

WHITEFRIARS JOURNAL.

Edited by
FRIAR G. B.
BURGIN.

No. 18. VOL. III. JANUARY, 1913.

PRIVATE
CIRCULATION

CLUB DIARY.

OCTOBER 18th.—*Club Guest:* MR. TIM HEALY, K.C., M.P..
Prior: FRIAR RICHARD WHITEING. *Topic:* "Spelling Reform."

NOVEMBER 1st.—*Club Guest:* SIR GEORGE R. ASKWITH, K.C.B.
Prior: FRIAR ROBERT DONALD. *Topic:* "The Problem of Labour Unrest."

NOVEMBER 8th.—*Club Guest:* SIR GEORGE ALEXANDER. *Prior:*
FRIAR KEBLE HOWARD. *Topic:* "The Stage and the Public."

NOVEMBER 22nd.—*Club Guest:* MR. NORMAN ANGELL. *Prior:*
FRIAR A. G. GARDINER. *Topic:* "Peace and War."

DECEMBER 6th.—*Club Guest:* MAJOR LEONARD DARWIN. *Prior:*
DR. BURNETT SMITH. *Topic:* "Eugenics."

DECEMBER 13th.—ANNUAL MEETING DINNER. *Prior:* FRIAR
GEORGE HENRY PERKINS.

DECEMBER 20th.—CHRISTMAS DINNER. *Prior:* FRIAR SIR
ERNEST CLARKE.

ON October 18th, the autumn programme was opened with an animated, if not altogether conclusive, debate on "Spelling Reform," a topic introduced in an exceedingly persuasive and eloquent speech by Mr. Tim Healy, K.C., M.P.

Prior Richard Whiteing confessed at the outset some little alarm lest the guest of the evening should prove his case too completely. His abilities were well known. Had he not, some years ago, suddenly taken it into his head to go on a voyage to Lisbon, knowing not a word of Portuguese, and, ere he reached port, been able not only to order his dinner, but to achieve other "biting" things equally difficult at the same time? And so powerful were his gifts of persuasion, that if he succeeded in reforming our spelling our best line of defence against the foreigner would be gone.

Mr. Healy began with a personal confession. Next to his

own country, he said, the subject of spelling reform had been near to his heart for forty years, but never before had he given utterance to his feelings on the matter. Isaac Pitman he regarded as one of the greatest Englishmen of the nineteenth century. His own present purpose was not to advocate any change that would affect themselves, their books, or their newspapers. His aim was to help the children—the children of the poor—in the elementary schools of the country. To these children the introduction of spelling reform, on the phonetic system, would mean a saving of from two to three years of their school life, which could be devoted to other subjects than reading. Comparing the case of the children in Germany and of other Continental nations with our own, he found that they had a great advantage. After only six months at school the German child, for example, could read fluently, whereas the English child, taking the average, would require not six months, but four years to attain such fluency. He maintained that there was a case for inquiry. The effect on the nation of the present system of spelling was tremendous. This system he stigmatised as miserable, absurd, and stupid. C A T, for instance, did not spell “cat.” The existing system had no authority. It was, he suspected, the invention of a number of printers, who stuck in letters to justify the case! It had against it all the eminent philologists, with one exception—Dr. Trench, who had lived to admit his errors. The scoffer was following suit, just as he had done in regard to the once much criticised tonic sol-fa system of musical notation, which had made the children of the masses lyrical. Every nation in Europe, save the Turks, the Irish (and the Irish were at it), and the English, were teaching language phonetically. He recalled a visit to a village schoolroom in Pennsylvania, in which nine out of every ten of the pupils were of foreign origin, and instanced their struggles and the struggles of the teacher. What was going on in that one school was going on in tens of thousands of schools where the English language was being taught, and he asked his hearers to consider the accumulated effect upon the race. At the least, he urged, let the phonetic system have a fair trial. Let them take one London school, and have two classes made up of children of equal age and capacity, the one trained on the phonetic system, the other on that of “this old husk.” Let there be a trial lasting for two years, and then a judgment by results.

Some years ago, the speaker continued, he noticed in a Melbourne paper a plea, on the ground of Imperial expediency, for a standardisation of spelling—a plea grounded on the fact that without such a standardisation the children of what were called “the back blocks” would lose touch with the language of the mother country. It appeared from this that some system of phonetic spelling was an essential complement of Colonial expansion. The common argument against the phonetic system was its ugliness. He granted this; but the objection, with others, had been discounted long since.

