
England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by hobbes - 26-03-2008 15:03

So England managed to pull off a 2-1 win in the away fixture. What sort of chance to the Kiwis have in the reverse fixture? Fleming's retirement will be a big blow but Ross Taylor looks like a major find. He was top scorer in the series wasn't he?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by E10 Rifle - 26-03-2008 18:05

Taylor, Vettori and, in places, Mills, McCullum, Oram and Martin looked useful for them in this series, but even an England team as uneven as this one should roll them over easily at home.

You get that sense that NZ are becoming a permanent second-tier nation at Test level now, though people do overlook their prowess at ODIs. They regularly make World Cup semi-finals, the sort of achievement that would have English pundits frothing.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 27-03-2008 00:20

McCullum's keeping has been shoddy apparently. Oram is good though. With him at 6 and McCullum at 7 and Vettori at 8 they have the chance to pick a genuine 5 man attack without sacrificing batting depth in the way that England (sans Flintoff) can't. In fact, even avec Flintoff nowadays we can't.

But they shouldn't be good enough.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Chubby Cyclist - 27-03-2008 07:42

If Southee's first test is anything to go by, they have the makings of an excellent lower order. If only Bond were regularly fit. The weak batting line-up probably means England are OK in the summer, though.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Etienne - 27-03-2008 15:46

Vettori's batting ranking is higher than (amongst others) Michael Vaughan. He's certainly a better batsman than Bell or Sinclair, and he's more consistent than either Oram or McCullum.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Raskolnikov - 27-03-2008 15:52

Bond retired over the ICL furore. Daniel Vettori, Brendon McCullum, Jacob Oram, Ross Taylor and Kyle Mills are also going to arrive late due to IPL commitments, which isn't likely to help much .

On the plus side for NZ, Strauss will presumably retain his place in the England team.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 28-03-2008 12:24

Hasn't Justin Vaughan (NZ CEO, no relation to Michael) hinted that Bond and Scotty Styris may be able to return? No quote, alas.

Here's England's stats for the six winter tests:

Matches, Innings, Not out, Runs, Average

Bell 6 12 1 511 46

Strauss 3 6 274 46

Prior 3 5 1 165 41

Cook 6 12 472 39

Collingwood 6 12 1 409 37

Pietersen 6 12 1 385 35

Ambrose 3 6 204 34

Vaughan 6 12 338 28

Broad 3 5 1 92 23

Anderson 3 5 3 32 16

Sidebottom 6 11 3 103 13

Bopara 3 5 42 8

Hoggard 3 5 29 6

Panesar 6 9 3 29 5

Harmison 3 4 1 10 3

Wickets, Runs, Average

Collingwood 8- 188- 24

Sidebottom 29- 728- 25

Broad 9- 345- 38

Panesar 19- 737- 39

Anderson 10-450-45

Hoggard 8-356-45

Harmison 7-336-48

Bopara 1-81-81

Pietersen 1-96-96

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Pan Tau - 28-03-2008 19:01

In other news, India have replied to South Africa's 540 with 468/1 at the end of play on Day 3. Sehwag is on 309 not out. Off 292 balls.

It's a flat wicket, but by all accounts neither side has bowled terribly well (d'oh).

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Etienne - 28-03-2008 22:07

Is Sehwag on course to break the longest-lived test record (highest proportion of teams runs in one innings)?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Pan Tau - 29-03-2008 09:41

He was out for 319 (off 304 balls), in a total of 627.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Etienne - 29-03-2008 09:56

He didn't then. Bannerman scored about 67% of Australia's runs in that innings, Sehwag just scraped over 50% of India's. Poor show!

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Etienne - 29-03-2008 10:06

Other near failures:

Gooch scores 154* out of 252 against Ambrose, Marshall, Patterson and Walsh. England win.

Lara scores 153* out of 311-9 against McGrath, Gillespie, Warne and McGill. Just under half (though Lara was operating under the disadvantage of not coming in till 5) and wouldn't have counted anyway as innings wasn't completed.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by hobbess - 07-05-2008 08:47

Well, first test next starts next week, with the Kiwis fresh off a decent win against Essex. The star of the show the fresh-faced 33 year old Michael Mason who gets 7-101.

