In the first ten pages of part xvi. of the 'Century' (the latest to hand), we count 260 quotations, fewer than in the earlier parts of the work, which seems to be overrunning its limits. Quotations under pilfer from Dryden and Bacon, under pilgrim from Grew's 'Anatomy of Plants,' and under ploioage from Raleigh, have been taken from Johnson, apparently without verification, and quotations under pillery from Daniel and under pimping from Crabbe have been similarly drawn from the 'Imperial.' An abridged quotation and wrong definition, under pinax, come from Webster. We may state here that a few references appear to be either erroneous, misleading, or insufficient. Under pilz, in the electrical sense, it might have been well to quote from Volta's own description, which was originally published in English.
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NOTES

CSP. identification: MS L. 159.4. See also Fisch, First Supplement. Fisch suggested that only a part of this might be attributable to Peirce. This is unsigned in Haskell’s Index to The Nation, vol. 1.

Mr. George Shea has printed a pamphlet with the title, Some Facts and Probabilities relating to the History of Johannes Scotus, surnamed Duns, and concerning the genuineness of the Spagnoletto Portrait belonging to the General Theological Seminary of the United States (Cambridge: Riverside Press). Three other portraits of Duns Scotus, he says, are known, one at Windsor, one in the Bodleian, and one at Merton, and these are all admitted to be copies. The New York picture came from the shop of Mr. John Chaundy in Oxford; Mr. Chaundy had it from a gentleman who understood that it had been brought to England from the south of France, and this gentleman's family believed it to be the original Spagnoletto. This, it must be confessed, is a somewhat indefinite pedigree. Mr. Shea adds that "the painting is recognized by connoisseurs as a genuine Ribera." Here is the gist of the question. The genuineness of the portrait can be decided on only by experts. We cannot rest on the opinion of unknown "connoisseurs"; if some acknowledged Spagnoletto authority should examine the picture, his decision would carry weight, but for the present, it will be generally felt, opinion must be reserved. The figure of Scotus, as represented in the photograph, is striking, and it will be pleasant if it should prove to be an original Ribera. The sketch of the great schoolman's life in the pamphlet is not carefully done. The author says, for example (p. 17): "So rapid was his advance that in his first year at the University [of Paris] he was appointed Regent of its Theological School." But the title "regent" belonged to any Master of Arts who chose to teach; and though there was a theological "Faculty," and the Sorbonne was in existence in 1304 (when Duns went to Paris), it is doubtful whether there was "a Theological School," for colleges had already been established, and in all of them theological instruction was given. The statement (p. 15) that "upon a vacancy occurring by the removal to Paris of his master, William Varron (A.D. 1301), Scotus was appointed to the chair of Philosophy," has too modern a tone. There was then, properly speaking, no "chair of philosophy" at Merton College; any master might lecture on any or all of the subjects of the curriculum (in which the philosophy of the time was, of course, prominent), and had to trust to his ability to attract pupils. A similar looseness of expression occurs in Mr. W. J. Townsend's 'Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages.' Why so much space should be given to Erigena, who had nothing to do with Duns, is not clear. Mr. Shea has, however, done well to call attention to the portrait, and it is to be hoped that the authorities of the Union Theological Seminary will submit it to a competent expert who may enlighten us on the question of its genuineness.