From: Peter Griffiths [pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 24 February 2015 09:45

To: Lawton Smith Cc: Stephen Musk'

Subject: Re: 1909 Changes from Colin

I've sent the book to the printer (Richard Shaw).

On the two questions - I changed the bowling order to match CricketArchive for the Devon match and I agree Tony Webb's numbers on the Bedford grounds - the book numbers were taken before I'd changed the 1909 match ground.

Julian - I've told Richard Shaw that he should contact you for the copy for the back cover and also asked him to contact you about timescales.

I'm working on the ACS Yearbook next, but once that's done I'll start on the 1910!!!

best wishes

Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 23/02/2015 16:55, Lawton Smith wrote:

Hi Pete,

Colin called me today to give me a number of changes to the latest proof – see attached file. Let me know if anything is not clear.

If you can make these changes, then I think we are done and 1909 can be sent to the printers. What is the likely timescale to get the printed copies? It would be good if we could get them before the AGM on 21^{st} March.

With regards to the cover for the book, this usually comes from Richard Shaw via Andrew Hignell so I will request a proof. The back page will need changing to reflect the new ACS Sales address.

Thanks Julian

Julian Lawton Smith

From: Peter Griffiths [pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 23 February 2015 13:30
To: Stephen Musk; Lawton Smith

Subject: Re: partnership

added to my master copy

Pete

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 23/02/2015 12:19, Stephen Musk wrote:

'Afternoon (just) Both,

Colin has just 'phoned to point out that, although it is not recorded in the FOWs, the following partnership was recorded in the notes of the relevant match (on page 71) and should be added to the list of 7th wicket partnerships on page 140:-

99 2nd Watts, GH and OW Bocock Cambridgeshire Norfolk Newmarket 40

in addition, on page 139, the number of matches for which 'sufficient' data also exists should now be increased to 28 and the number for which 'inadequate' data exists should be dropped to 33 to compensate.

Well spotted, Colin!

Regards, Stephen.

From: Peter Griffiths [pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 22 February 2015 08:45

To: Lawton Smith

Subject: Re: FW: Captain Young

master copy updated - also changed page 164

Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 21/02/2015 10:22, Lawton Smith wrote:

I think that we should go with Tony's view and change him to Capt ED Young. Changes required on pages 63 (debutant + scorecard), 159 (1909 averages), and 175 (4 entries).

Thanks Julian

From: Tony Percival [mailto:tony@tonypercival.co.uk]

Sent: 20 February 2015 16:37

To: 'Lawton Smith'

Subject: RE: Captain Young

I still think it is ED. I told Colin I found a team selection before the match showing him as Capt S Young but as the paper got a number of initials wrong I have not placed much credence in him. Capt ED Young was still a Captain in Devon early 1909 but moved that year. I have not found a JY Young in Army lists a few years before.

Tony

From: Lawton Smith [mailto:lawtonsmith@supanet.com]

Sent: 18 February 2015 17:51

To: 'Tony Percival'

Cc: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com

Subject: Captain Young

Tony,

Colin Munford has reminded me that we have a query over the initials for Captain Young who played for Devon in Match 32 in 1909. In the original draft scorecard there were no initials, then a subsequent version showed them as 'JY' but I don't know where these came from. In the Devon Cricketers book he is shown as 'ED' with a rank of Brigadier General.

I tend to favour the latter as it still shows a military title. Unless we have good evidence for 'JY', I suggest we go with 'ED'. What do you think?

Regards Julian

From: Peter Griffiths [pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 20 February 2015 11:49
To: Lawton Smith; 'Stephen Musk'

Subject: Re: 1909

added to my master copy - also changed H Coulson to Harry Coulson Pete

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 20/02/2015 10:54, Lawton Smith wrote:

I have established the following Christian names, mainly from CricketArchive:

SR Nicholson (Wilts) – Stanley WE King (Beds) – Wilfred

H Mitchell (Wilts) - Harry

E Gee (Carmarthenshire) – Ernest

J Armstrong (Notts II) – John (from Peter W-T)

WN Bickford-Smith (Cornwall) - William

Sir CEMY Nepean - Charles

Pete, can you please update the Leading Performances in the Introduction.

