



The Elizabethan.

Vol. VI. No. 18. WESTMINSTER, DECEMBER 1890.

Price 6d.

O.WW.

WE can all remember the time when we looked on an O.W. with the greatest admiration, not unmingled with awe; some, no doubt, still do so, and we may well envy these in that they have some idol that claims their admiration. It seems a great pity to disenchant the happy few, but even in the case of O.WW. the old saw 'Familiarity breeds contempt' is more or less true, and we may venture with cold, judicial eye to peer into those mysteries which are hidden, as it were, under the cloak of the name 'Old Westminster.' While the glamour of this name is upon us, we regard it as a golden gate leading to the happy land, and we do not dare examine the paths of those who have crossed its threshold; but, alas! these illusions fade, and we may now even criticise the bearers of this magic name. O.WW. may be divided into three classes, which may overlap each other, but which include all who leave Westminster. These three classes are: 1st, Those who go

hence and are no more seen; 2nd, Those who go to either University; 3rd, Those who become great on the football field or in the Elizabethan Club.

With regard to the first class, it consists almost entirely (for, of course, there are exceptions to all these remarks) of those who have profited little by their sojourn in the School, and are themselves profitless to the School; these are they who during their time at Westminster, be that time short or long, have felt no enthusiasm, no love for it, who have lived for themselves alone, and have not considered that they owe a sacred duty to the School and that the advancement of its interests should be paramount in their eyes. These fall into oblivion, and glide away to the dark ocean of the outer world; nor need we lament their loss overmuch.

Those who leave to go to either 'Varsity, and more especially those who go to Christ Church and Trinity, find that the O.WW. there are numerous, and are linked together at Oxford by a club, at Cambridge by a society; they find that they are a body worthy of con-

sideration, and even a body possessing power; they feel justly proud of the School they have so lately left; but soon they are carried farther, and are prone to expand the dictum, 'There is no School like Westminster,' by adding, as a corollary, 'There are no men like O.W.W.' Thus in the conceit of their hearts they turn their pride in the School to pride in themselves, and through this often fall into the error of exclusiveness. In saying this, I do not mean to condemn exclusiveness utterly and entirely; there are many arguments in favour of it. If you do not care to know people, there is no reason why you should. Of the two arguments that are usually alleged against it, the one, that it is useful in after-life to know many people, is the offspring of the mercenary spirit of the present day, and, as such, is contemptible; the other, that exclusiveness is apt to make one narrow-minded, carries more weight, but is not irrefutable; but the exclusiveness that is here meant consists in knowing all O.W.W. merely because they are O.W.W., and despising others merely because they are not O.W.W.

We now turn to the third class, comprising those who become great on the football field or in the Elizabethan Club. There is no doubt that football is a very strong link between the School and O.W.W. Even at the School it is those who are in the Eleven, especially at football—which is primarily the Westminster game—who possess the influence and are looked up to with reverence and envy by the smaller members of the School. Hero-worship is not dead, and at Westminster the captain of football is the hero who receives most worship. This feeling is intensified towards O.W.W., and the team which has won the London Cup is set upon a pinnacle of glory. Yet so much the more for all this are football-playing O.W.W. liable to the errors into which, it has been shown, 'Varsity O.W.W. sometimes fall. Those who play regularly for O.W.W., and share in the glories of many a well-earned triumph, being few in number, too often form a clique, that worst offshoot of exclusiveness. They forget that the School is, or ought to be, their connecting link, and instead set up the O.W. Football Club as their 'Alma mater'; in place of making a god of the School, they make gods for themselves of themselves. Of the other subdivision of this class—the Elizabethan Club—I need say little. The Elizabethan Club is a true friend to the School, and its aim is the advancement of the School; it is all-embracing, and does not to such

an extent make the mistakes of the other classes of O.W.W.; yet it is not entirely immaculate even in this respect. The greatest and purest love for the School is cherished by the oldest and the youngest generations of O.W.W.; the former love to look back, perchance with the prejudiced eyes of age, that casts a rosy hue over the period of their youth, on the happy days of their school-life, and feel their love for Westminster grown strong by lapse of time; the youngest generation have but lately left and discover, what, it may be, they have never discovered before, the beauties and glories of Westminster. They feel that school-life is the happiest and most free from cares, and they envy those who are still enjoying that life, and who in their turn perchance, for such is the way of all flesh, are envying them, for we never know the true worth of a thing until we have lost it.

It may be thought that this article is written in a carping and fault-finding spirit, but so much has been said and sung in praise of O.W.W. that it may be as well to point out that even O.W.W., as such, are not entirely unassailable; and I trust that these few words of disparagement will not be taken amiss, but rather may help to guide those who are still in the School in avoiding, when their turn comes, the errors here indicated. I will conclude by stating once more what has been the burden of my song—let O.W.W. remember that it is the School that has given to them a *raison d'être*, and not they to the School.

O.W.

COMMEMORATION.

THIS is the second year of the Commemoration Service, and it has proved a far greater success even than last year. The number of visitors was larger, the music and singing better and heartier, and the whole arrangements showed an improvement on the first year of the new ceremony.

Among those who had expressed their desire to be present, and most of whom attended, were the Lord Chancellor, the Right Hon. Sir John Mowbray, the Right Hon. John Morley, Sir Walter Phillimore, Mr. Justice Stirling, Sir Frederick Pollock, Sir Frederick Abel, Sir J. Parker Deane, Sir Theodore Martin, Sir Philip Magnus, Sir Peter Spokes, Mr. Bompas, Q.C., Mr. E. A. Bond, C.B., the Rev. Professor Bonney, the Right Hon. Leonard Courtney, M.P., Professor Corfield, Mr. Henry Craik, C.B., the Rev. Canon Daniel, the Rev. Canon Ellison, Professor Flower, Mr. Archibald Geikie, Mr. Seager Hunt, M.P., Mr. Norman Lockyer, the Rev. W. J.

Loftie, the Rev. Professor J. B. Mayor, Mr. G. L. Pearson, R.A., Mr. Richmond, R.A., Dr. Robson Roose, Mr. George Spottiswoode, Mr. W. Stebbing, Mr. Alan Stewart, Mr. Howard Vincent, M.P., and Mr. Henry Waterfield.

The office began with the 'Pater Noster,' which was followed by the sentences 'Domine, labia nostra aperias,' &c. Then to Gregorian music were sung the 148th, 149th, and 150th Psalms. The Dean then read the lesson, the 44th chapter of Ecclesiasticus, 'Laudemus viros gloriosos.' The *Te Deum* was then sung to Gregorian tones and was followed by the 'Forma Commendationis,' which was read by the Head Master.

