

FOOTBALL.

The Season of 1898.



CAPTAIN DIBBLE, HARVARD.

THAT the football season of 1898 was an off year there can be no doubt. Those who saw all three of the big games agree that the standard of play was not as high as last season. Only one of the college elevens showed true championship form; and while there was a marked improvement at Harvard, Yale's team was the poorest turned out at New Haven for several years, and Pennsylvania's eleven was distinctly poorer than her elevens of last year and the year before, despite the fact that most of her old layers were still in harness. Princeton and Cornell cannot be said to have progressed or retrograded, while Brown, the Indians, West Point and other strong elevens of the second class were neither noticeably better or poorer than last season.

It has been many years since such poor kicking and so much fumbling as was seen in the Princeton-Yale game has been shown in a first-class match, while there was also a great deal too much fumbling in each of the other big games. The total absence of good kicking full-backs was emphasized by Harvard and Yale each using a tackle for punting, and Pennsylvania using a guard. What was almost as bad, not one of the five big teams had a good drop-kicker. Chamberlain tried several times for

goals from the field, but not once did he come within hailing distance of the posts.

One redeeming feature this season, one distinctly bright spot, was the Harvard team and its signal success. It is now many seasons since there has been any decisive football championship, but this fall the palm may safely be awarded to Harvard. While Princeton remained unbeaten at the end of the year, few good judges believed that her team was equal to that of Harvard, and her draw with West Point was a bad spot in her record. Nothing will kill competition sooner than a monopoly of victories, and Yale has monopolized the lion's share long enough. Harvard's success in football this fall, like Cornell's success in rowing, should instill a healthier and deeper interest in college sports.

With Yale hopelessly weak at both ends of her line, and her hacks unable to catch a punt; with Princeton utterly lacking behind the line; with Pennsylvania confined to one play, which was burst like a bubble in the Harvard game, and Cornell a bit shy at ends and tackles, Harvard's evenness of development was a distinct relief. It is difficult to find a weak spot in the crimson line. Before the Pennsylvania game one would have picked out the right side of the center, but when the much-heralded guards-back attack failed to pierce even this point, it was evident that the whole line was defensively very strong. Back of the line there was less fumbling than on any of the other big teams, and the interference for the first time in many years got under way fast enough and was compact enough to require a good deal of stopping.

As compared with the Princeton eleven, we find the Cambridge team about equal in defensive strength, although there is a possible weak spot at left tackle with the Tigers. When the backs are considered, however, Princeton's claims to championship form at once fade from view. Behind the line she was outclassed by Harvard, while her slowness in getting her running plays under way weakened her attack. There were many people who believed Yale's defence to be strong because she stopped the Tigers' advance, and they were surprised when the blue line crumbled under Harvard's attack. But these critics had miscounted Princeton's weakness for Yale's strength.

The Princeton-Yale game was a struggle in which a good line with fair backs was opposed to a fair line with good backs. As was shown, it was practically impossible for either to score, and the issue reverted to punting and the handling of punts, with luck playing a large part in the result. Princeton's success was due chiefly to her superiority in ends and the wretched fumbling of the Yale backs.

The moral of all this is that in modern football, as I said last month, the defence is rapidly becoming stronger than the attack, and kicking becomes more and more prominent each season. If one will glance back at the detailed reports of the big games this year he will be surprised to see the number of times in which one team has got the ball inside the op-

ponents' 10-yard line without scoring. Again and again we saw the ball worked down the field from the center to within ten or fifteen yards of the opposite goal, but the backs were then too exhausted by their line-plunging to carry it over. With the defence becoming stronger the nearer the attack approaches the goal, it is not surprising that the attacking backs are not equal to the effort of forcing the ball over for the promised touch-down.

Would it not have been very different had there been a good drop-kicker back of that attacking line when the third down was reached, with waning chances for further progress? With reasonably strong defence for his kick, would not a goal from the field have been easy? I venture to predict that had Hudson been laying quarter-back for Yale she would have beaten Princeton; had he been with Pennsylvania she would have beaten Harvard, and with Cornell she would have beaten either Princeton or Pennsylvania. Each had plenty of chances when Hudson could certainly have kicked goals from the field, and in any close game when five points would probably turn the result, and ten points would surely do so, a clever drop-kicker like the little Indian expert would mean victory to any one of the big teams.

