



# Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

VINDICIÆ WYKEHAMICÆ;

OR, A

*Vindication of Winchester College,*

IN A LETTER TO

HENRY BROUGHAM, ESQ.



**VINDICIÆ WYKEHAMICÆ;**

OR, A

*Vindication of Winchester College:*

IN A LETTER TO

**HENRY BROUGHAM, ESQ;**

OCCASIONED BY HIS

LETTER TO SIR SAMUEL ROMILLY,

ON

**Charitable Abuses.**

---

BY THE

**REV. W. L. BOWLES.**

---

PRINTED BY

**RICHARD CRUTTWELL, ST. JAMES'S-STREET, BATH;**

AND SOLD BY

**LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN,  
PATER-NOSTER-RROW, LONDON.**

1818.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

*THE* Writer of these Observations was entirely ignorant, when they were sent to the press, that the subject had been undertaken by the Rev. Mr. CLARKE, a Fellow of Winchester, whose examination by Mr. BROUGHAM is before the Public.

Had this circumstance been known previously to the sheets being printed, the vindication would have been left to one, who, having access to the Statutes of the College, was more capable of doing it justice. To him I must leave those points which his knowledge of the Statutes can best explain.: but I hope what is here offered will dispose the public mind to a dispassionate view of the subject.



---

---

## A LETTER, &c.



SIR,

**I**F I presume most respectfully to recall your attention to some points, connected with the enquiry into the Abuses of Public Charities, which, to judge from your letter to Sir Samuel Romilly, I think you have neither seen yourself, nor placed before the public in a just light; I hope you will not consider my addressing you on the subject, as arising either from want of proper deference to yourself, or a disposition in the remotest degree adverse to the great and benevolent undertaking in which you are engaged.

The prominent and active part you have taken, in dragging into light concealed frauds, and in pursuing, both with zeal and firmness, the great object of enquiring into the abuses of Public

Charities, does you honour as a man, a legislator, and **A CHRISTIAN**; and I believe there are few, (except such as may be implicated,) who are not interested in the cause, if more silently, yet not less ardently or anxiously, than yourself.

You have acknowledged the promptitude and alacrity with which the **PAROCHIAL CLERGY**, as a body, have answered all enquiries transmitted to them, respecting the existence and administration of Charities, in the places where they reside. But in your examination of some gentlemen of this valuable class in society, connected with the large establishments of public education, may I be permitted to ask, whether you have entered on the enquiry, as far as these schools are concerned, with a fair, dispassionate view of the subject, and without predetermined opinions, or partial bias?

Your letter to Sir Samuel Romilly is before the public; and although I would not detract from the candour which distinguishes those parts in which you speak of men of different political views from your own; I am almost tempted to believe, that when our great national institutions of public education are the subject, *that* spirit of impartiality and candour forsakes you.

As some misunderstanding seems to have gained ground, and as a very great share of odium, on account of the language you have

held, is likely to fall with full weight on those establishments, which I verily believe *least deserve* the imputation; may I venture to solicit your pardon, whilst I call your attention to some circumstances, from which it appears to me you have misunderstood the nature, intention, and character of those munificent national foundations.

In the first place, when there were many instances of most flagrant and gross delinquency in the abuse of *public trusts*, it seems extraordinary, that those venerable institutions on which no particular obloquy had hitherto been cast, (however they may have been assailed, as they always will be, in an age tending to fanatic feelings,) should be brought into the **VERY VAN**, if I may say so, of inquisitorial scrutiny; as if the front of their offending had been the most conspicuous, and their abuses most flagrant.

Why was this? Could it be intended, when the public mind was excited to a state of irritation, and when an idea had gone forth of the poor being robbed, that they should be led to believe that even the places destined by ancient piety and charity for their especial advantage had been unjustly wrested from them; and that thus a vague feeling of some monstrous misapplication and fraud should be studiously kept alive against these establishments in particular?



When the enquiry was first begun, every honest and independent heart was with you: "They wished you good luck in the name of the LORD;" and the whole nation hailed you, not as the orator of a political party, but as the great and noble defender of the cause of humanity, in which all minor feelings were merged and lost.

But when ingenuous minds observed how eagerly you seemed to fix your first stern look on those institutions, which they had regarded with well-founded, or, if you please, "romantic," attachment;—when they remarked gentlemen and scholars, as well educated as yourself, subjected to a mode of sarcastic scrutiny, as if they stood before the Attorney-General Noy, in the Star-Chamber of Charles the First; or rather like the students of Oxford, at the inquisitorial visitation of the Earl of Pembroke, under Cromwell;—when eagerly pouncing (as it were) on these great objects, you almost seemed to verify the proverb,\* if not that part of it, *dat veniam corvis*, at least that in which it is said, "*vexat censura COLUMBAS*;" (for in comparison with some of the grosser abuses of charity, the public schools may be considered as "doves" compared with "*vultures*;" ) then it was the dispassionate and well-informed less readily went with you. Nay worse; for, if it was then, and not

\* "*Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura COLUMBAS.*"

till then, that the Government turned round, and, as you complain, not only in part defeated your plans, but, passing by the honourable services of such characters as the Marquis of Lansdowne and the Bishop of London, absolutely substituted some who had been *unfriendly* to the cause in general; if they dared to add one more *abuse* to those already existing, by giving large salaries to their friends, to undertake what they had no wish should be undertaken; if they had thus sought to turn into the greatest ABUSE the very investigation of ABUSES; if it were in consequence ordered, that “none shall be asked QUESTIONS without THEIR OWN CONSENT;” and the measure, according to your opinion, in great degree thus rendered ineffectual; may it not in some degree be said that the blame lies ON THE CONDUCT OF ITS AUTHOR!

Before I speak more particularly of the points relating to our great establishments of education, on account of which I have taken the liberty of publicly addressing you, allow me to say, that those who have received an education at either of our Universities, and who perhaps have been sent there from some of our great public schools, cannot forget, that these illustrious seats of learning, for many years, had been objects of invidious but impotent attack

in a literary journal, with which, it is generally understood, you were connected.

Those attacks, particularly on the University of Oxford, were repelled by a scholar and a gentleman, now one of the greatest ornaments of that University, in an answer equally convincing and dignified, worthy the cause and the place.

All the world had admired the caustic satire and sonorous declamation of the Edinburgh Review. Few considered how many positions, with a parade of literary dictatorship, were confidently advanced, which could not bear the discussion of a man of sound judgment, or correct intelligence. Nevertheless, all tongues repeated, "How clever!" and all eyes were turned to admire the dazzling brilliancy of sarcasm, to which an obnoxious and shrinking author was exposed; whilst, on the other hand, not judicious praise, but fulsome adulation, was showered on some favoured bard, or some sententious northern metaphysician.

