



The Meteor.

Edited by Members of Rugby School.

No. 10.

RUGBY, NOVEMBER 7th, 1867.

[With Extra Price 6d.
Sheet.]

It is an unfortunate propensity of human nature to do most things by fits and starts, —to feel a violent passion for one thing one week, and in the second week to find a new attraction, and utterly disregard the favourite amusement of the last week. This spasmodic mode of proceeding is perhaps seen in a Public School more than any where else, and certainly Rugby has frequently shown itself given to such a common weakness. No doubt it is one of the proper arrangements of nature that various pursuits should have their turn, as perhaps if we gave our attention wholly to one subject we should not know the delights of many other occupations. Had there not been an oratorical spasm much might have been lost during the last Term or two, when the Debating Societies flourished so generally. Who knows but what the *Meteor* is a but a spasm; its name at any rate pretends nothing but a momentary flash? The interest in the Rifle Corps burst forth again with a sudden start, and it seems that it has almost as suddenly collapsed, though perhaps there is some comfort in knowing that they can still muster a twelfth man for their shooting matches. But we have other instances to keep us in countenance for our apparent vacillation. A society came into existence last Term under the most distinguished patronage of all our scientific stars, who held their meetings and no doubt ventilated weighty questions at certain stated periods. But even the energy of these learned people has grown lax, and their meetings have dwindled as the fit of inquiry and research died out. Should they not try to resuscitate their

fading spirit? The *Meteor* is aiming at making its momentary gleam into a steady burning flame, and why should not the Natural History Society overcome the proneness to fits and starts, and become an established body? More interest would be excited were the members to write papers for themselves, and not trust to the occasional kindness of a Master. We have been told that beyond an exhibition of stray specimens, there is but little to occupy the attention, or raise the curiosity, of either members or strangers. If only papers were to be read, an audience, surely, would be always found, and by a small amount of trouble on the part of each member, a Society could be maintained with as much success as such Societies meet with at Harrow and Marlborough. There is a new inducement to the acquisition of knowledge now that the Arnold Library is thrown open; and at any rate under the influence of the as yet fresh mania for the opening the door of that retreat with our own key, and of sitting in our own compartment, it is fair to expect that something can be produced to instruct us. And it is, perhaps, more reasonable to expect this, when we see unhappy sufferers under the torments of a "copy," fly with their lexicons and such paraphernalia to the comfortable fire and chairs of the Arnold Library, there to seek the inspiration that their studies never could have given. But let the members of this would-be Society pay speedy attention to their perishing powers, and above all let them remember the proverb

Aide toi, et Dieu t'aidera :
then, perhaps, they may show to us that they,

at least, are above spasmodic propensities. It will be seen that we take for granted that those who belong to the Society are capable of writing papers; and certainly but little credit would be reflected upon them, if there are no fruits from all their learning. At the end of a School list, where the sets are arranged, we find in the place of the old-fashioned three subjects, no less than nine. This is progress indeed; and of course there is corresponding progress in the pupils. Let them then impart to the world what they have gleaned in their sets, and thus, by contributions, each writing according to his *forte*, let the Natural History Society be both amusing and instructive.

OUR last impression contained a protest from apparently an Old Rugbeian, against the monopoly of Fives Courts at a certain hour of the day by one of the Boarding Houses. The protest is seasonable, as, naturally, at this time of year,—amid the attractions of Football and the impediments that weather puts in the way of players in any open Court—new arrangements can be matured so as to be put into practice when the season for those games returns. But not only does there seem to be some change required in connection with the Fives Courts. A rumour has been floating about (for which, of course, there is no responsibility resting on anyone) that there is an idea of an Inter-Public-School contest in Racquets. Should such a proposal ever become a reality, Rugby, of course, will send its two representatives; and then would arise the difficulty,—how are the favoured two to be found, and how are they to be trained? In the case of the crews for the University boat race, we know (for Mr. Skey has told us) how strict is their discipline and diet, and how constant their practising. Though, perhaps, the School would not need to regulate the diet of its champions, still it would have to feed them with Courts, and to see that they did have a proper amount of practice. And in that case something would seem requisite to allow of respectable players getting more practice by more frequent Courts. The present system is probably very ingenious; but unless the Master of one's form closes first lessons early (and even then a seat near the door of the School is essential) or a friend is occasionally charitable, the pleasure of a Racquet Court is almost unknown. The numbers are too large: the competition

too great. There must be some line drawn which will exclude a number of small boys and non-players, so that not even their names can be of use to take up the hours. One's first idea is, of course, to cut off all the new boys and Lower School, and such parts of the School as we are, perhaps, too apt to consider as totally inferior creatures. But we must not forget that, in addition to the awful plague of wearing a black hat, every new fellow has to pay £1 to the Racquet Court; and it seems but fair to allow them at least the nominal privilege of playing on the Court, especially as we can hardly imagine a new fellow to be very pushing in taking Courts. Moreover, it is not the case with the Racquet Court that it is with the Bat-Fives Court. In the latter, the Upper School can always appropriate the Court of anybody in the Middle School; having bought that right originally by paying for the Court. But the Racquet Court was essentially a public undertaking; and, as such, ought always to be open to the whole School, as far as possible, equally.

