



# The Elizabethan.

Vol. III. No. 22.

WESTMINSTER, JULY, 1882.

Price 6d.

## SCHOOL CONVERSATIONS.

THE uniformity which pervades our School conversations is an evil not unfrequently touched upon. There are at present certain stock subjects which generally succeed in monopolising the conversational powers of the School, and of these such arid topics as Football and Rowing play an important part. Discussions on Cricket, which are equally common, are not, perhaps, equally profitless, for the game is one in which forethought and science can be judiciously introduced. But in expatiating on the art of kicking a large leather ball between two upright sticks, or of working painfully up the river backwards, with a motion like a pendulum, even the most lively conversationalist will be in danger of repeating himself. Much of this monotonous uniformity may be attributed to the athletic portion of the School, whose interests are centred in their pots and prizes; for, says the brawny man, proudly showing his biceps, 'We do not come to Westminster merely to learn Greek and

Latin, but to become gentlemen ready to play our part in the world.' Yet, in this laudable anxiety to obtain pedantry, too much interest is apt to be centred on tastes and wishes which belong properly to the professional and pot-hunter. But our athletes are not the only ones who make conversation bend to their wishes at Westminster; there is another class who are always busy with what is called loosely School news, which consists chiefly of stories about the last piece of 'cheek,' and the punishment it entailed. But far worse than all such tales, however dull, is the repetition of the witticisms of some school-wag. For, in the first place, the point of his joke generally lay in the surroundings, which are never reported, as well as the grimaces and buffooneries with which it was accompanied; and, secondly, the tale comes to the weary listener shorn of all its epigrammatic force, so that with a grim smile he bribes the merry storyteller to depart.

The small attention paid to the death of great men is a proof of the utter stagnation of all interests not intimately connected with the

School. Within the last few years, men in the first rank of art, science, politics, and religion have died; and it would not be hazardous to say that, with the exception of Lord Beaconsfield, none of them have excited the smallest interest in the School for more than a day after their deaths were announced. It would be absurd to try to make boys talk on subjects of which they know next to nothing; and, consequently, the death of Rossetti and even Darwin could not be expected to excite general sympathy. But most of us have read Longfellow, some of us Carlyle, we all admired Dean Stanley, and yet the circles where their lives and work were discussed were the exception.

It is but a short walk from Westminster to see the last and most magnificent monument of Street's life, and yet his name is hardly known in the School.

Possibly an enthusiast, who had never been at Westminster, would suggest that the fellows might also take some interest in the books they read in school, that those who are reading the masterpieces of ancient literature might be expected to discuss the story or characters.

But in our most sanguine moments we never looked for such a consummation. In the first place, so long as the construction is fairly correct, the fellows as a rule pay very little attention to the story; and, secondly, the ease with which the classics may be parodied always prevents serious discussion. A fair sample of the disrespectful way in which the gods and demigods are treated is the nick-name of 'sportsman' so often applied to cloud-compelling Zeus himself. Those who have suffered from the really serious arguments which follow a mental arithmetic or Euclid paper will all agree as to the scanty number of subjects which are accepted for discussion; yet, if this temper were extended to the classics, it would be at least equally profitable and certainly of more general interest.

In fact, serious discussion is at Westminster chiefly remarkable for its absence, and a subject of entirely intellectual interest is generally very roughly handled, if it is so fortunate as to escape being brained on the spot; and when rugged justice has been dealt to the interloper, conversation falls back into its old channels of Football and Rowing.

To this narrow range of topics for conversation, and their comparative barrenness, may be ascribed the incapacity for fair argument and candid discussion which is said to exist in the School. Hence also arises the dread with which most of us contemplate the necessity of writing

an essay. It is not a want of knowledge which is our real impediment, but rather a total ignorance of the way of throwing either thought or information into a definite shape.

However, we fear that in spite of a protest more eloquent than any we can make, Football and Rowing will continue to occupy the minds as well as the sinews of their votaries, and school-wits will continue to be misrepresented, to the annoyance of themselves and others.

---

## 'OLD WESTMINSTERS.'

---

No. XXI.

### FRANCIS ATTERBURY, BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

NEAR Newport Pagnel, in Buckinghamshire, at a place called Middleton (or Milton) Keynes, of which his father was rector, was born, on the 6th of March, 1662, Francis Atterbury, one of the most extraordinary and famous prelates this country has ever known.

Being sent to Westminster, at the time under the rule of Busby, he was admitted, as third of his election, into St. Peter's College, in the year 1674. We pause for a moment to mention a somewhat curious circumstance which we are unable to explain. It appears in the College book that the Captain of Atterbury's Election, one William Throckmorton, proceeded to Bedford in 1677, Atterbury himself and two others were elected to one or other of the Universities in 1680, and certain of the same year of admission to St. Peter's, Westminster, were removed by election to the Universities at various times from 1675 to 1679 inclusive. It is possible that this fact is easily accounted for, but *we* do not know the reason.

Atterbury had made his scholarly attainments conspicuous before he departed from under the government of the celebrated Doctor on his election to Christ Church College, Oxford, whither he proceeded with three school-fellows, each of whom won distinction in later life. These were: Harry Mordaunt, the second son of John, Earl of Peterborough, who entered the army and rose to the rank of Lieutenant-General, and, with the exception of the Parliament called together in 1698, sat in the House of Commons from 1705 down to his death in 1720; Francis Gastrell (a staunch friend in time of trouble to Bishop Atterbury), who was chaplain to Queen Anne, and died in 1725, having been Bishop of Chester since 1714; and Welbore Ellis, father of the first Lord Mendip (also an O.W.) and grandfather of Viscount Clifden and the Earl of Normanton (O.W.'s both), who as made Bishop of Kildare in 1705, and translated

to Meath in 1731, and died in 1734, his remains being interred with great ceremony in Christ Church, Dublin, of which he had been Dean for a quarter of a century. During the time Atterbury was at Oxford he laid the foundation of his fame. He published in 1682 a version of 'Absalom and Achitophel' in Latin; and, two years later, he received high commendation from Doctor Johnson for his anonymous work '*Ἀρθολογία*,' a selection from Latin poems written by Italians. In 1687 he published a tract in answer to what was asserted in 'Martin Luther, and the Original of the Reformation.' In addition to these, his pen was employed at this period of his life in poetical compositions, some of which were original, others translations.

