



The Elizabethan.

Vol. IV. • No. 13. WESTMINSTER, EASTER 1884.

Price 6d.

THE PAST FOOTBALL SEASON.

ANOTHER football season has come and gone, and we take this opportunity of reviewing its successes and defeats. When compared with the particularly disastrous season of 1882-3, there is a distinct improvement visible; that we have not succeeded in equalling the splendid record of 1881-2, we know too well, but yet we have done one thing which we then failed to do—we have beaten Charterhouse. At Christmas we experienced a serious loss in the departure of Bedford, who always played back consistently well, and who acted so efficiently as Captain through the play term; the eleven was likewise weakened by the fact of Thorne and Tritton leaving, and in the first match of this term Page sprained his shoulder so severely that he has not been able to play since. Yet in spite of these misfortunes the play of this term has shown a distinct improvement on that of last, owing chiefly, we think, to the combination play of the forwards. With regard to the general play of the eleven, the passing of the forwards has been

distinctly good; but we notice our bad point as regards the shooting, too much hesitation in front of goals where, especially, delays are found too often to be dangerous, and in consequence many opportunities of scoring have been lost. Otherwise the shooting was hard and accurate, and was a very distinct improvement on last year in that department. With regard to the backs the only fault we can find is the bad kicking of corners throughout the season, the ball as often as not being kicked behind the goal. But for this the number of goals would probably have been considerably augmented. The first match we played was against a team brought down by C. W. R. Tepper, which resulted in a victory for us, 4-2; a draw against O'Scoone's eleven, 3-3; and a victory over a team brought down by G. Stephenson, 3-2, inspired us with a hope that we were commencing a brilliant season, a hope which, however, was damped considerably in our next three matches, when we met with defeat from the Old Carthusians, 3-1, the Old Westminsters, 5-2, and the last and worst from Reigate Priory by 6-1. The form of our eleven in this match was very poor, for the

Priory team was not nearly so good as several we have beaten. The Old Wykehamists, our next opponents, brought a very strong team, but were only able to make it a draw, neither side scoring. We beat Old Foresters, 3—1, and Sandhurst, 1—0, the eleven playing particularly well in this match. The Swifts next brought a very strong team, and we were defeated by 3—1. We inflicted a most hollow defeat upon the Old Harrovians, 9—0, though playing ourselves but a weak team, as six of the eleven were playing elsewhere. In the remaining two matches of the term we had to put up with defeat from Brentwood and Old Brightonians successively, in the former match by 1—0, in the latter by 2—1.

We began this term with a game against the Old Foresters, who were desirous of practising for their tie in the London Cup, and as usual in our matches with the Old Foresters the eleven was at its best, and we were successful by 3—0. The match against the Clapham Rovers resulted in a draw, neither side scoring. We defeated a weak team of Old Westminster's, 3—1; but were in turn defeated, 3—2, by a very strong team of Old Carthusians. A hot team of Casuals we beat 2—1; but met with a decisive defeat at the hands, or rather feet, of Brentwood by 5—1. In this match we scored one goal to two before half time against the wind, and upon crossing over, and having a very strong wind at our backs, we ought to have been able to do more than keep our own instead of undergoing so decisive a defeat. This brought us to Charterhouse, and after having by far the best of the game throughout we were only able to retaliate on the successive defeats of seven years by beating them by 2—1. We drew a Cambridge eleven brought by R. T. Squire, 1—1, and beat the Old Harrovians and Old Etonians, each by 1—0. In a return match with the Casuals we were beaten, 4—3. A very strong team of Foresters we beat by 3—0, and we finished up the season by drawing the Ashburnham Rovers, 3—3.

During the entire season we played 27 matches, of which 12 were won, 10 lost, and 5 drawn. The number of goals kicked for the school was 55, against 49.

WE copy the following from the *Journal of Education*. For comment see the report of the Debating Society.

OUR LONDON SCHOOLS, PRESENT AND FUTURE.

I.—WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

During the hard struggle which Westminster School has had to maintain for the last ten or fifteen years,

a great deal has been written, much more has been said, about her, comprising a great deal of scandal, and, at the same time, it must be allowed, a great deal of honest truth. But, unfortunately, until lately the question has played the part of the proverbial red rag—at the very mention of the name the opponents of the School were ready to burst with spite and spleen, whereas the old Westminster metaphorically crossed himself, and was as one inspired with the fanaticism of a devotee. Just now, however, there seems to be a lull in the conflict; the School has now got all the promised increase of space, and the contending parties are waiting to see what will come next. The article in the *Times* last summer was typical of this change of feeling—it was nothing more than a sketch of the past greatness of the School, coupled with the expression of the belief that it is now on its trial. The well-known article upon Westminster in 'Our Public Schools,' questionable in taste, and still more in fact, was so fully treated in the *Journal of Education* for April 1881, that it is scarcely necessary to consider it in detail here. A few points will occur for notice incidentally.

It has been usual to suggest, as the first of the necessary reforms, that the boarding system should be done away with, and the school converted into a great day-school. It will be best, therefore, first to consider what reasons the authorities may have had hitherto before them in their desire to retain the boarding element.

The first reason which may be suggested is, that it is desirable that not all London schools should be of one type, the day school pure and simple—in other words, the authorities not improbably believe that they are supplying a definite want; nor does the writer in 'Our Public Schools' answer this argument when he says that 'the fact that one-third of the present boarders reside in London clearly proves the unreality of the want.' On the contrary, the boarding-houses are now always well filled, and at least two-thirds of the boarders reside in or near London. This is a fairly strong proof that the School does, in some way, supply a want; whether that want is a reasonable one is another question.

Again, it must be evident that the boarding element tends to preserve and stereotype the peculiar characteristics and advantages of the School. Even the writer of the 'Public Schools' article, in his better moments, acknowledges the great power of the Abbey and, in a less degree, of the Houses of Parliament in moulding the life of the scholars brought up beneath their shadow. If the boarders are eliminated, this influence is minimised. They have the surroundings of the School daily and hourly before them; it is through them that whatever effect these surroundings have is communicated to the rest of the School; if there were only day-boys, merely coming and going at the school hours, the advantages of the present site would be next to nothing.

Again, we venture to believe that the authorities are right in their estimate of the importance of games. Westminster has peculiar advantages over other London schools, in the possession of Vincent Square

as a ground for cricket and football. But, even with these advantages, the maintenance of regular football and cricket would be quite impossible without boarders. The experiment has been tried again and again in London day-schools, but it has hitherto been found impossible to preserve this part of the training in anything like efficiency without a nucleus of boarders as a centre round which the rest may work.

Many persons, while allowing that the Westminster boarding system supplies a certain want, find it difficult to explain how that want arises; in other words, why some parents choose Westminster as a boarding-school for their boys when they have all the country schools before them. We should say that such parents are generally actuated by one or both of two motives: in the first place, they may have been, at some time or other, connected either directly or indirectly with the School; and there is certainly no school in England where the feeling of loyalty and affection among the old boys is so strong. Let anyone who doubts this, stand before the walls of the great School, and look at the long rolls of family names inscribed upon them: the Glyns, the Phillimore, the Markhams—names which occur and recur through two or three centuries, and are still often to be found on the school register. Secondly, there are many parents, residing in or near London, who like to see more of their boys than a country public school allows, while, at the same time, they wish them to undergo the discipline and training of a boarding-school, and who are thus led to choose Westminster because the boarders there are allowed to go home, if they like, from Saturday to Monday.

Such is, we believe, a fair statement of the case with regard to the boarding system from the point of view, first, of the authorities, and, secondly, of the parents. It prevents all London schools being of one distinct type; it forms a nucleus which can preserve the *genius loci*, and hand on the old traditions of a great school; it is a centre for the games; and, lastly, it offers to many London parents just that of which they are in search. Now, we are of opinion that these grounds are sufficient for the retention of the boarding element, and that its destruction would be a fatal blow to the prospects of the School. The dangers of locality and the difficulties of discipline are not insuperable obstacles. No one will deny, for instance, that 'loafing' is bad, and perhaps Westminster boys are peculiarly liable to such temptations and their results; but, at any rate, it is well to consider whether even a boy who 'loafs' in the streets of Westminster has not more to stimulate his thoughts, more to make him remember that there is a world outside his own school, more to make him sink himself and aim at a higher ideal, than a boy who 'loafs' in the streets of a dull country town. In spite of what has been urged to the contrary, we hold it not proved that the moral standard of the average Westminster boy is lower than that of the average country school boy, and we believe that the same view of the case would commend itself to an impartial critic, who had opportunities for comparison. There are, of course, difficulties, and strong measures of

reform are necessary to obviate them or lessen their effect as far as possible. To begin with, there is the general question which applies to all boarding-schools. A cry is frequently raised, and the complaint is becoming more distinctly uttered year by year, that there is a lack of refining elements in such schools. Thus, a boy is taken from home, and nothing is given him to replace his home influences. If the boarding system in our great public schools is to continue, it must remedy this defect. One obvious means to this end is the establishment of a good library and reading-room; these are already in course of construction at Westminster. But the strongest, and, at the same time, healthiest, influence is to be found in the encouragement of a closer intercourse and more real sympathy between masters and boys, in the development of what may be called the 'brotherly' relation between teacher and pupil. Without this, all the libraries in the world will not help an average boy to a higher view of life; it is mind and mind that must be brought into contact before mind and book. This all-important change is beginning at Westminster; for, whereas, according to the statement in the article in 'Our Public Schools,' which we believe to be correct, not a single master then took any part in the games or societies of the school, now masters regularly join with the boys at Vincent Square and Putney, and elsewhere, and everything points to a still further development of a better and closer relation between masters and boys. Next in importance to this we should place such means of occupation as debating, natural history, or musical societies, a gymnasium, a carpenter's workshop, a swimming-bath, and fives-courts. All such minor helps are now within the easy reach of the authorities.