After the 'Hymnus vespertinus,' 'Salvator Mundi Domine,' the DEAN of LINCOLN (the Very Rev. W. J. Butler), O.W., preached from Ezra iii. 12: '*Many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice; and many shouted aloud for joy.*' After contrasting the new temple of which the foundation was referred to in the text with the far more magnificent edifice of Solomon, 'where silver was as common as stone, and cedars as sycamores that are in the vale for abundance,' the preacher pointed out how far nobler a future was in store for the more recent building, notwithstanding its comparative poverty and its inferiority to that which had preceded it, in that it was destined in after years to be the scene of the teaching of the Incarnate Son of God. He then continued:

May we not see in this history, in this absolute overturning of all human estimate, that which will encourage and cheer us on this the anniversary festival of our dear old School? 'God seeth not as man seeth.' He knows, as we know not, where the germ of vitality resides; and in His own good time he gives it growth and development. 'Dat Deus incrementum.' The fact that there may be present cause for depression gives no real augury for the future. Does it not come to pass that even as those things which seem to be for our wealth become, if wrongly handled, an occasion for falling, so, on the other hand, the things which seem to be discouraging become under prudent and wise management the occasion for mighty praise? 'From the nettle danger,' says the poet, 'we pluck the flower safety.'

After illustrating this principle from the death-struggle of Rome with Hannibal, the Norman Conquest and subsequent fusion in the great English nation of the Norman and Anglo-Saxon elements, and the independence of our North American colonies, he continued:

And now with these thoughts before us let me turn to the special subject of the evening—the past, the present, the future of our ancient School. Is the day, as some would have it, really gone by? Is the sun of glory set? Are we to speak in hushed and mourning accents as we recall the past? Have we nothing left us but the ghosts of the giants who once dwelt in the land? Is the voice of the 'laudator temporis acti' alone to be heard among us? I do not think so. I believe that the potentiality of a great future even now lies before us. Time was, it cannot be denied, when, like the Temple of Solomon, Westminster, as a school, was the wonder of the land. It is no exaggeration to assert that no school in this or any other country has ever sent forth so mighty a brood of nurslings,

eminent in all that is most esteemed among men. The list of alumni Westmonasterien es is a very mine of history. Scarcely one noble family, scarcely one eminent name that is not in some way or other represented or recalled there. It is told of the great Duke of Wellington that in the Peninsula Campaign which thrust Napoleon from his tyrant's throne, he selected the Westminster men, out of all that splendid following of officers, as the most resourceful and the most enduring of toil. And now, it cannot be denied, we look upon an altered state of things. Members, though of late years they have increased, are far below what once they were. The majority of those great families—no few of whom took their rise from Westminster—have ceased to send their sons. Many of those who knew the School in what may be called its more palmy days, are inclined, as they meditate on its changed condition, to cry Ichabod. But let us take heart. Even like those Jews—few in number, poor in means, yet brave, faithful, hopeful, offering of the best—rejoicing in the day of small things, let us go forward in the great and important work of building up our grand old School and believe that God's blessing will go with us. Why should we doubt it? Our work is surely for God's glory. Why should we doubt it? Is it not to build up and maintain in all virtue and godliness those who are the living temples of the Holy Ghost? Is it not to raise them to be faithful members of both Church and State; to make men at once good citizens and faithful servants of Christ? It may be that we must revise our methods—that we must not shrink from such arrangements as may best meet altered conditions—that we must take into consideration that neither London nor Westminster is what it was, comparatively rural and comparatively small, but enormous. What in truth can be a greater glory than that our Westminster should be the great school of this our empire city, gathering into her bosom all that mass of youths who live near her borders, and sending them forth into law or commerce, into holy orders or the other professions, into our colonies, into those distant regions of the world whithersoever the enterprise which is the characteristic of our nation may carry them, well trained in her noble traditions, full of love and reverence for the old paths and the good ways, full of love for that grand foundation which has made them what they are. Truly if we have not all that once was ours—the same position, the same pre-eminence among the schools of the land, the same hold upon what are called the higher classes of society—yet surely much remains to fill our hearts with joy, to make us thank God and take courage. Let us change the mood of our motto—'Det Deus incrementum.' Yes, Paul may plant and Apollos water, but it is God and God only who giveth the increase. And yet Paul must plant and Apollos water or the increase will not come. Let us thus do all our part; to each and to all, masters and scholars, the words apply—*Σπάρτην ἔλαχες, ταύτην κόσμει*. It is our privilege to call this grand old School our own; let us see that we make it our aim to exalt her to that place of honour in which I believe she may yet sit.

The Service altogether took about an hour and a quarter, of which the sermon occupied half an hour.

After the Service, a reception was given by the Head Master and masters in the Great School, which was numerously attended, it being computed that fully a thousand people were present.

WESTMINSTER WORTHIES.

NO. 26.—GEORGE COLMAN, THE ELDER.

It is, perhaps, a rather surprising circumstance that, with all the advantages of the dramatic training which they receive in connection with the Play, so few Old Westminsters should have risen into eminence on or

by the stage. But we must remember that the performances in Dormitory are calculated to train actors rather than playwrights, and it is only of recent years that the actor's calling has risen into such repute that anyone educated at a public school would think of adopting it. Amateur acting, which has done for the stage what the Volunteer movement has done for the Regular Army, cannot be traced back further than the reign of George II., and any young man of family who in the last century went on the stage would have been regarded with horror by his relations.

The elder Colman was to a great extent the creation of the Play. He inherited an artistic temperament from his father; but Plautus and Terence turned his attention to the drama, and he was indebted to them for numberless hints, which he always acknowledged with honourable promptitude. Indeed, he was over-anxious to proclaim his obligations in his earliest comedy, 'The Jealous Wife.' There is a scene which he asserts that he imitated from the 'Adelphi' of Terence, though there is absolutely nothing in common between his Charles Oakly and Syrus except intoxication. Sheridan might as well have confessed that he borrowed the jealousy of Sir Peter Teazle from Shakspeare's 'Othello.' But in this particular case we might suspect Colman, with some show of reason, of citing the authority of Terence to justify his own introduction of a most unpleasant scene, if not to conceal an acknowledged obligation to the author of 'Peregrine Pickle.'

