

a brilliant score of 269. Their shooting throughout was very fine, especially at 500 yards. The Rugby shooting was very fair at 200 yards, but we should like to see fewer misses at 500 yards. Pardoe and Forster shot very well for their respective corps. Score of School Corps:

	200 yds.		500 yds.	TL
Capt. Tobin.....	3 2 4 2 3	- 14	..	3 2 2 2 2 - 25
Lieut. Graham ..	2 3 3 2 3	- 18	..	3 3 2 4 4 - 29
Sergt. Baynes...	0 3 4 3 2	- 12	..	2 3 3 0 2 - 22
" Ackland .....	3 3 3 4 2	- 15	..	2 0 0 4 3 - 24
Corpl. Forster...	2 4 3 3 2	- 14	..	4 3 3 4 2 - 30
" Humphrey .....	2 0 3 2 3	- 10	..	0 0 0 0 0 - 10
L.-Corpl. Fletcher	3 2 3 0 2	- 10	..	2 0 3 2 0 - 17
" Panrose .....	0 2 4 3 3	- 12	..	2 3 4 0 4 - 25
Private Barker ..	4 3 3 3 2	- 15	..	3 0 2 2 3 - 25
" Chaplin .....	2 3 2 2 2	- 11	..	2 2 0 2 0 - 17
Bugler Whiting ..	2 3 2 2 3	- 12	..	4 2 0 2 3 - 23

Total..... 247

On Tuesday, Nov. 5th, the annual competition for the Wimbledon Cup took place. On account of many would-be competitors not being able to get down to the range on the above-mentioned day, the competition was left open for the succeeding Thursday. The match proved exceedingly exciting. Bugler Whiting being first with an excellent score of 33, and Capt. Tobin a good second with 31. Score:—

	200 yards.		500 yards.	TL
Bugler Whiting ..	2 4 3 3 4	- 16	..	4 4 3 4 2 - 33
Captain Tobin....	3 3 3 4 3	- 16	..	4 3 2 3 3 - 31
Corpl. Humphrey	2 3 3 3 3	- 14	..	3 4 2 2 2 - 27

On Thursday, Nov. 21st, a match took place between two elevens of the Town and School Corps. There were several absentees on each side, whose places had to be filled up, so that the scores were not so high as might have been expected. The highest scores were: for the Town, Col.-Sergt. Over, 31; for the School, Capt. Tobin, 26. Score: Town, 218; School, 206.

We are glad to ascertain that there have been no fresh cases of Scarletina and that that illness has been almost exterminated.

The Rev. C. E. Moberly's House re-assembled, with but few exceptions, on Wednesday, November 21st.

The Two Houses match will be played on Saturday, December 21st. The two Houses have not yet been proved.

In the Scotch Scratch Fours at Cambridge we notice T. Gemmel and J. Whigham in the winning boat.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

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

## HOUSE FEELING.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—I am not without fear lest the subject of this letter should, after the lapse of three months, have lost its interest. But as I see that the question of Black Hats has survived the holidays, perhaps this question (which is nearly as important) may be suffered to survive them also.

I read with great interest the letters of "Cosmopolitan" and "Senior" on "House Feeling;" and your own article on the same subject. With the letter of "Cosmopolitan" I heartily agree. He upholds, if I understand him aright, strong House Feeling and strong School Feeling, but deprecates any excess of either sentiment. He finds such an excess in the bar which is placed by public opinion upon intercourse between members of different Houses. I am not sure that I grasp the meaning of this part of his letter, but so far as I do so I differ from him. I remember the time when a House at Rugby was burnt down, and the members of it were dispersed among the remaining Houses of the School. And I remember that public opinion in our House encouraged rather than discountenanced intimacy with those strangers who were thrown upon our hospitality.

I hope you will pardon me if I venture to think that in the leading article of your seventh number you took a totally different line from "Cosmopolitan." I cannot find that he anywhere maintains that "Rugbeians let House Feeling sometimes extinguish School Feeling." Again, you say that you saw among Old Rugbeians at the Tercentenary "nothing of that which staunch present Rugbeians call House Feeling." And further on you say that present Rugbeians ought, in everything, to imitate Old Rugbeians. Your argument, therefore, is that

among staunch present Rugbeians ought to be seen nothing of what they call House Feeling. But what says "Cosmopolitan?" "The good effects of the feeling of the members of each House for their own more limited society, are beyond praise." He seems to me to stand at the opposite pole from you.