Meanwhile Shane Bond is suggesting that the door isn't closed as far as he's concerned.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Wyatt Earp - 07-05-2008 19:40

Anyone up for a day or two of this? It's only the Kiwis, tickets have got to be gettable.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by hobbles - 08-05-2008 10:00

I would be, but the tickets for Lords are £60 a pop.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by hobbles - 08-05-2008 10:08

There are tickets available for the Oval one-dayer for £50, £62 or £72 depending on the stand.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 08-05-2008 16:15

England A, sorry "Lions" (where's the puking smiley?) batsmen muffing their lines, I see.

Looks like same again for the Test squad.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Etienne - 08-05-2008 17:39

Flintoff has taken 3-7 so far in Durham's second innings, after 4-21 in the first. Think the no.8 spot might be his, as he's barely scored a run yet this summer.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Guy Potger - 10-05-2008 12:05

Me! Me! Me!

I'm going!

Old Trafford
Trent Bridge
Headingley
Oval

Anyone fancy drinkies?

(Either people who are going or Manchestershire/Notts/Lids/Lannan-based people)

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Guy Potger - 10-05-2008 12:09

Oh.

And Mustard must have caught the selectors' eye this week, ahead of Chris "can't bat" Read...

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by E10 Rifle - 10-05-2008 15:13

The only one I've got tickets for at the mo is the Friday at Edgbaston but I'll probably be up for fourth or fifth-day fun and frolics at Lord's and The Oval

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by barndoorio - 15-05-2008 11:02

England win toss and to bowl, lost some time this morning. But with ever consistent Jimmy Anderson in the team, I'm sure we'll finish this off by the middle of day 3.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 15-05-2008 11:38

Some griping on both the Cricinfo and Grauniad obo coverage about the cost of tickets.

65 quid a day for New Zealand does strike me as more than a bit high, but then that is increasingly my reaction to the price of pretty much everything in London.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Rogin the Armchair Fan - 15-05-2008 11:40

If the first test had been at Old Trafford, there'd have been a full morning session - it's glorious up here.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 15-05-2008 11:47

If they were always going to send Hoggard back to Yorkshire, why the fuck couldn't they have done it before Wednesday?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 15-05-2008 12:19

In case someone broke this morning.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 15-05-2008 12:35

And I see NZ are already 2-1 off 2 overs.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Big Daves Gussett - 15-05-2008 13:00

When did England get an adidas strip and why did no-one inform me? It makes them look a bit like tennis players. The one-day shirt looks lush though.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 15-05-2008 15:11

Classic seamers' paradise pitch. Some odd tactics by NZ- Taylor seemed to think it was the IPL, McCullum promoted to number 5.

NZ were £20 or so in 2004, with a better team.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 15-05-2008 15:57

BBC have come up with the crappiest nickname in the history of crap nicknames for Broad, "Lee Speaking". Fuck me, it's like some hilarious Chinky music hall sketch. Cringeworthy

Anyway, everyone knows he's Draco Malfoy.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 16-05-2008 11:18

NZ battling well, but Oram gone. Ian Smith has a rather high opinion of Kyle Mills' batting. It's Tim Southsee I'm worried about after what he did on debut.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 16-05-2008 11:22

"Chinky"? Don't try that in San Francisco (or pretty much anywhere else in the US), Egg.

It sounds as if someone at the Beeb has been "Chris Bermanised".

Berman's act got stale about eight years ago (though he hasn't stopped).

Tubby, are you ready to rethink your view on McCullum?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 16-05-2008 11:45

His keeping isn't that good, so I expect a few byes in this game. But it gives him a bit of breathing space to bat with freedom. He's not as solid as Oram but they (and Vettori) work very well together and deserve to come in after a better top order.

He measured his aggression brilliantly yesterday, which Taylor failed to do.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 16-05-2008 11:53

His keeping isn't that good, so I expect a few byes in this game

He'll do well to top Ambrosia's 16 so far. To be fair, I saw 12 of these (three long stop boundaries), and at least eight of the runs should have been wides.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 16-05-2008 11:59

His keeping is poor, and the IPL experience isn't going to help that. I wouldn't be that surprised if gives up the gloves in a couple of years.

