



The Elizabethan.

Vol. V. No. 17. WESTMINSTER, DECEMBER 1887.

Price 6d.

THE SCHOOL AND THE ABBEY.

THERE are many links which bind Westminster of to-day to Westminster of days gone by, and which join young and old Westminsters in a bond of common sympathy, but there is none stronger than the Abbey. For more than three centuries Westminster boys have played in its cloisters, gazed in wonder at its grim old windows or the delicate pointing of its arches, and read the records engraved upon its tombs. They have scampered along its triforium and climbed upon its roof. They have listened to the music of its organ, and prayed in the solemn stillness of its choir. Their boyhood has been spent under its shadow, and many in their maturer years have sought encouragement and refreshment in a return to its walls. Some lie buried beneath its pavements, while over their heads tread those who have filled their places in the old School. Many more still live 'in

mockery of monumental stone,' or have their names inscribed for successive generations of Westminster boys to read as they walk in the quiet Abbey. Nor is the memory of bygone generations preserved by monuments alone. On the walls of the triforium and the cloisters, and even on the tapestry of the sacarium, may still be detected the marks of many a former Westminster, whose British eagerness to commemorate his name forgot the reverence due to the character of the place. Dean Stanley, with the true human sympathy so characteristic of him, declares that 'even the traces of the Westminster boys who have played in its cloisters and inscribed their names on its walls, belong to the story of the Abbey no less than its venerable beauty, its solemn services, and its lofty aspirations.' Sometimes, too, they were not satisfied with scratching their names, but went so far as to appropriate pieces of the stonework of the monuments. That of Major André has suffered especially. In Stanley's words:— 'Often has the head of Washington and André been carried off, perhaps by republican or

royalist indignation, but more probably by the pranks of Westminster boys; "the wanton mischief," says Charles Lamb, "of some schoolboy, fired perhaps with some raw notions of Transatlantic freedom. The mischief was done," he adds, addressing Southey, "about the time that you were a scholar there. Do you know anything about the unfortunate relic?" Southey, always susceptible at allusions to his early political principles, not till years after could forgive this passage at arms. The monument itself has long since been restored.

Five Westminster boys have grown up to be Deans of Westminster, some of them among the most famous that have held the office. Francis Atterbury and Zachary Pearce are names well known in the history of the Abbey. The last Old Westminster Dean, William Vincent, had an ideal Westminster life. He entered the School at the age of seven; and returning to it as usher, after he had spent four years at Cambridge, he became successively under master, head master, and Dean, thus spending almost a whole lifetime in the School and the Abbey. The connection of the School with the Abbey is an almost boundless subject, which yet awaits the illustration of an able pen. It has not come directly within the scope of any of the historical works at present dealing with the School. Dean Stanley, in whose hands this subject must have had an additional charm, forbore 'to go at length into the history of the School.' 'It opens a new field,' he says, 'which one not bred at Westminster has hardly any right to enter.' But though not professing to give a complete historical outline of the School's relations with the Abbey, Dean Stanley throws very valuable light upon them, and tells us many interesting incidents in this connection. To those who are not familiar with the 'Memorials of Westminster Abbey,' we can only say 'Go and read them at once.' It is a book which must be full of interest to anyone to whom the Abbey or the School is dear; but it is probable that only a few Westminsters are really well acquainted with it. The sixth chapter has a special interest for us at the School. From it the series of historical incidents which follows has been gathered. To those who are acquainted with the sources from which it is drawn, we can only apologise for a weak version of what is so fascinatingly told in Stanley's own words; to those who are not, we hope it will be an inducement to read a book every page of which should be known to Westminsters.

Originally, of course, the School was much more part and parcel of the Abbey than it is now. For instance, in the time of Elizabeth, we know that the Dean received boarders into his house. Again, in James I.'s time, Dean Andrews, as we read in Bishop Hacket, 'did often supply the place of the head master and usher for the space of an whole week together, and gave us not an hour of loitering time.' On the other hand, the 'head schoolmaster' occasionally occupied the position of prebendary to the Abbey. Dean, chapter, master, and scholars, were all part of one collegiate body. As time went on, the tendency was for the jurisdiction of the Dean and the head master to become more and more distinct; and by the beginning of the eighteenth century certainly the 'School' was something quite separate from the Abbey. The authority of the Dean and Chapter over the School, however, continued almost to our own day; and we have many instances of the kind and thoughtful care of successive Deans. The Dormitory is the result of Atterbury's exertions to a great extent; 'Vincent' Square was secured to us by Dean Vincent, and the schoolroom was restored to its original proportions by Dean Stanley in 1868. The nominal connection between Chapter and School has now been severed; but the practical connection between the School and the Abbey is too close to be really altered in any way by the change. Not a year ago the present Dean, as his predecessor had done, supplanted the 'head schoolmaster' and the 'ushers' on more than one occasion in school hours in kindly instructing us in the history of the Abbey, of which we are a part, and certainly 'gave us not an hour of loitering time.'

(To be continued.)

'WESTMINSTER AND THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.'

WE have received the following explanation of our privilege of attending debates in Parliament. It appears that Charles Abbot, afterwards Lord Colchester, who was a King's Scholar from 1771 to 1775, became in 1802 Speaker of the House of Commons, and that he allowed members of the School to be present. This, however, does not explain the fact mentioned in the last number of *The Elizabethan*, that some members of the School were allowed to be present at the trial of Warren Hastings, some fifteen years before the date of Abbot's appointment.

WESTMINSTER WORTHIES.

SIR RICHARD BLACKMORE.—No. 13.

'LUCAN appeared upon a fiery steed . . . and made a great destruction of the enemy's horse. Which slaughter to stop, Blackmore, a famous modern, but one of the mercenaries, strenuously opposed himself. Then Lucan threw a lance, but Æsculapius came unseen and turned off the point.' So writes Swift in his 'Battle of the Books,' hinting in no obscure fashion that Blackmore's dulness as a poet was only atoned for by his excellence as a physician. Indeed, anyone who has been blessed with such superabundance of leisure that he has found time to struggle through even one of Blackmore's twenty-two books on 'Arthur,' will wonder that a professed admirer of the classics should have named the subject of this article in the same sentence as Lucan, more especially as Blackmore was opposed to Swift in politics, and claimed in his dedication to Alfred to have 'had a greater part in the succession of the House of Hanover than ever he had boasted,' difficult as it is to imagine what that part can have been. In other places, however, Swift was less polite in dealing with Sir Richard, who enjoys unenviable pre-eminence in the number of great writers who lampooned him—Dryden, Wycherley, Ledley, Gay, Addison, Steele, Garth, and especially Pope, having exercised their wit at his expense.

