



# The Elizabethan.

Vol. VI. No. 9. WESTMINSTER, DECEMBER 1889.

Price 6d.

## THE COMMEMORATION SERVICE.

A NEW ceremony has been added this year to the list of events in the School Year at Westminster. On November 18, a Latin Service was held in the Abbey, by permission of the Dean, to commemorate our Foundress and Benefactors, and the benefits they had done to the School.

In order to allow as many people as possible to be present, the service was held at half-past eight in the evening. It began with a procession of the Choir, a Choir of O.W.W., the Dean and several of the Chapter, the Masters, the Queen's Scholars, Town Boys who sing, and lastly, the great body of the Town Boys. When they had all passed to their seats, Dr. Troutbeck began the service with the Lord's Prayer; after a few versicles, the one hundred and forty-eighth, one hundred and forty-ninth, and one hundred and fiftieth Psalms were sung to Gregorian music.

The thirty-fourth chapter of the book of Ecclesiasticus was read as the lesson by the Dean, and then the Te Deum was sung. This was followed by the Order of Commemoration, which was read by the Head Master. This sets forth the names of all who have endowed the School with benefits and enlarged it with privileges, from the Kings and Princes who fostered the grammar school to Queen Victoria, and from Dean Goodman to Archbishop Trench. A sermon was preached by Canon Ellison, who, taking as his text the words 'Compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses,' pointed out that life at school, as in the world at large, is a race in which all must do their best: at Westminster we must strive the more eagerly because we have so many famous witnesses, and we must not disgrace the school where they were educated. The service was concluded by Mr. Gladstone's Latin version of the famous hymn of an Old Westminster, A. M. Toplady, 'Rock of Ages,' set to music by Dr. Bridges.

After the service a large number of O.W.W. and others went 'Up School' to a reception



given by the masters; some light refreshments were provided, and the guests seemed to take great interest in some of the documents, &c., belonging to the School, and in the Scott Library. Altogether the evening was a very pleasant one. Of course, as was only to be expected on the first occasion, everything was not perfect. In the service itself it would be well to decide another year what pronunciation should be used throughout. In the singing and intoning of the prayers, the Italian pronunciation was adopted; in the Order of Commemoration the Head Master used the pronunciation in general use at Westminster; while the Dean in the lesson took something between the two. The anthem was rather too long and elaborate for the rest of the service, and it was not particularly well sung. We also rather doubt the advantage of the sermon: it is the only part of the service which is in English, and it seems to be scarcely worth while to have it. In the gathering 'Up School' afterwards the refreshments might have been better arranged, and it will be necessary in future years to have some novelties to amuse the guests. But these are but slight drawbacks, and on the whole the evening was a success, and we hope that it will become one of the regular events of the year, as we think that there is plenty of room for it without disturbing any older institutions.



## THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS YEAR-BOOK.

—

IN these times of annuals and year-books, it is quite in accordance with strict correctness that the Public Schools should have their proper handbook, and we therefore welcome the publication of this new and useful book, and wish it all the success which the undertaking, adequately carried out, deserves. The book, so far as it affects Westminster School, should receive some notice in the *Elizabethan*—in the first place, to introduce it to all the present members of the School (as such a handbook must, from the nature of its contents, more strongly appeal to the present than to the past members of the School), and secondly, in a spirit of criticism, to ascertain that the portion dealing with the School is sufficiently carried out, and to test its correctness as far as it goes.

The book consists of two parts, one of which is devoted to Education, and the other to Athletics. Each of the parts can be obtained separately, if desired. Old members of Eton, Harrow, and Winchester, the editors claim to have 'spared no effort in

making the information given accurate and complete.' Whether from their own fault or not, it is not for us to say—we have to deal with facts, and facts only—exception must be taken to the assertion in the case of Westminster. It would be next to impossible in a handbook of this description to ensure completeness in its first year of issue, but none the less, it strikes us on a perusal of the book that Westminster has not received as much attention as it deserves, or as much as has been given to most of the other schools. The editors limit themselves to thirty schools, and the names of those inserted need not be mentioned here, but it must be admitted that the names of some of those included hardly, in our opinion, warrant their insertion.

Leaving generalities, let us now pass on and deal with the article on the School itself. After a slight mention of the origin of the School, followed by a list of the staff, the book proceeds to give useful information as to its constitution, particulars of the forms, the books in use, the standard of work, and other details convenient to be known by parents. Following (or preceding) the enumeration of the staff of the School should have been inserted the names of the Governing Body, and herein consists the first sin of omission. The list of benefactions, again, is by no means complete, and it is important that this information should be amplified so as to set forth to the public the full list of the exhibitions and prizes, as these things are known to weigh materially when the selection of a public school is being made. Another serious sin of omission in the treatment of Westminster is the total omission of any list of Exhibitioners or Prizemen, whereas in the cases of the other schools this forms a carefully-prepared item. A prize gained, the winner is but a mortal, and, as such, is pleased to see his success properly recorded, as it undoubtedly should be.

The admission to vacancies in college is stated to be 'by open competition in an examination named the "Challenge."' Is not this statement incorrect? We have not heard of our old friend (at the time of trial a somewhat doubtful friend, it must be admitted) the Challenge having been restored to its own time-honoured place in the School customs. For anyone not actually in the School, or not having been there since the changes made by the present Head Master in the curriculum of the School, it is impossible to speak to the accuracy of the information given, so we shall leave this portion of the criticism of the book to be dealt with by others more conversant with the facts.

Turning to the second part of the 'Year-Book,' which treats of Athletics, we notice with regret the omission of Westminster in all of the sections relating to cricket, football, rowing, and swimming. Rowing, which was once Westminster's *forte*, is, we are forced to admit with a sigh, a 'thing of the past'; but is swimming also defunct? We hope not. It should undoubtedly form part of a boy's school education, and we should like to see all boys made to go through



a pass examination. Why no mention is made of Westminster under 'Cricket' or 'Football' we cannot say. Care should be taken to remedy this defect in subsequent issues of the 'Year-Book.' It is true the full score of the cricket match between the School and Charterhouse is given under 'Charterhouse,' but the list of the matches, and the characteristics of the individual members of both elevens, with the batting and bowling averages, should certainly appear, as in the other schools. The result of the endeavours of the Old Westminster Football Club should also, we think, be inserted. Short particulars of the result of the School racquet and fives contests are given. Until Westminster has a real racquet court, it is impossible for the School to enter for the Public Schools Challenge Cup, but we look forward to the day when this difficulty may be removed, and the cup no longer left to the practical monopoly of two or three schools, which up to the present has been the case.

It is with pleasure that we recall to memory what has already been stated in the *Elizabethan*—that Westminster took part in the Public Schools Gymnastic Competition. We congratulate Olivier and Woodbridge on representing the School at its initial contest. At its first trial it was not to be expected that Westminster would take a prominent place in the result, but as year by year its trials are repeated, we hope to see the School in due course take a higher position. The results of the School gymnastic and fencing competitions are recorded, and also of the School athletics. Comparisons, we know, are often odious, but they are sometimes salutary and an incentive to greater exertions. A table of the athletic times, &c., of the thirty schools comprised in the 'Year-Book' is given, and it should be studied by all the youthful 'rising' athletes at Westminster, and goad them to renewed efforts.

In school clubs and societies Westminster compares favourably with other schools; but why is the Chess Club, the Play, the School Mission, the Bell-ringing Society, 'Orations,' and the Election Dinner omitted? The Elizabethan Club and the Old Westminster Football Club should likewise be mentioned under this heading, as also the School Commemoration Service on Founder's Day, which we understand is to be an annual commemoration.

