

# THE REVIVAL OF THE GRANTITE REVIEW.

Since the end of last Summer term the GRANTITE REVIEW has slumbered in an untimely grave; and doubtless many of its readers saw in the "Farewell" of the last number, what might seem, good reasons for so sudden an ending. But if we study the matter carefully, we find that the difficulties which presented themselves to the last Editors were of a kind which, with a little pluck and energy, might easily be surmounted, and that pluck and energy we propose to devote to the GRANTITE in its revived existence. Despite the fact that those Editors found it beyond their power to make the paper anything but exiguus, yet we venture to hope that in our turn we may not only leave exiguus behind, but also may acquire the vires eundo which the motto of the paper asserts it will attain, and present to our supporters, at the end of each term, a lively record of interesting and noteworthy occurrences which have happened in that term. Under these conditions, we trust that in its revival the GRANTITE REVIEW will have as flourishing and prosperous a career as it undoubtedly deserves.

The GRANTITE REVIEW has once more risen from its The difficulties attending the production of such ashes. a paper are manifest, for its existence is justified only by its endeavour to record matters relating for the most part to one House; it must therefore necessarily be somewhat scanty and devoid of startling interest. The attempt to revive it is to be commended, as actuated by patriotic Let us hope that the Editor will be rewarded motives. for his energy by achieving the success he deserves. No doubt one of the chief obstacles to this result is the fact that most of the events recorded in a House-paper are also to be found in the *Elizabethan*; but these events, such as House Matches, &c., are naturally allotted greater space in a paper whose special object is to record them, and, for this reason, its columns should not be without interest to Grantites.

If past and Present Grantites be willing to support the paper with their pen and purse, there is no reason why it should not have a long and honourable career. Fitful and short-lived as it has been, it boasts longer periods of existence than other House-papers, which were mainly characterized by paltry invective and unsuccessful attempts at facetiousness. It only remains for GRANTITE supporters to shew that its revival is thoroughly approved, and that its reproduction is welcome to all interested in Grantite matters.

## NOTES.

We have to record a more successful football season this year than the last. Last season we only scored 3 goals to our opponents 15, whereas during the present season we have won 7 goals and lost 14. The results are as follows:—Junior Ashburnham beat us 2 goals to 3; we drew 3rd Elections 2-2; and beat Ashburnham in the Trial House Match by 2-1; but were defeated by H.B B. 1-7; and in the Shield Match this term, Rigauds beat us 4-0. W. F. Fox, H. E. T. Agar, L. J. Moon, G. Hutchinson and C. Stanhope-Jones, have all received their House-Colours.

We are glad to say that Mr. Tanner has kindly put up some more panelling in "Inner", on which future Grantites will be able to carve their names.

K. Kelly in the Modern Shell, from being an H.B. has become a boarder up Grants this term.

# TOWN-BOY CHALLENGE SHIELD.

## GRANTS v. RIGAUDS.

This match was played up Fields on Saturday, March 12th, and resulted in a win for Rigauds by 4 goals to nil. Berens won the toss and Woodbridge started the ball from the church end, the wind being in favour of our opponents who at once began to press and brought play into the Grantite half. Rigauds penned us hard but were unable to break through the Grantite defence. Several corners fell to Rigauds, which all proved fruitless, many of them being kicked behind the line, and though some good attempts were made to score, we managed to keep them in check. Up to half-time neither side had got a goal, but on crossing over, Rigauds forced the game and Nve succeeded in notching the first point for his side (1-0). After the ball had again been started, a little give-and-take play ensued, but D'Arcy, who had come forward, bringing the ball down the centre defeated our goalkeeper and scored a second goal (2-0). Rigauds' third goal was the out-come of a shot by Praed, which though stopped, was eventually rushed through by Waterfield (3-0). After a short interval, Nye got possession of the ball, from a kickoff behind, and with a stinging shot added the last point for his side, this making the score four love. We were unfortunate in being without the services of Gatty and

Agar, while Rigauds were also minus Allen and Armstrong. There is no doubt that our forwards were weak, and it was owing to the fact that they were unable to break away to any extent that gave so much work to our back division. Hutchinson played very well in goals, while Fitzmaurice, Severn and Fox shewed good form. Moon worked hard at half-back and promises to be a good player.

For Rigauds, Berens, Nye and D'Arcy were the best The teams were :---

Rigauds:-- H. W. Gates (goal); \* W. D'Arcy and \*J. Langton (backs); H. Barwell; \* L. D'Arcy and C. Probyn (half-backs); H. Waterfield and F. Urch (right); B. C. Praed and \* H. Nye (left); \* E. Berens (Capt.) (centre) (forwards).

