

it lay, but leaving it on the upper part of the stump. All the fields crowded round amid intense excitement, but the bail kept its place notwithstanding. Off the next ball was the winning hit. Score:—

THE CLUB.—1st Innings.

D. Buchanan, c Tobin (mi.), b Ellis.....	3
D. Campbell, b Walker	2
J. M. Masefield, b Warner	44
G. Fitzgerald, c Tobin (mi.), b Walker	0
G. Millington, run out.....	5
A. C. Thewles, b Gwyer	56
R. P. Smith, c Yardley, b Gwyer	9
T. R. Miller, c Bucknill, b Gwyer.....	6
C. W. Carles, b Gwyer.....	10
F. Paget, not out	16
W. O. Moberly, c Soutter, b Walker.....	13
Byes 3, 1-b 2, w 1	6

Total..... 170

THE SCHOOL.—1st Innings.

F. Tobin (mi.), b Millington	6
S. K. Gwyer, c Carles, b Buchanan	29
W. Yardley, c Moberly, b Millington	8
S. P. Bucknill, lbw, b Masefield.....	23
F. Tobin (ma), st Carles, b Buchanan	35
J. T. Soutter, st Carles, b Buchanan	46
F. H. Maitland, not out	10
J. W. Gardner, b Buchanan	0
E. H. Warner, b Buchanan	0
J. R. Walker, b Buchanan	4
V. Ellis, not out	1
Byes 6, w 7.....	13

Total..... 175

ANALYSIS OF THE BOWLING.

Rugby Club.—First Innings.—V. Ellis bowled 60 balls for 36 runs, 5 maidens, and 1 wicket; J. R. Walker, 114 balls, 61 runs, 8 maidens, 3 wickets; J. T. Soutter, 36 balls, 29 runs; E. H. Warner, 20 balls, 13 runs, 1 maiden, 1 wicket; S. K. Gwyer, 64 balls, 26 runs, 7 maidens, 4 wickets, 1 wide.

THE SCHOOL.—First Innings.—D. Buchanan bowled 136 balls for 67 runs, 12 maidens, and 6 wickets; G. Millington, 62 balls, 45 runs, 5 maidens, 8 wickets, 5 wides; J. M. Masefield, 34 balls, 19 runs, 3 maidens, 1 wicket, 2 wides; D. Campbell, 16 balls, 14 runs, 1 maiden; T. R. Miller, 8 balls, 8 runs; R. P. Smith, 44 balls, 10 runs, 8 maidens.

OLD RUGBEIAN MATCHES.

Our great cricket week began on Thursday and Friday, the 18th and 19th, with the usual Old Rugbeian matches. There was rather a scarcity of O.R.'s at first on Thursday morning, and a good many of the faces of the Third Eleven of the School began to grow rather dark as towards 12 o'clock it began to be whispered about: There are really only about 20 O.R.'s down. However, the arrival of the Captain served to give

things a better turn, and about 12.15 the First Eleven match began. The School, as in the other two elevens, lost the toss, and J. Wilkes and H. V. Ellis appeared at the wickets as representatives of the O.R.'s. A very short career, however, awaited the latter as he was bowled by Francis' second ball. No great stand was made against the bowling until E. Davenport came in; he played a very finished innings of 67, and the efforts of bowlers and fielders alike failed to oust him from his position at the wickets. We must not, however, omit to mention that Francis succeeded in clean bowling D. Buchanan. Their innings closed for 165. The first innings of the School amounted to 229, and a great deal of good play was shown in Yardley's 53, Bucknill's 27, and Tobin ma.'s 36. The younger Tobin was from an injury unable to play. In the 2nd innings of O.R.'s Ellis and Bennett made good scores. The following is the score:—

OLD RUGBEIANS.

