

Chapter 2

The Old Theology and the New Learning at Cambridge to 1549

As we observed in Chap. 1, Bucer's lectures in Divinity took the form of an exposition of Scripture, in part because the Cambridge Injunctions decreed that all theology lectures should be taught from the Old and New Testaments, and not in the manner of scholastic theologians. The oft-cited rendering of the third Injunction is as follows: "That neither in the university or any other college or hall, or other place, should any lecture be read upon any of the doctors who had written upon the Master of the Sentences, but that all divinity lectures should be upon the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, according to the true sense thereof, and not after the manner of Scotus" (Mullinger 1873, 630).¹ The wording of this Injunction indicates that its framers took a dim view of how theology had been practiced and taught in the centuries prior to 1535. This view held, among other things, that the study of Scripture had been overshadowed in the theological curriculum by the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, and that the practice of theology had been too beholden to methods which they identified in a shorthand way by the name of John Duns Scotus (1255/6–1308).² It was in the place of this earlier practice that the Injunctions mandated a new approach to the teaching of theology, one that resonated with the program of biblical humanism.³ It is worth considering, briefly, the characterization of scholastic theology found in the Injunction and the extent to which it was a fair representation, and to look as well at the humanist critique of scholastic method which informed the attitude of the framers of the Injunction, before turning to the context that immediately preceded that in which Bucer found himself in 1549.

¹It must be noted that this is an abridged translation of the original that Mullinger provides; a full translation will be offered later in this chapter.

²As we shall note later in this chapter, Scotus was a *bête noire* of Erasmus, and the Dutchman's animosity no doubt influenced the framers of the Injunctions.

³We will return to the Injunctions in their historical context below.

2.1 Scholastic Method in Theology Through the Lens of the Third Cambridge Injunction

Polemical though it was, the third Injunction did correctly identify three key features of scholastic method in the study of theology, the discipline which held pride of place at Cambridge (and elsewhere) at the outset of the sixteenth century: the place of the Bible; the place of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*; and the teaching (and practice) of theology "after the manner of Scotus," that is, the practices of scholastic method.⁴ Our brief consideration of scholastic method will take up each of these elements in turn in order to flesh out our understanding of this Injunction and the context into which Bucer came.

2.1.1 *The Bible*

Even a cursory survey of the study of theology in the Middle Ages makes clear that in a fundamental sense the Bible was central to everything theologians were about.⁵ Despite the practical division that developed in the sacred disciplines between the study of the Bible and the study of theology (see below), no theologian in the Middle Ages would have thought that in his work in theology he was doing anything other than interpreting and applying the Bible. The extent to which the third Cambridge Injunction suggested that the case was in fact otherwise would have been for polemical reasons and for the most part should be understood in that context. In fact, the positive mandate of the Injunction served, in practical terms, to single out the biblical element of the medieval theological curriculum and make it the sole concern of the new curriculum, and in that respect was a continuation of previous practice, albeit with a new emphasis.

In addition to its central place in the theological curriculum as a text book and object of study, the Bible provided the very stuff of theology as that discipline developed into a field of study in its own right—as will become clear in the next two sub-sections of the present chapter. As the academic discipline of theology emerged and developed, it drew its substantive questions from the work of biblical interpretation (Evans 1980, 92). Gradually, the study and analysis of these questions became ever more important as an end in itself. In the process, theology in practice became divided between the interpretation of the Bible on the one hand, and the development of the question literature on the other—the most significant work in this genre being

⁴The present sketch draws upon the following secondary works: Chenu (1997); Colish (1994); Colish (1997); Evans (1980); Evans (1984); Evans (1985); Evans (2001); Knowles (1962); McGrath (1987); Overfield (1984); Smalley (1969); Smalley (1964). Steinmetz (1999, 18–23) is a helpful interlocutor, though it will be apparent that the present examination differs with his in the interpretation of the subject. Notice should also be taken of Evans (2012), especially Chapter 11.

⁵The two volumes of Evans (1984, 1985) make this point emphatically clear. See also Colish (1994). Smalley (1964) is still the major resource on the subject.

the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard—even though in theory and intent theology was still a unified subject of study.

2.1.2 *Peter Lombard's Sentences and Academic Theology*

From the early thirteenth century onwards the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard was, with the Bible, the fundamental text for the teaching of the emerging academic discipline of theology, and its significance for the development of a distinctively *scholastic* approach to theology is therefore hard to overstate.⁶ At the outset of this development, theology continued to be closely tied to the exegesis of Scripture; its purpose was initially to resolve problems that arose in the course of biblical interpretation (Evans 1980, 92). As this practice developed, the questions became ever more prominent and the exposition of the biblical text receded in importance.⁷ In practice if not in theory, a separation between biblical exposition and theological discussion had occurred, and which pointed to further developments along this line (Smalley 1964, 74–5).

Thus, while theology continued to be centered on questions that arose from the interpretation of Scripture, there developed a need (for pedagogical and practical reasons) to devise a more orderly structure for the new discipline of theology as the number of questions multiplied and were separated from the text that originally prompted them.⁸ This led to the employment of alternative means of organization beyond the simple exposition of the biblical texts in their canonical setting. Compendia of texts drawn from both the Bible and the Church Fathers were composed, organized around topics that came to guide the teaching of theology. The most famous and influential of these compendia was Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, which became the standard text for the teaching of theology in the Middle Ages from the thirteenth century onwards.⁹

Lombard's work was fundamental to the development of a distinctively scholastic approach to theology (Evans 1985, 101–105). This is true both for the work itself, and for the shift in theological method it represented (namely, the increased focus on *quaestiones*). Although the work was initially received with some suspicion, it came to be the key text-book for the teaching of theology (along with the

⁶The most comprehensive study of the *Sentences* is Colish (1994). As we have noted above in the Introduction, when the Cambridge Injunctions banned the use of the *Sentences* and the commentaries that had been written upon it, this constituted a dramatic change in the theological curriculum. The best work on the rise of theology as an academic discipline is Evans (1980). See also Evans (1983), and Colish (1994, 1: 33–154), which is especially good on the place of Lombard in this development.

⁷For a useful discussion of this, see Evans (1984, 125–132) and Chenu (1997, 291–300).

⁸Evans (1984, 110) observes: “The question literature evolved its own system of organisation—a necessity since there was no single underlying text to provide a common link between the questions.” Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

⁹For the critical edition of this text, see: Peter Lombard (1971–1981).

Bible) until the time of the Reformation (Evans 1985, 102). The *Sentences* was studied either directly or through commentaries by later theologians written upon the Lombard's work. These commentaries had their origin in the basic requirement of the theological curriculum that degree candidates in theology give lectures on the *Sentences*, in addition to lectures on the Bible.¹⁰ Indeed, every major theologian in the centuries following Lombard's death wrote a commentary on the *Sentences*,¹¹ and these commentaries in turn became the basis for lectures by later generations of theologians—hence their prominence in the theological literature produced in these centuries, and the stricture in the Cambridge Injunctions *against* teaching on the basis of any theologian who had commented on the work of Lombard.

2.1.3 Teaching “After the Manner of Scotus”¹²

As the new discipline of theology developed, it became apparent that the simple exegesis of Scripture and the effort to systematize questions and engage in speculative thinking were separate activities with different methods (Evans 1980, 30). This was tacitly recognized in the composition of works like the *Sentences*. Questions came to form the focus of the discipline, and (arguably) not only did the central place of biblical exegesis recede in importance, but theology took on an increasingly speculative character as the questions raised led to more subtle issues that were now generated not by Scripture but by the questions themselves. As M-D. Chenu has noted, for all that Bible remained the basis of teaching theology, and the authority to which appeal was made, by the thirteenth century it was hard to see how a direct reading of it was as important as the creation of a system (Chenu 1997, 146).

The most distinctive features of scholastic method narrowly understood were: the focus on questions [*quaestiones*] and distinctions [*distinctiones*] that arose in the course of reading [*lectio*]; the refinement of dialectic as a means to resolve the questions raised; and the disputation [*disputatio*] as the academic setting in which dialectic was exercised.¹³ In its simplest terms, scholastic method proceeded by reasoned investigation, employing dialectic, directed to problems that arose in the course of reading authoritative texts.¹⁴ As we noted above, compendia of authorities

¹⁰For a concrete instance of this, see the discussion of the scholastic theological curriculum at Cambridge below.

