament but still left many Greek manuscripts to the university at his death in 1652.<sup>89</sup> Most likely, Turner would not have chosen to be associated with Sir Jerome Sankey, an army officer intruded into All Souls by the visitors, as a benefactor of the library.<sup>90</sup> Similarly, in Cambridge, the ejected master of Emmanuel, Richard Holdsworth, was still content to leave his library to his old college, its new governors notwithstanding, following his death in 1649.<sup>91</sup> The variety of benefactors to places of education in the Interregnum

---

against the visitors were memorably described by one historian as 'these wily gentlemen [answering] with fair words and anarchical deeds' [J. Buchan, *Brasenose* (London, 1898), p. 23].

<sup>87</sup> Brasenose GOV 6 A2/4 (Folder 7), letter of John Houghton to Thomas Yates (29 & 30 August 1660).

<sup>88</sup> WCA, Library Book of Donations, ff. 53-7, 64.

<sup>89</sup> Bodl., MS Lib. recs. e. 8., f. 148v.

<sup>90</sup> Bodl., MS Lib. recs. b. 903, f. 368.

<sup>91</sup> C. Sayle, *Annals of Cambridge University Library, 1278-1900* (Cambridge, 1916), p. 78. His library eventually ended up passed to the university rather than Emmanuel.

speaks to the common attitudes to education which they possessed and that were widely shared.

The consensus over education could also prompt cooperation. At University College in the mid-1650s the master, Francis Johnson, began an ambitious building project. Although the venture occurred after the fall of the Rump, it is comparable to educational funding taking place during the Commonwealth years and, like in the Rump period, a variety of persons contributed. At first glance, the fundraising campaign looks dominated by a mixture of those connected to the college and supporters of the Cromwellian regime, as might be expected since Johnson owed his position to the protector's favour.<sup>92</sup> College members and Anna and Elizabeth Hoyle, daughters of Johnson's predecessor Joshua Hoyle, were natural benefactors.<sup>93</sup> So too were Oxford locals like Henry Wilkinson of Magdalen Hall and the scientist Robert Boyle, at the time living close to the college.<sup>94</sup> Thanks to Johnson's links, the scheme also gained the support of national political figures connected to the Cromwellian government such as the minister Hugh Peters and William Lenthall, speaker of the First Protectorate Parliament.<sup>95</sup>

However, there were many contributing to the project who were virulently opposed to the Protectorate. Several, such as John Bradshawe and Sir Peter Wentworth had been fervent Rumpers and were marginalised by the dissolution of the Commonwealth.<sup>96</sup> Wentworth, who gave £10 in 1655, had been a leading republican under the Rump, closely

---

<sup>92</sup> R. Darwall-Smith, *A History of University College, Oxford* (Oxford, 2008), p. 176.

<sup>93</sup> University College Archives, UC:BE1/M5S1/1, ff. 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 15, 16.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 19.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 22; S. Barber, 'Sir Peter Wentworth', *ODNB*; S. Kelsey, 'John, Lord Bradshaw', *ODNB*.

associated with Henry Marten and John Milton. He withdrew from London after the Commonwealth but opposed the Protectorate in the localities. Arguing that no money ought to be levied upon the nation without the consent of Parliament, he prosecuted a tax collector in Warwickshire. He was brought before the Council of State for this action and dropped his case, allegedly due to age and infirmity rather than a change of heart.<sup>97</sup> He, like Bradshawe, was deeply opposed to the lord protector and the Protectorate which some of his fellow benefactors keenly supported, yet Wentworth was happy to join them in contributing to the college. So too was a royalist and episcopalian like John Prestwich, fellow of All Souls, who donated £7 in 1656.<sup>98</sup>

Like during the Rump, the variety of contributors showed that support for the scheme was not based on political loyalties, but on ideas about the advancement of learning. Captain Cresset captured this sentiment with his justification for donating in 1655. As he explained, ‘having turned away from affairs of war’, he wished to support ‘togas and good letters’.<sup>99</sup> Who wore the togas and what the letters spelt was less important than that they were endorsed. The case of University College is indicative of the cooperation which such attitudes to learning created, a theme which is returned to throughout this thesis, especially in chapter four. A shared attitude to education had brought together a variety of individuals for a joint enterprise at University College in a project with a discernible aim.

A wider point to emerge by looking at issues of finance inside places of learning is the agency of academic institutions and their involvement in national debates. As seen

---

<sup>97</sup> Barber, ‘Wentworth’.

<sup>98</sup> University College CA, UC:BE1/M5S1/1, f. 19.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., f. 23 [‘et Rebus Bellicis versatus; pro sua tamen erga Togatos et Bonas Literas Benevolentia’].

above, schools and colleges took a strong interest in the fate of their finances and were willing to take action independently of Westminster. Indeed, they tried to shape events as much as possible, sometimes seizing opportunities presented by chance, as was the case at Winchester College in 1653 a few months after the collapse of the republic. When tithes, on which many places of learning relied, were threatened by the Nominated Assembly in 1653, campaigns in their defence emerged from localities. In September 1653, a petition from Hampshire was presented to the Parliament by the recorder of Winchester urging the retention of tithes unless some other, suitable means could be found.<sup>100</sup> Likely, it was in relation to this petition that a document now kept in the archives of Winchester College was written. On the back of another letter, dated 26 August 1653, Warden John Harris wrote a draft to an unknown correspondent. Harris was replying to a message, which does not appear to have survived, concerning a contribution to ‘those worthie lawyers, who have shewed themselves in the Cause of Tithes’. Harris wrote that he believed it to be a very admirable cause but upon discussing the issue with some ‘sure brethren’ in Winchester he found it ‘reported and beleaved’ that the lawyers had refused to accept ‘any reward or fee’. Harris explained that he heard ‘this report’ from a local minister, ‘Mr Ellis’, likely Humphrey Ellis, who had in turn heard it from ‘Mr Adoniram Bifield’, the former clerk of the Westminster Assembly who seems to have played an important, unofficial role in the CRU.<sup>101</sup> Harris suggested that ‘a considerable piece of plate’ should be given to one of the lawyers, Mr Maynard, who had spoken ‘as much and as effectually as any in the cause’ as ‘a lasting monument of our thankfulnes’.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> *The Humble Petition of the Well-Affected of the County of South-Hampton in Behalf of the Ministers of the Gospel and for Continuance of their Maintenance...* (London, 1653). See also, A. Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate* (Oxford, 1982), p. 246.

<sup>101</sup> Byfield was involved with the CRU’s augmentation efforts, receiving a salary for his efforts [LPL, COMM VIa/2, f. 880; L40.2/E16, ff. 733, 736].

<sup>102</sup> WCA, 425.

Harris's letter shows how invested a school could be in the national debates shaping their funding. Harris's interest in the future of tithes was likely as much to do with his school's circumstance as with his wider support for tithes since they were important for Winchester's security. Harris's interest, and canny use of plate, was a sign that those inside institutions were neither isolated nor passive while London discussed issues concerning them. Rather, they were knowledgeable and able to see what developments would best suit their interests. It is also clear from his letter that Harris was sufficiently well-connected to have some agency in national matters: Adoniram Byfield was an important advisor to both the CRU and trustees for maintenance and had been crucial in establishing many of the augmentations given to college heads. Humphrey Ellis meanwhile was a minister of some importance in the county, commissioned by influential figures to write a denunciation of regional heresy in 1650 — which received the imprimatur of the leading Independent Joseph Caryl — and utilised by the Rump in the transmission of the Cathedral library to Winchester in 1652.<sup>103</sup> Harris's involvement in the 1653 petition was a demonstration of his connections, as much as his interest in national events.

Another example from Winchester shows how such connections could be utilised by appealing to the advancement of learning and piety. Winchester was beset by monetary concerns throughout the 1640s and sometime in the decade Harris wrote to a number of Hampshire dignitaries and MPs seeking help. Harris explained that his college was in severe danger of collapsing under the weight of the excise and was soliciting help in having it be

---

<sup>103</sup> H. Ellis, *Pseudochristus, a True and Faithful Relation of the Impostures Acted by William Frankelin and Mary Gadbury...* (London, 1650). Ellis described the work as resulting from 'The importunate desire of many Christian Friends, Ministers and others' [ibid., p. 3]. For the books, R. Foster, 'Winchester Cathedral Library, 1642-1669' (unpublished paper).

excused. Harris linked the financial health of the school to the education of ‘the great number of poore schollers’ who could not afford their education, or meals, without the school’s help. As the warden explained, any help would be ‘a favor...to the poore boyes whose com[m]ons you know to be so short’. The warden’s use of traditional justifications — ‘the poore boyes’ — was safe ground on which to base an appeal to MPs about the dire financial consequences of the parliamentary state. Harris was essentially complaining about the problems to his school caused by war and tax and as a notorious royalist — a point investigated in a later chapter — may have expected little sympathy when lamenting his penury. His arguments avoided politics by framing the issue in the familiar terms of charity and learning. Piety featured too, as Harris solemnly informed the recipients that their help would ensure they would ‘gaine the praiers of a great manie little ones’ alongside the thanks of the warden.<sup>104</sup>

Harris’s use of the same language as Parliament is a sign of its malleability as much as its wide use. In his case, it was also effective as his appeal achieved its aims, with one of the recipients, the Winchester MP Nicholas Love, successfully managing events at Westminster for the school’s benefit. After an initial attempt to secure an exemption for Winchester failed, Love lent on the excise commissioners ‘to intimate a connivencys of the excyse for a time’ and the school was able to underpay the taxes they owed on beer brewed by the college.<sup>105</sup> Love, who was a friend of Harris, was always a likely ally of the school, but the warden’s rhetoric explains why parliamentarians more generally would have been willing to help him. Harris was making appeals to accepted ideas about why education institutions ought to receive financial help, ideas which Parliament itself frequently

---

<sup>104</sup> WCA, 420.

<sup>105</sup> WCA, 421, 422. See also T.F. Kirby, *Annals of Winchester College, from Its Foundation in the Year 1382 to the Present Time* (London, 1892), pp. 334-5.

endorsed. The general agreement about these principles made them flexible, suitable for both parliamentarians and royalists to use. Like with University College's fundraising, consensus over education allowed Harris's petition to be widely supported, gaining the aid of those on the other side of the political divide.

Harris's success was not solely due to his rhetoric but also his ability to lobby Westminster. He had been able to enlist the help of Love and he had the ears of many prominent parliamentarian figures including the Fiennes family, John Lisle, and Robert Wallop.<sup>106</sup> It is easy to assume individual schools or colleges lacked the type of influence and ability to influence national politics that a university could wield. Yet, Harris was far from unusual in possessing a range of useful contacts and is a reminder that even an individual school tended to have patrons and friends who could be approached. Many colleges also had links to friendly MPs, especially if the politician in question was an *alumnus* such as Michael Oldisworth. Oldisworth, sometime chairman of the CRU, was especially eager to help his old Oxford college of Queen's. The master, Gerard Langbaine, happily noted in 1651 that Oldisworth had 'expressed himself a cordial friend' to the college in some of their financial business about vacant fellowships.<sup>107</sup> Nor was Oldisworth, who also donated a book of martyrs to the college, alone in using his influence to help his old college.<sup>108</sup> Sir John Danvers, an former student of Brasenose, likewise was approached by his old college in 1648 for help in a collegiate matter and proved so helpful that the vice-principal and fellows wrote him a letter of thanks.<sup>109</sup> Brasenose was clearly well-connected — in December 1651 they paid one Mr Bruen £03.07.06 for a present which was to be

---

<sup>106</sup> For Wallop, see WCA 420, 445. For the Fiennes family, see WCA 420, 424, 429, 430, 445, 449, 461 and also, 452, 431, 450. For Lisle, see WCA, 430 and also 450.

<sup>107</sup> Bodl., Selden Supra 109, f. 335r.

<sup>108</sup> Queen's Oxford CA, LR C, August 1651-August 1652, 'Custos Forinsecorum'.

<sup>109</sup> Brasenose CA, PR I 1 A1/1.

delivered to the lord president of the Council of State, John Bradshawe, for his love and favour to the college as ‘shew’d uppon sev[er]all addresses made unto him by the College’.<sup>110</sup> Cases like Harris, Oldisworth, Danvers, and Bradshawe suggest colleges or schools were neither isolated nor lacking in political influence in the revolutionary period. Not only were places of learning invested in ongoing national debates, but they spoke the suitable rhetoric and possessed the necessary influence to have agency and to influence what happened at Westminster. Under a shrewd college head, like Harris or Langbaine, this agency could be used to great effect via political lobbying.

Another example of this political lobbying occurred with Eton in 1649. In that year, the Commons debated the abolition of dean and chapter lands, an act which had potential to diminish the school’s income. As seen above, eventually Eton — along with the universities and Winchester and Westminster — secured an exemption. However, it is clear from the college’s account books that they took no risks and lobbied MPs. That year they spent the enormous sum of over £57 ascertaining the ‘sence of the house about the Clause Concerninge Eton schoole in the Ordinance’.<sup>111</sup> Meanwhile, possibly around the time the ordinance was debated, the warden and a fellow of Winchester travelled to London ‘in negotiis collegii’ which perhaps was also linked to the ordinance, though this is impossible to prove.<sup>112</sup> The lobbying of both was eventually successful; the gargantuan sum used by Eton, which was likely used to befriend MPs, seems to have been a case of spending to save. The exemption Eton and Winchester received was not a foregone conclusion: an exemption from taxation for them, Westminster, and the universities had been rejected by the Commons

---

<sup>110</sup> Brasenose CA, SB Accounts NO 1+2, A 2.43-44, 1647, 1648, 1651, 1650-1, ‘Dona et Regarda’.

<sup>111</sup> ECR, 62/10, f. 309. However, in the draft audit book [ECR, 62/61] the same expense is listed as £00.57.04.

<sup>112</sup> WCA, Bursars’ Book, 1644-1671, 1648-9, ‘Custus Necessarioru[m] cum donis’.

in 1646.<sup>113</sup> That an exemption was secured is likely due to the lobbying shown in the schools' account books and a sign of the ability educational institutions possessed to influence decisions at the centre of government.

---

<sup>113</sup> *CJ*, iv, p. 736. Though, when the ordinance was eventually issued the following year, the exemption was included [Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 141].

## Conclusion

It is likely that more attempts by institutions to influence politics occurred than can be seen through surviving evidence. The only reason Eton's intervention in 1649 is known is thanks to a fortunately descriptive entry in the college account books. Had the bursar described it as simply a journey to London then any evidence of Eton's agency would be lost, as would an awareness that Winchester may have also been lobbying Parliament around the same time. However, although fragmentary, the materials in institutional archives which do remain show that issues such as their funding were being keenly considered by those inside places of teaching. Nor were college bodies willing to wait and see what happened in Parliament, but often attempted to influence national discussions or improve their own circumstances through networks of allies. As this chapter has demonstrated, college societies had a number of tools at their disposal with which to shape their fate. An acknowledgement of this fact adds a new facet to the understanding of the relationship between the localities and the centre already analysed in this thesis, emphasizing the agency those in educational institutions held. The role of institutional authorities and private individuals in the issue of finance is a reminder that the Rump's rule cannot be understood through events at Westminster alone.

Funding also emerged in this chapter as another area in which the Rump was a proactive governor of education. Although the Rump's efforts were piecemeal, conservative, and largely reactive, they also demonstrated a running concern with the financial situation inside places of learning. Partially, the government worked through legislation. However, the activity of its committees in institutional contexts shows the breadth and vitality of the

government's interest in funding and education. How they attempted to ameliorate the financial difficulties facing places of learning is also in keeping with the government's conservative approach to education discussed above. The Commonwealth did not treat places of learning as needing to be transformed but worked on a case-by-case basis through a committee. Even the augmentations of college heads, arguably the most ambitious Rump attempt in educational funding is far more erratic and far less coherent than it might first appear. Arguably, the limited nature of the Parliament's initiatives and focus on committee work is what ensured a scheme like mastership augmentations was established whereas far grander plans for ecclesiastical reform faltered. The government's approach to educational funding shows a pragmatic approach to places of learning and suggests a desire to work through the pre-existing system of educational institutions in England.

By looking both at Parliament and outside of London it has been possible to examine in detail the language used to discuss education in the period and to show the degree of consensus about educational matters. Many of the governmental or private initiatives undertaken to improve the material state of places of learning were rooted in tradition and widely agreed understandings of learning, piety, and the importance of training the ministry. The impreciseness of the rhetoric around the ministry and education perhaps explains why both royalists and parliamentarians were able to use similar language and, as seen through the example of donations, acted from similar principles. Occasionally, the common ground over education seems to have allowed cooperation between those of different political persuasions, seen particularly in the case of University College. Education, as this chapter has showed, was not only a subject with points of consensus which transcended the political differences of the period, but one which could support cooperation in post-Regicide Britain. More evidence of consensus and appeals to tradition in educational matters occur in the next

chapter when examining an issue mentioned above, the production of a university-educated ministry. A crucial difference to emerge below, however, was the relative importance of financial concerns and the education of the ministry in determining the government's treatment of school and universities. Whereas the material improvement of educational institutions was an important consideration, the next chapter demonstrates its importance was greatly inferior to the training of the ministry.

### Chapter 3

#### Stopping ‘the mouthes of vaine men’: The Learned Ministry

##### in Commonwealth England

In 1644, the head of Trinity, Cambridge told the Lords that ‘[i]f those Nurseries [i.e. the universities] bee not well pruned, you may receive such Chaplains thence, as may study to corrupt you and yours, flattering you into everlasting misery’.<sup>1</sup> By the time of the Rump, the Lords had been abolished but the master’s warning, that the universities were instrumental in the formation of the ministry, still rang true and was still relevant. As this chapter demonstrates, the Commonwealth was a period when traditional notions of the ministry, including the need for ministers to be trained in the universities, came under increasing threat. In response to radical criticisms, the Rump, through its committees, intervened in ecclesiastical matters more than historians have realised, defending the notion of an university-educated ministry approved by the magistrate. By showing the government’s role in ministerial matters, this chapter continues this thesis’ re-evaluation of the Rump through an analysis of its committees, here with the focus on their involvement in the ecclesiastical sphere. This chapter also offers a new perspective on the story of the ministry during the Commonwealth. It is easy to think of the story of the ministry following the collapse of the Caroline church as defined by a search for a new confessional settlement and new procedures for setting ministers apart. However, the study below shows an alternative history in which the fate of the ministry can be charted by looking at committee work and developments in institutional contexts.

---

<sup>1</sup> T. Hill, *The Right Separation Incouraged...* (London, 1645), p. 33.

This chapter also further explores the role of the Rump as governors of academic foundations. As in previous chapters, the government are shown to have been heavily involved in places of learning. Here, however, the focus shifts to their priorities for educational reform. A study of these concerns brings up, again, the theme of consensus in educational matters as the widespread agreement about the training of the ministry is analysed. As will be shown, the belief that ministers ought to receive some form of university education and receive university degrees was commonly shared. The concept of the learned minister was changing during the Commonwealth, however, and this chapter explores how, in the absence of a widely agreed system of ordination, divines were increasingly becoming defined by less controversial skills and qualities which they could gain inside places of learning. Concerns about ministerial education influenced the Rump's approach to educational reform and a study of how reform was carried out shows once again that affairs inside places of learning were determined by both the government and institutional authorities.

## I: Ordination, Approbation, and the Ministry

During the Commonwealth, traditional notions of the ministry came under threat. As this section will show, the absence of an agreed system of ordination and the proliferation of heresy created a pressing need for the government to find a new method of setting apart an orthodox ministry. Historians have largely argued that the Rump were unable to find a solution to this problem. No new settlement was agreed upon by the Commonwealth to replace ordination. Instead, in the words of Ann Hughes, it was not until the Protectorate that Cromwell ‘succeeded in establishing at last general procedures for approving ministers and for removing the unsatisfactory clergy’ by using a system of triers and ejectors based on proposals for a religious settlement articulated by a collection of Independent ministers led by John Owen.<sup>2</sup> Rump efforts, historians argue, to create such ‘general procedures’ were hamstrung by internal divisions, especially over the thorny topic of the magistrate’s power in ecclesiastical matters.<sup>3</sup> However, a different image emerges when attention is shifted towards the underexamined evidence of Commonwealth committees and places of learning. As this section will demonstrate, parliamentary committees were intervening in ecclesiastical matters far more than historians have realised, addressing problems relating to the ministry by using learning as an important tool in approving ministers.

---

<sup>2</sup> A. Hughes, ‘The Public Profession of these Nations’: The National Church in Interregnum England’, in C. Durston & J. Maltby (eds), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), p. 97. See also the important essay of Jeffrey Collins on the topic, ‘The Church Settlement of Oliver Cromwell’, *History*, 87:285 (2002), pp. 18-40. For the system being based on the proposals, B. Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester, 2002), p. 40. For the proposals themselves, J. Owen *et al.*, *The Humble Proposals of Mr. Owen, Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, and Other Ministers...* (London, 1652). For the proposals, see also S. Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 196-204.

<sup>3</sup> For an important recent essay touching on the controversies over the magistrate’s role, see H. Powell, ‘Promote, protect, prosecute’: The Congregationalist Divines and the Establishment of Church and Magistrate in Cromwellian England’, in E. Vernon & H. Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 222-41.

Changing attitudes to the ministry reflected the changing circumstances of the 1640s church. Before the civil wars, university education and ordination were recognised as crucial qualifications for ministers. However, while the schools and universities survived the battles of the civil wars, ordination became another casualty of the political fighting at Westminster. The politicians of the Long Parliament never agreed on a new system to replace Episcopalian ordination.<sup>4</sup> Although a parliamentary ordinance of 1644, reissued in 1645, 1646, and 1648, had established temporary procedures for the ordination of ministers by a presbytery in lieu of Episcopalian ordination, this measure was not universally accepted by the time of the Rump, a victim of the failure to enact a Presbyterian church system.<sup>5</sup> The Commonwealth therefore inherited a lacuna from the Long Parliament in the matter of ordination, the absence of which posed both general and particular problems to the republic.

The general problem was due to how the Interregnum governments understood their role as godly magistrates. One of the primary purposes of ordination had been to separate the ministry from the untrained and unlicensed laity. The Rump, like its predecessor, feared the social and theological consequences of laymen taking on themselves ministerial responsibilities, believing that it was the responsibility of the godly magistrate to preserve true religion and social order. It was from this sense of responsibility that the Long Parliament in 1645 prohibited preaching by laymen, an order which was followed the next year by a Commons' declaration of dislike for unordained preachers and a reaffirmation of the preceding ordinance.<sup>6</sup> The Rump was no less concerned than their predecessors about

---

<sup>4</sup> Episcopalian ordination continued but underground [K. Fincham and S. Taylor, 'Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity, 1646-60', in J. McElligott & D. Smith (eds), *Royalists and Royalism in the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), esp. pp. 28-35].

<sup>5</sup> *A&O*, i, pp. 521-6, 1199-1215; *An Ordinance...for the Ordination of Ministers by the Clasicall Presbyters...* (London, 1646); *LJ*, vii, pp. 683-5.

<sup>6</sup> *A&O*, i, p. 677; *CJ*, v, pp. 34-5.

maintaining orthodoxy through a distinct and approved ministry. As will be shown shortly, they were faced with similar contextual troubles of sectarianism which only seemed to proliferate following the Regicide.

However, general magisterial concerns with protecting true religion were exacerbated by particular contextual pressures in the Commonwealth period. In the early 1650s, traditional notions of what defined the ministry were increasingly questioned in the famous ‘learned-ministry controversy’, a voluminous and vitriolic pamphlet war.<sup>7</sup> The point of tension in the dispute was about the necessary skills for being a minister. Traditionally, it had been thought that ministers needed a number of qualities, including ordination and the possession of university degrees. Critics, such as William Dell, argued that all that was needed was the sense of an inward calling, ‘meeerly [*sic*] through the Uction of’ the ‘Spirit’.<sup>8</sup> If the ‘Spirit’ was all that was required, then all who were called by it could preach regardless of human authorisation. As the pamphleteer Thomas Collier pithily asked, ‘what *Presbytery* sent *Paul* when he preached?’<sup>9</sup> This controversy raised the issue of what was required to be a minister. If a sense of calling and the movement of the Spirit was all that was needed, then the idea ‘of *Schools* inabling men for the Ministry...is contrary to the truth of Christ’, as was the authorisation received by ordination.<sup>10</sup> The apostles had been ‘illiterate or unlearned men’ and Paul had avoided ‘excellency of speech’; what grounds were there then to insist that ministers ought to be learned or set apart by human authority via means such as ordination?<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> For an excellent summary of this debate, Twigg, *Cambridge*, pp. 206-33.

<sup>8</sup> W. Dell, *The Stumbling Stone...* (London, 1653), p. 23.

<sup>9</sup> T. Collier, *The Pulpit-Guard Routed...* (London, 1651), p. 25.

<sup>10</sup> J. Webster, *Academiarum Examen...* (London, 1654), p. 6.

<sup>11</sup> Collier, *Pulpit-Guard Routed*, p. 25; J. Horn, *A Consideration of Infant Baptism...Together with a Digression, in Answer to Mr Kendall...* (London, 1654), p. 160.

The learned-minister controversy indicated the scale of problems facing the Rump. Calls for an end to ‘the Doctrine and Domination of the Clergy’ and in its place a priesthood of those ordained by ‘graces and abilities from God’ were alarming and made with increasing loudness and frequency in the early 1650s.<sup>12</sup> Opponents of self-proclaimed preachers argued that ministers required authorisation from human authorities to preach or else they would be ‘Usurpers of the Priests office’, yet the role of the civil magistrate in ecclesiastical matters was itself controversial.<sup>13</sup> In October 1652, the leading Independent minister John Owen lamented to the House that some had argued that the magistrate had no right to be involved in matters of the church and the propagation of the Gospel.<sup>14</sup> The same year, one well-informed pamphleteer described the debate in 1652 as becoming ‘the great controversial business of these polemick times’.<sup>15</sup>

The author in question, Thomas Cobbet, was not exaggerating. The Whitehall debates of 1648-9 about the Second Agreement of the People had brought to the fore subtle but important differences within the broad parliamentary coalition over the powers of the magistrate in ecclesiastical matters which only became starker during the Commonwealth.<sup>16</sup> From 1652, following the military securing of the Commonwealth, a collection of leading Independent ministers grouped around Owen argued for the magistrate’s role in religious

---

<sup>12</sup> W. Dell, ‘The Testimony of Martin Luther...touching Universities, Humane Learning...’, in his *The Tryal of Spirits...* (London, 1653), p. 21. W. Hartley, *The Priests Patent Cancelled...* (London, 1649), p. 9.

<sup>13</sup> R. Boreman *The Triumph of Learning over Ignorance...* (London, 1653), p. 33.

<sup>14</sup> J. Owen, *A Sermon Preached to the Parliament, Octob. 13. 1652* (London, 1652).

<sup>15</sup> T. Cobbet, *The Civil Magistrates Power in Matters of Religion...* (London, 1653), dedicatory epistle to Oliver Cromwell. The epistle is dated 4 August 1652. For a discussion of Cobbet’s work, see C.W.A. Prior, ‘Rethinking Church and State during the English Interregnum’, *Historical Research*, 87:237 (2014), pp. 456-60.

<sup>16</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, pp. 190-6.

matters with increasing vehemence, something which was met with widespread resistance.<sup>17</sup> Much criticism of the Independents' position appears to have come from outside Parliament, such as the *Several Queries* which declared it antichristian to attempt to 'exercise not only a Civill but Ecclesiasticall power over the Consciences, and persons of men in matters of Faith'.<sup>18</sup> Other dissenting voices came from within the House itself. One such opponent was the leading MP, Sir Henry Vane jr. who anonymously published the text *Zeal Examined*, in which he argued that were the magistrate to intervene in the rectifying of religious issues, it 'would prove much worse then the disease' of religious error since the magistrates lacked the competency to judge such cases correctly.<sup>19</sup>

Such divisions over the rights of the magistrate in ecclesiastical matters might be expected to have hamstrung the Rump in resolving the crisis of the ministry. They had a pressing need to find an alternative system of approbation and yet any solution was also likely to require the intervention of the civil authorities in religious matters. As mentioned above, historians have traditionally argued that the answer to the dilemma only emerged coherently in the Protectorate with the Instrument of Government and the system of triers and ejectors. Implicit within this framework is the idea that the Rump was too divided to coalesce around an answer, including over the role of the magistrate.<sup>20</sup> For example, it was not until February 1653 while considering a grand propagation bill for the entire nation that the Parliament took into consideration whether the propagation of the gospel and the right

---

<sup>17</sup> For an overview, *ibid.*, pp. 196-232.

<sup>18</sup> *Several Queries... Together with a Few Other Necessary Proposals...* (London, 1652), p. 13. See also, C. Polizzotto, 'The Campaign against the Humble Proposals of 1652', *JEH*, 38:4 (1987), pp. 569-81.

<sup>19</sup> [H. Vane,] *Zeal Examined...* (London, 1652), p. 12. For his authorship of the text, Polizzotto, 'The Humble Proposals', p. 579-80.

<sup>20</sup> 'The religious duties of the magistrate were enshrined in the Instrument of Government' [A. Milton, *England's Second Reformation, the Battle for the Church of England, 1625-1662* (Cambridge, 2021), p. 345, see also pp. 344-7]. For an example of the controversy over the magistracy in the Rump, see Worden, *Rump*, p. 294.

to approve new ministers was the duty of the magistrate, resolving in the end with a vote that it indeed was.<sup>21</sup> Such clarity, which came only a few months short of its demise, appears too little too late. Historians, like Jeffrey Collins, of the Cromwellian church settlement also tend to distinguish between the work of the Protectorate and the ‘expedients’ of the Long Parliament and Rump.<sup>22</sup> It might be thought that, freed from the stagnant inaction of the Commonwealth and the radicalism of the Nominated Assembly, the Cromwellian clique were finally able to articulate a clearer role for the magistrate in ecclesiastical affairs via the triers.

However, several problems with this conclusion emerge when looking at the work of parliamentary committees during the Rump. The supremacy of the magisterial Independents and the notion that the Interregnum role of the magistrate in ecclesiastical matters was only established with the Protectorate is based, in part, on the Rump’s failure to agree on anything comparable to the 1654 Cromwellian church settlement. However, the issue can be revised by looking away from the floor of the Commons and instead towards the meetings of various Commonwealth bodies. At a committee level, civil authorities were regularly intervening in the ecclesiastical sphere to address the issue of the ministry and to determine how to set it apart from the laity. Previously, the licensing and care of ministers had traditionally been within the authority of bishops. With the abolition of episcopacy, however, parliamentary bodies took over many of these responsibilities and made use of a system known as approbation, a method of examining potential ministers by civil authorities. As early as August 1649, the Rump discussed establishing ‘some able Persons’ in the counties ‘to examine, approve, and allow’ men to carry out ministerial work who ‘do

---

<sup>21</sup> *CJ*, vii, p. 262.

<sup>22</sup> Collins, ‘Church Settlement of Oliver Cromwell’, p. 37.

scruple the [Presbyterian] Form of Ordination now settled'.<sup>23</sup> Approbation was a useful sifting mechanism for preachers; as Oliver Cromwell described in September 1650, it was 'an act of conveniency in respect of order; not of necessity, to give faculty to preach the Gospel.'<sup>24</sup> Whereas ordination was carried out by ecclesiastical bodies, approbation could be carried out by civil authorities. This was the case in the propagation schemes in Wales and the four northern counties, where civil commissioners were appointed with the power to eject scandalous ministers and to approve new ministers.<sup>25</sup> A comparable ejection scheme was mooted in July 1651: the Council of State directed Parliament to create local commissioners who would examine seditious or scandalous ministers, eject them, and approve new persons in their places.<sup>26</sup> Although approbation schemes involved civil officers, they still sometimes involved an ecclesiastical element. The commissioners in Wales were expected to work with godly ministers to approve ministers just as, in a similar way, the CPM worked with the Westminster Assembly of Divines.<sup>27</sup> However, the schemes were essentially reliant on civil authorities, meaning that the examination was a civil rather than ecclesiastical affair.

Committees dealing with the approbation of ministers wielded their authority in ecclesiastical matters in a way which was, on the one hand, controversial when articulated in Parliament, and yet, on the other, seemingly acceptable in a committee-context. In the propagation schemes mentioned above, parliamentary commissioners had to decide which ministers ought to be approved. A Pembrokeshire survey of 1650, for instance, revealed that

---

<sup>23</sup> *CJ*, vi, p. 282.

<sup>24</sup> In R.L. Greaves, 'The Ordination Controversy and the Spirit of Reform in Puritan England', *JEH*, 31:3 (1970), p. 228.

<sup>25</sup> *A&O*, ii, pp. 342-8; *Several Proceedings in Parliament*, 23 (February 28, 1650), pp. 311-14.

<sup>26</sup> *CJ*, vi, p. 597; TNA, SP 25/20, f. 82.

<sup>27</sup> S.W. Carruthers, *The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly* (Philadelphia, 1943), pp. 3-4; W. Knight, *The Case and Vindication of William Knight...* (London, 1653), pp. 7-8.

out of 49 beneficed ministers, 17 had been put into their posts by parliamentary authorities.<sup>28</sup> The court of appeal for the Welsh propagation scheme was the CPM, who were also heavily involved in the approbation of ministers. In a similar sense in which the Welsh commissioners worked with a number of godly ministers in their approbation schemes, the committee worked with the divines of the Westminster Assembly to vet ministers. The examination involved appears to have been thorough, judging by the testimony of William Knight, a prospective minister of Whitby. Due to local intrigue and a bizarre incident with a fraudster claiming to be the cousin of the CPM's chairman, Knight's case was drawn out and convoluted.<sup>29</sup> However, his pamphlet does show that CPM were taking their role in his approbation seriously. They interviewed Knight and studied the testimonials from local ministers which he had brought before sending him for a further examination by the committee of the Westminster Assembly.<sup>30</sup> The CPM's role, like those of other approbation committees, testified to the role the Rump played in ecclesiastical matters such as the issue of the ministry.

An example from an educational institution shows how the magistrate's role in the approbation of the ministry was recognised during the Rump. In June 1650, Trinity, Cambridge, revised a statute for fellows to enter holy orders seven years after taking their MA degrees. The fellows decided that the power of Presbyterian churches to ordain had lapsed and they therefore abandoned the statutory requirement.<sup>31</sup> As a result of the order,

---

<sup>28</sup> S. K. Roberts, '“One of the least things in religion”: The Welsh Experience of Church Polity, 1640-60', in E. Vernon & H. Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), p. 73. For ejections and approbations more generally in Wales, T. Richards, *A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales* (London, 1920); S.K. Roberts, 'Commissioners for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales (1650-1653)', *ODNB*.

<sup>29</sup> W. Knight, *The Case and Vindication of William Knight...* (London, 1653).

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 7-9.

<sup>31</sup> Trinity Cambridge CA, Conclusion Book, 1607-1673, f. 211.

fellows who would normally have been required to seek ordination merely had to sign an undertaking to obey the statute ‘as far as it holds parallel with the present Reformation’ and to use their gifts to propagate the gospel in Trinity ‘whilest fellow’ and to ‘imbrace’ whatever ‘Outward Call’ would ‘be held out by Parliament’<sup>32</sup> The college’s decision reflected not only the problems facing the ministry since the collapse of ordination, but also their awareness and acceptance of Parliament’s authority in determining the future of the ministry. As the order made clear, whatever ‘Outward Call’ the government established, including methods of approbation, would be followed by the members of the college.

As the above examples illustrate, although Parliament did not produce a clear articulation of the magistrate’s powers in ecclesiastical matters, in practice the civil magistracy was regularly intervening in ministerial affairs during the Rump and with less controversy than might be expected. It is thus within this context that the creation of the CRU in May 1649 ought to be situated. The committee was another attempt by the Commonwealth to address problems with the ministry via a committee body. As explored above, the republic was a period in which many not only denied the need for ministers to be ordained but also even educated in the universities due to the ‘blind lying learning’ taught there.<sup>33</sup> Previous chapters in this thesis have discussed how the CRU’s work in places of learning was driven by an understanding of the universities and schools as seminaries of ministers. Their work was significant within the context of radical criticism and approbation as it showed a desire for the ministers to be university-educated and for degrees to be used as a tool for approbation. As shown below, university education under the Commonwealth

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> [T. Tany], *Theavrauiohn High Priest to the Iewes, His Disputive Challenge to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the Whole Hirach. of Roms Clargical Priests* [1652], p. 7.

assumed new importance as the government sought new ways to preserve a distinct and orthodox ministerial caste.

While the importance of university education for ministers grew, agreement around ordination declined. The Parliament's 1644 order for Presbyterian ordination had put the prospective minister's learning on trial, ordering their skill in tongues — including Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, with a separate requirement to produce a discourse in Latin on an assigned theme — to be tested.<sup>34</sup> However, in 1644, a university education was one of only several requirements for ministers; others included preaching, gifts, a sense of call, and ordination itself. During the period of the Rump, the importance of university education demonstrably increased while the need to be ordained faded, indicating that the preaching of the Gospel was becoming seen as more important than the administration of the sacraments for ministers. The Humble Proposals of the magisterial Independents in 1652 stated that 'Persons of Godlinessse and Gifts, in the Universities and elsewhere, though not Ordained, may be admitted to preach the Gospell'.<sup>35</sup> In March of the following year, the Commons passed a resolution that men with a university education should be able to receive public maintenance for preaching the Gospel 'though not ordained'.<sup>36</sup>

These individual incidents were part of a much wider Commonwealth trend that increasingly emphasised the necessity of university degrees for ministers. Degrees had already become an important prerequisite for ministers by the time of the civil wars, but under the Rump, they were treated as a sufficient qualification for one to preach in their own

---

<sup>34</sup> *A&O*, i, pp. 521-6; *LJ*, vii, pp. 683-4.

<sup>35</sup> Owen, *The Humble Proposals*, p. 3.

<sup>36</sup> *CJ*, vii, p. 264.

right. The propagation scheme in Wales was a prominent example of the new prioritisation of university-educated preachers. Vavasor Powell, a leading commissioner, emphasized that the commissioners had sought ministers from the universities and London and that ten out of sixteen preachers in his county were university men.<sup>37</sup> His fellow commissioners in the English northern counties were also clearly making use of ministers with degrees, with Powell arguing that the limited success in Wales was a result of many such ministers from the universities and London going to preach there.<sup>38</sup>

Those running the propagation schemes similarly wanted to employ learned schoolmasters. In a sense, pedagogues were a part of the preaching ministry. Education in schools had always been understood as a means of edification, inculcating godliness in a place which enforced catechizing and sermon attendance. As stated by Thomas Gataker, an influential clergyman and member of the Westminster Assembly, ‘who come neerer to Ministers then Schole-masters do?’<sup>39</sup> The use by the commissioners of learned schoolmasters reflected the same basic aim as a learned ministry: to ensure that those evangelising had attained some level of academic qualifications. The commissioners were clearly keen to employ schoolmasters with the necessary qualifications also to act as propagators of the Gospel. A defence of Vavasor Powell and the propagation effort in Wales more widely declared that ‘We are sure, the Major part of Teachers and Schoolmasters are University-men’.<sup>40</sup> The commissioners themselves stated that ‘we have endeavoured all we could to procure godly School-masters from the University’ in Wales.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> V. Powell, *Bird in the Cage Chirping...* (London, 1661), narrative of the propagation and restriction of the Gospel in Wales.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> J. Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning and Education* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 212.

<sup>40</sup> *Vavasoris Examen, & Purgamen...* (London, 1654), pp. 17-18.

<sup>41</sup> A. G[riffith], *A True and Perfect Relation of the Whole Transaction...* (London, 1654), p. 40.

Trends in the wider country emphasising the new importance of degrees under the Rump can also be seen in collegiate archival materials. Trinity, Cambridge holds a draft valuation of the yearly allowance of Cambridge parishes from 1650 with a note on the back which reads: ‘there are Divers masters of Arts in the university of fitt abilities to carry on this preaching work, if they were encouraged w[i]th a sufficient maintenance’.<sup>42</sup> The emphasis on the degree of the potential ministers is striking, suggesting that the college’s opinion was that it was actually the qualifications of the minister, reflecting their learned status, which gave them the ability to preach. That the emphasis on degrees reflected a diminution of ordination’s importance is suggested by the order of another Cambridge college: St John’s resolved the shortage of fellows in holy orders by ordering that all MAs should take turns to officiate in the chapel ‘and not onely Ministers’ as before, reinforcing how episcopal authorisation was being replaced by possession of degrees.<sup>43</sup> Nor were Trinity and St John’s unusual in their focus. In December 1650, the Oxford convocation approved a decision for MAs of four year’s standing who planned to be in holy orders to be allowed to preach at the university church on Sundays.<sup>44</sup> The Commons mirrored the decision when they ordered in October 1651 that Oxford MAs preach, in turn, every week at the university church.<sup>45</sup> The orders suggest how the collegiate emphasis on university degrees for preachers was merely part of wider trends in places of learning.

The changing role of university degrees reflected the Rump’s concern with approbation and the need to set apart the ministry. The importance attached to academic

---

<sup>42</sup> Trinity Cambridge CA, Box 29 CIV, no. 468.

<sup>43</sup> St John’s Cambridge CA, SJAR/5/1/15/1/1, f. 279r.

<sup>44</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, f. 124.

<sup>45</sup> *CJ*, vii, p. 31.

qualifications was also shown by efforts to grant extraordinary degrees to ministers. During the Interregnum, university chancellors and parliamentary committees held the power to nominate for degrees those scholars who lacked the length of studies prescribed by university customs. Several of these special dispensations were made to ministers who were already preaching, such as George Beare, a minister of Yarcombe who was recommended for a degree of MA at Oxford by the university's chancellor, Oliver Cromwell. Cromwell explained in his letter of recommendation that Beare had spent three years in Oxford and would have taken a degree but had been forced out of the town by the king's occupation of the city. Cromwell asked the university to give Beare a degree in order that 'the mouthes of vaine men may be stopt that for want of his Degree are open against him, and their Designe to render his ministry contemptible may be destroyed'. Cromwell hoped that by being given a degree 'the honest man' might be 'incouraged', presumably by his increased stature in the eyes of his parishioners, 'to lay out himselfe and his partes as may make most for the glory of God and the good of Soules.'<sup>46</sup> Cromwell's letter highlights the extent to which university degrees had become a requisite for ministers in this era, as Beare's 'want' of a degree had been used to undermine his credibility among his parishioners, leading Cromwell to believe that possession of one alone would help the minister.

Others in the government and universities clearly agreed with Cromwell about the need for ministers to hold degrees. In February 1651, the CRU recommended that Cuthbert Sidenham, a lecturer in Newcastle and propagandist of the republic, be given an MA by Oxford.<sup>47</sup> Sidenham was reported by the committee to be learned and well-affected to the

---

<sup>46</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, f. 56.

<sup>47</sup> J.T. Peacey, 'Cuthbert Sydenham' *ODNB*. At the same time as this recommendation, Sydenham was awarded £100 and an annual salary of the same sum for his writings on behalf of the Commonwealth [*ibid.*].

Parliament but unable to perform the length of stay in the university required for a degree due to his service ‘for the Publique’, although he had performed some part of the requisite time before the royalists occupied Oxford.<sup>48</sup> Sidenham’s degree was likely motivated by a similar sense of logic to Beare’s and aligned with wider Rump concerns about the spread of the gospel in his region, much in line with the propagation schemes for the northern counties. Sidenham’s case suggests that some in the CRU shared Cromwell’s concerns, as did university authorities in Oxford. In 1652, Cromwell delegated some of his powers as chancellor to the vice-chancellor, John Owen, and to four Oxonians: Jonathan Goddard, Thomas Goodwin, Peter French, and John Wilkins.<sup>49</sup> This group, like Cromwell and the CRU before them, clearly felt that ministers ought to hold a university degree. In May 1653, they ordered that Clifton Stone, formerly of New Inn Hall, ought to be given the degree of Master of Arts considering his ‘Piety, Learning, and great paines in the Ministry’.<sup>50</sup> As the last reason implies, Stone had been acting as a minister without a degree, something which the university officials once again believed was necessary for him to be truly approved of as a minister.

As the use of degrees suggests, procedures to set apart the ministry were not invented in 1654. Although the role of divines like John Owen and the achievements of the Protectorate ought not to be underestimated, there is a danger of treating the Rump as a lacuna in the history of the ministry in a way which highlights what the Parliament did *not* achieve as a legislative body. By investigating the efforts of parliamentary committees and developments inside places of learning, a fresh image of the Rump’s role in ministerial

---

<sup>48</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, f. 131.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 173.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 199.

matters emerges. As has been shown above, parliamentary bodies intervened regularly in ecclesiastical matters to approve ministers and used university degrees as a tool for approbation. Although the work of various committees did not amount to a uniform system, it should not be ignored. Instead, the 1654 settlement represented a clarification of Commonwealth practices to a degree previously underestimated, one which was designed to set ministers apart from the laity. In its attempts to create an orthodox ministry, the Rump emphasised the importance of the education of their ministers. What the 'learned ministry' meant in practice is examined next.

## II: Redefining the Learned Ministry

Developments inside places of learning show how notions of what constituted a learned minister were also changing in response to the contextual circumstances of the Rump. As the learned-minister controversy illustrated, many wished for ministers to be ‘great Masters of Learning’ in the Interregnum.<sup>51</sup> However, historians have made little effort to unravel what an educated minister would have looked like in practice or what aspects of their education were emphasised during the Interregnum. Using evidence from places of learning, this and the following section explore which elements of ministerial training were emphasised and what these elements reveal about the changing expectations of the ministry. As will be shown, any attempt to train the ministry had to overcome Commonwealth disagreements about theology. Due to the lack of a confessional settlement, ministers were not trained in educational institutions to be defined by their adherence to a set of doctrinal principles. Instead, it appears that those elements of the ministry about which there was widespread agreement were emphasised, showing again the degree of consensus in educational matters as seen in the previous chapter on maintenance. Two important examples are analysed in this section: the minister’s ability to preach, and their knowledge of classical and oriental languages. As in the previous section, the trends which are analysed below support the conclusion that the ministry of the word rather than of the sacrament was the priority for those governing places of learning during the Rump.

The emphasis on both preaching and linguistic capability was a reaction to Commonwealth uncertainty in theological matters. In the face of widespread heretical

---

<sup>51</sup> E. Waterhouse, *An Humble Apologie for Learning and Learned Men* (London, 1653), p. 70.

thought, many sought to establish a new confessional settlement which ministers could then promulgate and against which they could be defined. A rich seam of scholarship has already detailed the search for a confessional settlement, especially the efforts of the magisterial Independents associated with John Owen.<sup>52</sup> However, no settlement was reached, and its absence was emblematic of the wider disagreements within the parliamentary alliance to construct a definitive theological consensus. For the education of the ministry, this failure meant that there was no agreement during the Commonwealth about a theological programme of instruction for ministers. Although there was much care to ensure that sermons were carried out and well attended, there is a lack of orders, either by parliamentary or university officers, about the theological content of education and preaching. This is not to say that officials were unconcerned about theology or that there were no common themes in theological teachings. Most college heads actually showed a clear wish to uphold a ‘Reformed consensus’ by attacking sectarian or Arminian thought.<sup>53</sup> Thomas Hill, master of Trinity, especially detested the latter, allegedly placing his hand on his breast and declaring, ‘Every Christian hath something here that will frame an argument against Arminianism’.<sup>54</sup>

However, attacks on heterodox groups only highlight how little agreement there was inside the parliamentary alliance or places of learning. The ‘fallacies’ of Socinians and Arminians could be attacked by John Conant, rector of Exeter College, but it was much harder to specify what the new theological orthodoxy was inside Oxford or other

---

<sup>52</sup> J. Coffey, ‘John Owen and the Puritan Toleration Controversy, 1646-59’, in K.M. Kapic & M. Jones (eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen’s Theology* (Abingdon, 2012) pp. 227-48; Collins, ‘The Church Settlement of Oliver Cromwell’, pp. 18-40; T.M. Lawrence, ‘Transmission and Transformation: Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Project 1600-1704’, (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2002), esp. pp. 142-87; Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, esp. pp. 220-5; Powell, ‘Promote, Protect, Prosecute’, pp. 222-41.

<sup>53</sup> E. Vernon, *London Presbyterians and the British Revolutions, 1638-64* (Manchester, 2021), p. 249.

<sup>54</sup> J. Hunter, *The Rise of the Old Dissent...* (London, 1842), p. 44.

institutions.<sup>55</sup> The decision of Oxford's convocation to commission Francis Cheynell, a leading Presbyterian, college head, and Lady Margaret professor in divinity, to produce a work defending the Trinity in 1650 is an example of agreement, albeit one over a very widely accepted principle which was unlikely to arouse any serious disagreement inside the universities or parliamentary coalition.<sup>56</sup> Given the obviously unsettled nature of doctrinal education in the country, it could not be the defining aspect of ministerial education. However, although historians have explored the frustrated search for a confessional settlement in depth, it is important not to assume that theology was the sole consideration when training ministers. There were other aspects of the ministry about which there was far more agreement than the thorny topic of doctrine.

One such area of consensus was the importance of preaching for the ministry. Both critics and defenders of a separate ministerial caste concurred that ministers needed to be good preachers, reflecting its importance to ideas of ministry in post-Reformation Protestant thought.<sup>57</sup> The difference between them lay in whether those who would preach had to be set apart from the rest of the laity. To detractors of the idea, such as the pamphleteer Thomas Collier, women and children could be preachers if suitably inspired by the Spirit.<sup>58</sup> Nonetheless, all could agree on the need for ministers to be effective preachers, and so throughout the 1640s, Parliament's legislation promoted its importance. One example of this is a 1646 ordinance for preaching inside Cambridge which commanded heads to preach at the church of St Mary's every Sunday or else find a replacement, as well as for there to be

---

<sup>55</sup> J. Conant, *The Life of the Reverend and Venerable John Conant...* (London, 1823), p. 14.

<sup>56</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, f. 97.

<sup>57</sup> For a discussion of the ministry which touches on importance of their sermons and preaching, see B. Donagan, 'Puritan Ministers and Laymen: Professional Claims and Social Constraints in Seventeenth-Century England', *HLQ*, 47:2 (1984), esp. pp. 84-6.

<sup>58</sup> Collier, *The Pulpit-Guard Routed*, p. 24.

a combination lecture for every Lord's Day in the afternoon.<sup>59</sup> Since good preaching relied on teachable skills, like logic and rhetoric, it was a skill which could be learned by the ministry, and which attracted far less controversy than doctrinal education.<sup>60</sup>

As evidence from inside places of learning suggests, it was preaching which was emphasised by collegiate and parliamentary authorities during the Commonwealth. The Parliament continued to be interested in preaching at the universities, as evidenced in 1651 when they ordered two favourite preachers and college heads, John Owen and Thomas Goodwin, to give regular lectures in the university church of Oxford.<sup>61</sup> The CRU shared this interest in the provision of preaching, ordering in March 1650 a valuation of the yearly allowance of the thirteen parish churches in Cambridge in order to help set up preaching in each church twice every Sabbath.<sup>62</sup> Colleges, meanwhile, ensured the regular performance of preaching and religious duties. In some cases, as at New College and Christ Church in Oxford, the college authorities ordered the fellows or chaplains to carry out their scheduled prayer duties.<sup>63</sup> Christ Church, which appears to have been a hotbed of reform in the Commonwealth, commanded its tutors to pray with their students nightly.<sup>64</sup> Other colleges, such as Peterhouse, created elaborate systems of fines and substitutes to ensure that the regular course of prayer was not disrupted.<sup>65</sup> Peterhouse was one of several colleges to formulate extensive rules to promote the officiating of duties in chapel and, when placed in the context of other college and government orders, indicates a wider interest, or possibly

---

<sup>59</sup> *A&O*, i, pp. 830-1.

<sup>60</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, pp. 121-41; M. Morrissey, 'Scripture, Style and Persuasion in Seventeenth-Century English Theories of Preaching', *JEH*, 53:4 (2002), pp. 686-706.

<sup>61</sup> *CJ*, vii, p. 31.

<sup>62</sup> Trinity Cambridge CA, Box 29 CIV, no. 468.

<sup>63</sup> Christ Church CA, D&C i.b.3, f. 23; New CA, 988, 3 July 1650. See also, *ibid.*, 15 February 1654.

<sup>64</sup> Christ Church CA, D&C i.b.3, f. 24.

<sup>65</sup> Peterhouse CA, N.1.33 [from front], ff. 9, 38-40.

even a boom in interest, in the preaching ability of ministers during the Commonwealth and a desire to ensure that they were better prepared for such duties.

Individual college members during the Interregnum seem to have been equally enthusiastic for prospective ministers to have an opportunity to practice preaching. A petition of the Students of Christ Church demanded that ‘the Church livings’ held by the college should be allowed to the divines ‘trained in the faculty for that purpose, to the end they may goe forth and spend their Talent there’ rather than being ‘unnaturally bestowed on Strangers or unfitly on the lower ranke of Juniors and Sophisters’.<sup>66</sup> As well as showing the interest of qualified MAs in preaching, the petition also revealed the willingness of underqualified college undergraduates to preach. This point can be further detailed by looking at other collegiate archival materials: for instance, Thomas Hill, master of Trinity, Cambridge, wrote in 1650 about how he had been forced to dissuade some self-confident undergraduates from preaching and convince them to focus on their studies ‘that they might gaine a greater store of abilityes’ for the church’s service.<sup>67</sup> At Lincoln College, it also appears that some of the undergraduates had actually been given the task of performing prayers in chapel, judging by an order of the Oxford visitors relieving them of this task.<sup>68</sup> The enthusiasm of young students was clearly irritating to individuals like Hill and the visitors, yet that zeal might be read as reflecting a wider attitude at the time encouraging ministers to hone their skills. Hill’s advice, after all, had not been that the undergraduates would never be ministers, but rather that they were not ready to preach just yet. The emphasis on skill in preaching during the Interregnum was therefore not the straightforward

---

<sup>66</sup> Christ Church CA, DP ii.c.1, no. 43.

<sup>67</sup> LPL, MS 804, f. 43r.

<sup>68</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 314.

continuation of business as usual as it might at first appear. Rather, it suggested a desire to train the ministry in those skills which were commonly believed to be necessary. At the same time, the new importance of preaching rather than the administration of the sacraments indicated how ideas of what defined a minister were changing and becoming closely aligned with uncontroversial qualities.

The same conclusion might be reached by examining the focus on language education during the Commonwealth. Learning in classical and eastern languages was especially important for hopeful ministers, though their study was open to all students. From an early age, children receiving a formal education were expected to learn the grammatical principles of Latin and then progress, expanding their knowledge of the language before advancing to Greek and, in some cases, Hebrew.<sup>69</sup> However, although the laity also acquired linguistic skills at schools and universities, the intended beneficiaries were prospective ministers as Greek and Latin were understood to be crucial, along with other studies, for understanding and explaining the Bible to the laity. As one Puritan minister wrote, ‘How shall a man bee able to Analyze and open many obscure phrases in Scripture, without Logick, Rhetorick, Tongues?’<sup>70</sup> Knowledge of the classical languages was considered of enormous importance to biblical hermeneutics and allowed the preacher to grapple with the Greek and Latin versions of the Gospel, taking them closer to earlier versions of the text.

---

<sup>69</sup> For the importance of classical languages in universities, M. Feingold, ‘The Humanities’, in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), esp. pp. 242-6, 256-69. For a recent study of classical languages in grammar schools, E. Hansen, ‘From ‘Humanist’ to ‘Godly’? The Changing Social Function of Education in Early Modern English Grammar Schools’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of York, 2015).

<sup>70</sup> T. Hall, *The Pulpit Guarded with XVII Arguments...* (London, 1651), p. 20.

A desire to return to the original texts of the Bible prompted ministers to go further in the acquisition of languages. If the understanding of Latin and Greek aided a minister, then skill in Hebrew and other Middle Eastern languages informing biblical texts would be of inestimable value. Hebrew was the most preeminent of these additional languages, described, along with Latin and Greek, as one of the ‘Gifts required in a Minister’ by Thomas Hall, a Puritan writer and minister.<sup>71</sup> These three, however, were not the limit of ministerial ambitions; other eastern languages, such as Syriac and Arabic, were also considered useful. Indeed, English scholarship of the latter language reached a ‘heyday’ during the seventeenth century, with the revolutionary period in particular being a ‘high-water mark of Arabic studies’, to quote Mordechai Feingold.<sup>72</sup> This interest in multiple languages was not only related to general knowledge of the classics, but also indicates how important linguistic capability was to ministers of the time. In the words of Sidrach Simpson, master of Pembroke, Cambridge and a leading Independent divine, ‘Arts and Tongues are the Cups in which God drinks to us.’<sup>73</sup> Some critics of the learned ministry, such as John Webster, rejected such arguments, writing that ‘while men trust to their skill in the understanding of the original tongues, they become utterly ignorant of the true original tongue’ which is ‘the language of the holy Ghost’.<sup>74</sup> However, like preaching which it aided, knowledge of languages was another commonly-valued skill of the ministry which could be taught in educational institutions. Even one anonymous pamphleteer who denied the necessity of

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>72</sup> M. Feingold, ‘Oriental Studies’, in N. Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), p. 449; G.J. Toomer, *Eastern Wisdom and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1996), p. 210. See also, M. Feingold, ‘Learning Arabic in Early Modern England’, in C. Burnett et al., *The Teaching and Learning of Arabic in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, 2017), pp. 33-56.

<sup>73</sup> W. Dell, ‘A Plain and Necessary Confutation of...Mr. Sydrach Simpson’, in his *The Tryal of Spirits...* (London, 1653), p. 3.

