



# The Elizabethan.

Vol. VI. No. 21.

WESTMINSTER, MARCH 1891.

Price 6d.

## SOUNDS OF WESTMINSTER.

PERHAPS of all agencies by which our lives are moulded, one of the most powerful is sound, and here at Westminster this is so to a peculiar extent. Volumes might be written on the poetry of the sounds we hear in our everyday life, and on the strange influences they exercise, though, perhaps, at the time they strike our ears we hardly seem to hear them.

What a matter of course becomes our old friend Big Ben, reverberating through the hot streets of a summer day as we walk wearily down fields, struggling now loud and close at hand, now faintly far away against a December gale which is shrieking among the Abbey pinnacles, or climbing among the rafters of the schoolroom as the forms troop in to prayers. How natural seems his voice ere school days are over, and how different from the first night we spent as a new boy at Westminster, maybe now years ago, when, what with our anxious and

excited thoughts and those booming notes from the clock tower, no sleep was possible, and when seven o'clock came we felt something akin to a genuine hatred of that noisy bell! And how unnatural at first to sit in our rooms at Trinity or at the House and hear many a stranger's voice striking the hours round us, but no Big Ben; or sail the open seas, with no sound but clank of engine and sullen roar of heavy seas—as many of us perhaps must do—and know Big Ben is fading many a league astern. But even then imagination becomes strong enough to conjure up the old tones, and we may stand and listen for a moment and think we hear him hailing us through the night again.

There is something, too, in the bang of the ball in Green on a winter's evening; to the stranger fraught only with most prosaic consideration of a lake of very shining mud and dire peril to his best top hat, but to the Old Westminster bringing infinity of memories—glimmering gas lamps shuddering in the cold blast; dark shadows, hatless, passing here and



there ; perhaps aside, spoken in some quiet spot, the momentous words, 'You may have your Pinks,' from the lips of the captain who that day had led the School to a glorious victory — words which turned the evening shades to brightness, made tea a royal feast, and work impossible for days!—visions of play rehearsals or of House suppers, dreams of grand red toasting fires in Inner, in Upper, or in Hall.

And what do they not recall? the drone of the entombed band, and the hum of talk which drowns its wildest efforts to gain an audience, announcing that once again the play is come, and that the first act is over, or the prologue spoken? What beauty is there not in that ugly squeaking door at the end of dormitory, what majesty in the tiny tinkle of the call bell, what music in the thund'rous applause! Or, stay a moment and note the face of that grey-whiskered veteran seated there in the second row, how eagerly he follows every word and gesture of the actors, how twinkles his eye at the coming joke; fifty years ago it was a much loved old joke that, and hark how royally he greets it! And like an old friend once met again, perchance it starts great trains of thought, else why is his gaze so far off now, why when the curtain falls sits he still there so wrapt, or slips out down cloisters so silent in the night air? He surely is walking linked arm in arm with the spirits of his boyhood, wrapt in the folds of half a century.

W.

## WESTMINSTER WORTHIES.

No. 27.—WILLIAM BECKFORD.

TAKING the *Alumni Westmonasteriensis* for the most part as our guide, it would appear that at least six Lord Mayors of London have received their education at the old school. To some extent it would be natural, if the future could be anticipated, that citizens who eventually rose to be Chief Magistrates of the City of London should be indebted for their early training to the first school in the Metropolis. Of these six Lord Mayors the five following were at different times Stewards of the Westminster Anniversary Dinners—Marsh Dickinson, Sir Charles Asgill, Sir Samuel Fludyer, Alderman Harley, and Sir Richard Carr Glyn. The sixth forms the subject of our present sketch, and may be pronounced, on the whole, as the most famous, or at any rate the best known, of them all. As we shall hereafter see, William Beckford was twice elected Lord Mayor. His mayoralties are remembered for the sumptuousness of the banquets, and himself for his spirited speech in reply to

George III.'s answer to the petition of remonstrance presented by the City of London. In addition to this he is also remembered as the father of his more famous son and namesake, the author of the well-known romance 'Vathek,' which was written at one sitting.

The ancestors of William Beckford were originally a Gloucestershire family. In the seventeenth century his great-grandfather migrated to Jamaica, became a planter, and soon rose to be wealthy and prosperous. His son, Colonel Peter Beckford, before his death became lieutenant-governor and commander-in chief of Jamaica, leaving behind him a large fortune, which devolved upon his son, Peter Beckford, the father of the future Lord Mayor, who himself became the Speaker of the Assembly in the Colony. William Beckford was the second son only, and it was by accident that the vast family wealth eventually came by descent to him. His mother was Bathshua, the daughter and co heir of Colonel Julines Herring, of Jamaica. Born on December 19, 1709, he was sent to England in 1723, or when he was 14 years old, to receive his education, and for this purpose was placed at Westminster School. Dr. Robert Freind was then head-master, and is stated to have considered him as one of the best pupils the school ever had. Of his schoolfellows he is said to have acquired particularly the friendship of Lord Mansfield, Dr. James Johnson, Bishop of Gloucester, and Lord Kinnoul, the last three being 'then known in the School as "the triumvirate," from being the best scholars and makers of extempore verses.' This statement, we think, at any rate so far as Lord Mansfield is concerned, has an element of doubt about it, as he was elected to Oxford in the same year that young Beckford arrived in England from Jamaica. He may have subsequently met Lord Mansfield, and an acquaintance, commenced between them as Old Westminsters, may have ripened into friendship; or, again, there may have been some link between them outside the school which would account for the Captain of the School taking a great interest in a new boy, and one but recently arrived for the first time in England. Without some such explanation as we have suggested, it is difficult to concur with the statement in its entirety.

Beckford's father died on September 23, 1735, whereupon his large fortune devolved upon his eldest son, Peter Beckford; and upon the death of the latter, but little more than a year later, and unmarried, it all passed by natural descent to his brother William, the future Lord Mayor. From the time he commenced his public career his onward progress is fairly rapid, and he owed it no doubt to some extent to his wealth. Money begets money, and Beckford soon extended his business as a West Indian merchant. He became a magistrate, and entered Parliament. He also, somewhere about this time, purchased an estate in Wiltshire, where he built a palatial residence known as Fonthill Abbey. Sumptuous as it was, it was not deemed sufficiently so by his son, who, when the property became his, thought it necessary to demolish the



Abbey and substitute a still grander mansion for it. On June 4, 1752, he was elected an Alderman for the Ward of Billingsgate, and early in the following year was chosen Master of the Ironmongers' Company, having been admitted to the freedom of the Company in the preceding year. The year 1754 saw a General Election, when Beckford was returned both for the City of London and for the Borough of Petersfield. It need hardly be added that the Alderman elected to sit for the City, but he showed his appreciation for the honour conferred upon him by the burgesses of Petersfield by forwarding the munificent sum of £400 towards the paving of the streets. The following year (1755) Beckford became one of the Sheriffs of London, having as his brother Sheriff, Ivo Whitbread. He was re-elected to Parliament as member for the City in April 1761, and became Lord Mayor for the first time in the succeeding year. Though in the ordinary course of rotation it fell to his turn for election almost as a matter of course, an opposition candidate was put forward. Incensed at this proceeding he sent in his resignation as Alderman. His proposal was adjourned to the following day—namely, October 29, 1762—when, instead of his resignation being accepted, he was elected Lord Mayor by a practically unanimous poll, only one vote being recorded for the opposing candidate.

The first mayoralty of Beckford's was chiefly distinguished for the splendour of the banquets, though he was very moderate in his personal habits. The infamous John Wilkes was at this time one of the Aldermen of the City, and it was during Beckford's year of office that No. 45 of the 'North Briton' was published, and resulted in the arrest of those concerned in its publication. Beckford throughout these stormy times sided with Wilkes. On March 25, 1768, Beckford was again elected to Parliament by the City, and the next year we find him once more installed as Lord Mayor. Though he was elected by a majority of ten votes, receiving sixteen himself, while his rival numbered six, his election was strenuously opposed. His re-election was an unusual honour, but it was not of his seeking. Though by no means an old man (he was then fifty-six) Beckford endeavoured to be released from his election, pleading age and want of health as an excuse. This view, however, was not coincident with the views of his supporters, and a deputation, numerously attended, waited upon him at his house in Soho Square, and besought him to withdraw his resolution. In the end he acquiesced with their wishes, and entered upon his second mayoralty.

Many turbulent spirits were rampant amongst the civic dignitaries and citizens of London, and stormy times were to follow. The Government was most unpopular with the City, and among the citizens had no more strenuous opponent than the Lord Mayor. The series of remonstrances to the King now commenced, which so eventually culminated in the bold reply verbally addressed by Beckford to the King, which became historic. They began practically in the year 1770, when on the 14th of March an address

was presented by the City, with Beckford at its head, on the occasion of a false return at the Middlesex election. In consequence of the King's reply this address was followed in the month of May by an 'Address, Remonstrance, and Petition,' more strongly worded than the previous one, the 'remonstrance' being a personal expostulation to the King on his non-fulfilment of the expressed wishes of his subjects. Great difficulty was experienced from one cause or another in obtaining an audience for the presentation, but at length the 23rd of May was fixed for the purpose. A large deputation attended and the 'remonstrance' was read. The King returned a somewhat angry reply. The object thus attained, the deputation in the ordinary course would have at once retired, but the Lord Mayor seized the opportunity of approaching the throne and delivering the following 'impromptu' speech. At the same time it must be pointed out that the speech, on the face of it, suggests that it was already thought out, if not actually prepared, and was not unpremeditated:—

Most Gracious Sovereign!—

Will your Majesty be pleased so far to condescend as to permit the Mayor of your loyal City of London to declare, in your royal presence, on behalf of his fellow-citizens, how much the bare apprehension of your Majesty's displeasure would at all times affect their minds; the declaration of that displeasure has already filled them with inexpressible anxiety and with the deepest affliction. Permit me, Sir, to assure your Majesty that your Majesty has not, in all your dominions, any subjects more faithful, more dutiful, or more affectionate to your Majesty's Person and Family, or more ready to sacrifice their lives and fortunes in the maintenance of the true honour and dignity of your Crown.

We do, therefore, with the greatest humility and submission, most earnestly supplicate your Majesty, that you will not dismiss us from your presence without expressing a more favourable opinion of your faithful citizens, and without some comfort, without some prospect, at least, of redress.

Permit me, Sir, further to observe, that whoever has already dared, or shall hereafter endeavour, by false insinuations and suggestions, to alienate your Majesty's affections from your loyal subjects in general, and from the City of London in particular, and withdraw your confidence in and regard for your people, is an enemy to your Majesty's person and family, a violator of the public peace, and a betrayer of our happy constitution, as it was established at the glorious and necessary Revolution.