The lesson is plain. To be sure, one may say that drop-kickers like Hudson are born and not made at a rigorous course of training for this specialty, with the promise of a chance to make use of it, will soon develop men nearly as good. With all the material in the big colleges to choose from, there is sure to appear some good kicker, if only the candidates are made to understand that this ability will be considered a strong recommendation. It is a mistake to think that teams should always try for a touch-down when they get inside of the fifteen-yard line. Then is the time that the field goal is easiest and if the quarter only has the judgment to make the preceding play a run that will bring the ball straight in front of the posts, it ought to be easily made with modern defence for kickers. Baird, of Princeton, used to kick many goals from the field, but he insisted on making his trial from twenty or thirty and sometimes forty yards out, when it was very difficult, rather than using the better opportunities for drop-kicks instead of touch-downs.

There were several other important conclusions forced on the student of football by this season's games. Firstly, there is a limit to the value of weight in the center of the line, as was shown by the exhaustion of the Princeton trio of big men near the end of their game against Yale. A 200-pound man is better there than one weighing 220 or 230, while a similar conclusion seems inevitable in regard to the ends. Their work under present conditions requires so much running up and down the field under punts that big men do not stand the strain as well as smaller men. All four of the best ends of the year, the Princeton and Harvard pairs, were comparatively small men, and the coaches will probably realize more thoroughly next year the superiority of 150 pounds over 180 for this position.

After Harvard and Princeton have been conceded first and second places respectively for the season's work, the question of third is easily

accorded to Pennsylvania—in fact the Quakers and the Tigers would seem to have been very evenly matched this season. Yale and Cornell were both poorer than this leading trio, but it would be impossible even to estimate their relative strength for the year. Both were beaten by Princeton with the same score, and their scores against the Indians, whose reliable form always serves as a good guide for comparisons, were very nearly equal.

A second group of teams to follow the five leaders should undoubtedly include the University of Chicago, West Point, the Indians, Brown and Wesleyan, all of whom seem approximated, even on paper, although not one of the five played any of the others. Below them should come Dartmouth, Amherst, Williams, Lehigh. In classing these teams, however, no attempt has been made to estimate the skill of the Western college teams which did not play in the East, nor the athletic club elevens, some of which showed excellent form.

AN "ALL-AMERICAN" TEAM.

It is unusually difficult this season to select a list of the star players of the year for an "All-American" team, because there are many good players in certain positions and a corresponding dearth of them in others. In all of the Eastern colleges, for instance, there is not a single first-class full-back, while good quarter-backs are almost as scarce. The supply of tackles is far above the normal; but practically only one of the center rushes of the big teams showed championship form.

It is also difficult to weigh the merits of the stars of the second-rate teams, for they should be considered under the same conditions as their rivals who are fortunate enough to play with the bigger elevens. We can only estimate, for instance, how good some of the backs at Wesleyan and West Point would be if put behind Harvard's line. Undoubtedly, the regular Crimson players appear to distinct advantage in being part of so fine a team. But as the "All-American" eleven must be selected entirely on the individual skill of the men, it is necessary to consider some of the star players from the smaller teams, who suffered by comparison on account of the weakness by which they were surrounded.

On this basis, the following teams have been selected after a careful consideration of all the players who have been seen prominently in the college football arena this season:

<i>All-American.</i>	<i>Position.</i>	<i>Second Team.</i>
Poe (Princeton)	right end	Hallowell (Harvard)
Hillebrand (Princeton)	right tackle	Haughton (Harvard)
Boal (Harvard)	right guard	McCracken (U. of Pa.)
Overfield (Univ' of Pa.)	center	Jaffray (Harvard)
Hare (Univ' of P.)	left guard	Edwards (Princeton)
Chamberlain (Yale)	left tackle	Donald (Harvard)
Cochran (Harvard)	left end	Palmer (Princeton)
Hudson (Indians)	quarter-back	Daly (Harvard)
Outland (U. of P.)	right half-back	Whiting (Cornell)
Dibblee (Harvard)	left half-back	Durston (Yale)
Hershberger (U. of Ch'go)	full-back	Reid (Harvard)

Hedges (University of Pennsylvania) should rank nearly even with Hallowell for substitute right end; Pierce (Indians) and Sweetland (Cornell) with Haughton, for substitute right tackle; Brown (Yale) and Reed (Cornell) with Edwards, for substitute left guard; Warren (Harvard) with Whiting, for substitute right half-back; Raymond (Wesleyan) with Durston, for substitute left half-back, and Romeyn (West Point) with Reid, for substitute full-back.