In the general results of education, it must be confessed that Westminster has, of late years, failed most remarkably. With a few brilliant exceptions, nothing worthy of the School has been done for many years; the success of a Westminster man at Oxford or Cambridge is now rather a matter for surprise. This is due partly to the want of sufficient stimulus and competition amongst the Queen's Scholars; but there are other causes at work which affect the whole School. There has been no properly organised system of work; the mechanical apparatus for teaching has been very bad; there have been no class-rooms worth speaking of; rules for superannuation have been allowed to fall into abeyance; there have been no provisions for modern classes. No amount of skill in teaching could have counterbalanced these difficulties. It will be seen that none of these defects are now irremediable—in fact, they are being remedied as fast as possible; class-rooms are being built, a modern class has been established, and a laboratory provided. All these reforms were begun under the rule and at the initiation of the late Head Master, and are being carried on by his successor. It is to be hoped, then, that the public will be content to wait until they are completed, as it will not be fair to judge of results until the improvements have been got into working order. An important alteration has also been already made in the hours for school work, so that the whole School

now assembles at 9 A.M., instead of the futile arrangement by which boarders began at 8 and day-boys at 9; and, if the preparation school before 8, which has been substituted for boarders, be well looked after and insisted on, this new arrangement ought to do a great deal towards welding boarders and day-boys into one compact body, and stimulating the work as a whole; it has the additional advantage of allowing the whole School to join in an Abbey service at 9. The hours of afternoon school must, of course, differ from those of all London day schools, if the boarding element is to be maintained, and probably the present hours of 3 to 5 in the summer, and 3.30 to 5.30 in the winter, could not be bettered; the lateness of these hours is amply compensated by the opportunities for games in the interval. Perhaps, in the summer, 2.30 to 4.30 might be substituted with advantage.

Lastly comes the burning question of reform of 'College'; that is to say, that part of the School set apart for the abode of the Queen's Scholars, or Foundationers, to the number of forty boys. It is here that a reformer will meet his greatest difficulties. To begin with, the standard of work among the scholars is at present extremely low; something must be done to provide them with the necessary stimulus which the absence of competition denies them. Under the present system a newly elected scholar only sees before him the vision of a comfortable income at one of the Universities—a vision which he knows he can realise without any supreme effort of his own. One step in the right direction has been taken by throwing open the Scholarships at the Universities to the whole School; but it is plain that this is not enough; there must be a better system of Entrance Examination, a definite standard must be fixed, and the Scholarships withheld if necessary; the rule of superannuation among Queen's Scholars must be rigidly enforced.

It is natural that a place like 'College' should be the repository of all the oldest traditions of the School; but few will deny that it is possible for even the oldest traditions to become mere anachronisms, and to degenerate into something very like abuses. As it is now, the life of a 'junior'—that is, of a boy on his first entrance into College—is crowded with a host of petty duties imposed upon him by the authority of tradition; his work is spoiled, his powers of concentration and application are weakened. He is taught to look wholly upon the greatness of the past, and never upon the possible greatness of the future.

Of course, there can be no doubt that it is well to encourage boys to independence; but independence may be carried too far. According to the present system, a Queen's Scholar lives an almost independent life, and rather prides himself on the great gulf which separates him from the masters; while the annual Play, and the foolish scribbles thereon in the newspapers, give him every chance of thinking more highly of himself than he ought to think. In fact, the whole plan of life is an anachronism, and is being outdone by healthier systems. One important reform has already been made by the abolition of the dual

control of 'Under Master' and 'Head Master'; but there must be a further encouragement of a greater community of feeling between the governors and the governed, and we believe that this can be done—nay, has already been begun—in a friendly and brotherly spirit, without interfering with the liberty of the subject, and without anything like prying into the details of a boy's inner life. We would venture to suggest that the Play should no longer be confined to the Queen's Scholars, and some may even go so far as to say that Queen's Scholars and Town Boys (*i.e.* non Queen's Scholars) should no longer exist as two distinct bodies; but that both should board and live together under one common system and rule of life. But, whatever is done, it is earnestly to be hoped that Old Westminsters will not offer any strenuous opposition to real and obviously necessary reforms. Their loyalty to their School, and their reverence for the past, deserve all honour from those who have felt the power of the traditions of a great school in forming character; and every one must sympathise with the feeling that it is well to preserve old traditions, which are not in themselves absolutely harmful, but when any of these traditions have degenerated, or are likely to degenerate, into abuses, it is time to give them up and apply new remedies. 'For if Time, of course, alter things to the worse, and Wisdom and Counsell shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end?'

School Notes.

We omitted to mention in our last issue that the University of St. Andrews has conferred the honorary degree of LL.D. on the Head Master.

On Friday, March 14th, the Literary Society read Sheridan's 'School for Scandal.' This is the first occasion on which any other author than Shakespeare has been chosen. An interesting feature of the meeting was the song 'Here's to the maiden,' the solo in which was well rendered by M. R. Bethune.

The Bell-ringing Society has rung a Plain Hunt on six bells. This is the first essay of the Society in half-pull ringing.

We observe that a paper has been issued up Grant's, under the title of the *Grantite Review*. Some of our readers may recollect similar outbursts of literary activity within the last five or six years, and the brief existence which was the lot of all. There can be no objection to such in themselves; on the contrary, as signs of energy and enterprise in the School, they are rather to be welcomed. But we feel that till the *Elizabethan* is better supported, till its yearly accounts can show such a surplus as we should wish, these lesser magazines do not justify their existence, for the first literary duty of a school-boy is clearly to his school magazine.

The concert is fixed for Thursday, May 1st. The first part will this year be devoted to sacred music, which we believe to have been the arrangement when the concerts were originally instituted under the late Mr. Turle.

THE DEBATING SOCIETY

met on Monday, March 10th, to elect a new member, when C. Gibson was elected after a close contest with Street, Q.S., and Morgan-Brown, Q.S.

The Society met again on Thursday, March 13th, to consider a vote of censure on the Secretary, based on the alleged one-sided character of the report furnished to the last number of the *Elizabethan*. The President (H. C. Peck), in moving the vote of censure, said nothing in particular, and said it very badly. He referred with much bad taste to the editor of the *Elizabethan* as incapable, a remark which alienated from him the support of C. J. Shebbeare. M. T. Pigott (seconder) examined in detail the shortcomings of the much-abused report.

P. M. Francke opposed the motion in his editorial capacity. He concluded a long and brilliant defence of the offending report by remarking (to the astonishment of the Society, the disgust of the President, and the delight of the Secretary and his partisans) that even if it did become necessary for the Secretary to resign his post, he would still be commissioned to furnish reports of the proceedings of the Society to the *Elizabethan*.

C. J. Shebbeare, amidst loud cheers, said that, although he was in favour of the motion, he could not vote for it after the excessively misdirected abuse of the editor contained in the proposer's speech.

E. F. Allen said that the hon. proposer was merely a tool in the hands of the real originators of the motion, those who had been shown in their proper colours in the report, whose motive was nothing but spite; and that the 'apology' at the end of the report was actuated by good feeling rather than fear. (Hear, hear.)

F. H. Collier opposed the motion, but characterised the report in question as extremely conceited.

G. Berens contended that the report was very amusing, and in no way deserving of censure.

G. Ince then harangued the Society in his own defence. He concluded by referring to J. Watt as the real proposer of the motion, and quoting, *apropos* of that hon. member and his motive of spite, the lines,

'Give me the man who is not passion's slave,
And I will wear him in my own heart's core,
Ay, in my heart of hearts.'

The House divided, when the numbers were—

Ayes	18
Noes	7
Majority	11

The Secretary accordingly resigned, and the House adjourned at 6.55.

On the following Monday, G. Ince was re-elected

Secretary amidst great excitement by 12 votes to 10 obtained by his adversary J. Watt.

On Thursday, March 20th, after sundry questions and notices, the House proceeded to discuss a motion of C. C. J. Webb's, condemnatory of an article which recently appeared in the *Journal of Education*.

C. C. J. Webb opened the discussion by reading to the Society that portion of the article under discussion which related to College. Proceeding to criticism, he said that College was the distinctive feature of Westminster (hear, hear), the abolition of which would bring the School down to the level of others far inferior in antiquity and reputation. (Hear, hear.) The entrance into College was no guarantee of election to the Universities, and the statement to that effect in the article was inconsistent with the fact mentioned immediately after, that the Christchurch and Trinity Scholarships were open to T.B.B. Whether Election was a 'supreme effort' or not, it was no light examination. With regard to the remark about the 'host of duties' imposed upon a Junior, he did not think that a system involving a 'host of petty duties' stood self-condemned. All communities in the early ages of their development passed through such a stage; what was the Mosaic Law itself but a 'host of petty duties'? And if so, was it unreasonable that the individual who in the development of his body went through the same process of physical evolution as the race should, as part of his training, be brought under a system of this sort? (Hear, hear.) There was a practical advantage, moreover, in the 'host of petty duties,' and the system which rested upon it. It made the bonds of unity firmer; the life of every one in College was brought into close connection with that of others. Modern reformers were always trying to loose the bonds of society. There was a passage in Carlyle's 'Past and Present' which spoke of the innumerable bonds which linked men of old the one to the other, 'from the Sacrament of Matrimony downwards,' and lamented the breaking up of this noble state of things in our own days. The speaker then branded the remark of the article that 'the whole plan of life (in College) is one anachronism, and must soon be superseded by healthier systems,' as ridiculous dogmatism. (Cheers.) The writer, though he must undoubtedly have been at some time very closely connected with the School, was obviously not intimately acquainted with the details of College life, and had no right to make sweeping assertions of this kind. The bad effects of College on boys were not proved. The speaker said that he himself was an example to the contrary. As a half-boarder T.B. he had not enjoyed his School life; but since he had got into College, he had acquired such a love for Westminster that he never cared to be away from it. (Hear, hear.) Yet he should never think of bringing this forward as a reason why the half-boarders should be abolished. It was, beyond a doubt, his own fault that he did not get on as a T.B. There must be under every system some individuals to whom it is unsuitable, and College is no exception to the rule. But College, probably, has less to answer for than most;