The speech was afterwards written out by the Lord Mayor from memory, and the accuracy of his memory was vouched for by those who were present at the delivery of the speech. It was ordered by the Court of Common Council to be recorded in its journals. Lord Chatham, whose ardent supporter Beckford was, expressed himself as enraptured with it, and it soon became public property by its insertion in the various newspapers of the day. Absurd pretensions have been put forward on behalf of several persons—of whom was Horne Tooke, another O.W.—as to the authorship of the speech, Beckford being asserted to have been responsible only for its utterance, but there would seem to be no ground for such opposing claims.

It was on May 30, 1770, that Beckford, as Lord



Mayor, again presented an address to the King, but this time it was a congratulatory one on the occasion of the birth of the Princess Elizabeth. His last public act was the laying of the foundation stone of Newgate, which took place on the day succeeding the presentation. On June 21, only three weeks after this event, he died in London from a chill caught while returning from his Wiltshire estate. Dying during his year of office, his death was announced by the tolling of the big bell at St. Paul's. He was taken to Fonthill for interment, and was buried there on the last day of the month. The feelings of the public had vent in laudatory verses and notices of the usual style, but a more permanent expression of his worth was the erection of a monument to his memory in the Guildhall. The City voted the sum of £1,000 for the purpose. The monument represents Beckford in the act of delivering his famous speech, part of which, with one or two slight variations, is engraved in letters of gold, upon a black tablet let into the pedestal. On each side of him are portrayed mourning figures symbolical of Liberty and Commerce. His character may be shortly noticed. As a politician he was a strong partisan, but he was no mere political weathercock, and was ever staunch to those to whom he gave his support. As a magistrate he was impartial, and always on the side of justice. As a man, though somewhat warm-tempered, he was liberal and hospitable. Possessed of great wealth he was not too eager to parade it; and we have already pointed out that though a City magnate, and upholding when occasion required the honour of his position, he was by inclination a man of moderate habits. He was of an artistic temperament, and made large collections of works of art. Though he cannot be called altogether a popular man, he was held in esteem by his supporters, and genuine regret was evinced on his death.

Beckford was twice married. His first wife was a Mrs. March, the widow of Francis March; his second being Maria, the daughter and co heir of the Hon. George Hamilton, M.P. for Wells. There was issue of the first marriage an only daughter, and by his second wife, who survived him, he had an only son, William Beckford, the eccentric author of 'Vathek.' Only ten years old on his father's death, the son, on attaining his majority, inherited a vast fortune, with an estimated income of some £100,000 a year.

URLLAD.

### School Notes.

It is gratifying to know that Westminster has at last escaped defeat at Football on the Charterhouse ground at Godalming. 1863 was the last year in which we, *as visitors*, were not beaten, but in that year Charterhouse had not moved out of London. This fact speaks for itself, and is a strong argument in favour of a neutral ground.

The following members of the team have received their 'Pinks':

J. S. Shearme,  
A. F. Guy,  
W. T. Barwell,  
J. C. Hollocombe.

E. V. Allen has also received his Pink and Whites.

A Commemoration Service was held in Abbey on Wednesday, February 25, for the Earl of Albemarle, an O.W., who has just died. A good many of the School attended the service, and a few Queen's scholars followed the coffin among the mourners.

Colonel Tryon has just placed in the vestibule of Great School a handsome brass, commemorating the connection with the School of his father, General Tryon. The makers are Garrett & Haysom, of Southampton.

A Confirmation will be held on March 21, in Henry VII.'s Chapel, by Bishop Barry.

Sir Watkin Williams Wynn being unable to come down on March 2, St. David's Day, to give the Welsh boys a sovereign, Mr. Arthur Williams Wynn came down to the School and gave each boy his sovereign.

We are very much pleased to hear that F. Street, Captain of Football in 1889, has received his 'Blue.'

There were three O.W.W. playing in the 'Varsity match: F. Street for Oxford, and J. G. Veitch and A. H. Harrison for Cambridge.

Old Westminsters have been very prominent at Hockey lately. H. B. Willett played for Oxford University against Cambridge, and E. L. Clapham and E. A. Battersby for the South of England against the North.

We hear that there is to be an 'Old Westminster Football Club' dance at the Westminster Town Hall about the end of April. The Dance Committee are anxious to obtain as much assistance as possible from fellows in the School, and hope that, as the dance will be in the holidays, all who are able will avail themselves of this opportunity of attending.

The Glee Society will give another entertainment 'Up School,' on Wednesday, March 18.

The Secretary of the Sports Committee will be glad if all holders of Challenge Cups won at the last Sports will send them in to him before April 6.



The following have been elected members of the School Mission Committee, in addition to those already on it:

- A. L. Longhurst, by College.
- J. Fanshawe, by Rigauds.
- C. E. Page, by Home Boarders.

The following have been elected members of the Sports Committee:

- A. W. F. Guy.
- C. E. Page.

The Vincent Prize has this year been awarded to Rigby. Proxime accessit, G. F. Martin.

FOOTBALL RESULTS UP TO DATE.

1890			Won	Lost
Sat.	Sept. 27	Old Westminster.....	2	8
"	Oct. 4	Clapham Rovers .....	4	1
"	" 11	F. Bickley's XI. ....	1	4
"	" 18	J. P. Paul's XI. ....	3	1
"	" 25	Casuals .....	2	4
Wed.	" 29	University Coll., Oxford ...	2	2
Sat.	Nov. 1	Christ Church, Oxford.....	1	5
"	" 8	Crusaders .....	(Exeat)	Scratched.
"	" 15	Lancing Old Boys .....	0	0
Mon.	" 17	Cambridge O.WW. ....	6	0
Sat.	" 22	Old Harrovians.....	2	4
Wed.	" 26	Trinity College, Oxford ...	1	6
Sat.	" 29	Royal Engineers .....		Scratched.
1891			Won	Lo t
Sat.	Jan. 24	H. E. Oliver's XI. ....		Scratched.
Wed.	" 28	Clapham Rovers .....	0	1
Sat.	" 31	Old Wykeham-its .....	2	3
"	Feb. 7	Christ Church, Oxford ...	6	0
Wed.	" 11	Old Carthusians .....	2	4
Sat.	" 14	Casuals .....	5	5
"	" 21	Old Et nians .....	7	3
"	" 28	CHARTERHOUSE .....	2	2
"	Mar. 7	Old Westminster .....	1	3
"	" 14	Old Harrovians .....		Scratched.

CRICKET FIXTURES, 1891.

Saturday, May 9	v. Incogniti.
" " 16	v. Kensington Park.
" " 23	v. M.C.C.
" " 30	v. I Zingari.
" June 6	v. Lords and Commons.
" " 13	v. Free Foresters.
Wednesday, " 17	v. Upper Tooting.
Saturday, " 27	v. Old Carthusians.
Wednesday, July 1	v. Masters' XI.
Saturday, " 4	v. Oxford University Authentics.
Friday, " 10	v. Charterhouse.
Saturday, " 11	v. T.B.B. v. Q.SS.
Monday, " 27	

GAMES COMMITTEE, 1890.

RECEIPTS.			EXPENDITURE.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Levies :			Athletics :		
Q.SS. & H.BB.	228	15 9	Prizes . . . .	35	0 0
Rigauds' . . . .	77	13 10	Band . . . .	5	0 0
Grants' . . . .	60	10 5	Printer . . . .	4	9 6
Failers' . . . .	2	0 0	Police . . . .	1	0 0
Preparatory School	11	14 6	Extra Help . . .	1	5 0
Athletics :			Sundries . . . .	3	18 5
Entrance Fees . .	8	0 7	Cricket :		
Balance of Pavilion			Balls . . . .	30	5 0
Fund . . . .	2	16 2	Bats, Stumps, Pads,		
Elizabethan Club	15	0 0	Gloves, Bails . .	16	4 0
Masters' Fund . .	20	0 0	Score Books . . .	1	7 0
Shop . . . .	10	0 0	Presentation Bats		
Balance from 1889	23	9 3	and Ball . . . .	2	14 0
			Printer . . . .	1	8 6
			Umpire . . . .	3	0 0
			Nets and Pegs . .	8	16 0
			Cricket Ledger . .	1	10 0
			Board of Names . .	1	2 0
			Repairs & Sundries	5	4 9
			Football :		
			Martin . . . .	19	16 0
			Drags . . . .	2	10 0
			Football Ledger . .	1	10 0
			Printer . . . .	1	3 0
			Board of Names . .	1	2 0
			Sundries . . . .	1	6 4
			Wages :		
			Harris . . . .	75	0 0
			Lewis . . . .	31	4 0
			Professionals . . .	58	8 2
			Help . . . .	4	8 6
			Dressing-room &		
			Pavilion . . . .	16	15 10
			Ground, Turf, Horse	45	6 10
			Charterhouse Supper	4	14 4
			Luncheons . . . .	24	16 0
			Shop Expenses . . .	9	10 5
			Sundries . . . .	11	1 3
			Balance, Dec. 31,		
			1890 . . . .	29	3 8

£460 0 6

£460 0 6

G. H. LENOX CONYNGHAM, Treasurer.

Audited and found correct { E. L. FOX, President.  
J. S. PHILLIMORE, Hon. Sec.

THE FIELDS.

SCHOOL v. CASUALS.

THIS match was played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, February 14, and resulted in a draw (5-5). As soon as the ball was kicked off we pressed and scored three times in quick succession—Barwell (2) and Page. The School then went to pieces, and the Casuals pressed and scored three times—Moon, Hemmerde, and Perks. The score at half-time then stood 3-3. After half-time the Casuals continued to press and scored twice more—Perks and Leman. Powell shot two more goals for us, but one was disallowed by the umpire, as another ball happened to be on the ground at the same time. After the match, Bickley, who captained the Casuals, in the most sportsman-like way, offered to allow us to count the goal, as it



had been fairly shot, and the other ball had not baulked the goal-keeper. The School played about as badly as they have played this year after the first ten minutes; the back division were especially weak. We played with only ten men three quarters of the time, as Shoubridge got hurt, and had to leave the field. For the School, Longhurst, Powell, and Sherring, were best.

#### SCHOOL TEAM.

J. Langton, H. R. Blaker, and J. S. Shearme; F. B. Sherring, A. W. F. Guy, T. C. Hollocombe, A. L. Longhurst, and W. T. Barwell; H. O. B. Shoubridge, C. E. Page, and J. O. T. Powell.

#### CASUALS.

E. L. Dewdney, R. M. Cowie, and F. G. Oliver; F. C. Ryde, F. Bickley, and G. O. Slatlock; E. G. Moon and A. G. Hemmerde; D. C. Leman, G. P. Stevens, and J. E. Parks.