We then beg humbly to make some such proposal as follows, by which other and wiser people may frame a new plan. Should any such change ever be adopted, we might hope that the play of the School would improve, and improvement is naturally always acceptable and probably possible among any class of players at any game. Let three days out of the week be given up to a certain number of players, say 80, who should be chosen from all the Houses, and who might not have their names down in the book on two consecutive days out of their three. For instance, if Tuesday, Friday, and Saturday were given up, there would be, on an average, 17 available hours per week to be distributed among 20 sets of four players. Then there would be more probability of a larger number of fellows playing decently; and then, too, the method of choosing a partner before being drawn in ties for the Racquets would be very useful; for one pair would learn how to play together, and mutually supply each other's deficiencies, and, by having the chance of playing more frequently, would, of course, make the better match when the ties are drawn. It is needless to mention that the winners of the School Racquets would be the proper representatives of the School at any competition, and it would evidently be far better for them to have always played together. We are, however, taking for granted that the School Ties would be finished and

decided before the time for the Public School competition, and we conclude that this would be the case; however, the Ties could, by proper attention, be finished within a very reasonable time. Supposing three days to be engaged for these 80, the other three ought to be left for the whole School promiscuously, and not divided among different parts of the School, as the contrariety of circumstances generally permits one to get out of first lesson very early on a morning that belongs to another division of the School.

Such, then, is a rough sketch of what might be arranged, and we hope that this subject will not be allowed to drop unnoticed, as we feel sure that some improvement is necessary in the general style of Racquet play in the School, and such improvement can only be acquired by practice, which at any rate leads to, if it does not make, perfection.

“GOOD Americans, when they die, go to Paris,” says someone. Granted: and good Rugbeians, when they leave, go to Oxford. Well, perhaps some to Cambridge as well, but our remarks must be taken to apply to Oxford only. There are two things for which Rugbeians are rightly noted—fellow-feeling and football. We have plenty of proof, when they come down here, that they do not lose these attributes, but we cannot help thinking that they must have rather hard work to avoid doing so; for, in the first place, when they get to Oxford they find no Rugby Club, and in the second, they find no Rugby football. They hear of Clubs of other Public Schools, and they envy: they hear of Football of other Schools, and they sneer, or worse, they go and play an Amalgamation game. An Amalgamation game! All the intricacies and difficulties of real football swamped in a huge round ball. You cannot go wrong; there are no rules to violate; “a child could play at it.” Rugby football professes to be somewhere in footballs, but it is at present unrepresented at Oxford. We should recommend the present generation (we make no recommendation to the past, but merely bear their grumblings); we should recommend the present generation, we say, to see to this when their time comes, and to make it all comfortable and ready for the next.

No one will deny that the tendency of the present age is to be accurate in its measurements.

To know exactly the relative quality and magnitude of everything on the face of the earth, and to value it accordingly. It is hardly surprising that in science the word immeasurable is in every sense almost unknown; that men of science know the distance of Saturn, and the motive power of a comet, with the same ease as ordinary men do their own height and weight: that there is, in short, hardly any extreme which cannot be accurately measured, and reduced to black and white. But the rage has extended far beyond the limits of science: everything around us falls under the same sway; we know precisely how much one town is more healthy than another, how much more popular one church than another; nay, even we ourselves (at least a large and increasing number of us,) have been subjected to the measuring process and have found, by competitive examination, our relative value to the rest of the world in tens and hundreds.

Yet, amidst all this, one thing has entirely escaped, in one branch of knowledge we are still as utterly ignorant as the cannibals of California; it is the measurement of our own sensations, and above all our own likes and dislikes. Years have been spent and volumes written in trying to determine how these sensations are produced, what they are; they have been classified and analysed; you will find numberless philosophers who will tell you when you feel pleased, that it is due partly to a sense of harmony, partly to a sense of the beautiful: but no Aristotle, no Locke, has been found to give us, what we may term, our “Sensationometer;” to give us the means of knowing, in actual numbers, the intensity and magnitude of our feelings. And, alas! we seem to be absolutely without the first elements of knowledge which might lead to progress in this direction; there are points indeed, the laughing point, the weeping point, the shrieking point, at which our sensations reveal themselves, and which might be thought, at first, to serve as maximum and minimum points in our scale. But these are, it is clear, so different in different persons, so subject to variations of time and extraneous circumstances as to be utterly useless.

Yet imagine, reader, for an instant that the great discovery has been made, that you possess the coveted instrument, and consider what intense gratification the use of it would afford you, and the number of interesting problems it might help you to solve. You would have the power, when a sobbing sister assured you that she never felt so miserable, as this letter or that disappointment had made her, of saying: “My dear, you are quite wrong; your sorrow is now just 89°; a week ago, when you were in the midst of the dying scene in ‘Kate’s Revenge’ (3 vols), you were over 92°.” Imagine how consoling, when plucked for your degree, or jilted, or ruined in Agra and Masterman’s, to know for a certainty that your friend Smith, when he underwent the same calamities, was

far more struck down by them, and yet is now himself again. Yet, endless as would be the variety of the questions you might decide, there would be none more interesting than that we purpose to speak of now: the relative discomfort of Business and Idleness, of having too much, and having nothing to do, of being behind Time, and of wishing time to go faster a head.

We are tempted, at first sight, to set Idleness down as a curable, and over-work as an incurable evil and so to assign the latter by far the higher reading in our measurement; but many instances may be brought, without straining the point, to show that it is the rarity of the evil rather than its actual nature which leads to such a conclusion.