George Colman, the elder, was born at Florence in April 1732. The exact date of his birth is uncertain, but he was baptized on April 18, receiving the name of the reigning monarch, who stood sponsor for him—an empty honour generally paid to ambassadors' children. His father, Francis Colman, was British envoy at the Court of Tuscany, a dilettante musician, correspondent of Handel, and amateur agent for the manager of the Opera at Drury Lane; but he died when George, his second child and only son, was little more than a year old, and just as the question of the Polish succession was about to 'let slip the dogs of war' in northern Italy. His widow was left in poor circumstances, but she was not without powerful friends, as her sister was married to William Pulteney, afterwards Lord Bath. This distinguished Old Westminster was a warm and consistent friend to young George Colman, whom he sent to his old school in 1744. Mrs. Colman found a residence till her death near Rosamund's Pond (now filled up) in the south-west corner of St. James's Park. When Colman went to Westminster Dr. Nicholl was head master, Dr. James Johnson, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester and (by translation) of Worcester, was second master, and the celebrated 'Vinnny' Bourne master of the fifth form. Warren Hastings and Robert Lloyd were in the Under School with him. Two years later, Colman was elected ninth into college Lloyd being three places above him; that election could claim the unprecedented honour of

including two future head masters, John Hinchcliffe and Samuel Smith, among its members. Fane William Sharpe, whose name is still commemorated by one of the School exhibitions, was captain. Cracherode, whose memory is preserved by a similar benefaction, had just been elected to Oxford. Charles Churchill, 'who blazed the comet of a season,' was at the head of the second elections. Warren Hastings and Elijah Impey were admitted into college in the following year. The biographer of Colman must regret that it is impossible to discover the casts of all the plays performed while he was in college; but, as the editors of the *Lusus* have failed to discover them, they must indeed be irrevocably lost. Colman took no part in the 'Ignoramus' performed in 1747, but in 1749 he acted Geta in 'Phormio,' when Frederick Vane, son of Lord Darlington, performed the title rôle. The play of 1748 has left no memorial behind—the 'Eunuchus' of 1750 nothing but an epilogue.

Colman's first recorded attempt at verse-writing was made when a second election. His Hudibrastic verses to his cousin, Viscount Pulteney, are by no means devoid of merit, even without taking into account the youth of the writer. Lloyd afterwards published them in the *St. James's Magazine*.

In 1750 Colman was head monitor, but as, according to the system then followed, this would have insured his election to Trinity, Lord Bath exerted his influence to enable him to 'stand over' for a year, and so secure a more valuable studentship at Christ Church. This arrangement was not unusual, and hardly irregular; in the election immediately above him there were two cases—not to mention one in that immediately below him—of boys who stayed five years in college, though over 14 when admitted. Of his Oxford life there is little or nothing to be said.

Lady Bath had quarrelled with Mrs. Colman, but, nevertheless, retained the warmest affection for her nephew, whom she destined for holy orders, while her husband was no less anxious that he should win wealth and reputation at the bar. Indeed, the persistence with which Lord Bath exhorted his 'dear Coley' to imitate Murray, then Solicitor-General, and, above all, to avoid 'running away to play-houses,' may well have grown monotonous.

But Colman, although he was called to the bar on taking his B.A. degree in 1755, had already tasted the sweets of literary success, and was not at all disposed to deny himself that luxury for the sake of a problematical career as a jurist. His first publication was a 'Vision,' which formed No. 90 of Dr. Hawkesworth's *Adventurer*. While still at Oxford he started, in partnership with Bonnell Thornton, an Old Westminster of somewhat longer standing, a paper called the *Connoisseur*, which must have met with some success, as it survived nearly three years. From time to time he formed fruitless resolutions to attempt to gratify the wishes of his generous uncle; for, to quote one of his characters, 'he indulged his own passions too much' to wish to thwart those of other people. But his was

not a nature—if any such exist—to drudge on at distasteful work without the sharp goad of poverty; and the dust was scarcely shaken from his law-books before it began to accumulate again. His associates, Thornton, Lloyd, and Churchill, were not of a character to encourage regularity and application, though Lord Bath never quite abandoned the hope of seeing his protégé upon the bench, and Colman's conscience was not quite easy at exercising his own preference, if we may judge from his verses written in 1757:—

There are whom love of poesy has smit,
Who blind to interest, arrant dupes to wit,
Have wandered devious on the pleasant road, &c.

It was about this time that he formed a close friendship with Garrick; it is not quite certain how the acquaintance was brought about—whether by Colman's 'Critical Reflections on the Old English Dramatists,' or by the delicately veiled flattery of his unsigned 'Letter of Abuse to David Garrick, Esq.' In any case, the introduction was effected either in 1757 or 1758.

In 1758 Colman took his M.A. degree, and in the September of the same year his aunt, Lady Bath, died, which removed one of his already insufficient inducements to persevere in the pursuit of his ostensible calling. Nevertheless, he went circuit in the following year, and defended two prisoners in capital cases. On that occasion Lord Bath wrote to him as follows: 'I am glad to hear of your notable success at Oxford. You say you got two guineas by saving two men from hanging. I wish you was [*sic*] to have two guineas apiece for every man in Oxford that deserves to be hanged, and then the University would be of some use to you.'

This, however, was almost his last appearance as an advocate, for his literary reputation was fast increasing. In that same year appeared his 'Ode to Obscurity and Oblivion,' written in ridicule of the poet who made 'gorgeous dames and statesmen old' appear promiscuously 'in bearded majesty.' In 1760 appeared his first attempt at dramatic writing—the farce, 'Polly Honeycomb,' played with some success by Yates, King, and Miss Pope. Garrick wrote the prologue, in which he exhorted the audience to—

Exert their favour for a young beginner,
Nor use the stripling like a battered sinner.

The piece itself it would scarcely be fair to criticise now, as Colman declined to claim any literary merit for it, and never inserted it in his collected dramatic works; but its success was sufficient to induce Garrick to accept a more ambitious effort of Colman's, 'The Jealous Wife,' which was produced in the February of the following year, and published soon afterwards with a letter to Lord Bath prefixed, in which Colman apologises for his choice of an occupation. It seems a little strange that he should have sought such publicity for a matter of purely private concern to his uncle and himself; but we cannot but admire the ingenuity with which he professes to have been corrupted by his uncle's wit, and concludes by exhorting

him, in the words of Dogberry, to 'correct himself for the example of others.'

'The Jealous Wife' made no pretensions to originality of plot. 'Tom Jones,' *The Spectator*, and his own *Connoisseur* are specified as having been laid under contribution. Lloyd wrote the prologue, and confessed on behalf of the author—

Books too he read, nor blush'd to use their store,

defending his friend by the example of Shakespeare.

The success of the piece was probably rather due to the acting of Garrick, Yates, Palmer, and Kitty Clive, than to any intrinsic merit of its own. The development of the plot is abrupt, and the characters exaggerated. Theatrical tradition asserts that Garrick wished to throw up the part of Oakly, and it was certainly unworthy of his powers. The gratuitous unpleasantness of the scene in which the hero, under the influence of drink, insults the young lady whom he is supposed to love, would never be tolerated by a modern audience; nothing comes of the incident, and, even if it were necessary to the plot, it was most unfair to try and throw the responsibility of it upon the author of the 'Adelphi.'