Dividing the two parts of the 'Year-Book' will be found five appendices. Appendix I. deals with the Bibliography of the Public Schools—first, generally, and second, individually. The list would appear to be fairly compiled as a whole, but we miss in the general class the mention of 'The History of the Colleges of Winchester, Eton, and Westminster, with the Charter-House, and the Schools of St. Paul's, Merchant Taylors', Harrow and Rugby, and the Free School of Christ's Hospital,' published by Ackerman in 1816; and, in the special class, of the 'Lusus Alteri Westmonasteriensis,' first and second series, published in 1863 and 1867, 'Some Account of Westminster School,' &c., by James Mure, 1860, and 'The Westminster Play: its Actors and its Visitors,'

by G. Lavie, published in 1855. The second Appendix contains the 'Winners of Entrance Scholarships, 1888-89,' but in the case of Westminster, which is incompletely dealt with, there is an editorial note that the list did not arrive in time.

The object throughout these notes has only been to point out some of the deficiencies to be met with in the Westminster section, and we would urge upon the School authorities, or the captain, or whoever may be the person whose proper business it is, the expediency of seeing in the future that the School receives its proper share of attention, and is not neglected as in the present issue of the 'Year-Book.' In books of this description the editors are greatly dependent upon information supplied, and it should be made the duty of someone to see that correct and full information is given annually, and in proper time. And this should be done not only for the sake of rendering the 'Year-Book' in itself complete, but for the dignity of the old School. We need hardly repeat the truism that what is everybody's business is nobody's business, and therefore someone should be made responsible for the fulfilment of this duty.

Should this article meet the notice of the editors, and they at once remedy the defects we have pointed out, we shall still more heartily wish success to their endeavours. In conclusion, we may, despite all sins of omission (it must rest with others to point out any sins of commission), congratulate the editors and publishers on what should prove an interesting and useful book, and a successful venture. For our part, our trouble will be amply repaid if the next year's issue is less sparse in information about Westminster than that afforded by the one under notice.

ALPHA.

[This article is somewhat too severe upon the 'Public Schools Year-Book' for faults for which the editors were not altogether to blame. The editors wrote to us to ask for the *Elizabethans* for the past year; but their letter came during the summer holidays, and when it reached us at the end of September it was too late to be of any use. We may mention that as soon as the book was published the Head Master wrote to the publishers to complain of the omissions noticed in this article. The old system of Challenges has not been restored, but the name is applied to the examination which takes its place.—Ed. *Elizabethan*.]

## THE SCOTT LIBRARY.

At the Reception after the Commemoration Service several people asked whether the Library would accept donations of books. The Librarian asks us to say that he will be most happy to receive books; the donor's name will be inscribed in each book, and the gift acknowledged in the *Elizabethan*. Most valuable of all are books written by O.W.W. and presented by the author.



Mr. F. W. Bain has presented his 'Christina, Queen of Sweden,' to the Library.

The following details of changes in the Library in the last year may be of interest. At Election 1888 the Library contained 2,046 books; at Election 1889, 2,681; thus 635 books were added in the year. The Coin Room (formerly the Masters' Common Room) was added, and the ante-room furnished. The whole Collection of Books has been re-arranged under subjects, in the Inner and Scott Rooms, and re-catalogued on the slip system. An interesting collection of Old Pottery and Glass, presented by the Cyprus Exploration Fund, has been placed in cases in the Inner Room.

The most interesting of the Minerals in the School Collection have been exhibited in cases in the Inner Room.

A set of valuable old Singhakor Coins has been presented to the School by Sir J. F. Dickson. This, with selected specimens from the School Collection of Coins, has been arranged in a case in the Coin Room.

A case has been placed in the Coin Room, containing many valuable Westminster 'Antiquities'—the old College Registers, *Vulgaria*, &c., &c.

A collection of prints of distinguished O.W.W. and water-colour sketches of the school buildings has been lent by the Elizabethan Club and hung in the Drawing and Coin Rooms.

## WESTMINSTER WORTHIES.

NO. 21.—CHARLES CHURCHILL.

(Continued from p. 92.)

To the year which saw the publication of the 'Rosciad' and the 'Apology' belongs also 'Night,' an epistle to Robert Lloyd—a poem in which the author makes some sort of apology for his mode of life. The succeeding year the 'Ghost' followed, which is chiefly known for the satire on Johnson—the Pomposo of the piece. Churchill's pen was very busy in 1763. One satire followed another in rapid succession. The 'Prophecy of Famine' was a satire on Scotland and the Scotch nation. His original intention was an essay for the *North Briton*. Indeed it was written as such, but before it was actually published he withdrew it from the printers, and turned the materials into a poetical satire. At this time he was accustomed to go about accompanied by one of his sons attired according to Scotch fashion, who, when queried as to the reason, replied, 'My father hates the Scotch, and does it to plague them.' The 'Epistle to William Hogarth,' which we have already noticed, was succeeded by the 'Conference,' after which appeared the 'Duellist,' written after Wilkes's duel with Samuel Martin. These four satires, with the 'Author,' by some considered his best satire, together containing some three thousand and twenty-two lines, were the product of his pen during this year. In the last year of his life his pen was even more prolific. The number of his published satires

reached five, and the 'Journey' and an unfinished 'Dedication' were published after his death. We cannot do more here than briefly enumerate these. They consisted of 'Gothan'; the 'Candidate'—a satire on Lord Sandwich, who was a candidate for the High Stewardship of Cambridge University; the 'Farewell,' the 'Times,' and 'Independence'—notable for a self-drawn portrait of himself, to which we shall have occasion to advert again.

Wilkes, who was now residing in France, in consequence of the publication of his 'Essay on Women,' frequently importuned Churchill to pay him a visit. Churchill had given him a promise to do so, and at length decided to carry out his friend's wishes. Accordingly he left England on October 22, 1764, little thinking that he would never live to return to his native country. On the 29th of the same month he was seized with a military fever at Boulogne. Besides political integrity, Churchill prided himself on his fondness for his native land.

'Be England what she will,  
With all her faults she is my country still.'

Conscious of the dangerous nature of his illness, he solicited his friends to remove him to the country he loved so well. But fate was against him. His friends endeavoured to comply with his wishes, but the attempt only hastened his end, and on November 4 he died at Boulogne. Wilkes, who had met him at Boulogne, remained by his side during his illness, and was with him at his death. He expressed great sorrow at the loss of his friend; but the blow was more real and fell with greater force upon his old school-fellow Robert Lloyd. He received the tidings as he was on the point of commencing his dinner, was seized with a sudden illness, and thrust aside his plate untouched. The only expression of his feelings which escaped him was, 'I shall soon follow poor Charles.' He retired to his bed, from which he never rose again, and within a short time his prophetic words became true. Churchill's favourite sister Patty, who was said to have been engaged to Lloyd, did not long survive her brother and his friend.

Churchill's remains were removed to England for interment, where they were buried in the churchyard of St. Martin at Dover. The following inscription was placed on his tombstone:—

'Here lie the remains of the celebrated  
C. CHURCHILL.  
Life to the last enjoyed, Here Churchill lies.  
*The Candidate.*

In his satire of the 'Candidate' Churchill expressed a wish that his life should not be published, adding, in the following lines, the memory he desired posterity should have of him:

'Let one poor sprig of Bay around my head  
Bloom whilst I live, and point me out when dead;  
Let It (may Heaven, indulgent, grant that prayer!)  
Be planted on my grave, nor wither there;  
And when, on travel bound, some rhyming guest  
Roams through the churchyard whilst his dinn r's drest,  
Let It hold up this comment to his eyes,  
Life to the last enjoyed, Here Churchill lies.'