Richard Blackmore was the son of Robert Blackmore, of Corsham, in Wiltshire, 'gentleman,' according to that most useful writer, Wood; 'attorney,' according to Johnson. Of his early life we know but little; even the date of his birth is uncertain, and, consequently, the statement that 'he was sent to Westminster at the age of thirteen' conveys little definite information. The first certain date in his life is 1668, the year in which he was entered at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, and commenced a truly phenomenal residence of thirteen years. In the present day such a lengthy sojourn at that seat of learning would signify a portentous inability to 'pass his schools,' but Blackmore took his master's degree five years before he went out of residence, the precise date of the ceremony being the 3rd of June, 1676. We may, however, excuse a reader of his poems for feeling some surprise that in such a long course of study he gained no mastery over the accentuation of proper classical names, but such is unquestionably the fact.

The darkness which hangs over Blackmore's early life extends also over his doings during the four years which followed his University studies. We hear something about an Ushership at a school, something also about a visit to Padua, where he certainly took a doctorial degree; Johnson mentions a course of study under the celebrated Dr. Sydenham, but his life of Blackmore cannot be a very trustworthy

authority, as he 'sends Blackmore to Westminster School' three years *after* he matriculated at Oxford. In 1687 a new charter from James II. added thirty new Fellows to the College of Physicians; and Blackmore, who had already built up an extensive practice, was one of the number, but his literary efforts had not yet commenced. It was while travelling in his brougham, or its ancient equivalent, that Blackmore composed epics where his professional brethren would have studied their case-books. The 'writing to the rumbling of his chariot-wheels,' and his residence in Cheapside—neither of them very heinous offences in modern eyes—were equally favourite topics with his detractors. In his preface to his earliest work he apologises for its deficiencies by saying that it was written 'by such catches and starts and in such occasional uncertain hours as his profession afforded, and for the greatest part in coffee-houses or in passing up and down the streets.' He further adds that he had read 'but little poetry throughout his whole life; and for fifteen years before had not written an hundred verses except one copy of Latin verses in praise of a friend's work'—valid pleas, perhaps, against over-severe criticism, but equally valid reasons for not publishing. 'Prince Arthur,' however, as his earliest work was entitled, found so many readers—even in the illiterate times of the House of Orange—that it reached a third edition, and even gained the discriminating applause of John Locke and William Molyneux. The ten books of 'Prince Arthur' were commenced in 1693, and published in 1695; but, encouraged by success, the physician's pen became even more prolific, and in two years more the twelve books of 'King Arthur' were completed and laid before a still enduring public. 'Some admired his writings as masterpieces of art and nature,' writes his sworn enemy, Dennis; 'others exploded them with extreme contempt.' Dennis himself belonged to the latter faction; but Blackmore did not return railing with railing, if his praise of Dennis as 'equal to Boileau as a poet, and superior as a critic,' is seriously meant. It may be so, as the probability is that Blackmore had never read Boileau.

Meanwhile, Blackmore added to the poet's bays professional honours of a more solid character. In 1697 he was appointed one of the physicians in ordinary to King William, receiving at the same time knighthood and a gold chain and medal. The 'malignity of the wits' regarded this advancement as bestowed rather on the poet than on the doctor; it would indeed have been worthy of the monarch who offered Swift the command of a troop of horse, and knew St. Evremond only as a major-general in the French army, to disregard Blackmore's indubitable skill as a physician for his very problematical powers as a poet. We have no reason, however, for believing that the physicians-in-ordinary were appointed for other than professional reasons. Indeed, Blackmore complained of William's distaste for the Muses in his poem on the Kit-Cats, which may be quoted

as among the most respectable of Blackmore's efforts :—

Reverse of Louis, he (example rare)
Lov'd to deserve the praise he could not bear,
He shunn'd the acclamations of the throng,
And always coldly heard the poet's song.
Hence the great King the Muses did neglect,
And the mere poet met with small respect.

This is hardly the language of a man who owed an important rise in the world to the effect of his own poems on the monarch he is writing about. At all events, success in his regular profession seems only to have stimulated Blackmore's poetic ardour; for in 1700 (only three years after the publication of 'King Arthur') 'the public were gratified' (as advertisers are wont to say) with two more works 'from that gifted and original pen,' namely, a paraphrase of the 'Book of Job,' and a 'Satire against Wit.' Sir Richard had long been on bad terms with a more distinguished O.W., John Dryden, and, in his satire, reproached him bitterly for his coarseness, and asked

How will he shrink when all his lewd allay
And wicked mixture shall be purged away?

following it up by the remark that the melter who could get 'one sterling crown' from a chestful of Dryden's works would be remarkably lucky. Dryden was then near the close of his career, but he lived long enough to retort by an attack on Blackmore's Job. This 'inverted panegyric' appeared in one of the latest of his prologues:—

His man of Uz, stripped of his Hebrew robe,
Is just the proverb, and as poor as Job.
One would have thought he could no longer jog,
But Arthur was a level; Job's a bog.

The hostility between these two writers deserves, however, a somewhat fuller explanation. FLOREAT.

(To be continued.)

School Notes.

PERHAPS the greatest event since our last issue has been the defeat of the O.W.W. by the Old Etonians at the Oval on November 26. The defeat was as crushing as it was unexpected, the Etonians winning easily by seven goals to two. It is, however, some consolation to know that the Old Etonians were nearly as much surprised as we were.

A late play was given on Monday, November 21, in honour of the success of A. M. T. Jackson, C. A. Sherring, and C. Bompas in Indian Civil Service examinations.