Grants: — G. Hutchinson (goal); \* D. Fitzmaurice and C. Stanhope-Jones (backs); W. F. Fox, \* A. R. Severn and L. J. Moon (half-backs); A. H. Woodbridge and G. Lambert (right); G. Scott and K. Kelly (left); \* E. T. Woodbridge (Capt.) (centre) (forwards).

## RIGAUDS v. HOME-BOARDERS.

# FINAL TIE.

This match, which was decided up Fields on Wednesday, March 16th, resulted in a win for Rigauds by 2 goals to 1, after a very exciting game. Homeboarders lost the toss, and Shimield started the ball, the Rigaudites defending the Church end. At first the Homeboarders pressed and were very close to scoring several times, keeping the game very near the Rigaudite goal; but the latter gradually assumed the offensive and with Berens as centre-forward carried the ball into close proximity to the H.BB. goal. For some time, however, they were unable

• Played last year.

4

to score, but about a quarter of an hour before half-time, Praed, with a good shot, registered the Rigaudites' first point. When sides had been changed, some exciting play was witnessed, both sides wiring up hard, and towards the end of the game, Urch, making a good run down, got the ball past Allen and added a second goal, with a hot low shot, from the side. After the ball had again been set rolling, the most vigorous play ensued, and Shimield, amid the shouts of Homeboarders, notched a goal for his side, only a few minutes before the whistle sounded; leaving Rigauds the winners by 2-1. The latter played up well, Berens and Nye being the most conspicuous; rather too rough a game was carried on by Langton at back, which ought to have been avoided. For H.BB., Newman, Shimield, Howlett and Longhurst were good, while Allan did some useful work at back; H.BB. were without the valuable assistance of C. E. Page (Capt.).

The teams were :---

Rigauds:—H. W. Gates (goal); \*W D'Arcy and \*J. Langton (back); H. Barwell, \*L. D'Arcy and C. Probyn (half-backs); H. Waterfield and F. Urch (right); B. C. Praed and \*H. Nye (left); \*E. Berens (Capt.) (centre) (forwards).

Homeboarders:—V. Rigby (goal); \* M. Allen (Capt.) and B. Howlett (backs); V. Bristowe, F. Plaskitt and \* T. Newman (half-backs); H. C. Wilson and H. F. Carr (right); F. W. Longhurst and T. D. Millar (left); W. Shimield (centre) (forwards).

\* Played last year.

# THE YARD TIES.

# BOARDERS' FIRST ROUND.

D. Tacey	)		(A. Severn
J. Lesley	}	beat	{G. Lambert
G. Hutchinson	)		G. Phillimore

by 22-12. Hutchinson played well for the winners.

A. H. Woodbridge F. Fox G. Scott	}	beat	$ \begin{cases} E. T. Woodbridge \\ W. Willet \\ L. Burroughes \end{cases} $
--	---	------	--

by 12-9. This was a good tie, the winners playing hard.

A. R. Severn	)	(E. Kite
K. Kelly	> beat	{H. Agar
P. Day	)	(L. Moon

by 15-6. A. Scott a bye.

HALF-BOARDERS.

D. Fitzmaurice	)		(A. Gatty
G. Horner	{	beat	B. Stanhope-Jones
W. Chapman	)		(D. Jowers

by 15--9.

C. L. Stanhope	e-Jones	)
Mathews		a bye
H. Watt		)

Two of the losers in the first round were drawn to complete a tie in the second.

SECOND ROUND.

C. Stanhope-Jones G. Scott D. Tacey	}	beat	$\begin{cases} G. Hutchicson \\ J. Lesley \\ A. Scott \end{cases}$
by 14—3.			

A. Gatty	)		(A. H. Woodbridge
K. Kelly	Ę	beat	W. Chapman
W. F. Fox	)		(A. Scott

by 31-3; Gatty's side won easily as may be seen from the result.

A. R. Severn	)		G. Horner
D. Fitzmaurice	- F	beat	{ H. Watt
E. Kite	)		( Mathews

by 29-2.

## SEMIFINAL ROUND.

D. Fitzmaurice	)		E. Kite
G. Scott	Ş	beat	{D. Jacey
K. Kelly	<b>)</b>		F. Fox

by 22-11.