for a large class of boys, whose uncongenial temper would always prevent their winning themselves a position in an ordinary school society, improve greatly in College, where a position, with manifold duties to others, is ready made for every Q.S. The article in the *Journal of Education* referred to the gulf existing between Masters and Q.S.S., saying that the Q.S. prided himself upon it! (Oh, oh!) But it was in the School as in the Church itself: 'There are many members in one body: and all members have not the same office.' (Hear, hear.) The staff of Masters and College were different members of the same body; and there was a distinction between the offices of each. Not only was it the Master's office to teach, and the scholar's office to learn, but while the Masters, the speaker supposed, should always represent the reforming element, the Q.S.S. were the natural guardians of a great body of ancient tradition, which they were bound jealously to guard, leaving it in no other hands than their own to defend or to destroy. (Cheers.) As for the T.B.B., the same saying applied to them: they were another member of our body and had not the same office as the Q.S.S. They also had traditions, and noble traditions, to keep up (hear, hear), as all must feel who had had the honour to look at that splendid record, the Town Boy Ledger, extending back over so many years—the best school record in existence. (Cheers.) The abolition of College would not be desired by Town Boys. (Hear, hear.) They were interested no less than the Q.S.S. in the maintenance of the historic constitution of the school. (Cheers.) What was called T.B. and Q.S. spirit was dying out. (Hear, hear.) The speaker knew he was saying the truth in asserting that there was at present very little in the School. He hoped that it would in time die out altogether. All were agreed that it was most prejudicial to the interests of Westminster. (Hear, hear.) There was no more ground for supposing that the abolition of College was necessary to the unity of the School (cheers) than that the abolition of the distinction between clergy and laity was necessary for the unity of the Church. With regard to the suggestion that T.B.B. should be admitted to take part in the Play, that was one of those ideas which have a great show of wisdom, but little more. The opening of the Play to T.B.B. would mean much more than those few words convey. (Hear, hear.) It would mean the destruction of all the customs and traditions, all the associations and the life which centre round the annual festival. (Cheers.) The only reason, which is a reason, that can be given for such destruction is that the Play, the only School festival, is open to only a portion of the School. But why should it be the only School festival? The concert, the athletic sports, the great matches, might be made far more of than is at present the case. How this reform is to be carried out opened a wide question, which was foreign to the present debate. But the speaker was certain that it might be carried out, and then he hoped they would hear no more of opening the Play to T.B.B. (Hear, hear.) If College were destroyed, it would be very soon universally regretted (cheers), but could never be restored. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, there should be great hesi-

tation before doing an irreparable injury to the School, taking a step which could never be retraced. College could not be abolished as an experiment. It was not wanted by the School, it was not wanted by O.W.W., it was not wanted by the parents of Westminster. The only people who were supposed to want it were the outside world; and why should the outside world be considered? They had no stake, no interest in the School; their criticism was what Lord Beaconsfield had called, in words which should never be forgotten, 'the hare-brained chatter of irresponsible frivolity.' (Laughter.) The outside world always thought they knew more of medicine than the greatest doctors, more of theology than the best divines; they would think they knew more law than the most eminent lawyers, did they not have a wholesome dread of meddling with the law, because the evils of that course were immediate and evident. Finally, the proposer commended the motion to the Society's votes, saying that it was not a Q.S. motion, but one of equal importance to Q.S.S. and T.B.B. He asked the House to condemn an attack on College which he said was manifestly unfair (cheers), and as written by one who was clearly a strong partisan (hear, hear), though of whom, except himself, he was a partisan, he (the speaker) was at a loss to know. (Laughter and cheers.)

A. M. T. Jackson, in seconding, said he had little to add to the arguments of the hon. proposer. The remarks he wished to make referred chiefly to the latter part of the article in question. He believed the abolition of College to be the greatest calamity that could possibly happen to the School. (Cheers.) College was the body from which Westminster had grown to its present dimensions, and it had preserved the traditions of the School through all its changes of fortune. (Cheers.) The proposal that Town Boys should act in the Play would also, he thought, have bad effects; it would no doubt be very pleasant for the Town Boys who had parts, but the interest taken in the Play would be diminished rather than extended. (Hear, hear.) For at present every one of the 40 Queen's Scholars had some duty connected with the Play. He concluded by affirming that if College were abolished the School would sink to the level of an ordinary 'London academy for young gentlemen.' (Hear, hear.)

G. Ince opposed the motion *pro forma*, and in doing so said a few words in favour of the motion. He dwelt on the unanimity of the College, its discipline, its refining influences, and its privileges.

C. J. Shebbeare, in the course of a long and admirable speech, said that when a somewhat similar motion was brought on four years ago, he remembered that H. R. James, in seconding, had remarked that a debate on such a subject was the most useful that could take place in the society. No reformer could fail in some measure to respect the opinion of the majority of the School, and it would show that we took an intelligent interest in our institutions, and show that we do not 'worship we know not what.' (Hear, hear.) He was glad that this motion was supported by T.B.B. as well as Q.S.S. They (the T.B.B.) had traditions to

keep up as well as Q.SS. (cheers), and the Q.SS. had got no record so valuable or of so great an interest as the T. B. Ledger. (Cheers.) He thought that this article was not written with any evil intent. We were too apt to suppose that every movement of this kind was instigated by the 'craft and subtlety of the devil or man.' (Laughter.) He did not think that was the case in this instance. Indeed, there were portions of the offending article with which he thoroughly agreed. (Hear, hear.) But he was always a little afraid of such sweeping reforms as those suggested in the article. No two men were agreed as to the precise nature of the reforms which were necessary; they only agreed that it was above all things necessary that a boy should be able to live a moral and Christian life at Westminster—beyond that, *quot homines, tot sententiae*. He did not believe himself that either an increase of numbers or of scholarships was the chief thing necessary (hear, hear), and that our system was an anachronism; and that we should always keep up with the spirit of the times was the greatest delusion in the world. (Oh, oh.) It was difficult for a reformer to foresee the sequence of cause and effect in such cases, and thus to know how to apply his remedies, so as not to sweep away the good with the bad. (Cheers.) After speaking for 40 minutes the hon. member moved the adjournment of the House at 6.55, and the House accordingly adjourned.

On Monday, March 24th, there was a meeting in the upper 5th room, for the election of two new members, when H. B. Street, Q.S., and C. Ritchie were elected.

On the ensuing Thursday, the debate on C. C. J. Webb's motion was continued.

C. J. Shebbeare having concluded his remarks, Mr. Blackburn said that, in coming forward as the first real defender of the article, he wished to point out that to disagree with anything did not imply that it must be censured. (Hear.) He had not had the advantage of being up at the former debate, and so wished only to reply to the somewhat weak arguments he had heard that evening. First, with regard to College. He quite agreed with the writer that the Junior's duties were too heavy; and most people would support him in his statement that a Junior's work was very much below par. (Oh, oh.) Again, he thought that the discipline in College was by no means all that it might be. (Oh!) With regard to the Play he thought it would be an excellent thing to have T.BB. acting. There would be more chance of getting that *rara avis*, a good actor. With regard to the relations between masters and boys, he totally disagreed with Mr. Shebbeare's somewhat weak remarks on that subject. He had not the *honour* of Mr. Shebbeare's acquaintance (laughter), but there were many people in the School with whom he would be proud to walk arm-in-arm. (Laughter and cheers.) In conclusion, he asked the Society not to censure the article merely because they disagreed with it, but to

be thankful that the virulent attack contained in the *Times* article (from which he read some extracts) had not been repeated. (Hear, hear.)

F. H. Collier said that he wished to protest most strongly against the extreme superficiality of the knowledge displayed by the writer of the article. Two reasons were given why parents sent their sons to Westminster, 1. Loyalty and affection to the School; 2. Because they lived near London and wished to have their sons home often. He ventured to suggest that parents sent their sons here because they thought it was an excellent school, and trusted that the influence it imparted would exercise a beneficial effect on their future life. (Hear, hear.) He thought that the ignorance displayed by the writer with regard to College was well instanced by these two statements, viz., 'that the standard of work among the scholars is extremely low,' and 'that a newly elected scholar sees before him the prospect of a comfortable income at one of the Universities.' (Oh, oh.) With regard to the hardships of a Junior's life, how was it that nearly all O.WW. looked upon their first year in College as the happiest year of their life at Westminster, and in some cases the happiest time of their whole life. (Loud cheers from the Juniors.) It was these hardships, these much-reviled tannings, these petty tyrannies, that made life worth living at Westminster; this it was that made all Q.SS. so fond of their School, this it was that accounted for the loyalty and affection referred to by the writer of the article. (Cheers.) Next for the Play. No one well informed on the subject would venture to affirm that it would be a good thing to have T.BB. in the Play. As long as the Play was in College Dormitory, so long must the Q.SS. be the sole actors in it. Take it out of Dormitory, and you destroy an old custom coeval with the foundation of the School. (Cheers.) With regard to the relations between masters and boys, the statement of the writer was only equalled by the extremely foolish remark of Mr. Shebbeare, that a master couldn't lay aside his dignity with his cap and gown. If Mr. Shebbeare didn't get on well with the masters, he felt quite sure it was his own fault. For his part, he had only experienced the greatest kindness and hospitality at the hands of most masters, and he felt sure many members of the Society could say the same thing. (Hear, hear.) One point mentioned in the article they could not shut their eyes to, and this was the almost proverbial failure of O.WW. at the Universities. He trusted there was a better time coming. Attacks like these should only stimulate them all to greater exertions, and to strive and make Westminster no longer a mere *nomini's umbra*, but in every way equal to the grand old School it once had been. (Cheers.)

