



# The Elizabethan.

Vol. VI. No. 12.

WESTMINSTER, MARCH 1890.

Price 6d.

## WESTMINSTER WORTHIES.

No. 22.

CHARLES MORDAUNT, LORD PETERBOROUGH.

(Continued from p. 131.)

THE retired First Commissioner of the Treasury maintained a by no means languid, if somewhat spasmodic, interest in politics; but his efforts were directed less to secure the endangered fabric of the Revolution Settlement than to exclude its lukewarm supporters from office, and to thwart and embarrass the King, who declined to act from the throne as the leader of a party. He still retained some official posts at Court, and, as a Gentleman of the Bedchamber, shared the King's peril on that January night which the champion of European liberty spent in an open boat amid fog, shoals, and ice-packs. None the less, Mordaunt both spoke and voted for a Commission of Inquiry into the conduct of the French war, which was practically a vote of censure on the Sovereign; and, in 1693, introduced into the House of Lords a Triennial Bill of almost precisely similar import to the one which William had vetoed in the preceding session. These reiterated acts of in-

subordination at length overcame William's sense of gratitude, and, in 1694, Mordaunt was suspended from the execution of his duties in the Bedchamber, and ceased to be summoned to the meetings of the Privy Council. At about the same time he resigned his colonelcy in the army, probably sparing the Court the unpleasantness of having either to endure or cashier him, on the understanding that his command should be transferred to his younger brother. His exclusion from office was not, however, entirely due to the King's irritation at his open opposition in Parliament, for certain dark suspicions had gathered round the name of Mordaunt which his subsequent conduct was not calculated to disperse.

While Mordaunt was still in high office, and a member of the Council of Regency, agents of the Government had intercepted a series of letters written in lemon-juice to a French agent at Antwerp. These letters were obviously from the hand of some one well versed in the secrets of the Executive, for in them the debates at the Council Table were recorded with minute accuracy. As it was observed that these letters were only written—or at least were only intercepted—when Mordaunt was in town, his master and colleagues were not slow to connect him with the correspondence; nor is it easy to show they were

wrong. Mordaunt's zeal for the Revolution Settlement should have been above suspicion, yet he had not done more or risked more to dethrone James II. than Shrewsbury, who had undeniably allowed himself to be entangled in a correspondence with the exiled family; and he certainly was not so odious to James as Marlborough had been, whose well-timed disclosures had earned him a pardon under the Great Seal of Saint Germain. The most tenable supposition is that Mordaunt wrote the intercepted letters, not with any intention of conveying useful information to his country's enemies, but in order that they might fall into the hands of the Government, and be ascribed to some of his Tory colleagues. This was probably William's own view of the case, as he never attempted to punish Mordaunt for his conduct, though it may materially have contributed to alienate his confidence from the offender.

The attainder of Sir John Fenwick is part of the history of England, and the facts connected with it need not be detailed here. Suffice it to say that the Bill of Attainder occupied at least as prominent a position in the Session of 1696 as the Report of the Parnell Commission threatens to occupy in the Session of 1890. When the Bill was brought up to the House of Lords, Mordaunt felt that his opportunity was at last come. In the judicial and semi-judicial proceedings of that House he had often been honourably prominent. In 1693 he had been one of the fourteen peers who declined to condone Lord Mohun's barbarous murder of Mountford the actor—he had voted, as his latest biographer phrases it, 'on his honour and to his honour,' for the conviction of the culprit. In 1695 he had been foremost in urging an investigation into the dealings of the East India Company with the Duke of Leeds. On the present occasion he determined by tampering with the prisoner to gain a decisive victory over the traitors who had supplanted him in the favour of William. Fenwick had made an artful confession which, while it inculpated no sincere Jacobites, brought the gravest charges against Marlborough, Godolphin, Russell, and Shrewsbury, who had all indeed been concerned in correspondence with Saint Germain, but whose treachery William found it politic to condone. Mordaunt employed his cousin, the Duchess of Norfolk, to communicate with the prisoner's wife; and through her he adjured the prisoner to boldly affirm that his confession was true, and to demand that the Earls of Portland and Romney, who were the King's chief confidants, might be asked whether they were not in possession of confirmatory evidence. 'Unless,' said Mordaunt, 'Sir John is under a fate . . . he will take my counsel. As for the King, he is the worst of men. He pretends not to believe these charges against Shrewsbury, Russell, Marlborough, Godolphin. And yet he knows by — that every word of the charges is true.'

Mordaunt's plan was admirably contrived for the exposure of his rivals and the mortification of the King, but, unfortunately, it made no provision for the prisoner's personal safety. Naturally, Sir John Fenwick declined

to carry out his share of the scheme on those terms, as Mordaunt's plan would only have further embittered his assailants. Mordaunt, in his irritation at Fenwick for declining to exchange his chance of escape for the pleasure of creating a widespread panic among politicians, immediately dropped his pretence of zeal for the interest of the accused and supported the Bill of Attainder with wit, vote, and interest.