### SCHOOL *v.* OLD ETONIANS.

This match was played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, February 21, and resulted in a victory for the School by 7-3. Nothing was scored on either side till just before half-time, when Gosling shot their first goal (1-0). Just before half-time, F. C. Weatherhead twisted his knee and had to leave the field. Resuming at half-time the School had things all their own way. Barwell shot the first goal for the School from a pass by Longhurst. The Old Etonians then made a determined rush, but without result. Longhurst then scored the second goal for the School with a splendid shot. Soon after Sherring also shot a goal. The Old Etonians then made a rush, and Gosling scored with an easy shot (2-3). Blaker then put the ball well into their goal, and Powell put it through, judging it excellently. Gates, with rather a lame shot, scored another goal for the School, and Trotter shot a third goal for the Etonians. Page shot two more goals (3-7). We may truly say that we have never seen the team play so well together before. The Old Etonians brought one of the strongest teams we have played this year, and the School acquitted themselves most creditably. The whole team played well: of the forwards, Longhurst, Powell, Page, were best, and of the back division, Guy, Blaker, and Sherring.

#### OLD ETONIANS.

H. N. Alson, A. T. B. Dunn, and C. Heseltine; J. F. P. Rawlinson, N. M. Farrar, and A. B. Marten; F. C. Weatherhead and A. H. Dickinson; W. S. Gosling, H. A. Trotter, and W. C. Bridgeman.

#### SCHOOL TEAM.

J. Langton (goal), H. R. Blaker and J. S. Shearme (backs), F. B. Sherring, A. W. F. Guy, and T. C. Hollocombe (half-backs), A. L. Longhurst and W. T. Barwell (right), E. A. Gates (centre), C. E. Page and J. O. T. Powell (left).

### WESTMINSTER *v.* CHARTERHOUSE.

(From our Special Correspondent.)

It was not with very confident feelings that the XI. journeyed down to Godalming this year. Charterhouse had six of last year's victorious eleven, and had

had a most successful season, and had beaten a nearly representative team of Cambridge University. At the last minute a change of goal-keepers was decided on, and, as Hollocombe had been hurt playing against the Old Etonians on the previous Saturday, Longhurst thought that it would be safer not to play him, so Campbell took his place. The XI. went down determined to prevent a repetition of the disasters of the two previous years, and splendidly they played too.

Directly after the kick-off, Westminster went off with a rush, and looked like scoring in the first minute, but Smith relieved by a good run on the right, and was only just pulled up in time. Then Blaker missed his kick, but recovered the ball, but Hewitt on the outside left made a splendid run, and put the ball right in front of our goal, from which Clark scored six minutes from the start (0-1). Page and Shoubridge put in a pretty combined run when the ball was re-started; then Hewitt was conspicuous for a good run, but his centre went behind. Then Allen had to save twice, and Charterhouse gained five corners in rapid succession. These were splendidly placed by Bailey, but time after time Shearme headed the ball out of danger in fine form. 'Hands' close to our goal looked very dangerous, but the ball was got away. Owing to miskicks by Blaker and Allen it looked as if Charterhouse were bound to score, but our forwards rushed the ball up the field, and, after some exciting play close to their goal, Page equalised the scores by a neat shot, thereby scoring the first goal that has been gained by Westminster at Godalming since 1883 (1-1).

Immediately on re-starting Charterhouse rushed the ball to our goal, and Allen had to save a very awkward high shot. Then Hewitt put in a good dribble, and centred, but Salt headed the ball over the bar. Then 'hands' were given against Shearme, followed by a corner to Charterhouse, but the backs got the ball away on both occasions, and the Westminster forwards took it down to the other end, where Wilkinson had to save. Then Hewitt came down very fast, and, eluding both Sherring and Blaker, looked certain to score, but was forced out just in time. A corner resulted, which was splendidly put by Bailey, but Shearme got the ball away. Two 'hands' very close to our goal followed, but, try as the Charterhouse forwards would, they could not beat Shearme and Blaker, and, after a shot by Merriman, which went behind, 'half-time' was whistled with the score standing at one goal each.

Shoubridge re-started the ball for Westminster, and Powell made a magnificent long shot, which Wilkinson saved in good style. Bramwell passed to Salt, who was getting near our goal, when Blaker stopped him. After a corner to Charterhouse, from which nothing resulted, Shoubridge made a good run, but failed to pass Bray, who passed to Merriman, but he handled the ball. Then Powell got the ball from Page, and made a very fast run, when Bray stopped him, and kicked the ball to the centre. Guy returned to Barwell, and some pretty passing ensued between



him and Longhurst, which ended in the latter putting in a very hot shot, which was fisted out by Wilkinson after it had passed between the posts (2-1). This was received with tremendous cheering, and when Clark kicked off again for Charterhouse, the game became most exciting. Charterhouse gained a corner, but the ball was kicked away. Then both sides gained a corner alternately, after which Powell tried a long shot, but the ball went over the bar. Then Hewitt and Merriman dribbled up, but only a corner resulted, which was got safely away. 'Hands' were next given against Charterhouse, and, after some give and take play in the centre, Clark made a very good dribble, and, getting by our backs, equalised the scores (2-2). On re-starting, the Charterhouse forwards came up with a rush, and Hewitt ran the ball over the goal-line. It was kicked into play by a spectator, and Merriman, not aware of this, put it through, while our backs had stopped play. The goal was, of course, disallowed. With only a few minutes left for play, Westminster made a desperate attempt to gain the winning point, but, though Wilkinson had to save, nothing further of importance occurred, and, when the whistle sounded for time, the match ended in a draw (2-2).

Our team was severely handicapped by the nature of the ground, which contrasted very unfavourably with Vincent Square, and made our fellows more fatigued than would have been the case if the ground had been less uneven and sandy.

For Westminster, Allen, considering that it was the first time he had played for the School, played splendidly, and kept out several shots that seemed absolutely certain to score. As this is only his second term in the School, we hope that Westminster may be provided with a safe goal-keeper for several years to come. Of the backs, Shearme played magnificently, his tackling and kicking being equally good; he was always in the right spot in front of goal, and time after time headed away the corners which were placed dangerously near our goal. Blaker, at starting, appeared to be rather bothered by the ground, and missed his kick once or twice, and after that he played as well as ever, and that is saying much. Campbell stuck to Smith like grim death, and almost completely spoilt his play. In the centre Guy did a tremendous amount of work in an unostentatious way, and passed well to his forwards. Sherring at first seemed to find Hewitt rather too fast for him, but later on in the game was nearly always able to stop him; his kicking over his head was very good. Page was the best of the forwards, and got through a lot of good work. Powell at times was fast and tricky, but he too seemed to be rather bothered by the ground. We do not think, however, that he got the ball often enough. Shoubridge was fair in the first half, but in the second improved very much, making one particularly good dribble. Considering that after half-time he had a most painful headache, his was a highly plucky and meritorious display. Barwell performed most energetically, and worked like a demon all through. Longhurst combined well with Barwell and put in

some very good centres from the outside. We must congratulate him and the rest of the team on the success of their efforts.

For Charterhouse, Wilkinson kept goal well, and saved one or two difficult shots in good style. Both the backs were very good kickers, and in this respect were decidedly superior to us, Bray's volleying being especially noticeable. The halves kicked better, but did not tackle as well as our men. Bailey was especially noticeable for his accurate corner kicking. Hewitt was the best of the forwards, being very fast and centering well; the first goal was almost entirely due to his efforts. Of the others, Clark was the most prominent, Smith being too well watched to make any brilliant runs as he did last year.

In conclusion we must thank Mrs. Haig-Brown for her kindly hospitality, of which, we are quite sure, full advantage was taken. On the whole our display must have been pleasing to all Westminsterers, and no one had any cause to go away dissatisfied.

The following were the teams:—

#### CHARTERHOUSE.

B. K. Wilkinson (goal), E. H. Bray and J. G. Alston (backs); E. C. Bliss, E. Bramwell, and E. H. Bailey (half-backs), C. D. Hewitt and H. A. Merriman (left), F. Clark (centre), R. J. Salt and G. O. Smith (captain) (right forwards).

#### WESTMINSTER.

E. V. Allen (goal), H. R. Blaker and J. S. Shearme (backs), F. B. Sherring, A. W. F. Guy, and G. E. S. Campbell (half-back), J. O. T. Powell and C. E. Page (left), H. O. B. Shoubridge (centre), W. T. Barwell and A. L. Longhurst (captain) (right forwards).

#### GRANTS v. H.BB.

For various reasons the House matches this year have to be played much earlier than was originally intended, and the first match, Grants v. H.BB., was played on Wednesday, March 4. Since last term H.BB. have lost two House colours, both forwards, so that their attack was considerably weakened; their backs, too, were not so good as the Grantite backs, but they had a decided advantage in their halves and goal. Page chose to play with a strong wind in his favour for the first '45,' but the Grantite defence proved so good, that for about half an hour, during which the play was extremely even, nothing was scored; before the whistle sounded for half time, however, both sides had scored: Grants got the first goal from the foot of Powell, a shot which Allen could not have saved, while Page had made the score even by a high shot which was badly misjudged by Fitzmaurice, who made great preparations for stopping it, but when the time came, tamely let it go through. At 'half-time' an army of small Grantites invaded the ground with refreshments, in the shape of lemons, for their champions. This refreshment, however, had no very great effect, as though Grants had the wind at their backs, they were unable to add to their score, and so when time was called it was agreed to play



another half hour to try and decide the match. Home boarders again began with the wind, but, chiefly owing to the poor shooting of their right wing, were unable to score. At this period of the game Powell and Severn showed up to great advantage for Grants. On beginning the last quarter of an hour all looked favourable for Grants, and it was only the splendid goal-keeping of Allen which prevented their scoring; meanwhile the H.B.B. forwards, headed by Page, had made several attacks on Fitzmaurice's charge, and about four minutes before the end of the two hours' play Page got in a long low shot, which for some unaccountable reason beat the Grantite goal-keeper. Grants in general and Powell in particular made desperate efforts to equalise during the remaining three minutes, but were unsuccessful. H.B.B. were left winners of a most exciting match by the narrow margin of 2 goals to 1.

For the winners, Allen, Fevez, Guy, and Page were best, and Chatterton, considering the sudden change in his place, was very good; and for Grants the backs, Powell, Barwell, and Severn were most conspicuous.

The teams were :

H.B.B.

E. V. Allen (goal), G. Howlett and Pilkington (backs), Fevez, A. W. F. Guy, and Robertson (half-backs), Phelps, R. Campbell, Shoubridge, Chatterton, and Page (forwards).

GRANTS.

Fitzmaurice (goal), Burton and G. E. Campbell (backs), Leake, W. Barwell, and Yeld (half-backs), Lambton, Severn, Powell, Gatty, and Woodbridge (forwards).