None will deny that the number of men in the world who have too much to do, is far larger than of those who have too little; but the disease exists though the sufferers from it are few. Of course there is a conglomeration of evils in solitary confinement—four bare walls to look at, nobody at all to speak to, a prison dress to wear, a stone slab to sit on—these are no small ingredients of the punishment; but, (we scarcely speak from experience,) there can be no doubt that the perfect idleness it involves is one of its greatest miseries. Let us put the two cases side by side. Take a thoroughly busy professional man—a man who has to read his briefs while he eats his breakfast and who at six o'clock has half-a-dozen more that must be known before morning—or a man whose consulting room is filled from nine till four, and who has then a hundred more patients to see before night. Set him down in a small country town or a small watering place with no briefs, no courts, no patients, no hospital, and afterwards compare that man in his present self and his past self in respect of happiness. Naturally enough, for the first few days there will be a reaction, but when the immediate effect of toil is over, and he is thoroughly immersed in his idleness, will he be happier than he was when he had never five minutes to call his own? For our own part we think not.

How does the question affect us? Which of the two would be found to be most irksome to us? There is no difference which more strongly marks the beginning and the end of a school career than its relation to Time; we come to school with very little to do, with work that we can manage with tolerable ease, with very little to think about, very little to look after, with abundance of time for "punt about" or an "end"—we leave school (that is, unless very prematurely superannuated) exactly the reverse. We have a dozen different interests to look to, possibly we are just going to matriculate, or worse still be tortured for Scholarships, we are in the Rifle Corps, we are in the Choir, or we are very eager for our House Football or Cricket, in a word we have almost more than we can do. When the grand discovery of the sensation-

ometer has been made we shall know which of these is the most disagreeable. For the present the decision must be left to individual taste. Certainly the old truth that we like what we have not better than what we have, goes a great way. The perpetual combatant with Time must envy the freedom, the idleness which he possessed two years ago, and the small new-boy—if he ever thinks enough to form any ideas at all—the interest of being busy.

It would certainly influence our decision in favour of the idle life being preferable here at least, inasmuch as those who share it (among ourselves at least) are gifted with the most insensibility to its disagreeableness. There is a real bother in being always behind, in the thought of books not read, grim unseens not prepared for, House twenties or elevens not sufficiently practised, recruits not enlisted, simply from want of time; but it is also really painful to look at the clock and long for bedtime, to wander disconsolately in the close and wonder when the next lesson will come, even though those afflicted with the latter pain may be the more insensible class.

It would be absurd to have written all this and yet end with no moral. Yet it is a simple and one-sided one, and hardly deduced from what we have said.

Here at least, if no other, there is one marked difference between the two classes of sufferers: for those who are entangled in a multitude of ties, who are really busy here, nothing can be done—the multitude of ties cannot reasonably be dissolved; but for you whose complaint is over-freedom, the cure is easy. Read papers at the Natural History Society, join the Rifle Corps, win Drill Prizes, visit the Arnold Library, write to the *Meteor*, and rejoice in your freedom; for the day may be coming when a dozen other things will have to be done than that you wish, and you will be the slave of Time and business.

NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY.

The first meeting of this Society was held on Saturday, the 26th October, the President in the Chair.

Mr. Marshall presented a water-colour sketch, representing the glacial action in Borrowdale.

Mr. Lawe showed the fish which he has been the first to discover in the Lias-shale at Newbold.

After other exhibitions, the President showed wood, bones, and a Mammoth's tooth from the fossil forest at Cromer, Norfolk, and explained the position of the forest, and the beds above it.

It was announced that the Rev. J. W.

Hayward (O.R.) will bring to Rugby, in the course of the Term, his promised collection of Lepidoptera.

Mr. Marshall was elected Treasurer. The next meeting will be on November 9th, at a quarter to eight.

BATTING AVERAGES OF THE ELEVEN FOR THE SEASON, 1867.

Names.	Matches.	Innings.	Runs.	Most in an Innings.	Most in Match.	Average per Innings.	Over.	Times not out.	Least in a Match.
B. PAUNCEFOTE	14	17	630	122	122	37 ..	1	4	14
S. P. BUCKNILL	17	24	526	72	85	21 ..	22	1	1
F. STORES	18	25	640	98	93	25 ..	15	2	0
W. YARDLEY	17	22	471	72	141	21 ..	9	1	1
J. WILKES	16	4	556	175	175	26 ..	10	2	4
F. TOBIN, ma.	18	24	682	85	110	28 ..	10	1	0
V. ELLIS	15	12	66	15	15	5 ..	6	7	0
A. A. BOURNE	13	10	64	23	23	6 ..	4	6	0
J. T. SOUTTER.....	14	19	211	40	58	11 ..	2	2	0
F. TOBIN, mi.	17	17	170	32	32	10 ..	0	3	0
C. K. FRANCIS	12	16	113	26	37	7 ..	1	0	0

BOWLING AVERAGES.

Names.	Innings.	Balls.	Overs.	Runs.	Maidens.	Wickets.	Runs for each wicket.	Over.	Balls for each wicket.	Over.	Runs off each over.	Over.	Wide balls.	No balls.	Average wickets per innings.	Over.
B. PAUNCEFOTE	19	2204	551	960	127	78	12 ..	24	28 ..	20	1 ..	409	0	2	4 ..	2
V. ELLIS	22	2612	653	868	278	73	11 ..	65	35 ..	57	1 ..	215	2	0	3 ..	7
A. A. BOURNE	21	2340	585	925	181	67	13 ..	54	34 ..	62	1 ..	340	20	0	3 ..	4
C. K. FRANCIS ...	10	888	222	273	97	20	13 ..	13	44 ..	8	1 ..	51	3	0	2 ..	2

RUGBY FOOTBALL AT CAMBRIDGE.

