

G. Fitzgerald, b Pauncefote	0
J. W. Gardner, st Lyttelton, b Buchanan	0
A. Gray, st Lyttelton, b Buchanan	2
J. R. Walker not out	1
Byes 9, leg-byes 3, wide 1, n-b 2	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>214</b>

CRUSADERS.—1st Innings.

W. E. Goschen, not out	34
B. Pauncefote, c and b Francis	13
Rev. F. R. Evans, c Yardley, b Walker	4
K. A. Muir Mackenzie, run out	22
Hon. N. Lyttelton, not out	9
A. G. Liddell,	} To bat.
D. Buchanan,	
A. Godley,	
R. J. Graham,	
A. Vaughan,	
W. H. James, Leg-byes 4, wides 4	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>

ANALYSIS OF THE BOWLING.

THE SCHOOL: 1st innings.—D. Buchanan bowled 186 balls for 79 runs, 12 maidens, and 6 wickets; Rev. F. R. Evans, 104 balls, 47 runs, 9 maidens, 1 no-ball; K. A. Muir Mackenzie, 76 balls, 41 runs, 5 maidens, 1 wide; A. Vaughan, 24 balls, 15 runs, 2 maidens, 1 wicket, 1 no-ball; B. Pauncefote, 36 balls, 18 runs, 2 maidens, 3 wickets.

THE CRUSADERS: 1st innings.—C. K. Francis bowled 76 balls for 32 runs, 7 maidens, and 1 wicket; J. R. Walker, 32 balls, 29 runs, 1 maiden, 1 wicket, 3 wides; F. Tobin (mi.), 28 balls, 16 runs, 1 maiden, 1 wide; G. Fitzgerald, 12 balls, 8 runs.

THE ELEVEN v. TWENTY-TWO.—This annual match was begun immediately after the School reassembled, and ended in a complete victory for the Twenty-Two. Little need be said in detail, as one Twenty-Two match is very like another. Fitzgerald played rather a lucky innings of 42, and Yardley and Bucknill good ones of 33 and 23 respectively, for the Eleven. The bowling of Walker and Graham was very good and steady. Score:—

THE TWENTY-TWO.—1st Innings.

A. W. Rowden, absent	0
W. O. Moberly, c and b Francis	0
T. F. Eaden, c Scutter, b Yardley	6
C. Sidgwick, c Tobin (mi.), b Yardley	5
E. H. Warner, c and b Yardley	1
F. H. Maitland, b Yardley	21
J. R. Walker, b Yardley	18
A. G. Botfield, c Gardner, b Ellis	18
J. Graham, c Tobin (mi.), b Ellis	4
G. Walsh, c Tobin (ma.), b Fitzgerald	18
W. F. Neilson, st Gray, b Yardley	9
J. C. Lambert, b Yardley	10
B. Tower, run out	2
F. Baring, b Yardley	5
A. H. Hudson, c Francis, b Yardley	10
S. Pearson, c Francis, b Yardley	3
H. W. Badger, st Gray, b Yardley	5
T. G. Lushington, c Francis, b Ellis	0
G. H. Lloyd, c and b Yardley	4
F. C. Selous, b Yardley	0
J. Penrose, not out	13
H. W. Gardner, b Yardley	20
Leg-bye 1, wide 1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>175</b>

THE ELEVEN.

1st Innings.		2nd Innings.	
F. Tobin (mi.), c Maitland	b	0 c Botfield	b Walker
Walker	7	0 c Graham	b Walk'r
S. K. Gwyer, b Walker	33	0 (injured)	0
W. Yardley, c Walker, b Graham	7	0 c Penrose, b Gra-	
S. P. Bucknill, c Eaden, b		7 ham	23
Walker	0	c Penrose, b Gra-	1
F. Tobin (ma.), c Moberly, b Gra-		ham	0
ham	9	b Graham	0
C. K. Francis, c Moberly b Gra-			
ham	3	c Warner b Walk'r	6
J. T. Scutter, c Sidgwick, b		Walker	2
Walker	42	c Moberly b Walk'r	7
G. Fitzgerald, not out	0	0 c Sidgwick, b Gra-	4
J. W. Gardner, b Walker	23	ham	0
A. Gray, b Graham	6	leg-bye 1 wide 1	2
V. Ellis, c Warner, b Neilson	23	not out	0
Wides 5, n-b1	6		
<b>Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>

In the 2nd innings of the Twenty-Two, Mawdsley scored (not out) 2; B. Tower, c Tobin (mi.), b Francis, 1; Byes 4; Total, 7.

