



# The Meteor.

Edited by Members of Rugby School.

No. 8.

RUGBY, JULY 25th, 1867.

[With Extra  
Sheets, Price 6d.]

LONG summer evenings, and sights and sounds of Examination, alike warn us that the end of the Term is drawing near. Long since have those who remember the old holidays begun to cry out at having to work in the hot July weather; and long since have all, old and new alike, begun to grumble at spending half the evening in their studies.

By the time, too, this reaches our readers' hands we shall be living in the close atmosphere of work which precedes the calmness of the holidays. We shall be, doubtless, as we peruse these pages, speculating on past Tutor papers, calculating on future form lines, inveighing against examiners and papers;—in a word, we shall be in the middle of Long List. It may seem absurd for us to attempt any review of our own career in the past Term. Four times only has the *Meteor* been guilty of appearance, and, according to the present *regime*, future Terms will see it no oftener. If we are to begin each Term with something of an Introduction, and end it with something of a Review, we shall certainly fall into the criticism of being all beginnings and endings.

But if the *Meteor* can claim no right to review the past, if it has no past to review, the School, to which it belongs, has passed through a career of the utmost importance. If as Meteorites we have no exploits, no history, to moralise on, as Rugbeians we have much to think of, much to be proud of. Rugby has passed through an eventful Term. It has beaten Marlborough; it has won nearly all its foreign matches; it has nearly carried off the trophies of Wimbledon; it has, above

all, celebrated its Tercentenary. Everything in the past is bright and pleasant to look upon: what can we say of the future?

The long holidays, and an extra week, will make our return late. By October nets will have vanished, Big-side goal-posts appeared. We shall have but a moment to recover our wind and order new boots, 'ere the Sixth Match will plunge us into the depths of Football. We are fully aware of the sacred nature of the ground we are about to enter on, yet, in glancing at the future, one question in connection with Football presents itself most forcibly to us: Is the present system of the game such as it ought to be, such as it is best for the School it should be? We wish not to be understood to refer to the actual rules of play; such questions we hold the Committee and Big-side Levée amply competent to deal with. But of the feeling and spirit which Football produces, and which make Football what it is,—of these what judgment can we form? Even the worst enemies of Football must allow that pluck, endurance, patriotism towards one's house, are qualities which should be justly held in the highest estimation, for at least three months in the year; that there are worse standards than these by which a fellow's character may be judged in the School; that their existence is advantageous, and not the reverse. We are not enemies, but ardent lovers of Football, therefore we concede these points completely and willingly. But the question which remains to be answered,—and which we recommend for our readers' consideration next Term,—is,

Whether these feelings are not by Football carried too far? Whether there is no brutality and utterly ill-feeling caused by the game? It is undeniable that much of that "House feeling" which "Cosmopolitan" attacks, takes its rise in Football. We believe it to be equally undeniable that our House matches at Football might be played, —as our matches at Cricket are,—as well and as thoroughly with less ill-feeling and spite than exists at present.

Our space warns us to cease our speculations and admonitions. Yet it would be hard were we not to find a place for a word of regret at the loss which the summer holidays, this year as in other years, will bring to the School. Great, we fear, will be the crowd of new faces that will crowd the chapel door the first Sunday of next Term. We shall return to great changes everywhere,—to great names in Cricket, in Football, in School, alas! passed away from us. Of them we have nothing new to say. We can only offer them, like everyone else, our best wishes and hopes, and remind them briefly of the great facilities of communication which unite Rugby with the rest of the habitable globe.

And for ourselves, readers, in spite of our confession of insignificance, we may claim a word for ourselves. What prospect is there for the *Meteor*? If we have failed often and grievously, we have learnt many lessons, we have gained much experience. If we have been rude, careless, and lazy, we intend to redeem our character yet. May we not, too, look forward hopefully to the future?

---

HATS! Yes, hats: tall hats; black hats! Reader, we hear that these hats are gradually sinking down from their egregious ugliness into something like a becoming and useful form of head-gear; but it is not this we wish to discuss—we wish to show that, so long as hats are hats, it is well that the new comer to Rugby School do wear one. We publish two letters on the subject in this number. Ranged against us are "A. H. St. V.," "Four Years" (dear us!), and "Cosmopolitan." Our ranks consist of "An Utter Fool." *Our* ranks, we say, for such a handle has been made of his name that we must defend him. "A. H. St. V.'s" original letter is, chronologically speaking, the first; let us examine it. He anticipates his opponents in raising up some objections which, as "An Utter Fool" remarked, he complacently

knocks down again: but he rather reminds us of one hitting at the cushion of a dynamometer, which gives with the blow, and then, at the touch of the proprietor, springs back again; only, in this case, "A. H. St. V." is proprietor as well, and does not give the required touch. For he seems to think the objection—"It is an old custom"—quite sufficiently answered by the question—"If an old custom cannot distinctly be proved good, why retain it simply because it is old?" You will see that this is rather Ultra-Liberal, but we will defend the objection later. The second objection—"It reduces new fellows to a sense of their inferiority"—we presume he raised for the diversion of crushing. Does he really think new fellows an inferior class of beings? for he does not deny their inferiority, but only the success of the hat in reducing them to a sense of it. How liberal! He does not make much of the third objection—"It enables new fellows to be recognised at once"—for he suggests the substitution of some other distinction, to get rid of the annoyance the hat is to a new fellow; declining to see that it is not the hat that is the annoyance, but the fact of the hat being the badge of a new fellow. After all this, "A. H. St. V." brings forward his reason for wishing the custom abolished. "That the hat is a decided nuisance at any time, but especially in summer, and only an encouragement to others to knock it about." We suppose he means the hat. But we thought the race of *ursa Rugbeiensis* was nearly extinct. "An Utter Fool" has shown him his mistake in thinking that new boys would be less bullied in straw than silk hats. Let us see how "A. H. St. V." upholds his case by his letter in the present number. Half a page of invective is followed by two crushing arguments. The first is—"It is evident," without proof, we suppose, "to any one who will consider the matter, that, so far as the question of bullying goes, it is the hat which really brings the annoyance upon the wearer, and not, usually, the wearer himself. The hat, by its peculiarity, must at once attract notice." (He has forgotten that he proposed the substitution of some other peculiarity.) We cannot think the truth of this statement as evident as does "A. H. St. V.," and have an idea that the fellows who want "taking down" would still get taken down in a straw hat, and that the fellows who do not want taking down, do not often now get bullied in a silk one.

After a few discursive surmises on "An

Utter Fool's" early life, he comes back to the point; at least he accuses him of a wilful mis-statement, which civility, he seems to think, looks neater without any proof.

In the *postscript* of his *second* letter, "A. H. St. V." gets out his reasons for objecting to the custom. "The hat is expensive;" perhaps so, but we cannot agree with him that a silk hat wears no better than a straw one. We think a fellow would want two straw hats his first Term.

"Faulty," because it is a great nuisance; this he says, requires no proof, so gives none.