Most of his time, however, was occupied in the company of young Mr. Boyle, who afterwards became Earl of Orrery on the decease of his brother, a pupil of his. With Mr. Boyle and Doctor Bentley, Atterbury became concerned in a controversy touching the 'Epistles of Phalaris.' Boyle was selected by Dean Aldrich to publish an edition of these letters, and the Doctor engaged himself hotly in criticising adversely the work named, having against him 'all the wits of Christ Church.' In 1698 these Letters of Phalaris were published, and at first they attracted considerable attention and became exceedingly popular—afterwards, Bentley won the victory. How much concerned in the work was the subject of this notice may be gathered from a letter he addressed to Boyle in 1698:—'Some time and trouble this matter cost me. In laying the design of the book; in writing above half of it; in reviewing a good part of the rest; in transcribing the whole, and attending the press—half a year of my life went away.' In 1684 he took the degree of B.A., and three years later that of M.A.

The year 1690 was a notable one in his life: in its course, he was made Censor of Christ Church, ordained, and married—his wife being a Miss Osborne, a very beautiful young lady with some fortune. Next year he was appointed Catechetical Lecturer, an office founded by Busby, and in the month of October Bishop Compton recommended and obtained for him the post of Lecturer at St. Bride's, London; and although he was neither a Whitehall Preacher nor Her Majesty's Chaplain, he had the honour of delivering a sermon before the Queen at Whitehall.

In 1693 Atterbury was made Preacher at Bride-well Chapel, and in the following year King William and Queen Mary chose him to be their Chaplain, when he removed to Chelsea. His sermons were marked, not only by the bold sentiments they declared, but also by an elegance of language difficult to surpass. In 1698 the eminent divine was appointed Preacher at the Rolls Chapel.

Some two years later he published (at first anonymously, but afterwards, when a second edition was called for, with his name attached as the author) a reply, entitled 'The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation, Stated and Vindicated,' to a work published by Dr. Wake (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), called 'The Authority of

Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods.' Atterbury's answer met with great success and caused much stir both in London and Oxford, not only in the ranks of the clergy, but also among the laity. The judges met and consulted upon the subject, they holding the opinion that the work was a trespass upon the Royal Prerogative. When the Convocation assembled in 1701, our High-Church 'Westminster' took an active part in the proceedings, and through his advocacy an 'Old Westminster' was elected to the office of Prolocutor. This was Doctor Hooper, who was Bishop of St. Asaph in 1703, Bishop of Bath and Wells 1704, and died in 1727; he obtained his election to Oxford from Westminster in the year 1657, in company of Thomas Knife, Head Master of Westminster School 1695, and Prebendary of Westminster 1707; Ralph Trumbull; Greaves Austin; Thomas Smith, to whose memory there is a curious inscription on the North Wall of the Abbey Cloisters; and Robert Salisbury, or Salusbury, a member of the old Llewain House. On the 10th of March, 1701, King William received an Address from the Convocation, on which occasion Archdeacon Atterbury (who had been made Archdeacon of Totnes on the 29th of January, by the celebrated O.W. Bishop of Exeter, Sir Jonathan Trelawney, Bart.) was present. On the 8th of the month following, on the motion of Doctor Jane, the only 'Westminster Boy' elected to either of the Universities in 1660, Dean of Gloucester in 1685, the Lower House of Convocation voted their thanks to Atterbury 'for his learned pains in asserting and vindicating the rights of Convocation,' and did him further honour by sending a request to Oxford University that they would 'confer on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity by diploma, without his doing exercise or paying fee,' which favour the University authorities at once granted. There are some curious passages in a letter, dated 11th March, 1701, addressed by Atterbury to Trelawney, during the sitting of the Convocation: 'Doctor Jane has taken the chair in the committee for inspecting books written against the truth of the Christian religion. We sat to-day; and several books were brought in to be censured, and an extract from one Toland's "Christianity not Mysterious" laid before us. Doctor Jane is very hearty in it, and moved that we might sit *de die in diem* till we had finished our business. I bring in, to-morrow, a book of one Craig, a Scotchman, Chaplain to the Bishop of Sarum (Dr. Burnet), to prove by mathematical calculation, that, according to the pretension of the probability of historical evidence, in such a space of time the Christian religion will not be credible. It is dedicated to the Bishop. We have made a previous order that nothing done in this committee shall be divulged till all is finished, and, therefore, I must humbly beg your lordship to keep these particulars secret.'

In the same year he was employed in a revision of the Greek Testament, but we believe this was never edited.

He has been described as a *High-Churchman*. It would be as well, perhaps, to state what Atterbury's idea of a High-Churchman was: it is given us in a



Visitation Charge he delivered to the Clergy in his Archdeaconry in 1703. 'The men who take pleasure in traducing their brethren have endeavoured to expose those of them who appeared steady in this cause under the invidious name of *High-Churchmen*. What they mean by that word I cannot tell! But if an High-Churchman be one who is for keeping up the present ecclesiastical constitution in all its parts, without making any illegal abatements in favour of such as either openly oppose or secretly undermine it; one who, though he lives peaceably with all men of different persuasions and endeavours to win them over by methods of lenity and kindness, yet is not charitable and moderate enough to depart from the establishment—even while it stands fixed by a law—in order to meet them half-way in their opinions and practices; one who thinks the canons and rubric of the Church, and the Acts of Parliament made in favour of it, ought strictly to be observed and kept up to till they shall, upon a prospect of a thorough compliance from those without—if such a case may be supposed—be released, in any respect, by a competent authority—I say, if *this* be the character of an *High-Churchman*, how odious a sound soever that name may carry, I see no reason why any man should be displeased with the title, because *such* an *High-Churchman* is certainly a *good Christian* and a *good Englishman*.'