Will you allow me to make a few remarks on these statements of yours? Firstly, as to the analogy which you draw from the case of Old Rugbeians. I confess that this objection does not seem to me to possess much weight. For, in the first place, the mere fact of leaving a great School like this must necessarily affect the way in which we think of it and the light in which we look at it. In such a case, House Feeling, to a certain extent, dies a natural death, not because it was ever in itself bad, but because we have removed from the sphere in which its excellence and utility were most plainly manifested. This difference is only the difference which may be seen between the sentiments of the Queen and of any ordinary Englishman with respect to Scotland. The breadth and largeness of mind which induces the Queen to regard Scotland with far less prejudiced eyes than the ordinary English farmer, is precisely the same as that which modifies the feeling of Old Rugbeians with respect to their own House and other Houses. Or, to make use of a Homeric simile, it is as with the traveller who, when he retires from a well-known landscape, sees the less prominent features of it fade away in the distance till nothing but the strong outline is distinguishable; in like manner the Old Rugbeian gradually loses the more transitory part of his School Feeling—namely, his love for his House—and retains only the more abiding part of it, his love for his School.

But, in the second place, I do not think that this argument can be used with any fairness, for the simple reason that in no instance is the affection of an old member of a Public School, for his School, so strong as that of a present member. The affection of

the Old Rugbeian undergoes a change not only in kind but also in degree. I do not see that we need be ashamed to confess this; men would be mortal beings no longer if this were not the case. At Oxford or at Cambridge, in the Indian Army, or in the Bush of Australia, his old School can no longer be to a man what it has been in bygone days. He may, indeed, love it passionately, and feel that he owes to it more than he can ever fully realize; but it is impossible that he should ever again be swayed, as he has once been swayed, by the full tide of its life and thought,—should ever again know the hopes and fears, the pride in its fame and the anguish at its defeat, which stirred his inmost soul so powerfully a few years ago. This is one of those points in respect of which the past is irrevocably past; and therefore to build upon it an argument against House Feeling is, I think, an entire misapprehension.

But House Feeling (you say again) is apt to produce bitterness between Houses. Unquestionably; and School Feeling is apt to produce bitterness between Schools. It is bad that Jones' house should nourish a spite against Smith's House because they have had two goals kicked against them; but it is at least equally bad that Eton should nourish a spite against Harrow because they have been beaten by six wickets. Nothing in this world is perfect, and therefore every question resolves itself into a balance of advantages and disadvantages. The question with respect to House Feeling, no less than School Feeling, is, does the good which it produces preponderate over the evil?

You object further that the love for the House tends to stifle love for the School. This I emphatically deny. I maintain that the less necessarily implies the greatest; that love for the House pre-supposes love for the School; that the man whose sympathies are apparently most bounded, is really the man whose sympathies are widest. I never yet met a fellow who was devoted to his House

and who was not also enthusiastically enamoured of his School. "I never knew a dutiful son," said an eminent man, "who made an unpatriotic citizen." Volumes of philosophy are condensed in that remark.

With your correspondent "Senior" I must also quarrel. He says that your Light Blue is your true cosmopolitan, because his interest in the Eleven outweighs his interest in his House. Is your correspondent really in earnest? Does he call it cosmopolitanism to set the narrow clique, the narrow aristocracy to which he belongs, above the House to which he is bound by the strongest natural ties? This cosmopolitanism surely is like the cosmopolitanism of the Stoics, who dignified themselves with the title of the "Wise," and stigmatized all the rest of mankind as "Fools." To me it always seemed, when I was at Rugby, the peculiar evil of two bodies for which I otherwise felt the highest respect—the Sixth and the Eleven—that the members of them were apt to form habits of thinking compared with which the most perverted and most bigoted House feeling is generous and large-minded; and to cling, through evil report and good report, to those who happened to wear the same ribbon, or sit in the same Form with themselves.