"Disagreeable." To support this he says—"In winter, at punt-about, there are usually lots of fellows in hats who doubtless would prefer house caps if they had time to get them." We can only reply that in winter, at punt-about, there are usually lots of fellows in *straws* who doubtless would prefer house caps if they had time to get them.

"Untidy, because no one cares to keep his hat neat when he knows that it will probably be knocked off in the course of his walk down to lessons." We ask—Who do these things? Who is so easily amused as to care to make a buffoon of himself by knocking off a new fellow's hat? not every one, we think. Reader, our discussion grows dull; excuse, as garnishing, a quotation, dipped in inverted commas for use:—"A hat which has been *popped*, or exploded, by being sat down upon, is never itself again afterwards." True; but a straw has a like tendency, and, unluckily, hat brushes have not the same salutary effect on straw as silk. Another bit of garnishing—"The hat is the *ultimum moriens* of respectability. *Ultimum moriens* is old Italian, and signifies last thing to die." Yes, with new fellows, when clothes take quite too much time to brush, the hat often gets a rub round, and looks respectable. We know that a new fellow's hat is not generally supposed to be a very tidy object. It is not, but a new fellow's straw would be still less so. It may be said, why not all wear hats, then. No: the thing is that when a boy comes to Rugby he is set loose from the ties and restrictions of a private school, and, amongst others, that of keeping himself neat; and it has its effect upon him for a short time until he regains his balance—which takes some boys not long, if they ever after lose it, and others some years.

"Cosmopolitan" (let us take this opportunity of thanking him, in the name of our public, for such admirable suggestions as he

made in our June 13th number, on house feeling) seems to have been dreaming; for he begins (cf. "Cosmopolitan's" letter) by talking about some Reactionaries (cf. Johnson) whom he accuses of adopting a new tone—becoming deprecatory instead of contemptuous; plaintive instead of blustering. Now, at present there has only been one letter on the opposite side of the subject to his, so how can *they* have changed about so? But perhaps he has had a conversation with somebody about it.

He afterwards asks "Why should flowers be to any a forbidden fruit? Why should not young aspirants to knowledge read the hall newspapers?" We cannot see. There are several reasons why they should read the newspapers, and none, we think, why they should not wear flowers; but there is a class of animal that, after being at Rugby a year or so, selfishly sets itself in its own small but effective way, to make those who have been sent here a little later than itself as conscious of their inferiority (?) as possible. We once knew a boy who actually invented a code of coxiness, which, having been here himself about a year, he instilled into those who had come after him. It is really not the old customs, generally, that are oppressive, but these new ideas worked in by the selfishness of would-be patriarchs.

"Cosmopolitan," later on, brings forward some opinions—marked 1 and 2—which he attributes to what he calls "these Conservatives" (hardly the word, we think). They are most barbarous. If there be any who hold these articles, we beg to disclaim any connection with the gang. It was, we think, hardly necessary for him to overthrow the first; but his objection to the second he has put into such true words that they must do great good.

We are conscious of having left the objection, "It is an old custom," undefended. Trees cannot flourish without roots, nor can institutions be satisfactory without them, and roots do not grow in a day. "Let us expand a little." We will impersonate our Liberal and our Conservative, calling the latter, child A., and the former child B. Both these children have a small piece of land, say a flower-box, and both have in it, at first, some good healthy flowers, and some weeds. They both begin by pulling up the weeds. After this child A. tends and waters his flowers, and is contented, letting them bloom in their proper season; but child B. soon roots up his because one day there were

no flowers on them, and goes and gets cuttings from most beautiful flowers, which he sticks into his garden, without any roots. The effect is very good; and though they soon fade, child B. runs off and gets some more most beautiful flowers, and so on.

This way of managing is, perhaps, satisfactory, but it must take a great deal out of child B; and, after all, there is something of hollowness in his showy best-of-all, is there not, reader? Let us be child A.

The following subscriptions have been received for the organ since our last:—

	£	s.	d.
G. H. Purves ... ..	1	1	0
A Friend ... ..	1	1	0
H. G. Purves ... ..	10	0	

£2 12 0

ERRATUM IN OUR LAST.—Page 4. Mr. S. W. Bromfield obtained a first-class in Mathematical moderations, not in Final Mathematical Schools.

The Rules published in our last, for the regulation of Football House Matches, were passed through Bigside Levée, on Thursday, July 18th, without a division, although it must be explained that in Rule 1, only one representative is to be chosen from the Caps of each House, and not an indefinite number. Also the representative is to be chosen by Bigside in the House, not by the whole House. In Rule 3, we cannot think what will happen to the House which does not scratch during the first week after drawing. We should have suggested "That Houses not wishing to play, be requested, &c." Rule 8, which has been the subject of so much derision, empowers the Committee to give the victory to the House which appears to be the best, although the other may have had a slight advantage.

The School Single Hand-fives have been won by Gwatkin; 2nd, Haslam.

The following Eleven is going to play at Derby and Burton next week:—Gemmell, Bicknell, Browne, Clark, Collins, Eaden, Gardner, Gwatkin, Gray, Rowden, and Steward.

Two large holes are the only signs at present of the new pavilion.

The Examiners for Exhibitions are the Revs. P. Chase, T. Mayor, and T. Ward.

The Swimming took place about a week ago. The heats were won by Gordon, Russell, and Crofts. The final heat was won by Russell, Selous being second.

The Diving was won by Hudson and Prevost, equal, who both brought up 11 eggs.

## HOUSE NEWS.

REV. T. W. JEX BLAKE'S.

The Challenge Cup given by A. Babington, Esq., for best average in House Eleven, has been won this year by Tobin, ma., with an average of 39.—The Double Racquets have been won by Gray and Fletcher; the Double Handfives by Tobin, ma., and Johnston.

REV. C. B. HUTCHINSON'S.

The Single Handfives have been won by Yardley, and the Double (buttress courts), given by F. E. Kitchener, Esq., by Yardley and Wilson.

## NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY.

Meetings were held of this Society on June 29th and July 13th, the President in the chair.

On the 29th the Secretary, G. B. Longstaff, read some notes on "Galls upon the Rose," and the Rev. T. N. Hutchinson read a most interesting paper "On the structure and habits of Sea Anemonies." He illustrated his paper by exhibiting living specimens, brought at some risk from his own aquarium, and the Society were introduced to some young sea anemonies not 24 hours old.

F. Hawker was elected an Associate.

On the 13th a fine sketch in water-colours painted by W. C. Marshall, was presented to the Society. It represents a curious contortion of the Lias at the Newbold Lime pits, and was explained by Mr. Wilson.

Dr. Oldham, Superintendent of the Geological Survey of India, made an address on the difficulties of that undertaking, and generously presented to the Society all the publications as yet issued by the Survey, and promised to gradually complete the Series.

Among many exhibitions of interest may be mentioned the beak of the Sword-fish, extracted this year from the planking of a vessel on its arrival at Liverpool. This was exhibited and described by F. R. Smith.

J. Lowe and J. M. Lester were elected Members, and W. Sutcliffe an Associate.

The Society will not meet again this Term.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

We cannot be answerable for the opinions of our correspondents.