Colman himself was not altogether satisfied with the success of his *début*, if we may judge from his lines written about this time, in which he speaks of himself as—

That little sinner,
That essay weaver, drama spinner:
Too much the comic sock he'll use,
For 'tis the law must find him shows.
And though he thinks on Fame's wide ocean,
He sings and has a pretty notion.
Inform him, Lloyd, for all his grin,
That Harry Fielding holds his chin.

(To be continued.)

School Notes.

THE Play this year is 'The Adelphi' of Terence. The play nights are Thursday the 11th, Monday the 15th, and Wednesday the 17th December.

Orations were on Thursday, November 27 (being postponed a week), when the piece set for recitation was Byron's 'The Isles of Greece, the Isles of Greece.' Competitors numbered ten, but the reciting was hardly as good as it has been before. C. F. Watherston was first, A. Paget and T. Brailey were bracketed second—*sed longo intervallo*.

Sixes in Green are to be played off in the first week of December. Rules have been drawn up by a sub-committee of the Games Committee, as follows:—

1. Rules for play are the same as the rules for ordinary football, with the following exceptions:

(a) Provided there be only one full back, he may use his hands within a marked limit.

(b) The off-side rule shall hold for two men instead of three.

2. Each tie shall be played for twenty minutes, ten minutes each way.

3. The umpire must be a School-colour.

4. The touch-line shall be an imaginary line between the trees, not the railings, and the umpire shall be the sole judge of touch.

5. To score a goal, the ball must touch the railings, after passing between the trees which act as posts.

6. There shall be no change in a team after the draw.

There are as many as a hundred and fifty entries.

We notice that one of our contemporaries, the *Clavinian*, has taken to criticising other School Papers. *The Elizabethan* (or, as our critic calls it, *The Elizabethian*) once did this, but left off owing to complaints from the criticised. Are papers' feelings less sensitive now, or the criticisms less biting? Or why is this allowed to go on?

Of some thirty new coats-of-arms commenced on the wainscoting Up School, about a dozen are finished or advanced. They number many names of interest.

Among them is General Sir John Stuart, K.C.B., who was a 'Westminster Steward,' but of whom we can find no further mention in the *Alumni*.

Edward Vernon Harcourt is there, too, who was for forty years Archbishop of York; John Hacket, Bishop of Lichfield, who rebuilt his cathedral, and was a great benefactor of Trinity, Clare, and St. John's Colleges, Cambridge; and the genial and accomplished successor of the Papist Dean Massey, Dean Aldrich, of Christchurch, who, in addition to being a distinguished divine and musician, and a very good fellow, had some taste for architecture, and made the original plans for Peckwater and Canterbury Quadrangles—plans which, however, were not carried out; Madan Spencer, Bishop of Peterborough 1794-1813, cousin-german and friend of Cowper the poet; and William Gresley, Canon of Lichfield, author of sermons of some note, are the Churchmen.

Several more Westminster poets are there. Ben Jonson, one of the greatest and oldest Old Westminsters; Bentley's grandson, Richard Cumberland the dramatist, Charles Churchill, and Robert Southey; and lastly, the great names of Elijah Impey and Henry Fynes Clinton.

The following O.WW. have been called to the bar:—

Inner Temple.—P. M. Francke, B.A. Oxon.

Middle Temple.—M. H. M. T. Pigott, B.A. Oxon (30-guinea Middle Temple International and Constitutional Law Scholar, 1889), H. P. Lowe, B.A. Oxon.

The first half of the football season is now over, and we print its results below:—

Sat. Sept. 27	O. WW.....	Lost 2-8.
" Oct. 4	Clapham Rovers	Won 4-1.
" " 11	F. Bickley's XI.	Lost 1-4.
" " 18	J. P. Paul's XI.	Won 3-1.
" " 25	Casuals	Lost 2-4.
Wed. " 29	University College, Oxon.	Drawn 2-2.
Sat. Nov. 1	Christ Church, Oxon.	Lost 1-5.
" " 8	Crusaders.	Scratched.
" " 15	Lancing Old Boys.....	Drawn 0-0.
Mon. " 17	Cambridge O.WW	Won 6-0.
(Commemoration Day.)		
Sat. Nov. 22	Old Harrovians.....	Lost 2-4.
Wed. " 26	Trinity College, Oxon.....	Lost 1-6.
Sat. " 29	Royal Engineers	Scratched.

Matches played, 11—won, 3; drawn, 2; lost, 6. Goals for, 24; goals against, 35.

The match *v.* Royal Engineers on Saturday, November 29, was scratched owing to the snow.

THE FIELDS.

FOOTBALL.

THE SCHOOL *v.* LANCING OLD BOYS.

Played 'up fields' on Saturday, November 15.

Result: A draw, 0-0.

The visitors were not a very strong team, and we should have scored. The team played very well and showed good combination.

THE SCHOOL.

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

The visitors did not leave their names.

THE SCHOOL *v.* CAMBRIDGE O.WW.

Played 'up fields' in miserable weather on Monday, November 17.

Result: The School won by 6-0.

We cannot take very much credit for this match, as the visitors' team had no backbone, except perhaps Squire, who did not come off much on such a bad ground.

THE SCHOOL.

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

CAMBRIDGE O.WW.

J. Langton (goal), R. T. Squire, O. P. Stevens (backs), C. Daniel, G. Winter, C. C. Sharpe (half-backs), G. L. Edwards, W. A. W. Last, P. J. Preece, C. J. B. Hurst, C. A. Benn (forwards).

THE SCHOOL *v.* OLD HARROVIANS.

Played 'up fields' on Saturday, November 22.

Result: Old Harrovians won by 4 goals to 2.

We may, without presumption, claim this match to be a draw. Had it not been for misunderstandings

on two occasions in the game the visitors would not have scored four but two goals. It appears that W. T. Barwell, after a good run with Longhurst, put in a good shot which was generally considered a goal—indeed, one umpire gave it—but suddenly, while our forwards were walking quietly back, L. L. Cox rushed past and scored a goal. Hollocombe then retired for twenty minutes, and a goal was shot in his absence by the wing which he should have opposed.

Teams :

OLD HARROVIANS.

S. W. Morgan (goal), J. H. Farmer and R. Mortimer (backs), A. C. Sturgis, C. C. O. Forester and G. Macan (half-backs), L. L. Cox, C. E. Broughton, T. B. A. Clarke, G. L. Pares, and R. C. Kinlock (forwards).