<sup>74</sup> Webster, *Academiarum Examen*, p. 8. Others on Webster’s side, such as William Sheppard, took a more cynical approach to the issue, pointing out that if the ‘defect’ of ignorance in languages ‘make men unable, by this you will disable at once the one half at least of’ existing English preachers [W. Sheppard, *The Peoples Priviledge and Duty Guarded...* (London, 1652), p. 57].

languages for ministers still admitted that he ‘would advise such [as would preach] to get as much knowledge of the tongues as possible they can...that they may be able to convince gainesayers’.<sup>75</sup>

Like preaching, the teaching of languages became increasingly important during the Commonwealth. This point can be illustrated by looking at college records as a body of evidence, where less traditional sources, such as references in audit books and records of text acquisitions, are the most reliable illustrations of interest in language studies. We might see the importance of Hebrew, for example, to the governors of Clare College by their purchase of a Hebrew Bible in 1649-50, even though on its own the example seems limited in its significance.<sup>76</sup> However, what happened at Clare was also part of a wider trend. Purchases by Trinity, Cambridge, of Arabic and Persian books during the Commonwealth can be placed alongside the aforementioned example as evidence of collegiate interest in fostering knowledge of oriental languages.<sup>77</sup> Another example from a college audit book shows a trend of enthusiasm in Oxford in 1650 for a specific Hebrew work. The author of the text was Victor Bythner, a Polish scholar ‘blessed with the most admirable geny for the obtaining of the tongues’ who read a Hebrew lecture at Christ Church before the first civil war.<sup>78</sup> The conflict seem to have begun a period of peregrination for Bythner, whose activities during the 1640s and 1650s are little known.<sup>79</sup> However, he did receive a payment in 1650 from Magdalen, Oxford for an unspecified service, likely for teaching, and it was in the university in the same year where his name appeared in numerous college account

---

<sup>75</sup> *A Dispute Betwixt Two Clergie-Men upon the Roade* (1651), p. 5.

<sup>76</sup> Clare CA, CCAD 2/1/1/3, Michaelmas 1649-Annunciation 1650, general expenses. The charge relates to its carriage to (presumably) the college.

<sup>77</sup> Trinity Cambridge CA, Senior Bursar’s Audit Book, 1637-1659, 1653, f. 12v.

<sup>78</sup> A. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses...* ed. P. Bliss (4 vols, London, 1813-20), iii, pp. 675-6, the quote is on p. 675.

<sup>79</sup> P. Life, ‘Victorinus Bythner’, *ODNB*.

books.<sup>80</sup> Exeter, New, Oriel, St John's, and Wadham all record giving Bythner money for a work, 'pro libro suo Hebraico', presumably with Bythner keeping a store of his books for sale in Oxford.<sup>81</sup>

Although precise identification of the work is difficult, the purchases reveal a deep interest of Oxford colleges to provide Hebrew texts. Which Hebrew book the colleges received is unclear, as Bythner published two works in 1650: one was a reprint of his 1638 *Lingua Eruditorum*, a grammar which promised to teach Hebrew to its reader within the 24 hours; the other was a new work, *Lyra Prophetica Davidis Regis*, a 'lexicon for the critical and grammatical study of the Hebrew psalter'.<sup>82</sup> There is potential evidence that it was the *Lyra* which the colleges purchased, as a list of benefactors to St John's College includes Bythner and notes him as the *Lyra's* author by way of character detail.<sup>83</sup> It is also possible to infer that the college would be interested in what they considered Bythner's definitive work and so would have purchased it on publication. No matter which work it was, however, the appeal of Bythner's book reveals the significant interest of the colleges in possessing Hebraic grammatical works for their students.

College records also show this interest extended to the wider nation, as manifested in the donations of books by private individuals. A notable number of gifts were recorded by Peterhouse during the course of the Interregnum. Among these, the quantity of texts in

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Exeter CA, RA2/02, 1649-50; St John's Oxford CA, ACC I.A.34, f. 22r; New CA, 4207, 1649-50, library expenses; Oriel CA, TF 1 A1/6, year ending Michaelmas 1650, necessary expenses in college; Wadham CA, 16/1, f. 24.

<sup>82</sup> M. Jolland & S. Mandelbrote, 'Isaac Newton Learns Hebrew: Samuel Johnson's *Nova Cubi Hebraei Tabella*', *Notes and Records*, 70 (2016), p. 13; Life, 'Victorinus Bythner'.

<sup>83</sup> Bodl., MS Rawl. J. 4. 28, f. 9.

Oriental languages is noticeable. For instance, a Mr Cartwright, who died in 1657, left to the college all his books in Hebrew, Chaldean, and Syriac.<sup>84</sup> A former college fellow, William Stavely, bequeathed to Peterhouse a New Testament in Syriac as well as a Syriac Lexicon.<sup>85</sup> An indication of the intended use of such texts is provided by another reference in college documents to donations for the use of ‘poor scholars and sizars’.<sup>86</sup> Among the texts listed are works aimed at improving the students’ knowledge of classical or oriental languages for the purpose of Biblical explication, works which the donor believed ought to be available to all scholars and not merely those who could afford the necessary works. The polyglot bible of Benito Arias Montano, a work in five languages, was one such gift; also included was the *Lexicon Philologicum* of Matthias Martinius, which helped students in the study of Latin, and Cornelius Schrevelius’ *Lexicon Manuale Graeco-Latinum et Latino-Graeco* for the study of Greek and Latin.<sup>87</sup> As the donations show, there was sentiment outside of educational institutions, as much as inside, that students needed to have ready access to resources which would help their acquisition of classical and oriental languages. It was this rationale which explains why Oxford’s chancellor, the earl of Pembroke, thought a suitable gift to the university’s library in 1649 was the Paris polyglot bible.<sup>88</sup> Pembroke believed that the text was necessary for a ministerial training ground such as Oxford and that, like the benefactors of Peterhouse, it was a suitable gift for a wealthy individual to make to such a seminary.

It is notable that the examples in the preceding paragraphs were donations of books. As mentioned above, the teaching of oriental languages was not a routine part of life in the

---

<sup>84</sup> Peterhouse CA, O.2.23, f. 27.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 27.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 34.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 34.

<sup>88</sup> W.D. Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library Oxford...*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Oxford, 1890), p. 107.

universities and thus the provision of books reflects the growing interest in these languages during the seventeenth century. It also shows the contemporary understanding that autodidacticism and private study were necessary to complement the patchy provision of pedagogy in eastern languages. Although the books hint at some of the limitations of the study of languages, they also demonstrate the wide interest in the topic of those inside and outside the institutions and help to explain why certain areas of academia, such as this shift to tradition, attracted support in the Commonwealth. A remarkable aspect of this turn which is easy to overlook is how little disagreement it caused among Parliament and college heads, especially given the potential of education to create differences of opinion. The relationship between learning and religion in general had always been uneasy inside Puritan circles, as John Morgan has demonstrated, and disagreements over what ought to be taught could easily emerge.<sup>89</sup> Even languages became a source of division later in the Interregnum, when Oxford's vice-chancellor, John Owen, criticised Brian Walton's polyglot bible for, to its 'eternall shame', undermining the credibility of Scripture.<sup>90</sup> A reason why the Commonwealth experience of education seems to have lacked these later controversies was because they emphasised custom and lacked novelty, a point seen in previous chapters and detailed further in the next section. The purchase and donation of books was not new and did not change how languages were taught in the universities. Rather, the appearance of these works demonstrates an area of scholarship about which there was considerable agreement concerning pre-existing customs yet within a new context of heretical thought and challenge to the orthodox ministry.

---

<sup>89</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, esp. pp. 41-78.

<sup>90</sup> J. Owen, *Of the Divine Originall...Also a Vindication of the Purity and Integrity of the Hebrew and Greek Texts...* (Oxford, 1659), epistle to the prebends and divinity students of Christ Church, Oxford. See also C. Gribben, *John Owen and English Puritanism: Experiences of Defeat* (Oxford, 2016), esp. pp. 182-95.

Parliament shared this desire to promote language education. The CRU passed a series of orders for both universities commanding that students speak Latin or Greek ‘in their familiar discourse within’ their colleges and halls.<sup>91</sup> There was nothing novel in this order seeing as university students, according to tradition, ought to have been speaking Latin or Greek in their colleges and halls; however, they do reveal the Rump’s interest in the teaching of languages, something they shared with their predecessor.<sup>92</sup> In March 1648, the Long Parliament decided to give Cambridge £2000 for its public library and £500 for purchasing a collection of Hebrew books which had formerly belonged to an Italian rabbi, Isaac Pragi.<sup>93</sup> The first resolution was never effected and the library, according to John Evelyn, was in a ‘meane’ condition in 1654, but the university did receive the £500 for the purchase of the Hebrew texts and entrusted the selection to John Lightfoot and John Selden.<sup>94</sup> Although the focus on books is a reminder of the limited provision of language education, the flow of such works to places of learning is a clear sign of the booming interest in the matter both during the Commonwealth and immediately before it.

An example from the end of the Rump highlights how interest in oriental languages extended to ambitious scholarly endeavours. The support that Brian Walton’s polyglot bible, ‘a monument of seventeenth-century English scholarship’, received in colleges can be measured by their account books and provides more evidence of the flourishing state of language studies in institutions and the wider country.<sup>95</sup> The initiative led by Walton, Bishop

---

<sup>91</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 250. See also pp. 266, 311-12, 320; C.H. Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge* (5 vols, Cambridge, 1842-52), iii, p. 429; Queen’s Oxford CA, College Register H, ff. 128-9.

<sup>92</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. xcvi; J.B. Mullinger *The University of Cambridge from the Election of Buckingham to the Chancellorship in 1626 to the Decline of the Platonist Movement* (3 vols, Cambridge, 1911), iii, p. 368.

<sup>93</sup> *CJ*, v, p. 512; C. Sayle, *Annals of Cambridge University Library, 1278-1900* (Cambridge, 1916), p. 78; Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 136.

<sup>94</sup> Sayle, *Cambridge University Library*, p. 78.

<sup>95</sup> Toomer, *Eastern Wisedome*, p. 202. For Toomer on the Polyglot more generally, see pp. 202-10.

of Chester following the Restoration, aimed to produce a bible with parallel translations in nine languages as a cheaper alternative to expensive multi-lingual bibles such as that of Paris given by Pembroke to the Bodleian.<sup>96</sup> The project emerged in 1652 and immediately received a great deal of interest and approval from across the political and religious spectrum.<sup>97</sup> The Council of State approved of the project on 11 July 1652; the enterprise was praised at the Cambridge Commencement of 1655 as ‘a work of eternal fame’; and the Scottish Presbyterian Robert Baillie described it as ‘that excellent book, the best to me that ever was published’, even though Walton was ‘bitterlie episcopall’ and supported by episcopalian figures such as Gerard Langbaine, James Ussher, and Edward Pococke, the noted oriental scholar.<sup>98</sup> The manner in which the polyglot attracted support from all, despite being predominantly a project of scholars who ‘had lost their ecclesiastical livings or university posts’ under Parliament, is a strong reflection of how the type of scholarship and subject matter involved was both not new and not controversial.<sup>99</sup> Like the wider educational trends in places of learning under the Commonwealth, enthusiasm for the Polyglot appears to reflect enthusiasm for existing areas of education relevant to ministers.

To these statements of support can be added the enthusiasm of multiple educational institutions. Similar to Bythner’s case, the degree of institutional support the polyglot received has been overlooked because the evidence for it is held in a range of college

---

<sup>96</sup> D.S. Margoliouth, revised by N. Keene, ‘Brian Walton’, *ODNB*; P. Miller “‘Antiquarianization’ of Biblical Scholarship and the London Polyglot Bible (1653-57)”, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 62:3 (2001), pp. 463-82; H.J. Todd, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Right Rev. Brian Walton...* (2 vols, London, 1821), i, pp. 32-44.

<sup>97</sup> For the reception of the polyglot, especially by John Owen, see Gribben, *John Owen*, esp. pp. 182-95. The interest in Biblical languages was also reflected by Parliament ordering a bill to be made for a new English translation of the Bible in 1652 [Todd, *Walton*, i, p. 89].

<sup>98</sup> For the Council of State, TNA, SP 25/30, f. 19. For the Cambridge Commencement and Baillie, Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, iii, pp. 490 n. 1, 499-500. For the involvement of the Episcopalian scholars, Bodl., Selden Supra 109, ff. 374r, 416r, 422r.

<sup>99</sup> Toomer, *Eastern Wisdom*, p. 202.

archives; however, assembling these disparate sources together shows that Walton's project was popular among colleges. Funds for the polyglot were raised, in part, by allowing copies to be purchased in advance. This was an opportunity of which many colleges availed themselves. As St John's, Cambridge, noted in its library expenses for 1652, £01.13.04 had been spent by the college master on 'the great bible now in the presse' with the college 'to have one cobby as they come out'.<sup>100</sup> Magdalene of the same university also paid in advance for the same scheme as likely did Trinity College, which gave £2 to its master 'towards the Charge of the great Bible' around the same time.<sup>101</sup> Wadham spent the same in 1653 as did Winchester College, which listed the charge as for printing of the bible 'in orientalibus linguis'.<sup>102</sup> Given that many college records from the period are lost, irregularly kept, or maintained in a cursory fashion which omits individual items, these mentions are likely the minimum rather than maximum of collegiate support for the polyglot. The interest in the polyglot reflected the importance of language education inside places of learning during the Rump. As has been shown in this section, a study of the learned ministry shows how notions of what constituted a minister shifted under the Commonwealth. Qualities about which there was widespread agreement, such as languages and preaching, were emphasised rather than the still unsettled issue of doctrine or the administration of the sacrament. The government's attention to the training of the ministry, as this and the previous section have demonstrated, was great and had repercussions for educational reform more widely, as is shown next.

---

<sup>100</sup> St John's Cambridge CA, SJAR/3/2/4/6, 1652, f. 87v.

<sup>101</sup> Magdalene Cambridge CA, B/422, f. 6; Trinity Cambridge CA, Senior Bursar's Audit Book, 1637-1659, 1653, f. 12r.

<sup>102</sup> WCA, Bursars' Book 1644-1671, 1652-1653, chapel and library costs.; Wadham CA, 16/1, f. 57.

### III: Committees and Colleges: The Reformation of Educational Institutions

As seen in the previous sections, the production of the educated ministry was of great concern to the Rump. This section will explore how the government's reform of educational institutions, in which ministers were trained, was influenced by their concerns with the ministry. That the government had a discernible pedagogical plan or even that it be considered an educational reformer at all is rarely argued. As seen in the introduction to this thesis, most historians after the Second World War have seen the state as apathetic if not reactionary towards educational reform. Initiatives to advance learning came from outside Parliament and often met the disapproval of MPs who, in the words of Richard Greaves, faced with 'revolutionary reforms', defended 'ecclesiastical and educational establishments' as part of a 'social structure they themselves realized needed changing'.<sup>103</sup> Even historians more sympathetic to the Rump's rule of places of learning, such as Blair Worden, see parliamentary reforms as little more than a desire to improve morality and make the university godly.<sup>104</sup>

To understand the Rump as educational reformers, it is necessary to understand their concerns with the ministry and within which reforming tradition they stood. One of the key arguments against the government as educational reformers is their lack of interest in altering teaching practices inside places of learning. As is shown below, by utilising evidence of Parliament's rule inside institutional contexts, the CRU and other parliamentary bodies paid attention to the spiritual development of students and to the execution of existing

---

<sup>103</sup> R.L. Greaves, *The Puritan Revolution and Educational Thought, Background for Reform* (New Brunswick, 1969), p. 6.

<sup>104</sup> Worden, *Oxford*, pp. 157-65.

educational practices but not to the introduction of new procedures. However, the lack of novelty in the Parliament's approach is not the same as an absence of an agenda. As John Morgan has demonstrated, earlier Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritan reformers had 'limited intentions' and a 'lack of innovation in developing an alternative educational path'.<sup>105</sup> Puritan colleges, such as Emmanuel, were established with the intention of prioritising living faith and godliness and training ministers, but they did not develop alternative educational systems. The Rump stood within this older tradition and were motivated by the need to ensure the stream of educated ministers continued to flow in the face of attacks on the ministry. It was this concern which influenced their reform of the educational institutions and which rarely translated into academic innovation, though the emphasis on learning and preaching for the ministry was itself a point of discontinuity with the pre-war years.

The most important reforming issue by quantity of parliamentary orders was morality. Like the founders of the Elizabethan Puritan colleges, parliamentary authorities believed that educational institutions were not only centres of scholarship, but also places within which the piety and virtue of students could be fostered. Concerns about the character of students were not new. Some issues overlapping with morality, such as the drinking of healths, did take on a novel importance in the political and religious context of the republic, such as when some students made toasts to Charles II.<sup>106</sup> However, although there was a new context to morality in the Interregnum, most of the issues relating to it were old. The order of Oxford's visitors that only 'auncient weomen' of 'good report' were to make beds and do other services for students in the university was not the first time in the university's

---

<sup>105</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, p. 181.

<sup>106</sup> For a case at Cambridge, CUL, GBR/0265/UA/VCCt.I 61, ff. 74v-75v. For Oxford, Wood, *Annals*, pp. 627, 637.

history that tutors worried about the morality of the students.<sup>107</sup> Yet, even if morality was a general concern, it still had a particular resonance for the ministry: they were the group which most needed to be moral and pious to be ‘no insignificant hope of the Church of Christ’, in the words of Oxford’s vice-chancellor.<sup>108</sup> Their specific focus of the ministry had only assumed greater importance in the context of the Commonwealth, as explored above, especially in areas about which there was widespread agreement such as their morality. Therefore, although a common Puritan concern, the reform of morality and the extent to which its improvement was pursued is evidence of the focus on the production of the learned ministry.

Moral reforms were pursued diligently by Parliament, including the removal of dangerous temptations. It was with an eye on students falling into bad habits that the CRU wrote to the visitors of Oxford in November 1650, complaining of reports ‘that there is a common practice among’ students ‘to keep hounds and horses’ which ‘must needs be very prejudiciall to them by drawing them from their studies’. Gambling was merely one dangerous vice which parliamentary authorities showed a desire to break; another was vanity. The same committee letter complained about ‘disorderly and loose’ carriage and ‘unseemly’ ‘apparell and haire’ of the students, and it is likely the visitors shared their concerns with student appearance.<sup>109</sup> Vanity was an issue in which the visitors had already demonstrated an interest, as in May 1650 they prohibited ‘all excesse and vanitie’ in the dress of scholars and ordered them to forbear using powder in their hair, wearing ribbons, or ‘walking in boots and spures and bote-hose-tops’.<sup>110</sup> Given the time which elapsed

---

<sup>107</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 284.

<sup>108</sup> *The Oxford Orations of Dr. John Owen*, ed. P. Toon (Callington, 1971), p. 13.

<sup>109</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 313.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 294.

between the May and November orders, it seems that the parliamentary authorities were fighting a losing battle against the habits of students and the morality of the students. The fight against immorality was one which never ceased and which could never be fully won. Several years later, the registrar of the visitors of Oxford, Ralph Austen, lamented that the ‘sinfull superstitious Custome’ of May Day was continued despite being ‘cry'd out against by godly Ministers’.<sup>111</sup> The continued interest in reforming morality throughout the Commonwealth era reflected its status as a perennial battle. It also showed, however, that it was a running concern of parliamentary authorities while its recurrence at different bodies and in orders affecting both universities suggest it was an important concern for the parliamentary authority.

If morality was a concern of parliamentary bodies in educational reform, it was one shared by college heads. One source base which illustrates this is the registers and order books of the colleges themselves. At Christ Church, under its dean and sometime vice-chancellor of the university, Edward Reynolds, the governing body resolved to ‘Reform all scandalouse ffashons of long and powdered haire’ and to enact serious measures to ban swearing: first and second time offenders were to be fined twelve pence, while those who swore a third time would be ‘p[ro]ceeded against as a scandalouse p[er]son’.<sup>112</sup> Ironically, the successor of Reynolds was the notoriously fashion-loving John Owen, but it is still clear that others in colleges shared these concerns with morality including immoderation.<sup>113</sup> As John Twigg has noted for Cambridge, throughout the 1640s and 1650s, colleges banned the

---

<sup>111</sup> HP, 41/1/20A.

<sup>112</sup> Christ Church CA, D&C i.b.3, f. 25.

<sup>113</sup> Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, iv, p. 98.

celebration of customary feasts which were believed to lead to dissolute behaviour.<sup>114</sup> Some colleges seem to have been reluctant to cut down on extravagant celebrations and meals. Famously, Thomas Baskerville remembered Balliol having a particularly grand Act Supper in the Interregnum.<sup>115</sup> The variation in attitudes to feasting and drinking is a sign of the independence colleges had in setting the pace and extent of their reformation, as is discussed below, but occasional dinners should not detract from the overall pattern in places of learning that attempted to promote moderation. Even the families of college officers demonstrated their dislike of taverns. When John Wilkinson, the master of Magdalen, Oxford, died and left £100 to the city of Oxford, his widow requested that it not be given to alehouse keepers.<sup>116</sup>

The war against immorality also reveals the extent to which the committee worked with collegiate authorities. As seen in previous chapters, the CRU's approach to educational institutions was to promote their autonomy, treat college officials as partners rather than servants, and empower college officers and heads of houses. The same type of partnership is evident in the committee's reformation of morality. From London, the CRU could guide developments in places of learning but it could not intervene directly in the college's day-to-day running. Although it had subordinates — the university visitors in Oxford and at various points in Cambridge — these delegates could not enforce all the orders in all the colleges by themselves. As one CRU order of May 1650 for Cambridge reveals, the committee expected university officers to step into the gap and to prevent all 'rude uncivill

---

<sup>114</sup> Twigg, *Cambridge*, pp. 132-3, 185. See also, OUA, SP/E/4, ff. 102br-v. Wood commented that although Presbyterians and Independents avoided taverns and alehouses there was also hypocritical activity as they would still entertain company in their chambers and 'Tiple and smoak' [Bodl., MS Wood F. 31, f. 16r].

<sup>115</sup> Bodl., MS Rawl. D. 810, f. 35r.

<sup>116</sup> *Oxford Council Acts 1626-1665*, ed. M.G. Hobson & H.E. Salter, Oxford Historical Society, 95 (Oxford, 1933), p. 168.

unscholarlyke behaviour' at university meetings and to crack down on 'obscene, malignant, or abusive speeches'.<sup>117</sup> The same officers were given further extensive tasks and were told to visit taverns, inns, alehouses, cooks houses, and other victualling houses such as tobacco shops, bowling alleys, and public tennis courts not within college walls, all of which were places where students misspent their time and money.<sup>118</sup> Those caught were to be proceeded against by the vice-chancellor and publicly admonished, while second-time offenders were to be reported to the committee. At the same time, the vice-chancellor and the heads of house were ordered not only to enforce the former injunctions, but also to meet frequently and to consider how they could encourage 'piety and Industry' and punish 'viciousnos and Idlennesse' in the university.<sup>119</sup> Moral reforms, in the eyes of the committee, were to be enforced by the institutions themselves.

The prominent role institutional authorities were to play is further demonstrated by Parliament's concern with personnel. By 1649, both universities had been purged of many royalists or other opponents of Parliament. Though there remained many who were apathetic and some who were hostile to the republic, the Rump could generally rely on most college heads and officials to be willing to comply with parliamentary rule and to play prominent roles in the improvement of academic foundations. The importance of these individuals can be seen in the focus on the character of tutors and college heads which recurs in a number of committee orders, such as the 1650 exhortation for tutors at Cambridge to 'walk exemplarily before' their students.<sup>120</sup> To ensure candidates for fellowships were of suitable moral calibre, a sub-committee had been established at Oxford in July 1648 specifically to

---

<sup>117</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 359r.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., ff. 359r-60r.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., f. 360r.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., f. 359r.

vet candidates for fellowships.<sup>121</sup> The lack of detail in what exactly made a suitable candidate beyond having hitherto avoided scandal or sedition and having evidence of learning and morality is noticeable, signifying how developments inside the institutions mirrored changing ideas of the learned minister. Parliament was largely concerned with producing divines defined by their degrees and a few basic ministerial skills, not by their acceptance of a confessional or ideological test. The suitability of teachers was therefore mainly determined by a similarly limited attention to their character. A CRU order of March 1650 — an order affixed to all appointments thereafter — that colleges were to inform the CRU if anything could ‘be justly excepted against’ the ‘piety and learning’ of their nominations to positions, is a case in point.<sup>122</sup>

The prominent role of institutional authorities was therefore a discernible aspect of Parliament’s approach to educational reform. The government’s hope that college heads would take on the burden of teaching was largely satisfied. Commonwealth college heads such as Edmund Staunton of Corpus, Oxford, Thomas Hill of Trinity, Cambridge, John Conant of Exeter, and Henry Langley of Pembroke, Oxford, were all described by former students or biographers as personally dedicated to the advancement of learning and piety in their colleges, setting an example to the students and paying attention to their morality.<sup>123</sup> Staunton, in the eyes of a former student, seems never to have slept in his efforts to ‘vigorously’ ‘put in execution...all such Statutes as tended most to the advancement of Learning and Religion’.<sup>124</sup> It is unsurprising that parliamentary concerns with the morality

---

<sup>121</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 141.

<sup>122</sup> Queen’s Oxford CA, College Register H, f. 121.

<sup>123</sup> For Conant, see Conant, *John Conant*, p. 44. For Langley, see J.H., *The Life of the Reverend Mr George Trosse...* (Exeter, [1714]), p. 81; For Staunton, see R. Mayo, *The Life and Death of Edmund Staunton...* (London, 1673), pp. 16-18.

<sup>124</sup> Mayo, *Edmund Staunton*, p. 16.

of personnel were also present in educational institutions. The need for college heads or tutors to be diligent and not scandalous was not only a low bar, but it was something which many scholars would have agreed with regardless of their attitude to the Commonwealth. As with the reform of morality more widely, the Rump's emphasis on exemplary college officers was a matter of creative conservatism: the demands were traditional, but their significance had increased.

However, the empowering of institutional officials did mean that parliamentary rule was not a uniform experience for those inside educational institutions and that reform was often determined outside London. Colleges made use of their agency and different governing bodies interpreted parliamentary injunctions in different ways. An example of this can be seen in the removal of 'monuments of Idolatry and Superstition' from colleges, part of Parliament's efforts to remove any corrupting influences from the seminaries of the ministry.<sup>125</sup> The destruction or removal of such objects has been noted before by chroniclers such as Wood and later historians.<sup>126</sup> However, to recover the process of how unwanted materials were removed, it is necessary to look into the archival records of the colleges themselves. The particular benefit of this evidence is that it emphasises how the removal of such objects was based on the decision of the colleges rather than directives from above. This point is borne out by looking at the chronology of destruction shown in college account books. In some cases, it appears that colleges were prompted to iconoclasm relatively late and by the spur of a recent martial success. Anthony Wood noted the wave of destruction which followed Worcester in 1651, something which also appears to be mirrored in the

---

<sup>125</sup> The quote is from the May 1644 ordinance for demolishing such monuments [A&O, i, pp. 425-6].

<sup>126</sup> For Wood, see, for example, his *Annals*, pp. 648-9. For iconoclasm in the universities, see also J. Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm during the English Civil War* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 217-49.

college account books of St John's, Oxford, and Oriel, both of which tore down religious statues around that time.<sup>127</sup> The decisions of King's to send its chapel ornaments to London in 1652, presumably to be sold or otherwise dispersed, and of Eton to remove a 'Brazen deske' from its chapel in the same year, are also possibly linked to Worcester.<sup>128</sup> It is unlikely that such objects had been kept back as insurance in case of a political change of fortune, especially in the case of Eton, whose provost was the sometime chair of the CRU, Francis Rous. The relatively late date of their removal may instead suggest that it was only after the complete military victory of the republic over its enemies that some institutions were sufficiently motivated to remove controversial objects.

In other cases, colleges were only too keen to get rid of superstitious materials. A disapproving fellow of All Souls noted that the newly intruded fellows were so determined to remove 'the picture of Christ above the colledg gate' that they took the image down at night due to the opposition of 'neighbors and passengers'.<sup>129</sup> At Peterhouse, royalist fellows before their ejection in the 1640s hid a number of objects from the chapel in the library.<sup>130</sup> Their fear was likely that such materials would be destroyed or dispersed by the new officials, including the college head Lazarus Seaman. They were right to be afraid: a reference dated 17 June 1650 in the college register reveals that Seaman was tipped off about the concealed goods and so ordered a search of the library which revealed a treasure trove of chapel materials, including altar cloths and the organ pipes.<sup>131</sup> Unlike the college officials at King's, the governors of Peterhouse moved fast to get rid of the chapel goods and decided

---

<sup>127</sup> St John's Oxford CA, ACC I.A.35, f. 57; Oriel CA, TF 1 A1/6, year ending Michaelmas 1651, necessary expenses in college.

<sup>128</sup> ECR, 62/10, f. 342; King's CA, GBR/0272/KCAR/4/1/1/29, 1651-2, necessary expenses.

<sup>129</sup> Bodl., MS Walker c. 9, f. 195r.

<sup>130</sup> T.A. Walker, *Peterhouse* (London, 1906), p. 113.

<sup>131</sup> Peterhouse CA, O.2.23, f. 13.

by early July to send the materials to London for valuation before selling them to raise money for the college.<sup>132</sup> That the dates of the discovery and sale of the objects are known for Peterhouse is invaluable for showing the eagerness to dispose of the chapel goods of the governors and master. College account books rarely offer such definite dates, so in many cases it is only known that iconoclasm took place, not when. However, although it is comparatively rare to know precisely when monuments of superstition were removed, chronologies can emerge by looking at the archival sources from places of learning that suggest that colleges possessed agency in determining the pace and progress of educational reform.

Because colleges had so much control over the reform of superstition, there was variation in the treatment of more moot issues, such as organ music. Organ music was never prohibited by Parliament, but it was styled ‘the whining of pigs’ by Puritans who preferred plain psalm singing in church worship.<sup>133</sup> The warden of Winchester College’s love of organ music was even used as an accusation against him by the county committee of Hampshire.<sup>134</sup> However, it was still an issue on which colleges differed, with John Evelyn remarking on his astonishment at seeing a double organ at Magdalen, Oxford in 1654.<sup>135</sup> The decision of two Oxford colleges, Christ Church and St John’s, to remove their organs was therefore a sign of those colleges’ and their masters’ — Edward Reynolds and Francis Cheynell respectively — dedication to further reform.<sup>136</sup> However, in the same manner that these

---

<sup>132</sup> Ibid. The organ pipes were eventually sold to Gregory Hardwick of London for £31 [ibid., f. 16].

<sup>133</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 31, f. 10r. For psalm singing, *A Directory for the Publique Worship of God...* (London, 1646), p. 40.

<sup>134</sup> WCA, 399. Despite Parliament’s opprobrium, an organist was still employed by the school in 1653 [*Winchester Long Rolls, 1653-1721...*, ed. C.W. Holgate (Winchester, 1899), p. 1].

<sup>135</sup> L.W.B. Brockliss, E. Cockayne, C. Ferdinand, & L. Wooding, ‘Magdalen in the Age of Reformation, 1558-1688’, in L.W.B Brockliss (ed.), *Magdalen College Oxford, A History* (Oxford, 2008), p. 153.

<sup>136</sup> Christ Church Oxford CA, D&C i.b.3, f. 2; St John’s Oxford CA, ACC I.A.35, f. 57. The university itself also took down the organs in the university church in the early 1650s [OUA, WPβ/21/4, 277, f. 145r].

colleges went further than necessary in their actions against superstition, others stopped short of demolishing all controversial objects. University College stored its stained glass window behind a locked door throughout the Interregnum, possibly uncertain on what to do with such a valuable resource, while others preserved and used items which would probably have been destroyed elsewhere, such as the organs of Queens', Cambridge, and Christ's.<sup>137</sup> Westminster School, too, seems to have had something of a thriving musical culture in the Interregnum, including the appreciation of organ music.<sup>138</sup> Although the removal of superstitious items was an important issue during the Commonwealth, the actual process of carrying out reform resulted in varying outcomes as different colleges differed in their judgements. By empowering academic societies and college officers to carry out reform, Parliament had ensured the process was as much determined inside the institutions as from London.

Yet, despite the agency of colleges and the existence of variety, there is a notable similarity between the major concerns of the CRU and events inside the colleges. Whether the implementation of reform was from above or from below, colleges shared many of the concerns of Parliament for education. Unsurprisingly, the shared ground meant there was often a clear similarity between parliamentary concerns and the actions of collegiate officials either because colleges were happy to follow the directives of the government, or because

---

<sup>137</sup> Christ's CA, B.1.10, ff. 140, 214; CUL, QC 15, Michaelmas 1649-Michaelmas 1650, necessary expenses; University CA, UC:BU2/F1/1, f. 257. Merton College also still had 'an Organ in pieces' in 1652 [*Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis 1603-1660*, ed. J.R.L. Highfield, Oxford Historical Society, new series, 41 (Oxford, 2006), p. 342].

<sup>138</sup> One former student thanked the headmaster, Richard Busby, for 'reconciling me to Church-musick' and remembered that the 'first organ I ever saw or heard was in your House' [E. Wetenhall, *Of Gifts and Offices in the Publick Worship of God...* (Dublin, 1679), dedication to Busby preceding 'Of the Gift and Duty of Singing to God']. For music at Westminster, see also WAM, 52530 which is an undated Interregnum petition by Walter Porter, a former chorister of the abbey and gentleman of Charles I's chapel, to the governors of the school. Porter was seeking to establish a fortnightly musical meeting and to train selected students of the school in music.

they were working towards similar goals. The common sentiment between Westminster and the institutions can be seen with another concern of the Commonwealth: to improve attendance and engagement with devotional practices. Experiential or living faith was one of the chief ambitions of Puritan pedagogical thought, as John Morgan has demonstrated, and crucial for the spiritual development of prospective ministers.<sup>139</sup> In educational terms, a focus on living faith meant that religious practices and customs were not only carried out but also approached in a spirit of eagerness and engagement. The CRU's order in May 1650 for Cambridge that divinity disputations be performed and attended in college chapels and that commonplaces, 'especially [those]...tending to Edificac[i]on', be spoken rather than read out of a book, reflected these concerns.<sup>140</sup> Its intention was to ensure that students truly engaged with religious instruction in places of learning. By forcing the commonplaces to be spoken, the CRU appear to have been showing a concern with guaranteeing the edificatory effect of education.

Orders of collegiate authorities and other parliamentary bodies showed the same concerns with the spiritual growth of students. In early 1651, the visitors of Oxford found that religious devotion and 'scholastical exercises' at All Souls had been neglected and ordered the college officers to ensure that these practices were duly observed 'according to the approved Statutes of the Colledge'.<sup>141</sup> Colleges too, as can be seen from their registers and order books, spent much of the Commonwealth encouraging the proper attendance of educational exercises through their decisions: St John's, Cambridge, passed various orders during and after the Rump for preventing the neglect of exercises and studies; Christ Church,

---

<sup>139</sup> Morgan, *Godly Learning*, esp. pp. 58-61, 184-93.

<sup>140</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 359r.

<sup>141</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 321.

Oxford, passed a number of orders for the attendance of prayers, rules for tutors and chaplains, the performance of exercises, and education of scholars; Lincoln, Oxford, established fines for fellows who did not perform their divinity disputations in the college when their turn came; and Pembroke, Cambridge, established in October 1651 that, in the future, scholars would be punished not only for absence from chapel but also for arriving late, in addition to two years later adding fines and rules for those meant to lead prayers.<sup>142</sup>

The similar valuing of experiential faith is a reminder that much of what is often seen as a ‘Puritan’ inflection in educational attracted widespread support. As seen above, the CRU’s plans for education reflected concerns with academic life traditionally associated with the English Reformed community. However, the changes based on those concerns were in practice not divisive and amounted to little more than curbing immorality, executing existing educational practices, and encouraging piety in order to train the ministry. To preach effectively, the minister needed to understand Scripture fully. In order to inculcate students with this ability, the CRU called on tutors at Cambridge to ‘read frequently to their Pupills, as also to pray and read the Scriptures dayly with them’.<sup>143</sup> An emphasis on the study of Scripture might initially appear to have close connotations with the more radical segments of the New Model Army and lay preaching. Indeed, a petition of Fairfax, Cromwell, and the Council of Officers in May 1649 called on the Commons to establish a lecture at Oxford for the exposition of the Scriptures.<sup>144</sup> The request was referred to the CRU, and then dropped. However, although the petition was made at a moment of the army’s triumph, following the

---

<sup>142</sup> Christ Church CA, D&C i.b.3, ff. 23-5, 51-2; Lincoln CA, LC/R/2, f. 94r; Pembroke Cambridge CA, Registrum Magnum II, ff. 6, 10 [pagination restarts for each master. These events happened during the headship of Sidrach Simpson]; St John’s Cambridge CA, SJAR/5/1/15/1/1, ff. 276r, 277r-v, 279r.

<sup>143</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 359r.

<sup>144</sup> *CJ*, vi, p. 216. See also a mention of the expository lecture recommended by Fairfax to Parliament in Burrows, *Register*, p. 264.

crushing of the Leveller mutiny at Burford, it was not the radical demand antipathetic to the conservative university which might be expected.

On closer investigation, it is clear that the study of Scripture was warmly embraced within the universities. The closer study of the Bible was of obvious interest to nearly all colleges, an interest demonstrated by the number of colleges who bought new bibles during the Commonwealth years.<sup>145</sup> College account books for the Commonwealth reveal a number of such purchases, such as St Catharine's, Cambridge, which spent 4 shillings in late 1651 on a bible for the hall.<sup>146</sup> The purchases were not driven by want, but showed how widely accepted the need was for scriptural exegesis in education by the college officials as much as by the committee or the army. The bibles being acquired were a sign of the centrality of Scripture and its studies within institutional contexts, showing that even the more characteristically 'Puritan' aspects of education were within the usual course of collegiate life. When Henry Cromwell entered Cambridge as a MA and the university presented him with a perfumed English bible, the gift signified the pervasiveness of biblical culture and studies within the institution.<sup>147</sup> As the issue of scriptural exegesis captures, the Commonwealth brought new approaches to education based on a particular understanding of the ministry but not necessarily new content.

---

<sup>145</sup> Clare CA, CCAD 2/1/1/3, Michaelmas 1648-Annunciation 1649, general expenses; Jesus Oxford CA, Bu:Ac:Gen:1, f. 182; Lincoln bought a psalm book for their Bible clerk [Lincoln CA, Calculus 1650]; St Catharine's CA, L/26, f. 196v; Trinity Cambridge CA, Senior Bursar's Audit Book, 1637-1659, 1649, f. 13r, 1653, f. 12r; Trinity Hall Cambridge CA, THAR/2/1/1/4/1. Cambridge University also paid for two folio annotations of the Bible to be bound in 1650-1 [CUL, GBR/0265/UA/U.Ac.2/1, f. 765]. See also the discussion of the polyglot bible in this chapter.

<sup>146</sup> St Catharine's CA, L/26, f. 196v.

<sup>147</sup> CUL, GBR/0265/UA/U.Ac.2/1, f. 787.

Indeed, it was the better performance of existing educational practices which concerned parliamentary authorities rather than creating new ones. Parliamentary authorities regularly promoted the attendance or execution of existing practices, such as when the visitors of Oxford in January 1651 ordered the warden of Merton to ensure that several college lectures be delivered since they had been neglected.<sup>148</sup> The CRU not only wanted practices to be carried out, but for a spirit of zeal to permeate academic studies to ward off moral or intellectual etiolation. The links between mental and spiritual ossification worried the committee, as seen in a 1649 order aimed at Oxford. That year an anonymous individual presented a ‘model’ for reformation of Oxford to the CRU who, in turn, sent the proposals to the Oxford visitors in August 1649 for them to consider in their work of reformation.<sup>149</sup> The CRU clearly approved of the model, which included, among other things, a recommendation for imposing strict time limits on fellowships to prevent college officials from becoming ‘droanes’.<sup>150</sup> Fellowships, it was worried, would become an attraction for the wrong reasons; namely, as sources of a comfortable ‘retirement’. The model recommended that, to avoid this, no one should be allowed to enjoy a fellowship beyond the degree of doctor or one year after their commencement. Exceptions were to be given to those who were professors or public lecturers and so performed ‘eminent service’ to the university. The desire to avoid people seeking out fellowships for a comfortable retirement was based on concern that it was not only academic studies which mattered for the student, but the spirit in which they were approached.

---

<sup>148</sup> Burrows, *Register*, pp. 322-3.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 261.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 264. See also, Wood, *Annals*, pp. 626-7.

A concern for how studies were approached rather than what was taught reflected Parliament's approach to educational reform. Once the motivation and intellectual ancestry of the parliamentary authorities are understood, it becomes apparent that they did have an agenda for educational reform. As seen above, the Rump stood within a Puritan educational tradition which prioritized the spiritual development of students and were themselves concerned with producing a certain type of university-educated ministry in response to radicalism. They pursued the better personal formation of the ministry by reforming morality and removing corrupting influences including material objects. Students were to be instructed by exemplary college officers with an emphasis on experiential faith, the study of Scripture, and the fulfilment of existing educational practices. Rather than being reactionary, the Rump's educational reforms reflected their desire to produce learned ministers. They also reflected the changing notions of the ministry. As ministers were increasingly defined by what were agreed to be necessary attributes for the ministry of the word, so their education was focused on other uncontroversial qualities, such as their knowledge of Scripture rather than the introduction of new practices. Historians have previously overlooked the idea of the Rump as educational reformers because they achieved so little that was innovative and showed such a lack of interest, in practice at least, with the advancement of learning. As this section has shown, such an approach is to impose unfair standards on the concept of educational reform and to obscure the activity and coherency of the Rump's reform of places of learning.

## Conclusion

In February 1651, upon being elected chancellor of Oxford, Oliver Cromwell wrote to the university to state his hope ‘That that seed and Stocke of Piety and Learning (soe marvellously springing up amongst you) may bee usefull to that great and glorious Kingdome of our Lord Jesus Christ’.<sup>151</sup> As this chapter has explored, Cromwell’s statement reflects the significance the Rump attributed to educational institutions, especially the universities, in the production of the ministry. The role of these institutions in training divines has been mentioned in previous chapters but has been the focus in this one and used as a means to explore how ideas of the ministry changed during the Commonwealth. The ministry, in the context of proliferating heresy, attacks on traditional notions of a distinct ministerial caste, and disagreements over ordination, became increasingly defined by commonly accepted qualities such as their morality, their ability to preach, and their possession of university degrees. This last point in particular assumed new levels of importance as a qualification for the ministry, reflecting the Commonwealth attachment to the concept of the learned minister. These trends highlight how, in contrast to Laudianism, preaching and the expounding of Scripture were key hallmarks of Christian ministry during the Interregnum with morality, prayer, and bible reading treated as central to the Christian life.

This chapter, like its predecessors, also demonstrated the need to rethink how the Rump is studied. As mentioned above, historians have largely worked from the basis of the government’s record as a legislative body, leading them to conclude that the Commonwealth

---

<sup>151</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, f. 130.

failed to establish procedures for vetting the ministry, neglected to articulate the role of the magistrate on ecclesiastical matters, and were unable to act as an educational reformer. These conclusions are challenged when examining the work of the government's committees in institutional contexts, as evident in the relevant archival materials. The picture of the Rump that was developed in this chapter was of a civil magistrate regularly intervening in the matter of the ministry's training and approbation, using committees to approve candidates and encouraging university degrees as qualifications.

This chapter also reinforces the notion of the state as the dominant agent in places of learning during the Commonwealth, demonstrating how the government was invested in the management of educational institutions. It also corroborated the idea of the Rump as a conservative governor of educational institutions. This is not to say that they were reactionary or wished to carry on business as usual. Their approach to educational reform, like educational finance, was pragmatic and piecemeal, meaning that they did not wish to fundamentally transform the institutions. As seen in the earlier study of the CRU's administrative role, they instead sought to work with the institutions as independent partners, at least after the process by which they had been suitably purged and settled. As a result of this approach, educational reform was often heterogenous and driven by those inside institutions rather than directed by those in London. Yet, the government and their committees were responding proactively to new contextual issues specific to the Commonwealth, particularly to do with the ministry. Though their actions were guided by custom, they were not proof of counter-revolutionary or apathetic sentiment as it has sometimes been considered.

In the Rump's attempt to produce the learned ministry of the Commonwealth, the government had the support of many colleges whose own decisions often mirrored Parliament's concerns. As seen with the administration of colleges and the lobbying over financial matters explored previously, the Rump's rule cannot be understood by examining Westminster alone and requires attention to the relationship between the capital and the localities. Government and educational institutions evidently shared common concerns about places of learning which is explicable given the appeal to tradition evident in so much of Parliament's rule of educational institutions. As mentioned in previous chapters and explored further here, there was extensive common ground during the Commonwealth around ideas about the role and purpose of schools and universities and the related issue of the ministry. As the next chapter explores, this consensus underlay a significant degree of cooperation in the everyday management of academic foundations.

## Chapter 4

### ‘A shame to bee out of a prison, or in a Fellowship’: Cooperation and Education

Thus far in this thesis, the focus of analysis has been on how the Rump worked through committees like the CRU and interacted with educational institutions. Though this chapter continues to look at the committee, places of learning, and the management of educational institutions it shifts the spotlight of analysis onto the individuals sitting at the committee table and on the governing bodies of colleges. This chapter analyses the cooperation which took place over the management of educational institutions, among MPs sitting at the CRU and among those inside places of learning, to make a wider point about the Commonwealth period: that there was more consensus and more cooperation between the supporters of the regime and those opposed or apathetic to it than has previously been realised, and that this can be seen by looking at what actually happened on a day-to-day basis.

A study of cooperation, and the revelation of how widespread it was in educational administration, challenges existing understandings of the Commonwealth. Until recently, it has been common to see the republican period as one of rancorous divisions characterised by the unwillingness of different political and ecclesiastical groups to work together. In Parliament, the various factions were racked by ‘internal divisions and innate inertia’, torn apart by their disagreement over major issues of domestic policy and unable to work productively bar in moments of unity following military victories.<sup>1</sup> In places of education, it has been common to see institutions riven by intense factionalism with royalists and

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford, 2002), p. 515. See also the classic account of Rump divisions and stagnation in Worden, *Rump, passim*.

parliamentarians in a state of such bitter hostility that they ‘often kept themselves apart.’<sup>2</sup> In the country at large, the general unpopularity of the republic and Puritan rule and the resultant tensions between its supporters and a wider, unimpressed, populace are often discussed.<sup>3</sup> As mentioned in the introduction, some recent work has begun to demonstrate what Anthony Milton terms the ‘centripetal’ tendencies in ecclesiastical or theological matters during the period and this chapter shows that there were similar trends in places of learning, including groups of individuals not often seen as willing to compromise.<sup>4</sup>

By investigating this trend, this chapter not only draws out the theme of cooperation mentioned earlier in this thesis, but also develops a broader point about places of learning during the Rump being sites where ideology and pragmatism met. As has been shown, education as an issue in its broadest terms during the Commonwealth overlapped with several controversial ideological topics, such as the future of the ministry and the powers of the civil magistrate in ecclesiastical matters. Yet, there was evidently broad consensus during the Interregnum about many aspects of education such as the need for a learned ministry and funding for educational institutions. The great degree of agreement was manifested in the pragmatic approach to educational reform in the period since governmental and collegiate authorities alike were willing to improve rather than transform the existing educational structure. Places of education, as this chapter fleshes out, therefore serve as apt case studies to show the continued existence in the Commonwealth of consensus which was capable of bringing together diverse political and ecclesiastical groups.

---

<sup>2</sup> Worden, *Oxford*, p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> For two excellent examples of scholarship on the response to Puritan rule, see, C. Durston, ‘Puritan Rule and the Failure of Cultural Revolution, 1645-1660’, in, C. Durston & J. Eales (eds), *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 210-33; A. Hughes, ‘The Frustrations of the Godly’, in J. Morrill (ed), *Revolution and Restoration England in the 1650s* (London, 1992), pp. 70-90.

<sup>4</sup> A. Milton, *England’s Second Reformation: The Battle for the Church of England, 1625-1662* (Cambridge, 2021), p. 368. See also the introduction, n. 98.

## **I: Education and Cooperation at Westminster**

This section shows how a wide cross section of MPs sat on the CRU and worked together on educational business, cooperating around the committee's management of educational institutions. Any analysis of a committee necessitates an analysis of its members. In order to show how educational matters tended to unite MPs it is necessary to look at committee orders and those signing them; to judge the significance of the signatories, whether they were regular attendees or not, it is important to know the committee's patterns of attendance. To understand the MPs sitting on the CRU, this section adopts a prosopographical approach, detailing who some of the leading committeemen were and their political or ecclesiastical outlooks. In order to show when these men were attending, this thesis includes for the first time a calendar of attendance for the CRU, attached as an appendix to this thesis.

More summary calendars have also been created for the CPM and the committee/governors of Westminster School to improve our understanding of the CRU and are also included as appendices. The CPM was something of a sister committee to the CRU, dealing with similar issues of ministerial care and augmentations alongside other duties.<sup>5</sup> It has been chosen for comparison both because it is similar to the CRU in remit, but also because it is often seen as a rival, Presbyterian committee. Stephen Roberts in his excellent work on the CPM suggested that the creation and empowerment of the CRU might be interpreted as the triumph of an Independent faction at Westminster over their Presbyterian rivals with the latter taking over significant areas of the former's authority in

---

<sup>5</sup> For the CPM, see the introduction, n. 30.

augmentations.<sup>6</sup> However, the idea of these committees representing rival factions in the Rump is undermined once their overlapping memberships are noted. An awareness that the CPM and CRU shared members helps demonstrate the central argument of this section: that the educational work of the CRU was not undertaken by a political group within Parliament, but was an activity that brought a range of MPs together. This argument is also supported by including a study of the governors for Westminster, another major educational committee under the Rump. The patterns of attendance at the governor meetings, including some regular attendees of the CPM and CRU, further strengthen the notion that MPs of different interests were being brought together by the committee's work in the school.

The decision to use calendars of attendance when analysing the committees is deliberate. Calendars are the most secure way of judging frequency of attendance and can avoid misconceptions which might be produced by other methods. Committees during the Parliaments of the period had large memberships with members often attending only for cases which concerned their own interests. Similarly, reporting to the House from a committee was not a sign of regular involvement in the committee. Sir Henry Mildmay reported on matters relating to Cambridge for the CRU not because he was a particularly active member of the committee but because he was descended from the founder of Emmanuel College.<sup>7</sup> Calendars of attendance avoid such misconceptions, laying out how often each individual was present at a committee over a long period of time.

---

<sup>6</sup> S.K. Roberts, *History of Parliament Trust*, London, unpublished article on 'The Committee for Plundered Ministers', for the 1640-60 section.

<sup>7</sup> *CJ*, vi, p. 382.

To assemble the calendars is not without some difficulties. The first is the different source base for each committee. For the CPM, their register books, now held in the Bodleian MSS 328-9, have been used. No register book for the governors of Westminster remains, so their calendar is reconstructed using loose orders held at Westminster Abbey Library. The CRU presents greater difficulties as their individual orders are not in one archive but in various educational institutions. The calendar of attendance for the CRU is deliberately based on these loose orders relating to their work on educational matters rather than a register of their augmentations held at Lambeth Palace Library.<sup>8</sup> As Charles Hotham, a petitioner to the CRU noted, the committee divided its augmentation and education duties between two different days. On Wednesdays, the committee sat as one for augmentations, leaving their work as the committee for the universities until Thursday.<sup>9</sup> While there was overlap between the two sittings, it is necessary not to conflate them as the membership was not necessarily the same on both days. For instance, Thomas Chaloner, the radical MP, seems to have been a prominent member of the CRU's augmentation group but a much rarer attendee of the education equivalent.<sup>10</sup> Since the CRU's work with places of learning is the main matter of importance, evidence from its register of augmentations has not been used except with regard to one issue: the stipends of college masters. Orders in the register of augmentations relating to that issue have been included since they were directly relevant to educational institutions, as shown in chapter two.

Another set of difficulties when assembling a calendar of attendance for the CRU is the evidence itself. The approach taken here has been to reconstruct attendance

---

<sup>8</sup> LPL, Sion L40.2/E16.

<sup>9</sup> C. Hotham, *A True State of the Case of Mr Hotham...* (London, 1651), p. 4 [\*].

<sup>10</sup> D. Scott, History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Chaloner, Thomas (c. 1595-1660), for the 1640-60 section.

predominantly through signatures on committee orders, naming each person who signed an order on the specific day in question. Sometimes these are the original orders of the committee preserved in order books and institutional archives. At other times, they are orders which have been transcribed and copied down by college registers with the signatures included and on a few occasions they are orders printed in contemporary pamphlets. This method of building up calendars of attendance is not always failsafe. Sometimes, and especially in the first two years of the CRU, committee orders were signed by the chairman alone and so it is unknown who else was present. Even when there are multiple signatures, there is the possibility of more people being present than actually signed. For instance, a CRU order for 29 May 1651 addressed to Peterhouse has five signatures but, thanks to a passing comment in a pamphlet, we know there were six more MPs present at the meeting who did not sign the document.<sup>11</sup> An additional problem with veracity is the copying of signatures by the college official. On multiple occasions it is clear the record keeper of the institution in question could not decipher the signature of the MP — for instance, Thomas Lister became Thomas Pister — or decided to note down the content of the order without transcribing it or its signatories.<sup>12</sup>

Despite these caveats, calendars of attendance can be established for the CPM, CRU, and the committee/governors of Westminster College. What they show is that all three groups were structured around a small core of regular attendees, a similar sized group of semi-frequent attendees, and then a very large group of infrequent attendees. The lists also show a noticeable overlap between the committees. This is especially true of the infrequent

---

<sup>11</sup> Peterhouse CA, N.1.33 (from back), f. 24. Hotham, *True State*, pp. 13-14.

<sup>12</sup> For Lister/Pister, CUL, Grace Book H, f. 98. For examples of orders being summarised in college records, Gonville and Caius CA, GOV/03/01/02, ff. 3-4.

attendees, as might be expected. However, it is also true of the semi-frequent and even some of the most regular attendees. Gilbert Millington, for example, was chair of the CPM but also frequented the CRU and the board of governors for Westminster College. Michael Oldisworth, meanwhile, was one of the more frequent attendees of the CRU and a chairman for at least part of its life. He also attended the CPM frequently and the Westminster governors on a few occasions. John Moyle and Robert Brewster were frequent attendees at both the CPM and CRU while John Fielder was a chair of the CRU on some occasions before becoming chair of the board of governors at Westminster.

It is apparent that many MPs of otherwise different opinions were buying into the business of educational governance and brought together by the work of the CRU. By looking at CRU orders and utilising the calendar of attendance it is possible to see how politicians agreed about many of the key tenets of the committee's agenda and worked together towards its goal. As seen in previous chapters, the purpose of the CRU in its most general sense was the promotion of learning and godliness within places of learning. This purpose is evident in two orders of the CRU signed by some its most influential figures. In January 1651, James Chaloner was the signatory on a committee enforcing the speaking of Latin in the universities.<sup>13</sup> Chaloner was also co-signatory from a CRU subcommittee in April of the same year with Francis Rous tasked with viewing the statutes of the universities and with removing anything 'prejudicial to Religion, Learning, good Manners or the p[re]sent Governmt'.<sup>14</sup> As seen in previous chapters, the committee was not a pedagogical innovator. Their primary concern was to ensure that the teaching practices of the universities were regularly performed and attended, especially those subjects which were of use to

---

<sup>13</sup> Burrows, *Register*, pp. 311-12; Wadham CA, 4/88.

<sup>14</sup> Wadham CA, 4/90.

ministers. Languages, especially classical and Eastern, were especially important for ministers during the Commonwealth period as the focus on the ministry shifted away from ordination and towards their education and possession of degrees. The behaviour of students and customs of the universities was pertinent for any prospective preacher too, as the new governors of educational institutions looked to create a moral, educated clergy to combat the heresy of the post-Regicide period.

By signing the orders, Rous and Chaloner demonstrated a concern with the ministry and an educationally conservative outlook. Their endorsement of the committee's central aims is to be expected: both were leading members of the body. As can be seen from the charts of attendance, they were among the most regular attendees and both acted as chairmen. Yet, from their biographies it might be considered strange that the two would be close colleagues. Rous was an arch-Cromwellian who would go on to serve as speaker of the Nominated Assembly and was an important figure in the Protectorate period, acting as a member of the protectorate council of state and the Cromwellian 'Other House'.<sup>15</sup> Chaloner, by contrast, was a client of the Fairfax family and seems to have shared Lord Fairfax's unease with the encroachment of an Independent army into political affairs following the Regicide.<sup>16</sup> Chaloner played no role in the Protectorate Parliaments and was even suspected on several points of having sympathies with the royalist cause against the Protector.<sup>17</sup> The two chairmen had many similarities including hostility towards radical reform and the Levellers, but there were clearly serious differences in their political loyalties which emerged during the 1650s. However, in their work as committeemen they were being united

---

<sup>15</sup> C. Burrow, 'Francis Rous', *ODNB*.

<sup>16</sup> See BL, Add. MS 71448, ff. 67r-8r.

<sup>17</sup> D. Scott, 'James Chaloner', *ODNB*.

by the government's approach to learning and a similar approach to the reform of learning. The orders signed by Chaloner and Rous are emblematic of the CRU's work and thanks to the calendars of attendance we know that these two very different men were committed to the Rump's management of learning.

The same agreement over the CRU's work is apparent with two other chairmen, Miles Corbett and Henry Darley. When the revision of Cambridge's cycle of proctors was discussed in 1650, the two orders of the CRU relating to it were signed by Corbett and Rous with Corbett's order approving the final version of the cycle.<sup>18</sup> Corbett, a regicide, was an important figure in the CRU during its early days serving occasionally as chair and in August 1650 being mentioned by William Petty as a frequent attendee.<sup>19</sup> His appearances dropped off after being appointed one of the four civil commissioners of Ireland in October 1650 but, judging by his later career, he appears to have been closer to Rous in his positive view on Cromwell than Chaloner. He too had an influential series of positions in the Protectorate era, being created chief baron of the Exchequer of Ireland in 1655.<sup>20</sup> Whereas Corbett seems to have taken to post-Regicide politics with ease, Henry Darley had to overcome serious doubts. Darley also signed several CRU decisions as chair, including a letter sent to the Oxford visitors in November 1650 about the reform of the 'disorderly and loose' carriage of scholars.<sup>21</sup> Unlike Corbett, Darley appears to have felt uneasy about the creation of the republic. He played no role in the Regicide and absented himself from the House between

---

<sup>18</sup> Magdalene Cambridge CA, B 422 Register II, ff. 15-17.