Friar C. W. Kimmins thought the average English child experienced comparatively little difficulty in learning to read, being led on by interest in the subject. The parallel suggested between the musical notations and spelling was, he considered, unfair, the tonic sol-fa notation leading on naturally to the staff notation, whereas in the teaching of language there could be no such natural progression. If reform came, it would have to be a root-and-branch reform.

Friar A. G. Gardiner suggested that the subject was one for the next Imperial Conference.

Friar Sir Ernest Clarke urged that the initial problem was that of the standardisation of pronunciation. Pronunciation was a better line of defence against the foreigner than our spelling. The musical parallel was a confusion of physiology with philology. There was a far greater need for a reform in ciphering—the introduction of metric symbols in our arithmetic.

Friar Wilfred Whitten felt dubious of the saving of time urged by Mr. Healy. How did he make his calculation? To his own view, it seemed that the child would have two systems to learn instead of one. In all schools, spelling was graduated according to the ages of the scholars. As to C A T not spelling “cat,” the name of the animal was so spelt throughout the world. He doubted very much if *catena* in Latin was a device of the Roman compositors. Absence of “authority” was the strength of our language. Sound symbols in music were devices for training the voice, and arbitrary. The written or spoken word was a reservoir of latent meaning, a philological landscape, a history, a poem. And when they sought to enable children to learn the language by a phonetic system of spelling, they would be teaching them to read and speak a language divested of history and of nearly all its human interest.

Friar W. Algernon Locker expressed agreement with Mr. Healy.

Mr. J. Hynes (of Messrs. Pitman's) thought that Mr. Healy had made out an exceedingly strong case for inquiry, especially when they bore in mind the fact that only one word in every thousand in our language was spelt as it was pronounced. There was a great waste of time, and he was sure the average child had a very great difficulty in learning to read.

Friar W. H. Helm condensed his argument into a story—a story of a party of travellers approaching a hill. One of them, a lady, expressed her regret that such an ugly thing as a gasometer had been placed on the summit. When the summit was reached the “gasometer” proved to be the remains of a Norman castle! But, as the late Mr. Labouchere had once said, perhaps it did not matter how a word was spelt so long as there was no doubt as to the precise word that was intended.

Friar A. B. Cooper quoted some humorous verses he had written years ago typifying the difficulties of the child in its adventures in spelling.

Mr. Bernard Kettle (librarian of the Guildhall) advanced the “derivation” argument in support of the existing system of spelling, particularly in reference to place names.

The Prior then tendered the thanks of the company to the guest of the evening, at the same time paying a graceful compliment to the Irish, who, taking the language as they found it, made the best of it, and, he thought, spoke the best English.

Mr. Healy, who was enthusiastically cheered, dismissed the “derivation” argument as obsolete, told an interesting story of the loss at sea of a fount of phonetic type taken out by a party of Japanese students in 1875, and concluded with an earnest plea that the members of the Whitefriars Club would give the subject of reformed spelling sympathetic consideration, if only out of regard to those humbler members of the community to whom, as he had suggested, it was a “bread-and-butter” question.

Sir George Askwith, K.C.B., was the Club's guest on November 1st, and spoke about “Labour Unrest,” Friar Donald being in the chair. In the course of an address marked by singular penetration and fairness, he gave us the inner history of

the settlements arrived at in the dock strike at Hull and the cotton strike in Lancashire, telling both stories admirably. There was, he said, no one cause of unrest, and no one cure. Compulsory arbitration was impossible in this country, because awards could not be enforced; but, after all, voluntary agreements were kept by both sides in the majority of cases. Some Unions had kept agreements for thirty or forty years.

The Hon. W. Pember Reeves said that compulsory arbitration had come about as "a fruit of education and experience," and worked well. It was not, however, imposed upon any trade against its will, as some people imagined, and not enforced by imprisonment. There were fines, collected by a process of attaching wages; but they only secured that agreements should run their course, and did not preclude a strike or lock-out after due notice when any new award was considered unsatisfactory.