THE SCHOOL.

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

THE SCHOOL v. TRINITY COLLEGE, OXON.

Played 'up fields' on Wednesday, November 26. Result : Trinity won by 6 goals to our 1.

Something seemed to be wanting in our team, and it was probably energy. This is nearly always the case at the end of the term. We lacked the valuable support of J. O. T. Powell, too, but we cannot by any means congratulate ourselves, especially when we find that Repton soon afterwards beat the same team.

THE SCHOOL.

A. C. Morris (goal), H. R. Blaker and J. S. Shearme (backs), F. B. Sherring, A. W. F. Guy, and J. C. Hollocombe (half-backs), A. L. Longhurst, W. T. Barwell, C. E. Page, H. O. Shoubridge, and E. A. Gates (forwards).

The visitors did not leave their names.

UPPER ELECTIONS v. RIGAUDS.

Played Thursday, November 13. Result : Upper Elections won by 1-0.

Teams :

RIGAUDS.

J. Langton (goal), H. R. Blaker and W. Armstrong (backs), J. Fanshawe, J. C. Hollocombe, and (half-backs), W. F. D'Arcy, H. B. Harvey, H. Langton, H. W. Gates, and E. A. Gates (forwards).

UPPER ELECTIONS.

A. M. Andrews (goal), A. L. Longhurst and J. S. Shearme (backs), F. B. Sherring, E. H. Cox, and R. Balfour (half-backs), A. C. Nesbitt, B. E. Strauss, J. H. Alderson, D. Shearme, and P. E. Knapp (forwards).

UPPER ELECTIONS v. H.B.B.

Played Thursday, November 20. Result : A draw, 1-1.

Teams :

UPPER ELECTIONS.

As above.

H.B.B.

A. C. Allen (goal), Howlett and Pilkington (backs), Fevey, A. W. F. Guy, and Robertson (half-backs), N. Doherty, Jones, Page, Morcom, and Shoubridge (forwards).

TRIAL HOUSE MATCH.

GRANTS v. H.B.B.

Played Wednesday, December 3. Result : H.B.B. 3, Grants 1.

Teams :

H.B.B.

Morris (goal), Howlett and Chatterton (backs), Robertson, Guy, Fevey (half-backs), Doherty, Jones, Page, Shoubridge, More (forwards).

GRANTS.

Fitzmaurice (goal), Powell and Campbell (backs) Burton, Yeld, Barwell (half-backs), Woodbridge, Teake, Gatty, Severn, Lampton (forwards).

DEBATING SOCIETY.

THE House met on Thursdays, November 12 and 20, to discuss the motion : 'That in the opinion of this House the present state of the periodical press is a disgrace to the country.'

For the motion : G. G. S. GILLET (Proposer) ; J. S. PHILLIMORE (Secunder) ; Mr. J. SARGEAUNT, D. SHEARME, R. BALFOUR.

Against the motion : L. F. WINTLE (Opposer) ; P. B. HENDERSON, L. R. HOLME, Mr. G. LENOX-CONYNGHAM, J. S. SHEARME.

THE PROPOSER mentioned all the chief evils of the press of the present day, and suggested several schemes for reform, notably the abolition of advertisements, in which opinion, however, he did not carry the House with him. He also objected to the slang and bad grammar that was to be found in the papers, more especially in the sporting papers of to-day.

THE OPPOSER did not venture to defend the comic and vulgar papers, which he thought were not worthy of the name of papers at all.

THE SECONDER especially criticised local papers, giving as an example of their style a quotation from a Hampshire paper which had said, in connection with a harvest festival, that 'Mrs. —, supported by her gardeners, had made a fine effect upon the font.'

MR. SARGEAUNT pointed out some rather patent faults in the Proposer's speech, excluding which faults he would vote for the motion.

THE debate was re-opened on the following Thursday by the Proposer, who was followed by P. B. HENDERSON, who, in a very fluent speech, failed to bring up many arguments of serious weight, and was severely criticised in turn by D. SHEARME.

AFTER the Opposer had made a few remarks, L. R. HOLME rose and defended the comic and vulgar papers ; he was followed by Mr. LENOX-CONYNGHAM, who proved to the House that newspaper-English must not be taken as the standard of the English language. He said that few papers were ever found abroad but the *Times* and *Punch*, and, as these were the best of English papers, the standard of the English press was judged to be a very good one from without.

After J. S. SHEARME had spoken strongly against the motion, the debate degenerated into a conversation, and the motion was finally lost by 17 to 4.

The following motion was discussed on November 27: 'That a basis of literary training is essential to a good public school education, and that the introduction of Modern sides into old established public schools is greatly to be deprecated.'

For the motion: R. BALFOUR (*Proposer*), A. L. LONGHURST (*Secunder*), F. B. SHERRING, L. F. WINTLE, Mr. G. LENOX-CONYNGHAM.

Against the motion: A. Y. G. CAMPBELL (*Opposer*), J. S. PHILLIMORE.

This debate was not to be compared with the last, though the speeches of the Proposer, Opposer, and Secunder showed careful preparation of the subject.

F. B. SHERRING also made his maiden speech.

It is greatly to be regretted that no members of the Modern side were present, as they would have prevented the one-sided view that the House was taking.

The OPPOSER did not venture to disagree with the first half of the motion.

The criticism on Modern sides chiefly became a criticism on the Modern side at Westminster. Some specimens of the Latin of the Modern side were quoted.

The motion was eventually lost by 8-4.

POETRY.

L'INDÉCISE.

Oh, why must I drive myself frantic
To make this embarrassing choice
Between Jack who has swum the Atlantic
(Or something) and Dick with the voice?
Is it right that a brow should be waxen,
Or vexed by the wind and the skies?
Brown hair is diviner than flaxen,
But blue is the colour for eyes.

You see, if when it comes to proposing,
I'd better know which to accept;
Though a certain allowance for prosing,
And tears (which would have to be wept),
Gives time to dispel hesitation,
I'm sure to be flurried the while;
And mistakes would give rise to vexation
I couldn't set right with a smile.

My mind is an absolute Babel,
Confused without reason or rhyme.
Though the park has a glorious stable,
The oaks at the hall are sublime,
And so on. Perhaps, on reflection,
I'd better say 'no' when they woo,
And wait for a third whose perfection
Combines the good points of the two.