Thanks Julian

From: Peter Griffiths [mailto:pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 20 February 2015 09:38

To: Stephen Musk

Cc: lawtonsmith@supanet.com

Subject: Re: 1909

It turns out that the question we asked the database for 100 matches was wrong - the list on page 12 is totally wrong - there were no players who reached 100 matches in 1909 so I've deleted the table.

thank goodness you spotted this.

Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 18/02/2015 21:08, Stephen Musk wrote:

'Evening Both,

The proof duly arrived (thanks, Pete) and, so far, I've checked the 'bits' that I 'do'. I found the 'Partnerships' and 'Missing Data' to be correct with a couple of changes which were clearly right and proper.

Under 'Leading Performances', we still lack Christian names for: SR Nicholson (Wilts), WE King (Beds - surely Tony W?), H Mitchell (Wilts), E Gee (Carmarthenshire), J Armstrong (Notts II - Peter W-T?), WN Bickford-Smith (Cornwall) and Sir CEMY Nepean (isn't he 'Cyril'?).

I assume that the tribute to Tony will go in. There are two errors regarding the Norfolk team. Firstly, SD Page appeared in only 57 Championship matches in his career rather than 100+ and need to be deleted from the appearance milestone list. Second, the partial batting order in Norfolk's second innings in Match 35 is: (8) Thurgar, (9) Page, (10) Pilch, (11) Smith. The others as already given (or unknown). White's hat-trick consisted of Cozens-Hardy, Thurgar and Page (the latter two 'bagged 'em').

I'll have a run-through before 'Stars On Sunday'.

Regards, Stephen.

Date: Wed, 18 Feb 2015 16:29:15 +0000 From: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com
To: stephenmusk@outlook.com

Subject: Re: 1909

try this Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: <u>pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com</u>
Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 18/02/2015 15:38, Stephen Musk wrote:

Hi Pete,

My computer hasn't spotted the proof that you sent yesterday. Please can you try sending it again? If that doesn't work I'll have to try asking Julian to see if I can receive it from his engine. I hate computers...

Regards, Stephen.

Date: Tue, 17 Feb 2015 09:08:15 +0000 From: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com

To: StephenMusk@outlook.com

Subject: 1909

Another proof Pete

--

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may

contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

From:

Peter Griffiths [pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent:

19 February 2015 13:19

To: Subject:

Lawton Smith Re: FW: FOWs

updated Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 19/02/2015 12:01, Lawton Smith wrote:

See Stephen's note below about changing the FOW missing data to 61.

From: Stephen Musk [mailto:stephenmusk@outlook.com]

Sent: 19 February 2015 10:34

To: Lawton Smith **Subject:** FOWs

'Morning,

I think that you're right Julian - leave it as it is but add a note. The 9th wicket is probably wrong but it's just possible that there was some shenanigans involving a retired hurt...

I guess that, under "Analysis Of Match Scores Missing Data", the number of matches in which fall of wickets is unknown or incomplete should be increased from 60 to 61 in order to compensate.

Regards, Stephen.

From: lawtonsmith@supanet.com
To: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com
CC: stephenmusk@outlook.com

Subject: RE: FW: 1909

Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2015 08:59:59 +0000

With regards to the FOW query in Match 12, Paul Dyson has responded:

You're right, there's obviously something wrong somewhere but what it is I've no idea. The scorebook clearly shows each of the last two wickets falling at 157. Sorry to be so unhelpful. Good luck with solving it.

So I think we may need to leave it as is but add a note to point out the discrepancy.

Regards Julian From: Lawton Smith [mailto:lawtonsmith@supanet.com]

Sent: 16 February 2015 17:20 **To:** 'pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com'

Cc: 'Stephen Musk' Subject: RE: FW: 1909

See my comments below. How about sending out the proof copy now and we can try and get the last couple of queries resolved in the next couple of days. If you can post it to Colin tomorrow, hopefully we can all sign it off by the end of the week.