A. R. Severn A. Gatty C. Stanhope Jones } a bye

## FINAL TIE.

D. Fitzmaurice K. Kelly C. Stanhope-Jones beat beat A. R. Severn A. J. Gatty G. Scott by 13-9.

E. T. Woodbridge played as substitute for Gatty, who was out of school. The tie was very even until within a few minutes from the end, the score at half-time being 6-5 in Severn's favour. Fitzmaurice played energetically for the winners; and the losers all played up hard.

# GRANTITE LITERARY SOCIETY.

The meetings of this society have been continued this reason with very fair success; several plays have been read, and some of the scenes have gone off very well, but there is still room for improvement. A little more spirit would be a very good thing; and fellows ought to try to convey the meaning more clearly and put more life into the reading than they do at present. The Literary Society is a good institution and deserves to be well supported.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

#### To the Editor of the GRANTITE REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,

Might we make the suggestion of introducing "Cricket Ties" in the yard? Surely, with about four or five fellows a side there might be some very interesting games. Also, on skying a ball, let the batsman be out and three runs scored to the other side!

Hoping this suggestion will meet with your approval,

Yours, etc.,

### X, Y and Z.

[We do not see why such ties should not be instituted. -ED.]

## To the Editor of the GRANTITE REVIEW.

#### DEAR SIR,

Not so very long ago, I believe there used to exist a Debating Society "up Grants" which for a time was very popular. Surely in a House like ours, such a society could be formed again, and be made to flourish, meeting, say, once a week to discuss subjects of universal interest, which the School Society appears to fail in doing.

Thanking you in anticipation for the space granted me in your valuable columns and trusting that what I have said may be of some use,

I remain, yours,

#### ORATOR.

[Such a Society did exist ; but whether it would prosper, if revived, is doubtful.—ED.]

#### To the Editor of the GRANTITE REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,

Is there not a rule to the effect that a fellow may only cut his name once in each "Chiswick", unless he has a special reason for cutting it again, such as becoming a double "Pink"? This rule, if such there is, has been of late neglected; one fellow especially, with no very great deeds to boast of, having cut his name no less than five times in "Middle", thus filling up all the remaining available spaces. This seems a great shame on fellows who have not cut their names at all, and I think it would be a very good thing if all there, but one, were cut out, and new pieces put in, so as to make a little more room.

Yours, etc.,

WOODCUTTER.

[This is going to be done as far as possible.—ED.]

### To the Editor of the GRANTITE REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,

I am sorry to find that "racquets" do not apparently find favour "up Grants". For the last four years, the cup has been won by a member of this House, but if Grantites no longer support the game or enter for the ties, the trophy must soon be wrested from them. Last year, Grants sent in four entries for the ties; this year, only one. I hope that in the future, Grants will make some attempt to retain what is, I believe, the oldest Challenge-cup in the School.

Yours, etc.,

RACQUETS.

To the Editor of the GRANTITE REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,

Would it not be possible to enlarge the House Library and make it more interesting? Surely if an extra sixpence, or even a shilling, was added to the paper-subscriptions, a few more books that would be more amusing and interesting to the fellows, could be added; as I think that most of the books in the Library (to use a vulgar expression) are rather "stale", especially to the more ancient members of the House. Deeply apologising for thus intruding on your valuable columns,

Yours etc.,

ONE WHO NEVER READS THEM.

#### To the Editor of the GRANTITE REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,

I wish to call attention through your columns to football "as she is played" in the yard "up Grants". It is certainly an excellent game, but I doubt whether it really does much to improve fellows' play "up Fields". I am inclined to think that it encourages a careless style of play, half Rugby and half Association, as when fellows stop the ball with their hands, etc. I know that there are those "up Grants" who are brilliant in the yard, but quite useless "up Fields". This may be due to the greater opportunities for "ragging" with the ball in the yard and the desire to play a somewhat selfish game. The Ties are exciting and diversified by frequent reminders that asphalt is a harder substance than the human body, and that the "hole" is an unpleasant place wherein to be deposited. The game admits of much skill and pace, and it is a pity that the former, so well developed in the yard, cannot in more instances be brought to bear as effectually "up Fields".

Yours, etc.,

FOOTBALL.

## NOTICES.

All contributions to be clearly written on one side of the paper.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of the GRANTITE REVIEW, 2, Little Dean's Yard, S.W.

The yearly subscription is two shillings post-free; by Terms, sixpence each.

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

### FLOREAT.

WOMEN'S PRINTING SOCIETY, Limited, 21B, Great College Street, Westminster.