

12TH WARWICK.

	200yds.	500yds.	Tl.
Captain Tobin	16	14	— 30
Lieutenant Graham	13	10	— 23
Sergeant Baynes	6	6	— 12
" Humphry	13	12	— 25
Corporal Penrose	9	11	— 20
" Botfield	11	12	— 23
Lance-Corporal Stuart Wortley	14	5	— 19
" Whiting	10	13	— 23
Private Cobham	11	6	— 17
" Peel	12	5	— 17
" Selous	9	10	— 19
Total	124	104	228

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

	200yds.	500yds.	Tl.
Captain Tomlinson	14	7	— 21
Ensign Mackintosh	18	2	— 15
Sergeant Carlisle	16	5	— 21
" Ingham	12	11	— 23
Corporal Bouverie	12	12	— 24
" Kinlock	14	13	— 27
Private Reid	11	4	— 15
" Templer	15	13	— 28
" Ingram	12	8	— 20
" Barber	14	10	— 24
" Buxton	12	9	— 21
Total	145	94	239

THE RACQUET COURT.

A novelty was introduced at the Racquet Court, on a certain wet Saturday afternoon; a handicap being played among the Eleven and Twenty-two. This limitation was made, in order if possible to get it finished that afternoon—only one round, however, could be got through. A committee acted as handicappers. The numbers indicate the number of points given.

Tobin ma.	} 0	beat	Francis	} 12
Gwyer		Badger		
Walker	} 0	"	Lambert	} 0
Graham		Lloyd		
Yardley	} 0	"	Rowden	} 6
Gray		Gardnermi		
Moberly	} 0	"	Walsh	} 7
Neilson		Hudson		
Gardner ma.	} 0	"	Mawdsley	} 0
Fitzgerald		Lushington		
Sidgwick	} 0	"	Tobin mi.	} 2
Maitland		Botfield		
Bucknill	} 6	"	Eaden	} 0
Baring		Pearson		
Mr. Wilson	} 0	"	Mr. B. Smith	} 4
Mr. Sidgwick		Mr. Potts		

SECOND TIES.

Mr. Wilson	} 3	"	Tobin ma.	} 0
Mr. Sidgwick		Gwyer		
Sidgwick	} 0	"	Graham	} 7
Maitland		Walker		

CORRESPONDENCE.

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

To the Editor of the Meteor.

DEAR SIR,—On the supposition that your article on Debating Societies has found the same favour in the eyes of the School as in mine, I should like to suggest two ideas for putting it into successful operation.

The first is—That, if the Masters do not object, the meetings of the School Debating Society should be held successively in the halls of the different Houses.

The second is—That either alternately with the Debate, or in addition to it, there should be held meetings of a Shakspeare Club, or Literary Society; *i.e.*, that a play of Shakspeare, or some chosen pieces from the Poets—such, for instance, as the *Ancient Mariner*, or the *Morte d'Arthur*, or one of the *Idylls*, or some of the finer pieces of less known authors (of which notice shall have been given the week before), should be read aloud by the fellows, and discussed either then or at the next meeting of the Debating Society.

The grounds for suggesting the first idea are: that, as you pointed out, a School Debating Society would be a great means of opening up Houses; and the adoption of this plan would render it a still greater means. These are my reasons for thinking so: If the debates are held in the Vth. or VIth. School, fellows will probably walk there and back with their own House, just as they do to lessons; and that the chances of acquaintance with men of other Houses would not be very greatly increased, while the ugliness of the Schools themselves, or rather, I should say, the "schooliness" of them, would take away from the pleasure of the Debate.

If the fellows can be brought together into House halls, the novelty of their meeting-house (I'm strictly orthodox) will prevent the Debates from feeling like lessons; and the fellows to whom the hall belongs will, or ought, to feel put on their honour to show a certain amount of cordiality and friendliness in their reception of comparative strangers. More reserved fellows will often have almost *forced* upon them the opportunity of talking to fellows of other Houses whom their reserve alone has prevented them from getting to know before. The hanging

about hall fire, chatting before the Debate begins—when every fellow in the House will feel bound to make himself agreeable to every fellow out of the House, and *vice versa*—ought to rub off much of the present stiffness, and help many a quiet fellow to know others whom his want of self-confidence alone has kept him from being intimate with before. The dread of being thought to “hang on” would not be present on these evenings—the greatest misfortune of reserved fellows, and one more particularly likely to trouble those for whom the Debating Society would be most fun. How many fellows of that sort couldn’t you mention, each wanting to know the other, neither having the pluck to begin!