C. C. J. Webb said that Mr. Blackburn had assumed that the motion was intended to censure the whole of the article under discussion. But as he (the proposer) had proposed the motion, it was only condemnatory of the attack upon College at the end. (Hear, hear.) The rest of the article no one could wish to censure; we should rather be grateful for its support of the boarding system. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Collier had flatly

contradicted Mr. Blackburn, and said that Westminsters never loafed about the streets. He could not conceive why Mr. Collier should deny what was obviously a fact. (Hear, hear.) On this point the remarks of the writer in the *Journal of Education*, in the earlier part of his article, were excellent—that a boy who loafed about the streets of Westminster would find more to occupy his mind, more to make him feel that there was a world outside his own, than a boy who loafed in the streets of a dull country town. (Hear, hear.) As to Town Boys acting in the play, he thought the remarks made at the last debate, when Mr. Blackburn was not present, by Mr. Shebbeare, and by the hon. seconder, Mr. Jackson, the Head Town Boy (hear, hear), were conclusive. Those remarks had shown that the admission of T.B.B. to the Play would, as his friend on the left (Mr. Crews), a Town Boy himself, had just been saying, have no effect at all in extending the interest felt in the Play. (Hear, hear.)

G. C. Ince, in his reply, took exception to F. H. Collier's speech, as containing a maximum of bad taste and a minimum of common sense. (Hear, hear.) He proceeded to answer the argument of the alleged uselessness and anachronisms of the duties of a Junior in College. He asked if the keeping up of fires, the illumination of rooms, the maintenance of punctuality, the ventilation of College, and the keeping of it tidy for prayers in the evening and the inspection of visitors at all times (laughter), could be considered anachronisms. (Hear, hear.) He denied that masters and boys were at all estranged, and mentioned the well-known hospitality of masters towards boys as an instance to the contrary. (Cheers.) He said that, notwithstanding the good authority they had for supposing that the writer of the offending article was in a position to know a good deal about his subject, he (the writer) did not seem fully to realise the fact that College was one of the grandest old foundations in the kingdom (cheers), and that the Play was an old custom absolutely unique in the public schools of the country. (Cheers.) Under these circumstances, he appealed to the Society—was it advisable to tamper with either of these institutions? (Cheers.) 'Mr. President,' he concluded, 'we live now in an atmosphere of innovation. (Hear, hear.) Our school times have been altered somewhat for the better. (Hear, hear.) Our Abbey services have been altered very much for the worse (loud cheers), and we hear of nothing but changes, and rumours of changes, on all sides. But, Mr. President, I hope that all this excitement will blow over, and that the School will weather this storm, as she has weathered many others (hear, hear), and continue in the future, as she has done in the past, to send forth sons who shall be in the highest degree "profitable members of this Church and nation.'" (Cheers.)

The House divided, when there voted :

Ayes	23
Noes	2
Majority	21

The announcement of the numbers was received with deafening cheers, and the House immediately adjourned.

On Thursday, April 3rd, no meeting was held, owing to the death of V. E. R. Yglesias.

FOOTBALL.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL v. A CAMBRIDGE ELEVEN.

As we had not a match on this day, Squire brought down an eleven to play us, amongst which were one or two of the Cambridge Eleven who had beaten Oxford the day before. At starting the visitors had the best of the game, and a run by Squire and Richards nearly proved fatal to us, as the latter's shot hit the bar and then went behind. This roused our forwards to action, and Crews and Hurst taking the ball down the ground, the latter put it through with a neat shot. However, a little before half-time, Richards, with a hard low shot, made the game 1-1. After half-time both sides played up hard, Vincent, Richards, and Ingram for the visitors, and Harrison, Vavasour, Peck, and Crews for the School showing to advantage. However, at the call of time nothing had happened further, and so the game ended in a draw (1-1). The sides were :

WESTMINSTER.

R. A. Ingram (capt.), A. Fevez (backs); R. Vavasour, G. Berens, H. Harrison (half backs); J. Paul, A. R. Hurst (centre); C. Ritchie, H. Peck (right); A. E. Crews (left); W. R. Moon (goal).

CAMBRIDGE XI.

R. T. Squire (capt.), E. J. S. Moore, G. E. Preston, J. Vincent, L. M. Richards, C. F. Ingram, L. J. Attay, A. S. Cave, J. F. P. Rawlinson, P. G. Spiro.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL v. OLD HARROVIANS.

Played on Saturday, March 1st, and resulted in a victory for us by 1-0. Old Harrovians came down with as strong a team as they could get, in order, no doubt, to avenge their defeat of last term by 9 goals to nil. At the outset the game was very even, both goals being in turn attacked. At length Gibson, from a good run by Crews, scored for us; but on Old Harrovians for offside their umpire disallowed the goal. After half-time we penned them considerably, and Hurst scored for us, though this point was also disputed, but the umpire in this case decided in our favour. Nothing worthy of note occurred after this, and so the game terminated in our favour by 1 goal to love. For the School, Hurst, Crews, Vavasour, and Harrison were best, while Davidson, Macan, Hext, and Welch were most conspicuous for the visitors. The sides were :

WESTMINSTER.

R. A. Ingram (capt.), H. C. Peck, A. E. Crews, R. Vavasseur, J. Paul, A. R. Hurst, C. Ritchie, A. Fevez, G. Berens, W. R. Moon, H. Harrison.

OLD HARROVIANS.

H. B. Rendall (goal); G. Macan, R. de Welch (backs); T. Campbell, A. G. Topham (half-backs); T. W. Holloway, A. G. Kinlock (left); Rev. W. Law, K. A. Grogan (centre); A. H. Davidson, G. Hext (right).

WESTMINSTER v. OLD ETONIANS.

Played on Wednesday, March 5th, and resulted in a victory for us by one goal to none. The Old Etonians turned up one short, so Man played in goals for them as a substitute. Soon after the commencement, Paul sent in a shot, which Man caught and threw away, but, getting hold of it again, he put it safely through the posts. The School for some time after this penned their opponents, but could not force the ball through, though Crews two or three times middled right in front of goals. The visitors, led on by Maryon-Wilson and Paravicini, invaded the School quarters, but Moon saved his charge well. After half-time, the School, now playing against the wind, which had got up considerably, had some difficulty in repelling the many attacks made by the visitors, but no other point was scored, and so the game ended as stated above. The sides were :

WESTMINSTER.

R. A. Ingram (capt.), A. Fevez (backs); R. Vavasseur, G. Berens, H. Harrison (half-backs); A. E. Crews, A. R. Hurst (left); E. Paul (centre); H. C. Peck, C. Ritchie (right); W. R. Moon (goals).

OLD ETONIANS.

E. Man (sub.) (goal); H. W. Hotham, F. Hogg (backs); P. C. Morris, C. W. Foley, Hon. H. G. Coleridge (half-backs); J. F. P. Rawlinson, F. Laming (left); F. Bickley, J. Maryon-Wilson (right); P. J. de Paravicini (centre).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL v. OLD MALVERNANS.

Played at Vincent Square on Saturday, March 8th, resulting in a victory for the visitors by two goals to one. For the first half the Old Malvernians had a slight wind in their favour, and obtained one goal from the foot of Jobson. After half-time the School played up better, and made several attacks upon the visitors' fortress, but without success. Wooldridge made a capital run down the right for them, crossing to Morice, who goaled neatly through. Several rushes were now made by the School into the visitors' territory, the ball once hitting the bar from a good shot by Peck. Just before time, after a combined rush of our forwards, Hurst scored the only point for us, and the game ended as stated above. The sides were :

WESTMINSTER.

R. A. Ingram (capt.), H. C. Peck, A. E. Crews, R. Vavasseur, J. Paul, A. R. Hurst, C. Ritchie, A. Fevez, G. Berens, W. R. Moon, H. Harrison.

OLD MALVERNANS.

E. C. Evelyn (goals); N. Morice, J. O. Benwell (backs); F. P. Oakley, W. S. Johnson, W. Salter (half-backs); W. S. Morice (centre); A. L. Whitfield, G. F. Wooldridge (right); T. J. Powell, C. de Beaufort (left).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL v. CASUALS.

This match was played on Wednesday, March 12th, and resulted, after a well-fought contest, in a defeat for the School by four goals to three. Bickley having won the toss, the ball was started for the School by Paul from the Hospital end.

At first, Westminster seemed slightly superior, and a good run was soon made by Ritchie, which resulted in a corner for Westminster. The ball having been placed well before the goal by Vavasseur, a smart tussle ensued, which ended in a neat goal being scored for the School by Harrison. After this, the Casuals pulled themselves together, and Taunton made a good run down the right, but was stopped by Fevez. Our opponents, however, continued to press on, and at length the first item in the score of the Casuals was gained by a magnificent long shot from England. The game was very even for some time after this, and Gibson shot just over the bar from a good middle by Crews, while Patrick very nearly succeeded in scoring another goal for our opponents. A shot from Bell, however, soon raised the Casuals' score to 2-1. Several good runs and shots were now made by Westminster, and one magnificent attempt was made from the right by Peck. The score, however, at half-time was still in favour of the visitors. Soon after half-time a 'hands' was gained by the Casuals, directly in front of our goal, and, after a smart contest, the ball was put through by a ridiculously easy shot. Almost immediately after Hurst narrowly missed scoring for us, but the ball went just over the bar. Patrick, however, soon gained the last goal for the Casuals, making the score 4-1. After this, Westminster had decidedly the best of the game, and soon Peck made a splendid run down the right, and middled well to Gibson, who put the leather through. Janson soon put in a splendid shot, but the ball was well returned by Berens. It was not long, however, before Paul scored another goal for us from a bully in front of our opponents' goal. Westminster now strained every nerve to equalise the score, but their efforts were frustrated by the fine play of Hotham and Coleridge. The teams were as follows :

CASUALS.