REV. T. W. JEX BLAKE'S v. J. M. WILSON'S BELOW XI. and XXII.—This match was finished on May 10th, Wilson's winning by three wickets.

BLAKE'S.

1st Innings.		2nd Innings.	
R. Bassett, b Heath	11	c Dudgeon b Heath	4
T. R. Mills, c Parton b Heath	6	c Heath b Tennant	41
R. O. Millne, c Peake b Harri-			
son	10	b Heath	3
T. Tinklar, b Heath	0	b Tennant	0
W. E. Barratt, b Heath	4	b Heath	11
S. Parker, b Harrison	0	b Peake	0
E. Peel, c Heath b Harrison	1	b Heath	1
H. M. Tobin, not out	16	b Heath	0
F. Arbuthnot, lbw b Heath	1	not out	0
E. Bowden Smith, b Tennant	9	b Tennant	5
A. K. Coles, b Heath	1	c Benham b Peake	7
Byes 4, leg-byes 3, wides 9	16	b 7, 1-b 3, w 9, n-b 1	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>92</b>

WILSON'S.

1st Innings.		2nd Innings.	
F. C. Selous (Dudgeon), b Bassett	18	run out	8
H. W. Peake, b Bassett	11	run out	4
E. A. R. Benham, c Coles b			
Bassett	0	h-w b Mills	6
J. A. Parton, c Peel b Bassett	1	b Bassett	0
H. C. Harrison, b Tinklar	0	b Mills	4
T. Heath, c Peel b Bassett	3	c Mills b Bassett	6
R. F. Langford, c Coles b Bassett	2	not out	41
R. M. Campbell, b Bassett	8	not out	5
J. R. Tennant, c Tinklar b			
Bassett	5	b Mills	0
A. E. Bourne, b Bassett	0		
G. E. Jeffery, not out	4		
Byes 11, leg-bye 1, wides 14	26	b 10, 1-b 2, w 3	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>

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,—I should like to say a few words about the new plan of allowing racquets to be

played on two out of the three Rugby fives-courts. A hand-fives player has not nearly so much opportunity for practising now as before this rule came force, and I think that unless great care is taken hand-fives will deteriorate and become a less popular game than formerly. It is true that anyone wishing to play hand-fives has the right to turn anyone playing racquets off the court, but it is unpleasant to do so, and many would rather give up their game than obtain the court by turning others off. Would not some such rule as the following be better,—“That the courts, after second lesson, may be taken for *hand-fives* up to 10.30, but if not then taken for hand-fives, they may be taken for *racquets*.” Of course the racquet player might put in his paper before 10.30, but it might be overruled by a hand-fives player. Anyone taking the court for hand-fives should be strictly prohibited from playing racquets on it. The same plan might be adopted after calling-over and at other times. Thus a hand-fives player would have a fair chance of getting a court, and we should not have the mortification of perceiving any falling off in this popular game of

#### HAND-FIVES.

#### THE ATHLETIC CUP.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

“First fixed he prizes for the athletes bold;  
An eared tripod that could measures hold—  
Twenty and Two.” *Homer.*

SIR,—I am very unwilling to trouble you with this letter, partly because I fear that it will be unconscionably dull, and partly because I labour under no slight apprehensions that your readers should have wearied of the subject. But I trust that they will allow me to appeal to their public spirit, and lend me their attention to the consideration of a question which, I do not think, is the least important that has been discussed in the pages of the *Meteor*—I allude to the subject of the Athletic Cup.

I have always, sir, felt a profound reference for the genius of the man who first struck out the plan for the Athletic Cup. I do not know who he was, but if these words should meet his eye I hope he will feel assured that he has at least one ardent admirer. The idea of starting a Cup to be held by the greatest athlete of his day, and to be handed down to late posterity with his name engraved upon it in letters over which Time has no power, seems to me to be pre-eminently the thought of a great creative

genius. But much as I approve of the conception I by no means approve of the method in which it has been carried out. Indeed, to judge from the letters which have appeared in the *Meteor*, there would seem to be a general feeling of dissatisfaction on this point.