Of the School Matches this term we have won five, lost five, and drawn one. Considering the way in which we have been handicapped by accidents, and the fact that only one last year's 'pink' has been available, we may congratulate ourselves on the success of our Eleven, and the great general improvement they have shown.

In the November number of *The Elizabethan* we mentioned that a subscription was being raised to provide a new Swimming Cup. We are authorised to state that the head master will contribute £5 towards it if a like sum be forthcoming from other sources. We hope Westminsters, past and present, will come forward and subscribe the necessary sum.

We learn that an Old Westminster Rugby Union Club has been started at Cambridge. We should have thought that C.O.W.W. would have done better by sticking to the school game at which they have so often turned out good teams. But it is not our province to criticise, and we wish the new club every success.

We hear with pleasure that interesting discoveries are being made in the older portion of the School Library, now in Ashburnham House. Several books of value and rarity have been found, and exercises, &c., of former generations of Westminsters.

It is, we believe, a fact not generally known that Peter Elmsley, the celebrated scholar, was at Westminster as a Town Boy. We regret to be unable to acquire any information as to the date of his sojourn in Little Dean's Yard.

We are indebted to Dr. Scott for the following information with reference to the queries in the November number of *The Elizabethan* :—

The tablet with Frewin's name on it belongs to one of the large pictures on the staircase in Ashburnham House—the one with gloves and a college cap.

The roof of School is of oak.

In the School Motto '*Det*' is merely an error for '*Dat*.'

Dr. Scott has kindly promised to present to the Library a piece of the burnt beams taken down when the shell disappeared.

THE FIELDS.

Q.SS. v. T.BB.

IN answer to our appeal in our last number, a correspondent has kindly sent us the following account of the above cricket match, which we are glad to insert, although somewhat late.

This match was played Up Fields on Election Monday, July 25. T.BB. were first represented by Moon and Balfour, who contributed 90 runs between them before they were separated, Moon being well caught by F. Street in the deep field. Balfour continued to hit well until bowled by H. B. Street, having played a splendid innings of 72. None of the other wickets offered much resistance, with the exception of Thornton and Lambert, Street's bowling being very effective, and the innings finally closed for 222.

The Q.SS. on going in, though seriously handicapped by Barwell's absence, made a good show,

Sandilands and Street playing well, until the latter was run out, and Whitaker, after contributing 11, shared the same fate. Sharpe then joined Sandilands, and at the call of time the pair were still together, having added 56 runs to the score. Sandilands played a magnificent innings of 75. The match was thus left drawn. Scores:—

T.BB.	
E. G. Moon, c. F. Street, b. H. B. Street...	40
A. M. Balfour, b. F. Street.....	72
P. C. Probyn, c. Goldie, b. H. B. Street ...	10
A. H. Harrison, b. H. B. Street.....	5
T. G. Veitch, b. H. B. Street.....	11
A. G. Prothero, b. H. B. Street	0
G. P. Stevens, b. E. L. Clapham	15
C. W. Grant Wilson, b. E. L. Clapham ...	2
A. G. Lambert, not out	19
F. G. Oliver, c. Hamilton, b. F. Street.....	9
R. G. Thornton, c. and b. Sandilands	23
Extras	10

222

Q.SS.	
R. E. Hamilton, c. Harrison, b. Moon	1
R. R. Sandilands, not out	75
H. B. Street, run out	16
E. L. Clapham, c. Probyn, b. Balfour.....	0
H. T. Whitaker, run out	11
R. E. Olivier, b. Oliver	8
C. C. Sharpe, not out	19
F. Street	} did not bat
P. J. Preece.....	
B. M. Goldie	
J. S. Shearme ...	
Extras	26

156

THE SCHOOL v. OLD CARTHUSIANS.

THIS match was played on Saturday, November 12. The Visitors having won the toss, elected to play from the Hospital end, and Lambert started for the School from the Church end at 2.45. The ball was immediately taken down to their quarters by Preece and Street, but the Carthusian cleared his charge, and the game returned to our end, and Price was enabled to score the first point for them (0-1). The Carthusians then had it all their own way for some time, but Daniel and Everington both showed well, and after some loose play Willett got away, but the ball was soon returned; however, not to be denied, Preece made a splendid run, well backed up by Winckworth, and a goal was shortly afterwards scored by Lambert (1-1). The restarting of the ball was disastrous to us, as the Visitors immediately rushed down to our end, and from a scrimmage in front of goal, one of our own half-backs put the ball through (2-1). Our opponents again took the ball down to our quarters, and a corner resulted, which was well put by Lewes, but was kicked away by our backs. Preece, Willett, and Woodbridge then took the ball down the ground, and a shot from Willett went over the bar. Pim and Price then made another attack, but the danger was averted by Witherby, who was showing to advantage. Harrison, who, as is usual, was playing well, then put the ball

right forward, and Willett, from a pass by Woodbridge, was enabled to score (2-2). Half time was now called. After this, Street took the ball down to their quarters, but was stopped by the backs, and Pim getting the ball, after a fine run succeeded in obtaining a goal (2-3). A corner fell to the School, which, although well placed by Daniel, was without result. The School now wired up hard, and, barring a run by Powell for them, we had rather the best of the game, Woodbridge putting in one or two hot shots, but without result; another corner fell to the School, which was well placed by Witherby, but which their backs put away, and shortly afterwards time was called; the match thus ending in a win for the Old Carthusians by 3-2. The School played very well in this match, and it would be invidious to make distinctions, but we might mention especially Harrison and Witherby behind, and Woodbridge, Willett, and Street forward, the latter's passing being very neat and accurate. For our opponents, Pim was distinctly good, and Price, Coulby, and Blenkiron deserve praise.

The following were the teams:—

THE SCHOOL.

E. A. Everington (goal), A. G. Prothero and E. Daniel (backs), A. H. Harrison (captain), W. N. Winckworth and H. C. Witherby (half-backs), A. R. Woodbridge and H. Willett (right), A. G. Lambert (centre), F. Street and P. J. Preece (left), forwards.

OLD CARTHUSIANS.

G. Coulby (goal), H. Lewis and W. Locker (backs), T. W. Blenkiron, G. Lewes and A. G. Clark (sub.) (half-backs), B. Escombe and G. Pim (right), H. Price (centre), A. Martyn and E. O. Powell (left), forwards.