Mr. G. R. Sims, Sir George Riddell, Dr. Rouse (Cambridge), and Mr. Gordon Selfridge contributed speeches to an interesting debate.

On November 8th, Friar Keble Howard in the chair, Sir George Alexander, opening a debate on "The Stage and the Public," entered a strong plea for the municipal theatre. Before plunging into his subject, however, the guest of the evening, looking round the company for faces familiar to him, said he was reminded by the presence of "my old friend Catling" of the time when he first came to London, and found in him such a staunch friend.

In Sir George Alexander's opinion, there never was a time when the stage had such a great hold—such a great intellectual hold—upon the public. Our dramatists had created for the theatre a new audience for which any manager might be glad to cater. He demurred to the idea that a manager's sole aim was the making of money. If municipal commerce was a practical and defensible thing, and municipal art also, he asked himself, why not municipal drama? He was confident that under the management of expert permanent officials, the municipal theatre could be run on successfully commercial lines, and thought the municipal theatre might be made of great service educationally to the younger generation.

Friar Richard Whiteing did not feel in a position to offer

criticism of the proposed municipal theatre, but maintained that if any theatre gave to the public plays in which the touch of human nature was manifest, plays that would go to the heart of the old pit and the old gallery, there would be a full response from the public. The drama was a popular success abroad because it was cheap, and everyone had a chance to see it. In this country, it was largely the drama of a class.

Friar Clement K. Shorter expressed a doubt as to the standard by which a municipal theatre was to be run, especially from the educational standpoint, and tentatively suggested that no play written within the past hundred years should be performed.

Sir Laurence Gomme said he was a believer in the municipal theatre, and pointed out the many benefits which the people had derived from existing municipal enterprises.

Mr. Charles Geake, of the *Westminster Gazette*, asked for details. How many municipal theatres were there to be? And might not the performances in private houses prove more attractive? Were the public to be admitted free? We were all to get in for sixpence? And how was the question of locality to be settled?

Mr. Hugo Valentin, who has translated several of Mr. Shaw's and Mr. Galsworthy's plays for the Scandinavian stage, gave some interesting experiences of two State-subsidised theatres in Sweden. They had not paid very well, he said, but they had been a great stimulus to the intellectual life of the country. There was a great economic question, and this was made more difficult in London because the land was so expensive. The English people did not know how excellent the theatres were that they had at present, theatres that compared in all respects favourably with any others he had seen in Europe. No country furnished the Continent with so many plays as England did; and producers and playwrights, underrated here in their own country, were appreciated abroad. But he thought the actor-managers here somewhat underrated the public intelligence in adaptations from the foreign stage. It was not necessary in these cases to transform a French marquis into an English earl. As to the English critics—and he himself had written criticisms for some fifteen years—the only thing against them was that they were rather afraid of new things.

Sir J. Newton Moore, Agent-General for West Australia, was inclined to support the municipal theatre on educational grounds.

Friar Sir Robert A. Hudson confessed that he was not a theatre-goer. Sir Laurence Gomme had urged in support of the municipal theatre the consideration that in the intervals it would be possible to go freely about and talk to one's friends. "I," said Sir Robert, "would like to be able to do this throughout the piece."

Friar Desmond T. Coke having referred to the opposing claims of the drama of ideas and the drama of action.

Friar G. B. Burgin gave some entertaining reminiscences of his experiences with a certain actor-manager. Proceeding, he suggested that the people, as a rule, did not want ideals in their drama, unless the ideals were their own ideals. Some preferred classical drama; some "a leggy piece," and so on. He remembered the case of one old lady who had attained to a passion for the classical drama, and confided to a friend that she had seen *Adipose Wrecks* and was going to see *Mil-es-tones*! If managers provided plays they thought people ought to see instead of plays the people themselves thought they ought to see, the British stage would be in a very much worse position than it was now.

Friar G. Moulton Piper thought the public had been rather left out of the discussion. If drama was to receive national support, why not every other form of art? It was true they taught artists drawing, but that was no reason why the public should buy the artists' pictures. As to the municipal drama abroad, it meant starvation for the players engaged. And if they were to have a municipal drama here, how was it to be managed? How many theatres were they to have? Was Clapham to be taxed for a theatre in the Strand? How were the varying claims of Poplar and Brixton, for example, to be catered for? There was at present a sufficiency of provision in London for all tastes; and as to education, he did not know that we always wanted to be educated.