First, I suppose every thoughtful critic would agree with all your correspondents that something must be done with respect to the manner in which seconds count for the Cup. I think much the simplest plan would be (as “Equity” suggests) to pass a rule—“that any winner in one year may run again in the same races in succeeding years, and, if he win, count those winnings again towards the Cup, but not take the prize a second time.” Against this proposal “Old John Cross” raises an extraordinary objection, namely, that it would bar a great number of entries and thus spoil the race. Why so, if the winner cannot take the prize but only wear the laurels? And even if the result were such as he supposes, can a race be said to be spoiled by a rule which allows the best runner in the School to compete for it? Ardent Rugbeians perpetually complain of the bad time of the races. Where is the marvel in this, if we persistently exclude the winners of preceding years?

Secondly, I come to a proposal made by “Aquila,” on the suggestion of a Master and an Old Rugbeian. It is too long to quote, but your readers will perhaps be good enough to read it over again. I differ with regret from so high an authority, but I cannot assent to either of his proposed amendments. That “things once won should be entirely done with after the year in which they are won” may be a very admirable rule, but, unsupported by arguments, it fails to convince me. That “Racquets, Hand-fives, Bat-fives, Steeple-chases, Dropping, Placing, &c., should not count towards the Cup,” is a proposition against which all Present and Past Rugbeians will energetically protest. Surely the Cup ought to be won by the best athlete, and surely Athleticism is not confined to running between two flags without tripping up, to clearing a dozen hurdles without knocking off a bar, and to jumping over a horizontal bit of string without touching. Which is most admirable, to be the best Racquet player, the best “drop,” and the best “place-kick” in the School, or to be able to jump four feet without a run? To ask such a question is to answer it.

Thirdly, I come to the important sugges-

tion of your correspondent "Change." Scarcely any one, I think, will doubt that it is absurd to make every prize count equally towards the Cup. But having thus, as is the case with most reformers, agreed with your correspondent on the principle, I differ from him *toto cœlo* as to the details. He thinks it "absurd that two or three straight drops with a football should count as much as winning the mile." I think it absurd that to run 1,760 yards along a hard, high road in the space of five minutes, should count as much as good dropping, which may cover the School with immortal fame, which may exalt to the highest pinnacle of human glory the Barby or the Hillmorton Road, and which may sway, whether for weal or woe, the destinies of Houses. But his opinion and my opinion on specific details is of little matter provided that the general principle be recognised. He would probably agree with me, that it is most desirable a Committee should be appointed to examine into the whole question, and weigh carefully all the arguments which are advanced. And that I may not be accused of leaving all suggestions to others, I will throw out a few hints of the changes which might be acceptable to such ultra-radicals as myself.

In the first place, I think it might fairly be said that an undue preponderance is given to Long Running in the deciding of the Cup. Since the cup was started two additional long races have been founded, but the short races remain just as they are. Is this altogether fair to the winners of the 100 and 200 yards? Secondly, I would go even further than "Change." I would make a really important thing, such as the Racquets, count twice, nay, five times as much as Diving, for instance. Great numbers in the School play Racquets the whole year round. No one can doubt that an expert Racquet player expends immense toil and energy in bringing his play to perfection. Few, on the other hand, take any interest in Diving, and fewer still practice that immaculate accomplishment. It might be urged by a cynical critic that no great importance ought to be attached to a plunge to the bottom of the Avon, resulting in half a minute's immersion, when the ardent diver reappears—in no such poetic fashion as Schiller's of yore—puffing and blowing like a young grampus, with his hands full of eggs and his mouth full of mud. Again, why should the Standing Jumping count as much as the High Jumping or the Broad Jumping? nay, why should it count

at all? I believe that it is generally allowed to be an exploded branch of Athleticism. I have scarcely ever seen any account of Athletics where it has occupied a place. In Oxford and Cambridge certainly it is unknown.

Lastly, sir, I come to my most startling innovation, and I beg your readers in judging of it to vouchsafe me their kind indulgence. Why should not Cricket, Football, and Hare and Hounds count towards the cup? Surely no one can pretend that eminent Athleticism at Cricket is less meritorious than eminent Athleticism in jumping hurdles. Why should Silean Ajax be honoured more highly than Achilles or Hector? Why should the bright butterfly of the hour, who is the first to breast the tape in the Quarter of a Mile, arrogate to himself a glory which is denied to the Cricket of the great bowler of 1863 and the great bat of 1867? And may not the same be said in the case of Football? Surely it is less skilful to run 100 yards along a fair course with no favour, than to bear the ball in triumph from the Three Trees to the Island Goal through the serried ranks of the impeding foe amidst a storm of flying hacks. If it is a feat of skill to drop a puntabout between the goal posts in cold blood, without let or hindrance, it is, at least, a feat of equal skill so to drop it with unblenching eye and hand that trembles not amid the hoarse shouts and fierce charges of desperate assailants. Why should the palm of victory be assigned to the one feat, whereas the other remains to future ages "unnoticed, unremembered, and unknown?"