His IPL batting, however, seems to be capable of transferring succesfully to test cricket, which is a good sign for NZ.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Etienne - 16-05-2008 12:06

It's Tim Southsee I'm worried about after what he did on debut

Yes, England might just have to wait for his bubble to burst.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 16-05-2008 12:10

Ursus- don't forget NZ play fewer tests than the other countries. They can carry a non-specialist keeper in the 50 and 20 short games.

The weakness of their top batsmen makes it more difficult to squeeze in a rookie keeper at #7 or #8.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 16-05-2008 12:22

Etienne, LOL. I'm developing Keith Fletcher's approach to names.

Having woken up late today, it seems my praise of Oram's solidity was rubbish. Apparently he's now known to play short fast stuff as badly Glenn Turner, and England duly hit him 3 times.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by E10 Rifle - 19-05-2008 22:36

Is this the most inactive Test thread ever on OTF? No one's been bothered have they? Mind you, having sat in front of it for much of today I can see why. Some moderately rubbish fielding from England, some good stuff from McCullum,

Vaughan, Cook, Oram and Vettori but that was it.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 20-05-2008 06:22

I was waiting to see who Tubby was going to slag off next, as it appears to be a good indicator of which New Zealand batsman is going to excel in his next innings.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by teerex - 20-05-2008 06:41

Rain robs Kiwis.

Never mind that I turned in and tuned out once McCullum was injured, and fully expected to wake up to an England win this (NZ) morning.

300 chase, 4th innings, only one winner. Robbed, I tell you.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Purple Cow - 20-05-2008 08:30

I think you are wrong about McCullum's keeping, I think he's pretty good. Certainly the best wicket-keeper/batsman in the post-Gilchrist world.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 20-05-2008 09:02

The pundits yesterday were discussing this at length. McCullum is very athletic, which means he can overcome a tendency to favour his right side. Whereas Prior crouches awkwardly and too low, so shells them both on and off.

I was impressed by the debutant guy, Flynn. He blocked out for a three hour 30, while Oram smacked around the ground at the other end.

England looked pretty ordinary yesterday, to be honest.

PS Eoin Morgan shouldn't be twelfthing for England- he ought to be psyching up for this weekend's grudge double header at Edgbaston and Trent Bridge.

Bob Willis, King of Spain, Dennis Amiss, Purple Cow can you hear me. Yer boys took a blarney of a beating...

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 20-05-2008 09:39

"Chinky"? Don't try that in San Francisco (or pretty much anywhere else in the US), Egg.

I wouldn't try it anywhere but in the context of a "that was the racist way they spoke then, and it was fucking crap" comment. Jesus wept. I fucking resent the implication I'm racist.

Anyway, what a load of rubbish that Test was. With the weather situation, England were the only team who could win it,

but instead of trying to force the issue and smack up a total to try and bowl out New Zealand over four sessions they fiddled about and played conventionally, got tied up and Vaughan and a few lower order bravos aside, got out cheaply. And even if we had died by the sword in the first innings, there was no way New Zealand could have racked up a big enough lead to bowl us out again in the time available. Lions and lambs, hanging thereof, springs to mind.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 20-05-2008 10:02

Tongue very much in cheek, Egg.

Apologies for the unintended offence.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 20-05-2008 14:47

And here I was about to follow it up with my hilarious revue, What Ho, Darkie.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 21-05-2008 10:24

Ursus, Ross Taylor may have let the IPL go to his head. Don't rate him.

Watch this space.

Simon Jones seems to be bowling well at the moment.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 21-05-2008 12:29

I saw Jones take five in a 50 game at Worcester last week. He looked lively (grunting loudly like Monica Seles at every delivery), but it was Hants reserves and three of them were tailenders.

Then he grabbed five more agin yer Glaster boys in the championship- but this time they scored well over 400.

If he stays fit all summer and plays somewhere in the winter, who knows for an Ashes recall? More likely than SKW, anyway.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by teerex - 22-05-2008 08:29

I'm calling on OTF (or whatever you call yourselves nowadays) to boycott this thread in PROTEST. I thought we all had a week off while the New Zealanders knocked off a county 2nd XI, but I've just realised there is a Test match starting on Friday, which is wrong, wrong, wrong. Tradition!

I hope it pisses down.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 22-05-2008 08:34

Well, after a few days of nice weather, it's clouding up again nicely. Are your lot bringing the bloody rain with you?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 23-05-2008 10:40

Well, new Test up and running and what's this? Anderson getting carted to all corners off four overs, Sidebottom conceding three times less runs in one more over? Normal service resumed, then.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 23-05-2008 14:26

And now it's raining . . .