Queen Anne's accession to the throne was an incident favourable to the High Church party in general and to Atterbury in particular. Her Majesty selected him to be her Chaplain: this in 1702. In May, 1704, he was installed Canon Residentiary of Exeter, and in October of the same year, he was advanced to the Deanery of Carlisle. In 1710 he was busily engaged in assisting Doctor Sacheverell during his trial, and is reputed to have composed the speech delivered by that famous man on the occasion. Prior to what has just been noticed, Atterbury had been appointed a Busby Trustee (he acted in that capacity down to the year 1732, when he was succeeded by the Duke of Newcastle), and Chaplain to the Lord Mayor of London, Sir Thomas Rawlinson; the first, in 1705; the other, in the year following. He was elected, in the year 1710, Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation. Next year his installation as Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, took place; and this was followed in 1713 by his advancement to still higher dignities; Lord Chancellor Harcourt, somewhat against the inclination of Queen Anne, obtaining the Deanery of Westminster for him on the 12th of June, and the Bishopric of Rochester on the 5th of July. As Dean of Christ Church, Atterbury interested himself warmly in the successful training of students who came to Oxford from Westminster; he occupied the post with honour to himself and advantage to Oxford. When he was raised to the Bench, he performed with much zeal and wisdom the Parliamentary duties pertaining to his new office.

When the Queen died, Atterbury took a prominent part in advancing the claims to the throne of the Pretender, and, it is said, abused those of his friends

who would not fall in with his views, 'with many oaths.' The same authority adds that the Bishop 'was accustomed to swear on any strong provocation.'

The new reign was the commencement of a new life in the subject of this sketch; with the accession of George the First, who hated the Bishop, began Atterbury's experience of the bitter side of the picture. When the Archbishop of Canterbury drew up a declaration of the abhorrence with which the Bishops regarded the rebellion in Scotland, Atterbury and his intimate friend Doctor Smalridge were the only members of the Bench who declined to subscribe their names. The Bishop of Rochester also made himself conspicuous against the King by protesting on nearly every occasion against the measures of the Government, notably on the question of the 'Quakers' Bill' in 1721-22.

On the 26th of April, 1722, his wife's death gave him a severe shock. By her he had four children. Of these, Osborn, with the assistance of Walter Titley (who left in his Will, 1,000*l.* to Westminster School, 1,000*l.* to Cambridge University, and 1,000*l.* to Trinity College, Cambridge), who was selected by the Bishop to be his son's 'Help,' was elected 'Head into College,' in 1722, when he was 13 years of age, and left school for Oxford in 1722, the same year as that in which the foundation stone of the new Dormitory at St. Peter's College was laid—a work owing its conception and carrying out chiefly to Bishop Atterbury. 'Alumni' speaks as follows about Osborn Atterbury West: 'A letter from the Bishop, written soon after his son's election to Oxford, expresses great pleasure at Osborn's progress in composition, and also at the dutiful style of his letters. Osborn, however, afterwards offended his father; he fell into great pecuniary difficulties, and, from some cause or other, was forced to quit his Studentship about 1725. It would appear from a passage in the Bishop's letter to Mr. Morice, September 9-18, 1728, that he had been furnished by his father with money to set up as a merchant, but that the money had been misapplied; and in a previous letter to Mrs. Morice, dated August 10-30, in the same year, the Bishop speaks of his son's "perverse nature and ill habits." In December, 1728, by the kindness of Mr. and Mrs. Morice, Osborn went to the East Indies, perhaps in the East India Company's Merchant Service, for Mrs. Morice says that her uncle "gave him five guineas as a present, to encourage him to behave well and mind his business at sea." This uncle, dying in 1731, bequeathed to him the reversion of an estate of 400*l.* a year, to which he succeeded within a few months of his uncle's death. His father, on the other hand, left him nothing. He returned to England in 1732, when he married a Miss Ashworth, and was ordained by his father's antagonist, Bishop Hoadley. [We find that he was Rector of Oxhill, Warwickshire, 1746.] He died in 1752, but his widow survived until 1789. His son, Francis, was elected from Westminster to Christ Church, in 1755.'

(To be continued).

## POETRY.

## A NIGHT RAID.

In the castle hall  
 Silver cups are gleaming,  
 From the marble wall  
 Purple flags are streaming.  
 Knights from many a flask  
 The honied mead are quaffing,  
 And in many a cask  
 The ruddy wine is laughing.  
 In the vaulted hall  
 The minstrel's harp is ringing,  
 And many a baron tall  
 His roundelay is singing.  
 Both to feasting lord and thrall  
 The signs of merriment are clinging.  
 By the castle moat,  
 While the moonbeams quiver,  
 And the night mists float  
 Down the winding river,  
 On a thousand crests  
 Snow-white plumes are dancing,  
 On a thousand breasts  
 Are steel cuirasses glancing.  
 In the pale moonlight  
 Many a sabre flashes,  
 Through the river bright  
 Many a horseman splashes.  
 So, before the close of night,  
 That haughty castle lay in ashes.

T. M.

## School Notes.

Mr. C. Tracey's place in School has been filled by Mr. A. W. Upcott, of Exeter College, Oxford, to whom we offer most hearty welcome.

The examinations for the major candidates resulted as follows :—

Elected to Oxford—

J. B. Hodge.

F. W. Bain.

W. L. Benbow.

Elected to Cambridge—

W. C. Dale.

T. Morison.

H. G. Gwinner.

The Triplett Exhibitions were awarded to W. C. Dale and T. Morison, and a Triplett gratuity was conferred upon H. G. Gwinner. The Examiners were :—Rev. H. L. Thompson, of Christ Church, Oxford ; W. D. Rawlins, Esq., of Trinity College, Cambridge ; and, in Mathematics, W. W. Rouse Ball, Esq., of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Mr. Sloman has kindly promised to present a bat for the highest average obtained in the 'big games.'

Each side must complete an innings, or the game cannot count in reckoning the averages. We take this opportunity of heartily thanking Mr. Sloman for the great interest he has shown in Cricket at Vincent Square, and hope that his efforts will not be without the desired effects.