### SCHOOL v. OLD WESTMINSTERS.

This match was played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, March 7, in very wet weather, and resulted in a win for O.W.W. by 3-1. In the first half Longhurst scored the only goal for the School, and Probyn equalised. In the second half two more goals were shot for O.W.W. by Hemmerde and Probyn. The School were all very slack, and the only people who showed any energy were Barwell, Longhurst, and Blaker.

Teams :

SCHOOL TEAM.

E. V. Allen (goal), H. R. Blaker and J. S. Shearme (backs), F. B. Sherring, A. W. F. Guy, and T. C. Hollocombe (half-backs), A. L. Longhurst and W. T. Barwell (right), H. O. B. Shoubridge (centre), C. E. Page and J. O. T. Powell (left).

O.W.W.

E. H. Winslow (goal), A. L. Fevez and F. G. Oliver (backs), C. H. Gardiner, J. P. Paul, and Stevens (half backs), S. C. Probyn and H. Berens (right), W. R. Moon (centre), A. T. Hemmerde and D. C. Winckworth (left).

### O.W.W. v. OLD ETONIANS.

This match was played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, March 7, and resulted in a win for Old Etonians by 4-1. In the first half W. R. Hoare scored the first

goal for O.E.'s. After 'half-time' Fox scored the only goal for O.W.W., and Old Etonians scored three more. For O.W.W. Winckworth and Sandilands were best.

The teams were :

O.W.W.

C. W. Grant-Wilson (goal), R. T. Squire and E. G. Moon (backs), H. Wetton, W. N. Winckworth, and R. O. Mills (half-backs), O. R. Heath and H. C. Peck (right), O. J. M. Fox (centre), G. P. Stevens and R. R. Sandilands (left).

OLD ETONIANS.

G. A. Foljambe (goal), C. Heseltine and W. C. Bridgeman (backs), A. B. Marten, J. B. Littledale, and N. M. Farrer (half-backs), R. C. Gosling and A. T. B. Dunn (right), W. C. Gosling (centre), W. E. Hoare and G. Lawrence (left forwards).

## WESTMINSTER REDIVIVUS.

THIS year a new departure has been made with reference to the encouragement of Football and Cricket, especially among the younger and smaller members of the School. Much dissatisfaction existed not only throughout the School as a whole, but also among O.W.W. generally, about what was termed the slackness in games during the last few years. The truth was that both the School and Old Westminsters were tired of a long series of disastrous seasons both in Football and Cricket, and cast about for means to remedy this state of affairs.

During the course of last year an attempt, and we think we may say a *successful* attempt, was made to deal with this question, by the appointment of a Special Committee to consider the matter, and by carrying out the recommendations of that Committee.

It is known to all the readers of *The Elizabethan* that last Cricket season, for the first time, one day every week was set apart for House games, in order to bring out any latent talent, and to enable the smaller boys to obtain some practice and experience by playing with fellows superior to them in point of skill.

Another of the suggestions of the Committee also carried into effect, was the institution of regular Form Matches, which caused a very keen interest to arise in all parts of the School as regards Cricket. This was especially noticeable in the case of the lower forms, as before that time Wednesday games had excited no interest whatsoever.

In the Football term also the same system was carried out, but in a less degree; last term there were House games for each House about once a month, and there can be no doubt that this system was productive of the best results.

Another scheme, aimed specially at inspiring the smaller fellows in the School, was set on foot and worked by one or two O.W.W., chief among whom was G. Stephenson, Esq. Their intention was to make the School keener about Football by starting a Football competition, in which all, even the smallest



boys, were to have an equal chance. The scheme was that the thirty highest colours or best players in the School should each draw lots for five other fellows. These sides were then drawn against one another until all the ties were played off. Under these conditions a small fellow has just as much chance of being in the winning VI. as a big fellow, since there was no opportunity for anyone to get together an exceptionally strong VI.

The ties were played in green, and a good many were finished at the end of last term, but unluckily they had been left till rather late in the term, and so could not all be played off as originally intended; there were also a large number of drawn games which threw them back still further. The continued frost and snow at the beginning of this year again prevented them from being finished when they should have been, as it was found impossible to play them off with Charterhouse looming in the distance. At last, however, we are glad to say all difficulties have been successfully surmounted and the ties will soon be played off. It was felt that something besides the House and Junior House matches was needed to arouse an interest in boys who would play neither in the one or the other, and we must say that we think the aims of the promoters of these schemes have been fully achieved.

Even in the space of one year the system has worked wonders, and in the course of the Football term as well as the Cricket term the results have been easy to discern. There is more confidence felt in the teams throughout the School as a whole, and this reacts on the minds of the teams and makes them more confident in themselves. At Westminster we are never likely to be prejudiced by any over-confidence, it is almost a necessity that we get beaten several times during the season, owing to the strength of some of the teams we play, so there is no fear of over-confidence; the real cause for fear is a despondency, first felt by the members of the team, and then by the School, which steadily increases after every unsuccessful match.

Lately, however, there has been shown an unprecedented amount of keenness and interest in all things connected with School games, and if we will only make up our minds to go on as we have begun, there is no reason why Westminster should not once again take its old pre-eminent place.

J.

---

## THE MISSION.

---

A MEETING of the Mission Committee was held 'Up School' on Friday, February 27, at which a very large number of members were present.

The business before the Committee was the discussion of several improvements in the Mission, at the instance of A. R. Knapp, Esq.

Mr. KNAPP moved the following resolution, which was seconded by Mr. RAWSON:

That in addition to the present members of the School who are on the Committee *ex-officio*, every year there should be an extra member elected for College and for each of the Houses to act on the Committee.

After a short discussion, this was carried unanimously.

By this regulation not only, as heretofore, the Captain and Monitors and Heads of Houses will be members of the Committee, but also four extra members—one from each House.

Mr. KNAPP then made some remarks as to the class of boys dealt with by the Mission, asserting that in the first place they were of a class higher than that with which the Mission had originally intended to deal; and, secondly, that many of them were too old. He gave several instances to support his contention. The fact that there was a Cycling Club in existence in connection with the Mission, and also that they had to pay their own fares at excursions, showed that they were not of the lowest class. It was remarked, on the other side, that there were only a small number of better-class boys, and these were useful in maintaining discipline.

It was decided, after some discussion, to make an alteration in two of the rules.

One rule stood, that every person, to become a member of the Club, had to be introduced by two boys who were already members. This rule was repealed, on the motion of Mr. OLDHAM, as it prevented the friendless boys from becoming members.

Secondly, it was proposed by Mr. RAWSON, and seconded by Mr. SHEARME, that the age of admittance to the Mission should be reduced from 14 to 12 years, and the date of leaving from 21 to 17 years, as it was pointed out that the Mission was not intended to benefit men of that age. An amendment was added to the effect that all present members of the Mission must leave at the age of 19, and that the rule should come into operation at the end of the Technical Classes year.

Then there were some remarks made in regard to the substitution of a Bible Class on Sundays instead of a Service, and the change was agreed to.

Mr. KNAPP complained that the Technical Classes were pushed at the expense of the Boys' Club, so as to make a good show at exhibitions; and it was determined that the Superintendent should be requested not to compete with other institutions so keenly in the matter of technical work, and that for the future there should be fewer exhibits and more attention paid to the duller boys.

The next question before the Committee was whether the boys should be allowed to use boxing-gloves. It was decided that they should be allowed to box, if under strict supervision.

Mr. GWYNN then informed the Committee that the School Board had refused to pay the cost of fire and lighting at the Mission any longer, so it was



decided that the cost must be defrayed from the funds of the Mission.

It is a very encouraging sign that so many members attended this meeting, as it shows that there is a great deal of real though unostentatious interest taken in the affairs of the Mission.

## GLEE SOCIETY.

MR. RANALOW'S careful training was again evident in the successful entertainment given by 'Glee Soc.' on Wednesday, February 25. There was a great muster of violinists, assisted by W. B. Edwards, Esq., and F. B. Ranalow, and the importation of a grand piano considerably enlivened the performance of the opening 'Grand March,' in which the string-instruments had a very good effect. 'The Mice in Council' is an old friend; we think it hardly went as well as we have heard it sung Up School, apparently the trebles were saving their voices for later items of the programme. A song by A. L. Longhurst followed, which was excellently sung, and was received with enthusiastic applause, and gained a well-deserved encore. We may heartily congratulate Eason on his 'maiden' solo, the piece was excellently rendered if not quite happily chosen. Of the duets, that sung by E. Kite and F. W. Longhurst pleased us most, though Longhurst's voice, a good one withal, was rather too strong for Kite's treble; however, their duet was well given, and we hope to hear them both again. R. Balfour, L. F. Wintle, and A. L. Longhurst caused no little amusement by their round, 'Three Oxford Cries.' We are not acquainted with Oxford costermongers (if they have such things in so classic a town), but the performers in this round had apparently studied with effect the cries to be heard in Great College Street, and reproduced them even to the indistinct mysteries of their words. The 'Jovial Beggars' went with spirit, the trebles were more to the fore than in the preceding chorus. H. D. Everington had chosen a distinctly difficult song in 'By the Fountain,' he therefore deserves all the more praise for the success of the rendering. Norman, another *débutant*, played with marked precision, he is a decided acquisition to the force of violinists. H. E. T. Agar was very good in the pretty song 'Rose Marie,' and gained some well-earned applause. The audience were convulsed with laughter, no less by the acting than by the singing of C. E. Page, R. A. Yeld, and H. D. Everington in the well-known round 'Three Blind Mice,' which is always amusing if only for its simplicity.

'La Carnavole' gave every part an opportunity of showing their powers, which they did with great effect, we do not remember ever to have heard it sung so well before; the altos and tenors were especially

praiseworthy. 'God save the Queen' brought to a close a most enjoyable entertainment, and as far as we could ascertain everyone went away fully satisfied.

This seems to be the proper place to call attention to a point which can easily be remedied, that is, the behaviour of people in the back part of the audience. Quite loud conversations were carried on during solos. This is not fair to the singers, and is all the more reprehensible as, we believe, library is open, and attendance Up School is not compulsory.

## PROGRAMME.

INTRODUCTION ...	'Grand March' ...	... Hill.
CHORUS ...	'The Mice in Council' ...	W. Filby.
SONG ...	'Cockles and Mussels' ...	J. Yorksten.
	A. L. LONGHURST.	
VIOLIN SOLO ...	'Cavatina' ...	... J. Raff.
	H. V. EASON.	
VOCAL DUET ...	'Greeting' ...	Mendelssohn.
	E. KITE and F. LONGHURST.	
ROUND ...	'Three Oxford Cries' ...	... Hayes.
	R. BALFOUR, A. L. LONGHURST, and L. F. WINTLE.	
CHORUS ...	'The Jovial Beggars' ...	Montgomery.
SONG ...	'By the Fountain' ...	Stephen Adams.
	H. D. EVERINGTON.	
VOCAL DUET ...	'Summer' ...	H. Walmsley Little.
	T. N. GRIFFIN and C. W. UNDERWOOD.	
VIOLIN SOLO ...	... ..	... ..
	G. NORMAN.	
SONG ...	'Rose Marie' ...	... Molloy.
	H. E. T. AGAR.	
ROUND ...	'Three Blind Mice' ...	... Anon.
	H. D. EVERINGTON, C. E. PAGE, and R. A. YELD.	
CHORUS ...	'La Carnavole' ...	... Rossini.