¹¹Erasmus commented in 1518 that the number of commentaries on the *Sentences* equaled the number of theologians (Leader 1988, 177). On these commentaries, see Evans (2002) and Rosemann (2010).

¹²The quotation is taken from Mullinger's rendering of the Third Cambridge Injunction (1873, 630).

¹³Evans deals extensively with this (1984, 51–168); see also Chenu (1997, 291–295).

¹⁴See Evans (1984, 72–100) for a discussion of dialectic in relation to Biblical and theological studies.

such as Lombard's *Sentences* invited the application of this method (and thus contributed to its further development), in large part because the texts assembled demonstrated (intentionally or not) that there were differences of opinion among the Church Fathers that demanded resolution (Steinmetz 1999, 19). The purpose of disputations was to enhance careful and critical thinking about theological problems (Steinmetz 1999, 21).¹⁵ It is worth noting that under the influence of dialectic and its central role in the method of disputation as a pedagogical tool, theology took on an argumentative aspect. Argument was encouraged in order to refine thinking (Steinmetz 1999, 21). In the process, questions became disputed questions (Chenu 1997, 295–296).

When applied to theology, these later developments resulted in a significantly more subtle and profound theology, but also a theology that was increasingly speculative and (frankly) increasingly removed from the text of Scripture.¹⁶ In this respect, the practice of Scotus was famous (or infamous). It is true that Scripture continued to be crucially important as the source of questions and terms for investigation. Theologians were intensely interested in the literal sense of the text, and in questions of grammar and syntax (Evans 1985).¹⁷ Yet, while the Bible was one of the two key texts of theology throughout these centuries, it is highly suggestive of a shift in priorities that among the leading theologians between the late thirteenth and late fifteenth centuries, few if any were known as biblical scholars.¹⁸

This brief review of scholastic method in the light of the Third Cambridge Injunction has shown that the latter accurately identified the essential elements of the method it sought to overturn. The study of the Bible remained a fundamental feature of the theological curriculum throughout these centuries. Yet over the course of the years following the twelfth century, the practice of theology became increasingly sophisticated and speculative, and in the process the place of the Bible in sacred studies was altered. Where earlier there had been an intense concentration on the study of the biblical text alone, now there developed a profound interest in questions that arose in the course of biblical exposition but which became separated from their original locus. In the course of studying these questions, issues of

¹⁵However, disputations came to focus on increasingly abstract and speculative issues. For instance, the record of theological disputations at Oxford in the late thirteenth century indicates that the questions included: “Whether the idea in God has reason (understanding) of everything universally or particularly or integrally?”; “Whether essence and person are the same thing according to the thing?”; “Whether person is that thing itself according to the thing which is essence, and whether relation constitutes essence?”: Leader (1988, 175–176), translated from the Latin text in Little and Pelster (1934, 106–114). Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

¹⁶On the early development of speculative theology, and its emergence as an exercise in abstract (as opposed to contemplative) thought, see Evans (1980, 91–136).

¹⁷And yet, one does not come away with a sense that these academics studied the grammar and syntax with an eye to literary appreciation, but rather in the sense of scientific linguistics, which is not the same thing (on this, see Heath [1971]). Here one finds a strong contrast with the literary approach taken by humanists in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

¹⁸Indeed, it has been argued that exegetical work went into steep decline from the middle of the fourteenth century, while at the same time study and exposition of the *Sentences* continued to flourish: Verger (1984, 225–226).

language, epistemology, and metaphysics came to the fore. These studies were intended to aid in the study of the Bible. Yet it is hard to dispel the impression that for all the affirmation of the study of the Bible as the central task of theology, close attention to the Bible in its full, canonical form had been displaced by systematic, speculative concerns that owed more to metaphysics than to the sacred page. That certainly was the view of biblical humanism as it developed by the end of the fifteenth century.

2.1.4 *The Role of the Humanist-Scholastic Debate*¹⁹

Hence, before we turn to the more specific context of Cambridge in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, notice should be taken of a growing critique of scholastic method in theology (and other subjects) which began in Italy but grew in strength and prominence in northern Europe—and which served to influence education reformers in England, and in particular the framers of the Cambridge Injunctions. This critique formed perhaps the most explosive aspect of the humanist-scholastic debate to which reference has been made in Chap. 1 above.²⁰ While it is true that one should take care in evaluating the animosities between the two over the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and not conclude on basis of the declarations of the participants that the two positions were irreconcilable, nevertheless there *was* a debate and there *were* some profound differences in method and approach to a wide range of subjects, including theology and the exegesis of Scripture.

Much of the recent research in this area has focused attention upon the fact that it was at heart a debate over the question of intellectual method: it was (simply put) an academic “turf” war. As such, the debate took place primarily in the universities of northern Europe, though its origins can be traced to the middle of the fourteenth century in Italy—most notably in the work of the great humanist, Petrarch (1304–1374)—where scholasticism began to be subjected to searching criticism by those who came to be known as humanists.²¹ Of the Italian humanists, none was more scathing in his critique of it than Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457). Although best known for his exposure of the Donation of Constantine as a forgery, and for his writings on language and on logic, Valla should be better known for his contribution to theology, even though he was not himself a theologian.²² However, humanism in relation

¹⁹ Portions of this section are drawn with modification from Amos (2003); reprinted by permission of the publisher.

²⁰ Again, this rivalry of scholastic theologians and Renaissance humanists has received greater attention in the last few decades in no small part because of the work of Erika Rummel (1994, 1996) and Charles Nauert (1973, 1998, 2006). See also Evans (2012), Chapter 15.

²¹ For a good, brief discussion, see Nauert (2006, 19–24).

²² The major works on this aspect of Valla’s thought are: Fois (1969) and Camporeale (1972). See also Amos (2003, 44–48) for a brief discussion of Valla as a critic of scholastic theology and its handling of Scripture.

to theology did not become a bitter point of contention until it moved north of the Alps in the fifteenth century, where the practitioners of the method developed a greater concern with religious matters and in that connection encountered a formidable and well-entrenched scholastic university establishment, and tensions could be seen by the mid-fifteenth century (Rummel 1994, 4 and 63–125). The debate carried on into the sixteenth century, and at the center of it was Erasmus, to whom we will return below (in Sect. 2.2.2).

Perhaps the most acrimonious aspect of this dispute was the argument over who was competent to interpret Scripture (Rummel 1994, 83–95), which ultimately led to the broader question of what constituted the proper theological method. Almost by definition, humanists were not principally concerned with theology, but with texts and language. However, when it became a question of who possessed the qualifications for handling the Bible—which clearly involved texts and language—theological issues came into play. Scholastic theologians sought to safeguard what they maintained was their sole right to interpret Scripture, and aggressively asserted their prerogative, to which humanists responded in kind (Rummel 1994, 84).

What was the humanist critique of scholastic method? In respect of the question of theology and theological method, two key elements of it will concern us here: an antipathy towards metaphysics—that is, towards the speculative character of scholastic theology, which had a bearing on the purpose of theology; and the manner in which texts were handled by the scholastics. Humanists believed theology should be concerned with living the Christian life, not with abstract, metaphysical speculation. Far too often, in their view, metaphysics resulted in vain (even impious) speculation and linguistic quibbles about the arcane meaning of words, or endless disputations over unimportant subjects (Overfield 1984, 94). One can regard Petrarch as representative in his questioning of the scholastic program to fashion all-embracing systems (Witt 1995, 106). Though he did not directly attack scholastic theology, he did object to the excessive use of Aristotelian philosophy (which he believed contributed little to the Christian life), and found much that was pointless in the fascination for Aristotelian logic and its derivatives; for his part, Petrarch preferred Augustine and other Fathers to the work of scholastic theologians and metaphysicians (Trinkaus 1988, 330).

More than anything else, though, what aroused the ire of humanists (as literary scholars) was the manner in which texts were handled by the scholastics. This was true whether the object of examination was a biblical book or a secular book. As humanists saw it, scholastics treated individual texts as expressions of a given timeless truth that is best analyzed through the use of dialectic, all too often with little sensitivity to what the original author might have meant. Further, authoritative writings were not taken whole, but rather in piecemeal fashion, and this included the Bible. Humanists charged that when statements [*sententiae*] were extracted from texts and then gathered into anthologies organized according to issues [*quaestiones*], the original context ceased to be central in determining meaning.²³ In the view of the humanists, the result was that violence was done to the texts. For them, it was

²³ Clearly, Lombard's *Sentences* would have been in view in this critique.

a distortion of the original to extract statements from a larger body of work and then treat such statements as the adequate expression of a writer's thought (Nauert 1998, 434). In effect, the humanists alleged, the authors of these texts disappeared; their statements were removed from the original context and applied to questions they did not necessarily raise themselves. The meaning of the excerpts was thus opened to subtle and (perhaps) not so subtle reshaping at the hands of theologians (Nauert 2006, 19).