Mr. Norman Angell spoke about "Peace and War" to a full gathering on November 22nd, Friar A. G. Gardiner presiding.

Mr. Angell contended with great energy that the benefits claimed for war are illusory, and that it is the duty of the Press to educate Europe in this knowledge. Of an organised era of peace at some early date, he avowed himself hopeful. Fifty years after a child was burnt alive for its faith in Madrid, every-

one knew that this could never happen again; and so it would be with war when the opinion of civilised mankind grew really opposed to it. The trouble was that people did not make up their minds.

After a pessimistic reply from Mr. Sidney Low, Friars Whiteing and Hamilton Fyfe continued the debate, the latter declaring that he believed in war. The attempt to do away with it reminded him of the New Yorker who gazed rather a long time at a giraffe in the Zoo, and then said: "Well, there ain't no sech animal."

Friar Whitten thought there was an analogy between war and temper; neither could be entirely guarded against.

In a very spirited reply, Mr. Angell declared that he never said people would not go to war for any cause whatever. But those who approved war because they thought it inevitable, were simply preaching the doctrine of the Turk—Kismet. Man is a savage beast: perfectly true. But what are you going to do about it? Leave it at that? Struggle is the law of life, but what kind of struggle? A struggle of man against Nature, not of man against man. The test of civilisation is our capacity to understand human relations, and while they are settled by force they will never be understood.

On December 6th, Major Leonard Darwin, President of the Eugenic Society, was the guest, the topic being "Eugenics." Dr. Burnett Smith was Prior, and, in proposing the health of the guest, spoke of the rare distinction of the family of the famous author of the evolution theory, and in particular of the work undertaken by Major Darwin.

The latter, in a thoughtful and modest speech, said that the Society of which he was President did not claim to have advanced very far in the field of research in which it had entered; there was a well-known opinion attributed to the world, of learning too little and of teaching too much. The Eugenic Society recognised that it was impossible to go beyond public opinion, and that public opinion moved slowly. They were a little society, living in an attic in York Place. They were, however, stirred by the seriousness of a great fact. Only fifty years ago, the more fit were progressing more rapidly than the unfit. Now, the reverse was the case. The unfit class was progressing more rapidly than the fit. The Society thought that something was to be learned from

the methods of the stock yard. In the case of the domestic animals, two things were considered—environment and heredity. In the case of man, we almost entirely neglected heredity; the country needed education in this matter. Crime and poverty were associated with the inferior qualities. Major Darwin gave some striking statistics to show how crime ran in families, and urged that the whole subject was worthy of grave thought by the country.

In the course of the discussion, Friar Newton Crane endorsed what the Club guest had said, touching on the statistics as to idiocy, and heredity in feeble-mindedness. He congratulated the young Society on the strides it was making under the presidency of Major Darwin.

Friar Richard Whiteing thought that this was largely an economic question. Let them take care that the people had sufficient means, and the marriages might be left to take care of themselves.

Friar Spurgeon referred to the workhouse population of feeble children, and the multitudes of others almost born foredoomed by their conditions. He was sympathetic to the aims of the Society.

In a humorous speech, Friar Silas Hocking submitted that the Society, if it proposed to settle marriage by conditions of health, and not by love and romance, would ruin the vocation of novelists.

Friar Helm, criticising the guest's thesis, pointed to services rendered to literature and life generally by those who had been sickly or abnormal children, and urged that if breeding were confined to the rearing of strictly healthy offspring, the world would be the poorer in people of ideas and imagination.

Friar W. Kimmins, with some vehemence, related his observations in the poorer districts of London of the terrible plight of children of feeble intelligence, and of the hopelessness of the task of preparing them adequately for the battle of life. He thought it was high time that the Eugenic Society came to the aid of educationists.

Major Darwin, in a vivacious reply to the various speakers, said it was a mistake to hold, as some did, that the race should be left as it was without selection owing to the fear that it might suffer from selection. The history of Evolution went against that theory. While the law of survival of the fittest obtained, the case was different: but now with the preserving influence of modern civilisation for the benefit of the weak, it was necessary that there should be some selection.

ANNUAL REPORT AND BALANCE SHEET, 1912.

