

## Chapter 2

# **“Those that Have Most Money Must Have Least Learning”: Undergraduate Education at the University of Oxford in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries**

Robert Wells

### **2.1 Oxford in the Eighteenth Century: The University in Decline?**

In the University of Oxford’s long and storied history, much of the eighteenth century has marked a low point in the university’s reputation. The Oxford colleges have suffered a barrage of criticism from both contemporary writers and later historians for a perceived decline in the quality of scholarship and instruction compared to earlier and later periods. Commentators in the eighteenth century charged the colleges with everything from openly espousing Jacobitism, to encouraging social climbing, profligacy, and alcoholism in its students. Alumni and ex-students confirmed some or all of these accusations in their memoirs, letters, and other publications, including notable intellectuals and public figures like Edward Gibbon. As a result, many have found reason enough to condemn the period between the Glorious Revolution and the year 1800 as, in the words of John Henry Newman, “a century of inactivity” (Newman 1852, p. 4).

In *The Eighteenth Century*, volume five of the *History of the University of Oxford* series, editors L.S. Sutherland and L.G. Mitchell, along with the volume’s other contributors, pushed back against this enduring characterization. In his introduction to the volume, Mitchell declared the need to reassess the quality of an Oxford education in this period by acknowledging the full range of testimonies available and understanding the contexts in which most criticisms of the university were made. He and the other authors placed Oxford amidst the greater political and religious tensions Britain experienced throughout the century in order to show why the university was such a convenient and persistent target for critics and reformers. They also demonstrated that important advances were made in research and educa-

---

R. Wells (✉)

Department of History, Indiana University, Ballantine Hall 742,  
1020 East Kirkwood Avenue, Bloomington, IN 47405-7103, USA  
e-mail: robwells@indiana.edu

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2015

A. Simões et al. (eds.), *Sciences in the Universities of Europe, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, Boston Studies in the Philosophy and History of Science 309, DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-9636-1\_2

tion, and that the whole body of evidence reveals as many satisfied graduates as discontented ones (Sutherland and Mitchell 1986).

Although Sutherland, Mitchell et al.'s much-needed reappraisal is now the standard account of the period, and in spite of Mitchell's almost defensive insistence that "Gibbon can no longer be allowed to dominate the field," the disparaging remarks of such ex-students still loom large in most accounts (Mitchell 1986, p. 1). Part of the reason for this is the importance often ascribed to the Examination Statute of 1800 and its various successors in modernization histories of the University of Oxford. By making changes to the examinations most students underwent in their colleges, and introducing the first vestiges of the honours class system, the Statute and its supporters are said to have initiated a process of much-needed reform that improved academic discipline and made Oxford more meritocratic. The terms of these reforms were endlessly and heatedly negotiated throughout the first half of the nineteenth century amid religious tensions and fears of revolt, and Parliament itself eventually intervened with the Oxford University Act of 1854. Thus, when read with these later changes to the university curriculum and examination statutes in mind, accounts from students like Gibbon have often helped historians paint a convenient 'dark age' of idleness and profligacy that the early-nineteenth-century reforms are supposed to have dispelled.

In the most recent major treatment of eighteenth-century Oxford and the nineteenth-century reforms, Heather Ellis emphasizes continuity between the two rather than a radical break. She embeds the new examinations, the battles over the curriculum and tutorial system, and the religious conflicts surrounding Tractarianism within a longer history of conflict between the colleges and their undergraduates during the 'Age of Revolutions.' Going back well into the opening decades of the eighteenth century, Ellis argues that it was repeating cycles of Oxford faculty and administrators trying to control their increasingly unruly students that produced these changes in university education and governance. Rather than a battle of Ancients against Moderns over the classics and sciences, or the actions of a few liberal, meritocratic crusaders, she sees the introduction of new examinations and changes to the curriculum as a series of very conservative responses to what were perceived as constant political and intellectual threats to authority and order at Oxford.

Ellis's account is largely convincing and the challenge it poses to traditional periodizations of university history is especially welcome. But her narrative of continual conflict between junior and senior members of the Oxford colleges presupposes that at least one of these "interest groups" was more cohesive than the evidence indicates, especially in the eighteenth century (Ellis 2012, p. 4). She is right to argue for Oxford as a site of political conflict in the Age of Revolutions, not just an elite bastion against the revolutionary demands of the lower socio-economic classes without. "Instead of opposition drawn along class lines," she writes, "it is suggested that tensions within the ranks of the elite were frequently played out along the axis of youth and age, of generational difference." (Ellis 2012, p. 4) But significant differences between the undergraduates, or 'junior' college members, need to be acknowledged as well, for these distinctions were one of the most pervasive and frequently-discussed facts of college life.

