

missioners examined:—Hanley Castle, endowment £247 per annum, educates 40 boys; one half the number however are, at 20 years of age, unable to read or write. Penwortham, endowment £966 per annum, has 20 grammar boys. Butterwick, endowment £312, has two learning the declensions. Humberstone, with £737 a year, has five or six. Bosworth, with £1,120 a year, has three boys learning grammar!

THE VERY LAST OF THE HAT QUESTION.

COSMOPOLITAN:—

- “Seedy new fellow, wandering about in
Cloister or School-quad, miserably seeking
What to do next, I want a little conver-
sation with you, please!
- “Tell me, new fellow! how came you to wear hats?
Do the big brutes tyrannically use you,
Make you wear tall hats, laugh at your tears, and
Piteous remonstrance?
- “Weary new fellow, little think the proud swells,—
Who in their straw hats stroll about the streets and
Close,—what hard work 'tis walking all day long in
Chimney-pot hats, O!
- “I am a Cosmopolitan, and you, too,
Did you but know it, are a Cosmopoli-
tan, and you therefore ought to wear a straw hat,
Ribbon included.
- “Look at my tears, a trembling on my eyelids;
Tell me your tale, the *Meteor* shall have it,—
There shall you see it, beautifully printed,
All for a sixpence!”
- NEW FELLOW:—
- “Sixpence, God bless you! I have none to give, sir:
Only last night they cleaned me out of every
Sixpence I had, sir, for (I think they said) the
Little-Side Raquets.
- “Hats are a plague,—they knock 'em off and kick them;
Only this morning, going into lesson,
This poor old hat (for old it looks, sir, now,) was
Scrunched in a scrimmage.
- “Still I don't mind much,—theirs have been as seedy,
And the next lot's will be as bad; and, please sir,
I should be glad to spend the little coin you
Mentioned, at Hobley's.”

COSMOPOLITAN:—

- “Hobley's! *O mores!* I will see you far first!
Wretch! whom no sense of wrong can rouse to
grumble!
Sordid, unfeeling, reprobate, degraded,
Spiritless outcast!”

[Exit Cosmopolitan, knocking off new fellow's hat in
a rage.]

HOUSE NEWS.

SCHOOL-HOUSE.

A “Below Caps” v. Hutchinson's was commenced on Feb. 8th, on which day the School-House obtained a touch-down, after a good run in by Shirley. The match was resumed on Feb. 15th, when the School-House again obtained a touch-down and a try, which was, however, again missed. For the School-House we may mention Sidgwick (forward) and Vecqueray ma. (half-back) as deserving especial notice; while for Hutchinson's, Machinlay (back) played well.

This House has had three Paper-chases this Term,—on Feb. 11th, Feb. 20th, and Feb. 27th.

On Feb. 24th there was Brook-leaping, in which the House was joined by Tobin mi. (Blake's) and Bennett (O.R.)

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*.

SIR,—The difficulties of taking Fives-courts by running are and always have been great.

Running from calling-over was prolific in disorder and disputes. The story of its abolition is historical. A certain head of the school, short and corpulent, whom not even the burning suns of India have been able to prevent growing more corpulent, and more short, at least of wind, insisted on ten yards start, and answered his name from the fives-court. The calling-over Master naturally objected. A deity interveled of no less gravity than Dr. Goulburn, and the Sixth had to give up scudding and take by seniority. Big-Side, I believe, was not consulted, it being thought that the Sixth could not all be so fat as to be outrun by the XX.

Here, for the first time, scudding succumbed; and therefore the rule I am attacking having thus yielded before, may do so again. The taking of courts after other epochs than calling-over—such as dinner, or second lesson—is further complicated by the start being either not at the same time, or not from the same place, or neither.