But, alas, "all these things availed nothing," while the illustrious seats of learning towered pre-eminent in a neighbouring country. Sister Peg,\* with all her real talents, (and should envy,

"Seek from her brows the wreath to tear,  
"England would labour to replace it there,")

\* Scotland.

ceased not to make a kind of angry comparison, and was continually casting a splenetic look, not without some "anile" scolding, on her brother John Bull's blue-schools.†

Not only the Universities were the theme of repeated calumnies, but the most distinguished public schools were arraigned with a particular obloquy, as if scarce any eminently wise and good of their generation were indebted to these seats of education for their wisdom or virtue. A writer of an article against them, in this Journal, not shrouding his arguments in specious generalities, had the hardihood, with some insidiousness, to appeal to untoward facts. The system of education, to which England had justly been partial, was condemned by negative inference, as having reared scarce any of the most eminent poets, divines, or statesmen, whose names crowd the pages of her history. The writer's challenge was accepted, and answered by an appeal to that very test he had proposed.

Will not the reader smile, when, among the great names adduced to prove the superiority of *private education*, he finds the name of Ben Johnson, as a poet, and Sherlock as a divine; one of whom, almost every one knows, was educated at *Westminster*, and the other at *Eton*. *Ex pede Herculem*. I shall add one

† See History of John Bull.

specimen from an essay, which was first published in the quarterly *Classical Journal*, in which a complete answer is given to this solemn enumeration of poets, warriors, divines, statesmen, actors, painters, and philosophers, who attained their eminence without being indebted to public schools.† When these things are put together, it does appear extraordinary that an Enquiry concerning the Abuses of Charity should be almost commenced, by the public attention being called to these institutions, on

† “ The case is directly the reverse with another most eminent character, placed against Public Schools,—Ben Johnson. In opposition to Shakespeare, he stands, I confess, the most consummate proof of the force of education. In native gifts he was, no doubt, far below Shakespeare; but education and learning seem in him to run the race with genius, and unite to exhibit to after-ages one of the most striking instances of their effects. In point of poetical imagery and wildness of fancy, let the reader compare, with this view, the songs of the witches in Johnson’s *Mask*, and then in Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*. Ben Johnson, therefore, but not Shakespeare, would appear to be a splendid example, as far as poetry is concerned, against Public Schools. I am inclined, however, to suspect that the reviewer is not very intimately acquainted with the works of this distinguished writer: I will therefore call his attention to the following “ Epigram,” as it is called.

“ TO WILLIAM CAMDEN.

“ Camden, most reverend head, to whom I owe  
 “ *All that I am in arts, all that I know,*  
 “ (How nothing’s that!) to whom my country owes  
 “ The great renown and name wherewith she goes:  
 “ Than Thee the age sees not that thing more grave,  
 “ More high, more holy, that she more would crave.  
 “ What name, what skill, what faith, hast thou in things,  
 “ What sight in searching the most antique springs!

which the least suspicion hitherto had rested of any remarkable abuse; and that this enquiry should be conducted in no very courtly manner, by a writer in that very Review, the attacks of which had been so constantly, but impotently, directed against them.

Be this as it may; when it was expected that those abuses of Charity Schools would be first

“ What weight, and what authority in speech!  
 “ More scarce can make that doubt, but thou canst teach.  
 “ Pardon free truth, and let thy modesty,  
 “ Which conquers all, be once o’ercome by Thee.  
 “ Many of thine this better could than I:  
 “ But for *their powers* accept my piety!

“ Now as the critic may know as little of this William Camden, as he seems to do of Ben Johnson; it may be proper to acquaint him, that this WILLIAM CAMDEN was the author of a book called “ Britannia,” of “ Remains concerning Britain,” and of “ Annals of Queen Elizabeth;” and that, moreover, HE WAS HEAD MASTER OF WESTMINSTER SCHOOL: under whom, at that same school, was educated THIS IDENTICAL BEN JOHNSON. It is probable that the critic may not have read so much of Ben Johnson as to have seen this “ Epigram;” yet had he but opened the first page, the following remarkable and decisive words would have stared him in the face, in the dedication to Camden: ‘ I am none of those, who can suffer the benefits conferred upon my youth to perish with my age—I pray you to accept this, such, wherein neither the confession of my manners shall make you blush, nor of my studies repent you to have been the *instructor* !!!’

“ Who will not be astonished at such ignorance, such impudent ignorance! The writer has committed himself in this instance, as in others, by an inaccuracy the more unpardonable, since Ben Johnson is himself precisely such a character, as in estimating the comparative merits of schools, so far as his own art and learning are concerned, would turn the scale.”—*Answer to an Attack of Public Schools, in the Edinburgh Review.*

pointed out to the indignation of the public, where a less number than that which the founders had appointed, was educated; or where the funds set apart for this end were notoriously absorbed, or grasped by the hand of some unfeeling monopolist; when it was expected that the merited odium would justly be cast on such gross and glaring perversions; suddenly we find those institutions the objects of attack, which stood venerable from time, and illustrious in the eye of day, where no particular abuses were alleged; and which were still, year by year, pouring into cultivated community their liberal, learned, and accomplished sons, *velut ex equo Trojano meros principes!*\*

If this was a kind of corroboration of the suspicion, with which some regarded the views of the man most active in the Committee of Education, certainly the very mode in which the examination was proceeded in, tended to keep alive this suspicion. Begging the reader not to forget these circumstances, I shall now turn to your Letter; and, in answer to some objections, I shall speak of one of those seats of education, to which I am indebted for most of that knowledge (as little as it may be) which I possess. I allude to WINCHESTER COLLEGE. If I shall be able to

\* Applied to Winchester College, by the Monthly Review, in 1786, I believe.

prove, that you have mistaken the objects of that illustrious charity; that you have pursued an erroneous mode of construction; that you have attributed abuses which do not exist; have exaggerated some objections; and even misunderstood the language of the statutes to which you appeal; I trust the meditated blow which has been aimed at all similar establishments, may lose somewhat of its direction and force.

It seems evident from your letter, that you consider the bounty of the munificent Founder of Winchester, as diverted from its object, the "poor and indigent," and applied to enrich the Wardens and Fellows, whom you appear to place in the light of robbers of the poor! You therefore cite the words of the statute of the Founder, "*Pauperes et indigentes scholares*;" literally seeming to consider the word *pauperes* the same as is used to designate "paupers" at our Quarter-Sessions!

Now, the public may, perhaps, remember a pointed and decisive observation of your own, by which you confounded the arguments of some of the ignorant or unprincipled defenders of Universal Suffrage, quoting **MAGNA CHARTA** (to which they foolishly appealed) against themselves. The beginning of that material clause in the charter to which you



referred, you justly said contained **THREE** Latin words—*Nullus—Liber—Homo*.