The first thing that will be noticed in this All-American team is that for the guard's position two left guards have been selected and no right, and two right tackles and no left. This was not an oversight, by any means, but rather an acknowledgment of the superiority of Boal and Hare over any of the right guards, and of Hillebrand and Chamberlain to any of the left tackles. The duties of one tackle or one guard are identical with those of his partner on the opposite side of the line, and it is only a matter of a little practice to accustom one of these star players to his shift of position. In both cases I have given the stronger player the preference in his regular position.

The absence of an first-class punting full-back among the big Eastern colleges has given, without question, the choice to Hershberger, from the University of Chicago, for this position. Punting is such a vital point in modern football that it is absolutely essential to have a strong punter behind the line in an ideal team. Hudson's selection for quarter-back may seem radical at first, but this phenomenal goal kicker would undoubtedly add many more points to the score of a selected All-American team than any other quarter who could be put in his place. Daly showed up stronger than Hudson in some points of his position, but Hudson has never been tried behind such a line as that of Harvard's. Give him such protection and such backs behind him, and his goal kicking ability would make him the best scoring player of the year. In the selected combination we have the best punter on the field this year, the cleverest drop-kicker, and in Hare and Outland two strong place-kickers. With kicking so important a feature of the game, these men should prove a tower of strength if combined in any one team.

Team play is the vital point in the success of any eleven, but given three weeks' proper coaching in the Yale system of running attacks on tackles and ends, Pennsylvania's center attacks and Cornell's trick plays, with the Princeton defence for end plays and the Harvard defence against center plays and protection for kicks, this combination of football talent would be invincible. Allowing the second team selected here the same coaching, I should estimate the All-American eleven to be about 10 to 0 better than either the second team or the Harvard champion eleven, and 15 to 0 better than Princeton.

IMPORTANT GAMES OF THE MONTH.

HARVARD, 17; YALE, 0.

For the first time in eight years, on November 19th. Harvard beat Yale, and, what was still more to the glory of the Crimson, won by a decisive score and on the home field of the enemy. Princeton's victory over Yale the week before was by so small a margin that the Harvard supporters were by no means confident when they journeyed to New Haven for the final game of their season. Harvard's eleven, however, completely outplayed Yale at every point, and good judges agreed that her team was certainly the best of the year, as well as being the best she has turned out for many, many years. The score was 17 to 0, but it

might have been even larger without giving a wrong impression of the difference between the two teams.

Never once during the game was the Harvard goal threatened, and only once, half a minute before the end of the game, was there any possibility of Yale's scoring. Then Chamberlain, in sheer desperation, tried for a goal from the field, but his attempt was low and wide, and the game was over before any other play could be made. Yale's fatal weakness, as in the Princeton game, was the hopeless fumbling of the backs, and Ely, who was used at quarter in place of the crippled De Saullés, muffed so often that Harvard regained the ball after punting quite as often as had Princeton. The reason Harvard's score was larger than Princeton's was that her running attack was so strong that Yale's line crumbled under the constant hammering of Dibblee, Warren and Reid, and she scored three times, and ought to have scored at least once more.

At every position in the line, with the possible exceptions of Brown and Chamberlain, Yale was distinctly outplayed. Chamberlain played his usual star game, and the duel between him and Donald was about even, while Brown nearly held his own with Burden. In all of the other five line positions, however, Harvard had the advantage in both attack and defence, while behind the line the visitors completely outclassed Yale. Dibblee is the star half of the year, while Daly is certainly the best quarter on any of the "big four" teams. Reid and Warren did better work, gained more round, fumbled less, and tackled better than did either Durston or Dudley, and Haughton's punting was on an average fifteen yards better than Chamberlain's or McBride's. Yale's system of interference and the quick starting of her backs was her only chance to advance the ball, but Harvard's line was so strong in defence that the plays crumbled when the interferers struck the Crimson forwards.