In consequence of Confirmation, which has been fixed for Saturday, July 1st, the match *v.* Nondescripts cannot be played this year.

We publish a letter from G. H. I., suggesting that a column of *The Elizabethan* be appropriated to *Notes and Queries*, relating to Westminster history and customs. We purpose carrying out the suggestion in our next number in place of 'Epigrams,' which are this month brought up to the present year.

E. P. Guest was a Senior Optime in the Cambridge Mathematical Tripos.

A meeting of the Debating Society was held on Saturday, July 10th, to elect new officers for the short term. The following were chosen :—

J. B. Hodge . . . . *President.*

C. C. J. Webb . . . . *Vice-President.*

A. M. T. Jackson . . . *Secretary.*

G. Ince . . . . . *Treasurer.*

## RACQUETS.

## 'WOODENS.'

For the 'Woodens' this year there were very few entries. The ties were drawn as follows :—

F. W. Bain *v.* A. J. Stanfield.

R. T. Squire *v.* F. T. Higgins.

E. C. Frere *v.* R. Beames.

H. Lawrence a bye.

The play again showed a great falling off, and little interest was taken in the games ; consequently, no true record has been kept. Bain was beaten by Stanfield ; Squire won his tie easily ; and Beames scratched to Frere.

In the second ties, Squire beat Stanfield after two very good games, in which each played their best. Frere was compelled, by leaving, to scratch to Lawrence.

The final tie was easily won by Squire, who defeated Lawrence game-two and game-one.

## 'WIRES.'

For these also the number of entries was very small. The ties were drawn as follows :—

F. W. Bain *v.* F. G. Thorne.

R. T. Squire *v.* F. T. Higgins.

Bain, with some difficulty, beat Thorne, and Squire scratched. The final tie, Higgins *v.* Bain, was scientifically won by Higgins after a very even game.

## CRICKET.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL *v.* LORDS AND COMMONS.

THIS match was played on Saturday, June 17th, and resulted in a most decisive victory for the School by 219 runs. The day began badly for us, and the first three wickets fell for only 11. As soon as Higgins, however, reached the wickets the score began to rise rapidly, the last comer beginning well with two successive fours. Roller, too, kept the field at work, and 60 was up before he was tempted out of his ground by Herbert, and paid the penalty. The bowling was by this time weak, and Dale and Higgins ran the score quickly up, until lunch, when the telegraph board showed 160 for four wickets. On play being resumed, the tens continued to change, and loud cheering greeted the second century. The applause was redoubled when a fiver brought Higgins into three figures. Soon after this Higgins was caught off a fine but misplaced hit in the long field: the retiring batsman's 107 included two fives, 8 fours, 5 threes, and 15 twos. The last wicket had raised the score from 60 to 223, and Higgins had not given a single chance until the last fatal hit. Rogers now joined Dale, and runs came less quickly. Dale was caught at long-on after making 77. Tritton sent some good hits to leg before he was given out l.b.w. After this the wickets fell without much scoring, and our innings closed for the total of 303.

The wicket, which had played excellently through our innings, was somewhat worn when our opponents went in. Tritton bowled remarkably well, and he and Higgins quickly disposed of the enemy, until the Hon. S. Herbert came to the wickets. When the score had reached about 75 a change of bowling was made, time being nearly up. Ten minutes before the time at which it had been agreed to draw stumps, Thorne stumped Herbert, who had made 47 out of the total 84. We append the score:—

## WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

F. G. Thorne, b. Herbert.....	0
A. E. Bedford, b. Grenfell .....	2
G. E. M. Eden, b. Herbert .....	0
F. T. Higgins, ct. Walrond, b. Lord Lewisham ..	107
C. T. Roller, st. Walrond, b. Herbert .....	28
W. C. Dale, ct. Lord Lewisham, b. Herbert ...	77
A. G. L. Rogers, b. Grenfell .....	17
C. B. Tritton, l.b.w. Herbert .....	26
J. M. Dale, b. Herbert.....	7
M. R. Bethune, b. Herbert .....	0
A. J. Stanfield, not out.....	6
Byes 17, leg byes 4, wides 12 .....	33

Total..... 303

## LORDS AND COMMONS.

Viscount Lewisham, b. Tritton .....	4
Lt.-Col. Walrond, b. Higgins .....	1
W. Grenfell, b. Tritton .....	10
W. H. Long, b. Higgins .....	0
R. T. Reid, b. Higgins.....	10
R. K. Causton, ct. Thorne, b. Tritton .....	0
Lord G. Hamilton, ct. Rogers, b. Tritton .....	4

Hon. S. Herbert, st. Thorne, b. Dale .....	47
Hon. St. J. Brodrick, b. Higgins .....	0
Hon. G. Leigh, not out .....	5
Byes 2, l. byes 1 .....	3

Total..... 84

## BOWLING ANALYSIS.

## WESTMINSTER.

	Wides.	Runs.	Wkts.	Overs.	Maidens.
Grenfell .....	5	79	2	21	4
Hon. S. Herbert .....	0	67	7	31.3	8
R. H. Causton .....	3	44	0	11	1
Lord Lewisham .....	0	27	1	8	1
Lord G. Hamilton ..	4	28	0	15	6
Lt.-Col. Walrond ...	0	29	0	9	2

## LORDS AND COMMONS.

C. B. Tritton .....	0	29	4	14	7
F. T. Higgins .....	0	45	4	13	3
W. C. Dale .....	0	7	1	1.4	0
G. E. M. Eden .....	0	0	0	1	1

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL *v.* OLD CARTHUSIANS.

AGAINST the Old Carthusians we suffered a defeat even more severe than that we had inflicted a week before on the Lords and Commons. The wicket was very bumpy, and the fielding of our opponents good; but their bowling was certainly not much harder than that we had found so easy. Nevertheless, our Eleven utterly collapsed, and in divers manners all the wickets fell for only 43 runs.

