



# The Elizabethan.

Vol. VII. No. 17. WESTMINSTER, DECEMBER 1893.

Price 6d.

## EDITORIAL.

IN future *The Elizabethan* will be worked under slightly changed rules. Articles of a more general nature, though for the most part on subjects connected with the School, are wanted.

Any member of the School or O.W. may send contributions to the Editor, which will be welcomed.

The cause of this alteration is an agreement made with the Editors of *The Martlet*.

The Treasurer wishes to state that, in consequence of the O.W.W. subscriptions falling into arrears, the balance in his hands has considerably diminished. He hopes that all O.W.W. owing money will pay it in as soon as possible. The amount of money at present owed by O.W.W. is over £40.

## SATURDAY AFTERNOON.

THERE is much misapprehension as to the origin, purpose, and proper use of the Saturday afternoon. We have no desire to be etymological, or, by the help of an argument of Scheler, we might point a moral to which the deaf would listen. That philologist is good enough to derive season from *stationem*. Now we know that Saturn, to whom Saturday owes its name, was the god of the sowing or the season. The old lady in the novel thought that etymology was a process of ingenious guessing. Even though we cannot agree with the old lady or with Scheler, we might possibly allow ourselves to be so unscientific as to admit an option in the matter. It would follow that the proper meaning of Saturday afternoon were voluntary station. But we will take no credit for our ingenuity, since we have no more wish to be unscientific than to be etymological. Moreover, we have surer ground, from which we will again



raise our cry, trusting to be heard for our importunity.

We said again in our last number that the proper place for a Westminster on a Saturday afternoon was 'Up Fields.' The new things are not true, but no one will accuse us of bringing forward a new proposition. The principle has been before our world for years. It is almost of the rank of *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. No man has openly gainsaid it, but how many have not lurked in secret places to stultify it in act? *Vident meliora probantque*, and at last we have discovered why the following phrase is also true. We should have liked to use every evil name of the miserable and skulking minority who are not to be seen 'Up Fields' on a Saturday afternoon, but the notable discovery that we shall presently proclaim renders such a torrent needless. We have long known that these personages, who retire to their private amusements, into the cloak of their selfish individualism, forfeit all claim to be counted members of a public school. They turn themselves into—no, we will imitate the noble restraint of Mr. Pickwick, and not say haberdashers. It is no use their saying that they can do nothing if they do come. 'They also serve who only stand and' shout. Their absence is bad for their fellows; it is ten times worse for themselves. And now we have found them out. They profess to seek other amusements of a worthy kind. We do not believe it, and we shall not shrink from proclaiming the truth. The fact is that they spend the Saturday afternoon in knitting stockings. There may, perhaps, be one here and there who does not, but how are we to distinguish him? *Noscitur a sociis*. If he wants to clear his character, he must appear 'Up Fields.' If anyone fails to appear 'Up Fields' in future, we may safely infer that he is finishing off the heel, or has had a serious difficulty with the stitches of the toe.

## CLOISTERS.

DARK Cloisters are dark no longer. The dusty accumulations of ages have given way to an indescribable colour, the name of which can only be known to its maker and the clerk of the works. Here, where of old no light penetrated, where sombre gloom filled us with respectful memories of the builders of these quiet walks,

here we are met on the very threshold, not by the Curses of Revenge, but—what to our minds is much worse—by a garish colour, hideous, and awful in its hideousness. The Curses of Revenge would at least have been artistic, with their hissing snakes and various other objects of beauty, or, if not artistic, they would have been shaded with the limelight of romance. But, as we have said, there is nothing artistic, nothing romantic, nothing but a colour—and what a colour! What, we wondered the other day, would the venerable monks have said—or rather, what do they say now when their ghostly eyes encounter this awful sight? For surely they do encounter it. They doubtless keep their vigils of a night in their old haunts and discuss their changed surroundings.

Or perhaps they stroll round to Hall, mindful of many and many a delicious salmon caught in the clear waters of Father Thames, and of the choicest brand of the abbot's Malvasy. What a changed sight is there before them? A parlous modern-looking building, built of new stone in an olden fashion, with paneless windows, from which, we will venture, their reverences have caught quite as many ghostly catarrhs as we have physical. There the abbot will see the latest forms of high art that Westminster has been able to produce. He, haply, wonders at the gleaming, unnatural brightness of the coats of arms, and at the extraordinary view of an interior of a college cap. Varnish can do a lot when lavishly applied, and there has been no stint here.

This at least can be said for the Cloisters—they are not varnished. We wonder that they are not done with enamel. It is very bright and lasting. At present, however, they are only whitened (?) sepulchres; the interior and the things contained therein remain and will remain as they were—or at least we hope so. If it is intended to proceed with the whole of Cloisters and all that they contain in the same style as is at present followed, we fear that our scenic arrangements of the Play will not be so highly commended as formerly. It would be unique, possibly, but hardly popular. In that case, too, in order that the whole effect may not appear fearfully incongruous, the walls of Dormitory must be covered with the same colour. *Quod omnes di avertant*.

The above conclusion may not at first sight be evident to one who does not know the arrangements of Cloisters. It must be remembered that, besides the gymnasium, the



choir school, the bodies of twenty-six monks who died of the Black Death, and various other ornamental articles, Cloisters are also the haven of rest for the stage, scenery, and other 'effects' of the Play, including the gods and two well-behaved ghosts. These are respectively of high and low degree. The first is our foundress, 'Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory,' and the second an unlucky Q.S. who, in lack of other food, died 'from a surfeit of racket-balls,' as the history books would have it. These twain are content to pass their time in the gloomy recesses of the Cloister cellars, and to take one outing, and but one, every year, on the third Play-night. They are distinctly visible, we believe, to anyone who cares to venture out at the witching hour of midnight. This, at any rate, is certain, that ghostly sounds, as of a racket-ball violently striking against the wall of college, have been heard on that night. This, of course, is caused by the Q.S. and not by Queen Elizabeth, for we can hardly suppose that they both play.

## WESTMINSTER WORTHIES.

NO. 40. LORD JOHN RUSSELL, FIRST EARL RUSSELL.

(Continued from p. 181 ante.)

WHEN the worthy electors of Tavistock—to the number of about a hundred and ten, all told—returned Lord John to Parliament, they probably knew very little about him. He and they belonged to the same family; that family ordered them to elect him; the thing was done. What would you have?

Lord John himself was abroad at the time, and did not so much as record his election in his diary; his return was hastened rather by the inconvenience of quarantine regulations in Sicily than by a fervent desire for that political life for which he was, strictly speaking, not yet eligible, being still in his twenty-first year.

He made two short speeches in his first session, and was elected a member of Grillon's, after which he resumed his travels in Europe.