ALGERNON.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

I SEE in your last issue but one a reference to the execution of a Westminster scholar for forgery. As your account is not strictly correct in all its details, I subjoin the following account, extracted from the 'Newgate Calendar.' The facts there stated are these:—'John Dyer was indicted for uttering on the 7th May, 1789, a forged acceptance to a bill of exchange for £10. 10s. on Messrs. Hankeys, bankers, purporting to have been accepted by Joseph Chapman Hankey.' He is stated to have been of respectable parentage, and to have been brought up in a merchant's office, and was at the time in the service of a man named Kelsy, under whose directions he said he had acted. He had originally been educated at Westminster School, and was scarcely nineteen years of age. He was found guilty, and executed at Newgate on August 5, 1790. From this it is evident that he was not at school when he committed the crime; nor does it appear that he was a scholar. On the latter point, however, there may be evidence in the 'Alumni.'—J. H. C.

THE ROOF OF BIG SCHOOL.—The following extract from Hurst's 'Tredgold's Carpentry' may be of interest. Fig. 79 is a sketch of the roof of Westminster School from Smith's 'Specimens of Ancient Carpentry.' It shows the form most usual for Gothic halls, which differ more in the ornaments and tracery than in the essential parts of the framing. The timbers are so disposed as to throw the pressures a considerable way down the walls, and at the same time in nearly a vertical direction. Indeed, considering the effect that was intended to be produced, the arrangement of the parts is worthy of much praise.—X. Y. Z.

CAN anyone say whether the Q.S.S. have ever possessed the privilege of interment within the Abbey precincts? If not, how came it that one, Collier, a young barrister, was buried in Cloisters about 1750? He was of no eminence whatever.—W. H. A. COWELL.

THE following transcript from the 'Annual Register' may serve as a partial answer to F. C.'s query in the October number. It ought to be possible to fill up the gap between the opposite poles of his career, a place at Westminster and the gallows at the Old Bailey:—'1790, August 4.—At half-past seven o'clock, John Dyer, for forgery, was brought out of Newgate, and, after the usual solemnities, was executed before the debtor's gate in the Old Bailey, pursuant to his sentence. He was only 22 years of age, and was brought up at Westminster School.' From Dyer's age it will be seen that he can hardly have been a Westminster boy at the time of his trial.—Z.

ROWING AT WESTMINSTER.¹

THE editor of this book is to be congratulated upon having produced a very interesting and complete account of the performances of Westminster upon the river. The period covered is from 1813 to 1883, the information being obtained, for the most part, from the School Water Ledgers.

The races between Eton and Westminster will probably have the most interest for Westminsters as well as others. We find that Eton proved victorious on nine occasions, while Westminster won only four races—viz., those of 1837, 1842, 1845, and 1846. The most memorable race is undoubtedly that of 1837, when King William IV. insisted on seeing the race, notwithstanding the efforts of Dr. Hawtrey and Lord Howe to keep him in the Castle. The Rev. W. Rogers, who rowed No. 5 in the Eton boat, says: 'I remember well his figure seated in a close carriage, wrapped in a white great-coat, about 150 yards from the bridge. As soon as he saw that the Westminsters were ahead, he pulled down the blinds, and drove back to the Castle, which I do not think he afterwards left.' The race took place on May 4, and the King died on June 20, the Eton boys attributing his illness to their defeat. The number of times that the race was stopped by one or both head masters seems remarkable to us in these days, when inter-public-school competitions of every sort are so much encouraged.

One of the most remarkable rows recorded is that of April 23, 1825, when an eight-oar went to Windsor and back in twenty-one hours, the actual time they were rowing being fourteen hours. They left the Horseferry at 3 A.M., went through Windsor Bridge at 2 P.M., saw Eton, dined at Staines, and reached the Horseferry at midnight. Mr. J. H. Bailey, who rowed No. 4, says: 'We left one oar at Richmond on our way down, and at Putney our stroke oar was so done up that he lay at the bottom of the boat, and we came the last six miles with only six oars, in a pouring rain.' The distance from the Horseferry stairs to Windsor Bridge is given as fifty-six miles (the Ledger says the bargemen are paid for sixty miles); but surely there must be some mistake about this. The distance between Windsor Bridge and London Bridge, according to Tombleson's map of the Thames, is forty-four miles, and this agrees with the distance recorded by the Thames Conservancy at Old Windsor Lock (thirty-nine and three-quarter miles), which is about four miles below Windsor. But, under any circumstances, this row remains a remarkable feat of strength and endurance.

The last Old Westminster in the Cambridge eight was R. H. Coke, who rowed in 1885; but at Oxford we have had no representative since E. Giles rowed in 1871.

The book contains also records of the annual

¹ 'Rowing at Westminster.' (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., Ltd. 1890.)

Town Boy and Queen Scholar races, both the cups being held now by the Queen Scholars; also of the races for the Colquhoun sculls, the goblets, &c.

From 1867 to 1871 there was no Water, owing to the building of the Thames Embankment, and the consequent difficulty of getting boats; but in 1872 Water was revived at Wandsworth. The School sent a four to Henley several times, but never succeeded in obtaining the Public Schools Challenge Cup.

The book closes with the melancholy announcement, that, 'in 1884, the alteration of hours introduced by the new head master caused the total discontinuance of boating.'

Among those who distinguished themselves in after life, we find Sir E. Vaughan Williams, Archdeacon King of Rochester, Bishop Short of Adelaide, General Markham, the second Earl Amherst, the third Lord Forester, Dean Fremantle of Ripon, Canon Ellison, the Duke of Richmond, Dean Butler of Lincoln, the Earl of Normanton, Lord Esher, Sir Warrington Smyth, Sir Patrick Colquhoun (to whom the book is dedicated), Admiral Somerset, and Lord Stalbridge.

It only remains to add that the book is illustrated with some very good etchings by Mr. Herbert Marshall.

X.Y.Z.

Correspondence.

FROM OUR OXFORD CORRESPONDENT.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—I must apologise for omitting to mention in my last letter that M. E. Coster got Fourth Class Honours in Law at the end of last term.

A. J. Lee has obtained a Theological Studentship of the Diocese of Exeter, for which he has our best congratulations.

F. Street played in the last 'Varsity match (against Crusaders on November 22) and shot three goals. We had arranged to played Old Carthusians last Friday, but it was unfortunately stopped by the snow.

The Club had a Smoking Concert on Thursday, November 13, which was very successful. There was some good singing, and two original recitations by Aveling, which were very amusing. It is to be hoped that this will be made a terminal event.

Hoping that the Play is progressing satisfactorily,
I remain, yours obediently,
BOSPOROS.

Oxford: November 30, 1890.

COMMEMORATION.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—Ere the Play with its countless distractions drives out of Westminster minds all thought of the now annual Latin Service, may I, while congratulating all therewith concerned on the marked improvement which this year's service showed over that of 1889, point out one or two additions and alterations which might, I think with advantage, be made to the printed form of service distributed about the Abbey, with a view to securing greater accuracy and unanimity?