1st Innings.	2nd Innings.	
J. Wilkes, b Francis	31 b Francis	1
H. V. Ellis, b Francis	0 b Francis ..	43
D. Buchanan, b Francis.....	11	
L. Novelli, b Francis	0 not out ..	23
E. K. Browne, c Maitland b Francis	15 c Ellis b Francis..	26
E. Davenport, not out	67 run out	7
S. Linton, c Maitland b Walker	8 run out.....	9
R. G. Venables, c Gwyer b Soutter	20 b Gwyer ..	1
A. A. Bourne, lbw, b Soutter ..	0 not out	0
F. H. Francis, b Francis	1 b Yardley.....	9
G. Bennett, lbw, b Francis....	5 b Yardley.....	45
Byes 3, leg byes 4.....	7 Byes 9, lb 2, w 1..	12

Total.....165 Total.....176

THE SCHOOL.—1st Innings.

S. K. Gwyer, c Davenport b Francis	14
F. H. Maitland, c Davenport, b Francis	5
W. Yardley, c Davenport b Buchanan	53
S. P. Bucknill, c Francis b Bourne	27
F. Tobin, ma., b Francis.....	36
J. T. Soutter, b Buchanan.....	17
C. K. Francis, st Davenport, b Buchanan ..	9
A. G. Botfield, b Francis.....	26
J. W. Gardner, c Davenport b Francis	8
J. R. Walker, b Francis	6
V. Ellis, not out	8
Byes 8, leg byes 5, wides 7	20

Total.....229

SECOND ELEVENS.—A victory for the School, after a very close match. Moberly played a first-rate innings, proving himself too much for the Old Rugbeians. Tower, also, was a very good second. The Old were 68 behind by the first innings. Very small scores were made on the second day, except by Spens, Newnam, and Haslam, in whose

innings were some good smacks. The School went down with amazing rapidity, but, through some steady play at the close, triumphed over their adversaries. Score:—

OLD RUGBEIANS.

1st Innings.		2nd Innings.	
T. M. Davenport, b Warner..	2 c Warner b Graham	1	
A. Smythies, b Warner	24 c Tower, b Graham	6	
J. E. Lloyd, b Warner	7 b Graham.....	8	
G. S. Millington, c Rowden, b Graham	7 c Tower, b Graham	7	
J. Edwards, c Eaden, b Warner	12 b Moberly	9	
F. Haslem, lbw, b Graham ..	27 run out	4	
R. Newman, b Warner	39 run out	5	
L. Spens, not out	50 lbw, b Warner	37	
R. S. Lea, b Warner	0 c Sedgwick, b Graham	21	
H. A. Rickard, absent	0 c Walsh, b Graham	11	
T. W. Isherwood, b Moberly ..	19 not out	5	
B 3, 1-b 2, w 2, n-b 1 ..	8 B 10, w 10	20	
Total	195	Total....	134

THE SCHOOL.

1st Innings.		2nd Innings.	
C. Sidgwick, b Millington....	0 ht wkt, b Lea	9	
G. Walsh, c Spens, b Lea	18 c and b Millington	8	
W. O. Moberly, st Davenport, b Spens	125 b Millington.....	4	
E. H. Warner, run out	0 run out	3	
A. W. Rowden, b Millington..	2 run out	7	
J. F. Eaden, b Lea	5 b Millington	2	
J. C. Lambert, b Spens	9 c Rickard, b Millington	12	
B. Tower, not out	54 st Davenport b Lea	2	
F. H. Baring, b Spens	0 not out	7	
J. Graham, c Davenport, b Spens.....	6 not out	13	
W. F. Neilson, c Lloyd, b Spens	12 c Davenport b Lea	1	
B 12, 1-b 6, w 12, n-b 2 ..	32 B 3, w 3	6	
Total	263	Total.....	74

THIRD ELEVENS.—The Old Rugbeians, by the able assistance of some of the School Fourth Eleven, managed to win. Peile ably showed his men how to play, by scoring 83 in fine style, including 2 sixes, &c. Hudson played a hard-hitting innings for the School, in which were 1 five, 5 fours, &c.; in the second innings Pearson made 45 (not out) by good steady play. Old Rugbeians won by 56 runs. Score:—

OLD RUGBEIANS.