[FROM A CAMBRIDGE CORRESPONDENT.]

On Wednesday evening, October 23rd, a meeting of Old Rugbeians was held in Mr. E. M. Ward's rooms, at Trinity. Upwards of forty Old Rugbeians were present. Mr. C. E. Tritton (Trin. Hall) opened the proceedings by proposing that Mr. E. W. M. Lloyd (St. John's) be the President of the Rugby Football Club, and that he do take the chair accordingly. The motion being carried, Mr. E. W. Lloyd proposed Mr. J. E. Lloyd (Trin. Coll.) as Secretary; and Mr. Neild proposed Mr. Tritton as a member of the Committee. Mr. E. W. M. Lloyd then proposed that the following gentlemen's names be added to the Committee—Messrs. C. W. Neild, T. Buckmaster, and L. W.

Novelli. Mr. W. Lee Warner seconded the motion, which was carried *nem. con.*

On the question being put whether Football should be played on ce or twice a week, there was a large show of hands in favour of the latter.

Mr. E. W. M. Lloyd then proposed that there be a match every Tuesday and Saturday afternoon, on St. John's cricket ground; the Committee to decide on a match beforehand, and put up notice of it on the Hall screens of Trinity and St. John's, and at the Union: he also proposed that the opening match be played on Thursday, October 24th.

Mr. G. L. Bennett (St. John's) proposed that any "Gentile" be allowed to play, provided, of course, he conform to the Rugby Rules.

After a few unimportant motions the meeting separated.

The First Match was played on Thursday, October 24th, and was "Sixth v. School." There were about 16 on each side. For the Sixth W. Lee Warner and Chamberlain played back, J. E. Lloyd and Bourne half-back. For the School, Crawley (Marlborough) and L. W. Novelli played back; P. Hoole and Gwatkin half-back. The match was very even and when "no-side" was called, at four o'clock, the Sixth had obtained two touches down. For the Sixth, Lee Warner (back), E. W. M. Lloyd and Bourne (half-back), and E. N. Ward (forward), were especially conspicuous. For the School, Crawley and Novelli (back), Hoole and Gwatkin (half-back), A. B. Cook and Dixon (forward), played splendidly. The strangers who played were—For the Sixth:—Benson (Marlborough). For the School:—Upcher (Uppingham), Crawley (Marlborough), Lawrence (Wellington), and S. Cook (Cheltenham).

The next Match was "Mayor's v. School," in which the School kicked two goals.

FOOTBALL.

SIXTH MATCH.—Now, perhaps, it will be allowed by those who voted at Big-Side Levée for the Sixth Match on October 19, that they were thoroughly in the wrong. Why they persisted to such an extent in their motion, when plain reason told them that no Old Rugbeians would be present—the day before being the day of meeting for the latest Colleges in either University—every Old Rugbeian was at a loss to understand. However, it is now long past; another epoch in Rugby Football—the Old Rugbeian—is past too, and it is no use grumbling now, but we hope this year will be an example for succeeding generations to avoid. Instead of the old meeting of friends on this annual match-day, about a dozen had, with great difficulty, come down. Being so few, we may as well enumerate the heroes;—for the Sixth, Fisher, Bowen, W. Lee Warner, H. Cook, E. Fulton, A. Cordery, E. Kynnersley, H. Lee Warner, and E. F. Grenfell: for the School, C. S. Dakyns, F. S. Gwatkin, — Brocklebank, E. Wason, — Turner, — Bellis, B. Dakyns, F. A. Dakyns, and G. Yule. The School, according to custom, had the School Goal; the Sixth kicked off. After this the ball was driven down to the Pavilion, and remained not far from the Sixth's goal line for the most part of the afternoon. It

would be tedious to go into detail,—how the Sixth, with great vigour, once or twice nearly succeeded in getting the ball past the three trees; how the School, by overwhelming force, drove it back; and how C. S. Dakyns made many but ineffectual attempts to drop a goal. All this while, however, the School got some more substantial advantage than merely penning the unhappy "Stripes." A capital run-in was effected for them by Tyser (Moberly's). The try, although a very easy one, did not result in a goal. Not long after Yule (O.R.), who had been playing with great vigour, succeeded in accomplishing a like feat, which was attended with the same result. The Sixth were also compelled to touch it down in their own goal six times. On Monday the match was resumed, and a repetition of Saturday's discomfit was too apparent to the Sixth. More tries at goal, more punts out: so went the day, and finished without a goal being kicked. This day is memorable in the annals of the match, since the Sixth, by some good play on the part of their forwards, actually got the ball down to the School goal, where it was touched down by the goal-keepers. The Sixth Match came on again with Thursday: more runs-in, and more tries at goal, were the order of the day. In the last quarter of an hour, owing to a miserable piece of bad play by one of the Sixth backs, the ball was touched down between the posts, and a goal was kicked for the School by Yardley. Thus the match, which everyone hoped would end that afternoon, could now last for two more days. On Saturday, even with more uneven sides than before, play was resumed, and after one more unsuccessful try, a beautiful goal was kicked by Gardner, from a run-in by Tobin *mi.*: thus ended the match, in favour of the School, who had many players, but no one who could be entrusted with kicking a goal; however, practice makes perfect, and the second was perhaps harder than any former try. The Sixth played as well against long odds as could be expected, but were greatly in want of back and half-back players; the School had great power from their number of forwards, and were also assisted by nearly all the best back and half-back players in the School. Of course it is invidious to select any for their good play, but still we may be allowed to praise for their deeds—for the Sixth, Haslam (back), Moberly (half-back), and Davenport, Soutter, Crenshaw, Gray, Rowden and Graham (forwards); for the School,

Tobin ma., Yardley, and Gardner (back), Tobin mi., Lloyd, and Westfeldt (half-back), and Bucknill, Hare, Tyser, Peshall, and Sidebotham (forward). Of course all Old Rugbeians played as the traditions of their respective Houses tell, and there is little need in repeating what is so well known.