The ambiguities of these questions lead to a constitutional struggle, fiercely contested on both sides, soon after Dr. Temple came, which could only be determined by again

bringing down the deity from his machine, with two minor deities as his assessors. Into the merits of this fearful question I dare not enter. Why should I dig up the buried tomahawk? Even in these cosmopolitan days it might yearn for a scalp, though the enemies' bright blade have become a lancet, and his war horse prance in the hunting-grounds of the rising sun. I would not for worlds give the slightest clue to the heroes of that conflict.

Since that date the racquet court has introduced the rule of the Universities, where a court can be taken beforehand, at the very least the day before. In this case, every one knows when he is to have a court, and can select the best possible three to play with him. Is it impossible to have a slate somewhere on which fives-courts also can be taken beforehand, say the day before? If the Sixth cling to their right of seniority—which, indeed, is but a right of some thirteen years' standing—they might still have the courts after callings-over reserved to them. Into the time and place of taking I do not enter; there will be difficulties in arranging them equitably, I fully expect, but could not that racquet court committee knock out a few more rules? Vested interests will no doubt oppose: but fair play is a jewel more valued by Rugbeians than the most antique, most traditional injustice.

As the girl said to the serpent, "Whatever you do, eat fair."

Yours obediently,

A FIVES PLAYER.

Whether other things—as grounds for cricket or football,—should follow suit, is another question. The two points might be settled differently.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR, — Although your correspondent "A. M." is, I think, right in theory, there is one very valid objection to his proposed place of starting. After even a moderate amount of rain, I'm afraid the authorities would justly complain of nine or ten fellows racing exactly across the best pitch on Big-Side; and if this took place every day, even in dry weather, the result could not be otherwise than bad for the ground. I should suggest that instead of a common starting-point for all objects, each object should have its own starting-point. This would prevent

too great a crowd starting at once from one point. Thus, for instance, fellows who wished to get "Ends" might start from the Doctor's wall; while those who wanted Fives Courts, might start from the path by the island; or, if they wanted the covered Courts, they might start from "A. M.'s" point, the School Bath. By this arrangement, none of the running for Fives Courts, which, of course, dry much quicker than the ground, would be over cricket ground; while, if the ground was very wet, there would be no cricket in the Close, and therefore no running for "Ends." This seems to be a better arrangement than "A. M.'s," though I have no doubt, that somebody will be able to suggest some still better plan than

NOBODY.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—Why should the head of the School House be allowed to take Bat-fives Court after dinner every day? Has the head of the School House a stronger right to one single hour of Bat-fives, much less to nine of the best hours, than a Moberlyite, when the payments of both have been precisely equal? Surely, Sir, he has a right. It is a custom, and why should it be abolished, and has it not worked very well? and why should not the Arnoldites continue to exercise their privilege of taking Hand-fives Courts after dinner? That is one advantage of the situation of the House. Dear me, Sir, cannot we leave the thing alone?

I am, yours obediently,

H. J.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

DEAR SIR,—It was with much pleasure that I read in your last number "Dol. (o.r's)" letter concerning our present system of awarding the School athletic cup.

I think, however, that while noticing one fault he has overlooked another: while showing that our arrangement is faulty as regards the number of points to be gained by two competitors in the same race, he has entirely omitted to touch on the comparative value of competitions which count for the cup. Now, Sir, it seems to me absurd that two or three straight drops with a football should

count as much as winning the mile. "Dol. (o.r.)," in his letter, entered on the different classes of grumblers, and most objectionable all such persons are, but it is not fair to call anyone who points out a fault and shows how it may be removed a grumbler; and, as I do desire to come under that head, I must even try and find a solution to our difficulty, though the task is a hard one.

(1.) Let the different races be valued, and let the most important, such as the mile, the 100 yards, and single racquets, count 3 points, the bulk of the other contests 2 points, and the unimportant ones, such as the dropping, placing, 1 point.

(2.) Let a selection be made from our present list, and let a few contests count for the cup; these should of course be as different as possible, so as to give all an equal chance.

In both these suggestions I think that "Dol. (o.r.'s)" proposal for counting in the same race could be advantageously adopted.