Contributions will be received at the *Advertiser* Office, or at Mr. Pepperday's, under cover to the "Editor of the *Meteor*."

## SUPERANNUATION.

To the Editor of the *Meteor*.

SIR,—I hope you will pardon my presumption if I venture to suggest a solution of the problem with which your genius has failed to cope. But I think that the question which was started by your correspondent "Anti-super-Education" is so important that it well deserves a frank discussion. And in offering a few remarks upon the rules of Superannuation, I wish it to be understood that I am speaking solely from my own experience, and do not pretend to give an explanation which shall represent the opinions either of those who approve of the rules, or of those who are opposed to them.

Though I was not superannuated myself, I confess I sympathize most strongly with the feelings of your correspondent. I am quite certain that there are cases in which moral worth cannot be measured by intellectual development. I know that there are many fellows who cannot imbibe the elegancies of the Classics, or dive into the mysteries of Mathematics,—who are the stumbling-blocks of Form Masters and the despair of their Tutors,—and who, nevertheless, are burning and shining lights in their House and their School, the unfailing supporters of all that is manly and noble, and whose unconscious influence may be traced far beyond the circle in which they have moved, long after they have left.

But though I am quite willing to allow all this, I would ask any impartial Rugbeian whether he can assert that this is true in the majority of cases? And if it be not true, I can see two strong reasons for supporting the rules of Superannuation,—the one intellectual, the other moral.

I trust that I am as little inclined as any one to attach an extravagant value to mere force of intellect. But if a School is anything at all, it is a place of education. If, therefore, those who come to it do not choose to conform to its principle,—do not suffer themselves to be educated,—I think that the School has a perfect right to say "You are not doing your duty by me. You come here

professing to learn, and you obstinately refuse to learn anything. I consider that you have no longer any claims upon me. You must go." Now I maintain that this is what takes place in the majority of cases. A fellow without brains, instead of working doubly hard to make up the deficiency, generally takes the other line, and says "It is no use working; I shall never be a swell. Much better give up work altogether, and stick to football and cricket; I shall, perhaps, be a swell at those. Blow Education!" Has a fellow like this any right to remain at a Public School?

I contend, then, that if Superannuation rules were designed to make the idle industrious, there is every probability that they will effect their object. Nor do I think that it can be justly said that their working is unfair, for I should fancy that the number of really industrious fellows who cannot get out of the Middle School by 16 must be very small. That there are exceptions I have already allowed, and regret as much as anyone; but I do not see how it is possible to make rules to which there shall be no exceptions.

Lest your correspondent should be still unconvinced by what I have said, I would add the following anecdote. At the time when I got into the Lower V. there was in it a very clever fellow, about 18 years of age, who had been bottom the half before. One day I happened to ask him how it was that he had been so low the preceding half? "Why," he said, "this is how it was. The first paper which we had in Long List was an Unseen Paper, and early the next morning — called me and up and said 'Jones, you have done the best Unseen Paper in the whole Form; if you do your other Papers half as well you are certain to get out.' You may fancy what a fright I was in. The bare thought of the Upper V. and Long Copies made my blood run cold, so for the next four papers I sent up *four blanks running!* No, no! I know a good thing when I've got it, and you won't catch me leaving the Lower V. as long as I stay at Rugby." Could the force of absurdity further go? Here was a clever fellow, who might have been in the VI., taking as much trouble to avoid promotion as most fellows take to win promotion! Ought such a paradox to be possible at any really good School?

So much for the first reason. And now for the second, which in my opinion is by far the most important. I think that, as a

rule, big, backward fellows are fatally injurious to the morals of a school. Here again I willingly admit that there are striking exceptions: I am speaking of the majority of cases. It would take too long to discuss all the causes of this, but I may point to two obvious reasons. In the first place big, backward fellows are generally idle, and we all know the verses about idle hands finding some mischief still to do. In the second place, they have no sense of responsibility; they have no character to maintain like fellows in the Upper V. and Twenty; no one looks to them to set a good example to the small boys with whom they associate, and so they generally reverse the matter and set a bad example. They become the leaders of those who are younger and smaller than themselves, and having just wit enough to learn what is bad, are apt tutors in poisoning the minds of others. That this has been the case at Rugby in bygone days no one who has read "Tom Brown" can deny—nay, during my first half at Rugby the Lower Middle was infected with two or three such characters. I remember the language which I used to hear at "Anstey's Hole" when I bathed there; and I remember the ducking which I got from one of these big monsters because I could not repress my disgust at his words and gestures. Happily your readers are ignorant of all this: but let me advise them not to rail at a Superannuation system till they have heard what are the evils which it removes.

I think I have said enough about the general question: I will now address myself to the special grievances of your correspondent. I am not quite sure that I understand his first complaint. Does he complain that he did not know of the existence of a matriculation? or does he complain that there is a matriculation at all? I can scarcely suppose that he means the former. But if he means the latter, let me ask him to answer this question: Rugby is a favoured School; it can have the pick of some of the best material in England; it is compelled to reject numerous applications: under such circumstances, ought it to take any fellow who turns up? is it not bound, in justice to itself, to select those whom it thinks most likely to reflect credit on itself and its system? is it fair to expect that it should crowd its forms with fellows who can scarcely stumble through the Latin irregular verbs? Your correspondent dwells on the fact that he and his father were at Rugby. If he

means to imply that he would like a system of patronage and favouritism, I respectfully submit that he ought to apply to Charterhouse and not to Rugby.

As to your correspondent's second complaint, I venture to think that under the circumstances it would have been more judicious in him if he had not sent his son to Rugby at all. If he knew the rules of Superannuation, he must have known that it was impossible for his son to get out of the Lower Middle into the Upper School between 15½ and 16; and I should, therefore, (had I been in your correspondent's place) have sent him to some school where the rules were less rigorous. Lastly, I venture to think, from my acquaintance both with Rugby and with Oxford, that any fellow who was still in the Lower Middle at 16, would not have much chance of entering any more eminent College at Oxford than St. Mary's Hall or New Town Hall.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,  
A. BABINGTON.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—I am glad to find that someone has thought it worth while to reply to my letter on the new fellows' hat. Criticism must always be acceptable, and, indeed, to a certain extent valuable, even when it only serves as a means by which aspiring genius may hurl its satire at the unfortunate originators of a new idea.

I had hoped, on first seeing the letter of your correspondent, to find in it some practical suggestion with regard to the proposed change, or, at least, a valid objection against it. I was, however, disappointed after reading through a page of specious and ungrammatical verbosity, to find that the subject remained almost precisely where I left it. There is, in fact, but little to reply to in his effusion,—so I shall not trouble you with many new remarks. Let me begin, however, by saying that, if an "Utter Fool" had only condescended so far as to defend the objections which I raised against the continuance of the wearing of the hat by new fellows, he would have advanced the matter a stage, by, perhaps, presenting it in a somewhat different light. Instead, he merely offers an opinion—doubtless a very valuable one, but which I feel some hesitation in adopting—unbacked as it is by any evidence. Perhaps I ought not to suspect that he could have discussed the matter properly, as, by his own confession, he is unable to see the force of argument.