THE OLD RUGBEIAN MATCH this year was in many ways different from the match of former years. Its result was perhaps its most distinguishing feature, but one could not help feeling that there was something wrong, when upon coming out of chapel one did not find the porch crowded, and one did not see the sight, peculiar to the day of most Old Rugbeian matches, of Puntabout on Little Side, and did not shake hands with more than a dozen friends that were soon to be opponents. However the numbers increased later on, and when the match began there were about 38 on either side. The ground was slimy and soft from a drizzle that had unkindly fallen in the morning. Masterman kicked off for the Present Rugbeians, and even at this early stage, when the School is accustomed to feel the first-rush of the Old Rugbeians, and to succumb, things were reversed, and the kick-off was soon followed by the Old Rugbeians touching it down in their goal. They soon dropped the ball out, and even then were penned, but gained some ground by a fine piece of play by Martin, one of their half-backs, which was followed up well, and it seemed that the School were now to be pushed back. Meanwhile there was a good deal of play among the half-backs, in which Buckmaster (o.r.), distinguished himself, and very shortly after Tobin ma. (back) made a splendid run for the School, and with the efficient aid of the other backs, Badger and Gardner, the ball was again worked on towards the Old Rugbeian goal, where it was again touched down. This time their drop out was more fortunate, and upon Martin getting the ball, he, by a very fine run, nearly succeeded in getting into the School goal, but such a catastrophe was narrowly avoided, and the game was soon transferred to quite the other extreme of the close by a good run by Gardner, and again the Old Rugbeians were forced to touch the ball down in their goal. Now, oddly enough, the School seemed to be beginning to feel the weight of their adversaries, and gradually gave way, while the Old Rugbeians rejoicing in a chance of pushing, came on with a rush, and after a crafty run of Thompson (o.r.),

the ball was driven over the heads of the School backs, and was touched down by one of the many goal-keepers. After this there was nothing very remarkable on either side, and "No Side" was called before anything decisive had been gained by either the Past or Present Rugbeians. For the School Tobin ma., Badger, Gardner, and Haslam played back, and Fletcher, Lloyd, and Moberly were half-back, all of whom deserve mention. The backs on the other side were Haines, Haslam, Venables, and Fryer; while Martin, Lyon, and Buckmaster played half-back, and certainly showed that football is not forgotten among Old Rugbeians. Of the forwards, Ingham (o.r.), W. E. Hart (o.r.), Soutter, Cook (o.r.), W. F. Thompson (o.r.), Crenshaw, Kennedy, Davenport, and Bucknill deserve notice, if, indeed, it is not unfair to mention names among so many that played well on both sides. The match on the whole was most enjoyable, and only lacked two things, a better day for running and for spectators, and a more decisive victory for the School. We can, however, only hope that with this encouragement, the School may again be able to assert its superiority when playing with sides as equal as on last Friday.

BLAKE'S v. WILSON'S, Oct. 26.—Blake's, with Island goal, had strong wind in their favour. Wilson's kicked off, and for some time the ball was kept in the middle of the ground, but at length Blake's slowly forced their opponents back until close to their goal, when the ball was passed back to Tobin mi., who ran in between the posts, and Haslam kicked the first goal for Blake's. On changing, in spite of the wind, which was now against them, they gradually advanced, and after some good forward play, Tobin mi. succeeded in touching it down in Wilson's goal, the punt out which followed was well caught once, but missed the second time. A short run and a good drop of Badger, took the ball a long way out of goal, but Tobin ma. getting the ball made a splendid run, almost to the goal line, and soon after Wilson's were obliged to touch the ball down. On their dropping out, Tobin ma. caught the ball, and by a splendid run got in, but rather far from the goal; Tobin mi. tried but failed; by a good run of Lloyd the ball was brought to the three trees, but this success was only short-lived, for Tobin ma. again, by a good run, brought the ball back to the front of Wilson's goal, and Barratt succeeded in touching

the ball down. The distance was great from goal, but Fletcher was equal to it, and kicked a splendid goal, thus finishing the match.

THE THREE B'S v. THE SCHOOL.—This match was begun on Saturday last, the Road match having occupied the attention of Big-side for so short a time. It promised to be one of the best contended in the season, the School having a slight preponderance in weight; but the play on both sides was uncommonly good. The B's began with the School goal, but by some accident their opponents managed to kick one goal that afternoon, the B's obtaining a punt-out. The match was continued on Monday, when the School got a try between the posts but were foiled in their attempt, owing to the kick being charged down by Scutter. The Houses, after some excellent play on the part of several forwards, touched the ball down in the School goal. A punt-out ensued, which was not caught. The match will be continued on Thursday (to-day.)