Churchill's wish was in two respects carried out. The line he wrote, the index of his life, formed the only epitaph upon his tomb; and when Byron was leaving England for the last time, he found time to visit his brother poet's grave, and it was the 'comment' desired by the satirist which met the eyes of the 'rhyming guest.' Over the grave of him 'who blazed the comet of a season' he mused on the 'glory and the nothing of a name,' and afterwards recorded his feelings in a poem called 'Churchill's Grave.' In the bustling scene which nowadays attracts people to Dover, who shall say if his grave has ever been visited by any other 'rhyming guest'?

On his death-bed Churchill executed his will, by which he made proper provision for those dependent upon him. His intentions at least were just, but he does not appear to have left sufficient property to meet his various bequests. Amongst the provisions of his will may be mentioned one which requested that 'his dear friend John Wilkes should collect and publish his works, with any remarks and explanations he may think proper to make.' Wilkes expressed himself willing to undertake the task; declaring, indeed, that 'my life shall be dedicated to it.' The task, it is true, was commenced, but the mood soon passed off, and his friend's dying request was never performed. Perhaps in some respects it was as well that he failed to redeem his promise. Granted his impartiality, no person could have been more suited to undertake the work of annotation; but had he accomplished it, on the other hand, it is more than probable that his notes would have centred around himself, and tended rather to self-glorification than to the elucidation of his friend's works. Of all things Wilkes was a time-server, and throughout his life self was the centre around which his actions revolved, which actions, one may safely add, would probably have remained unperformed, were no benefit to be derived to himself from their fulfilment, or were more benefit likely to accrue to himself by their non-fulfilment.

In summing up Churchill's life and work, our first duty must be an expression of great regret and disgust at his profligacy and dissipation, doubly noticeable and condemnable from the nature of his profession. But here, as we have already pointed out, the fact that his profession was to all intents and purposes thrust upon him against his wishes must not be overlooked. This fact we do not recall and repeat as an excuse for his profligate conduct, which is and ever must be inexcusable; but in the light of his sacred calling the grossness of his behaviour is aggravated and becomes more conspicuous in the absence of this slightly mitigating circumstance. One episode in his life, however, is unpardonable, though it is only fair to add that he publicly, in one of his poems, expresses his repentance, and did all in his power to repair the wrong committed. On the other hand, we are told, and it is a pleasure to give credence to the statement, that when a curate in Somersetshire, and in fact until he returned to the temptations of the metropolis and

again came under the influence of his old friends there, he was discreet in his conduct and performed his clerical duties with regularity. Throughout his short life he was of a generous disposition and of a kindly heart; and one story, which need not be repeated here, tells of his spontaneous assistance to and relief of a family in destitute circumstances, who were only keeping body and soul together by the self-degradation of a member of the family. His faithful friendship and timely help to his friend Lloyd, and his voluntary payment of his old debts, from which he was freed by the acceptance of the composition by his creditors, again testify to his generosity and innate sense of justice.

'Whilst (O, what joy that pleasing flattery gives!)  
Reading my works, he cries, here Churchill lives.'

In this couplet the satirist expresses the remembrance in which he would posterity should hold his work. But it must be admitted that few beyond students of literature are now to be found who read his works. Nevertheless, amongst much that is coarse, crude, commonplace, and grossly personal, are many lines and passages possessing great power and force.

'If brighter beams than ail he threw not forth,  
'Twas negligence in him, not want of worth.  
Surly and slovenly, and bold and coarse,  
Too proud for art, and trusting in mere force;  
Spendthrift alike of money and of wit,  
Always at speed, and never drawing bit,  
He struck the lyre in such a careless mood,  
And so disdained the rules he understood,  
The laurel seemed to wait on his command,  
He snatch'd it rudely from the Muse's hand.'

Thus speaks Cowper of him in his 'Table Talk,' and he speaks truly. In a letter of his to Mr. Unwin in 1786, he alludes to the delight with which he had read and re-read some of his pieces, and in the enthusiasm which he felt for his old school friend and protector, he sings his praises, and terms him 'the great Churchill,' who 'deserves the name of poet.' Some allowance must of course be made for his eulogy of his old champion at school. Gratitude demanded it. But posterity, for the most part, does not endorse his opinion. A man, however, must also be judged by the times in which he lived, and undoubtedly in his own time he was not only appreciated, but, as a satirist, respected. The fear in which he was held speaks to the truthfulness of his satire. Were his lines a tissue of unsubstantial falsehood, they would have suffered the silent contempt they would have merited.

'Always at speed, and never drawing bit.'

Cowper, in this line, strikes the cause of the slovenliness of much of the satirist's work. No sooner had he launched one satire on the world which caught the fancy of the public than he made strenuous efforts to follow it closely with another, in the hope that the success of the one would prove valuable towards the recommendation of the second. Isaac Disraeli tells us that blotting and correcting were his abhorrence, and



that to do the one or the other the satirist considered to be akin to 'cutting away one's own flesh.' Dr. Johnson, whose original opinion of Churchill was contained in the one word 'blockhead,' was forced, when pressed by the indefatigable Boswell, to modify his former opinion, and to own that the satirist possessed 'more fertility' than he expected. 'To be sure,' added the literary dictator, 'he is a tree which cannot produce good fruit; he only bears crabs. But, sir, a tree that produces a great many crabs is better than a tree which only produces a few.' The Doctor bore him no good will, and is too sweeping in his criticism. It is true that Churchill produced a great many crabs, but who is there who will gainsay that some good fruit is to be found amongst his productions? Had he taken the trouble, he might have produced better and more lasting work.

Physically the satirist was not prepossessing, as we may gather from his self-drawn portrait, which we take leave to reproduce here from his satire of 'Independence.'

'Broad were his shoulders . . . . .

Vast were his bones, his muscles twisted strong,  
His face was short, but broader than 'twas long,  
His features, though by nature they were large,  
Contentment had contrived to overcharge  
And bury meaning, save that we might spy  
Sense lowering on the pent-house of his eye;  
His arms were two twin oaks, his legs so stout,  
That they might bear a mansion-house about,  
Nor were they, look but at his body there,  
Designed by fate a much less weight to bear.'

His gait he tells us was awkward; he likens his walk to a roll 'like a porpoise just before a storm.' In outward appearance he was 'fond of show.'

'O'er a brown cassock, which had once been black,  
Which hung in tatters on his brawny back,  
A sight most strange and awkward to behold,  
He threw a covering of blue and gold.'

About the time of the publication of his 'Rosciad' and 'Apology,' he doffed his unsuitable clerical clothes, and donned the costume of a man of the world. 'He started up a fop,' to use his own words, and 'looked like another Hercules turn'd beau.' His chief noticeable feature consisted of his size and strength—one which was convenient to a satirist, and served him in good stead. After the publication of some of his pieces, he was accustomed to perambulate the streets with a cudgel in his hand, to openly show how little he cared for the taunts and personal attacks of the public generally. Many, we are told, who meditated personal violence, reconsidered their boastful intention when his burly form emerged round the corner of some street or entered some coffee-house attended by his faithful weapon. His portrait by Schaak is in the National Portrait Gallery, an engraving from which picture forms the frontispiece to the Aldine edition of his works.

URLLAD.