I have not nearly done, but in very mercy to your readers I must forbear. Perhaps you will allow me on some future occasion to continue (as the *Globe* would say) to infect the School with delirium tremens, induced by the drugged alcohol of my democratic infatuation.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,  
TREBLA.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—We are thinking just now of improving our Racquets; we have formed the Racquet Club for that purpose, and there has been some talk of getting a marker to teach them. But the first thing that is necessary for improved Racquets is a Court on which it is possible to play well. When the Racquet was first built, it was found that it was almost impossible to play during a great part of the day, by reason of the sun,

which shone in through the glass. Blinds were proposed, to be worked by cords from the gallery; but the estimate for them was £140. At last, at the suggestion of Mr. Wilson, the glass was painted. This cost £6, and was expected to last four years. It answered perfectly, and has lasted much longer; but at last the paint has almost all fallen off. In the middle of the day the sun comes in through the glass at the top; when it is too low for that, it comes in through the windows in the gallery. On the left side of the Court, except close to the back wall, the ball pops from the light into the shade, and from the shade into the light again, till you have not the least idea where it is. Why should not the glass be re-painted? The windows in the gallery used to have tarpaulings over them. I suppose they were taken away in winter, when there is little sun, and the Court is often very dark: but now that summer has come they ought to be put up again.

I remain, Sir, yours truly,

B.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—Why not £900 for a Pavilion? I hope you will excuse me if I say I entirely disagree with your correspondent "Olim." I have the same longing as most in the School to see the New Pavilion built while I am in the School; but I will ask your correspondent whether it would be better to build a pavilion for £500 no bigger than the present, in better style perhaps, but not at all sufficient to answer the demand of the present day; or to wait until we have requisite funds to build a really good one, with proper accommodation for all classes of cricketing swells from the Captain of the Eleven to Fell. In the former case, we should require to make some additions in less than half-a-dozen years, and shall then be sorry that we did not do the thing in proper style at first.

I beg to remain,

WHOLE HOG.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—I confess that we can never expect to have everything which we desire, but I think some approach to it. I wish I could always have my racquet, racquet shoes, and fives-gloves to myself and myself alone. This may be selfish, but I cannot but wish for the fulfilment of my desires in this case. I pay for my racquet; and I do not see why some one should smash it (I suppose) by hitting

it hard against the wall. I pay for my shoes, and I do not go on the court often, but my shoes are worn out at the soles and sides before a month is over. I also pay for my gloves, and I feel grieved, nay, angry, when I go up to the court and find them (sometimes I do not find them) lying about the floor, in a state far from that in which I should like to see them. This state of things has gone on so long and so much that very few can afford to keep themselves comfortable in the above articles; and those who do have their own find it too much trouble to carry them from their houses every time they are going on a court. I do hope by publishing this you will assist me in preventing this unbounded liberality, with which many appear to believe the owners of these commodities are gifted.

I am, Sir, yours truly,

F. R. C.

*To the Editor of the Meteor.*

SIR,—I feel myself bound to write a short answer to a letter which appeared in your columns of last number; I allude to that of "Rantoon." I will always contend that it is impossible to keep the ground in proper order, when there is no fixed place for members of the School to stand. For instance,—in the 200 yards course, can you expect that fellows will be content to remain at the slope? I say you must allow them up to the side of the course. In the case of the jumping, I would have none in the enclosure, nor in the longer races. Until, then, we have courses that can be kept in order, we cannot blame the mass of the School for wishing to have a glimpse of the Races, nor the Sixth for allowing them to do so.

I do not think it can be seriously objected that so many feet spoil the turf of Big-Side, for the Athletics are just before the Easter holidays, and there is plenty of time to get the ground in order before the School re-assembles.

I beg to sign myself

LENIENCY.

#### ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Cantab."—We can see no reason why the spring-board at the bathing-place should not be covered with cocoa-nut matting as it is at Cambridge.

"Scrutator."—Your query does not lie at all within our province.

"Point."—That is a matter entirely for the Captain of the Eleven.