Accordingly we took the field, and Higgins and Tritton were appointed to dispose of E. O. Powell and B. Ellis as soon as possible; for we were without the services of Eden and Healey, the two who had bowled with most success against Old Westminsters, and had little change bowling. Powell continued to score, though not playing faultlessly, and, accompanied by H. G. Jeaffreson, sent the score up to 86. Here a mistake occurred between the two batsmen, and Powell was thrown out by Bethune. Soon after Lewis had joined Jeaffreson, Thorne at the wicket received a severe blow on the left temple from a fast ball of Higgins', but pluckily determined to go on playing. So far Higgins and Tritton had continued to bowl, but at 90 a change was made and Tritton was replaced by Roller, whilst Dale took the ball from Higgins. Neither of the new bowlers being successful, the other two once more began to bowl. Several catches at the wicket off Tritton's bowling were missed, but this would not probably have been the case had the wicket keeper not been bothered by a sore head and the bumpy ground. Soon, however, Tritton changed ends, and Dale again tried left-hand slows. At length Jeaffreson was smartly caught by Hoskins, and Lewis was leg before to Dale. But another change was soon needed, and Higgins bowled with great success, taking three wickets in two overs. Prinsep and Searle getting in together made a long stand, and the former had made 52 before Dale dismissed him. Tritton, who had been bowling very steadily all through, but with exceedingly bad fortune, now caused Searle to retire. A shooter sent Wake



back to the tent after he had made 23, and at last the innings closed for 305.

The School now went in a second time, but fared no better than they had done before, until Higgins went in. His brilliant innings made up of a six, 3 fours, 3 threes, and a like number of two's, had just ended, when the time arranged for ending play arrived, leaving us four more wickets to fall and the score at 62, as the score shows.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

F. G. Thorne, run out.....	6	b. Fisher .....	5
A. E. Bedford, b. Vincent	8	b. Fisher .....	2
C. B. Tritton, ct. Wake, b. Lewis.....	0	b. Fisher .....	7
C. T. Roller, l.b.w. Vincent	0	b. Prinsep.....	0
F. T. Higgins, l.b.w. Vincent .....	1	c. Wake, b. Fisher .....	35
W. C. Dale, c. Vincent, b. Lewis.....	5	b. Fisher .....	0
A. G. L. Rogers, c. Ellis, b. Lewis .....	0	l.b.w. Fisher.....	2
J. M. Dale, not out.....	3	not out .....	0
A. J. Stanfield, b. Lewis...	0		
M. R. Bethune, st. Connell, b. Fisher .....	9		
H. Hoskins, b. Fisher.....	0		
Extras—II			
Total.....	43	Total.....	62

OLD CARTHUSIANS.

E. O. Powell, run out .....	55
B. Ellis, l.b.w. Higgins .....	5
H. G. Jeaffreson, c. Hoskins, b. Dale .....	63
W. E. Lewis, l.b.w. Dale .....	36
J. Vincent, b. Higgins .....	8
A. R. Connell, b. Higgins.....	2
E. Fisher, c. J. M. Dale, b. Higgins .....	8
J. F. Prinsep, b. Dale .....	52
G. Searle, c. Hoskins, b. Tritton .....	30
A. J. Wake, b. Dale .....	23
G. E. Smythe, not out .....	0
Byes 13, leg byes 5, wides 4, no ball 1	
Total.....	305

BOWLING ANALYSIS.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

First Innings.	Wides.	No Balls.	Runs.	Wkts.	Overs.	Mdns.
J. Vincent .....	0	0	14	3	10	4
W. E. Lewis.....	0	0	18	4	9	4
E. Fisher .....	2	0	0	2	1	1
Second Innings.						
J. Vincent .....	0	0	18	0	6	1
E. Fisher .....	0	0	14	6	10.4	6
J. F. Prinsep.....	0	0	19	1	5	0

OLD CARTHUSIANS.

C. B. Tritton.....	0	0	78	1	33	7
F. T. Higgins ...	0	0	81	4	42	4
W. C. Dale .....	2	1	97	4	21	1
C. T. Roller .....	2	0	12	0	4	2
M. R. Bethune ...	0	0	14	0	2	0

EPIGRAMS.

THE Epigrams this year spoken as usual at the Election dinner were, perhaps, chiefly remarkable for their paucity, as they were considerably dimi-

nished in number from those of previous years; but these few, we think, were certainly up to the usual standard as far as quality is concerned; moreover, although the ingenuity of the Q.S.S. themselves was not productive of very many 'Auctore' epigrams, yet the quality of these also amply made up for their small quantity, they being decidedly among the best of the evening. The 'theses' were 'Eodem cogimur' and 'Lene tormentum.'

The pun in the first one we select was given with great emphasis, as was obviously intended by the author :

Though we our heads full high may raise,  
And great Eliza's bounty praise,  
When by examiners oppressed,  
We're but a bored School, at the best.

The heading of the following consists of the solitary word 'Sausages,' which is rendered into Latin by the well (?) authenticated word 'botulus' :

Fata manent eadem cunctos felesque canesque ;  
Defuncto botulus cuique suillus adest.

Of course one could not expect that the Clôture question would refrain from such an opportunity of displaying itself :

Why abroad for examples of clôture roam  
When its lesson is taught to the House by the Home ?  
For what married M.P. can afford to laugh  
At the evident sense of his better half ?

Doubtless music hath charms, but this is one of those numerous cases when distance considerably lends enchantment to the sound :

Love and peace can dwell in a cottage that's thatched,  
Howe'er scanty the dinner may be ;  
But they'd starve in a villa that's semi-detached,  
With a neighbour's piano for-te.  
When practice, which never makes perfect, prevails,  
And despite all we do to prevent 'em,  
Ever in the ascendant are Virgo and Scales,  
'Tis by no means a lene tormentum.

The well-worn subject of æstheticism seems to be an endless topic for enlargement upon :

Palliduli pueri languescentesque puellae,  
Culturæ proles desidiosa novae,  
Deseruere Jovem, divinam aesthesin adorant,  
Et sua permittit numina laude colunt.  
Aurea caesaries illis, sublustrior artus  
Graecorum velat palla imitata modum.  
Solis amant flores ; manibus dant lilia plenis ;  
Verbaque sollenni mystica voce tonant.  
Perniciosa seges ! melior cultura recursans  
Spinarum ex agris vellat id omne genus.