The anti-house feeling movement would be encouraged in another way. It is not improbable that fellows would ask their friends or slight acquaintances from other Houses to come up to their studies just before the Debate, so as to be ready for it when it began, or to come and chat about it when it was over. We might have the proposer holding a caucus in his study before his motion was brought on, and then, confident in the support of his adherents, speak with increased vigour and effect. These are one or two of the arguments which suggest themselves in favour of the first idea.

Now as to the reasons for the second: they are briefly these:—

Fellows do not take half as much interest in good English writings as they might, because they never come in their way. This obstacle a Poetry Club might help to remove. The advantages of such a club seem to be: that it would supply good subjects for Debate, and plenty of them, and that it would extend both the knowledge and the reasoning powers of the members, because the speakers would first have to read and then to criticise; that fellows would read books more carefully and accurately, if they knew that they would afterwards have to read them publicly and then discuss them. Those who cannot recognise the good points for themselves, and therefore find but little pleasure in reading, might read with much greater zest after a debate, when he had heard cleverer fellows at that sort of thing point out and criticise the good and bad in it, and show the meaning of the piece. Debates on politics tend, after a time, to vapid denunciation. The merits of winter and summer are points few fellows care to argue about, since whatever the conclusion, the facts can-

not be altered, besides, too, being a question *de gustibus*. But the occasional discussion of a play, poem, or character, on the other hand, prevents denunciation to so great an extent, since the proofs to the contrary are readily accessible in the book itself, and speaker and listener alike profit by it, because they have to decide why they have liked or disliked what they have read in itself, or preferred it to any other compared with it.

It would be good, I think, always to have the works to be discussed, as far as possible, read publicly before the discussion, either on the same evening or the week before, because unless everybody has more or less of an idea of the question discussed, the end is not gained of waking up the young or more indifferent to take an interest in what is going on. Don’t have fellows trying to prove that Tennyson, for instance, is better than Wordsworth, until some pieces of each of them have been publicly read and discussed on a former evening, so that there may be some material for sensible ideas to be gathered from.

The objection to political subjects—that they involve so many other points than the particular one on which the debate is grounded, and thus enable confident fellows to talk dogmatic nonsense without evidence to the contrary being readily accessible, does not apply to these discussions on things already read, or to literary criticism of that kind, so much, because anybody can lay hand on a volume of poetry now-a-days and try and think the question over for himself. And I believe that by some such system as this, Debates might be made much less prosy and vapid, real interest might be felt by most fellows present, and it would, I should think, if carefully managed, bring about the expulsion of many a yellow-socked “Boodle” in favour of green-backed Moxon’s and gloves, and “Golden Treasury’s,” and “Dickens’” and “Thackeray’s,” to the no small improvement of Rugby tea-talk and society.

With best wishes for the success of the Rugby School Debating Society, if it is to exist,

Believe me, dear Sir, yours,
KNIGHT TEMPLAR.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—The fast-flowing fluency, the prodigious prodigality, of the prolix prose of patriotism poured into your columns by “Trebla,” tends to intimidate opposition;

nevertheless, I will venture to raise a faint remonstrance against his crushing criticism of "Aquila's" opinions. * * * *

[Here follow a page and a half, very closely written, to shew that everyone has a right to speak (loud, and all at once).] * * * *

Sir, may I be permitted, through the medium of your excellent paper, to ask your candid readers whether "Trebla" can be right in awarding more honour to the winner of the Dropping or Placing than to the hero of the mile, or 1760 yards, as he truly calls it? Surely we have known the School Dropping got by those who have distinguished themselves on no more honourable field than the Pontines. * * * *

[Here our correspondent goes off into two pages which need no comment] * * * * Sir, is Racquets really so much more important than Diving or Swimming as "Trebla" thinks? * *

* * * [A page and a half, proving that swimming and diving were absolutely indispensable to brave Horatius at the bridge; c. f. Macaulay's Lays, most of one of which is quoted.] * * * *

Surely, Sir, none can think that proficiency in Racquets is really more useful, I do not say more pleasureable, but * * * [A somewhat wearisome discussion of pleasure and profit] * * * than Swimming and Diving. Could a racquet hero save the life, in virtue of his racquets, of a sinking fellow-creature in the flood? no, not if he had his racquet in his hand!

"Trebla's" proposition to include Football and Cricket in Athletics is indeed an honour to these games. One did not think that they were not classed with them from their being so far inferior, but because they were quite different, some think superior, some think not, but all probably put them on a different footing. * * * *

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

TRIFLE TIME.