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 23-05-2008 15:18

God, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday it's been bright and sunny. Test match hoves into view and it's pissy drizzle and bad light. Fuck's sake!

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by E10 Rifle - 24-05-2008 11:03

Two completely avoidable and stupid run-outs in an over. Thanks NZ.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 24-05-2008 11:24

Vettori's sounds absolutely incredible. Not quite a captain's innings.

Mind, it also sounds as if England's fielding leaves something to be desired.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by E10 Rifle - 24-05-2008 11:29

Yeah, Anderson dropped a sky-er earlier. Or rather missed it.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 24-05-2008 11:39

Well done, Taylor.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Purple Cow - 24-05-2008 12:50

Brilliant umpiring from Taufell on the Vettori run-out.

I'm watching this while sitting on the balcony/bar of a Tyrolean ski lodge, much to the bemusement of the waitresses.

Delicious cream-cakes, but probably a 1000 calories a time, I reckon.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 24-05-2008 17:59

Tyrolean knockabout.

Rain forecast for much of Monday and Tuesday, so it looks like a draw. England bowled badly earlier, then batted sluggishly. Vettori looks in control of this one- he even teased Pitersen near the end by bringing on a part time spinner, Redmond.

The Telegraph thinks Prior should return as batsman only.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Chubby Cyclist - 24-05-2008 19:53

I've mentioned it before, and I'll say it again. Nightwatchmen are stupid. The idea is ludicrous and rarely works. You need a tail to bat along with the last batsman. Now Ambrose or Collingwood will only have Monty and Broad and Anderson whilst they try and pick up the innings. Meanwhile, even if it had worked, you'd have had a rubbish batsman scratching around for 30 minutes tomorrow morning scoring little and disrupting the batting, and at the same time giving an early breakthrough and confidence to the opposition.

Stop doing it!

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 24-05-2008 20:39

Agree about nightwatchmen, although slightly harsh on Sidars and Broad. Both of them are as competent batsmen as Mills, who scored 50 for New Zealand.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by erwin - 24-05-2008 22:28

.

As far as I can make out, the nightwatchman, who would be out for nought later on anyway, will keep a top order batsman away from the pressure of being out the evening before, and then when the nw is inevitably out the next day, the opposition could get a false sense of security at the minor triumph.

(but then what do I know about crckt?)

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by King On The Rye - 25-05-2008 10:53

Come back Duncan Fletcher, all is forgiven.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 25-05-2008 15:00

More apologies, this time to Kyle Mills. He averages a very useful 29 batting in F/C.

At Old Trafford, nine man New Zealand are being bamboozled by Monty- five wickets, his hundred in tests and it's 99-6 (effectively for nine, as Oram's in but can't move with a back injury, Flynn won't reappear and the last two average an aggregate seven between them). But with the Kiwis' 180 first innings lead, they should still win.

England have batted badly, been careless in the field and tolerated a lot of picnic bowling. At least two or three of these guys shouldn't play in the South Africa series- I'd say Colly, Anderson and Strauss in order for the chop.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 25-05-2008 17:55

If a top order batsman can't see out a few overs of pressure at the end of the day, he doesn't deserve to be batting for his country.

Now, our top order seriously need to get some runs, they've been shit for ages, each of them managing to weigh in with odd century or a couple of 60s to cover up the expanses of low scoring rubbish and prolong their place in the team.

As of this morning, none of them have averaged 40 this year.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 25-05-2008 19:36

No doubt it will come to naught, but West Indies need 286 in their second innings to beat Australia, after bowling them out for 167.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 25-05-2008 19:55

Some tasty action at Kingston (not upon Hull, their bus parade's tomorrow). As Ursus says, Australia should win. The target is similar to England's in Manchester, but Oz have a bowling edge over the Kiwis.

Highlights included Symonds smacking another 80, well supported by Hodge and Haddin. Lee- who knocked over Chanderpaul in the first innings- took some clobber himself in two hostile overs from Edwards before nicking one behind.