1st Innings.		2nd Innings.	
V. Fitzgerald, b Lushington mi.....	31 c Hare, b Lushington mi.....	4	
E. A. Were, run out	3 c Hudson, b Lushington mi.	2	
G. L. Oldham, b Lushington mi.....	0 run out.....	7	
K. R. Fletcher, b Lushington mi.....	19 (McGregor) not out	11	
J. A. Curling, b Lushington mi.....	0 b Heath.....	0	
E. E. Montagu, b Lushington mi.....	4 c Hudson, b Lushington mi.....	4	

G. R. Westfeldt, c & b Lushington ma.....	27 b Heath.....	31	
E. A. R. Benham, b Heath ..	39 c Heath, b Lushington mi.	61	
C. J. Peile, b Lushington mi.	83 run out	8	
R. T. Bassett, not out	15 b Lushington mi.	10	
C. S. Morris, b Lushington mi.	0 run out	0	
B 20, 1-b 4, w 2	26 B 12, 1-b 1, w 4	17	
Total	247	Total....	155

THE SCHOOL.

1st Innings.		2nd Innings.	
G. H. Lloyd, c Bassett, b Montagu	25 b Bassett	4	
T. G. Hare, c Oldham, b Montagu	4 c Sub., b Montagu	0	
H. W. Badger, c Fitzgerald, b Bassett	21 c Bassett, b Montagu	19	
S. Pearson, b Bassett	4 not out	45	
A. H. Hudson, b Montagu	58 b Bassett.....	25	
J. Penrose, c Curling, b Montagu	0 b Mantagu	4	
H. W. Gardner, b Bassett ..	14 run out	0	
T. G. Lushington, c Westfeldt b Montagu	6 lbw, b Montagu ..	4	
W. H. Mawdsley b Montagu	8 lbw, b Fitzgerald	4	
R. Heath, b Montagu.....	3 c Peile, b Oldham	24	
A. J. Lushington, not out....	10 c Westfeldt, b Bassett	1	
B 21, 1-b 3, w 5	29 B 21, w 11, n-b 2	34	
Total	182	Total.....	164

BARBY ROAD V. HILLMORTON ROAD.—Played May 14, 16, and 28. Won by Hillmorton by one innings and 6 runs. Score:—

BARBY ROAD.

1st Innings.		2nd Innings.	
W. Yardley, c Moberly b Soutter	1 c Warner b Soutter	36	
S. Gwyer, c and b Francis.....	1 c Eaden, b Soutter	0	
S. P. Bucknill, c Moberly, b Soutter	20 c Moberly b Francis	70	
F. H. Maitland, c Moberly, b Soutter	12 b Francis	11	
J. W. Gardner, st Tobin ma., b Francis	4 b Moberly	11	
G. Fitzgerald, lbw, b Soutter	3 c Warner b Francis	1	
V. Ellis, b Francis	2 c and b Moberly ..	4	
J. R. Walker, c Sidgwick, b Francis	5 b Francis	0	
A. W. Rowden, absent	0 run out	2	
J. C. Lambert, not out	2 not out	1	
B. Tower, absent	0 b Francis	5	
B 2, 1-b 3	5 B 11, 1-b 2, w 2	15	
Total	55	Total.....	156

HILLMORTON ROAD.—1st Innings.