The *liberi* homines were indeed very few, in those blissful times, in comparison of the *villani, cotelarii, &c.*

Allow me to use the same mode of argument towards yourself. The sentence "*pauperes et indigentes scholares*," (besides the "*et*," ) consists of **THREE WORDS—pauperes—indigentes—scholares—not pauperes et indigentes, but pauperes et indigentes scholares.** You, Sir, leave out "*scholares*," and say "poor and indigent." And who were the **SCHOLARES?** Not the children of the lowest orders in the state; but the children of those men in general who were able to give them some previous education. For these the endowments of Winchester and New College were established. The choristers, in that very reign, were distinguished, as the children of the lowest poor, from these *pauperes et indigentes SCHOLARES*. The same difference was constantly intended to be kept up by the appointment of all inferior servants.

To proceed: it is required that the scholars at fifteen shall take an oath, that they have not, of their own, **FIVE** marks to expend by the year, three pounds six shillings.

It is plain, these *pauperes et indigentes scholares* might, have to spend in a year of their

own 3l. 5s.\* And how much was that? I think we may come to the conclusion, that it would keep in those days ten cows and fifty sheep! and if this be so, or any thing approaching to it, then those poor scholars who had 3l. 2s. or ONE POUND a-year to spend, could not be of the description and class for which you think the magnificent halls and chapels of these establishments were provided.

The reason why, I think, we may set so high a value on the sum specified, may be almost proved from one of the sermons of Old Latimer. He says, his father rented land at FIVE POUNDS a year, with which he kept twenty cows and one hundred sheep, was enabled to *portion* out his children, to maintain some hospitality, to exercise charity, and give a cup to the poor!

I will allow the money to have been *pounds in weight*, that is, three pounds to one: estimating the value of money in the time of Latimer's father, and the time when Winchester College was founded, I think we may reckon the sum nearly at what I have inserted; but take only one-half, that a boy at school had as much as would rent a farm of ten cows or fifty sheep, or *half* this, it is plain that the pious and

\* The scholar is to leave the foundation, if he have *more than a hundred shillings* of his own to expend; a sum equal, it may be conceived, to a hundred pounds in these days.

liberal Founder of the two St. Mary Colleges had not in view those objects exclusively to which you think the words *pauperes et indigentes scholares* would confine them.

To shew, further, and beyond all doubt, that the expressions "poor and indigent scholars" could not be meant by the Founder to designate mean, destitute, charity children; there is absolutely no *provision whatever for their subsistence* for the first two years, after they become fellows of New College, unless they are Founder's kin. From whence are they to get any support for those two years, before they become actual fellows? \* Or, can we believe for a moment, that the beneficent Founder's intention was, after furnishing the means of education, with a cruel mockery to say, "now subsist as you can; you *must* "starve, if neither yourselves or friends have "any thing." The supposition is utterly impossible; and therefore they could not have been those to whom only you apply the words "poor and needy," in the English sense of those words, leaving out "scholars."

If they had been "poor and needy" absolutely, and not *comparatively*, they could have no *means of arriving* at the first degree of education, which designates them as *scholares*; nor

\* Undoubtedly, from the hundred shillings, or less sum, which they were allowed to possess of their own, or from their parents.

could they have been afterwards left at Oxford, utterly *destitute* of all subsistence, by him who had brought them there.

To put this farther beyond a doubt, I will quote a particular fact, which cuts *both ways*, proving, that TWO PERSONS were admitted to New College, having had the advantages of Winchester School, who were of a KNIGHT'S FAMILY, and who, when they came to New College, not being Founder's kin, had to subsist themselves. The words are these :

“ Est enim certissimum, Joannem Wicamum de Swakeclive  
 “ (quem constat ex antiquâ stirpe equestri procreatum  
 “ fuisse, et Ricardum Wicamum de comitatu Hampshire,  
 “ quos Hurpifildus in presidiis suis collocat, ut funda-  
 “ torem ex egregiâ Wicamorum familiâ ortum esse ve-  
 “ niat) non jure singulari et privilegio, sed MORE USITATO  
 “ et ORDINARIO, non *statim* ut consanguineos Fundatoris,  
 “ sed DUOBUS probationis *annis* jam expletis, ut *extraneos*  
 “ in numerum sociorum Collegii esse ascriptos.”—  
*Louth's Life of Wykeham.*

From which it appears, that the Knightly family of Wykeham received the benefit of the Foundation at Winchester, in the very age of the Founder, or shortly afterwards ; and yet, not being Founder's kin, were for two years to find their own subsistence ; and this, before any abuses of time could have crept in.

And who, in general, are those who now partake of the benefits of these Institutions ? Those, I do not fear to say, for whom they were in-

tended. The spirit of the Institution is still kept in view; and, when we compare money (a mere *sign*) with its real value in corn or cattle, the liberal discretion of those entrusted with the management of these institutions will be justified, who make the oath of possessing £66 to exclude a boy, instead of one hundred shillings.

The great question is, whether the management of this place of education is such, all circumstances taken into consideration, as, in a fair view of society, it may be supposed **THE FOUNDER INTENDED.**

They who are educated on the foundation of Winchester, are, for the most part, sons of clergymen, many with large families, and some without preferment. The fathers who had been bred up, perhaps, by the same bounty, are anxious to procure for their children that education which they cannot entirely afford themselves. The preamble of the statutes of William of Wykeham, written by himself, states that his foundation was intended to “relieve *poor scholars* in their ‘*clerical*’ education.”

The children of all such as a limited income presses, who gladly avail themselves of that relief which the Founder has held out, are admitted, though the majority are sons of clergymen.

The Reformation brought many claimants, of this peculiar description; and let me call your

attention to a beautiful picture by a Poet of the very age when these Colleges were founded: the person of whom Chaucer speaks had '*tithes*,' and yet is called, "the *Poor* Parson of a Town:

" There was a good man of religion,  
 " And was a *poor* parson of a town ;  
 " But *rich* he was in holy things and work ;  
 " And he was a scholar and a clerk.  
 " Benign he was, and wonder diligent,  
 " And in adversity full patient.  
 " And such he was proved oft sythes,  
 " And lothe they were to curse him FOR HIS TITHES !"

Such *poor* men, designated as *poor* in the very age that William of Wykeham lived, after the Reformation, have *poor children* ! Could you deny to such the benefit of instruction, which these Institutions bestow ? Then you would strike at the VERY ROOT OF THE CHARITY. For the benefit of those who had *some property*, who were anxious that their children should have these means of education vouchsafed to them, which they could not afford themselves, were these asylums of learning, in an ignorant age, established ; and that their advantages are confined chiefly to that description of people, as far as worldly situation may be estimated, for whom they were intended, (not the lowest, certainly, but those in humbler life, who have small incomes, and who find the education of their children difficult,) I trust I shall still

further prove, to the conviction of every dispassionate mind.

Though it is provided, that grammatical learning be taught, yet the general designation, from the statutes, is, that the boys may be admitted, by your own account, at the ages *between* eleven and twelve—not exceeding twelve.