The gurn on Punter and Hussey's gobs when they got out was well worth watching. They were 17-4 last night.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Chubby Cyclist - 25-05-2008 20:38

Highlight for me was that spectacular 4-way collision and catch to get rid of Symonds. Are the Windies becoming a semi-serious team again? Very good in the field, and some decent bowling. The batting's still pretty suspect, mind.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 25-05-2008 21:12

Usually 4th innings targets are hard to get because of the threat of the spinner. But MacGill has looked out of sorts, so West Indies have more chance than normal. Johnson is wild too. So it's up to Lee and Clark. Please don't let Symonds rip through them.

DG, what's Strauss done wrong for England in this game?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 25-05-2008 21:14

England did however beat NZ in the 1979 World Cup semi-final on ESPN Classic, helped by John Wright running himself out, and a few tight overs of inswing from around the wicket by the cap-clad Geoff Boycott.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 25-05-2008 21:39

Tubby Isaacs wrote:

DG, what's Strauss done wrong for England in this game?

He's batted fairly well in this game, if a bit too slowly. Although Vaughan was even more sluggish in the first dig.

I suggest dropping him not on the strength of one game, but because he shouldn't have returned in NZ and still looks well below the standard he managed in 2004 and 2005.

As I've said before here, the way English pundits, fans and even players keep concentrating on the Ashes series is daft, when there are five or six other teams to play in between. But you do need to plan ahead a bit. The way England are scratching at the moment, they have little chance of beating South Africa later in the summer. Collingwood would struggle to hit me off the square at the moment, Anderson routinely goes for a run a ball on each of his many comebacks, Vaughan drifts in the field. As Agnew moaned on the BBC today, for the batters especially it seems to be impossible to fall out of this England side. All of the top six are too comfortable. I'm not suggesting a bad run over one or two games should see anyone dropped, but over three series they all need to perform. Hence the suggested order for the axe- Colly, Jimmy, Strauss.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 25-05-2008 22:52

Maybe he was lucky to come back, but he has done OK and of the batters, he's the one who doesn't look too comfortable to me. I thought his 60 yesterday was a solid enough innings which should have set up 300 at the very least. But Sky seemed to think he was at fault for not charging down the track and hitting the best finger spinner in the world down Warwick Road. There's too much made of the need to score quickly- Messrs Atherton and Hussain might

understand that.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 26-05-2008 05:20

Windies take an offer of bad light and end Sunday at 46 for 1; 247 left to get.

Australia's 17 for 4 start in this innings was their worst in 72 years.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by barndoorio - 26-05-2008 07:28

The final innings of the match started with 30ish overs of day 3 remaining, so criticising Strauss for scoring his 60, the highest in the England innings, too slowly seems completely false to me.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 26-05-2008 09:53

I think there's a big difference between slowly building a big score through judicious shots and well taken singles and simply sitting in your crease waiting to be caught behind or given out LBW.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Purple Cow - 26-05-2008 10:27

"As of this morning, none of them have averaged 40 this year."

Strauss has averaged 53 in test cricket this year. He's also scored 120 more runs than any other England batsman.

**

"I suggest dropping him not on the strength of one game, but because he shouldn't have returned in NZ and still looks well below the standard he managed in 2004 and 2005."

See previous answer.

Agree about Colly, he needs to make runs today if he's to justify his inclusion. But even if he wins the match today, I think he can't afford to wait till the end of the season for that shoulder op.

**

Another interesting stat: Ian Bell has never scored the first century of an England innings.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Rogin the Armchair Fan - 26-05-2008 10:31

England get to 100-1. I always think, mentally, they should now forget about chasing 294, and think to themselves "we're chasing 194, with nine wickets left".

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 26-05-2008 10:42

Now 113-1. Some shambolic fielding from New Zealand; if England win it they may have overthrows to thank.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 26-05-2008 10:47

And Strauss gets his half-century.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by barndoorio - 26-05-2008 11:11

Drop him!

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Purple Cow - 26-05-2008 11:33

150 - 1.

Still time for england to fuck up, but so far it's been too easy for them. Kiwis just standing round waiting for something to happen.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Purple Cow - 26-05-2008 11:36

Christ, when am I going to learn to keep my mouth shut?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 26-05-2008 11:36

You beat me to it...

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by thom - 26-05-2008 13:38

England are going to win, and Collingwood isn't going to get a bat, or at least not a substantial innings. He'll be dropped for the next test I reckon, and perhaps encouraged to have that shoulder op sooner rather than later.

