

MEMORANDA

EARLY RECORDS

THE COLLEGE REGISTER OF ADMISSIONS published between 1911 and 1916 contains lists of officers with the dates of their tenure, but no list of fellows: and so far as I know there is no list except that in the Library made by the late Sub-Librarian William White. This list is compiled from the books of Admissions of Masters Fellows Scholars and Officers, which begin in 1560, and therefore omits not only the fellows named in the Charter of Foundation but also some 50 others (known to have been fellows) who were never sworn under the statutes of Elizabeth. The list is also not very accurate, some names being omitted and many materially misspelt (e.g. Sutton for Hutton, Bampton for Hampton, Protram for Outram). The obstacles in the way of making a complete and accurate list will be apparent to anyone acquainted with the condition of the early records of the College and a reasonable approximation is all that can be attempted. While making this attempt I have put together the following notes on the records examined and on some of the problems which have presented themselves, in the hope that the information contained in them may save some rather tedious labour for future inquirers into the history of the College, particularly in the 16th and 17th centuries. After the Restoration the list is merely a transcript of the admissions.

Henry VIII's Charter of 19 December 1546 sets out the names of the Master and 60 'socii et scolares' who formed the original foundation, and the same names are given in the 'Distribucio Collegii' mentioned below. There were at first no statutes and no regular record of admission of fellows. Edward VI gave statutes in 1552 of which there is a good account (with extracts) in the second volume of Mullinger's *History of the University* and a thoroughly bad account in the Introduction to the *College Register of Admissions*. Under these statutes there were to be 50 fellows and 60 scholars (*discipuli*), anyone under the degree of Master of Arts ranking not as a fellow but as a scholar, even if a Bachelor 'ad societatem designatus'. New statutes were drafted in Queen Mary's reign, the preamble being actually dated 12 November 1554: but, the date notwithstanding, they never became legally operative, though apparently their main provisions did in effect govern the College practice in place of those of the statutes of Edward VI. These draft 'Marian' statutes raised the number of fellows to 60, those under the degree of Master of Arts being Minor fellows and the rest Major fellows: and the scholars were still to be 60. These

6 FELLOWS OF TRINITY COLLEGE

numbers were repeated in the statutes finally given by Queen Elizabeth on 29 March 1560 which were in the main copied word for word from the draft of 1554, the changes being generally those occasioned by the demise of the crown and the re-establishment of the reformed religion. The actual fellows, though some of them had held their fellowships from the earliest years of the College, were sworn and admitted under the new statutes, and from that date onwards (except between 1642 and 1660) the admissions of fellows are regularly recorded. For the first 200 years the records are contained in a book of 'Admissions and Admonitions 1560-1759' except from 1645 to 1660 when they are in (a) 'Admissions 1645-1659', or (b) 'Admissions and Conclusions 1660' which deals only with the changes at the Restoration. It may be noted that from 1560 to 1859 fellows were normally admitted twice (as Minor fellows and Major fellows). The statutes of 1860 did not preserve this distinction and from that time there was only a single admission: though Bachelor fellows were still so far a separate class that they had no part in the government of the College, and until 1885 did not dine at the High Table.

Before 1560 however the only regular records of fellows besides the Charter are the lists of stipendia and liberaturae in the Bursar's books (including till 1551 the Junior Bursar's): and these are also useful afterwards both as a check on the admissions and as giving some indication of the period of tenure, or at least of residence. Dividends were not paid until (probably) 1630, and until 1655 only the total amounts distributed were entered, without any lists of recipients; but from 1655 the dividend lists are also a valuable source of information. I have given in the list the references for the first and last recorded payments to all fellows admitted before the end of the 17th century.