<sup>19</sup> HP, document 20, the James Marshal and Marie-Louise Osborn Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

<sup>20</sup> S. Barber, 'Miles Corbett', *ODNB*.

<sup>21</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 313.

September 1648-May 1649, suggesting antipathy towards the army-backed purge of the Long Parliament and execution of the king.<sup>22</sup>

Although their attitudes to the republic's creation were at odds, Darley and Corbett were both invested in the CRU's governance of the universities and worked to similar ends at the committee. Darley's interest in reforming the 'disorderly and loose' appearance of Oxonians fitted firmly into the CRU's moralizing drive. As the letter he signed explained, the committee was unhappy with the 'carriage of many Schollers', such as 'their apparell and haire' because it was 'unfitt for the sobriety and decency' that was required from those 'that make profession of civility and learning'. Alongside being concerned with the outward and inward character of the scholars, the letter was also a reminder of how limited most of the committee's interventions into places of education were. Although the CRU was pointing out problems in Oxford, there was still the understanding that it would be the university visitors and heads of houses who would deal with the problem. As Darley instructed the visitors they were 'desired and required to confer with Heads of Houses concerning a through [*sic*] Reformation of these abuses'.<sup>23</sup> The relationship evident between the external committee and institutional authorities reflected the CRU's general intention to restore autonomy to places of learning. The same sentiment is present in the decisions signed by Corbett implementing the revised cycle of proctors at Cambridge. That reform had been a case of rationalising an existing university process, working within the customs of Cambridge and ensuring the institutional structure was functioning efficiently and important university officers were chosen correctly. Corbett and Darley, like Rous and Chaloner, were of different political creeds but the idea of respecting educational institutions and their

---

<sup>22</sup> D. Scott, 'Henry Darley', *ODNB*.

<sup>23</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 313.

ability to govern was shared by both and the basis for similar work undertaken by both, sometimes even as colleagues attending the same meetings.<sup>24</sup>

Many more MPs than just the chairs appear to have been brought together by the CRU's approach to the rule of educational institutions. The CRU's tendency to correct individual problems as they arose was easy to support, avoiding the potentially divisive question of changes. MPs were not forced to support a novel agenda and many seem to have found it easy to come together in day-to-day decisions about minor issues, such as misconduct of college members. On 14 November 1650, Walter Strickland was the signatory of an order that college heads in Oxford and Cambridge were to reside in their respective colleges.<sup>25</sup> Residence was an occasional cause of dispute between masters and their fellows, with absent heads sometimes accused of avoiding their collegiate duties. Lazarus Seaman, master of Peterhouse and member of the Westminster Assembly, was castigated by one fellow for preferring London to his college responsibilities. Indeed, the fellow in question wrote in 1651 that if one were to put all of Seaman's 'short visits' to the college over the previous 'seven years' together they would not amount 'to one years continuance'.<sup>26</sup>

The order of November 1650 was aimed at curtailing such abuses of the system as were CRU moves to crack down on absentee fellows. An order of 19 June 1651 ordered college heads to report college fellows who had leave to travel and the length of their absence and included amongst its signatories Chaloner, John Corbet, Michael Oldisworth, Edmund

---

<sup>24</sup> Trinity Cambridge CA, Box 29 CIV, nos. 485a-b.

<sup>25</sup> Wadham CA, 4/87.

<sup>26</sup> C. Hotham, *The Petition and Argument of Mr Hotham...* (London, 1651), p. 24.

[sic] Ashe, and Edmund Harvey.<sup>27</sup> As the order is a copy rather than the original, it appears the ‘Edmund Ashe’ was a mistranscription for Edward Ashe, MP for Heytesbury. Neither Ashe nor Harvey were regular attendees of the CRU, but Oldisworth certainly was. Oldisworth was one of the most regular and preeminent CRU attendees in the latter half of his lifespan and a figure who differed sharply from Strickland. Oldisworth, the secretary to the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> earls of Pembroke, was a supporter of a Presbyterian settlement and a keen attendee of religious committees. Oldisworth’s absence from the Protectorate Parliaments was likely a sign of dislike towards the Cromwellian interest, an antipathy he shared with Chaloner but not with Walter Strickland who, as seen above, was similarly opposed to illegal absences.<sup>28</sup> Strickland was considered a close ally of Cromwell by John Milton and was clearly a trusted advisor, being consulted after the expulsion of the Rump and later sitting in the Nominated Assembly.<sup>29</sup>

Strickland was also involved in CRU efforts to protect or rectify the traditions of the institutions. A string of orders relating to Winchester College were passed by the CRU regarding scholarships at the school and the progression of students to New College and reflected the committee’s respect for tradition and desire to be seen as upholders of institutional customs. An order of 1651, signed by Francis Rous, ordered there to be no transmission of scholars from school to college till the next election, provided the order was not prejudicial to any of the superannuated scholars.<sup>30</sup> Another order of September 1651 had resolved that the founder’s kin at both the school and college would not exceed 20 and was

---

<sup>27</sup> Christ Church CA, D&C i.b.3, ff. 42-3. Some colleges also attempted to crack down on absences. E.g., Sidney Sussex in December 1652 passed an order that if any scholar discontinued for more than ninety days in a whole year, except in certain justified cases, his place or scholarship would be declared vacant [Sidney Sussex CA, MR.2, f. 46].

<sup>28</sup> J. Wroughton, ‘Michael Oldisworth’, *ODNB*.

<sup>29</sup> T. Venning, ‘Walter Strickland’, *ODNB*.

<sup>30</sup> WCA, 405.

signed by Sir Henry Mildmay, Thomas Chaloner, John Fielder, Nicholas Love, Oldisworth, and the aforementioned Strickland.<sup>31</sup> An order of February 1652, signed by Millington, Oldisworth, Moyle, and Richard Aldworth demanded that those New College fellows who were resigning hand their resignations to the warden and fellows of the college to prevent corrupt practices and ‘that soe the Schollers of Winchester College annually elected, may succede in such void places according to Statute.’<sup>32</sup> The various orders involving Winchester all stemmed from the committee’s desire, examined in previous chapters, to be a defender of institutional customs and for educational institutions to be governed according to their statutes.

These aims drew together the frequent and less frequent CRU attendees who signed the aforementioned orders. Several of those appearing were likely only there due to their local affiliation to the school: Love was good friends with Warden John Harris of Winchester College and the city’s MP; Sir Henry Mildmay was a local landowner who had taken an interest in the school’s affairs before.<sup>33</sup> Fielder had been an occasional attendee of the CRU and sometimes acted as chairman though his time seems to have largely been taken up with his role on the board of governors for Westminster.<sup>34</sup> Judging by his important role on religious committees, the CPM, and his involvement in bills suppressing sectarianism, he brought with him a desire for a national church and suspicion of religious heterodoxy.<sup>35</sup> The same could not necessarily be said of Thomas Chaloner. Chaloner, a member of the notorious group of republican MPs around Henry Marten, was noted for his unusual

---

<sup>31</sup> WCA, 21852. A copy of this order is held in LPL, SECKER 6, f. 84.

<sup>32</sup> WCA, 404.

<sup>33</sup> For the correspondence and friendly relations between Harris and Love, see, WCA, 421-2, 429, 445-7, 455. For Mildmay’s attempts to gain the wardenship, see, WCA, 445.

<sup>34</sup> See appendices one and two.

<sup>35</sup> A. Barclay, History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Fielder, John (c.1614-aft. 1686) for the 1640-60 section.

religious opinions being described by John Aubrey ‘as far from a Puritan as the East from the West’.<sup>36</sup> Chaloner was not a natural fit with several others signing the Winchester orders due to his political and ecclesiastical opinions, but these differences did not interfere with institutional traditions. Instead, the business of statutes and scholarships was yet another feature of CRU business upon which MPs could agree and cooperate.

The CRU’s plans for educational funding similarly united MPs of diverse opinions. Of the various signatures on committee orders for augmentations of masterships were Chaloner and Rous, but also Gilbert Millington, Nathaniel Hallowes, John Moyle, and Sir John Bouchier, with the final four names joining Chaloner’s on an order of August 1651 ordering the augmentation previously granted to George Bradshaw, master of Balliol, Oxford, to be transferred to the new master Henry Savage.<sup>37</sup> The desire to augment the salaries of college heads, as we saw in a preceding chapter, was widespread and based on traditional ideas about national honour and the need to educate poor scholars and future ministers. These sentiments were uniting the signatories who were all familiar faces at the committee. As the calendar of attendance demonstrates, all were at least fairly frequent attendees with Bouchier and Millington especially regular. As their cooperation showed, the issue of educational grants united people of different ecclesiastical outlooks. Sir John Bouchier, a leading MP in the northern English counties, appear to have had sympathies more in line with religious Independency than a covenanted Presbyterian system of church government.<sup>38</sup> In this sense, he was at odds with Gilbert Millington, the chair of the CPM, and Nathaniel Hallowes, both of whom had allegiances to the Presbyterian settlement.

---

<sup>36</sup> J. Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, ed. O. Dick (Michigan, 1957), p. 61.

<sup>37</sup> LPL, Sion L40.2/E16, ff. 42, 46-8, 51-54, 56, 63, 390-3, 395-401, 406.

<sup>38</sup> D. Scott, ‘Sir John Bouchier’, *ODNB*.

However, the ambition of properly funding the universities was uniting these MPs including Millington, one of the most interesting of the committee men involved in the CRU for his regular attendances there, but also the CPM and board of governors for Westminster.<sup>39</sup>

The governors of Westminster are a reminder that the CRU's educational work was supported because it was based on widely held principles. It might be thought that the CRU's practical management of educational institutions and the limited ambition of their work explains the cooperation taking place at its meetings among the diverse MPs. However, while this is true, it is not the full explanation. As the meetings of the Westminster governors help illustrate, there was nothing unique to what the CRU was doing. The MPs were acting according to common ideas about the advancement of learning and piety which led to predictable types of actions and so could be replicated by the Commonwealth MPs outside the CRU, something supported by an awareness of the vast number of infrequent attendees. In other words, it is misleading to think of the CRU's actions as distinctive to the committee. Rather, the committee was merely a venue for standard ideas, clearly shared by many MPs, to be put into practice. If they were not enacted by the CRU, MPs were capable of enforcing them elsewhere and so the cooperation seen at the committee was not unique to it.

This point is illustrated by looking at some of the decisions Millington signed at the board of governors for Westminster. In November 1650 Millington was one of five governors who signed an order for the scholars of the school to have gowns provided for them according to ancient custom.<sup>40</sup> The decision showed that the governors, like the CRU,

---

<sup>39</sup> R.L. Greaves, 'Gilbert Millington', *ODNB*.

<sup>40</sup> WAM, 43247.

were interested in ensuring customs at their school were continued. The gowns had been a traditional accoutrement for scholars at Westminster and by upholding them governors set themselves apart from those who urged radical reform in places of learning. Academic garb was disparaged by some during the Commonwealth as ‘rags’ of superstition and had the governors been suspicious of Westminster’s traditions they may have dropped the wearing of gowns.<sup>41</sup> Their order therefore shows that the governors, like the CRU, were putting into practice their respect for places of learning as they had been traditionally managed and their practices. Also like at the CRU, the MPs joining the Presbyterian Millington were not likely allies of him. Two of the other signatories, Luke Hodges and Humphrey Salwey, both also regular attendees at the board of governors, were noted for their Independent sympathies and it appears they set aside their different ecclesiastical opinions in the general business of education.<sup>42</sup> Neither, however, were regular attendees of the CRU. Their votes at the board of governors, and the crossover of MPs, is a sign that the type of work the CRU performed was not unique to that committee.

The extent to which agreement about the management of education brought diverse MPs together can be seen by an example of the same committeemen falling into conflict. One case which can be examined in detail thanks to the survival of his autobiography is that of William Lilly, the famous astrologer. Lilly was interrogated by the CPM in 1652-3. As mentioned, the CPM, CRU, and governors of Westminster had significant overlaps of

---

<sup>41</sup> H. P.[eters], *Good Work for a Good Magistrate...* (London, 1651), p. 4. See also, W. Dell, ‘An Apologie to the Reader touching the following Reply to Mr. Sydrach Simpsons Sermon’ in his *The Tryal of Spirits...* (London, 1653); C. Hill, ‘The Radical Critics of Oxford and Cambridge in the 1650s’, in J.W. Baldwin & R.A. Goldthwaite (eds), *Universities and Politics, Case Studies from the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period* (London, 1972), p. 117.

<sup>42</sup> S.K. Roberts, *History of Parliament Trust*, London, unpublished articles on Hodges, Luke (1590-1656) and Salwey, Humphrey (c. 1575-1652) for the 1640-60 section. Hodges and Salwey both attended the CRU occasionally with the latter being reportedly a close friend of Michael Oldisworth, sometime chair [Bodl., Selden Supra 109, f. 335v].

personnel. Lilly's case involved many of the CRU personnel, some of whom have just been sketched, and gives a sense of how unusual the unity in education had been. The issue at the heart of the Lilly's episode was his *Merlini Anglici Ephemeris*, a work of astrological prediction, which had averred 'that the Parliament stood upon a tottering foundation, and that the Com[m]onalty and Soldiery would join together against them'.<sup>43</sup> This was an immensely controversial prediction at the time of its publication: throughout late 1652, the division between supporters of the Rump and supporters of a Cromwellian faction associated with the Independent and army factions was growing wider.<sup>44</sup> As Cromwell later reminisced in his speech to the Nominated Assembly, in Autumn 1652 officers and MPs met and the former criticised the latter, urging them to remember their duties to God and to carry out their offices better than they had previously done.<sup>45</sup> Lilly's pamphlet, arriving in the midst of this rancour and predicting what seemed eminently possible, was too important a statement to be ignored. In October 1652 the Commons ordered the CPM and Council of State to investigate the issue and the CPM to send for Lilly.<sup>46</sup>

Lilly's trial brought to the surface many underlying tensions among the committeemen. The introduction of a topical, controversial issue was reflected by the unusually high attendance. As Lilly himself noted, there were 36 committeemen at his trial 'whereas it was observed at other tymes it was very difficult to gett five of them together'.<sup>47</sup> All recognized that the handling of Lilly would be significant for the future of the Rump. If

---

<sup>43</sup> Bodl., MS Ashmole 421, f. 209r.

<sup>44</sup> Worden, *Rump*, esp. pp. 306-13.

<sup>45</sup> *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, ed. T. Carlyle (4 vols, Leipzig, 1861), iii, pp. 149-50.

<sup>46</sup> *CJ*, vii, p. 195.

<sup>47</sup> Bodl., MS Ashmole 421, f. 209r. It would be interesting to know if Francis Rous, the sometime chairman of the CRU, was one of the 36. In 1650, a work attacking 'diabollcall Astrologie' had included a dedicatory epistle to Rous as a 'Freind', with the author's being sure that Rous would not be able to 'withhold your approbation, to cry downe' astrology [N. Homes, *Daemonologie, and Theologie...* (London, 1650), dedicatory epistle to Francis Rous].

the astrologer were punished, it would be seen as a rebuttal to those who thought the government was flawed and that the army ought to intervene. If Lilly were acquitted, it would give license to those calling for an intervention by the army in Parliament. Supporters of the latter course of action accordingly flocked to the trial. Oliver Cromwell, Sir Arthur Hesilrige, and Richard Salwey were cited in Lilly's account as appearing on his behalf but do not otherwise appear in our calendars for the CPM. These figures, and others such as Walter Strickland or Hugh Peters, the army preacher and associate of Oliver Cromwell who 'spok much in my behalfe', were attending due to the wider significance of the case rather than as regular CPM attendees.<sup>48</sup>

As well as the appearance of unfamiliar faces, Lilly's case also brought out the political tensions among MPs which educational work had transcended. Millington, who had worked so often with Independents at the CRU and Westminster's board of governors, emerged as Lilly's *bête noire*, 'much my enemy', leading the 'many churlish Presbiterians' who attacked Lilly as a stalking horse for the Independent interest.<sup>49</sup> Ranged against him were those like Walter Strickland and Sir Arthur Hesilrige, neither of whom were frequent attendees of the CRU but both of whom had attended at times and been able to work on educational matters with the Presbyterians they now fought. Hesilrige and Millington had even attended at least one committee meeting together when discussing a disciplinary case of a Peterhouse fellow in 1651.<sup>50</sup> Strickland, meanwhile, worked on several occasions with

---

<sup>48</sup> Bodl., MS Ashmole 421, f. 210r.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Hotham, *True State*, p. 14.

another of Lilly's Presbyterian persecutors, 'Cawley of Chichester', that is William Cawley, at CRU meetings.<sup>51</sup>

That these committeemen should spar so violently over Lilly throws into sharp relief the cooperation that the educational work of the CRU had engendered. The consensus around education and the business of the committee transcended, or at least avoided, many of the obvious tensions among the MPs about politics and ecclesiology which could flare up when a case such as Lilly's was introduced. Whether the MPs in the Rump turned to educational work because they realised it was a lowest-common-denominator issue is hard to prove but is possible and perhaps a sign that there was a willingness among the divided Rumpers to seek out an area of common ground. Whether they sought or stumbled into agreement, education was an area of much agreement among MPs, and the basis for a level of cooperation which can be easily overlooked. However, by examining committee orders and reconstructing calendars attendances it has been possible to recover the willingness of MPs to work together and the type of projects on which they collaborated. Such an archive-based approach has been crucial in showing the cooperation taking place in the CRU and as we see below, it is equally important when discussing the same phenomenon inside places of learning.

---

<sup>51</sup> Bodl., MS Ashmole 421, f. 210r. For Cawley, J.T. Peacey, 'William Cawley', *ODNB*. For Cawley and Strickland attending the same meetings, see appendix one.

## II: 'A shame to be left behind': Cooperation in Places of Learning

As at the CRU, so in places of learning the management of educational institutions brought diverse groups together. As we shall see, schools and universities relied on individuals apathetic or even antipathetic to the republican regime being able to work with its supporters. As with the CRU, this cooperation was rarely discussed explicitly, but it is apparent in a granular study of the running of the institutions. Such an archive-based approach is necessary due to attempts after the Restoration to mask any evidence of cooperation. After 1660, those who had been in educational institutions during the Interregnum preferred to depict themselves as keeping apart from parliamentary colleagues. But a very different image emerges by looking at how places of learning were actually being managed and by whom. Many college officials during the Commonwealth were survivors of the pre-revolutionary period and experienced hands at college administration. In some cases, enough biographical evidence remains to show that these individuals were not supporters of the republic and were almost certainly privately opposed to its existence. Yet, despite any private misgivings, during the Commonwealth they were able to work alongside new parliamentary fellows in the management of the institutions.

Peterhouse, Cambridge, was one college deeply indebted to a fellow who survived the civil wars and Interregnum, John Francius, for its running. Francius had been made a fellow in 1628 and managed to retain his position until 1665. In the intervening decades, he was a stalwart of college government, including during the reign of the leading Presbyterian divine, Lazarus Seaman.<sup>52</sup> Seaman's tenure was fractious, frequently controversial, and

---

<sup>52</sup> For Peterhouse in the Interregnum, T.A. Walker, *Peterhouse* (London, 1906), pp. 107-28.

divisive with the master ruling in a way described by the aggrieved college as ‘arbitrary and unstatuable’.<sup>53</sup> Francius was one constant throughout the period and his long-experience likely was valued in college matters. He was an integral and clearly trusted member of Peterhouse’s administration fulfilling a variety of official roles - such as college president, bursar, and tutor in the 1640s and 1650s. Francius’ workload was great and made even greater by Seaman’s frequent absences from college as in his absence the fellows’ duties increased.<sup>54</sup> Francius was regarded by the CRU as one of the most well-informed members of Peterhouse, working closely with a fellowship dominated by intruded parliamentarians. When one college fellow, Charles Hotham, launched a complaint against Seaman to the CRU, Francius was among those asked by the committee to give information, reflecting his place at the heart of the college.<sup>55</sup> Given his age and experience, a characteristic he shared with the other case studies below, it is unsurprising he would have been an important presence in college affairs. The turnover of personnel in educational institutions as a consequence of the civil wars and various parliamentary purges was vast. Someone like Francius, with decades of experience and a willingness to work with different regimes, was a valuable commodity.

Colleges in both universities found a similar use for such experienced officials. Many colleges seem to have been reliant on the willingness of an old fellow opposed to the republic to set aside his private misgivings. All Souls, Oxford, was dominated by a number of parliamentarian fellows such as Sir Jerome Sankey and Joshua Sprigg, ruled by a Rump MP, John Palmer, and is often thought to have been riven by conflicts between parliamentarians

---

<sup>53</sup> Peterhouse CA, O.2.20, f. 526. See also, Bodl., MS J. Walker C. 4, f. 49v.

<sup>54</sup> Hotham, *Petition and Argument*, p. 24. A CRU order of 14 November 1650 commanded all university heads of house to reside in college. The order is referred to in the archives of Peterhouse [Peterhouse CA, N.1.33 (from back), f. 30]. See also, Trinity Cambridge CA, Box 29 CIV, no. 486; Wadham CA, 4/87.

<sup>55</sup> Hotham, *Petition and Argument*, p. 3.

and royalists.<sup>56</sup> However, one of its key administrators was Martin Aylworth, elected fellow in 1610. Aylworth's opinions of his new colleagues was low: in one letter following the visitation he remarked 'wee have had no exercise, discipline, nor respect to statut since the Reformation' which had brought them in.<sup>57</sup> Aylworth's natural allies inside the college seem to have been the remaining royalist fellows, such as George Stradling. Stradling, who mocked parliamentarians such as Sprigg for their lack of learning, spoke approvingly of 'Dr Ayleworths' from whom he received tuition in civil law.<sup>58</sup> However, inside college, Aylworth continued to play a very active role which necessitated working closely with the new fellows. The college's minute book, the primary record for the decisions of its governing body, was predominantly written by Aylworth for almost forty years, between 1620-1657.<sup>59</sup> Aylworth's presence in these pages was an indication of his continued role and presence in college management throughout the Interregnum, despite his opinion of 'these troublesome times', as he often described the period.<sup>60</sup>

A third old fellow prized for his usefulness was John Houghton, of Brasenose. Houghton was opposed to the new Parliamentary regime of his college referring dismissively to the new college head, Daniel Greenwood, and fellows as 'Moses and his Myrmidons', as we have seen at the beginning of this thesis.<sup>61</sup> Houghton thought the new

---

<sup>56</sup> For All Souls in the Interregnum, S. Mandelbrote, 'From Civil War to Glorious Revolution', in, S.J.D. Green & P. Horden (eds), *All Souls under the Ancien Régime: Politics, Learning, and the Arts, c. 1600-1850* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 55-75; Worden, *Oxford*, pp. 144-5.

<sup>57</sup> Bodl., MS J. Walker c. 9, f. 195r.

<sup>58</sup> For Stradling mocking Sprigg, see Bodl., MS Add. B 109, f. 135v/150v. For Stradling mentioning Aylworth, see *ibid.*, f. 123r/138r. Despite his dislike of the new faces, Stradling appears to have resided in college for most of the Commonwealth [All Souls CA, MS. DD. All Souls Coll b. 86-7].

<sup>59</sup> All Souls CA, MS 400a. See also, N. Aubertin-Potter, "'These Troublesome Times': All Souls College and the English Civil War"

[[http://library.asc.ox.ac.uk/blog/occasional\\_papers\\_pdfs/01\\_TheseTroublesomeTimes\\_OP\\_1.pdf](http://library.asc.ox.ac.uk/blog/occasional_papers_pdfs/01_TheseTroublesomeTimes_OP_1.pdf) accessed 12/7/22].

<sup>60</sup> Aubertin-Potter, 'All Souls'.

<sup>61</sup> Brasenose CA, GOV 6 B1 Juramenta (folder 21), letter of John Houghton to Thomas Yates, 11 January 1650.

members of the society behaved in an unstatutable and covetous manner when seeking college offices and complained that in drawing up the financial records they ‘understand not what they doe, nor what accounts to make.’<sup>62</sup> Houghton felt himself at odds with these new fellows and reported in a letter to the former royalist head, Thomas Yates, that he and Robert Jones, another remaining fellow, had been set aside as ‘useless thinges’ by the new faces in the college.<sup>63</sup> However, his actions undermine this claim of marginalisation. Despite the antipathy which existed between Houghton and the others, his correspondence shows that he was valued for his experiences and working closely with the college regime to ameliorate Brasenose’s finances. There was a pressing need for attention to this issue: reportedly, Brasenose at the beginning of the Rump, had been £1200-1300 in debt while the total body of the college had numbered a mere 20.<sup>64</sup> In December 1649, Houghton worked closely with Greenwood himself in the auditing of accounts. Although Houghton mocked his colleague’s ‘contriv’d accounts’ and habit of ‘mixing one yeare w[i]th another’, they were still working together with Greenwood ‘grumblinge’ before ‘gentlie submitting’ to Houghton’s corrections.<sup>65</sup> As with Francius and Aylworth, daily business showed Houghton was willing to work with parliamentarians in institutional administration and had an important role to play.

The longevity of Houghton, like Aylworth and Francius, is also notable for helping reveal their flexibility. While in post, Aylworth managed to outlast two Stuart monarchs, the republic, the Nominated Assembly, and the first Protectorate Parliament. Francius began his fellowship later than Aylworth, but finished it later too, seeing England return to a

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., letter of John Houghton to Thomas Yates, 7 December 1649.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., letter of John Houghton to Thomas Yates, 11 January 1650.

<sup>64</sup> Brasenose CA, PRI A1/3.

<sup>65</sup> Brasenose CA, GOV 6 B1 Juramenta (folder 21), letter of John Houghton to Thomas Yates, 7 December 1649.

monarchy. The ability of both men to navigate the changes of government is a testament to their use, but also their willingness to change with the times. As William Moses, who kept the register of Pembroke, Cambridge, put it in his summary of the college during the 1640s, ‘Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis’.<sup>66</sup> It is likely that as part of this changing with the times Francius and Houghton, who had played such prominent roles in the Interregnum, played down their own involvement in college life after the Restoration. Although there is vanishingly little evidence about either, a problem compounded by the wider misinformation about life in the Interregnum spread by Restoration literature as analysed below, there are some hints that Houghton at least was careful after the return of the monarchy to distinguish himself from his Interregnum colleagues. In a letter of September 1660 to his friend Thomas Yates, returning to Brasenose as college head, Houghton was careful to mention that ‘for my part I have had little conversac[i]on with...most of the new fellows’.<sup>67</sup> As is shown below, many others who had been willing to bend with the times during the Interregnum were keen to rewrite their involvement after 1660.

Before moving on from these three case studies, however, it is useful to discuss how they suggest that the bar for cooperation was set low. The work Houghton and the others undertook were matters of routine administration and evidence of a wider point: that Parliamentary rule of educational institutions meant ensuring that they were functioning efficiently and according to their own statutes at a time of great turmoil. These were ambitions shared by devotees and opponents of the new regime alike and explain why Francius, Aylworth, and Houghton found it so easy to remain in their posts and work with their new colleagues. The tasks they performed were uncontroversial and largely to do with

---

<sup>66</sup> Pembroke Cambridge CA, Registrum Magnum II, f. 25.

<sup>67</sup> Brasenose CA, GOV 6 A2/4 (Folder 7), letter of John Houghton to Thomas Yates, 10 September 1660.

pressing administrative issues which did not raise uncomfortable questions of loyalty or obedience to a new regime. If it was easy for opponents of the regime to work with parliamentarians, then it was likely equally easy for parliamentarians to work with those of different loyalties. Most places of learning were in a state of severe financial or administrative chaos following the civil wars. The most pressing problem of Daniel Greenwood was to restore Brasenose's finances to a position of security. An experienced college official like Houghton was invaluable in such a project, and, as Houghton's letter suggests, the college master was willing to submit to his suggestions after his initial 'grumblinge'. Houghton and others like him were not only able to work with parliamentarians but were of great value in Commonwealth places of learning.

There were likely far more examples of cooperation between opponents of the regime and parliamentarians than have survived. The three case studies above are fairly unusual in possessing enough direct or circumstantial evidence to identify the loyalties of the individuals in question. However, even in those three cases the evidence was slim and for the vast majority of university or school members during the Commonwealth it is practically non-existent. This is to be expected since opponents of the republic likely kept their heads down during the Commonwealth. Yet, there must have been many more fellows and scholars who contributed to the management of places of learning while secretly disagreeing with the regime than can be known now. Anyone holding a college position under the Commonwealth would have been forced to engage with the regular business of academic life and work alongside their new colleagues, especially after the efforts of the parliamentary authorities to clamp down on absent fellows.<sup>68</sup> Houghton's friend, Thomas

---

<sup>68</sup> Christ Church CA, D&C i.b.3, ff. 42-3; University CA, UC:GB3/A1/1, f. 60; Wadham CA, 4/94.

Yates, was one who lost his place not due to his principles but because he had been absent from college business without the consent of the governing body.<sup>69</sup> College positions were onerous, and it is likely that many filling those roles and working alongside parliamentarians held little affection for the republican regime.

Occasionally, glimpses of evidence remain to suggest many fell into this group. Nicholas Crouch, a member of Balliol since 1634, played an active role in his college throughout the Commonwealth: having survived an order for his ejection in 1648, he was elected Greek reader in 1649 and 1650, public notary in 1652, junior bursar in 1649, and bursar in 1653. Yet, an entry in his diary about the Regicide — ‘Rex Barbare capite Truncatus’ — hints that he was a royalist at heart.<sup>70</sup> In the absence of further information there is simply not enough evidence to identify Crouch’s sympathies conclusively. However, given the low barrier to cooperation and Crouch’s career as a fellow both pre-visitation and post-Restoration it does seem likely that he was no friend to the Commonwealth. Nor, likely, was Edmund Matthews, a fellow of Sidney Sussex, Cambridge for 51 years, elected in 1641 and surviving through the civil wars, Interregnum, and reigns of Charles II and James II. Matthews avoided giving his approval to the election of the parliamentarian head, Richard Minshull, and likely privately disagreed with the parliamentary regime.<sup>71</sup> However, like Crouch he stayed on in college throughout the Commonwealth, teaching, delivering a college benefactor’s sermon, and regularly attending governing body meetings.<sup>72</sup> Matthews,

---

<sup>69</sup> Brasenose CA, Gov 3 A1/2, f. 76r.

<sup>70</sup> Balliol CA, College Meeting Minutes 1, ff. 242, 244, 249, 251; MS 355, January 1649, October 1649 [for junior bursarship]. For Crouch see also, J. Howarth *et al.*, *Reconstructing Nicholas Crouch, Cataloguing and Conserving a Seventeenth-Century Library* (Oxford, 2018). For Crouch being ejected, see Burrows, *Register*, pp. 164, 167.

<sup>71</sup> R. Humphreys, *Sidney Sussex: A History* (Cambridge, 2009), p. 117.

<sup>72</sup> Sidney Sussex CA, MR.2, ff. 45-47; MR.61, f. 437. For some of his students, Humphreys, *Sidney Sussex*, p. 117.

like Crouch, was almost certainly no friend to the republic. Regardless, both found it possible to work with their parliamentary colleagues. Their presence, and the nature of the fragmentary evidence surrounding them, suggests that there were many others like them in places of learning: fellows who kept their heads down throughout the Commonwealth but who were instrumental in college life, working with their new colleagues to manage places of learning.

Even those inside ‘bastions’ of royalism found institutional business forced them to work with parliamentarians. A school head like Richard Busby of Westminster, known to have had little fervour for the cause of the republic, might have been expected to enjoy more freedom than those inside the universities. However, although Busby may have enjoyed a degree of autonomy in his school, he was still answerable to the parliamentary committee and the subsequent board of governors which controlled it and, as their records demonstrate, they took an active interest in both school and headmaster. The boards met frequently, comfortably over 65 times at least between April 1649 and November 1653, and were involved in all aspects of college life, from the supply and design of scholars’ gowns through to maintenance of buildings.<sup>73</sup> As might be expected, the regular course of college governance brought the board and Busby into contact. In April 1649, he appeared before the governors to recommend that Lambert Osbaldston continued in post as steward. At the same meeting, he was also ordered to ensure statutes regarding absence by and expulsion of scholars were executed.<sup>74</sup> In 1653, the records show him engaged with measuring out a potential library space for Bishop John Williams’s books as part of the governors’ plans for

---

<sup>73</sup> For scholars’ gowns, WAM, 43154, 43180. For building maintenance, *passim* but especially, WAM 43152, 43335. For attendance, see appendix two and WAM, *passim*.

<sup>74</sup> WAM, 32463.

housing the volumes.<sup>75</sup> Although the evidence for Busby's relationship with the governors is necessarily patchy, being derived as it is from committee orders, enough pieces of evidence survive to show that Busby was not working in his own kingdom and nor were he and the MPs unable to work together. The fact that they were capable of coexisting and working in the same space is further implied by a remarkable draft seating plan for Westminster Abbey produced at some point in the 1650s for an unknown reason.<sup>76</sup> This shows Busby seated alongside a host of Parliamentary grandees such as John Fielder (chair of the board of governors) and John Bradshawe, sometime president of the Council of State. Although a seating plan is not straightforward proof of friendly relations, in the wider context of Busby and the governors working relations it is a reminder that they were working colleagues.

The relationship between Busby and the governors strengthens the argument that the management of places of learning largely transcended political differences. Busby was not known for his sympathy for Parliament and was a famous pedagogue in his own right. It might be expected that disagreements over the running of Westminster would occur between an opinionated headmaster and an intrusive board of governors. That no such difficulties surfaced was not only a sign of Busby's tact, but the fact that his interactions with parliamentary authorities were on uncontroversial matters of daily business. The governors left what was taught to the headmaster and were rewarded with a flourishing pedagogical scene in Westminster as Busby introduced the teaching of Arabic and published many educational texts.<sup>77</sup> As the examples of their interaction show, the governors largely worked

---

<sup>75</sup> WAM, 43487.

<sup>76</sup> WAM, 24857.

<sup>77</sup> For the introduction of Arabic, J. Field, *The King's Nurseries: The Story of Westminster School* (London, 1987), p. 37. For Busby as a pedagogue and his publications, J. Sargeant, *Annals of Westminster School* (London, 1898), pp. 113-25.

with Busby to see the school functioned, not to determine what he taught. While this is a reminder that Parliament's rule of education was predominantly about running rather than changing existing places of learning, the relationship between Busby and the governors shows once again how widely shared attitudes toward learning were in the Commonwealth. The enlargement of Westminster's library, the execution of statutes, the appointment of school officials were routine decisions, but they are all emblematic of deep-rooted positions on learning: namely the desire to advance scholarship, respect institutional traditions, and ensure places of learning were being well-run. Cases like Busby and others opposed to the regime show that the everyday business of running educational institutions was a lowest-common-denominator issue. Yet, they also reveal the common adherence to ideas of learning and how it ought to be advanced.

The consensus around education prompted cooperative enterprises as well as collaboration on a daily basis. A desire to promote scholarship is evident in efforts to protect Edward Pococke, professor of Hebrew and Arabic at Oxford, from losing his lectureships in late 1650 for refusing to subscribe the Engagement.<sup>78</sup> Orders were passed stripping him of his role only for a petition to be presented to the CRU by members of the university.<sup>79</sup> The petition emphasised Pococke's academic excellence, 'in the Orientall languages especially' and stated that he wanted to 'serve this state and his owne countrey' in a peaceable manner. As argued in chapter three, the study of oriental languages was widely promoted during the Commonwealth as a necessary tool for Biblical scholarship and the education of the ministry more generally. It was to Pococke's skills in languages which those petitioning pointed.

---

<sup>78</sup> L. Twells, 'The Life of the Rev. and most Learned Dr. Edward Pocock' in *The Lives of Dr. Edward Pocock, the Celebrated Orientalist by Dr. Twells; of Dr. Zachary Pearce...* (2 vols, London, 1816), i, p. 135. See also G.J. Toomer, 'Edward Pococke', *ODNB*.

<sup>79</sup> Twells, 'Edward Pocock', pp. 136-7.

They emphasised the value to the nation of a linguistic scholar, languages being generally acknowledged ‘so usefull...and so generally p[ro]moted in these westerne nations’.<sup>80</sup> Pococke’s scholarship, and particular area of expertise, were greatly in his favour and the cavaliers in Oxford quickly used these points to protect him. Gerard Langbaine, master of Queen’s and a close friend of Pococke, beseeched the MP John Selden to protect one of the ‘eminent parts’ of the university.<sup>81</sup> Selden would indeed aid Pococke as would John Wilkins, the warden of Wadham who was known for his kind treatment of royalists.<sup>82</sup>

However, support for Pococke would also come from leading parliamentary figures in the university. Pococke’s biography details how the petition on his behalf was supported by, among others, Daniel Greenwood, master of Brasenose, George Marshall, the warden of New College, and Thankful Owen, president of St John’s.<sup>83</sup> Greenwood especially seems to have played a key role in organising the defence of Pococke. On the back of the manuscript petition, now in Bodl., MS Wood F. 27, is a note written by Ralph Button, a canon of Christ Church, to an unknown provost of an Oxford college — likely Langbaine, who was provost of Queen’s, rather than John Saunders of Oriel.<sup>84</sup> In this missive, Button informed the recipient that ‘3 or 4 friends’ who wished well ‘to Mr Pocock’ were planning to meet the next day in Dr G[reen]woods lodgings. you know them all’. Beneath the message is an endorsement in a different hand: ‘for the continuance of Mr Pocoke in his lecture 1649. or 50.’<sup>85</sup> Greenwood, Owen, and Marshall were all leading parliamentarians and not known for their kindness to royalists, especially the latter.

---

<sup>80</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 27, f. 132r.

<sup>81</sup> Bodl., MS Selden Supra 108, f. 147.

<sup>82</sup> Twells, ‘Edward Pocock’, pp. 136-7.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid. See also G.J. Toomer, *Eastern Wisdome and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 158-9.

<sup>84</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 27, ff. 132r-v.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., f. 132v.

Marshall, a former army chaplain, had ruthlessly overseen the ejection of royalist fellows from New College, demanded a purging visitation of Winchester College, and was generally known as a fervent supporter of the Parliament.<sup>86</sup> The appearance of the three working with royalists like Langbaine to protect Pococke is unlikely but still explicable due to Pococke's scholarship. Parliamentarians and royalists alike were keen for the university to prosper and linguistic scholarship was a point of consensus, something which most could agree was valuable for the ministry and a worthy academic pursuit. Those inside Oxford did not only agree about Pococke's value but were prompted to a collaborative enterprise by the strength of their shared conviction.

The funding of education was another area of consensus about learning which led to a cooperative venture. Like with the promotion of scholarship in general and linguistic scholarship in particular, the need to improve the material state of educational institutions was a widely shared idea within Commonwealth attitudes to education. Concerns at Oxford with this can be seen through attempts to retrieve university documents, materials which had either been removed from the university or sent to the capital on business. It was for the latter reason that five patents were taken out of the university archives on 30 October 1648 and sent to London when Parliament discussed the taking away of dean and chapters. Of these five, only four returned, with the mislaid document pertaining to an annexation of the prebend in the church of Worcester to the Lady Margaret Reader.<sup>87</sup> The keeper of the archives, Gerard Langbaine, kept scrupulous records about the recovery of these and other

---

<sup>86</sup> For Marshall purging New College of royalists see H. Rashdall & R.S. Rait, *New College* (London, 1998), p. 174. WCA, 445 describes Marshall as one of those pushing for 'a purging reformation' of Winchester.

<sup>87</sup> OUA, SP/E/4, ff. 21r-v.

documents and the result is a vivid picture of an university enterprise which took place in the early period of the Commonwealth.<sup>88</sup>

The search for the document touched on the issue of funding. The prebendary of Worcester helped salary the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, a position which was of particular importance during the post-Regicide wave of heterodox thought as a mouthpiece for orthodoxy. In the face of heresy, there seems to have been a noticeable turn by many towards existing institutions and areas of the Calvinist consensus, both of which were aided by a better funded professor of divinity. As mentioned in chapter three, it is no coincidence that the lecturer of the time, Francis Cheynell, was commissioned by Oxford to produce a stalwart defence of the Trinity in 1650.<sup>89</sup> By the time Cheynell's work was produced, the benefits of the Worcester prebendary had been restored to his post. In an act of 1650, Parliament ordered that £80 *p.a.* was to be settled on the lectureship in lieu of the dividend previously received from the prebendary.<sup>90</sup> With the successful legislative outcome, Oxford had ensured that an important piece of funding remained in place for an important lecturer. Securing the funding from London, however, was only one battle: the evidence sent to London had to be returned so that the university could make any necessary defences of its rights in the future.

The efforts to recover university documents, including the Worcester patent, involved a broad cross-section of the newly remodelled university. The central figure in the

---

<sup>88</sup> These papers are held in OUA, SP/E/4. A helpful list of the papers is OUA, SP/E/4, ff. 109r-v.

<sup>89</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, f. 97. F. Cheynell, *The Divine Trinunity...* (London, 1650).

<sup>90</sup> *A&O*, ii, pp. 369-78.

recovery of the materials was the keeper of the archive himself, Langbaine.<sup>91</sup> Langbaine's status as a royalist head of a royalist college — Queen's — coexisted with his role as the custodian of the university archives. His was a crucial role in the running of Oxford, as the convocation regularly turned to him for guidance or leadership for issues involving the university's rights or precedents. Langbaine was a seminal figure in many of the key episodes of university governance during the Rump period: he was one of the delegates appointed to consider the reformation of the university in 1650; he played an important role in the bitter quarrel with the town over the university's privileges; he was instrumental in efforts to re-establish the chancellor's court, along with another royalist Richard Zouch and a parliamentarian, John Mills; and he helped to settle collegiate issues, such as the financial confusion of University College.<sup>92</sup> Care of university documents was another aspect of his duties and so he played a central role in the retrieval of missing materials.

Aiding the royalist Langbaine with the recovery of university documents were several erstwhile persecutors of royalists. Henry Wilkinson, vice-president of Magdalen College, in March 1649 was involved with recovering registers and books belonging to the university which had fallen into the hands of Sir Robert Harley, the chair of an earlier iteration of the CRU.<sup>93</sup> Wilkinson was one of the senior Puritan figures of visitation Oxford, known as 'Dean Harry' to distinguish him from his namesake, Dr Henry Wilkinson, the canon of Christ Church.<sup>94</sup> Wilkinson of Magdalen was appointed a visitor in 1647, became vice-president of Magdalen college in May 1648, principal of Magdalen Hall in August, and

---

<sup>91</sup> A.J. Hegarty, 'Gerard Langbaine', *ODNB*.

<sup>92</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, ff. 53, 112, 114. University CA, UC:S8/MS1/1. For the chancellor's court see also, Wood, *Annals*, pp. 626, 636. For the conflict with the citizenry, see *ibid.*, p. 631-2.

<sup>93</sup> OUA, SP/E/4, ff. 14r-15r.

<sup>94</sup> J. Spivey, 'Henry Wilkinson (1616/7-1690)', *ODNB*.

Whyte's professor of moral philosophy of March 1649.<sup>95</sup> As might be expected from someone closely tied to the visitation, his sympathies lay with Parliament. When army officers visited Oxford in 1649 they were entertained at Magdalen Hall and Wilkinson 'prayed hard' for them.<sup>96</sup> He and Langbaine were unlikely bedfellows, but they were able to work together for university business with the two corresponding about Wilkinson's efforts in London and Langbaine providing supporting documentation.<sup>97</sup> Wilkinson, the well-connected Puritan head of house, was of obvious use to Langbaine in the recovery of documents from London and the relationship was more of a partnership than a forced alliance. Wilkinson's involvement appears to have been *ad hoc* in nature rather than a specific role assigned to him by the university, a fact which suggests that he and Langbaine had reached an informal agreement about the enterprise and were able to create a partnership together for university business. The fruit of their labour came on 24 May 1649, when Langbaine recorded that he had received a number of the books held by Sir Robert Harley from Wilkinson.<sup>98</sup>

Nor was Wilkinson the only parliamentarian working with Langbaine. Both Wilkinson's namesake, Wilkinson of Christ Church, and Francis Cheynell, intruded president of St John's, are mentioned in Langbaine's notes as helping to recover documents. Dr Wilkinson is mentioned in 1650 as returning Dr James's book of statutes, absent since 1641, in 1650 to the university archives.<sup>99</sup> Cheynell's help came with the search for the missing patent relating to the Lady Margaret Reader — Cheynell, as the current holder, may have been thinking of his own salary as much as the cause of learning. Whatever Cheynell's

---

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>97</sup> OUA, SP/E/4, f. 14r.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 15r.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 18r.

motivations, Langbaine mentioned in a letter that he had been informed the missing patent was in London, at Gurney House, and that ‘Dr Cheynell p[ro]mised to enquire after it, and returne it again’.<sup>100</sup> Both Cheynell and Dr Wilkinson were notorious as the fiercest of the Puritan leaders in the Oxford visitation; they had been seen as leaders of the early purge of the university with Wood capturing royalist sentiment towards them by dubbing them the ‘Two madmen’.<sup>101</sup> Yet, they were able to work with the royalist Langbaine productively in the issue of educational funding, and he with them. Nor was this the only such example of ‘hot and furious’ Cheynell being considered in cooperative schemes for Oxford’s financial security.<sup>102</sup> In late 1648, when Parliament discussed the act for abolishing dean and chapters, which had the potential to undermine university revenues, a coalition involving the royalist Richard Zouche, the MPs John Selden, Francis Rous, and Edward Reynolds discussed the best ways to protect the university’s interests.<sup>103</sup> Zouche, the correspondent on the scene in London, reported to Reynolds, after a discussion with Rous, that either Cheynell or Wilkinson of Magdalen Hall ought to be sent to the capital as men well-known to the committee for Oxford.<sup>104</sup>

The case of university finances was another sign of the endemic cooperation taking place inside educational institutions. Not only was there significant consensus about education and how it ought to be managed and promoted, but the agreement was leading to collaboration between those of different political stances on a regular basis, both in daily business and more unusual enterprises. Once cooperation is recognised as taking place

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., f. 21v.

<sup>101</sup> Bodl., MS Wood, E. 32, f. 21r.

<sup>102</sup> Bodl., MS Walker C. 8, f. 247v.

<sup>103</sup> Bodl., MS Tanner 456, ff. 3r, 5r. A contemporaneous letter related to these efforts was written by Reynolds to Selden and is in the British Library [BL, Add. MS 32093, f. 266r]. See also E. Calamy, *A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers...* (2 vols, London, 1727), i, pp. 96-7.

<sup>104</sup> Bodl., MS Tanner 456, f. 3r.

frequently, many other less obvious examples of the collaborative atmosphere inside educational institutions become apparent. At a chapter meeting of the governing body of Christ Church, Oxford, in August 1649 it was agreed that the provost of Oriel, John Saunders, would be asked to be one of two arbitrators in a small college dispute with a Mistress Hawkes.<sup>105</sup> The incident is seemingly insignificant, yet, if the persons involved are examined, it stands once again as an example of how much unexpected collaboration took place at the everyday level of college life in educational institutions. Saunders, provost of Oriel since 1644, had opposed the parliamentary visitation of the university. Although questions were prepared for him by the visitors, he never submitted to them and kept his place ‘by friends in the Committee’.<sup>106</sup> As provost of Oriel, he seems to have ruled over a pro-royalist community, with the college giving £1 to captive Scottish prisoners, likely following Worcester.<sup>107</sup> Yet, even with his royalist principles and friends, quotidian business and a common attitude to education still drew Saunders into dealings with parliamentarians. In the case of Christ Church, this meant high-ranking parliamentarians — the college had been filled with leading figures of the visitation including the new vice-chancellor, Edward Reynolds.

Cooperation was the foundation of administration in early modern places of learning, yet without a granular study it would be hard to prove. Most memoirs and works from within places of learning produced after the Restoration deliberately tried to obfuscate any hint of collaboration. Ralph Bathurst spent the Interregnum in Trinity, Oxford, and, as his

---

<sup>105</sup> Christ Church CA, D&C i.b.3, f. 6.

<sup>106</sup> University College Archives, UC:MA30/3/MS/57; Wood, *Annals*, p. 588.

<sup>107</sup> ‘Captivis Scotiis’ [Oriel CA, TF 1 A1/6, year ending Michaelmas 1651, ‘Soluta pro necessariis extra Coll:’]. These were possibly the Scottish soldiers who Wood mentions were kept in the yard of St Giles Church following Worcester [Wood, *Annals*, p. 649]. For Oriel’s royalism see also, K. Fincham, ‘Expansion and Retrenchment, 1574-1660’, in J. Catto (ed.), *Oriel College, A History* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 94-134; Worden, *Oxford*, p. 182.

biographer noted, appeared to some ‘chargeable with temporary compliance, in retaining his fellowship’.<sup>108</sup> Clearly aware of these criticisms, Bathurst left a firm vindication of his royalism and time in Oxford arguing that it was ‘my fortune to escape; as many others, persons of unquestionable loyalty, did’.<sup>109</sup> For Bathurst, his survival was a matter of luck rather than compliance and something he shared with others of unimpeachable royalism such as Thomas Barlow or Gerard Langbaine. Anthony Wood disagreed and cattily noted that Bathurst, after complying with Parliament, became head of Trinity ‘by putting aside an old cavalier that had suffered ejection’.<sup>110</sup> Nor was Wood much kinder to Barlow — a person ‘of no conscience, honesty or Religion’ — who was notoriously good friends with John Owen, the parliamentary vice-chancellor who praised him as the ‘most learned librarian’ in July 1654.<sup>111</sup> Bathurst’s answer to criticisms levelled against him was essentially to argue that he had not sacrificed his principles. As he wrote, his survival had been one of ‘fortune’, not of compliance, and his loyalty remained ‘unquestionable’.<sup>112</sup> Nor, he was keen to stress, had he been required to engage with the parliamentarians in any meaningful way.

What Bathurst’s memoir showed was the post-Restoration desire to avoid accusations of cooperation as well as compliance. For those eager to show their royalism had never wavered, the idea that they had been able to avoid close contact with parliamentarians was useful. From these printed accounts, a very different picture of life in Commonwealth educational institutions emerges from that which actually occurred. Like Bathurst, most of those who had lasted through the Interregnum inside the schools and universities emphasised any examples of royalism they could remember, but also argued, as

---

<sup>108</sup> T. Warton, *The Life and Literary Remains of Ralph Bathurst...* (London, 1761), p. 204.

<sup>109</sup> Warton, *Ralph Bathurst*, p. 205.

<sup>110</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 31, f. 14v.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 4v; *The Oxford Orations of Dr. John Owen*, ed. P. Toon (Callington, 1971), p. 11.

<sup>112</sup> Warton, *Ralph Bathurst*, p. 205.

it seemed Houghton attempted to do in his correspondence cited above, that they had managed to remain separate from the new roundhead members. The biography of Henry More, a fellow of Christ's, Cambridge, depicted its subject as one living removed from vicissitudes of the world in the serenity of his room: 'he would say at times, *That Archimedes like, he was so busie in his Chamber, with his Pen and Lines, as not to mind much the Bustles and Affaires of the World that were without*'.<sup>113</sup> Walter Pope, in his *Life of Seth Ward*, promoted the same notion of separation when describing how 'the Antediluvian Cavaliers', meaning those fellows 'who had the good fortune to survive the Flood of the Visitation', had lived since 1648 'retir'd in their Cells, never meddling with Public Affairs in the University'.<sup>114</sup>

The idea of swathes of fellows remaining untainted with parliamentary contact is incompatible with how the institutions actually ran, but it was one actively promoted in print. Bathurst in his apologia emphasised that by keeping quiet he had 'constant converse' with other royalists and 'scarce knew, or was knowne to, any of the other party' for an extended period until his 'small skill in physick at length got me a little interest among some of them'.<sup>115</sup> Henry More's biographer claimed that it was precisely because of More's seclusion that he survived: the Parliament 'had that Opinion of his *Integrity and Retiredness*, that they were willing, it seems, to let him rest as he was'.<sup>116</sup> The idea of seclusion and separation therefore emerged as an important strand in post-Restoration apologias. At Winchester College, an anonymous biography of the Interregnum warden, John Harris, memorably linked the idea of contact with parliamentarians with infection, describing the

---

<sup>113</sup> R. Ward, *The Life of the Learned and Pious Dr. Henry More...* (London, 1710), p. 191.

<sup>114</sup> W. Pope, *The Life of Seth Ward...* (London, 1697), p. 40.

<sup>115</sup> Warton, *Bathurst*, p. 205.

<sup>116</sup> Ward, *Henry More*, p. 186.

school as the only ‘publique or considerable schoole that was not infected with the Venime of the Times’.<sup>117</sup> The intention of authors like the biographer was often to show that their subject had not complied with the times, perpetuating a valuable, but false, idea that individuals could sit out the Interregnum while remaining within educational institutions.

As might be expected, not all believed the post-Restoration apologies. To Anthony Wood, the concept of noble separation during the Interregnum was a lie and those who had remained in their posts had ‘cringed to the late times’.<sup>118</sup> Decades later, the same suspicion was evident when a correspondent of John Walker discussing three ‘elected Fellows before the usurpation’ at St John’s, Cambridge who ‘were then [i.e. when elected] esteemed orthodox and loyall’. The trio were ejected over the Engagement before being restored after the return of Charles II. At the time of their restoration they ‘were then likewise so reputed’ [i.e. ‘orthodox and loyall’].<sup>119</sup> With the implication that he felt these three had likewise cringed to the times, the author of the letter concludes that if ‘they were [orthodox and loyal] at the time of their ejection [several years after Parliament’s visitation], I cannot say.’<sup>120</sup> It was in response to such post-Restoration suspicions that the memoirs and biographies of university figures were produced, sometimes explicitly. The anonymous biography of John Harris — likely written by the warden’s son, Thomas — described its production as a response to his awareness that, ‘some are ready to Censure both him and the fellows that they would designe to keep their places in such times’.<sup>121</sup> Others, like an early historian of Jesus, Cambridge, named John Sherman, were less frank about the obvious motivations for

---

<sup>117</sup> WCA, 447.

<sup>118</sup> Bodl., MS Wood, F. 31, f. 4r.

<sup>119</sup> Bodl., MS J. Walker, C.4, f. 44v.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid.

<sup>121</sup> Thomas was likely the author given that he was the recipient of his father’s books, papers, and correspondence on the latter’s death [TNA, PROB 11/280/411]. For the quote, see WCA, 447.

their works. Sherman, a fellow of Jesus in the Interregnum who subscribed the Engagement, was as susceptible to criticism as the members of Winchester and opted to drown out any suspicions of his past loyalties with a fervently royalist history of the college during the ‘recent madness of the fanatics’.<sup>122</sup>

Although not immediately apparent, Restoration texts do help historians better understand the cooperation they tried to hide, specifically that it was a choice. Anger towards those who had collaborated with Parliament was in part a matter of principle. As Thomas Barlow, a fellow of Queen’s, Oxford, throughout the Interregnum, grimly joked about the Oxford visitation in 1648, ‘If this world goes on, ‘twill bee a shame to bee out of a prison, or in a Fellowship.’<sup>123</sup> George Morley, later bishop of Winchester, refused to stay in Oxford saying that it would be, ‘if not a sin, yet a shame to be left behind’.<sup>124</sup> Many agreed with such sentiments including John Hales, a fellow of Eton, who was removed from his living in 1650 for refusing the Engagement. His successor offered to resign in his favour out of guilt but Hales refused, telling him that ‘the Parliament having put him out, he was resolved never to be put in again by them’.<sup>125</sup> Such principled stands were often predicted by royalists, if not always pursued. A fellow of All Souls, George Stradling, wrote ‘I doubt not but the’ University ‘will be constant to its principles [i.e. in not submitting to Parliament], though it suffer never so much by maintaining them, and I for my owne part shall willingly receive my doome with the rest, if it comes to that’.<sup>126</sup> When Stradling was indeed ejected he sought

---

<sup>122</sup> ‘[N]upera Fanaticorum rabie’ [A. J. Sherman, *Historia Collegii Jesu Cantabrigiensis*, ed. J.O. Halliwell (London, 1840), p. 40].

<sup>123</sup> [T. Barlow], *Pegasus or the Flying Horse from Oxford...* (Mongomery [i.e. Oxford, 1648]), p. 6.

<sup>124</sup> I. Walton, *The Life of Dr Sanderson, Late Bishop of Lincoln...* (London, 1678), n.p.

<sup>125</sup> T. Harwood, *Alumni Etonenses...* (Brimingham, 1797), p. 73. See also, Bodl., MS J. Walker, C.2, f. 196r.

<sup>126</sup> Bodl., MS Add. B 109, f. 122v/137v.

to avoid ‘doome with the rest’ and succeeded in retaining his fellowship thanks to the intercession of his Parliamentary relatives, Edmund Ludlow and Michael Oldisworth.<sup>127</sup>

Fury towards compliers did not stem solely from principle, but also from an awareness that there had been alternatives to remaining in fellowships. One alternative to which many turned was the private tutoring of royalist families. When one Oxford fellow was ejected in 1648 he immediately wrote to his royalist patron seeking employment ‘going behond [*sic*] the sea with somebody, or pedanting in some Gentlemans house’.<sup>128</sup> Whether he succeeded or not is not known, but others certainly ended up ‘pedanting’. George Bull of Exeter, Oxford, who had been prepared to use arms to refuse entry to the visitors in 1648, followed his tutor to Somerset where they taught.<sup>129</sup> Francis Mansell of Jesus, Oxford, likewise was able to live as an educator in Wales. He tutored in the house of a kinsman and was supported by a former student until forced out of the region by local soldiers.<sup>130</sup> Private tuition was not the only means of sustenance for displaced academics — the royalist master of Brasenose spent the Interregnum practicing law after being ejected — and demonstrates that those inside educational institutions did have alternatives to working with parliamentarians or starving, a point which underlaid the invective levelled at those who cringed to the times.<sup>131</sup> To those who had left or been forced from their positions for reasons of principle, it must have appeared many erstwhile peers were colluding with the enemy despite other options, enjoying comfortable positions while the more conscientious took on far less financially secure roles such as private tutoring.