In June (1815) he appeared again in the House of Commons to denounce the new war, which, however, by its brilliant ending justified the Ministry, and brought the session to a speedy conclusion before Lord John or anyone else had said half they had got to say on the subject.

With the peace came the resumption of payments in cash, and, as a result, a rapid fall in the price of gold, which had been preserved at an artificial level by the Bank Restriction Act of 1797.

The landowners were, perhaps, the chief sufferers, as they had laid out large sums on their properties, often on inferior land; and their first step was, of

course, to retrench, with the result that the country was filled with the complaints of agricultural labourers who had been turned off from their employment. To these were added the appeals of many soldiers and sailors whom the Government had discharged when the war was ended. Prosperity, to use Lord Russell's words in the beginning of the next session, prosperity was gone, except for those who were paid out of the public purse.

Lord John began with an active attack on the Government, the army estimates and the income tax being the points most vehemently assailed by the Whigs, with whom he naturally threw in his lot. But his name soon disappeared from the debates and even from the division lists, and before the end of March he had retired from political work altogether for a time.

A cold wet summer increased the general distress and discontent; riots followed, and the Government sought to pass measures which are now grouped under the general head of 'coercion.'

Lord John emerged from his retirement to speak against the Bill, and on its being passed withdrew again, and was rarely heard in the House of Commons during the next two years.

Ill-health, and possibly some disappointment at the strength of the forces opposed to him, seem to have almost decided him at this time to abandon politics altogether. This phenomenon of political youth is at least as old as the book of Jonah, and does not require or excuse lengthy comment.

In 1819 a new Parliament assembled, and Lord John rapidly came to the front as the champion of the moderate reformers. When the occurrences at St. Peter's Field, near Manchester, which have come to us as 'Peterloo' and its 'massacre,' seemed likely to be followed by coercive Government measures, many were the letters which sought out Lord John, who, as usual, was wandering on the Continent. He returned at once, breathing fire against the disturbers of his peace—"D—n the reformers and Lord Sidmouth too for this"), and was in his place before the end of November. Electoral abuses at this time began to occupy public attention very prominently, but the Cato Street conspiracy, followed by the arrival of Queen Caroline in England, rendered Parliament incapable of any activity beyond speech.

In the Parliament of 1820 Lord John sat for Huntingdonshire, and no doubt appreciated at its proper value the somewhat dubious privilege accorded to county members of wearing spurs when within the precincts of the House. Borough members, be it well understood, had to rely on mere boot force in case of strife.

The history of the next few years can by no stretch of the imagination be called interesting. Lord John represented Bandon in 1827, and was rejected by one vote in his attempt to represent Bedford in 1830—to the surprise of its owners and his friends. He had wasted a very good election address on this unresponsive borough.



Visits to the Continent were varied by brief periods of activity in the political world. Under the Wellington Administrations he and his party were naturally very active, and a motion in favour of an increase of religious liberty met with unexpected success.

Of this he wrote to his friend Moore, 'My constitution is not quite so improved as the constitution of the country by late events.' The country declined, however, further medical treatment, and a very moderate motion which was to enable Manchester, Leeds, and Birmingham to return members to Parliament was rejected by 188 to 140.

In November 1830, however, on a declaration by Lord Grey in favour of Reform, the Duke of Wellington thought good to reply that he would, if he had to construct a constitution himself, endeavour to form such a legislature as they then possessed. This utterance probably hastened the fall of the Ministry; in November they placed their resignation in the King's hands, and before the end of that month Lord Grey had offered the Paymastership to Lord John, and his career as a Minister had begun.

The history of the Reform Act is, no doubt, familiar to every Westminster, and a repetition of the events of that exciting time, though tempting, would scarcely be justifiable. In many respects the scenes to which it gave rise in the House of Commons were then unprecedented—we doubt whether they would now provoke even the more irresponsible journals to an ecstasy of capital-lettered head-lines.

*'One member threw his hat up in the air, and the vociferous cheering was prolonged for several minutes,'* is Lord John's account of the great scene of the session: nowadays the members throw up their hats (or someone else's) when certain Ministers enter the House. To create a scene of 'much exultation' in our advanced age it would be needful to cast not only hats but bodies and benches in large quantities into the air. But then there was passion outside the House as well as within. The 'whisper of a faction,' in Lord John's view, was endeavouring to prevail against 'the voice of a nation,' so there was tumult on all sides where now there is boredom.

How the Bill was finally passed is well known. It should, however, be better known that Lord John, in this season of excitement and success, found time for a memorable act of kindness to the family of the most distinguished of Scotsmen. It came to his ears that Sir Walter Scott was suffering from an illness which was aggravated by monetary distress. At once, and in the most tactful manner, Lord John made it known to Sir Walter's family that any sum which would relieve that distress should be immediately advanced by the Treasury.

Lord John's career during the present reign must be deferred to a future chapter.

(To be continued.)

## School Notes.

The Lent Term begins on January 18.

Old Wykehamists were unable to raise a team against the School on Wednesday, November 29.

The Phillimore Translation Prize has been awarded to R. K. Gaye.

The Sixes in Green were begun on Monday, December 4.

H.R.H. The Duke of York was asked to the Play, but was unable to accept the invitation.

The following is the Football Card up to date:—

1893.		
Saturday, September 30	7	O.W.W. (lost, 2-14).
" October 7	7	Casuals (lost, 1-4).
Wednesday, October 11	11	Crusaders (lost, 0-8).
Saturday, October 14	14	Old Rossalians (won, 2-1).
" " 21	21	Old Foresters (won, 3-1).
" " 28	28	Old Carthusians (won, 4-0).
" November 11	11	O.W.W. (lost, 1-2).
Friday, " 17	17	Cambridge O.W.W. (drawn, 1-1).
Saturday, " 18	18	Trin. Coll., Oxon. (lost, 1-4).
" " 25	25	Clapham Rovers (won, 4-1).
Wednesday, " 29	29	Old Wykehamists (scratched).
1894.		
Saturday, January 27	27	A. L. Fevez's XI.
Wednesday, " 31	31	Old Brightonians.
Saturday, February 3	3	Old Carthusians.
" " 10	10	Christ Church, Oxon.
" " 17	17	Old Harrovians.
Wednesday, " 21	21	Old Etonians.
Saturday, " 24	24	Casuals.
" March 3	3	Charterhouse.
" " 10	10	Clapham Rovers.
" " 17	17	Oxford O.W.W.
" " 31	31	O.W.W.
Wednesday, April 4	4	T.B.B. v. Q.SS.