Let not any one imagine that I think my proposals cannot be bettered. I am quite aware of their many weak points, and hope many improvements may be made on them before a new system is adopted; still I think that even they would be better than our present system of managing the athletics. Hoping to be freely criticised in your next number,

I remain, Sir,

Yours most obediently,

C. HANGE.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—Several letters appeared in your last number, on the subject of the Athletics, and everyone must agree with your correspondents that something ought to be done.

One step has already been taken towards quickening the pace of the mile; all must allow it to be a move in the right direction. It was formally proposed, seconded and carried *nem. con.*, as the majority of your readers probably already know, that the mile should be run this year upon the high road. There can be no doubt that the change will be greatly beneficial. Two of your correspondents in your last number complain, most justly I consider, of the unfair manner

in which things count for the cup. One of them, "Equity," suggests that previous winners may run as often as they like, and if he win that he count those winnings *again* to the cup, but that he may not take the prize a second time. All this I think is perfectly just and to the point. The proposal I am about to make is to the same effect but goes a little further; it was suggested to me by a master the other day,—one who takes a lively interest in the proceedings of the School, not only from a master's point of view, but also from an Old Rugbeian's: it is as follows:—"That the Cup be obtained, merely for what is done on the ground, during the two days of the Athletics; that things once won be entirely done with after the year in which they are won, and should not go on accumulating, year after year, as long as a fellow stops in the School, as is the case at present; that all Racquets, Hand-fives, Bat-fives, Steeple-chases, Dropping, Placing, &c., in fact everything that takes place at a different time to the Athletics, have nothing whatever to do with the Cup, but that *everyone* be allowed to go in for *everything* year after year, whether he be a previous winner or not." This I should think all will allow to be quite fair. It will not only give the *best man* a chance of winning the Cup each year, the best man of the year,—as at present is not always the case; it will not only increase the chance of deserving merit carrying off the Cup altogether by winning it three years in succession, which is scarcely possible as matters now are, but it will also give the spectators a chance of seeing the *best man* win, which now often is not the case really, in fact in some instances even the *third* best wins, while the other two who are better than himself are actually on the ground, alive and sound in wind and limb. It scarcely shows us up in our true colours for the name and time of the third best man to be set before the public, who, not knowing the real state of affairs, naturally suppose we are worse at Athletics than other Public Schools. I think a previous winner should not take the prize a second time, as nearly, if not quite all that run, do so more for the honour of the thing, than for "filthy lucre." If this proposal should ever be adopted, another Cup might be started for proficiency in the rest of the things, viz., for winners of Single Racquets and Hand-fives, Bat-fives, &c.,—in fact for all that does not take place at the Athletics, or that did not count for the Cup.

With regard to the matter of the races being so crowded, as mentioned by your correspondent "Dol. (O.R.)" in your last number, would it not be as well for all the most interesting events to be got over first and without hurry, during the regular Athletic days, and for such events as "Throwing the Cricket Ball," "Putting the Stone," and the innocent and harmless (except for the bystanders who get too much in the line of fire, or push too eagerly against the net), but to say the least of it rather tedious operation of "Pecking at the Wicket," be deferred to some other day, say to the following half-holiday, between dinner and calling over? Of course if there was any spare time on the Athletic days, they might be got through there and then, but I think it a pity that the more interesting events should be hurried over for those that require no change of raiment, or "apparatus." I am afraid my subject has grown, as I proceeded, more than I originally intended, so with numerous apologies for trespassing on your valuable space, and your readers' patience,

I beg to sign myself, Sir,

Yours, &c.,

AQUILA.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

DEAR SIR,—Though I agree with "Dol. (O.R.)" that the arrangements of the School Athletics are bad, I cannot support him in his notion of allowing winners to gain the same race a second time. This would certainly bar a great number of entries, but would it not at the same time deaden the spirit of the thing. A fellow would say "Z. won the 100 yards last year most easily; it is nonsense to run against him if he is allowed to run again." This, I fancy, would be the general complaint, and spoil the Games. Though I disagree with "Dol. (O.R.)" in this general point, I certainly think he is right in his notion of the Cup points. My plan would be that "no one be allowed to count the second of a race, if he has gained the first in the same race." This would be very fair, and is, I see, the plan proposed by "Equity."