BOWDEN SMITH'S v. BURROWS'.—This match was commenced, Oct. 28th, by Tobin mi. kicking off for Burrows', who had the School goal. Burrows' gained considerable advantage by the kick off, and penned slightly for a short time, till a fine run on the part of Gardner ma., for Bowden Smith's, brought the ball to the School side of the three trees, where it remained more or less for the remainder of the match, as Bowden Smith's penned closely ever afterwards, till "no-side" was called, in spite of the strenuous efforts of Tobin mi. (Blake's), who was playing for Ellis ma. No goal was obtained by Bowden Smith's, though they had two tries and a punt out, and made Burrows' touch the ball down eight times in their own goal. For Bowden Smith's we noticed Gardner ma., and Mc.Millan back, Gardner mi., (who, by the bye, made a very good drop at goal, which just went under the bar,) half-back, and Rowden, Paterson, and Kough, forward, as being most conspicuous; while for Burrows' Riley and Russell mi., back, Tobin mi. and Benham (Wilson's) for Ellis mi., half-back, and Russell, ma. and Maitland, forward, played well.

SCHOOL HOUSE v. ARNOLD'S.—This was the first match of the season. The School House took the Island Goal, and gave kick off to their opponents, an advantage which they did not keep for long, as the ball was

soon carried past the three trees and tided into their goal, where they touched it down. Lambert then dropped out, and soon after one of the Arnoldite backs dropped the ball in front of their goal, where Warner (a School House back) caught it and made his mark. Scutter then made an unsuccessful try at goal. They again dropped it out, and Davenport made a short run in, and touched the ball down in the Arnoldite goal. Then followed another unsuccessful try, and a run in by Scutter, but as it was too far for a place kick, Davenport punted it out; the ball was not caught, and a long scrummage ensued under the goal, when the ball was luckily passed back to Moberly (half-back) and he ran in between the posts. This time Scutter kicked a splendid goal. After the change of goal, the Arnoldites stood up very pluckily, and prevented their opponents from making much progress, but Senior (a School House back) soon made up for this by a first-rate run through and past several fellows, and finally touched the ball down in their goal. No goal, however, was kicked, nor indeed after another run in by Moberly. The play on both sides was very fair indeed, and the half-backs, Moberly, Lambert, and Westfeldt, did great service for their respective sides.

FOOTBALL COMMITTEE.—A meeting was held on Thursday, October 31st, for the purpose of drawing the Second House Ties. The results of the first ties our readers will see in another column.—Rev. C. E. Moberly's play School House; Rev. C. B. Hutchinson's play Rev. P. Bowden Smith's; Rev. T. W. Jex Blake's odd house.—Rev. C. E. Moberly's have scratched, so there remains only one match in this round, which is to be played on Saturday next. There will afterwards be one tie and one odd-house.

THE RIFLE CORPS.—The School XI. v. Rossall XI.—The simultaneous match between these sides resulted as follows:—Rossall, 269; Rugby, 247.

The Batting Averages of the Eleven are unusually high for this year. The highest average, that of the Captain, B. Pauncefote, is 37-1; the highest at Eton is that of C. J. Thornton, 32-2; at Cheltenham, F. Baker, 31; at Marlborough, H. Hillyard, 29-2; at Harrow, J. Walsh, 20-4.

The Sermon for the Rugby Fox Master-ship, in India, was preached this year by the

Rev. W. Benson, Headmaster of Wellington College.

The following subscriptions to the Organ Fund, received by Mr. Edwards, have been paid by him to the Treasurer:—E. W. P., 10s.; E. Hailstone, Esq., 10s.; S. Hailstone, Esq., £1; H. H. Johnston, Esq., £1 ls.

CORRESPONDENCE.

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

RUGBY FOOTBALL.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

DEAR SIR,—Having known football at Rugby now for some years, I venture to send you a few remarks on my impressions of the present state of the game.

In the first place I remark two very great improvements in the game of late years, one is the suppression of vicious hacking and the other the absence of "mauls." But I do not think that these two improvements, excellent as they are in themselves, have been conducive to unmixed good to the game. In idea the object both of the hacking and the mauls was to get the ball on. Often a good strong fellow carried the ball clear through a scrumage, by dint of hard hacking, and also a little dodgy fellow would somehow wriggle out of a maul and get away for a clear drop: so it happened that the ball was seldom stationary for long together; but now the "squashes" which follow a fellow being caught with the ball, and made to put it down, may last an indefinite time, for the ball lies quietly on the ground, while the players shove each other in the ribs with their elbows; and even if the ball has the luck to show itself outside the scrumage, it is instantly shoved, rather than kicked, back among the forest of motionless legs. Now my notion is that it is a most desirable thing to get the ball out of a scrumage, and that as soon as it appears outside it should be kicked at once *sideways*, or only slightly forward, so as to give the half-backs a chance of a clear run, and drop. My impression is that the present practice, which keeps the game so tame, has arisen from a wrong idea about funking, namely, that a fellow must be a funk unless he sticks always quite close to the ball. This is a mistake, for much more pluck is wanted to make a good run at the ball, when it is *loose*,

than to shove, with the whole side to back you; and the consequence of the idea is that there are never any open scrummages, in which the ball is carried on with the feet,—more as in Eton football—instead of the hands. With our strict rule of "off-side" there is not much fear of "sneaking;" and the game is much livelier and more exciting if the sides spread more, so that the players can help each other. I suppose the object of each side is to get the ball on, and I maintain that the best means are not taken to do so. I believe this is clear if you think what the result of a game would be in which one side kept close upon the ball, according to the present fashion, and the other spread itself out, and observed the rules that backs and half-backs should always get their drops, and forward players seldom or ever take up the ball at all, unless with the fair chance of a "run in." It used in my time to be a rule that back players of both kinds should make sure of their drops, and by the side spreading out it was ensured that if a back player made a "skew" drop, some other fellow far out would follow it up for him and prevent a long-back on the other side having, as he has now, a calm run away from the game. There has been an idea abroad that a back player funks unless he runs till he is caught; no doubt some times this leads to a brilliant run in, such we saw in the VI. match, but generally I think it only tends to choke the game. My two suggestions are that backs and half-backs should drop more and try to run less; and that the forward players should spread more, and in the case of a tight scrumage should aim at getting the ball out, forwards, sideways, or backwards, according as it gives the best chance of a neat run and drop. It is obvious that I speak from a back-player's point of view, and so no doubt my opinion is open to suspicion, but at any rate it is founded on a good deal of experience, and offered from a sincere desire that all should get as much fun as possible out of the jolly old game, which we always so doggedly maintain *must* be the best game in the world.