We doubt the truth of the statement made in the last two lines of the following :

Per tubulum suadent comites me ducere fumum  
Quo placidus gratâ nempe quiete fruar.  
Protinus at tristis male torquet nausea ventrem ;  
'Noxiaque,' exclamo, 'Niciotana, vale !'

The next one speaks for itself :

A Westminster fellow, well-trained, will repel a  
Hat as a bore, much more an umbrella ;  
But when a Maclean's on the head to be beaten,  
We envy the chance to luxurious Eton.

The next three are 'Auctore' epigrams, and, we think, those who understand them will agree with us in our statement that their quality amply makes up for their quantity; the first relates to college duties:

Eheu! nunc etiam taedet meminisse, quot olim  
Functus sim miseris Junior officiiis.  
Sorte malâ jussus scalis considerare 'Custos';  
Undique et assidue pervolitare 'Mon. Os.'  
Mox cura e somno Seniores mane ciere,  
Omnino extinctos aut refovere focos.  
Denique ut infandum sit opus renovare dolorem,  
Pro bene perfecto munere virga fuit.

'On the prospect of a scarcity of fags in College:'

πάλλ' ὑμεῖς, ἔρχοντες, ἐμοὶ κακὰ μέλλει' ἐποσειν  
παῖσι τε τούτω ταχέως δάμ' ἐξελευσομένοισι.  
νῦν γὰρ δὴ δύο παῖδες ἐμοὶ πάρα, πρίνινοι ἀμφώ,  
οἳ γε δὴ ὄντες ἐμοὶ προσπιλοῦσι μόνω.  
ἕστερον αὐτε βοῶντί μοι οὐδ' εἰς "ἔρχομαι" ἄσσει  
πλήν γε μέρος σμικροῦ μεираκιου τὸ τρίτου.

It is hardly necessary, we presume, to draw attention to the pun in the last line of the following on the Pancake 'Greeze':

Θαυμάσιόν γ' Ἐπίπαστον ὕτανπερ χειρὶ παχείῃ  
Δούλοισι Ἰωάννης ἐν μεγάροισι βάλῃ  
Δεινὸν ἄμοι παῖδες φερόμεσθ' ὀπισμῶ ἅπαντες  
Καὶ τύψῃ ἀντιτύψῃ καὶ βοῇ ἀμφιλαφεῖ.  
'Ἄλλ' αἰὶνὸν μετ' ἀγῶνα κεδασθέντων κατὰ δῖφρους  
Σχισθειῶν χλαμύδων καὶ τέλοσ ἐστὶ πόνω.  
'Ἦν δὲ τύχῃ τις ἔχεσθαι βλον διὰ πάντ' Ἐπιπαστου,  
Παγκρακον ἀντὶ κακῶσ καὶ κλέος ἐκφέρεται.

We wind up naturally with the Clôture:

The plan which Ministers propose  
Has common sense authority,  
Who should betake themselves to close,  
If not a bare majority?  
We're not surprised at their confessing,  
Such a condition wants redressing.

## Our Contemporaries.

WE beg to acknowledge the receipt of *Our School Times* (2), *The Taylorian*, *The Rossallian*, *The Blue*, *The Wellingtonian* (2), *The Meteor* (2), *The Tonbridgian*, *The Laxtonian*, *The Newtonian* (2), *The Durham University Journal*, *The Malvernian*, *The Blundellian*, *The Felstedian*, *The King's College Magazine*, *The Carthusian*, *The Wykehamist*, *The Marlburian* (2), *The Berkhamstedian* (2), *The Ousel*, *The Fettesian*, *The Cranleigh School Magazine*, *The Bloxamist*, *The Geelong Quarterly*, and *The Wesley Chronicle*.

Cricket! Cricket! Cricket! is the mainstay of our contemporaries at this time of year, and we are dazzled successively by Brown's 'Century,' Jones' 'hat trick,' and 'that wonderful catch at square-leg.'

*Our School Times* begins: 'How short a time it seems since the beginning of the term. We can hardly realise that we have been back now almost five months.' How fond of work the Irish must be. Four columns of this entertaining periodical are devoted to an account of their distribution of prizes—No! not athletic. Nine more to 'An Address by Dr. Hime, &c. &c.' No wonder that their balance-sheet shows thirty shillings in hand, and liabilities to the amount of about fifteen pounds.

A correspondent of *The Meteor* says that seven or eight years ago 'the 'Pontines' was the only 'Three Belows' ground.' What a pretty state of things! Another pens the

following mysterious passage: 'Swimming club drawers, as often as not, tally with a diseased self-conceit.'

*The Wesley College Chronicle* has a poem entitled 'The Voyage of the Mail Steamer,' doubly amusing to those who have had the luck to read 'The Voyage of Maeldune.' Read this:—

'Pale faces a moment ooked forth, and with loathing they  
glanced at the fare,  
And they shrank back into the darkness, and revelled in  
horrors there.'

Cricket reporters have always been allowed license, but a 'willow-wielder' is rather strong. Here is a puzzle. Given, photographs of mother and sister, photograph of subject at the age of two years, and her dress and ornaments, to produce her portrait at the age of thirteen. This feat has been successfully accomplished by the Wesley College drawing-master.

*The Tonbridgian* prints an article on the old story, 'A Day of my Life at — Tonbridge,' as it happens to be in this instance, including the very ancient jests concerning the morning toilet.

*The Carthusian* commences a series of 'Amateur Professionals' by the 'Cricket Professional,' an amusing individual, who has Lillywhite's Annual by heart, and is always making 'drives for six' with his walking-stick, and 'putting down' wickets which exist but in his imagination. Unfortunately it is not terse enough to quote in any portion. The quarter mile was done at Charterhouse in 55½ secs.

*The Berkhamstedian* observes that May 24th was the Queen's birthday. We can also inform him that on the 28th, in 1878, Earl Russell died, and that June 18th was the anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo; but the connection of any of the three facts with a school magazine is not at first sight obvious.