R. H. Mills-Roberts (goals); Hon. G. D. Coleridge, and F. W. Hotham (backs); C. P. Wilson, and G. F. England (half-backs); F. Bickley (capt.); and H. G. Taunton (right); B. W. Bell, and D. Patrick (centre); P. H. Morton, and F. W. Janson (left), (forwards).

WESTMINSTER.

W. R. Moon (goals); R. A. Ingram (capt.), and A. Fevez (backs); R. Vavasseur, G. Berens, and H. Harrison (half-backs); H. C. Peck, and C. Ritchie (right); A. R. Hurst, and J. Paul (centre); A. E. Crews, and C. Gibson (left), (forwards).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL v. OLD FORESTERS.

Played on Saturday, March 15th. The Old Foresters, who played very nearly their cup team, played against a strong breeze, but nevertheless at once assumed the offensive, and in a short space of time got two corners, which, however, came to nothing. After a good run on the right by Ritchie, well backed up by Peck, both of whom worked admirably

together throughout the game, a plea of hands was obtained, from which Pryce by a sharp shot scored the first goal for the School. Nothing worthy of note till several minutes after half-time, when Pryce was again successful in scoring (2—0). After this several good runs were made by Horner and Cazenove for the Foresters, but without any final advantage. Just before Peck kicked the third and last goal for his side, Westminster thus winning by 3 goals to 0. For the School all the forwards played very well together, and the backs played better as the game went on, Vavasour, Taylor, and Harrison distinguishing themselves, while Moon in goal repeatedly saved his charge. For Old Foresters, Fairclough and Hugh Guy (backs), and Johnson, Mathews, and Cazenove were best. The sides were:

WESTMINSTER.

R. A. Ingram (capt.); H. C. Peck, A. E. Crews, R. Vavasour, J. Paul, C. Ritchie, A. Fevez, W. R. Moon, A. J. Pryce, J. W. Aris, H. Harrison.

OLD FORESTERS.

J. W. M. Guy (goal); T. W. Sewell, H. Guy (backs); P. Fairclough (capt.); L. Horner (half-backs); R. C. Guy, F. Woolley (centre); H. H. Johnson, T. H. Mathews (right); E. Cazenove, G. Horner (left).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL v. ASHBURNHAM ROVERS.

Played on Tuesday, March 25th. Soon after the commencement of the game Paul dribbled the ball up to the visitors' goal, and kicked it through Tritton's legs (1—0). However, C. Heath soon equalised the score, his shot hitting the cross-bar and going under. This point was disputed, but as neither umpires could see, it was given in favour of the Rovers (1—1). After half time we scored twice in quick succession from the feet of Ritchie and Paul (3—1). After this the School went to pieces, and the visitors playing up hard equalised matters by scoring two goals, the first being headed through by Sandwith, the second an easy shot from Jenner. Both these Moon ought to have stopped easily. The game thus ended in a draw, 3 goals all. The sides were:

WESTMINSTER.

W. R. Moon (goals), R. A. Ingram (capt.), A. Fevez (backs); R. Vavasour, G. Berens, J. Aris (half-backs); H. C. Peck, C. Ritchie (right); A. E. Crews, A. R. Hurst (left); J. Paul (centre).

ASHBURNHAM ROVERS.

A. C. W. Jenner (capt.), A. J. Heath (left); C. W. R. Heath, A. Price (sub.) (centre); O. Scoons, W. F. G. Sandwith (right); F. W. Janson, W. L. Benbow (half-backs); R. Berens, C. J. Roller (backs); C. B. Tritton (goals).

TOWN BOYS v. QUEEN'S SCHOLARS.

This match, the last of the season, was played on Wednesday, March 26th, and resulted in a win for the Town Boys, who were by far the strongest team, containing 7 pinks, by 5 goals to 3. Ingram won the toss, and chose to play from the Hospital end. The ball having been started for the Q.S.S. by Symns, Pigott immediately got hold of it, and, with a very quick rush, scored the first goal for the T.B.B. Almost directly after this Pigott scored another point from a

'hands' in front of the College goal, though some of the spectators thought that the ball had gone over the crossbar. The Queen's Scholars now played up hard, and obtained a 'hands'; but the ball went through the Town Boys' goal without touching any one. The T.B.B. soon renewed the attack, and though Sherring managed to avert a fast shot from Paul, he was immediately after baffled by one from Gibson, which raised the score to 3—0. These reverses roused the Q.S.S., and they soon obtained a free kick from a claim of 'off-side'; Peck also received the ball from Bethune, and put it cleverly through, thus making it 3—1. For some time after this the game was rather slow, until Peck, again getting possession of the ball, made a splendid run, and scored a second goal for his side. The Town Boys then played up very hard, but their efforts were for some time frustrated by the good play of Aris, Vavasour, and Bethune; a splendid shot from Hurst, however, raised the T.B. score to 4—2, a claim of 'hands' by the Q.S.S. being disallowed. The ball being restarted, Lowe got possession of it, and after a neat run passed to Peck, but the Q.S. captain being hampered turned it over to Symns, who scored a third point for the Collegers with a pretty shot. After this the T.B.B. had the better of the game, and though Sherring several times saved his charge in splendid style, he was unable to prevent a fifth goal from the foot of Hurst, who had completely distanced his opponents. As no further addition was made to the score of either side at the call of time, the T.B.B. were left victors by 5—3. The teams were as follows:

QUEEN'S SCHOLARS.

C. A. Sherring (goals); M. R. Bethune, and H. Harrison (backs); R. Vavasour, S. H. Clarke, and J. W. Aris (half-backs); H. C. Peck (capt.), and H. P. Lowe (right); R. C. M. Symns (centre); G. G. Phillimore, and R. R. Sandilands (right), (forwards).

TOWN BOYS.

E. Man (goals); A. Fevez, and J. Salwey (backs); R. A. Ingram (capt.), and G. Berens (half-backs); C. Ritchie, and C. Gibson (right); J. E. Paul, and M. H. M. T. Pigott (centres); A. E. R. Crews, and A. R. Hurst (left), (forwards).

GRANTS v. RIGAUDS.

This match was played on Thursday, March 20th, and resulted in a victory for Rigauds by 1—0, the match on the previous Thursday having resulted in a draw (1—1). Rigaud's having won the toss, Grants kicked off from the Hospital end with the wind in their favour. Soon 'hands' was given in favour of Rigauds, near Grants' goal, but no use was made of it. Pigott made a good run, and a few minutes after a good shot, but neither resulted in a goal. Hurst then made a good run, but when close to Grants' goals Moon ran out and prevented his shot from resulting in a goal. Nothing particular happened till half-time was called. Then Rigauds kept the ball near Grants' goal for most of the rest of the match. Petrocochino scored a goal for Rigauds, the only one in the match. For Grants, Pigott, Gibson, Salwey, Barwell, Pryce, and Moon played well; for Rigauds, Ingram, Hurst, Petrocochino, and Crews.

RIGAUDS.

Man (goals); Ingram, and Jervis (backs); Berens, Armitstead, and Wood (half-backs); Ritchie, Hurst, Crews, Probyn, and Petrocochino (forwards).

GRANTS.

Moon (goals); Salwey, and Armitage (backs); Barwell and A. M. T. Jackson (half-backs); Pigott, G. Jackson, Gibson, Kaye, Pryce, Bompas (forwards).

UNDER ELECTIONS v. RIGAUDS.

This match was played on Tuesday, March 11th, the ground being in a very heavy condition, and resulted in a win for Rigauds by 1—0. For some time after the ball was started, Rigauds penned their opponents, and made frequent shots, which were well stopped by Sherring. After a good shot from Crews, which was saved by the goal-keeper, Hurst put the ball through, thus scoring the only goal for Rigauds. A good run down the left by Sandilands was the only other noticeable event before half-time. After half-time Under Elections were again hard pressed, and their goal was often in danger, being saved only by the fine play of the backs; but, by some good passing, the ball was taken into proximity to the Rigaudite goal, and Phillimore obtained a shot, which, however, went the wrong side of the post. The Under Election forwards now played up well, and kept the ball for some time near the Rigaudite goal. Some good passing ensued between Phillimore and Shackleton, and the former made a good run down the right; but in spite of all efforts, the score remained the same till the call of time, and Rigauds thus won a well-contested game by 1—0. For the winners, Hurst and Ritchie forward, and Ingram and Berens behind, were most conspicuous; for Under Elections, who showed very good form all through, G. G. Phillimore and Sandilands played best among the forwards, and Harrison, Yglesias, and J. E. Phillimore among the backs, while Sherring was invaluable in goals. The sides were:

RIGAUDS.

A. E. Crews, C. Ritchie, A. R. Hurst, S. Petrocochino, Probyn (forwards); G. Berens, J. Wood, E. Man (half-backs); R. A. Ingram, C. Jervis (backs); A. M. Balfour (goals).

UNDER ELECTIONS.

G. G. Phillimore, R. R. Sandilands, R. C. M. Symms, E. F. Peck, C. A. W. Shackleton (forwards); J. W. Aris, F. M. Yglesias, J. E. Phillimore (half backs); H. Harrison, R. H. Bellairs (backs); C. A. Sherring (goals).