It was in part against this method that humanists developed their own literary, grammatical-historical method for the study of texts. At the most elemental level, the humanists sought to understand texts within their respective literary contexts. They argued that it was only in its original literary context that a given statement could be properly understood. Furthermore, texts were to be interpreted with reference to the circumstances and intentions of the author—intentions which, humanists argued, should be primary in interpreting the text (Nauert 2006, 17–19). In this work, humanists employed the tools of rhetoric as opposed to those of dialectic—and in respect of the deployment of these methods to the study of the Bible, they appealed to the example of the Church Fathers, many of whom were themselves rhetoricians (D'Amico 1988, 356). It has been argued that this rhetorical turn resulted in a shift not only in the method of theology, but also in the understanding of the purpose of theology: as we have already noted above, humanists believed it is for proper living through application of doctrine, rather than for endless refinement of doctrine as an end in itself (Rummel 1994, 12).

2.2 The University of Cambridge, ca. 1500–1549

Turning from the general to the more particular, the scholastic curriculum sketched above informed that at the University of Cambridge prior to the sixteenth century. That said, the institution to which Bucer came in 1549 had witnessed a steady progress of curricular reform for the previous half-century, influenced by Northern humanism and then the onset of the Reformation.²⁴ Though the coming of the Reformation represents the most dramatic context for change, and more specifically the Cambridge Injunctions of 1535 represent (in formal terms) the single most significant instrument for academic reform, change had in fact been coming gradually to the University of Cambridge since the late fifteenth century.²⁵ With respect to

²⁴ Leader (1988), is now the best account of the University up to 1546, and it will become evident that much of what follows is dependent upon this work; Morgan (2004) is also helpful, but most of what his volume covers falls beyond the scope of the present book. Though brief, Leedham-Green (1996) is very helpful. For very good examinations of the late medieval University, see the two works by Cobban (1988, 1999). Null (2000, 65–81) offers some useful perspectives on the Cambridge of Cranmer's undergraduate years, and its curriculum. Also worth consulting are: Porter (1958), especially Chapters 1 to 3; and Rupp (1947, 13–46). Though dated, Mullinger (1873, 1884) remains useful.

²⁵ See Cobban (1988, 254–257) on the gradual introduction of humanist reforms.

the teaching of theology (which is the primary concern of the present discussion), the general trajectory from around 1450 until 1600 was such that the study of the Bible directly—with the aid of Patristic literature rather than medieval commentators—became increasingly prominent (Leedham-Green 1996, 39), which proved to be something of a departure from what was described in Sects. 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3 above.

2.2.1 *Scholastic Theology in Late Fifteenth Century Cambridge*

However, although the number of candidates studying for a higher degree in theology was in decline before the end of the fifteenth century (Leedham-Green 1996, 19; Leader 1988, 170–171), theology continued to be the pre-eminent higher faculty within the University, and the curriculum as a whole continued to serve the needs of scholastic theology (Simon 1966, 52–53).²⁶ Evidence for the content of the theology curriculum at Cambridge (apart from a bare indication of the topics of some of the lectures) is quite meager—we are left with statutes,²⁷ anecdotes and lists of books (Rex 1991, 18).²⁸ What we lack are manuscripts of the lectures themselves or student notes that would give us some indication of content. However, we do know from the statutes the general outline of the course of study, which was in two stages following the earning of the BA. First, 5 years were spent in study of Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* and of the Bible, combined with a requirement for lecturing in the arts faculty. At the end of this, the student was awarded the BD. Following that, another 5 years were spent lecturing on Lombard and the Bible (preference was often given to the former, though by no means exclusively), which led to the award of the doctorate (University of Cambridge 1852, 1: 377).²⁹ Scholastic authorities and the scholastic character of university education were clearly dominant (Rex 1991,

²⁶ Greenslade (1986, 295) notes the pre-eminence of theology held true for Oxford throughout the Tudor period. The present discussion presupposes the treatment above of scholastic method in theology, and therefore will be brief.

²⁷ For the statutes, see University of Cambridge (1852, 1: 308–416, documents 1–188). This is a printing of *Statuta Antiqua in ordinem redacta (Ex Libro Procuratoris Senioris)*. A translation of the version of the statutes found in the Harleian Mss (British Library 7032, Baker’s Collection) is printed in Heywood (1840, 63–192). Though largely the same as the 1852 volume, Heywood’s text only includes documents 1–181; in addition, the enumeration does not match the version printed in the 1852 volume in every respect.

²⁸ This was true for Oxford as well, and held for all intellectual matters: McConica (1965, 77).

²⁹ This is document no. 124, “De incepturis in theologia”; Heywood (1840, 147) identifies it as no. 123, “Of those about to incept in theology”. This document went through a number of revisions since it was first issued ca. 1255–65, the last revision being no later than 1390: see the table in Appendix II of Hackett (1970, 337). For more on the curriculum, see: Leader (1988, 174–175 and more generally 170–191); Rex (1991, 18–19).

20–21). Throughout all this, the lectures were accompanied by disputations (University of Cambridge 1852, 1: 369–370).³⁰

Lectures in theology during these years were of three sorts. There was the simple reading of a given authoritative text with comment restricted to explaining the authorial intent—this was the “cursory” lecture, stemming from a time when books were not readily available, and was given by bachelors. Lectures of this type enabled the students to become familiar with authoritative texts that were otherwise of limited availability (Leedham-Green 1996, 17).³¹ There was also the reading and discussion of a commentary on a standard text. This constituted the “ordinary” lecture, given by MA’s with teaching responsibilities (known as regent masters), as required for the BD (Leedham-Green 1996, 17; Rex 1991, 19). Finally, there were lectures in which an original commentary was set forth—in theology, often a commentary on the *Sentences*—that included a comparison of earlier commentaries (Rex 1991, 19).³² With respect to lectures on the Bible, it is uncertain what biblical books were expounded.³³

2.2.2 *Humanism, Scholasticism, and Curricular Reform to 1535*

As the fifteenth century opened, changes were slow in coming, regardless of what may have been developing on the Continent, in Italy especially.³⁴ Under statutes in effect no later than 1390 (and which remained in force for nearly a century), the undergraduate studied the logical works of Aristotle and terminist logic in the first 2 years, and natural philosophy along with metaphysics and moral philosophy in the remaining 2 years (University of Cambridge 1852, 1: 360–361).³⁵ The traditional

³⁰ This is document no. 107, “De tempore opponendi in theologia et quaestiones determinandi in eadem”; Heywood (1840, 137) identifies it as no. 107, “Of the time of opponencies in theology, and determining questions in the same”. The original of this document is dated to 1300 at the latest, and was revised twice by 1390: Hackett (1970, 336). On the place of disputations, see Leader (1988, 175–176); see also Rex (1991, 18–19).

³¹ See also Rex (1991, 19) and Fletcher (1986, 166–167). Fletcher notes (at 188) that cursory lectures receded in importance as printed books became more readily available.

³² See also Leedham-Green (1996, 17) who refers to instances of “extraordinary lectures” in which the lecturer spoke outside of the usual hours and on other texts besides those included in the syllabus.

³³ It is argued that the Bible retained a sizeable role in the scholastic theology course, the claims of Protestant polemic notwithstanding (Rex 1991, 20). This was certainly true in reference to the intention of those who established the curriculum. Yet, as argued in the previous sections, this assertion must be qualified in light of how the Bible was handled in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

³⁴ See above, 2.1.4. For a discussion of the advance of humanism with particular reference to both Oxford and Cambridge, see McConica (1965, 76–105).

³⁵ This is document no. 86, “De incipientibus in artibus”; Heywood (1840, 125–126) identifies it as no. 86, “Of those incepting in the arts”. Both this statute and the next were originally issued by 1390, per Hackett (1970, 336). See also Leader (1988, 249).

reliance on disputations also remained (University of Cambridge 1852, 1: 384).³⁶ The arts curriculum continued to be oriented towards the study of theology using the scholastic method, as had been the case before (Leader 1988, 172–3). Hence, the scholastic approach remained officially dominant throughout the century and, indeed, continued into the sixteenth century (Rex 1991, 20–21).