A hard rainstorm lasted throughout the game, and deluged both players and spectators. The field was a sea of mud, and the ball, in consequence, so slippery that much of the fumbling was undoubtedly attributable to that cause. Under the circumstances, the lack of fumbling among Harvard's backs was really remarkable. The victors showed excellent physical condition and seemed strong at the end of the game. As in the Pennsylvania game, their snap and aggressiveness did not wane toward the end of the game, as has been the case with so many other Harvard teams.

The teams lined up as follows:

<i>Harvard.</i>	<i>Position.</i>	<i>Yale.</i>
Hallowell	right—end—left	Hubbell
Haughton	right—tackle—left	Stillman
Burden	right—guard—left	Brown
Jaffray	center	Cutten
Boal	left—guard—right	Marshall
Donald	left—tackle—right	Chamberlain
Cochran	left—end—right	Eddy
Daly	quarter—back	Ely
Warren	right—half-back—left	Durston
Dibblee	left—half-back—right	Dudley
Reid	full-back	Townsend

Harvard substituted Burnett for Jaffray at center, Eaton for Donald at left tackle, and Farley for Cochran at left end. Yale substituted Schwepps for Eddy for at right end. Eddy for Dudley at right half-back, and McBride for Townsend at full-back.

HARVARD FRESHMAN, 6; YALE FRESHMEN, 0.

The same tendency to fumble the ball which cost Yale the victory of Princeton, and had so much to do with Harvard's success, also extended to her freshmen team, and they were beaten by the Harvard freshmen, 6 too, as a direct result of fumbling a punt. The game was played at New Haven on the morning of the big 'varsity game, and not only was the field in a soggy, slippery condition, but rain fell throughout the game, making good play almost impossible. The players found it difficult to run under the unfavorable conditions, even when they could hold the ball long enough to get started. Harvard's interference was quicker formed and her running lays more systematic. Yale was on the defensive most of the time.

AMHERST, 16; WILLIAMS, 5.

Amherst beat Williams by 16 to 5 at Williamstown, Mass., November 19th, in a game that was marked by a woful amount of fumbling. The same rainy weather and slippery ball that handicapped the Harvard and Yale layers made it almost impossible for the New England collegians to hold the ball. Amherst used Pennsylvania's guards-back formations for her running plays, and they proved very effective against the Williams line. The center men of the home team seemed utterly unable to stop these attacks.

CARLISLE INDIANS, 11; ILLINOIS, 0.

The Carlisle Indians made a Western trip late in the season and played the University of Illinois at Chicago, November 19th, and won by 11 to 0. The Western collegians were reinforced by several strong players from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, but they could not stop the fierce onslaughts of the Indians. On the other hand, the home players found it difficult to make much headway against the splendid defence of the aborigines, and most of their backs were downed in their tracks. Bemis Pierce played his usual star game and seemed to be all over the field. The score gives opportunities for some comparison of the relative standing of the Eastern and Western teams, for the University of Illinois is among the leaders in the Middle West.

BROWN, 12; DARTMOUTH, 0.

The end of the football season at Providence came on November 21st, when Brown met and defeated Dartmouth, her old rival, by 12 to 0. The game was originally scheduled for Saturday, but it was postponed until Monday, because of the wretched football weather. While it was generally expected that Brown would win, the strong showing made by the Dartmouth team in some of their earlier games' had caused the Providence coaches some anxiety. In the first half the visitors held the Brunonians without score, although the latter were several times close to their opponents' goal, only to lose their opportunity through the fumbling of the backs at critical moments. In the second half, however, Brown was on the aggressive most of the time, and scored twice, both touchdowns being made by Richardson, who shared the honors for the

home team with Sheehan, right tackle. Crolius, Dartmouth's captain and right half-back, did the best work for the visitors.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, 12; CORNELL, 6.