In submitting the report for the year, the Committee are glad to be able to state that interest in the Club and its various meetings has been well sustained.

At the last annual meeting, it was decided to enlarge the membership so that the Club should consist of not more than 125 town members and of country members. A country member was defined as one "who has no permanent residence or occupation within twelve miles of Charing Cross." Consequent upon this enlargement, the following new members have been elected during the twelve months: Mr. H. E. Alden, Mr. A. H. M. Lunn, Mr. A. Reynolds, Mr. W. Francis Aitken, Mr. C. W. F. Goss, Mr. A. B. Cooper, Mr. Alfred Edmonds, Mr. J. A. K. Burnett, Sir Vincent Evans, Mr. Ivy J. Lee, Mr. Edwin Oliver, Mr. H. K. Hudson, Mr. H. H. Dent, Mr. Harvey Darton, and Mr. C. D. Cazenove. Several country members, waiting to be placed on the town list when the membership allowed, have been transferred.

Owing to removal, illness, or pressure of other engagements, the following Friars have resigned during the year: Friars Hinkson, Hasluck, Pinker, C. Arthur Pearson, Cyril Davenport, and Mostyn T. Pigott.

The Committee greatly regret to record the death of Friar Bram Stoker.

During the twelve months, twenty-one dinners in all were arranged by the Committee, three of which were informal House Dinners, to which Club guests were not invited. Our special guests at the weekly dinners have been: His Honour Judge Parry, Sir Robert Ball, LL.D., F.R.S., The Bishop of Birmingham, Mr. William Archer, Dr. Hagberg Wright, Sir Almroth Wright, F.R.C.S., Field-Marshal Lord Roberts, Mr. Tim Healy, K.C., M.P., Sir George Askwith, K.C.B., Sir George Alexander, Mr. Norman Angell, and Major Leonard Darwin.

Among the topics of after-dinner discussions have been: "The World and the Bench," "Wild Beasts of To-day," "The Germans and Ourselves," "What Playgoers Want," "Books as Gifts," "The Psychology of Women," "The Pen and the Sword," "Spelling Reform," "The Problem of Labour Unrest," "The Stage and the Public," "Peace and War," and "Eugenics."

The annual dinner was held at Anderton's on March 1st,

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS, 1911-1912.

RECEIPTS.

	£	s.	d.
To Bank Balance, Nov. 17th, 1911	...	112	8 11
" Interest on £300 London County Council 3%	...	8	9 8
Stock (cost £290 16s.)	...	279	6 0
" Members' Subscriptions	...	29	8 0
" Entrance Fees	...	56	2 0
" Christmas Dinner	...	34	10 0
" Ladies' Dinner	...	38	18 0
" Summer Pilgrimage	...	2	2 0
" Artiste's Fee refunded	...	1	0 0
" Railway Fare refunded

£562 4 7

ALGERNON S. ROSE,
Hon. Auditor.

EXPENDITURE.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
By Rent of Club Room	80	0	0
" Christmas Dinner	...	58	15 0
" Crackers	...	7	9 0
" Ladies' Dinner	66	4	0
" Summer Pilgrimage	40	12	9
" Booklet	...	48	3 6
" Artists	...	8	6 0
" Waiters' Gratuities	56	9	6
" Reporters	35	14	0
" Club Guests	6	5	0
" General Printing	2	2	0
" Special do.	4	11	7
" Club Journal	13	1	0
" List of Members	37	3	8
" Postages and Sundries	11	16	0
" Newspapers	6	0	6
" Clerical help	13	14	3
" Repairing Photos	1	2	3
" Cupboard	3	13	6
" Cheque Book	1	7	0
" Presentation Plate to Prior Shaylor on his retirement from the Hon. Secretaryship	2	10	0
" Balance at Bank, 30th November, 1912...	0	4	2

£502 4 7

EDWARD CLODD,
Hon. Treasurer.

Friar Helm presiding. Sir E. T. Cook, as the guest of the evening, responded to the toast of "Literature."

The Ladies' Banquet was held at the Trocadero on May 3rd; Friar Max Pemberton was Prior. Mrs. Baillie Reynolds proposed the toast of "Literature," to which Friar Sir Robertson Nicoll replied. Judge Parry gave the toast of "The Ladies."

