

when not. Who also had his prime cut short because of War and possibly his legacy because of ongoing war-pains.

BAGAPATH INDIA (JUN 2006) 21-03-2009, 10.17 PM

I think faulkner should be the greatest all-rounder of all time.

IKKI AUSTRALIA (SEP 2005) 21-03-2009, 10.32 PM

I don't know too much about Faulkner to be honest. I generally am sceptical of judging players that played just at the turn of the 20th century. He seems to have a pretty black and white record. Awful bowling against Australia and great against England. Awful batting against England and great against Australia.

BAGAPATH INDIA (JUN 2006) 21-03-2009, 10.42 PM

maybe. but to average 40 with the bat and 26 with the ball bowling leg spin is no mean achievement. also he had taken 4 five-fers and scored 4 centuries in 25 tests. would have scored a lot more in 55, 88, 93 or 102 matches. you know what I mean?

IKKI AUSTRALIA (SEP 2005) 21-03-2009, 10.47 PM

Uncovered pitches? Spinners in those days, on those pitches, like Trumble, Blythe and Rhodes were cleaning up teams for embarrassingly low figures.

BAGAPATH INDIA (JUN 2006) 21-03-2009, 10.50 PM

well... u r somewhat right... rhodes was not as a great a bowler as the rest on that list... but am gonna hold on with the arguments till the thread starts....

SJS MUMBAI, INDIA (MAY 2004) 21-03-2009, 10.53 PM

Originally Posted by **Uppercut - Pg 79**

Am happy with that, and since I consider bowling all rounders to be the most useful I'll have to go with Miller.
Imran's got a massive shout too though.

I agree about Imran but I have one issue. His best bowling years and his best batting years hardly overlapped. By the time his batting really flowered he was bowling from experience and memory and really relied on the younger legs of Wasim and Waqar (even Bakht) to prop up the bowling.



WASIM AKRAM