## GOD SAVE THE QUEEN.

FLOREAT.

## DEBATING SOCIETY.

THE House met on Thursday, February 12, and concluded the discussion on February 19 of the motion 'That in the opinion of this House, Napoleon was the greatest general of modern times.'

The following Members spoke—

For the motion—B. E. Strauss (Proposer), A. Y. G. Campbell (Seconder), J. S. Phillimore, J. S. Shearme, E. H. Marsh, Mr. Sargeaunt.

Against the motion—D. Shearme (Opposer), R.



Balfour, A. L. Longhurst, C. T. Agar. L. R. Holme spoke but did not vote.

The motion was carried (10-9) by the casting vote of the President.

The PROPOSER thought that Napoleon could not be compared to anyone; the way in which he had risen from a common soldier was wonderful. He would not enumerate his victories, but would say that he was only beaten four times. 'He never blundered into victory, but won his battles in his head before he won them on the field.' He would not defend Napoleon's moral character, as he did not believe he had one.

The OPPOSER said that this motion was entirely a matter of personal opinion, influence could only be brought to bear on that opinion. He carefully showed how Napoleon had failed utterly in his campaigns. He showed also that Frederic the Great was a greater general than Napoleon. The latter was unsuccessful in all his aims, especially that of ousting England, and left nothing behind him but a country exhausted with supplying men and money.

The SECONDER objected to Napoleon not being considered a great general because his campaigns in the end came to nothing. Hannibal's wars in the end came to nothing, but no one could say that he was not a great general.

R. BALFOUR thought that the Opposer presumed very much when he said that Napoleon's object was to conquer England. Could Napoleon have done anything after Waterloo? He thought that all those who had any opinions about generals were 'inevitably damned.'

J. S. PHILLIMORE said that Napoleon's rise was due to his generalship, but his plan against England failed through his statesmanship. As Frederic was outnumbered at Kolin, so was Napoleon at Leipsig. Napoleon's levies were of his own making, while Frederic had well-drilled troops left him by his father. Because the former failed in his campaign would not show that he was not a great general; how about Pompey, Antony, Rupert? There were circumstances, times, means, opportunities to be considered.

A. L. LONGHURST affirmed that a great general should not throw away lives. He ought to have had somewhere to fall back when Moscow was burnt.

C. T. AGAR: If Napoleon's men were raw recruits, more so were Wellington's from the slums of London and boy-officers from Eton and Westminster.

J. S. SHEARME accounted for the defeat at Waterloo by the fact that all France was thoroughly tired after fighting against all Europe.

On the second day (February 19) E. H. MARSH continued the debate, saying that we could not judge of Napoleon now any more than could a future generation of Mr. Gladstone.

L. R. HOLME: 'The genius of a leader is to be measured not so much by the actual results achieved as by the difficulties overcome.' Napoleon covered his defeats by his victories.

Mr. SARGEAUNT commented on the many ways in

which this motion had been viewed. A general must not be judged by his victories. William of Orange was a great general, but he won no great victories. The defeat of the Nile was unfair, as the French were put upon an element on which they were never equal to the English.

After A. L. LONGHURST, D. SHEARME, R. BALFOUR, J. S. SHEARME had spoken shortly the House divided with the above result.

The last half of the time of the meeting, on February 19, was occupied by the discussion of the motion:—'That this House approves of cremation, and considers it better than ordinary burial.'

For the motion—F. B. Sherring (Proposer), P. E. Knapp (Secunder), Mr. Sargeaunt, R. Balfour.

Against the motion—J. H. Alderson (Opposer), J. S. Shearme, A. L. Longhurst, Mr. A. R. Knapp.

The PROPOSER seemed to believe in cremation chiefly because it prevented the awful fate of being buried alive. He narrated an instance to show how difficult it really was to discover if a man was really dead. He thought that cemeteries were injurious in large towns. He briefly described to the House the method of cremation, and showed that in the bricks which absorbed the gases of the body, any poison could be detected.

The OPPOSER thought that the earth was the right and natural means of disposing of the body, and that we ought to aid it in its work. He objected to the use of leaden coffins. There was something to be said against cremation on the ground of sentiment, but that must stand second to public health.

The SECONDER maintained that it was a dirty trick to keep corruption in existence for the longest possible period. The adoption of canvas coffins would be a step in the right direction, but those who did not object to them, surely could not object to cremation. He thought that cremation would fairly do away with any renewed outbreak in case of plague or epidemic.

J. S. SHEARME complained that we should have lost a great deal of literature from mummies, if cremation had been in use in those days. He would like to be embalmed.

A. L. LONGHURST objected to a crematorium in the middle of a town, the scene would then be like the funerals which passed Vincent Square.

Mr. SARGEAUNT did not care what became of him after death, he thought the dead ought not to be an incumbrance to the living. We ought to do with the dead what would prove most useful afterwards.

Mr. A. R. KNAPP was delighted to see the Society was so conservative as to bring up this motion once again. He thought cremation must become cheaper if it were to be adopted.

R. BALFOUR said that a coach would call at your door and return the next day with your cremated ashes (15 guineas! from J. S. Shearme).

Though there were several other members wishing to speak, they were not bold enough to stand up when 'Divide' was called.

The division gave, Ayes, 10; Noes, 9.



### Obituary.

WE regret to have to announce the death of the Earl of Albemarle, who was one of the very oldest of Old Westminsters, as he left the School in 1815.

The Earl of Albemarle, George Thomas, the sixth Earl, died on Saturday at his residence, Quidenham Hall, Norfolk, in his 92nd year, having been born on June 13, 1799. Fifteen years ago the Earl published some very entertaining memoirs, under the title of 'Fifty Years of My Life,' the chief fault of which was that they brought the story down no further than 1855. From these we learn much not only of the distinguished Keppel family to which he belonged, but of the contemporaries, royal and noble, military and political, among whom he passed his life. He was the direct descendant of the Lords of Keppel in Guelderland, whose record goes back to the twelfth century, and who entered into English history with the Arnold Joost von Keppel who came with the Prince of Orange in 1688, and was made Earl of Albemarle in recognition of his great services. Two generations later the Keppels, then settled at Quidenham, were among the best known of the Whig families of England; and they are as familiar to ourselves as any of the people of that day from the admirable portraits painted of them by their illustrious friend, Sir Joshua Reynolds. Till the other day these portraits of the famous Admiral, of his brother the General, of the third Earl, of Lady Caroline, who married Robert Adair, and of Lady Elizabeth, who married Lord Tavistock, all hung in the room for which they were painted; but, alas! agricultural depression caused the late Earl to part with them, and they are now scattered in many directions. His memoirs tell us in lively language of his adventures at Westminster School, where he was abominably bullied, and fell a frequent sacrifice to Dr. Page's appetite for flogging; of his boy and girl friendship with the Princess Charlotte, who was under the charge of his maternal grandmother, Lady de Clifford; and of his last escapade, which led to his leaving Westminster at sixteen, and entering the army. He fought at Waterloo as ensign in the 14th Regiment; and we have from the old man's pen a lively account of the boy's experiences both in the terrible battle and in the long and hungry march to Paris.

He tells the story of his share in the Battle of Waterloo in his Memoirs as follows: 'The

regiment was in square, lying down. Our men lay packed together like herrings in a barrel. Not finding a vacant spot, I seated myself on a drum. Behind me was Colonel Tidy's charger, which, with his head pressed against mine, was mumbling my epaulette. Suddenly my drum capsized, and I was thrown prostrate by a blow on my right cheek. I thought half my face was shot away, but the skin was not even abraded. A piece of shell had struck the horse on the nose, exactly between my hand and head, and killed him instantly. The blow I received was from the embossed crown on the horse's bit.'

Returning to England, he was soon afterwards appointed equerry to the Duke of Sussex, and gained his full share of such other worldly advantages as were likely to fall in the way of a very presentable young member of a great Whig family. He served afterwards in India, and came home *via* Persia, Baku, Astrakhan, and St. Petersburg—a rare feat in those days. In 1829 he was with the British squadron in Eastern waters, went to Constantinople and Adrianople, and saw the famous Russian General Diebitsch. After the passing of the Reform Bill he stood for East Norfolk, to the great disgust of the squirearchy, 'who were astounded at this act of audacity in a man not owning an acre of land in the county,' but he was returned by a large majority, and sat till 1835. Appointed one of Lord John Russell's private secretaries in 1846, he again entered Parliament in 1847 as member for Lymington, and sat three years. He married, in 1831, the third daughter of Sir Coutts Trotter, and his son, who succeeds him, is the well-known Lord Bury, who was Under Secretary for War from 1878 to 1880, and was called up to the House of Lords in his father's barony of Ashford in 1876. Lord Albemarle was a general officer in the army and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries.

When he died he was, save General Whichcote, the sole survivor of the veterans who, at the 'Waterloo Banquet' at Apsley House, on June 18, were wont to gather round the table of the Iron Duke, and drink in solemn silence to the memory of those comrades who lost their lives in the battle. During the closing years of the Earl's life, on every anniversary of Waterloo, he was the recipient of the heartiest and kindest congratulations from Her Majesty the Queen and the Royal Family, as well as from friends innumerable.



## POETRY.

## THE CERTAIN KNOT OF PEACE.

On waves of parch'd and drooping wheat,  
 Dry vale and plain,  
 On thirsty leaves, in sunless heat,  
 Falls, with a whispering cool and sweet,  
 Heaven's own rain.

So to sad eyes, grown tir'd of sight,  
 That wake to weep—  
 'To hearts that mourn a dead delight  
 Comes, through the exquisite hush of the night,  
 Merciful Sleep!

KÉPI.

## THE SELF-ASSERTIN' SPOT OF GREASE.

On cuffs well starch'd, well-booted feet,  
 Shirt without crease,  
 On thirsty waistcoat, trousers neat,  
 Falls—if you're talking while you eat  
 Your chop—the grease.

So we, too tir'd to be polite,  
 Stop to perspire ;  
 Then set the deadly stuff alight,  
 Dropping the exquisite slush that you write  
 Into the fire.

FIRE-ESKÉPI.