The final big game of the season took place at Philadelphia on Thanksgiving day, November 24th, between the University of Pennsylvania and Cornell, the Quakers carrying off the honor by 12 to 6. Undoubtedly the most important feature of this game was the weather. The field was a sea of mud before the game began, and the last part of the play was finished in a hard snowstorm. It was utterly impossible to recognize the players, so deeply incased were they in mud and slush, and in the second half the spectators could not even distinguish the lines on the field.

Cornell's good showing against Princeton, combined with Pennsylvania's defeat by Harvard, gave the Cornellians great hopes. At the last moment the visitors sprung a surprise on the Quakers by playing Charles Young, last year's star quarter-back, with Captain Whiting at half. His younger brother had played successfully all the year at quarter, so he was found more useful at half than in his old position, because of his excellent kicking and his ability to carry the ball. This certainly increased the chances of the visitors, and there are many who are still willing to declare that they would have won the game had it not been for the absence of dry clothes to put on for the second half.

Cornell had all the best of the play in the first half, though they had the advantage of the wind, and when the whistle blew for the intermission they led by 6 to 0, the touchdown having been scored on a blocked kick which Hare made from behind his goal-line. Twice Cornell had the ball inside of the Quakers' 5 yard line, but could not get it over. Starbuck fumbled the first time, and the second Pennsylvania held them for downs, and, in trying to kick the ball out from behind the goal, the touchdown was scored. In the second half, however, the Pennsylvania attack was much more formidable. Their guards-back rushes crashed through the Ithaca line so often that it was a wonder they did not score more.

After the game, both sides were dissatisfied with the result, but impartial observers thought the score expressed pretty accurately the relative skill of the teams. There was some talk of another game, but this, of course, was out of the question. The game was disappointing because of the wretched weather and the consequent impossibility of good play.

The teams lined up as follows:

<i>Pennsylvania.</i>	<i>Position.</i>	<i>Cornell.</i>
Hedges	right—end—left	Duval
Carnett	right—tackle—left	Wyell
McCracken	right—guard—left	Reed
Overfield	center	Dorner
Hare	left—guard—right	Lueder
Reugenberg	left—tackle—right	Sweetland
McMahon	left—end—right	Cross
Gardiner	quarter back	G. Young
Coombs	right—half-back—left	Whiting
Outland	left—half-back—right	C. Young
Folwell	full-back	Starbuck

Pennsylvania substituted McCloskey for Overfield at center. Cornell substituted Grimshaw for Cross at right end, Wilson for Duval at left end. Short for G. Young at quarter-back, and Perkins for Starbuck at full-back.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, 22; STANFORD, 0.

For the first time in eight years the University of California beat Stanford University in their annual Thanksgiving day game. It was played, as usual, in San Francisco. Not a suggestion of the miserable weather that prevailed in the East marred the day, and over 20,000 spectators turned out to see the game. Stanford, however, came near scoring on a fluke. Her full-back kicked out from under his goal, and when the California back fumbled the ball Murphy picked it up on the bound and started down the field. He was caught from behind after he had got to within twenty-five yards of the California goal, however, and Stanford soon lost the ball again. Throughout the game California maintained the aggressive, and the Stanford line was unable to stop their fierce rushes. They outclassed Stanford in punting,

too, and this was responsible for many long gains.

LAFAYETTE, 11; LEHIGH, 5.

Lafayette and Lehigh played their second game of the season at Easton, Pa., on Thanksgiving Day, in a snow-storm, and Lafayette turned the tables on the visitors by 11 to 5. The first game had resulted in favor of Lehigh by 23 too. In the second half, with the wind at the backs of the home team, but the score 5 too against them, Bray took his old lace at full-back and soon made his presence felt. His kicking practically won the game, for he out-classed the Lehigh backs in this particular and seldom failed to make big gains by punting. Late in the second half he kicked a goal from the field, thirty-five yards away from the posts, and this practically settled the game in favor of the home team. Their defeat was a surprise to Lehigh, for they had expected another victory.