The following are the results of the various O.W.W. matches:—

Saturday, Sept. 30	30	Westminster School (won, 14-2).
" Oct. 7	7	Crusaders (won, 4-2).
" " 14	14	Swifts (won, 13-3).
" " 21	21	Old Brightonians (won, 4-2).
Wednesday, " 25	25	Cambridge University (lost, 2-5).
Saturday, " 28	28	R. M. C., Sandhurst (won, 2-1).
" Nov. 4	4	Luton Town (lost, 0-1).
" " 11	11	Westminster School (won, 2-1).
" " 18	18	2nd Scots Guards (lost, 2-3).
" " 25	25	London Caledonians (lost, 0-5).
" Dec. 2	2	Oxford University (lost, 3-5).

It is only fair to say that in the matches against Cambridge, Scots Guards, London Caledonians, and in the second match against the School, O.W.W. were but poorly represented. Against Oxford they had by no means their full team.



## House Notes.

ASHBURNHAM.—The House Fives ties are now finished. Griffin and Robertson were drawn together in the final, and won easily. In the Junior House matches we were not so successful as we ought to have been, and were defeated by Rigauds (1-0). We certainly ought to have beaten them, as several of their team were out of School. In the Trial Matches we were drawn against Grants, and were again defeated (1-0). The whole Ashburnham team played very well, and we ought to have scored, as we were constantly close to their goal. For us Griffin and Kennedy played splendidly, and Lart and Haweis were also very good. The loss of Severn considerably weakened Grants, and robbed the match of much of its interest. We are very sorry he is so badly dished, but hope he will soon be quite well again. Ashburnham has not been very successful in the Sixes so far.

COLLEGE.—Nothing has happened worth mentioning in College since last number. The Play, of course, is the subject of chief interest. Preparations are hurrying on. The stage and gods are up, which makes a great difference to rehearsals. The Play itself seems to go very well as yet, though in some parts there is great room for improvement. The Literary Society has finished reading 'Othello.' Mr. Raynor and Mr. Sargeant were absent last time. The former's part was well read by E. M. Loughborough. E. H. Waterfield also showed to advantage as the clown. There will be no more meetings this term. Sixes in Green are in full progress. J. F. More has the best six, and ought, in our opinion, to win the cup. We offer our late, though none the less hearty, congratulations to C. Van-der-Gucht on obtaining his 'pinks.' We hope at the beginning of next term to see E. P. Garrett 'Up Fields' once more.

GRANTS.—Our Literary Society has now held its last meeting for this term. We have read 'Rivals,' 'Hamlet,' and 'She Stoops to Conquer.' We managed to beat Ashburnham, though without Severn (1-0), after a straggling game; but against Rigauds our look-out is not very bright, as Severn will probably be absent, and Moon has been suffering, of late, from a bad foot. The final Yard tie, viz., A. R. Severn, G. E. Hornor, and A. Scarisbrick v. W. F. Fox, W. H. Lonsdale, and W. V. D. Matthews, has been indefinitely postponed. In the Junior House matches we were badly beaten by Home Boarders (5-0). It was a most uninteresting game. The shooting of both sides was very poor; H.B.B. should have scored far more largely.

H.B.B.—Our Juniors beat Junior Rigauds in the final, after a good game, by 1-0. Muiel, Last, and Blaker played very well. In the Senior match the tables were turned, but not so disastrously as we had expected, the score at the end being 2-1. We were sorely handicapped by Allen spraining his ankle a

few minutes after the commencement of the game, and the unavoidable absence of Hollocombe and Blaker. The game was an extremely fast one, and the opposing forwards gave a lot of trouble to our backs, who did their duty well. The forwards played well together, Last being especially good, and making five runs down, one of which resulted in a goal. Owing to his sprain Allen has not been in School for the last few days. We regret to say that Hollocombe is leaving at the end of the term.

RIGAUDS.—We regret to say that Mr. Marklove has had an attack of influenza; but he is now recovering, and we hope soon to see him in School again. In the Junior House matches we beat Ashburnham (1-0), Harvey playing best for us; in the final we played and were beaten by H.B.B., who had a strong team, the forwards being our weakest point. In the first round of the Trial House matches we beat H.B.B. by two goals (C. Armstrong and A. E. Stewart) to one (Last); W. L. Armstrong was best for us, but the forwards were decidedly out of form, and did not shoot nearly enough. During the last half of the match H.B.B. were without the services of Allen, who, unfortunately, had to retire owing to an injury. We beg to congratulate Rivaz on getting his 'pinks,' and Beasley his 'pink and whites.' Of the Yard ties the last two rounds have yet to be played.

---

 COMMEMORATION.
 

---

ON Queen's Day, November 17, was held the fifth Commemoration of the Founders and Benefactors of Westminster School. The service, which was the same as in the last two years—there being no sermon—began at 8.30 P.M., and lasted rather more than half an hour. It was attended by a large congregation, consisting for the most part of parents of boys in the School, and of Old Westminsters, though our representatives from Oxford were very scanty. The singing was better than in any former year, and came almost entirely from the School itself, so much so that there seems every prospect of our soon dispensing with the aid of the Abbey choir. The Prayers were intoned by the Rev. H. G. Daniell-Bainbridge, and the Lesson and Form of Commemoration were read by the Dean and the Head Master respectively, both of whom used the English pronunciation.

After the service the usual reception was given 'Up School' by the Head-Master, and seemed more largely attended than ever. A novel feature this year was an exhibition given by the School Photographic Society, an account of which will be found on another page. The refreshments were arranged at the bottom of 'Up School' instead of in the drawing room of the Scott Library, as they were last year. By these means the Scott Library was left free for the photographic exhibition. It has been decided that in future Commemoration shall only be held biennially.



## THE FIELDS.

### WESTMINSTER SCHOOL *v.* TRINITY COLLEGE (OXFORD).

THIS match was played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, November 18, in pouring rain. The visitors had a strong team, and, owing to their superior weight, won by 4 goals to 1. The visitors kicked off with a strong wind against them. Play ruled very even, and the visitors could only score once (Carlton) before half-time. On resuming, the visitors pressed and scored three times through the agency of Alington (2) and Bathurst. Just before time our forwards came with a fine rush, and Severn, from a lengthy run through the sloppy turf, shot a brilliant goal for the School. This terminated the match, after seventy minutes' play.

For the School, Allen saved several shots, while the backs were, as usual, good, Rivaz being, perhaps, the best. Severn, More, and Van-der-Gucht were good forward. For the visitors, Alexander, Carlton, Alington, and Bathurst were best. After the match Rivaz and Van-der-Gucht received their 'pinks.' The teams were as follows:—

#### WESTMINSTER.

M. A. Allen (goal), T. H. Newman and F. C. Rivaz (backs), W. Fox, W. L. Armstrong, and H. O. Beasley (half-backs), H. Waterfield and J. F. More (right wing), A. R. Severn (centre), G. Nye and C. Van-der-Gucht (left wing) (forwards).