The Bill was passed and Sir John executed; but his friends might be excused for desiring to wreak their vengeance on the false ally, who, when they declined to become his dupes, had led the attack against them. Accordingly, Lady Mary Fenwick persuaded her kinsman, Lord Carlisle, to lay before the House of Lords the papers which Sir John had received from Mordaunt. The Peers proceeded to investigate the matter; the evidence of the Duchess of Norfolk bore very strongly against her cousin. Mordaunt spoke in his own defence 'with more disturbance of mind than it was thought he could be capable of.' In vain he appealed to his sacrifices for the Revolution, contrasted his poverty with Nottingham's wealth, and declared that the whole matter was a plot of the Papists to ruin him. 'He solemnly declared—and this was the most serious of the many serious faults of his long and unquiet life—that he had nothing to do with the papers which had caused so much scandal.' His defence proved fruitless; the 'contrivance of the papers' was unanimously voted 'a high crime and misdemeanour,' and a large majority of the Peers present voted that Lord Mordaunt had had such a share in the contrivance of the papers as justified his committal to the Tower. Anyone unacquainted with the peculiar morality of the time, or the extraordinary elasticity of Mordaunt's character, would imagine that such a scene could have had no sequel save an old age of contempt and dishonour; yet Mordaunt's real life in history begins *after* he had been branded by his Peers as a deliberate liar and a suborner of false evidence.

Even his biographers—close and binding as is the tie of allegiance which binds a biographer to the subject he treats—scarcely dare to dispute the justice of that sentence. All that the boldest of them attempts is to press on his readers' attention the fact that Mordaunt had no selfish end to gain—at worst he was only actuated by a monkey-like spirit of mischief, at best by a commendable public spirit. Even then it must be owned that the petulant change of front when Fenwick declined to enter into his plans was spiteful and small-minded.

Concerning the facts of the case there is unfortunately little room for doubt. The Duchess of Norfolk may have borne a bad character, and the incriminating papers may not have been in Mordaunt's handwriting, but the whole intrigue bears the impress of his mastermind. It may be mentioned that at that very time Mordaunt was engaged in suborning two highwaymen to come forward and swear that they had been hired by the Jacobites to waylay and carry him off. This last story rests on rather dubious evidence, but, taken

in conjunction with the other two manifestations of Mordaunt's spirit of intrigue, is by no means improbable.

His imprisonment did not last long; on the 30th of March he was released on his petition to the House of Lords. Within three months he became Earl of Peterborough on the death of his uncle; and the change of title may have helped the world to forget his disgrace. Within two years he had returned to his place in the House of Lords, where he acted generally in concert with Marlborough and Godolphin as the adversary of Whig principles and Whig chieftains. In 1699 the House of Lords had to interfere to keep the peace between him and his old ally Russell, newly created Earl of Orford, just as in 1696 it had been forced to intervene between him and young Lord Jeffreys, stung by some well-merited reflections on his father's character cast by Peterborough during the Fenwick debate. In 1702 he was censured by the House of Commons for interfering in the election at Malmesbury.

The death of William on March 8th, 1702, opened a new official career to Peterborough, whose political alliance with Marlborough now stood him in good stead. One of the first Acts of the new reign appointed him Lord-Lieutenant of Northamptonshire, and in the December of the same year he was nominated Governor of Jamaica, and promised the command of an expedition against the Spanish West Indies. This enterprise was abandoned in consequence of the vacillation of the Dutch, and Peterborough had for some time to forego his hopes of military distinction. However, when reinforcements were despatched to Spain in 1705 he was gazetted General and Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in the Fleet. It may have seemed a bold experiment to entrust the supreme command, afloat and ashore, to a middle-aged politician whose military and naval experience had been acquired in a subordinate capacity more than twenty years before, but such an appointment was by no means unprecedented; and in this case, at least, was signally justified by the results.

In June 1705 Peterborough arrived at Lisbon; on the 16th of August he landed before Barcelona. His own wish had been to make a bold push for Madrid, but he was overruled by the Archduke and the Prince of Hesse-Darmstadt. The siege of Barcelona seemed an impossible task for his six thousand soldiers, who were actually outnumbered by the garrison, and after three weeks Peterborough, who regarded the whole undertaking as an act of 'suicidal folly,' gave orders to raise the siege and march for Tarragona. The news reached the beleaguered garrison, and they celebrated their triumph with festivities. They little knew their antagonist.

A swift countermarch with the troops told off to head the march to Tarragona placed Peterborough before the fort of Monjnich, the key of the fortifications. At dawn he delivered his assault, and after a combat, in which his personal courage was as brilliant as his tactical dispositions, the English flag was hoisted on the fort. After this success the capture of Bar-

celona was inevitable; and it surrendered on the 9th of October. The townspeople rose against the garrison, and the Governor was forced to appeal to Peterborough for aid. The English general quieted the disturbance, receiving a bullet in his wig while so engaged, and would then have honourably withdrawn to await the stipulated term of the capitulation had it not been found impossible to maintain order in the town without the aid of his soldiery. The fall of this important fortress secured the adhesion of all Catalonia. Las Torres, with 7,000 men, advanced from Madrid; but Peterborough, with 1,200, drove him back and pursued him into Valencia. A French army, 20,000 strong, crossed the frontier to recover Barcelona, and the town seemed lost when Peterborough, putting out to sea in an open boat, intercepted the English fleet and brought them to the relief of the town. For this great success he was rewarded by the nomination of Ambassador Extraordinary with a salary of £7,000 a year.

From the commencement of the siege of Barcelona the Archduke, conscious how necessary Peterborough was to him, had treated him with all imaginable courtesy; but in the hour of prosperity he felt strong enough to stand without him, so disparaged his exploits and neglected his advice. But such action was premature; for, though Galway and Las Minas had profited by the consternation caused in the French camp by the events of the campaign in Catalonia to advance on Madrid from the frontier of Portugal, the conflict in Spain was only opening. Madrid fell into the hands of the allies; but they profited very little by their conquest.

*(To be continued.)*

### School Notes.

A. I. Longhurst and J. A. Willett have been elected to serve on the Sports Committee; the former is secretary, while F. Y. Eccles is treasurer.