## THE PAVILION.

### PAVILION FUND.

#### SIXTH LIST OF DONATIONS.

	£	s.	d.
Amount already acknowledged	972	10	0
R. Mills, Esq.	1	1	0
H. R. Ladell, Esq.	1	1	0
W. V. Doherty, Esq.	1	1	0
H. T. Whitaker, Esq.	1	1	0
H. C. Barnes, Esq.	1	1	0
W. A. Robertson, Esq.	1	1	0
R. C. Phillimore, Esq.	1	1	0
S. C. Woodhouse, Esq.	1	1	0
G. H. Fry, Esq.	1	1	0
A. G. Clark, Esq.	1	1	0
F. Street, Esq.	1	1	0
R. B. Hickman, Esq.	1	0	0
P. G. L. Webb, Esq.	1	0	0
C. J. M. Fox, Esq.	2	2	0
F. W. Janson, Esq.	1	1	0
H. Wetton, Esq.	1	1	0
A. L. Fevez, Esq.	1	1	0
J. P. Jeffcock, Esq.	1	1	0
J. P. Paul, Esq.	0	10	6
A. J. Hemmede, Esq.	0	10	6
C. W. Grant-Wilson, Esq.	1	0	0
W. R. Moon, Esq.	1	1	0
E. G. Moon, Esq.	1	1	0
T. S. Oldham, Esq.	1	1	0

£997 11 0

### School Notes.

WE omitted, by an oversight, to mention in our last number that Lord Mure, a distinguished Old Westminster, has lately resigned his position as a Judge of the High Court of Scotland.

Orations were held 'Up School' for the second time this term on November 19. The piece selected was Hood's 'I remember, I remember'; it was not generally well recited; the best was C. F. Watherston, and second, Brailey.

We are sorry to hear that Mr. Grenfell is leaving this term to take charge of a school near Chester. Mr. Grenfell has not been long with us, but all who have had anything to do with him will be sorry to lose him, and wish him much success.

The full Gumbleton Prize for English Verse has not been given this year, but part of it has been awarded to E. H. Marsh.

The Ireland Prize for Latin Verse has been awarded to W. Covington.

The Phillimore English Translation Prize has been awarded to E. H. Marsh. F. Y. Eccles was mentioned *honoris causa*.



The following matches have been arranged to be played 'Up Fields' by Old Westminsters during the holidays :—

Saturday, December 21st	v.	Old Carthusians.
" " 28th	v.	Old Foresters.
Wednesday, January 1st	v.	Old Wykehamists.
Saturday, " 4th	v.	Crusaders.
Wednesday, " 8th	v.	Old Harrovians.
Saturday, " 11th	v.	Old Etonians.
Wednesday, " 15th	v.	Old Brightonians.

## THE FIELDS.

### WESTMINSTER v. ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL.

THIS match was played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, November 16, and after a fast game resulted in a win for 'Bart.'s' by 3 goals to 2, though had the School played their full number all the time we think that the balance of goals would have been on our side.

Gifford won the toss, and Carruthers kicked off for the visitors from the Church end at 2.45. The 'Hospital' at once began to press us, and about ten minutes after the ball had been set in motion Shattock got hurt and had to leave the field; this weakened our defence, and a continual bombardment was kept up on our goal. After missing several easy chances Brown scored with a rather lucky shot from half-back, which just went through the goal (0-1), and shortly afterwards Hopkins rushed another goal (0-2). Longhurst next dribbled the ball up, but his shot was a failure, and Carruthers got right away and notched a third point for the visitors (0-3). Things looked very bad for the School, as 'Bart.'s' kept up the attack with undiminished vigour, but Hollocombe's arrival relieved the pressure slightly. Longhurst put in a shot which Rigg just managed to save, and S. A. Gregory shot over the bar. Then Blaker had to save, after which half-time was called, with Westminster three goals to the bad.

After the ball had been re-started the game was of a very even character, though the visitors missed one or two chances of adding to their score. Then Waterfield got possession of the ball and passed it out to Woodbridge, who ran it down and centred, and from a scrimmage in goal Willett put it through amidst loud applause (1-3). For the next twenty minutes Westminster had much the best of the game, and Rigg had to save two splendid shots from Longhurst and Woodbridge respectively, the first of which was very nearly a goal. Just before time Westminster worked the ball up, and Waterfield scored a second goal for Westminster (2-3).

For Westminster, Blaker played as well as usual, and we do not think that he could possibly have saved any of the goals. C. H. Gregory was distinctly the best of the backs, and he generally managed to be in the right place at the right moment, and it will be very

difficult to fill up his place in the team after Christmas; Williamson kicked well, but Carruthers was rather too fast for him. Gifford played very hard and well, and was invaluable in keeping his men together; Stephenson again worked untiringly for the good of his side, and helped his back immensely; Hollocombe was fairly good, but he completely missed his man on one occasion. Willett was the best of the forwards, the first goal being almost entirely owing to his exertions. Woodbridge was too much marked by the half-back opposed to him to be really conspicuous, though he made some good runs whenever he got a chance; S. H. Gregory in the same way was rather over-weighted; Waterfield passed well, and Longhurst put in some excellent shots, one of which looked as if it was bound to be a goal.

For the visitors, Carruthers, Lewarne, and Faber were the most conspicuous.

The following were the teams :—

#### WESTMINSTER.

H. R. Blaker (goal), P. Williamson and C. H. Gregory (backs), J. C. Hollocombe, J. D. Gifford (captain), and H. L. Stephenson (half-backs), E. W. Woodbridge and S. H. Gregory (left), J. A. Willett (centre), P. Waterfield and A. L. Longhurst (right), (forwards).

#### ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL.

S. Rigg (goal), G. Henry and J. S. Mackintosh (backs), F. Lewarne, J. G. Faber, and R. Brown (half-backs), A. E. Carruthers (captain) (centre), F. J. Dixon and N. O. Wilson (left), W. K. Hopkins and J. M. Wrangham (right), (forwards).

### WESTMINSTER v. OLD HARROVIANS.

THIS match was played 'Up Fields' on Saturday, November 23, and resulted in a defeat for the School by 5-2.

Gifford won the toss, and kicked off from the Hospital end at 2.50. Broughton, immediately after the ball was started, dribbled up and scored for them (0-1). The ball was re-started by Willett, and after some loose play, mostly in our half, we obtained a corner, which, however, came to nothing; they then began to press us, and Blaker was compelled to use his hands twice, the latter time at the expense of a corner. Our forwards then had a look in, Page rushing down the ball, but he shot over. Gregory next was within an ace of scoring, and on the ball being returned Gifford put well in front of goal, and a corner was the result. For the next ten minutes nothing material took place, the School acting chiefly upon the defence, the forwards every now and then making runs. The next occurrence worthy of note was a splendid shot by Gifford, which just went over the bar. The Harrovians were next busy, and after a good run, Thompson scored for them (0-2). On re-starting, some even play took place, our half-backs playing up very well. Hoare next sent the ball well into our territory, but Williamson returned it, and Gregory, from a good pass by Willett, scored with a splendid shot (1-2). We now began to press them, our for-



wards passing very well among each other, and Waterfield, after a lofty shot which was saved by the goal-keeper, neatly headed it through (2-2). Shortly after this the fog came on very thick, and this seemed to take all the energy out of the School, for in quick succession three goals one after another were shot by Cox, Hext, and Broughton; Blaker being seemingly unable to see the ball. It now got so dark that it was impossible for play to continue, and so time was called at shortly after four, when the score stood 5-2 in their favour.

For us, Gregory and Williamson played well, and Gifford and Stephenson both did good service; Waterfield and Woodbridge were the best of the forwards. For them, Hoare and Broughton were the best.