FOOTBALL RECORD 1898	HARVARD	PENNSYLV.	PENN.-	YALE	CORNELL	WEST POINT	INDIAN	BROWN	WESLEYAN	DARTMOUTH	AMHERST	WILLIAMS	LEHIGH	LAFAYETTE	GAMES				POINTS	
															WON	LOST	DRAWN	WON	LOST	
HARVARD	-		10	17		28	11	17		21	53	11			8	8	0	0	168	13
PENNSYLV.		-		6	6	6		23					21	34	6	5	0	1	96	6
PENN.-	0		-		12		35	18	17				40	32	7	6	1	0	154	21
YALE	0	0		-		10	18	22	5		34	23			8	6	2	0	112	34
CORNELL		0	6		-		23					12		47	5	3	2	0	88	24
WEST POINT	0	6		0		-							18		4	1	2	1	24	44
INDIANS	5		5	5	6		-					17			5	1	4	0	38	93
BROWN	6	0	0	6				-		12					5	1	4	0	24	80
WESLEYAN			0	0					-	23	61	22			6	4	2	0	106	27
DARTMOUTH	0						0	5		-	10				4	1	3	0	15	62
AMHERST	2			0				0			-	16			5	1	4	0	18	153
WILLIAMS	0			0	0		6	0	6	5		-			7	0	7	0	17	111
LEHIGH		0	0			0							-	28	5	1	4	0	28	90
LAFAYETTE		0	0		0									-	5	1	4	0	11	141
POINTS GAINED	13	6	21	34	24	44	93	80	27	62	153	111	30	141	80	39	39	2	899	897

Wesleyan and Amherst played two games (scores, 33-0 and 28-0 in favor of Wesleyan), and Lehigh and Lafayette played two games (scores, 23-0 for Lehigh and 11-0 for Lafayette). For both these scores have been lumped here. Harvard was scored against (6 points) by Bowdoin, and Pennsylvania was scored against (11 points) by the University of Chicago.

J. PARMLY PARET.

THE WESTERN SEASON.

The Western season has been one of the most interesting and successful ever known, and most of the leading teams have developed a good game. The tendency of the season has been to do away with the old close formation, which so generally marked the play last year, and to play a more open running game. The fact that nearly all the teams have had at least one fair punter has contributed materially to this change, and no previous season has ever seen so many teams playing the kicking game.

Michigan has been under the direction of alumni coaches, but all the others have relied more or less on Eastern experts to teach them the game. The predominance of Eastern coaches led to the early overthrow of the rules drawn up by Messrs. Stagg and Everett, and all the games were played under the Eastern rules.

The University of Michigan has unquestionably won the Western championship, and that, too, without any very remarkable stars. Their

games were won by the team as a whole, even though Widman's spectacular playing in the Chicago game might seem to disprove that assertion. The work in the early games gave no prospect of a winning team. On November 5th they only beat Northwestern 6 to 5, but on the following Saturday they defeated Illinois, at Detroit, 12 to 5. The two weeks remaining before the Chicago game were put to good use by the coaches, and Thanksgiving day saw them win the championship from Chicago, 12 to 11, although victory had been quite generally conceded to Chicago. The game was far from being as close as the score indicates.

Chicago is certainly entitled to second place, as their only defeat in the West was at Michigan's hands. At the first of the season their chances were the rosiest of any, as the unusually large number of veterans was reinforced by much good new material. The men got to playing their game in the early part of the season, and rolled up large scores on the weaker teams. The first big game, that with Northwestern, was won, 34 to 5. Chicago had doubtless expected to win, but the score was so much larger than any one expected that the Maroons were at once hailed as the season's champions. A week later Pennsylvania defeated them, 23 to 11, but Chicago made a very creditable showing all through. Purdue lost on November 5th, 17 to 0, and the week after Wisconsin went down, 6 to 0.

The Wisconsin game was played November 12th, at Marshall Field, Chicago, before 12,000 persons, and was won by Chicago by 6 to 0.

Chicago had no more games till Thanksgiving, and the general impression is that her men lost ground in the intervening time. Herschberger's work in the last game was certainly below his ordinary standard, and while all the team were in good physical condition, their football ability seems to have suffered a temporary relapse. The Michigan defeat was a bitter disappointment to Chicago, especially as they thought the championship had been "cinched" by the Wisconsin game.

