

KING'S WALDEN.

1st Innings.		2nd Innings.	
Mr. Warner, b Francis	..... 2	c Bucknill	b Walker 0
Mr. Lines, c Moberly, b Francis	..... 0	b Walker	..... 2
W. H. Trower, run out	..... 0	run out	..... 14
B. Pauncefote, b Francis	..... 16	b Walker	..... 0
G. D. Baker, b Francis	..... 0	c & b Francis	..... 2
Mr. Hughes, c Moberly, b Walker	..... 0	b Francis	..... 0
G. Hughes, b Walker	..... 9	b Francis	..... 19
S. Reid, run out	..... 38	b Francis	..... 12
C. F. Reid, st Yardley, b Francis	..... 2	run out	..... 2
W. E. Bayliff, b Walker	..... 1	lbw, b Francis	..... 6
C. C. Hale, not out	..... 0	not out	..... 0
Bye 1, lb 2, w 1	..... 4	Byes 7, l-b 1	..... 8
Total	..... 72	Total	..... 65

For the information of Old Rugbeians, we may announce that the Rev. C. Elsee now has the house formerly presided over by the Rev. T. W. Jex Blake; also that the Rev. T. L. Papillon has been appointed to the vacant mastership, consequent on the removal of Mr. Jex Blake to Cheltenham.

A challenge, to play 20 a side, has been received by the Head of the School from the Richmond Club, and accepted on the condition, as usual, that the 20 be all Old Rugbeians.

We hear that in consequence of All Saints' Day this year falling on a Sunday, the sermon in behalf of the Fox Memorial Fund will be preached on Wednesday, the 28th inst. The sermon on this occasion will be preached by the Very Rev. E. M. Goulburn, Dean of Norwich. The Old Rugbeian match will be played on the same afternoon.

Football was commenced last Saturday under the most unfavourable circumstances, rain falling heavily nearly the whole day. Football ardour, however, was not to be quenched, and the game was renewed by all the houses.

The following cricketers have been promoted to the Twenty-Two this term:—Westfeldt, Benham, Isherwood, Buckland, Garrett, Wilson, Gilpin, Lushington, Tubb, Bassett, Sidgwick, Robertson, Macmillan.

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*."

To the Editor of the *Meteor*.

DEAR METEOR,—I must really begin by thanking your correspondent "Trebla" for so ably seconding me in my so-called attempt to transform the *Meteor* into "a polemical magazine;" but at the same time I must congratulate myself on the *partial* success at least of my letter, as "Trebla" has, on this

occasion, brought himself down from his high-flown "Trifle Time" style, to argue the point in plain English.

I fear, however, that I cannot allow him to be altogether consistent, even in this letter, and I admit that it does seem absurdly strange to me that this "Patriotism pure and simple," which he now tells us inspired his effusion, should consist—as he owns in his former letter—in "infecting the School with *delirium tremens*, induced by the drugged alcohol of his democratic infatuation." I—poor, ignorant Scrutator—confess that I do not know what this last sentence means, but I am sure that I never yet heard it used as a synonym for patriotism.

I will not again allude to the subject of the letter,—not because I flinch from the raking broadsides of his scathing sarcasms,—on the contrary I rather enjoy them, as showing "my very small shot" have not been wholly without effect upon his equanimity,—but because I do not consider it necessary, having already given you my opinion on the subject.

I need, therefore, add nothing more, being unwilling to furnish "Trebla" with a handle for further rallery, and because I am sure no one would thank me, were I to damp the enthusiasm of such an ardent Rugbeian as he represents himself to be. And I add that I shall not write again on the subject.

I am, yours &c., SCRUTATOR.

[We must ask "Scrutator" what has caused him to suppose that "Trebla" and "Trifle-Time" are identical? Even if they were, "Scrutator" has no right, seeing they are written under different *noms-de-plume*, to confute his opponent by quotations from the other.—ED.]

To the Editor of the *Meteor*.