The accounts for 1547 are very incomplete and the first regular accounts appear to be for 1548-9. The lists of liberaturae are not at first arranged in any order, but the lists of stipendia from 1548-9 onwards give the names in order of seniority. Down to 1552 the Bachelor fellows are succeeded by a few 'dialectici' who bring the number up to about 60 and are followed by 40 or more scholars ('grammatici' till 1550, afterwards 'discipuli'). The dialectici include some of the 'socii et scolares' named in the Charter and are correctly recognised as fellows. In 1553 the rule of Edward VI's statutes is followed, none below the degree of Master of Arts being shewn as fellows, the dialectici disappearing, and B.A.s being given in a single list with undergraduate scholars: but in 1554 the M.A. fellows are followed by 20 'bacchalauii et scolares socii' and then by 43 discipuli, some of whom are B.A.s. This agrees with the draft statutes of 1554 and with the Elizabethan statutes. The

FELLOWS OF TRINITY COLLEGE

7

accounts for 1555 are confused and useless as far as classification is concerned, and there are no accounts for the four following years.

Unfortunately the Bursar's books from 1546 to 1641 are most defective, 38 years in all being entirely missing and several others being in very bad condition. The accounts which have disappeared are those for the years 1556-9, 1562, 1568, 1573, 1575, 1584, 1598-1600, 1603, 1605, 1607, 1611, 1613, 1617, 1619, 1620, 1622-36, 1638, 1639 and 1641 (all inclusive).

There remain the Conclusion Books which record the decisions of the Seniority. The first of these (the 'Old Conclusion Book') begins in 1607 and runs to 1673, and the second (the 'New Conclusion Book') runs from January 1646/7 to November 1811, the two books apparently being used indiscriminately from 1646 to 1673: and as if this were not sufficiently distracting, many of the entries in the Old Conclusion Book are out of their proper order, while a number of conclusions ranging from 1656 to 1679 are to be found in a part of the New Conclusion Book otherwise occupied by entries of the later years of Bentley's mastership—1735 to 1741. I have referred in these notes to the Old Conclusion Book as C.B. 1 and to the New Conclusion Book as C.B. 2.

The 'Distribucio Collegii' to which I have referred above is a document mentioned in the Introduction to the *College Register of Admissions* (vol. 1, p. 1). It is said to have been drawn up by an officer in the Court of Augmentations, whose son gave it to Paul Thompson (Bursar 1611-13) who gave it to the College. It contains the same list of fellows as the Charter, but varying slightly in the order and in some of the Christian names: and also lists of 40 'Childer-Grammarians' and of officers, servants and dependents of the College by name, with their stipends. The date given in the *Register of Admissions*—37 Henry VIII (i.e. 22 April 1545-21 April 1546)—does not appear on the document itself, but is the date assigned to it by Paul Thompson. If however the 'Distribucio' was really drawn up by April 1546, it is singular that with one exception all the 40 Childer-Grammarians named in it appear in the stipendium list of grammatici in the accounts for the year 1548-9 three to four years later.

Of the 60 *socii et scolares* named in the Charter about one-fourth do not appear in the accounts and may not have accepted nomination. Their places seem to have been promptly filled up, for even in the incomplete accounts for 1547 there are four fresh names, and the first complete accounts (1548-9) contain a full list of 60 (including the *dialectici*) though in a few cases no actual payment is recorded. There were until 1552 no statutes and consequently no regular machinery for vacating fellowships and supplying vacancies, and probably difficulties and disputes arose in particular cases. In

8 FELLOWS OF TRINITY COLLEGE

two instances, the admissions of Thomas Barwick and Richard Smythe to fellowships vacated by James Gressham and Michael Fitzherbert, bonds indemnifying the College against all claims in respect of the vacated fellowships are preserved (see note (5) p. 17), and this may have been the usual practice where doubts were possible: but there seems to be nothing to shew how appointments were made. A curious feature of the early lists is that in no less than four cases the disappearance of a Charter fellow seems to be followed immediately or very closely by the addition of a junior fellow of the same name (see Notes on Thomas Blythe, William Boyes, Roger Carowe, and William Allington).