But a concern with the Renaissance humanist program of a return *ad fontes* began to grow in significance, especially with respect to the arts curriculum, and changes were instituted in 1488 with an emphasis on the study of *libris humanitatis* (University of Cambridge 1852, 1: 360–361).³⁷ In 1495, in one instance, *libris humanitatis* was specified as the work of Terence (University of Cambridge 1852, 1: 384–385).³⁸ Humanist concerns with a proper classical style in the composition of written and spoken Latin began to supplant the dominance of medieval grammarians and medieval logicians, a development which had significant implications for the whole of the curriculum, theology included (Leader 1988, 236–237). The teaching of modal grammar (the predominant approach up to this time) was gradually supplanted by a humanist approach (Leader 1988, 301–302). Though this might seem a minor point with respect to the teaching of theology, in fact it had profound implications. Modal grammar—with its intense concentration on linguistic and logical analysis of words and concepts—was a key component of dialectic, which was itself fundamental to scholastic method in theology.³⁹ In contrast to this, humanist grammar was grounded in rhetoric, and was concerned with proper literary interpretation, which included attention to the historical context of the author and the text, to the language used and how it might have changed since antiquity, and to the broader literary context of the specific passages studied. Nevertheless, although the changes were significant in their long-term implications, they were not sweeping in their immediate context. Yet while scholastic method was not renounced, the curriculum became somewhat more eclectic (Leader 1988, 249; Leedham-Green 1996, 30).

In the early sixteenth century, one of the leading proponents of curricular reform and of the introduction of humanist methods into the theological curriculum was John Fisher (1469–1535). Fisher, who rose to become Chancellor of the University in 1504, and then Chancellor for life from 1514 until his death (by execution) in

³⁶ This is document no. 139, “De baccalaureis et opponentibus in quacunque facultate de respondentibus quaestioni et incipientibus”; Heywood (1840, 155) identifies it as no. 138, “Of the bachelors and opponents in any faculty, and of those respondent to the questions, and inceptors”.

³⁷ This is document no. 87, “De electione trium ordinare legentium”; Heywood (1840, 126–127) identifies it as no. 87, “Election of three ordinary lecturers”. This document was in force by 1488 according to Hackett (1970, 336). See also Leader (1988, 236–237) and Leedham-Green (1996, 30).

³⁸ This is document no. 140, “De determinatoribus pro se”; in Heywood (1840, 155–156) it is document no. 139, “Of those determining by themselves”.

³⁹ For an extensive discussion of this, see the important article by Heath (1971).

1535,⁴⁰ was the most significant educational reformer of the University in the early sixteenth century, in large part through his role in the foundation of Christ's College in 1505 and of St John's College in 1511, and his influence upon the patronage of Lady Margaret Beaufort, mother of Henry VII.⁴¹ He was instrumental in the promotion of humanist methods that encouraged and supported a theology more firmly rooted in Scripture (Leader 1988, 246–247). He was also influential in persuading Erasmus to come to Cambridge, thereby setting the seal upon his efforts towards the introduction of a more humanistically-oriented curriculum at the University (Leedham-Green 1996, 34).

Erasmus may well have visited Cambridge for the first time in 1506, but it was not until 1511 that he took up residence as lecturer in Greek at the request of Fisher (Leedham-Green 1996, 34). Though there is little or no trace of his visit in the University of Cambridge archives, Erasmus is generally regarded as having had a profound influence upon the institution, especially in solidifying the work of Fisher in the reform of the curricula of both arts and theology (Leader 1988, 291–297).⁴² His residence lasted 26 months, from August 1511 to December 1513 (Leader 1988, 297). It was the first instance in which Erasmus made a “systematic effort as an academic professor” (Mullinger 1873, 473). The significance of his tenure for our purposes lies in what he taught while in Cambridge, and the educational program he sought to promote—emphasizing the close study of Scripture, coupled with a turn towards the Church Fathers (and away from the scholastic authorities) for guidance—as well as the extent to which others sought to follow in his path after his departure.⁴³ It was his purpose to promote the renewal of Christendom through the application of the tools of humanism to the study of the Bible, which would in turn lead to a revival of the “true” or “old” theology, best exemplified by Origen, Augustine, and Jerome (McConica 1991, 38). In so doing, Erasmus became the leading proponent of what is now recognized as Christian or biblical humanism.⁴⁴ His efforts in this regard proceeded along two tracks—most importantly, his work on the New Testament; but also of great significance, his work in producing editions

⁴⁰ Fisher rose steadily through the University hierarchy: senior proctor (1494–5); lecturer (1496–7); vice-chancellor (1501); the first Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity (1502); chancellor on a yearly basis from 1504, President of Queens' College in 1505, and chancellor for life from 1514 (Leedham-Green 1996, 40). Needless to say, the cause of his fall was fundamentally his opposition to Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon.

⁴¹ For more on Fisher's importance, see especially Rex (1991), Chapter 3; Porter (1958), Chapter 1; and Leader (1988), Chapter 12.

⁴² A very good discussion of Erasmus's time in Cambridge, along with letters of this time, is found in Erasmus (1963). See also Porter (1958), Chapter 2.

⁴³ See Amos (2003, 48–54), for a summary discussion of Erasmus's program for theology. I have learned much on this aspect of Erasmus from the following works: Augustijn (1991); Bentley (1983); Boyle (1977); Dickens and Jones (1994); Hoffmann (1994); Kroeker (2011); McConica (1991); Payne (1969); Rabil (1993); Rummel (1986); and Tracy (1996). See also the recent work of Christ-von Wedel (2013).

⁴⁴ See Augustijn (1991, 109–110), cited above in Chapter 1, for a working definition of “biblical humanism” as it is used in this book.

of the Church Fathers, whom he regarded as exemplars of the theological method that he sought to promote.

While at Cambridge, he lectured on Jerome, lectures which constituted his teaching of theology—perhaps as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity—thus promoting the study of the Church Fathers (Leader 1988, 295).⁴⁵ He also gave lectures in Greek which, in the view of the conservatives at the University, posed a challenge to theology as it had traditionally been taught, because these lectures were oriented towards the New Testament, and thus (in the view of the conservatives) the authority of the Vulgate was threatened (Leader 1988, 298–299; Simon 1966, 84–85). Though there had been scholars at both Oxford and Cambridge from the mid-fifteenth century who knew Greek, Erasmus was the first recorded teacher of Greek at either institution (Leader 1988, 293–295). Nevertheless, it has to be said that his initial lectures on the Greek grammar of Manuel Chrysoloras appear to have been lightly attended. He hoped for larger audiences when he began to lecture on the grammar of Theodorus, but even in this case the turnout was much less than expected (Mullinger 1873, 493). It is ironic that, in immediate terms, his impact was hardly obvious—in addition to light attendance at his Greek lectures, no trace of his theology lectures remains. And for all his importance in being the first teacher of Greek at either university, the formal honor of “the first introducer of Greek into the University” (that is, Cambridge) went not to Erasmus but rather to his friend Richard Croke (professor of Greek from 1517) upon the latter’s appointment as University orator in 1522 (Mullinger 1873, 508).

Yet Erasmus was significant nonetheless in contributing to the continued development of humanist methods in sacred studies, as seen in the efforts of his friends and students to follow his example. In the Spring of 1516 Henry Bullock lectured in the Faculty of Theology on the Gospel of Matthew, employing the notes of Erasmus (Leader 1988, 295). He wrote to his mentor, telling him that Greek literature was all the rage at the University at the moment (Erasmus 1963, 91 and 194). Among those of a more evangelical bent, George Stafford spent several years in the 1520s lecturing on Scripture rather than the *Sentences* of Lombard (the latter was more customary) as he undertook study for the doctorate in theology (Leader 1988, 322).⁴⁶ Though Erasmus’s tenure was relatively short and his lectures may not have had the immediate impact for which he could have wished, throughout the 1520s and 1530s, the study of Patristic literature became more common in the University (aided, no doubt, by his example and his critical editions), and the works of Erasmus were nearly ubiquitous in the personal libraries of Cambridge scholars (Leader 1988, 317). In this connection, the primary vehicle by which Erasmus transmitted his method of exegesis, and what made his work so important for the developments regarding biblical humanism and the close relationship of Scripture and theology,

⁴⁵ See also Leedham-Green (1996, 34). Hilmar Pabel (2008, 54) notes that the basis for our knowledge of this is a passing comment in Caius (1904, 125).

