

## Lawton Smith

---

**From:** Douglas Miller [douglasm@gotadsl.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 25 August 2014 19:53  
**To:** 'Lawton Smith'  
**Subject:** RE: 1909 etc

Julian,

A miserable day has its compensations. I have devoted a few hours to 1909.

Here are my comments. First, a few general points. I have looked at Cricket Archive as well as my own records such as they are and discovered, to my delight, that I had photocopies of most of the match scores from Cricket, kindly sent to me years ago by Don Ambrose. Cricket Archive fills a few gaps on initials etc., but there may be a couple of instances where I believe their cards are wrong. In the interests of singing from the same hymn sheet I wonder whether you will be drawing discrepancies to their attention. I thought it would be messy if I were to do so in mid-stream as it were.

The Bucks captain was always Lowndes. His initials on CA are given as WFL. You have them as WF. CA correctly says of him that he had changed his name to William Frederick Lowndes Frith Lowndes. He had started out in his pre-Bucks days as WHL Frith but inheritance of substantial property in Chesham led to his adoption of Lowndes as a surname. It is rather curious that CA should have acknowledged this but then failed to give him his fourth initial. Our 1908 book gave all four initials and I hope this will continue, ideally with CA amending their score cards.

I have increasing difficulty with professionals. As one who advocated indicating them by showing the initials after the name, I now find myself asking this question: in Minor Counties cricket what makes a man a professional? There is no doubt that certain people were paid a match fee and some earned money from coaching, perhaps as well as tending a club ground. But class rears its ugly head. Bucks was a county with a strong public school/university contingent and there were some others who did not conform to this pattern – what my grandmother would have gaily called ‘the lower orders’. I am happy that Wright was a pro, earning his living at Eton, though I think he played as an amateur in his last few seasons. Vickerstaff and Page are also pros, the former acknowledged as such in the minute book, while Page was engaged at High Wycombe for many years. However, Wheeler also earned his living as a coach and groundsman – he used to come over from Chesham to my local ground in the 1930s, but he is sometimes given an initial and Bucks may not have paid him. ES Boddy, a Beaconsfield man, is always shown as a pro, but GH, who was his younger brother, generally (but not always) appears as an amateur, which suggests a measure of inconsistency. 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! I know Bucks will not have had much money to lash out on pros and I rather wonder what, if anything, some of these people received.

A general point that I would advocate following is, where in doubt, to give the benefit to the historian of whichever team a man belongs to. In my case I will have reconciled the figures with the published averages, just occasionally throwing up incompatibilities but, for the most part, I will be back into inability to reconcile my figures of some of the changes now mooted take place.

It is usually a complete waste of time believing one is going to find the fall of wickets, boundaries in an innings etc. at this stage in the proceedings. I think we were over-ambitious at the outset in dealing with scores in years when the press showed more interest in Minor Counties cricket than had become the case by 1909. Bucks also had a rotten secretary in 1909, who may have failed to send things in.

### Match 17

Add PL Frith as a Bucks debutant.

Where do the initials TC come from for Stafford? I have always had F and CA has adopted this, albeit without having identified the man further. This was the only match recorded for him and there is no TC Stafford on CA.

Vickerstaff certainly dismissed Stafford, not Faulkner, if the averages are to be trusted. Vickerstaff has 4 wickets and Faulkner 2.

My records indicate that Page bowled second and Faulkner fourth – but all this suggests muddled scorers and the pattern of the wickets is perhaps more consistent with the reverse view.

CA gives O'Dowda as BF with supporting names.

Vickerstaff bowled three maidens.

Orton 1 and Page 5 fits our records.

On Blacklidge Bucks sources have been amended to 2.2 and 2 acknowledging the Surrey version.

### **Match 31**

Make Wheeler a professional (as well as Orton).

Seven overs for Hitch is logical or Platt would have been taken off, yet still come back to take the penultimate wicket.

Faulkner top-scored with 20, not 38.

### **Match 43**

CA indicates and supports extra initials: Shoosmith HW, Whichelow HV, Barney not M but FJ. Nothing for Simpson. CA has GH Boddy, but this would be at odds with the averages as published by Bucks and Cricket. It is undoubtedly ES, the batsman, as you have it. Need to alert CA to the change.

CA has JM Bagley. This is really difficult. He kept wicket and your sheet spells him thus in the field but not when batting, I notice. For good measure he was Bagley in Cricket but not in their averages, where he was Baguley. My spelling comes from other sources and a belief that, as a stand-in wicket-keeper, he must be the man who played in 1901. In the interests of consistency and finding nothing else after trawling censuses etc., I opted for JW Baggaley in my history, but let us go with JM Bagley, which is how he appeared (if he is the same man) in our 1901 book.

You have Vickerstaffe (as he often appears) in your summary notes. Should be Vickerstaff.

I confirm Wright as 39 and Faulkner as 3, averages supporting this.

On all the other queries my original sources disagree, but Cricket says otherwise and I would, in any case, happily bow to Berkshire's own records (though Roy New is no Colin Munford!)

### **Match 74**

CA has SJH Taunton and justifies it with full names.

CA has FE Newman, again justified. Note he is the brother of AW but apparently playing as an amateur.

Cricket has ES Grant but CA has only E.

Mitchell is H (Harry), shown incorrectly as B in Bucks sources.

Smith is WRR

Shaw was caught by CS Awdry.

A curiosity to me is that GH Boddy should have opened the batting, while his brother, often an opening batsman, is shown at 9, but this is what all sources seem to say and the averages support it, though I think Cricket is actually slightly wrong with its figures for ES, though spot on for GH.

### **Match 81**

Clarke played in only this one match for Dorset. I fear I may have started him off with an O, duly copied by CA instead of a C as now shown. However, Cricket has APL and I would be inclined to go with that.

Wright bowled 34 overs, not 30 as you suggest I have indicated. If I did so, it was in an early version.

You know the Bucks captain! What is the problem with HF Hodges?

Correct 'at shortly after lunch' by removing 'at'.

### **Match 86**

RW Awdry captained Wilts.

It is FE Newman and Smith WRR.

Confirm that Wright scored 1.

It amuses me that TN Perkins becomes TTN. I guess he didn't care for Tossill. This is typical of the ACS who cannot allow a man to call himself what he wishes (which is his absolute right) but has to scurry off for the birth certificate to dig up the B for GO Allen, which he disliked, add a B to Robertson and switch round poor old Les Berry's initials.

### **Match 91**

It is Shoosmith HW. He certainly scored 50, not 59.  
Ferryman should be HM as shown on CA with full names. He was only 17 and soon to be another WW1 death.  
Nepean's dismissal was as shown. The earlier error was not with him but with Howard, whose dismissal is also now correctly shown.  
I agree 40 runs off Wright and 63 off Boddy.

**Match 96**

It is HCB Cummins.  
I prefer 12 maidens for Wright, though CA shows otherwise.

I hope this is of some help.

Douglas

---

**From:** Lawton Smith [mailto:lawtonsmith@supanet.com]  
**Sent:** 20 August 2014 17:53  
**To:** 'Douglas Miller'  
**Subject:** 1909 etc

Douglas,

I hope that you are keeping well.

Following the successful publication of the 1908 book, we are now pressing on with 1909. I sent you the Bucks scorecards for that year in April 2013 and now need feedback on any potential changes, ideally in the next few weeks.

We have now booked the annual project team meeting at Trent Bridge for Saturday 27<sup>th</sup> September. I will send an agenda nearer the time but hope that you can make it.

Regards  
Julian

**Julian Lawton Smith**  
Home: 01865 768258  
Mobile: 07740 292173