[This is really all that we can insert, with the most sincere apologies to our correspondent, of a letter which included—besides the matter of which we have given slight headings—a long and accurate account of the bathing arrangements of the Romans, and eulogies of Rugby, England, and the next Concert. Seven stamps were on the outside of the communication, which came by post.]

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—I was greatly struck, and I may add amused, by the letter of "Trebla" in your

last number, nor can I quite make it out. If he really thought that it would be so dull and unacceptable to his readers, why waste the time required for its composition? and having written it, how did he expect it to be received? It certainly seems to me to be the most inconsistent and contradictory letter which has ever yet appeared in your valuable pages, and the style, though certainly *amusing*, is hard to appreciate. Can the writer really think that this high-flown style is at all in place while treating of a subject for the remedy of which a little plain reasoning and sober estimation of facts is alone required? or does he think that in a paper edited by *school-boys* this sort of stuff is likely to pass for fine writing?

But without wishing to too be hard upon "Trebla," I should like to allude to one or two points, which especially meet with my disapprobation—though it is difficult, really, to criticize a letter which says so much and suggests so little.

In the first place, the views that he takes of Athleticism are—I had almost said—childish. His definition of the races, viz., "running between two flags without tripping up," suggests the idea of a lot of drunken men, so far helpless as to be unable to keep in the course, or even on their legs, for the short space of 100 yards. For the matter of that, our Football, on which we so pride ourselves, might be defined in much the same way, if we substitute goal-posts for flags. The same may be urged with respect to his other definitions. Again, so various and contradictory are the opinions he quotes at every step, and so constantly does he appear to change his own, that it is really hard to arrive at his general drift. Thus when he affects to make light of the 1,760 yards run upon a "*hard* high road," are we to believe him to be in earnest? If so, I think I am right in saying that he is the first Rugby-beian to whom the Barby and Hillmorton match is a source of such infinitely greater interest than the running of the mile race; so much so that I think there are very few in the School who would be able to tell him, at once, which road is at present exalted upon this "highest pinnacle of human glory," (I quote his own words) while the name of *Bucknill* is in every mouth.

Thirdly, I think he is desirous of giving an undue preponderance to Racquets, which, after all, may be got by a fellow who lays no claim to being an athlete, and as for "the immense toil and energy" required in bring-

ing his play to perfection, I am certain that there are numberless fellows in the School who would gladly relieve any member of the R.C. of his superfluous courts; and if those who enter for "the mile" could train with as little discomfort to themselves, I am quite sure that there would be a much greater number of starters, in far better condition, than there is at present.

Lastly, with regard to the proposition that Cricket and Football should count for the cup, I quite disagree with him; as, in these games there is no real athletic contest involved. To begin with,—there is already a challenge cup for the best batting average in the Eleven, while any large score in any of the great matches is almost always rewarded at the time with a presentation bat: and although, occasionally, some fellow, by brilliant play, places himself conspicuously first, yet it would not always be so easy to select both the best batsman and bowler of his year. And as for Football, I think that the chief beauty of those hard-fought battles for "Cock House" (which test the real worth of a player more than any) is the fact that they are for honour and glory, and nothing else; in my humble opinion it would be degrading such a noble game to offer a prize for it; and I do not think that any fellow, after dropping such a goal as "Trebla" describes, or effecting a successful "run-in," would desire any further reward than the satisfaction of knowing that he has done his best for his side, or his House, and distinguished himself in the eyes of all spectators. Nor do I agree with "Trebla" that the remembrance of such a run or such a goal is soon erased from the minds of those who witnessed it; and by future ages it is even more likely to be remembered than the name of the winner of the School "dropping" or "placing" (last year an insignificant Below-Cap).

Hoping that the length of "Trebla's" letter may prove an apology for that of my own,

I am, yours truly,
SCRUTATOR.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—There has been a good deal of correspondence in your columns lately about the Big-Side Cup: but no one seems to have distinctly set before us what is the first thing we have to settle. It is this: Is the cup to be given for Athletics or Athleticism? By Athletics we commonly mean contests which are won by strength of limb and

soundness of wind, as opposed to those which depend on the quickness and correctness with which hand and eye work together. Athleticism is a much wider word, wider even than "Trebla" has made it. For surely the correct eye and steady hand, which make the best average at the butts, are at least as valuable as the biceps born of dumb-bells, by which the cricket ball is thrown ninety odd yards, or the weight put thirty odd feet. The principle is the first thing to decide; till it is decided, I will not say it is useless to discuss, but it is impossible to settle any details.