DEAR SIR,—It seems to me that swimming and diving might very easily and very advantageously be encouraged to a greater extent than they are at present. On their value as healthy and agreeable sports, I need not enlarge: but it seems to me (as an outsider who knows a little of your great School) that it would be a good thing—and a great boon—if those who have started in the School swimming and diving were to be allowed to bathe at Swifts, without a Sixth fellow being with them. I understand that, unless you have Sixth fellows who bathe frequently in the house, it is difficult to get taken down, and I know instances at this moment of boys who have been deprived of proper practice for the race by this very

accident, and who are really fond of bathing—at respectable places. If few take advantage of it, the inconvenience or loss of peculiar privilege to the Sixth will be inconsiderable; if many, it is evident that some encouragement is necessary—if too many, some limitation again might be made—but at present I do think it is hard on a boy who has done well one year in the race to be prevented from practising next year because he cannot get a Sixth fellow to take him down.

Apologizing for troubling you, I remain,  
ETONENSIS.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—During the past week certain “demonstrations” in Reynolds’s field have reminded us that the Football Season is at hand. A word or two, perhaps, on this subject may not, then, be out of place. In the VIth Match all caps follow up, but not so in the O. R. A selection is made, so many from each house, the number varying according as the house is strong or weak. Now, sir, is not this unfair? Last year a “Cap” who was “honourably mentioned” in the account of the VIth Match, did not follow up in the O. R. because he stood low on the roll of his House Caps, he being a “this year’s” in a strong House. Could not this obvious wrong be rectified by giving power to the Football Committee to draw up a proper list of those who have to follow up? May I take this opportunity, Sir, of asking whether the Committee are going to publish a new edition of the Rules. At present the majority of fellows have an indistinct idea that there are some new Rules, but there their knowledge ends. Umpires, too, would, I think, be glad of a “Blackstone” to fall back on.

Your most obt. Servt., D.O.R.K.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—It was with much surprise, that, immediately on the assembling of the School, we heard that a Marker was engaged for the Racquet Court, an improvement which we have long desired to see effected. The first idea that struck us was that the Committee appointed for reconstituting the Racquet Court arrangements had come to the determination of engaging a Marker at the end of last term, and that the business which invariably prevails at the end of the term (especially at Midsummer) had prevented our hearing of it at the time. But, however, on appealing to some members of the old

Committee, we were astonished to find that the only two out of the four that we were able to consult were unaware that any such measure had been passed, although mooted—and were quite as much if not more astonished than ourselves (almost an impossibility) at hearing the fact. Such being the case we began to praise the laudable exertions of the new Committee, as we imagined, though we had not heard of the appointment of such a body; but still greater was our surprise at finding on closer enquiry, that not only was no such body yet in existence, but that the engagement had taken place and the keys actually demanded by the marker between the breaking up of the School last term and its reassembling this, or in other words during the Vacation!!

May we now be permitted to ask a few questions in connection with the above: 1. If it be known by whose authority a marker was engaged? 2. If either the resigning or the future heads of the School, or the two combined, have the power of making any such engagement during the vacation, such being the only remaining sources from which we can imagine this engagement to have emanated? 3. Whether any such engagement on the part, even of a Head of the School actually in office, does not need the sanction either of a committee appointed by Big-Side Levee and thereby representing it, or of Big-Side Levee itself?

We could ask many more questions on the subject, but have already proceeded further than we originally intended. We cannot help, however, remarking on the injustice done to Diver in the sudden and unexpected blow dealt to him so unceremoniously, in the omission on the part of the author or authors of the engagement, of a regular notice. But as the fact of its being an injustice seems to be universally felt amongst Old and Present Rugbeians, we can have no doubt that full justice will eventually be done.

With fears that the engagement of the marker, as it now appears, is questionable, to say the least of it, in a constitutional point of view, and with hopes that all will be soon satisfactorily explained and arranged, we are, Sir, yours, anxiously expecting an answer,

F.R.A. (TRES CONSCRIPTI).

#### ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

“666.” Next Term will be more seasonable for your suggestion.—“Justitia.” We are afraid of ill-feeling arising from your letter, and prefer keeping silence on the subject.—“K.T.L.” Your proposal has been made before, but never met with approval.