I remain, dear Sir,

Your obedient servant,
F. H. FISHER.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

School House, Nov. 2, 1867.

SIR,—Will you allow me to remind your correspondents "Trio," that the jurisdiction of the Football Committee only extends to

matters connected with House matches. As was passed at the Big-Side Levée last Term their decision as to which are the two cock houses is final, and from it there is no appeal to Big-Side; but with Big-Side Matches, and Football in general, they have no concern. I do not deny that some measure is needed to ensure the attendance of Caps at Big-Sides; I merely wish to remind "Trio" that it does not lie with the Football Committee to frame it.

Yours very truly,
J. S. M.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

DEAR SIR,—Pardon me for addressing you on a subject which seems to be at present under discussion. In looking over your last number I was somewhat startled at some remarks in the second article, relative to the slender attendances of Caps at Big-Sides. Now, Sir, I would ask,—Is the attendance voluntary or compulsory? I was always under the impression that on the first absence, without leave, a Cap would either get lines or a severe reprimand from the head of his side, and on the second it would be two chances to one that he got his cap taken away. I judge from your remarks that it is now almost a matter of his own choice whether a Cap plays or not. By all means let the old system of notes be revived in all its strictness. A few words to the heads of House Twenties and heads of sides from the Captain of the Committee, would, I am sure, do more to better the attendance than any amount of fines.

While on the subject of Football, let me refer to one other point. I gather from some remarks in your last that the new rule proposed last February is entirely disregarded. Now, whether it is a good rule or not is a matter of very even dispute, if one is to judge by the variety of opinions; but that it should be put aside merely from prejudice, or, at all events, without a formal repeal, is, I think, very unfair, and unlike what Rugby management ought to be. You will perceive from my letter that I am an O. R.; if I have been meddling, by all means annihilate me in your next number, but at present permit me to remain

Yours truly,
PRINCIPLE.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

DEAR SIR,—I wish to point out what has always appeared to me a great deficiency in

our Football at Rugby. I have been often asked here at Oxford, "Were you in your School Twenty?" and I was obliged to answer, "there was no such thing in existence." Now it seems to me that this defect might be remedied, and I am sure the result would be beneficial. Why should there not be a School twenty? The one great argument, I know, is,—What are they to do? Who are they to play? And I can only reply, in the first place, they could play the rest of the Caps, which would equal in cricket the eleven playing the twenty-two. Secondly, it would be a means of getting twentys down from Oxford or Cambridge, which would not interfere with the Old Rugbeian, and which would tend immeasurably to foster good play in the School. Thirdly, in the end it might bring about a match with some other School, such as Marlborough. Against this I know there is the old objection that School feeling would be sure to run high, and the match might end in something like a fight. If this is true, it seems to me to be a most degrading confession; but I do not believe it would be the case. So much for the argument against the formation of a School Twenty. Let me briefly state a few of the arguments in its behalf.

1. It would improve the play on Big-Side. At present, when a fellow gets his cap, there is simply nothing more for him to try after, and he may take football tolerably easy for the rest of his time. Of course he will always play his best for his house, but I believe that the competition aroused by the fact of there being some further dignity to attain, would increase the good play of the School in general, and especially on ordinary Big-Side Matches, which of course would constitute the greatest test for admission into the School Twenty.

2. If by this means something like School matches could be brought about, we should have done something towards liberalising Football. Football is a strongly Conservative game, hedged round with all sorts of prejudices, and that is the reason why it has not flourished as it ought. Cricket on the other hand is very Liberal, it has spread all over England, opening its ranks to all classes; and the result is that it has flourished beyond all other games, and the chief danger it has now to fear is of becoming Radical.

Such appear to me to be the chief arguments in favour of my proposition, and if during this term and the two which follow this subject can be discussed, and more

arguments brought for it, as I have no doubt there may, and more against it, as there may be also, this letter will quite have fulfilled the intention of yours most truly,

O. R. AT OXFORD.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—Seeing that the *Meteor* has already carried into effect the proposals of several correspondents, I venture to hope that the same success may attend these. In the first place could not the part of the path immediately by the White Gate on the Barby Road, be made “in touch?” If this could be done, many unnecessarily *hard-tumbles* would be avoided. My second proposal, which, I fear, your readers will consider very radical and revolutionary, is that a fellow be allowed to have his cap if he be thought *throroughly* worth it, without reference to the time he may have been in the School. In anticipation, I hear cries of, “What humbug,” &c., but I shall hold to my opinion that it would answer well, until thoroughly convinced that it would not. In answer to one objection which would probably be made, that a “new fellow” would not know the rules, I say that it would be very easy for him to learn them, and certainly, after reading the rules over three or four times, and playing as many Little Sides or below caps, he would know quite as well as some, not a few, who already wear the “velvet cap” on Big Side; which brings me to my last question or proposal. Could not *all* be obliged to pass an examination in the rules before being allowed to have a cap?