#### TRINITY COLLEGE.

E. W. Sutton (goal), C. Lubbock and J. C. Nelson (backs), E. B. Alexander, A. Rauthmell, and D. B. Wilson (half-backs), T. B. Henderson, C. A. Alington, L. C. V. Bathurst, F. W. Carlton, and J. Hewetson (forwards).

### THE SCHOOL *v.* CLAPHAM ROVERS.

THIS match was played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, November 25, resulting in a victory for the School by 4 goals to 1. On starting the Rovers immediately pressed, and within five minutes from the start Witherby scored for them (0-1). On re-starting, the School forwards showed up to great advantage, and play was very exciting. It was not long before Van-der-Gucht sent the ball into the net with a good shot. The point, however, was disallowed on the plea of offside, a decision which gave great dissatisfaction. Play now became very even, until Severn made a brilliant run from the centre of the ground, ending up by putting in a stinging shot which completely beat the Rovers' custodian, thus making the scores level (1-1). On restarting, play ruled even, the visitors having the best of exchanges, until the School left wing rushed down, and Moon put the ball through with a shot which was palpably offside and promptly disallowed. No other point was scored before half-time. After crossing over the School forwards came away with a fine rush, but could not score. Soon afterwards, from a hands in front of the Rovers' goal, the ball was kicked through, but this was disallowed. The School, however, were not to

be denied, and after some exciting play Van-der-Gucht scored a second goal for us (2-1). From this point to the end of the game the visitors did not have a look-in, the School defence being excellent, while the forwards played up with a fine dash and had it all their own way. Waterfield was especially prominent on the outside right, his centres being very fine. Of two of these Severn was enabled to take advantage, thus increasing the School's score to 4 goals, while the Rovers could not add another point to their score. Soon afterwards time was called, leaving the School victorious by 4 goals to 1.

For the School the defence was very steady, and Waterfield, Severn, and Van-der-Gucht were especially prominent forward. For the visitors Aylen and Witherby were best. The teams were as follows:—

#### WESTMINSTER.

M. A. V. Allen (goal), T. H. H. Newman and F. C. Rivaz (backs), H. O. C. Beasley, W. L. Armstrong, and W. F. Fox (half-backs), H. Waterfield and J. F. More (right wing), A. R. Severn (centre), L. J. Moon and C. Van-der-Gucht (left wing) (forwards).

#### CLAPHAM ROVERS.

E. H. Winslow (goal), C. H. Aylen and P. G. Rathbone (backs), H. C. Witherby, E. L. Bristowe, and S. C. Probyn (half-backs), H. Rathbone and H. A. Newbronner (right wing), H. Foster (centre), S. Dunsmuir and A. K. Cronin (left wing) (forwards).

### TRIAL-HOUSE MATCHES.—SEMI-FINAL ROUND.

#### GRANTS *v.* ASHBURNHAM.

THIS trial house-match was played 'Up Fields' on Wednesday, November 29, Grants winning by 1 goal to nil. Grants pressed at the start, but Severn was soon dished and had to leave the field. Although Ashburnham pressed hard the whole time Grants were the first to score through Templar. After half-time Woodbridge was several times within an ace of scoring for Grants, but was always pulled up in time by Lart, who was very prominent at back. Ashburnham now had several chances, but did not take advantage of them. No further point was scored when the whistle blew.

For Grants, Fox and Woodbridge were good, and Taswell did what he had to do in goal well. For the losers Lart and Griffin were very good; the forwards were a poor lot, Kennedy being the best. The teams were as follows:—

#### GRANTS.

Taswell (goal), G. E. Hornor and Lambert (backs), W. Fox, Day, and Kirkpatrick (half-backs), A. R. Severn, L. J. Moon, A. Woodbridge, Templar, and Bernard (forwards).

#### ASHBURNHAM.

J. A. Robertson (goal), E. H. Lart and Adams (backs), Haweis, Raikes, and Griffin (half-backs), Kennedy, Guy, English, Langston, and Skeffington (forwards).

### RIGAUDS *v.* H.B.B.

PLAYED 'Up Fields' on Thursday, November 30, resulting in a win for Rigauds by 2 goals to 1.



During the first half Rigauds pressed and ought to have scored several times, but their forwards missed several easy chances. Armstrong and Stuart managed to get two goals, and on re-starting Waterfield ran down and had the goal entirely at his mercy, but shot wide. Nothing further happened before half-time. On re-starting, Allen was disabled and remained a spectator for the rest of the match. This loss, however, did not seem to dishearten H.B.B., as Last made a brilliant run down and scored H.B.B.'s only goal. Rigauds' forwards still had many opportunities, but failed to take advantage of them, while H.B.B. could not penetrate the strong defence offered to their forwards.

For Rigauds, Newman, Rivaz, and Armstrong were good. Whittow was best for the losers, and Woodhouse showed up well at times. The teams were as follows:—

#### RIGAUDS.

Stenning (goal), T. H. Newman and F. C. Rivaz (backs), S. C. Probyn, W. L. Armstrong, and H. O. Beasley (half-backs), H. Waterfield, G. Nye, Stuart, C. Armstrong, and R. E. More (forwards).

#### H.B.B.

M. A. Allen (goal), A. M. Whittow and Muriel (backs), C. Underwood, Jones, and Colley (half-backs), Last, E. Underwood, Maughan, Woodhouse, and Brailey (forwards).

The football during the past term has been fairly successful, the School having won four matches, lost five, and drawn one, scoring 19 goals against 36. The 2nd XI. have played two matches, *v.* Condors and Clapham Rovers' 'A' team, winning the first and drawing the second, and scored 4 goals against 3. The Eleven started badly, with a crushing defeat at the hands of O.W.W. The next match (against Casuals) was lost, but should have been drawn. Crusaders then inflicted a heavy defeat on us, the forwards showing no combination whatever. In the next three matches a vast improvement was manifested, the forwards playing up well. Old Rossalians, Old Foresters, and Old Carthusians were beaten in succession. In the last-named match the forwards showed great dash and pretty combination. Next followed a draw with a strong team of Cambridge O.W.W., but in the next match O.W.W. just managed to beat us. We also had to put up with defeat at the hands of Trinity College, Oxford, who brought down a strong team, and won mainly through their superior weight. Clapham Rovers were easily beaten, and the last match of the term (against Old Wykehamists) was scratched. Goals for the School were scored by Severn (11), Moon (3), Van-der-Gucht (2), Newman (1), Waterfield (1), and More (1). In the first match *v.* O.W.W. Robertson was played in goal, but was completely off-colour, while Allen was quite out of his place at back. So against Casuals Allen went into goal, and Garrett back, while Rivaz was played half-back. Garrett soon got dished, and Rivaz then went full-back and Beasley half-back, while Moon displaced Fisher, who played in the first