In a work of high credit it is said, the statute-able age is from eight to seventeen, [*Carlisle Endowed Schools* ;] but allowing you may be more accurate, if the boys are admitted *under* twelve, and *more* than eleven, some previous education must be necessary: and this could not be given, if the boys were of the class to which you think the bounty of the Founder should be confined.

Even taking your words, without the addition of “scholars,” I think they would prove this point against you.

The word *poor*,\* in its primary sense, signifies those who are *not rich*; and, upon the most severe examination, I think you would find very *few*, if any, (notwithstanding you say, indefinitely, they are “ALL IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES,)” very few, if any, of the parents who could fairly be so estimated. It would be impertinent to send a senator to a dictionary; but, permit me, Sir, to think, that those who

\* Johnson’s English Dictionary.

have had the benefits of this public education, to which you seem at all events unfriendly, would better have understood the meaning of the words "*pauperes et indigentes*," grammatically considered, and without the adjunct "*scholares*."

Let us then for a moment turn to a dictionary :

" *Egens est cui necessaria desunt!*

" *Pauper est qui parùm habet,*" &c.\*

*Nempe quod alter egens, altera PAUPER erat.*

OVID.

*Non video quid sit paupertas, nisi PARVI POSSESSIO!*—Seneca.

And what is strictly the meaning of *indigens*? he who wants aid; *indigens mei*—in want of my help: the very words of the statutes—to relieve poor scholars, in their *clerical* education.

You say, *sweepingly*, that the parents of children of Winchester College are "ALL in EASY circumstances!"

Can any man think, a person, hazarding so unfounded an assertion, to be unprejudiced? *All in easy circumstances!* "Didst thou say "ALL?" Many and many, thus indefinitely, and without exception, pronounced "to be "in easy circumstances," without being weighed down, perhaps, by

" Such expense as pinches parents blue,

" And mortifies the liberal hand of love,"

would be most thankful to you, if you could

\* Latin Dictionary.



prove the assertion to be true. Some of them I know.

But what are we to understand by "easy circumstances?" A logician ought to be more accurate upon a point so important, from which to establish his deductions.

The Member for Winchelsea may talk, with great complacency, of "easy circumstances;" but has he visited the firesides of a thousand humbler gentlemen, humbler in their lot of life, but as adorned in every thing that might distinguish the scholar and gentleman, as himself? Has he witnessed the anxieties of many a parent, so situated, in the decent, but humbler walks of life, educated as a gentleman, whilst the small stock, he had laid by for the comfort of his declining days, has been little by little reduced, in consequence of his care for the education of a beloved son! Has the Member for Winchelsea ever witnessed the pride such a parent has displayed, forgetting all the circumstances of a small fortune, with a large family, that preyed upon an ingenuous mind, when, perhaps, that son has gained some distinction at school?

Are the children of such parents improper objects of the munificence and charity of William of Wykeham?

I might exemplify this, without any undue remarks on others, by speaking of myself, the

eldest son of seven children. Nor can I ever forget those sacrifices which a father and mother made, to give that education which their son could have received no where else, without an effort beyond their income. How often have I witnessed the first "stealing line" of sorrow on the mild features of a mother now in the dust! The son of a father with a small hereditary property, and a small living, was to all intents and purposes "*a poor and indigent scholar*;" and such are hundreds who have received at Winchester the cheapest and best education in the country.

I have before me a list of those who were on the foundation at the time; and though some now adorn the highest situations in the country, they began life like me; and the bounty of William of Wykeham was never better bestowed, when that, and that alone, enabled them to acquire those attainments, which distinguish them in their higher destinations.

But, you will say, why are these observations addressed to me? Have I not expressly said, the object of the enquiry is to ascertain facts, not to decide what is to be done?

Alas! can any one doubt, though these foundations, to all intents and purposes, have answered the great ends for which they were designed; yet that, in an irritated state of the

public mind, much will be inferred that can never be proved, and which, after all, may be only found to exist in the prejudiced minds of adversaries. Have the funds of the establishment been alienated? Has it ceased to perform its duties to society? Are the sons of the *rich preferred*,—are they *even admitted*? Are the numbers lessened, or the comforts of the boys, in any essential points, neglected? Go down to Winchester; look at their animated eyes, and glowing countenances. Think of that description of deserving people, from whence so many are taken. Think of a Curate, liberally bred up, but with five or six children to educate; a widow, who, without these aids, must be content to see her sons, the sons of a scholar and a gentleman, grow up as *rustics*.

Let no gross delinquency, in the name of charity and of GOD, be *screened*! But can we shut our eyes to the malignant feelings inevitably awakened, which will impute the most unprincipled and odious robbery, when you fix the attention on the paltry circumstances of spoons, trenchers, and forks?

If the general system pursued creates, not only for the church, but for all services political and moral, a class of learned and liberal men, PECULIAR TO OUR OWN COUNTRY, and which is one of the moral causes of its pre-

eminence as a nation ; a wise Legislator would be most anxious to preserve, not only *inviolata*, but uninjured in the high public estimation, these Establishments.

But I come to a more serious charge. The Masters and Fellows have taken an oath, which they could reconcile TO THEIR CONSCIENCES ; and you speak with the tone of irony, because they will not take an oath AGAINST THEIR CONSCIENCES. Your inference, if I do not misunderstand you is this :

“ When they are sworn to execute the statutes according to their *literal* acceptation, and notwithstanding alter the hundred shillings, according to the *ad valorem* of the times, by making it sixty-six pounds : why *not violate their oaths*, which they have taken not to *reveal their statutes ?*”

I, for one, could do the first ; and think I discharged my duty, *literally* performing the INTENT of the Founder ; judging the value of the hundred shillings by the produce, and estimating it according to how many sheep or oxen the sign of so much money would purchase in the market in the time of Richard the Second.

This oath, to fulfil the *plain intention* of the Founder, may and must be taken according to the *real value* of what is implied by the *sign*, not the *nominal*.

But, if I can take this oath, most conscientiously, can I take another, the meaning of which is peremptory and decisive?

Though I have said thus much, I trust it will not be necessary for me to add, that my anxiety that this momentous enquiry may go on without let or impediment, is as ardent as your own. But hasty and prejudiced views are the only circumstances which can defeat the object of enquiry.

There are four essential qualities, without which no one could be a proper person to superintend these enquiries,—a great understanding, inflexible integrity, a dispassionate temper, and, where public schools are concerned, practical and experimental knowledge of the subject.

There are *two* descriptions of persons equally improper for the deliberate investigation of this delicate subject: “ persons who will enter upon their ‘ *inquisitorial*’ functions with a disposition to find *ground of justification*, rather than of charge; who will reluctantly open their eyes to truths, which thwart their favourite prejudices; and feel desirous that their inquiries should convict of exaggerations the statements now before the public.”