⁴⁶ See also the comment of Richard Rex on opposition to Stafford (Rex 1999a, 52).

was his landmark scholarly achievement—the *Novum Instrumentum* of 1516,⁴⁷ on which, it might be noted, he had been working during his Cambridge sojourn (McConica 1991, 40). The *Novum Instrumentum* was eagerly sought after by scholars desiring to study the Bible, especially by those of a reformist cast of mind, and because of the demand for this work his program of biblical humanism was disseminated to the widest possible audience in close proximity to the text he believed essential for the renewal of theology—the Bible. Accompanying the *Novum Instrumentum* was prefatory material that has a particular significance for the issues raised in this chapter (and this book as a whole), especially the discussion of exegesis and its relation to theology found in the *Methodus*, which was later expanded in 1518 into the longer and more detailed *Ratio Verae Theologiae* (published separately at first, and then in 1519 with the *Novum Testamentum*). It is in this treatise, especially in its expanded version, that we find the most influential statement of his prescriptions for exegetical practice, but also his argument for how theology should be “done,” which, one can suggest, informed his teaching while in Cambridge.

What, briefly, was Erasmus’s “method of true theology”? It becomes evident as one reads the *Ratio*—fundamental to true theological method is the practice of exegesis, turning decisively away from a focus on Lombard and his commentators (even granting that this literature was intended to aid in the study of Scripture).⁴⁸ Erasmus’s prescriptions range from the application of textual criticism to the development of theological exegesis, and one of the distinctive features of his program is that he bound together what had become separated in sacred studies in the two centuries leading up to his own age. In so doing, he exercised an enormous influence in his time, and in particular upon many of the first generation of Reformers—not only in their exegetical practice (a commonly accepted point), but also in their assumptions as to what constituted the task and purpose of theology (a point that awaits more extensive study, to which the present examination intends to contribute in a limited way with respect to Bucer).

The broader humanist-scholastic debate notwithstanding, it has been argued of late that at the University of Cambridge the two intellectual traditions—humanism and scholasticism—coexisted without major conflict; the figure of John Fisher (who supported both) is often cited as a case in point.⁴⁹ Whether the changes we have considered were accepted without challenge is debatable, for there demonstrably was resistance to humanist methods within the University from the scholastic establishment.⁵⁰ It is true that Erasmus, whose writings clearly demonstrate that he was

⁴⁷ He changed the title to a more conventional *Novum testamentum* in the second and subsequent editions.

⁴⁸ See, particularly, Hoffman (1994) and Christ-von Wedel (2013), as well as Amos (2003, 48–54), all cited above.

⁴⁹ See in particular Rex (1991) Chapters 1 and 3. See also Leader (1988, 314), and Null (2000, 66–71).

⁵⁰ Richard Rex has argued that it is wrong to hold that humanism was “inherently a challenge to the doctrinal *status quo*, that it was inherently favourable to the cause of the Reformation, and that its progress was therefore resented or even resisted by the clerical establishment” (Rex 1993, 26); reprinted by permission of the publisher. It can be agreed that it was not “inherently” so, but it is

in conflict with scholastic method and its proponents, encountered no overt opposition during his time in Cambridge, though J. B. Mullinger suggests this was due to the protection of John Fisher, whom Mullinger regards as nearly omnipotent within the University (Mullinger 1873, 495–496). Yet despite the fact that the teaching of Greek enjoyed the support of Fisher, there was resistance. Consider what Erasmus wrote to Henry Bullock in August 1516 regarding the reception of his *Novum Instrumentum* in Cambridge:

[C]ertain quite trustworthy people have told me there is one college there, a “most theological” one, that has perfect Areopagites in it; they’ve passed a full-blown resolution to prevent anyone from bringing “that book” within the august walls of the said college “by horse, ship, waggon, or porter.” (Erasmus 1963, 195 [reprinted by permission of the publisher])

As we have noted, Greek was seen by some as a threat to theology, because it was tied to a different approach to Scripture and was perceived to undermine the authority of the Vulgate (Leader 1988, 297–299). Further, although we have observed that the impact of Erasmus was such that he had imitators among those who lectured in subsequent years, the old curriculum continued to hold sway in the teaching of theology in the 1520s. To cite a few examples: Patrick Gower lectured on Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae*; Ralph Songar lectured on Aquinas’s commentary on Lombard’s *Sentences*; Humphrey Walkden lectured on Scotus’s commentary on Lombard (Rex 1991, 19).

2.2.3 *Curricular Reform, 1535–1549: Reformation and Resistance*

What unquestionably charged the atmosphere and changed the character of subsequent curricular reform was the coming of the Reformation, whether in its political guise or in its theological guise.⁵¹ In both respects, the Reformation took statutory form in Cambridge in 1535. Formally speaking, the Cambridge Injunctions of that year—promulgated at the behest of Henry VIII’s principal secretary Thomas Cromwell (also Chancellor of the University from 1535 to 1540)—constitute the watershed that divides the medieval from the modern in the history of the University, even if the full implication of the changes did not become manifest in an immediate sense (Mullinger 1873, 631).

nonetheless true that humanism, especially biblical humanism, contributed much to the cause of the Reformation. Dr Rex has clearly established, however, that the phrase, “new learning,” is properly understood in the Tudor context to refer to evangelical (i.e., heretical) teaching, and not to humanism.

⁵¹ For all the resonance between the Injunctions and Protestantism, we should not assume that the introduction of the former meant official introduction of the latter. The implacable opposition of Henry VIII to much of Protestant doctrine meant that evangelicals in England had to tread a very careful path. Official Protestantism was not introduced until the reign of Edward VI.

With respect to the present discussion of lectures in theology at Cambridge, it was the third of the Injunctions that had particular significance:

We intend...that in no college or hall or other place throughout your academy should any public lecture be read upon any of such doctors who write upon the Master of the Sentences. But...for the greater increase of Sacred Theology and of the Divine Word...[lectures] should be read from no other teachers than from the body of Sacred Scripture—namely, the New Testament and the Old—and the lecturers...should interpret the aforesaid text honestly and simply according to the sense of true Scripture, and should not—after the manner of Scotus and of other authors of inextricable labyrinths—overwhelm their listeners with ignorance [and] blindness, as they have been hitherto accustomed.⁵² (University of Cambridge 1785, 136–137)

This Injunction decisively cast aside what we have seen lay at the heart of the scholastic curriculum for the teaching of theology—the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard—and it reflects the biblical humanist program of Erasmus as much as it resonates with the program of Protestantism.⁵³ It clearly embodied a humanist critique of earlier methods in theology. First, there was the explicit rejection of the work of Peter Lombard, concerning whom Erasmus made an indirect, though clear, comment in his *Ratio* (Erasmus 1519, 36/[Cc6] verso; Erasmus 1964, 284), and which had a clear echo in the Injunction. Second, the positive mandate to teach theology from the text of Scripture alone in its natural, literal sense is another major emphasis of Erasmus. Third, equally prominent in both Erasmus and in the Injunction is the rejection of the theological method of scholastics in general and Scotus in particular (whose method Erasmus apparently loathed), summarized in the Injunction by the reference to him by name.⁵⁴ In banning not only the work of any theologian who commented upon the *Sentences* but also (by implication) the *Sentences* themselves, at a stroke every major theologian from the twelfth century

⁵²“Volumus...ut per totam academiam vestram in nullo collegio vel aula seu loco alio quocunque publica legatur lectura aliqua doctorum talium qui scribunt in magistrum sententiarum. Sed...ad sacrae theologiae ac verbi divini majorem proventum...legantur ex nullis aliis doctoribus quam ex corpore scripturae sacrae videlicet novo testamento et veteri utque lectores...sincere ac simpliciter ad verae scripturae sensum praedictum textum exponant non iuxta Scoti et aliorum inextricabilium labyrinthorum authorum morem ignorantia caecitate auditores involvant prout antehac soliti sunt.” An abbreviated translation, found in Mullinger (1873, 630), has been commonly used in the secondary literature: “That neither in the university or any other college or hall, or other place, should any lecture be read upon any of the doctors who had written upon the Master of the Sentences, but that all divinity lectures should be upon the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, according to the true sense thereof, and not after the manner of Scotus.”