three matches. Armstrong was unfortunately absent against Old Foresters and Old Carthusians, but his place was ably filled by Griffin. Allen was always very good in goal, several times saving what seemed certain goals. Rivaz and Newman were two safe backs, their kicking and tackling being especially noticeable. They both made the best use of what weight they had. Of the half-backs, Armstrong was the best, tackling very well. Fox, on the left, was very good both in tackling and using his weight. Beasley, on the right, played a hard game, but did not take advantage of his weight. The forwards this year were a distinctly good lot, Severn being the best centre we have had for some time. He was very fast, and a good shot, but inclined to be selfish. More, who has greatly improved since last year, was very tricky, but passed too soon. Waterfield, on the outside right, dribbled and centred well. Moon, inside left, was very slow, but had great command over the ball, though he did not hustle his opponents enough. Van-der-Gucht, on the outside, although very light, played pluckily. He dribbled well, but did not pass enough, and was rather liable to be offside.

## THE 'PHORMIO' AT RADLEY COLLEGE.

WE see from the *Radleian* of November 20 that the 'Phormio' of Terence was performed there on November 1 and 2. Radley is an example of one of the newer schools taking up the plan which originally belonged to most of the older public schools—Westminster being now the only one left—of having a regular annual representation of a Latin play. The Latin play at Radley and the Greek play at Bradfield are becoming quite institutions.

Radley is to be congratulated on the success of this year's representation of the 'Phormio,' the best, we believe, they have yet given of that play. And that this success is well-deserved is proved by the *Radleian*, which tells us that 'every year sees novelties and improvements in things great and small.' And such improvements, whether great or so small as to be almost imperceptible, are the only means of ensuring success and ultimate perfection, as far as may be, in the representation of any play. Moreover, these 'new departures' have to be undertaken before traditions begin to arise which make many changes—otherwise desirable—impossible.

And Radley's success has not been gained without any difficulties, as the *Radleian* tells us; to be without a stage-wardrobe, and 'at the mercy of a dresser with *strange ideas of his own*,' must, indeed, be an infliction.

Then, of course, there was the difficulty of two actors finding it *impossible* to see or hear each other, when speaking aloud, at the distance of a yard or two. 'This difficulty was especially noticeable' (we quote from the *Radleian*) 'upon two occasions when



Geta refuses to stop and speak to his master ; while a similar awkwardness, we are glad to hear, 'was very cleverly avoided in Phaedria's exit, "*nempe ad Pamphilum*," at the end of Act II.'

At Radley, it appears, the 'Phormio' is considered 'a better acting play, according to modern canons, than the other three which form their cycle.' We are inclined to agree with the *Radleian* when it allows this to be 'a bold criticism.' For, we believe, long experience at Westminster shows that by far the best acting play of the four is the 'Andria.'

In almost all points in which the two plays can be compared the 'Andria' appears far the most effective. Antipho's sentiment cannot, in our opinion, be compared with the exquisite pathos of Pamphilus. The lawyer's absurdities, amusing as they are, are entirely surpassed by the unbroken humour of the Baby-scene in the 'Andria.' The rude familiarity of Geta cannot be said to equal the admirable cunning and independence shown by Davus. These and other points have generally combined to make the 'Phormio' at Westminster inferior in effect to the 'Andria.'

The *Radleian* also observes: 'A reform which appeals especially to the old Radleians is the gradual dying out of the custom of clapping to the echo any utterance which may have been used as an example in the Latin Grammar, a practice which was, no doubt, amusing to a certain section of the audience, but *disconcerting to the actors, and interfered terribly with the continuity of the action.*' It is interesting to compare this with a letter signed 'A Sufferer' which appeared in the last *Elizabethan*. He says: 'All interruption of the rendering of a drama is objectionable. . . . Surely this clapping is no benefit to the actor. If there is one thing that makes acting difficult, it is interruption,' &c. But the two cases are by no means parallel.

We see that 'the only point for the critic to take hold of was the "*exsequias Chremeti*." Phormio's delivery was a novelty and created a great effect ; but—was it Art?' The *Radleian* goes on to say: 'Phormio was in himself exceptionally interesting this year, as the part was read upon entirely new lines.' The Phormios of 1885 and 1889 conceived that character as a swaggering bully ; but 'Coutts attempted it this year in the quietest and most cynical of veins, and we think it went the better for it.' It may be of interest to quote some words from *The Elizabethan* (Play No. 1887): 'The character' (Phormio) 'was played by R. E. Olivier on lines which certainly contrasted with the Phormio of the past, or at least the last two representations, in 1882 and 1878. But there is a distinct advantage in the presentment of a fresh and, in some measure, original aspect of this important Terentian rôle. Those who please may prefer a robusiter and more overbearing audacity to the light impudence with which Olivier played the part. But lovers of Terence can have small quarrel with his . . . playing. Specially happy was his "*oh tunc is eras?*" and again his "*exsequias*

*Chremeti* . . ." was very effective.' The character was, we remember, continued on these lines in '91 by D. Shearme, whose 'manners were unexceptionable ; indeed, they were bland and charming to a degree. But there lurked a sneer beneath Phormio's polished suavity, quite marked enough to give the key to his real character.' An interesting comparison.

The actors at Radley were coached, we believe, almost entirely by L. James, O.W., and no doubt the success of the 'Phormio' at Radley was due as much to his efforts as the annual success of the Westminster play is due to the unflagging energy and continuous zeal shown by Mr. Raynor.

The prologue was from Mr. James' able pen. In conclusion, we congratulate Radley on the success of their play, and wish them a continuation of such success in the future.

## THE DEBATING SOCIETY.

THE House met on Thursday, November 2, when the following motion was discussed: 'That this House strongly condemns any system of legal limitation of hours in any trade.'

*Proposer*, J. F. WATERS ; *Seconder*, A. H. HOGARTH ; *Opposer*, R. AIRY.

THE PROPOSER began by congratulating himself on the absence of ambiguity in his motion. He thought that, even if some limitation were needed, universal limitation was impossible. He declared that the Bill would only give the men more time to spend in public-houses. Universal limitation would be very unfair to some trades, and brain-workers ought to have limitation of hours if any trade did. He declared that the men would be unable to earn the same wages as before, and that the Bill would be only taking away the liberties of the British workman. He said that less hours would mean less work done, and, therefore, articles of commerce would rise in price. Mr. Waters then touched lightly upon the Factory Act, which, he remarked, was very hard to enforce, and only referred to women and children, who needed less hours to a greater degree than men. He then closed his speech by referring to Australia, and by gently hinting to the House that this was a Socialistic motion.