The following were the teams :—

#### WESTMINSTER.

H. R. Blaker (goal), C. H. Gregory and P. Williamson (backs), J. C. Hollocombe, J. D. Gifford, and H. L. Stephenson (half-backs), E. W. Woodbridge and S. H. Gregory (left), J. A. Willett (centre), C. E. Page and P. Waterfield (right) (forwards).

#### OLD HARROVIANS.

S. W. Morgan (goal), C. W. Forrester and R. B. Hoare (backs), Buckingham, Hewett, and Farmer (half-backs). L. Cox and Broughton (left), Hext (centre), J. C. Thompson and A. E. Cox (right), (forwards).

#### WESTMINSTER *v.* LANCING OLD BOYS.

Gifford lost the toss, and Willett kicked off from the Church end at 2.35. For the first quarter of an hour the School had somewhat the best of the game, the forwards constantly making runs to the goal of the other side. But though our forwards had many chances of shooting, none were accepted. Druce next put in a hot shot for them, which just went over the bar. Powell, who up to the present had been playing for Woodbridge, who had not yet come up, made a good run up the left, but Woodard put it back and Hardy scored by a splendid shot almost on the goal line (0-1). After the ball was restarted, Woodbridge, who had come up in the meanwhile, rushed the ball down the left, but failed to score, his shot resulting in a corner which was put behind. Half-time was called shortly after this. We, who had pressed them during the first half, now were pressed in our turn. But Willett relieved the pressure by a good run and put in a splendid shot, which the goal-keeper saved very well, and shortly after a corner took place which was put behind. Shortly after this Page and Waterfield broke away, but were unable to score. Woodbridge next made a good run, and from about two feet from the goal line put in a splendid shot, which completely beat the goal-keeper (1-1). Both sides now played up, and they pressed us a great deal. About this time Williamson strained his knee and was unable to take part in the game for a short time; this handicapped us greatly, and finally, after several near shaves, Slowcock scored the second goal for them, which first hit the

bar and then glanced through, and the match ended in a defeat of the School by 2-1.

For us C. H. Gregory played very well at back, kicking clean and hard; Woodbridge was the best of the forwards, who were not so well together as usual, their shooting also being rather erratic. The loss of Longhurst and Shattock was felt a good deal. Of the half-backs Gifford was the best, getting through a large amount of work. For them we may mention Jackson, their back, as being the best, and of their forwards Hardy.

The teams were as follows :—

#### WESTMINSTER.

H. R. Blaker (goal), P. Williamson and C. H. Gregory (backs), J. S. Shearme, J. D. Gifford (captain), and H. L. Stephenson (half-backs), E. W. Woodbridge and S. H. Gregory (left), A. Willett (centre), P. Waterfield and C. Page (right), (forwards).

#### LANCING OLD BOYS.

W. E. Sturges-Jones (goal), R. Mason and C. Jackson (backs), H. Woodard, A. Hicks, and E. Hicks (half-backs), E. Andrews, E. Druce (left), R. Slowcock (centre), H. Hardy and F. Sparrow (right), (forwards).

#### O.W.W. *v.* OLD ST. MARK'S.

##### THIRD ROUND OF THE LONDON CUP.

This match was played at Kennington Oval on Saturday, November 23, and after a very monotonous match resulted in a draw of one goal all, which score does not at all give a true impression of the game, as the Old St. Mark's had much the best of the game right through the second half. The O.W.W. may consider themselves very fortunate to get off with a draw, as but for the fog, which opportunely came on and stopped the game about 20 minutes before time, they would almost certainly have been beaten.

Squire won the toss and Powell kicked for the Old St. Mark's from the end opposite the gasworks at ten minutes to three. Both sides began playing one short, and the O.W.W. began to press, but Schumacher made a good run down the right, and got right away, but Paul hustled him as he was taking his shot, which went wide of the mark. Westminster next obtained a corner, but no score resulted. Then E. G. Moon turned up and gave Westminster their full number, and after a splendid run by Peck, followed by a good centre, Fox scored the first goal for us (1-0). After this the game was fairly even, until from a good rush by the Old St. Mark's forwards, Talford scored for them and thus made the two sides equal (1-1). After this, Westminster went hopelessly to pieces, the forwards showing no combination or individual good play, and the backs both tackling and kicking in the most feeble manner possible. St. Mark's, on the contrary, played up splendidly, their right wing simply running round our backs, and Moon in goal had to do all he knew to keep his charge intact; in fact, once St. Mark's claimed to have scored with a shot which hit the post, but the goal was disallowed by the referee.



After half-time St. Mark's simply walked round Westminster, and it was only with the greatest luck that they were able to prevent several goals being scored against them, so Fox went back and Squire played centre forward. Janson shortly after this left the field, so O.W.W. played one short for the remainder of the time. Still the St. Mark's forwards swarmed round our goal, but Fox's huge kicks managed to keep the enemy off until a dense fog came on and saved Westminster from a disastrous beating.

That the O.W.W. played most disgracefully is a fact which cannot be denied. To begin with, why does some member of the team invariably turn up late? It looks very bad form for the O.W.W. to begin playing one short, as they have in their last two Cup ties. Surely someone could have been found to play in Janson's place, for it was perfectly evident that he was far from well at the beginning of the match. Consequently O.W.W. were playing one short nearly the whole time, and, owing to Janson's being entirely unable to run or tackle, the right wing of the Old St. Mark's got right away several times. 'W. R.' was not at all up to international form, and both his brother and Squire were extremely weak. Paul and Winckworth played well, and were the only members of the back division that did not lose their heads. Forward, Fox was entirely out of his element, and was never in his right place, and altogether failed to keep his forwards together. Heath and Probyn were extremely rank, and never combined at all. C. F. Ingram played fairly well at first with Peck, but missed several chances of scoring. Peck was out-and-out the best of the forwards, his dribbling being very neat and tricky. For Old St. Mark's, Schumacher, Florance, and the backs played best.

If O.W.W. do not play better when the match is replayed, their efforts to win the London Cup will not be covered with glory.

The following represented O.W.W. :—

W. R. Moon (goal), R. T. Squire and E. G. Moon (backs), F. W. Janson, W. N. Winckworth, and J. P. Paul (half-backs), A. C. Peck and C. F. Ingram (left), C. J. M. Fox (centre), P. C. Probyn and C. W. R. Heath (right), (forwards).

### O.W.W. v. OLD ST. MARK'S.

#### THIRD ROUND OF THE LONDON CUP.

THIS match was replayed at the Oval on Saturday, November 30. This time the Old Westminsters made no mistake about it, and beat their opponents by four goals to nothing.

Loud cheers greeted Veitch as he came on to the ground, for the crowd evidently thought that unless Veitch threw up the 'Varsities and played for O.W.W., the Old St. Mark's would be victorious. Florance won the toss, and Veitch kicked off for O.W.W. from the end opposite the gasworks at 2.30. O.W.W. started with only nine men, so E. G. Moon kept goal, and Fox played back by himself. Old St. Mark's had

rather the best of the game at first, and E. G. Moon had to save, which he did quite satisfactorily. When Probyn and 'W. R.' turned up, O.W.W. began to press, and a good run by Peck resulted in Veitch getting right away and scoring the first goal (1-0). Old St. Mark's protested that the goal was off-side, but the referee decided against them.