Well into the nineteenth century, the Oxford colleges themselves separated their undergraduates into strict socio-economic classes that affected every aspect of college life. While students might emerge from Oxford with degrees and careers that eventually made them part of the British elite after graduating, many of them came from very humble backgrounds, and certainly did not live privileged lives at the university. Undergraduates were separated into one of five distinct ranks and granted or deprived college liberties according to the prominence of their station. This status depended upon the wealth and influence of a student's family rather than the student's own skill or desire to learn. These young men may have lived together in their colleges and studied roughly similar subjects, but they had a fixed position in Oxford society established by the colleges that they could not improve much through study alone.

While it may be tempting to dismiss this social hierarchy as secondary to the more important issues of education and governance within the college, and their connection to socio-political conditions in greater British society, a student's rank translated into more than just prestige within university society. It both determined the academic standards he needed to meet in order to take a degree and influenced the quality of the instruction he received. If a young man's parents paid enough money to enter him into the top two ranks of students, he was excused from most academic exercises and exams and could instead receive an honorary degree simply for remaining in residence long enough at the college. At the same time, these gentlemen students were highly sought after by tutors and members of the college faculty because of the high fees and patronage opportunities their families offered. This meant such students had access to a greater pool of potential instructors and often received more individual attention from qualified scholars than the rest of Oxford's undergraduates. Without many actual academic requirements to complete, however, fewer gentlemen students took advantage of such benefits.

It is exceedingly presumptuous to conclude from the writings of a few dozen ex-students and critics that the thousands of students who passed through Oxford's gates over the course of more than a century learned nothing or were all miserable during their college tenure. Yet we cannot treat their criticisms merely as vindictive or political attacks, especially when clear patterns emerge from them that point toward a very specific problem. Of the writers who disparaged their time at Oxford, those entered into the top two categories of students, the noblemen and gentlemen commoners, were most critical of the shocking lack of academic requirements and discipline they were subjected to while in residence. Individuals who fell into the other classes of students, the commoners, battelers, servitors, and other students on scholarship, more frequently complained about bad tutors, boring lessons, and a general lack of opportunities for intellectual stimulation. Certainly a student's experiences often depended on his tutor's ability and their relationship, as others have pointed out. But the clear divide among the experiences of the students studied here shows that the undergraduate class system could, and did, have notable effects on education in the colleges.

The two parts of this analysis will show that the tutorial and lecture systems functioning at Oxford in the eighteenth century combined with the formal student

hierarchy to undermine the quality of undergraduate instruction in this period. The result of this system was that students with the most access to academic resources often had the least incentive to actually study and vice versa. There is no doubt that a talented, motivated undergraduate of any rank might have had a positive learning experience at Oxford in this period and there is plenty of evidence that many did. But the degree to which this depended on factors like the skill and character of a student's tutor, as well as his access to other knowledgeable men and books, meant that financial and political resources were of great importance. For the colleges and tutors to often allow, even encourage, students with those assets to do everything but dedicate them to their education meant that the attention and skills of many instructors were misemployed and opportunities were further limited for less-wealthy students. As a result, it should not be surprising that intellectual curiosity and discipline suffered across all ranks of Oxford undergraduates at various points in time.

## 2.2 The Oxford Student Ranks

Before pursuing this analysis further, it is necessary for readers to have a basic understanding of what university life and the undergraduate ranks were like at Oxford in the early modern period. While different statutes and practices under different headmasters meant that some variation existed between the individual colleges throughout the eighteenth century, a general overview of how the undergraduates were organized will have to suffice here. Plenty of detailed studies are available and highly recommended for a more complete picture.<sup>1</sup>

The Oxford colleges created and maintained a class structure that was both more conspicuous in its external markers and operative privileges, and more fluid as a result of its dependence on payable fees, than existed throughout most of British society. At the top of Oxford's five different ranks of undergraduates were the noblemen and gentlemen commoners. Drawn only from the ranks of the British peerage, the extraordinary wealth and prestige of noblemen students made them celebrities not just of their colleges, but the entire university. Such privileged individuals were very few in number at Oxford compared to the other students, and it was a mark of distinction for a college to attract them. Peers also frequently entered their sons as gentlemen commoners, a title that carried many of the same privileges as that of a nobleman, but this rank of student was more readily associated with the sons of the landed gentry and other wealthy gentlemen. These distinguished positions were reflected in the clothes students were required to wear everywhere: luxurious silk gowns with elaborate lace patterns (gold or silver for the noblemen) and tasseled caps (gold again for the noblemen) (Salmon 1744, p. 422; Midgley 1996, pp. 11–15).