„Doch bin ich treu bis in den Tod.“

Love, this is no pledge writ on the breezes,  
 Graven in the desert's shifting sand ;  
 Changing as the changing fancy pleases,  
 With the moment's whim to fall or stand :  
 Love, my troth not idly thus was plighted,  
 No, nor lightly shall it broken be ;  
 Nought shall quench the holy fire once lighted,  
 Nought shall check the life throb of the sea.

In the circling fulness of the seasons,  
 In the long accomplishment of years,  
 There will be temptations, doubtings, reasons,  
 False persuasions, seeming-grounded fears ;  
 Love, I charge thee heed them not ; perséver  
 Stedfast in thy love, as I to thee ;  
 I am thine for ever and for ever,  
 Be thou no less faithful unto me.

PNYX.

## NOTES AND QUERIES.

*From the 'Arminian Magazine.'*

SAMUEL WESLEY, jun., was educated at Westminster School, and during his stay there an incident occurred which strikingly displays the providence of God. The forty king's scholars lodged in one room, which was called the dormitory. One morning the head boy cried out vehemently, 'Lads! lads! you over-sleep yourselves! You lie too late. It is time to be at school.' They all started up, dressed themselves as quickly as they could, and ran down with him. When they came into the cloisters, one who was a little before the rest saw something white, and cried out, 'What have we got here?' They went up to it, and found a man stark naked, and so benumbed that he could not speak. Just then the clock struck two. They took him up, and carried him into the dormitory, and put him into a warm bed. After some rest he recovered his senses and speech; and being asked how he came into that condition, he told them that as he was coming over Chelsea fields, he was robbed by two footpads, who then stripped him stark naked, tied him neck and heels, and threw him into a ditch. There he must have perished, but that some young woman, coming to market very early in the morning, heard him groan, and, going to the ditch, untied him, and then ran away. He made toward the town as well as he could, till, being unable to walk any farther, he crept into the cloisters upon his hands and feet, where he lay till the king's scholars came. Probably in an hour or two he would have expired. After he had slept some hours, they gave him something warm to drink; then one gave him a shirt, another a coat or waistcoat, others what they could spare, till they had clothed him from head to foot. Then they collected for him among themselves about forty shillings, and wished him well home. 'See the wisdom of God,' says Mr. John Wesley, who relates the fact, 'in making the sport of a boy the means of saving a poor man's life.'

J.

The following extract from a German paper of February 13 may be interesting to some of our readers. A literal translation is given below:—

Pfannkuchentag in der Westminster Schule.—Aus London wird uns vom 11. ds. geschrieben: Gestern, am Fastnacht-Dienstag—hier Shrove-Tuesday geheissen—ist nach althergebrachtem Brauch in allen Haushaltungen und Restaurants die Mahlzeit mit einem Gericht Pfannkuchen beschlossen worden. Diese Gewohnheit ist auch in den großen öffentlichen Schulen eingeführt. In der Westminster Schule besteht in Verbindung mit dem Fastnacht-Dienstag ein kurioser alter Brauch. Nach Beendigung der Schulstunden am Vormittag werden alle Schüler in der großen Halle versammelt, wo der große eichene Tisch mit dem schwarzen Buch und den zum Abstrafen der Schüler



gebrauchten Gerten steht. Die „Monitore“ der Schule bestimmen durchs Loos zwölf baumstarke Jungen, welche sich in der Mitte der Halle, genau unter einer von einer Wand zur anderen reichenden Eisenstange, aufstellen. Die Glocke läutet und gefolgt von dem weißgeschürzten Koch tritt der Profos herein, in schwarzem Anzug, das silberne Schulscepter auf der Schulter. Auf ein Zeichen stellt sich der Koch mit der Bratpfanne, in der ein braun gebackener Pfannkuchen leuchtet, vor der Eisenstange auf, balancirt seine Pfanne einen Augenblick und wirft dann den Inhalt über die Stange in die Höhe. Wie der Kuchen dem Boden zufällt, werfen sich die Jungen darauf: ein Haufen schreiender, keuchender, strampelnder Buben wälzt sich auf dem Boden umher. Plötzlich ertönt eine halberstickte Stimme: „Ich hab ihn“, und der Knäuel löst sich auf, um dem Sieger, den zersehten Kuchen in der Hand, das Erheben zu erleichtern. Er ist arg zugerichtet, gerade wie die elf, die leer ausgegangen sind, aber seine Belohnung ist eine blanke goldene Guinee. Die ganze Schule feiert Nachmittags.

PANCAKE DAY IN WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.—Yesterday, on Fast-Eve Tuesday—here called Shrove Tuesday—according to old-established usage in every household and restaurant the meal was concluded with a dish of pancakes. This custom is also introduced into the great public schools. In the Westminster School there exists a curious old usage in connection with the Eve of the Fast. When school hours are over at noon all the boys are assembled in the great Hall, where stands the great oaken table with the Black Book, and the rods used in punishing the boys. The ‘Monitors’ of the School choose by lot twelve youths strong as trees, who range themselves in the middle of the Hall, right under the iron Bar which reaches from wall to wall. The Bell sounds, and the Bedesman enters, dressed in black robe, with silver School-sceptre on his shoulder, followed by the white-aproned cook. Upon a signal the cook takes his place before the iron bar with his Frying-pan, in which a brown baked Pancake gleams, balances his Pan a moment, and then throws the contents high over the Bar. As the Cake falls to ground the youths throw themselves on it; a heap of screaming, gasping, trampling boys wallows on the ground. Suddenly a half-choked voice is heard, ‘I have it!’ and the ball unwinds to facilitate the rising of the victor, crushed cake in hand. He has been roughly handled, as are the eleven who came out empty-handed, but his reward is a new golden guinea. The whole School keep holiday in the afternoon.

## Correspondence.

### FROM OUR OXFORD CORRESPONDENT.

To the Editor of ‘The Elizabethan.’

DEAR SIR,—I am very sorry that no letter from your Oxford correspondent appeared in your February number. As the number was very late it is somewhat difficult to find a plausible excuse for my conduct. However, I will humbly suggest the following two: Firstly, I did not receive the usual

information from the preceding number. Your December number informed your readers when to send in contributions for the play number, but said nothing of those for the first ordinary number of the new year. Secondly, when I thought I should write, I was told that the number was already in the press, on which information I unfortunately relied, although I did not receive my *Elizabethan* till a fortnight later.

Varley has our best congratulations on his scholarship at Oriel, where we shall hope to see him next term, if he is not drawn over the way in the interval.

Turning to football, I must first congratulate you on drawing Charterhouse on their own ground. It is sad that we have always been beaten at football at Godalming before, but, as such is the fact, we must welcome drawing them as a distinct advance.

Street has been playing regularly for the ‘Varsity, and got his Blues before the match with Cambridge on Saturday, in which, I need not say, he played well and aided the satisfactory result.

O.W.W. played against the ‘Varsity here on February 7. They brought a fair team, but were disappointing and were beaten. Gardiner was plucky and accurate at half-back, and H. C. Peck worked hard on the left wing.

The House has again got the Cup this year, James, Doherty, Street, Hurst, and Olivier being in the team. In the final with Oriel, Hurst got two goals. He hurt his shoulder, but went on playing to the end of the game. I hear that Trinity Rest (having won the Cambridge Colleges Cup) have challenged the House. This is a new departure, but I hope the challenge will be accepted, as the two Universities see very little of each other, owing to the tiresome cross-country railway journey between the two. Six other O.W.W. have been playing in the Cup ties, H. B. Willett leading University to victory in the early rounds.

Willett also played back at hockey against Cambridge, to whose defeat he doubtless contributed.

In the Torpids we were not very largely represented. Cox rowed in the Queen’s boat, and Edwards and Liberty rowed in and steered respectively the House Second, which kept its (for a second boat) very high place of fifth.

In the ‘Varsity Sports Rolleston won the quarter handicap.

In the House Sports, which were finished last week, we were well represented. Goldie won the quarter (55½ secs.) and 120 yards handicap; Street the 100 (10½ secs.) and the long jump (19 ft. 9½ in.); and Booker was second in the 600 yards handicap.

The Club has lost Erskine, who has gone for a year to Wells Theological College. Aveling takes his place on the Committee. On February 26 we had our second Smoker, which was very successful. The President (Page) was invested with dictatorial powers and took great pains to get it up. We had three visitors who kindly helped to entertain us. Also the President, Doherty, and Booker sang; Cuthbertson sang and ‘musical sketched’; Aveling recited, and Edwards whistled to us.

Hoping to have some Firsts in Mods to record next time,

I remain, yours obediently,

BOSPOROS.

### FROM OUR CAMBRIDGE CORRESPONDENT.

To the Editor of ‘The Elizabethan.’

DEAR SIR,—It is such a short time since I last took up my pen to write to you, that news has not really had time to accumulate. We are in the middle of the Lent races; ‘Third’ has bumped Jesus, and twice rowed over the course without effecting anything; whether we can bump Trinity Hall on the fourth night remains to be seen. I cannot think why the O.W. ‘scratch fours’ fell through last term; I hope such an excellent institution will not be allowed to drop out of existence from sheer laziness. The *Granta* has rendered the memory of A. H. Harrison, Captain of the C.U.A.F.C., for ever imperishable, by enshrining in its last number a short life of him among the ranks of ‘Those in Authority.’

Trinity College, Cam.: March 13, 1891.



## DEBATING SOCIETY.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—In your leader in the last number of *The Elizabethan*, I think you are unduly severe on the Debating Society. It is not the general practice, nor has it been for some time, for everyone to read their speeches. In fact, at the present moment, only a very few members—and these chiefly new ones—read their speeches, and I have no doubt that their number will grow 'smaller by degrees and beautifully less.' I am sure that, for all that, nobody can say that the speeches are a whit less brilliant and interesting than they have been for the last three years. It is only natural that members who are new to the Society should wish to have what they want to say written down before them in black and white, as, until the first nervousness is overcome, a new member on speaking is very likely to find himself 'hung up' for a word or phrase several times in the course of a not very long speech. Even if he be so eloquent as not to be at a loss for a word, he may very possibly excite the mirth of the House by some piece of bad grammar, or by some sentence fearfully and wonderfully made. It is very easy to go on stringing together sentence after sentence until at last you quite forget how the original sentence began.

Another point in your leader also deserves remark. You say that there are 'very, very few speakers, and no debaters,' and in this I think you are quite mistaken. One would almost suppose that you, Mr. Editor, were not a member of the Debating Society, you seem so totally unmoved by the eloquence so often displayed by a fair number of speakers. Besides, as far as I personally am concerned, I differ from you entirely with respect to the number of debaters. I think there are as many debaters as speakers, for several members of the Society have a good claim to belong to both classes. I won't mention names, as that might be invidious, but I am quite sure the members of the Society can think of several. You seem to forget that the Society has not many members, and that on this account it is not fair to compare it with other debating societies consisting of sixty or seventy members. One cannot expect all the members, some of whom are of tender years, to be speakers and debaters, but that, I have not the slightest doubt, will come some day when more interest is taken in the Society by the School as a whole.