When the ball had been re-started, Veitch made a splendid attempt at goal, but the ball went just outside. O.W.W. had two corners in succession, the second of which was beautifully put by J. P. Paul, and the ball was 'greazed' through (2-0). Westminster continued to have the best of it, though on one occasion Old St. Mark's nearly obtained a goal, 'W. R.' being knocked right through the goal in saving, but about five minutes before half-time Veitch scored a third goal with a good shot (3-0).

After change of ends the game was more even, Talford on two occasions making brilliant runs, but Fox always got the ball away before he became really dangerous. Then Old St. Mark's obtained a corner, but though well put, Squire easily got the ball away, and passed to Stevens, who made a good run almost the whole length of the ground at a tremendous pace. He centred to Veitch, who shot, but Florance fisted the ball out of goal, and Peck running up caught the ball on the half-volley, and drove it just under the bar at a terrific pace. Then the Old St. Mark's obtained a corner, but they could not get a goal, and when 'time' was whistled, O.W.W. had qualified for the fourth round by four goals to nothing.

For Old Westminsters, whose play showed a marvellous improvement on their form on the previous Saturday, 'W. R.' kept goal in quite his usual form. Both E. G. Moon and Fox played well, the latter playing quite a mild game, and only 'rooting' his man once. Squire was the worst of the halves, and he found Schumacher rather too fast for him. For ward, Veitch kept his forwards together well, but he was too closely marked to do much by himself. Stevens played splendidly, and simply made 'rings' round the half-back opposed to him, and Heath showed great improvement on his form of the previous Saturday. For Old St. Mark's, Schumacher, Talford, and Adamson were best.

The following was the O.W. team :—

W. R. Moon (goal), C. J. M. Fox and E. G. Moon (backs), R. T. Squire, W. N. Winckworth, and J. P. Paul (half-backs), C. W. R. Heath and P. C. Probyn (right), J. G. Veitch (centre), H. C. Peck and G. P. Stevens (left) (forwards).

### RIGAUDS v. GRANTS.

In the trial matches these houses met on Wednesday, November 27, and after an interesting game Rigauds proved victorious by 3-4. In the first half, play was very even, Rigauds scoring twice and Grants once. On crossing over Grants scored twice in quick succession; about a quarter of an hour before time Rigauds equalised, and shortly afterwards scored the



winning point after some exciting play in front of the Granite goal.

For the winners, Blaker kicked well at back, while Fairchild worked hardest of the halves, Nye and Waterfield being the pick of the forwards. For Grants, Scarfe was good in goals, Everington was far the best of the backs, and Fitzmaurice of the halves, while Woodbridge was the only forward who played at all well.

The teams were :—

#### RIGAUDS.

J. Langton (goal), H. R. Blaker and H. C. Jonas (backs), J. G. Difford, H. Fairchild, and C. F. Rivaz (half-backs), E. Gates and P. Waterfield (right), J. A. Willett (centre), E. Berens and R. Nye (left), (forwards).

#### GRANTS.

N. Scarfe (goal), G. E. Campbell and D. Everington (backs), J. Corbett, D. Fitzmaurice, and E. Burton, (half backs), J. O. Powell and E. W. Woodbridge (left), J. E. Mills (centre), W. T. Barwell and D. P. Winckworth (right), (forwards).

#### H.BB. v. RIGAUDS.

THIS match was played 'Up Fields' on December 11. Rigauds won the toss, and Pendred kicked off from the Hospital end at 2.35, and after some loose play Nye rushed the ball down and scored (1-0). Soon after it was rushed down again, but Paget fisted it out and Gregory sent the ball down to the other end, but it was again brought back, and was kept in the centre until half-time was called. Shortly after Berens brought it down and centred splendidly, and the ball was put through by Gates (2-0). Pendred then rushed it down and a corner ensued; Gregory had now to do a lot of work, and if it had not been for him and Gilbert, Rigauds would have scored more heavily than they did. Soon after Pendred and Gregory rushed it down again, but with no result, for Page shot over. Now Gifford played more forward than half-back and scored by a splendid shot (3-0). This was retaliated to by Pendred, who scored, making the score 3-1. Soon after time was called, and Rigauds remained victors by 3-1.

For H.BB. the Gregorys, Pendred, and Paul were the best; while for the winners, Gifford, Willett, Nye, and Berens were most conspicuous.

The teams were :—

#### RIGAUDS.

J. Langton (goal), H. R. Blaker and H. C. Jonas (backs), J. D. Gifford, G. O. Shattock, and H. Rivaz (half-backs), E. A. Gates and W. F. d'Arcy (right), J. A. Willett (centre), S. Nye and E. Berens (left) (forwards).

#### H.BB.

E. V. Paget (goal), C. H. Gregory and F. Gilbert (backs), J. Hollocombe, A. W. F. Guy, and W. Paul (half-backs), R. R. Campbell and S. H. Gregory (left), B. Pendred (centre), C. Page and H. Showbridge (right), (forwards).

## THE DEBATING SOCIETY.

C. A. PHILLIMORE and A. L. Longhurst have been elected members of the Standing Committee.

On Thursday, November 14, the discussion of H. STEPHENSON'S motion was resumed—'That this House disapproves of the attitude assumed by the dockers in the recent strike.'

SPEAKERS.—*Ayes*: H. STEPHENSON, C. A. PHILLIMORE, J. SHEARME, L. F. WINTLE. *Noes*: Mr. LENOX-CONYNGHAM, P. WILLIAMSON, G. GILLET.

This second discussion was not so interesting as the first, except for Mr. CONYNGHAM'S excellent speech for the dockers. He began by stating that strength and force were still supreme, but in an organised and therefore more powerful form; though he did not approve of all strikes, he thought that the present one was justified. The charges against Burns and Tillett had not been proved; as for throwing many men out of work, he thought it better that one hundred should live in moderate comfort than one thousand on starvation wages; if a business cannot afford to pay good wages—at any rate, the employers ought to lose before the poor.

C. A. PHILLIMORE took the side of the employers altogether; he thought that no one could be expected to give up business because he could not pay high wages.

Mr. LENOX-CONYNGHAM thought they should be forced to give up.

H. L. STEPHENSON pointed out that Mr. Conyngham had omitted any mention of the intimidation practised by the strikers. Burns wanted to keep his name before the public, wishing to supplant Broadhurst as labour-member.

P. WILLIAMSON ably defended Burns' conduct; it was quite right to use the strike-money to live on during the strike, while he was giving up his own work for the men.

C. A. PHILLIMORE, as at the previous meeting, went so far as to wish to introduce foreign labour if it could be got at a cheaper rate.

H. STEPHENSON and J. SHEARME strongly objected to Burns' conduct.

WINTLE thought dockers ought not to marry; he also 'considered the emigration question highly desirable.' Mr. Wintle should cultivate a little more lucidity of style.

C. A. PHILLIMORE again turned to the subject of foreign labour; he commented on the stunted and miserable physical condition of London workers.

G. GILLET thought that this was the result of starvation wages, and a life without any comfort or brightness: that, therefore, their condition should be improved.

H. L. STEPHENSON made a few further remarks.

On the motion—*Ayes*, 8; *Noes*, 6. Majority for the motion, 2.

On Thursday, November 21, F. ECCLES moved: 'That this House disapproves of the existence and policy of the Triple Alliance.' G. GILLET, Seconder; C. A. PHILLIMORE, Opposer.



**SPEAKERS.**—*Ayes:* F. ECCLES, G. GILLET, R. BALFOUR. *Noes:* C. A. PHILLIMORE, H. STEPHENSON.

The Proposer and Opposer both made good speeches, and presented in concise form the arguments on either side; but the interest taken in the debate by the general body of the House was not great, as nobody seemed to know anything about the subject.