⁵³In view of the dangers attendant upon espousing Protestantism at the court of Henry VIII, the ideological background of the Injunctions is almost certainly found in the biblical humanist tradition best represented by Erasmus—for which it is clear Henry VIII had strong sympathies. On this, see two essays: MacCulloch (1995); and Bernard (1999). See also Bernard (2005, 228–243). On the importance of humanist thought for English reform efforts at the time of the Injunctions, see McConica (1965, 106–149, and especially 150–199).

⁵⁴Scotus was, with Aquinas, the chief theologian in the theological curriculum at Cambridge: Null (2000, 72, and more generally 65–81). For Erasmus’s sharp comments about Scotus in the *Ratio*, see Erasmus (1519, 59 and 61/[Ee6] recto and Ff recto; 1964, 294 and 304).

was removed from the course of study.⁵⁵ In the place of the traditional curriculum, the exegesis of the Bible was made the primary theological task, apparently bringing to fruition the reforms for which Erasmus labored.

In spite of this statutory backing of change, resistance to the Cambridge Injunctions within the University was found among its leaders—partly for confessional reasons (no doubt) but also for professional reasons—and this resistance is testimony to the fact that in the eyes of contemporaries, if not of some modern commentators, the changes signaled in the Injunctions were far-reaching. Dr John ap Rice, one of Cromwell’s representatives in the visitation of the University at the time of the Injunctions, wrote to Cromwell on 22 October 1535 that he “observed in the heads [of some of the colleges] great pertinacity to their own blindness” and argued that if “they were gradually removed, learning would flourish here, as the younger sort be of much towardness” (Gairdner et al. 1886, 223 [item 661]).⁵⁶ Another of Cromwell’s operatives, Dr Thomas Legh, wrote on 30 October 1535 that a number of the college heads were firm adherents of “sophistical learning” (a phrase he used twice) and who sought to modify the Injunctions (Gairdner et al. 1886, 238, [item 708]). It is worth noting that Legh did not say “papistical learning,” which would have made explicit that the problem was with their confessional allegiance rather than their pedagogical commitments. Resistance within the colleges can be seen in the fact that scholastic works continued to be used in various ways (if not openly for instruction) throughout the years following the Injunctions (Leedham-Green 1996, 36–37).⁵⁷

The strength of opposition to the changes can also be seen in the intensely hostile reception given to Alexander Alesius, a Lutheran-educated Scots theologian, who in 1536 delivered a series of lectures on the Psalms in which he employed a method of teaching fully in accord with the Injunctions.⁵⁸ His negative experience was such that he did not remain very long (Simon 1966, 260).⁵⁹ While there can be little doubt that Alesius’s evangelical theology played a major part in engendering hostility towards his lectures, one can suppose that his method would have played some part as well, coming so soon after the Injunctions and the ban on scholastic method.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Most commentators regard the Injunction as having banned Lombard as well as his successors: see, for instance, Leedham-Green (1996, 37) or Leader (1988, 334–335).

⁵⁶ For more detail regarding the Visitation, see Logan (1991).

⁵⁷ See also Leader (1988, 335). If these works were used for instruction within the colleges, those who so used them would no doubt have relied in part on the protection of the same heads of colleges (and their successors) to whom Legh referred.

⁵⁸ Alesius was appointed as King’s Reader in Theology, a position that proved to be the forerunner of the Regius Professorship subsequently held by Bucer. Alesius later produced a commentary on Psalms 1–25 and dedicated it to Henry VIII, a work that appears to represent what he set forth in his lectures (Rex 1999a, 64–65). On Alesius, see Wiedermann (1986, 15–41). A critical edition of Alesius’s commentary is found in Wiedermann (1988, 141–246).

⁵⁹ Wiedermann (1986) deals most extensively with this; see also Rex (1999a, 66–67).

⁶⁰ Alesius followed Melancthon in his approach, who in turn stood in the tradition of biblical humanism. Rex (1999a, 65–66); Wiedermann (1988, 91–92, 104–107). Yet, we should note Wiedermann’s point that in Alesius’s commentary we find not simply the work of a biblical humanist

This is not to deny that there were efforts on the part of conservatives to adapt lectures to the new requirements. Attention has been drawn to a short work of John Redman, *De iustificatione* (Redman 1555)⁶¹ and it has been suggested that the piece may reflect Redman's teaching at Cambridge around 1543 or 1544, in much the same way that Alesius's teaching is represented in his Psalms commentary (Rex 1999a, 68). The piece is in the form of extracts from biblical books combined with theological propositions, gathered in the fashion one might employ in preparation for a scholastic disputation, which certainly appears plausible (Rex 1999a, 68). Each section of the text is a short paragraph, with a marginal notation of the relevant biblical text and/or doctrine mentioned in each paragraph. Given the brevity of the piece, it would seem to be an outline Redman used as the basis for the lectures, rather than the lectures themselves. Each paragraph would then have functioned as a basic proposition upon which Redman would have expanded at greater length. If it is the case that the piece reflects Redman's teaching, then it would represent another example of how the third of the Cambridge Injunctions was put into practice—in this case, by a conservative.

In any case, it is worth noting that in fact not a great deal of pressure was applied by the authorities to ensure compliance with the Injunctions (Simon 1966, 260). This reflected, no doubt, the vagaries of Court politics and the need for circumspection on the part of evangelicals.⁶² As a result, those who held to the old order could continue to do so with what amounted to only a token show of conformity. In the aftermath of the reversal of government policy in 1539—displayed most visibly in the Act of Six Articles, which arrested further Protestant advance and which seemed to confirm conservative doctrine—the conservatives at the University naturally assumed that whatever else might change, doctrine would remain the same. This perception, combined with the lax enforcement of the Injunctions, not only inhibited the further advance of curricular reform but also set the stage for strong opposition within the universities to the introduction of more decidedly Protestant doctrine in the reign of Edward VI (Simon 1966, 260).

In addition to the curricular changes introduced in 1535, this period also saw the founding of what would become the Regius Professorships. It has been argued that behind the professorships lay the Injunctions imposed by Thomas Leigh/Legh (to be distinguished from the Cambridge Injunctions) and their requirement that a lectureship in either Greek or Hebrew be established by the University (Logan 1977, 273).⁶³ The idea for these important positions may have originated with Thomas

(though it does reflect the practice of such), but a work that is decidedly Lutheran and Melancthonian in the stress on the Law/Gospel dialectic on the one hand, and in the stress on fundamental theological principles [*loci communes*] on the other (Wiedermann 1986, 22–23).

⁶¹ The text of the treatise is on Ai-Aiv, 1–47, followed by the “*Hymnus*” on 48–55. I have consulted the copy in the Parker Collection of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (SP 334). See Rex (1999a, 67–70) for a discussion of this work (upon which the present discussion is dependent).

⁶² For an excellent discussion of the difficulties faced by evangelicals at this time, see MacCulloch (1996), Chapters 7 and 8.

⁶³ Logan's work is the most thorough discussion of the Professorships, which he notes are only anachronistically called such at this time. The correct contemporary term for the post would have

Cromwell, but they took shape in the early 1540s under the chancellorship of Cromwell's successor, Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester (Leedham-Green 1996, 48). Initially there were four professorships—Divinity, Greek, Hebrew, and Civil Law—to which was added a fifth in Medicine (Logan 1977, 275). Of the professorships, those of Divinity, Greek and Hebrew held a place of honor—underscored by their subsequent attachment to the royal foundation of Trinity College—and in this way the significance of biblical humanism was emphasized, for those who had eyes to see the implications (Logan 1977, 277). It is interesting to observe that of the three higher faculties (theology, law, and medicine), the professorships were heavily weighted towards theology, and that the theology envisaged was clearly non-scholastic in character—that is, it was of the character of the “new learning” (Logan 1977, 277).

The final curricular changes to be promulgated prior to the arrival of Bucer at Cambridge were embodied in the Edwardian Statutes for the University (8 April 1549).⁶⁴ These instituted further reforms of the undergraduate curriculum for the BA and the MA.⁶⁵ Except for individuals who chose to pursue a higher degree in medicine or law, those studying beyond the MA were required to undertake work for the BD either in divinity or in Hebrew (Simon 1966, 252–253).⁶⁶ By direction of the Injunctions appended to the Statutes, students studying for the BD were permitted to concentrate on the Pauline Epistles, and those studying for the doctorate in theology, the whole of the Bible (Leedham-Green 1996, 37–38).⁶⁷ In studying for the doctorate, students were required to attend daily theological lectures, to sustain two disputations on theological topics, and to preach in the University Church

been *praelector* or reader (Logan 1977, 272). In the present work, however, the more conventional term will be employed.