The three football elevens have been filled up as follows:

FIRST ELEVEN.

R. A. Ingram.	A. R. Hurst.
C. Page.	C. Ritchie.
H. C. Peck.	A. Fevez.
A. E. Crews.	G. Berens.
R. Vavasour.	W. R. Moon.
J. E. Paul.	H. Harrison (twelfth man).

SECOND ELEVEN.

M. T. Pigott.	J. Salwey.
C. Gibson.	J. W. Aris.
G. G. Phillimore.	E. Jervis.
R. R. Sandilands.	H. P. Lowe.
M. R. Bethune.	C. A. Sherring.
A. R. Pryce.	

THIRD ELEVEN.

H. Smyth.	D. Petrocochino.
J. C. Barwell.	J. E. Phillimore.
R. C. M. Symms.	J. Armitstead.
J. H. Clarke.	J. H. Peck.
G. Man.	A. Armitage.
C. Thornton.	

Our Contemporaries.

The *Durham University Journal* has always got a grievance. The latest extraordinary notion expressed in its correspondence columns is that the University ought to have a representative in Parliament. A constituency of 200 would be rather an anachronism in this age of reform.

The *Blue* makes its appearance in an illustrated cover which bears a striking resemblance to that of *Little Folks*. The contents of the number, we should think, would be about up to the intellectual standard of the juvenile readers of that magazine. They comprise (we should think) perhaps the largest amount of unmitigated trash on record in any school paper, and that is saying a great deal. 'Shooting Niagara—and after?' is a promising title for a poem if one could only understand what it meant. We subjoin two verses, which are, if possible, more incomprehensible than the title:

'On lonely men sick visions lower.
Here man from man takes fire;
We march past age's final flower,
To bring the future nigher.'

* * * * *

'The trumpets blare, the gay flags flare;
Hear ye no undertone—
(Know ye no doubt, nor any care?)
The dull poor's patient moan?'

The writers of the 'Dreadful Dream,' and the 'Three S's,' ought not to be at large.

We have received from the distant shores of the Isle of Man the *Barrovian*, the organ of King William's College, Douglas. This otherwise admirable periodical contains (among a great many poems good, bad, and indifferent) one or two gems which we cannot refrain from quoting. The following irresistibly comic verses occur in a short poem called the 'Sepoy,' narrating with all due bathos a touching incident of the siege of Lucknow:

'Through loop-holed street and outpost tore
The fiery kilted Scot;
*He ran that faithful Sepoy through,
Who yet resisted not (!)*
'The noble Sepoy waved his hand,
And "Never mind," replied;
'"Tis all for the good cause," he said—
Then, "Welcome, friends," and died.'

The *modus operandi* of the Manchester Grammar School's Debating and Scientific Societies seems, according to the *Ulula*, to be of a very non-committal character. Whenever a motion is passed in either of these august assemblies, an amendment in almost exactly opposite terms is also carried, and by this means, we suppose, everybody is satisfied.

The *Lily* makes use of a rather ingenious shift in order to fill up the necessary amount of space to make an extremely poor number. It apparently selects the best of the Sixth Form Iambics, and publishes them under the heading 'Translations.'

The *Wellingtonian* contains a very poor ghost-story, in which the hour of 1 A.M. is described as being 'always so propitious for Ghosts, &c.' On the other hand, we ourselves should consider any ghost very ungentlemanly, or any *etcetera* (whatever that means in this case) very 'one-horse,' which did not attract our attention at the more orthodox hour of midnight. The writer also sums up his terror-stricken condition on seeing the apparition in the extremely terse and commonplace remark that

he felt *very clammy indeed*. A French Debating Society is rather an appalling idea. If its proceedings are conducted at all on the model of those of the French 'Chamber,' they must be of a very lively and exciting character.

The only thing that can be said for the advertisements on the last page of the *Malvernian* is that they are quite as interesting as the rest of the number.

The same remark applies to *Our School Times*.

The *Cliftonian* is a very good number. It has an extremely funny article on 'Bores.'

We notice the usual crop of 'Adventures in the Jungle,' of man-eaters and shikarees, of pad-elephants and tiffin-baskets, &c.; the customary football matches in which the 'home custodian failed to keep his charge intact,' and the losing side 'strove hard to avert defeat'; the inevitable complement of weak parodies on 'Hiawatha' and the 'Heathen Chinee'; the regular quantity of indignant letters on almost every subject under the sun, replete with hackneyed quotations in the shape of *laudator temporis acti*, *Revenons à nos moutons*, and other old friends, and signed with various comprehensible and incompre-

hensible *noms de plume*, classical and otherwise; and last, but not least, the same enormous proportion of utterly uninteresting matter, and of pure unsophisticated nonsense.

There! With that stupendous sentence we have taken ample revenge for the hours of dull reading to which we have been condemned by the cruelty of an unfeeling editor. Let us then throw down the pen of criticism and take our well-earned rest. But stop! We had forgotten the *Grantite Review*, of which we may say that its appearance gratified our O.G. pride; its ghost story froze the very marrow in our bones; and its bad grammar set our hair on edge and our teeth on end,—but we are getting mixed, or perhaps we ought to say, 'intoxicated with the exuberance of our own verbosity.'

Under these circumstances, we will content ourselves by merely acknowledging with thanks the receipt of the *Radlean*, the *Pauline*, the *University College School Magazine*, the *New-antonian*, the *Blundellian*, the *Rossallian*, the *Wykehamist*, the *Marlburian*, the *Tunbridgian*, the *Salopian*, the *Glenalmond Chronicle*, the *Fettesian*, the *Carthusian*, and the *Elizabethan* (Barnet), the last three of which were unfortunately mislaid before they came into our hands.

Obituary.

Sir James John Randall Mackenzie, of Scatwell, Ross-shire, died at Versailles, aged 69. The deceased baronet was the only child of the late Sir James Wemyss Mackenzie, of Scatwell, Lord Lieutenant and sometime M.P. for the county of Ross, by his marriage with Henrietta Wharton, sister and sole heiress of Major-General John Randoll Mackenzie, of Suddy, and was born in June, 1814. He was educated at Westminster School and at Trinity College, Cambridge, and was a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for the counties of Ross and Cromarty, and formerly held a captain's commission in the Ross-shire Rifle Volunteers. Sir James, who succeeded to the baronetcy on the death of his father in 1843, married first, in 1838, Lady Anne Wentworth Fitzwilliam, fourth daughter of Charles William fifth Earl Fitzwilliam, who died in 1879, and secondly Mary Anne, daughter of Mr. James M'Niel, of Liverpool. The next heir to the baronetcy, according to 'Lodge' and 'Debrett,' is his cousin, Major James Dixon Mackenzie, of Findon, Ross-shire, formerly of the Cameron Highlanders, who was born in 1830, and married, in 1858, Julia Stanley, daughter of Mr. Samuel Clutsam, M.D.

Lord Mostyn died at his ancestral seat, Mostyn Hall, Flintshire. He had been suffering for some days from pneumonia and congestion of the lungs. The Right Hon. Edward Mostyn Lloyd-Mostyn, second Lord Mostyn, of Mostyn, Flintshire, in the peerage of the United Kingdom, was the elder and only surviving son of Edward Pryce, first lord, by marriage with Elizabeth, third daughter of the late Sir Roger Mostyn, and was born at Mostyn Hall on the 13th of January, 1795. His lordship was educated at Westminster School, and was one of the few surviving

Liberals of the old school who sat in the unreformed House of Commons. He was first returned to St. Stephen's as member for Flintshire in 1831, and sat till 1837, when he was defeated by Sir Stephen Glyne. At the general election in 1841, Mr. Lloyd-Mostyn was again returned for the county, but was unseated on petition. He then sat for Lichfield from January, 1846, till August, 1847, when he was once more elected for Flintshire, and sat till his accession to the peerage on the death of his father in April, 1854. His lordship assumed the name of his maternal uncle, Sir Thomas Mostyn, on inheriting his estates, in 1831. He was Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the county of Merioneth, and held the colonelcy of the Merionethshire Militia from 1847 to 1852, in which year he was appointed a deputy-lieutenant of the county of Flint. He was nominated 'Vice-Admiral' of the coast of North Wales and Carmarthenshire in 1854. Lord Mostyn married, in 1827, Lady Harriet Margaret Scott, eldest daughter of the second Earl of Clonmell, by whom he has left surviving issue three sons and four daughters. The title devolves upon his grandson, Mr. Llewellyn Lloyd-Mostyn, who was born in 1856, and is married to Lady Mary Florence Clements, sister of the Earl of Leitrim.

It is with deep regret that we record the death of V. E. R. Yglesias, who passed away on Wednesday, April 2nd, at East Grinstead. Some few weeks ago, soon after ill-health had forced him to leave school, he fell into a rapid decline. Throughout his illness he showed great patience, and was calm and resigned to the very last. He entered the School at Easter, 1883, as a boarder 'up Grant's,' and, had he lived, would have been a Minor Candidate this election.

Correspondence.

[FROM OUR OXFORD CORRESPONDENT.]

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—The Easter Vacation has by this time put an end to a term of no very great excitement for the O.W.W. up here. None of the great questions which have agitated Congregation—the Horton question, the question of opening the Examinations to Lady Students, and the proposed modifications of the First Public Examination, better known as Mods—will possess any direct interest for your readers. Only two O.W. matches have been played this term—against Bradford and Univ. In both we were deprived of the services of some of our best men: both resulted in draws. A game was got up on March 1 between Oxford Old Westminsters and the rest of the 'Varsity, resulting in favour of the latter by three goals to two.

In the Torpids most of the boats in which Westminster was represented went up. I forgot to mention that A. A. Froude steered Oriol.