Squad for the next test:

Strauss
Cook

Vaughan
Pietersen
Bell
Prior/Key/Shah*
Ambrose**
Flintoff/Tremlett/Anderson***
Broad
Sidebottom
Panesar

* Could be any of these; I have a hunch it'll be Prior, who's in the runs for Sussex.

** Will be given another chance, but needs some runs soon.

*** England's attack lacks a big man sending them down at pace. Harmison's not doing enough for Durham (and is gone for good, I reckon). Flintoff to play if he's fit; otherwise Tremlett. Anderson's too wasteful, and not different enough to Sidebottom, but may get one more chance.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 26-05-2008 13:51

Hmmmmm.

This has gotten quite interesting.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by thom - 26-05-2008 13:53

Collingwood's in now, but this is a poisoned chalice: if he fails, he gets dropped, but if he doesn't he won't have scored enough runs to justify retention for the next test.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 26-05-2008 13:58

"As of this morning, none of them have averaged 40 this year."

Strauss has averaged 53 in test cricket this year. He's also scored 120 more runs than any other England batsman.

Sky were lying then, because that's what one of their stats said.

/buck passing mode/

No doubt a gritty 20* by Collingwood will show he's got his touch back...

Edit: Is anyone else listening to the commentary on TMS? It sounds like it's coming from a yurt on the Mongolian steppes the way the wind's howling through the mikes.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by thom - 26-05-2008 14:08

Actually, you can add Bopara to my list of possibilities for the no. 6 spot: he's getting stacks of runs for Essex, and can act as the fifth bowler. On the other hand, he had a torrid time in internationals over the winter.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 26-05-2008 14:33

Fair points by the Strauss fan club. My anti-jinx on England works again, bah.

That'll teach me to rely on Agnew for authoritative comment. Strauss clearly owes him money or something. Not that I make out much of the commentary with that gale blowing.

Talking of the Mongolian steppes, some inspired bowling from international Division 5 in the Jersey tournament.

Apparently tournament favorites Afghanistan were disappointed to find a small island between France and England. They were expecting Hoboken and Atlantic City.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 26-05-2008 15:13

Collingwood was out, wasn't he?

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Duncan Gardner - 26-05-2008 15:18

Hawkeye had the ball hitting close to the top, but aye he was lucky. Bell was luckier- he scooped an easy return catch to O'Brien who dropped it.

Boycott says: "Strauss is playing like a left-handed me".

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 26-05-2008 15:21

In other news, your predictions work better on the other side of the Pond.

Windies now 62 for 3; Clark with both wickets this morning (and Windies' 1, 2 and 3 in each innings).

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 26-05-2008 16:07

Windies shouldn't have gotten them mad.

86 for 6, with Chanderpaul the last to go.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Étienne - 26-05-2008 18:44

172-7, not all over yet.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Etienne - 26-05-2008 19:00

Jinxed. Sammy out.

I can see Powell and Edwards thrashing a few boundaries, but I can't see 100 runs for the last 2 wickets.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 26-05-2008 20:52

To some extent, I think Anderson suffers from over attacking fields. Sure you don't want to be setting defensive fields for your opening bowler, but I might consider sticking an offside sweeper back after about 10 overs or so, and certainly when you bring him back for later spells. He will usually bowl wicket taking balls, they just cost too much. So maybe try and make them cost more? He can't have bowled as many bad balls as MacGill for Australia but he had a man or two back (defensively, they weren't going to take any catches) and went for far fewer.

How many runs went through third man for NZ today?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 27-05-2008 09:11

I was right about Collingwood.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 02-06-2008 21:37

Australia 371 up with four wickets left going into the final day, but the umpires had a shocker today.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 02-06-2008 21:54

I made it 4 wrongly given out and 1 wrongly given not out.

Was it just me or did Chanderpaul not try too hard to get down Brett Lee's end?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 02-06-2008 22:02

I only caught the last 90 minutes or so of the Aussies' 2nd innings. I guess that Symonds will never walk, will he?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Before you accuse me - 03-06-2008 08:14

Only if his car breaks down in the Outback.