---

<sup>1</sup> The quote in the article's title is from Amhurst (1726, p. 47). For excellent descriptions of student life and the student ranks at Oxford in the eighteenth century more generally, see Bennett (1986); Green (1986); Midgley (1996). Individual college histories also contain detailed information, such as Bill (1988) and Jones (1988).

What really set the noblemen and gentlemen commoners apart from the other students were the liberties their rank afforded them in daily college life. These lucky young men were freed from academic requirements and would receive an honorary bachelor's degree if they stayed at Oxford for a few years (and sometimes a master's degree as well).<sup>2</sup> This allowed them to focus on other social pursuits considered more appropriate for a gentleman, such as developing relationships with the university faculty and other important men. According to Thomas Salmon, noblemen eat “with the Fellows, and have private Tutors usually, but do not seem to be subject to the Rules of the University any further than they please” (Salmon 1744, p. 422). Besides sharing such important privileges, the very small number of students who enrolled as noblemen makes it appropriate to discuss them and gentlemen commoners together because the latter usually represented the highest rank of undergraduate in a college at any given moment. Whereas Wadham College hosted only a handful of students with nobleman status over the course of the century, Christ Church, for example, enrolled more peers as noblemen and gentlemen commoners than all of the rest of the colleges combined (Gardiner 1895; Cannon 1984, pp. 48–51).

Students acquired these places of prestige in the Oxford community and the freedoms associated with them by literally purchasing them from the colleges. Fees payable to the college for enrollment, tutoring, room and board, meals, and other goods or services were highest for noblemen on down to the lowest rank of student, the servitor, who paid comparatively little. Thomas Salmon reported that gentlemen commoners paid roughly twice as much per quarter for tuition as commoners (Salmon 1744, p. 423). That hardly compared to the expenses that noblemen incurred, however: keeping the dignity of their title at Oxford was a very costly enterprise. A letter written by Dr Joseph Hunt, Master of Balliol College, spelled this out clearly:

Sir James Harrington may, if he pleases, drop his title and be admitted a Gentleman Commoner of our College: and if he shall chuse to do so I will find him a Tutor for whose care of him I will be answerable. The expense will then be, with prudent management, abt. £ 20 a year. If he should keep his Title then I cou'd take care of him myself and the expense wou'd be £ 200 a year. I would not care to agree for less for his tuition than Sir John Napier pays me for his but would leave that matter to his Guardians to do as they would think fit.<sup>3</sup>

Although Harrington's family decided gentleman commoner status was good enough, others were not willing to put a price on their honor. The fabulously wealthy James Brydges, 1st Duke of Chandos, paid at least £ 400 to keep his son, the Marquis of Carnarvon, along with “a servant, a footman, a groom, and three horses” at Balliol College for a year (Baker and Baker 1949, pp. 101–102). That did not even include additional money the Duke paid to both the master of the college and to the Marquis's personal tutor (the same Joseph Hunt mentioned above) who were jointly

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Hunt mentions gentlemen commoners receiving honorary M.A.s in Letters to Richard Rawlinson dated July 4, 1743 and December 9, 1745. Bodleian Library, University of Oxford, MS Rawl. letters 96 fol. 105 and 223.

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Hunt to Hilkiah Bedford, 11 March 1723, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford, MS Rawl. letters 45 fol. 172.

responsible for his son's education: each received a further £ 200, and the charges for Hunt's D.D. degree were paid.