THE OPPOSER began by finding fault with most of Mr. Waters' statements, but was neither lucid in his remarks nor fluent. He said that legal limitation of hours would prevent the masters from overworking their men, and also would prevent the selfish minority of workmen who could work overtime from overworking the majority who could not. He said that the lessening of hours would not necessarily lessen the wages, as foreign competition was the cause of low wages, and would, by this Bill, be done away with. He thought Parliament had a right to interfere in what was fast becoming a national grievance. He said that a man with a family would naturally like to



have more time with his family, which he could not get under the present system. This Bill would, by causing the masters to get in more workmen, lessen the number of the unemployed. Mr. Airy did not think Mr. Waters had shown the Bill to be impossible. The Opposer declared Mr. Waters had only dragged in party politics in order to get the votes of the Conservatives who were in the House. He said that the motion was neither Socialistic nor Radical.

The SECONDER said that the Bill was very unfair to workmen, because men would not be able in the summer to lay up money for the hard times of winter. He said that there were very few overworked men in England. He thought that the Bill would be against sensible men who wished to work overtime, and in favour of those who wasted their time. He said that ordinary workmen worked from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., with an hour and a half interval for meals, for which they got from 25s. to 30s. a week. In winter their hours were shorter and they got the same wage. Mr. Hogarth also declared that a workman spent most of his spare time in the public-house getting drunk.

Mr. WATERS declared that the motion was a party question, since it figured on Mr. Gladstone's programme, and denied Mr. Airy's statement that the British workman was overworked.

Mr. J. SARGEAUNT blamed the Proposer for bringing in party politics, and said that a considerable number on both sides of the House of Commons were in favour of the Bill. He said that the Proposer had prided himself on the lucidity of his motion, but was not at all clear about it. There were many trades which endangered life, such as glass-cutting, in which the average length of life was very short. He said that if the Bill was passed foreign competition would not come in. Mr. Sargeaunt also told the House on good authority that eight hours per diem was the most profitable length of time for work.

The House then adjourned.

The discussion of the motion was continued on Thursday, Nov. 16th. Though the House was small, the debate was the most interesting one of this term.

E. P. GARRETT, in a brilliant speech, regretted that he had not been present at the previous meeting, as he could not get a very clear idea from the ledger of what had been said. He blamed both sides for bringing in party politics, and said that it showed a bad spirit in the debates when either side tried to get votes by declaring a motion to be a party question. He declared that legal limitation was not a solution of the question of the unemployed, as Mr. Airy seemed to think, for the work that is given to one man is taken away from another, and a good many of the unemployed were incompetent. Legal limitation would not only be a disadvantage to the men—for they would get less wages—but also a disadvantage to the masters—because their capital would have to be increased—and to the consumer, for the prices would go up. This would seriously hamper English trade in its competition with foreign countries. In trades where men worked

by the hour the Bill would interfere with the liberty of the workman. He also declared that very few labourers are overworked; that the spirit of the times is against long hours, and hours are gradually reducing, and that, therefore, there is no need for Parliament to interfere. All trades could not have the same limit, and an Act to comprehend all trades would be an impossibility.

Mr. AIRY thought that Mr. Garrett's arguments had been answered at the previous meeting, and he would repeat some of them for his benefit. He defended the action of his supporters in talking of party politics, throwing the blame on Mr. Waters, and said that the unemployed were often clever mechanics. He stated, without explanation, that if legal limitation came into force foreign competition would not come in. He objected to Mr. Garrett imputing drunkenness to the British workman. There were very few workmen who took too much, and these should not be taken as examples of the whole class. He thought that if men could get the same pay in winter as in summer, while doing less work, they could do the same all the year round. Eight hours would, in the long run, produce better and possibly more work than twelve hours.

The SECONDER said the proposers of this motion stick up for the British workman as much as the opposers pretend to. It is better to reproach workmen with drunkenness openly than to slur it over quietly. Many of the 'unemployed' do not desire to get work, which he illustrated by an anecdote from *Punch*. It would be hard on builders who are thrown out of work in the winter if they were prevented from working long hours in summer. In dangerous trades hours are already short, e.g., the cutlery trade. How would masters be provided for? He blamed the union promoters for suggesting this Bill.

C. D. FISHER began by praising Mr. Garrett's speech, but did not seem convinced by it. He censured the slackness of those who had gone to the other House. He thought Mr. Hogarth had more sense than to take stories from *Punch* for facts. He thought that attention should have been called to the case of young women in shops, who often faint from overwork, and that the public-house was the workman's club.

H. T. SHERINGHAM, in a maiden speech, said that mowing could not be considered a trade. He could not understand why prices should go up and wages go down. He also misunderstood the reference to the cutlery trade.

G. F. MARTIN thought there ought to be more workmen's clubs. If a labourer got weak through overwork he could stop. It is not the workmen who compete against each other, but the masters who compete.

W. A. E. STAMP, in a maiden speech, and E. H. WATERFIELD, spoke against the motion.

E. P. GARRETT, in closing the debate, was sorry the Opposer had denied his statements without giving



any reasons, as he rather wished to hear some of the arguments for legal limitation. He said that Mr. Sheringham had seemed to misunderstand everybody's remarks. He explained that the total wages of a workman would be less if he worked less hours a day, while the rate of wages would remain unaltered, and prices go up from other causes. He said that the public-house was to some extent the workman's club, but could hardly be called the 'bosom of his family,' where the opposers of the motion philanthropically wished him to spend his extra leisure time.

The House then divided—Ayes, 5 ; Noes, 5. The Chairman, E. P. Garrett, then gave the casting vote for the motion.

The House then adjourned.

The House met on Thursday, November 23, when the following motion was discussed: 'That this House approves of the extension of the franchise to women possessing the necessary qualifications.'

*Proposer*, H. J. LANGHORNE ; *Opposer*, B. C. BOUTLER ; *Seconder*, J. A. WATERS.

The PROPOSER, in a maiden speech, on which he must be congratulated, began by saying that there must naturally be a strong feeling against this motion in this House, constituted as it is. He chiefly spoke about women having votes at Parliamentary elections. He thought that a man and wife would get on better together. That Queen Elizabeth was a striking argument of what a woman could do. The chief fault to be found with his speech was that it was at times quite inaudible.

The OPPOSER founded his arguments upon the fact that in any family worthy of the name the husband represents, and so should have the vote of, the family ; and if he were at 'daggers drawn' with his wife, he would make her, by intimidation, vote against her conscience. By giving women votes the eminently desirable distinctions between the sexes would have to be broken down, and, women becoming a separate class, 'women's questions' would be an even greater nuisance than at present, and domestic happiness would be ruined. As females greatly exceed males in number, England would be literally under 'petticoat rule !' Only the objectionable 'strong-minded' woman would really take up politics, and she by no means represents the sex. The excitement at Parliamentary elections is far greater than that at municipal elections, and women would lose their heads. Then, women's suffrage would mean in the end the *presence of women in Parliament !* Mr. Boulter's speech was one of the best we have heard this session.

