more explicit recognition of the privileges of the university is found in a royal enactment of the forty-fifth of Henry III. (1260), prohibiting “the king’s justices from interfer­ing in hearing and determining offences between scholars and laymen;” meaning by the latter term those who were not scholars.@@1

The royal support thus given to the university was not sufficient to check the spirit of insubordination among the scholars, or to prevent them from engaging in frequent con­flicts with the townsmen. On one occasion the students from the north and south, arranged in opposite sides, es­poused the cause of two of their countrymen who had quar­relled, and proceeding from words to blows, threw the uni­versity and town into the utmost disorder. The chancel­lor interfered, but academical authority was too weak ; and the townsmen who were called to his aid, mixing in the fray, contributed only to increase the confusion. Public plunder, burning of records, and every species of horror en­sued. The king sent a delegate to inquire into the dis­putes, and to cause summary justice to be executed on some of the delinquents. Sixteen of the townsmen were hanged, and others belonging both to the university and town took refuge in the religious houses, or were committed to the common gaol. By this means peace was restored ; but many of the scholars retired to Northampton, where they were allowed by the king to form themselves into a literary society.@@s These tumults were likewise increased by the tournaments which were held at Cambridge during the thirteenth century, and which not only interrupted the studies of the university’ during their continuance, but gave rise to animosities which did not easily subside. To re­move this impediment to learning, Henry III. issued letters patent, which were confirmed by Edward II.,, forbidding any tournament from being held within five miles of the town.@@3

The most important document of Henry III. is the famous Composition (1270) between the scholars and burgesses, confirmed by royal authority, which ordained that “ a certain number of the scholars and the townsmen should be bound by oath to take the names of all the principal houses in the town, and of those who dwelt in them, so that no person should be lodged therein who could disturb the public peace.” Offenders who could not be expelled by the authorities of the university and town, were to be denounced before the king and his council.@@4 The effects of this arrangement were beneficially felt by the university ; and accordingly the current of its history was not disturbed by any violent agi­tations during the next century. In the year 1381, the hos­tility of the townsmen to the students displayed itself with great violence, which led to the destruction of the charters of the university, and those of Bennet College. After nume­rous other acts of violence, the tumult was suppressed by the bishop of Norwich, and the principal leaders were punished. The mayor was deprived of his office, and the liberties of the town were declared forfeited, and bestowed on the vice- chancellor, in whom they were vested till the reign of Henry VIII. when the corporation was restored, though several of its former privileges were retained by the university.

The university obtained its first formal charter of pri­vileges from Edward I. in the twentieth year of his reign (1291). This charter, besides confirming the letters of Henry III. and the Composition, conferred upon the uni­versity some new privileges, among which was one, that no one imprisoned by order of the chancellor should be libe­rated by the mayor and bailiffs under pretext of a king’s brief formerly issued.@@5 Charters more and more ample were granted by Edward II. Edward III. Richard II. and Henry IV. in the beginning of their reigns, as we have already found to be the case with the university of Oxford. By these charters the university obtained the control over victuallers of all sorts, with power to punish *regraters* and *forestallers,* and to deliver scholastics and clerks from prison ; and all causes in which they were concerned, relating to laws, letting of houses, &c., were made cognisable before the vice-chancellor or his commissary. The jurisdiction of this officer was extended to all cases, whether civil or cri­minal, except those of mayhem and felony, in which one of the parties was a master or scholar. the assize of bread, wine, and beer, with the supervision of weights and measures, which had formerly belonged to the magistrates of the town, were exclusively lodged in the university; and for these pri­vileges the university was to pay into the exchequer a yearly tribute of ten pounds. The mayor and bailiffs of the tow n were sworn every year, before the vice-chancellor, to keep the peace of the university.

So far as the extant documents enable us to judge, Cam­bridge was not much troubled by papa) bulls and rescripts ;@@c and was less exposed than the sister university to ecclesi­astical interference at home. When Edward' II., in the tenth year of his reign (1316), granted to the univer­sity a charter containing some additional privileges, he solicited a confirmation of them from the papal see. A bull was accordingly issued at Avignon, by John XXII., in the second year of his pontificate (1318), which, after confirming the privileges conferred by former popes and for­mer kings of England, ordains “that there shall be thence­forth at Cambridge a *studium generate,* and that every fa­culty shall be maintained there ; and that the college and masters of the said *studium* shall be accounted a university, and enjoy all the rights which any university whatsoever, lawfully established, can and ought to enjoy.”@@7 From the date of this bull, Cambridge was recognised among the universities of Christendom.

We have already seen that the jurisdiction of the bishop of Ely, as bishop of the diocese, was in ancient times dis­tinctly acknowledged ; but it was soon limited, partly by the concessions of the bishops themselves, and partly by papal authority. Hugh Balsham, the founder of St Peter’s College, disclaimed (1275), by a public letter, any inten­tion of derogating from the privileges of the university, or disturbing the jurisdiction of the chancellor, but re­quired all suits to be brought before the chancellor in the first instance, restricting himself to receiving appeals. In the following year the same bishop limited the jurisdiction of his archdeacon.@@8 Farther limitations in the power of the

one of the public letters for a charter of incorporation. (Malden, pp. 93, 94). “ Wherever,” says Mr Dyer, “ we choose to make our stand,

whether at the diploma of Henry III. which is undoubtedly authentic, or any which preceded him, that are of doubtful authority, they all suppose the existence of a university, but say nothing of its creation : nor, indeed, from the meaning of the word, does it seem to have been necessary ; the word was previously in use, and suited to a literary as well as any other body : so it was insensibly adopted, without annex­ing to the term any of that charm attached to it in later years. Privileges, i. 385.

@@@1 Dyer’s Privileges, i. 6.

@@@8 Dyer’s History, i. 62. This *university* lasted only four years. The studenls were ordered by the king to return to Cambridge in 1264

@@@a In the year 1701, when the celebrated Dr Bentley was vice-chancellor, the mayor and corporation of Cambridge gave permission to players to perform at Sturbridge Fair, which called into exercise the power of the university, and has since prevented a repetition of the offence. Monk’s Life of Bentley, i. 152.

@@@\* Dyer’s History, i. 67. Privileges, i. 66.

@@@4 Dyer’s Hist. i. 67. Priv. i. 73.

@@@. In the reign of Henry VIII. the university and colleges were ordered to send in all their grants, charters, statutes, and bulls ; and though the charters, &c. were restored, it does not appear that the bulls were returned. It is doubtful, therefore, if we possess the most ancient do­cuments of this kind. See Dyer’s Priv. i. 394.

@@@1 This bull is given at full length by Dyer (Priv. i. 60 and 61), who successfully proves (p. 410) that it was issued by John XXΠ.. and not, as Mr Parker supposes, by John X., whose pontificate extended from 914 to 928.

@@@, Dyer’s Privileges, i. 8. Malden, p. 102.