---

<sup>127</sup> *Sermons and Discourses upon Several Occasions by G. Stradling...with an Account of the Author*, ed. J. Harrington (London, 1692), ‘Preface’.

<sup>128</sup> Bodl., MS Clarendon 31, f. 276v.

<sup>129</sup> R. Nelson, *The Life of George Bull* (Oxford, 1840), pp. 24-6. For Bull being prepared to use arms against the visitors and their soldiers, Bodl., MS J. Walker C. 7, f. 15r.

<sup>130</sup> L. Jenkins, *The Life of Francis Mansell* (London, 1854), pp. 16-20.

<sup>131</sup> J.M. Crook, *Brasenose: The Biography of an Oxford College* (Oxford, 2008), p. 63.

The anger over those who stayed in places of learning was therefore driven in part by an awareness that it was a choice. Although the likes of Bathurst argued they held their place by fortune, they had made a decision to stay rather than leave. That it was a choice raises the question of why so many felt able to take it. Fear of the alternatives was certainly one reason for remaining in place. An Oxford subscription campaign for episcopal figures in 1654 tellingly mentions £1 being donated to Dr Oliver Lloyd, an ejected fellow of All Souls, who now lived ‘in some distresse’.<sup>132</sup> But it is also clear that a reason why so many may have felt comfortable remaining in places of learning and been able to make such a choice was the low bar to cooperation examined above. The life of scholars in the Commonwealth period did not differ on a quotidian basis of administration and teaching. Nor did the work being undertaken in the management of these institutions expose differences between supporters and opponents of the republic. What the post-Restoration criticisms reveals is not only outrage, but also indirect proof of how widespread and easy cooperation was in the period and why so many found it possible to remain in places of learning and work with the new roundhead regime.

---

<sup>132</sup> Jesus Oxford CA, PR Mansell B.10.

## Conclusion

This chapter has revealed the cooperation taking place at the CRU and places of learning in work relating to the management of educational institutions. At a committee level a wide range of MPs worked together on issues relating to learning while the universities functioned because of the willingness and ability of opponents and those apathetic to the regime to work with its supporters. Developing the arguments made earlier in this thesis, this chapter has shown further the existence of common ground in Commonwealth England around learning and how widespread traditional attitudes to education were under the Rump, both among MPs and scholars. There was a noticeable consensus about how places of learning ought to be governed which, when put into practice, largely consisted of small changes, pragmatic decisions, and generally ensuring they ran as before. If any did not agree with the principles behind the CRU's approach to education, they were likely to be content with the form the committee's activity took.

Cooperation in education also revises our understandings of the Rump and the relationship between government and the people in Commonwealth England. As outlined above, it is common to think of the republic as characterised by intense disagreements within the government, within the academic institutions, and within the wider country. The evidence of this chapter has challenged these perspectives. Although there were serious and rancorous divisions in Commonwealth England, there were still areas of agreement and a willingness and ability to coalesce around them, with friends and enemies of the new regime able to work together. The type of cooperation which was practised tended to be over relatively insignificant incidences but is no less important as a pool of evidence. Indeed, its

very quotidian nature raises a point of wider significance about the historiography of the Commonwealth. By focussing on the great matters of division during the Rump historians have overlooked the numerous examples of cooperation taking place at an institutional or administrative level which undermine any characterisation of the period as one of overwhelming hostility. In the following chapter a similar granular approach to educational institutions is employed to continue our revision of the relationship between rulers and ruled during the Rump.

## Chapter 5

### ‘Work half done’? Republicanism, Dissent, and Places of Learning

In his *Sufferings of the English Clergy*, the eighteenth-century historian John Walker commented on the perceived importance of educational institutions for determining political loyalty during the English Revolution. Walker wrote how Parliament’s removal of ‘the Loyal Clergy’ had been ‘but Removing the *Effect*, without Reaching the *Cause*’. To ensure future generations of ministers, and laymen, were indoctrinated with zeal for Parliament, Walker argued it was necessary for the Long Parliament to take control of the universities for ‘whilst the *Universities* continued *unreform’d*, their Work was but *half done*’.<sup>1</sup> Walker believed that, by indoctrinating students, places of learning could be used to secure the parliamentary regime and it was to achieve this purpose that Cambridge and Oxford were purged by the Long Parliament. This chapter looks beyond the purges on which Walker focused to explore whether the Rump used educational institutions as tools of indoctrination and whether the government tried to create an ideological uniformity within them. As will be shown in three sections, there was far less effort by the CRU to remove opponents and endorse a new Commonwealth culture than might be thought and far more willingness to reconcile opponents of the regime. Whether the Rump attempted to use educational institutions as seminaries of republicanism is examined first followed by two sections on dissent, the former analysing what type of dissent was tolerated by parliamentary authorities and the latter showing what was considered intolerable.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Walker, *Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England...* (London, 1714), p. 108.

By exploring the issue of ideological uniformity, this chapter continues its predecessor's focus on the relationships between those inside places of learning. How supporters of the regime and those disaffected or apathetic to it interacted in practice is analysed below and once again demonstrates the gap between the written memorialisation of the republican period and its reality. As emerges from studying proceedings inside the universities and schools, there were prominent strains of compromise and pragmatism in institutional life and less segregation along political lines than is often believed to be the case. Although a great deal of focus in this chapter is devoted to those inside educational institutions, parliamentary attitudes towards the ideological education of students are also extensively analysed. As will be seen below, how parliamentary authorities dealt with royalist dissent reveals the tacit conditions which allowed some opponents of the regime to stay in place and also the priorities of parliamentarians and what they wanted from those inside places of learning. Additionally, how fervent supporters of the republic interacted with the CRU illustrates the committee's lack of interest in imposing a new Commonwealth culture on the institutions.

## I: 'True Republican-Magistrates'? Educational Institutions and the Republic

Did the Rump use educational institutions to promote a new republican culture? Republicanism is a very loaded term but can be used, and is used here, as a convenient shorthand for attachment to the kingless regime of the Commonwealth. In recent decades historians such as Sarah Barber, Sean Kelsey, David Norbrook, and Jonathan Scott have attempted to show the thriving republican culture which emerged after the Regicide and it might be expected that places of learning, which were so vital in the rearing of future statesmen and ministers, would become training grounds for a new Interregnum mentality.<sup>2</sup> However, this section challenges such a line of historiographical interpretation. As will be shown, there is evidence of support for the new regime within the educational institutions themselves, but it is largely restricted to individual members of colleges who attempted to promote republicanism and to prompt college heads and the CRU to support it. There was noticeably little support from parliamentary authorities, or college heads, for these initiatives possibly due to, this section suggests, the numerous personal connections committeemen had to royalist scholars. It is also likely that conciliatory trends — as colleges attempted to reconcile useful scholars and administrators to help run the Interregnum places of learning — deterred committeemen and college officials from ruthlessly pursuing the transformation of educational institutions into republican seminaries.

When discussing a new republican ideology, it is easy to focus on the issue of ideological tests, such as the Engagement. This promise of loyalty to the Commonwealth government was periodically imposed over the course of several years and spawned an

---

<sup>2</sup> See the introduction, pp. 24-5.

immense debate in contemporary pamphlets.<sup>3</sup> Much historiographical discussion has taken place about the relative success and failure of the Engagement and the important theoretical works on *de facto* ideas of loyalty which were emerged as a result, works like that of Oxford's Camden professor of history, Lewis du Moulin, which showed that the legality of they that 'Governe' was immaterial and what mattered was that they 'are set over [their subjects], and appointed by God.'<sup>4</sup> Although Amos Tubb has recently argued for the success of the Engagement as an initiative, most historians tend to think of it in more pessimistic terms, even as 'a strategic error of the first magnitude'.<sup>5</sup> Certainly, the evidence from inside places of learning suggests the implementation of the Engagement was patchy at best. Ejections at both universities were fairly limited: only 9 Oxonians were expelled while Cambridge lost 49 including its chancellor, the earl of Manchester.<sup>6</sup> Blair Worden has established that the limited ejections at Oxford were due more to a general unwillingness to enforce subscription and remove non-subscribers than a general acquiescence to the Engagement.<sup>7</sup> As one fellow of All Souls, ironically one of the few ejected over the Engagement, noted in December 1649 'some temper[ing]' of its imposition had been desired by the university's vice-chancellor and 'granted by the' CRU.<sup>8</sup> The case study of the Engagement therefore presents an image of republican efforts to impose loyalty to the new regime which were mixed at best.

---

<sup>3</sup> For an overview of the pamphlets, J. Wallace, 'The Engagement Controversy 1649-1652: An Annotated List of Pamphlets', *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, 68 (1964), pp. 384-405.

<sup>4</sup> L. du Moulin, *The Power of the Christian Magistrate in Sacred Things* (London, 1650), p. 24. For du Moulin see also, J.R. Collins, *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 219-31. The classic works on the Engagement Controversy are, G. Burgess, 'Usurpation, Obligation and Obedience in the Thought of the Engagement Controversy', *HJ*, 29:3 (1986), pp. 515-36; Q. Skinner, 'Conquest and Consent: Thomas Hobbes and the Engagement Controversy', in G. Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (London, 1972), pp. 79-98.

<sup>5</sup> A. Tubb, 'The Engagement Controversy: A Victory for the English Republic', *Historical Research*, 89:243 (2016), pp. 42-61; Worden, *Rump*, p. 231.

<sup>6</sup> Reinhart, *Oxford*, p. 453. Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 162. For Manchester's dismissal, CUL, Grace Book H, f. 98. See also, CUL, GBR/0265/UA/U.Ac.2/1, ff. 772-3 for the university's expenses relating to the change of chancellor.

<sup>7</sup> Worden, *Oxford*, pp. 102-4.

<sup>8</sup> HP, 9/11/19A.

However, there are other means to understand contemporary attitudes to the republic and attempts to shape them than ideological tests. It is necessary to look for alternatives because an example like the Engagement is deeply problematic for establishing conclusions about the experience of republican rule in places of learning. The most obvious difficulty is that of evidence. The Engagement has left a thin body of material on which to draw conclusions; indeed, it is very difficult in most cases to ascertain who actually subscribed the document. Even determining where and when it was imposed is difficult. It might be assumed the three schools under the CRU or a parliamentary board of governors had the promise tendered to them, but there is only certain proof for Eton whose account book shows parchment being brought for subscriptions and wine and biscuits being provided for the justices of the peace overseeing it.<sup>9</sup> At Winchester and Westminster there is no evidence of it being tendered but much later mentions and, even then, there are directly conflicting statements about whether the warden of Winchester, John Harris, subscribed.<sup>10</sup>

Alongside problems of evidence, it is also dangerous to treat the Engagement as ordinary or emblematic of wider trends because it was so unusual. The Engagement was understood at the time as an extraordinary initiative which caused intense division among parliamentarians, many of whom were uneasy about the risks of ejecting principled Presbyterians instead of royalists. As Charles Hotham noted, ‘men of all principles, even those most disaffected to the Common-wealth, flock in to the Engagement as to a common

---

<sup>9</sup> ECR, 62/10, ff. 344-5.

<sup>10</sup> For Busby at Westminster, see Bodl., MS J. Walker C.8, f. 259r. For Harris *not* taking the Engagement, see Bodl., MS J. Walker C. 2, f. 138r. For Harris *taking* the Engagement, see A. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses...*, ed. P. Bliss (4 vols, London, 1813-20), iii, p. 455.

Asylum'.<sup>11</sup> Many leading parliamentarians, such as Oliver Cromwell, were uncomfortable about the consequences of rigorously implementing the engagement, with the lord general intervening in both Oxford and Cambridge to protect individuals at risk of ejection, including the Oxford college heads John Conant and John Wilkins.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, while the Engagement was a seminal point in the Rump's history and deeply significant in its own right, it must be used cautiously as an example of wider trends. So, too, ought the conclusions about republican culture which might be drawn from it: that the government's attempt to impose a promise of loyalty was emblematic of a desire to create a republican culture, including in places of learning, through the means of a test.

Indeed, this conclusion, and the wider importance of the Engagement, can be challenged by looking away from the issue of tests and towards evidence of efforts to create a republican culture in the university colleges. The benefit of such an approach is to demonstrate how questions such as loyalty and obedience were continuous during the Commonwealth. A case study which can be used to illustrate the perennial presence of such issues is statute reform. The revision of college and university statutes to remove any lingering superstitious, antiquated, or popish elements had been mooted and pursued at various points throughout the 1640s and it might be expected that republican elements would be added.<sup>13</sup> Under the Rump, there were further efforts to change any unwanted elements but by 1651 most efforts had withered on the vine. In that year, another spurt of activity occurred, prompted by the CRU's arbitration of a Cambridge college dispute. A Peterhouse

---

<sup>11</sup> C. Hotham, *A True State of the Case of Mr. Hotham, Late Fellow of Peter-House* (London, 1651), p. 31.

<sup>12</sup> Worden, *Oxford*, pp. 113-14. Cromwell also reportedly tried to protect 'non-subscribers' at Cambridge in July 1650 [*Memorials of the Great Civil War in England from 1646-1652*, ed. H. Cary (2 vols, London, 1842), ii, p. 224]. See also for Conant and the Engagement, E. Calamy, *A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers...* (2 vols, London, 1727), i, p. 113.

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of statute reform at Oxford see, Reinhart, *Oxford*, pp. 442-5.

fellow, Charles Hotham, had complained to the CRU about the conduct of his college master, Lazarus Seaman, and Seaman's exercise of a negative voice in college matters.<sup>14</sup> During the course of the hearings, committee members began to wonder whether it was a fruitful use of time to allow fellow and master to cast aspersions on one another endlessly. Would it not be wiser, they wondered, to 'single out the point of Statute to be determined' and so settle the disagreement.<sup>15</sup>

The CRU's decision eventually prompted a new order for the revision of statutes. On 10 April, the committee resolved that the statutes of the universities and their colleges and halls be reassessed.<sup>16</sup> The purpose of the review was to alter the statutes to a state most 'conducting to the advancement of true piety, and interest of a Commonwealth'.<sup>17</sup> A sub-committee of 11 were named to oversee the business with Michael Oldisworth being given special care of the business. The initial order, in the eyes of Hotham, appeared the first step towards remodeling the culture of the universities, with its '*masculine expression*' concerning the '*Interest of a Common wealth*'.<sup>18</sup> If the statutes were changed to promote the republic's interest, then they could better promote a republican culture among young students and so force out any lingering institutional royalism. However, no sooner had the CRU's order been made than its sense was altered. A little over a fortnight later, on 25 April, the sub-committee resolved that the heads and fellows of the university colleges send to the committee transcripts of their statutes. The same order commanded the heads of houses and college officers to consider what statutes were prejudicial to religion, learning, good

---

<sup>14</sup> For an overview, Twigg, *Cambridge*, pp. 164-5.

<sup>15</sup> C. Hotham, *The Petition and Argument of Mr Hotham...* (London, 1651), p. 32.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 'To the Honourable, the Committee for Reformation of the Universities'.

manners, or the present government and to propose alterations if they found any defects.<sup>19</sup> At a stroke, the '*masculine expression*' regarding the Commonwealth was removed, much to Hotham's dismay. As he wrote, by changing the order to consider what was '*prejudicial to the present Government*', '*most men*' would deliberately '*confine their understandings solely to the Consideration of the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, or something of that nature, as fit to be abolished*'.<sup>20</sup>

Even changed to a less controversial wording, the new order was a failure, though noticeably not due to lack of collegiate interest. College accounts from both universities from the months following the order show that many took the initiative seriously, writing up and sending their statutes to the committee.<sup>21</sup> At Oxford, several of the college suggestions have survived, presumably having been drawn up and either never sent to London or because copies were kept in the city.<sup>22</sup> Similar engagement is evident at the university level: Oxford sent its register's statute book to the CRU wrapped in vellum while several alterations to the university's statutes were approved by convocation.<sup>23</sup> However, the response of the CRU was lacklustre and ineffective. No changes were approved and there is no evidence of the committee taking up the matter again. Although the failure to enact statute reform was a recurring pattern in the universities throughout the Interregnum, the 1651 case is noteworthy given the CRU's change of attitude towards the issue of Commonwealth principles. The change in the later order to demand merely the removal of

---

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33. See also Wadham CA, 4/90.

<sup>20</sup> Hotham, *Petition and Argument*, 'To the Honourable, the Committee for Reformation of the Universities'. Hotham was likely right in his presumption. Thomas Gilson, a fellow of Corpus, Oxford, wrote in January 1650 about an earlier effort at statute reform that most interpreted the issue 'to reach no further than takeing away of holy dayes, the oath of Allegiance and such like crepundia' [HP, 10/1/1A].

<sup>21</sup> For example, Christ's, Cambridge, spent 10 shillings for a book and transcribing the statutes for the committee in 1651 [Christ's Cambridge CA, B.1.10, f. 166].

<sup>22</sup> OUA, WPγ/6/2.

<sup>23</sup> OUA, WPβ/21/4, 276-7 [144v-5r]; NEP/Supra/Reg T, ff. 141-3.

rules prejudicial to the current government was a reversal from efforts to create a new culture inside places of learning and seems to corroborate the suggestion that the committee was generally not interested in imposing a new culture on places of learning. The committee's return to their usual attitude was a discouragement to those inside educational institutions eager to promote republicanism. Charles Hotham lamented that pro-Commonwealth scholars were discouraged from altering their statutes by the CRU's having not '*declared your own senses in favour of the cause of Liberty*'.<sup>24</sup> The original order of the 10<sup>th</sup> had been the type of declaration Hotham wanted; the order of the 25<sup>th</sup> seemed to kill any pro-Commonwealth expression stone dead.

Yet, although the committee may have been lukewarm, there are hints from the statute suggestions that some inside the colleges were hopeful for the creation of a new republican culture. These are only hints because, bar a few examples, most of the suggested amendments have not survived. One or two suggestions from Oxford do remain, however, such as a Christ Church proposal that a new phrase be added at two points in the statutes: '*Quae non repugnant Dei aut Reipub: legib[us]*'.<sup>25</sup> The suggestion appears initially fairly innocuous and more a pragmatic rephrasing than evidence of any republican fervour. Yet, there are other incidents which suggest such an alteration was more tellingly pro-Parliament than might first appear. At other institutions throughout the Interregnum similar types of small changes were made and were considered by contemporaries as examples of parliamentary sentiment. At Trinity, Cambridge, a republican alteration to the college grace was made *ex tempore* by a student in 1646 who added a request for God to preserve

---

<sup>24</sup> Hotham, *Petition and Argument*, 'To the Honourable, the Committee for Reformation of the Universities'.

<sup>25</sup> OUA, WPγ/6/2, 3.

Parliament then found his precedent followed.<sup>26</sup> When the custom was dropped by the college authorities, students in 1650 complained about the decision to the CRU, framing it as disloyal to Parliament, a sign that the original change, although small, was considered to have deeper meaning as a sign of changing political loyalty. The words of the statutes clearly mattered to at least some in colleges, and Thomas Hill, master of Trinity, thought it necessary to assure the CRU that should statute reform go ahead, the governing body of the college ‘should like it very well’ if the word *Parliamentum* was returned to the grace, though whether it ever was returned is unknown.<sup>27</sup>

Trinity’s case suggests the wording of the statutes mattered, but also that the push for reform came from individual members of the college. Christ Church, dominated in 1650 by leading parliamentarians such as Edward Reynolds and Henry Wilkinson sr., might be expected as a college to make republican suggestions. At other colleges, like Trinity, the drive was coming from individual members and students, something mirrored at Clare College. There, a young John Tillotson, future archbishop of Canterbury, allegedly enlarged the college grace to include praise to God for the Parliament’s victory at Worcester ‘*contra Carolum Stuartium*’.<sup>28</sup> Although Tillotson’s loyalties while at Cambridge were later debated according to the historiographical patterns outlined in the previous chapter, there is evidence that in his youth he felt himself attached to the Interregnum regimes. In late 1649 he discussed his own willingness to subscribe to the Engagement and also his disappointment that Thomas Goodwin, a leading Independent divine associated with Oliver Cromwell, did

---

<sup>26</sup> LPL, MS 804, f. 42v.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> G. Hickes, *Some Discourse upon Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson...* (London, 1695), p. 63. However, the claim was later disputed: *The Works of the Most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson...*, ed. T. Birch (3 vols, London, 1752), [vol.] i, pp. ii-iv. See also I. Rivers, ‘John Tillotson’, *ODNB*.

not become the new college head of Clare as at one point had seemed possible.<sup>29</sup> His example, like that of the republican student at Trinity, suggests that there were some in educational institutions keen to reform the culture of educational institutions to make them aligned to the new republican regime but their enthusiasm was not matched by parliamentary authorities. Without the support of parliamentary authorities, the most any of the Commonwealth's supporters could hope for was that a college's governing body, like at Christ Church, would share their sympathies. Failing that, it was up to individuals to try and reform their colleges to share in zeal for the new regime.

Collegiate reactions to the military campaigns of 1651 strengthen the notion of varying levels of support for the republic inside educational institutions. The invasion of the Scottish forces under Charles II prompted alarm in Oxford which was believed to be at risk of seizure.<sup>30</sup> In the panic, troops were raised by the university to fight on behalf of the republic with colleges providing the necessary funds. By delving into the financial records of the colleges it becomes apparent that some felt more devoted to the republic than others. New College, Oxford, may not immediately have seemed the most likely acolyte of the republic. The college had been one of the hardest nuts in Oxford to crack for Parliament's visitors and even after the intrusion of new fellows and a new warden — the 'Chaplain' to the governor of Oxford — George Marshall, had contained a residual royalist element.<sup>31</sup> However, at the time of Worcester, the college became closely tied to the university's force and the master and some fellows were evidently zealous for the republic. The college's governing body decided that the gentlemen troopers of the college ought to receive rings

---

<sup>29</sup> *Weekly Miscellany; or, Agreeable and Instructive Entertainer*, 4:156 (14 January, 1777), p. 425.

<sup>30</sup> Wood, *Annals*, pp. 644-7.

<sup>31</sup> For New College see Worden, *Oxford*, p. 144. For Marshall being chaplain to the governor of Oxford, see HP, 9/11/6B.

with the logo and arms of the university troop on them while the accounts demonstrate an enormous outlay on horses and weapons at the time of Worcester: expenditure in the college stables nearly tripled from £36 in the preceding quarter to over £109; pistols, holsters, powder were bought in abundance; £07.15.00 was spent on banners, colours, and trumpets for the university troops; swords and pistols were mended; a horse was hired and bridles and saddles procured.<sup>32</sup> A number of the college's members were also serving in the troop, including the captain, John Kent, and John Gunter, who received money for a case of pistols.<sup>33</sup>

New College was one of several colleges with strong parliamentary bodies to show martial activity at the time of Worcester. Another was Brasenose which housed a strong collection of parliamentary members including the university's then vice-chancellor, Daniel Greenwood. In August 1651, the same time as New College's expenditure, the college accounts show money being spent on weapons and several horses being geared for combat including over £10 spent on 16 August 1651 buying and shoeing a dun coloured mare, complete with a saddle, bridle, other items.<sup>34</sup> As with New, Brasenose was another college which clearly contained some fellows who were willing to surpass what was necessary in helping the republic fight against the Scots. So too was Magdalen, Oxford, a dominant republican stronghold under its president, Thomas Goodwin. Goodwin had close links to the army, being named in an army request to Parliament in May 1649 to deliver an expository sermon on Scripture at Oxford and giving a thanksgiving sermon for Cromwell's

---

<sup>32</sup> New CA, 988 15 September 1651; 4207, 1650-1, 'Custus Stabuli', 'Custus ad Intra'.

<sup>33</sup> For Kent's role and the troop more widely, Wood, *Annals*, pp. 646-7. New CA 4207, 1650-1, 'Custus ad Intra'.

<sup>34</sup> Brasenose CA, SB Accounts No 2, A 2,44, 1650-1, '?Instantrationes'.

victory at Worcester in Parliament.<sup>35</sup> As president of Magdalen, he showed a similar dedication to the cause of the New Model Army with the college accounts revealing a staggering outlay of £62.12.00 for six horses; £59.01.00 to soldiers; and £33.16.02 for various armaments ‘tempore obsidionis Worcestrensis’.<sup>36</sup> Wadham, too, under John Wilkins who would become a leading figure in Cromwellian Oxford, armed soldiers, spending £23.02.01 for ‘Setting forth Troopers’.<sup>37</sup> Although the variances between college accounting systems mean comparisons are not always straightforward, it is surely more than coincidence that colleges with strong pro-Parliament influences such as Brasenose, Magdalen, New, and Wadham were spending notable sums to defend the republic while such expenditure is absent from the more royalist colleges such as Queen’s, Oxford. There were clearly strong pro-Commonwealth elements inside the colleges and places of learning more widely, but a willingness to fight for the republic did not feed into the development of a republican culture, nor was the energy of the would-be defenders of the Commonwealth matched by a programme of republican ideology from those inside the committees.

Indeed, there is very little sign of Parliament attempting to turn the educational institutions into bastions of a new Interregnum political culture. Previous historians, such as Joan Simon, have correctly argued that the parliamentary interest in education was from an awareness that it was a ‘primary means’ to maintain a ‘hold over the ideas of the people’, but it is noticeable how little specific attention the Commonwealth paid to the political culture of educational institutions.<sup>38</sup> Indeed, the closest Parliament came to turning places of learning into republican seminaries was via acts and ordinances affecting the whole

---

<sup>35</sup> *CJ*, vi, p. 216; Reinhart, *Oxford*, pp. 449-50; B. Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs...* (4 vols, Oxford, 1853), iii, pp. 38-9.

<sup>36</sup> Magdalen Oxford CA, LCE/29, 1651, stable costs.

<sup>37</sup> Wadham CA, 16/1, f. 36.

<sup>38</sup> J. Simon, ‘Educational Policies and Programmes’, *The Modern Quarterly*, new series, 4:1 (1948-9), p. 154.

country. Parliament's enforcement of the strict observation of days of thanksgiving in an act of April 1650 seems to have encountered few obstacles from colleges and schools.<sup>39</sup> Most educational institutions show some evidence in their accounts of having celebrated various days of thanksgiving, some with details of the celebrations such as at Eton which spent just over £1 entertaining various strangers with wine and tobacco in 1651.<sup>40</sup> Other parliamentary orders affected the appearance of the educational institutions. A parliamentary order of February 1651 for taking down the king's arms and putting up those of the Commonwealth was followed in several colleges, including at Trinity, Cambridge, where the 'States armes' were carved over both the court gate and in the college hall.<sup>41</sup> Like many elements of republican rule, the Commonwealth arms were transient: the same painter, a Mr Knuckles, who was involved in painting the new arms in Trinity would under a decade later gild Charles II's arms at St John's, Cambridge.<sup>42</sup> The nationwide and ultimately ephemeral implementation of various acts and ordinances was a testament to the half-heartedness of Parliament's interest in remodeling educational institutions into republican seminaries.

The CRU's lack of interest in stoking Commonwealth fervour in places of learning was likely influenced by the personal interests of individual committeemen. As seen in the previous chapter, historiographical perceptions of the relationship between those in colleges and those in Parliament are greatly influenced by the works of Restoration authors. One theme of those authors was that the survival of those opposed to the regime was due to a singular act of fortune by a single parliamentarian rather than part of a wider phenomenon.

---

<sup>39</sup> *A&O*, ii, pp. 383-7.

<sup>40</sup> ECR, 62/10, ff. 382, 427.

<sup>41</sup> *CJ*, vi, 531. Trinity Cambridge CA, Senior Bursar's Audit Book, 1637-1659, 1651, f. 23; Junior Bursar's Accounts 1620-1660, f. 171v.

<sup>42</sup> Trinity College CA, Junior Bursar's Accounts 1620-1660, f. 173r; M. Nicholls, 'The Seventeenth Century', in P. Linehan (ed.), *St John's College Cambridge, A History* (Woodbridge, 2011), p. 148.

Walter Pope's biography of Seth Ward, for instance, stressed that its subject became Savilian professor of astronomy 'by the means of Sir John Trevor [a member of the committee for Oxford and then the CRU], who tho' of the Parliament Party, was a great lover of Learning' and in so doing subtly distinguished Trevor from the rest of Parliament.<sup>43</sup> Trevor, Pope implied, was unusual in his attitude to royalist scholars and therefore not an example of wider parliamentarian attitudes.

However, it is possible to demonstrate that such acts of kindness by MPs sitting on the CRU and its earlier iteration, the committee for Oxford, were quite common. The means to make this argument is by looking at a number of examples from across the institutions together rather than in isolation. By drawing together these different cases actions which appear superficially idiosyncratic suddenly appear far more run of the mill. At first glance, the survival of George Stradling might appear of limited significance. Stradling, a royalist fellow of All Souls, was initially ejected by the visitors for Oxford but managed to retain his place thanks to his relations. Stradling's sister, Jane, had married the leading CRU member Michael Oldisworth following the death of her first husband William Thomas of Wenvoe.<sup>44</sup> Stradling's biography describes how Oldisworth and Edmund Ludlow — the latter of whom had married Stradling's niece — helped prevent him being 'utterly ejected' and so made his survival appear an idiosyncratic matter of lucky connections.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> W. Pope, *The Life of Seth Ward...* (London, 1697), p. 20. Trevor was added to the CRU in May 1651 [*CJ*, vi, p. 577].

<sup>44</sup> P. Townend (ed.), *Burke's Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Peerage and Knightage*, 103<sup>rd</sup> edn (London, 1963), p. 2395. See also, P. Jenkins, *The Making of a Ruling Class: The Glamorgan Gentry, 1640-1790* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 296.

<sup>45</sup> *Sermons and Discourses upon Several Occasions by G. Stradling...with an Account of the Author*, ed. J. Harrington (London, 1692), preface. For the marriage, Townend, *Burke's History*, p. 2395.

However, in the context of other actions by committeemen, Stradling's case was far from unusual. Trevor was instrumental in Ward's appointment as professor of astronomy, receiving the appellation of 'Vir Dignissime' from the grateful scholar.<sup>46</sup> At Winchester, the MP and committeeman Nicholas Love played a crucial role in helping the warden, John Harris, and protecting him from expulsion regardless of his status as a 'constant and contumacious Rumper'.<sup>47</sup> Love's actions during the Interregnum ensured that he was remembered fondly by those connected with the school: one scholar of Winchester during the Interregnum praised Love's 'one good act' of protecting the school; an anonymous biography of Harris described how 'in fine by the meanes of Mr Love Natt. Fiennes and others w[i]th who[m] the Dr pr[e]servd an interest' the CRU exculpated the warden during its investigation of 1649-50.<sup>48</sup> Such interventions to protect royalists cast into sharp relief the committee's lack of effort to create an ideological uniformity inside places of learning. Rather than be committed to removing royalists, these stories suggest some committeemen were more comfortable helping those apathetic or even hostile to the regime remain *in situ*.

There were doubtless far more examples of committeemen protecting royalists which are not known now due to a lack of evidence. In Oxford, royalist heads of house such as John Saunders of Oriel or Paul Hood at Lincoln were reported to have retained their places thanks to unnamed friends on the committee and board of visitors.<sup>49</sup> A 'powerful man in the Parliament and of that Committee [of Oxford]', who showed George Morley, future bishop

---

<sup>46</sup> S. Ward, *De Cometis Ubi de Cometarum Natura Differitur...* (Oxford, 1653), 'Illustrissimo Viro, Dno Joanni Trevor Equiti Aurato'.

<sup>47</sup> *The True Characters...of All and Every One...Who Sate as Judges upon...King Charls I* (London, 1661), p. 2. For Love helping Harris with the excise as well as the visitation see, WCA, 421-422, 445-7, 455. For Harris's concern with the excise, see also, WCA, 420.

<sup>48</sup> Bodl., MS J. Walker C.2, f. 138r; WCA, 445.

<sup>49</sup> For Saunders: Wood, *Annals*, p. 588. In August 1648, Saunders was reported by one fellow of Corpus Christi to have been 'voted out as a malignant and ill affected person' [HP, 10/1/5B].

For Hood, G. Tatham, *The Puritans in Power: A Study in the History of the English Church from 1640 to 1660* (Cambridge, 1913), p. 177 n. 4.

of Winchester ‘a peculiar favour’, attempted to protect him from ejection in 1648 only for Morley to refuse the offer out of principle.<sup>50</sup> At Peterhouse a malignant fellow, who was appointed by the CRU, and before the whole college compared the Parliament’s proceedings against the king ‘with the Powder treason of the Jesuits and Papists, contrived and carried on under pretence of Religion’ was not punished by the committee, to the outrage of at least one pro-republican fellow.<sup>51</sup> Such cases where the name of the parliamentarian patron is not known suggest that there were likely many other, similar, examples which occurred without being memorialised in print. It is difficult to determine which committee members were helping Hood, Morley, and Saunders and impossible to say definitively why. It is likely, however, that the MPs in these cases were motivated by the same mixture of familial, institutional, and patronage ties which are mentioned in those incidents where more detailed evidence survives. In any case, the survival of these scholars shows the willingness of many committeemen to help those opposed to the regime and the many personal links which existed between the two groups of individuals. Given this attitude of the MPs and their own connections to those opposed to the regime, the lack of effort by the committee to enforce the ideological uniformity which would have necessitated the removal of royalists becomes more explicable.

It is within this trend of leniency that the words of James Chaloner should be interpreted. Chaloner, sometime chair of the CRU, compiled in the wake of the Restoration a defence of his actions at the time of the Regicide and afterwards which now survives in a manuscript at the British Library. His apologia was influenced by a desire to save himself from royalist criticism: Chaloner argued that he had been against the ‘horride and desperate

---

<sup>50</sup> I. Walton, *The Life of Dr. Sanderson, late Bishop of Lincoln...* (London, 1678), n.p.

<sup>51</sup> Hotham, *Petition and Argument*, p. 45.

acteinges' at the time of the king's trial which led to the Regicide and Interregnum but had been motivated by a desire 'to keepe things from falling into a worse condition, if it were possible'.<sup>52</sup> Attempting to establish his royalist credentials, Chaloner claimed that he used his influence during the Interregnum 'to doe good offices for such as were in distress either for their lives or estates' [i.e. royalists] and that 'both the Universitys cann testifye I did many good offices for them'.<sup>53</sup> Although his claim was likely exaggerated, and contained no details, it ought not to be dismissed as the invention it initially appears. When placed next to other examples of committeemen helping opponents of the regime, Chaloner's assertion appears more plausible. There were clearly many on the committee who were ready to protect royalists and the committee often did so; if Chaloner had wanted to help the 'distressed' he would have found some of his colleagues pliable.

The willingness of committeemen to protect royalists also reflected a conciliatory element in Commonwealth places of learning. As has been shown, the primary concern of the CRU and those inside educational institutions was to stabilise academic institutions following the disruption caused by the 1640s. A means to achieve this purpose was to avoid unnecessary turmoil and to reconcile talented scholars and administrators by not raising uncomfortable questions of political loyalties. It is likely that the willingness of committeemen to protect royalists was at least in part driven by this search for administrative security. That these sentiments existed inside places of learning is certainly suggested in post-Restoration descriptions of college heads: Edmund Staunton, warden of Merton, was described in his biography as trying 'to accommodate himself to those [Christians] that

---

<sup>52</sup> BL Add. MS 71448, f. 67r.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 68r.

differed from him so far as lawfully he could'.<sup>54</sup> John Worthington, master of Jesus, Cambridge, claimed in correspondence from 1660 that he had 'done what civilities were at any time desired, in behalf of the old plantation [i.e. royalist fellows]'.<sup>55</sup> Worthington, who had been intruded in 1650, was likely trying to defend his own conduct, but there is good reason to think that those running educational institutions during the Commonwealth had a vested interest in reconciling royalists to the new state of affairs when possible rather than pouring their efforts into creating seminaries of republicanism. Although there was ideological attachment to the republic inside educational institutions, the CRU was not committed to creating a new republican culture or ideological uniformity. As a result, republican zeal came from individuals within colleges and a few college heads rather than the CRU, to the disappointment of those who hoped the committeemen would prove to be 'true Republicall-Magistrates'.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> R. Mayo, *The Life and Death of Edmund Staunton...* (London, 1673), p. 49.

<sup>55</sup> *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington...*, ed. J. Crossley (2 vols in 3, 1847-1886, Manchester), i, p. 38. See also A. Gray & F. Brittain, *A History of Jesus College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 85-7.

<sup>56</sup> Hotham, *Petition and Argument*, p. 17.

## II: Tolerable Dissent

In November 1648, Henry Wilkinson of Magdalen Hall warned his audience at St Mary's, Oxford, to 'leave neither roote nor branch of the old stocke [i.e. royalists]', fearing the corrupting effect of this 'stumpe of Dagon' on the students.<sup>57</sup> On the surface, Wilkinson's words show a parliamentary concern with the consequences of allowing ideological variety inside educational institutions. Even if Parliament did not try to impose an ideological uniformity on places of learning or to create a new adherence to the republic, it might be expected they would attempt to quash politically troubling opinions, such as expressions of royalism. However, something very different will be demonstrated below. This section, like its predecessor, treats ideological issues as continuous concerns in institutional settings and shows the response of parliamentary and collegiate authorities to dissent to have been far from straightforward. As will be shown, there was a willingness to allow ideological variety within certain conditions which might be identified from institutional case studies, namely: *de facto* acceptance of parliamentary authority, restricting dissent to private settings and to not threatening the regime, and usefulness to the regime in an academic setting.

One incident it is possible to analyse in detail involved Trinity, Cambridge, with the CRU being petitioned in June 1650 by students of the college who complained about seditious personnel among their peers. As seen above when discussing the issue of the college grace, Trinity more than many other colleges appears to have been wracked by disputes between pro-royalist and pro-republican factions.<sup>58</sup> As might be expected, the latter

---

<sup>57</sup> Bodl., MS Wood F. 35, f. 333v.

<sup>58</sup> Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 152.

were far more evident following the Regicide. Indeed, three students of the college published a work in 1649 justifying the king's execution in triumphant terms, describing it as justice executed on a man 'degenerated from a king unto a Tyrant'.<sup>59</sup> However, alongside these anti-monarchical elements, the college also housed a number of suspected or known royalists. In 1649, a fellow called Elias Pledger allegedly accused the Parliament of breaking the Covenant and murdering the king. The incident was made more incendiary by the reaction of several colleagues of Pledger who, when presented with the charge against him, were said to have replied that 'they did not know whether it were Malignancy or not'.<sup>60</sup> Pledger was removed as a fellow, as discussed below, but as the 1650 petition made clear, much of the ill-feeling from the case had not dissipated in the intervening year.<sup>61</sup> Among various complaints, the petitioners accused three fellows of uttering 'dangerous words' about the Parliament; recalled the aforementioned Pledger praying in the chapel with 'dishonourable reflexion upon the Parlam[en]t'; complained that one Beveridge had made a speech against Parliament; and, as mentioned above, noted that 'Parlamentum' had been excluded from the college grace in a section importuning God's protection.<sup>62</sup>

Surprisingly, given the republican element within the college, Trinity emerges as an example of how willing many were to overlook certain types of anti-Parliament behaviour. Despite the serious nature of the accusations, the college master, Thomas Hill, mounted a successful defence of his conduct and some of the accused college members.<sup>63</sup> The

---

<sup>59</sup> J. Fidoe *et al.*, *The Parliament Justified in Their Late Proceedings Against Charls Stuart...* (London, 1649), p. 15.

<sup>60</sup> Trinity Cambridge CA, Box 29 CIV, no. 462.

<sup>61</sup> Pledger had been removed as a fellow by June 1650 [LPL, MS 804, f. 42v], perhaps coinciding with him taking up the rectorship of Chipping Ongar in Essex [J. Venn & J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses...* (2 pts in 10 vols, Cambridge, 1922-54), part 1, vol. 3, p. 371].

<sup>62</sup> LPL, MS 804, ff. 42r-v.

<sup>63</sup> For the exoneration of Trinity's governors, Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 151. Hill and other fellows travelled to London at this time 'upon sum[m]ons from the Com[m]ittee', likely to present their case to the CRU [Trinity Cambridge CA, Senior Bursar's Audit Book, 1637-1659, 1650, f. 14v].

accusations concerning the college grace and Beveridge were easily dismissed: the college was following its statutes by not using the word ‘Parlamentum’ and Beveridge had been removed over idleness and reasons of conduct before complaints were made against him.<sup>64</sup> The other accusations, however, presented more difficulties. Hill’s solution to the charge against the three fellows was counterintuitive, for, rather than attack the validity of the accusation, he tried to claim that the context of the remarks, despite their royalist content, rendered them insufficient grounds for further punishment. Hill explained that when he heard that one of the three, Isaac Barrow, ‘had spoken dangerously’ he sent the dean to investigate who in turn reported ‘that considering the place and man[n]er when they [the words] were spoken (at a feast in a chamb[er])’ there was no need for further action. Hill agreed and, having made the ‘young men...promise to bee more carefull even in disputes’ in the future, considered the matter closed.<sup>65</sup> The implication of the episode and Hill’s defence was that the casual setting diminished the seriousness of the sentiments expressed. Thus, the master dismissed the ‘dangerous words’ as little more than ‘rash expressions in a way of disputing, and not defended or persisted in out of rooted disaffection’.<sup>66</sup>

Hill’s logic was that the context within which anti-parliamentarian rhetoric was expressed determined the seriousness of the offence. Publicly criticising the regime and privately voicing discontent, Hill implied, were different crimes, and it was under this rationale that Elias Pledger had been removed from his fellowship partly because of the public nature of his comments. Hill himself hints at this difference between the private and public settings of the incidents in his answers. In his initial crossed-out response to the

---

<sup>64</sup> LPL, MS 804, f. 42v.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., f. 42r.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

accusation concerning Pledger, Hill wrote that neither he nor any of the governors had heard the offending speech. However, the master had previously heard something which offended him in a prayer of Pledger's and thus sent for him to request that he forbear such behaviour.<sup>67</sup> Hill had clearly realised that in the public setting of the college prayers, Pledger's comments had to be challenged. The difference in punishments between Pledger and the feasting fellows can therefore be seen as a sign that context mattered when judging the gravity of royalist behaviour.

Hill's argument was also implicitly based on the idea that dissent had to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Rather than royalism being treated as a single crime to be proved or disproved, as one might expect, the case of Trinity suggests that questions of degree, context, and importance weighed on contemporary minds when judging anti-parliamentarian behaviour. Hill was not endorsing the 'dangerous words' of the three fellows, but he did suggest that the private setting in which the words were spoken made them less dangerous than Pledger's public announcements and so implied that the level of threat posed by royalists to the regime mattered when determining the seriousness of their crime. Hill's ideas were also clearly shared by some of the visitors of Cambridge to whom his defence was 'presented' or by some of the CRU to whom the Trinity petitioners had submitted their complaints; the committee, perhaps on the recommendation of the visitors, exonerated him and the three fellows by returning free elections to the college a few months after the students' petition.<sup>68</sup> Trinity therefore seems to exemplify a more nuanced approach to opposition to the republic than might be expected, one in which context mattered in judging the seriousness of the crime and punishment it deserved.

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 42v.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 42r. Twigg, *Cambridge*, p. 151.

Hill's answers also suggest that wider parliamentary concerns with the future of academic institutions helped to determine the treatment of royalist scholars. The aforementioned Isaac Barrow was an openly royalist scholar who had been elected with Hill's patronage in 1649 and later protected by him. Barrow was a brilliant academic, described by the Regius Professor of Greek, James Duport, as 'an excellent scholar' and skilled in Maths, Greek, and 'all other Kind of learning'.<sup>69</sup> Hill clearly valued Barrow highly, protecting him once again after the fellow made an anti-Parliamentarian speech in a public college oration in 1651.<sup>70</sup> That Barrow, and the other two accused persons, had something to offer Trinity, such as their academic ability, was stated explicitly in his reasons for not punishing them: he felt it a 'better service to the publique' to retain such talented young men on their promise to be more careful in the future.<sup>71</sup>

Nor was Hill the only college master to cite academic ability as a reason to protect those hostile to the regime. Gerard Langbaine, provost of Queen's, Oxford, defended a number of his college members from expulsion by the Oxford visitors by cataloguing their intellectual accomplishments and abilities in a letter of October 1648 to the visitor John Mills. According to Langbaine, Mr Tully was 'a very hopefull yong man' who 'repeopled the colledge with a new colony of com[m]oners to whom he is Tutor and Reader of Hebrew in the House' following Oxford's surrender. Another was Mr 'Rallingson', 'a very excellent yong man, extremely studious, a generall scholar; but a most eminent Mathematicien.'<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> BL, Add. MS 4275, f. 199v.

<sup>70</sup> Pope, *Seth Ward*, p. 132.

<sup>71</sup> LPL, MS 804, f. 42r.

<sup>72</sup> For Richard 'Rallingson' (i.e. Rawlinson), see also W. Poole, 'A Royalist Mathematical Practitioner in Interregnum Oxford: The Exploits of Richard Rawlinson (1616-1668)', *The Seventeenth Century*, 33:3 (2018), pp. 363-92.

Additionally, there was Thomas Barlow, whose accomplishments needed little mention since he was ‘a man so well knowne and reputed of’ by the university. The purpose of listing these achievements was to show ‘that for the number they [the fellows] are as civill, religious men and as able scholars as ani colledge in this Kingdome can afford.’ Furthermore, it would be ‘much to the glory of the Visitors to preserve such a company and engage them in thankfulnessse to God and them’.<sup>73</sup> Langbaine’s argument, like Hill’s, was essentially that academic ability was a reason to keep individuals in their place, even if their own loyalties were not straightforwardly to Parliament. The unspoken assumption inside such arguments was that Parliament, eager to ensure educational institutions continued in good hands and not concerned with the teaching of uncontroversial studies, such as in maths and Hebrew, would concur and so marked out academic ability as a reason to overlook evidence of royalism.

However, Langbaine’s letter suggested that more than academic ability alone mattered to parliamentarians. One of his comments in the letter pointed to what many parliamentarians must have considered the fundamental condition for overlooking some types of dissent. At the end of his discussion of the fellows, Langbaine wrote: ‘I dare promise a reasonable conformity to any thing the Visitors shall ordaine tending to the advancemt of piety and good letters’.<sup>74</sup> His words highlighted the importance attached to academic ability by both the visitors and the scholars, but also hints at what he believed would be an acceptable acknowledgment of parliamentary authority. Langbaine did nothing to pretend the fellows were zealots for Parliament and the tenor of support for the regime he voiced was markedly weak. His words point to the shared broad ambition to promote education and

---

<sup>73</sup> Queen’s Oxford CA, 2T97.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

piety in the Commonwealth. They also suggested that the fellows would comply with Parliament conditionally, presuming they saw nothing in the visitors' orders as intolerable.

He also implied that parliamentary authorities would be willing to accept a recognition of their authority based on *de facto* understanding of their legitimacy in which obedience was owed to Parliament not as a lawful authority, but because of their possession of power. The fellows of Queen's were acknowledging the power of the visitors and were agreeing to serve under them, but they were not willing to recognise the Parliament they represented as the rightful government. The same type of acknowledgement had been evident in Hill's defence of the royalist scholars. Hill had extracted from them a promise to be more careful in the future, rather than to be loyal supporters of the Commonwealth. Queen's and Trinity suggest that parliamentary authorities were understood to desire, at least, an acknowledgement that they ought to be submitted to as a reigning power, even if they were not believed to be the rightful authority. Such a focus on *de factoist* arguments was common during the Commonwealth. From its inception, the republic had to contend with the questioning of its legitimacy. One strand of defence, which emerged prominently during the Engagement, were *de factoist* arguments of legitimacy, such as Francis Rous' argument that 'although the change of government [to a republic] were believed not to be lawfull, yet it may lawfully be obeyed'.<sup>75</sup> Langbaine and Hill's words suggest that *de factoist* arguments had important practical implications inside educational institutions. The changing ideas about the legitimacy of the government influenced developments inside places of learning with a recognition of the Parliament's authority, if not its right, and a willingness

---

<sup>75</sup> F. Rous, *The Lawfulness of Obeying the Present Government...* (London, 1649), p. 1.

to serve under it being of great importance in determining the treatment of the regime's opponents.

The importance of a *de facto* acceptance of parliamentary authority and concerns with pedagogical ability are also evident in the case of Richard Busby.<sup>76</sup> Busby, master of Westminster School, was described as a timeserver after the Restoration but his tenures under Charles I and Charles II would suggest that his loyalties lay with the royalist cause, hints of which are apparent in the Interregnum.<sup>77</sup> Robert South, an important churchman and theologian after the Restoration and a student at Westminster and Christ Church in the Interregnum, detailed in an undelivered and undated sermon that the school's 'Loyal Genius' was perpetual throughout the period.<sup>78</sup> As an example he reported how, on the 'Black and Eternally Infamous Day' of the Regicide, the school prayed for Charles I.<sup>79</sup> There is no corroboration for this and South had plenty to gain by exaggerating the loyalty of Westminster during the Interregnum. Embarrassingly, he had been a contributor to the *Musarum Oxoniensum* of 1654, an Oxford-produced panegyric to the lord protector, in which South praised Cromwell as 'Dux pariter Terrae Domitorq[ue] profundi'.<sup>80</sup> However, despite the uncertainty of South's testimony, Busby appears to have supported the royalist cause. He was conveniently 'sickly' in 1644 when required to sign the Covenant and at the Restoration he received certificates attesting to his loyalty and religion from, among others, Henry King and John Cosin.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> For lives of Busby see, G.F. Barker, *Memoir of Richard Busby...* (London, 1895); C.S. Knighton, 'Richard Busby' *ODNB*; B. Young 'Richard Busby', in, P. Derham (ed.), *Loyal Dissent: Brief Lives from Westminster School* (Buckingham, 2016), retrieved from <https://bodleian.ox.ac.uk> (1 December 2022).

<sup>77</sup> Bodl., MS J. Walker C. 8, f. 259r.

<sup>78</sup> R. South, *Twelve Sermons and Discourses on Several Subjects and Occasions... Vol. V* (London, 1717), p. 48.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> *Musarum Oxoniensum...* (Oxford, 1654), p. 40.

<sup>81</sup> L.E. Tanner, *Westminster School* (London, 1951), p. 30; WAM, 43160; Young, 'Busby', para. 80.

Busby's sympathies do not seem to have been of great importance to the parliamentary board of governors. It is unlikely, considering Busby's reputation and actions, that the governors were ignorant of his proclivities; nor, as was shown in chapter four, was Busby able to operate completely removed from their influence or that of other parliamentarians. Busby was evidently willing to work closely under the parliamentary board of governors, a compliance that was clearly necessary for royalists hoping to survive in places of learning under Parliament. That he was willing to cooperate with parliamentary forces was likely a reason for why he avoided any serious trouble for his opinion; another was the lack of threat his opinions posed to the security of the realm, as with some of the fellows at Trinity. Busby's opinions were known by contemporaries but, bar South's alleged incident, do not seem to have been demonstrated in public settings and did not prove much of a threat to the regime. Any privately held views do not seem to have been too great an issue for the MPs governing the school and were likely outweighed by Busby's value as a pedagogue. As mentioned previously, the school flourished under his headship, due in no small part to his own status as a teacher and writer of academic texts.<sup>82</sup> Busby was also clearly an extremely competent administrator. By 1655 he had helped restore the school's financial position to a position of such strength that he had been able to spend £500 repairing an old house belonging to the schoolmasters and raising a new story of 8 rooms.<sup>83</sup> Busby's usefulness as a headmaster likely mattered more to the governors than his sympathies, especially when they were of such a quiet kind.

---

<sup>82</sup> For Busby's texts and his use of them in teaching see, J. Sargeaunt, *Annals of Westminster School* (London, 1898), pp. 113-25.

<sup>83</sup> WAM, 51004.

Busby's abilities were especially relevant in the context of Westminster College. As Julia Merritt has shown, Westminster Abbey, and by extension its college, were at the heart of a republican prestige project.<sup>84</sup> The abbey and surrounding area were the religious and political heart of the new regime, meaning that the governors' remit was far more wide-ranging than simply maintaining a pedagogical institution. They cared for the abbey, including paying soldiers to guard it 'to keipe the peopell from making disturbance in sermon time' during the tumultuous period of winter 1649/50.<sup>85</sup> The governors looked after provision of preaching in the abbey and surrounding area and were entrusted with housing important figures, such as John Bradshawe, lord president of the Council of State, in the abbey complex.<sup>86</sup> The significance of the school is also evident in the new seal designed for the governors in 1649: aptly symbolising the relationship between Westminster and the republic, it depicted the abbey's porch on one side and the Commons in session on the other.<sup>87</sup> The governors were keen for the abbey and its school to flourish with the idea that this would show the grandeur of the Commonwealth, making Westminster 'one of the most famous schools of Christendome' and at 'the seate of the magistracy and government of the nation'.<sup>88</sup> Ironically, however, it was also perfectly feasible to employ a royalist to achieve their ambitions, as shown by Busby's presence there. Busby embodied some of the traits which Parliament found desirable among scholars and on account of which parliamentary authorities were willing to overlook apathy or opposition to the Parliament. He was an

---

<sup>84</sup> J. F. Merritt, 'Monarchy, Protestantism and Revolution: 1603-1714' in D. Cannadine (ed.), *Westminster Abbey: A Church in History* (London, 2019), esp. pp. 190-206; idem, *Westminster 1640-60: A Royal City in a Time of Revolution* (Manchester, 2013).

<sup>85</sup> WAM, 42733, 42796, 42799-800, 42802-13. The Commons had ordered the committee for Westminster to prevent distractions during preaching in the abbey in March 1648 [*CJ*, v, p. 519].

<sup>86</sup> *A&O*, i, pp. 803-5. For examples of the committee and governors' interactions with these preachers and lecturers, WAM, 9371, 42725, 42727, 42817, 42833, 43259, 43308. An example of payments for the wider London area came with a payment on 30 June 1649 to pay a minister at Knightsbridge [WAM 42726]. For the housing of Bradshawe and other Parliamentarians, see WAM, 43055, 42765, 42766, 42902, 43282, 43337, 43476, 43192, 43341, 43482, 9394, 66907, 18169, 18166, 18188.

<sup>87</sup> WAM, 43166.

<sup>88</sup> WAM, 9827.

excellent academic who was willing to cooperate with parliamentary authorities even if he was not a supporter of the regime. Crucially, he was also willing to restrict any opposition to the republic to a private setting. As the next section demonstrates, it was when dissent strayed into public places that it became intolerable.

### III: Intolerable Dissent

Having examined above what made dissent acceptable, this section identifies what made it intolerable to governmental authorities. Two issues emerge as of particular importance in provoking a hostile parliamentary response to dissent: opposition voiced in a public setting and actions which threatened the regime's security. The case study of John Harris, warden of Winchester College, shows how dangerous it was to voice opposition in a public opposed to private setting. Because of his indiscreetness, at two points in the 1640s Harris came dangerously close to being removed by Parliament. A first visitation of the school conducted by the committee for Hampshire took place sometime after the first civil war. Later, the school endured a second investigation, this time by the CRU in winter 1649/50. The latter was managed by a mixture of CRU officials and local parliamentarians, some of the motivation for which was rumoured to be deeply cynical with Sir Henry Mildmay, one of the commissioners, having 'design'd himselfe' for the warden's place.<sup>89</sup> Mildmay failed; Harris and the fellows survived in place.

Both visitations seem to have been prompted by Harris's public professions of royalism.<sup>90</sup> Whereas Busby was adept at keeping his own sentiments private, Harris proved to be a far more vocal supporter of the king. The school, for instance, had asked Charles I

---

<sup>89</sup> WCA, 445.

<sup>90</sup> Harris' loyalties were misidentified by Anthony Wood who wrote, mistakenly, that '[i]n the beginning of the grand rebellion raised by the presbyterians, he [Harris] sided with them, was elected one of the assembly of divines, took the covenant and other oaths, and so kept his wardenship to his dying day' [Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, iii, p. 455]. Wood's opinion was reiterated by Daniel Neal in his *History of the Puritans* and then by later historians commenting on Winchester College, such as John Lavicount Anderson who portrayed Harris as 'tainted with the schismatical principles of the age' [J.L. Anderson, *The Life of Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells* (London, 1851), p. 13; D. Neal, *The History of the Puritans, or, Protestant Non-Conformists...* (4 vols, Dublin, 1755), iv, p. 175. See also, E.H. Plumptre, *The Life of Thomas Ken, D.D., Bishop of Bath and Wells* (2 vols, London, 1888), i, p. 30 n. 3].

for protection during the war itself and Harris allegedly supported the royalist cause with preaching and his own plate.<sup>91</sup> It was because of his reputation that the committee for Hampshire investigated him sometime in the second half of the 1640s. This investigation produced a list of charges which Harris had to satisfy. Although the date for the visitation is unknown, it can be narrowed down to 1646-8 by investigating other materials in Winchester College Archives. This window of time is suggested by a comment in an undated letter of Harris's written to John Lisle in the 1650s.<sup>92</sup> This letter was one of a pair with the other going to Lord Keeper Nathaniel Fiennes. Since Fiennes was only made lord keeper in 1655 and Harris died in 1658, the missive would have been written within that time bracket. Harris's letter to Lisle begins, 'I doubt not but it is yet fresh in y[ou]r Lorpps memorie what articles I was questioned upon 9 yeares agoe before the Committee for the Countie of Southampton' as, Harris continued, Lisle had been chairman.<sup>93</sup> The years between 1646-8 are further corroborated by a document detailing the students and staff of the school.<sup>94</sup> Previous historians have traditionally argued it was written at the time of one of the two parliamentary visitations.<sup>95</sup> There is no firm evidence for why it was produced so that is only a possibility. However, if it were drawn up under the alleged circumstances then it is noticeable that 'Mr Trusell' is listed as a fellow: William Trusell/Trussel died in 1648 reaffirming the possible dating window for the allegations against Harris.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> T.F. Kirby, *Annals of Winchester College, from Its Foundation in the Year 1382 to the Present Time* (London, 1892), p. 332; WCA, 399. See also Harris' complaints in winter 1641-2 about Parliament's proceedings and the likely outbreak of war in WCA 410.