⁶⁴These can be found in Heywood (1840, 3–41). The “Laws or Statutes of the University of Cambridge” (dated 8 April 1549) are on 3–27. Following the Statutes, there are the “Injunctions framed by the Visitors of King Edward VI” (dated 2 July 1549) on 26–37. Finally, there are “Ordinances for removing doubts which have arisen from the Statutes” (2 July 1549?) on 37–41. For the Latin text, see University of Cambridge (1785, 146–174).

⁶⁵Undergraduates were to study arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and cosmography in the first year, dialectics in the second, and philosophy in the third and fourth years. They were to dispute twice in the public schools, and to respond twice (Heywood 1840, 7–8). Those studying for the MA were to attend lectures in philosophy, perspective, astronomy and Greek, and to dispute six times over the course of 3 years (Heywood 1840, 8).

⁶⁶The BD course consisted of: daily lectures in Hebrew and theology for 5 years; two disputations against a BA, two responses after the third year of study; one sermon in Latin, and one in English, both preached in the University Church (Heywood 1840, 8–9).

⁶⁷The wording of the Injunction is thus: “The vice-chancellor, on admitting a bachelor of divinity, is to use these words: ‘We admit you to the enarration and interpretation of all the apostolical epistles, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.’ But on admitting a doctor he shall thus say: ‘We admit you to the interpreting and professing of universal sacred scripture, as well of the old as of the new Testament, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.’” (Heywood 1840, 28).

(Great St Mary's)—twice in Latin, once in English (Simon 1966, 253).⁶⁸ Finally, the theological disputations were to be held on alternate Thursdays from one to four in the afternoon (Heywood 1840, 14). The continued importance of divinity within the University can also be seen in the fact that at its foundation in 1546, 56 out of 60 fellowships in Trinity College were reserved for MAs who intended to study divinity—of the remaining fellowships, two were for medicine, and two for civil law (Simon 1966, 251).

2.3 Conclusion

Such was the curricular background to Bucer's lectures on Ephesians. For all the changes with implications for the advance of biblical humanist education that we have considered, whether of a gradual or dramatic character, the *extent* to which they were manifested beyond the level of the statute book remains an open question. Formally speaking, the changes were quite substantial, and in the case of theology, radical. In regard to theology, formally speaking the Cambridge Injunctions were every bit as significant for the history of the University as Mullinger asserted they were. Scholastic method and authorities were completely removed from the curriculum and replaced with what can fairly be described as a biblical humanist method and a pronounced emphasis on Scripture. The difficulty in saying more than this is the dearth of evidence for what actually went on in the lecture halls. What evidence there is seems to suggest that for a time the change may have been more apparent than real, and that the use of scholastic method and authorities continued (if not openly) throughout the period. The continued use of disputations, a key feature of scholastic method in education, is testimony to its continued influence.⁶⁹

In any case, we should be clear that until the death of Henry VIII it was not possible for anyone to associate openly with Protestant doctrine, and the linking by

⁶⁸When the student completed this academic marathon, the statutes allowed that no more labor should be required of him, but another Latin sermon and disputation was still expected (Heywood 1840, 9). These were the requirements at the time Bucer was awarded his doctorate.

⁶⁹It might be thought, in light of the discussion of the influence of biblical humanist method, that one of the striking features of the Edwardian Statutes is the continued emphasis on disputations (Heywood 1840, 7–15). However, while in a formal sense there was a continuity between medieval disputations and those of the sixteenth century, the emphasis in the humanistically-oriented education program was on rhetoric rather than dialectic, and on persuasive reasoning in debate. See Jardine (1974), and Todd (1987, 63). Dialectic was not the exclusive property of scholastic method, and the two should not automatically be equated. With respect to the relationship of scholastic and humanist curricula, Mordechai Feingold has warned against the easy assumption that they were largely similar because of superficial terminological similarities between them—particularly in the common prominence of dialectic and the presence of Aristotle. Feingold argues that we should not take the compressed abbreviation of the curriculum that we find in the statutes at face value, but instead recognize that there was much more to it than the bare reading of them would suggest. The place of humanistically-oriented, classical studies (language and literature) was much larger than might seem to be the case (Feingold 1997, 212–214).

some conservatives of biblical humanist method with heterodoxy (if not heresy) was no doubt a hindrance to its further promotion and required great circumspection on the part of its adherents. This would certainly be the case with any subject that touched upon theology, directly or indirectly. In this respect, we have noted above the strong opposition faced by Alexander Alesius, and Stephen Gardiner's opposition to the attempts of John Cheke and Thomas Smith in 1542 to promote the Erasmian theory of the pronunciation of Greek can be seen as of a piece with this (Hudson 1980, 43–46).⁷⁰ The opposition of the conservatives at the universities to evangelical theology (if not also to humanist method) was quite significant throughout the period under consideration, and set the stage for strong confessional conflict with the accession of the Protestant Edward VI. But on the level of the curriculum at the universities, the advent of official Protestantism in 1547 did not bring about immediate change, and one can only assume that lecturers at the universities at best grudgingly acquiesced to biblical humanist reforms—until the arrival of Peter Martyr Vermigli at Oxford in 1548⁷¹ and Martin Bucer at Cambridge in 1549.

References

- Amos, N. Scott. 2003. New learning, old theology: Renaissance biblical humanism, scripture, and the question of theological method. *Renaissance Studies* 17(1): 39–54.
- Augustijn, Cornelis. 1991. *Erasmus: His Life, Works, and Influence*. Trans. J.C. Grayson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bentley, Jerry. 1983. *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament scholarship in the Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bernard, George. 1999. The piety of Henry VIII. In *The education of a Christian society: Humanism and the Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands*, ed. N. Scott Amos, Andrew Pettegree, and Henk van Nierop, 62–88. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishers.
- Bernard, George. 2005. *The king's Reformation: Henry VIII and the remaking of the English church*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Boyle, Marjorie O'Rourke. 1977. *Erasmus on language and method in theology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Caius, John. 1904. *The annals of Gonville and Caius College*, ed. John Venn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Camporeale, Salvatore. 1972. *Valla, umanesimo e teologia*. Florence: Nella sede dell'Istituto.
- Chenu, M.-D. 1997. *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*, ed. and trans. Jerome Taylor and Lester K. Little. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Christ-von Wedel, Christine. 2013. *Erasmus of Rotterdam: Advocate of a New Christianity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Cobban, Alan B. 1988. *The medieval English Universities: Oxford and Cambridge to c. 1500*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

⁷⁰ See also Leedham-Green (1996, 48–49). On humanists in the English Reformation more generally, see Rex (1999b, 19–40).

⁷¹ Martyr was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1548; he lectured on I Corinthians in 1549, and on Romans in 1550. See: Greenslade (1986, 318–319); Loach (1986, 369, 373); and McNair (1980, 100–105).