Still, one cannot help thinking that if he is the "Utter Fool" he represents himself to be, it would have been more prudent, not to say more desirable, if he had withheld his impressions from the public.

It is evident to anyone who will consider the matter that, so far as the question of bullying goes, it is the hat which really brings the annoyance upon the wearer, and not usually the wearer upon himself. The hat, by its peculiarity, must at once attract notice, and so subject its wearer to annoyance. I do not think the point,—that it is an efficient means of curbing conceited individuals, is worth much. Really they are very few who do not get conceit taken out of them in other ways; and it seems unfair to subject the majority to a nuisance, when it is the minority who deserve it. I should be inclined to suppose that your correspondent, on first coming to Rugby, did not receive as much of that estimable system of education, "taking down," as was good for him—and so he does not know in how different ways it may be effected.

He proceeds to assert that the discomfort of wearing a hat is small,—that, on the face of it is so wilful a mis-statement that it requires no answer. A few lines lower down we are informed, in eloquent language, that Rugby is dependent for its very existence upon traditions—and we are then requested to class among them the wearing of a hat by new fellows. No one has a deeper respect for this place than I have; but I was unaware that my respect should be grounded in any degree upon reverence for the new fellows' hats.

The pith of his letter is contained in the last few lines, which do, fortunately, admit of some reply. Apparently, he argues that as the hat is only worn for a short time, it should therefore always be worn. Whereas, surely he must allow that if the wisdom of our predecessors, which he inductively praises, has seen fit gradually to lessen the time for which new fellows are to wear a hat, it becomes us no less to improve upon their rules, and by degrees abolish it entirely.

It is very amusing to notice the high-minded tone he assumes upon the moral and beneficial side of the question. Can you tell us, Sir, what that side is? Such a tone is most proper. I can only regret, for my part, that I have awakened the pious horror of such an utter fool by my "benevolent philanthropy" and "noble disinterestedness."

I have the honour, etc.,

A. H. ST. V.

P.S.—On reading your correspondent's letter a second time, I find that he complains of my having stated the hat to be a bad institution without proving it. I think the following objections are tolerably valid:—The hat is an expensive, faulty, disagreeable, and untidy distinction. Expensive—because a hat costs three times as much as a straw, which would, I believe, last as long as a new fellow's hat. Faulty—because it is a great nuisance to many, while it is not an efficient check upon the conceited few. Disagreeable—especially in hot weather—because it must be worn, frequently, in the case of those whose houses are at some distance from the schools, in the interval between lessons, as well as whenever they want to go into the town. In winter, at punt-about, there are usually lots of fellows in hats, who doubtless would prefer house caps if they had time to get them. Untidy—because no one cares to keep his hat neat, when he knows that it will probably be knocked off in the course of his walk down to lessons.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—The letter of "Cosmopolitan," in your number of June 13, complains that house feeling tends to displace school feeling, and is a bad substitute for it. Your leading article in the following number justly remarks, that this exaggeration of the importance of houses, and disintegration of the School, are a growth of modern times.

Nothing is more interesting than the examination of the changes of what we call *feeling*, when conducted with a view to ascertain their causes, and to guide them for the good of the School. Some changes creep in upon us we know not how, for the School reflects from decade to decade the state of English Society, and this has undergone great changes. The marked revolution in the tone of this place thirty years ago was commonly attributed to the personal influence of Dr. Arnold. It was rightly so attributed; but it has been remarked that he had the approval of the whole of society to assist him. At the present moment the increase in the refinement and softening of manners and customs in the School indicates a national as well as a local progress: the exaggeration of the importance of games is a sign of a national as well as a local depreciation, for the time being, of the highest objects of culture.

But the change spoken of in your article, and deplored by your correspondent, has a different origin. It arises from the gradual

destruction of the old balance of influences at work in the School. And wise legislators, be they masters or boys, must study this balance of influences; and, when one side is preponderating by a growth irresistible by local efforts, not merely notice the fact and deplore it and abuse modern times, but aim at establishing counter influences.

The increased importance of games is the main cause of the growth of house feeling. A new boy becomes a member of a community which is pledged to fight shoulder to shoulder for the honour of the house; the equality among the houses renders the competition close: the keenness with which success is desired makes it exciting. He is a member of no other club, of no other society that demands his co-operation, his self-sacrifice, his enthusiasm. The mere contiguity in study and hall and bedroom induces familiarity and friendship; but the clanship of the close is the strongest bond. There they are fellow-soldiers, united in mutual confidence, fighting for a common cause. When the School has a common cause, how closely are the members of the houses drawn together! A member of the Eleven feels his interests instantly widened. Your light blue is the truest cosmopolitan. His sympathies with the Eleven are greater than those with his house. A school Twenty, with a common object, would similarly enfranchise the distinguished caps.

Institutions must therefore be sought, which will unite the interests of the houses, and give them a common cause. Any school society or institution, in which the houses are totally lost sight of, is valuable; and it is obvious that we want more of such societies. Such an influence is pre-eminently the School Chapel. Such also are the School lessons, the School Choir, the School Eleven, the School Rifle Corps. Such, in its degree, is the Natural History Society; such is the *Meteor*, which, thanks to you, Sir, is a "cosmopolitan" magazine. Such would be the Debating Society if it existed; such would be an Essay or Literary Society of any kind. Such may be, if the School will make it so, the establishment of the School reading-room in the Arnold Library. It may become the focus of the intellectual interests of the School. There all may meet as fellow students. For the younger boys a house is a sufficiently large society. The seniors should aim incessantly at increasing the facilities for their intercommunion as members, not of houses, but of the School. This must be one of the

influences to counteract the disjoining effects of rivalry in the games.

Again, the existence of *house caps* and *house ribbons*, coupled with the non-existence of any *school cap* or *school ribbons*, is a significant and by no means unimportant fact. *Feeling* is the result, not of mysterious causes, but of past and present institutions. It cannot be doubted that the fact of the houses distinguishing themselves by dress has a considerable influence on the School in the long run. House caps—the undress—might be tolerated on account of their usefulness in the close as marks of distinction, where distinction is wanted; but straw hats are not very useful for this purpose. I hope this suggestion will be candidly considered when the vexed question of straw hats is discussed, settled as it must be ere long.

It would be easy to point out how the acceptance of these principles should influence legislation on a variety of subjects,—a "Radical's" scheme among them. But I will not trespass further on your space; and beg to subscribe myself,

Your obedient servant,  
SENIOR.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—I hear that the mission of the *Meteor* which has shot its beneficent rays across the sky of Rugby is to reform every kind of abuse, and to bring everything connected with Rugby up to that pink of perfection, which should befit the celebration of its Tercentenary. I wish it to pierce into a dark subject which the rays of ordinary luminaries have hitherto failed to approach.