The Games Committee have appointed a Special Commission of four members to inquire into the state of school games and suggest means for improving them.

The Pancake 'Greeze,' in its modern form, took place duly on Shrove Tuesday, H. R. Blaker getting the Pancake.

Sir Watkin Wynn came down on St. David's Day to ask for a Late Play, as usual.

The Confirmation will be held on Saturday, March 22, by Bishop Barry, Bishop-Assistant in the Diocese of Rochester.

Orations were held on Tuesday afternoon, the 4th March. The piece set was from Goldsmith's 'De-

serted Village,' and very little justice was done it; Watherston was best where none were good, but had not caught much of the spirit of the lines. It is really absurd that never more than five competitors should appear, and that the standard of oratory should have deteriorated as it has.

We must congratulate P. Williamson, J. A. Willett, Shattock, H. L. Stephenson, A. L. Longhurst, H. R. Blaker, and P. Waterfield on receiving their Pinks; C. Rivaz and C. Page their Pink and Whites.

W. R. Moon, J. G. Veitch, and R. R. Sandilands played for London *v.* Birmingham on March 1.

W. R. Moon played for England, on March 15, against Wales.

R. L. Aston played for England (Rugby) against Scotland on the same day.

The Vincent Memorial Prizes have been awarded to W. H. Brailey and Howarth.

The Ireland Prize for Greek Verse has been gained by E. H. Marsh.

An account of the House Match between Grants and Rigauds, which was played Wednesday, March 12, will appear in our next issue with the Final and T.B.B. *v.* Q.S.S.

## OLD WESTMINSTER FREE-MASONS.

THE 'OLD WESTMINSTERS' LODGE, No. 2233.

A REGULAR meeting of this Lodge, which was founded in 1887 for the convenience of Freemasons educated at Westminster School, was held at the Café Royal, Regent Street, on Friday, February 7th, when Mr. Edward Festus Kelly was initiated into Freemasonry by the W.M., Bro. Thomas Wakley. There were also present the following members of the Lodge (all being 'Old Westminsters') :—

Reginald J. Mure	Thomas Tomlinson
Hugh D. Sandeman	William Hicks
Henry H. Hyde Clarke	Walter Tomlinson
Malcolm O. Sim	Henry Sutherland, M.D.
Francis J. Pearse	Charles M. Barker
Arthur M. Cope	Samuel H. West, M.D.
	William A. Ellis, M.R.C.S.

and one 'Old Westminster,' Bro. Gumbleton, amongst the visitors.

## 'ELIZABETHAN' ACCOUNTS.

THE Treasurer begs to acknowledge, with very many thanks, the following donations :—

	£	s.	d.
The Head Master . . . . .	10	0	0
Rev. E. Robinson . . . . .	0	10	6
R. U. Penrose Fitzgerald, Esq., M.P. . . . .	1	0	0
W. S. Wintle, Esq. . . . .	1	0	0
C. C. J. Webb, Esq. . . . .	0	16	0
Rev. H. M. Ingram . . . . .	0	10	0
'General View' . . . . .	0	10	0
<i>Westminster Truth</i> . . . . .	5	0	0
G. Berens . . . . .	0	10	0

## BALANCE SHEET.

RECEIPTS.	£	s.	d.	EXPENDITURE.	£	s.	d.
In hand from 1888 . . . . .	19	9	3	Paid to Spottiswoode . . . . .	132	17	0½
College . . . . .	10	18	0	Paid to Woman's Printing Soc. . . . .	1	0	0
Grants . . . . .	1	14	4	Postage . . . . .	7	16	3½
Rigauds . . . . .	8	6	0	In hand . . . . .	2	9	7
Homeboarders . . . . .	12	1	4				
Ashburnham . . . . .	2	12	0				
Faile's . . . . .	0	8	0				
Masters . . . . .	4	10	0				
Dean and Chapter . . . . .	1	8	0				
Back numbers . . . . .	8	5	0				
'Deb. Soc.' . . . . .	0	12	0				
O.W.W. . . . .	46	6	0				
Donations . . . . .	27	13	0				
	£144	2	11		£144	2	11

H. L. STEPHENSON, *Treasurer*.  
Examined and found correct,  
E. L. FOX.

It is with great pleasure that we announce that the *Elizabethan* is now free from debt. We are extremely grateful for the generous assistance our appeal brought in (which is duly acknowledged above) from many sources.

We are sorry that *Westminster Truth* was hurt at our notice of it in our last issue, and are most grateful to it for the substantial help it has accorded our finances.

The paying off of the £70 of debt has been materially helped by a largely increased list of subscribers in the School and O.W.W. We hope these will not fall off again as in 1886-89.

## THE FIELDS.

WESTMINSTER *v.* CLAPHAM ROVERS.

*Result*.—The School won by 3-1.

This match was played 'Up Fields' on Wednesday, February 10th. The School played against the wind for the first half.

The teams were as follows :—

WESTMINSTER.

H. R. Blaker (goal), P. Williamson and C. Rivaz (backs), H. L. Stephenson, J. D. Gifford, and G. Shattock (half-backs), A. L. Longhurst and P. Waterfield (right), J. Powell and J. Willett (centre), C. E. Page and E. W. Woodbridge (left), (forwards).

CLAPHAM ROVERS.

Glazier (goal), Christian and Ingram (backs), Shephard, Cretchly, and Dunsmuir (half-backs), Coleman and Rathbone (right), Brookes and Peck (centre), Keely and Keely (left), (forwards).