THE SCHOOL v. CASUALS.

ON November 19, the School met a fair team of Casuals, and defeated them easily by seven goals to one; a very creditable performance if the wet state of the ground be considered. Winckworth won the toss, and Hemmerde started the ball for the Visitors. Preece immediately obtained it, and after a fine run, middled, and Winckworth scored for the School. The score was, however, immediately equalised by Burge from a pass by Hemmerde. From this time the School began to press, and in spite of some good runs by the Casual forwards, Lambert succeeded in heading the ball through. In the second half there was little of interest in the play, our forwards having the game all their own way, and gaining five more goals (Willett 4, Lambert 1).

The following was our team:—

THE SCHOOL.

E. A. Everington (goal), E. L. Clapham and A. G. Prothero (backs), W. N. Winckworth, E. C. Daniel, and H. C. Witherby (half-backs), A. R. Woodbridge and H. B. Willett (right), A. G. Lambert (centre), P. J. Preece and F. Street (left), forwards.

THE SCHOOL v. CAMBRIDGE OLD WESTMINSTERS.

ON Monday, November 21, on the late play given in honour of Bompas and Sherring, a team of Cambridge O.W.W. came down to play the School, and were

defeated by two goals to one. The weather was very foggy, and but few good shots were made, but the School played up much better than it had done in the earlier matches, and defeated what was a fairly strong team; although it must be remarked that the title of our opponents is rather misleading, as only six of their number came down from Cambridge, the others being young O.W.W. of different stages. Veitch kicked off for the Visitors, and the School forwards at once obtained the ball, and ran it down, but failed to score. We continued to press them for some little time, but the untiring energy of Sherring was very effectual, and our backs had soon their work to do. Bompas and Veitch made good runs on several occasions, but without result, while Clapham, Street, and Woodbridge played up well for the School. In spite of the good defence of H. B. Street, Willett succeeded in registering a goal for the School, and when the ball was restarted, we again tried to score, but the O.W.W. went to work, and succeeded in obtaining several corners, James, on the right, doing a lot of work, and Veitch at last was able to put the ball through (1-1). After half time, the Visitors made several determined attacks, but Everington saved some hard shots, and the School forwards again got away. Preece, who was playing on the left in place of Clapham, the latter having gone back on Harrison retiring hurt, made some good runs, and looked like scoring, but was unable to put the ball through. Woodbridge, however, with the aid of Willett, ran the ball down, and shot successfully, making the score 2-1 in favour of the School, and no further change had occurred when 'time' was called.

The following were the teams :—

CAMBRIDGE OLD WESTMINSTERS.

H. B. Street (goal), E. G. Moon and G. P. Stevens (backs), J. Watt, C. C. Sharpe, and C. A. Sherring (half-backs), L. James and A. G. Clark (right), J. G. Veitch (centre), C. Burge and C. Bompas (left), forwards.

THE SCHOOL.

E. A. Everington (goal), A. H. Harrison and A. G. Prothero (backs), E. C. Daniel, H. C. Witherby, and W. N. Winckworth (half-backs), H. B. Willett and A. R. Woodbridge (right), A. G. Lambert (centre), E. L. Clapham and F. Street (left), forwards.

O.W.W. v. OLD CRANLEIGHANS.

PLAYED Up Fields on Saturday, November 19, resulting in a win for the former by three goals to one, after an exciting game. Our opponents had the best of the game for some time, but on Wetton's arrival a change took place, and the O.W.W. made several attempts to score, but without success. Jenner, who was in very good form, made several good runs, but did not score, while Ware and Orr for the Visitors showed some good combination, and the latter at last succeeded in shooting past Winckworth. Patrick and Heath did their best to equalise matters, but failed, and it was not till within twenty minutes of time that Jenner put the ball through from a corner by Janson. Patrick succeeded in scoring again, and Veitch put the ball through, but the goal was disallowed,

and finally Jenner was again successful, leaving the O.W.W. victors by three goals to one.

Teams :—

OLD WESTMINSTERS.

W. B. Winckworth (goal), C. T. M. Fox and E. G. Moon (backs), F. W. Janson (captain), H. Wetton and J. C. Phillimore (half-backs), C. R. W. Heath and D. Patrick (right), J. G. Veitch (centre), A. C. W. Jenner and T. E. Paul (left), forwards.

OLD CRANLEIGHANS.

S. F. Charlton (goal), W. Crosier-Hayne (captain) and E. Cubitt Nicholas (backs), C. Brooks, R. E. Mills, and E. S. Phillips (half-backs), A. Ware and H. M. Orr (right), W. S. Coles (centre), E. T. Blakeman and C. E. Riddell (left), forwards.

OLD WESTMINSTERS v. NORFOLK COUNTY.

THIS match was played Up Fields on December 3, and resulted in a draw, owing chiefly to the poor shooting of the O.W.W. forwards, who, however, had the best of the game during the greater part of the time. The two goals were shot by Jenner.

Teams :—

OLD WESTMINSTERS.

W. B. Winckworth (goal), C. J. M. Fox and E. G. Moon (backs), H. Wetton, W. R. Moon, and W. N. Winckworth (half-backs), A. J. Heath, D. Patrick, F. W. Janson (captain), A. C. W. Jenner, and J. E. Paul (forwards).

NORFOLK COUNTY.

A. Clifton (goal), H. A. Scotter and W. T. Wickham (backs), R. Webster, W. A. Rix, and G. N. Armfield (half-backs), W. E. Hansell, C. Morley, F. Fernie, G. L. Horne, and H. Plowright (forwards).

FENCING.