Wisconsin, whose work justifies her being assigned third place, has done as well as could reasonably have been expected, as only three men returned to form the nucleus of this season's eleven.

Wisconsin defeated her historic rival, Minnesota, by a large score, 29 to 0, and on Thanksgiving annihilated Northwestern by a score of 47 to 0. After two minutes of play O'Dea made a drop goal, standing sixty yards away from the posts, without any wind, and all but two or three of his punts were over fifty yards.

It is difficult to give any ranking to the other Western teams, as the schedules have not permitted many of them to meet and settle the supremacy.

Purdue won the Indiana State championship with ease, but lost her only big games, those with Oberlin and Chicago. Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota and Missouri all refused to play her, and so the team that used to have a monopoly of big games had little incentive to hard work.

Probably no team ever had more discouragements to contend with than Illinois. The men were in poor physical condition all through the season, and lost some of the games that were accounted easy by the other big colleges.

Oberlin again won the Ohio championship, and played a clean, strong game the season through. They were unfortunate in not being able to meet any of the stronger Western elevens, though they certainly deserve a place on the schedules. They made their best showing against Cornell, where they were beaten, 6 to 0, and against the University of Cincinnati, who later on tied the Indians.

Knox, Beloit and Notre Dame have done the best work of the minor institutions. Knox deserves the most credit, as the amateur standings of some of the players of the other two would hardly bear investigation.

TRANS-MISSISSIPPI.

Of the trans-Mississippi universities, Iowa, for financial reasons, was forced to remain out of the League. Nebraska won the championship of the League by defeating Kansas, 18-6, and Missouri, 47-0, but on Thanksgiving lost to Iowa, 6-5. Kansas beat Missouri on Thanksgiving, 12-0, and both of them defeated the strong Kansas City Medics, who beat Nebraska, 24-0.

Iowa seems to have the best paper claim to supremacy, and their defeat by the University of Chicago, 38-0, affords some criterion for judging the relative strength of the leading teams east and west of the Mississippi,

ELLIOTT R. GOLDSMITH.

FOOTBALL RECORDS.

- Nov. 19—Harvard, 17; Yale, 0; at New Haven, Conn.
 " Harvard Freshmen, 6; Yale Freshmen, 0; at New Haven, Conn.
 " Amherst, 16; Williams, 5; at Williamstown, Mass.
 " Syracuse, 0; Trinity, 0; at Syracuse, N. Y.
 " Lehigh, 5; Maryland A. C., 0; at Baltimore, Md.
 " Knickerbocker A. C., 12; Orange A. C., 0; at Orange, N. J.
 " U. S. Naval Cadets, 6; University of Virginia, 0; at Annapolis, Md.
 " Haverford, 11; Swarthmore, 0; at Swarthmore, Pa.
 " Carlisle Indians, 11; University of Illinois, 0; at Chicago, Ill.
 " Lafayette, 6; Bucknell, 0; at Easton, Pa.
 Nov. 21—Brown, 12; Dartmouth, 0; at Providence, R. I.
 Nov. 24—University of Pennsylvania, 12; Cornell, 6; at Philadelphia, Pa.
 " Georgetown, 12; Columbian University, 5; at Washington, D. C.
 " Lafayette, 11; Lehigh, 5; at Easton, Pa.
 " University of California, 22; Stanford University, 0; at San Francisco, Cal.
 " University of North Carolina, 6; University of Virginia, 2; at Richmond, Va.
 " Orange A. C., 5; Riverside A. C., 0; at New York (indoors).
 " Chicago A. A., 18; Dartmouth, 5; at Chicago, Ill.
 " University of Michigan, 12; University of Chicago, 11; at Chicago, Ill.
 " Purdue, 12; Oberlin, 0; at Lafayette, Ind.
 " University of Illinois, 12; University of Minnesota, 10; at Minneapolis, Minn.
 " University of Wisconsin, 47; Northwestern, 0; at Evanston, Ill.
 " University of Indiana, 11; University of Cincinnati, 11; at Cincinnati, O.
 " Hamilton, 5; Colgate, 0; at Utica, N. Y.
 Nov. 26—University of Cincinnati, 17; Dartmouth, 12; at Cincinnati, O.

J. PARMLY PARET.