Yes, Sir, such men are improper; and, let me add, those men are equally improper, who, where no prominent abuses are found, are *yet eager to cast an imputation*, and to excite an

hostile impression in the public, exaggerating minor circumstances, with the view of depreciating those institutions which they dislike.

If but the least *dust*, or none at all, be found on the garments of these establishments which Englishmen yet prize, such men would seem resolved, with different feelings from the lover in Ovid, to brush off their dust; and we might apply the classical line, in another sense than intended by its author;

“ Si nullum est,—tamen, excute,—NULLUM!”

Among these abuses, what is especially pointed out? That the boys eat off clean trenchers, which they cannot break, instead of plates, which they *can*; and that they have not forks and spoons, as the Fellows have.

Aye, there is the rub! You seem anxious to dispossess the Fellows of that independent provision, which in advancing life they possess; and by a work of supererogation, constitute yourself a better judge than the Founder of his own intention.

Why not take away the spoons and silver forks of these supine Fellows, and admit more “indigent and poor children,” though the Founder limited the number to seventy? Why not reduce the fellowships of Winchester to be on a level with those of Oxford, &c. What business have the Fellows of Winchester, though

it was the intention of the Founder that a fellowship should be held out as a reward of greater preferment than New College, to receive *more* than they received at Oxford? Let them all be put, long or short, in the new **BED OF PROCRUSTES!** Nay, have they not, some of them, *horresco referens*, even wives and children! What *need of these*, when the Fellows of New College\* have not the same indulgence? What need of their many domestic accommodations?

“What needs five and twenty? ten, or five?”

“What needs one?”

“Oh! reason not the need—our basest beggars

“Are, in the *poorest* things, superfluous!”—*King Lear*.

Why not bring in a bill to prevent from marrying those who have retired from Oxford on this more lucrative, but far from *splendid*, preferment?

What is the impression excited by all this? That the Fellows of Winchester regard only themselves; that they have such incomes as should be pared down; that they ought not, I suppose, to have a footman in livery, but should be contented, if they had only, as in a highland manse, a bare-footed maid!

You, Sir, have seen the statutes, which I have not; but I have an opportunity of setting

\* Marriage is forbidden by the statutes of New College: in the qualification for a Fellow of Winchester, it is only said he shall be a Priest.

before you an exact account of the great and splendid emoluments which these envied Fellows possess. My father's uncle was Fellow from the year 1725 to 1781, and from his great age was familiarly called by the boys "William of Wykeham." I was then at school, and since his death have become possessed of all *his accounts*, a most accurate balance of all he received and expended, to the smallest items.

I will take the first year that occurs, 1736. The reader of course will make his own estimate of the increased value at this day.

The receipts from the College are thus entered, "*Computus*."

A. D. 1736.	£	s.	d.
Of the College for commons	58	17	2
Fine and increment .....	80	0	0
Sealing ....., .....	1	8	0
<hr/>			
Annual receipt from Winchester college .....	140	5	2

Now let us see the splendid use made of this income,

There is,

*Solutio servorum—Emptio vestimentorum—Emptio librorum—hospitium—et Eleemosynæ.*

Servants, clothes, books, housekeeping, and charity.



With the comforts, far from splendid, in no item, for so many years, is *charity* omitted. I shall take the account for this one year; hoping you will not think the buying books, for an old retired scholar, too great a luxury. The expense for clothes is £19 : 4s. : 3d.; books, £19 : 18s. : 4d.; housekeeping a whole year, including even £16 for one hogshead of Port wine, (which some will think, perhaps, unpardonable,) £41.; Eleemosynæ, £16 : 13s. 7d.

Lest these items should appear too expensive, I will put down one whole article, *verbatim*, relating to the expenses at Winchester.

	£.	s.	d.
For a pair of snuffers* .....	0	2	6
For candles .....	1	0	0
For coals, 52 bushels .....	2	7	0
Mr. Garret, for prayers .....	0	10	0
For sweeping a chimney .....	0	1	0
Mending a tea-kettle .....	0	1	0
For three hampers .....	0	6	0
For corks .....	0	3	0
For a mop .....	0	0	11
For a pair of pinchers .....	0	3	0
For three hampers .....	0	5	3
Small things .....	0	3	0

In all £5 2 8

\* Quere, whether the boys are allowed snuffers?—If not, what a subject for super-sensitive compassion, as well as want of spoons, &c.!

With such minute attention to every thing received and expended, with a heart, notwithstanding, "open as day to liberal charity," this man having no family, during a long life, saved a considerable sum of money.

It was *all left to public charities*, and particularly Charity Schools.

His charities, from youth till he died, were of this description. I will take an extract from the book before me, for one year.

	£.	s.	d.
Charity school at Winton .....	4	4	0
Boys at Shrovetide .....	0	4	10
Wool distributed .....	1	14	0
Bartlet .....	0	1	0
Widow Bridge .....	0	8	0
Society for Gospel .....	6	6	0
Fire at Moreton .....	1	1	0
Mrs. Franston .....	3	3	0
J. Beer .....	0	1	0
County Hospital .....	2	2	0
Superannuate Scolars .....	2	10	0
Divers more persons .....	0	5	0
	<hr/>		
	£21	19	10
	<hr/>		

This worthy old man, when I was at school, regularly asked me to dinner on Sunday; and,

after dinner, I had *one glass* of WINE, from a bottle, out of which, at 84 years of age, he indulged himself with THREE ! One glass of wine allotted to me, and a *shilling* with it, were always accompanied with a *health*, which he never omitted ; and, at the age I have mentioned, I have seen him repeat it with tears in his eyes ; it was the following :

“ To the THREE SCORE AND TEN†—

“ May GOD make them HAPPY MEN !”

Why do I bring these things before the public ? To shew, by unanswerable documents, the emoluments of the preferment, at the time ; and moreover to prove, that before such a man, in such a situation of life, could have thought that he had been *robbing the poor*, of *one farthing*, he would rather have suffered the ‘ flesh-fly to ‘ blow his mouth !’ And such are most of those in disposition, habit, and heart, who partake of William of Wykeham’s bounty !

I leave these facts to speak for themselves, which I think they will do, as well as your inferences.

Your next charge is, also, a most grievous one.

You *assert*, that the BOYS, when they attain the age of fifteen, SOLEMNLY SWEAR that they have not £3 : 6s. a year ; and as a PRACTICAL

† The number of boys.

commentary on THIS OATH, THEY PAY ten guineas a year to the master!

The BOYS, then, at fifteen years of age, according to your assertions, *take* a FALSE OATH!! When you penned this, did it never occur to you, that the boy might not have, and doubtless had not, *one penny* he could call his own? Did the boy pay the ten guineas, or his parents?