It is this, Sir. In our day there was a nasty spirit prevailing in the lower strata of the School. There were some who were not content with affecting to raise class distinctions between those who were all alike Rugbeians, but vented the spleen of mean jealousy on the cleverer town-louts, who happened to get above them in form. They did not openly kick them, but kept up a kind of under-hand bullying, making irritating allusions to the occupations of their parents. I do not mean to say, Sir, that I suffered from this myself, as from the fact of my never rising above the Second Form, I did not excite the jealousy of any very important section of the School, and moreover, I was so thick-skinned that I did not care a screw for being called "pill-maker's devil," or "Holloway's-ointment-distiller," or any other appellative, reflecting on the honourable

trade of a chemist, the hereditary business of my family. But I knew some of my contemporaries, equally inferior in social position, but both cleverer and more sensitive than myself, who had all their prospects of rising in life, and of doing some honour to the name of Rugbeians, cut off through the despicable tyranny of some "sons of guns," who employed a perpetual system of petty annoyance to drive the poor creatures out of the School.

Now, Sir, I do not for one moment wish to insinuate that there could be any depths of meanness so low as this in the year of grace 1867, in the fourth month of the existence of the *Meteor*, but I thought it was possible there might be some, in a school of 500, who, not being gentlemen in the higher sense of of the term, might try to substantiate their claims to mix in good society, not by showing the highbred courtesy, which desires to put others at their ease, but by cringing to the rich, and turning up their noses at the poor.

I hope no offence, if I add that inasmuch as you, Sir, are confessedly the only organ of the School, I trust, you are not a mere barrel-organ, with a set of stereotyped tunes, but that you can extemporize some soul-stirring air which will drum all such offenders out of "Arnold's Own;" and that if you have any barrel at all you will use it to shoot down the skulking foes of enlightenment. But I cease, for I fear you may not agree with me on a point of æsthetics, that all metaphors should be well mixed before they are taken.

I send, as in duty bound, a tithe of my pay (as Capt. of H.M.'s Own Shoeblock Brigade) to the Tercentenary fund, and the pair of boots with which I should like to have it down with any of the pseudo-aristocratic snobs I have alluded to, and have the honour to subscribe myself,

Faithfully yours,

OUT OF THE DEPTHS.

To the Editor of the *Meteor*.

Rugby, 13th July, 1867.

SIR,—The game goes merrily forward. The most advanced ideas are propounded by "Four Years," with a brisk and cheerful audacity that is quite refreshing. But more than that. The re-actionaries who desire to maintain that long-condemned abomination, the new boy's hat, have adopted a new tone. The change is significant. They were contemptuous. They have become deprecatory.

They were blustering. They have become plaintive.

"An Utter Fool" (it is his own name) may be left to the tender mercies of "A. H. St. V." The only difficulty in replying to him is, the difficulty of conceiving that any person could really be influenced by such arguments as he submits. And, indeed, it is plain that it was not from such considerations that "An Utter Fool" and his friends arrived at their opinions. They find in their minds a conservative sentiment in favour of the existing system. They hammer out their arguments *ex postfacto*. Effect a change in the old custom, and in a few months these weighty supporters will be found on the side of the new.

Such conservatism is, in my view, very like ivy. It is sombre, it is imposing, it is ever green. It attaches itself to all structures of any age, perhaps by preference to rotten ones. And while it is no real support to anything, its function is to keep together in a fallacious and precarious consistency, an edifice too mouldy and obsolete to be of any use to anybody.

It is of immense advantage to the progress of truth and common sense that "Utter Fools" should be induced to state their case. When they do so, it is odd how different it looks on paper, in ruthless black and white, compared with its seeming cogency when discussed in the wise circle of sympathizing friends. And when riddled by "A. H. St. V.," I have no doubt it will be made to look more different still.

Now, Sir, my object in writing to you is to ask, can we not induce the supporters of others of these childish and tedious distinctions, to shew cause why they should be maintained? In some cases there may be good cause; in others there may be specious pleas, destined to collapse upon examination; others will be found hopelessly bad from the first. In any case discussion will be a clear and unmixed gain to everybody.

For instance, as "Four Years" forcibly asks, why should not this hat grievance be abolished altogether? Why should special privileges in dress be reserved by law or custom for "swells?" Why should flowers (if you will excuse the bull) be to anybody a forbidden fruit? Why should young aspirants to knowledge be at any time debarred from the Hall newspapers, especially when they pay for them? And these are not all. There are many other customs still prevalent, at once petty and vexatious, which

ought to have died a natural death long ago. The old creed, that a new boy is an inferior animal, who should be taught his inferiority by having his life made a burden to him, is not, we hope, to be found as a really living and professed tenet. But it can yet be traced in many of the stock opinions and threadbare stock phrases still in vogue. The creed, I say, is dead. But the defunct and putrescent dogma still pollutes the air.

The real belief of these Conservatives may be analysed into two main articles.

1. That new boys are "coxy" and must be humbled.
2. That these old privileges constitute the splendour and glory of the place.

Now, Sir, (1) is directly and distinctly contrary to experience. The majority of new boys are timid, and even over-anxious to learn the ways of the place, and if some do seem "coxy" (I use that detestable appellation under protest) it is more often awkwardness than vanity. The really loathsome object (which one has quite enough chances of observing) is the Rugbeian of some standing, who has learnt nothing at Rugby but to despise those of his fellows in whom arrogance and conceit are less indurated.

Against (2) also I am equally anxious to proclaim my fervent hostility. Whatever excellence we have here, is certainly not bound up with any old customs at all; except indeed the old customs of uprightness, energy, and goodwill, which are assuredly not promoted by these petulant and contemptible follies.

What we want, Sir, is a more active and penetrating civilisation: a civilisation to remove all social obstacles, to clear away all stumbling-blocks, hindrances, and restrictions: to promote helpfulness, kindness, culture, spirit, and freedom. We want it to be impossible that any young enthusiasm should be checked, as it is so often and so disastrously checked. We want to condemn all roughness and vulgarity of mind, if possible, to extinction, if not, at any rate to obscurity. The spirit which desires to maintain those puerile frivolities will be found fighting against us on the broader issue also. For it is a spirit born of the meanness and selfishness of a few, and fostered by the unreflecting conservatism of the multitude.

Therefore it is, Sir, that we look for your enlightened aid and countenance in this

struggle between stagnation and progress, between the bigot and the

COSMOPOLITAN.

### ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Macedonicus," and "E."—We are sorry we have not room for your letter in this number.

"Ignoramus."—Your letter will appear in the first number of next Term, when we think it will produce more effect than at the end of this.

"L. W."—We will endeavour to insert your letter before the next Speech-Day.

"A Blakeite."—We have not room for more than a note on your subject this number.

"A.D.A.M."—Your letter will appear in our first number next Term.