The subscriptions of town and country members, with a balance brought forward of £112 8s. 11d., showed that the total receipts for the year were £562 4s. 7d., the expenditure £393 5s. 2d., leaving a balance of £168 19s. 5d.

Friars are again indebted to Friar G. B. Burgin for his editorship of the *Journal*, and to Friars Keighley Snowden and W. F. Aitken for their interesting records.

THE ANNUAL DINNER.

The Annual General Meeting of the Brotherhood took place in the Chapter Room, Anderton's Hotel, on Friday, December 13th. Members dined together at 6.30 under the Priorship of Friar G. H. Perkins. On this occasion, no "outside" guests were invited to the dinner which precedes the Annual Meeting.

The report of the Committee and balance sheet were submitted, and the Officers and Committee elected for the ensuing year.

Friar F. J. Cross brought forward a resolution dealing with the Club's surplus funds for charitable purposes. The resolution, which was withdrawn after an animated discussion, was seconded by Friar the Hon. Gilbert Coleridge.

The circulation of the Loving Cup ended a most enjoyable and interesting evening.

THE CHRISTMAS DINNER.

The Christmas Dinner was held at the Trocadero on December 20th. Friar Sir Ernest Clarke was the Prior of the night, and Lady Clarke kindly officiated as hostess.

The Prior gave "The King," making an historical reference to the birthday (Dec. 20th) of Prince George. The customary formula of welcome was then read to the guests.

The Club Guest was Miss Lilian Braithwaite.

The other guests were :—

THE PRIOR—Lady Clarke, Mrs. E. Cooper, Mr. H. C. Wallace, Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Woodthorpe. FRIAR AITKEN—Mrs. and Miss Aitken. FRIAR H. J. BROWN—Mrs. H. J. Brown, Miss Maud Brown, Miss Dora Brown, Mr. S. C. Schooling. FRIAR HERBÉ BROWNING—Miss MacManus. FRIAR G. B. BURGİN—Mrs. G. B. Burgin, Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Burgin, Mr. and Mrs. E. L. Burgin, Miss Beryl Kilner, Mr. Harold Burgin. FRIAR CLODD—Miss Jane Harrison. FRIAR F. J. CROSS. FRIAR R. N. FAIRBANKS—Mr. Fairbanks. FRIAR FALCK—Mrs. Falck, Miss D. Falck, Mrs. Burt, Mr. and Mrs. Clayton, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Polak. FRIAR FOSTER FRASER—Mrs. Foster Fraser, Mrs. Bevan, Mr. Ernest Platt, Mr. and Mrs. B. Van Praagh, Mr. Merton Spicer, Mr. Herbert White. FRIAR TOM GALLON—Miss Nellie Tom-Gallon, Mr. and Mrs. Engelbach, Mr. and Mrs. James George, Dr. Cecil Johnson, Miss Johnson, Mrs. Arthur Rogers. FRIAR A. G. GARDINER—Mrs. Gardiner. FRIAR GASTON—Mrs. Gaston, Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton Sawyer, Mrs. J. Maitland Jones. FRIAR W. HELM—Mrs. Helm, Mr. Cyril Helm, Miss M. Cook. FRIAR S. HOCKING—Mrs. Hocking, Miss Hocking, Mr. A. V. Hocking, Miss Lloyd, Mr. Norman White. FRIAR CLIVE HOLLAND—Mrs. Clive Holland, Mr. Herbert Jennings, Miss F. Budden. FRIAR JERROLD—Mrs. Jerrold. FRIAR LEIGHTON—Mrs. Leighton, Sir Laurence Gomme, Lady Gomme. FRIAR G. H. PERKINS—Mr. and Mrs. Sidney F. Boan, Mr. C. E. Fagan, Mr. Alfred B. Garside, Friar and Mrs. Locker, Mr. and Mrs. Oyler. FRIAR WARD MUIR—Mrs. Ward Muir, Mr. and Mrs. Beattie. FRIAR A. D. POWER—Miss Power, Mr. and Mrs. Hildred Causton, The Hon. Mrs. Codrington, Miss Margaret Codrington, Mr. H. E. Morgan, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Pitman, Rev. Canon Morley Stevenson, Mrs. Stevenson, Canon and Mrs. Wesley Dennis, Miss M. W. Dennis, Mrs. F. Danvers Sladen. FRIAR PIPER—Mrs. Piper, Mr. Gordon Piper, Surgeon and Mrs. Walter Biddulph. FRIAR REYNOLDS—Mrs. Reynolds. FRIAR ALGERNON ROSE—Mrs. Algernon Rose, Miss Macfarren. FRIAR MACCALLUM SCOTT, M.P.—Mrs. Scott, Mrs. John Scott, Dr., Mrs., and Miss Dvorkovitz. FRIAR JOSEPH SHAYLOR—Mrs. and Miss Shaylor, Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Stephenson. FRIAR CLEMENT SHORTER—Mrs. Shorter, Mrs. W. M. Thompson. FRIAR W. B. SLATER—Mrs. and Miss Slater, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Gale. FRIAR BURNETT SMITH—Mrs. Burnett Smith, Colonel and Mrs. Hubert Barclay. FRIAR WALTER