Your correspondent "Senior" is an ardent advocate of cosmopolitanism, but is he also a consistent advocate? If cosmopolitanism means anything, it means that natural divisions ought to be nothing to us; that it is our duty to love Russians as much as Anglo-Saxons; to care for France as much as for England; to be as enthusiastic about Eton as we are about Rugby. Let him give me his reasons for preferring Rugby before Eton, and I will prove that every one of those reasons would induce me equally to prefer my House to Smith's House.

It has, indeed, always appeared to me that, except in the rare cases of minds of the highest order, cosmopolitanism is apt to degenerate on the one hand into a milk-and-water sentimentalism, and on the other into a cynical indifferentism. I have no doubt

that the latter is more frequently the case, and that men who begin by trying to like everyone equally, generally end by liking nobody but themselves. That Roman cosmopolitanism produced some fine characters I will not deny; but I confidently assert that its results, as a whole, were far inferior to the results of the narrow-minded patriotism developed in the Greek cities. Julius Cæsar represents the type of character which School cosmopolitans would wish to realize: Pericles represents the type of character which the House system produces. I know which type I should choose.

To a cosmopolitan, nothing, I should imagine, would appear more odious than the feeling which inspires a House match at football. But it seems to me that the sentiment which, theoretically, animates a Sixth match is incomparably worse than the feeling which, theoretically, animates a House match. I do not mean that either is practically bad; but I do mean that it is the height of injustice to abuse the one and extol the other.

Something more I had to say, but I must reserve it for another time. One remark I would make before I conclude. If the confession will give any satisfaction to my opponents, I confess that I can neither think nor write impartially on this subject. I have loved my House too passionately to be able now to argue dispassionately upon the disadvantages of having loved it. And if I am told that the ideal state is never to have loved it at all, or having loved it to get rid of my love as soon as possible, I confess, with the deepest humility, that it is an ideal to which I have neither the power nor the will to aspire.

I am, Sir, &c.,

TREBLA.

#### FOOTBALL.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

DEAR SIR,—I hope you will allow me to say a few words in answer to the letter of your correspondent "Football" that appeared in your last number. His first proposal will

no doubt generally be allowed to be a good one, for the gravel path by the white gate on the Barby road is a very awkward place to fall upon, and there seems no reason why the touch-line should not be carried in a curve round the edge of the path in the same manner as it is round the edge of the Island moat and the Pavilion. His second proposal, however, viz.—“that a fellow be allowed to have his cap if he be thought thoroughly worth it, without reference to the time he may have been in the School”—I *do* consider both radical and revolutionary, as he expects. To say that it would be very easy for a new fellow to learn the rules is all very well in theory: it is hardly the same in practice. Reading the rules over three or four times does but very little good: they need to be illustrated by the game itself. And for that matter three or four Below Caps effect but little; the rules are not sufficiently drilled into a new fellow's brain by the first few matches, and though “Football” says that many new fellows with this short experience would be as well acquainted with the game as some of the present “caps,” surely he would not willingly add to the number of those who are out of place on Big-Side because of their ignorance. A new fellow, who might seem to know the rules and be tolerably at home in a smaller match, would not be the same man on Big-Side and by an egregious piece of off-side play might spoil the most interesting struggle of the afternoon. I might quote the case of a fellow who got his cap his second football half and in his first match on Big-Side completely lost his head and made the most awful mistake in the very heart of a crisis. And yet he was far from slow at learning the rules and eventually turned out the best back-player of his year. Of course there are at long intervals new fellows who are perfect enough for a cap, but why make a rule for these exceptional cases? What with wanting “straws” and “caps” their first half, new fellows must be getting much more impatient of their term of probation than they were in the time of

Yours faithfully,  
A CONSERVATIVE OLD RUG.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

DEAR SIR,—I should not have ventured to offer any remarks on the desirability of a Football XX at Rugby, had not a letter, signed “O.R. at Oxford,” expressly invited

discussion on the subject. As it is, I should like to say a few words.