### CRICKET.

THE SCHOOL V. RUGBY CLUB.—This, the return match, was played in the Close on Saturday, July 6th. Notwithstanding the absence of Pauncefote and Wilkes—two of our best batsmen—the School made an exceedingly good show of batting, the captain for the time being taking the lead with a finely played 72. Stokes and Tobin, ma., Steward and Gardner, also showed some very good batting. The Clubs' prospects did not look very flourishing, losing three wickets in 25 minutes. Score:—

#### RUGBY SCHOOL.

F. Stokes, c Willes, b Carles ..	57
W. Yardley, c Swainson, b Buchanan ..	2
J. T. Soutter, b Buchanan ..	4
S. P. Bucknill, c and b Buchanan ..	72
F. Tobin ma., c and b Raven ..	45
G. E. Steward, not out ..	34
F. Tobin mi., c and b Raven ..	12
J. W. Gardner, c Mordaunt, b Buchanan ..	30
V. Ellis, c Buchanan ..	6
C. K. Francis, b Buchanan ..	13
A. A. Bourne, c Browne, b Buchanan ..	0
Byes 15, 1-b 3, w 13 ..	31
Total .. ..	307

RUGBY CLUB.

J. H. Raven, at Yardley, b Bourne	..	13
C. W. Carles, c Gardner, b Bourne	..	0
R. F. Smith, c Tobin mi., b Bourne	..	6
G. L. Bennett, not out	..	3
D. Buchanan, not out	..	0
Leg-byes	..	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>23</b>

FREE FORESTERS V. THE SCHOOL—MONDAY AND TUESDAY, JULY 8 & 9.—The match was very closely contested, and on the fall of Yardley's and Tobin ma.'s wickets in the 2nd innings, it seemed as if the Foresters would yet pull off the match. After some careful play, Tobin mi. made the winning hit for the School, with two wickets to fall. The Foresters lost the services in the middle of the match of Raven, who met with a bad accident. On the one side Mordaunt and Higgins, and on the other Tobin mi., Yardley, and especially Tobin ma.—who played two fine innings—deserve mention. Score:—

FREE FORESTERS.

1st Innings.	2nd Innings.
D. Buchanan, c Ellis b Bourne	0 b Ellis .. 7
G. Bennett, run out	.. 0 not out .. 22
J. R. Raven, retired	.. 43 absent .. 0
A. Hillyard, b Bourne	.. 7 b Bourne .. 11
R. Brodie, b Bourne	.. 1 c Ellis b Bourne 4
O. Mordaunt, c Ellis	.. 6 c Wilkes b Soutter 55
M. F. Higgins, b Ellis	.. 21 b Ellis .. 50
F. Paget, c Tobin mi., b Pauncefote	.. 30 Pauncefote .. 3
A. R. Kenney, c Tobin ma., b Ellis	.. 3
A. Lee, lbw b Ellis	.. 11 c Tobin ma., b Ellis .. 3
S. B. Chamberlayne, not out	.. 4 b Pauncefote .. 14
Bye 1, w 1	.. 2 b 2, 1-b 1, w 2.. 5
<b>Total</b>	<b>128 Total.. 175</b>

RUGBY SCHOOL.

1st Innings.	2nd Innings.
F. Stokes, b Chamberlayne	.. 1 c Hillyard b Chamberlayne 14
J. Wilkes, run out	.. 1 b Buchanan .. 7
J. T. Soutter, run out	.. 18 c Buchanan b Chamberlayne 0
S. P. Bucknill, c Buchanan b Chamberlayne	.. 3 b Chamberlayne 0
F. Tobin ma., b Chamberlayne	75 c Chamberlayne b Buchanan .. 35
W. Yardley, b Hillyard	.. 16 run out .. 53
F. Tobin mi., b Kenney	.. 24 not out .. 6
B. Pauncefote, b Buchanan	.. 6 c and b Chamberlayne .. 9
C. K. Francis, b Buchanan	.. 9 run out .. 0
V. Ellis, not out	.. 3 not out .. 1
A. A. Bourne, run out	.. 9
Byes 4, 1-b 5, w 8	.. 12 b 1, 1-b 1 .. 2
<b>Total</b>	<b>177 Total.. 128</b>

REV. C. B. HUTCHINSON'S HOUSE V. REV. T. W. JEX BLAKE'S HOUSE.—This match was for second House, and was won easily by the Rev. C. B. Hutchinson's House by 145 runs. For Hutchinson's, Wilkes scored well both innings, making 27 and 113; Yardley made 46 and 4; and Gwyer two good innings of 34 and 40. Scully also played two useful innings of 20 and 21. For Blake's, Clark went in first and carried his bat out for 92. Tobin ma., and Gardner (for Tobin mi.) made each two good innings—Tobin ma. making 27 and 27, and Gardner 23 and 17. The score as follows:—

HUTCHINSON'S.

1st Innings.	2nd Innings.
W. Yardley, c and b Clark	.. 46 b Piercy .. 4
J. Wilkes, c Clark, b Graham	.. 27 c Penrose, b Graham .. 113
J. Scully, c Haslam, b Piercy	20 c Tobin b Graham 21
T. G. Hare, c Penrose, b Graham	0 b Clark .. 3
S. K. Gwyer, b Clark	.. 34 c Gray, b Graham 40
J. H. Becke, c and b Clark	.. 9 c Hornby, b Graham .. 12
A. B. Chapman, b Clark	.. 15 b Graham .. 14
C. T. Layton, b Clark	.. 1 (Anderson mi.) c Gray, b Graham 0
F. W. Isherwood, c Gray, b Clark	0 not out .. 4
W. K. Eddis, c Gray, b Graham	15 c Gardner, b Graham .. 0
K. R. Fletcher, not out	.. 7 c Penrose, b Graham .. 5
Extras	.. 20 Extras .. 17
<b>Total</b>	<b>194 Total .. 238</b>

BLAKE'S.

1st Innings.	2nd Innings.
C. H. Clark, not out	.. 92 c Eddis, b Yardley 15
F. Tobin ma., c Wilkes, b Yardley	.. 27 c Yardley, b Gwyer 27
H. P. Hornby, c Layton, b Yardley	.. 4 b Gwyer .. 0
A. Gray, c and b Yardley	.. 2 b Gwyer .. 7
H. H. Johnston, b Gwyer	.. 6 b Yardley .. 7
J. W. Gardner, c and b Yardley	28 c Yardley b Gwyer 17
J. M. Piercy, b Yardley	.. 0 b Yardley .. 16
F. W. Haslam, b Gwyer	.. 3 run out .. 6
J. Graham, b Yardley	.. 2 not out .. 4
J. Penrose, c Yardley, b Gwyer	5 b Yardley .. 0
W. Fletcher, c Eddis, b Gwyer	2 b Yardley .. 0
Extras	.. 18 Extras .. 1
<b>Total</b>	<b>183 Total .. 100</b>

The Rev. C. B. Hutchinson's House Pie Match ended in a victory for Yardley's side by six wickets, the chief scores being H. Hall 22 and 31, W. Yardley 48 and 3, and J. C. Anderson 8 and (not out) 21, for the winning side;

and J. Wilkes 28 and 36, S. K. Gwyer 16 and 22 for the losing.—The Tutor Pie Match was won by Wilkes's side by 7 wickets. W. Yardley made 50 and 51, J. Wilkes 47 and 1, S. K. Gwyer 3 and (not out) 49, W. K. Eddis 41 and 8, and M. Kitchener 20.