SMITH—Mrs. Walter Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Charles E. Denny. FRIAR SNOWDEN—Mrs. Snowden, Miss Snowden. FRIAR ARTHUR SPURGEON—Mrs. Spurgeon, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Attee, Miss Bestwick. FRIAR SIR WILLIAM TRELOAR, BART.—Mrs. Treloar, Mr. T. R. Treloar, Miss Treloar, Col. Sir W. H. Dunn, Miss Dunn, Mr. and Mrs. R. Gill, Dr. and Mrs. Hetley, Mr. and Mrs. R. Rough. THE HON. SECRETARY—Dr. and Mrs. Chapple, Dr. and Mrs. Rideal, Mrs. Walter Folliott, Miss Wilkins.

In giving "The Spirit of Christmas," Sir Laurence Gomme alluded to a cult which existed in Persia in the year 50 B.C., and had for its Christmas rite the slaughtering of bulls. It was a sacrifice made in every household. When we now eat our roast beef on Christmas Day, we were continuing a rite which began in a period prior to the advent of Christianity. Although some of the old traditions of this festive season had departed, there still remained something of love and charity which was worth remembering. These were some of the few ideals left in our prosaic life. He was one of those who believed that idealism was worth preserving, in spite of all the scientific and mathematic rules which, as they were told, governed the world at the present moment. (Applause.) We had now a conference of peace in our midst; it was somewhat fortunate that we could refer to the period when peace should reign in our midst when that conference was going on. (Applause.) The spirit of Christmas in the olden days was a real valuable asset in the family life. If we could only still preserve just a few relics of that spirit as we go forward generation after generation, it would confer a lasting benefit on husband and wife, their children, and those who would come after them. (Applause.)

The Prior, in proposing "The Ladies," explained that the Whitefriars Club was founded half a century ago by a few choice spirits, who came together at periodical intervals and discussed matters of national and imperial importance. Now and then, they felt entitled to have a "gaudy" evening. At the Christmas dinner, they had the privilege of the ladies' company; they took a pleasure in making it as pleasant and as little formal as possible. The Whitefriars did not come in their white garb, as they should, that evening, being associated with Mount Carmel. (Laughter.) He was only a Prior of a day; when that agreeable assembly was over he retired to his shell—no longer a Prior, but a common or garden friar. (Laughter.) He coupled with the toast the name

CLUB NOTES.

As the Friars will not let me know of their doughty deeds, I have to confine myself to outside sources.

"Mr. Punch" has his eye on us:—

"The weekly prize of 5s., or a copy of the Rev. Offley Bolsover's 'Soul Food,' for the best paragraph contributed to this column, has been awarded to the author of the communication relating to Balm. For the ensuing week, the prize will be awarded to the writer of the ten best rhymes on the model of the headlines in a recent number of *The Pall Mall Gazette*: 'Can you Name a Kitten? By Wilfred Whitten.' As examples for the use of competitors, I give: 'Chatter about Jane Porter. By C. K. Shorter'; and 'Are Dissenters fickle? By Sir Robertson Nicoll.'"