Willett kicked off for the School at 3.10, and nothing of any importance occurred until Waterfield shot a goal for the School about twenty minutes from the start. Shortly before half-time Powell, who was playing as twelfth man, put the ball through their goal (2-0). Both sides now played up extremely hard, and about five minutes before time Peck rushed the ball through our goal (2-1). Very shortly after the ball went through their goal off one of their own men from a shot by Page (3-1). The School played well together, though the wind hindered the combination in the first half; Blaker was good in goal, and of the rest, Gifford, Williamson, and Page were best.

WESTMINSTER *v.* OLD HARROVIANS.

*Result.*—Old Harrovians won by 3-2.

Played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, February 22.

The teams were :—

OLD HARROVIANS.

H. T. Grundtoig (goal), R. G. Mortimer and J. H. Farmer (backs), R. B. Hoare, C. G. O. Forester, and H. C. Buckingham (half-backs), P. W. Hull, E. E. Broughton, H. C. Kinlock, G. L. Pares, W. F. Wilkinson, and W. L. Allcroft (forwards).

THE SCHOOL.

H. Blaker (goal), P. Williamson and C. Rivaz (backs), G. O. Shattock, J. Gifford, and H. L. Stephenson (half-backs), E. W. Woodbridge, C. Page, J. A. Willett, P. Waterfield, and A. L. Longhurst (forwards).

The match was even and exciting throughout, and the School team played well together. Willett and Williamson were best.

WESTMINSTER *v.* CHARTERHOUSE.

This match was played 'Up Fields' on March 8th, and ended in an appalling defeat of Westminster by 8 goals to none. Play had been impossible on March 1st owing to a heavy fall of snow, which made the ground in a fearful state. Stephenson was unable to play, so Sherring took his place, while Longhurst hurt himself at the last moment, so Winckworth took his place on the right. Charterhouse won the toss, and Willett kicked off for Westminster from the Church end at 2.35. Westminster went to work with a dash that augured well for their success, and some beautiful passing took place between Winckworth and Waterfield. The ball was centred, but Woodbridge shot outside the mark. Then Winckworth had a try, but he shot

over, but in retaliation Smith made a good run and scored (0-1). After Smith had nearly scored again, Waterfield got away, but was given off-side, and two more goals were shot by Buzzard and Smith (0-3). Buzzard again got away, but Williamson charged him and his shot went wide. After this Westminster made a feeble effort and obtained a 'hands' and a corner, but nothing resulted, and Smith shot yet another goal with a splendid kick (0-4). After Winckworth had kicked the ball over the Charterhouse goal, half-time was whistled.

After the ball had been re-started Wade nearly scored, while Blaker saved well on two occasions, but Wilson managed to put Charterhouse five goals to the good by a fine run (0-5). Gifford made a splendid shot which only just failed, but Charterhouse scored yet another goal through the agency of Buzzard. Blaker gisted out a good shot by Hewitt, but Buzzard made the score seven, and Smith completed the alarming total after a splendid run.

For Charterhouse all played well. Their forwards passed beautifully, and played with great dash and determination right through the game. They never lost their heads in front of goal, always shooting at the right moment, Smith in particular putting in some splendid shots. Their halves and backs tackled well, Bliss being out and out the best of the back division.

For Westminster, Blaker, despite the enormous number of goals against him, played fairly well, though we think that he might have saved one or two of the shots. Williamson played hard and tackled well, but Rivaz was awful, missing his kick times without number. Of the halves who were completely out of it, Sherring was too slow for the men against him; Gifford, who seemed not to think it worth while to 'back' up after Charterhouse had scored their first goal, was hopeless, and Shattock was not nearly good enough for Smith.

Of the forwards, Willett was wretched, having no idea of dash and charging; Woodbridge and Winckworth were perhaps the least rank; Page did a certain amount of good work, but Waterfield was too light for the opposing half.

The teams were as follows :—

CHARTERHOUSE.

J. D. Ogilvy (goal), R. E. Rising and E. H. Bray (backs), G. Head, E. C. Bliss, and E. Bramwell (half-backs), C. D. Hewitt and G. S. Wilson (left), E. T. Buzzard (centre), R. W. Wade and G. O. Smith (captain) (right), (forwards).

WESTMINSTER.

H. R. Blaker (goal), C. F. Rivaz and P. Williamson (backs), F. B. Sherring, J. D. Gifford (captain), and G. O. Shattock (half-backs), E. W. Woodbridge and C. E. Page (left), J. A. Willett (centre), P. Waterfield and D. P. Winckworth (right), (forwards).

OLD WESTMINSTERS *v.* ROYAL ARSENAL.

(LONDON ASSOCIATION CUP, FINAL.)

Played at the Oval on Saturday, March 8.

*Result:* O.W.W. won by 1-0.

The teams were :—

O.W.W.

W. R. Moon (goal), R. T. Squire and C. J. M. Fox (backs), W. N. Winckworth, H. Harrison, and H. Wetton (half-backs), P. C. Probyn and H. C. Peck (right), J. G. Veitch (centre), F. Street and F. W. Bain (left), (forwards).

ROYAL ARSENAL.

F. W. Beardsley (goal), P. Connolly and J. M'Bean (backs), D. Howat, J. W. Bates, and J. W. Julian (half-backs), R. T. Horsington and J. W. Meggs (left), R. Barbour (centre), H. R. Robertson and W. Offer (right), (forwards).

WESTMINSTER *v.* OLD WYKEHAMISTS.

Played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, March 15.  
*Result*: Old Wykehamists won by 7-0. Teams :—

OLD WYKEHAMISTS.