C. Sidgwick, b Fitzgerald	42
F. Tobin (mi.), b Walker	4
F. Tobin (ma.), c Badger (-ub.), b Yardley..	62
C. K. Francis, b Fitzgerald.....	48
A. Gray, b Fitzgerald	34
J. T. Soutter, b Yardley	4
A. G. B. field, c Fitzgerald, b Walker	10
W. O. Moberly, b Walker	0
G. Walsh, c Badger, b Fitzgerald	0
E. H. Warner, b Walker	3
J. F. Eaden, not out	0
Byes 3, 1-b 4, w 2, n-b 1	10
Total	217

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 had always imagined that the *Meteor* was a paper designed for the friendly interchange of sentiments among Past and Present Rugbeians, and not for the bandying of hard epithets. Your correspondent "Scrutator" seems to think otherwise, and I can only hope that the spirit of his letter has not met with the approbation of many of your readers. If he wishes to transform the *Meteor* into a polemical magazine, I can tell him that he has set the right way to work; and I would only advise him to reflect whether he is not more likely than most people to lose by a contest in which quarter is neither given nor taken. The style and the arguments of my letter are of course fair game for his criticism. I sincerely trust that I can stand without finching the fire of his very small shot. I hope he felt unbounded satisfaction in delivering himself of his courteous remarks. I tender my humblest thanks to him for his surpassing condescension in declining to be "too hard" upon me. And, if I do not follow his example, I can assure him it is most certainly not because I consider either the matter or the manner of his epistle to be above criticism.

"Scrutator" seems to object to my definition of the races. Does he mean to imply that it is erroneous? I defy him to prove it. Or does he mean that he could give us a more satisfactory definition? Then by all means let us have it. Any definition from his pen would be indeed a treat.

I am told that the opinions I quote are "various and contradictory." The opinions I quoted were the opinions of your correspondents. If, then, the opinion of one correspondent was in contradiction to that of another, the conclusion which would suggest itself to any ordinary mortal, "Scrutator" excepted, is that they were meant to be contradictory. But, "Scrutator" continues: "so constantly does he appear to change his opinions, that it is really hard to arrive at his general drift." Nothing less will content him than to give an instance of my constant change of opinion which is, that I "affect to make light of the 1,760 yards run upon a hard high road." Where is the proof of my "constant change of opinion"? That

I affect to make light of the 1,760 yards? Or in my assertion that it is run on a hard high road?

After some further observations, not worth noticing, "Scrutator" finds fault with my remark that toil and energy are needed for perfection in Racquets. I would only observe that what I said on that point has been endorsed by all the Racquet-players I have ever spoken to.

The next point on which "Scrutator" touches is whether Cricket and Football should count for the Cup. He decides in the negative, because "there is no real athletic contest involved." But your correspondent "E" goes to the heart of the matter when he asks what the Cup is given for. He will pardon me if I venture to think that in defining "Athletics" and "Athleticism" he has been drawing a distinction without a difference. Surely "Athletics" and "Athleticism" mean the same thing, viz., "the performances of Athletes;" and "Athlete," according to the etymological signification of the word, denotes "a combatant, or one who contends," though in Greece, as in England, the word was restricted to the special notion of "physical" contention as opposed to "intellectual." It is for this reason that I think Cricketing, Football, &c., ought to count for the Cup. Is not the Cricketer "a combatant as much as the Mile-racer? And is not the Football-player "one who contends" as much as the hurdle-racer? What reason is there (apart from practical difficulties) for excluding the one and including the other?

"Scrutator," indeed, has discovered a most sapient reason. It would (it seems) degrade "such a noble game" as Football to reward excellence in it by making it count for the Cup. Apparently, however, it does not, in "Scrutator's" opinion, degrade such a noble game as Cricket to reward excellence in it by a presentation bat. If this be not inconsistency I know not what is.

This much I am fully prepared to allow, that it would if possible be far nobler to reward all athletic distinctions, as the Greeks rewarded the greatest athletes the world has ever seen, with a simple olive-wreath. Glory and honour ought in all cases to be the ruling motives. But we moderns are not as high-minded as the old Greeks, and therefore we must make the best of our more sordid inclinations. This I contend we shall do if we exalt our Athletic Cup, if we lead fellows to strive to live for posterity and not for the