F. ECCLES denounced the Alliance as unnatural, unnecessary, and unjust; unnatural because the Italians are the natural enemies of Austria, unnecessary because France would not attack Austria or Italy even though hostile to Germany, nor would Russia attack Germany or Italy. Therefore Italy has no reason in joining. Again, a Franco-Russian alliance is unlikely, because France has no anti-Turkish interests. The Alliance is unjust because it necessitates conscription; it wastes money; it engenders bitter hatred; it absorbs energies which might be devoted to better objects. Even if France tries to recover the Alsace-Lorraine provinces, Austria would have no right to help Germany to keep them.

The OPPOSER maintained that the Alliance does not menace the peace of Europe—it is merely defensive; it is not unnatural, because caused by mutual interest; it commands great respect, and is, therefore, a guarantee of peace. The Opposer then drew a vivid and blood-curdling picture of the horrors of a great European war, which he assured the House could only be averted by strengthening the Triple Alliance.

After a few remarks by the Seconder, who was succeeded by C. A. PHILLIMORE, F. ECCLES dwelt on the possibility of a Franco-Russian alliance; he also said that the Alsace-Lorraine provinces were disaffected.

R. BALFOUR strongly condemned the conduct of Italy in joining the Alliance.

C. A. PHILLIMORE said that the Italians joined merely to try and put down the power of the Papacy; the French might at any time favour the policy of the Vatican.

After ECCLES had replied and C. A. PHILLIMORE made a few further remarks, H. L. STEPHENSON said that conscription was no result of the Alliance; he also showed that the Alliance was merely defensive. An Alsatian revolt was highly improbable.

The House then adjourned.

The debate was resumed at the next meeting, when F. ECCLES said that he considered the Alliance unjustifiable, because neither France nor Russia had shown aggressive designs; Phillimore had not shown that peace is menaced.

C. A. PHILLIMORE, after a few remarks about the conquered provinces, said that the Alliance does no harm even if no good. Austria is justified in promoting Germany's anti-French scheme just because it is her interest to do so.

On the motion—*Ayes*, 7; *Noes*, 9. Majority against, 2.

'That this House views the recent revolution in Brazil with the greatest disfavour.'

**SPEAKERS.**—*Ayes:* C. A. PHILLIMORE (Proposer), A. L. LONGHURST, A. Y. G. CAMPBELL (Seconder); *Noes:* G. GILLET (Opposer), F. ECCLES, R. BALFOUR.

The debate was a very short one, the arguments on both sides being quickly disposed of. Though C. A. Phillimore had proposed the motion at a previous meeting, A. L. LONGHURST took his place; he delivered a rhetorical effusion, the effect of which was somewhat marred, as he seemed hardly even to have read it over previously. He began by describing the revolution as a pronunciamiento. He proceeded to say that both considerations of sentiment and of right should make us oppose such a movement,—the people are merely tired of their Emperor, who had abolished the iniquitous curse of slavery, and has engaged in none but necessary wars. He considered it unnecessary to defend the monarchial against the republican form of government. He then eulogised the firm and equitable administration of Dom Pedro, and asked what would the Brazilians gain by such a step; slavery would not be re-established, no good could possibly come, but only disorder and an imitation of the other feeble republics of South America, where mushroom presidencies follow each other in endless succession.

The OPPOSER praised the good order with which the movement was effected. He then said that there had been a strong feeling in favour of republicanism among the Brazilians; all other American countries, except those under British rule, are republican. He then remarked on the immediate causes—the unpopularity of the Crown Princess, who was entirely under clerical influence; the natural dislike of her husband, the disaffection of the army and navy, the jealousy between the police and the army. He admitted that the ex-Emperor had achieved many wise and liberal reforms, and he regretted that the revolution had not been deferred till after his death; but the people seemed unanimous in accepting it, and the will of the people is law.

The SECONDER made a rather long but disjointed speech, having to search about in his notes after every two or three sentences. He contrasted the feebleness of the Provisional Government with the beneficent rule of Dom Pedro.

C. A. PHILLIMORE devoted himself to making sarcastic and abusive remarks on the Opposer's speech. After this preliminary matter he eulogised monarchies in general, and the Brazilian in particular—constitutional monarchies everywhere succeed well. He then said that the Czar was very popular within his own dominions.

G. GILLET hardly thought the Czar was a constitutional sovereign.

F. ECCLES thought Mr. Phillimore's observations hardly to the point; he hoped the House would take no notice of Phillimore's misplaced sarcasm and Longhurst's ill-timed quotations.

C. A. PHILLIMORE denied that he had said the Russian was a constitutional monarchy.

F. ECCLES said he, at any rate, implied it.



R. BALFOUR, in a few words, but exceedingly to the point, said that the supporters of the motion were arguing merely out of sympathy to Don Pedro. Any one might sympathise with him without disapproving of the revolution. No one had answered Mr. Gillett's argument, that it was the will of the people and must be accepted as such.

As no supporter of the motion replied to Mr. Balfour, the House divided on the motion—*Ayes*, 10; *Noes*, 5. Majority for, 5.

## THE LITERARY SOCIETY.

THE Society met on Fridays, November 22 and November 29, and 'Macbeth' was read at both meetings. The principal parts were taken as follows:—

<i>Duncan</i>	. . .	J. S. PHILLIMORF.
<i>Malcolm</i>	. . .	R. W. KNOX.
<i>Donalbain</i>	. . .	G. G. S. GILLETT.
<i>Macbeth</i>	. . .	Rev. G. H. NALL.
<i>Banquo</i>	. . .	P. WILLIAMSON.
<i>Macduff</i>	. . .	C. A. PHILLIMORF.
<i>Lenox</i>	. . .	A. C. NESBITT.
<i>Rosse</i>	. . .	W. T. BARWELL.
<i>Meneth</i>	. . .	Rev. A. G. S. RAYNOF.
<i>Angus</i>	. . .	G. LENOX-CONYNGHAME, Esq.
<i>Caithness</i>	. . .	H. L. STEPHENSON.
<i>Lady Macbeth</i>	. . .	A. L. LONGHURST.

## FENCING.

THE Competition for the Fencing Badge took place in the Gymnasium on Monday, December 9, before a large number of spectators. The entries this year were extremely few in number, and let us hope there will be some improvement in this respect next year. In the first round, Jonas defeated Davidson with great ease, but in the second round he found a more powerful adversary in S. H. Gregory, while in the final C. H. Gregory gained an easy victory over Jonas and thus secured the badge for the ensuing year. The score was as follows:—

### FIRST ROUND.

S. H. Gregory beat H. V. Eason (5-2).  
H. C. Jonas „ F. C. Davidson (5-0).  
C. H. Gregory „ H. Davidson (5-2).

### SECOND ROUND.

H. C. Jonas beat S. H. Gregory (5-4).  
C. H. Gregory, a bye.

### FINAL.

C. H. Gregory beat H. C. Jonas (5-0).

H. Davidson, whose fencing seemed to afford great amusement to the spectators, challenged H. C. Jonas for the second place, but was defeated after a well-fought contest (4-5).

## QUERIES.

ENCORING THE EPILOGUE.—The author of the interesting 'Greville Memoirs,' under date of December 20, 1843 (New Ed. 1888, vol. v. p. 22) says:—'On Monday night I went to the Westminster Play "Phormio," admirably acted by three of the boys. It was very amusing, much more than I thought possible on reading the play. It is the work of an accomplished playwright, full of good situations and replete with stage effect. They ought to leave off the vile custom of encoring the Prologue and Epilogue. We had to listen to ninety-six lines of the latter repeated twice over, when the audience were tired, and however well entertained, impatient to disperse.' From this it would appear that there was a regular custom of encoring the Prologue and Epilogue. Is this so? and when was the habit discontinued? In what other years were either of the two encored?