F. D. Watney (goal), Hon. P. M. Thesiger and A. M. Darling (backs), R. K. Harvey, F. M. Ingram, and C. E. Wilkinson (half-backs), B. H. Wilkinson and W. W. Phillips (left), P. L. Canning (centre), J. S. Watney and W. P. Richardson (right), (forwards).

THE SCHOOL.

R. W. Knox (goal), P. Williamson and J. S. Shearme (backs), J. D. Gifford, F. B. Sherring, and G. O. Shattock (half-backs), A. L. Longhurst, C. Page, P. Waterfield, J. A. Willett, and E. W. Woodbridge (forwards).

It had been hoped that this would be a better match, and last Saturday's defeat in some measure atoned for; but it was not. The School collapsed utterly; the play of the team collectively was miserable. Shearme and Williamson were the only redeeming points, the former playing very well. H. R. Blaker, H. L. Stephenson, and C. Rivaz were unable to play.

OLD WESTMINSTERS *v.* CLAPTON.

LONDON CHARITY CUP SEMI-FINAL.

Played at the Oval on Saturday, March 15.  
*Result*: O.W.W. won by 1-0. Teams :—

CLAPTON.

H. A. Swepstone (goal), A. E. Casselton and E. J. Watts (backs), R. H. Clark, T. Radford, and S. Smith (half-backs), J. Sellar and J. H. Robertson (right), J. Burns (centre), J. S. L. Prior and W. G. Connell (left), (forwards).

O.W.W.

C. W. Grant-Wilson (goal), C. J. M. Fox and R. T. Squire (backs), N. C. Bailey, W. N. Winckworth, and H. Harrison (half-backs), F. W. Bain (centre), F. Street and R. R. Sandilands (left), P. C. Probyn and A. R. Woodbridge (right), (forwards).

OLD WESTMINSTERS *v.* CIVIL ENGINEERS.

Played at Chiswick on Saturday, March 15.  
*Result*: A draw, 1-1. Teams :—

CIVIL ENGINEERS.

Walker (goal), St. B. Haskett-Smith and H. Russell (backs), E. L. W. Haskett-Smith, B. Glover, and W. M. M'Cowen (half-backs), H. E. Barham and P. W. Symmons (captain), (right), C. J. Hobbs and D. M. Hawes (left), H. G. Hawkins (centre), (forwards).

O.W.W.

E. L. Dewdney (goal), R. O. Mills and A. G. Prothero (backs), J. P. Paul, F. C. Ryde, and A. G. L. Rogers (half-backs), G. H. Viner and G. Lambert (right), C. R. Heath (centre), E. L. Clapham and A. J. Hemmerde (left), (forwards).

DEBATING SOCIETY.

FOUR meetings of the House have taken place since the last number of the *Elizabethan*. The first two meetings were occupied almost entirely in the discussion of Mr. F. Y. ECCLES's motion, 'That death should not be the penalty fixed by law for any crime.'

The PROPOSER began by explaining that he did not support the entire abolition of Capital Punishment, but thought that the attending circumstances of crime and the mental condition of the criminal should be taken into consideration for more than it is at present. He quoted the maxim, 'If a man is sane, he is entirely sane; but, if not, he is a raving lunatic,' and severely criticised it.

Mr. C. A. PHILLIMORE opposed the motion with considerable ability. He argued that the abolition of Capital Punishment would greatly endanger the interests of society. If there was any doubt about the guilt of the criminal, the public would, in most cases, recommend him (or her) to mercy, as they had recently done in the case of Mrs. Maybrick. Medical science had made such progress in this century that there was no difficulty in deciding whether the criminal was in his right mind or otherwise.

The Seconder (Mr. J. S. PHILLIMORE) thought that crimes should be judged by motive and not result as far as it was possible. He gave instances to prove that in States where Capital Punishment had been abolished, crime had considerably decreased. He thought that imprisonment for life was much more dreaded than the gallows, and therefore more likely to make a criminal repent.

The PROPOSER, SECONDER, and OPPOSER of the motion seemed each to have formed their own ideas as to the exact meaning of the wording of it, and so apparently had all the other individual speakers, amongst whom were Mr. H. L. STEPHENSON, Mr. A. L. LONGHURST, Mr. R. BALFOUR, and Mr. D. SHEARME. The arguments both for and against Capital Punishment which were brought up by the different speakers were consequently very inconsistent. The result when the House divided was—*Ayes*: 7; *Noes*: 11.

On Thursday, February 27, the House discussed Mr. D. SHEARME's motion—'That this House approve of Vivisection.'

There was not so much opposition to this motion as might have been expected. Mr. D. SHEARME, aided by the Seconder, Mr. R. BALFOUR, brought up some excellent arguments in its favour, which were, without doubt, feebly opposed by Mr. I. G. FARRAR, (the Opposer). The only other opponent of the

motion who spoke was Mr. G. G. S. GILLETT, who quoted many statistics from papers of the Anti-Vivisection Society, and eventually had to be stopped from deviating from the point. Mr. H. L. STEPHENSON, Mr. J. SHEARME, and Mr. C. A. PHILLIMORE also spoke, objecting to the way in which the subject was being discussed. The result was—*Ayes: 11; Noes: 3.*

THE GLEE SOCIETY.

The Glee Society gave its first entertainment for this term on Wednesday, March 12, 'Up School.'

The programme was as follows :—

PROGRAMME.