Your correspondent begins, as it seems to me, by begging the question; he calls the non-existence of a Football XX a “defect.” Now, though I am quite prepared to agree with him in his next assertion, that the result of remedying a defect is likely to be beneficial, I deny that this *is* a defect; while I conceive that in calling it so, he is assuming the very point which he has to prove. Unless, indeed, the defect, which he deplores, is the fact that he wasn't himself in a school XX.

However, let us turn to his arguments.

Firstly, To the question, “What are they to do?” he answers at once, “Oh, play the other Caps;” because “it would equal in Cricket the XI playing the XXII.” I don't know what it would equal in Cricket, but in Football I should say that after a time it would get monstrous. And I am sure that our experience of the Football XI and XXII match is not such as to make us wish for more like it. At least, I know that in my time, though the XI and XXII thought it a point of honour to keep up the match (and, indeed, the play of their backs and half-backs usually gained for them the victory), yet, in consequence of the disproportion of numbers, both sides were always heartily glad when it was over. And in the present case that disposition would be still greater.

But “it would be the means of getting down twenties from Oxford and Cambridge, which, at the same time, would not interfere with the Old Rugbeian.” And yet we know that Cambridge men are, with very few exceptions indeed, unable to come down even for the Old Rugbeian, and a canvas among Oxonians with the view of bringing them down to play a school XX this month, resulted in the appearance of three individuals.

Secondly, he goes on to say, “it will improve the play on Big-Side.” I doubt it. A man who wishes to play well for his House *must* play up on Big-side; and if a fellow, when he has got his Cap, proceeds at once to “take it easy,” he will find that when he tries to do his best for his House, that best will be but a sorry performance. And I further protest against the notion that games must flag, if there isn't a Cap or a Cup to be won in everything; and I sincerely hope, for the credit of the School, that this is not found to be the case at Rugby now.

Thirdly, “In the end it might bring about a match with some other School, such as Marlborough!” So it might. What then?

As for the hackneyed objection that "School feeling would be sure to run high," and that unpleasant consequences might result, your correspondent cannot entertain the thought; it is too degrading. For a Football match to end in a "fight," I quite agree with him *would* be degrading; but when it was once suggested that the players on Big-Side should leave off their "disgusting hacking" and "fight it out like men," I, for one, thought that the speaker had mistaken the spirit of Rugby Football; and the suggestion was certainly not accepted. But if the writer only means by "fight" that there might be a good deal of hacking, I feel quite sure that such would be the case, and as for its being a degrading confession, I do not for a moment hesitate to make it. If strangers wish to play Football with us they must conform to our rules. At the same time I think it more than probable, that in a Public School match, the hacking would pass all reasonable or desirable limits! But, however that may be, we should do "something towards liberalising Football." Quite so. Though what is meant by this I am at a loss to conceive. Never mind; it is a glorious thought, and it is very sad that it should be marred by any fear that Cricket is in danger "of becoming Radical." For my own part, however, if, as he says, "Football is a strongly Conservative game," the more Conservative games we have, the better, say I, though at the same time I should be inclined to think that the reason why Cricket now encloses "all classes in its ranks," while Football "has not flourished as it ought," is partly, perhaps, owing to the different nature of the game, and the different kind of exercise which it entails, and not altogether because the latter is "hedged round with all sorts of prejudices."

In conclusion, I beg to assure your correspondent that I quite enter into his feelings, when asked at Oxford, "Were you in the School Twenty?" and unable to answer "Yes." Although, if his remarks about the play of Caps on Big-Side apply to himself, it is, perhaps, as well that he is able to say, "There was no such thing in existence."

I am, dear Sir,

Your obedient servant,  
PSITTACUS.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—In your last impression, there are two letters, about which I venture to send

you a few remarks, notwithstanding the double amount of abuse I shall bring upon myself in your next number by so doing.

In the first place then, "Principle" proposes that the old system of notes of excuse for being absent from Big-Side be renewed. I did not know it had ever been discontinued, but anyhow I think some distinction between the old and new caps being compelled to have notes for absenting themselves, should be made.

