



# The Meteor.

Edited by Members of Rugby School.

No. 25.

RUGBY, FEBRUARY 27th, 1869.

Price [With Extra Half-Sheet.] 6d.

AFTER the numerous suggestions which appeared in our columns last year for improving the way of awarding the Athletic Cup, we had hoped this Term to hear something more on the subject. Disappointed in this, we wish to recall some of their proposals; in the eleventh hour, certainly, but there is still a fortnight before the Athletics, and the subject is not so very complicated that it cannot be settled in that time.

All our correspondents seemed to agree on one point, namely, that the present plan of allowing all events to count alike, is wrong, and that some system of valuation ought to be resorted to, a certain number of marks being assigned to each, in proportion to its importance. We heartily second this proposal, in the belief that there would be no great difficulty in adopting it.

On a second point however,—what should count at all—a good deal of controversy took place. There were two proposals put forward. The first was that of “Aquila,” “That the Cup be obtained only for what is done on the ground during the two days of the Athletics.” But we think that few would like to see the School Steeplechase, the Racquets, and the Fives, excluded from the Cup, or even, as “Aquila” suggests, provided for by a second Cup.

The other opinion is that of “Trebla,” who would have Football and Cricket to count for the Cup, saying that they are Athletics of the highest order. This is very true, and the scheme looks well on paper; but it would, we think, be impossible to work. By means of the batting and bowling averages we certainly can decide on the

best cricketer, and award him marks towards the Cup: but how are we to settle on the best football player? The only test of merit which will give any definite result is that of running in or dropping goals; but this would utterly exclude the “forwards.” Thus we see it is quite impossible to put Football on the same level as Running and Racquets, and such being the case, it is fairer for Cricket to share its fate. Our own view is that no change is required in the number of events which award the Cup, if only their comparative value is settled.

Another proposal we must notice; it is to allow winners to win a second time, counting their victory towards the Cup, but not taking the prize. This, we think, would be beneficial; we should see our best man win, and the very clumsy and unfair expedient of counting up all a fellow has won in previous years, would be no longer needed.

The Stewards have already made several improvements in the programme, and we hope they will turn their attention to this very important question.

WHATEVER blame the unlucky remarks at the commencement of our last Number may justly incur, they have at least this merit, that they have stirred up our Correspondents from the languid condition into which, from want of a grievance, they had gradually fallen. Vials of wrath are poured on our devoted head. Our transgression has had no parallel since the rash moment when we ventured on our Double Acrostic of immortal memory. But in the depths to which we