After the gentlemen students came the commoners, the most numerous class of students. Since meals were the central organizing principle of the college day, the name commoner was derived from the practice requiring all such students to eat meals, or commons, together in their college dining hall. These boys were most often the sons of clergymen or any tradesmen of moderate wealth, but they could also come from the ranks of prominent families if their parents did not feel official gentleman status was worth the additional costs. E.G.W. Bill asserts in his excellent history of Christ Church that the gulf between gentlemen commoners and commoners was a narrow one as a result (Bill 1988). Yet because Christ Church was exceptional for enrolling so many wealthy, titled students as noblemen and gentlemen commoners, the latter probably did not stand out as much as they did elsewhere; the lack of noblemen at Wadham and other colleges meant the gentlemen commoners occupied the top undergraduate rank there. Unlike the gentlemen students, commoners did not lead lives of luxury or hold noteworthy titles, but their position was usually respectable enough for them to avoid deprecation on its basis alone. Their dress reflected this status: they wore basic gowns of wool that were not full length and did not have sleeves. There is some confusion over whether they wore tassels on their caps, something that may have varied by college, but at least during Jeremy Bentham's time at Queen's College they seemed to.<sup>4</sup>

In contrast to the gentlemen students, commoners were under more scrutiny from the college faculty, particularly the men who they either hired or had assigned to them as their tutors. Commoners were required to go to lectures and lessons, to study afterwards at regular intervals, and might be punished for lax attendance or any number of other gaffes. Part teacher, part supervisor, tutors were really the only people responsible for their assigned students on a day-to-day basis. While noblemen and gentlemen commoners were mostly relieved of such surveillance, tutors could exert a good deal of control over other students if they were so inclined. The anonymous author of *Memoirs of an Oxford Scholar* was dismayed to find that all of his school funds had been left in the hands of his tutor, and instead made a habit of purchasing items on credit rather than trying to pry the money away from him. The author's plan to visit a sweetheart in London was also frustrated by his tutor's diligence, who explained that he had "particular Instructions from your Father not to let you lye a Night out of College, without his orders" (Anon 1756, p. 44). Obnoxious to the student or not, such a dutiful tutor was quite the blessing for a parent concerned with their son's progress. None of the liberties afforded to the noblemen or gentleman commoners were extended to commoners and thus they led regimented lives, at least in theory.

The presence of the non-commoner students at Oxford probably prevented commoners from ever complaining too much about their situation. Each college had its

---

<sup>4</sup> Midgley (1996, pp. 13–14) states that commoners did not wear tassels on their caps, but a shopping list followed by Jeremy Bentham's father for outfitting his son included a tassel (Bentham and Bowring 1843, pp. 36).



own financial resources, some of which might be put towards helping talented (or well-connected) students attend at lower cost than others. These included a rather irregular range of studentships, scholarships, exhibitions, and foundations often established by individual benefactors that might confer a certain amount of prestige on the students holding them. Other financial aid from the colleges came at a price, however, and students who entered as either battelers or servitors were marked as distinctly inferior to the commoners. The term ‘battelers’ refers to a student’s accounts with the college, including their meals, and Thomas Salmon explains that “battelers” purchased their food and drink directly from the college buttery and ate in their rooms. While costs were lower for them as a result, they were thus denied access to eating and socializing “in common” with most of the college in the dining hall (Salmon 1744, pp. 423–424).

Servitors were the lowest order of students at Oxford throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the model of a destitute scholar. Ideally when the son of a poor family (or maybe a second or third son from a more bourgeois background) distinguished himself by his academic achievement and was recommended to an Oxford college, there was a decent chance the university would take him in. A young man might also enter as a servitor if he came to Oxford as the personal retainer of a gentleman student. Servitors studied in the same manner as the other students, proceeded to the same degrees, and also had a tutor, but paid far less for room and board than commoners. George Whitefield’s mother was inspired to send him to Pembroke College when a former schoolfellow “told her how he had discharged all college expenses that quarter, and received a penny” as a servitor there (Whitefield 1960, p. 42). Such a situation was possible because, in addition to paying low fees, servitors were often able to make additional money performing all sorts of odd-jobs for other students or scholars of the college.

Their college’s generosity came at a cost, however, and a servitor was identified in student society by his poverty. Their gowns might be similar to those of the commoners, but servitors were the only rank of students not permitted to wear the square hat of a scholar. They were made to wear round hats instead, cheap, awkward pieces of fabric that marked their wearers as conspicuously inferior to the other students. They were not allowed to take commons with the other students, but they were permitted entrance to the dining hall and kitchen in a unique capacity: as meal servers to the rest of the college.