As regards the arrangements, I consider them bad in every way. First, because there are too many privileged persons inside the ropes. And this leads to my second, that

these persons get in the way of the Stewards, and last, not least, the spectators. The old rule used to be "that there be clearers of the course, and that these be the Heads of the different Houses." This is an old rule (published in the Rules of 1857) and no innovation. Probably the Sixth may grumble at this proposal, but if this was a rule in 1857, why should it not hold good and useful in 1868? So I would suggest "that no one be allowed inside the ropes but the Stewards and clearers of the course." This would greatly increase the comfort of the spectators, as well as lessen the arduous duties of the Stewards.

I certainly think that no entrance-money ought to be exacted, as by rule 2 "the expenses of the Games are defrayed by a uniform tax of not less than two shillings on the whole School." This is done in the Houses by "docking" the allowances, so perhaps your correspondent "Dol. (O.R.)" may not be aware of such. I consider a guinea a very fair prize for most races, though the mile deserves more, because therein the notion of expenditure of toil shows itself. Well, Sir, the first in that race *does* get more than other firsts.

Let me further add that running-shoes greatly assist the "ped." and jumper.

Yours faithfully,

OLD JOHN CROSS.

Oxford, March 3rd, 1868.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—As I lay basking in the sun the other day, I suddenly discovered a large piece of paper lying on my best pitch. A small boy in L. M. I. passed by just then, so I asked him to pick it up, and see what it was. He kindly did so and told me it was the *Meteor*. I did not know what that meant, though I remember that a lot of fellows kept walking over me one night about a year and a half ago and talking of *Meteors*. The small boy explained that it was a paper and offered to read it to me. As you may suppose I was much edified, though I could not understand it all; but there was one letter which I understood only too well and which made every blade of grass on my body stand

bolt upright, I mean that of "A. M." in proposing that the fellows should start from the School Bath to run for Fives' Courts; why by so doing they will make a path right over my best pitches! I remember that the slate was removed from the Racquet Court to Diver's in order to preserve the wasted frame of my aged relative over the way, and surely I am of more consequence than she is! I beg and entreat of you, Mr. *Meteor*, to raise your voice in the matter, and lay me under an everlasting obligation. Written by the aforesaid small boy, at the dictation of

NEW BIG-SIDE.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—The first thing that struck me on reading your correspondent "Dike's" letter in your last number, was, the utter absurdity of his arguments (if such they may be called). He requests that you would "kindly allow him space to ask, why the R. C. should include members of the XI. and XXII. without regard to the fact whether they play Racquets or not." The simple answer to that enquiry is, that the Stewards who were appointed as a Committee for making new rules about Racquet-playing, were not only obliged to choose those who they *knew* to be the best players (as the number in that case would have been so small), but were also obliged to choose those who they thought would make good players with practice. For that reason they naturally turned to cricket, as being most likely to supply the needed material. "Dike" says "he cannot see that cricket has anything to do with Racquets." Evidently "Dike" is no cricketer from the fact of this absurd remark; but he adds greatly to the absurdity by coolly asking, "Why should not the Club as well include all the *Caps*?" It is now my turn to ask, I flatter myself with a little more reason than "Dike"—what has *Football* to do with Racquets? The answer is obvious. Nothing whatever. I *do* assert, however, that *Cricket* has a great deal to do with Racquets, it has much in common with Racquets. In both games the skill depends upon the *eye* and the arm of a player; whereas in *Football* the skill depends almost entirely upon the *legs*. This I believe to be sufficient argument in favour of the choice of the Committee. I am sorry that

matters are not arranged more to the satisfaction of "Dike." I presume he is not a member of the R. C. or he would not be so ready to pull it to pieces. I beg to draw his attention to rule 4 made by the Committee (there was a copy of the rules published in your last number which he might easily refer to, and there is also a copy at the Racquet Court), and to suggest that he challenge one of those members of the R. C., whom he considers wrongfully in the Club to the exclusion of such as himself; and I venture to prophecy, that if his Racquet-playing be no better than his arguments, he will have a poor chance of beating him, even though he should be one of those "who have never been on the Court."