Edward VI's statutes of 8 November 1552 established as governing body of the College with the Master a *Senatus* or Seniority consisting of the digniores magistratus, namely the Vice-Master, Deans, Head Lecturer (*Magister Aulae*) and Bursars 'et praeterea regii professores quotcunque in eo collegio socii fuerint'. Apparently, as observed above, these statutes were practically disused after the accession of Mary: and the signatures appended to the sealed copy of the statutes of Elizabeth seem to be those of the Master and eight senior fellows, and do not correspond to the *Senatus* of Edward VI's statutes. But it may be noticed that the titles given by the Edwardian statutes to the officers (*Propraeses*, *Censores*, *Quaestores* for Vice-Master, Deans, and Bursars) survive in the accounts into the reign of Elizabeth.

THE 'STATUTES OF PHILIP AND MARY'

There is in the Muniment Room an engrossed MS book labelled 'Statutes of Philip and Mary' to which I shall refer as the draft of 1554. It contains a draft body of statutes for the College with a preamble in the form of letters patent of Philip and Mary dated 12 November 1554, empowering the Bishops of Winchester, Durham and Ely, and Henry Cole, Thomas Watson and John Christopherson the Master of the College to go through, examine and according to their judgment correct and approve statutes '*iam partim ex optimis quibusdam aliorum Collegiorum statutis partim ex fundatione et ordinationibus dicti Collegii transcripta et in unum volumen redacta*' (meaning undoubtedly the draft which follows) for the good government of the College by the eight senior fellows and the Master. These statutes when approved and signed by the six commissioners named were to be valid until confirmed and established under the great seal or by Parliament: and in the meantime the commissioners were to have power to amend at their discretion. The letters patent were not sealed nor were the draft

FELLOWS OF TRINITY COLLEGE

9

statutes signed by the commissioners, but the draft is undoubtedly that on which the statutes of Elizabeth (29 March 1560) were framed as those statutes follow it mostly word for word except for necessary amendments. Edward Vernon (Junior Bursar 1722–6), whose ‘Notitia’ is the completest existing account of the College estates, has left a curious note in the copy of his ‘Notitia’ known to Bursars as ‘Lort’s Vernon’ about the careless way in which the Elizabethan statutes were copied: but the oddest thing is that his description of the book from which the copy was made, and which he says, ‘I have now in my hands’, differs so much in details from the book now in the Muniment Room that it must have been another copy which had perhaps had noted more fully on it the changes to be made for the new statutes. He says positively, ‘This Patent never passed the Seal and not to be found in the Rolls Office. No statutes either signed by the Queen’s intended commissioners or under her Great Seal of the Kingdom are now or were ever as believed existing.’

Now Mullinger, in his *History of the University* (vol. II. p. 151), refers to the ejection of Dr Bill from the Mastership on Queen Mary’s accession and his replacement by John Christopherson ‘who in conjunction with the seniority was shortly after empowered to prepare a new body of statutes for the College’, adding a reference to the *Calendar of State Papers*: and the late Mr Stamp, Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, added to the debt which the College already owed him by presenting it with a copy of the document in the Record Office to which the entry relates. It is apparently an undated draft of letters patent (never issued) of Philip and Mary giving power to John Christopherson Master of the College ‘atque octo ex sociis eiusdem maxime senioribus’ (not the Senatus of Edward VI’s statutes) to make laws and statutes for its government. The recital of the reasons for a commission agrees word for word with that in the preamble of the draft of 1554 until the last sentence, which runs

Atque cum satis constet inter omnes nullam rempublicam absque legibus posse bene administrari, neque leges rite sanciri sine hominum consilio, qui usu rerum et prudentia plurimum valent, *quique nati educatique sunt in ea ipsa republica pro qua leges statuere debent*

the words down to ‘valent’ being common to both documents but the remainder being peculiar to the Record Office draft. The statutes made or to be made (‘vel iam descripta et communi consensu confirmata vel in posterum describenda ac confirmanda’) by the Master and Seniors are to be valid until confirmed under the great seal or by Parliament, and as in the draft of 1554 power is

given to amend in the interval. But the confirmation is to depend on the approval of special commissioners to be appointed for the purpose (*'certorum hominum ad eadem graviter ponderanda accurateque expendenda per nos designandorum'*); and great stress is laid on the importance of extended consideration and trial of the proposals before the final settlement.