THE competition for the Fencing Badge, which has lapsed since 1878, has been again revived, and additional interest has been imparted to the competition by the fact that the winner of the badge is also entitled to the presentation foils kindly promised by E. A. H. Newman, Esq., the last holder of the badge. The badge itself was presented to the School in 1861 by the Rev. T. W. Weare, formerly under master. For some years fencing seems to have been in great favour in the School, but the entries gradually grew fewer and fewer, and so little interest seems to have been aroused, that when the badge disappeared in 1879 little seems to have been done to recover it. However, we hope that the revival of the competition and the new stimulus which it has received will be successful in making this important art a favourite at Westminster. We append a list of former winners of the badge:—

1862.	G. Gumbleton.	1871.	E. O. Darley.
1863.	A. H. Winter.	1872.	R. W. S. Vidal.
1864.	F. Pownall.	1873.	W. S. Rawson.
1865.	F. Pownall.	1874.	E. H. Holthouse.
1866.	R. Druitt.	1875.	C. F. Brickdale.
1867.	W. G. Davies.	1876.	A. A. N. Jackson.
1868.	} H. G. Rawson.	1877.	W. R. Beverly.
1869.		1878.	E. H. A. Newman.
1870.	H. E. Rawson.	1887.	E. V. B. Rutherford.

The competition this year commenced on November 28, and took place in the Gymnasium. The entries were fourteen in number, and the following was the result of the first round:—

A. E. Balfour	beat	H. M. Dawson (4—1).
W. A. Last	„	F. A. Wilkins (4—2).
E. V. B. Rutherford	„	W. M. Woodhouse (4—1).
E. F. Knox	„	S. V. Rolleston (4—1).
C. H. Gregory	„	J. S. Rutherford (4—0).
G. S. Moore	„	E. C. Pandorf (4—0).
Gregory scratched to W. Grant-Wilson.		

There was nothing of much interest in the play of this round, although several of the younger competitors showed great promise.

The second round resulted as follows:—

G. W. Grant-Wilson	beat	A. E. Balfour (4—0).
E. V. B. Rutherford	„	W. A. Last (4—0).
C. H. Gregory	„	E. F. Knox (4—0).
G. S. Moore a bye.		

In the third round, however, the play was of a much higher standard, Gregory winning easily.

C. H. Gregory	beat	G. S. Moore (4—1).
E. V. B. Rutherford	„	G. W. Grant-Wilson (4—2).

Final round.—E. V. B. Rutherford, who played steadily all through, beat C. H. Gregory (4—2), and thus won the badge and foils.

Mr. Edgell having kindly promised a second prize, another competition took place, in which Woodhouse beat Last, and Grant-Wilson beat Gregory, but suffered defeat at the hands of Woodhouse, who thus holds the second prize.

THE DEBATING SOCIETY.

THE Society met on Thursday, November 3, to discuss Mr. Chapman's motion: 'That in the opinion of this House considerable reform is needed in the Police System of Ireland.' Seconded by Mr. Cuming; opposed by Mr. Stapleton.

Mr. CHAPMAN maintained that the Irish police were not the same as those in England. The verdicts of the Irish magistrates were by no means impartial, because most of the magistrates were landlords, and had no sympathy with the people. He condemned the Irish police, saying that they took every possible opportunity to bully the Irish. He quoted the arrest of Mr. O'Brien under the pretext of the Crimes Act, and that of Mr. Wilfred Blunt at Mitchelstown, as instances of the brutality of the police.

Mr. CUMING declared that private detectives were not properly controlled, and had too much power. He read a short extract condemning their conduct.

Mr. STAPLETON seemed to think that Mr. Chapman wished the Irish police to content themselves with only stopping the riots, and not arresting any of the ringleaders. He thought that men who chose to riot must take the consequences. He objected to Mr. Cuming's speech about private detectives, on the ground that if detectives are to be at all successful, they must have full power to do what they like.

Mr. BUCHANAN was of opinion that Ireland

required severe treatment. He quoted the success of the Government of Ireland in the times of Cromwell and William III., when Ireland had been treated with the utmost severity. He pointed out how badly the Irish behaved themselves as compared with England. Considering the police in Ireland were recruited from the Irish peasantry, he thought that their behaviour was more than ought to be expected of them. He was certain that the Irish police would, if possible, be better organised if there was a form of central government. He was against any great change being made in their system.

At the next debate, November 10, the motion was resumed.

Mr. CHAPMAN thought that the reason why there were few deserters in the Irish police was because such deserters knew that they would be boycotted. With regard to Mr. Wilfred Blunt, he said that he had done his best to give notice of his meeting by telegraph, and was not to blame. He thought the amount of crime in Ireland was exaggerated. He acknowledged that murders did occur in Ireland, but in every country there are murders committed.

Mr. BUCHANAN remarked that the proposer left out the causes of the murders, which, as a rule, arose from rent not being paid. He thought that Mr. Blunt, inasmuch as he was an Englishman, was a disgrace to the nation, as it was much worse for an Englishman to stir up sedition in Ireland than an Irishman, and that Mr. Blunt, if he had chosen, could have taken all proper measures before his meeting took place. In the time of William III. the police had enormous power, and it succeeded perfectly.

Mr. CUMING remarked that murders in broad daylight were braver than murders in the dark.

Mr. PHILLIMORE thought that perhaps as many exaggerations were made about the Irish police as there were made about the crimes in Ireland.

The House divided—Ayes, 5; Noes, 15. The motion was, therefore, lost.

The House met again on Thursday, November 17, to discuss the motion, 'That in the opinion of this House Mr. O'Brien, and all other prisoners of whatever grade, shall conform to prison rules, and wear prison dress.' Proposer, A. H. Cuming; seconder, R. E. Olivier; opposer, J. B. W. Chapman.

Mr. CUMING said that Mr. O'Brien was just as much a prisoner as anyone else. He said that the question was whether Mr. O'Brien was rightly imprisoned or not. He argued the Crimes Act in Ireland was law, and Mr. O'Brien had transgressed it, so he was rightly imprisoned. He maintained that men, whether poor or rich, ought to be treated alike in prison. He thought that prison dress was used to show the prisoners' separation from the outer world, and as a mark of their crime. He mentioned Mr. O'Brien's foolish conduct in prison when he refused to wear prison dress.