Wishing "Dike" luck in his game in the case of such a challenge, and apologizing for intruding so much upon your valuable space.

I remains, Sir, yours,

ST. E. WARD.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

DEAR SIR,—It was with great pleasure that I hailed the appearance of a School Twenty, for the second time, in the field last month, and now that it seems to have become almost an institution, I think that some steps ought to be taken towards the legislation of it, as in the case of the XI. Though it is rather late for this sort of suggestion, still it might be of use to take the matter into consideration before next football season. Why should not the Twenty be made up regularly every year, whether they play matches or not? By this means Big-sides would hold out more attractions to the Caps, who would know that on their distinguishing themselves in those matches depended their chance of getting—I had almost said their colours. And, *apropos* of that, why should not the XX. wear a particular ribbon, as well as the XI. and XXII.? Hoping you will excuse any errors,

Believe me yours,

S. P. Q. B.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—In an early number of the *Meteor* a correspondent signing himself "Monomaniac of an hour," proposed starting Boating Races on the Canal. No notice was taken of this letter at the time, but as the idea really seemed to me a good one, I am resolved to call the attention of the public to it again. Your correspondent acknowledged that there would be difficulties to overcome, but surely, Sir, no amount of trouble, however great, would be misspent if it resulted in the formation of a Boating Club. I do not intend to go into the *pros* and *cons* of the question, I merely venture to bring the subject again before the eyes of the public.

I have the honour to remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

S. M. ALL BOY.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

February 11th.

DEAR SIR,—Allow me, through your columns, which have already effected many improvements in the School, to ask a question. Why should not puntabout go on this Term, in which there is so little to do? I am sure the greater part of the School would be exceedingly glad of it.

Believe me, Sir, yours,

PUNTABOUT.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—Numerous suggestions have been made, in your columns and elsewhere, for the amendment of the intoning in Chapel. Would not ten minutes devoted to intoning occasionally, at Choir practices and under the experienced guidance of Mr. Edwards, have the desired effect? We have had sufficient proof that the choir do not mean to acquire the art by the light of nature.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

MONOTONE.

To the Editor of the Meteor.

SIR,—As a constant attendant at the School Chapel Service, I wish to ask a single question. Are the responses, &c., in the Chapel Service intended to be intoned or not? At present, a sort of midway system seems to have been adopted, and to be followed.

Is not this, Sir, a great blot on the improvement which has been undoubtedly effected in this respect?

The news that the question has been settled one way or the other, will be exceedingly grateful to your obedient servant,

MUSICUS.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Toujours gai." We have given place to one poetical effusion, and poetical effusions ought to be avoided.

"A. B." The Athletics, you will learn, are already fixed for this Term.

"Barby Road." To our knowledge, not once.

"Horace." You should make sure that your facts are correct before you write such an epistle.

"Z, 26." We should advise you not to be too forward.

The School House Steeple Chases were held on the 2nd of March; winners of the Open to all:—Lyon, Field, ma. (equal), Warner 3rd. This was a splendid race, the winners changing places every minute, and ended in a dead heat.—The Steeple Chase (under 5ft. 4 in.)—1st, Westfield, mi.; 2nd, Field, mi.; 3rd, Ringrose.

Mr. Wilson's House Steeple Chase was held on Tuesday last; the result being:—1st, Lloyd, 2, Francis.—The Steeple Chase (under 5ft. 4in.)—1st, Benham.