- SOLO & CHORUS 'Awake, boys, Awake!' ... ..  
E. G. BURTON, S. LIBERTY, and G. N. SCARFE.
  - SOLO ... .. 'Come to my heart' ... .. *Werne.*  
F. W. LONGHURST.
  - DUET ... .. 'The Two Gendarmes' ... .. *Offenbach.*  
G. N. SCARFE and E. G. BURTON.
  - CHORUS ... .. 'Oberon' ... ..  
VIOLIN SOLO ... .. 'Gavotte' ... .. *Carl Bohm.*  
H. V. ANTHONY.
  - SOLO ... .. 'The Old Flag' ... .. *Marks.*  
E. G. BURTON.
  - FOOTBALL SONG }  
SOLO & CHORUS } ... 'Play up' ... ..  
E. G. BURTON, A. L. LONGHURST, G. N. SCARFE,  
and R. A. YELD.
  - DUET IN CANON 'Friendship' ... .. *Marzials.*  
H. W. HOLLAND and F. W. LONGHURST.
  - PART SONG ... .. 'Happy Fair' ... .. *W. Shield.*
  - PIANOFORTE SOLO 'L'Amaranthe' ... .. *Voss.*  
H. V. ANTHONY.
  - CHORUS... .. 'May Day' ... .. (*Orpheus.*)
- GOD SAVE THE QUEEN.  
FLOREAT.

The entertainment was successful on the whole, though the choruses were not so good as we have heard them on former occasions. The audience was smaller than usual, the School being but poorly represented, and somewhat capricious in its 'encores.' A treble solo is always appreciated 'Up School,' and F. W. Longhurst's 'Come to my Heart' was quite the best thing of the evening. Good trebles are always scarce, and he is certainly a great acquisition, though his voice is hardly powerful enough to fill the Great Schoolroom. The same may be said of G. N. Scarfe, whose voice, while very melodious, lacks strength. H. V. Anthony was in his best form, and his 'Gavotte' on the violin well deserved the enthusiastic applause accorded it, while his 'L'Amaranthe' on the piano was splendidly executed. The football song, 'Play up,' was sung with more heartiness and vigour than the other choruses, but has little else to recommend it besides its 'go.' The substitution of 'Westminster' for 'Harrow' in various passages struck us as an un-

necessary piece of piracy. However, the concert was as successful as could be expected, after so long an interval, and we hope that some of its little faults may be corrected by next time.

THE LITERARY SOCIETY.

At the last four meetings of the Society, 'A Winter's Tale' and 'Othello' have been read. The latter play was read with far more spirit than any other for some time past, Mr. Raynor's Othello being very powerful.

The principal parts in 'A Winter's Tale' were taken thus :—

- Polixenes* . . . . . C. A. PHILLIMORE.
- Leontes* . . . . . The Rev. G. H. NALL.
- Camillo* . . . . . P. WILLIAMSON.
- Antigonus* . . . . . J. S. SHEARME.
- Archidamus* . . . . . A. Y. G. CAMPBELL.
- Rogers* . . . . . W. T. BARWELL.
- Hermione* . . . . . J. S. PHILLIMORE.
- Perdita* . . . . . A. L. LONGHURST.
- Paulina* . . . . . G. G. S. GILLETT.
- Autolycus* . . . . . { G. H. LENOX-CONYNGHAM,  
Esq.
- Clown* . . . . . H. L. STEPHENSON.

Those for 'Othello' fell as follows :—

- Brabantio* . . . . . The Rev. G. H. NALL.
- Lodovico* . . . . . A. L. LONGHURST.
- Othello* . . . . . The Rev. A. G. S. RAYNOR.
- Cassio* . . . . . J. S. SHEARME.
- Iago* . . . . . H. L. STEPHENSON.
- Roderigo* . . . . . P. WILLIAMSON.
- Desdemona* . . . . . J. S. PHILLIMORE.
- Emilia* . . . . . C. A. PHILLIMORE.
- Bianca* . . . . . A. C. NESBITT.

There will be no more meetings held this term.

POETRY.

LINES ON READING THE 'EDITORIAL' IN THE LAST *ELIZABETHAN*.

You complain that your verse  
Is scanty and 'scarce';  
Your distress may be easily figured :  
But when rare is a song  
As a black swan, it's wrong,  
But not strange, if your poets are '*niggard*.'  
BOHEE.

FROM PLATO.

Being come into a shady coppice deep,  
Found we Cythera's babe, that was so fair  
As rosy apples; he had laid aside  
His shafts and supple bow, and quiver where  
His darts he wont to hide,  
And hanged them up on the fair branching trees;

And fettered with sleep  
 He lay a-cradled in a rose's cup,  
 While russet-coated bees  
 Urto his delicate lips came flying up,  
 And swarms, wax-laden, round his mouth did go.  
 ANON.

FROM RONSARD.

Sweet, let us seek the rose  
 Which spread at morning's call  
 Her raiment in the light.  
 Hath she at evening's close  
 Let all her crimson fall—  
 Her hue, than thine more bright ?  
 Ah, see how short a day  
 Hath strewn her on the soil,  
 And left her stem forlorn !  
 Ah, cruel Nature, say,  
 Why must the evening spoil  
 The fairest flower of morn ?  
 Sweet, pluck the joys of youth,  
 While yet thy loveliest hour  
 Blooms with its early glow ;  
 For Age, in very truth,  
 As it hath slain the flower,  
 Will lay thy beauty low.

ARIEL.

### Obituary.

It is with great regret that we record the deaths of the following Old Westminsters :—

On February 4, at Thorbury Park, Yorkshire, aged 51, the Rev. CHARLES GARTH FULLERTON.

The Rev. Charles Fullerton was born on April 26, 1838, and entered at Westminster as a T.B. in February, 1848. In 1856 he left for Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and took his degree in 1860, and a little later took orders.

On January 22, in London, HENRY HOWARD BOVILL.