England to win at Nottingham unless the rain ruins it. The Kiwi top order still looks too fragile.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 03-06-2008 19:57

This will no doubt jinx them, but Windies need 166 off the last 24 overs to win, with 7 wickets remaining.

Chanderpaul and Sarwan have been in for most of the day.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 03-06-2008 22:10

Ponting offers a draw a few overs before the minimum are bowled and the Windies take it, having scored around a hundred and lost two wickets in the interim.

The first drawn test between these two since the mid 90s, and some genuine signs of life from Windies.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 04-06-2008 10:57

Indeed.

In the meantime, NZ to wear "hi-tech trousers":
<http://content-uk.cricinfo.com/engvnz/content/current/story/353558.html>

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by E10 Rifle - 04-06-2008 11:22

I was surprised Ponting shook on a draw with five overs still remaining. A couple of quick wickets and I'd have fancied their chances.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 04-06-2008 11:24

Hmmmm.

I wonder if they incorporate advanced "anti-2d innings collapse" technology.

The thing about the abrasion pads is weird. The Laws may not prescribe the material for clothing, but surely they prohibit ball tampering (as we discussed at length on the old board). So while one would be allowed to wear flannels with Brillo pad inserts, one would be banned as soon as ball touched pad (so to speak).

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 04-06-2008 11:29

Didn't look much chance of that. Not even if he brought Michael Clarke on.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 04-06-2008 11:42

Part of the problem certainly was the wicket, but the Aussies' bowling seemed very one-dimensional.

And MacGill didn't look like he would get anyone out if he bowled for a week.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 04-06-2008 19:05

A very sad end to a very good career, even if he is Dante to Warne's Vergil.

Apart from Lee's spell (excellent, 3 close decisions notwithstanding) they did look ordinary overall. Is Shane Watson likely to play again? He's not far off other possible third seamers, and with either he or Haddin at 8, that would be quite something.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 04-06-2008 23:03

Swing to be king tmrw, according to cricinfo. Trent Bridge seems to have a "microclimate" which has seen an average first innings total of 197 this season, and no score higher than 279. Had Panesar not got all those wickets at Old Trafford, he might not have played here.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 05-06-2008 12:15

England really are toss, aren't they? 84-2 at lunch. Cook and Vaughan out cheaply. I would suggest the former needs to work on his technique in the county game and the latter is waning severely as a Test player.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 05-06-2008 12:45

Oops.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 05-06-2008 12:57

Oh dear. This really isn't going well at all, is it.

Where is Dunc to heap opprobium on poor Mr. Collingwood?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 05-06-2008 13:01

Fuck "consistency". Fuck "We know he's playing badly, but he's got character" (Geoff Miller you prick). FUCKING PICK PLAYERS WHO ARE IN FORM AND HAVE ACTUALLY SCORED MORE THAN 50 RUNS IN THE WHOLE FUCKING SEASON!

Jesus. Normally we're having a go at KP for doing something loony, but this is a collapse of mid 90s proportions. KP to take on the Thorpe/Atherton role and eke out a 60 with the tail getting us to about 170 all out.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by E10 Rifle - 05-06-2008 14:51

I've got a lot of time for Collingwood but the shot he was out to - bat well away from body, pushed out limply, with no footwork - was the sort of thing my grandad used to lecture me about when I was 10. Shah and Bopara must really be stewing now.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 05-06-2008 15:05

KP appearing to be somewhere near his former best.

/mockers gods/

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 05-06-2008 18:52

I think that's a decent score from England. Chris Martin had a poor day (after bowling a couple of snakes at the start), as did Vettori.

O'Brien did well. They look to have replaced Ewen Chatfield at last.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by hobbess - 05-06-2008 20:49

Seriously though, what the fuck has happened to Collingwood?

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by hobbess - 06-06-2008 13:01

Nice rearguard action from the usually feeble England tail. Vettori must be spitting woodchips. A top test score for Anderson, Broady past his half-ton. Either the wicket isn't nearly alive as it appeared or they've got themselves a bit of backbone.

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 06-06-2008 13:04

And, as if by magic...

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 06-06-2008 13:09

Draco has scored more runs this innings than nos 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 have managed collectively. Still, consistency is the watchword. They have the character to get through this.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 06-06-2008 13:11

When did England last get 400 in a first innings?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by E10 Rifle - 06-06-2008 13:23

Fucking hell, liquid bowling from Anderson.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 06-06-2008 13:26

Is that Jimmy "The All-Rounder" Anderson?