The SECONDER did not think that if women got into Parliament they would oppose the best interests of the country. He said that women were not always inferior to men. That in the lower classes women earned the money to support the family. That women know as much about political questions as men.

E. P. GARRETT, in a very amusing speech, said that he would turn to the practical side of the ques-

tion, after the Seconder's quibbles and contradictions. Mr. Boulter had said all that could be said on the motion, and he disdained to speak about the Seconder's speech. He pointed out to the House that 'women's rights' was a foolish phrase. It is often better for people to be without what is strictly their right.

R. AIRY thought that if the franchise were extended women would have everything their own way. They would get into Parliament, hold offices, and even get into the Church. Very many women, if the franchise were extended, would be illiterate, and, therefore, should have no votes.

Mr. WATERS remarked that he could not stand the things that had been said about his speech. Everybody had disregarded his arguments and counted them only as contradictions.

The House then divided—Ayes, 2 ; Noes, 14. The motion was therefore lost.

The House then adjourned.

## PHOTOGRAPHIC SOCIETY.

THE exhibition of the Photographic Society was held on Friday and Saturday, November 17 and 18. The first of these two days being Commemoration, it was opened in the evening to visitors. As the refreshments were moved 'Up School,' the Society obtained permission to utilise the Library for exhibiting their photographs. These were arranged in the drawing-room on screens, four running down the centre of the room back to back, and two at the sides. The photographs were carefully arranged, and, as great attention had been paid to the illumination, they showed up to great advantage. The room soon after the beginning of the reception began to fill, and was crowded for the rest of the evening. The exhibition seemed much appreciated, and was a welcome addition to the Head-Master's reception 'Up School.' From a technical point of view the work exhibited was for the most part good average work, the best specimens being some photographs by H. Loeffler and A. E. Stewart, who obtained prizes. Loeffler exhibited some views which, though not bearing a title, were easily recognised as scenery at and round about Dover. Stewart showed some landscapes which were highly spoken of by the judges. Among the rest, the most conspicuous were some Norwegian views by Rev. G. H. Nall, some of which attracted much attention, both by reason of the beauty of scenery and also for the nicety of finish and the care bestowed on the work. F. R. Cunningham, Esq., kindly lent some magnificent views of Paignton harbour, and some Welsh scenery ; also some instantaneous views on the Thames, especially of Henley Regatta. It seems a pity that only one O.W. should have come forward to support the Society, but it is to be hoped that the exhibition will show that such a thing as a School



Photographic Society exists, and that in future more O.W.W. will send photographs to the Society's exhibitions.

On Friday evening, December 1, the Photographic Society held its second 'Lantern Evening.' The science lecture-room was crowded with members and their friends, to whom Mr. F. R. Cunningham showed a very interesting and excellent series of slides made by himself. First came views of Switzerland. The curtain rose upon Dover Pier, with the steamer lying alongside; next appeared the train with its sleeping cars, and soon we were whisked away into the midst of mighty valleys, or climbing

huge glaciers, and deep in the mysteries of mountaineering. The snow and ice scenes were magnificent—subjects which tax more than any others the skill of the photographer. As 6 o'clock struck we were hurried homewards, and saw Henley on Regatta Day, and the famous Burnham Beeches, and scenes in Wales and Devonshire. The series ended with a few photographs of sculpture. On finishing his lecture, Mr. Cunningham offered to give help and advice to any members of the Society who were interested in lantern-slide making. A hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Cunningham wound up the evening, which was greatly enjoyed by everyone present.

### Obituary.

WE regret to have to announce the death of the following Old Westminsters:—

Lieutenant-General GEORGE COURTNEY VIALLS died, after a long illness, on November 10. He was the youngest son of Thomas Vialls (O.W.), and was born on February 26, 1824. He was admitted to Westminster in July 1837, and on leaving went to Trinity College, Cambridge. Entering the army as Ensign in the 95th Foot in 1843, he was promoted to a lieutenancy in 1846. He served from 1854 till 1856 in the Crimea as Captain and Major. He became Colonel in 1865, and Major-General in 1870; and, after being made a Companion of the Bath on June 2, 1877, he retired with the honorary rank of Lieutenant-General in 1882. On June 8, 1850, he married Sophie Louisa, youngest daughter of Sir Henry Oakes, Bart.

Colonel HERBERT MILLS REPTON died on

November 27, having been born on September 2, 1836. He came to Westminster on June 19, 1846, and in 1854 became an Ensign in the 67th Bengal Native Infantry. He was created Lieutenant in 1857, and on February 18, 1861, joined the Bengal Staff Corps. In 1866 he was made Captain, and eight years afterwards succeeded to the rank of Major. He became Lieutenant-Colonel in 1880, and eventually Colonel on June 9, 1884. He was Deputy-Commissioner of the Central Provinces.

ARTHUR HARVEY MONROE died on November 14. He was born on March 7, 1870, and so was, at the time of his death, aged 23. He was the eldest son of Mr. Justice Monroe, and was admitted to Westminster School on September 22, 1882. Leaving in December 1885, he went to Switzerland, where he was at the time of his death.

### Correspondence.

#### LORD CHANCELLOR COWPER.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

SIR,—It is to be hoped that some definite evidence that Lord Cowper was at Westminster may yet be produced. Perhaps it will be well to wait a little before surrendering our claim to him. Meantime I am glad to say that further search has enabled me to fix the year of his birth. My former letter put his birth between 23 April, 1664, and 23 April, 1665. Hearne writes in his diary for 14 October, 1705: 'The Mr. Cowper who is made Lord Keeper is but 41 years of age, being the youngest Lord Keeper ever known.' It follows that Cowper must have been born before 13 October, 1664. Putting the two passages together we may fix his birth between 23 April and 13 October, 1664.

Your obedient servant,  
J. S.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

DEAR SIR,—The following score from *The Sporting Magazine* of May 1793 may interest some of your readers.

CRICKET.—On Monday and Tuesday, the 13th and 14th inst., was played in Lord's ground, Mary-le-bone, a grand game of cricket between six gentlemen and five players of Eaton, against six gentlemen and five players of Westminster, for 500 guineas.