Could not a rule be introduced, allowing caps of three or more years' standing, to be absent one Big-Side a week if they like. This would not diminish the size of a Big-Side very much, as the old caps are generally too fond of football to absent themselves often; and it would be giving them a privilege, which the amount of hard play at football they must necessarily have gone through previous to obtaining it, fully entitles them to, in my opinion.

In the next place, I neither quite agree with "Football's" proposal to allow a new boy to get his cap his first foot-ball term, if thoroughly worth it; nor with his suggestion for an examination in football rules previous to being allowed to get one's cap. For it is not those who best know the rules that put them best into execution, and therefore an examination (as it only shows the knowledge and not the practice,) would be useless.

I think that a boy, previous to his getting his cap, should be watched (as I believe is the usual custom) by the head of his house and others, to see if he plays fairly, and he should not obtain his cap till he has given full satisfaction on that point. Now there would not be time in one half to see if a new boy plays fairly, and I therefore contend he should not get his cap his first football term. I presume it was for this reason that the rule forbidding them to do so was passed. I have no doubt, Sir, that I shall be told that I am (on this subject) what I venture to sign myself,

ALL ABROAD.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

Oxford, Nov. 8.

SIR,—Permit me to correct a slight misstatement in the last number of the *Meteor*, which says there is no Rugby football played at Oxford. Allow me to say that it has just been started at Wadham College, and that the meetings are, I believe, held on Wednesday, and each member can introduce two strangers to the game.

The opening day was on Wednesday, Oct. 30th, when a very good game was played, though the numbers were rather small, and there was some confusion, owing to many not having played the rules before.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,  
O. R.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—We troubled you several weeks ago with suggestions in reference to attendance at Big-Side. Little did we then think that we should have to apologise for so doing; but if to miss goals is the primary object of a Big-Side it seems rather hard to make caps follow up, and certainly offers them very little inducement to play their best.

In proof of this we beg to remind you of the *unnecessary* length of the Sixth, and later still of the A. to K. matches. No one can say that the tries (?) in either were few.

Yours truly,  
TRIO.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR.—May I be allowed to ask by what "precedent," or by what rule the XI. and XXII. Match was broken off in the middle? Did such happen by the vote of Big Side Levée?

Yours truly,  
PHILORUGBY.

P.S.—Will the match be continued or rest as it now stands?

[Our correspondent will see that the match has been continued, but we sympathize with him in his complaint.—*Ed.*]

H A T S.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

Rugby, Nov., 1867.

SIR,—Once more, with your permission. I do think that the Hats are a mere annoyance, without any compensating good effects whatever. So my "middle term" is, after all, correct, "Marcellus" notwithstanding. He may demur to the truth of my premises, if he pleases; but he cannot impugn the accuracy of my conclusion.

Our difference is this. He thinks that the new boys show a tendency to arrogance, a tendency which is even on the increase; and that slight discomforts are desirable to impress upon them a due notion of their posi-

tion. I think that neither are they, generally speaking, at all arrogant; nor if they were, would such discomforts be anything but the clumsiest and most ineffectual method of cure.

So far on this particular question. But I should like to go a little further. The traditional view of new boys, (which is at the root of "Marcellus's" remarks) is one which seems to me to be as groundless as it is pernicious. I had hoped it was becoming obsolete; but "Marcellus" reproduces it with the authority of an O. R., an authority to which even an undue weight may possibly be attached. In this view the new boy is regarded not as a person likely to be timid, and almost certain to be awkward; not as a person eager to learn the ways of the place, and sure to need and to be grateful for any kindness or help that can be shown him; but he is considered an object, at least of suspicion and criticism, and probably for a little "wholesome" discipline also.

Sir, this is essentially a mean view; and as such I must vehemently protest against it. It is one of the last remnants of the spirit of bullying, in an age when bullying is everywhere condemned. Civilization has rid us of very much that is brutal; it is time that an enlightened public opinion should declare decisively against what is left.

As to "Marcellus's" illustrative story, I can scarcely think that he seriously relies much upon that. If it is a single real incident, it is irrelevant, for isolated instances may occur at any time. If it is meant to describe what generally happens, it is simply untrue.