J.

## DEBATING SOCIETY.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—I do not intend to answer in detail the malicious and misleading letters signed 'X.' and 'Justice,' which appeared in your last number; they are not worthy of such notice. The subject cannot be of great interest to those who do not know the facts, and it is only necessary for me to say that those letters misrepresent the events to which they refer. Those who do know the facts will need no further justification of my conduct. I can safely leave them to judge from their own knowledge.

I may add that, whatever others do, I shall take no further part in a controversy carried on by means of such letters as those of 'X.' and 'Justice.'

Yours truly,

P. WILLIAMSON.

## PERSONALITY.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—The letter of your correspondent 'Justice' is enough to make any honest man's blood boil. To say that it misrepresents the facts would be a compliment, and it is only a respect for you, Sir, and the paper which you conduct, that makes me hesitate to use the one short word which alone is adequate to describe its relation to truth.

Personal controversy of all kinds is odious, and especially so in a School paper; and with all deference to you, Sir, I would suggest that letters of so mean and petty a stamp as that

of 'Justice' are appropriate perhaps to a low 'society' weekly, but not to *The Elizabethan*. But as this controversy has been stated, it is only right that the facts should be stated fairly. The President of the School Debating Society for last year is accused of having caused 'the failure of debates' in various ways which it is needless to specify. In a clear and able letter the accused President completely exonerates himself. Then some person, who profanes the name of Justice by appending it to his letter, enters the lists. The President had argued, 'If he had been causing "the failure of debates," why was he not censured and ejected from his office?' Your correspondent answers that he *was* so ejected, but that he took no notice of the ejection owing to an informality. Out of his own mouth shall he be convicted. He says this happened 'within three weeks' of the President's election. On two out of the three possible meetings during this time the President was away doing his duty on the School Mission Committee, which met at the same hour. We are to suppose, then, that he caused 'the failure of debates' by his conduct of *one* meeting. Really, Sir, this is trifling—I wish I did not feel obliged to give it a worse name!—it is dishonest. Your correspondent has made a deliberate attempt to damage Mr. Williamson in the eyes of your readers by an unscrupulous misstatement of facts; and his letter is as conspicuously wanting in good feeling as it is in honesty—it is as offensive as it is unfair. A gentleman and a Westminister—and I believe the writer to be both, though he gives no sign of being either—should surely be above demeaning himself to use these underhand means of making a malicious attack upon a brother Westminister. The other letter upon this subject from a person signing himself 'X.' is equally unscrupulous and misleading, though to do him justice he does not descend to offensive personalities. But the letter would appear to be an attempt at a ponderous joke, and, I may add, a failure.

For shame, gentlemen, for shame! If neither the associations of school days nor a love of fair play and truth can keep you from dishonest attempts to discredit a schoolfellow, yet surely a respect for the School paper, which has always maintained its dignity above the level of petty personalities, might move you to restrain your bitterness.

You will, I hope, Sir, excuse the vehemence of my writing. In the old days this thief of the sanction of Justice as a cloak to dishonesty might have been horsewhipped or put under the pump in Dean's Yard, where other vermin have been drenched before him. In these days he must be chastised in writing. It is possible that he may have so lost all sense of shame as to attempt to justify himself. For his sake, I hope not; but in any case he need not expect to hear again from me or from any Westminister who respects himself or the School paper.

Believe me, yours faithfully,

DRACO.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—I have noticed in the course of the last two years that *The Elizabethan* has contained a considerable number of personal letters, which such a respectable and moderate paper ought never to publish if it can possibly avoid. I do not know, Mr. Editor, whether these extremely personal and offensive letters are the productions of a clique of old or present Westminster, but I should imagine that they were, from the similarity of style. A school paper seems to me to be the last place in which petty spites and ill-feelings should find vent, as it must give such a bad impression of the internal affairs of the School not only to any outsider who reads the paper, but to a great many O.W.W., who, I am sure, are deeply pained at the insertion of two such letters as that from 'Justice,' and, in a less degree, as that of 'X.' in your last number. I have not the pleasure of Mr. Williamson's intimate acquaintance, but it seems to me he gave a full and manly explanation of his conduct in respect to his position as President of the School Debating Society. At any rate it was not such a letter as to call down the abusive violence and veiled offensiveness of those two letters I have mentioned. Another correspondence, at



present actively carried on in your columns, might profitably be concluded. I refer to that between H. R. Blaker and someone who signs him-elf 'Vindex.' If they cannot agree, the sooner the correspondence lapses the better. I am aware that the personalities of which I complain are all to be found in the correspondence, and I quite recognise the fact that it is very difficult for an editor to decide whether to put in a certain letter or not. I quite understand your point of view, Mr. Editor, in putting in 'Justice's' and 'X.'s' letters; what you said to yourself was, 'I have put in P. Williamson's letter, and so I ought to put in the letters of the opposite side to make everything fair;' but you don't seem to recognise the fact that the two sets of letters were quite different, and that if you carried out your principle to the fullest extent, correspondence on any subject would never cease. Apologising for trespassing so much on your space,

I am, yours, I.

### CRICKET.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

DEAR SIR,—I was amused to see another letter from the 'Captain of Cricket' in your last number.

We are, however, deeply indebted to him for explaining his mysterious reference to the Upper Remove. He says that the Upper Remove consisted of eighteen fellows, chiefly H.B.B., and that only five turned up for a form-match. Supposing this to be true, it is probable that the patriotic five were H.B.B., and this only shows that the Upper Remove, as a whole, was unpatriotic, and in no way reflects on the patriotism of H.B.B. in general.

But to take the other side of the question, look at the numbers of H.B.B. that go down to Charterhouse, at a manifestly far greater inconvenience than boarders, to watch a match which may or may not be over when they get there.

'He takes but little interest in the school,' &c., may be very fine phrases, but seem to be little more than equivalent to 'He does not play cricket,' &c.

I think that if captains of Cricket would keep their opinions to themselves about matters which do not concern them in the slightest, it would save a great deal of unpleasantness on both sides.

Lastly, I think it is quite as easy to speak the truth under one name as under another.

I am, yours most sincerely,  
VINDEK.

### SWIMMING.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

SIR,—Now that the summer term is approaching, would it not be possible for the Games Committee to enter into some arrangement with the officials of the Baths in the Buckingham Palace Road, so that a Westminster Swimming Club might be formed there for those in the School who can swim, and for those who are anxious to learn from their friends, so that all who chose may profit by it? I feel sure that there are many in the School who would gladly avail themselves of the privileges which such a club would afford, and if subscriptions of intending members were collected and paid to the proprietors of the Baths, surely they would be willing to let in Westminsters for a less sum than we should have to pay, if we had to buy a ticket every time we went. I need hardly add that it seems a rather curious thing that there are swimming races, &c., in the summer term, while there is no recognised practice for them during the term at Westminster.

Hoping that some effort will be soon made,  
I am, Sir, yours truly,  
'SOLLICITUS.'

### THE MISSION.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

DEAR SIR,—I note in the last number of *The Elizabethan* a rather severe commentary on the absence of Committee men from Mission Committee Meetings. I think perhaps it is only fair to point out that it is not always that business men can get away from their work early enough to reach Westminster by 5.15 P.M., and to this is owing the fact that very often so few Old Westminsters are present.

Yours, Sir, very respectfully,  
W.

### THE 'LIBERTY BOY' TABLETS.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

DEAR SIR,—I wish to raise the question of the old Liberty Boy tablets on the walls of dormitory. In 1880 'Liberty Boy' was abolished—why, I have never learnt. The proper function of the Liberty Boy tablets was, therefore, at an end. It seems to have been settled that the tablets should still be used for the names of the Captains, and accordingly the names of the Captains of 1884-5 and 1885-6 have been put up. But a Captain and a Liberty Boy are not the same thing, and the tablets are therefore now misused. The list of Captains has not been brought up to date, and before further names are added, I think it is desirable that old Liberty Boys and others should have a chance of having their 'say' in the matter.

It seems that there are two alterations possible. One is that the tablets should still be used to record the names of the juniors who are elected head each year into college, and who correspond to the old Liberty Boys in all but name and privilege. The other is, that if it be thought better to use the tablets for the names of Captains, there should at least be left a decent gap to signify that the series is not continuous, and that either a new tablet should be put up, or that the series of Captains should begin on the second, and hitherto unused, panel of the tablet now in course of being filled up.

At present the name of the Captains of 1884-5 immediately follows that of the Liberty Boy of 1880-1, an arrangement which, at any rate, confuses chronology, if it is not open to objection on other grounds.

The list contains the names of Dr. Busby; of Philip Henry, the great Dissenter; of Mr. Brady, the versifier of the Psalms; of Charles Montague, the first Earl of Halifax; William Murray, Lord Mansfield, William Markham, Head Master and Archbishop of York; Charles Churchill, the poet; Warren Hastings, to whom, more than to any other man, we owe our Indian Empire; Cyril Jackson, Dean of Christ Church; Charles Abbott, the Speaker of the House of Commons; and Charles Langley, Archbishop of Canterbury. It cannot, therefore, be without interest to Westminsters, and especially to old Captains and Liberty Boys. Some of these will, no doubt, be willing to express their views in *The Elizabethan*, and it will probably be easy to discover on which side the balance of opinion lies.

I am, Sir,  
Yours faithfully,  
PROPRAEFECTUS.

### TUG OF WAR.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

DEAR SIR,—I would venture to suggest for the consideration of the Games Committee that a tug-of-war between teams representing the different Houses should be included among the events at the forthcoming athletic sports; it would, I am sure, be a most popular innovation.

I remain, yours faithfully,  
T.



O.WW.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—I have been moved several times of late to remonstrate with you, but have felt so sure that abler pens than mine would not be wanting, that I have refrained. I see by the February number that I was justified in my expectation, and that two grave and reverend seniors have taken upon them the castigation of that youthful cynic whom, Sir, you or your predecessor in a moment of weakness allowed to write your December leader.