Lest it might be thought that I have been personally interested in repelling these charges, let me add, that since leaving the place where I received the benefit of an education, which I could not have had, without the munificence of such a founder, I have never received the value of one sixpence from the establishment. But I shall ever feel—not a rash, or even, I hope, “romantic,” but—a well-grounded attachment to an institution so distinguished; an ardent anxiety to repel unmerited reflections; and a gratitude which will never leave my heart,

*Dum memor ipse mei, dum spiritus hos reget artus.*

Though I have ventured thus to appear before the public in defence of one public institution, I cannot conclude without expressing again the most anxious solicitude for the general objects of your pursuit; and begging pardon, if I have hastily used any language

which a scholar and gentleman ought not to have used towards a gentleman and scholar; and with sincere respect for your great abilities, and benevolent motives, but lamenting palpable prejudices,

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

**W. L. BOWLES.**

*Bremhill, Oct. 20, 1818.*

**POSTSCRIPT.**

I have hitherto confined myself to your letter to Sir Samuel Romilly. I shall now beg to make a few observations on what appears to me a false construction and false view of the intent of the Founder, from the **REPORT** of your examination.

The great point to ascertain is undoubtedly this: Whether the establishment, founded by William of Wykeham, has been diverted from those objects for which he intended it, and given to others, whom he had not in his contemplation. The observations I have made will assist the reader in determining this question. I hope I have proved, that, generally speaking, those who now receive the advantage of this institution, are those for whom it was intended; but, in confirmation of this, I shall take the liberty of making some observations on the extracts now published from the statutes.—At Eton, it appears, that if any preference be given to a scholar, it is expressly stated, the preference shall be given to the *poorest*; and yet, remark, the children of Villani, the lowest orders, are **EXPRESSLY EXCLUDED** by the words of the Founder!

Nothing is said, in the statutes of Winchester, about any preference given to the *poorest*: and, if the children of the lowest orders were excluded, even when this condition was annexed, it is plain that an order *above* those must be originally intended.

Besides, in the times of Richard the Second, the feelings of hostility against "*scholares*," of any description, were too general, in the mind of the lower orders, to incline them to have a wish of belonging to that despised class; nor can we otherwise account for the instantaneous feelings of indignation, so widely excited, and so exclusively diverted to particular objects, in the rebellion of Wat Tyler. Stowe says, "they beheaded all men of law, as well prentices, and either barristers, and justices, as jewrers. They spared none, whom they thought to be LEARNED, were it never so LITTLE, especially if they found *any* to have pen and ink."

If learning was not offered to the children of the Villani, or Cotelarii, nor would have been accepted, probably, when Wykeham wrote his statutes, if it had been; for whom was it intended, but for those in the middle classes of life, who wanted assistance in breeding their children "*scholars*?" For such, I trust, I have shewn the charity of the Founder was intended; and to such is it now applied. The boys

neither being lessened in number, and as well fed, as they are (I believe the nation will grant) well-taught! If the words *pauperes* and *indigentes*, generally speaking, can be understood only as *comparative* terms; in the time of Richard the Second, when there were scarcely any divisions and subdivisions of property, they must have been peculiarly so understood. Perhaps a better illustration of the relative signification of "*pauper*" cannot be found than in an Ode of Horace, to which I would refer you as a more elegant classical authority, than the plain literal words of a dictionary.

Non ebur, neque aureum  
 Meâ renidet in domo lacunar:  
 Non trabes Hymettiae  
 Premunt columnas ultimâ recisas  
 Africâ. Neque Attali  
 Ignotus hæres regiam occupavi:  
 Nec Laconica mihi  
 Trahunt honestæ purpuras clientæ,  
 At fides et ingenî  
 Benigna vena est: PAUPEREMQUE DIVES  
 Me petit. Nihil suprâ  
 Deos lacesso, nec potentem amicum  
 Largiora flagito,  
 Satis BEATUS UNICIS SABINIS.

Horace had, at that time, his Sabine FARM.  
 He speaks also of

Hoc erat in votis, .....  
 ..... AUCTIUS atque  
 Dii MELIUS fecere.



If it be said that, as he applies to *himself* the word, it must not be *literally* understood as implying he really meant to call himself "*pauper*;" I will say, I do not think there is a passage in his writings, except where it is used in its *relative* sense.

The surest knowledge we could derive of its signification in William of Wykeham's time, would be from the writers of the middle ages; but, I think, sufficient appears to convince yourself, that it cannot mean, as you seem to imply, absolutely **POOR**.

If you have taken this word, and also *indigens*, in a wrong sense; let me now intreat your attention to some observations on the false interpretation you have given the words in the statutes. May we be permitted to doubt, whether the acquirement of the Latin tongue be as accurately taught at Edinburgh, as the knowledge of law and metaphysics?

We find that the Warden and Fellows are bound by an oath, not to alter the *tenorem et substantiam* of the Founder's statutes.

Have they altered the "tenor and substance?" The very words allow a discretionary construction; and if we must either give up the *strict* literal words, and *part* with the *tenor* and *substance*, or retain the tenor and substance, and give up the strict literal words, we must adhere, to the best of

our understanding, by the *tenor* and *substance* of the Founder's intention.

This is not to make "NOVA STATUTA," nor is it repugnant to the "SOUND AND PLAIN SENSE!" *Plano et sano sensu!* Nor "to break these statutes "under any colour or plea;" nor to change their "tenor and substance, in the eye of reason, humanity, or GOD."

I might be *excused* from suggesting to a lawyer, that the "intention" of the *testator* is the best guide in construction.

The words of Wykeham are, that nothing shall be done *contra intentionem nostram*. Then those who have the custody of his statutes are to follow, to the best of their judgment, as they will answer to GOD, THIS INTENTION; and I should think I violated the very essence of this intention, if I acted so as to make one penny halfpenny in Richard the Second's time, of precisely the same value as one penny halfpenny in the reign of George the Third. I should be guided, as nearly as possible, by the price of labour, which was one penny halfpenny per day then; and now, where I live, *one shilling and sixpence*, though it ought to be much more, and would be so, except for the abuses of the poor laws.

By the 12th of Richard the Second, it is enacted, that a bailiff for husbandry shall take

13s. 4d. by the year; the master hind, 10s.; carter, 10s.; cowherd, 6s. 8d.; driver of the plough 7s. **BY THE YEAR.**

By the 25th of Edward the Third, it is enacted, that “ none shall pay, in the time of “ sarcling or haymaking, but **A PENNY A DAY!**”

I think you will admit I have not overcharged the estimate.

But you ask, “ Were such **LARGE rents** and “ **finer** as are now, known in the time of Richard “ the Second, any more than knives, forks, plates, “ and *spoons*?”

Surely, Sir, you will retract this question. The possessions of the College are not *larger* than they were in Richard the Second's time! They are the same; and the rents now will not purchase more labour, or necessaries, or conveniences, than they would then.