A Match between the Twenty and Fifth Forms has been won by the former by six wickets.

Mr. J. M. WILSON'S HOUSE PIE MATCH has been won by Bourne's side, beating Gemmell's by 220 runs. The chief scorers were—Bourne, 0 and 80; Botfield, 3 and 171; Langford (not out) 7; and (not out) 33.

REV. T. W. JEX BLAKE'S TUTOR PIE MATCH, won by Tobin mi.'s side by 9 wickets, the principal scorers being—Tobin ma., 24; Soutter (for Tobin mi.) 23, and Tobin terts., 31; and Clark, 25 (not out).

THE WIMBLEDON SHOOTING.

It seems as if the Ashburton Shield was destined never to return to Rugby. Each year (to omit the never-to-be-mentioned 1866) have we pushed our way among the first three, but never since 1861 have we managed to distance all our opponents.

It is hard to look back on the present season without feeling unfeigned regret that the efforts made by the Rifle Corps have not been crowned with success. It was the hope—and lately the belief—of many that in this illustrious year we should have gained a double victory—at the Oval and at Wimbledon. We have achieved a victory in the former field, and, but for an unlucky accident which befell the Captain of the Rifle Corps a week before the contest, preventing all practice, we may be sure we would have

achieved one on the latter. The best scores were made for us by Lance-Corporal Forster, Lieutenant Graham, and Private Whiting, and to these gentlemen the thanks of the School are due, especially to the first-named, who took second place for the Spencer Cup, with a score which would have obtained the prize in any of the last four years. Subjoined is the score:—

HARROW.			
	200 yds.	500 yds.	Total.
Private Mitchell ..	14	17	31
Serjeant Richie ..	13	13	26
Serjeant Bentley ..	12	12	24
Serjeant Wood ..	14	10	24
Capt. Shakespeare ..	12	10	22
Lieut. Flood ..	15	7	22
Private Matheson ..	12	9	21
Corporal Richie ..	13	8	21
Corporal Sibney ..	10	9	19
Corporal Maudsley ..	8	10	18
Corporal Lathom ..	13	3	16
	136	108	244

RUGBY.			
	200 yds.	500 yds.	Tl.
Capt. Tobin .....	2 3 3 4 2-14	2 0 4 0 0-6	.. 20
Lieut. Graham ....	4 3 3 3 3-17	3 4 2 3 R-12	.. 29
Serjt.-maj. Watkins	2 2 3 2 3-12	0 0 2 0 3-5	.. 17
Serjeant Piercy ....	4 3 0 3 2-12	2 3 0 2 0-7	.. 19
Lance Cp. Acland ..	2 2 3 3 3-13	0 2 0 2 0-4	.. 17
“ Forster	2 2 3 3 4-14	4 3 3 2 4-16	.. 30
“ Humphry	3 2 2 2 3-12	0 0 3 3 3-6	.. 18
Private Crowdy ....	3 2 3 2 3-13	0 2 0 0 0-2	.. 15
“ Fletcher ....	4 2 3 2 2-13	3 3 0 2 3-11	.. 24
“ Penrose ...	3 2 2 3 3-13	3 2 2 0 3-10	.. 28
“ Whiting ....	0 3 4 2 2-11	4 4 2 4 3-17	.. 28
	144	96	240

	200 yds, 138.	500 yds, 101.	Total, 239
CHELTHENHAM ..	128.	104.	232
ETON .....	132.	98.	230
ROSSALL .....	114.	90.	204
MARLBOROUGH ..	124.	69.	193

The following is the score for the Spencer Cup:—

1st—Private Collier (Cheltenham) .....	2244433	22
2nd—Lance-Corp. Forster (Rugby) .....	2423323	19
3rd—Corporal Cartwright (Eton) .....	3033423	18
4th—Private Mitchell (Harrow) .....	8403332	18
5th—Capt. Bourdillon (Marlborough) ..	2203443	18
6th—Private May (Rossall) .....	3003233	14
7th—Corporal Helme (Winchester) .....	3203003	11

## THE METEOR.

### THE MARLBOROUGH CRICKET MATCH.

We have had reason to believe that we were wrong in thinking that our readers would need no further account of the Marlborough match from us. In case any of our readers wish to keep an account of it in their copies of the *Meteor*, we give an account of it now. Notwithstanding the present Rugbeians being unable to witness the match, a large number of old Rugbeians collected to see the performance of the School, at Kennington Oval. At a quarter past eleven on Tuesday, the 24th, Messrs. Stokes and Wilkes appeared at the wickets, Rugby having won the toss, against the bowling of Messrs. Moeran and Macgregor. Runs were got fast, and a change had been made in the bowling, Hillyard going on with slows in place of Moeran, before Wilkes was caught at the wicket for 11. Soutter joined Stokes, and both played splendidly, putting on some 80 runs before they were parted, and bringing Head and Gordon on to bowl. At 120 up Stokes was stumped, and retired for a brilliantly played innings of 66. Pauncefote followed, and his batting was, as usual, perfect. Soutter, however, was soon forced to part company with him with a score of 40. Bucknill was caught for 4, but Pauncefote and Tobin ma. were not parted till the Captain had made 58 and his companion 38. The next three wickets fell for 232; and the score was brought to 241 by Messrs. Francis and Bourne, at which the innings closed.

