

Irish, (whose chambers gave name so early as Henry 1st's reign to "Irishmen's Street," in the Parish of St. Thomas), ranged themselves with the Southernmen, while the Scotch students naturally went with the North countrymen. In any quarrel with the townsmen, both nations generally joined, as, in the famous riots of 1209 and 1238; the former arising out of the accidental killing of a townsman by a student practising archery; and the latter, from the intentional shooting of the Lord Legate Otho's cook, who had been guilty of throwing a ladle full of scalding soup, "in the face of a poor Irish clerk," who had made his way uninvited, into the said Lord Legate's kitchen. Party spirit, however, divided the nations bitterly amongst themselves, in the wars of the Roses. From what I have been able to read of the annals of Oxford, I cannot concur with Professor Huber, the able German historian of the English Universities, that the Northerners always, or even generally, represented the popular, and the Southerners the royalist principles at issue. It seems to me, such theorizing as this is attempting to string ancient facts too exclusively on modern wires; is attempting to force facts to our own theories, rather than to suffer them to speak freely for themselves. If any party represented steadily "popular principles," it was the townsmen, battling alike against Northern and Southern for the immunity of their franchises, and the freedom of their markets. These franchises, according to Anthony a'Wood, "extend from Magdalen bridge to Milham, great Marten river, thence cross Christ Church meade, above the ditch to the walk; to the Wharf down to Free Water Stone, and back again through Bell-founder's Arch, and over the meads, cross Hog Acre ditch to Hinxley ferry; to Botley and up Seacouth, hard by Binsey Church, and up to Godstow, cross the fields down to the Isle of Rhe; then take boats to Magdalen bridge, and home." Such were the limits of the Town's jurisdiction, which were to be maintained and defended during four turbulent centuries, against the choleric and quarrelsome nations quartered in the quadrangles of the Colleges.

It was a strangely motlied population that of Oxford, during the middle ages. The timid, tenacious Jew, fearful of his life, and hardly less fearful of the gains for which he lived; the austere mendicant friars in their early fervor; the matriculated townsmen, servitors of the University; the gay and dissipated "Parisians;" the dilapidated Welsh and Irish *Chamberdekins*; the magnificent Prelates; the grave *Taxors* and Guardians, ready to arbitrate on house-rent or homicide, with the town authorities; the University Proctors; the town Bailiffs; altogether a very marked and various community. Over all, presided, on the one hand the Mayor, on the other the Chancellor; each with his own Police, and no lack of armed volunteers to enforce his decisions, whatever they might be.

The relation of the twenty Colleges and five halls, now existing at Oxford, to the University, has been compared by Mr. Goldwin Smith to a Federal government. Every member of the University must be a member of some College; the University Convocation is the supreme legislature, as the Chancellor is the supreme executive power. But the utmost variety exists in the College Constitutions themselves:

With the exception of Jesus College founded by Queen Elizabeth, chiefly for Welsh students, and Oriel founded or rather favored by the unfortunate Edward II., the vanquished at Bannockburn, all the other twenty-five foundations owe their endowments, to munificent merchants, to pious ladies, to court Chaplains, or Bishops, or Lord Chancellors of England. Their statutes bespeak the ages in which they rose. Some founders give prominence to