At the end of the versicles immediately following the opening 'Pater Noster,' and before the 'Gloria Patri,' I

would suggest the insertion of the words 'All standing.' I imagine that it was quite by accident that we sang the 'Gloria Patri' kneeling on November 17. Then at the end of the 'Forma Commendationis' it seemed extremely inconvenient to begin the versicles following (I am not sure if I am using a right term) before the head master had reached his seat. This might be obviated either by the introduction of a hymn or by a rubric directing the congregation to rise and stand until the master is again in his stall.

As to the music itself, I should like to make one or two suggestions. With so large and unformed a choir, it is really necessary to print in the books of service the music for *all* the responses and *amens*. Otherwise, the result is sure to be at least a terrible want of precision, or, worse, complete confusion, owing to some singing in unison, and others in harmonies of their own arrangement. Again, in the Psalms and Te Deum, there should be marks to indicate what verses are to be sung 'full,' &c.

I venture to think, but of this I am not certain, that the pointing of the Glorias is still wrong. I believe that the wavy line should come before the last two syllables of the word 'glor-ia,' the effect being to sing (*e.g.* in the first chant) F, G, B flat on the syllable 'glor,' 'iä' are then sung on B flat, and the accent remains as before on the first syllable of *Patri*. I hope my meaning is clear.

Lastly, a suggestion was made to me by an O.W. who was singing in the Choir that it would be very nice and suitable, provided that 'Salvator Mundi' be the hymn chosen, to sing the last verse kneeling.

I must apologise for taking up so much of your space. I do so hoping that some, if not all, of these suggestions may find approval with the authorities, and, carried into execution, may greatly further the devotional and seemly conduct of what is undoubtedly a very grand service, such as is likely to become prominent among the many Westminster anniversaries.

I remain, Sir, yours truly,
Z.

'ALAPAE WESTMONASTERIENSES.'

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—As I happen to be in the way of meeting many O.W.W., I have out of mere curiosity asked no less than forty-two of them their opinions on the 'Alapae Westmonasterienses,' keeping my own to myself. Ten of the number expressed their decided approval of it, seven seemed to consider it fairly good, three somewhat twaddle, while the remaining twenty-two termed it utter trash. For myself I would venture to say that there are certainly two or three good epigrams, but the vast majority seem to be entirely pointless. So I take the liberty of suggesting that if anyone should intend to write another such book he should remember, first, that nonsense verses can also be clever, and, to write such, a certain amount of brain is necessary, and, secondly, that pointless epigrams are always superfluous even when inserted simply for the purpose of filling up.

Believe me, yours sincerely,
EX-QUEEN'S-SCHOLAR.

November 16, 1890.

SQUASH RACKETS.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—In the November number of *The Elizabethan* I see some correspondence on the subject of a revival of the old 'wires' in a modified form. I daresay it would make a game, and, as your correspondent suggests that the Games Committee should give a challenge trophy to be competed for annually, I think this point might be settled by my returning the silver wire, the old challenge trophy of the 'Wires' Competition. It has now been in my possession since 1887, and I think the present a favourable opportunity for returning it to the School.

I am, Sir, yours truly,
A. G. PROTHERO.

Malta: November 21, 1890.

H.BB. CRICKET.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your correspondent who pompously signs himself 'Capt. of Cricket,' I should like to say that it is perfectly impossible for H.BB. to attend evening station, get back home again, and do any work at night. But, oh! we beg pardon, we forgot for the moment that our noble founders intended the School to be an athletic club.

Your correspondent's unwarranted attack on the head of H.BB. is probably only provoked by his absence.

Lastly, I should think that even the 'Capt. of Cricket' would find it difficult to explain the connection between the non-appearance of the Upper Remove and H.BB. patriotism.

Wishing that 'Capts. of Cricket' would think before they write,

I am, yours, &c.,
VINDEK.

THE FOOTBALL TEAM.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—I happen to know that there is great despondency among football authorities at Westminster at present, owing to what they choose to call 'the rankness of the team.' It is doubtless quite right that there should be a strong feeling about the reverses the School have suffered in the last two matches, the latter of which was a lamentable display from a Westminster point of view; but I don't think it should go as far as despondency when there is a remedy to be found. As a constant spectator at Vincent Square, perhaps I may be allowed to give my opinion, and I should like to do so in a short exhortation to the members of the team. You have got weight, and you have got some skill; but you have got a terrible amount of half-heartedness, which is the ruin of any team. When you go for a man, I can see you don't much care whether you get the ball or not. A forward says to himself, 'Oh, the half-back will stop him'; and the half-back, when dishd, says, 'I needn't trouble to get back, — is a safe kick; and besides, even if they do get a goal, it will be all the same in the long run as far as I am concerned.'

For goodness' sake, Westminster, stop this half-hearted, don't-care play, and think of your School, not of yourselves; you will have to put up with a little inconvenience; perhaps you will even feel badly done up after the match, but you must put up with that if you would make the School's football record better than it has been for the last two or three seasons. Let every member of the team, as he reads this, register a vow to forget himself completely in the matches next term, to play wholly and unselfishly for his School, and we shall see some good results. I feel perfectly certain of this. Let me never more hear, as I heard to-night, the following sentiment expressed: 'It were better for Westminster if we had no footer at all.' Mr. Editor, I have not been thinking of any special member of the team in these remarks, though, as far as I can judge, they apply to some more than to others.

X.

OXFORD v. CAMBRIDGE.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—In your last number you published a letter from your Cambridge correspondent in which were these words: 'Owing to the preference of Westminster for Oxford over Cambridge' κ.τ.λ. Now, sir, I should like to know what authority your correspondent has for that statement. The fact is that Westminster, as anyone else would do, prefer £100 a year to £40 a year. It is not owing to any preference for Oxford that so many Westmins es go to the House, but because most people here, being poor, find it easier to live at Oxford with a £100 annual scholarship than at Cambridge with one of £40.

Yours, &c.,
WESTMINSTER.

O.W.W. AT OXFORD.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—May I correct a statement in your last month's School Notes? You say there are more O.W. Freshmen at Oxford than from any other school. If you had said 'Christ Church' instead of Oxford, you would have been right.

P.P.

THE DEBATING SOCIETY.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—A letter appeared in your last number containing a statement that I caused the failure of the last session of the Debating Society. If that was your correspondent's opinion, it is a pity that he did not express it a year ago, when the failure might have been to some extent avoided; and it is unfortunate that he did not decide whether there was any failure to explain before he attempted to explain it.