<sup>92</sup> WCA, 430. The date of 1649-50 seems unlikely as that was the period the CRU carried out its investigation.

<sup>93</sup> WCA, 430.

<sup>94</sup> WCA, 398.

<sup>95</sup> Kirby, *Annals*, pp. 337-9.

<sup>96</sup> T.F. Kirby, *Winchester Scholars: A List of the Wardens, Fellows, and Scholars of Saint Mary College of Winchester...* (London, 1888), p. 12.

The accusations themselves demonstrate how overt Harris had been in his opposition to Parliament. It was alleged against him that he had prayed for the royalist commander Lord Ogle and had also desired ‘the destrucc[i]on of those who were risen up against the Kinge’.<sup>97</sup> Harris was also said to have ‘often preached for and practis’d sup[er]stic[i]on’, including maintaining and defending corporal bowing at the name of Jesus, ‘Ceremonies imposed by the B[isho]pps in their Convocac[i]on’, ‘the Lawfulness and antiquity of Organicall musicke in the Quire’, the punishments handed out by the Star Chamber, surplices, and adoration of the high altar. These religious accusations are strikingly Laudian, showing that Harris supported the ceremonialism and worship associated with the former archbishop. Furthermore, the endorsement of the Star Chamber was especially damning. The punishment of Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne (which Harris defended) had been infamous for its harshness and utilized by opponents of Laud as an example of prelatical tyranny and anti-Protestant sentiment. Harris’s support for the Star Chamber associated him with the most disliked parts of the Laudian period and his actions would have marked him out in the county as a supporter of the discredited Caroline period. The public setting of Harris’s actions would also have guaranteed his notoriety. Some of his actions, such as preventing his wife from reading a godly book, took place within the private setting of his household but the majority occurred in the cathedral, itself renovated in a Laudian style in the 1630s, or the college chapel.

The second visitation was sparked by displays of defiance by Harris which were as public and notorious as any sermon in the cathedral. The background to the CRU visitation appears to have been Harris’ supportive treatment of New College fellows ejected by

---

<sup>97</sup> WCA, 399.

Parliament's visitors in 1648-9 such as when Gilbert Coles, a fellow at New College, was purged in 1648 and yet made a fellow at Winchester only a week later.<sup>98</sup> A Mr "Beesley" mentioned as Harris's assistant at his living of Meonstoke was almost certainly the John Beeslie also expelled in that year.<sup>99</sup> Roger Heigham, a fellow also at New, received a great deal of help from Harris including the drafting of petitions to present to a parliamentary committee to protest his expulsion and was eventually restored.<sup>100</sup> One of the most detailed case studies to emerge from the archival materials is that of Thomas Grent, a relative of Harris who in 1648 had been removed by the visitors of Oxford from his New College fellowship.<sup>101</sup> He and his sister were practically adopted by the warden, becoming valued members of the warden's family and Thomas in due course was 'made Physician to the Colledge' — he was presumably gathering medicinal supplies for his new position when he wrote to a friend at New College asking the recipient to send plants and seeds.<sup>102</sup> Grent himself stood as witness to the warden's will, appointed one of Harris's sons as an executor of his own, and was remembered in the familial sections of the wills of the warden's sister, Phoebe, and son, John.<sup>103</sup> Meanwhile Grent's own sister received money for her dowry from Harris, since the Grent father had only 'an indifferent Vicaridge'.<sup>104</sup> Grent continued at Winchester and was eventually reinstated as fellow at New College following the Restoration, though he died shortly afterwards.

---

<sup>98</sup> Burrows, *Register*, pp. 54, 144; Kirby, *Winchester Scholars*, p. 12; S. Wright, 'Gilbert Coles', *ODNB*.

<sup>99</sup> Burrows, *Register*, pp. 54, 144. For references to Beeslie as Harris's curate, see WCA, 431, 424, 452. Beeslie was one of those reinstated at New College following the Restoration. New CA, 9655, f. 43. For Harris and Beeslie, see also WCA, 410, letter of John Harris to his son, 17 December 1641.

<sup>100</sup> For Harris's involvement in Heigham's case, see WCA, 424, 452, 890a, 891, 892. For Heigham being restored to, and possibly ejected a second time from, New College, see Burrows, *Register*, pp. 263, 529.

<sup>101</sup> Burrows, *Register*, p. 58.

<sup>102</sup> Bodl., MS. Eng. hist. c. 5, f. 10r; WCA, 424.

<sup>103</sup> HRO, 1660 P/1; 1661 PC 2; 1661 PC 4; TNA, PROB 11/280/411.

<sup>104</sup> WCA, 424.

It was the assistance to the New College fellows which was deemed unacceptable by Parliament. As mentioned above, Gilbert Coles was made a fellow of Winchester a week after being ejected from New and it was presumably Coles who Harris' anonymous biographer had in mind when discussing how the warden 'made Fellow of Winchester Colledge' one ejected from New.<sup>105</sup> This, according to the author, 'stomacht the Visitors most of all, and was frequently cast in his dish by those that envyed the happinesse' of the school, with a friend chiding the warden 'that that was an Act of boldnesse beyond prudence and such a one as might have actually brought the Visitation and Mildmay and [George] Marshall [warden of New Colledge and one of the commissioners for the Winchester visitation] upon them'.<sup>106</sup> Like Pledger, and like his own earlier speeches in the cathedral, Harris had made the mistake of demonstrating his royalist sympathies in a public and provocative way. By taking on ejected fellows from New College, Harris had publicly insulted the competency of Parliament and aligned himself with malignants, threatening to undermine the Commonwealth by filling his seminary of learning with enemies of the regime. The visitations he endured were a testament to the seriousness with which parliamentary authorities took dissent outside of a private setting.

In several ways, Harris' survival seems to be explicable within the conditions for dissent explored in the previous section. Like with the examples above, Harris was willing to comply with Parliament and accept their *de facto* authority, as demonstrated in his responses to the charges of the committee for Hampshire.<sup>107</sup> In his answers, the warden dealt

---

<sup>105</sup> WCA, 452.

<sup>106</sup> WCA, 452.

<sup>107</sup> That these charges are from the committee for Hampshire's visitation can be seen from a comment in WCA, 445: 'The first Visitation...See that Visitation on the Articles [*sic*]'. Also, Harris's comment in his letter to Lisle about the 'articles I was questioned upon 9 yeares agoe before the Committee for the Countie of Southampton' [WCA, 430]. The charges have sometimes been misdated to the CRU visitation [Kirby, *Annals*, pp. 339-340; Knighton, 'John Harris']. Leach correctly identified the articles with the county committee's

with the charge that he only served the times. Namely, that he had supported Laudian innovations when they were established and moved away from them when Laud fell. The wider implication of such criticism was that he was seen as a timeserver, meaning that his loyalty to the Parliament was therefore suspect. Harris, for his part, did not deny the accusation so much as embrace and make a virtue from it. In answering the charges that he had preached for corporal bowing at the name of Jesus and for Laudian ceremonies in general, he wrote:

These two I have confessed, desiring only that the time may be considered wherein I preached. W[hi]ch was while the Canons (Whereby those ceremonies are enjoined) stood established (as I thought) by law; for then I thought it my duetie as occasione forced to declare the lawfulness of them, and to take away all scruples that might trouble mie in the use of them<sup>108</sup>

Harris's answer emphatically shows that he would serve whatever authority was in power at the time. The canons were considered — 'I thought' — lawful because they stemmed from the governing authority of the time. Harris was duty bound to declare their lawfulness because they were proposed by the governing authority while any personal scruples he might have were unimportant. Like with the examples shown above, Harris' survival was conditional and had to be tacitly negotiated. As with Barrow and Busby, Harris was able to play the card of compliance and promised to recognise Parliament in a *de facto*, if not fervent manner, a condition which appears to have been frequently accepted by parliamentary authorities.

Harris would also be able to point to his academic value, satisfying another of Parliament's conditions. Harris was famous for his skills as a Greek scholar — 'so admirable

---

visitation [A.F. Leach, *A History of Winchester College* (London, 1899), p. 347] but does not discuss the CRU visitation and seems to conflate the two when discussing the role of Sir Henry Mildmay [ibid., pp. 348-9].

<sup>108</sup> WCA, 418.

a Grecian’, according to Anthony Wood — and his learning more widely.<sup>109</sup> A note at Winchester discussing Harris’s character made clear the extent of his scholarship and talent in a range of subjects. His ‘facultyes in Musique’ had enabled him to set the odes of Horace ‘to Musical Notes’; a talented orator, he could express himself well in both Latin and English. The author was keen to stress Harris’ abilities and what he perceived to be his association with leading academic centres. As the note continued, after his education at Winchester, ‘on [*sic*] of the best gram[m]ar schooles of Europe’, Harris had proceeded to New College, also described as ‘one of the best Colleges of the best University’. He had enjoyed a glittering career there, serving as junior proctor of the university and regius professor of Greek as well as the ‘Hebrae professor’ in New, ‘the College being as it were a private Academye [which] has all professo[r]s wthin it selfe’.<sup>110</sup> His scholarly credentials had enabled him to be elected master of Winchester in 1630; there, he proved an excellent pedagogue. One former student, Nicholas Floyd/Lloyd, dedicated a work of Latin and Greek translations in 1652 to Harris and the equally royalist school headmaster John Potenger, praising them as ‘Viri Colendissimi’, ‘Mecanates...novi’.<sup>111</sup> A new Maecenas was exactly the type of teacher Parliament wanted, and the services which Harris could offer in his role must have appealed to the parliamentarians and acted as a reason to keep him in place.

Alongside his scholarly credentials and willingness to work under Parliament, Harris was also able to keep most of his royalist activities covert. Although some of his activities attracted attention, many of his cavalier escapades took place behind closed doors.

---

<sup>109</sup> Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, iii, p. 455.

<sup>110</sup> WCA, 426.

<sup>111</sup> BL, Burney MS 127, ff. 1r, 2r. Potenger was remembered by his son as often discoursing ‘about the unhappy times, and lament[ing] the church’s, and king’s misfortune’ [J. Potenger, *Private Memoirs Never Before Published of John Potenger* (London, 1841), p. 26]. Potenger’s love of classics clearly was inherited by his son as shown in the latter’s letters, poems, and translations in Bodl., MS. Eng. poet. d. 161. For Floyd/Lloyd see, P. Life, ‘Nicholas Lloyd [Floyd]’, *ODNB*.

Throughout the later 1640s and 1650s the school made a string of donations to old cavaliers including four men who fought at Naseby and an old cavalier who had been grocer to the king.<sup>112</sup> Royalist charity indicated royalist sympathies but was still within the boundaries of acceptable behaviour, judging by the number of similar donations made by university colleges during the Commonwealth.<sup>113</sup> Nor was Winchester's status as a loyalist school necessarily a great risk for Harris, though its reputation was well-known. Old royalist families, such as that of Lord Capell, a royalist commander executed by Parliament in 1649, sent their sons to be educated in Winchester because, in the words of an anonymous biography of Harris, they wanted them to remain 'untainted w[i]th the Instructions of the Innovating Party.'<sup>114</sup> When the Capell sons left the school, they donated £20 which was later spent by the school on a silver cup made by a silversmith Richard Blackwell, who was noted for often working with royalist clients.<sup>115</sup> However, again, a reputation among royalist families was unlikely to worry CRU members or be seen as a great risk to the Commonwealth, especially given that other colleges, such as Oriel and Queen's at Oxford, seem to have enjoyed similar reputations.<sup>116</sup> Harris' general willingness to restrict his royalism to a quiet kind, to accept the authority of Parliament, and his use as a pedagogue were all credentials which satisfied parliamentary authorities, as seen above.

---

<sup>112</sup> Kirby, *Annals*, p. 336.

<sup>113</sup> Balliol CA, Bursar's Computi 3, Feast of St Luke 1651-July 7 1652, 'Minutae Expensae'; Clare CA, CCAD 2/1/1/3, Michaelmas 1652-Annunciation 1653, general expenses; Oriel CA, TF 1 A1/6, year ending Michaelmas 1651, expenses outside of college [to Scottish prisoners]; Trinity Cambridge CA, Senior Bursar's Audit Book, 1637-1659, 1653, f. 12r [to Scottish prisoners]; Trinity Hall CA, THAR/2/1/1/4/1, extraordinary expenses [to the king's servants].

<sup>114</sup> WCA, 447. Neither of the Capell brothers, Charles and Henry, appear to have proceeded to New College, perhaps because they believed it too parliamentarian under the wardenship of George Marshall. Charles, however, did make it to Oxford as a tourist. At an uncertain date, a friend of Charles Capell wrote to the New College fellow, Richard Witt, to say that Capell 'is now in Oxford' and 'will take it kindly if you keepe him company and shew him what's to be seene in the University' [Bodl., MS. Eng. hist. c. 5, f. 22r].

<sup>115</sup> R. Foster, 'The Capel Cup, 1652', in R. Foster (ed.), *50 Treasures from Winchester College* (London, 2019), p. 89. The Capell brothers also donated books to the library [WCA, Library Book of Donations, ff. 48-50].

<sup>116</sup> Worden, *Oxford*, p. 182.

Yet, it is also clear that Harris' survival was due to his exceptional number of allies. The aforementioned anonymous biography of Harris records how the warden and Potenger were 'hardly acquitted' in the first visitation and that Harris only survived ejection in the second by means of friends on the committee. In both cases, Harris had been immunised from removal by his wide range of contacts. As the biography mentioned, in the first visitation Potenger, and presumably Harris, were protected by the former's 'Interest in Mr Withers of Manidowne whose daughter hee had married'.<sup>117</sup> The Wither in question, William sr., was an influential committeeman for Parliament in Hampshire and, as well as the father-in-law of Potenger, was also related to one of the fellows of the college.<sup>118</sup> As discussed in chapter two, Harris possessed many useful contacts at Westminster and in Hampshire and it was their help which almost certainly protected him from ejection. Indeed, in 1654, a few years after the second visitation, Harris joined four erstwhile visitors of his school in a small local initiative to raise subscriptions for the repairing of Winchester Cathedral.<sup>119</sup> Although the various factors explored above must have played some role in preserving Harris, it is highly probable that the warden survived thanks to his connections. That he relied on his circle of friends highlights how much danger Harris had placed himself in by straying into public displays of dissent and how elements of his conduct were intolerable. Although many of his activities were sufficiently covert to be ignored, his sermons and helping of ejected fellows were viewed as suitable grounds for ejection. Harris' anxieties about a possible visitation towards the end of the 1650s, seen in various letters,

---

<sup>117</sup> WCA, 445.

<sup>118</sup> For the Wither family, see R.F. Bigg-Wither, *Materials for a History of the Wither Family* (Winchester, 1907). See also the will of William Wither sr. in which he left Potenger's son (his own grandson, John) £50 [HRO, 102A17/D1/1/1]. And see also HRO, TOP351/3/2 for a note concerning the marriage of John Potenger and Anne Wither.

<sup>119</sup> HRO, DC/E3/1/1.

only further shows his awareness of his own fortune and wish not to put his luck to the test a third time.<sup>120</sup>

If Harris illustrated parliamentary intolerance of public displays of defiance, three other case studies show a similar intolerance for threats to the regime's security. As mentioned above, much of Harris' activity avoided scrutiny because it was limited in scope and significance, such as charitable donations to cavaliers. However, parliamentary authorities were unable to overlook significant threats to the regime, as may be seen by examining the fates of three colleges given to the CRU in May 1651. The colleges of Sion, Manchester, and Gresham were suddenly added to the committee's responsibilities, the first addition for two years, at a time of great crisis for the republic.<sup>121</sup> The Parliament was awaiting the invasion of the Scottish forces under Charles II, a campaign which eventually culminated at the battle of Worcester in September 1651. The coming invasion raised the spectre of an English fifth column, with Presbyterian groups considering supporting 'their Scottish counterparts' ill-fated relationship' with the Stuarts due to their shared 'attachment to the Solemn League and Covenant'.<sup>122</sup> Although Gresham seems to have presented less of an obvious threat to the government, Sion and Manchester were associated with regional Presbyterian networks and it was this association which made them dangerous and led to the harsh treatment they received under the Rump.

---

<sup>120</sup> WCA, 415, 429. As he wrote to Nathaniel Fiennes, 'I feare there are some who have long had a designe not only to visit the persons of our college but to alter our statutes, and to put us into a model quite different from that wherein our ffounder left us' [WCA, 429].

<sup>121</sup> *CJ*, vi, p. 577.

<sup>122</sup> E. Vernon, *London Presbyterians and the British Revolutions, 1638-64* (Manchester, 2021), p. 225.

Sion was a serious cause for concern given its role in the powerful London Presbyterian network. Founded by Thomas White in February 1624 for the benefit of capital's clergy with an almshouse attached, the college had become an 'institutional stronghold of London presbyterianism' during the civil wars.<sup>123</sup> It had been nominated as the meeting place for the London Provincial Assembly in 1648 and became a shorthand for the Presbyterian interest in London.<sup>124</sup> As one pamphleteer wrote, Sion was the 'fountain originall from whence flowes all that [Presbyterian] rubbish, trash, and trumpery' in the city.<sup>125</sup> As the spectre of the Scottish invasion loomed, leading London Presbyterians increasingly came under the scrutiny of the anxious government. In September 1649, the ministers Thomas Jaggard, Christopher Love, and Peter Witham were hauled before the CPM accused of preaching against the government.<sup>126</sup> On 27 June 1650 the same committee questioned James Cranford, later president of Sion between 1653-5, and William Jenkyn for ignoring a day of public humiliation.<sup>127</sup>

Suspicion of the college was only exacerbated when London Presbyterians were implicated in pro-royalist plots. In March 1651 the republic's intelligence service had managed to arrest Thomas Coke, a royalist agent. Coke, under interrogation, had revealed a conspiracy network which included a number of London's more prominent presbyterian ministers, most famously the aforementioned Love.<sup>128</sup> The minister was a leading Presbyterian with close links to Sion: indeed, he had donated books to the college's library

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., p. 212. See also his 'The Sion College Conclave and London Presbyterians during the English Revolution' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1999) and P.J. Anderson, 'Sion College and the London Provincial Assembly, 1647-1660', *JEH*, 37:1, (1986) pp. 68-90.

<sup>124</sup> *A&O*, i, pp. 1188-1215. The Provincial Assembly had decided in June 1647 to meet at Sion College [LPL, Sion L40.2/E17, f. 6v].

<sup>125</sup> S.T., *A Thunder-Clap to Sion-Colledge...* (London, 1649), n.p.

<sup>126</sup> Vernon, 'Sion College', p. 337.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., p. 348.

<sup>128</sup> Worden *Rump*, pp. 243-8.

in 1646.<sup>129</sup> His involvement in anti-government plotting and subsequent execution not only drew attention to the loyalties of London's Presbyterian community, but to Sion itself. The decision of the Commons in May 1651 to refer the college to the CRU was a move driven by the wider threat to national security posed by the capital's Presbyterians and, as may be seen in the minute books of the college's governors, the government was determined to disrupt and intimidate the college. Parliament's first action with Sion came on 16 April 1651 when the Council of State ordered that Sion be used to quarter such soldiers as Colonel Barkstead who were sent for the safety of the city.<sup>130</sup> The soldiers clearly proved a nuisance since on 22 April, the college's governors 'thought fitt and agreed in respect' that the college's annual 'dynner appointed to have byne this day is put of by reason of the Souldiers quartering in the Colledge'.<sup>131</sup>

From the financial records of the college, it is clear that the unwelcome guests prevented any possibility of the college continuing as the heart of the Presbyterian community. College chambers were filled with soldiers, the 'fabrick' of Sion 'susteyned great damage' and 'the silver clasps that were on the great book of Benefacto[rs] to the Library' were stolen, likely by the new guests.<sup>132</sup> The soldiers also seem to have deliberately intimidated the college members including carrying off the unfortunate college clerk as a prisoner to Whitehall and then dispossessing him of his chamber.<sup>133</sup> Unsurprisingly given the presence of the soldiers and their actions, Sion ceased to function as a meeting point for potential fifth columnists, as the Rump had intended. The annual dinner on the college

---

<sup>129</sup> LPL, Sion L40.2/E64, f. 47.

<sup>130</sup> LMA, CLC/198/SICA/008/MS33445/001, f. 122; TNA, SP 25/65, f. 273.

<sup>131</sup> LMA, CLC/198/SICA/008/MS33445/001, f. 122.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 123, 127. Replacement clasps were acquired for £01.10.00 [LMA, CLC/198/SICB/001/MS33458, f. 123].

<sup>133</sup> LMA, CLC/198/SICA/008/MS33445/001, f. 124.

election day was discontinued for several years and eventually the Presbyterian network conceded defeat, deciding to find new meeting places for the London Provincial Assembly and eventually settling on the Presbyterian strongholds of St Anne, Blackfriars, and St Mary Aldermanbury.<sup>134</sup> The relocation symbolised the victory of the government over a threat to their security and it is hard to avoid the suspicion that they had intended to make an example out of Sion. The soldiers did not leave till the Protectorate, and even then the college was in a state of great disrepair with the governors complaining that there was ‘Not a lock or key or boulte scarce left about the house’.<sup>135</sup>

Like Sion, Manchester was given to the CRU because it posed a Presbyterian threat to the regime. To be more precise, since the college itself had been abolished in 1650, its former members were a threat to the regime. Although the college had been dissolved, the warden and several fellows had managed to retain roles as chaplains in the collegiate church and were leading members of an influential Presbyterian network.<sup>136</sup> Worryingly for the Rump Parliament, these chaplains also had connections to their denominational peers in London. Richard Heyrick, the college’s former warden, served as a moderator of the synod in Lancashire but he had also been a member of the Westminster Assembly and retained close links to leading London divines such as Thomas Case and Edmund Calamy, whom he had befriended while at the Merchant Taylors’ School.<sup>137</sup> In 1648 Heyrick would support his friends by writing *The Harmonious Consent* of the Lancashire ministers which supported the London ministers’ *Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ, and to Our Solemn League*

---

<sup>134</sup> For the dinners, LMA, CLC/198/SICB/001/MS33458, ff. 115, 120, 125, 130. For the move, LPL, Sion L40.2/E17, f. 111v; Vernon, ‘Sion College’, p. 372.

<sup>135</sup> E.H. Pearce, *Sion College and Library* (Cambridge, 1913), p. 115.

<sup>136</sup> F. R. Raines, *The Rectors of Manchester, and the Wardens of the Collegiate Church of That Town*, ed. J.E. Bailey, Chetham Society, new series, 5 (2 parts, Manchester, 1885), ii, p. 129.

<sup>137</sup> *An Account of the Wardens of Christ’s College Church, Manchester...* (London, 1773), pp. 14-15; Michael Mullett ‘Richard Heyrick’ *ODNB*; Raines, *The Rectors of Manchester*, pp. 122-39.

*and Covenant*.<sup>138</sup> His colleague, and fellow moderator of the Lancashire synod, Richard Hollinworth, had similarly warm relationships with Presbyterians in the capital: he helped the heresiographer Thomas Edwards compile his *Gangreana*; he used the London Presbyterian Luke Fawne as his publisher; and he even had Christopher Love write the introduction to one of his works.<sup>139</sup>

Manchester concerned the government because it was part of the same threat to the republic's future as Sion. The members had close links to their London brethren and posed their own regional problem for the regime in Spring 1651 due to the geography of Lancashire. Charles II intended to invade through Lancashire and travel down the Welsh borders. This was land traditionally pro-royalist and could offer Charles military support. Indeed, the earl of Derby, the erstwhile owner of the college buildings, would raise a force of Lancashire royalists before being defeated by Robert Lilburne at Wigan. Like at Sion, the college members had been public in their opposition to the regime and come to the attention of authorities on multiple occasions. For instance, Hollinworth and another of the chaplains, William Walker, had been cited before the Council of State in July 1650 for their preaching and been forced to promise to conduct themselves more peacefully in the future.<sup>140</sup> The Commons order of May 1651 signalled that the government was not willing to trust in the sincerity of the chaplain and unsurprisingly there are clear signs of a crackdown on the members: Hollinworth would be imprisoned following Worcester and Heyrick himself would be imprisoned in 1651 for his involvement in Christopher Love's plot.<sup>141</sup> In the

---

<sup>138</sup> Mullet, 'Heyrick'.

<sup>139</sup> C.W. Sutton, revised by R.C. Richardson: 'Richard Hollinworth', *ODNB*; F.R. Raines, *The Fellows of the Collegiate Church of Manchester*, ed. F. Renaud, Chetham Society, new series, 21 (2 parts, Manchester, 1891) i, pp. 145-6. I am very grateful to Elliot Vernon for his advice on this paragraph.

<sup>140</sup> Raines, *Fellows of Manchester*, i, p. 147.

<sup>141</sup> Mullet, 'Heyrick'; Sutton, 'Hollinworth'.

fraught circumstances of 1651, the public dissent of the Presbyterians and their association with the invading Scots was not only unwelcome but dangerous to the republic and it was this danger which the government attempted to quench.

If Manchester and Sion were under scrutiny in 1651 because of their Presbyterian connections, why was Gresham handled alongside them? At first glance, Gresham appears to have borne very little danger for the republic. Established by Sir Thomas Gresham, ‘that noble Maecenas and Patriot’, in the reign of Elizabeth, the college provided public lectures to the citizens of London, and was famed as a centre for learning, though its reputation had fallen in the years preceding the civil wars as its professorships became little more than gifts for court favourites.<sup>142</sup> The college, the professorships of which had been filled with those loyal to Parliament during the 1640s, did not appear on paper a danger to the regime.<sup>143</sup> Yet, there were reasons for the republic to be concerned with the potential problems Gresham could pose if it fell into the wrong hands. The public nature of the lectures meant they could possibly become incendiary or touch on sensitive matters, a pertinent issue in the febrile atmosphere of 1651. Alongside explosive speeches, Gresham also posed a possible military threat. Gresham during the Commonwealth held brass guns, fit for military service, which would be requisitioned for the navy in March 1652, carriages for guns, and even the tent of the lord mayor of London, the latter being requisitioned for Cromwell’s use during the

---

<sup>142</sup> For the decline in the college’s reputation, see I.R. Adamson, ‘The Administration of Gresham College and Its Fluctuating Fortunes as a Scientific Institution in the Seventeenth Century’, *History of Education*, 9.1 (1980), pp. 21-5. See also, HP, 30/4/28A-36B, 29B; *Sir Thomas Gresham His Ghost* ([London], 1647). For Gresham generally, see, I.R. Adamson, ‘The Foundation and Early History of Gresham College London, 1596-1704’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1976); F. Ames-Lewis (ed.), *Sir Thomas Gresham and Gresham College: Studies in the Intellectual History of London in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century* (Aldershot, 1999).

<sup>143</sup> For example, Joshua Crosse and Ralph Button both became Gresham professors in the 1640s and later played prominent roles in the visitation of Oxford [J. Ward, *The Lives of the Professors of Gresham College...* (London, 1740), p. 154]. For other Gresham professors during the period, see Ward’s *Lives* and the ODNB entries referenced in the bibliography.

Scottish expedition of 1650.<sup>144</sup> Unlike Manchester and Sion, Gresham did not present an active danger to the Commonwealth, but it did have the potential to be dangerous. Like with the other two colleges, it was this threat that prompted the government to take action.

The treatment of the three colleges showed the Commonwealth's prioritisation of its own security over other concerns, including the advancement of learning. All three institutions, to varying degrees, had the potential to act as centres of learning. Manchester and Sion both had reputable libraries, the latter being especially famous and utilised by scholars such as Thomas Fuller during the Interregnum.<sup>145</sup> Gresham was especially notable as a site of knowledge, praised by historians like Christopher Hill as the heart of London's intellectual community and envisaged by members of the Hartlib Circle as an important part of several reform schemes, including a university in London.<sup>146</sup> That the Rump's leading educational committee was given control of the colleges might be thought to be motivated by at least some type of concern with the educational potential of the institutions. However, there is precisely one reference to the CRU in records pertaining to all three colleges and on an administrative matter: in 1652, the governors of Gresham had a dispute with the committee over whether the professor of divinity, Thomas Horton, had forfeited his position by marrying.<sup>147</sup> The addition of the colleges to the committee's remit appears to have been a formality, a matter of ensuring the troublesome or potentially troublesome institutions had a specific parliamentary authority to watch over them, rather than driven by a desire to promote a new attitude to learning. As examined previously in this thesis, the

---

<sup>144</sup> TNA, SP 25/8, ff. 3, 6; SP, 25/66, f. 508; SP, 25/97, f. 236. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1650...*, ed. M.A.E. Green (London, 1876), pp. 247-8.

<sup>145</sup> W.B. Patterson, *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England's Religious Past* (Oxford, 2018), p. 186.

<sup>146</sup> C. Hill, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution – Revisited* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 15-76. HP, 47/9/16A-17B, 19A-B. See also the plan of William Petty for the reform of Gresham, C. Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-60* (New York, 1975), pp. 548-51.

<sup>147</sup> See chapter one, pp. 52-3.

Commonwealth government paid attention to education and attempted to promote it, but the evidence of the three colleges is a reminder that they were not pedagogical innovators. The examples also show the limits of the importance which the government attached to education. As the damage dealt to Sion suggests, in the pursuit of greater safety the government was willing to place the cause of education low in its priorities.

## Conclusion

Christopher Hill once described the universities as ‘crucial to seventeenth-century society’, as the places which ‘trained the opinion-formers, the persuaders’.<sup>148</sup> As seen throughout this thesis, contemporaries of the revolutionary period would have agreed with Hill’s words. Yet, there is remarkably little evidence of parliamentary authorities attempting to indoctrinate the ‘opinion-formers’ with Commonwealth opinions. Much literature in recent decades has pointed to the vivacity of republican culture during the Interregnum but the evidence from educational institutions offers an important check on too-enthusiastic interpretations. Although there was support for the republic, there is markedly little evidence of parliamentary authorities like the CRU promoting efforts to turn the universities or schools into republican seminaries. It was beyond the scope of this chapter to explore in detail why the government did not pursue such schemes but, as suggested above, several considerations mentioned previously in this thesis make explicable the lack of effort. The Rump’s rule of educational institutions was characterised by a desire to stabilise the places of learning after earlier disruptions, not to change them. It is easy to see why the government and college heads alike may have wished to avoid the turmoil which would follow an ideological remodelling of the universities, especially in institutions which had already been purged or visited by the Long Parliament.

This chapter’s particular focus on issues of loyalty and acquiescence to republican rule also developed some of the broader themes of this thesis concerning the experience of

---

<sup>148</sup> C. Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down, Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Harmondsworth, 1975; repr. Harmondsworth, 1991), p. 301.

Commonwealth rule in institutional contexts. It is common to think of the Rump's concern for allegiance as episodic and, like the Rump's rule more generally, as dominated by sudden bursts of activity amidst a general sea of inaction. Such a reading is especially tempting in discussions of ideology during the republic because of a focus on the Engagement and an understanding of such questions as a matter of infrequent tests. However, like in previous chapters, a focus on developments at an institutional level offered a different image of the period, showing a drip of continuous activity by parliamentary authorities and those inside places of learning. In this chapter, the decisions and acts of these groups showed how controversial issues to do with the relationship between subject and state were being considered regularly by individuals in a nuanced fashion, not concealed until brought back into the light by the occasional implementation of the Engagement. This chapter therefore further demonstrated the importance of looking beyond events at Westminster or the major flashpoints of the Rump to understand how republican rule was being implemented and experienced.

The examination of dissent and republicanism also allowed this chapter to examine further the interactions between scholars and parliamentary authorities. The issue of dissent especially brought students, college authorities, and committees into contact. An examination of what was happening inside the universities and schools undermines notions of intractable segregation and brings to the fore examples of compromise and pragmatism. Not all opposition to the regime was considered intolerable by parliamentary agents. Instead, it is clear that royalists and parliamentarians were able to establish a number of tacit conditions under which non-supporters of the regime could continue in their academic positions or even express some form of dissension to the Commonwealth. Disagreement with the republic voiced in a public setting and threats to the security of the regime were

considered unacceptable, but the handling of dissent again shows the degree to which life inside Commonwealth educational institutions was marked by the intermingling and cooperation of the different political and ecclesiastical factions. Having investigated what happened inside educational institutions, the next and final chapter of the thesis turns to the wider country as well as academic establishments to explore how developments occurring in the universities and schools were mirrored by propagation initiatives taking place outside them. As will be shown, the concerns with the advancement piety and learning which characterised the state's management of educational institutions were not only shared by those in schools and colleges but also by members of the general population and manifested in attempts to spread the Gospel.

## Chapter 6

### 'Promoting learning and piety in those poor rude and ignorant parts': Propagation and Education in Commonwealth England

Previously, this thesis has examined the relationship between Parliament and educational institutions. It was shown that in the Commonwealth there existed a broad consensus over the need to advance piety and learning. It was also argued that to understand the period of the Rump rule and the government, it is necessary to look at the localities as well as Westminster and to utilise evidence beyond the regime's legislative record. This chapter develops these points further through an examination of propagation, by which is meant attempts to expand the Christian community and expurgate any corrupting elements including anti-Christian ignorance. Like in earlier chapters, parliamentary and institutional agents are analysed but, more than previously, evidence from the wider nation is utilised. To make its points, this chapter is split into two sections. The first examines propagation schemes, and the importance of education within them, which were initiated at Westminster and in the localities. The second examines support for propagation schemes inside the universities.

Examining propagation in these different contexts continues this thesis' revision of the Rump Parliament by looking at its activities beyond its legislation. It also offers a new perspective on propagation, not least the integral role education played in it. Preconceptions about the Rump as a body apathetic to the radical cause of propagation can be tested by recovering evidence of the government's interest in, and concerns about, propagation. The role of the localities in evangelism, and the agency they possessed to create evangelical schemes, can also be demonstrated. The nature and context of propagation itself can be

revised more generally, to show that its famous association with radicalism can mask its popularity as an issue in the wider nation. Additionally, the traditional focus on the British context of evangelical projects can obscure the manner in which Protestant contemporaries understood propagation taking place in a much wider, international context as part of a global confessional conflict.

## I: ‘Trodden under foot’? The Rump, the Localities, and Propagation

This section focuses on the relationship between educational and propagation but looks at evidence predominantly from outside of the propagation acts. Such an approach is necessary to cast new light on a topic previously dominated by the legislative record of the Rump. A rich historiographical tradition has focused extensively on this body of evidence, including the famous acts for propagation in the four northern counties, Ireland, New England, and Wales.<sup>1</sup> Each of these acts has received attention and they dominate the historical treatment of the issue. One consequence of their predominance in accounts has been to see the Rump as only intermittently interested in propagation, occasionally passing individual acts, but failing to pass a general bill for propagation of the Gospel for the entire country. By contrast, as is discussed below, the New Model Army, and especially Oliver Cromwell, are seen as the real proponents of propagation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The seminal work on Puritan propagation is J.E.C. Hill, ‘Puritans and ‘the Dark Corners of the Land’’, *TRHS*, 5<sup>th</sup> series, 13 (1963), pp. 77-102. See also by the same author for more of a focus on propagation during the revolutionary period his ‘Propagating the Gospel’, in H.E. Bell & R.L. Ollard (eds), *Historical Essays 1600-1750 Presented to David Ogg* (London, 1963), pp. 35-59. An exciting new overview of propagation in Commonwealth has come in recent work by Jeremy Fradkin [‘Religious Toleration and Protestant Expansion in Revolutionary England, 1642-1658’ (D.Phil. thesis, John Hopkins University, 2019), esp. pp. 121-68]. For the Rump’s relationship in particular with propagation, see Blair Worden and David Underdown who emphasise the piecemeal and *ad hoc* nature of propagation work [Worden, *Rump*, pp. 120-1; Underdown, *Pride’s Purge*, pp. 272-4].

For Ireland, see T.C. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland: English Government and Reform in Ireland 1649-1660* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 96-8 and also pp. 186-212.

For New England, see W. Kellaway, *The New England Company, 1649-1776* (Glasgow, 1961), esp. pp. 1-40, 60-72, 81-92.

The excellent scholarship on revolutionary Wales has discussed the 1650 propagation act at length. The classic study is T. Richards, *A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales...* (London, 1920) which has been supplemented since by, for instance, A.M. Johnson, ‘Wales during the Commonwealth and Protectorate’, in D. Pennington & K. Thomas (eds), *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 233-56. Lloyd Bowen and Stephen Roberts have also cast new light on the propagation act in recent years: L. Bowen, ‘Oliver Cromwell (*alias* Williams) and Wales’, in P. Little (ed.), *Oliver Cromwell New Perspectives* (Basingstoke, 2009), esp. pp. 178-80; S.K. Roberts, ‘‘One of the least things in religion’’: The Welsh Experience of Church Polity, 1640-60’, in E. Vernon & H. Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 60-79.

For a summary of propagation legislation during the Rump see, W. Bidwell, ‘The Committees and Legislation of the Rump Parliament, 1648-1653: A Quantitative Study’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of Rochester, 1977), pp. 200-8.

Yet, although the propagation schemes were undoubtedly important, recent scholarship has begun to treat the Commonwealth as ‘an extraordinary evangelical moment’ filled with propagating activity which stretches beyond individual acts.<sup>2</sup> By analysing educational initiatives with an evangelical dimension, this section sits within this vein of scholarship and discusses some of the key motivations for propagation and the manner in which it was pursued, both in Westminster and the wider country. The importance of education to these projects is emphasised as is the agency of the localities. Also apparent is the correlation between parliamentary and local educational initiatives, reflecting how both stemmed from common contextual issues and concerns about heresy and the wider Commonwealth agreement about the need to promote piety and learning. Additionally, the Rump’s involvement in educational initiatives challenges the view mentioned above of a government whose interest in propagation was flickering at best.

To begin with, though, it is necessary to demonstrate that education and propagation were interlinked and explain why. That there was a close association between the two is evident from the four major propagation acts of the Commonwealth in Wales, the Northern Counties, Ireland, and New England. All four schemes, to some degree, were consciously designed to help with the foundation of new schools or places of higher education. The commissioners for propagation in Wales and northern England were noted for founding new free schools with 60 alone being created in Wales.<sup>3</sup> The act for propagation in Ireland was intended to improve the finances of Trinity College, Dublin, but also to help found a new

---

<sup>2</sup> Fradkin, ‘Religious Toleration and Protestant Expansion’, p. 145.

<sup>3</sup> Richards, *Wales*, p. 224. A.F. Leach, ‘Schools’, in W. Page (ed.), *Victoria History of the County of Durham* (London, 1905), i, pp. 365-414.

free school and second university in the city.<sup>4</sup> As with Britain so in New England the propagation scheme was explicitly designed to help create ‘Universities, Schools, and Nurseries of Literature’ which would complement the recent foundation of Harvard.<sup>5</sup>

The association between learning and education is explicable by analysing what contemporaries believed was the purpose of propagation. Patrick McGhee in a recent Cambridge doctoral thesis has offered an insightful analysis of the idea of the heathen and heathenism in the Protestant Atlantic world and shown how the concept ‘could describe the seemingly ignorant and unreformed peoples of rural and remote regions in Britain’.<sup>6</sup> Heathens were marked by their anti-Christian beliefs, practices, and, especially importantly for the purposes of this chapter, their ignorance of the true faith. Ignorance did not just mean an absence of knowledge, but also erroneous or mistaken belief. As an idea, the concept of the ‘heathen’ other was multivalent rather than monolithic and could be applied in different ways to a number of people and groups, including other Protestants. Nominal members of the Reformed faith could easily slip into heathenish habits without proper education or introspection. To many English Protestants, entire regions of Britain such as Wales, the northern counties, and Ireland seemed to be infested with heathenism due to the proliferation of Catholicism or the lack of an adequate preaching ministry owing to historical problems with parish divisions and funding. In 1628, the politician Sir Benjamin Rudyerd claimed that “there were some places in England, which were scarce in Christendom, where God was

---

<sup>4</sup> A&O, ii, pp. 355-7. For the act and education in Ireland more generally see also, Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp. 96-8, 186-212.

<sup>5</sup> A&O, ii, pp. 192-200. In 1650 the governance of Harvard was established on surer ground by the obtaining of a charter of incorporation from the General Court of Massachusetts [R. Geiger, *The History of American Higher Education: Learning and Culture from the Founding to World War II* (Princeton, 2014), p. 4].

<sup>6</sup> P.S. McGhee, ‘Heathenism’ in the Protestant Atlantic World, c. 1558-c. 1700’ (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2019), p. 10. See also, *ibid.*, pp. 113-56 for a discussion of the idea of the ‘Heathen’ in post-Reformation Britain.

little better knowne than amongst the Indians”.<sup>7</sup> As the seminal work of Christopher Hill on these ‘dark corners’ of the land illustrated, propagation could therefore take place in Britain among nominal Protestants as much as abroad.<sup>8</sup> The purpose of evangelism might therefore be understood as a fight against ignorant heathenism, driven by the desire to expand the true faith to new communities and safeguard existing Protestant groups from any corruption.

Education and the foundation of places of learning were therefore important in both an exclusionary and expansionist sense. The education of ministers which, as was shown earlier in this thesis, was an important purpose of educational institutions for contemporaries, served both purposes. In the context of evangelism, new places of learning had an obvious role to play, allowing a younger generation to be trained to replace earlier missionaries who could not only win new converts but also care for the existing flock. As Charles Chauncey, the president of Harvard College, explained, ‘if there should not be some supply by schools of learning, Gods people would soon be left *without a teaching ministry*’.<sup>9</sup> New educational institutions, seen so often in the propagation schemes, therefore helped to train the ministers who could proselytize and keep a vigilant watch over local communities.

The new universities or schools could also help create and maintain a godly community. Places of learning not only ensured children were raised in a form of approved Christian piety but learned the necessary customs and behaviours to be considered, in the terminology used at the time, civilised. As one leading missionary in New England wrote, for evangelisation to take place it was ‘absolutely necessary, to carry on civility with

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 154.

<sup>8</sup> Hill, ‘The Dark Corners of the Land’, pp. 77-102.

<sup>9</sup> C. Chauncey, *Gods Mercy Shewed to his People...* (Cambridge MA, 1655), p. 29.

religion'.<sup>10</sup> Appeals for funds for propagation in the New World frequently emphasised the connection between Christianity, education, and civility with the 1649 act for New England stating that evangelical efforts would fizzle out unless 'Universities, Schools, and Nurseries of Literature [are] settled for further instructing and civilizing them [the Native Americans]'.<sup>11</sup> Education's links with religion and civility explain why it was such an important part of spreading the gospel. Not only did it disseminate ideas, but it helped define the community around them, establishing education as a necessary characteristic of a godly community. A 1649 appeal for New England produced by the vice-chancellor and college heads of Oxford captured this point when it mentioned as proof of progress that some Native Americans were willing to place their children in the families of the colonial English and send them to grammar schools and universities.<sup>12</sup> The progress of these young people through the newly available institutions captured the importance of education in binding the community: orthodox religious and cultural ideas were disseminated, ignorance countered, and learning itself became a staple of what made up the society. If ever a member of the community faltered, a vigilant and educated minister would be on hand to correct them. Together, an educated community and their minister could maintain the true faith but also expand its boundaries.

Having established why education was important within propagation, it is noticeable how the Rump used educational initiatives with evangelical intentions. By looking beyond the government's legislative record into other activities, two case studies, both from 1652, emerge which allow the regime's relationship with propagation to be analysed: the transfer

---

<sup>10</sup> Quoted in, J. Fradkin, 'Protestant Unity and Anti-Catholicism: The Irenicism and Philo-Semitism of John Dury in Context', *JBS*, 56 (April 2017), p. 291.

<sup>11</sup> *A&O*, ii, pp. 197-200.

<sup>12</sup> [University of Oxford,] *To our Reverend Brethren the Ministers of the Gospel in England and Wales* (1649).

of books to Winchester College in May 1652 followed at the end of the year by the publication of John Owen's *Primer*, a work 'Approved and allowed by a committee of Parliament', on 6 December 1652.<sup>13</sup> At first glance, there is very little to link the two incidents. Owen's work was a book for small children, primers being a second step for children acquiring literacy, used 'after they have got some knowledge of their letters, and a smattering of some syllables and words in the horn-book'.<sup>14</sup> The works usually contained basic religious and literacy information such as the alphabet, the Ten Commandments, and a catechism — a far cry in difficulty from the books being given to Winchester College.<sup>15</sup> The texts received by the school were from the collections of Winchester Cathedral, the library of which had been seized following the abolition of dean and chapter lands and moved to London.<sup>16</sup> The Commons decision in May 1652 to give the volumes to Winchester College therefore gave the school works which had been intended for the use of the local clergy and, as a recent study has shown, were up to date on the latest theological controversies affecting Europe.<sup>17</sup>

However, although the two cases seem different, both reflected long-running fears about the consequences of heretical ignorance and misinformation. The religious and

---

<sup>13</sup> For Owen's primer, J. Owen, *The Primer: Or, an Easie Way to Teach Children the True Reading of English with a Necessary Catechisme...* (London, 1652), title page; *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers: From 1640-1708 A.D.* (3 vols, London, 1913-14), i, p. 406. For Winchester's books, *CJ*, vii, p. 136. For the delivery of the books to Winchester College, see, R. Foster, 'Winchester Cathedral Library, 1642-1669', (unpublished paper); T.F. Kirby *Annals of Winchester College, from Its Foundation in the Year 1382 to the Present Time* (London, 1892), p. 345. See also, WCA, Library Book of Donations, ff. 53-7.

<sup>14</sup> C. Hoole, *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole...* (London, 1661), p. 20.

<sup>15</sup> For primers, catechisms, and religious instruction for children more widely see, I. Green, *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England c.1530- 1740* (Oxford, 1996); P. Tudor, 'Religious Instruction for Children and Adolescents in the Early English Reformation', *JEH*, 35:3 (1984), pp. 391-413; F. Watson, *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice* (Cambridge, 1908), esp. pp. 69-85. See also, E.D. Holley, 'The English Bible and English Primary Education in the Tudor and Stuart Periods' (Ph.D. thesis, Florida State University, 1998), esp. pp. 90-124.

<sup>16</sup> Foster, 'Winchester Cathedral Library'.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

pedagogical importance of primers, given the age of the intended readers, was vast. Yet, following the collapse of censorship in the early 1640s, the numbers of catechisms had skyrocketed, with the prominent London Independent minister, Philip Nye, stating in 1660 that there were ‘no less than five hundred several Catechisms extant’.<sup>18</sup> But the number of new catechisms was of less concern to many than their often-unorthodox nature, contributing to the Commonwealth fears about the spread of heterodoxy and undermining of orthodox thought. Catechisms from Episcopalians, Baptists, and Socinians all enjoyed a wide dissemination or notoriety in the 1640s and 1650s to the discomfort of many in government.<sup>19</sup> As the Socinian John Biddle warned readers of his *Twofold Catechism* in 1654, they would ‘readest things quite contrary to the doctrines that pass currant amongst the generality of Christians’.<sup>20</sup>

Parliamentary fears over the potential effect of such heretical or untrustworthy works on impressionable minds was reflected by their long-running concern over the matter. In November 1650 they ordered that the CRU consider the primers, ‘the new one now presented, and the old ones; and how the old ones may be suppressed’.<sup>21</sup> The work under discussion is unknown and no action seems to have been taken immediately. Instead, it was nearly a year before the Commons resolved that ‘all Primers, formerly used in the Time of Kingship in this Nation, be suppressed; and shall from henceforth be no further used in any School, either publick or private’.<sup>22</sup> Owen’s work in this context seems to be the result of

---

<sup>18</sup> Green, *Christian’s ABC*, p. 45.

<sup>19</sup> For example, the frequently reprinted catechism of the episcopalian Henry Hammond [S. Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 124] and a 1652 Baptist work [H. Jessey, *A Catechisme for Babes or Little Ones...* (London, 1652)]. The reprinting of a Socinian catechism, *The Racovian Catechism*, in 1652 caused an enormous stir, including a Commons investigation [CJ, vii, p. 86].

<sup>20</sup> J. Biddle, *A Twofold Catechism...* (London, 1654).

<sup>21</sup> CJ, vi, p. 494.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 609.

this long-running concern with the issue of primers and a sign of the issue's significance. Owen, as Oxford's vice-chancellor and dean of Christ Church, was a figure of great importance in Commonwealth politics. His name, and the endorsement of the primer by an unknown parliamentary committee, point to a desire to set the text apart from the crowd of heretical or misleading primers then in existence. Coming two years after the Commons resolution that primers be considered, the publication of Owen's work also illustrates how continuously held, if not acted upon, concerns about learning and heresy were during the Rump.

This point is also evident in the case of Winchester's books. Like the primer, the vote in 1652 was the culmination of long-standing worries about heresy in the area and the consequences of ignorance. Several years previously, in March 1650, an act for propagation and better maintenance of ministers in the city was discussed by the Commons.<sup>23</sup> There was likely a specific contextual reason for the discussion as only a few months prior to the discussion the city and neighbouring countryside had been rocked by a notorious case of heresy. In late 1649, a self-proclaimed messiah, William Franklin, had left his work as a rope-maker in London and travelled to the town of Andover.<sup>24</sup> There, with the help of his companion Mary Gadbury, he managed to draw a number of followers, including a parish minister, and created a significant stir in Hampshire. The result was a moral panic, the crackdown of the local authorities, and then a detailed pamphlet of the whole affair by a minister of Winchester Cathedral, Humphrey Ellis.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 383.

<sup>24</sup> A.M. Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649-1689* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 56-60.

<sup>25</sup> H. Ellis, *Pseudochristus, a True and Faithful Relation of the Grand Impostures Acted by William Frankelin and Mary Gadbury...* (London, 1650).

Winchester was beset by problems of heresy stemming from misinformation and ignorance. A key aspect of Franklin and his supporters, emphasised by Ellis, was their lack of learning. Franklin was a rope-maker by trade and, in Ellis's eyes, 'very ignorant' in the 'Principles' of religion.<sup>26</sup> Nor were his supporters, bar one local minister, any better-educated. Any propagation act for Winchester would have been intended to battle the same credulous ignorance which had created the '*Pseudochristus*' and his disciples. In this context, the passage of books to Winchester College appears less an act of benevolence than conditioned by the same fears which had led to the discussion of a propagation act in 1650. In a region where fears about the effects of anti-Christian behaviour and unlearned religiosity had prompted debates about a propagation act, a collection of learned books, up to date on recent heresies, were now being returned. There were also links of personnel between the two incidents. Humphrey Ellis, who had produced the definitive account of Franklin, was not only a neighbour of the school and friends with the warden, John Harris, but helped evaluate the cathedral books before they came to Winchester.<sup>27</sup> Like with the primer, the transfer of books to Winchester reveals that there were concerns about heresy and learning running over a number of years connecting seemingly disparate events.

The books and the primer imply a parliamentary attitude to education in relation to propagation. As mentioned above, the purpose of propagation might be thought of as two-fold: to expand the Christian community, but also to define it. Both of these aspects are

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>27</sup> See, for Ellis evaluating the books and being a neighbour of the college (living in Winchester Cathedral close), *Documents Relating to the History of the Cathedral Church of Winchester in the Seventeenth Century*, eds W.R.W. Stephens and F.T. Madge (Winchester, 1897), pp. 71, 83. For Harris and Ellis knowing one another, WCA, 425, and see chapter two, pp. 113-14.

evident in the two case studies and help the historians understand how the Rump thought the godly society ought to be separated from the ungodly. As the texts indicate, one crucial component of the propagated community would be their learning. This point is implicit in the transfer of the books to Winchester College but can be shown particularly through the example of primer. The primer was one example of parliamentary efforts throughout both the 1640s and 1650s to create a body of authorised religious texts, such as the decision to make Francis Rous' translation of the psalms the only legal psalmody or efforts in 1652 to produce a new English version of the Bible and vet new translations.<sup>28</sup> The primer in this context was one example of an interest in creating a canon of authorised knowledge. In turn, an authorised body of knowledge suggests a wider interest in using learning as a tool to define the community.

How learning would function in this way is suggested by the content of the text and its marked lack of novelty. As with other works in the genre, Owen's primer included materials for improving literacy such as an alphabet, Roman and Arabic numerals, and religious texts and prayers. Bernard Capp has noted a small act of republican removal — the absence of any mention of royalty from the work — but bar that it is a traditional document.<sup>29</sup> The catechism within the primer was very similar to both Owen's own short catechism of 1645 and the 1647 version of the Westminster Assembly.<sup>30</sup> The lack of novelty in the primer, however, is itself revealing. As throughout this thesis, developments inside places of learning were deeply traditional and largely a matter of affirming existing practices in the

---

<sup>28</sup> For the psalmody, C. Burrow, 'Francis Rous', *ODNB*. For the Bible translations, *CJ*, vii, pp. 245, 264; TNA, SP 18/26, ff. 199r-200r.

<sup>29</sup> B. Capp, *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its enemies in the Interregnum 1649-60* (Oxford, 2012), p. 17. See also, C. Gribben, *John Owen and English Puritanism: Experiences of Defeat* (Oxford, 2016), p. 141.

<sup>30</sup> *The Grounds and Principles of Religion, Contained in a Shorter Catechism...of the Assembly of Divines...* (London, 1646); J. Owen, *The Principles of the Doctrine of Christ...* (London, 1645).

face of radical challenges. Educational content was important, but largely a matter of enforcing what was already being taught and finding areas of agreement around basic theological tenets. The primer mirrors these institutional processes and suggests a similar conclusion but for the wider nation. Whereas events inside the universities indicated a Commonwealth trend of defining the ministry by their education, the primer suggests a desire to define the Christian community by their learning. As in the ministry, the content mattered in so far as it was agreed what was necessary for people to know — at one level a university education; at another, the use of an approved educational text. The emphasis was not on the particulars of what people knew, but that they were passing through some form of education which could be measured as orthodox. The same was evident in the passage of the Cathedral books to Winchester. There was no government direction about what books went to the library — the college seems to have had a free choice about what books it took — because it was the learning the books represented rather than their content which mattered in the expansionary and exclusionary aspects of propagation.<sup>31</sup>

The two case studies also demonstrated Parliament's desire to ensure a wide dissemination of the educational tools. At Winchester, where Parliament's order had specified that the Cathedral's books were to be available 'for publick Use', it appears the books were open to at least some of the local population.<sup>32</sup> As Richard Foster has demonstrated, a markedly higher number of benefactors with no links to the school donated to the library during the Interregnum than before it, strongly suggesting that the Parliament's order had been taken seriously and that the books were being used by more than just college

---

<sup>31</sup> Foster, 'Winchester Cathedral Library'.

<sup>32</sup> *CJ*, vii, p. 136.

members.<sup>33</sup> The primer's catechism, similarly, seems to have been intended to reach as many people as possible. The clergy were the most obvious catechising group, but for such a simple text it was also likely that parents were supposed to teach their own children. Owen himself had encouraged parents to 'instruct your families in' his 1645 'lesser' catechism designed for children which was similar in content to the primer.<sup>34</sup> The relative brevity and simplicity of the text was a choice — in the sixteenth century, the Norfolk cleric Thomas Becon had produced a catechism for his five-year-old son which ran to more than 271 folio pages — and one which appears a clever solution, giving laypeople the tools to help themselves and so ensuring the work's dissemination.<sup>35</sup> At a time when Welsh parliamentarians were investing great effort in the wide distribution of Welsh language Bibles, questions about how to ensure evangelical literature had a wide reach appear to have been current.<sup>36</sup> The imprimatur of Parliament was a means to ensure the text stood out from others, but the content itself meant the text could be used widely, with or without the guidance of a minister.

The fate of the schemes is also instructive. Given the limited ambition of the book transfer, it is unsurprising that Winchester seems to have received its volumes smoothly. Owen's project, however, was an abject failure never becoming a standard text and not being included in the bookseller William London's 1658 catalogue of vendible books despite the inclusion of a several other works by the same author.<sup>37</sup> The primer, designed for small children, even suffered the ignominy of being mocked in royalist satire as requiring an 'explanation of some obscure passages' by a made-up work: '*Plus vident oculi, quam*

---

<sup>33</sup> Foster, 'Winchester Cathedral Library'.

<sup>34</sup> Owen, *Principles of the Doctrine of Christ*, prefatory epistle.

<sup>35</sup> Tudor, 'Religious Instruction', p. 394.

<sup>36</sup> Hill, 'Propagating the Gospel', p. 47.

<sup>37</sup> W. London, *A Catalogue of the Most Vendible Books in England...* (London, 1658).

*oculis...by Dr. Stanton*'.<sup>38</sup> However, although it failed, the primer still reveals a great deal about the attitude of the Rump to propagation. It shows that the government had consistent concerns about the spread of heresy and its relation to ignorance and wanted to counter both with the wide dissemination of godly learning, especially knowledge which could be considered officially approved such as the primer. The primer does not show that the government were more or less successful than previously thought in their propagation work, but the issue of failure can overshadow the equally important question of how the regime approached the issue of evangelism. A study of their attitude to learning suggests that their inconsistent legislative attitude was not due to a lack of consistent concern with propagation, as might be expected, but rather the inability of the Parliament to translate their widely shared attitudes towards learning and propagation into successful action.