It is rather interesting that a small club like ours should have so many members mentioned in one "par." Friar Shorter has been parodied two or three times in *Punch* this year; that inveterate jester, in alluding to my imaginary play at the billiard table, has christened me "The Double Balkan"—a side hit at Eastern travel; and there have been scathing and utterly undeserved allusions to Friar Silas Hocking's handicap at golf. Friar Tom Gallon has twice been eulogised in *Punch*. He has also been the victim of a curious parallelism at the hands of Mr. Belasco, who wrote a book with the same plot as "Levity Hicks." Both books appeared on this side of the Atlantic within a fortnight of each other.

Every now and again, the microbe of a certain plot or idea gets into the air, and some mysterious thought transference wafts it from one side of the Atlantic to the other.

No one who knows Friar Tom Gallon and Mr. David Belasco will imagine for a moment that their respective stories are anything but curious parallels. The thing constantly happens. Some years ago, I wrote a novel, "The Shutters of Silence," which had a Trappist monk for hero. Almost as soon as it appeared, a play on the same subject was produced at the Adelphi, and Mr. Hichens published "The Garden of Allah."

While I am on the subject of books, I should like to mention Friar Joseph Shaylor's "The Fascination of Books," with its absolutely astounding knowledge of the ins and outs of the book trade, of authors and publishers, and everything that pertains to "the craft." As Mark Twain once said of himself, information "leaks out" of Friar Shaylor "like otter of roses out of the otter."

According to Friar Shaylor and the most learned and reliable Egyptian authorities, "The Book of the Dead" enjoys the distinction of being the first literary production in which there is any evidence of there being a supply and demand. The priests and undertakers of ancient Egypt were respectively the first publishers and booksellers, this strange combination being apparently contemporary with the building of the great Pyramids of Egypt.

A mind conversant with the titles of books is all that is necessary to translate what works were required when the following were asked for: "Earnest Small Travellers" and "Alice, the Mysterious," by Bulwer. Homer's "The Ill he had," and Cæsar's "Salvation Wars," were only Homer's "Iliad" and Cæsar's "Helvetian Wars" slightly altered. "Curiosities of a Woman Hater" was "Curiosities of Nomenclature." "Little Monster," by J. M. Barrie, the author of "Widow's Thumbs," "Many Sins of Judge Hawkins" ("Reminiscences of Judge Hawkins"), and "Hard Draughts," by Miss Marie Corelli ("Ardath"), are a few specimens of other inquiries for books.

Here are a few unintelligible titles of Friar Shaylor's, which have been taken from bona fide orders: "The History of the Uninhabited Islands of the Pacific, by One of the Natives"; "Hints on Swimming on Land, by One who has tried it." Another curious mixture is "Goldsmith's 'She Swoops to Conquer,'" and "The Social Evolution of Kidds."

A bookseller wrote the following reply to a clergyman who sent to him for a copy of a volume entitled "New and Contrite Hearts": "We regret to be unable to supply any 'New and Contrite Hearts,' as we are out of stock ourselves, and there are none to be obtained in the town."

Altogether, a most enjoyable and remarkable book. It is absolutely indispensable to busy editors, authors and raconteurs.

Which reminds me. I was at the Palace Theatre one afternoon, and two elderly gentlemen were talking behind me. "And so this chap was advertised to go down to a place as a 'raconteur,'" said one of them. "When he got to the inn, he couldn't find his room, and told the landlady that one had been reserved for him. He had come down to tell stories to the villagers. 'Ah,' said the landlady apologetically, 'I know who you are now, sir. You're the rake on tour.'"

Friar Lindley Jones writes as follows:—"There must be many golfers in the Brotherhood, and a Whitefriars golfing circle with a golfing day in each year should be possible. I do not know whether you contemplate another issue of the Journal in the early future; but if you do, I shall be glad if you will set the ball rolling by mentioning my suggestion. If, however, you propose to shirk your editorial duties, and intend to keep us waiting some months before you favour us with another issue, I will approach the Secretary with a view to addressing the members individually.

It is, of course, understood that in any tournament, you, as Editor, will play from the scratch mark."

One or two stories were told at the Darwin dinner. Major Darwin's mother once found her maid in tears after an animated discussion with the butler. "Well, what is there to cry about?" asked her mistress. "If you please," sobbed the maid, "the butler says as we're *all* descended from Mr. Darwin, and I couldn't believe it."

Another story was that of a man who met a friend. "I got such a fright on my wedding day," he hurriedly began. "Yes," said the friend, "I saw her."

G. B. B.