His first charge is that I did not enforce the rules preventing a debate from becoming a conversation. By this, I suppose, he must mean the rule which limits the number of speeches that each member may make in a debate. It is customary, when a member wishes to speak more than the lawful number of times, for the President to ask the House whether it wishes to hear the member again; therefore, it is the House's fault, not the President's, if the rule is not enforced. The shortness of the speeches was not the cause but the effect of the weakness of the Society; the good speakers of the previous session had left, and their places were taken by a large number of new members who had to learn to speak: this they did best by speaking often, and not trying to say too much at a time.

To turn to the other charges, there is no rule, written or unwritten, that the President should be responsible for the number of speakers, and there is no necessity for such a rule; and it is not an essential part of the duties of the President that he should keep debates going on when all the members have said what they have to say on the subject.

If the Society was dissatisfied with me, it was always open to it to get rid of me and elect the efficient President who 'can always be found in the School.' Why did not your correspondent come forward and induce the Society to save itself? If we may take his own explanation, it was because there was no failure from the members' point of view; and, if there was no failure from the members' point of view, there was surely no failure at all. The Society exists for its members, not for readers of *The Elizabethan*; and the members who are present at the debates are more likely to have a correct opinion of them than those who can only judge from bad reports. If there was no failure, it is obvious that I could not have caused it.

But I was not the only cause of this imaginary failure; the T.B.B., it appears, were equally to blame. Certainly the T.B.B. did not do all that they might have done, but that is no reason why they should not be given credit for what they did. Not only were there T.B.B. wishing to be elected last year, but nine actually were elected; and, on an average, two-thirds of them were present at each meeting in the play term. They were less regular the next term, but still some of the best speakers were T.B.B. Surely the better answer to the sneer about Junior Q.S.S. is that, in consequence of the rule about the qualifications of members, it very rarely happens that a Junior can be elected because he is a Q.S., or for any other reason whatever. This answer quite disposes of the obnoxious suggestion; and it has the additional advantage of being true.

Yours truly,

P. WILLIAMSON.

THE DEBATING SOCIETY.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—For many years have I now read monthly the reports of the Debating Society in your columns; consequently I have been much interested in the correspondence which has

lately drawn out so many opinions as to the cause of the degeneracy of that institution.

Myself—I never was a member of the Debating Society, but I have a distinct recollection of once attending one of its meetings 'up-school' as a visitor; not because I was anxious to refresh myself in the interval between 'lockers' and tea by gazing on my more gifted friends 'varying long spells of somnolence with conversational utterances' (to quote the happy phrase of 'An Ex-Member'), but because it was confidently expected that a certain muscular, athletic, and withal pugnacious T.B. was likely to settle certain differences, which unhappily existed between himself and a similarly gifted Q.S., by the issue of that striking and summary method of argument with the materials for which nature had generously endowed him. For the satisfaction of the present Debating Society authorities, I must add that their predecessors of that date were not, after all, submitted to the degradation of witnessing so unhallowed a proceeding.

Such, then, being the extent of my more immediate knowledge of the Society, I venture to offer to you, sir, a suggestion or two which a pretty constant reading of *The Elizabethan* has led me to suppose might be beneficial if adopted. In this matter I can lay claim to no bias—not even to those trifling prejudices which must necessarily cling to an 'ex-member' of the Society. In fact, I feel I am now the humble representative of that unfortunately large majority of mankind to whom the doors of the Westminster School Debating Society are of necessity closed, but to whom it is permitted month by month to gather what information of its proceedings may be vouchsafed them in the impartial revelations of *The Elizabethan*.

In the first place, I cannot help thinking that it was a mistake abolishing the old system of abbreviated reports of the speeches for publication in *The Elizabethan*, and instead instructing the Secretary to write a critique. I should think that these critiques are extremely discouraging to young members. I observe (vol. vi. p. 39) that the motion was only carried, 'after a very acrimonious debate,' by the vice-president's casting vote. (Can it be, sir, that pining for the fun you used in old times to extract from your contemporaries by freely criticising them, you felt the members of the Debating Society would prove an excellent substitute and supply the needful witty element to *The Elizabethan*?)

But what I, as an outside observer do wonder at, is why the Society's officers do not exercise some sort of supervision over the subjects chosen for discussion. If they did, let us hope that such silly and priggish motions, as I am about to quote from your report, would never have been suffered to enter the Minute Book:—

(1) 'That there is no such thing as absolute good or evil, but only a conception of good or evil dependent on popular opinion.'

(2) 'That the vulgarity and degeneracy of the present day is the natural outcome of a too great material civilisation, and that this civilisation is fatal to artistic development, the only test by which the greatness of a nation can really be measured.'

Comment on these ridiculous propositions is superfluous, as probably the unfortunate members who may have tried to discuss them found. How can anybody be expected to argue respectably about such things? I should think that there would be no alternative to 'conversational utterances' on such subjects. Fancy preparing a debating speech for a school debating society on the 'absolute existence of good and evil'!

I take another motion, the subject of which is the 'House of Stuart.' Why, in the very wording of the motion, is every member of that unfortunate house to be reviled as 'utterly contemptible, degraded, abandoned, and profligate'? Surely this multiplicity of adjectives is extremely childish; all that sort of thing can be imagined and taken for granted.

I am very pleased, though, to observe that such motions as I have above quoted are very much the exception; were, indeed, that not the case, I should feel inclined to suggest 'that the inanity and degeneracy of the Debating Society of the present day is the natural outcome of a too profound puerility, and that

this puerility is fatal to debating development, the only test by which the greatness of a debating society can be measured.'

Yes, sir, let the officers of the Society see that sensible motions on subjects likely to awaken a general interest are *always* put forward, and let members feel that their discussions have a definite and sensible object; then, perhaps, they will take the trouble to prepare speeches, and get up the subjects, and so help to infuse enthusiasm into the members, and life into the proceedings of that eminent Society of which your correspondent must again confess that he himself was

NEVER A MEMBER.

Our Contemporaries.

WE beg to acknowledge, with thanks, the receipt of: *The Ousel, The Blue, The Radleian, The Carncrosshurstian, The Felstedian, The Seminary Echo, The Reptonian, The Pauline, The Marlburian, The Haileyburian, The Wykhamist, The Cheltonian, The Cliftonian, The Cambridge Review (4), The Penn Charter Magazine, The Alleynian, The Bradfield College Chronicle, The Newtonian, The Meteor, The Durham University Journal, The Milvernian, The Ulula, The Carthusian, The Derbeian, The Blundellian, The Shirburnian, The South*

Eastern College Magazine, The Clavinian, The Wellingtonian, The Raven.

NOTICES.

All contributions to the Play number of *The Elizabethan* must be sent in to the Editor, St. Peter's College, Westminster, not later than January 20, 1891.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Morrat.