Mr. H. H. Bovill was admitted as a T.B. in 1865. He afterwards became a student at Guy's Hospital and a House Surgeon ; and was subsequently for some years domestic physician to the Dowager Duchess of Cleveland. He then went to Australia, and returned to England in October last. He was a brother of the late Bursar and the present Chief Justice of Cyprus.

On February 23, at Nice, aged 73, THOMAS EDWARD PRESTON, Esq., of Beeston Hall, Norfolk, son of the late Sir Thomas Preston by his second marriage.

### BIRTH.

We record the following with all due congratulations :—On February 11, at 53 Vincent Square, the wife of Ralph Tanner, Esq., of a son.

### Correspondence.

FROM OUR OXFORD CORRESPONDENT.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

DEAR SIR,—As you doubtless have seen, the House has won the Colleges' Challenge Cup, under the captaincy of G. G. Phillimore, and with four other O.W.W. playing for the House. Hurst and Street each scored a point for the winners, and James and Doherty played well at half-back. Probyn played for the losers with his usual energy, perhaps with a trifle more. I dare not say more about the match, Sir, lest I should incur the censure of the Debating Society.

I am sorry not to be able to chronicle any matches played by us. I hope that next season we shall arrange three (say) each term against old boys of other schools. There should be no difficulty in getting up teams, especially now that we have the Club. The House alone could put into the field a team of O.W.W. quite equal to an average college team.

We had three representatives in the Torpids—Shore, Cox, and Gates, the latter's boat going up three places.

The influenza has been very prevalent, and has interfered with most things, including the Torpids. Whitaker—who first acted a minor part, 'Lord Holland,' in Browning's play *Strafford*—would have played 'King Charles,' but was unfortunately taken ill with it. P. Dearmer played 'Hampden.'

H. B. Willett has got his half-blues for hockey. Rolleston has won the quarter-mile handicap in the University sports.

Davies has again distinguished himself in shooting, winning the Recruits' Cup and the Handicap Cup, his score for the latter being beaten only by his own score of last year.

With best wishes for the Charterhouse match,

Believe me, yours truly,

Oxford : March 4, 1890.

BOSPOROS.

FROM OUR CAMBRIDGE CORRESPONDENT.

*To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'*

DEAR SIR,—My first duty is to congratulate Veitch on the brilliant success which attended the Cambridge team at the Oval, and on the fact that he was the first to score a goal for us in the match ; also, we must all be pleased to hear that he is going to represent England very shortly in the match against Ireland. Very sincere are our regrets that Harrison was unable to share in the glory of the 'Varsity match, as he is still a martyr to his leg. We should have been glad to see a third Westminster man on the field, J. E. Phillimore, who has played so steadily all through the season, but it was not to be.

The Lent Races have caused us an unusual amount of satisfaction. On the first night we easily bumped First Trinity II ; but the next night our bump was only won by a most plucky and gallant effort. Caius and Pembroke were ahead of us, our boat being till Ditton quite two lengths behind the former ; but Caius were pressing Pembroke all the way, and, indeed, overlapped them for some time, when, to everybody's astonishment, 'Third' spirted about the middle of the Long reach, came up hand over hand, and bumped Caius under the Bridge. The next night we bumped Pembroke, but were unable to even gain on First Trinity I the last night. Stevens rowed seven, and Preece five ; Markham, who was to have stroked, caught the influenza about a fortnight before the race, and was unable to row at all.



It is a long time since Westminster has provided even a sort of 'ninth man' to the 'Varsity Eight'; so with all the more pleasure we saw Smyth rowing for ten days, and wished he might have stayed there.

The other day the 'Indian Civilians'—to which learned body Westminster supplies quite her share—held high festival in the Devonshire Rooms, the occasion being their annual 'mock trial.' The witnesses, among whom were to be seen Last and Cuming, seemed to suffer from an uncertainty as to what evidence was expected of them, while the counsel had an unfortunate knack of eliciting, as a rule, such statements as told against themselves. Phillimore, as 'usher,' was quite up to his usual form, and played the part with ease and skill; we, indeed, presume, 'he did it *extempore*, as it was nothing but roaring.'

Everybody up here is looking forward to the performance of Gluck's *Orpheus*, early next term in the Theatre. With Professor Stanford as musical director, a university chorus, and first-rate artistes for the principal characters, a most finished and artistic rendering of this much-neglected opera may be expected. Markham is secretary to the committee, and is to be applied to for tickets.

Trinity College, Cambridge :  
March 1, 1890.

#### 'WESTMINSTER TRUTH.'

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—If I am not too late for your March issue, I should like to make a few comments on the subject of *Westminster Truth*.

It seems to be usual to celebrate in your columns a new departure of school journalism by a long letter of good-humoured chaff and small jokes, which is of course harmless if you want to fill up your last page. The gist of the letter of 'Zelotes' is contained in the fifth paragraph, in which he asks, and essays to answer, the question of the need of a weekly paper in the School. The *Elizabethan* seems to think that the balance of advisability is against a weekly paper, or at any rate an independent weekly paper, on the ground that it draws pecuniary and literary support away from the recognised School organ. These are definite charges, and deserve careful consideration.

I do not think the first objection is of much importance. If anyone wants an *Elizabethan*, he buys it; if he does not want it, I hope he does not buy it. I do not think anyone who really enjoys his *Elizabethan* would be deterred from buying it by having bought a copy of *Westminster Truth*, simply because the two papers are of a totally different character. The occasional difficulties of the *Elizabethan* I believe always to have been due to unbusiness-like treasurers.