There is one statement in that leader, however, which they neither of them seem to me to meet with the flat contradiction which it deserves. I mean the concluding words which the writer tells us are 'the burden of his song.' Now, Sir, if the singer understood the meaning of the French phrase with which he was pleased to adorn his composition, and used it in its ordinary sense, he states the exact contrary of the fact. O.WW. are the '*raison d'être*' of the School. The School is a means to an end, not the end itself, and that end is neither more nor less than the production of O.WW. The '*raison d'être*' of all nurses, from the nursemaid who wheeled our perambulator to the school, and University which guided our footsteps when we had learned to walk, is simply the formation of useful Englishmen, faithful servants of God and the Queen. And why, Mr. Editor, do we O.WW. honour and love our nurse, this Westminster, whose name we are proud to bear? Because she has been true to her duty, and because the record of her faithfulness is written in the history of England 'in fair and legible characters,' the great deeds of those whom she has trained, and because for ourselves we feel that her spirit is in us, ever prompting us to high thought and worthy deed. The writer's division of O.WW. really shows a want of the sense of proportion, which can only be paralleled by that of the Scotch minister, who prayed every Sunday 'for the Greater and Lesser Cumrae and the adjacent islands of Great Britain and Ireland.' But mark, Mr. Editor, how the divider shows his real estimation of the School which he professes to honour with an honour above that of other men. His first class is to include all who do not fall into his second and third, and possibly some who do. But the second and third classes are in numbers as nothing compared to the first, therefore the great majority of Westminster's sons are 'those who have profited little by their sojourn in the School, and are themselves profitless to it.' Oh, reverent son! Oh, reverend mother! Of a truth, dear Mr. Editor, I have a sort of suspicion in which of the three divisions the writer of the article must be included.

And now, Sir, will you pardon my long-winded diatribe, and let me allude to another subject, remarking to begin with, that I do not feel sure whether I am not reproaching you, both in what I have said and what I am going to say, with the doings of a predecessor in office. At the end of the leader in the Play number you remark that the plays of our series are somewhat deficient in action. True, but the comment is irresistible. Why, then, did the reviser of the text cut out the one scene in the Adelphi in which there was real effective action; I mean the opening scene in Act II., between Sannio and Cæsinus. As it stood in the old edition (*impensis*, G. W. Ginger), with one unpleasant word altered, there was nothing in it that could have offended Mrs. Grundy herself.

And then, further on, you tell us the reason of the shortening of the play. 'There are some who think four hours a long time.' And it is to these, the impatient, the uninterested, the unappreciative, that you are ready so lightly to sacrifice the feelings of the 'old and regular guests, who have not failed for many years, who value every line, every word, every syllable,' who must now be content to be 'sorry.' Oh, Mr. Editor, that it should be you who so heartlessly say it! *Et tu, Brute!* Is this the reward of old and faithful service? It is the world's way, but hitherto it has not been the way of Westminster. I am, dear Mr. Editor,

Yours, 'sorry,' but still yours faithfully,

February 21, 1891.

C.

O.WW.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

DEAR SIR,—In writing the article on O.WW. in the December number of *The Elizabethan* I certainly expected some criticism, but I also expected that critics should at least take the trouble to read the article in question. I will first take the letter of 'Sinbad,' who appears indeed to have read the article but in haste, and to have been singularly unfortunate in misunderstanding every other word of it. First then, 'the arguments by which your writer establishes his conclusion are quite illusory.' This is severe, but I hardly dare think how much more severe it would have been had he had time to read the article through. I used no arguments, I drew no conclusions; I merely stated what I conceive to be facts. 'The object (and according to your writer the rightful object) to be sought for in going to Westminster is the admission to the ranks of O.WW.' I said nothing about the object to be sought for in going to Westminster, still less did I imply that this was the rightful object; on the contrary, I characterised the idea of the happiness of being an O.W. as an illusion which faded as one grew wiser. This being so, no one will credit me with saying that 'the ideal schoolboy looks forward to leaving school as the completion of his hopes' (by the way, the article was on those who leave Westminster, not on those who are still there); moreover, I, an O.W., am far from assuming to be the ideal anything, still less the ideal 'Westminster.' Passing over an apparent lacuna, where an argument has dropped out, we come to this statement, 'With great injustice he declares that O.WW. who are not to be seen about the school are profitless to the school,' referring to the first division of O.WW. which appears to have given rise to a vast amount of misapprehension. I find that I have described them as 'those who go hence and are no more seen.' Now this, Sir, is a quotation, though I did not think it necessary to put it in quotes, and no one but the veriest quibbler would have taken it in the sense of 'not lounging round Westminster,' or of 'not being seen by myself;' but on reading these letters my only wonder is that my critics have not taken it in its absolutely literal sense. I referred to those whose connection with the School, for any cause whatever, has been severed. I may point out that there are many ways of keeping up this connection without 'remaining near Westminster;' there is *The Elizabethan*, the Elizabethan Club, the Play, Election Dinner, &c., some of these means are available alike to the hardworked business man and the soldier, those at home and those abroad. Those who, still cherishing a love for the School, are unable to use any of these means, are my exceptions; these, with those exceptions to the other classes, who do not fall into the errors I have mentioned as prevalent in these classes, make up the 'good and patriotic' body of O.WW., who, if not in a numerical minority, at least give the appearance of being so. The expediency of the exclusiveness of 'Varsity O.WW.,' may possibly be a matter of opinion, and very possibly also I may have had 'Sinbad' in my mind's eye when I remarked on it. With regard to the football playing O.WW., the ball they gave at the Westminster Town Hall last year is one of the best proofs of my assertion. The hardest thing I said of the Elizabethan Club is, that they being human, are not immaculate, while I was before 'Sinbad' in his praise of them.

Now I come to 'O. O. W.' His one or two objections that have anything to do with my article have been answered. With his remarks that have nothing to do with it, such as those about 'those who live for the mere blank purpose of leaving school,' 'who are satisfied to lounge gracefully about Dean's Yard for the remainder of their days,' 'those who go away and no more come under my own scrutiny, are not worthy of my acquaintance, and may be dismissed with a general curse,' I have nothing to do. Indeed, 'O. O. W.' plumes himself so much on his cleverness in making some guess at the authorship, that in reading between the lines he seems to have forgotten to read at least every other one of the lines themselves. I, too, have a word to say on the score of good manners. Are such personalities as the following, for example, that have nothing to do with the case, in good taste? 'My long and bitter experience



of being an O.W. (he would judge this to have been of quite three months' duration); 'disillusion of my youthful anticipations concerning life in general;' 'I suffer such *ennui* as an O.W.;' 'life deprived of my many friends for whom I can no longer feel other than a half envious contempt;' &c. With regard to the last, may I be permitted to inquire who are these friends? If they are present Westminsters, there is no question of half envy, still less of contempt; if they are O.W.W., where does even the half envy come in? I am an O.W. myself; as to being deprived of their friendship, if I ever had 'O. O. W.' as a friend, I can quite understand that I have lost his by writing this article, but he must pardon me if I deny his conclusion (that life without it, &c.) *in toto*; but he has no right to speak for others. I suppose it is the privilege of maturity to lavish such abuse on young, very young, antagonists. Obviously your correspondent is genuinely an O., very O., O.W., probably old enough to suffer from gout and dyspepsia, and possibly old enough to know better. I must apologise for the length of this letter.

Yours truly,  
THE WRITER.

#### WESTMINSTER PHRASEOLOGY.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—I notice with regret that *The Elizabethan* no longer thinks it worth its while to maintain the use of an expression peculiar to Westminster, which seems to be well worth preserving. In your February number I see that in place of the title 'Late Plays,' the School Notes speak of 'halves,' a word which, no doubt, might be intelligible in many a private school, but which is distinctly not applicable at Westminster. I should like to know whether this new departure is simply an experiment on the part of *The Elizabethan*, or represents a change in the language of the School. If the former, it is to be condemned; if the latter, may I suggest that it is the duty of *The Elizabethan* to keep up in the School the use of such expressions, the age and peculiarity of which make them decidedly worth preserving. Let me beg of you, Sir, not to popularise further *The Elizabethan*; the use of 'exeat' for Sat., Sun., Mon., and the introduction of a new word, 'recess,' have already gone too far in this direction. While I am on the subject I should like to call attention to another nuisance. I see occasionally that books have been added to 'Library,' and that meetings have taken place in the 'Old Library.' I presume that 'Library' is thus used for the 'Scott Library.' If so, why not call it by its proper name? Besides being more accurate, this would perpetuate the memory of Dr. Scott, and call attention to the benefit he has done to the School.

Yours truly,  
A.

#### ERRATA.

Page 290, left hand column, 7 lines from bottom, for 'Housemastership' read 'House tutorship.'

Page 291, left hand column, 3 lines from the top, for 'two days' read 'ten days.'

Page 296, left hand column, 10 lines from bottom, for 'upon a third election' read 'when a third election.'

Page 238, Westminster Worthy, for 'No. 27' read 'No. 26.'

Page 250, left hand column, 2 lines from bottom, for 'Lutton-Coldfield' read 'Sutton-Coldfield.'

#### ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

'A. R. S.'—We think your remarks are quite right, but there are already two letters on the same subject in *The Elizabethan*, and your letter seems to raise the old points all over again.

#### Our Contemporaries.

WE beg to acknowledge, with thanks, the receipt of the following: *Carthusian* (2), *Raven* (2), *Our Boys' Magazine* (2), *The Felstedian* (2), *The Durham University Journal* (2), *The Meteor* (2), *The Marlburian* (2), *The Radleian* (2), *The Lancing College Magazine* (2), *The Penn Charter Magazine* (2), *The Uhula* (2), *The Ousel* (2), *St. Edward's School Chronicle* (2), *Cheltonian* (2), *Cambridge Review* (4), *The Blue* (2), *The Wykehamist* (2), *Meteor* (2), *Wellingtonian* (2), *Newtonian* (2), *Barnet Elizabethan* (2), *Clistonian* (2), *Rossalian* (2), *Reptonian* (2), *Malvernian* (2), *Haileyburian* (2), *Salopem* (2), *Fettesian* (2), *Forest School Magazine* (2), *Derbeian* (2), *Alleynian* (2), *Bradfield School Chronicle* (2), *University College Magazine* (2), *Pauline* (2), *Melburnian* (2), *Geelong Grammar School* (2), *Eagle*, *Shirburnian* (2), *Norgolcian* (2), *Kingsman* (2), *South Easter College Magazine* (2), *Loughburian* (2), *Cheltenham Reveille* (2), *Dovorian* (2), *Clavinion* (2), *Blundellian* (2), *Seminary Echo* (2), *School World* (2), *Public Schools Gazette* (2), *Public Schools Review* (2).

#### NOTICES.

All contributions to the April number of *The Elizabethan* must be sent in to the Editor, St. Peter's College, Westminster, not later than March 25.

All other communications should 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, may be forwarded to A. L. LONGHURST, St. Peter's College, Westminster (not addressed to 'The Treasurer'). Post Office Orders to be made payable at the Broad Sanctuary Post Office, Westminster.

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

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

Contributions can only be inserted if written on one side of the paper only.

Back numbers of *The Elizabethan* may be had from the Secretary at 6d. each.

A few copies of the 'cast' of the 'Adelphi' are still to be had from the Captain, St. Peter's College, Westminster, at 3s. 6d. each.

Moreat.