it must of necessity be invaluable to all students of philosophy and Middle-English literature.

At the request of Dr. F. J. Furnivall, the slips already written have been entrusted to my care; and I now earnestly invite the cooperation of all who are interested in the works of our first great poet, or the study of comparative philology. As there are still a large number of slips to be written out before the final work can be commenced, I hope all who can render assistance will kindly communicate with me at the address given above.

WILSON GRAHAM.


In the Glasgow Evening Times (June 9) a writer, whose name I recognize, charges me with "not using my subscribers well." I had agreed to complete my present work in five supplemental volumes, when a sixth was found necessary to contain a last instalment, "The New Arabian Nights," and to include the various indexes to the entire supplement.

I hardly need my saying that those who decline taking vol. vi. shall not lose the papers which complete the work as promised in the prospectus. The lists shall be bound up with No. v., and thus my subscribers will not be "interested" (in the old Glasgow critic) "to a good milk cow." R. F. BURTON.


Prof. Holland begins his very courteous, but I think, not very fair, criticism of my views on the origin of the university by saying that I start with a series of assumptions to the effect that the schools of Oxford must have been due to a movement *ab extra*, &c. My argument was an argument from analogy. I might even call it an induction. This being the nature of the argument, it is exceedingly difficult to state it in a completely more uniform, and I think, at a time when the schools of the archbishop's household had disappeared and Oxford was a flourishing university. The question is, which is most probable—that Gervase mistakenly assumed that it was the far more important university lectures at Oxford? It must be remembered too that if Gervase lectured both at Canterbury and at Oxford, the two series of lectures have to be got into such a relation that there cannot be no action or interaction of these legal studies and their suppression by Stephen. Prof. Holland will hardly pretend that Gervase, like some of his successors, held that the university was the same as the college at Oxford or Paris, because he is known to have taught in England or in France respectively, has been made by writers of what ought to be far more important evidence, and Gervase (see Bulsaeus, Bax, Pits, Wood, &c., passim). My scepticism about such statements is not an a priori scepticism, but is begotten of experience. I may also remind the reader that the existence of a university is not in fact, of something like a university—in the archbishop's household is independently ascertained. For further information about them I may again refer to Bishop Stubbs's Lectures.

But the fact is that Prof. Holland appreciates the real nodus of the problem with which we have to deal. Let it be admitted *argumenti causa* (and only *argumenti causa*) that Vaccar did teach at Oxford. The admission would in no way explain the origin of the universities or of the schools out of which they grew. How then, according to Prof. Holland, does Vaccar cease in consequence of Stephen's edict? When the schools of Oxford again dawn upon our view, they are schools of 'diverse and learning, whether of theology or of arts,' and we cannot mistake them, while among those faculties arts and theology are clearly the most prominent. Where did these schools come from? They are not accounted for by the law-lectures of Vaccar. The original problems of the existence of a numerous body of masters and scholars in non-constitutional relation to an Oxford church—are still in its infancy. If my critic should think it worth while to pen a rejoinder, will he tell us how he will account for the existence of a body of masters and scholars in non-constitutional relation to an Oxford church—returns in all its force. If my critic should think it worth while to pen a rejoinder, will he tell us how he will account for the existence of a body of masters and scholars in non-constitutional relation to an Oxford church—returns in all its force. Is it not true that the universities were supposed to be connected with the see of Paris?...

* Cambridge I believe to have originated in a similar way by migration from Oxford.