The second objection I believe to be quite illusory, as an independent weekly paper taps a different literary source from the *Elizabethan*. It is to be regretted that there should always be some people shy of contributing to the *Elizabethan*; but this is the fact. The question is much the same as that between the Established Church and the Salvation Army, and the existence of the Church Army and the late existence of your weekly 'Supplement' seem to show that in both cases the phenomenon has been recognised. If any member of the School contribute some good verses to an independent weekly paper, I do not think that either author or editor would object to you, Mr. Editor, engraving them in your more permanent chronicle. Also by collecting scraps of interesting news, which have afterwards appeared in the monthly paper, I think both the *Westminster Review* and *Westminster Truth* have done useful work.

As for matches, I would point out, in the first place, that the reporting of them was one of the main arguments for the 'Supplement,' whose issue was, I understand, reluctantly abandoned owing solely to inability to make it pay; and, in the second place, that, as your more permanent chronicle has very wisely reduced the football reports, there is unusual reason for detailed weekly ones.

If I have convinced you, Mr. Editor, that an independent weekly paper does you no harm, I am satisfied. That it does good, both to you and the School, seems to me obvious. Does not the second eleven do good to the first by feeding it and encouraging young players? Remember, Mr. Editor, the difference in the positions of the two papers. A lamb may gambol about in a way that would not become the father of the flock. I am not arguing that an independent weekly paper is indispensable. Of course it is not, no more are House matches; but, nevertheless, both are good things. I am not pleading for your enthusiastic support of the present one; but I do ask you to consider seriously whether such a paper is good for the School, and if you agree with me in thinking that it *is* good, do not throw cold water on the efforts of those who give time and trouble to this end.

I think the reason the 'Supplement' failed where the *Westminster Review* succeeded was partly that it did not sufficiently bear in mind that a weekly paper may publish much that is not suited to a monthly one.

Trusting my remarks, if incoherent, may at any rate induce you to reconsider your opinion,

Believe me, your humble servant,

GENERAL VIEW.

[We are sorry that our 'Note' seemed unjust, and must again point out that we are not responsible for the opinion of 'Zelotes,' or any other of our correspondents.—ED.]

#### 'THE ELIZABETHAN.'

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—In your last number you appeal to O.W.W. for subscriptions to free your paper from debt; but I venture to think we are entitled to demand some explanation of the causes of that debt, as well as a statement of its magnitude. On referring to back numbers of *The Elizabethan*, I find that in March 1886 there was a balance of £16 odd; in March 1887 this balance had increased to over £17; in March 1888 it had fallen to £11 odd. But, on referring to the March number, 1889, strange to say, I find no accounts for the previous year, and, after searching through the subsequent numbers, I find that they were never published. In the May number, 1889, I find it stated that the weekly 'Supplement' was a financial failure, and only paid two-thirds of its expenses; but as it was published during two terms only, viz., Play term 1888, and Lent term 1889, the loss from this cause cannot have been very great. What, then, has caused the present enormous debt, besides swallowing up the balance which *The Elizabethan* had at the beginning of 1888? I think, Sir, that if you answer this question, O.W.W. will be more ready to assist you in your difficulties than if you continue to leave us in the dark as to the real causes of the debt.

I am, Sir, yours truly,  
AN O.W.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—By your kindness I have been allowed to see a letter signed 'O.W.' with reference to the *Elizabethan* accounts, and am happy to give him all the information in my power, though of course I can only refer to the accounts of my predecessors.

In March 1887 the balance was £17. 1s. 2d.; but a bill of £7. 10s. was omitted in the accounts, so that the real balance in March 1887 was £9. 11s. 2d.

By March 1888 the nominal balance was £11. 15s.; but again a bill of £19. 4s. was not reckoned, so that there was really a deficit of £7. 9s.

In March 1889 no accounts were published in the *Elizabethan*; but the deficit had by now increased to £49. 13s. 9d.

In October, when I took over the Treasurer-ship, the debt was £68. 9s., while at present there is a balance of £2. 9s. 7d.

In 1887-8 the *Westminster Review* undoubtedly caused a large falling off of subscribers, and these were not recovered in

1889. In 1889 the 'Supplement' caused heavy losses, and throughout all these years there was great difficulty in getting in O.W.W. subscriptions. This is all the information that I can give.

Yours truly,

H. L. STEPHENSON,  
*Treasurer.*

#### ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

'PEREAT.'—Your letter was too violent and personal to be inserted in the *Historian and Mentor*.—ED

'KUKLISTES.'—Your suggestion should be made directly to the Sports Committee.—ED.

#### Our Contemporaries.

WE beg to acknowledge, with thanks, the receipt of: *The Kingsman*, *Penn Charter Magazine*, *Cambridge Review* (4), *Radlean* (2), *Alleyrian* (2), *Felstedian*, *Cheltonian* (2), *Blue*, *Meteor* (2), *Durham University Journal* (2), *Marlburian* (2), *Ousel*, *Rossalian*, *Haileyburian*, *South Eastern College Magazine*, *Derbeian*, *Carthusian*, *Wellingtonian*, *Wykehamist*, *Ulul*, *Blundellian*, *Shirburnian*, *Clavinian*, *Cliftonian*.

#### NOTICES.

All contributions to the May number of the *Elizabethan* must be sent in by April 26, to the Editor, St. Peter's College, Westminster.

All other communications must be addressed to the Secretary, 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 H. L. STEPHENSON, St. Peter's College, Westminster. 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 cannot be inserted unless they are written on one side of the paper only.

Back numbers may be had from the Secretary, at a cost of 6d. each.

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

Florrat.