*The Newtonian* is interesting, as usual. The following seems worth transcribing:—

*Temporibus geminis canebat sparsa senectus,  
Insonitque flagello,  
Nimium gaudens popularibus auris:  
Attonitæ stebant demisso crine ministræ;*

of which the English reads:—

*The stinky old man was singing in double time,  
And sounded with the flageolet,  
Delighting too much in popular airs:  
The astonished minstrels fled with long hair.*

A suggestion appears to the effect that the license to write anonymously may perhaps act as a stimulus. This is much more sensible than the rigmarole about 'a guarantee of good faith,' which appears in most of our contemporaries. Do we not know that

'A rose  
By any other name would smell as sweet?'

## Correspondence.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—A query was sent to your paper some little time since (*see ante*, p. 172) on the subject of rooms being reserved in the various school-houses as a sanatorium for the boys in college in case of illness. This has not yet been answered, but, hoping that it will be eventually, I venture to send some further queries on somewhat the same subject.

In a magazine for last month I came across this paragraph:—'A large rambling old mansion at Chiswick, sometimes known as the "Pest House," and used for centuries as a sanatorium for the scholars of Westminster School, has lately been demolished. The building was long occupied as the printing office of Messrs Whittingham and Co., and gave its name to the Chiswick Press.'



Previously to reading the above paragraph, I was entirely ignorant that a sanatorium for the school ever existed at Chiswick, so I referred to several books on Westminster that I had at hand, but which were, alas! only too few, for further particulars, and the following are the facts I could find, and to these you notice I have added a few queries.

This 'rambling old mansion' apparently came into the possession of the school in the reign of Elizabeth, being purchased by Dean Goodman, in order that the prebendaries, masters, and scholars might take refuge therein, in case any contagious disease reached Westminster. When Dean Goodman acquired this property, which was then called the 'College House,' he held the prebend of Chiswick, and is said to have 'planted a row of elm-trees there with his own hands, some of which are said to be still standing,' i.e. 1867. Can anyone refute or confirm this? According to Lysons it is doubtful whether the school was ever removed to Chiswick since the time of Dr. Busby, but he records that 'he (Busby) resided there with some of the scholars in the year 1657.' Can any of your readers give me any information as to whether it has been used since Busby's time, and who was the last to frequent it? It was occasionally also the summer resort of Westminster head-masters, being occupied by Drs. Friend and Nicoll, who were head-masters in 1711 and 1733 respectively; and in 1853 it became the property of Messrs Whittingham & Co. What is known of it between 1733 and 1853? Did it cease to be school property in 1853, or was it sold previously, and if so, when?

Faulkner, in his 'History and Antiquities of Chiswick,' says that 'to this day a piece of ground is reserved in the lease to the sub-lessee as a *play-place* for the scholars.' Was this piece of land so reserved ever used as a *play-place* for the school? The name 'Pest House' I presume was given to this house from the fact of its being bought as a retreat when the pestilential plague visited London, a not uncommon thing in those days, but happily not known now. Is this presumption correct? It is pleasant to know the history of one's old school, and its belongings, and especially of any that have become things of the past; and I shall be glad to learn anything more of the house in question than is here mentioned, as also to have the above queries answered. I must offer my apologies for digressing here, but while on the question of queries, I should like to mention that I think it would be a good thing to have a sort of 'Query' column in *The Elizabethan*, on subjects which relate to the school.

It has often been remarked, I believe, in the columns of your paper, that the subjects are too limited to elicit many letters or articles from those in the school.

If a 'Query' column was started, surely this would open out a large field of research and inquiry for those who would take the trouble to do so; and as regards those who would not, their wants, I may say, are beneath consideration. Of course it would also include 'Notes' as well. As in the *Provincial Press*, a large portion of which have started 'Notes and Queries' columns, it has proved a success, so I hope, if one is started at Westminster, the result will be the same, and perchance it may be the means of increasing the circulation of *The Elizabethan*.

In the event of one being started, I would suggest the following proverb as a suitable motto, viz., 'Let nothing be lost that it is possible to find by diligent search.'

If this motto was adopted and acted up to, the result could not be but satisfactory to all concerned.

Hoping you will give this your kind consideration and favour me by publishing it in your columns,

I am, dear Sir,  
Yours truly,  
G. H. I.

#### 'TUNING UP.'

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

SIR,—As a penitent who wishes to do a public penance, I ask you to lend me a corner of your sheet. For the eminent author of 'Eminent Old Westminsters' has convicted me, to his own satisfaction, of libel, of falsehood, and of many other

such notorious sins. He has swooped down upon me, like an eagle on a lamb, and so mauled me, and torn me with his indignant beak, that even now I have scarcely breath to reply. He has accused me of attempted wit and of ineffectual sarcasm, and has dubbed me 'a literary Don Quixote,' which I take to mean that I have charged a literary windmill, or perhaps a windbag. For all this my grief is great; and not because I have offended your contributor, for that he assures me I have failed to do. I have only succeeded, as he puts it, 'in staining my own fingers.' Alas! I know myself guilty of worse, and hence my sorrow!

For I have delayed by two months the publication of No. 21 of his series of 'Eminent O.W.W.'; and this is no venial crime. Even if your readers (I ask their pity) should be partly consoled by the powerful Philippic that took its place last May, how shall I make amends to those poor souls in Hades, who were next to be immortalised by his prophetic pen? Fancy Cowper, and Locke, and Herbert, still waiting, as they have waited so long, to be grouped in spiritual brotherhood with Lord Albemarle and Sir Watkin; and to think that it is my reckless act which has put off for months the moment of felicity! How will they pardon me, 'the thoughtless, amateur, critical scribbler'? How shall I appease these imperial spirits?