I now ask the reader, whether he can do otherwise than believe, that the language you have used against these institutions has been detrimental to the cause which you are so anxious to promote?

One word more in answer to what you have thrown out, respecting the funds being applied to increase the number of boys. The numbers cannot be increased, according to the words of the statute; and most erroneous is the inference, that, because the number may be

*diminished* by the funds failing, as at Eton, therefore they may be added to, when the words of the statute are, *augeatur et accrescat, ac alias in omnibus percipiant, SICUT PRIUS.*

That is, they shall proceed increasing, AFTER THE DIMINUTION, till they attain the ORIGINAL NUMBER—SICUT PRIUS—as it was before the diminution.

Now, Sir, you, who are so anxious that the will of the Founder should be complied with *literally*, suggest an improvement, which strikes at the root of his expressed will. William of Wykeham established his colleges for SEVENTY scholars, numerically, at Winchester, and SEVENTY fellows at Oxford, neither more nor less; and *he is said* to have laid down the exact number of seventy, after the number of the disciples; Warden and ten Fellows, after the number of the Apostles, *Judas* being omitted; three Chaplains and three inferior Clerks, after the number of faithful deacons, six; sixteen Quiristers, the number of the prophets, twelve greater, and four less.

Whether these numbers were fixed on from FANCY, or SUPERSTITION, or piety, we can have no right to alter them. You doubtless think the Fellows have too much. I think they have too little, to live even with that degree of respectability which their benefactor intended. £10 a

year was the income of a Fellow of New College, during the life of the Founder; and a Fellow of Winchester was elected to that station, as to a station of greater preferment. I leave you to judge, if a Fellow of New College had £10, how much more he would have *now*, reckoning *ad valorem*; and by consequence, if a Fellow of Winchester was higher in point of preferment, how much greater the endowment might reasonably be expected. Now the utmost they have as Fellows, is barely sufficient to place them in what you may call "easy," certainly not in *rich*, "circumstances."

But an impression is made, as if the funds were applied to nourish the selfish extravagance of the Fellows, an impression the more to be deprecated, as it is excited at a time, when it has been asserted, that the present order of society is a confederacy of kings, lords, and priests, against the poor.

I have no other object in making these remarks, than a wish that, after having perused them candidly, you should reconsider the impression you have made.

Nor am I in fear, that these venerable institutions will be destroyed, or even shaken. Their battlements have weathered very angry storms, and remain inviolate.

The noble foundation escaped almost by miracle from the rapacious tyranny of Henry the Eighth, for two years, a decree of dissolution remaining against it. It escaped again, and almost by miracle, from the Puritanical and republican Iconoclasts, under Cromwell; and was saved only in consequence of his leaders, Nath. Fiennes, or Law, the Regicide, REMEMBERING THEIR OATHS!!

Far be it from me to attribute any views of *hostile* violence to you. No, Sir; I believe your motives to be as *benevolent* as they are *sincere*: and I pray to GOD, that your endeavours may never be relaxed, till EVERY POOR MAN IN THIS KINGDOM has EVERY RIGHT of which he has been defrauded. But good men fear, least, by involving in one apparent censure those institutions which deserve it, and those which do not deserve it, you might eventually injure that cause, in which all the best and wisest of their generation wish you success.

The most anxious care, then, ought to be taken in a subject of such moment; lest, under a vague impression of equal abuses in all charitable foundations, these Institutions, which have in general nobly served the purposes for which they were founded, which have dispensed for centuries, and are yet, in the eye of a great nation, dispensing the greatest good;—lest

such institutions should be classed with those charity schools, the funds of which have been monopolized and grossly perverted ;—and lest those abuses of charity, which are most foul and flagrant, might seem to derive a kind of covering, in consequence of their being involuntary associated with institutions which the public yet regard with reverence.

Whatever, upon a fair and dispassionate view, may be found faulty in the administration of Winchester College, it is an insult to humanity that it should be mentioned in the same day, nay, in the same century, with Yeovil, and and other places of that description.

And this generous distinction is the more necessary to be kept in mind, when, besides the unmerited tone of obloquy, among respectable writers, there are not wanting, in the present day, writers of “ coarser grain,” who, for political purposes, insidiously or openly direct their attacks, with particular hostility, against those seats of learning.

Whilst I am now writing, in the same public paper, Winchester and Yeovil, for obvious purposes, are pointed out, as it were, to the same indignation of the public though the plain facts relating to *one* are heart-rending, and though the alledged abuses of the other consist in *false translations* of the Latin statutes; garbled

extracts from your examination; and partial and exaggerated circumstances, purposely and deliberately placed in the most invidious and injurious point of view. I will mention one instance. William of Wykeham, by his statutes, constituted the two Wardens, &c. examiners of the boys who are to be placed on the roll for New College. The word "*influence*" is introduced, as if the necessary consequence must be, that an undue influence was exerted, by those whom the Founder constituted judges, against that Founder's intention! How base is the insinuation! The examination is the fairest that can be conceived.

This will be sufficient, I hope, to shew in what spirit the article is written.

This article I read, with almost involuntary shudderings, at such base insinuations and artful colourings, in the Bath Chronicle, copied, no doubt, from a London paper. I shall trust to the well-known liberality of the Editor, to print some extracts from this Vindication, in any way he may think just.

The article I speak of, was furnished originally, by either a most ignorant or most malicious commentator. Without attributing feelings of this kind to you, we cannot but perceive that they are the effects of that zeal, which, like ambition.



“ O'erleaps itself,  
 “ And falls on th' other side;”

a zeal which, whilst it is actuated by charitable motives, wounds the bosom of charity herself.

These are the effects, we fear, on the public mind, and of which we already perceive the traces; and when we reflect on the great body of moral and intellectual worth, which has been silently nurtured in these seats of education, and sent forth to adorn and dignify society; we mourn the injudicious haste of that zeal, which would, in its effects, tear off the decent draperies from that class, which it is the interest of the state to protect in its legitimate claims, fairly appreciated, as well as to restore the garment to the “ poor and needy” in the English sense of those words, of which they have been robbed.

I cannot conclude without again lamenting the circumstances which have deprived the country of the honourable services of the Marquis of Lansdowne and the Bishop of London; characters in every respect most suited to do justice to so momentous and arduous an enquiry; of “ inflexible integrity,” to screen no real abuse; of “ superior understanding,” accurately to discriminate between gross offences and trifling objections; of “ dispassionate judgment,” to view what is submitted to their investigation,

in all its bearings, without prejudice or partiality; and of "experimental knowledge," where the great public schools are concerned, to appreciate their high character and general importance. The loss of such men, on such an occasion, a whole nation will feel; but none more than myself, who, in early life, have wandered with one of those eminent personages, in the studious shades which are the objects of your unjust animadversions, and

" Both together heard  
" What time the grey-fly winds her sultry horn;"

LYCIDAS.

and who, from the other, have received those kindnesses which have added enjoyment to a retired and unambitious life.