Outside of Westminster, it is evident that some local populations shared the government's sentiments about evangelism through education. This trend can be examined through two schemes which emerged during the Commonwealth. Both originated in local communities in northern England and both were designed to further propagation through education in areas deemed to have problems with the adequate provision of religious education. The first scheme emerged in Manchester. The collegiate church of Manchester Cathedral was in a ruinous state by 1649, looking 'like a dunghill' after the civil wars according to a local dignitary, Humphrey Chetham.<sup>39</sup> Chetham was the leader of an effort to create a charity school and library on the college grounds to serve local children and ministers.<sup>40</sup> The second scheme was similarly rooted in a local population, this time it was

---

<sup>38</sup> J. Birkenhead, *Two Centuries of Pauls Church-Yard...* (London, 1653), p. 47.

<sup>39</sup> Chetham Library, Allen Deeds E.2.7 Parcel N no. 302. For a history of the college, see C. Hartwell, *The History and Architecture of Chetham's School and Library* (New Haven, 2004). For a history of Chetham's Library, see M. Yeo, *The Acquisition of Books by Chetham's Library, 1655-1700* (Leiden, 2011).

<sup>40</sup> Hartwell, *Chetham's School and Library*, p. 55.

the citizens of Durham who presented a petition to Parliament in 1650 calling for the foundation of a university in the city.<sup>41</sup> Durham and Manchester are both indications that it was not only Parliament who could undertake propagation schemes involving education in the period. The localities are not often incorporated into discussions of propagation because it is assumed that members of the public lacked the agency to form and execute such schemes. However, while this is true of legislation, it is untrue of educational projects which, as in the case of the two cities, could be initiated outside of Parliament.

Although these schemes did not emerge in Westminster, they were comparable to Parliament's own educational projects. Manchester and Durham were conceived as tools for evangelism by disseminating godly knowledge. Like in New England, the construction of institutions like Durham was perceived by its supporters as a means to spread Christian civility. As one leading supporter of the scheme, Oliver Cromwell, described the possible foundation in a letter to the speaker of the Commons, the university would be a means for the 'promoting of learning and piety in those poor rude and ignorant parts'.<sup>42</sup> Also like in New England, Manchester and Durham were intended not only to spread godly knowledge, but also to help local missionaries. Manchester as a school would only introduce its students to the basic tenets of Christian learning, but its associated public library was intended by Chetham to be a resource for the local ministry — among others — and the executors of his will carefully assembled a collection which could benefit them.<sup>43</sup> One early benefactor to the library, John Prestwich, a fellow of All Souls renowned as a 'notable punner',

---

<sup>41</sup> W. Dumble, 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs in Durham During the Civil War and Interregnum' (Ph.D. thesis, Durham University, 1978), pp. 301-2.

<sup>42</sup> *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, ed. T. Carlyle (4 vols, Leipzig, 1861), iii, p. 53. The idea of a university being founded in Durham was first discussed in the Commons in May 1650 and then again in June 1651, though nothing more was done before the dissolution of the Rump. [*CJ*, vi, pp. 410, 589-90].

<sup>43</sup> Yeo, *Chetham Library*, p. 75.

approvingly wrote to Chetham's trustees that he admired them as 'lovers of religion in the first place, and learning in the second'.<sup>44</sup>

The citizens of Durham believed that a new university would provide even more extensive help for the local ministry. As is implicit in a petition published in 1652, the proponents of the university scheme had the same belief as Charles Chauncy that the foundation would help create a new generation of ministers. The petitioners argued that the 'Laudable and Pious work' would allow many native students who could not afford to travel to the south for their degrees to gain an education. Although the inhabitants of Durham did not say it explicitly, it is clear that the 'Learned Persons' to be educated included prospective ministers. As the petition had sadly noted, many of those who had travelled south for the universities in the past seldom returned from the rich livings of the south unless they were lucky enough to receive the 'lucre of some great Preferment'.<sup>45</sup> With their concern for the training of ministers, Chetham's desire to create a resource for the ministry, and the wish of both to create centres of learning to disseminate godly education, the two local projects strongly resemble the use of education by the Parliament to promote propagation. The similarities between what the Rump was doing and the ideas about education evident in their schemes and the actions in the localities are striking and reminiscent of the correlation in education reform between government and educational institution analysed earlier in this thesis. As was the case there, the similarities do not seem to suggest a top-down or ground-up phenomenon so much as efforts based on common ideals concerning learning and stemming from common contextual pressures.

---

<sup>44</sup> Bodl., MS Wood, E. 32, f. 16r; Chetham Library, CPP/2/134.

<sup>45</sup> *The Humble Desires of the Gentlemen, Free-holders, and Inhabitants, of the County and City of Durham, and Other of the Northerne Counties, for Founding a Colledge at Durham...* (London, 1652).

The stimulus for the local schemes, like the parliamentary acts, had been fears about heresy or the lack of adequate preaching ministry in the local area. As seen above, the transfer of books to Winchester Cathedral and the creation of an official primer both represented efforts to counter perceived heterodoxy through a remedial action based on the promulgation of godly knowledge. In the case of Winchester this was a regional problem with heterodoxy, in the case of the primer one of genre. As in those cases, the creations of Manchester and Durham both seem to have had problems lurking in the background which would have influenced attitudes to propagation. The inclusion of County Durham in the act for propagation in the four northern counties reflected the historic problems with providing for an adequate preaching ministry and fears about the spread of heresy in the region.

Manchester's difficulties with preaching were less obvious and more recent in nature, judging by a small piece of evidence held in Chetham Library. This document, a petition from some of the local population in Manchester in early 1652 to the CRU, complained that in the challenging circumstances following the abolition of the Cathedral dean and chapter, they had been forced to maintain ministers at 'ten severall places of publique meetinge' at their own cost and only through vast personal expense had the region not been left bereft of a preaching ministry.<sup>46</sup> Manchester was no more immune to the outbreak of heresy in England than any other region. Indeed, the same winter as the CRU petition was produced, the former members of the collegiate church, including some of the trustees of Chetham's library, worriedly wrote to one another about the 'springing leprosie' of 'error' in the 'contagious times' in which they lived with a new 'Anabaptisticall

---

<sup>46</sup> Chetham Library, CPP/2/125.

Catechism' circulating in the region.<sup>47</sup> Like in Durham, Manchester had problems with both the provision of preaching and unorthodox thought. In both cases, education emerged as the chosen response.

The similarity of response suggests that propagation was more popular in Commonwealth Britain than previously thought. The pursuit of propagation is often associated by historians with a particular part of the parliamentary alliance — the more radical godly led by Cromwell and including the New Model Army. The idea that Cromwell and the army were the guardians of evangelism was one of which Cromwell himself was particularly fond. In Cromwell's eyes the Rump was a time when 'that Business [propagation] was trodden under foot'. By dissolving the Rump, he had rescued the cause of propagating 'which, I must confess for my own part, I set myself upon', from the damaging negligence and dislike of the Commonwealth government.<sup>48</sup> The evidence from legislation seems to support Cromwell's argument. Acts such as propagation in Ireland and Wales were the result of lobbying by Cromwellian allies such as John Owen and the same nexus of officers, ministers, and MPs pressured the Parliament towards the end of its life to pass a general act for propagation through means such as petitions and sermons.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> F.R. Raines *The Fellows of the Collegiate Church of Manchester*, ed. F. Renaud, Chetham Society, new series, 21 (2 parts, Manchester, 1891), i, p. 153.

<sup>48</sup> *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, iii, p. 153.

<sup>49</sup> For Cromwell and his allies' involvement in the act for Ireland, see Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp. 96-8. For a sermon urging Parliament to take up propagation by a leading ally of Cromwell, see J. Owen, *A Sermon Preached to the Parliament, Octob. 13. 1652* (London, 1652), esp. pp. 28, 36-7.

For the army petition to Parliament in August 1652, including the demand for 'speedy and effectuall meanes' to 'be used for the propagation of the Gospel', see E. Whalley *et al.*, *The Humble Petition of the Officers of the Army...* (London, 1652). See also *CJ*, vii, pp. 164-5; S.R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1656*, (4 vols, 1897-1903) ii, 1651-1653, pp. 221-7; Worden, *Rump*, pp. 306-10.

However, the evidence from outside legislation challenges this characterisation of propagation's radical status. The willingness of local populations and the government to pursue the aforementioned educational schemes suggests more interest in evangelism in the Commonwealth than is often thought. Durham and Manchester have been highlighted in these chapter, but there were many other demands for new educational institutions throughout the revolutionary period such as calls for a place of higher learning in Wales or 'some Public Schools' in Lincoln.<sup>50</sup> The calls for new institutions and initiatives by the government and local populations suggest that propagation was not necessarily a radical demand, but a popular one, a suggestion further corroborated by the popularity of fundraising campaigns for propagation in New England. The scheme relied to a great degree on popular subscription campaigns which proved wildly successful and raised enormous sums, close to £16,000 from 1649-60, reflecting enthusiasm for propagation activity in general and for New England evangelism in particular.<sup>51</sup> As evidence from the time of the collections shows, donations came from all levels of society including ministers from Cheshire 'taken with the design' and academic institutions such as Winchester College, which gave £5 in late 1652 'ad propagationem Evangelii in nova Anglia'.<sup>52</sup> Alongside their popularity, a common element in the above-mentioned examples was the importance of education. As was also seen in previous chapters, fear of radicalism stimulated comparable actions by parliamentary and institutional bodies in places of learning. The widespread support for educational schemes to promote propagation was a response to many of the same

---

<sup>50</sup> Richards, *Wales*, p. 233; W.A.L. Vincent, *The State and School Education, 1640-1660, in England and Wales: A Survey Based on Printed Sources* (London, 1950), p. 32; Yeo, *Chetham's Library*, p. 15.

<sup>51</sup> Kellaway, *New England Company*, p. 36. A previous estimate put the money collected by voluntary subscription at £11, 430 [*History of the New England Company, From Its Incorporation in the Seventeenth Century, to the Present Time...* (London, 1871), p. 2].

<sup>52</sup> Kellaway, *New England Company*, p. 29. WCA, Bursar's Book, 1644-1671, September 1652-September 1653, 'Custus Necessariorum cum Donis'.

fears and appears to be more evidence of a Commonwealth turn to learning manifesting in similar responses at both the level of government and locality.

As also seen in the previous chapter, it was not the content of what was being taught which mattered. All the major propagation acts described the type of teaching which would take place in platitudinous terms which lacked any detail about the curriculum which would be enforced. A certificate from the University of Oxford supporting propagation in New England spoke of how the establishment of schools and universities would ‘*put into their* [the local population’s] *hand[s]*’ a ‘Key of knowledge’ but what that knowledge entailed is unspecified.<sup>53</sup> In practice, most of the new academic institutions or attempts to advance learning were rudimentary or traditional. The free schools founded in Wales and the northern counties offered a basic literacy and Christian education while the schemes of Chetham School and Durham University were more about the spread of ‘Learned Persons’ than disseminating a particular type of knowledge. Humphrey Chetham’s accounts show that the main tools for the education of the schoolboys of his foundation were to be ‘Scotch Primers’, as befitted his own Presbyterian loyalties, and other rudimentary texts such as New Testaments and works to improve their Latin grammar.<sup>54</sup> The propagation schemes emphasised the importance of being formally educated and passing through an institution — and a concern with an approved knowledge via institution, imprimatur, or godly literature — but did not represent a new propagation curriculum. This lack of novelty contributed to the comparable nature of the schemes and their popularity, drawing as it did on un-divisive ideas about the importance of schools and universities in a Christian community.

---

<sup>53</sup> [Oxford], *To our Reverend Brethren*.

<sup>54</sup> F.R. Raines & C.W. Sutton, *Life of Humphrey Chetham, Founder of the Chetham Hospital and Library, Manchester*, Chetham Society, new series, 49-50 (2 vols, Manchester, 1903), i, p. 198. See also, *ibid.*, pp. 198-201.

Educational initiatives do not only show the popularity of propagation but illustrate the continuity within it. Because propagation is usually defined by legislation and set in the unstable context of Westminster politics, it is depicted as a patchy narrative characterised by bouts of interest rather than sustained attention. Yet, the examples used in this section nuance this reading. The Durham petitioners pursued a university for years; the primer and books of Winchester Cathedral were both stories which only reached a conclusion after an extended period of time. Chetham's school and library had to overcome numerous setbacks, including the obstruction of a leading local committeeman and dignitary, Thomas Birch before opening its doors.<sup>55</sup> It was not until after Chetham's death in 1653 that the executors of his will were able to purchase the property and establish the school and library.<sup>56</sup> Although in the case of Manchester and the other examples there are interludes between the bouts of activity, they reveal a continuous interest in the matter based on ideas about the purpose of propagation. In all cases, the belief that propagation involved a battle against antichristian ignorance was manifested, as was the idea that education was a remedy which could be applied, and these notions remained consistent throughout the Commonwealth.

Rather than offering a new propagation curriculum or representing a new propagating enthusiasm, the novelty of the initiatives perhaps lay in the context of the post-episcopal church. As was the case with the augmentations of college heads, the abolition of deans and chapters had created the possibility of funds and sites for new institutions,

---

<sup>55</sup> J. Booker, *The History of the Ancient Chapel of Birch, in Manchester Parish...*, Chetham Society, 47 (1859), pp. 92-3, 145-6; Chetham Library, CPP/2/99; Hartwell, *Chetham's School and Library*, pp. 55-6, 59, 61-5. For Birch see also, David Whitehead 'Thomas Birch', *ODNB*. Birch may have had ulterior motives as the buildings ended up in the hands of his client, the Independent minister John Wigan.

<sup>56</sup> Hartwell, *Chetham's School and Library*, pp. 61-5.

opportunities eagerly seized by the proponents of educational initiatives. Chetham's foundation and Durham university were both to be founded using land and buildings owned by the dispossessed episcopal authorities. Winchester, too, had profited from the recycling of church possessions when it received the cathedral's books. The educational initiatives represented a local variation of this wider phenomenon in which the collapse of the Caroline church presented materials for new works and projects. It was in this new context that existing propagation ambitions could take place, rather than the initiatives being engendered by creation of the republic. As early as 1646, the minister John Owen had told Parliament 'Doth not Wales cry, the North cry, yea and the West cry "come and help us"'.<sup>57</sup> It is surely more than a coincidence that all three of these areas were soon having new educational institutions established or discussed. The urge to propagate preceded the Commonwealth and the civil wars and although Parliament's victory likely increased fervour, it was the possibilities victory created, such as the sudden appearance of new materials, which was the real novelty. It was to the ruins of episcopacy which proponents of the new schemes looked and which presented new opportunities for propagation.

There was great interest in propagation during the Commonwealth but there are significant problems with depicting it as a new spirit unleashed in the wake of the Regicide. As seen by looking at evidence from outside of legislation, there was enormous support for propagation around the country — reflecting its aspects of continuity and consensus — including in the localities where communities were able to pursue evangelical goals. The decentralised aspect of propagation is a reminder of the conflicting approaches to the management of the church during the Commonwealth mentioned previously in this thesis.

---

<sup>57</sup> Hill, 'Propagating the Gospel', p. 39.

As was seen in chapter one, a potential reason why the CRU was dissolved was because it represented a centralised approach to the administration of the church and the ministry which was supplanted by a devolved method associated with the magisterial Independents and which eventually resulted in the Cromwellian settlement. However, although Commonwealth evangelism was often determined outside London, the government's involvement in various initiatives should not be overlooked and an awareness of that challenges the characterisation of propagation as 'trodden under foot' during the period. As the next section demonstrates, the geographical context of propagation in the Commonwealth must also be revised.

## II: Universities, Greek Clergymen, and Propagation Beyond Britain

Having examined attitudes to British propagation projects through parliamentary and local initiatives, this chapter now investigates British attitudes inside the universities to foreign propagation projects. Such an analysis may seem counterintuitive as historiography tends to approach propagation in Britain, with good reason, in fairly isolationist terms. As Jeremy Fradkin has recently stressed, propagation was a duty of the godly magistrate.<sup>58</sup> Although all Christians had a duty to propagate, it was the magistrate who was supposed to oversee efforts which would have to be limited, generally, to those areas under their jurisdiction. If historians of propagation have emphasised its local focus in theory, so too have those working on it in practice. As important studies, such as Stephen Roberts' work on *Interregnum Wales*, have demonstrated, individual propagation acts were often rooted in local concerns and pressures.<sup>59</sup> However, by continuing this chapter's focus on education and propagation using evidence from outside legislation three distinct but connected themes emerge which challenge the emphasis on the local context: the sense of an international pan-Protestant identity, the importance of anti-Catholicism, and interest in foreign propagation. These elements show that Commonwealth attitudes to propagation were not limited to Britain, but rather must be understood in a much wider global context.

The case of Hierotheos Abbatios is especially useful for illustrating interest in evangelism beyond Britain. Abbatios was a Greek Orthodox clergyman who came to Oxford in 1649. Although rarely mentioned in any history of Oxford or the *Interregnum*, he casts a

---

<sup>58</sup> Fradkin, 'Religious Toleration and Protestant Expansion', esp. pp. 152-160.

<sup>59</sup> For his recent overview, see Roberts, 'The Welsh Experience of Church Polity', pp. 60-79.

new light on propagation efforts in these years, showing that there was an appetite for propagation beyond the trans-Atlantic sphere. Abbatius came to Oxford sometime in July and was preceded by a letter of recommendation by the university's chancellor, the earl of Pembroke.<sup>60</sup> In his letter Pembroke explained that Abbatius, from the Greek island of Cephalonia, had 'spent much time and travaile in translating the Confessions of Faith, Catechismes, and the like of the forraigne parts into the Vulgar Greeke, for the benefitt of the Easterne Churches.'<sup>61</sup> Abbatius, Pembroke went on, had arrived in England with 'sundry ample Testimonies from forrayne Universities, professing the Protestant Reformed Religion' and was eager to visit Oxford in the pursuit of any benefits for his work.<sup>62</sup>

Pembroke's sketch can be filled out by exploring the little evidence that survives about Abbatius. Abbatius is unknown in Interregnum historiography, but he does appear in literature about ecumenical efforts between the Greek Orthodox and Protestant faiths.<sup>63</sup> On Cephalonia he had been a monk of the monastery of the *Theotokos*, abbot of Pigi, and held the living of the church of Sisia. An earthquake on the island in 1636 prompted him to begin journeying abroad seeking aid to repair damage caused by the disaster. These early travels were a prelude to an extended peripatetic career as Abbatius became involved in attempts to reconcile the Orthodox Church with the Reformed faith.<sup>64</sup> These efforts predated the 1640s and had reached their peak under Patriarch Cyril Loukaris who had initiated warm relations with the Jacobean Church of England, including the sponsoring of Greek scholars at Oxford.

---

<sup>60</sup> OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, ff. 55-6.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 55.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup> K. Rozemond, *Archimandrite Hierotheos Abbatius 1599-1664* (Leiden, 1966). See also, S. Henny, 'Nathanael of Leukas and the Hottinger Circle: The Wanderings of a Seventeenth-Century Greek Archbishop', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 27:3, (2020), p. 461; V. Tsakiris, 'The 'Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Confessio' and the Attempted 'Calvinisation' of the Orthodox Church under Patriarch Cyril Loukaris', *JEH*, 63:3 (2012), pp. 484-6.

<sup>64</sup> For his life, Rozemond, *Hierotheos Abbatius*, esp. pp. 17-49.

Lukaris had sought to establish a conciliation between Reformed and Greek Orthodox faiths along the basis of the *Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Confessio*.<sup>65</sup> The original bilingual edition of this confession had been in scholarly Greek and Latin. However, the potential reach of this translation was extremely limited as most Greek clergymen could only work in vernacular, rather than scholarly, Greek.<sup>66</sup>

Abbatios took on the task of translating the *Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Confessio* into vernacular Greek. By the 1640s, he was closely linked to some remaining followers of the dead Lukaris. Abbatios was in Leiden with Lukaris's ally, and his own relative, Meletios Pantogalos, the metropolitan of Ephesos, in December 1644 and there began work on his translation. His work was sponsored by the States General of the United Provinces who promised to bear the costs of printing the work which could then be distributed across the Middle East. By May 1646, Abbatios had finished his project and 1,000 copies were printed two years later. His work completed, Abbatios expressed a desire to attain the position of a metropolitan in the synod of the churches under the patriarchate of Constantinople in order to ensure the proper distribution of his translation. Acquiring this position required money and after failing to raise the necessary sums in the Netherlands, Abbatios asked the States General for travelling expenses and an honorarium for his work with which to travel in pursuit of fund-raising. As he prepared for his trip, Abbatios seems to have left nothing to chance and sought introductions to useful Englishmen, such as John Selden, the renowned scholar and MP. A Dutch correspondent of Selden, Jacobus Lydius, found himself in the

---

<sup>65</sup> For Lukaris and these earlier ecumenical efforts between Orthodoxy and Protestantism see, D.J.C. Cooper, 'The Eastern Churches and the Reformation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 31 (1978), pp. 417-33; Henny, *Nathanael of Leukas*, esp. pp. 455-7; W.B. Patterson, 'Cyril Lukaris, George Abbot, James VI and I, and the Beginning of Orthodox-Anglican Relations', in P.M. Doll, *Anglicanism and Orthodoxy 300 Years after the 'Greek College' in Oxford* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 39-55; idem, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 196-219.

<sup>66</sup> Tsakiris, 'Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Confessio', p. 484.

unenviable position of intermediary between Grecian and Selden, writing to the latter to complain that Abbatis bothered him far more than their slight acquaintance warranted.<sup>67</sup> Abbatis's time pestering people was, however, well spent and eventually he came to England armed with a travelling allowance, recommendations, and 150 copies of his work for distribution.<sup>68</sup>

Before going to Oxford, he travelled to London where he presented a copy of his book to the Dutch Church and presumably sought out Selden.<sup>69</sup> It must have been from London, with the 'sundry ample testimonies' to which Pembroke referred, that Abbatis came to Oxford, explaining his mission to disseminate reformed theology in the Orthodox Church. His daily activities once in Oxford are difficult to retrace. The convocation book reveals that the university gifted £50 to Abbatis, to be collected from the various colleges, and that on 13 July the vice-chancellor showed convocation a work in vulgar Greek, presumably the *Confessio*, which Hierotheos had donated to the university library.<sup>70</sup> It is unclear whether Abbatis made use of the Bodleian while in the city. Registers of admissions for the library from the time make no mention of the Greek abbot, though there are references throughout August 1649 to someone marked only as 'Gr' using the library which possibly may be shorthand for 'Graecian', the term often used in the college account books to describe him.<sup>71</sup> Ultimately, however, Abbatis' stay in Oxford is detailed only in

---

<sup>67</sup> Bodl., Selden Supra 108, f. 219r. A letter in the British Library also shows Abbatis being similarly solicitous about receiving a testimonial from Constantin Huygens, secretary to the Prince of Orange [BL, Add. MS 22953, f. 73r].

<sup>68</sup> Rozemond, *Hierotheos Abbatis*, pp. 23-46.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 46-7.

<sup>70</sup> OUA/NEP/Supra/Reg T, f. 61. The library's book of benefactors (Bodl., MS Lib. recs b. 903) does not record the donation and the original gift does not seem to be in the Bodleian's collection. See also, A. Wood, *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695, Described by Himself Collected from his Diaries and Other Papers*, ed. A. Clark (5 vols, Oxford, 1891-1900), i, pp. 154-5.

<sup>71</sup> Bodl., MS Lib. recs e. 544, ff. 84v-88v. For foreign visitors to the Bodleian: Bodl., MS Lib. recs e. 533; Bodl., MS Wood E.5.

Pembroke's letter, the records of convocation, and mentions in college account books.<sup>72</sup> Nor was he in England for long. While still in the country, he made an agreement with the States General to distribute copies of his translation and of the New Testament in vernacular Greek around the Greek-speaking Mediterranean, the latter text having been printed by order of the States General in 1638. In March 1651 he was in Geneva, by 1658 he was in his native Cephalonia, and by 1664 he was likely dead.<sup>73</sup>

Abbatios's time in England was brief, but his reception is revealing. At its heart, the abbot's project was ecumenical, not only between Protestantism and Greek Orthodoxy, but between the different strands of Protestantism.<sup>74</sup> The preface to his translation insisted the book formed part of the rite observed by all the churches of Holland, Scotland, and England and many in France, Germany and other parts of the world and was intended to present an image of a united Reformed community.<sup>75</sup> However, the help he received does not only reveal attitudes to ecumenism inside England, but also self-perceptions of Protestant identity. Abbatios arrived in Oxford as the figure of a pan-Protestant scheme. He had been feted across Europe and was arriving from Leiden, one of Reformed Europe's intellectual centres. When he came to the university, he was a figure who evoked notions not only of confessional solidarity, but of an international Protestant community stretching beyond Britain. Recent scholarship by Anthony Milton and Jeremy Fradkin, has emphasised the international sense of Protestant identity inside Commonwealth England, especially by using

---

<sup>72</sup> Brasenose CA, SB Accounts, No 2, A 2.44, 1650-1, 'Dona et Regarda'; Christ Church CA, D&C i.b.3, ff. 4, 7; Corpus Christi Oxford CA, C/1/1/10, f. 59v; Exeter CA, RA2/02, July 1649-November 1649; Jesus Oxford CA, BU:AC:Gen:1, f. 184; Magdalen Oxford CA, LCE/29, 1649, expenses inside and outside college; Queen's Oxford CA, LR C, 1649-1650, 'Custos Forinsecorum'; UCA, UC:BU2/F1/1, f. 236; St John's Oxford CA, ACC I.A.33, August 18 [1649].

<sup>73</sup> Rozemond, *Hierotheos Abbatios*, p. 48.

<sup>74</sup> A. Milton, "'The Unchanged Peacemaker'? John Dury and the Politics of Irenicism in England, 1628-43', in, M. Greengrass, M. Leslie, & T. Raylor (eds), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 95-117.

<sup>75</sup> Rozemond, *Hierotheos Abbatios*, pp. 34-5.

evidence from charitable donations.<sup>76</sup> Abbatios, if understood as the recipient of charity for confessional reasons, appears to be further proof of an international sense of confessional identity.

More evidence for this wide-ranging self-perception comes from records of collegiate charity during the Commonwealth. College audit books contain a rich source of evidence about donations — explicitly or implicitly for confessional reasons — to Protestants during the Rump years. Many were to Irish Protestants forced to flee due to the wars, such as the ‘poor Irishman, exiled from his homeland’ given 6d by Winchester College in early 1650.<sup>77</sup> A far larger group of confessional cases, however, than might be expected were European Protestants, likely forced to flee their homelands due to religious persecution.<sup>78</sup> French or German exiles, such as a banished German given five shillings by Clare College in 1651, were given kind receptions and money.<sup>79</sup> Following the defeat of the Protestant forces at the battle of the White Mountain in 1620, many Bohemians, including the poet Jan Sictor, fled the subsequent Catholic occupation, with several exiles to Britain still attracting sympathy during the Commonwealth.<sup>80</sup> What this body of charitable evidence

---

<sup>76</sup> J. Fradkin, ‘Christian Hospitality and the Case for Religious Refuge in Interregnum England’, *P&P*, 254 (2022), pp. 51-85; A. Milton, *England’s Second Reformation, The Battle for the Church of England, 1625-1662* (Cambridge, 2021), pp. 339-44.

<sup>77</sup> ‘[P]auperi Hibernico, exulanti a patria’ [WCA, Bursars’ Book, 1644-1671, 1649-50, distributions to the poor]. Donations to Irish Protestants displaced by the wars occur regularly throughout the Commonwealth in college account books.

<sup>78</sup> For religious exile in the period, see N. Terpstra, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge, 2015).

<sup>79</sup> Clare CA, CCAD 2/1/1/3, Annunciation 1651-Michaelmas 1651, general expenses. For French Protestants, see Lincoln CA, Lincoln College Calculus 1652, f. 30; New College Archives, 4208, ‘Custus ad Intra’ [there are two such entitled sections in the MS, this is the from the second]; OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, ff. 34-5, 37. For German Protestants, see Trinity Hall Cambridge CA, THAR/2/1/1/4/1, extraordinary expenses; WCA, Bursars’ Book, 1644-1671, 1648-9, 1651-2, distributions to the poor.

<sup>80</sup> For Sictor, see W. Poole, ‘Down and Out in Leiden and London: The Later Careers of Venceslaus Clemes (1589-1637), and Jan Sictor (1593-1652), Bohemian Exiles and Failing Poets’, *The Seventeenth Century*, 28:2 (2013), pp. 163-85; R. F. Young, *A Czech Humanist in London in the 17th Century* (London, [1925]). For donations to Sictor, see Emmanuel CA, Bur.8.2, expenses since the accounts of 17 April 1651; Merton CA, SC/MCR/F/1/4/2, f. 111r; SC/MCR/F/1/4/3, f. 11r.

suggests is that Abbatis' reception was not unique. Instead, college members exhibited a strong sympathy for foreign Protestants in a manner which points to an understanding of their identity not as just British Protestants but as part of a much wider community. While this is not the same as support for international propagation, it would have informed attitudes to it, emphasising the importance of British support for foreign propagation schemes such as Abbatis proposed.

It is clear that Abbatis' project received enormous support from within England. Not only was Oxford interested in Abbatis' mission, but so too were Cambridge — which gave him money — and the CRU.<sup>81</sup> A month after the order of the Oxford delegates, the chairman of the committee, James Chaloner, reported to the Commons recommending Abbatis for a public collection and showing his translation to the House.<sup>82</sup> Although nothing appears to have come from Chaloner's recommendation, parliamentary interest in the traveller was unsurprising as he was essentially promoting an educational propagation scheme. Abbatis was leading a project involving the distribution of approved religious literature to promulgate the Reformed faith. Like with Owen's primer, the work was intended to be widely accessible, hence it being produced in the vernacular and plans to ensure it had a wide reach. The use of an educational tool and attempts to engage with a large audience show that the Abbatis project was essentially the same type of evangelical

---

Another named Bohemian was Daniel Melincer, who received money from Clare Cambridge and Winchester College [Clare CA, CCAD 2/1/1/3, Annunciation 1651-Michaelmas 1651, general expenses; WCA, Bursars' Book, 1644-1671, 1652-3, distributions to the poor].

For unnamed Bohemians receiving charity, see Christ's CA, B.1.10, f. 78; Sidney Sussex CA, MR.61, f. 524; Trinity Cambridge CA, Senior Bursar's Audit Book, 1637-1659, 1648, f. 17v.

<sup>81</sup> CUL, GBR/0265/UA/U.Ac.2/1, f. 752. For the college records relating to Abbatis: Christ's Cambridge CA, B.1.10, f. 129; CUL, QC 15, 1648-9; Clare CA, CCAD 2/1/1/3, Michaelmas 1649-Annunciation 1650, general expenses; Emmanuel CA, Bur.8.2, expenses since the accounts of 19 October 1649; St Catharine's CA, L/26, f. 188v; St John's Cambridge CA, SJAR/3/2/4/6, f. 406v; Trinity Cambridge CA, Senior Bursar's Audit Book, 1637-1659, 1649, f. 12r.

<sup>82</sup> *CJ*, vi, p. 282.

educational initiative taking place in Britain under the Rump. The crucial difference was location. Abbatis was proposing a propagation effort not in the usual sphere of the trans-Atlantic world but in the Greek-speaking east. The level of interest Abbatis received, and the amount of money he was given, was a sign that serious attempts to evangelise far away from Britain could receive support, and Abbatis was offering an impressive initiative, one backed by multiple states and the intellectual *literati* of Protestant Europe.

Abbatis' case reflects the eagerness of those in the universities to support propagation outside England. It is evident that individual propagation efforts were also receiving charitable help. Richard Fitz Gerald was one recipient of aid whose appeal was his potential as a missionary in his native, Catholic Ireland. Fitz Gerald petitioned the university authorities of Oxford for help sometime between 1651-2. His petition survives and is a remarkable, *Tristram-Shandy*-like document containing an outline of his life, from the marriage of his parents till the time of his writing, as well as endorsements from Oliver Cromwell, the chancellor of the university, and a recommendation from the vice-chancellor, Daniel Greenwood. Fitz Gerald was a Catholic convert to Protestantism. As he explained, he had been born in Ireland to a Protestant father and a 'papist mother'. Due to an 'agreement' at his parent's marriage, likely financial as it was 'upon some secular consideration', he was raised in his mother's faith. He then proceeded to France, to the Jesuit College at Orleans, to further his burgeoning religion.<sup>83</sup>

It was while in France that he became a Protestant. During his studies, he met an English minister who converted him, following which he moved to the university of Saumur,

---

<sup>83</sup> OUA, WPy/22/1, document f.

a Huguenot academy in the Loire Valley. The death of his father, fighting ‘against the [Catholic] Rebels in Ireland’, deprived him of the financial means to continue his education at which point he came to England.<sup>84</sup> Although he admitted his decision was partly motivated by a desire for greater financial security, Fitz Gerald emphasized that he wanted to continue the development of his Protestant faith and to that end had sought a place in one of the universities where he could further his understanding of Reformed doctrine. With that purpose, he secured a letter of recommendation from Cromwell as well as the support of other unnamed persons of quality. The support had been to little avail, however, and he had been unable to find a place in the universities. Lacking the means to support himself, his petition asked for assistance with his material wants. He succeeded in this aim: Greenwood’s certificate recommended Fitz Gerald for charity from members of the university.<sup>85</sup>

As with Abbatis, support for Fitz Gerald reveals a deep concern in the Commonwealth universities with propagation. Perhaps because he was aware of this level of appeal, Fitz Gerald emphasised his potential use as a missionary. Fitz Gerald stressed that he would not keep his new religiosity to himself. He explained in his petition that he wanted to develop his own knowledge of Protestant faith so that he could help the ‘enlighteninge of many others his country men and kindred accordinge to the flesh, who sitt yet in that darkness’. His words suggested a future in propagation of some kind. The idea appealed to Cromwell who argued ‘this poore stranger’ ought to be helped ‘soe it may redound to the good of the publiq[ue]’. The good of the public likely meant the protection of the Protestant faith as Fitz Gerald’s letter made clear he intended to return to Ireland and there engage in

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

bringing his Catholic family out of their religious ‘darkness’.<sup>86</sup> Although Fitz Gerald’s future was confined to the British Isles, like Abbatis the support he received was predicated on his prospective role in propagation. However, unlike the Greek abbot, his missionary intentions were of a small, personal nature and this seems to have materially affected his appeal. While Abbatis had been able to offer the prospect of a state-backed distribution of religious materials, Fitz Gerald intended to proselytize to his ‘kindred’ and neighbours. The discrepancy between his testimonials and struggles and Abbatis’ university gift of £50 is stark. Yet, the similarity between the two cases remains: propagation had an appeal in places of learning which translated into financial support.

The importance placed on propagation explains the disparity with Abbatis in the support given to another Greek clergyman seeking charity: Anastatius Comnenus. Comnenus is even more elusive than his countryman in the historical records. From a seventeenth-century German work it is known he visited Germany in 1649.<sup>87</sup> From academic financial records, it is also evident that he was in Cambridge on 25 October 1651 when Emmanuel gave him £01.06.00.<sup>88</sup> By 18 December, he was in Oxford, receiving £03.16.06 from New College with several colleges specifying that payments were part of a collection ordered by the university’s delegates.<sup>89</sup> He then disappears from the historical record before

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> P. Cyprius, *Chronicon Ecclesiae Graecae...* (Leipzig, 1687), pp. 486-90.

<sup>88</sup> Clare CA, CCAD 2/1/1/3, Michaelmas 1651-Annunciation 1652, general expenses. Clare potentially paid him twice as in September 1651 they made a payment to another poor Grecian [ibid., Annunciation 1651-Michaelmas 1651]; Emmanuel CA, Bur.8.2, expenses since the accounts of October 2 1651; St John’s Cambridge CA, SJAR/3/2/4/6, 1650, f. 25v. Cambridge University also made a payment of £2 ‘to Butler for his carefull attendance upon a Grecian’ about the time Comnenus was in Cambridge [CUL, GBR/0265/UA/U.Ac.2/1, f. 767].

<sup>89</sup> Corpus Christi Oxford CA, C/1/1/10, f. 84r; Exeter CA, RA2/02, 1651-2; Magdalen Oxford CA, LCE/29, 1651, expenses inside and outside college; Merton CA, SC/MCR/F/1/4/2, f. 120v; New CA, 988, 18 December 1651; Pembroke Oxford CA, PMB/D/1/1/1, f. 4v; St John’s Oxford CA, ACC I.A.35, f. 69v.

The order of the delegates is not recorded in the university’s register for convocation. This may be due to a clerical error: in the university’s register the entry for 4 November 1651, ‘Acta Delegatorum sequuntur’, appears unfinished with a large gap between it and the next entry. Since the order for Comnenus was made by

emerging again at Winchester College in late 1653.<sup>90</sup> Winchester's record also explained why he was raising money: to redeem captives from Algerian pirates.<sup>91</sup>

Comnenus' dramatic story is fleshed out by a testimonial from August 1652, signed by a collection of English divines in London. The certificate explained that Comnenus was a minister of the Greek Church who, along with fellow Greek clergymen, had been robbed by pirates from Algiers. Although Comnenus was now free, he needed to raise money to pay off his ransom and those who were still held as hostages. Having been in several parts of Germany and Sweden and received testimonials from the patriarch of Alexandria, the university of Leiden, the queen of Sweden, and several German princes, Comnenus had come to England sixteenth months prior to the testimonial without receiving a public collection. The signatories, discussed below, therefore recommended him 'as a true object of Charity'.<sup>92</sup>

Even with the testimonial, raising the sum did not prove easy. Comnenus would spend the next decade seemingly travelling the length of the kingdom seeking money. In 1656 he was in Scotland.<sup>93</sup> In March 1658 he was petitioning the Council of State in London with his case referred to the committee for approbation of public ministers.<sup>94</sup> In February 1659 a new certificate in his favour was signed by the Episcopalian ministers Peter Gunning

---

18 December when New College cited it in their records, it is possible the delegates made their order in November only for it to never be recorded [OUA, NEP/Supra/Reg T, ff. 151-2].

<sup>90</sup> There is also a reference to him receiving money at St Olave's, Hart Street, London, on 27 March 1653 [A.C. Grant, 'Scotland's 'Vagabonding Greekes', 1453-1688' *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 46:1 (2022), p. 90].

<sup>91</sup> 'Datu[m] Anastatio Commenes Graeca ad redimendu[m] captivos in Algeers' [WCA, Bursars' Book, 1644-1671, 1652-3, 'Custus Necessariorum cum Donis'].

<sup>92</sup> *Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae Archivum...*, ed. J.H. Hessels (3 vols, Cambridge, 1887-97) iii, pp. 2213-14; Grant, 'Vagabonding Greekes', pp. 81-97.

<sup>93</sup> Grant, 'Vagabonding Greekes', pp. 90-1.

<sup>94</sup> TNA, SP, 25/78, f. 522.

and William Chamberline and is now held at the Gloucestershire Archives, possibly a sign Comnenus travelled to that part of England.<sup>95</sup> Still not having raised the necessary sums, Comnenus remained in England for some time after the Restoration, writing at least one poem in praise of episcopacy and drawing a pension from Bishop John Cosin of Durham in 1662.<sup>96</sup> After this, Comnenus appears to have disappeared from the historical record.

Comnenus stands as a useful comparison to Abbatis and Fitz Gerald. Like Abbatis, it is striking how much financial support Comnenus received from a variety of places over a considerable length of time. The warm treatment both Grecians received is in keeping with the western European fascination with eastern travellers which John-Paul Ghobrial has recently analysed in several important articles.<sup>97</sup> Yet, the identities of those providing certificates for Comnenus suggests that his case is also an example of the pan-Protestant sentiment and sense of international identity inside English places of learning. Like Abbatis, Comnenus had drawn support and testimonials from the entire breadth of Protestant Europe. In England, as his 1652 testimonial showed, he had been able to bring together a remarkably disparate collection of ministers. Leading Presbyterian figures such as Simeon Ashe, Edmund Calamy, James Cranford, Thomas Gouge, William Jenkyn, and Obadiah Sedgwick were joined by dominant Independent ministers such as Joseph Caryl, John Goodwin, and John Owen. Several who would go on to be heavily associated with the millenarian Fifth Monarchists such as the army officer Thomas Harrison, and the preachers Christopher Feake and John Rogers subscribed while the ecumenicist, John Dury was

---

<sup>95</sup> Gloucestershire Archives, D1086/R23.

<sup>96</sup> *The Correspondence of John Cosin...* ed. G. Ornsby (Durham, 1872), pp. 102-3 and n.; LPL, MS 688, vol. 2, ff. 523r-8r.

<sup>97</sup> J-P. A. Ghobrial, 'Migration from Within and Without: The Problem of Eastern Christians in Early Modern Europe', *TRHS*, 27 (2017), pp. 153-73; idem, 'Moving Stories and What They Tell Us: Early Modern Mobility between Microhistory and Global History', *P&P*, 242 (Supplement 14) (2019), pp. 243-80.

unsurprisingly present too.<sup>98</sup> Although there was nothing unusual about supporting a distressed clergyman, the amount of support Comnenus received from such a diverse assortment of Protestant authorities and ministers is notable and another indication of the international sense of identity among English Protestants.

The main difference between Abbatios and Comnenus is equally striking. Namely, one managed to leave England after a brief visit and the other remained stuck in the British Isles for over a decade. Comnenus' was not a voluntary stay and Gunning and Chamberline wrote how he 'desires but to be set free here by discharge of his debt' contracted by necessary expenses before leaving the country.<sup>99</sup> Comnenus' presence in England after the Restoration, racked with gout, reliant on pensions from sympathetic figures, not only showed the sympathy he elicited, but the different degrees of support he and Abbatios received.<sup>100</sup> Because his case was one of altruism, Comnenus, like Fitz Gerald, did not receive the type of urgent help which marked out Abbatios. The latter was representing an impressive propagation scheme and it was this which led to his particularly special treatment including impressive university contributions, probable access to the Bodleian, and discussions of a public collection in Parliament. Comnenus did not receive such treatment. The disparity in the two cases helps to magnify the interest those in Commonwealth places of learning had for international Protestant propagation.

Comnenus's case does, however, reveal something which is only implicit in that of Abbatios: concerns with international Catholicism. Worries about the threat posed by

---

<sup>98</sup> *Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae Archivum*, iii, pp. 2213-14.

<sup>99</sup> Gloucestershire Archives, D1086/R23.

<sup>100</sup> *Correspondence of John Cosin*, pp. 102-3 n.

Catholic missionaries had informed Abbatis's scheme, designed for a region targeted by Catholic missionaries, and the support he received. Informing ideas about international Protestant identity and propagation were concerns about a global Catholic enemy also attempting to propagate. This point was illustrated in an appeal for funds, created by the university of Cambridge, on behalf of the New England missionaries. Drawing on historical precedent, the petition argued that the pharisees had historically spared no pains in gathering converts for Judaism while the Jesuits '*at this day refuse not to compass Sea and Land for spreading of Popery*'. Compared to these opponents, '*Shall Christianity, shall Protestantisme finde fewer Zelots set on worke for their propagation? God forbid*'.<sup>101</sup> As the petition suggests, while anti-Catholicism was not propagation nor identical to Protestant identity, it did inform both. It lent a focal point to what is shown below to have been a fragile Protestant unity while also giving a clear opponent to Protestant propagation. In both cases it also lent a global dimension, creating a sense of an international enemy and casting the individual Protestant and the question of evangelism into a stage which '*compass[e]d Sea and Land*'.

Comnenus' time in Oxford illustrated how concerned those in the universities were with the global Catholic foe. This point can be seen in a work of John Owen, one of the signatories of Comnenus' 1652 testimonial. Owen, in his *Vindication of the Animadversions on Fiat Lux*, quoted conversations with two members of the Greek Orthodox Church when attacking the Catholic claim to agreement with the Greek Church. *Fiat Lux*, which Owen was criticizing, praised the unity of Catholicism in contrast to the discord of the Protestant sects. Owen utilised his past conversations with members of the Greek Orthodox Church to

---

<sup>101</sup> Bodl., MS Wood 423, f. 30v.

undermine this work. As he wrote, he had personally known some ‘eminent members of that Church’; one had been ‘*Conopius*’, that is Nathaniel Konopios, who was a Greek scholar in Oxford from 1639.<sup>102</sup> The other Greek mentioned by Owen was Comnenus, whose testimonials described him as ‘of a *Monastery on Mount Sinai*’. These conversations must have taken place when Comnenus came to Oxford in late 1651 and Owen must have been instrumental in the charitable reception the visitor received. Nearly a decade after their meeting, the erstwhile vice-chancellor made use of their discussions in attacking Catholicism. Owen wrote that both ‘these [Greeks] I am sure made it their business to inveigh against *your Church & practices*, having the Arguments of *Nilus* against your Supremacy at their fingers ends.’ Owen’s point was to challenge *Fiat Lux*’s claim that the Catholic and Greek Church ‘are so well agreed’ and in the process to suggest that it was in fact the Greek and Reformed church, or Owen’s interpretation of the Protestant Church, which were actually compatible and in agreement.<sup>103</sup>

Owen’s questioning was representative of a much deeper Protestant interest in acquiring tools for intellectual debates with Catholicism. In this war, the endorsement of Greek clergymen was a great aid due to the Greek church’s association with early, uncorrupted, Christianity. In the words of Sundar Henny, in the confessional battles of the seventeenth century, ‘[e]astern Christianity became increasingly attractive as a window through which one could look (even if just through a glass darkly) at how things were done in the early church’.<sup>104</sup> Owen was not the only Protestant host to subject travellers from the east such questioning and similar appeals were made by his confessional peers to Greek

---

<sup>102</sup> J. Owen, *A Vindication of the Animadversions on Fiat Lux...* (London, 1664), p. 551. For Konopios, see Patterson, ‘Cyril Lukaris’, p. 51.

<sup>103</sup> Owen, *Animadversions on Fiat Lux*, p. 552.

<sup>104</sup> Henny, ‘Nathanael of Leukas’, p. 457.

authorities in controversies with Catholicism. For example, the work of Abbatios's sometime travelling companion, Meletios Pantogalos, was heavily utilised by both Catholics and Protestants in the second half of the seventeenth century. During a controversy over the Eucharist, a Protestant French pastor, Jean Claude, used a confession of Pantogalos to prove his case that the Roman Catholic Church had not remained the same since the origin of the church.<sup>105</sup> Comnenus' trip to Oxford was emblematic of a wider Protestant interest in anti-Catholicism and intellectual sparring with Catholic enemies, trends which were implicit in the help Abbatios and Fitz Gerald received. Although dislike of Catholicism is different from propagation, the international context in which this enmity was understood was connected to the Protestant attitudes to propagation and senses of Protestant identity analysed in this section. The sense of a global Catholic enemy attempting its own missionary activities around the world fed into the sense of a pan-Protestant community, one similarly international, and one which needed to produce or support rival evangelical efforts to its confessional opponents.

Yet, if Comnenus illustrates a focal point for Protestant unity, he also demonstrates how shallow that unity was. An interesting facet of Comnenus's story was his own ecclesiastical opinions. Although the surviving evidence is limited, there are strong clues that his own preferences were for an Episcopalian system, something which would have placed him at odds with many of the Protestant communities giving him aid. As might be expected, these sympathies are most strongly in evidence after the Restoration. Sometime after the return of Charles II, Comnenus penned a poem in praise of 'Gods sacred guift the Prelacy' and damning the previous decades when 'Sordid Mechanicks boldly did invade'

---

<sup>105</sup> Rozemond, *Hierotheos Abbatios*, pp. 30-1.

the hierarchy of the church.<sup>106</sup> Comnenus almost certainly avoided such remarks when talking with Owen, but there are hints that his post-Restoration opinions were sincere rather than entirely opportunistic. The Episcopalian Peter Gunning, who provided a certificate for Comnenus late in the 1650s, wrote that the Grecian had professed ‘his communion with us (which he thinks he hath cause to deny to papists and others)’.<sup>107</sup> If Comnenus held these opinions during the 1650s then it is likely he largely kept them to himself. Yet, the fact they were never an issue might be an indication of the type of questioning he underwent from his hosts. Pan-Protestant interest in the war against Catholicism did not invite a searching analysis into Comnenus’ own opinions so much as looking for material to be used in an intellectual fight. The focus on anti-Catholicism provided a focal point for Protestant unity but, similarly to the support given to Abbatis and Fitz Gerald, it also helped to mask divisions, perhaps to Comnenus’ benefit. The superficiality of concord suggests again why something like education featured so prominently in so many British and international schemes: at a time when little precise detail could be agreed, the desire to spread the Protestant faith through learning could receive little criticism.

---

<sup>106</sup> LPL, MS 688, vol. 2, ff. 526r-v.

<sup>107</sup> Gloucestershire Archives, D1086/R23.

## Conclusion

As this chapter has demonstrated, the broad Commonwealth consensus about the need to advance learning and piety is visible when examining propagation and stretched beyond parliamentary and academic bodies to include members of the wider nation. Education was an important aspect of propagation due to conceptions of heathenism, a state defined in part by ignorance and mistaken belief and applicable to both Protestants and pagans. Correct teaching could rectify these faults. The educational initiatives which formed the case studies of the first section of this chapter illustrated the importance attached to education in evangelism at a time of great contextual concerns about the spread of unorthodox thought and ignorance. The initiatives are indicative of a similar Commonwealth trend identified in earlier chapters whereby definitions of the ministry increasingly emphasised their learning. This chapter offered a comparison in which learning emerged in the wider nation as an important definition of a Christian community. The content of the propagation initiatives is strikingly limited and appears intended to define the community by possessing some type of approved knowledge rather than adherence to a set of doctrinal or educational principles.

As in previous chapters, by looking at the implementation of the Rump's rule in institutional and local contexts, the notion of the government as apathetic or only intermittently active was challenged. In the first section, existing understandings of the roles of government and the localities in propagation were revised. By moving away from the question of the government's failure or success and using evidence outside of legislation a better understanding of the Rump's motivations in propagation were recovered. The

examples of John Owen's primer and the transfer of books to Winchester College in 1652 showed how the government were concerned by the threat of heresy and understood it as caused in part by ignorance. Their efforts to address these issues through projects that were both educational and evangelical highlighted the extent to which the government believed learning could resolve such problems and so sought to disseminate approved godly knowledge widely. That these projects continued over a period of several years suggests that they represented continuous concerns rather than being the products of sudden stimuli caused by disgruntled members of the Cromwellian religio-political faction.

This chapter further demonstrated the need to examine the work of the Rump alongside developments at local and institutional levels. By looking at local educational initiatives and support for propagation inside the universities, this chapter showed that the government's propagating activity was part of a much wider Commonwealth phenomenon and driven by similar concerns. Such a diverse study also offered important revisions to understandings of propagation in the period. Agency for propagation was shown to exist in the localities, making the story of propagation as much one which was ground-up as top-down. The level of support for evangelism challenged the strong associations between propagation and radicalism in much historiography while the analysis of support given by university members to various individuals highlighted the need to place propagation in an international rather than British context. After all, it was Commonwealth understandings of propagation as a global issue which explained why Abbatis was able to leave England while Comnenus spent the Interregnum in a realm of 'Sordid Mechanicks'.

## Conclusion

The main purpose of this thesis has been to demonstrate that the Rump cannot be understood without examining its committees and their work. A study of how committees like the CRU operated reveals the implementation of the government's rule in institutional and local contexts, offering a very different image of the Rump to that seen in its legislative record. Previous studies of the Commonwealth have been dominated by analyses of the government's work in the House of Commons and at the Council of State and largely resulted in negative interpretations and a view of the government as riven with divisions and only sporadically active, usually at the prompt of the New Model Army. This thesis has largely avoided the question of the Rump's success or failure and focussed on recovering the priorities of the government and its patterns of activity. By utilising predominantly archival materials from a range of institutions, it has been shown that the Rump were far more active than is often thought and had identifiable, consistent concerns running throughout the period. The same approach offered new perspectives on several key issues of the Commonwealth. It was shown that commonly accepted ministerial attributes, especially university education, were emphasised as traditional notions of the ministry were questioned and that the civil magistrate played an important role in issues of approbation. In the final chapter, previous understandings of propagation were challenged to show the widespread support and interest throughout the country in evangelical schemes and the contemporary understanding of the matter as occurring within a global context.

Education was also shown to be an important issue for the Rump. As this thesis argued, the parliamentary state must be considered the most important agent in educational reform during the revolutionary period. Traditionally, the governments of the 1640s and

1650s, particularly the Rump, have been depicted as playing little role in places of learning or educational matters. That viewpoint has been rejected in this thesis. It has been shown, by offering the first in-depth analysis of the CRU, that Interregnum governments were not only deeply interested in education but closely involved in places of teaching and acting on a discernible set of concerns. The Rump's approach to the management of universities and schools and their reform was traditional and pragmatic; indeed, this thesis has suggested the government ought to be understood as working within a pre-existing Puritan reforming tradition. The main intention of the government was to restore autonomy to places of learning — having resolved issues to do with administration, finance, and personnel — after the chaos of the 1640s and ensure an educated ministry were produced. There was little sign of any desire to overhaul the existing academic structure of practices from parliamentary bodies, with most energy devoted to the moral reform of educational institutions and better execution of pedagogical and devotional practices. Yet, a traditional approach is not the same as apathy, nor should it be dismissed as reactionary. The government's approach to educational reform casts the entire issue into a new light. Rather than extra-parliamentary reformers like the Hartlib circle being obstructed by uninterested MPs, this thesis has suggested that such campaigners failed to gain governmental support because the Parliament had its own agenda for education which it was already pursuing and which was largely incompatible with the far more radical Hartlibian plans.

The Rump's relationship with places of learning was a recurring theme in this thesis and demonstrated the importance of analysing the relationship between Westminster and the localities when discussing the period. As was shown frequently, the rule of academic foundations was a two-way process rather than determined from London. University, college, and school authorities possessed enormous agency of which they often made use

and so any study of educational institutions in the period necessitates a study of both London and the localities. Such a dual focus allowed several key points to be made, including the broad consensus about education in Commonwealth England. There was a remarkable degree of agreement between the concerns of parliamentary authorities and the concerns or actions of institutional bodies which was testament to the ability of educational matters and ideas about education to bring diverse groups together.

Demonstrating widespread consensus about learning was one way in which this thesis challenged preconceptions about the response to Commonwealth rule. It is often thought that the period was one marked by hostile divisions between the different political and denominational groups. However, by looking at the workings of educational institutions and parliamentary committees, themes of consensus, compromise, pragmatism, and cooperation become readily apparent. In practice, supporters and those hostile or ambivalent to the regime were able not only to coexist but to interact and work in a manner which highlights the continued existence of areas of common ground, such as education. Many instances of dissent were overlooked by parliamentary authorities who appear to have been uninterested in imposing an ideological conformity in educational institutions or in converting them into seminaries of a new republican culture.

As this thesis has discussed, the interest of the parliamentary state in places of learning did not begin with the Rump and nor did it cease with it. There remains room to offer a broader temporal overview of the relationship between the parliamentary state and education during the revolutionary period, one which makes comparisons between the various regimes in order to produce a better understanding of how that relationship changed

over time. This thesis was restricted to the period of the Commonwealth and especially the lifespan of the CRU, but the Long Parliament had been invested in educational matters before it while the Cromwellian Protectorate signalled its own interest in the issue in September 1654 by establishing two new boards of visitors whose combined remit included both universities, and the schools of Eton, the Merchant Taylors' Company, Westminster, and Winchester.<sup>1</sup> While this piece has offered a case study on education and the state during the Interregnum, further projects could help to contextualise its findings, consider the questions it has raised, and determine whether education was indeed an antidote to the 'Venime of the Times'.

---

<sup>1</sup> A&O, ii, pp. 1026-9. The boards, in brief, were separate groups for each university with Oxford's board also having authority over the Merchant Taylors' School and Winchester, Cambridge's board controlling Eton, and both having power over Westminster.

## Appendix 1: A Calendar of Attendance at the CRU

### **Note on the Calendar**

*The following note should be read in conjunction with chapter four.*

The following calendar and list of attendance is based predominantly on archival materials along with several primary printed sources, notably the pamphlets of Charles Hotham. All materials used are listed in the bibliography. Due to the relative scarcity of surviving committee orders or evidence relating to committee meetings, the calendar should not be thought to encompass all the CRU meetings which took place.

### **Calendar of the CRU**

10 May 1649: Francis Rous

24 May 1649: Francis Rous

12 June 1649: Francis Rous

14 June 1649: Francis Rous

24 July 1649: Francis Rous

23 August 1649: Francis Rous

30 August 1649: Francis Rous

20 September 1649: Francis Rous

27 September 1649: Francis Rous

4 October 1649: Francis Rous

18 October 1649: Francis Rous

8 November 1649: John Fielder

15 November 1649: Francis Rous

17 January 1650: Francis Rous

14 February 1650: Francis Rous

7 March 1650 Francis Rous

28 March 1650: Francis Rous

4 April 1650: Miles Corbett

11 April 1650: James Chaloner

18 April 1650: James Chaloner

16 May 1650: Francis Rous

24 May: 1650 Francis Rous

6 June 1650: Francis Rous

4 July 1650: Francis Rous

5 July 1650: Francis Rous

11 July 1650: James Chaloner, Francis Rous

17 July 1650: Francis Rous

18 July 1650: Francis Rous

1 August 1650: Miles Corbett, Francis Rous

7 August 1650: Francis Rous

8 August 1650: Francis Rous

15 August 1650: Francis Rous

29 August 1650: Miles Corbett

6 September 1650: Miles Corbett

11 September 1650: Francis Rous

12 September 1650: Miles Corbett

19 September 1650: Miles Corbett

26 September 1650: James Chaloner, John Fielder, Francis Rous

10 October 1650: Henry Darley

24 October 1650: Henry Darley

5 November 1650: Henry Darley

7 November 1650: Henry Darley

14 November 1650: Walter Strickland

?21 November 1650: Henry Darley

28 November 1650: Miles Corbett, Sir John Danvers, Henry Darley, Nathaniel Hallows,  
Walter Strickland, [unknown]

5 December 1650: James Chaloner

12 December 1650: James Chaloner.

19 December 1650: Henry Darley

26 December 1650: Thomas Lister

2 January 1651: James Chaloner

16 January 1651: James Chaloner, Francis Rous

23 January 1651: James Chaloner

13 February 1651: James Chaloner

20 February 1651: James Chaloner

27 February 1651: James Chaloner

6 March 1651: James Chaloner

20 March 1651: John Fielder

27 March 1651: James Chaloner

29 March 1651: James Chaloner

3 April 1651: James Chaloner

10 April 1651: James Chaloner, Thomas Chaloner, Richard Darley, Nicholas Love, [Henry?] Marten, Sir Henry Mildmay, John Moyle, Henry Neville, Michael Oldisworth, John Palmer, Francis Rous<sup>1</sup>

17 April 1651: James Chaloner

24 April 1651: James Chaloner

25 April 1651: James Chaloner, Michael Oldisworth, Francis Rous

22 May 1651: John Dormer, Gilbert Millington, John Moyle, Henry Neville, Michael Oldisworth, John Palmer, Francis Rous, Peter Temple<sup>2</sup>

29 May 1651: Robert Brewster, James Chaloner, Richard Darley, Edmund Harvey, Sir Arthur Hesilrige, Gilbert Millington, Michael Oldisworth, Francis Rous, Humphrey Salwey, William Say, Peter Temple, Lawrence Whitaker

---

<sup>1</sup> This was the subcommittee appointed to consider university statutes [C. Hotham, *The Petition and Argument of Mr. Hotham...* (London, 1651), p. 33]. I have presumed that those who were named were present at the committee that day.