Yours truly,

FOOTBALL.

H A T S .

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—I have been greatly amused, not to say astonished, at the stolidity and rashness evinced by “An Utter Fool,” in daring to think that a stand could possibly be made against such evidently *magni tumores* as “Cosmopolitan” and “A. H. St. V.,” both of whom, I should think, must feel the greatest pity, though not unmixed with indignation, for one who is so purblind as not to be convinced, nay, overawed, by their wisdom.

I have two reasons, principally, for trespassing on your valuable space for this worn dispute; 1st, that I have a “practical suggestion” to make; and, 2nd, to answer “Cosmopolitan’s” letter in your last. He says:—“Briefly, this is our case. Hats are annoying to the new boys. Mere annoyance does no good to them, and certainly no good to others; *therefore*,” he concludes, “*hats* do no good to them, and certainly no good to others.” Now this would be a most convincing syllogism, and would at once end this dispute, if it *were* a syllogism; but the middle term is incorrect; for if we take it as it stands, “mere annoyance” is not synonymous with “annoyance,” and therefore the argument falls; and if we erase the “mere,” the middle term of the syllogism becomes intrinsically untrue, for this annoyance *is* good for new boys, because of the beneficial effects it brings with it. One might just as well say, medicine is an annoyance to a child; *mere* annoyance does the child no good, nor anyone else, therefore medicine does no good. True, *mere* annoyance does no good to the child; but the annoyance with its accompaniments, does. So with new fellows. The annoyance brings with it salutary effects. It teaches new boys (i) that they are not yet thoroughly conversant with the rules of the School, and must therefore submit to be taught them by those who are; (ii) that, as new members of an important society, they must first make good their claim to offer their opinions freely before they exercise that privilege. Now a *distinguishing badge* does this more effectually than anything else. It teaches them that although they may deceive *THEMSELVES*, *others* they *cannot* deceive into the delusion that they are either thoroughly conversant with the rules of the School, or that they have showed by their general actions in what rank their opinions are to be placed.

Now lately, since the hats have been discontinued to a great extent, the ‘upstart feeling’ has been growing bigger and bigger. This may be exemplified by the following *trifle*. Whereas, three or four years ago, new fellows used, when asked their names within a year from the time they entered, to give a civil answer; now, if an old boy asks a *very new* one his name (if he has been at Rugby a week), instead of answering, he turns round and stares, as much as to say, with Hood, “Pray, are you anybody in particular, or am I merely to regard this as idle curiosity?”

I have gone thus far only to show that the hat is not a "mere annoyance," and that assumed superiority is not always such a crushing argument as "A. H. St. V." and "Cosmopolitan" seem to me to think. For I do think that *another* badge may be accorded to new fellows, which will be, perhaps, nearly as efficient in its good qualities as the hat, of the bad qualities of which it will possess none. This is a *black straw with the house-colours on*. This will answer nearly every purpose. Not only will it distinguish *new* boys from *old*, but *new* boys from *new*; which is a great advantage.

My letter has become already much longer than I expected, and I will therefore close; but let me say one more word to "Cosmopolitan" and "A. H. St. V." In consulting for the good of new fellows, let us not merely attempt what seems at first sight a good, but also try to do them the greatest good *we can* do in this line, that of gaining for them the greater facility for more quickly obtaining the good esteem and liking of their school-fellows; and this not to be done by making them over-bearing and precocious.

Again apologising for taking up so much of your space, which I should not have presumed to do had I not had a "practical suggestion" to offer,

I remain, &c.,

MARCELLUS (O.R.).

FIVES COURTS.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—I perfectly agree with "Hillmorton" in his praise of Rugbeian fairness in most matters, but I do not think he has discovered a real exception. Do these "important times for fives courts" really "belong to one house?" I think not.

The fastest runners in Arnold's house take the courts, but they generally run for members of other houses. I know it was not

so for the first year, but that was, I believe, only because they were not so often asked to run, and so they left the courts to the small fellows of the house, who were always glad enough to get them.

Look at the proofs of skill in hand-fives playing. This is, if I remember right, the first year an Arnoldite has had a chance of the single.

Diver's books may show a larger "tick" at Arnold's, but is it due to these particular hours? or is it only that as Blake's have the highest average in the Sixth for their numbers, and Wilson's are most addicted to the Natural Science, (especially chemistry!) so Arnold's are the most addicted to voluntary games. Compulsory foot-ball depends of course only on the Sixth of the House. I think they play more puntabout and more ends than other houses.

I think, too, that unless the present plan is unjust, it is a real convenience to the School, as there is no house except Arnold's which can take courts at that time without ruining half their dinner time. And now, a fast runner in Arnold's is certain to take the court, whereas it would be difficult to tell who would be the most likely to get a court if all the school raced from Dr. Temple's garden wall, as running in a crowd is uncertain, and the result would be constant disappointments. Did not the existing practice of taking the batfives-court appear to "Hillmorton" "utterly contrary to the spirit of fairness?" I do not see that it is better for a court to belong to the Sixth fellows than to the fast runners in a house.

Yours,

AN O.R. WHO WAS IN THE SIXTH.

P.S.—Hillmorton must be rather farther from Rugby than I remembered, if "Hillmorton" left Rugby before the courts were opened, wrote within five years of that time, and yet his letter has but just reached you now.