In Athletics A. E. R. Bedford won the Mile at the B. N. C. sports with great ease, but I have not heard of any other O.W.W. distinguishing themselves on the running-path.

I ought here perhaps to humbly correct a mistake, either of myself or of the printer, in my last letter, when I stated that there were four O.W.W. playing for the 'Varsity team, as there have only been three, because Sandwith was not up this term.

FLOREAT.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL, PAST AND PRESENT.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly spare me a little of your valuable space to express my regret that two passages in my preface should have given any offence to the Queen's Scholars, and to offer a few words of explanation? It is stated in your leading article that 'the crisis of the season of change is past, and a period of repose about to succeed.' This is good news; but time alone can show the absolute truth, and if the repose be again disturbed, it must appear highly probable to any one who reflects, that the opinion expressed in my preface will prove approximately correct, and that one or two generations will see the extinction of the old customs and usages of College.

In your critical review you state that 'the Queen's Scholars still hold their position of superiority.' The objectionable passage relating to them in my preface is in the future tense, and is not with any propriety applicable to the status of the present Queen's Scholars. However, I am most willing and most desirous to suppose that, in predicting the effect of altered conditions, I did not pay sufficient attention to influences and circumstances which might counteract or greatly modify those effects. You make a short reference to the Eton Collegers. They were also in my mind when I wrote the passage of which you complain. Whilst I was a Westminster boy I had a brother on the Eton Foundation, and though no one, whether Etonian or outsider, had any doubt of the social position of the collegers being gentlemen and the sons of gentlemen, their inferiority of school position as compared with the oppidans was very marked. An analogy may be found in the estimation in which professional men are held by the very wealthy and titled classes.

In seeking to account for the very different state of things which had always obtained at Westminster, three causes presented themselves to my mind. The first of these was the assured prospect of election to Christchurch or Trinity. Eton had King's College to herself, and a Fellow of King's was substantially better off than a Christchurch student or a Trinity scholar. Yet in point of worldly distinction a Fellowship at King's was little more than a big college prize. On the other hand Christchurch Studentships and Trinity Scholarships were eagerly striven for by the most promising scholars in either University. To raise the members of one section of a particular

school to the level of these by an examination only slightly competitive, was to confer the greatest possible distinction on that section. Some may say that the elected from Westminster were never considered on an equality with the other students and scholars. No doubt they were not so considered by Dons, but by the world at large the fact of any difference existing was scarcely, if at all, appreciated. We know that an inherited peerage carries more *clat* with the multitude than a peerage won by the most brilliant services, and in the same way a feeling of reverence for what is ancient gave to the Westminster election a prestige of its own.

The second cause appeared to be that the Masters of Westminster School have been more consistently faithful to their founder's intentions than those of other great public schools, and have always treated the Queen's Scholars as the most important section of the boys, and the *raison d'être* of the school.

The third cause was found in the high public posts held by men who had been *alumni* of St. Peter's, and the numerous men of eminent genius who owed their training to the School. When the Studentships and Scholarships were commuted for Scholarships and Exhibitions of inferior dignity and value, and when these were thrown open to the whole School, the first cause of the special distinction of the Queen's Scholars manifestly vanished.

The second and third causes still exist, and truly glad am I to have been unwittingly the means of eliciting your statement, which will be read with pleasure by so many old Westminsters, that these causes have hitherto proved sufficient to prevent any deterioration in the school position of the Queen's Scholars. May they long and always suffice!

With regard to 'insufficient revision' I very much deplore some errors in the latter part of my book, which are assignable to this cause. When I first issued my prospectus I had no idea that the work would take so much time as it actually did. In order to bring it out at a period near to that promised, both composition and revision were in some parts hurried. Hence a very unkind Nemesis has ordained that I should overlook two misprinted dates in connexion with the name of your late Head Master. Fortunately they are both absurd, and are virtually corrected by the immediate context. Circumstances compel me to defer the explanation which I wish to give of my error in describing a window in College Hall which is not to be seen there.

Believe me, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

F. H. FORSHALL.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—I should like to point out in your pages some errors of detail in the above-mentioned work, occurring in the account of the school prizes and the list of the Q.S.S. and Exhibitioners. I myself am credited with two prizes which I never gained—the second prize for Greek Iambics in 1882 and the Gumbleton English Verse Prize for the same year. The subjects for the Ireland Verse Prize in 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, are not given; they were respectively 'Medea,' 'Cometae,' 'Mahumeda,' and 'Tyrus.' The prize in the last year was awarded to me. The Phillimore Prizes for 1882 and 1883 are given wrong. They should be as follows: 1882 Verse, E. D. Fawcett; Prose, J. B. Hodge; Essay, J. B. Hodge. 1883: Verse, C. C. J. Webb; Prose, C. J. Shebbear; Essay, C. C. J. Webb. The subjects for the Gumbleton Verse should be given. They are as follows: 1874, 'Livingstone'; 1875, 'Arminius'; 1876 I cannot find; 1877 'Cleopatra's Needle'; 1878, 'Rienzi'; 1879, 'Poet's Corner'; 1880, 'Joan of Arc'; 1881, 'William the Conqueror'; 1882, 'The St. Gothard Tunnel'; 1883, 'The Confessor's Abbey of Thorney' (not yet awarded). Several mistakes in the spelling of names require correction in another edition; read *Carleton* for *Castleton* (p. 327); *Renouf* for *Kenouf* (p. 396); *Henry Parker Lowe* for *Henry Packer Lowe* (p. 400); *George Grenville Phillimore* for *George Greville Phillimore* (p. 401); *Roos for Ross* (p. 402); *Peck for Peck* (p. 461); *Clement Francis Rogers* for *Clement Frank Rogers* (p. 400).

One entire Election is omitted—namely that of 1879. Walter Clare Dale (made 3rd monitor in election above, 1881), Reginald Henry Williams, Harry Wingfield Waterfield, Offley Scoones, John Henry Janson (abiiit Election, 1880), Arthur George Liddon Rogers, William Lewis Warren (abiiit June, 1880), Gerald Victor Sampson, Stephen Hardcastle Clarke, Charles John Shebbeare, Montague Robert Bethune (the last three admitted by new Regulation of the Governing Body, never having been T.B.B.); all these admitted Scholars of St. Peter's College, Election 1879; Edward Pitcairn Sandwith, admitted Pre-electus, Sept. 26, 1879 (abiiit Aug. 1881); Henry Newton Crouch, Edward Radclyffe Ellis, admitted Oct. 20, 1879—Crouch being a T.B., Ellis *ab extra*—by Open Examination for the Vacancies; John Roland Pryce and Henry Forshaw Hawking, admitted Easter, 1880, by Open Competition—Hawkins being a T.B., Pryce *ab extra* (Hawkins abiiit Christmas 1882).

One translation we have noted as inaccurate—that of Edward A. Webber's epitaph (p. 335). '*Ecclesie Riponensis Decani et hujusce Prebendarii*' is not translated by 'Dean of Ripon, and Prebendary of this Cathedral.' Ripon was not in 1833, Westminster was not then, and is not now, a Cathedral. *Ecclesia* only means *Church*. The full designation in either case would have been *Ecclesia Collegiata*. So again in Richard Phillimore's epitaph (p. 343) 'surviving parents' is an odd expression by which to translate '*parentes superstites*'; it suggests that there were more than two parents, some of whom were not surviving, though two at least were.

Hoping that the publication of these *errata* may be of use to Mr. Forshall and his readers,

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

C. C. J. WEBB.

P.S.—When I say that the 'entire Election' of 1879 is omitted, I know that those who were elected to the Universities in after years, as well as some of those admitted to vacancies later on, are mentioned—but as an election it does not appear at all.

MORNING ABBEY SERVICES.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

SIR,—In your last number I notice that a correspondent, signing himself 'Cantor,' expresses a desire that a hymn, sung to the accompaniment of an harmonium, should be added to the daily service. Now, Sir, I wish to protest against this proposal. I will not do more than mention that an harmonium seems to me a superfluity in a church which possesses, as the Abbey does, a powerful organ. What I wish to draw attention to is this, that, in the event of any lengthening of the morning services, some of those parts of the Church's office, of which we are deprived under the present arrangement, should be restored to us, before we begin to think of hymns—at the most a mere luxury, and not an intrinsic part of the Order for Morning Prayer. For example, the Absolution, or an Old Testament lesson, or a canticle, or even one of the intercessory prayers for our superiors in Church and State, commonly called the State prayers, any of these would be more acceptable than a hymn.

And speaking of a possible lengthening of the service, I cannot but allude to the disposition towards brevity in divine service, not only on weekdays but even on Saints' days, which seems to distinguish the authorities at present. I have often heard that brevity was the soul of wit, but never that it was the soul of worship.