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by E10 Rifle - 06-06-2008 13:40

Blimey, identical ball does McCullum. This is really good stuff.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Purple Cow - 06-06-2008 15:39

A 'michelle' for Anderson.

It's odd isn't it? A bowler who can look out of his depth at test level one week can look like a world-beater the next.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by ursus arctos - 06-06-2008 16:09

And another one.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by hobbles - 06-06-2008 16:46

He must have an arm like a traction engine!

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Gangster Octopus - 07-06-2008 14:24

And New Zealand follow on. Looks like Broad's decided to take up the bowling challenge...

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by hobbles - 09-06-2008 13:02

That was all rather easy wasn't it? Especially considering England were 86/5 in the first innings. Not sure whether it's a good England display or a woeful Black Caps display.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by smallweed - 11-06-2008 14:15

Credit to England for a good display, but it shouldn't be allowed to disguise the first innings top order failures, in particular, and nor should any of the bowlers take their places for granted with Harmison, Hoggard and (most excitingly) Simon Jones starting to bowl well for their counties. And Flintoff maybe ready to come back in, presumably for Collingwood.

I had hoped Adil Rashid would be having a better season for Yorkshire to give Panesar some competition for his place, but maybe he's a bit young yet.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Bring me Edelweiss - 12-06-2008 06:07

Isn't Rashid seen (by Yorkshire, if not England) as a batsman who bowls?

Simon Jones didn't bowl in the 50 friendly with New Zealand yesterday alas.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Bogzilla - 12-06-2008 10:55

The ECB have made a rod for their own backs here, really.

A few years ago, we all complained (legitimately, I think) that the selectors never showed any loyalty to players in a form slump and that too many players were capped and then discarded out of hand. The Fletcher era (and central contracts) have changed that. We've now swung too far the other way and players now seem cemented in place.

It's clearly ridiculous that Bell and Collingwood haven't been dropped. Being dropped from the side shouldn't be seen as a termination of the player's international career, just an opportunity to play themselves back into form on the county circuit and prove themselves worthy of a place in the lineup again. The fact that the selectors have shown so much loyalty to a select few players means that any attempt to drop them now sends a far more grave message than it should.

Regarding Rashid, my understanding is that, yes, Yorkshire see him primarily as a batsmen, but it's to their credit that they're giving him a decent amount of bowling and looking to develop that part of his game too.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 12-06-2008 17:44

"It's clearly ridiculous that Bell and Collingwood haven't been dropped"

From the one day squad? Collingwood is captain, bowls and fields very well. As for the test squad, as pointed out already, they played well enough in NZ. I think even under Lord Ted/Illy two bad games wouldn't have got them out of the team. Perhaps Cook might have gone though, given his run is longer.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by hobbes - 13-06-2008 08:42

P has a ticket for the 20/20 tonight. But she's not going becuase she's a bit tired.
ARRGHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHHH!
(and no, I can't have the ticket, it's a corpy.)

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Tubby Isaacs - 13-06-2008 11:27

I saw some 20-20 on TV last night. Much as it's nice to Hick still whacking it all over, it was crap and I forgot that I was supposed to care about Gloucs.

The West Indies-Australia test was good though. Decent looking Barbados crowd too.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Eggchaser - 13-06-2008 14:06

I wonder what Moeen Ali, who would appear to have more than a passing devotion to Islam if his beard is anything to go by, made of the muscial sting of "Rock The Kasbah" being played whilst he was batting.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by The Purple Cow - 14-06-2008 18:53

"Isn't Rashid seen (by Yorkshire, if not England) as a batsman who bowls?"

That's certainly how he sees himself.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by barndoorio - 14-06-2008 19:05

Strauss recalled to the ODI side now as well.

Watching Somersets 20/20 today yet again highlighted how sad Trescothicks issues are. He is exactly what the team needs, fast scoring and experienced and a great pair of hands in the slips as well.

=====

Re:England vs New Zealand Test Thread

Posted by Bogzilla - 16-06-2008 10:05

From the one day squad?

Nope, from the Test squad. I thought that's what we were discussing? Either way, both Collingwood and Bell look like they may be playing themselves into some form in the one-day series.

=====