The Marlborough innings was commenced by Bourdillon and Leach, to the bowling of Pauncefote and Bourne. For a few minutes the play was cautious, but Bourdillon soon opened his shoulders, and drove Pauncefote finely for five mid loud Marlborough cheers. Almost immediately, however, our Captain had his revenge, bowling Leach clean with a very fine bailer. Wyld came next, and Bourdillon, apparently undaunted at the loss of his companion, repeated his on-drive once or twice, scoring 6 for one. Wyld played steadily, but hit hard when he got a chance; and these two batsmen soon brought on Ellis at the Captain's end. The Old Rugbeians now began to get a little anxious, but Yardley soon brought relief by a fine catch at the wicket, which did for the Marlborough captain; almost immediately after Wyld also received his dismissal in the same way, Bourdillon having contributed 23 in a very short time by a few big hits, while Wyld's 19 comprised a four and three twos. After this Hillyard was the only one who made any important resistance to the very fine bowling of Bourne and Ellis, his hits including two fours and two threes. Rugby bowling, however, and fielding was well nigh perfect. Yardley was "all there" at the wicket; while Soutter at cover point, Bucknill at long stop, and Tobin ma. at long leg, were especially conspicuous. Of the bowling it is needless to speak: suffice it to say that the old Rugbeians were delighted with the performance of both Bourne and Ellis. The Marlborough innings closed shortly after five for a total of 91. Many were the congratulations and loud the praises which our Eleven champions received as they returned to the pavilion at the completion of the innings; and gloomy and dark the looks of the Marlburians as they scanned the faces of their successful rivals. However, in a short time they were ready to follow their innings, and sent Messrs. Bourdillon and Garnier (the not out) to the bowling of Bourne and Ellis. Garnier was soon disposed of for four, hitting one back to the bowler which was well secured. Soon after, Bourdillon was clean bowled by Bourne for seven (one for 11, two for 21.) Leach added 14, and played the ball on to his wicket. Wyld and Gordon now became partners, and brought the score up to 57, when time was called. On Wednesday, at quarter past eleven, Wyld (not out 17) and Gordon (not out 8) appeared at the wickets. Gordon added six to his Tuesday's score, when he fell a victim to Ellis. Money joined Wyld—and now the Marlburians appeared in their best form. Both batsmen played carefully and well, and necessitated a change in the bowling, Francis and Soutter taking the places of Ellis and Bourne respectively. Both the new bowlers bowled straight and well, but it was all to no purpose, as both batsmen were well in. Loud and long were the Marlborough cheers as ten after ten went up on the telegraph, and a perfect roar ensued when 150 was hoisted, which saved the innings. It was not till Pauncefote went on with slows at the far end that Wyld concluded a very fine innings of 74, being caught by Bourne off the captain. Wyld received a perfect ovation from both sides as he retired to the pavilion, his 74 being the score of the match. Head was next in, but after scoring 11 he, too, fell a victim to the slows (seven for 184.) Cummings showed very good form and great driving powers in his 24. The two last wickets were soon disposed of, Money (who owes a debt of gratitude to an oblique-eyed umpire) bringing out his bat for a well-played 62. The Marlborough total amounted to 238, leaving Rugby 89 to get in order to win. Stokes and Wilkes were the first to appear to the bowling of Hillyard and Moeran. Both played with great care, the Marlborough Eleven bowling and fielding brilliantly. Soon after dinner Stokes was very finely caught at long leg by Head for seven (one for 25.)

## THE METEOR.

Soutter came next, but was soon caught by the long stop. Marlborough was now in high spirits, and consequently uproarious; but the knowing ones who saw the Rugby captain take his place at the vacant wicket had a pretty good idea that their joy would not be of long duration. However, Pauncefote soon lost the company of Wilkes, and Bucknill, failing to get into double figures, Tobin ma. faced his captain, who had begun in a steady careful way: the hitting soon waxed freer and freer to the evident displeasure of the Marlburians, though both their bowling and fielding still continued very good. Pauncefote was in his very best form, and completely baffled the bowling. When only a few more runs were wanted to win, he made the hit of the match, driving one of Moeran's fastest magnificently to the on: the ball passed the racket court and hit the fence hard, realizing five runs (almost six), but worth seven if nothing had been in the way. After this the match was virtually won; and the Rugbeians gradually advanced from the pavilion, till the winning hit was made, when with one accord they rushed forward, tackled the captain, hoisted him up, and carried him with triumphant shouts to the pavilion. Pauncefote, Stokes, and Tobin ma., were presented with bats for their fine scores, an honour which they richly deserved. We must not omit to mention that Pauncefote was throughout the match indefatigable in the field, and the winning of the match is in no slight degree owing to his able management.

### RUGBY SCHOOL.

1st Innings.	2nd Innings.
F. Stokes, st Money, b Gordon	66 c Head, b Hillyard 7
J. Wilkes, c Money b Macgregor	11 b Gordon .. 24
J. T. Soutter, c Macgregor, b Gordon	c Garnier b Hillyard .. 4
B. Pauncefote, st Money, b Hillyard	58 not out .. 32
S. P. Bucknill, c Cummings, b Gordon	4 b Hillyard .. 8
F. Tobin ma., c Garnier, b Gordon	38 not out .. 13
W. Yardley, c Moeran, b Gordon	4
F. Tobin mi., st Money, b Hillyard	0
V. Ellis, c Money, b Gordon	0
C. K. Francis, b Hillyard	1
A. A. Bourne, not out	2
Byes 8, leg-byes 9	17
	Byes .. 4
	241
	92

### MARLBOROUGH COLLEGE.

1st Innings.	2nd Innings.
J. Bourdillon, c Yardley, b Bourne	23 b Bourne .. 7
R. Leach, b Pauncefote	2 b Bourne .. 14
W. H. Wyld, st Yardley, b Bourne	c Bourne b Pauncefote .. 74
C. S. Gordon, b Ellis	6 b Ellis .. 14
H. Hillyard, c Pauncefote, b Bourne	18 c Francis b Bourne 4
H. Cummings, c Ellis b Bourne	9 b Francis .. 24
R. L. Head, c Pauncefote, b Bourne	5 c & b Pauncefote 11
E. E. Money, b Ellis	0 not out .. 62
E. S. Garnier, not out	3 c and b Ellis .. 4
E. H. Moeran, c Wilkes, b Bourne	0 st Yardley b Pauncefote .. 4
J. P. Macgregor, c Soutter, b Bourne	2 b Francis .. 2
Byes 2, 1-b 1, w 1	4 Byes 4, 1-b 5, w 7 16
	91
	238

## THE RIFLE CORPS.

The following Matches have been shot by the School Eleven against other Rifle Corps in the neighbourhood:—At Lutterworth, on June 11. The School made—200 yds. 129, 500 yds. 91; total, 220. Lutterworth, at 200 yds. 115, 500 yds. 71; total, 186. The School won by 34 points.—At Leamington, against the Warwick Corps, on June 25th. School: 200 yds. 133, 500 yds. 106; total, 239. Warwick: 200 yds. 154, 500 yds. 111; total, 265. School lost by 26 points.—At Coventry, June 29th (13 on each side); the School were beaten by 34 points.—At Milverton, against Leamington, July 2nd. The School were beaten by 39 points.—At Coventry, July 6th. The School won by 12 points.—At Daventry, July 11th. The School won by 35 points.

In the last shooting the Baldwin Cup was won (for the third time) by Captain Tobin, who made, with a long Enfield, the excellent score of 73. The Cup has been held, since its presentation in November, 1865, by the following members of the Corps:—Sergeant Carpenter, Corporal Crowdy, Sergeant-major Ryley, Corporal Tobin, Sergeant-major Ryley, Private Watkins, Ensign Tobin, Captain Tobin, Private Acland, Private Penrose, Lieutenant Graham (2), & Captain Tobin.

THE BENTLEY CHALLENGE CUP.—On Tuesday afternoon, 23rd inst., this annual match was shot by members of the Corps. A novelty was introduced on this occasion—the entrance was made 6d. each, instead of 1s. as formerly, and sighting shots, instead of being free, were charged 2d. each, the proceeds to be added to the Sweepstakes. After a well-contested match, the winners ranged themselves in the following order:—

	200	300	400	500	Total.
1st—Private Fletcher.....	13	10	13	14	50
2nd—Private Crowdy.....	13	13	11	11	48
3rd—Captain Tobin .....	11	8	15	9	43
4th—Lance-Corporal Humphry.....	10	7	15	8	40
5th—Private Penrose.....	12	7	13	6	38