- Cobban, Alan B. 1999. *English university life in the Middle Ages*. London: UCL Press.
- Colish, Marcia L. 1994. *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Colish, Marcia L. 1997. *Medieval foundations of the western intellectual tradition, 400–1400*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- D’Amico, John F. 1988. Humanism and pre-Reformation theology. In *Renaissance humanism: Foundations, forms, and legacy*, 3 vols., vol. 3, ed. Albert Rabil, Jr., 349–379. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dickens, A.G., and Whitney R.D. Jones. 1994. *Erasmus the reformer*. London: Methuen.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. 1519. *Novum Testamentum omne, multo quam antehac diligentius ab Erasmo Roterodamo recognitu, emendatum ac translatum ... : una cum annotationibus recognitis, ac magna accessione locupletatis*. Basel: Johannes Froben.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. 1963. *Erasmus and Cambridge: The Cambridge Letters of Erasmus*. D.F.S. Thomson, trans.; Introduction, Commentary, and Notes H. C. Porter. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. 1964. *Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus: Ausgewählte Werke*, ed. Hajo Holborn and Annemarie Holborn. München: C.H. Beck.
- Evans, G.R. 1980. *Old arts and new theology: The beginnings of theology as an academic discipline*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, G.R. 1983. *Alan of Lille: The frontiers of theology in the later twelfth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, G.R. 1984. *The language and logic of the Bible: The earlier Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, G.R. 1985. *The language and logic of the Bible: The road to reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, G.R. (ed.). 2001. *The medieval theologians: An introduction to theology in the medieval period*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Evans, G.R. (ed.). 2002. *Mediaeval commentaries on the sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.
- Evans, G.R. 2012. *The roots of the reformation: Tradition, emergence, and rupture*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press.
- Feingold, Mordechai. 1997. The humanities. In *The history of the University of Oxford. Vol. IV: Seventeenth-century Oxford*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke, 211–357. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fletcher, J.M. 1986. The faculty of arts. In *The history of the University of Oxford. Vol. III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica, 157–199. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fois, M. 1969. *Il pensiero cristiano di Lorenzo Valla nel quadro storico-culturale del suo ambiente*. Rome: Libr. ed dell’Univ. Gregoriana.
- Gairdner, James, et al. 1886. *Letters and papers, foreign and domestic of the reign of Henry VIII*, vol. 9. London: Longman.
- Greenzlade, S.L. 1986. The faculty of theology. In *The history of the University of Oxford. Vol. III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica, 295–334. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hackett, M.B. 1970. *The original statutes of Cambridge University: The text and its history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, Terrence. 1971. Logical grammar, grammatical logic and humanism at three German Universities. *Studies in the Renaissance* 18: 9–64.
- Heywood, James (ed.). 1840. *Collection of statutes for the University and the Colleges of Cambridge*. London: William Clowes and Sons.
- Hoffmann, Manfred. 1994. *Rhetoric and theology: The hermeneutic of Erasmus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hudson, Winthrop S. 1980. *The Cambridge connection and the Elizabethan settlement of 1559*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Jardine, Lisa. 1974. The place of dialectic teaching in sixteenth century Cambridge. *Studies in the Renaissance* 21: 31–62.
- Knowles, David. 1962. *The evolution of medieval thought*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Kroeker, Greta Grace. 2011. *Erasmus in the footsteps of Paul: A Pauline theologian*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Leader, Damien Riehl. 1988. *A history of the University of Cambridge. vol. 1: The University to 1546*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leedham-Green, Elisabeth. 1996. *A concise history of the University of Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Little, A.G., and Franz Pelster. 1934. *Oxford theology and theologians: c. AD 1282–1302*. Oxford: Clarendon Press for the Oxford Historical Society.
- Loach, Jennifer. 1986. Reformation controversies. In *The history of the University of Oxford. Vol. III: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica, 363–396. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Logan, F.D. 1977. The origins of the so-called Regius Professorships: An aspect of the Renaissance in Oxford and Cambridge. In *Renaissance and renewal in Christian history*, Studies in Church history 14, ed. Derek Baker, 271–278. Oxford: Published for the Ecclesiastical History Society by B. Blackwell.
- Logan, F.D. 1991. The First Royal Visitation of the English Universities, 1535. *English Historical Review* 106: 861–888.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. 1995. Henry VIII and the Reform of the Church. In *The reign of Henry VIII: Politics, policy and piety*, ed. Diarmaid MacCulloch, 159–180. London: Macmillan Press.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. 1996. *Thomas Cranmer: A life*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- McConica, James. 1965. *English humanists and Reformation politics*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- McConica, James. 1991. *Erasmus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McGrath, Alistair E. 1987. *The intellectual origins of the European Reformation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McNair, Philip M.J. 1980. Peter Martyr in England. In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian reform*, ed. Joseph C. McLelland, 85–105. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Morgan, Victor. 2004. *A history of the University of Cambridge*, vol. 2, 1546–1750. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullinger, James Bass. 1873. *The University of Cambridge from the earliest times to the royal injunctions of 1535*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullinger, James Bass. 1884. *The University of Cambridge from the royal injunctions of 1535 to the accession of Charles the First*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nauert, Charles G. 1973. The clash of humanists and scholastics: An approach to pre-Reformation controversies. *Sixteenth Century Journal* 4(1): 1–18.
- Nauert, Charles G. 1998. Humanism as method: Roots of conflict with the scholastics. *Sixteenth Century Journal* XXIX/2: 427–438.
- Nauert, Charles G. 2006. *Humanism and the culture of Renaissance Europe*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Null, Ashley. 2000. *Thomas Cranmer's doctrine of repentance: Renewing the power to love*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Overfield, James H. 1984. *Humanism and scholasticism in late medieval Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pabel, Hilmar. 2008. *Herculean Labors: Erasmus and the Editing of St Jerome's Letters in the Renaissance*. Leiden: Brill.
- Payne, J.B. 1969. Toward the hermeneutic of Erasmus. In *Scrinium Erasmianum: Mélanges historiques publiés sous le patronage de l'Université de Louvain à l'occasion du cinquième centenaire de la naissance d'Érasme. Historische opstellen gepubliceerd onder de auspiciën van de Universiteit te Leuven naar aanleiding van het vijfde eeuwfeest van Erasmus' geboorte.*, 2 vols., vol. 2, ed. Joseph Coppens, 3–49. Leiden: Brill.
- Peter Lombard. 1971–1981. *Magistri Petri Lombardi Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, ed. Ignatius Brady. Grottaferrata: Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas.
- Porter, H.C. 1958. *Reformation and reaction in Tudor Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rabil Jr., Albert. 1993. *Erasmus and the New Testament: The mind of a Christian Humanist*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Redman, John. 1555. *Ioannis Redmani Angli Sacrae Theologiae professoris de iustificatione opus. Huic accessit Hymnus eiusdem argumenti per eundem authorem*. Antwerp: Ioannes Withagius.
- Rex, Richard. 1991. *The theology of John Fisher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rex, Richard. 1993. The new learning. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 44/1: 26–44.
- Rex, Richard. 1999a. The early impact of reformation theology at Cambridge University, 1521–1547. *Reformation & Renaissance Review: Journal of the Society for Reformation Studies* 2: 38–71.
- Rex, Richard. 1999b. The role of English humanists in the Reformation up to 1559. In *The education of a Christian Society: Humanism and the Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands*, ed. N. Scott Amos, Andrew Pettegree, and Henk van Nierop, 19–40. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishers.
- Rosemann, Philipp W. (ed.). 2010. *Mediaeval commentaries on the sentences of Peter Lombard*, vol. 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Rummel, Erika. 1986. *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: From philologist to theologian*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rummel, Erika. 1994. *The humanist-scholastic debate in the Renaissance and Reformation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rummel, Erika. 1996. The importance of being doctor: The quarrel over competency between humanists and theologians in the Renaissance. *Catholic Historical Review* 82: 189–193.
- Rupp, E. Gordon. 1947. *Studies in the making of the English Protestant tradition, mainly in the reign of Henry VIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, Joan. 1966. *Education and society in Tudor England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smalley, Beryl. 1964. *The study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Smalley, Beryl. 1969. The Bible in the Medieval Schools. In *The Cambridge history of the Bible. Vol. 2: The West from the fathers to the reformation*, ed. G.W.H. Lampe, 197–220. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steinmetz, David C. 1999. The Scholastic Calvin. In *Protestant scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, 16–30. Carlisle: Paternoster Press.
- Todd, Margo. 1987. *Christian humanism and the puritan social order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tracy, James D. 1996. *Erasmus of the Low Countries*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Trinkaus, Charles. 1988. Italian humanism and scholastic theology. In *Renaissance humanism: Foundations, forms, and legacy*, 3 vols., vol. 3, ed. Albert Rabil, Jr., 327–348. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- University of Cambridge. 1785. *Statuta Academiae Cantabrigiensis*. Cambridge: Typis Academicis Excudebat J. Archdeacon.
- University of Cambridge. 1852. *Documents relating to the University and Colleges of Cambridge*, 3 vols. London: Printed by G. Eyre and W. Spottiswoode for H.M.S.O.
- Verger, Jacques. 1984. L'Exégèse de l'université. In *Bible de tous les Temps 4: Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, ed. Pierre Riché and Guy Lobrichon, 199–232. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Wiedermann, Gotthelf. 1986. Alexander Alesius's lectures on the Psalms at Cambridge, 1536. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37: 15–41.
- Wiedermann, Gotthelf. 1988. Der Reformator Alexander Alesius als Ausleger der Psalmen. Dissertation, Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg.
- Witt, Ronald G. 1995. The humanist movement. In *Handbook of European history, 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, 2 vols., vol. 2, ed. Thomas A. Brady, Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy, 93–125. Leiden: Brill.

Bucer, Ephesians and Biblical Humanism

The Exegete as Theologian

Amos, N.S.

2015, XI, 222 p. 9 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-10237-5