To his "practical suggestion" I have no objection, except the great ugliness of a black straw; but that is a question of taste, and of detail. It would certainly be a great gain to get rid of the Hat. If it is thought convenient to have a distinctive colour for the new boys, I do not see why it should not be adopted. Not for "Marcellus's" reason, of course, that they may be cured of their "up-start feeling;" for, as I have said, I believe neither in the disease nor in the treatment; but simply because it is a natural and harmless principle, and one already, to some extent, recognised, to distinguish by different colours the different degrees of standing in the School.

I am, Sir, yours,  
COSMOPOLITAN.

P.S.—May I remind "Marcellus" that

nothing is gained by attributing to his opponents an "assumption of superiority." If anything I have said has really so impressed him, I can only regret the strange misconception. We think our cause right and our case strong, naturally; and do our best to make others think so too. But nothing is further from our thoughts than to assume any superiority whatever.

### TOWN BOYS.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—I am a being who is very well known by all Rugbeians. A being notheld in the highest esteem, usually, I am afraid, very much the contrary. I have some peculiarities which are special to my genus—peculiarities of dress, of appearance, of pursuits, altogether different from the rest of the School. If you, Sir, notice a particularly dirty and slovenly boy, with a battered hat, rumpled collar, and unlaced boots, and a cravat well greased and torn; who has a natural affinity for playing fives where he ought not, of running between everybody's legs, and, in fact, making himself generally obnoxious, you can safely set this boy down as one of my class, that singular anomaly of Rugby School—a Town Lout.

You will, perhaps, wonder why I can have any reason to write to you, but I, being the only one of my confrères who can spell, have been made the spokesman, who is to state the grievances of the worst used and least appreciated body in the School. My father is a cobbler, and cannot afford to pay the School subscriptions, I am, therefore, debarred from playing any game in the Close. I hear of Town Little Sides, &c., but, alas! we who want something to do, to keep us out of mischief, are left out. I have heard that a high authority has taken our part, and showed the absurdity of keeping any Rugbeian, and we, allow me to state, are the *real* Rugbeians, from enjoying what is the common property of the School, viz., the Close,—but nothing has as yet happened. Sir, cannot you employ your powerful pen in aiding us, and try and persuade the head of the "Town" to let us take part in their games?

This letter has been corrected by Mr. Sale, our writing master, and I hope contains no blunders.

Signed on behalf of twenty-three "Town Louts,"

AN ENERGETIC COBBLER.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

DEAR MR. PEPPERDAY—I don't know who to rite my letter to the *Meteor* to except you and I'll Pay you part of that Tuppence hapenny tomorrow if you'll put it in.

I've too grate greevances and old Grub says I oughtn't to stand it any longer and you'll print anything that's a shame even if you're quite small and not a Swell.

first they won't allow us to right anything on the walls any more and they've all got new witewhased and you get lines if you do and it wasn't me last Time and I was only going to Scratcht it out that I ain't a beestly Bully and I know who has wrote it because I only emtied the Inkpot down his cholara.

And then they all laugh at my hat and it wasn't too big at first but its got so and its very hard lines as somebody like mesopotamia said in the *Meteor* that I should have to ware it at all and its got most of the Brim on except the little square bit I wipe my pens on in my pocket. And if your had been sat on for four first Lessons and all the Big Bullies in Mr. Buckle's had puntabouted it most Callingovers it would be very knew now and I shall have a straw after Christmas. Please tell them not.

I remain,

LOWER SCHOOL.

### ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"A. M." We hardly think your proposals would find support.

\* \* We consider that we have done our duty in permitting the "hat" question to be sifted, and must now decline to publish any more communications on that subject.

"Duo." Your proposal should have been made a month ago.

\* \* \* The signature "O. R." is becoming so common in our correspondence that we are obliged to beg our friends to ventilate their opinions under other *noms-de-plume*.

A Prize, value £2 (10 Vols. of Charles Dicken's works, ed. 1867), will be given next Term to that resident member of Rugby School who shall show the greatest proficiency in the "Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club." The examination, of which due notice will be given, will be conducted by papers only, in the first or second week of next Term. Candidates are required to give in their names to Mr. Billington, on or before December 10th.