In his suggestions in the letter, "Trebla" seems a little wild; as when, in one breath, he says he thinks long running counts too much, and in the next proposes to include Hare and Hounds; though exactly what Rugby game he means is a puzzle to

Your obedient servant,

E.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

DEAR SIR,—This is my first attempt at writing a public letter, so I hope you and your readers will be lenient to me. The plan I am about to propose you may criticise as much as you like, but the composition of the letter I hope you will overlook. Some time last year, I believe one or two letters appeared in your paper on the same subject as that of my letter, viz., the pavilion dinner on foreign match days. Now, Sir, do you not think it is most disgraceful that gentlemen, some of whom have never been to Rugby before, and perhaps after their dinners here are so disgusted as never to come again, should, after having spent sometimes one and sometimes two days of their, perhaps, valuable time, not to mention the expense of the journey to and fro, have to pay a paltry half-crown or so for their dinner in the School pavilion? As I am not a member of the Eleven—nor, for the matter of that am I ever likely to become one—I cannot tell what *their* feelings are when the plate comes round, but I assure you, Sir; that were I dining there, I should blush with shame for myself and my School. To remedy this evil,—and every rational being will, I am sure, admit that it is an evil, and a great one too—could we not pay heavier subscriptions? No doubt some will say that the School is already heavily taxed enough. But I put it to you, Sir, as a matter of pride, and not of a mere half-a-crown or so, could anyone object to give half-a-crown to maintain the

honour of the School? Let the Eleven pay, say five shillings, the twenty-two three shillings, and the School two shillings annually. Surely this would provide the very best of dinners. My plan is, I know, open to objections of all sorts, but I merely give it to invite suggestions, and to bring the matter again into notice. Let the Captain take it into his hands, or let it be brought before a Big-Side Levee. It has taken me a long time in attempting to choose a *nom de plume*, but I have at last given up the attempt in despair, contenting myself with signing myself,

Your obedient servant,
TUDOR.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—The Speeches, I believe, are to be in little more than a fortnight. I think this time of year is the best time for them, but I wish to call attention to the great increase of School audience which there is certain to be. Heretofore the Speeches have been at the end of Term, and many fellows were either packing up, or had already gone off. This year, the day fixed is the interval between the Old Rugbeian matches and that with Marlborough; and, consequently, the visitors will more than fill the allotted space. Should not admittance to the Speeches be limited to the highest forms in the School, who have more interest in the speakers than the vulgar.

Yours, &c.,
PATRIARCH.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

“Hecla.” We cannot really insert a letter calling a person a fool, who wants to spend £900 on what the present day spends £500.

“Accuracy.” Your complaint, we confess, is just, if correct; but you have clothed it in language hardly fitted for this journal.

“A. P.” “Censor.” It would perhaps be better to let the subject drop, at least for this Term.

“E. P.” The organist, Mr. Edwards’ address is 7, St. Matthew’s Street.

RUGBY SCHOOL CHAPEL ORGAN FUND.

The subscriptions by allowances having been diminished to one half their former amount, voluntary subscriptions are requested from all members of the School, or Old Rugbeians, towards this fund.

Amount already paid in by allowances, £180.

The total cost of a new organ is £1,000, of which it is proposed the School should raise £600.

Contributions will be gladly received by Mr. Edwards, or can be paid to the head of the choir in any Boarding House. Acknowledgments of contributions will be made in the *Meteor* according to the wish of the contributor. It is hoped that many will make up by their voluntary subscriptions the 3s. before paid, so that the sum subscribed for the coming year may at least equal that of the allowances paid in the past year.

The following is a List of Subscribers:—

	£	s.	d.
Rev. C. T. Arnold	10	0	0
Rev. C. E. Moberly.....	10	0	0
Rev. J. Robertson	5	5	0
A. W. Potts, Esq.	10	0	0
Otto Goldschmidt, Esq.	10	0	0
C. B. Stuart-Wortley, Esq.	1	1	0
Anon.....	10	0	
E. W. P.	10	0	
A. W. R.	10	0	
Edward Hailstone, Esq.....	10	0	
Samuel Hailstone, Esq.	1	0	0
H. H. Johnston, Esq.	1	1	0
Ernest Steward, Esq.	1	1	0
G. T. Oldham, Esq.....	10	0	
S. P. M.	10	0	
A. Rowden	1	0	
F. Tobin	1	0	
J. C. Lambert	1	0	