<sup>2</sup> This was the subcommittee appointed to consider Charles Hotham's pamphlet [C. Hotham, *A True State of the Case of Mr Hotham, Late Fellow of Peter-House* (London, 1651), p. 13]. As above, I have presumed that those who were named were present at the committee on that day.

5 June 1651: James Chaloner, Sir John Danvers, Richard Darley, Sir Arthur Hesilrige,  
Michael Oldisworth

19 June 1651: Edward Ashe, James Chaloner, John Corbett, Edmund Harvey, Michael  
Oldisworth

26 June 1651: William Cawley, James Chaloner, John Moyle, Michael Oldisworth, Thomas  
Scot, Peter Temple, Bulstrode Whitelocke

3 July 1651: James Chaloner, John Corbett, John Dove, Sir James Harrington, Augustine  
Skinner

17 July 1651: Sir John Burchier, James Chaloner, Henry Darley, Michael Oldisworth, John  
Trenchard

24 July 1651: John Carew, James Chaloner, John Moyle, [Sir?] William Masham, Michael  
Oldisworth, John Palmer

15 August 1651: Sir John Burchier, James Chaloner, Nathaniel Hallowses, Gilbert  
Millington, John Moyle

21 August 1651: James Chaloner, Nathaniel Hallowses, Gilbert Millington, John Moyle,  
Michael Oldisworth

11 September 1651: Thomas Chaloner, John Fielder, Nicholas Love, Sir Henry Mildmay, Walter Strickland

9 October 1651: Abraham Burrell, James Chaloner, Thomas Chaloner, Edmund Harvey, Michael Oldisworth

16 October 1651: Sir John Bouchier, Abraham Burrell, William Cawley, James Chaloner, John Corbett, John Dixwell, John Moyle, Michael Oldisworth, Walter Strickland

6 November 1651: Richard Aldworth, Sir John Bouchier, John Corbett, Michael Oldisworth, Isaac Pennington

13 November 1651: Thomas Atkins, James Chaloner, John Corbett, Michael Oldisworth, John Trenchard

20 November 1651: James Chaloner, Gilbert Millington, John Moyle, John Trenchard

27 November 1651: James Chaloner, John Gurdon, Thomas Lister, Sir Henry Mildmay, Michael Oldisworth, Francis Rous, Valentine Walton, [unknown]

4 December 1651: Sir John Bouchier, Abraham Burrell, Michael Oldisworth, Walter Strickland

8 January 1652: James Chaloner, Humphrey Edwards, Michael Oldisworth, Isaac Pennington, Francis Rous

29 January 1652: James Chaloner, Sir John Hippisley, Nicholas Love, Gilbert Millington, John Moyle

12 February 1652: Robert Brewster, Thomas Chaloner, Humphrey Edwards, Sir Thomas Jervoise, Michael Oldisworth

19 February 1652: Richard Aldworth, Gilbert Millington, John Moyle, Michael Oldisworth, [unknown]

27 February 1651/2: Gregory Clement, Sir James Harrington, Michael Oldisworth, John Palmer, [unknown]

4 March 1652: Richard Aldworth, Sir John Bouchier, Robert Brewster, James Chaloner, Michael Oldisworth, Humphrey Salwey, [unknown]

11 March 1652: Sir John Bouchier, James Chaloner, Thomas Lister, John Moyle, William Stephens

25 March 1652: Thomas Atkins, Richard Darley, John Dove, Nathaniel Hallowes, William Stephens

1 April 1652: Robert Brewster, Nathaniel Hallowes, Gilbert Millington, [Sir?] William Masham, Michael Oldisworth

8 April 1652: James Ashe, William Cawley, James Chaloner, Henry Marten, Michael Oldisworth, Walter Strickland

**Attendance**

Chaloner, James: 39

Rous, Francis: 37

Oldisworth, Michael: 23

Moyle, John: 11

Darley, Henry: 8

Millington, Gilbert: 8

Bourchier, Sir John: 7

Corbett, Miles: 7

Strickland, Walter: 6

Unknown: 5

Corbett, John: 5

Hallowes, Nathaniel: 5

Brewster, Robert: 4

Chaloner, Thomas: 4

Darley, Richard: 4

Fielder, John: 4

Palmer, John: 4

Aldworth, Richard: 3

Burrell, Abraham: 3

Cawley, William: 3

Harvey, Edmund: 3

Lister, Thomas: 3

Love, Nicholas: 3

Mildmay, Sir Henry: 3

Temple, Peter: 3

Trenchard, John: 3

Atkins, Thomas: 2

Danvers, Sir John: 2

Dove, John: 2

Edwards, Humphrey: 2

Harrington, Sir James: 2

Hesilrige, Sir Arthur: 2

Marten, Henry[?]: 2

Masham, [Sir?] William: 2

Neville, Henry: 2

Pennington, Isaac: 2

Salwey, Humphrey: 2

Stephens, William: 2

Ashe, Edward: 1

Ashe, James: 1

Carew, John: 1

Clement, Gregory: 1

Dixwell, John: 1

Dormer, John: 1

Gurdon, John: 1

Hippisley, Sir John: 1

Jervoise, Sir Thomas: 1

Say, William: 1

Scot, Thomas: 1

Skinner, Augustine: 1

Walton, Valentine: 1

Whitaker, Lawrence: 1

Whitelocke, Bulstrode: 1

## Appendix 2: A Summary Calendar of Attendance at the Committee and Board of Governors of Westminster School, April 1649-April 1652

### **Note on the Calendar**

*The following note should be read in conjunction with chapter four*

This summary calendar of the attendance at both the committee and then the board of governors of Westminster School is based exclusively on the records from Westminster Abbey Muniments which are listed in the bibliography. The records used are from meetings on 49 individual days, the first being on 4 April 1649 and the last on 3 April 1652. This date range was chosen to correspond with the life of the CRU and also to examine a number of meetings large enough to establish who were the usual attendees. The calendar should not be treated as encompassing all meetings which took place within this time period as the committee/governors did not use a register book and so individual orders are likely lost or have been overlooked. Finally, it should be noted that there were two William Mashams, Sir William and his son, who attended the committee/board of governors regularly, often together. Because it is difficult to tell who was who from the signatures alone, the calendar lists Masham (A) and Masham (B) with the latter indicating the presence of a second Masham signature.

### **Attendance**

Fielder, John: 44

Salwey, Humphrey: 33

Millington, Gilbert: 27

Hodges, Luke 25

Masham (A), [Sir?] William: 22

Scobell, Henry: 18

Blagrove, Daniel: 10

Gurdon, John: 9

Trevor, Sir John: 9

Danvers, Sir John: 8

Ludlow, Edmund: 7

Brewster, Robert: 6

Masham (B), [Sir?] William: 6

Weaver, John: 5

Dove, John: 4

Edwards, Humphrey: 4

Lisle, John: 3

Oldisworth, Michael: 3

Thomson, George: 3

Whitelocke, Bulstrode: 3

Harvey, Edmund: 2

Hay, William: 2

Holland, Cornelius: 2

Lascelles, Francis: 2

Love, Nicholas: 2

Lucy, Sir Richard: 2

Strickland, Sir William: 2

Rous, Francis: 2

Allanson, Sir William: 1

Ashurst, William: 1

Bradshawe, Sir John: 1

Dryden, Sir John: 1

Gerard, [Sir?] Gilbert: 1

Hippisley, Sir John: 1

Hoyle, Thomas: 1

Howard, Edward: 1

Hutchinson, John: 1

Norton, Sir Gregory: 1

Pembroke, Philip the earl of: 1

Prideaux, Edmund: 1

Pye, Sir Robert: 1

Smyth, Henry: 1

Unknown: 1

### Appendix 3: A Summary Calendar of Attendance at the CPM, April 1651-April 1653

#### **Note on the Calendar**

*The following note should be read in conjunction with chapter four*

The following calendar of attendance is based on Bodl., MSS Bodl. 328-9 (two registers of the CPM) and uses evidence of meetings from 188 days between April 1651-April 1653. As in appendix 2, when two William Mashams were signatories to the same order this calendar lists Masham (A) and Masham (B) with the latter indicating the second Masham signature.

#### **Attendance**

Millington, Gilbert: 106

Hay, William: 71

Danvers, Sir John: 52

Ashe, James: 51

Atkins, Thomas: 51

Bourchier, Sir John: 43

Hallowes, Nathaniel: 42

Brewster, Robert: 36

Temple, Peter: 35

Gratwyke, Roger: 29

Oldisworth, Michael: 23

Cawley, William: 20

Dove, John: 18

Edwards, Humphrey: 18

Temple, James: 18

Moyle, John: 17

Martyn, Christopher: 17

Purefoy, William: 16

Blagrove, Daniel: 15

Goodwin, John: 14

Darley, Richard: 14

Fagge, John: 13

Lister, Thomas: 13

Baker, John: 12

Browne, John: 11

Fielder, John: 11

Heveningham, William: 10

Hussey, Thomas: 10

Masham (A), [Sir?] William: 10

Leman, William: 9

Lowry, John: 9

Palmer, John: 9

Pyne, John: 9

Aldworth, Richard: 8

Corbett, John: 8

Pennington, Isaac: 8

Jervoise, Sir Thomas: 7

Lascelles, Francis: 7

Nelthorpe, James: 7

Searle, George: 7

Stephens, William: 7

Dryden, Sir John: 6

Weaver, John: 6

Strickland, Sir William: 6

Bosvile, Godfrey: 5

Dormer, John: 5

Hodges, Luke: 5

Mayne, Simon: 5

Skinner, Augustine: 5

Waite, Thomas: 5

Harrison, Thomas: 4

Strickland, Walter: 4

Sydenham, William: 4

White, William: 4

Barker, John: 3

Bennett, Robert: 3

Burrell, Abraham: 3

Chaloner, James: 3

Crompton, Thomas: 3

Dixwell, John: 3

Edwards, Richard: 3

Fell, Thomas: 3

Harby, Edward: 3

Heyman, Sir Henry: 3

Lechmere, Nicholas: 3

Stapley, Anthony: 3

Carew, John: 2

Clement, Gregory: 2

Constable, Sir William: 2

Gurdon, John: 2

Hippisley, Sir John: 2

Ingoldsby, Richard: 2

Masham (B), [Sir?] William: 2

Mauleverer, Sir Thomas: 2

Mildmay, Sir Henry: 2

Norton, Richard: 2

Raleigh, Carew: 2

Robinson, Luke: 2

Salwey, Humphrey: 2

Skippon, Philip: 2

Armyne, William: 1

Bond, Denis: 1

Brereton, Sir William: 1

Chaloner, Thomas: 1

Darley, Henry: 1

Grey, Thomas Lord: 1

Herbert, Henry: 1

Holland, Cornelius: 1

Love, Nicholas: 1

Lucy, Sir Richard: 1

Mackworth, Thomas: 1

Marten, Henry: 1

Monson, William Lord: 1

Morley, Herbert: 1

Neville, Edward: 1

Nutt, John: 1

Piggot, Gervase: 1

Rous, Francis: 1

Say, William: 1

Scot, Thomas: 1

Smyth, Henry: 1

Walsingham, Sir Thomas: 1

Westrow, Thomas: 1

Wylde, Edmund: 1

## Bibliography

### **Manuscripts and Archival Sources**

#### **Aylesbury**

*Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies*

D104/76 [Pollicott leases]

#### **Cambridge**

*Cambridge University Library*

Baker MS XXV [Collections of Thomas Baker relating to the University of Cambridge]

Baker MS XXXIII [Collections of Thomas Baker relating to the University of Cambridge]

GBR/0265/UA/Grace Book H [Grace Book H, 1645-1668]

GBR/0265/UA/U.Ac.2/1 [Audit book, 1545-1659]

GBR/0265/UA/VCCt.I 61 [Act book of the vice chancellor's court, 1646-1652]

QC 15 [Queens' College treasurer's accounts, 1648-1660]

#### **Cambridge Colleges**

*Christ's*

B.1.10 [College audit book]

*Clare*

CCA B/1/3 [College correspondence]

CCAD 2/1/1/3 [College audit book]

CCGB/2/1/2 [College council meeting, 1654]

*Corpus Christi*

CCCC01/C/2 [Chapter book 2, 1632-1708]

CCCC02/M/24/10 [Note on the income of the college master, 1649]

CCCC07/6 [Order for sale of plate to finance college repairs, 1648]

CCCC08/27 [A note of expenses for several repairs in the college, 1648]

CCCC03/20 [Letter of William Dugard to the college]

CCCC03/21 [Letter from Valentine Walton to Richard Love]

CCCC15/33-33a [University cycle of proctors]

CCCC07/9x [List of plate sold in 1648 and, conjoined, list of plate taken out of the inner library to be sold, with receipt of Edward Yorke, 1648-1747]

CCCC/02/B/6 [College audit book]

*Emmanuel*

Bur.8.2 [College audit book]

*Gonville and Caius*

GOV/03/01/02 [Master/Registry Gesta 1650-1669]

GOV/02/01/01 MFGCC [Pandectae 1559-1658]

BUR/F/88/20 [Liber Bursarii, AD 1634-1661]

*Jesus*

JCAD/2/2/1/4 [College audit book]

*King's*

GBR/0272/KCAR/1/2/12/2 [Provost letters, volume II]

GBR/0272/KCAR/4/1/1/29 [Mundum book, 1649-54]

*Magdalene*

B/422 [Register II]

*Pembroke*

Masters 1589-1630; Socii 1589-1706 [Materials relating to the masters and fellows of Pembroke]

Masters 1589-1706; Fellows 1562-1720 [Materials relating to the masters and fellows of Pembroke]

Registrum Magnum II [College register]

Socii Pembroke 1562 AD 1710 Tom. II [Materials relating to the fellows of Pembroke]

Treasury Accounts, 1648-1699, Vol. II

*Peterhouse*

O.2.20 [Registrum vetus]

O.2.23 [Register, 1646-1719]

N.1.33 [Journal, 1645-1657]

College Computi

*Sidney Sussex*

MR.2 [College register]

MR.61 [College audit book]

*St Catharine's*

L/26 [College audit book]

*St John's*

SJAR/5/1/15/1/1 [Views of plate by auditors, 1649-1783]

SJAR/3/2/4/6 [Rental, 1650-1666]

SJAR/1/1/Arrowsmith:1-2 [Documents relating to pictures in the master's lodgings]

SJGR/3/2/1 [Admonitions book, 1628-1780]

*Trinity*

Box 29 CIV [Correspondence relating to the 1640s and 1650s]

Conclusion Book, 1607-1673 [College register]

Great Volume of Miscellany Paper, vol.iii

Junior Bursar's Books 1620-60

Senior Bursar's Audit Book, 1637-59

*Trinity Hall*

THAR/2/1/1/4/1 [Bursar's accounts, 1653-1664]

**Eton**

*Eton College Records*

Coll P 17 [Papers of Provost Rous, 1644-1659]

Coll P 17/2 [Francis Rous, statement of income and expenditure, 25 August 1646]

60/3/4 [Register 3, 1577-1666]

60/6/1/1 [Seal book, 1617-1792]

60/6/5/1 [Request of the fellows to use the college seal, 17 January 163/4]

62/10 [Audit book, 1637-1653]

62/61 [Bursar's book, 1648-1681]

## **Gloucester**

*Gloucestershire Archives*

D1086/R23 [Appeal for funds to support Anastasius Comnenus]

## **London**

*British Library*

Add. MS 4275 [Manuscripts collected by Thomas Birch, 1584-1722]

Add. MS 22953 [Letters of eminent Dutchmen, 1589-1811]

Add. MS 32093 [State papers, 1625-1660]

Add. MS 32094 [State papers, 1660-1676]

Add. MS 37682 [P.A. Taylor Papers, vol. I, 1650-1899]

Add. MS 71448 [James Chaloner: correspondence and papers]

Burney MS 127 [Nicolas Floyd, Παψοδία βιβλικὰ]

Stowe MS 185 [Miscellaneous historical papers]

*Guildhall Library*

CLC/L/MD/B/003A/MS34010/007 [Merchant Taylors' court minute book, 1637-1654]

*London Metropolitan Archives*

CLC/198/SICA/008/MS33445/001 [Sion College, court of governors' minutes, 1631-1716]

CLC/198/SICB/001/MS33458 [Sion College, general account book, 1631-1728]

*Lambeth Palace Library*

COMM VIa/2 [Register of orders for augmentations made by the CRU, 1650-2]

MS 688 [Miscellaneous papers]

MS 770 [University of Cambridge, annals and biographies]

MS 785 [University of Cambridge, annals]

MS 804 [Documents relating to the University of Cambridge]

MS 1048b [Collection relating to the history of the University of Cambridge]

MS 1104 [Papers of the trustees for the maintenance of preaching ministers, 1649-57]

MS 3152 [Miscellaneous papers, 1532-1952]

SECKER 6 [Correspondence and papers of Thomas Secker, 1749-1768]

Sion L40.2/E16 [Augmentation order book of the CRU, 1650-2]

Sion L40.2/E17 [Records of the London Provincial Assembly, 1647-1660]

Sion L40.2/E64 [Sion College Library: book of benefactors, 1629-1982]

*Mercers' Company Archives*

[N.B. When I visited the Mercers' Company Archives in 2022, their collections were temporarily held at the National Archives at Kew while new archive accommodation was constructed at Mercers' Hall.]

MC/1/1/1/12 [Acts of court, 1645-1651]

MC/1/1/1/13 [Acts of court, 1651-1657]

MC/1/9/A/1/1/2 [Minutes of the joint grand Gresham committee, 1626-1669]

MC/1/9/A/3/4 [Account book of the joint grand Gresham committee, 1636-1658]

MC/1/9/C/1/4/1 [Abstract of orders relating to the lectures in Gresham College, 1597-1753]

*The National Archives*

[N.B. All S[tate] P[apers] were accessed via [State Papers Online \(gale.com\)](https://www.gale.com)]

PROB 11/280/411 [Will of Dr John Harris, warden of Winchester College]

PROB 11/287/260 [Will of Francis Rous, provost of Eton College]

SP 16/71 [State papers domestic: Charles I, letters and papers, 1627 July 15-24]

SP 18/70 [Council of State: navy commission and related bodies, letters and papers, 1654 April 20-30]

SP 25/8 [Council of State: books and accounts, draft order books, 1650 July 22-August 14]

SP 25/20 [Council of State: books and accounts, draft order books, 1651 May 31-July 2]

SP 25/66 [Council of State: books and accounts, draft order books, 1651 December 1-1652 April 30]

SP 25/77 [Council of State: books and accounts, draft order books, 1656 March 25-1657 September 16]

SP 25/78 [Council of State: books and accounts, draft order books, 1657 July 13-1658 September 2]

SP 25/96 [Council of State: books and accounts, letter books, 1651 February 18-October 30]

SP 25/97 [Council of State: books and accounts, letter books, 1651 December 2-1652 March 31]

*Westminster Abbey Muniments*

5272 [Order of the school governors, 26 November 1649]

5273 [Petition from Hugh Molland to the committee for the school, 4 August 1649]

5275-7 [Petitions of John Hart and William Gilby to school governors, n.d.]

5278 [Order of the school governors, 11 November 1650]

5298 [Order of the school governors, 25 May 1650]

5316 A-F [Petition of Danyell Lyall to the school governors with certificates in his favour]

5333 [Letter from the Council of State to the committee for the school, 13 August 1649]

5336 [Order of the school governors, 15 June 1650]

5341 A-B [Petition of William Gregory to the school governors with a letter in his favour of William Lenthall, 6 September 1649]

5344 [Order of the school governors, 6 July 1650]

5364 [Order of the school governors, 8 October 1649]

5380 [Order of the school governors, 10 May 1650]

6375a-b [Petition from the servants of Westminster Abbey to the school governors, 1658]

7557 [Petition from John Collins to the school governors, n.d.]

9371 [Order of the school governors, 31 December 1649]

9393 [Petition of Thomas Gouldstone to the committee for the school]

9394 [Order of the school governors, 24 August 1653]

9633 [Letter of the Earl of Pembroke to the committee for the school, 10 June 1647]

9728 [Memorandum of the committee for the school, n.d.]

9798 [Petition of Edward Coxe to the school governors, n.d.]

- 9819 [Order of the school governors, 10 May 1650]
- 9820 [Petition of Thomas Gouldstone to the school governors]
- 9821 [Petition of Thomas Gouldstone to the school governors]
- 9822 [Petition of Thomas Gouldstone to the committee for the school]
- 9823 [Petition of Thomas Gouldstone to the committee for the school]
- 9824 [Petition of Thomas Gouldstone to the committee for the school]
- 9825 [Letter from Gruffith Williams to the school governors, 28 June 1651]
- 9826 [Sub-committee of school governors considering proposals relating to the library, 27 October 1657]
- 9827 [Letter of the school governors to Mr Vaughan, n.d.]
- 9828 [Order of the school governors, 26 November 1653]
- 9830 [Order of the school governors, 8 October 1649]
- 9831 [Order of the school governors, 12 March 1653]
- 9832 [List of books in Westminster College library furnished by Thomas Gouldstone, n.d.]
- 9833 [Petition of Richard Gouland to the school governors, n.d.]
- 9839 [Petition of John Harmar to the school governors, c. 1653]
- 12646 [Acquittance of Henry Eyre and Samuel Heron, 18 July 1650]
- 12648 [Petition of Hugh Williams to the school governors, n.d.]

14625 [Petition of the tenants of the late dean and chapter of Westminster to the school governors, n.d.]

18166 [Memorandum of John Bradshaw, n.d.]

18169 [Abstract of orders concerning the dean's house, 13 March 1650-8 January 1653]

18188 [Petition of Florence Hodges to the school governors, n.d.]

24875 [Draft seating plan for Westminster Abbey, n.d.]

24994 [Petition of John Phelps and Abraham Browne to the school governors, n.d.]

24995 [Petition of Thomas Dodd, c. July 1650]

24996 [Testimonial on behalf of Thomas Dodd, 9 July 1650]

25005 [Petition of Thomas Wivall to the school governors, n.d.]

25172 [Order of the school governors, 25 January 1651]

25173 [Order of the school governors, 25 January 1651]

32455 [Petition of the Westminster Scholars to the committee for the school, n.d.]

32463 [Paper of the committee for the school, 17 April 1649]

32464 [Order of the school governors, 10 May 1650]

32470 [Order of the school governors, 7 March 1651]

32471 [Payment by the school governors, 30 April 1651]

32472 [Order of the school governors, 30 April 1651]

32473 [Order of the school governors, 25 October 1655]

32479 [Petition from scholars of the school to the committee for the school, n.d.]

32481-2 [Draft and fair copy of petition of Richard Busby to the committee for the school, n.d.]

32489 [Petition from scholars of the school to the school governors, n.d.]

42682 [Order of the committee for the school, 23 April 1649]

42712 [Order of the committee for the school, 30 November 1648]

42725 [Warrant of the committee for the school, 30 June 1649]

42726 [Warrant of the committee for the school, 30 June 1649]

42727 [Warrant of the school governors, 20 October 1649]

42729 [Warrant of the school governors, 10 November 1649]

42731 [Warrant of the school governors, November 1649]

42733 [Order of the school governors, 17 December 1649]

42736 [Warrant of the school governors, 31 December 1649]

42740 [Order of the school governors, 29 June 1650]

42742 [Warrant of the school governors, 20 July 1650]

42743 [Warrant of the school governors, 20 July 1650]

42744 [Warrant of the school governors, 27 July 1650]

42745 [Warrant of the school governors, 11 November 1650]

42746 [Warrant of the school governors, 23 November 1650]

42765 A-E [Bill for altering the tower chamber, 27 April 1650]

42766 A-O [Bill for the work on the abbey's towers, 1650]

42781 [Acquittance of William Liptratt, 3 December 1649]

42794 [Acquittance of Thomas Fazakerly, 27 July 1650]

42796 [Letter of James Straghen to the school governors, 26 December 1649]

42799 [Letter of James Straghen to the school governors, 21 January 1650]

42800 [Acquittance signed by John Stanley]

42802 [Certificate of Nicholas Sheppherd, 3 February 1650]

42803 A-B [Certificate of Clem Keene and acquittance, 11 February 1650]

42804 A-B [Certificate of H. Hammond and acquittance, 18 February 1650]

42805 A-B [Certificate of Sam Lendrington and acquittance, 25 February 1649/50]

42806 A-B [Certificate of Thomas Smith and acquittance, 4 March 1650]

42807 A-B [Certificate and acquittance, 11 March 1650]

42808 A-B [Certificate of William White and acquittance, 18 March 1650]

42809 A-B [Certificate of James Straghen and acquittance, 25 March 1650]

42810 A-B [Certificate of Robert Ranker and acquittance, 1 April 1650]

42811 A-B [Certificate Richard Comes and acquittance, 7&8 April 1650]

42812 A-B [Certificate of Henry Hammond and acquittance, 21&22 April 1650]

42813 A-B [Certificate of Sam Lendrington and acquittance, 29 April 1650]

42817 [Order of the committee for the school, 23 November 1648]

42818 [Letter of the committee for the school to the committee for Essex, 4 April 1649]

42819 [Order of the committee for the school, 14 April 1649]

42822 [Order of the committee for the school, 25 May 1649]

42823 [Warrant of the committee for the school, 25 May 1649]

42824 [Warrant of the committee for the school, 26 May 1649]

42827 [Petition from the burgesses of Westminster and their assistants, 16 June 1649]

42828 [Warrant of the committee for the school, 22 June 1649]

42831 [Warrant of the committee for the school, 30 June 1649]

42832 [Warrant of the committee for the school, 14 July 1649]

42833 [Warrant of the committee for the school, 18 August 1649]

42835 [Order of the school governors, 1 October 1649]

42840 [Petition from a glazier, 13 March 1650]

42902 [Order of the school governors, 3 August 1650]

43054 [Students elected to the school, Oxford, and Cambridge, 3 May 1648]

43056 [Students elected to Oxford and Cambridge, 24 April 1649]

43057 [Names of those elected to the school, ?1650]

43058 [Bill for the election dinner, 1650]

43059 [Letter of Anthony Tuckney to John Bradshaw, 27 January 1654]

43055 [Paper of the committee for the school, 13 April 1649]

43150 [Warrant of the committee for the school, 28 June 1649]

43152 [Order of the school governors, 20 October 1649]

43154 [Order of the school governors, 19 November 1649]

43155 [Warrant of the school governors, 3 December 1649]

43162 [Resolutions of a committee [of the school?] to consider offices and their fit salary, n.d.]

43165 [Order of the school governors, 11 February 1650]

43166 [Warrant of the school governors, 11 February 1650]

43168 [Acquittance of Thomas Hill, 25 February 1650]

43169 [Acquittance of William Croyden, 26 February 1650]

43177-8 [Reports by a sub-committee of the school governors on the expense of bread and beer, n.d.]

43179 [Warrant of the school governors, 12 November 1650]

43180 [Order of the school governors, 8 November 1651]

43182 [Warrant of the school governors, 21 February 1652]

43185 [Order of the school governors, 19 May 1652]

43186 [Warrant of the school governors, 19 May 1652]

43188 [Warrant of the school governors, 23 October 1652]

43189 [Warrant of the school governors, 23 October 1652]

43190 [Warrant of the school governors, 6 November 1652]

43192 [Case presented by Lord President Bradshaw to the school governors, 21 December 1652]

43247 [Order of the school governors, 9 November 1650]

43251 [Warrant of the school governors, 28 December 1650]

43252 [Warrant of the school governors, 28 December 1650]

43253 [Order of the school governors, 28 December 1650]

43258 [Warrant of the school governors, 25 January 1651]

43259 [Acquittance of Philip Nye, 24 June 1650]

43261 [Warrant of the school governors, 7 March 1651]

43262 [Warrant of the school governors, 7 March 1651]

43263 [Warrant of the school governors, 7 March 1651]

43267 [Order of the school governors, 22 March 1651]

43268 [Warrant of the school governors, 22 March 1651]

43274 [Order of the school governors, 26 April 1651]

43276 [Order of the school governors, 3 May 1651]

43277 [Warrant of the school governors, 3 May 1651]

43282 [Order of the school governors, 30 May 1651]

43283 [Order of the school governors, 30 May 1651]

43285 [Order of the school governors, 8 June 1651]

43292 [Warrant of the school governors, 12 July 1651]

43292\* [Survey by the school surveyor concerning the library, c. 1651]

43296 [Warrant of the school governors, 24 September 1651]

43297 [Warrant of the school governors, 27 September 1651]

43300 [Order of the school governors, 4 October 1651]

43305 [Warrant of the school governors, 8 November 1651]

43306 [Testimonial for John Browne, 20 November 1651]

43308 [Acquittance of Philip Nye, 4 December 1651]

43309 [Order of the school governors, 20 December 1651]

43310 [Warrant of the school governors, 3 January 1652]

43311 [Warrant of the school governors, 3 January 1652]

43312 [Warrant of the school governors, 13 January 1652]

43313 [Warrant of the school governors, 24 January 1652]

43314 [Order of the school governors, 24 January 1652]

43318 [Warrant of the school governors, 20 March 1652]

43319 [Order of the school governors, 23 October 1652]

43326 [Order of the school governors, 24 January 1652]

43327 [Order of the school governors, 21 November 1651]

43328 [Warrant of the school governors, 28 February 1652]

43330 [Warrant of the school governors, 28 February 1652]

43331 [Warrant of the school governors, 3 April 1652]

43333 [Order of the school governors, 30 October 1652]

43334 [Order of the school governors, 30 October 1652]

43335 [Warrant of the school governors, 6 November 1652]

43337 A-C [Order of the school governors and report, 20 November 1652]

43341 [Order from subcommittee of school governors, 28 December 1652]

43442 [Book of arrears for Westminster school, n.d.]

43476 [Orders of the school governors, December 1652-January 1653]

43477 [Order of the school governors, 5 February 1653]

43478 [Order of the school governors, 12 February 1653]

43479 [Order of the school governors, 12 February 1653]

43480 [Warrant of the school governors, 12 February 1653]

43481 [Copy of an order of the school governors, 6 August 1653]

43482 [Order of the school governors, 18 August 1653]

43485 [Orders of the school governors, 12 November 1653]

43486 [Draft of orders of subcommittee of the school governors, 17/21 November 1653]

43487 [Report of the surveyor, Adam Browne, to the school governors, c. 1653]

51004 [Lease to Richard Busby, 1655]

52530 [Petition from Walter Porter to the school governors, n.d.]

57166 [Memorandum concerning the library, n.d.]

66907 [Lease to Richard Busby, c. 1653]

## **Manchester**

### *Chetham Library*

Allen Deeds E.2.7 Parcel N no. 302 [Draft copy of a letter from Humphrey Chetham to Ralph Brideoake, 17 March 1649]

CPP/2/52 [Letter from Nicholas Ramsbotham to Humphrey Chetham, 14 February 1649]

CPP/2/53 [Letter from John Bradshawe, 20 February 1649]

CPP/2/61 [Letter from Humphrey Chetham, 26 May 1648]

CPP/2/99 [Order for buying the college, 10 September 1649]

CPP/2/125 [CRU letter concerning the college, ?3 March 1652]

CPP/2/134 [Letter of John Prestwich, to Messrs Heyrick, Radcliffe, Mosley, Hartley, and Lightbourne etc, 19 April 1653 (N.B. the catalogue mistakenly lists the date as August)]

CPP/2/154 [Letter from John Prestwich to the 'Gentlemen ffeoffees of the Library in Manchester', All Souls Oxford, 16 November 1657]

## **Oxford**

### *Bodleian Library*

MS Add. B 109 [Notes and letters of George Stradling]

MS Ashmole 36 [English poetry]

MS Ashmole 421 [Autobiography of William Lilly]

MS Bodl. 328-9 [Registers of the CPM, 1650-3]

MS Clarendon 31 [Clarendon state papers, 1648]

MS Eng. hist. c. 5 [Nineteen letters, nearly all addressed to Richard Witt or De Witt, 1650-1656]

MS Eng. poet. d. 161 [Letters, poems, and translations by John Potenger]

MS Lib. recs b. 903 [Bodleian Library benefactors' register, 1600-1688]

MS Lib. recs. c. 27 [Bodleian Library original vouchers, 1642, 1646-57]

MS Lib. rec. c. 857 [Books of the Bodleian Library received from stationers, 1640-1764]

MS Lib. recs. e. 8 [Bodleian Library annual accounts, 1613-76]

MS Lib. recs e. 533 [Bodleian Library book of admissions, 1611-1692]

MS Lib. recs e. 544 [Bodleian Library entry books, 1647/8-1649]

MS Rawl. B. 265 [Collections for a history of the members of Eton College]

MS Rawl. D. 810 [Miscellaneous]

MS Rawl. J. 4. 28 [Benefactors to St John's College, Oxford]

MS Rawl. poet. 147 [Collection of poetry]

MS Selden supra 108 [Letters to John Selden, 1616-1654]

MS Selden supra 109 [Letters to John Selden, 1616-1654]

MS Tanner 456\* [Collections by Anthony Wood relating to the university and city of Oxford]

MS J. Walker C. 2 [Collections of John Walker's relating to his *Sufferings of the Clergy*]

MS J. Walker C. 3 [Collections of John Walker's relating to his *Sufferings of the Clergy*]

MS J. Walker C. 4 [Collections of John Walker's relating to his *Sufferings of the Clergy*]

MS J. Walker C. 7 [Collections of John Walker's relating to his *Sufferings of the Clergy*]

MS J. Walker C. 8 [Collections of John Walker's relating to his *Sufferings of the Clergy*]

MS J. Walker c. 9 [Collections of John Walker's relating to his *Sufferings of the Clergy*]

MS J. Walker e. 3 [Notes on cathedrals, colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, and Ripon by John Walker]

MS Wood E.5 [Collections from the university archives by Anthony Wood and collections from visitation records in the College of Arms]

MS Wood E. 32 [Oxford jests collected and written by Anthony Wood, 1647-1688]

MS Wood F. 27 [Copies of documents concerning the university and city of Oxford, written chiefly before 1660 by Anthony Wood and others]

MS Wood F. 28 [Miscellaneous papers concerning the colleges and halls of Oxford, written by Anthony Wood and others]

MS Wood F. 30, 32 [Collection of lives and miscellaneous]

MS Wood F. 31 [Miscellaneous papers concerning the university, city, and county of Oxford, written in the late seventeenth century chiefly by Anthony Wood]

MS Wood F. 35 [Miscellaneous papers, relating to the visitations of the university of Oxford, written in the seventeenth century]

*Oxford University Archives*

CC Papers 1651 [Papers of the vice chancellor's court]

HYP A 43 [Register of the vice chancellor's court]

NEP/supra/23 [Petition of gentlemen and diverse others of Oxfordshire, 1649]

NEP/supra/Reg T [Register of convocations, 1647-1659]

SP/E/4 [Papers relating to the parliamentary visitation and to general university business, including disputes with the city, 1640-60]

SP/E/5 [Papers relating to the parliamentary visitation and to disputes between the university and the city, 1647-9]

SP/E/9 [Papers concerning disputes with the city, 1639-61]

SP/F/27-8 [Draft letters to the chancellor, Oliver Cromwell, 1652]

SP/F/30 [Draft petition of the university to the chancellor, Oliver Cromwell, 1652]

SP/F/34 [Petition of the university bedels to the CRU, n.d.]

WP $\alpha$ /10/11 [Dr Gerard Langbaine's expenses in London, 1649-50]

WP $\beta$ /21/4 [Computus Vice-Chancellor, 1621-66]

WP $\beta$ /B/45 [Acquittance for £384.5.4 collected in the university for the Protestants in Savoy, 18 July 1655]

WP $\gamma$ /6/2 [Suggestions from certain colleges respecting statutes, c.1651]

WP $\gamma$ /22 [Petitions]

WP $\gamma$ /28/8 [Proclamations, 1634-1814]

## **Oxford Colleges**

### *All Souls*

Acta in Capitulis, MS. 400a [College minute book]

Computus Roll 1649

MS. DD. All Souls Coll b. 86 [Steward's Book]

MS. DD. All Souls Coll b. 87 [Steward's Book]

### *Balliol College*

Bursar's Computi 3

College Meeting Minutes 1 [First Latin Register 1514-1682]

MS 355 [Nicholas Crouch Diary for 1634-1672]

*Brasenose*

BT 1 G 1 [Benefactors' book]

BT 1 G 2 [Benefactors' book]

Gov 3 A1/2, 1594-1710 [College register]

GOV 6 A2/4 (Folder 7) [Letters of John Houghton to Thomas Yates, 1660]

GOV 6 B1 Juramenta (Folder 21) [Letters of John Houghton to Thomas Yates, 1649-50]

PRI 1 A1/1 [Letter sent by the college to Sir John Danvers, 13 July 1648]

PRI 1 A1/2 [Account of events in 1648 written in 1660]

PRI A1/3 [Case presented by Daniel Greenwood to the chancellor's commission, 1660]

SB Accounts A 2. 45 1652 [College accounts]

SB Accounts NO 1+2, A 2.43-44, 1647, 1648, 1651 [College accounts]

*Christ Church*

liii.b.3 [College accounts]

D&C i.b.3 [Register of the governing body]

DP ii.c.1 [Miscellaneous documents]

*Corpus Christi*

C/1/1/10 [Libri Magni]

*Exeter*

RA2/02 [College audit book]

RG1/02 [College register]

The Benefactors' Book

*Jesus*

Bu:Ac:Gen:1 [College audit book]

Bu:Ac:Gen:2 [College audit book]

PR Mansell B.9 [Receipt signed by Richard Davies, 8 May 1654]

PR Mansell B.10 [Subscription for Bishop Bramhall and others, n.d.]

PR Mansell B.11 [Receipt signed by John Dexensis alias Pierson [i.e. Bramhall],  
5/15 June 1654]

PR Mansell B.13 [Receipt signed by John Crook, 27 December 1654]

PR Mansell C.10 [William Bassett to Francis Mansell, 7 August 1647]

PR Roberts A:2 [Note from Hugh Wood to John Wood]

PR Roberts A:3 [Letter from Mr T. Rowney to Michael Roberts, 25 May 1652]

PR Roberts A:5 [Letter from Michael Roberts to Thomas Hervey, 3 January 1653]

PR Roberts A:6 [Statement by Michael Roberts justifying his accounting in absence of a college bursar, 16 August 1650]

PR Roberts A:7 [List of College Plate stolen from Jesus, 6 August 1654]

PR Roberts A:10 [List of sums to be charged to Michael Roberts from 1649-57]

PR Roberts A: 11 [Allegations of Dr Wallis against Michael Roberts, 12 November 1658]

PR Roberts A:12 [The answer of Michael Roberts against accusations of the fellows in the vice chancellor's court]

### *Lincoln*

Annual Accounts, 1648

Calculus, 1649

Calculus, 1650

Calculus, 1652

Calculus, 1653

LC/R/2 [College register]

### *Magdalen*

LCD/4 [Draft audit book]

LCE/29 [College audit book]

MS 367 [Letters and papers, 1460-1800]

VP1/A1/1 [Vice president's register, 1547-1839]

*Merton*

SC/MCR/F/1/4/2 [Liber Rationarius Bursarium 1633-1652]

SC/MCR/F/1/4/3 [Liber Rationarius Bursarium, 1652-77]

*New*

988 [Resolutions of the warden and thirteen, 1650-1655]

4207 [College audit book, 1649-51]

4208 [College audit book, 1651-2]

5072 [Drafts of letters by Henry Stringer regarding his election as warden in 1647]

9655 [The great register]

11704 [Miscellaneous documents]

*Oriel*

GOV 4 A1 [The dean's register]

TF 1 A1/6 [College audit book]

*Pembroke*

PMB/D/1/1/1 [Master's account book, 1648-1795]

*Queen's*

College Register H

LR C [College audit book]

2T97 [Letter of Gerard Langbaine to John Mills, 9 October 1648]

*St John's*

ADM I.A.3 [College register]

ACC I.A.33 [College audit book]

ACC I.A.34 [College audit book]

ACC I.A.35 [College audit book]

FNVA 13 [College register]

*Trinity*

Accounts I/A/3 [College audit book]

*University*

UC:BE1/M5S1/1 [College book of benefactors]

UC:BU2/F1/1 [College audit book]

UC:GB3/A1/1 [College register]

UC:MA26/C1/4 [Letter from Michael Oldisworth to Thomas Walker, 16 June 1648]

UC:MA30/3/MS/57 [Visitors' questions to Dr Saunders, April 1648]

UC:MA30/3/MS/69 [Copy of a parody of a proclamation from the visitors and the vice chancellor, 24 June 1648]

UC:MA30/3/MS/75 [Letter from "L.R." asking for help to save the university of Oxford from the effects of the parliamentary visitors, n.d.]

UC:S7/C1/4 [Letter from John Elmhirst [/Elmehirst] to Joshua Hoyle, 20 August 1652]

UC:S8/MS1/1 [Minutes of a meeting of the pro-vice chancellor and proproctors of Oxford regarding Ezreel Tonge and Mr. Norton, 1 September 1651]

### *Wadham*

4/83 [Order of the Visitors of Oxford, 6 February 1649/50]

4/87 [Order of the CRU, 14 November 1650]

4/88 [Order of the CRU, 2 January 1650/1]

4/90 [Order of a subcommittee of the CRU, 25 April 1651]

4/92 [Order of the CRU, 29 May 1651]

4/93 [Order of the CRU, 29 May 1651]

4/94 [Order of the CRU, 19 June 1651]

4/95 [Order of the CRU, 3 July 1651]

4/97 [Order of the CRU, 3 July 1651]

4/99 [Order of the CRU, 9 October 1651]

4/100a [Petition of Anthony Nourse to the CRU]

4/100b [Order of the CRU, 6 November 1651]

4/101 [Order of the trustees for maintenance of ministers, 5 December 1651]

4/102 [Order of the Visitors of Oxford, 20 January 1651/2]

16/1 [Bursar's accounts, 1649-60]

## **Sheffield**

*University of Sheffield Library, Hartlib Papers* ([The Hartlib Papers \(dhi.ac.uk\)](http://TheHartlibPapers.dhi.ac.uk))

3/3/30A [Letter from John Dury to Samuel Hartlib, 25 August 1646]

4/1/31A-B [Letter from John Dury to Samuel Hartlib, n.d.]

7/32/1A-2B [Letter from John Dury to Francis Rous, 2/12 February 1646]

9/11/6A-7B [Letter from William Hamilton to Samuel Hartlib, 22 January 1649]

9/11/10A-11B [Letter from William Hamilton to Samuel Hartlib, 7 May 1649]

9/11/18A-20B [Letter from William Hamilton to Samuel Hartlib, 17 December 1649]

10/1/1A-2B [Letter from Thomas Gilson to Samuel Hartlib, 1 January 1650]

10/1/5A-B [Letter from Thomas Gilson to Samuel Hartlib, 10 August 1648]

15/3/1A [Letter from Henry Langley to Samuel Hartlib, 9 January 1652]

15/3/3A-4B [Letter from Henry Langley to Samuel Hartlib, 3 April 1652]

15/3/5A [Letter from Henry Langley to Samuel Hartlib, 30 June 1651]

15/3/7A [Letter from Henry Langley to Samuel Hartlib jr., 8 January 1653]

15/3/9A-B [Letter from Henry Langley to Samuel Hartlib, 1 April 1652]

15/3/10A [Letter from Henry Langley to Samuel Hartlib, 18 October 1652]

15/3/12A-13B [Letter from Henry Langley to Samuel Hartlib, 17 January, n.y.]

15/3/14A [Letter from Henry Langley to Samuel Hartlib, 5 July n.y.]

30/4/28A-36B [Ephemerides 1639, Part 4, Samuel Hartlib]

41/1/20A-21B [Letter from Ralph Austen to Samuel Hartlib, 1 April 1653]

47/9/16A-17B [Notes on London University by Samuel Hartlin, n.d.]

47/9/19A-B [Notes on London University by Samuel Hartlin, n.d.]

Document 20, The James Marshal and Marie-Louise Osborn Collection, Yale [Letter from William Petty to John Dury, 26 August 1650]

## **Winchester**

### *Hampshire Record Office*

DC/E3/1/1 [Subscriptions for repairing Winchester Cathedral]

1660P/1 [Will of Phoebe Harris]

1661PC/2 [Will of Thomas Grent, physician of Winchester College]

1661PC/3 [Will of Thomas Hackett]

1661PC/4 [Will of John Harris of Silksteed]

1662B/33 [Will of Thomas Harris, fellow of Winchester College]

1667A/124 [Will of George Wither of Hall]

1676B54/1 [Will of Gilbert Wither]

1677B06 [Will of Edward Coles]

102A17/D1/1/1 [Will of William Wither sr. of Manydown]

312M87/E10/6 [Will of William Wither, fellow of Winchester College]

312M87/E10/7 [Will of George Wither of Winchester]

*Winchester College Archives*

392 [Discharge of college meadows from levy of Parliament]

393 [Discharge of college meadows from levy of Parliament]

395 [Commons' order, 29 May 1649]

396 [Commissioners of CRU at Winchester College, 3 October 1649]

397 [Order of the CRU appointing additional visitors for Winchester, 27 December 1649]

398 [Statement of John Harris of the members of the college and their rules]

399 [Articles against John Harris]

400 [Order of the CRU, 27 June 1650]

401 [Order of the CRU, 8 January 1652]

- 402 [Order of the CRU, 25 December 1651]
- 403 [Petition of James Sacheverell to the CRU]
- 404 [Order of the CRU, 19 February 1652]
- 405 [Order of the CRU, ?1651]
- 407 [Drafts of 3 petitions in the handwriting of John Harris to Oliver Cromwell and the CRU]
- 408 [Order of the CRU, 11 September 1651]
- 409 [Copy of ordinance appointing visitors for the universities, Winchester, Eton, and Westminster, 2 September 1654]
- 410 [Letters of John Harris to his son, 1641-2]
- 414 [Letter of John Harris to his son, 31 January 1654]
- 415 [Letter of John Harris to his son, 12 May 1656]
- 418 [The answers of John Harris to WCA, 399]
- 420 [Draft letters of John Harris concerning the excise]
- 421 [Letter of Nicholas Love to John Harris, May 1646]
- 422 [Letter of Nicholas Love to John Harris, 26 March 1647]
- 423 [Letter of John Harris to the CRU, n.d.]
- 424 [Letter of John Harris to Robert Reynolds (though later embellished as being for Dr Edward Reynolds), 31 July 1649]
- 425 [Letter of Robert Needler to Mr Pullen [aka Pullein/Pulleyn], 26 August 1653. Also, a draft letter of John Harris concerning tithes, n.d.]

- 426 [Comparison of John Harris with Titus Pomponius Atticus]
- 427 [A note on John Harris's loyalty to the king during the civil wars]
- 428 [Note on the establishment of Winchester College's sick house, Bethesda]
- 429 [Letter of John Harris to Lord Fiennes, n.d.]
- 430 [Three draft letters of John Harris to Lord Keeper Fiennes, Lord Commissioner Lisle, and unknown, ?1656-8]
- 431 [Draft letter of John Harris concerning the living of Meonstoke, n.d.]
- 445 [Letter of Nicholas Love to John Harris, 3 January 1650. Also, an anonymous biography of John Harris]
- 446 [Letter of Nicholas Love to John Harris, 14 June 1649]
- 447 [Letter of Nicholas Love to John Harris n.d. Also, an anonymous biography of John Harris]
- 448 [Orders of the CRU, 10 January 1650; 21 February 1650]
- 449 [Letter of Nathaniel Fiennes to John Harris, 12 November 1647]
- 450 [Letter of W. Pullein [aka Pullen/Pulleyn] to John Harris, 2 January 1656]
- 452 [Letter of Edward Reynolds to John Harris n.d. Also, an anonymous biography of John Harris]
- 453 [Richard Fitzherbert on behalf of the clergy of Dorset to John Harris as chaplain to Archbishop of Canterbury, 10 June n.d. Also, a discourse on anger, in the handwriting of John Harris]
- 454 [Letter of Ann Searle to John Harris, n.d.]

- 455 [Letter of Nicholas Love to John Harris, 18 September 1646]
- 461 [Letter from Lord Saye and Seale to John Harris, 16 December 1657]
- 528 [Letter from Robert Mathew to George Morley, 29 August 1670]
- 529 [Letter from W. Pullein [aka Pullen/Pulleyn] to John Harris, 20 November 1655]
- 883 [Appeal to the vice chancellor by Robert Mathew under sentence of expulsion, n.d.]
- 890a [Petition of Roger Heigham to the CRU, n.d.]
- 890b [Duplicate of 890a with minor differences]
- 891 [Papers by John Harris regarding Roger Heigham, n.d.]
- 892 [Letter of John Harris to his son, 31 January 1650]
- 894 [Inventory of college goods at New College in the warden's lodgings, 13 February 1657]
- 21852 [Register of Oaths, 1639-1727]
- Blackstone's Book of Benefactions
- Bursars' Book, 1644-1671
- Library Book of Donations

### **Printed Primary Sources**

*An Account of the Wardens of Christ's College Church, Manchester...* (London, 1773).

*Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-60*, ed. C.H. Firth and Robert S. Rait (3 vols, London, 1911).

[Allibond, John,] *Rustica Academiae Oxoniensis Nuper Reformatae...* [London, 1648].

*Alumni Oxonienses, 1500-1714*, ed. Joseph Foster (4 vols, Oxford, 1892).

*The Answer of the Chancellor, Master and Scholars of the University of Oxford, to the Petition, Articles of Grievance, and Reasons of the City of Oxon. Presented to the Honorable Committee for Regulating the University of Oxford the 24 of July 1649* (Oxford, 1649).

Arrowsmith, John, *Englands Eben-ezer or, Stone of Help...* (London, 1645).

Ascham, Roger, *The Scholemaster...* (London, 1571).

Aubrey, John, *Brief Lives*, ed. Oliver Dick (Michigan, 1957).

Bacon, Robert, *A Taste of the Spirit of God, and of this World...* (London, 1652).

[Barlow, Thomas,] *Pegasus or the Flying Horse from Oxford...* (Mongomery [i.e., Oxford, 1648]).

Biddle, John, *A Twofold Catechism...* (London, 1654).

Birkenhead, John, *Two Centuries of Pauls Church-Yard...* (London, 1653).

Boreman, Robert, *The Triumph of Learning over Ignorance...* (London, 1653).

*The Bounds & Bonds of Publique Obedience...* (London, 1649).

Burges, Cornelius, *Sion College, What It Is and Doeth...* (London, 1648).

Calamy, Edmund, *A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers...* (2 vols, London, 1727).

*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1650...*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1876).

*Cambridge University Transactions During the Puritan Controversies of the 16th and 17th Centuries*, eds, James Heywood and Thomas Wright (2 vols, London, 1854).

Chauncy, Charles, *Gods Mercy Shewed to His People...* (Cambridge MA, 1655).

Cheynell, Francis, *The Divine Trinity...* (London, 1650).

Churton, Edward, 'Memoir', in *Minor Theological Works of John Pearson*, (2 vols, Oxford, 1844), i, xiii–cxxxvi.

*Clare College Letters and Documents, Edited with Notes*, ed. John Reynolds Wardale (Cambridge, 1903).

[Cleveland, John,] *Midsummer-Moone, or Lunacy Rampant...* (1648).

Cobbet, Thomas, *The Civil Magistrates Power in Matters of Religion...* (London, 1653).

Collier, Thomas, *The Pulpit-Guard Routed...* (London, 1651).

Collings, John, *Vindiciae Ministerii Evangelici...* (London, 1651).

Conant, John, *The Life of the Reverend and Venerable John Conant, D.D. ...* (London, 1823).

*The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660*, ed. Samuel Rawson Gardiner, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn (Oxford, 1906).

*The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D. Lord Bishop of Durham: Together with Other Papers Illustrative of His Life and Times*, ed. George Ornsby, Surtees Soc., lii & lv, (2 vols, Durham, 1869-1872).

*The Correspondence of John Owen (1616-1683): With an Account of His Life and Work*, ed. Peter Toon (Cambridge, 1970).

Cyprius, Philippus, *Chronicon Ecclesiae Graecae...* (Leipzig, 1687).

D., T., *Zions Song for Young Children...* (London, 1650).

Day, Richard, *The Humble Petition or Remonstrance of Rich: Day of Eton, neer Windsor...* (London, 1652).

Dell, William, *The Tryal of Spirits... Whereunto Is Added a Plain and Necessary Confutation of Divers Errors Delivered by Mr Sydrach Simpson... also, Luthers Testimony...and Lastly, the Right Reformation of Learning...* (London, 1653).

— *The Stumbling Stone...Delivered Partly to the University-Congregation in Cambridge, Partly to Another in the Same Town...* (London, 1653).

*The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge...*, ed. James Crossley (2 vols in 3, Manchester, 1847-1886).

*The Diary of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605-1675*, ed. Ruth Spalding (Oxford, 1990).

*The Diary of Thomas Burton*, ed. John Towill Rutt (4 vols, London, 1828).

*A Directory for the Publique Worship of God...* (London, 1646).

*A Dispute Betwixt Two Clergie-Men upon the Roade...* (1651).

*Documents Relating to the History of the Cathedral Church of Winchester in the Seventeenth Century*, eds William Richard Wood Stephens and Francis Thomas Madge (Winchester, 1897).

*Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae Archivum...*, ed. Jan Hendrick Hessels (3 vols, Cambridge, 1887-97).

Edwards, Charles, *An Afflicted Man's Testimony Concerning his Troubles* [London, 1691].

Ellis, Humphrey, *Pseudochristus, a True and Faithful Relation of the Impostures Acted by William Frankelin and Mary Gadbury...* (London, 1650).

Fell, John, *The Life of Richard Allestree* (London, 1848).

Fidoe, John, Jeanes, Thomas, and Shaw, William, *The Parliament Justified in Their Late Proceedings Against Charls Stuart...* (London, 1649).

G[riffith]., A[lexander]., *A True and Perfect Relation of the Whole Transaction...* (London, 1654).

*The Grounds and Principles of Religion, Contained in a Shorter Catechism...of the Assembly of Divines...* (London, 1646).

Guerdon, Aaron, *A Most Learned, Conscientious, and Devout-Exercise...by Lieut.-General Crumwell...* (London, 1649).

H., J., *The Life of the Reverend Mr George Trosse...* (Exeter, [1714]).

Haddan, A.W., 'Life of Herbert Thorndike', in *The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike, Sometime Prebendary of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter Westminster*, ed. A. Haddan (6 vols in 10, 1844-56), 6, 153-266.

Hales, John, *Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable Mr John Hales of Eton College etc* (London, [1659]).

H[all]., J[ohn]., *An Humble Motion to the Parliament of England Concerning the Advancement of Learning, and Reformation of the Universities, by J.H.* (London, 1649).

Hall, Thomas, *The Pulpit Guarded with XVII Arguments...* (London, 1651).

Hartley, William, *The Prerogative Priests Passing-Bell...* (London, 1651).

— *The Priests Patent Cancelled...* (London, 1649).

Harwood, Thomas, *Alumni Etonenses...* (Birmingham, 1797).

Hickes, George, *Some Discourse upon Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson...* (London, 1695).

Hill, Thomas, *The Right Separation Incouraged...* (London, 1645).

— *The Season for Englands Selfe-Reflection...* (London, 1644).

Homes, Nathanael, *Daemonologie, and Theologie...* (London, 1650).

Hoole, Charles, *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole...* (London, 1661).

Horn, John, *...A Consideration of Infant Baptism...Together with a Digression, in Answer to Mr Kendall...* (London, 1654).

Hotham, Charles, *The Petition and Argument of Mr. Hotham...* (London, 1651).

— *A True State of the Case of Mr. Hotham, Late Fellow of Peter-House* (London, 1651).

— *Corporations Vindicated in Their Fundamental Liberties...* (London, 1651).

Howell, James, *Londinopolis, an Historical Discourse or Perlustration of the City of London...* (London, 1657).

*The Humble Desires of the Gentlemen, Free-holders, and Inhabitants, of the County and City of Durham, and Other of the Northerne Counties, for Founding a Colledge at Durham...* (London, 1652).

*The Humble Petition of the Well-Affected of the County of South-Hampton in Behalf of the Ministers of the Gospel and for Continuance of their Maintenance...* (London, 1653).

Hyde, Edward, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England begun in the year 1641*, ed. William Dunn Macray (6 vols, Oxford, 1888).