Mr. OLIVIER first touched upon Mr. O'Brien's past conduct. He argued that prison clothes were no worse than an ordinary man's clothes, and, if any-

thing, they were warmer. As to Mr. O'Brien being in a state of health which prevented him wearing the prison dress, surely he could not be any the colder in this dress than in his own clothes. He was of opinion that Mr. O'Brien was very undignified in refusing to wear a dress worn by every other criminal in prison. If Mr. O'Brien were allowed to wear what clothes he liked, it would be a precedent for other prisoners to do the same. He concluded by saying that if a man lowers himself to the extent of becoming a prisoner, he must bear all the consequences.

Mr. CHAPMAN denied that Mr. O'Brien had transgressed the Crimes Act. He was in favour of a trial by jury in Ireland. He maintained that as the Crimes Act was only a special Act for the place, a prisoner arrested under it was not under ordinary treatment. He quoted the Italian riots, when great enthusiasm was felt in England. Why should not the same enthusiasm be felt with regard to the Irish?

Mr. BUCHANAN thought Mr. O'Brien guilty of treason. He said that the Government have perfect right to make prisoners wear what clothes they like. He argued that as Mr. Gladstone's Coercion Bill, which was far more stringent, was considered legal, so ought the Crimes Act to be law. He thought that the Irish themselves were to blame for their treatment, as they had behaved so badly to the English. He compared Ireland with peaceful Scotland. He touched upon the Irish members of Parliament and their conduct in Ireland.

A division was then taken—Ayes, 15; Noes, 2. The motion was therefore carried.

The House then adjourned.

THE CHESS CLUB.

THE third round of the Handicap Tournament was played off as follows:—

Stephenson	beat E. H. Cox (Kt.)
Gully	„ Varley (R.)

Davson a bye.
In the semi-final

Davson (Kt.)	beat Stephenson.
Gully a bye.	

In the final

H. J. Gully	beat Davson (R.)
and won the tournament.	

THE LITERARY SOCIETY.

THE last play for this term was 'Love's Labour's Lost.' The principal parts were taken as follows:—

<i>Don Adriano</i>	. . .	C. S. W. BARWELL
<i>Sir Nathaniel</i>	. . .	F. STREET
<i>Holofernes</i>	. . .	MR. RAYNOR
<i>Costard</i>	. . .	MR. GRENFELL
<i>Princess</i>	. . .	A. E. BALFOUR
<i>Moth</i>	. . .	R. E. OLIVIER.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

WITH regard to A. O. W.'s query in the October number, Stanley says (p. 338) that in the fields adjacent to the Mill Ditch, which ran down what is now College Street (see plan facing p. 1 of Stanley's 'Memorials'), were the Orchard, the Vineyard, and the Bowling Allé, which have left their names in Orchard Street, Vine Street, and Bowling Street. These streets still exist, I suppose, and fix the sites. Walcott in his 'Memorials of Westminster' (p. 320) puts his description of Vine Street between that of Wood Street and that of Bowling Street. I have not found from either of the above mentioned authorities when the vineyard ceased to exist, or whether it was ever used for fishing with cormorants. I see Walcott says that it was enclosed with houses in the reign of Edward VI., and given by that king to a certain Smith. When James I. rented 'a portion of the vineyard,' it may have been a 'vineyard' only in name. Perhaps Wood Street is named after the 'Master of the Cormorants' mentioned by A. O. W. I should perhaps mention that Walcott says, on p. 320, that 'a plot of ground in St. James's Park in the last century was called the King's Vineyard,' and on p. 59, that there was in 1662 an old pond in St. James's Park, mentioned in a grant of Henry VIII. James I. would, however, hardly have rented a portion of a Crown park.

S. C. R.

Correspondence.

FROM OUR OXFORD CORRESPONDENT.

DEAR SIR,—The most important news I have to tell, is that Aris has obtained an open scholarship at Hertford. I am sure the fact will give you as much pleasure as it did to our small body here.

The scarlet fever that was so prevalent in London a little while ago was unfortunately brought hither by some one, and there have been several cases at the House and Trinity. Towers has been the only O. W. sufferer, and is, I believe, quite well now, though still in quarantine at the Radcliffe Infirmary.

The O. W. W.'s match with the University did not come off owing to the O. W. W. having a cup tie the same day.

The following Colleges are in the third round of the Colleges' Association Cup: The House, Balliol, Magdalen, Oriel, and Keble; the first three have respectively four, three, and one of our number in their cup team.

There were a few O. W. W. rowing in the Torpid Trial Fours, but they did nothing to especially distinguish themselves.

Hickman has won the shooting cup of his company in the University Volunteers.

I must apologise for not having observed before that only four results of the June Schools have been noticed in *The Elizabethan*. The others are as follows: A. G. L. Rogers and F. T. Higgins obtained a Second Class in History; K. P. J. Camm a Second in Theology; O. Scoones and J. R. Pryce a Third in *Litteræ Humaniores*; R. M. De Carteret and H. F. Hawkins a Third in Law; G. L. Marshall a Third in History; H. C. Peck and A. J. Stanfield a Fourth in History; and R. A. Ingram and G. Berens took a Pass Degree. I do not send you these results with the idea that they are new to any of our readers, but for purposes of future reference.

Oxford, Dec. 7.

FROM OUR CAMBRIDGE CORRESPONDENT.

It needs no great acquaintance with the Higher Mathematics to see that the amazing punctuality of this letter, which will contain no news more than a month old, may also account for its short bill of contents.

The last meeting of the Club for this term was held on November 23, Boyd-Carpenter again being our host. The only business was such as we could well have dispensed with, the resignation of the office of President by Denman, who is going down. It will be needless to tell readers of past Cambridge letters how much he has done during his residence here for Cambridge O.W.W. and Westminster at large. The undoubted growth of our body here in numbers and dignity has been in no small part due to his energy, and we may therefore hope for all reasons that the memorial of his stay and Presidency here may be an abiding one.

Of course the Club passed a very hearty vote of thanks, and testified to its collective appreciation of these sentiments. But pleasanter remains: we were able to elect Boyd-Carpenter to the vacant chair, so that it is with much hopefulness that we regard the future.

Water.—The O.W. Fours were rowed on November 26. There were a large number of entries, but the racing was hardly up to last year's standard, owing to their being so many absentees. We had a splendid race between Watt's boat and R. Armitage's, however; a mishap in the former, just short of the goal, giving Armitage the victory, which was shared by Benn, Stevens, Kirby, Sharpe (*cox*).