The position of servitor at Oxford drew criticism from contemporaries for its subjection of one student to another even while both studied identical subjects in their college and might come from similar backgrounds. George Fothergill was of a respectable family with Oxford connections and entering at Queen’s College Oxford in such a servile state was a rude awakening for him. He was relieved that at least his age prevented him from being named the “junior servitor”, thus saving him from “a slavery which I always dreaded, and could not well have undergone” (Thornton and McLaughlin 1905, p. 79). Having worked in his family’s tavern since he was a child, George Whitefield found the position less mortifying than Fothergill did. When he became interested in studying religion with the Wesley brothers, however, he had to contact them secretly out of fear that his low station would

offend them (Dallimore 1970, p. 65; Whitefield 1960, p. 46, 50). The poets Richard Jago and William Shenstone came from similar backgrounds and were close friends in grammar school, but after Jago entered as a servitor at University College and Shenstone became a commoner at Pembroke College, they suddenly had to start meeting in secret because of Jago's low rank. Both were successful gentlemen in later life and maintained frequent contact with each other, but their time at Oxford represented a strange anomaly in an otherwise close friendship (Davenport 1822, pp. 119–120; Graves and Seward 1788, pp. 27–30).

While a student's social standing might subject him to, or protect him from, varying degrees of embarrassment, it was in no way a signifier of academic success at Oxford in the eighteenth century. Nobody understood this better than Joseph Hoare, Principal of Jesus College in the middle of the century, and one of his students, William Jones. Hoare made the interesting decision to enter his nephew at Jesus College as a servitor when the boy could easily have entered with a different student rank. The nephew of an important man should have been safe from the daily humiliations of such a station, but far from wanting to punish his nephew with this role, Jones explained that Hoare enrolled the boy as a servitor "in order to render the young man more studious than he might have been." This plan failed, however, "for Master Lewis, being more than commonly handsome and shewy, and not bookishly inclined, exhibited his well-dressed person ... as much as he could have done, if his cap and gown had not been plain" (Jenkins 1908, pp. 74–75). Hoare personally valued education and discipline enough to place his nephew where he would make the most progress. Yet for that place to be the lowest, most embarrassing position in the college shows that some pursuits were held in higher regard at Oxford than learning in this period.

## 2.3 The Oxford Gentleman and a Different Education

Among the most common exercises that undergraduates performed at Oxford in the early modern period were oral disputations. In order to demonstrate their skills in logical reasoning and public speaking, as well as their knowledge of different subjects, classmates either answered questions or defended different positions in front of their tutor or other college authorities. Yet in a 1722 letter to his uncle, Nicholas Toke explained the difficulties of practicing or participating in these disputations as a gentleman commoner of University College:

I have long ago gone thro' Fells Logick; but have not those opportunities, I could wish, of improving my knowledge in that Science; & knowing ye bare Rules only of any art, without putting 'em in practice, will certainly signifie but little. For Gentlemen Commoners, tho they have many opportunities of getting improvement by ye best Company, may under this great disadvantage of not improving their learning so much as other inferior gowns in ye University. I might indeed go into ye Hall to Disputations; & should willingly perform all ye Exercise of an Under-graduate; but then I should draw upon me ye hatred of all ye Gentlemen of my own Gown, be guilty of great singularity (which in all places is to be



avoided) & be accounted a Person proud of his own performances, & fond of shewing his parts.<sup>5</sup>

By acknowledging here that gentlemen commoners had the most access to instructors and other pedagogical resources, but little incentive to actually use them, Toke clearly expresses the contradiction that lay at the heart of undergraduate education at Oxford. Although receptive to his uncle’s advice about the importance of disputations and personally interested in them himself, Toke pointed toward the minefield of different expectations and standards which undergraduates had to navigate. Despite the efforts of some individual headmasters (those at Christ Church in particular) the colleges widely failed to convince their gentlemen students that participating in even basic educational exercises would not compromise their honour or position. In fact, they often taught them just the opposite.

Numerous scholars have identified changing attitudes toward education among the British elite in the long eighteenth century as experience and worldliness came to be judged more important than formal Latin training. As James Rosenheim points out, sending a son to acquire an experiential education on the expensive (and oft-studied) Grand Tour “had the added virtue of very efficiently performing education’s less explicit objective, that of distinguishing the true gentleman from those who would mimic him.” (Rosenheim 1998, pp. 34–35) Oxford educators also adjusted to these changing demands throughout the eighteenth century by offering parents more opportunities to pay for lofty college titles so that their sons would learn to live independently as proper gentlemen in the safe, enclosed environment of the college. Rather than making them complete typical undergraduate exercises, the colleges allowed gentlemen students more time to participate in social activities that were deemed suitable for and crucial to the performance of politeness or civility.<sup>6</sup> This meant freeing them to participate in activities like horse riding and hunting, as well as helping them refine their tastes and social skills through frequent interaction with classmates of their rank, the college faculty, and other notable men associated with the university.