Thanks Julian

From: Peter Griffiths [mailto:pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 16 February 2015 16:04

To: Lawton Smith **Subject:** Re: FW: 1909

There are still questions on these:

page 43, match 12 - 9th FoW in Northumberland 2nd innings I'll follow up page 66, match 35 - the hat-trick Stephen — have you had a chance to check this? page 139 - unknown batsmen for one second wicket partnership. Silverlock AJ & Diver EJ 141 for Monmouthshire

page 140 - unknown batsmen for two seventh wicket partnerships J Bucknell & M Combey 63 for Durham and Nichols JE and CL Winser 55 for Staffs

page 196 - unknown batsmen for 4th wicket against partnership Pollitt G and H Squire 95 for Beds

I'm happy to send a proof copy now though if you wish - although we have missed the post for Monday to send to Colin

best

Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 16/02/2015 14:30, Lawton Smith wrote:

The final set of amendments from David Harvey below. Once these changes are made and you have done Colin's, that should be it. So if you agree, I guess it's time for what should be the final proof.

Thanks Julian

From: <u>Dgharvey@aol.com</u> [mailto:Dgharvey@aol.com]

Sent: 13 February 2015 19:03 **To:** lawtonsmith@supanet.com

Subject: 1909

Good evening, Julian.

Here is the last batch. I split the job into 5 parts as I have had a rather busy week with household duties etc., on my return from the beautiful island and devoted afternoons to the book. If you think I have been too fussy, please tell me. I will not be offended. I hope that i have not missed too much through doing it comparatively quickly.

Page 165 line 2 Bedfordshire lost 2, not 3, on first innings.

Page 166 line 2 Berkshire lost one on first innings, not none.

Page 170 In the heading to the Cambridgeshire averages the year should read 1909, not 1908.

Page 174 Cornwall. In the list of professionals, Vibart, not Vibert

Notes line 3 Hawken, not Hawkin (at least I think that is what my note says but I cannot read my

own lousy writing)

Page 176 Dorset In the "final season" list at line 15 Barnes, not Banres, and Bosworth-Smith, not Bosworth-

Smioth

Page 177 Notes line 3 Would not at 28.80 be preferable to and 28.80(Durham)

Page 179 Glamorgan. In the notes we seem to deal in Christian names where they are available. According

to Andrew Hignell's history, Maxwell was James and Sweet-Escott was Edward.

Page 180 Notes line 3 "in 1908 whe he scored 656 to 50.46" should read "in 1908 when he scored 656 at

50.46".

Page 183 In respect of Match 94 I said that Geen took over as w/k. From what is shown on page 183 it looks

as if the player's name was Green not Geen. An amendment to the Monmouthshire batting card in

Match 94 is, therefore, needed as are two amendments to the Cornwall card for catches by Green.

In the notes above the averages, for the sake of consistency, I think we should say that 1909 was

"the last or only season that these 5......"

Green has become Geen in the averages. I have no way of checking this chap's name as he is not

mentioned in 1910 Wisden. Cricketarchive has WP Geen so this seems correct. However I noted a couple of entries in CA for WP Green which probably need merging into Geen's records.

Page 186 Again for consistency I think we should say 3 players who made their (not his) debut in the

heading to the averages.

Page 187 In the notes above the averages insert "XI" after 2nd in line 2.

Page 188 Notes line 2 Edmund' not Edmind.

Page 191 Surrey secretary was Findlay not Findley.

Page 192 In line 1 of the notes "defeating Glamorgan"

Page 194 In the 7th wicket partnership for Bedfordshire in "milestones" we have T A Brown. I have a feeling that

Brown was a pro - he certainly was with Northamptonshire - and, if so, his initials need moving.

The same applies to George Pollitt for the 8th and 9th partnerships. Again, in the bowling,

Brown's initials need moving in 3 places. In the number of appearances below both Brown and

Pollitt need adjustment. I think that David is correct and that these two were both professionals.

Page 195 Cambridgeshire bowling - I think D,M. Hayward was a pro(3 places). Agreed, and also below

Page 196 Norfolk batting - Holland F.C. 5th wicket Relf A.E., 5th wicket (against) Hayward 6th Holland and

10th Davis were all pros.