The exact correspondence in language between these two documents makes it certain that they were not independent: that is, that one was used in the preparation of the other. At first sight the fact that the draft of 1554 presents a complete scheme suggests that it is the later document and contains the results of just such careful consideration as is contemplated by the Record Office draft. But this theory is weakened by the date of the draft of 1554—little more than a year after Queen Mary's accession—and by the full provision made in it for further consideration and amendment: and careful comparison seems to favour the hypothesis that the draft of 1554 was the original proposal. Edward VI's statutes had been prepared by outside commissioners, men of eminence and versed in public affairs, and it would seem natural (as proposed in the draft of 1554) to follow the precedent if a new code was to be made. The Record Office draft however expressly lays down what appears to be the reason for adopting a different course: the words noted above *'quique nati educatique sunt in ea ipsa republica pro qua leges statuere debent'* indicate and justify the creation of a more domestic body of commissioners in the first instance, and, taken together with the emphasis laid on prolonged examination of the scheme and the reservation of final approval for a special commission, seem to embody second thoughts, and to suggest the existence of doubts whether the original proposal was not too hasty and whether it had sufficiently taken into account the experience of those actually engaged in the administration of the College.

If this view is correct, it suggests an answer to the question why neither any new statutes nor any commission for the preparation of new statutes should have passed the seal in Queen Mary's reign. Assuming that the draft of 1554 was abandoned for the reasons suggested and that the Record Office draft was afterwards prepared to meet the objections, it may well have been thought that if after all special commissioners were to be appointed to pass the statutes in their final form before the sealing, it was not very important to appoint formally for the purpose of the preliminary work the actual College authorities who could perfectly well carry out that work without such appointment, using as a basis the draft already prepared: as in fact they appear to have done.

FELLOWS OF TRINITY COLLEGE

11

CIVIL WAR AND COMMONWEALTH

The period 1640-60 presents a number of special problems arising from the ejection of fellows and the irregular filling of vacancies. These are partly dealt with in notes on particular fellows, but the following general statement may be of interest.

G. B. Tatham, in *The Puritans in Power* (pp. 121 ff.), gives a careful account of the ejections. There were, he says, 77 fellows who received the stipendium in 1642. This includes four who had actually vacated their fellowships by Lady Day 1642 and 13 others who had been admitted Minor fellows in 1640 but only received payment as scholars, as they had been pre-elected, in accordance with the practice of the time, and were still awaiting vacancies. Of the 77 he shews that 22 are actually recorded to have been ejected down to 1650, namely Roe, Meredith, Thorndike, Rhodes, Crossland, Marshall, John West, George Chamberlain, Willis, Barry, Richard Cooke, Wotton, Arundell, Stacy, Cave, Abdy, Samwaies, Nicholas, Wheeler, Babington, Cowley, and William Chamberlain: and he adds seven others on the ground that having disappeared from the books they reappeared at the Restoration, namely Sherman, Nevile, Briscoe, Crane, Price, Crawley and Parish. The ejection of three of these (Nevile, Briscoe, and Crawley) is however not merely a matter of inference, but rests on direct evidence, and this applies also to two fellows, Thomas Ashton and Thomas Croyden, not included in Tatham's list of ejections. In the Bursar's Book for 1645 under 'Extraordinaries' there is an entry of 'the wages and other emoluments of some particular fellows paid to the Sequestrator and Mr Fortune and Mr Curd', the fellows including Nevile, Crawley, and Ashton: and on the page immediately preceding the Auditors' certificate there is a title 'The Addition of Fellows Wages and Liveries which could not be set down in the beginning of the book' which includes the details of payments

to Mr Bradshaw in place of Mr Briscoe
 to Mr Akehurst in place of Mr (Richard) Cooke
 to Mr Dunmoll in place of Dr Meredith
 to Mr Rolls in place of Mr Ashton