#### EATON.

First Innings.		Second Innings.	
Earl Winchelsea, b. Nichol, Esq.	9	c. Ray.....	13
A. Smith, Esq., b. Louch, Esq.	21	b. Fennex .....	2
Mellish, Esq., b. Fennex .....	3	b. Capt. Cumb ...	0
Walpole, Esq., b. Capt. Cumb...	1	c. Nichol, Esq. ...	0
Tyson, Esq., run out.....	14	c. Gouldham, Esq.	3
Mr. Sale, c. Dehany, Esq. ....	2	b. Capt. Cumb ...	0
Bulling, c. Nichol, Esq. ....	21	c. Welch, Esq. ...	27
Lord, run out.....	18	b. Sylvester .....	5
Turner, b. Capt. Cumb.....	2	b. ditto .....	c
Bedster, not out.....	15	b. Fennex .....	7
Graham, b. Capt. Cumb .....	25	not out.....	4
Byes.....	6	Byes.....	1
Total .....	137	Total.....	62



## WESTMINSTER.

<i>First Innings.</i>		<i>Second Innings.</i>	
Nichol, Esq., b. Lord .....	17	run out .....	0
Dehany, Esq., c. Bedster .....	5	b. Lord .....	22
Freemantle, Esq., b. Lord .....	1	c. ditto .....	1
Capt. Cumb, b. Bulling .....	9	b. Earl of W. ....	15
G. Louch, Esq., b. Lord .....	1	b. Lord .....	30
Welch, Esq., run out .....	7	c. Walpole, Esq. ..	4
Rutton, Esq., b. Bulling .....	8	c. Bedster .....	9
Gouldham, Esq., b. ditto .....	8	not out .....	10
Ray, b. Lord .....	0	b. Bulling .....	0
Sylvester, c. Bedster .....	0	b. Lord .....	11
Fennex, not out .....	1	b. Bulling .....	3
Byes .....	1	Byes .....	6

Total ..... 50

Total..... 111

This match was evidently played between Old Westminsters and Old Etonians, with players assisting each side. Although five players a side are mentioned, the Westminsters appear to have had the assistance of three only. I am unable to find all the names corresponding with the names on the side of Westminster in 'The Westminster Register, 1764-1883,' but Dehany may be George Dehany, admitted 1770, called to the Bar 1784; Welch, either Richard Welch, admitted 1779, or John Welch, admitted 1786, K. S. (Capt., aged 14) 1791; and Rutton is probably William Isaac Rutton, admitted 1782, K. S. (aged 15) 1783, elected to Christ Church, Oxford, 1787. The total of the Westminster first innings adds up 58, and of the Etonian second innings 62. Eton, therefore, won by 35 runs, unless the individual scores are wrong.

Yours truly.

Twickenham: November 23, 1893.

D. J. DRAKEFORD.

## ABOUT BOOKS.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

SIR,—I may as well state at once why I write. I have a grievance—nay, I should say two grievances—to air. Now, grievances are like murders: they 'will out.' So, Mr. Editor, I want you to give my grievances a little of your valuable space, for them to 'out, and air themselves' in.

Books, Sir, have in all ages been looked upon as 'things of beauty' and 'joys for ever.' It is Chaucer himself, I believe, who admits that the possession of a 'boke' is a 'pleasaunt thinge,' although he allows that he 'cannot understand to read therein.'

And yet, in these, alas! enlightened days—at Westminster, at any rate—a book is by no means a 'thing of beauty.' No; and the reason is apparent: the top of the leaves is stamped with a most barbarous stamp, printed in the most indelible of violet inks, and bearing the legend 'Westminster School.' In cases where the book in question is unimportant, small, or very elementary we do not so much mind. We do not object to our small German or French translation books, for instance, being so disfigured; we rather like it. But, as the poet observes, 'a thing of beauty is a joy for ever.' And when we possess a tome of Classic lore, which is destined, may be, to be for us 'a joy for ever' (that is, at the 'Varsity and even after), we also like it to be a 'thing of beauty,' which, in my opinion, after suffering the impression of the above-named stamp, it is *no longer*. Then we, as Chaucer, like our 'bokes' to be 'pleasaunt thinges,' all the more when 'to rede therein we do not understande.' This is the case especially with such books as Henry's 'Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin,' which, not content with its being a very 'unpleasaunt' thing—if, with respect, I may say so—inside, the School authorities also disfigure externally. Another, and yet more obvious, case is the *three-volume* edition

of Browning's 'The Ring and the Book,' which many of us got last summer. Practically, the only value of this book to most of us lay in the binding and exterior generally, for 'to read therein' we certainly did *not* 'understand.' And yet, alas! Mr. Editor, it also was marked with 'the mark of the beast.' This practice of disfiguring good books has few, if any, advantages. And its disadvantages, how great are they! Therefore, let us sweep it away.

Now, Mr. Editor, for grievance No. 2. We have now seen how the School disfigures the outside of our books. But it does not, I regret to say, stop here. No, Sir; having now got its blood up, there is no restraining it. The thought of so many valuable books lying quietly in Library undisfigured rouses it again to action. It cunningly conceives and fashions a new stamp; this time not of violet ink, but—for a change—with a high embossment. This one bears the legend 'St. Peter's College, Westminster. Scott Library.' The School then cries "'havoc," and lets slip the dogs of war' (in the shape of this particular piece of Philistinism) among the most sumptuous books in Library. It, so to speak, gnaws at the best 'steel engravings on best India paper.' These are its own especial favourite dainty, to which it is partial above all others. But it also gladly mutilates any other illustrations, and about every tenth page of printed matter throughout Library. It is positively appalling! Mr. Editor, I ask you, can such a state of affairs last? Nay, must not the whole Constitution of the School inevitably fall to pieces unless something be done? Mr. Editor, I think so; and subscribe myself, with apologies for taking up so much of your space,

Your obedient servant,

BIBLIOPHILE.

## Our Contemporaries.

We beg to acknowledge, with thanks, the receipt of the following:—*Cheltonian, Carthusian, Brighton College Magazine, Felstedian, Radleian, Ousel, Alleynian, Fettesian, Cliftonian, Meteor, Raven, Pauline, Barnet Elizabethan, A. A. Notes, Our Boys' Magazine, Wellingtonian, Lancing College Magazine, Salopian, Elthamian.*

## NOTICES.

All contributions to the Play number of *The Elizabethan* must be sent to the Editor, St. Peter's College, Westminster, not later than January 18.

All contributions to the February number of *The Elizabethan* must be sent to the Editor, St. Peter's College, Westminster, not later than February 1.

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

The yearly subscription to *The Elizabethan* is 4s. It is requested that all subscriptions now falling due, or not yet paid up, may be forwarded to E. M. Loughborough, St. Peter's College, Westminster (*not* addressed to 'the Treasurer'). Post Office Orders to be made payable at the Broad Sanctuary Post Office, Westminster.

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

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

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

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

Moreat.