**FINIS.**

*The haste with which these sheets have been composed, has unavoidably occasioned some verbal errors, which it is hoped the reader will pardon.*

Page 17, l. 5.—For "a particular facts," read "a particular fact."

36, l. 29.—For "adhere," read "abide."

41, l. 27.—For "I think they have," read "I might think they have."

44, l. 14.—Dele "and."

## ADDENDA.



IF it were worth while, I could bring example after example, which would completely determine the sense in which the word *pauper* is used by ancient writers, in nineteen instances out of twenty.

“*Pauper SENATUS.*”—Virg.

“*Pauperis EVANDRI.*”—Ibid.

But I cannot close these observations, without setting before the public some circumstances, which, happening in the age, during the life, or under the eye, of the FOUNDER himself, most decidedly declare his intention, respecting the situation in life, of some of those for whose benefit his establishments were endowed.

Bishop Waynfleet, the illustrious founder of Magdalen College, Oxford, received part of his education at Winchester school, during the life of William of Wykeham; and he was of an ancient family, son of Richard Patten, esq; by a daughter of Sir Richard Brereton, knight, of Cheshire.

Chichely, the founder of All-Souls, emulating the pious munificence of which he had partaken, was admitted to New-College the year after

its opening, in the *life of Wykeham*. In his epitaph it is said,

“ PAUPER *eram natus,* ’ &c.

Yet we find from Wood, that he was born *honestis et ingenuis parentibus*.

Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, the constant friend and liberal patron of Erasmus, was admitted to New-College in 1475, seventy-one years after the death of the founder. If he entered at Winchester at nine years of age, it must be only sixty-two years after Wykeham’s death.

Was he rejected, as not answering the description of “ poor and indigent scholar,” though he was, says Weever, (Funeral Monuments,) a gentleman of an ancient house in Hampshire?— All this great good, which has thus been derived to piety, to virtue, to literature, to individual enjoyment, and general improvement, would have been annihilated by one rash stroke of the pen of a reformer, unacquainted with the original principles of the establishment, and the conscientious adherence to those rules, under which it has flourished for centuries!

I could add numerous examples, which crowd on me on every side, but I think it needless; as I believe every person, not prejudiced, will consider the case as proved, and that your reflections have been as premature, as they are unfounded.

That you have misunderstood the very language of the statutes, which *peremptorily deny* the power that you think they grant, the extract from them, in the Appendix, will shew. Perhaps it would be best to translate it, to prevent cavil ; but I leave it to the learned and liberal as it is.

Though the examples which have been adduced, will, I trust, completely satisfy every one, the least conversant with the language in which the statutes of William of Wykeham were written, of the real meaning of the word *pauper*, as used in those statutes, yet the following examples, which I have met with, since the first sheet was printed off, are too apposite and incontrovertible to be omitted.

“ PAUPER:—*cui parva et angusta res familiaris est ; qui non affluit opibus, nec tamen eget, tenuis, medius inter EGENUM et DIVITEM.*” Cicero says, “ *M. Manilius PAUPER fuit, habuit, enim ÆDICULAS in Carinis et FUNDUM in LABI-CANO.*”—Forcellini Thesaurus.

“ PAUPER:—*proprie medium quid est inter DIVITEM et MENDICUM ; nempe, cui necessaria tantum suppetunt, NIHIL SUPEREST, eum PAUPEREM vocant !!*”—Gesneri Thesaurus.

## APPENDIX.



## RUBR. 46.

“ Statuentes nihilominus, et etiam ordinantes, quod si forsan temporum invalescente *malitiâ*, casibus fortuitis, possessiones, redditus, et proventus spirituales et temporales dicti nostri Collegii in tantum DECREVERINT, quod dictus custos, necnon Presbyterorum, Scholarium, et Clericorum de Capellâ, numerus per *nos superiùs definitus* de exitibus possessionum, reddituum, et proventuum prædictorum, cæteris omnibus oneribus eidem Collegio *incumbentibus debitè supportatis*, non poterunt juxta formam ordinationum et statutorum nostrorum commodè sustentari, ex tunc, communæ singulorum ipsorum Presbyterorum duodecim denariorum summam in septimanâ aliqua non transcendant, nec amplior quàm duodecim denariorum summa, pro eorum septimanatim communis de bonis dicti Collegii communibus aequaliter persolvatur; deinde si redditus et proventus præfati Collegii custodi, necnon Presbyterorum et Scholarium ac Clericorum *numero* non sufficiat, in hâc parte, tunc necessitate cogente, annua liberata vestium de quâ in dictis nostris ordinationibus et statutis sit mentio, a quolibet subtrahatur. Demum si posthæc infortuniis, quod absit, convalescentibus, *numerus supradictus* de redditibus, exitibus, et proventibus possessionum dicti nostri Collegii tunc ex-

istentibus, in formâ prædictâ non poterit sustentari permittimus quòd tunc, et non ante, nec aliàs quovismodo, juxta decrescentiam dictorum reddituum et proventuum, *decreseat* successivè numerus Sociorum et Scholarium nostri Collegii supradicti. In his tamen omnibus, Custodis et Sociorum Presbyterorum dicti nostri Collegii, qui pro tempore fuerint, conscientias apud altissimum, arctius oneramus. Ordinantes ac etiam statuentes, ut si necessitatibus, et infortuniis supradictis cessantibus, tempora mutantur in melius, possessionesque, redditus et proventus dicti nostri Collegii per Dei gratiam iteratò felicia recipiant incrementa; juxta ipsorum crescentiam *numerus supradictus*, sic ut præmittitur, in dictis casibus minuendus, *augeatur* etiam et accrescat, ac aliàs in omnibus percipiant, *sicut prius*.

The word "accrescat" is contrasted with "decreseat."

The "numerus superius definitus," and "numerus supradictus," refer to Rubr. 1; the very title of which is, "De totali numero Scholarium, Clericorum, Presbyterorum, et Personarum aliarum dicti Collegii prope Wintoniam." Then the founder enumerates—a Warden; seventy Scholars; ten Fellows; three Chaplains; three Clerks; sixteen Choristers; an Informator; and Hostiarius.

### ERRATUM.

In revising the preceding pages, I perceive that I have inadvertently stated, that by the statutes of Eton a preference is required to be given to the most-indigent: the son of a *Villanus*, indeed, is positively excluded. But I find, by referring again to Mr. Brougham's pamphlet, that what was said of the preference to be given to the more indigent, relates, not to Eton, but to St. John's College.



*Speedily will be Published, by the same Author,*

(A CORRECTED EDITION,) OF

**DEFENCE OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS;**

IN ANSWER TO

*An ARTICLE in the EDINBURGH REVIEW.*