Yours, &c.,

Q. S.

THE NEW BUILDINGS.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—For some months past I have been in an almost frantic state of anxiety, eagerly devouring the contents of every fresh number of your valuable paper, but all in vain, and at length I can no longer keep my disappointment to

myself, but must proclaim it to the world at large, and call on all Westminsters, both young and old, to share with me this unenviable state of mind. You will ask what is the cause of this outburst? My reply is, Mr. Editor, the Fives Courts and Swimming Bath. Before Dr. Scott left us he drew up complete plans of both a swimming bath and fives courts, and even offered to construct the latter at his own expense. For some reason or other, best known to themselves, the Governing Body refused to accept this generous offer. Mr. Editor, we all know the Laureate's words:

'Authority forgets a dying king,'

and so we held our peace, and waited patiently for the time when they should think to take some steps for our comfort. Nine months have passed, still are we waiting, and no one seems to have stirred at all in the matter. What a disgraceful state of apathy is this, Mr. Editor! Pecuniary difficulties might, perhaps, offer some obstacle to the immediate completion of the swimming baths, but no such objection could be raised about the fives courts in the garden of Ashburnham House. Why then should Westminster be deprived of all these advantages for no reason whatever? Why should we alone be without our baths, when schools infinitely our inferiors in age, standing, and everything else, have them? Why should the Carthusians, every time they come down, tell us of their baths and covered fives courts, and point with scorn to our two racquet courts and a half? Earnestly let us pray that some of the apathetic authorities be stirred up to take notice of this state of things, and by giving us our baths and fives courts comfort the hearts of all despairing Westminsters, and, with them,

Your obedient servant,

C. H. F.

OUR CONTEMPORARIES.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—I am surprised at the ignorance shown by the writer of 'Our Contemporaries' in your March number, for he seems to be rather mystified by the words *laid out*, which appear in an article entitled 'A Week's Holiday in India.' I should like to point out, if I may, the meaning of this expression, which is a very common one in India. When a person is intending to travel for some distance and wishes to accomplish his journey in as short a time as possible, he sends on his horses in front of him, *laying them out* at certain places on the road, so that he may always have a fresh horse waiting for him at different points of his journey. I hope that our captious critic will another time refrain from touching on a subject which he apparently does not understand.

I am, yours truly,

W.

THE 'ELIZABETHAN' ACCOUNTS.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

SIR,—The thanks of all your readers are due to 'G. I.' for his kindness and condescension in revealing to us all the true cause of the recent pecuniary distress of the *Elizabethan*. But is he not entirely wrong in his views?

First as to the contents. The Debating Society always has been reported, though perhaps not with doubtful taste, as in your last number. It would be impossible to have long reviews on the proceedings of the Bellingring Society, consisting of minute 'changes' and Triple Bob Minors. Again, the text of every reading in the Literary Society could not always be printed, as notice from time to time is all that the most patriotic member could desire.

Next, as to his pecuniary suggestions. Speaking from experience, I know that the only effect of increasing the O.W. subscriptions to 5s. would be to reduce the number of O.W.W. subscribers by one-half, and the only result of having 6d. paid monthly would be that the Fellows would forget to pay them, and the object of the Treasurer, which is to get as many subscriptions as possible, would be entirely defeated.

I am, yours, &c.,

Προθησαυροφύλαξ.

THE DEBATING SOCIETY.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—Although I am more accustomed to gaze with an inactive yet interested eye upon the pages of your admirable periodical than to seek publicity in its columns, the picture of mute and uncomplaining misery raised by the unfeeling and humorous comment of the *Secretary of the Debating Society* in your last number has for once roused my nature from its inmost depths. A new Don Quixote, I seize my pen to uphold the cause of oppressed innocence in a crusade against this critical Secretary; to your numerous readers I leave it to discover which of the labours of my chivalrous prototype has most resemblance to mine. And I ask you to pardon me, Sir, if at any time I show too much affinity with the Knight of the Doleful Countenance in allowing the warmth of my sentiments to carry me away.

By what authority does the *Secretary* pour these floods of satire upon his miserable victims? Does he imagine that because he can project his piercing eye further into the brick wall of a misguided Liberal policy than his less acute neighbours, he is therefore entitled to disregard the common laws of humanity which forbid the kicking of an enemy when he is down? After he has, as he himself points out, laid bare with a skilful tongue the errors of his adversaries, amidst the enthusiastic cheers of his party, must he repair to his private study, there to heap the full measure of misery and scathing sarcasm upon those whose arduous and unremitting labours in the cause of Mathematics under Mr. Jones, or whose predilection for neatly copying and recopying the Virgilian hexameter for Mr. Failes, have hitherto prevented them from applying themselves to that searching investigation of life and things which we find in the *Secretary*? Does no vision arise before him, as he tosses on a wakeful couch, of his victims in various stages of melancholy decline (may I be forgiven if *haud ignarus mali* I touch with a reverent hand the woes of others?); of Mr. C. J. Shebbeare's athletic frame bent double under the weight of premature affliction; of Mr. J. Watt, 'his eye in a fine frenzy rolling,' being consoled with words that cheer not by his partner in evil cases, Mr. Collier—himself a hopeless wreck on the rocks of satire; of Mr. A. S. Waterfield's once varied and intelligent glance having given place to the vacuous and uninteresting stare of the torpid batrachian—all because the ardent politics of a heartless secretary had found that *the exigencies of space compelled him to furnish a report more in the nature of a commentary than that in the D.S. ledger?*

Good heavens! Mr. Secretary of the Debating Society, what trifling is here; how weak and fallacious your explanations! Think you to lead captive the understandings of a deluded public—a public unprovided of those torch-bearers of logic, Mr. Bain and Mr. Jevons, by the extraordinary and dogmatic statement that you are compelled by *the exigencies of space* to furnish a report more in the nature of a commentary?

Be these your shifts to trample on the unprotected? Then, indeed, let us look at no distant date for diagrams and woodcuts, neat expositions of the ridiculous attitudes and hideous grimaces assumed by those members that had the misfortune to vent in the Debating Society their crude and unphilosophical opinions. Let us view in our mind's eye *the exigencies of space* compelling our unwilling Secretary to depict his own classic features, lit up with a superior smile, as he *satirises the style of his opponent's oratory*, and lays bare with a light hand—I should say tongue—the secret and unfathomable springs and motives of Bishops, Politicians, and Ignorance.

I sit, Mr. Editor, in my three-pair back, and I cast my eye over the events of a long and stormy life. Let me ask the Secretary to cast back *his*,—if his mind can pause an instant only from its consistent and liberal path to review in brief the actions of his life. Let him recall the time when first the object of his life was attained,—when, after secret agitation among his already privileged friends, he sat, by the suffrages of a majority, an honoured member of the Debating Society. Let him recall the feelings with which, for the first time breaking silence, he aired his immature views on politics, &c.—(I crave pardon if I have attributed to the Secretary a time when his views were immature; rather let us say, that Minerva-like they sprang full

grown from his head)—gave utterance to his inmost soul before a respectable audience, the awful gaze of the then Secretary, and the horror inspired by his active and recording pen. Let him recollect how, on the next issue of the *Elizabethan*, he eagerly studied its columns, and found either that 'the exigencies of space' had consigned his utterances to a glorious and unchronicled oblivion, or that they were there recorded with the same dignified nakedness of comment which distinguished the long and learned disquisitions of his elder brethren in debate. And let him then consider how, his mind being thus untrammelled and unoppressed, he finally, through a long series of debates, arrived at that full maturity of opinion and insight into motive, that voluminous and graphic flow of chosen and appropriate diction, which now so eminently distinguishes his elaborate orations. No; let us not discourage the early and unrooted utterances of youth. Let us give free play to those natural powers, that stuff of which statesmen are made, by abstaining from casting a refrigerating cold over the warm outpourings of unformed genius. Let the Secretary extend with a large generosity the same indulgence and license to his intellectual inferiors as he himself received, as it were but yesterday, lest that sensitive plant which under a larger cultivation and more responsive sympathy—aided by the ever anxious tutelage of Mr. Jones—might have blossomed forth with new projects for the salvation of miserable mortals—should have to find an immature hiding-place for its blighted and unprofitable existence in

BEDLAM.

MENTION OF WESTMINSTER SCHOOL IN NOVELS.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—As I was reading a new novel the other day, I came across a passage which spoke of the 'yellow stockings' of Q.SS., the author having confused Christ's Hospital with Westminster. Now it struck me that Westminster School being in London, and probably being better known than most public schools, must have often figured in the pages of novels and other tales. I suggest, therefore (in the hope that it will meet the approval of your readers), that any passage concerning the School which may be either interesting or amusing should be placed on record in your pages. As an instance of what I mean, I quote the following from Dickens's 'Hard Times' (p. 93):—

'There's stabling in this place for a dozen horses; and unless Nickits is belied, he kept the full number. . . . When that man was a boy, he went to Westminster School as a King's scholar, when I was principally living on garbage, and sleeping in market baskets. . . . You see this place, you know what sort of a place it is, . . . and here, got into the middle of it, like a maggot into a nut, is Josiah Bounderby, while Nickits, . . . who used to act in Latin in the Westminster School plays, with the chief justices and nobility of the country applauding him till they were black in the face, is dwelling at this minute, in a fifth floor, up a narrow dark street in Antwerp.' And in 'Pickwick' (p. 307) occurs the following uncomplimentary passage: 'The waiters from their costume might be mistaken for Westminster boys, only they destroy the illusion by behaving themselves much better.' It may not be generally known to your readers that Gustave Doré has a picture, in his book on London, of the confirmation in Henry VII. chapel, with a recognisable portrait of Dr. Scott. Having thus set the example, I hope your readers will carry out my idea and quote in the pages of the *Elizabethan* similar passages which may occur in standard works of fiction and novels of the day.

I am, Sir,

Yours obediently,
F. C.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

ALPHA.—Many thanks for your contribution, which we hope to insert in our next number.

NIHIL NIMIUM.—The Secretary of the Debating Society did not insert the notice in italics from a desire for publicity,

but because his political opponents whose 'style he loosely satirised' were anxious that all might know who the partial reporter was.

J. H. NIMBLE.—We might have inserted your poetry, if it had come from a member of the School, '*pour encourager les autres*,' but seeing that it is from an outsider, we consider it hardly good enough.

NOTICES,

All contributions for the May number of *The Elizabethan* to be sent in before April 25, to the Editor, St. Peter's College, Westminster.

All other communications must be addressed to the Secre-

tary 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 F. H. COLLIER, Treasurer of *The Elizabethan*. Post Office Orders are to be made payable at the Victoria Mansions Post Office, Victoria Street.

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

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

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

¶lorcat.