came at last of so little value to the proprietors that they were willing to dispose of them for a trifling sum. The old colleges thus extended their limits by easy purchase; and the new colleges, of which *six were* founded during the six­teenth century, were built on sites either obtained gratui­tously or for an insignificant price.@@1 Before this period the colleges had rarely admitted any students who were not on the foundation, and provided for by endowment ; but they now began to receive independent members, and the diminution of the number of students in the university rendered it possible to receive nearly all of them. Since the beginning of the seventeenth century, only one college has been founded ; and three of the eight surviving halls have been changed by endowment into colleges, but one of these is now extinct.@@'

In addition to the want of endowments, it may freely be admitted, that the more effectual superintendence and tui­tion which were supplied in the colleges, in consequence of the greater number of graduates who were members of them, contributed to the downfall of the halls. It remains only to mention the reason which, in the most crowded state of the university, has prevented one from being restored. Be­fore the period of their downfall, the establishment of a hall was easy, and the chancellor was not at liberty to refuse his sanction. A piece of university legislation has effectually secured the monopoly to the colleges. The earl of Lei­cester, when chancellor of the university, about 1570, “ through the absolute potency he had,” obtained from the university the right of nominating the principals of all halls, and consequently in effect a *veto* upon the institution of any ; and this right is now vested by statute in his successors. The heads of colleges being in reality the governing body, have since prevented any interference with their monopoly, by the establishment of a new hall.@@3

In the earliest period of the university, the scholars lodged, without domestic superintendence, in the houses of the citizens, as at Paris and Bologna, and attended such lec­tures as they chose. In the year 1231, it was ordained “that every clerk or scholar resident in Oxford must subject him­self to the discipline and tuition of some master of the schools;’’ i.e. should enter himself as the pupil of one or other of the actual regents, while he was still left at liberty to select his own place of residence. At the commence­ment of the fifteenth century, however, it had become the established law, that all scholars should be members of some college, hall, or entry, under a responsible head. The scholars who frequented the lectures of the university, with­out attaching themselves to any college or hall, were called *chamberdehyns,* as in Paris they were called *Martinets ;* and frequent and decisive measures were adopted against them.@@\* In the foreign universities, it was only the students of the faculty of arts who were obliged to place themselves under collegiate superintendence ; but in the English universities the graduates and under-graduates of every faculty were equally required to be members of a privileged house. It is necessary however to observe, that entrance at a college or hall did not imply entrance under any particular tutor. “ Young students, and many in those days were mere boys, were placed by their friends under the care of tutors ; but these were private tutors, and the universities did not inter­fere with the private arrangement. It was not till the time when Leicester was chancellor, that the university under­took to regulate who might be tutors ; and it was not till the chancellorship of Laud, that it was made necessary to enter under a tutor resident in the same college or hall with the pupil. Laud, therefore, may be regarded as the author of the system of college tuition.”@@3 In Oxford, according to its origi­nal constitution, as in all the older universities of the Parisian model, the business of instruction was not confided to a special body of privileged professors, but was conducted by the graduates at large. Every graduate had an equal right to teach, and even incurred the obligation of teaching pub­licly, for a certain period, the subjects of his faculty, as the condition on which he obtained his degree. Even the ba­chelor was obliged to give proof of his ability in teaching, by reading a short course of’ lectures under the superintendence of his faculty; and the doctor, after his promotion, immediately commenced *(incipiebat)* his duties as a public teacher *(regebat.)*@@*c. It* was however necessary for the uni­versity to enforce this obligation of public teaching, during the term of *necessary regency,* only if a sufficient number of *voluntary regents* did not present themselves. When this was the case the period of *necessary regency* was shortened, and even a dispensation from actual teaching during its conti­nuance commonly allowed.@@7 The regents, whose duty as public lecturers was dispensed with, still retained their pri­vileges as members of the governing body. The period of *necessary* regency was finally limited to one year ; but the masters were allowed to remain *voluntary* regents *(regentes ad placitum)* for two years. A lecturer might continue to teach as a *voluntary regent,* after his term of *necessary* re­gency had expired ; or he might resume bis regency at pleasure. Now that the sole effect of regency is to entitle the master to become a member of the house of congrega­tion, all continue regents for two years. All professors and public lecturers, the masters of the schools, and public exa­miners, are regents ; and the name has been extended to all resident doctors, to the heads of houses, and to the deans of colleges.@@8

The ancient system of instruction was gradually super­seded by the appointment of salaried professors. The un­salaried regents in general found their schools deserted for the gratuitous instruction of the privileged lecturers; and though the right was expressly reserved to every doctor and master, of lecturing in the public schools on any subject pertaining to his faculty, its exercise was in a great mea­sure abandoned.@@9 “ Some time,” says Mr Malden,@@10 “ before the present statutes were digested under the authority of Archbishop l.aud, there were, besides the professors of the superior faculties, ten professors or public readers of the seven arts and the three philosophies. They were appointed by the house of congregation, that is, by the regents ; and attendance on their lectures was enforced by statute. In the time of Laud six of these enjoyed a permanent endow­ment ; four were paid partly by the fees of their pupils, partly by fines levied on the regents whom they relieved from teaching. After the final collection of the statutes, a. D. 1C36, by which the university is still nominally govern­ed, we find eleven professors or readers in the faculty of arts. They lectured on grammar, rhetoric, and logic, the three branches of the ancient Trivium. Of the Quadri­vium, geometry and astronomy had their professors endowed by the munificence of Sir Henry Savile, in 1619. Provi­sion was made by royal endowment for teaching the Greek and Hebrew languages: and there were also professors of natural and of moral philosophy, of metaphysics, and of his-
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