Third Trinity have been rowing trial eights, which have been in abeyance for some time back. The Westminsters in the winning boat were Watt and Stevens. Sundry others were not quite so fortunate: but to have so many rowing men looks very well for our prospects next term. Benn was in the winning eight of the Hall trials, and Long is in one of the Cam's crews. News of more distant oarsmen is not to hand.

Football.—We have played eight matches at Football against the Schools, as you no doubt are aware: Clare, Corpus, and Cavendish, the Old Salopians, the Malvernians, and teams from Trinity and Caius respectively. We have lost three, and won two of these (goals: for, 11; against, 13). Veitch has repeatedly been distinguishing himself for the 'Varsity, as well as, in company with Sherring and occasionally Phillimore, for Trinity. Sundry other organisations are also much indebted to Westminster footballers.

The achievements of Harington and A. Armitage at Fenner's, I fear, must close this catalogue.
Trin. Coll., Camb.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—Your correspondents 'P. A. X.' and 'Bosporos' have at last sounded in your columns a blatant note, which for some time past has been spoiling the harmony of a contemporary Westminster journal. The taste for millinery that aspiring athletes seem to be developing is a very dangerous sign; it is to be hoped it will never reach such a pass, yet there is no doubt that the only logical development of this spirit can be, that fellows will no longer wire up for colours as heretofore, because, forsooth, 'how can a fellow play in so ugly a cap as that?' The fact of the matter is, the cap, which was the ensign of players who brought Westminster games to their present position, is quite good enough for the present generation, and to alter it would be to meddle with a monument of some interest in the School's history.

Added to this, there is a practical objection of which your correspondent himself has reminded us: at this time of day we could only go further and fare worse did we try to solve some new arrangements in colours, unless of course we bodily appropriate from some other club the uniform we admire. 'P. A. X.' has illustrated his meaning by an example of this; the cap he quotes is a most colourable imitation of that of one of the oldest and best clubs at either University, and, if nothing worse, is at all events a source of occasional perplexity.

In answer to your other sartorial correspondent, may I

suggest that a shag is no part of football uniform? there is in that game no 'in side' to dawdle around the ground with its hands in the pockets of its pretty pink jacket. If I am told that the Football Eleven think their attainments are not advertised enough on the field, and wish to turn themselves into sandwich men in Victoria Street, *minus* the sandwiches, I am answered. Only then the Cricket Eleven may feel discontented, and move heaven and earth to get pink nightcaps or spatter-dashers, as the only means remaining to carry their fame into those worlds it has still to attain.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

B. L. L. M.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—In your last number you published a letter— if such a lot of nonsense can be called one—signed 'Bosporos,' who is rather at sea in his ideas about cricket and football. He makes the alarming statement that if a fellow was good enough to represent the School at football, he ought surely to have been able to do so at cricket, which is absurd, as cricket needs science and energy; while at football, brute force and pluck go for a good deal. He then goes on to say that wearing blue shags would induce small fellows to change more regularly, and would give them more pride in their games. That, to say the least, is utter bosh, as why should fellows prefer playing in blue shags to any other kinds? The blue cap is ugly and common enough, but why add a blue shag? I think the captain ought to see about the change of the blue cap; but as this question has often been discussed before, I will duly add that I hope blue shags will never be worn—I mean by everyone; and apologising for taking up so much of your valuable space,

I remain, yours sincerely,

EUXINE.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—Can you, or any of your numerous readers, tell me why, in the royal arms over School doors, a griffin is substituted for the unicorn? My attention was called to it for the first time by the artist who was sketching here a few days ago for the *Illustrated London News*, and I was sorry not to be able to tell him the reason.

Yours truly,

December 6, 1887.

A. A. M.

'THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.'

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—After taking up a 'whole page' of your paper, and that in 'sarcastic references'—for which enormities I make all due apologies to your readers—I had intended to subside again into the obscurity from which a somewhat lengthy appearance in print had torn me. But it was not to be; and the ruthless and unpitying comments of a certain irascible and excited correspondent of yours demand some reply from the much-abused but inoffensive 'Nobody.' Your correspondent HANTEZ—(or, in spite of some misgivings arising from a slight acquaintance with the rudiments of Greek grammar, I have assumed that he is *singular*)—has compressed so many charges into little more than half a column, that I might take at least two 'whole pages' of your paper if I hoped to answer them all. But, gentle reader of *The Elizabethan*, be not alarmed. This would be a depth of degradation and iniquity too deep even for such an abandoned wretch as 'Nobody' is made to appear in his critic's letter.

I am 'youthful' and 'rash,' and my letter is 'unjustifiable,' 'absurd,' 'sarcastic,' 'abusive,' 'virulent,' and calculated to excite 'jealousy,' and ought never to have been published.

Well, Mr. Editor, I confess I am youthful—I plead guilty to *this* crime; and I cannot conceal the admiration which I feel for the acute perception which my unknown critic has displayed in making this discovery. In this quality I cannot very well hope to rival him, but I will nevertheless in return hazard a guess as to *his* time of life. In his letter there is such strong evidence of the 'crabbedness' of age, the *cavities morosa* of our friend Horace, that I do not hesitate to pronounce my critic a decided veteran. 'Crabbed age and youth cannot live together,'

we are told, and so it would seem. 'Youth is wild, and age is tame'—very tame in this case; and I, 'Nobody,' in the character of Youth, may well go on to exclaim with the poet, 'Age, I do defy thee!'

But I am not only young, I am also rash. Yes, I was indeed rash, almost to infatuation, to write a letter which has called down upon my head such a torrent of righteous wrath; and that I am thus tempting Fate a second time is doubtless only a stronger proof of my rashness. These two charges, then, may be considered 'proven.' But really, Mr. Editor, I cannot admit the truth of all the other adjectives which my critic heaps up against me. There is no need for me to try to answer each adjective seriously, and for this reason among others, that there can be nothing *serious* about a pile of epithets applied more or less at random, and evidently with only a very faint conception of their meaning. For instance, my critic seems to imagine that 'sarcastic references' and 'open abuse' are convertible terms. Then I should be much interested to know whether he has any distinct notion as to the meaning of the word 'virulent.' I can recommend him several good dictionaries, where he might learn what it means; but until he has done so, I would most sincerely advise him not to use the word. I appeal to readers of *The Elizabethan* to say whether there is anything in my last letter which by the very longest stretch of imagination could be called 'virulent'?