Having confessed my faults, I would say a few words in self-defence. Few will remember my humble letter of April; but its point was simple. It was an appeal to O.W.W. to support *The Elizabethan*, on the plea of the excellence of the matter which *The Elizabethan* supplied. As an example of what we should lose, if it perished, I cited your contributor's biographies. Now, surely, that was not to denounce him. 'Where should we go,' I said, 'for the scathing sarcasm of the reviewer of "Our Contemporaries," or for the prattling Autobiography of the biographer of Eminent O.W.W.?' This was praise, though in the latter case praise in the shape of ignorance; for I did not then know that there were two other published works by the same author, to which, falling *The Elizabethan*, we might go. Now our ignorance is enlightened, and praise interrogative is turned into praise positive. But, perhaps, he was nettled by the terms in which his work was singled out for praise. In that case he does not know the imperishable value of autobiography, especially of that guileless kind which may well be denoted 'prattling.' And yet he must know it; for we have his own word for it, that he has already completed—over and above the present work—'two separate volumes of an autobiographical character.'

Two separate volumes! May we all live to read them! If only to know completely what we already know in part. For though I maintain that these biographies contain hints and glimpses of their author's own biography, yet I allow that the hints are scattered, and the glimpses fragmentary. We have learned a little, but not all. We know, for instance, that the author's first name is Philip—'My name, Sir, is Philip,' were, he avers, the momentous words which precluded the drama of his school life—that he has no less than 'three other names,' that he is allied to both the Salusbury family and the Henry family; that he has been himself 'a wearer of the red jacket'; and, as we read later, has served 'on the staff of a Russian General in a recent war'—all honour to his red coat!—and there discourses on Balaclava. Among things we do not know is the name of his great-aunt's cat. But, to mark the date of his boyhood, two of his schoolfellows find their names enshrined in his pages: one Fellowes, and the other Wynn.

Of his pedigree, too, we glean some interesting information. 'The first Salusbury,' he sings, 'was Prince Adam.' Now if this is our old friend Father Adam, the fact is curious; for by a coincidence he is reputed to have been also ancestor to the Fiddlestickses. But he is apparently another, for we read afterwards 'that he came over to England in the train of the Norman William'—probably a special train.

We learn further 'that the Salusbury family became possessors of enormous estates in Wales and elsewhere'; which estates, it is harrowing to hear, have passed away now into other hands.

Your contributor, however, with admirable spirit, can still cry jubilantly: 'I am a Welshman, proud of my country, proud of my countrymen, proud of my history, proud of Sir Watkin.'

So much for our author's extraction.

Now for his own personality, where we depend entirely on his candour. 'So far from being captain of the School,' we read it with regret, 'I, namesake and unworthy descendant of the great divine (Philip Henry), was never lag.' Then he adds, in a strain that is almost Pauline, 'I many times received correction with the rod.' Such words lead us to look involuntarily for the familiar 'I speak as a fool'; but here there is no such confession of weakness. His youthful peccadilloes, however, were undoubtedly numerous, and there is no reason to think he has forgotten 'the chastening discipline of the rod.' But here again, on this essential point, the history is provokingly imperfect; for while we may guess that it was his bitter fate to suffer up-school under Dr. Scott, as he phrases it, 'alas! too often,' we have yet to learn, and we dare not guess, on precisely how many occasions he accompanied that eminent man into the library for purposes other than study. But for this we must wait—with as little impatience as possible—for one of 'the two separate volumes of an autobiographical character.'

I cannot end without trying to administer comfort to your critic-stung contributor. And with his wide knowledge of modern letters, and his fine taste, it will please him, I know, to find an historic parallel to his own case among the giants of recent literature. His prototype then is Carlyle, who had a pill to swallow that was hardly more palatable. We all know the story of the publication of Sartor: how Carlyle, like your contributor, prevailed on an editor's kindness to publish his early work in monthly instalments; and how the readers of *Fraser* were blind to the beauties of budding genius, just as one at least of the readers of *The Elizabethan* has seemed blind to your contributor's genius. But the historian of O.W.W. fared better than Carlyle; for whereas the ill-natured critics then wrote to the editor, and threatened to withdraw their subscriptions, if the budding genius was not incontinently crushed, the better-natured critic of to-day wrote to you, Sir, and appealed to the public to increase their subscriptions, lest an untoward calamity might befall, and a full-blown genius should be discouraged. What comfort had Carlyle? This, that another young author—Emerson—wrote in the opposite spirit to the editor, warmly welcoming Carlyle's articles.

And the parallel holds here; for hardly had you, Sir, ceased to smile at my supposed strictures on your contributor, than you received a certificate of the author's merit, not from any young American of rising genius, but from a man of recognised genius,

the outraged author himself. Nor is anyone more competent than he to testify to his own abilities.

So, Mr. Editor, I am glad that your mind is set at ease, and your confidence in your contributor re-established. May no random writer, holding views quite peculiar to himself, trouble you again, as I have troubled you, with his 'abortion of ideas.' Let many names be added to the deathless roll of 'Eminent O.W.W.'

And now, since I am not such a rapid writer as your contributor boasts to be, nor can I hope that my lumbering style will beguile your readers so easily as he with his pungent wit, I beg to withdraw from the scene, not without apologies for raising such a storm in a tea-cup. I have done my penance; I have kissed the dust; I have tried to explain my joke. It is time that this correspondence should close. For if another letter from another hand should follow this, and if the public should be called upon to arbitrate between us, it might be—to the humiliation of one of us—that, when they should be proclaiming the victor, they would only ejaculate

FIDDESTICKS.

#### NOTICES.

All contributions for the August number of *The Elizabethan* must be sent in before July 17, to the Editor, St. Peter's College, Westminster.

All other communications must be addressed to the Secretary of *The Elizabethan*, St. Peter's College, Westminster, and on no account to the Editor or printers.

The yearly subscription to *The Elizabethan* is 4s. It is requested that all subscriptions now falling due, or not yet paid up, should be forwarded to C. C. J. WEBB, Treasurer of *The Elizabethan*. Post Office Orders to be made payable at the Victoria Mansions Post Office, Victoria Street. Subscribers resident at Oxford can pay their subscriptions to W. A. PECK, Esq., Christ Church, Oxford.

Subscribers are requested to notify any change of address to the Secretary.

The Editor is not responsible for the opinions of his correspondents.

Floreat.