ALPHA.

## Obituary.

THE following is taken from the *Times*, November 27:—

We have to record the death, which took place at Ramsgate recently, of Mr. Henry James Wolfenden Johnstone, F.R.C.S. He was born in 1808, and was the eldest son of Dr. Johnstone, who was physician in ordinary to King William IV. He was educated at Westminster School and at St. George's Hospital, where he subsequently became house surgeon and teacher of anatomy. He had at one time a large practice, and was a frequent contributor to the medical Press, and was joint editor with his father of the *Medico-Chirurgical Review*. At the early age of 40, however, his health broke down from frequent attacks of suppressed gout, and he retired from practice. He resided in France during the memorable years 1848 to 1850, and learned to take a keen personal interest in French politics. In recent years Mr. Johnstone, after a brief interval of resumed practice, resided at Ramsgate, and took part only in local affairs.

The Treasurer begs to acknowledge with thanks the following donations to the *Elizabethan*:—

H. N. Robson	... £ s. d.	Rev. A. G. S. Raynor	£ s. d.
B. E. Strauss	... 1 0 0	H. L. Stephenson	... 1 0 0



## Correspondence.

## FROM OUR OXFORD CORRESPONDENT.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—I must apologise for omitting the name of A. J. Pryce from the Honour List of last term. He obtained a Third in Lit. Hum.

We have played three matches since my last letter. The first two we lost. In both cases our teams were very weak compared with what we could do, and several substitutes were played. It is, of course, always difficult to get up a team, owing to the number of College matches, but I think this term the failure has been partly due to not arranging the teams long enough beforehand. Our third was much better, and we won the match. Harrison has been playing for the University, and last Saturday played for Cambridge and Oxford against London. The principal athletic events lately have been the Cup Ties and the Torpid Trial Fours, which every College has this term. Westminster has been well represented in the former and fairly in the latter, Cox and Druitt being in winning boats.

In the Freshmen's Sports, Street was second in the 100 Yards and Long Jump.

In volunteering the mantle of Captain Slickman seems to have fallen on Corporal E. R. Davies, who has won his Company Cup for shooting and the Handicap Cup.

As you noticed, Lowe has retired from the Elizabethan Club Committee, and Probyn reigns in his stead.

On November 12, the Club met for the second time in Goldie's room, and abolished all it had done at the previous meeting, and began again. The expiring secretary reported progress, and read out a draft code of rules for the Society, which were passed with one small amendment. The Society then elected Withers as President, Major Wilson as Treasurer, Probyn as Secretary, and James, Erskine, Shore, and Page as non-official members of the Committee.

The Committee have taken the room over Vincent's shop in the High Street for the club room, and as members have received notices to pay their entrance fees, we may presume that their other schemes are progressing.

I remain, yours obediently,

Oxford, Dec. 5, 1889.

BOSPOROS.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—Since there seems to be renewed anxiety and energy about the clearance of the debt contracted by the *Elizabethan*, I may be justified in proposing a means of doing so, which, though rather slow, would prove effective finally. It is that the size of the paper be reduced without a corresponding reduction of the subscription; by a judicial pruning of the matter in such a way that the news of the School's doings may be given to those interested in it, without any matter which they don't want to know or can very well imagine for themselves. To begin with, I think our anxiety to be free of the debt will balance our sorrow at being deprived of those bright and interesting leaders. A few lines containing the essence of the intended article would suffice. The 'Westminster Worthy' must on no account be cut down; we cannot spare such interesting matter. But the football accounts are always unintelligible and useless, except in so far as they criticise the play of the teams and announce the result. They might be reduced to the result and the teams, and when necessary a comment on the play of our team. We might go further, and only insert the comment when the play was good. At other times we can well imagine it, and so not much space would be occupied.

The 'School Notes' cannot well be curtailed; they would

disappear altogether if the attempt were made. But the Debating Society reports might be reduced to the words of the motion and the result of the division. Such an account would be more edifying within those limits. The other societies' reports and the Correspondence and Notices never occupy much space. With such a pruning the size of the number would be greatly reduced, and, I take it, nothing lost that is worth having, save only the leaders; and at the same time the cost of production would be greatly reduced, and a considerable sum saved at each issue. I would advise you, Mr. Editor, and your treasurer to consider this, and I trust it may lead to some solution of your difficulties.

I am, yours, &c.,

O.W.

## GHOSTS IN THE DEBATING SOCIETY.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—I was glad to see in the last number of your paper a letter concerning the proceedings of the Debating Society. Will you kindly allow me to say a few words on the same subject? In the report of meeting held on October 17, it may be observed that sixteen times did members rise to speak, and at the next meeting seventeen times, which makes thirty-three speeches in an hour and three-quarters (allowing a quarter of an hour for questions, appeals, &c.), which gives an average of about three minutes to each speech. In these two debates on the same motion, the proposer spoke at least six times, and the seconder five times. Is that in accordance with the rules and bye-laws of this ancient institution? But what I want to speak about at fuller length is the absurd motion concerning which so many speeches—hardly less absurd than the motion itself—were made. I was greatly surprised, when I came to the reports of the Debating Society, to see that the House met for the discussion of the motion—'That this House affirms the existence of ghosts'—and still more was I surprised when I found that the motion had been carried by a majority of seven votes. *Pro tempora, pro mores*. Has the state of affairs in the Debating Society come to such a pass that a member shall get up and propose such a motion, and that the House shall pass it, too? My impression of ghosts, as one member put it, I believe, is that they are due to indigestion, and are like dreams; as England's greatest poet has it—

'I speak of dreams, which are the children of an idle brain,  
Begot of nothing but vain fantasy.'

If I am not taking up too much space, I will just tell you of an apparition that appeared to me myself, so I can vouch for the truth of this. It was a long time ago—I was a small boy of about seven years old—moreover, it was Christmas time, and I had eaten endless cakes and sweet things, and consequently retired to bed somewhat early. I had hardly closed my eyes five minutes, ere I saw a tall figure gliding through the door, which was fast shut. *Obstupui steteruntque comae et vox faucibus haesit*. I shall never forget that night. Still I do not believe in ghosts and such things. They are simply the result of over-eating. And yet there are eleven honourable members of Westminster School Debating Society who believe in them! They will grow wiser as they grow older; for the present, let them waste their time and eloquence about things that do exist. Trusting I have not trespassed too long on your valuable space,

Yours truly,

NEMO.

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

*Shylock*.—Some numbers of *The Elizabethan* have been out of print, and of others there are only very few left. But if there is a general wish to buy those of which there are many left at half price, we have no objection to selling them as you suggest.



Our Contemporaries.

WE beg to acknowledge, with thanks: *The Carthusian, Wykehamist, Meteor, Wellingtonian, Cheltonian, Cambridge Review (3), Cliftonian, Durham University Magazine, Bradford College Chronicle, Haileyburian, Blue, Pauline, Brighton College Magazine, Lancing College Magazine, Salopian, and South-Eastern College Magazine.*

NOTICES.

All contributions to the February number of *The Elizabethan* must be sent in by January 25 to the Editor, St. Peter's College, Westminster.

All other communications must 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, should be forwarded to H. L. STEPHENSON, Treasurer of *The Elizabethan*, 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.

Morcat.