It may be a weakness, but I must say that, when I am quoted, I have a kind of unreasonable preference for being quoted right; and after carefully reading and re-reading my previous letter, I have been unable to find that I used the words 'wondrous little leaflet' in any part of it. However, I daresay ΠΑΝΤΕΞ will be able to point them out to me; but until he has done so, I assure the editors of the *Westminster Review* that I should as soon have thought of accusing ΠΑΝΤΕΞ of the possession of common sense as of insulting the *Review* by calling it a—*Leaflet!* Again, he practically misquotes my remark about *The Elizabethan* aiming to be 'historian and mentor,' by severing the words he quotes from those which immediately follow. Perhaps, after all I have said, it is almost needless to add that ΠΑΝΤΕΞ is inconsistent. In the passage to which I am referring, he seems to find fault with *The Elizabethan* because it 'seeks only to be "historian and mentor;"' while at the same time he quarrels with my letter, which he himself allows 'may have brightened up *The Elizabethan* columns to some extent,' apparently because it does not perform either of the chief functions which I attributed to that magazine.

'There is no reason why *The Elizabethan* should quarrel with the *Review*.' No, certainly not; and there is still less reason why ΠΑΝΤΕΞ should quarrel with *The Elizabethan*, its present editor, yours truly 'Nobody,' and the whole School in general, as in his indignant warmth he has done. He quarrels with *The Elizabethan* for being 'monotonous,' for jealousy 'of its younger and more energetic contemporary,' and other sins; with its editor for sanctioning a 'virulent attack' upon the said contemporary, with yours truly 'Nobody' for more reasons than I could well account, even if I had the proverbial *lingua centum*, and with the whole School for having literary talents of a 'poor type.' ΠΑΝΤΕΞ will involve himself in difficulties if he goes on quarrelling at this rate.

The whole idea of a quarrel between *The Elizabethan* and the *Westminster Review* is absolutely absurd, and was entirely originated by ΠΑΝΤΕΞ. They cannot possibly clash, because their spheres and scope are quite different. How the 'large balance' in the hands of the hon. treasurer 'conclusively proves' that the *Review* has found great favour among 'even the most *Elizabethan*-loving Old Westminsters,' I fail to see; but that it has done so I am fully aware. In my last letter I gave my opinion about the *Review* without reserve, so that I hope that I shall not be suspected of insincerity in the additions which I now make. I think that the *Westminster Review* has supplied a gap in our literature, and gives us an advantage which few, if any, schools possess, namely, that of a *weekly* chronicle of events. To young O.W.W.'s like myself, whose eagerness to know all that is going on at the old School,

grudges the delay of several weeks which must often occur before the publication of news in a monthly paper, the *Westminster Review* has been a great boon. I can assure ΠΑΝΤΕΞ that it is one of the happiest moments of the week to me when, early on Friday morning, the *Review* is placed in my hands. Merely as a sign of intellectual activity at the School the *Review* is to be welcomed. The suggestion that the paper is 'protected' from criticism by the fact that its profits will be devoted to the School Mission is an unworthy one. I imagine that the originators of the paper determined that the profits should be employed from higher motives than to be 'protected from criticism.'

What can have induced ΠΑΝΤΕΞ to write in so violent a strain, or, indeed, to write at all, I cannot imagine, unless it was a sharp attack of toothache, or an almost pardonable pride in the possession of considerable talent for abuse. If ΠΑΝΤΕΞ is not already convinced that he has been making himself supremely ridiculous, I can only suggest that he should read a short paragraph on the last page of No. 8 of the *Westminster Review*, and compare it with his own letter. I suppose that ΠΑΝΤΕΞ will allow that the editor of the *Review* has most interest in the question, and that perhaps his opinion on it is more important than that of ΠΑΝΤΕΞ, or anyone else. I must confess that the said editor is kinder to me than I deserve, when he speaks of my letter as 'courteous and amusing;' and, as I read the paragraph, I experienced just the very faintest sensation of having 'coals of fire' upon my head. The editor of the *Review* had sense enough to take my letter, as it was intended to be taken, in good part; and why, if he is not offended, anyone else should be, is a question which I leave to ΠΑΝΤΕΞ to answer.

But I fear that I must be running on into a 'whole page' letter after all. I am afraid that I have taxed the patience of all readers; but the space will not have been altogether wasted if ΠΑΝΤΕΞ is induced to see that there is such a thing as good humour in the world, and that it is better than ill temper, even in dealing with a mere

Nobody.

Our Contemporaries.

WE beg to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the following: *Haileyburian, Carthusian, Ulula, Cambridge Review* (3), *Newtonian, Durham University Magazine, Barnet Elizabethan, Wykehamist, Marlburian, Forest School Magazine, Malvernian.*

NOTICES.

All contributions to the January number of *The Elizabethan* to be sent in by January 7 to the Editor, St. Peter's College, Westminster.

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

The yearly subscription to *The Elizabethan* is 4s. It is requested that all subscriptions now falling due, or not yet paid up, should be forwarded to C. L. C. AVELING, Treasurer of *The Elizabethan*, St. Peter's College, Westminster. Post Office Orders to be made payable at the Broad Sanctuary Post Office, S.W.

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

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

Contributions cannot be inserted unless they are written on one side of the paper only.

Photographs of the cast of the 'Adelphi,' 1886, may be had on application to the Captain, St. Peter's College, price 3s. each.

ERRATA IN NOVEMBER NUMBER.

Page 194, col. 2, twenty-ninth line from bottom of page, for *and* read *now*.

Page 195, col. 2, twenty-seventh line from bottom of page, for *but was only undertaken*; as *he himself*, &c., read *but was only undertaken because, as he himself*, &c.

Page 202, col. 1, eleventh line from end, for *T. G. Ritch* read *J. G. Veitch*.