Norfolk bowling Shore C.(4 places) and Tomlin E.

Page 197 These are all pros.

batting Ducat, Thompson & Baker

partnerships Hayes, Ducat, Holland, Davis (twice), Rothery (twice),

Hutchinson (not sure) – he was a pro, Thompson, Makepeace and Ellis. bowling Thompson (2), Smith (2), Nice appearances Baker.

I appreciate that all these minor things will cause a lot of work and leave you to decide what to do about them. All my previous MC books are in the loft so I have not checked who was a pro and who was not. I cannot remember if Albert Relf began as an amateur in MC.

It is a big job typesetting all these figures and I certainly don't envy Peter.

If you have any queries on what I have done, don't hesitate to get in touch and' if it is urgent, you can get me on 0115 9273937.

Good luck.

David.

From: Peter Griffiths [pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 19 January 2015 15:09

To: Lawton Smith Re: 1909 Changes

thanks for all of these - I've marked up everything on my master copy - do you want to see a new version before I get any marks from Colin?

match 49 - no indication on whether the missing runs we all attributed to Gee - I think that it's likely though.

Barmby - this was cause by us saying that his last match was in 1900 in the 1900 book

grounds - all pages are generated from the CricketArchive database where, for instance, we don't believe in Wearmouth which did not exist at this time and has been used incorrectly by Tony Webb as a shorthand. When I get Colin's marks, I'll edit to what is required.

best wishes

Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 17/01/2015 16:16, Lawton Smith wrote:

Hi Pete,

Colin and I have started to check the latest information that you sent through. He will post his comments back when he is finished but in the meantime here are a few other amendments:

Orton – I incorrectly advised you to show Orton as an amateur. Colin reminded me of Douglas's comments:

Orton is a young man who certainly started out with initials but had them taken away in 1909. He was groundsman class, his family having a long association with the Amersham club. I know he had initials in front of his name 1908, but I honestly believe that they should go behind in 1909, as shown in the local papers and Cricket!

So could you please change him to show as Orton RW in 1909.

BN Boswell-Smith – his only appearance was in match 99. In the averages for Dorset he shows as BNB Smith. CricketArchive seems to have both versions. We feel that he should be BN Boswell-Smith in the 1909 book (his only Minor Counties appearance).

Match 49 – you have added in the missing bowling analyses for the match but the Carmarthenshire figures, although showing a total of 313, are 95 runs short. Should these runs be attributed to Gee? If there is no evidence of this then the total should be adjusted to 218 and a comment added about the discrepancy. The current comment needs removing. Also in the Devon bowling figures there is a 24 run discrepancy. When compared to CricketArchive this is explained by Scott conceding 24 runs not 21 and the addition of Wilson 9-1-21-0.

From: Peter Griffiths [pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 09 January 2015 11:38

To: Lawton Smith

Subject: Re: 1909 Professionals

thanks for these - master copy updated I'll be working on the professionals this afternoon best wishes
Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com
Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 08/01/2015 20:36, Lawton Smith wrote:

Hi Pete,

Please find attached a list of professionals by county for 1909. In the course of compiling this I spotted the following cases where full initials were not shown:

Match 45 - Higgins J should be JB

Match 63 - Carr J should be JT

Match 98 - Smith W should be WRR

Also in Match 31 RW Orton has his initials incorrectly after his surname and in match 43 he has initials before and after! He should be shown as RW Orton.

Please let me know if you are missing any other information.

Thanks Julian

Julian Lawton Smith

From:

Peter Griffiths [pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent:

05 January 2015 10:10

To:

Lawton Smith

Subject:

Re: Reading ground update

thanks - added to my master copy

Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com
Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 02/01/2015 10:19, Lawton Smith wrote:

Hi Pete,

Colin raised a query over the over the address of the ground in Reading used for Berkshire matches. In 1908 we recorded it as

County Ground, Kensington Road, Reading

Whereas in 1909 it is currently shown as

The Amateur Sports Club Ground, Elm Park, Kensington Road, Reading

Roy new has confirmed that the correct address is **County Ground, Kensington Road, Reading.** Could you therefore please update matches 61, 68, 80, and 91.