The university’s ability to designate student rank and privilege on its own terms created demand for places of distinction in the insulated society of Oxford. How these titles played on the pressures of maintaining or building a family’s social respectability can be seen in the following letter from Theophilus Leigh to his sister:

My nephew being your eldest son, and Heir to a good estate, which will quickly be known there, without possibility of concealment I think indeed you ought to allow him £ 100 by the Year. Our Cosin Chamberlayne allowed his Son as much, and he spent much more. You must of necessity enter him a Gentleman Commoner. It will be otherwise very reflective upon You, and discouraging to him. Such as were Commoners in my time, are ... Gentlemen Commoners now. (Bennett 1986, p. 374)

<sup>5</sup> Nicholas Toke to Dr. Thomas Brett, Jan 15 [1722], Bodleian Library, University of Oxford MS Eng. th. c. 27 fols. 365–366.

<sup>6</sup> On the many faces of “politeness” in the British long eighteenth century, see the seminal article by Klein (2002).

Leigh warned his sister not to risk the honour of his nephew or the family by entering the boy in a position where others might consider him inferior. He also commented that commoner status was not as respectable as it had once been, suggesting that standards at Oxford had changed over time as families placed their sons in better and better positions. This parallels the concerns of eighteenth-century critics like Thomas Salmon who worried that Oxford colleges allowed a certain degree of social climbing to take place within the student ranks. Salmon noted that baronets and their sons were often allowed to enroll as noblemen, for example, a point confirmed by Erasmus Philipps, a gentleman commoner at Pembroke College, when he named one such baronet-nobleman as Sir Walter Bagott (Salmon 1744, p. 284, 422; Philipps 1860, p. 366). William Jones likewise complained that he was considered “plebeian” while his classmates from grammar school, who were “of the same class in life” as himself, were entered as the sons of “gentlemen” (Jenkins 1908, pp. 74).

Rather than lineage acting as a rigid indicator of social status, a student’s position at Oxford in the eighteenth century was almost entirely dependent on the financial resources available to him. In addition to the position purchased when a student was entered at his college, a culture of conspicuous consumption reigned in which the true costs of being a gentleman student built up through the living of a certain lifestyle. Those students of less-wealthy families were priced out not just through inflated fees, but the expectation that noblemen and gentlemen commoners would take advantage of the liberties afforded to them. High-end clothes and apartment furnishings were a necessity, while polite hobbies like hunting and riding horses were not cheap activities because they entailed keeping dogs and horses at the college or renting space in town. The ability to spend money and move in proper circles thus demarcated the upper crust of students in college society as much as their titles did. As has already been mentioned, Dr Hoare’s nephew Lewis was able to at least partly transcend his low position at Jesus College by otherwise dressing and acting as “if his cap and gown had not been plain” (Jenkins 1908, p. 75). Despite Theophilus Leigh’s concerns, the Brasenose College Register makes it clear that it was not uncommon for boys to enter as commoners and then move up to the rank of gentleman commoner later, perhaps after they had realized the benefits that accompanied the change in status. All they needed to do was pay the additional fees and do what was necessary to fit in.

Gowns were the most conspicuous signifiers of a student’s rank and the ones designated for gentlemen students were priced accordingly. When his two sons were gentlemen commoners at Oriel College, the “Fine silk Gent. Commoner’s gown” appropriate to their station cost John Lovell (the elder) more than £ 10 each, which was about the price of a half year’s tuition.<sup>7</sup> Just as Theophilus Leigh had advised his sister, it was recommended to Robert Pitt that he provide his son William with £ 100 to cover his enrollment as a gentleman commoner at Trinity College. Actual university fees were much less than that, but in order for William to fit in as a gentleman commoner, it was necessary for him to bring a personal servant and to give a substantial benefaction and “Piece of Plate” to the college (Mallett 1927,

<sup>7</sup> Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre, MS. 161 bundle 159/ NRA 7427 Francis.

Sciences in the Universities of Europe, Nineteenth and  
Twentieth Centuries

Academic Landscapes

Simoes, A.; Diogo, M.P.; Gavroglu, K. (Eds.)

2015, X, 393 p. 18 illus., 10 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-94-017-9635-4