Jenkins, Leoline, *The Life of Francis Mansell...* (London, 1854).

Jessey, Henry, *A Catechisme for Babes or Little Ones...* (London, 1652).

Knight, William, *The Case and Vindication of William Knight...* (London, 1653).

*The Letters of Sir Cheney Culpepper (1641-57)*, ed. Michael J. Braddick and Mark Greengrass, Camden 5<sup>th</sup> series, 7 (Cambridge, 1996).

London, William, *A Catalogue of the Most Vendible Books in England...* (London, 1658).

Ludlow, Edmund, *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Army of the Commonwealth of England, 1625-1672*, ed. Charles Harding Firth (2 vols, Oxford, 1894).

Mather, Richard, *A Catechisme...* (London, 1650).

Matthew, Henry, *An Account of the Life and Death of Mr Philip Henry...* (London, 1698).

Maudit, John, *The Christian Souldiers Great Engine...* (Oxford, 1649).

Mayo, Richard, *The Life and Death of Edmund Staunton...* (London, 1673).

*Memorials of the Great Civil War in England from 1646-1652*, ed. Henry Cary (2 vols, London, 1842).

*Mercurius Politicus*, 98 (15 April, 1652).

Milton, John, *Areopagitica and Other Writings*, ed. William Poole (London, 2014).

*Minutes of the Committee for the Relief of Plundered Ministers and of the Trustees for the Maintenance of Ministers; Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire 1643-1660*, ed. William Arthur Shaw, The Record Society for the Publication of Original Documents Relating to Lancashire and Cheshire, 28 & 29 (2 vols, 1893-6).

du Moulin, Lewis, *The Power of the Christian Magistrate in Sacred Things* (London, 1650).

*Musarum Oxoniensum...* (Oxford, 1654).

*Musgrave Muzl'd...* (London, 1651).

Neal, Daniel, *The History of the Puritans, or, Protestant Non-Conformists...* (4 vols, Dublin, 1755).

Nelson, Robert, *The Life of George Bull...* (Oxford, 1840).

*Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, ed. Thomas Carlyle (4 vols, Leipzig, 1861).

*An Ordinance...for the Ordination of Ministers by the Clasicall Presbyters...* (London, 1646).

Owen, John, *Diatriba de Iustitia Divina...* (Oxford, 1653).

— *Of the Divine Originall...also a Vindication of the Purity and Integrity of the Hebrew and Greek Texts...* (Oxford, 1659).

— *The Oxford Orations of Dr. John Owen*, ed. P. Toon (Callington, 1971).

— *The Primer: Or, an Easie Way to Teach Children the True Reading of English with a Necessary Catechisme...* (London, 1652).

— *The Principles of the Doctrine of Christ...* (London, 1645).

— *A Sermon Preached to the Parliament, Octob. 13. 1652* (London, 1652).

— *A Vindication of the Animadversions on Fiat Lux...* (London, 1664).

— *Vindiciae Evangelicae...* (Oxford, 1655).

Owen, John et al., *The Humble Proposals of Mr. Owen, Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, and Other Ministers...* (London, 1652).

*Oxford Council Acts 1626-1665*, ed. Mary Grizel Hobson and Herbert Edward Salter, Oxford Historical Society, 95 (Oxford, 1933).

P[eters]., H[ugh]., *Good Work for a Good Magistrate...* (London, 1651).

Pope, Walter, *The Life of Seth Ward...* (London, 1697).

Potenger, John, *Private Memoirs Never Before Published of John Potenger* (London, 1841).

Powell, Vavasor, *Bird in the Cage Chirping...* (London, 1661).

[Price, John,] *The Pulpit Incendiary: Or, the Divinity and Devotion of Mr Calamy, Mr Case, Mr Cauton, Mr Cranford, and Other Sion-Colledge Preachers...* (London, 1648).

*The Primer in Englysshe, Set Furth by the Kynges Maiestie and His Clergie...* (London, 1546).

*The Principles of Faith, Presented by Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simson...* (London, 1654).

*Proposals for the Furtherance and Propagation of the Gospell in this Nation...* (London, 1653).

*The Register of the Visitors of the University of Oxford, from A.D. 1647 to A.D. 1658*, ed., Montagu Burrows, Camden Society, 133 (London, 1881).

*Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis 1603-1660*, ed. J.R.L. Highfield, Oxford Historical Society, new series, 41 (Oxford, 2006).

[Reynolds, Edward,] *The Humble Proposals of Sundry Learned and Pious Divines...Concerning the Engagement...* (London, 1649).

Robinson, Matthew, *Autobiography of Matthew Robinson*, ed. John Eyton Bickersteth Mayor (Cambridge, 1856).

Rous, Francis, *The Lawfulness of Obeying the Present Government...* (London, 1649).

*Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, ed. Charles Webster (Cambridge, 1970).

Saunders, Richard, *A Balm to Heal Religions Wounds...in Answer to the Pulpit Guard Routed* (London, 1652).

Scobell, Henry *Memorials of the Method and Maner of Proceedings in Parliament...* (London, 1656).

Sedgwick, Joseph, *A Sermon, preached at S. Marie's in the University of Cambridge May 1st, 1653...Learning's Necessity to an Able Minister of the Gospel* (London, 1653).

*Sermons and Discourses upon Several Occasions by G. Stradling...with an Account of the Author*, ed. James Harrington (London, 1692).

*Several Proceedings in Parliament*, 23 (28 February, 1650), 134 (15 April 1652).

*Severall Queries...Together with a Few Other Necessary Proposals...* (London, 1652).

Sheppard, William, *The Peoples Priviledge and Duty Guarded against the Pulpit and Preachers Incroachment...* (London, 1652).

Sherman, A. John, *Historia Collegii Jesu Cantabrigiensis*, ed. James Orchard Halliwell (London, 1840).

*Sir Thomas Gresham His Ghost* (1647).

Snell, George, *The Right Teaching of Useful Knowledg to Fit Scholars for Som Honest Profession...* (London, 1649).

South, Robert, *Twelve Sermons and Discourses on Several Subjects and Occasions... Vol. V* (London, 1717).

*Strength out of Weaknesse; or a Glorious Manifestation of the Further Progresse of the Gospel Among the Indians...* (London, 1652).

[Tany, Thomas], *Theavrauiohn High Priest to the Iewes, His Disputive Challenge to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the Whole Hirach. of Roms Clargical Priests,* [1652].

Taylor, Francis *An Exposition with Practicall Observations upon the Three First Chapters of the Proverbs...* (London, 1655).

T., S., *A Thunder-Clap to Sion-Colledge...* (London, 1649).

*To the Supreme Authority of the Nation...The Humble Petition of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London...* (London, 1653).

Todd, Henry John, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Right Rev. Brian Walton...* (2 vols, London, 1821).

*The True Characters...of All and Every One...Who Sate as Judges upon...King Charls I* (London, 1661).

*Truth Appearing Through the Clouds of Undeserved Scandal and Aspersion...* (1654).

Townend, Peter (ed.), *Burke's Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Peerage and Knightage*, 103<sup>rd</sup> edn (London, 1963).

*A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers: From 1640-1708 A.D.* (3 vols, London, 1913-14).

Twells, Leonard, 'The Life of the Rev. and Most Learned Dr. Edward Pocock', in *The Lives of Dr. Edward Pocock, the Celebrated Orientalist by Dr. Twells; of Dr. Zachary Pearce...* (2 vols, London, 1816), i, pp. 1-1356.

[University of Cambridge,] *To Our Reverend and Deare Brethren the Ministers of England and Wales* (1649).

[University of Oxford,] *To Our Reverend Brethren the Ministers of the Gospel in England and Wales* (1649).

[Vane, Henry,] *Zeal Examined: Or, a Discourse for Liberty of Conscience in Matters of Religion* (London, 1652).

*Vavavioris Examen, & Purgamen...* (London, 1654).

Venn, John, and Venn, John Archibald, *Alumni Cantabrigienses...* (2 parts in 10 vols, Cambridge, 1922-54).

W., R., and M., D., *Some Few Proposals for the Reducing of Both Universities...* (n.d.).

Waideson, Robert, *An Accusation of Dr. Arrowsmith...* (London, 1649).

Walker, John, *Sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England...* (London, 1714).

Walton, Izaak, *The Life of Dr. Sanderson, Late Bishop of Lincoln...* (London, 1678).

Ward, John, *The Lives of the Professors of Gresham College...* (London, 1740).

Ward, Richard, *The Life of the Learned and Pious Dr. Henry More...* (London, 1710).

Ward, Seth, *De Cometis Ubi de Cometarum Natura Differitur...* (Oxford, 1653).

— *Vindiciae Academiarum...* (Oxford, 1654).

Warton, Thomas, *The Life and Literary Remains of Ralph Bathurst...* (London, 1761).

Waterhouse, Edward, *An Humble Apologie for Learning and Learned Men* (London, 1653).

Webster, John, *Academiarum Examen...* (London, 1654).

*Weekly Intelligencer*, 70 (20 April, 1652).

- Weekly Miscellany; or, Agreeable and Instructive Entertainer*, 4:156 (14 January, 1777).
- Wetenhall, Edward, *Of Gifts and Offices in the Publick Worship of God...* (Dublin, 1679).
- Whalley, Edward et al., ...*The Humble Petition of the Officers of the Army...* (London, 1652).
- Whitelocke, Bulstrode, *Memorials of the English Affairs...* (4 vols, Oxford, 1853).
- Wilkinson, Henry [1610-1675], *Miranda, Stupenda...* (London, 1646).
- Wilkinson, Henry [1616-1690], *Three Decades of Sermons...* (Oxford, 1660).
- W[illiams]., R[oger]., *The Fourth Paper, Presented by Maior Butler...* (London, 1652).
- *The Hireling Ministry...* (London, 1652).
- Winchester Long Rolls, 1653-1721 ...*, ed. Clifford Wyndham Holgate (Winchester, 1899).
- Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses...*, ed. Philip Bliss (4 vols, London, 1813-20).
- *The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford...*, ed. J. Gutch (2 vols, Oxford, 1792-6).
- *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695, Described by Himself Collected from His Diaries and Other Papers*, ed. Andrew Clark (5 vols, Oxford, 1891-1900).
- The Works of the Most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson...*, ed. Thomas Birch (3 vols, London, 1752).
- The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, ed. Wilbur Cortez Abbott & Catherine D. Crane (4 vols, Cambridge MA, 1937-47).

## **Printed Secondary Works**

[N.B. All O[xford] D[ictionary] of N[ational] B[iography] entries were accessed via <https://www.oxforddnb.com>]

Adamson, J.S.A., *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49* (Basingstoke, 2009).

Adamson, I.R., 'The Administration of Gresham College and Its Fluctuating Fortunes as a Scientific Institution in the Seventeenth Century', *History of Education*, 9:1 (1980), pp. 13-25.

Ames-Lewis, Francis (ed.), *Sir Thomas Gresham and Gresham College: Studies in the Intellectual History of London in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century* (Aldershot, 1999).

Anderson, John Lavicount, *The Life of Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells* (London, 1851).

Anderson, Philip J., 'Sion College and the London Provincial Assembly, 1647-1660', *JEH*, 37:1 (1986), pp. 68-90.

Archer, Ian, 'The Charity of Early Modern Londoners', *TRHS*, 12 (2002), pp. 223-44.

Ashley, Roger, 'Gloucester Hall and the Greek College', in Jonathan Bate and Jessica Mary Goodman (eds), *Worcester: Portrait of an Oxford College* (London, 2014), pp. 22-31.

Attwater, Aubrey, *A Short History of Pembroke College, Cambridge*, ed. S.C. Roberts (Cambridge, 1936).

Aylmer, Gerald (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-60* (London, 1972).

— *The State's Servants: The Civil Service of the English Republic, 1649-1660* (London, 1973).

Baldwin, John W., and Goldthwaite, Richard A. (eds), *Universities and Politics, Case Studies from the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period* (London, 1972).

Ball, W.W. Rouse, *Notes on the History of Trinity College, Cambridge* (London, 1899).

Barber, Sarah, 'Miles Corbett', *ODNB*.

— *Regicide and Republicanism: Politics and Ethics in the English Revolution, 1646-1659* (Edinburgh, 1998).

Barclay, Andrew, History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Ashe, James (c.1622-71) for the 1640-60 section.

— History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Fielder, John (c.1614-aft. 1686) for the 1640-60 section.

Barker, G.F. Russell, *Memoir of Richard Busby, D.D. (1606-1695) with Some Account of Westminster School in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1895).

Barnard, T.C., *Cromwellian Ireland: English Government and Reform in Ireland 1649-1660* (Oxford, 2000).

— 'Sir William Petty', *ODNB*.

Bate, Jonathan, and Goodman, Jessica Mary (eds), *Worcester: Portrait of an Oxford College* (London, 2014).

Beaven, Alfred B., *The Aldermen of the City of London, Temp. Henry III-1908...* (London, 1908).

Beddard, R.A., 'A Traitor's Gift: Hugh Peter's Donation to the Bodleian Library', *The Bodleian Library Record* 16:5 (1999), pp. 374-90.

Bell, H.E., and Ollard, R.L. (eds), *Historical Essays 1600-1750 Presented to David Ogg* (London, 1963).

Bendall, Sarah, Brooke, Christopher, and Collinson, Patrick, *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge, 1999).

Bigg-Wither, Reginald Fitz Hugh, *Materials for a History of the Wither Family* (Winchester, 1907).

Blackwood, Gordon, 'John Gurdon', *ODNB*.

Blakiston, Herbert Edward Douglas, *Trinity College* (London, 1898).

Boase, Charles William, *Registrum Collegii Exoniensis, Register of the Rectors, Fellows, and Other Members of the Foundation of Exeter College, Oxford. With a History of the College and Illustrative Documents* (Oxford 1894).

Booker, John, *A History of the Ancient Chapel of Birch, in Manchester Parish...*, Chetham Society, 47 (1859).

Boran, Elizabethanne, 'Malignancy and the Reform of the University of Oxford in the Mid-Seventeenth Century', *History of Universities*, 17 (2002), pp. 19-46.

Bowen, Lloyd, 'Oliver Cromwell (*alias* Williams) and Wales', in Patrick Little (ed.), *Oliver Cromwell New Perspectives* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 168-94.

Brockliss, Laurence (ed.), *Magdalen College Oxford, A History* (Oxford, 2008).

Brooke, Christopher, *A History of Gonville and Caius College* (Bury St Edmunds, 1985).

Buchan, John, *Brasenose College* (London, 1898).

Burgess, Glenn, 'Usurpation, Obligation and Obedience in the Thought of the Engagement Controversy', *HJ*, 29:3 (1986), pp. 515-36.

Burke, Peter, 'William Dell, the Universities and the Radical Tradition', in Geoff Eley and William Hunt (eds), *Reviving the English Revolution: Reflections and Elaborations on the Work of Christopher Hill* (London, 1988), pp. 181-9.

Bury, J.P.T., *A Short History of the College of Corpus Christi and the Blessed Virgin Mary in Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1949).

Burrow, Colin, 'Francis Rous', *ODNB*.

Burrows, Montagu, *Worthies of All Souls: Four Centuries of English History: Illustrated from the College Archives* (London, 1874).

Cannadine, David (ed.), *Westminster Abbey: A Church in History* (London, 2019).

Capp, Bernard, *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-60* (Oxford, 2012).

Carleton, John Dudley, *Westminster School: A History*, revised edn (London, 1965).

Carruthers, S.W., *The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly* (Philadelphia, 1943).

Catto, Jeremy (ed.), *Oriel College: A History* (Oxford, 2013).

Charles-Edwards, Thomas M. and Reid, Julian, *Corpus Christi College, Oxford: A History* (Oxford, 2017).

Chung, Youngkwon, 'Parliament, the Heresy Ordinance of 1648, and Religious Toleration in Civil War England', *Journal of Church and State*, 57:1 (2015), pp. 119-52.

Čížek, Jan, 'From Pansophia to Panorthosia: The Evolution of Comenius's Pansophic Conception', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters*, 4:2 (2019).

Clark, Andrew, *Lincoln* (London, 1898).

Clavier, Sarah Ward, 'The Restoration Episcopate and the Interregnum: Autobiography, Suffering and Professions of Faith', in Elliot Vernon, and Hunter Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c 1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 242-59.

Cockayne, Emily, Wooding, Lucy, and Brockliss, Laurence, and Ferdinand, Christine, 'Magdalen in the Age of Reformation, 1558-1688', in Laurence Brockliss (ed.), *Magdalen College Oxford, A History* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 135-252.

Coffey, John, 'John Owen and the Puritan Toleration Controversy, 1646-59', in Kelly M. Kapic and Mark Jones (eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen's Theology* (Abingdon, 2012), pp. 227-48.

Coleby, Andrew M., *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire, 1649-1689* (Cambridge, 1987).

Collins, Jeffrey R., *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford, 2007).

— 'The Church Settlement of Oliver Cromwell', *History*, 87:285 (2002), pp. 18-40.

Conant, James B., 'The Advancement of Learning During the Puritan Commonwealth', *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3<sup>rd</sup> series, 66 (Oct. 1936-May 1941), pp. 3-31.

Condren, Conal, 'Marvell's 'Horation Ode on Cromwell's Return from Ireland' and the Context of the Engagement Controversy', in Andrew Lynch and Anne Scot (eds), *Renaissance and Drama in Context: Essays for Christopher Wortham* (Newcastle, 2008), pp. 257-69.

Cook, A.K., *About Winchester College, to which is Prefixed De Collegio Wintoniensi by R. Mathew* (London, 1917).

Cooper, Charles Henry, *Annals of Cambridge* (5 vols, Cambridge, 1842-52).

Cooper, David J.C, 'The Eastern Churches and the Reformation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 31 (1978), pp. 417-33.

Cooper, J.P., 'Social and Economic Policies under the Commonwealth', in Gerald Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-60* (London, 1972), pp. 121-42.

Cooper, Tim, *John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity* (Abingdon, 2016).

Cotterell, Mary, 'Interregnum Law Reform: The Hale Commission of 1652', *EHR*, 83:329 (1968), pp. 689-704.

Coward, Barry, *The Cromwellian Protectorate* (Manchester, 2002).

Craven, Alex, 'Ministers of State: The Established Church in Lancashire during the English Revolution, 1642-1660', *Northern History*, 45:1 (2008), pp. 51-69.

— '“Soe good and godly a worke”: the Surveys of Ecclesiastical Livings and Parochial Reform During the English Revolution', in Fiona McCall (ed.), *Church and People in Interregnum Britain* (London, 2021), pp. 41-64.

Crawley, Charles, *Trinity Hall: The History of a Cambridge College, 1350-1975* (Cambridge, 1976).

Crook, J. Mordaunt, *Brasenose: The Biography of an Oxford College* (Oxford, 2008).

Cross, Claire, 'The Church in England, 1646-1660', in Gerald Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (London, 1972), pp. 99-120.

Cunich, Peter, Hoyle, David, Duffy, Eamon, and Hyam, Ronald (eds), *A History of Magdalene College, Cambridge 1428-1988* (Cambridge, 1994).

Curthoys, Judith, *The Cardinal's College, Christ Church, Chapter and Verse* (Oxford, 2012).

— *The King's Cathedral, the Ancient Heart of Christ Church, Oxford* (London, 2019).

Curthoys, J.H., 'Ralph Button', *ODNB*.

Curtis, Mark H., 'The Alienated Intellectuals of Early Stuart England', *P&P*, 23 (1962), pp. 25-43.

Daniel, C. Henry, and Barker, W.R., *Worcester College* (London, 1998).

Darwall-Smith, Robin, *A History of University College, Oxford* (Oxford, 2008).

— 'Oxford and Cambridge College Histories: An Endangered Genre?', *History of Universities*, 22:1 (2007), pp. 21-9.

— 'Oxford College Histories: Fresh Contributions', *History of Universities*, 29:1 (2016), pp. 136-43.

Davies, C.S.L., and Garnett, Jane (eds), *Wadham College* (Oxford, 1994).

David, H.W. Carless, *A History of Balliol College*, revised by R.H.C. Davis and Richard William Hunt and supplemented by Harold Hartley et al. (Oxford, 1963).

Debus, Allen G. (ed.), *Science and Education in the Seventeenth Century: The Webster-Ward Debate* (London, 1970).

Denton, Barry, *Only in Heaven: The Life and Campaigns of Sir Arthur Hesilrige, 1601-1661* (Sheffield, 1997).

Derham, Patrick (ed.), *Loyal Dissent: Brief Lives from Westminster School* (Buckingham, 2016).

Dexter, Keri, *'A Good Quire of Voices': The Provision of Choral Music at St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, and Eton College, c.1640-1733* (Aldershot, 2002).

Van Dixhoorn, Chad, 'Presbyterian Ecclesiologies at the Westminster Assembly', in Elliot Vernon and Hunter Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1625-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 104-129.

Van Dixhoorn, Chad, Garcia, Mark A., Halcomb, Joel A., Jones, Inga, and Wright, David F., (eds), *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1652* (5 vols, Oxford, 2012).

Doll, Peter M. (ed.), *Anglicanism and Orthodoxy 300 Years after the 'Greek College' in Oxford* (Oxford, 2006).

Donagan, Barbara, 'Puritan Ministers and Laymen: Professional Claims and Social Constraints in Seventeenth-Century England', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 47:2 (1984), pp. 81-112.

Durston, Christopher, 'Puritan Rule and the Failure of Cultural Revolution, 1645-1660', in Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (eds), *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 210-33.

Durston, Christopher, and Eales, Jacqueline (eds), *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Basingstoke, 1996).

Durston, Christopher, and Maltby, Judith (eds), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006).

Eden, R.J., *Clare College and the Founding of Clare Hall* (Cambridge, 1998).

Eley, Geoff, and Hunt, William (eds), *Reviving the English Revolution: Reflections and Elaborations on the Work of Christopher Hill* (London, 1988).

Feingold, Mordechai, ““And Knowledge Shall be Increased”: Millenarianism and the Advancement of Learning Revisited’, *The Seventeenth Century*, 28:4 (2013), pp. 363-93.

— ‘Gresham College and London Practitioners: The Nature of the English Mathematical Community’, in Francis Ames-Lewis (ed.), *Sir Thomas Gresham and Gresham College: Studies in the Intellectual History of London in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 174-88.

— ‘The Humanities’, in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 211-357.

— ‘Learning Arabic in Early Modern England’, in Charles Burnett, Alastair Hamilton, and Jan Loop (eds), *The Teaching and Learning of Arabic in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, 2017), pp. 33-56.

— *The Mathematician’s Apprenticeship* (Cambridge, 1984).

— ‘Oriental Studies’, in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 449-503.

Fell-Smith, Charlotte, revised by Stephen Wright, ‘Walter Marshall’, *ODNB*.

Field, John, *The King’s Nurseries: The Story of Westminster School* (London, 1987).

Fincham, Kenneth, ‘Expansion and Retrenchment, 1574-1660’, in Jeremy Catto (ed.), *Oriel College: A History* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 94-134.

— ‘A Protestant College’, in Jeremy Catto (ed.), *Oriel College: A History* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 135-59.

Fincham, Kenneth, and Taylor, Stephen, 'Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity 1646-60', in Jason McElligott and David Smith (eds), *Royalists and Royalism in the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010), pp. 18-43.

Fitzgibbons, Jonathan, 'Rethinking the English Revolution of 1649', *HJ*, 60:4 (2017), pp. 889-914.

Forbes, M.D., *Clare College 1326-1926, University Hall 1326-1346, Clare Hall 1346-1856* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1928-1930).

Foster, Richard, 'The Capel Cup, 1652', in Richard Foster (ed.), *50 Treasures from Winchester College* (London, 2019), pp. 88-9.

Foster, Richard (ed.), *50 Treasures from Winchester College* (London, 2019).

Fradkin, Jeremy, 'Christian Hospitality and the Case for Religious Refuge in Interregnum England', *P&P*, 254 (2022), pp. 51-85.

— 'Protestant Unity and Anti-Catholicism: The Irenicism and Philo-Semitism of John Dury in Context', *JBS*, 56 (2017), pp. 273-94.

Gardiner, R.B., *The Registers of Wadham College, Oxford* (2 vols, London, 1889-95).

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1656* (4 vols, London, 1897-1903).

Geiger, Roger L., *The History of American Higher Education: Learning and Culture from the Founding to World War II* (Princeton, 2014).

Gelderen, Martin van, and Skinner, Quentin (eds), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage* (2 vols, Cambridge, 2002).

Gentles, Ian, 'The Sales of Bishops' Lands in the English Revolution, 1646-1660', *EHR*, 95:376 (1980), pp. 573-96.

Ghobrial, John-Paul A., 'Migration from Within and Without: The Problem of Eastern Christians in Early Modern Europe', *TRHS*, 27 (2017), pp. 153-73.

— 'Moving Stories and What They Tell Us: Early Modern Mobility between Microhistory and Global History', *P&P*, 242 (Supplement 14) (2019), pp. 243-80.

Gianoutsos, Jamie, 'A new discovery' of Charles Hoole: Method and Practice in Seventeenth-Century English Education', *History of Education*, 48 (2019), pp. 1-18.

Gibson, Kenneth, 'John Dury's Apocalyptic Thought: A Reassessment', *JEH*, 61:2 (2010), pp. 299-313.

Glickman, Gabriel, 'Protestantism, Colonization, and the New England Company in Restoration Politics', *HJ*, 59:2 (2016), pp. 365-91.

Goldie, Mark, and Burns, J.H. (eds), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991).

Goodwin, Gordon, revised by Andrew Hopper, 'Thomas Lister', *ODNB*.

Goodwin, Gordon, revised by Jason Peacey, 'Humphrey Edwards', *ODNB*.

Goodwin, Gordon, revised by Andrew Warmington, 'John Dove', *ODNB*.

Grant, Alasdair C., 'Scotland's 'Vagabonding Greekes', 1453-1688', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 46:1 (2022), pp. 81-97.

Gray, Arthur, and Brittain, Frederick, *A History of Jesus College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1988).

Greaves, Richard L., 'Gilbert Millington', *ODNB*.

— ‘The Ordination Controversy and the Spirit of Reform in Puritan England’, *JEH*, 31:3 (1970), pp. 225-41.

— *The Puritan Revolution and Educational Thought, Background for Reform* (New Brunswick, 1969).

Green, Ian, *The Christian’s ABC: Catechisms and Catechizing in England c.1530- 1740* (Oxford, 1996).

— *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education* (Farnham, 2009).

Green, V.H.H., *The Commonwealth of Lincoln College, 1427-1977* (Oxford, 1979).

Greengrass, Mark, ‘Jan Amos Comenius’, *ODNB*.

— ‘Samuel Hartlib’, *ODNB*.

Greengrass, Mark, Leslie, Michael, and Raylor, Timothy (eds), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, 1994).

Greenslade, Basil, ‘John Hales’, *ODNB*.

Gribben, Crawford, *John Owen and English Puritanism: Experiences of Defeat* (Oxford, 2016).

Groenveld, Simon, ‘The English Civil Wars as a Cause of the First Anglo-Dutch War, 1640-1652’, *HJ*, 30:3 (1987), pp. 541-66.

Guscott, S.J., *Humphrey Chetham 1580-1653, Fortune, Politics and Mercantile Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*, Chetham Society, 3<sup>rd</sup> series, 45 (Manchester, 2003).

Guyer, Benjamin M., ‘“From the Apostles’ time’: The Polity of the British Episcopal Churches, 1603-62’, in Elliot Vernon and Hunter Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 17-37.

Haigh, Christopher, 'Where Was the Church of England, 1646-1660', *HJ*, 62:1 (2019), pp. 127-47.

Halcomb, Joel, 'The Association Movement and the Politics of Church Settlement During the Interregnum', in Elliot Vernon and Hunter Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 174-99.

Hamilton, Sidney Graves, *Hertford College* (London, 1998).

Hardy, Ernest George, *Jesus College* (London, 1998).

Harrison, Ross, *Our College Story, a Short History of the King's College of St Nicholas and Our Lady in Cambridge* (Croydon, 2015).

Hartwell, Clare, *The History and Architecture of Chetham's School and Library* (New Haven, 2004).

Hawke, John, 'The Scholastique Catechism of Tristram Sutte: Reconciling Ecclesial and Monarchical Authority During the English Civil Wars', *The Seventeenth Century*, 36:5 (2020), pp. 773-95.

Henderson, Bernard W., *Merton College* (London, 1998).

Henny, Sundar, 'Nathanael of Leukas and the Hottinger Circle: The Wanderings of a Seventeenth-Century Greek Archbishop', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 27:3 (2020), pp. 449-72.

Hessayon, Ariel, 'William Franklin [Franklin]', *ODNB*.

Highton, H.K., 'Samuel Foster', *ODNB*.

Hill, Christopher, *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution – Revisited* (Oxford, 1997).

— ‘Propagating the Gospel’, in H.E. Bell and R.L. Ollard (eds), *Historical Essays 1600-1750 Presented to David Ogg* (London, 1963), pp. 35-59.

— ‘Puritans and ‘the Dark Corners of the Land’’, *TRHS*, 5<sup>th</sup> series, 13 (1963), pp. 77-102.

— ‘The Radical Critics of Oxford and Cambridge in the 1650s’, in, John W. Baldwin and Richard A. Goldthwaite (eds), *Universities and Politics, Case Studies from the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period* (London, 1972), pp. 107-32.

— *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Harmondsworth, 1975; repr. Harmondsworth, 1991).

Hirst, Derek, ‘The Failure of Godly Rule in the English Republic’, *P&P*, 132:1 (1991), pp. 33-66.

*History of the New England Company, from Its Incorporation in the Seventeenth Century, to the Present Time...* (London, 1871).

Holmes, Clive, ‘Centre and Locality in Civil-War England’, in J.S.A. Adamson, *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49* (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 153-74.

— *Why Was Charles I Executed?* (London, 2006).

Hopkins, Clare, *Trinity, 450 Years of an Oxford College Community* (Oxford, 2005).

Hotson, Howard, *The Reformation of Common Learning: Post-Ramist Method and the Reception of the New Philosophy, 1618-1670* (Oxford, 2021).

Howarth, James, Tiley, Naomi, and Tomkins, Nikki, *Reconstructing Nicholas Crouch, Cataloguing and Conserving a Seventeenth-Century Library* (Oxford, 2018).

Hoyle, David, 'Part Two: Mid-Sixteenth Century to Mid-Seventeenth Century', in Peter Cunich, David Hoyle, Eamon Duffy, and Ronald Hyam (eds), *A History of Magdalene College, Cambridge 1428-1988* (Cambridge, 1994).

Hughes, Ann, 'The Cromwellian Church', in Anthony Milton (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume 1: Reformation and Identity c.1520-1662* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 444-56.

— 'The Frustrations of the Godly', in J.S. Morrill (ed.), *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London, 1992), pp. 70-90.

— 'A Moderate Puritan Preacher Negotiates Religious Change', *JEH*, 65:4 (2014), pp. 761-79.

— '“The Public Profession of these Nations”: The National Church in Interregnum England', in Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (eds), *Religion in Revolutionary England* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 93-114.

Humphreys, Richard, *Sidney Sussex: A History* (Cambridge, 2009).

Hunter, Joseph, *The Rise of the Old Dissent, Exemplified in the Life of Oliver Heywood...* (London, 1842).

Hutton, Ronald, *The British Republic, 1649-1660* (Basingstoke, 1990).

Hutton, William Holden, *S. John Baptist College* (London, 1998).

Jackson, Thomas Graham, *Wadham College Oxford: Its Foundation, Architecture and History, with an Account of the Family of Wadham and Their Seats in Somerset and Devon* (Oxford, 1893).

James, Margaret, 'The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution, 1640-60', *History*, new series, 26:101 (1941), pp. 1-18.

- *Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution, 1640-1660* (London, 1966).
- Jenkins, Philip, *The Making of a Ruling Class: The Glamorgan Gentry, 1640-1790* (Cambridge, 1983).
- Jewell, Helen, *Education in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1998).
- Johnson, A.M., 'Wales During the Commonwealth and Protectorate', in Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (eds), *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 233-56.
- Jolland, Michael and Mandelbrote, Scott, 'Isaac Newton Learns Hebrew: Samuel Johnson's *Nova Cubi Hebraei Tabella*', *Notes and Records*, 70 (2016), pp. 9-21.
- Jones, John, *Balliol College, a History* (Oxford, 2005).
- Jones, W.H.S., *A History of St Catharine's College, Once Catharine Hall, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1936).
- *The Story of St Catharine's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1951).
- Jordan, W.K., *Philanthropy in England, 1480-1660: A Study of the Changing Pattern of English Social Aspirations* (London, 1959).
- Kapic, Kelly M., and Jones, Mark (eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to John Owen's Theology* (Abingdon, 2012).
- Kearney, Hugh F., *Scholars and Gentlemen: Universities and Society in Pre-Industrial Britain, 1500-1700* (London, 1970).
- Kellaway, William, *The New England Company, 1649-1776* (Glasgow, 1961).
- Keller, A.G., 'Lawrence Rooke', *ODNB*.

Kelly, James E., Laugerud, Henning, and Ryan, Salvador (eds), *Northern European Reformations: Transnational Perspectives* (London, 2020).

Kelsey, Sean, 'Sir John Danvers', *ODNB*.

— *Inventing a Republic, the Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-1653* (Manchester, 1997).

Kirby, Thomas Frederick, *Annals of Winchester College, from Its Foundation in the Year 1382 to the Present Time* (London, 1892).

— *Winchester Scholars: A List of the Wardens, Fellows, and Scholars of Saint Mary College of Winchester, near Winchester, Commonly Called Winchester College* (London, 1888)

Knighton, C.S., 'John Harris', *ODNB*.

— 'Richard Busby', *ODNB*.

Larminie, Vivienne, History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Hay, William (1594-1664) for the 1640-60 section.

— 'Joshua Hoyle', *ODNB*.

Larminie, Vivienne, and Peacey, Jason T., History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Gratwyke, Roger (1593-1655) for the 1640-60 section.

Lawrence, T.M., 'Thomas Goodwin', *ODNB*.

Leach, Arthur Francis, *A History of Winchester College* (London, 1899).

— 'Schools', in William Page (ed.), *Victoria History of the County of Durham* (London, 1905), i, 365-414.

Lewalski, Barbara, 'Milton on Learning and the Learned-Ministry Controversy', *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 24:4 (1961), pp. 267-81.

Life, Page, 'Nicholas Lloyd [Floyd]', *ODNB*.

— 'Victorinus Bythner', *ODNB*.

Lindley, Keith, 'Thomas Atkins', *ODNB*.

— 'Christopher Packe', *ODNB*.

Linehan, Peter (ed.), *St John's College, Cambridge: A History* (Woodbridge, 2011).

Little, Patrick, 'A Fraudster in Cromwellian Scotland', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 91(2): 232 (2012), pp. 336-45.

— (ed.), *Oliver Cromwell New Perspectives* (Basingstoke, 2009).

Lyte, H.C. Maxwell, *A History of Eton College, 1440-1884* (London, 1889).

Macleane, Douglas, *Pembroke College* (London, 1998).

Maclear, James Fulton, 'Popular Anticlericalism in the Puritan Revolution', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 17:4 (1956), pp. 443-70.

Macray, William Dunn, *Annals of the Bodleian Library, Oxford: With a Notice of the Earlier Library of the University*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Oxford, 1890).

Magrath, John Richard, *The Queen's College* (2 vols, Oxford, 1921).

Mallet, Charles Edward, *A History of the University of Oxford* (3 vols, London, 1924-7).

Mandelbrote, Scott, 'From Civil War to Glorious Revolution', in S.J.D. Green and Peregrine Horden, *All Souls Under the Ancien Régime: Politics, Learning, and the Arts, c. 1600-1850* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 55-75.

Margoliouth, D.S., revised by Nicholas Keene, 'Brian Walton', *ODNB*.

Martensen, Robert L., 'Daniel Whistler', *ODNB*.

- Martin, G.H., and Highfield, J.R.L., *A History of Merton College, Oxford* (Oxford, 1997).
- Masters, Robert, *Masters' History of the College of Corpus Christi and the Blessed Virgin Mary in the University of Cambridge with Additional Matter and a Continuation to the Present Time*, ed. John Lamb (London, 1831).
- McCall, Fiona (ed.), *Church and People in Interregnum Britain* (London, 2021).
- McDonnell, Michael, *A History of St Paul's School* (London, 1909).
- McDowell, Nicholas, and Smith, Nigel (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Milton* (Oxford, 2011).
- McElligott, Jason, and Smith, David (eds), *Royalists and Royalism in the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010).
- Merritt, J.F., 'Monarchy, Protestantism and Revolution: 1603-1714' in David Cannadine (ed.), *Westminster Abbey: A Church in History* (London, 2019), pp. 179-223.
- *Westminster 1640-60: A Royal City in a Time of Revolution* (Manchester, 2013).
- Merton, Robert K., 'Puritanism, Pietism, and Science', *The Sociological Review*, 28:1 (1936), pp. 1-30.
- McGruer, Ann, *Educating the 'Unconstant Rabble': Arguments for Educational Advancement and Reform During the English Civil War and Interregnum* (Newcastle, 2010).
- Michel, Robert, 'Pseudochristus: A Religious Romance, 1649-1650', *Fontanus*, 6 (1993), pp. 97-118.
- Miller, Peter N., "'Antiquarianization" of Biblical Scholarship and the London Polyglot Bible (1653-57)', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 62:3 (2001), pp. 463-82.

Miner, John N., *The Grammar Schools of Medieval England: A.F. Leach in Historiographical Perspective* (Montreal, 1990).

Milton, Anthony, *England's Second Reformation: The Battle for the Church of England, 1625-1662* (Cambridge, 2021).

— (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume 1: Reformation and Identity c.1520-1662* (Oxford, 2017)

— ‘The Unchanged Peacemaker’? John Dury and the Politics of Irenicism in England, 1628-43’, in Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor (eds), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 95-117.

Meyer, W.R., ‘Charles Hoole’, *ODNB*.

Morgan, John, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes Towards Reason, Learning and Education* (Cambridge, 1988).

— ‘Puritanism and Science: A Reinterpretation’, *HJ*, 22:3 (1979), pp. 535-60.

Morison, Samuel Eliot, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (2 parts, Cambridge MA, 1936).

Morrill, J.S. (ed.), *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London, 1992).

— ‘Sir William Brereton’, *ODNB*.

Morris, Christopher, *King's College, a Short History* (Cambridge, 1989).

Morrissey, Mary, ‘Scripture, Style and Persuasion in Seventeenth-Century English Theories of Preaching’, *JEH*, 53:4 (2002), pp. 686-706.

Mortimer, Sarah, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2010).

Mullett, Michael, 'Richard Heyrick', *ODNB*.

Mulligan, Lotte, 'Puritans and English Science: A Critique of Webster', *Isis*, 71:3 (1980), pp. 456-69.

Mullinger, J. Bass, *The University of Cambridge from the Election of Buckingham to the Chancellorship in 1626 to the Decline of the Platonist Movement* (3 vols, Cambridge, 1911).

Nicholls, Mark, 'The Seventeenth Century', in Peter Linehan (ed.), *St John's College, Cambridge: A History* (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 94-161.

Norbrook, David, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge, 1999).

O'Brien, J.J., 'Commonwealth Schemes for the Advancement of Learning', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 16:1 (1968), pp. 30-42.

O'Day, Rosemary, and Hughes, Ann, 'Augmentation and Amalgamation: Was There a Systematic Approach to the Reform of Parochial Finance, 1640-60?', in Rosemary O'Day and Felicity Heal (eds), *Princes and Paupers in the English Church, 1500-1800* (Leicester, 1981), pp. 167-93.

O'Day, Rosemary, *Education and Society, 1500-1800: The Social Foundations of Education in Early Modern Britain* (London, 1982).

O'Day, Rosemary, and Heal, Felicity (eds), *Princes and Paupers in the English Church, 1500-1800* (Leicester, 1981)

Orme, Nicholas, *Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England* (Yale, 2006).

Orr, D. Alan, 'Sovereignty, Supremacy and the Origins of the English Civil War', *History*, 87:288 (2002), pp. 474-90.

Oster, Malcolm, 'Jonathan Goddard', *ODNB*.

— 'Millenarianism and the New Science: The Case of Robert Boyle', in Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor (eds), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 137-48.

Patterson, W.B., 'Cyril Lukaris, George Abbot, James VI and I, and the Beginning of Orthodox-Anglican Relations', in Peter M. Doll (ed.), *Anglicanism and Orthodoxy 300 Years after the 'Greek College' in Oxford* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 39-55.

— *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997).

— *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England's Religious Past* (Oxford, 2018).

Peacey, Jason T., 'Cuthbert Sydenham', *ODNB*.

— 'Daniel Blagrove', *ODNB*.

— 'Henry Mildmay', *ODNB*.

— History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Love, Nicholas (1608-82), for the 1640-60 section.

— 'William Cawley', *ODNB*.

Pearce, E.H., *Sion College and Library* (Cambridge, 1913).

Peile, John, *Christ's College* (London, 1900).

Pennington, Donald, and Thomas, Keith (eds), *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford, 1978)

Pincus, Steven, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650-1668* (Cambridge, 1996).

Plumptre, E.H., *The Life of Thomas Ken, D.D., Bishop of Bath and Wells* (2 vols, London, 1888).

Poole, William, 'Down and Out in Leiden and London: The Later Careers of Venceslaus Clemes (1589-1637), and Jan Sictor (1593-1652), Bohemian Exiles and Failing Poets', *The Seventeenth Century*, 28:2 (2013), pp. 163-85.

— 'A Royalist Mathematical Practitioner in Interregnum Oxford: The Exploits of Richard Rawlinson (1616-1668)', *The Seventeenth Century*, 33:3 (2018), pp. 363-92.

Polizzotto, Carolyn, 'The Campaign Against the Humble Proposals of 1652', *JEH*, 38:4 (1987), pp. 569-81.

Pooley, Roger, 'William Dell', *ODNB*.

Porter, Bertha, revised by J.T. Peacey, 'Anthony Stapley', *ODNB*.

Porter, Roy, 'The Scientific Revolution and Universities,' in Hilde de Rieder-Symoens (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe, Volume II: Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 531-62.

Powell, Hunter, "'Promote, protect, prosecute': the Congregationalist Divines and the Establishment of Church and Magistrate in Cromwellian England", in Elliot Vernon and Hunter Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 222-41.

Prior, Charles, 'Rethinking Church and State During the English Interregnum', *Historical Research*, 87:237 (2014), 444-65.

Rashdall, Hastings and Rait, Robert S., *New College* (London, 1998).

Raines, F.R., *The Fellows of the Collegiate Church of Manchester*, ed. Frank Renaud, Chetham Society, new series, 21 (2 parts, Manchester, 1891).

— *The Rectors of Manchester, and the Wardens of the Collegiate Church of That Town*, ed. John E. Bailey, Chetham Society, new series, 5 (2 parts, Manchester, 1885).

Raines, F.R., and Sutton, Charles William, *Life of Humphrey Chetham, Founder of the Chetham Hospital and Library, Manchester*, Chetham Society, new series, 49-50 (2 vols, Manchester, 1903).

Rannie, David Watson, *Oriel College* (London, 1998).

Raylor, Timothy, 'Milton, the Hartlib Circle, and the Education of the Aristocracy', in Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Milton* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 382-406.

Renton, A.W., revised by Charles G.D. Littleton, 'Paul Delaune', *ODNB*.

Reynolds, David (ed.), *Christ's, a Cambridge College Over Five Centuries* (Basingstoke, 2005).

Richards, Thomas, *A History of the Puritan Movement in Wales: from the Institution of the Church at Llanfaches in 1639 to the Expiry of the Propagation Act in 1653* (London, 1920).

— *The Puritan Visitation of Jesus College Oxford and the Principalship of Dr. Michael Roberts* (London, 1924).

de Rieder-Symoens, Hilde (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe, Volume II: Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)* (Cambridge, 1996).

Rivers, Isabel, 'John Tillotson', *ODNB*.

Roberts, Stephen K., 'Commissioners for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales (1650-1653)', *ODNB*.

— History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on 'The Committee for Plundered Ministers', for the 1640-60 section.

— History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Hodges, Luke (1590-1656), for the 1640-60 section.

— History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Salwey, Humphrey (c. 1575-1652), for the 1640-60 section.

— '“One of the least things in religion”: The Welsh Experience of Church Polity, 1640-60', in Elliot Vernon and Hunter Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 60-79.

Robertson, Charles Grant, *All Souls College* (London, 1899).

Roots, Ivan, and Wynne, S.M., 'Edmund Harvey', *ODNB*.

Rose, Jacqueline, 'The Godly Magistrate', in Anthony Milton (ed.), *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c.1520-1662* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 103-21.

Rostenberg, Leona, 'William Dugard, Pedagogue and Printer to the Commonwealth', *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 52:3 (1958), pp. 179-204.

Rozemond, Keetje, *Archimandrite Hierotheos Abbatios 1599-1664* (Leiden, 1966)

Ryrie, Alec, 'The Missionary Problem in Early Modern Protestantism: British, Irish, and Scandinavian Perspectives', in James E. Kelly, Henning Laugerud, and Salvador Ryan (eds), *Northern European Reformations: Transnational Perspectives* (London, 2020), pp. 377-403.

Saltmarsh, John, *King's College: A Short History* (Cambridge, 1958).

Sargeant, John, *Annals of Westminster School* (London, 1898).

Sayle, Charles, *Annals of Cambridge University Library, 1278-1900* (Cambridge, 1916).

Schlatter, Richard, 'The Higher Learning in Puritan England', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 2 (1954), pp. 167-87.

Shaw, William A., *A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth, 1640-60* (2 vols, London, 1900).

Scott, David, History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Hesilrige, Sir Arthur (1601-1661), for the 1640-60 section.

— 'Henry Darley', *ODNB*.

— History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Chaloner, Thomas (c. 1595-1660), for the 1640-60 section.

— History of Parliament Trust, London, unpublished article on Hallows, Nathaniel (1582-1661), for the 1640-60 section.

— 'Sir Gilbert Gerard', *ODNB*.

— 'James Chaloner', *ODNB*.

— 'Sir John Bouchier', *ODNB*.

Scott, Jonathan, *Commonwealth Principles: Republican Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 2004).

Scott-Giles, C. Wilfrid, *Sidney Sussex College: A Short History* (Cambridge, 1975).

Sharpe, Kevin, “‘An Image Doting Rabble?’ The Failure of Republican Culture in Seventeenth-Century England”, in Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (eds), *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetic and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution* (London, 1988), pp. 25-56.

— *Image Wars, Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (Yale, 2010).

Sharpe, Kevin, and Zwicker, Steven N. (eds), *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetic and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution* (London, 1988).

Simon, Joan, ‘Educational Policies and Programmes’, *The Modern Quarterly*, new series, 4:1 (1948-9), pp. 154-68.

Skinner, Quentin, ‘Conquest and Consent: Thomas Hobbes and the Engagement Controversy’, in Gerald Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (London, 1972), pp. 79-98.

Smith, David, ‘John Musgrave’, *ODNB*.

Solt, Leo F., ‘Anti-Intellectualism in the Puritan Revolution’, *Church History*, 25:4 (1956), pp. 306-16.

Spalding, Ruth, ‘Thomas Winston’, *ODNB*.

Spivey, Jim, ‘Henry Wilkinson (1610-1675)’, *ODNB*.

— ‘Henry Wilkinson (1616/7-1690)’, *ODNB*.

Spraggon, Julie, *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War* (Woodbridge, 2003).

Stride, William Keatley, *Exeter College* (London, 1900).

Stone, Lawrence, 'The Educational Revolution in England, 1560-1640', *P&P*, 28:1 (1964), pp. 41-80.

Sutton, C.W., revised by R.C. Richardson, 'Richard Hollinworth', *ODNB*.

Tanner, Lawrence E., *Westminster School*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (London, 1951).

Tatham, Geoffrey Bulmer, *Dr John Walker and the Sufferings of the Clergy* (Cambridge, 1911).

— *The Puritans in Power: A Study in the History of the English Church from 1640 to 1660* (Cambridge, 1913).

Teich, Mikuláš, and Young, Robert M. (eds), *Changing Perspectives in the History of Science: Essays in Honour of Joseph Needham* (London, 1973).

Terpstra, Nicholas, *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World: An Alternative History of the Reformation* (Cambridge, 2015).

Thomas, Keith, 'The Puritans and the Act of 1650 Reconsidered', in Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (eds), *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 257-83.

Thompson, Henry L., *Christ Church* (London, 1900).

Thornton, Percy Melville, *Harrow School and Its Surroundings* (London, 1885).

Tighe, Robert Richard, and Davis, James Edward, *Annals of Windsor, Being a History of the Castle and Town; with Some Account of Eton and Places Adjacent* (London, 1858).

Todd, Margo, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge, 1988).

Toomer, G.J., *Eastern Wisdom and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1996).

— ‘Edward Pococke’, *ODNB*.

Toon, Peter, *God’s Statesman: The Life and Work of John Owen Pastor, Educator, Theologian* (Exeter, 1971).

Trevelyan, George Macaulay, *Trinity College: An Historical Sketch* (Cambridge, 1990).

Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *Religion, the Reformation, and Social Change and Other Essays* (New York, 1967).

Trueman, Carl R., ‘John Owen’s ‘Dissertation on Divine Justice’: An Exercise in Christocentric Scholasticism’, *Calvin Theological Journal* (1998), pp. 87-103.

Tsakiris, Vasileios, ‘The ‘Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Confessio’ and the Attempted ‘Calvinisation’ of the Orthodox Church under Patriarch Cyril Loukaris’, *JEH*, 63:3 (2012), pp. 475-87.

Tubb, Amos, ‘The Engagement Controversy: A Victory for the English Republic’, *Historical Research*, 89:243 (2016), pp. 42-61.

Tudor, Philippa, ‘Religious Instruction for Children and Adolescents in the Early English Reformation’, *JEH*, 35:3 (1984), pp. 391-413.

Turnbull, George Henry, *Samuel Hartlib: A Sketch of His Life and His Relations to J. A. Comenius* (London, 1920).

— *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib’s Papers* (London, 1947).

Twigg, John, ‘College Finances, 1640-1660’, in Nicholas Tyacke (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 773-802.

- *A History of Queens' College, Cambridge 1448-1986* (Bury St Edmunds, 1987).
- *The University of Cambridge and the English Revolution, 1625-1688* (Woodbridge, 1990).
- Tyacke, Nicholas (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford: Volume IV Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997).
- 'Science and Religion at Oxford before the Civil War,' in Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas, *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth Century History Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 73-93.
- Tyerman, Christopher, *A History of Harrow School, 1324-1991* (Oxford, 2000).
- Underdown, David, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1971).
- Vallance, Edward, 'Oaths, Casuistry, and Equivocation: Anglican Responses to the Engagement Controversy', *HJ*, 44:1 (2001), pp. 59-77.
- Veall, Donald, *The Popular Movement for Law Reform, 1640-1660* (Oxford, 1970).
- Venning, Timothy 'Walter Strickland', *ODNB*.
- Vernon, Elliot, *London Presbyterians and the British Revolutions, 1638-64* (Manchester, 2021).
- 'Introduction, Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c 1635-66', in Elliot Vernon and Hunter Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 1-16
- "'They agree not in opinion among themselves': Two-Kingdoms Theory, 'Erastianism' and the Westminster Assembly Debate on Church and State, c. 1641-48', in Elliot Vernon

and Hunter Powell (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 130-54.

Vernon, Elliot, and Powell, Hunter (eds), *Church Polity and Politics in the British Atlantic World, c.1635-66* (Manchester, 2020).

Vincent, William Alfred Leslie, *The State and School Education, 1640-1660, in England and Wales: A Survey Based on Printed Sources* (London, 1950).

Walker, Eric C., *William Dell, Master Puritan* (Cambridge, 1970).

Walker, Thomas Alfred, *Peterhouse* (London, 1906).

Wallace, John M., 'The Engagement Controversy 1649–1652: An Annotated List of Pamphlets,' *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, 68 (1964), pp. 385–405.

Ward, Joseph P., *Culture, Faith, and Philanthropy: Londoners and Provincial Reforms in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 2013).

Wardale, J.R., *Clare College* (London, 1899).

Watson, Foster, *The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice* (Cambridge, 1908).

— 'The State and Education During the Commonwealth', *EHR*, 15:57 (1900), pp. 58-72.

Webster, Charles, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-60* (New York, 1975).

— 'William Dell and the Idea of University', in Mikuláš Teich and Robert M. Young (eds), *Changing Perspectives in the History of Science: Essays in Honour of Joseph Needham* (London, 1973), pp. 110-26.

Wells, J., *Wadham College* (London, 1998).

Whitehead, David, 'Thomas Birch', *ODNB*.

Wilson, H.B., *The History of Merchant Taylors' School, from Its Foundation to the Present Time* (2 vols, London, 1812-4)

Woolrych, Austin, revised, 'Arthur Squibb', *ODNB*

— *Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford, 2002).

— *Commonwealth to Protectorate* (Oxford, 1982).

Worden, Blair, 'Politics, Piety, and Learning: Cromwellian Oxford', in his *God's Instruments, Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 91-193.

— 'English Republicanism', in Mark Goldie and J.H. Burns (eds), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 443-76.

— 'Republicanism, Regicide and Republic: The English Experience', in Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds), *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage* (2 vols, Cambridge, 2002), i, pp. 307-27.

— *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653* (Cambridge, 1974).

Wright, Stephen, 'John Bond', *ODNB*.

— 'Gilbert Coles', *ODNB*.

— 'John Moyle', *ODNB*.

Wroughton, John, 'Michael Oldisworth', *ODNB*.

Yeo, Matthew, *The Acquisition of Books by Chetham's Library, 1655-1700* (Leiden, 2011).

Young, Brian, 'Richard Busby', in Patrick Derham (ed.), *Loyal Dissent: Brief Lives from Westminster School* (Buckingham, 2016), n.p. Retrieved from <https://bodleian.lds.org.uk> (1 December 2022).

Young, John T., 'John Durie [Dury]', *ODNB*.

Young, Robert Fitzgibbon, *A Czech Humanist in London in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century* (London, [1925]).

Zakai, Avihu, 'Orthodoxy in England and New England: Puritans and the Issue of Religious Toleration, 1640-1650', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 13:3 (1991), pp. 401-41.

— 'Religious Toleration and Its Enemies: The Independent Divines and the Issue of Toleration During the English Civil War', *Albion*, 21:1 (1989), pp. 1-33.

### **Unpublished Theses**

Adamson, I.R., 'The Foundation and Early History of Gresham College, London, 1596-1704' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1976).

Caudill, Randall L-W., 'Some Literary Evidence of the Development of English Virtuoso Interests in the Seventeenth Century, with Particular Reference to the Literature of Travel' (D.Phil. thesis, University of Oxford, 1975).

Bidwell, William Bradford, 'The Committees and Legislation of the Rump Parliament, 1648-1653: A Quantitative Study' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Rochester, 1977).

Cipriano, Salvatore, 'Seminaries of Identity: The Universities of Scotland and Ireland in the Age of British Revolution' (Ph.D. thesis, Fordham University, 2018).

Daigre, Eric Stephen, 'Teaching Revolutions: Literature, Literacy, and Education in the English Civil War Period, 1640-1660' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, 2001).

Dumble, W., 'Government, Religion and Military Affairs in Durham During the Civil War and Interregnum' (Ph.D. thesis, Durham University, 1978).

Fienberg, Stanley P., 'Thomas Goodwin, Puritan Pastor and Independent Divine' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1974).

Fradkin, Jeremy, 'Godliness with a Difference: Religious Arguments for Toleration in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England' (MA thesis, University of Alberta, 2012)

— 'Religious Toleration and Protestant Expansion in Revolutionary England, 1642-1658' (D.Phil. thesis, John Hopkins University, 2019).

Hansen, Emily, 'From 'Humanist' to 'Godly'? The Changing Social Function of Education in Early Modern English Grammar Schools' (Ph.D. thesis, University of York, 2015).

Holley, Edwin Darrell, 'The English Bible and English Primary Education in the Tudor and Stuart Periods' (Ph.D. thesis, Florida State University, 1998).

Johnson, George Arthur, 'From Seeker to Finder: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Spiritualism' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1948).

Knop, Judy A., 'The Editing and Publishing of the London Polyglot, 1654-1657' (MSt thesis, University of Chicago, 1977).

Lawrence, Thomas Michael, 'Transmission and Transformation: Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Project 1600-1704' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2002).

Maitland, David Johnston, 'Three Puritan Attitudes Toward Learning: An Examination of the Puritan Controversies over a Learned Ministry, 1640-1660, and the Consequences of this Struggle for Puritan Concern About the Reformation of Learning' (Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University, 1959).

McGhee, Patrick Seamus, '“Heathenism” in the Protestant Atlantic World, c. 1558- c. 1700' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2019).

Parsons, Katherine Amelia, 'Sir Thomas White's Dream: St John's College, Oxford, the Merchant Taylors' Company, London, and the Reformation' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2016).

Reinhart, Thomas Edward, 'The Parliamentary Visitation of Oxford University, 1646-1652' (Ph.D. thesis, Brown University, 1984).

Vernon, Elliot, 'The Sion College Conclave and London Presbyterians During the English Revolution' (Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1999).

## **Unpublished Papers**

Aubertin-Potter, Norma, ““These Troublesome Times”: All Souls College and the English Civil War’ [01\\_TheseTroublesomeTimes\\_OP\\_1.pdf \(ox.ac.uk\)](#) [accessed 5/9/22].

Brown, Simon ‘Making a Trade of Preaching: Clergy, Labor, and Political Economy between the Interregnum and Restoration’.

Foster, Richard, ‘Winchester Cathedral Library, 1642-1669’.

Fradkin, Jeremy, ‘Conversion: Contesting Christian Magistracy and the Propagation of the Gospel, 1649-1652’.

Harrison, Marie, ‘Eton College and the Civil War’ [Eton College and the Civil War - Eton College Collections](#) [accessed 5/9/22].