Further, the Order of the Lords and Commons of 22 September 1645 mentioned below put John Pratt into Nevile's fellowship: while with regard to Thomas Croyden there is a conclusion of 7 October 1647 (C.B. 1, p. 195) 'That Mr Croyden senior and Mr Barton's names be taken out of the Butteries they having lost their fellowships, their patents for travelling being expired'.

(Barton's patent was afterwards renewed, see C.B. 1, p. 220). The last payment to Croyden is accordingly that made for 1647.

In addition to these 31 fellows there are 14, namely Salmon, Wyatt, Shaw, Offley, Creswell, Bouchier, Shirley, Sclater, Appleby, Meade, Trevis, Campian, Yardley, and Lister, who are stated in *Alumni Cant.* to have been ejected, and five more, namely Jones, Herbert, Parrott, John Cooke, and Hayward, are in the list given in Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*. In the absence of direct evidence it is of course impossible to say positively whether particular fellowships were vacated by ejection or in some other way: but it is certain that not one of the 50 names given above occurs in the stipendium list of 1652, the first which shews the full effect of the ejections of 1650. And in fact only two fellows out of the 77 of 1642, Robert Boreman and William Bayley, received payments as resident fellows uninterruptedly throughout the period. Two others, Francis Barton and Charles Rich had 'patents for travelling' during part of the time: and James Duport as Regius Professor of Greek received (in accordance with the statutes) no payments as a fellow, but on vacating the professorship in 1654 satisfied the Seniority that he had retained his fellowship, and was appointed a Senior (see C.B. 1, p. 229).

The ordinary admissions of fellows between 1642 and the Restoration are entered in a separate book, and (with a few exceptions in 1659) are all admissions to Minor fellowships only. But in addition to these the following appear as fellows de facto in the accounts without any regular admission: Robert Metcalfe (see note 11, p. 18) and John Pratt, by virtue of an Order dated 22 September 1645 of the Lords and Commons, quoted in Cooper's *Annals*, vol. III. p. 379; Bradshaw, Akehurst, Dunmoll, Rolls, and Pledger (Bursar's Book 1645, additional payments referred to above); Griffith, Disney, Davis, Twiss, Jacombe, Badcock, Templer, and Robotham 'received' by the Master and Seniors 'into eight of the fellowships now vacant in Trinity College by ejection' by virtue of an Order of Parliament (conclusion 23 February 1645 [1645/6], C.B. 1, p. 184); Fidoe, White, Sanderson, Pole, Moyle, and [William] Spencer by Order of the Committee for Reformation of the University making them fellows in the place of such as they had removed (accepted by conclusion 29 October 1650, C.B. 1, p. 215); Michael Iles, who was a scholar and may have been accidentally omitted, for there is a blank in the admissions where his name would have come; De la Place; and finally Peter Vivian, John Wilkes, and John Castle by mandates from the Lord Protector in 1656, 1657, and 1658 respectively (*Admissions*, 1645-59, p. 32). Of all these 26 fellows not regularly admitted only Sanderson, Moyle, Spencer, and Vivian retained their fellowships after the Restoration when a list of fellows

FELLOWS OF TRINITY COLLEGE

13

of the ancient foundation (who had all been admitted not later than 1640) was drawn up and 39 others of 1647–59 were formally admitted.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL

The close connexion of the College with Westminster School affected the elections into fellowships in a way which raises some difficult questions. The statutes of Elizabeth gave a preference to Westminster in the election of scholars. The extension of this preference to the election of fellows, proposed in James I's letters patent of 1607, was strongly resisted by the College, and after a long controversy a settlement was reached by which three scholars were to be taken from Westminster every year and their seniority as candidates for fellowships was not to be prejudiced by pre-elections: but the power of the College to elect freely into fellowships was preserved. Nevertheless it seems clear that a strong tradition in favour of electing Westminster men into fellowships was established (though without any formal order) in the earlier part of the 17th century, and this persisted until the last quarter of the 18th. From 1600 to 1660 about one-fourth of the fellows admitted came from Westminster, and from 1661 to 1775 over three-eighths: the ratio during the forty years following the Restoration being actually over nine-twentieths and that from 1701 to 1775 being steady at about one-third. And then there was a sudden and complete change. In the ten years ended 1775 out of 42 fellows admitted 13 were from Westminster: in the following decade 42 fellows were again admitted, but only three from Westminster: and there was no later recovery. Indeed before long it had become a rare thing for a Westminster man to be elected into a fellowship. Now it is not easy to explain the growth of the tradition, though after a long and bitter dispute on a question which had actually threatened the independence of Trinity prudence would no doubt incline the College, having gained its point, to avoid further friction by doing full justice to the claims of Westminster scholars, and later on, particularly during the great headmastership of Busby, the excellent quality of those scholars may be supposed to have confirmed this tendency. But whatever the reason there is no doubt at all of the fact. In the century following the Restoration there were only six years in which fellows were admitted none of whom came from Westminster. And Mr Winstanley has shewn (*Unreformed Cambridge*, pp. 230–2) that in the earlier part of the 18th century it was regarded as the established practice that the senior Westminster Bachelor scholar should be elected into a fellowship. That

14 FELLOWS OF TRINITY COLLEGE

a customary privilege so long and firmly established should gradually fall into desuetude would not necessarily be remarkable, but that it should end sharply at a particular date suggests irresistibly a deliberate change of policy. Yet so far as I am aware there is no sort of record of any order or decision effecting or even referring to such a change. It may be noted that Dr Hinchliffe, who was Master when the change took place, was himself a Westminster and had actually been for a few weeks Headmaster of the School.

HONORARY FELLOWS

It has been suggested that a list of Honorary fellows (of whom there appears to be no record in the *Register of Admissions*) might be appropriately included in these notes. Honorary fellowships were instituted by Statute XXIII of the statutes of 1860 which made 'any Professor Praelector or other person distinguished for literary or scientific merits' eligible, and this qualification remained unchanged until the statutes of 1926. There is no admission of Honorary fellows. The first election seems to have been made in 1867 and the elections are entered in a separate book of Honorary fellows. Here are the elections.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| 10 June 1867 | The Bishop of St Davids (Connop Thirlwall) |
| | George Biddell Airy |
| 8 May 1869 | Alfred Tennyson |
| 22 May 1872 | Joseph Barber Lightfoot |
| | James Spedding |
| | Arthur Cayley |
| | James Clerk Maxwell |
| 7 October 1875 | Frederick Field |
| 24 March 1876 | The Archbishop of Dublin (Richard Chenevix Trench) |
| | Lord Houghton |
| 25 March 1881 | Lord Rayleigh |
| | Henry Sidgwick |
| | Edward Herbert Bunbury |
| | William Henry Waddington |
| 23 October 1885 | Edmund Law Lushington |
| | Sir James Fitzjames Stephen |
| | George Otto Trevelyan |
| 23 November 1888 | Richard Claverhouse Jebb |
| 2 May 1890 | Brooke Foss Westcott |
| 22 February 1895 | Lord Acton |
| 14 November 1902 | Arthur James Balfour |
| | Francis Galton |
| | Sir William George Granville Venables Vernon-Harcourt |
| | Lord Macnaghten |
| | Frederic William Maitland |
| 25 November 1910 | Samuel Henry Butcher |
| | John Westlake |