Many thanks Julian

Julian Lawton Smith

Match 53 – this relates to an earlier query. The FOW in Cheshire's innings should show the fall of the 6th wicket as blank (unknown) and the 7th wicket as 264 (confirmed in 3 sources).

Berkshire County Page - FJ Barmby's batting should show 1 match, 2 innings, 1 not out, 3 runs, highest 3 and average 3.00. This will amend the totals to 170 innings, 18 not outs, and 2341 runs to match the aggregate totals on page 22 of the book.

Staffordshire County Page – the totals at the bottom of the averages still show 1908 totals. Also there should be 1 substitute catch added to the line above.

Season's Results at a Glance – your version does not match the one I sent you on 1st January, please replace with mine.

100 matches summaries – Colin has noticed that a number of ground descriptions are different to those we have previously settled on. I'm not sure how this happened but we should aim to be consistent. I think that he will note the grounds affected.

Please let me know if you have any queries on these proposed changes.

Thanks Julian

Julian Lawton Smith

From: Lawton Smith [lawtonsmith@supanet.com]

Sent: 06 December 2014 19:52

To: 'pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com'

Cc: 'Stephen Musk'
Subject: RE: 1909

See comments in red below.

From: Peter Griffiths [mailto:pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 03 December 2014 08:41

To: Julian Lawton Smith; Stephen Musk

Subject: Fwd: 1909

please comment on these

Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: 1909

Date:Tue, 2 Dec 2014 23:53:27 +0000

From:Philip Bailey <philip bailey@btconnect.com>

To:pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com <pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com>

Noticed a few things in the cards you uploaded. A few typos that the upload sorted on initials which I won't comment on. Where you had a change to a county we haven't done a booklet for I have assumed the new version is correct, with one exception below.

87508

Your card has ES Whittaker. From Tony's Wiltshire list (the current booklet being worked on) S is correct so have changed back. The 1908 Addendum & Corrigendum confirms that it should be S (Sam) not ES.

87510

Your card had HM Blackwell (Herbert the 1904 player) where we have H (Henry) playing in 1909 - upload has assumed Henry is correct as we have it and I'm pretty sure Michael Weeks sorted the Blackwells out for me. Agreed H not HM in 1909.

87542

Your card has F Christian we have WF from Devon book so combined back. Agreed should be WF not F.

Two matches you have SG Bennett of Wiltshire we had as SG Bennet - also played in 1910 and 11, have combined back into one player. For now changed the name to Bennett but then I checked in the Suffolk

yearbook and the latest version I can see of their career records which they print each year does say Bennet so maybe I should have left it as we had it.

I have checked with Colin and it should be Bennett – it's an error in the current yearbook.

Philip

From: Lawton Smith [lawtonsmith@supanet.com]

Sent: 06 December 2014 19:57
To: 'pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com'

Cc: 'Stephen Musk'

Subject: RE: 1909 - match 29 Glam v Carm

Colin and I think that we should just remove the reference to Mills after the run out.

From: Peter Griffiths [mailto:pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 02 December 2014 13:21

To: Julian Lawton Smith; Stephen Musk **Subject:** 1909 - match 29 Glam v Carm

In the Carmartehn first innings we give John run out by Mills - is this right?

Was Mills a sub?

Pete

--

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com
Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

From: Peter Griffiths [pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com]

Sent: 02 December 2014 15:28

To: Julian Lawton Smith: Steve Musk

Subject: Re: 1909- match 53 - cheshire v northumberland

actually, this is wrong - the FoW should be 6-234 not 6-264 and so CoP was correct at 242-6 at least in my opinion

Pete

Peter Griffiths

Email: <u>pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com</u>
Web: <u>http://cricketarchive.com/</u>

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

On 02/12/2014 15:25, Peter Griffiths wrote:

CoP for Cheshire of 242-6 is non consistent with FoW I've assumed 264-6 for the time being - but need confirmation Pete

_-

Peter Griffiths

Email: pgriffiths@cricketarchive.com Web: http://cricketarchive.com/

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information.

Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited.

If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.