

together in a flash. Ten minutes remained and Johnston tried running back of the V. He made ten yards before a chorus of backs could stop him. Next moment he went around the left for ten yards. Flippin perforated the center for five. Johnston made a fine run of ten yards going between end and tackle, but was stopped by the crowd which ran into the line and surged about whither it listed. Next time he got through between center and right guard, and got well down the field. Just as the full back got him he passed to Porterfield, and Porter and his neighbor opposite rolled over and over on the ball. Four hands being on it when the combination run down, there was some question as to who was in possession. Without very much hesitation, however, commanded Porterfield to desist and while a broad grin was lighting up the features of his adversary and the Iowan quarter back was repeating his A B C's to be sure he remembered them, time was called and the usual cheering ensued. The referee publically announced the score as 26 to 0. But after the public had departed under that impression, he called the teams together and admitted that he was four points off. Perhaps a little matter of four points is not much in a score like the one in question, but the boys were naturally hot about it, especially as he responded to all enquiries as to how he figured out that result by "none of your business." He is an experienced man and very prompt and decided in his rulings—just the kind of a man needed for a referee. But he might imitate the gentlemen who acted as umpire to advantage in his manner of addressing the players. His language is far from calculated to soothe the ruffled spirits of a disappointed player. The score, it might be said, was 22 to 0.

Umpire, Wilson of Omaha. Referee, Holbrooke of Iowa City.

NOTES

There were several thousand spectators present, and they were present in every sense of the word. They formed a dense mass around the players at a distance of about fifteen yards and limited the work of the backs very effectively. The wedge of the doughty Hawkeyes was not visibly affected thereby, but Johnston was stopped in two good runs by a compact mass of ununiformed humanity. Two policemen were intended to keep the crowd out of the lines. But as soon as the ball was in play, they would rush down the field after it and the crowd would speedily follow.

J. B. White was badly injured in the forepart of the game. He showed admirable pluck, however, and continued to play. Soon afterwards he made a fine tackle, stopped the burly Iowan, but received a terrible fall and was taken from the field unconscious. He soon recovered from the shock and was feeling tolerably well Friday.

The Uni. delegation are indebted to Mr. Hayden, the proprietor of a department store, for a liberal discount on horns, eye-glasses, ribbon, and gold cloth. He said he had been a college boy himself. He presented us with all the gold cloth he had in stock, and kindly offered room in his store for our headquarters.

It is impossible for one not personally acquainted with the Iowa team to name the individual plays in describing the game. Most of their work was with the wedge, and when they ran good interference made it impossible to say who had the ball till he was downed.

He said A, B, C, X, P, Q,
X, P, Q,
X, P, Q.

He said A, B, C, X, P, Q,
The ball went P, D, Q.

Who was that man they called "the just?"

The game was well advertised by several howling mobs of Uni. boys, arrayed in old gold and tin horns, who explored all Omaha and most of Council Bluffs before the game began.

The Iowa team is composed of gentlemen. It is a pleasure to be beaten by men of their stamp. May their tribe increase.

The above pilgrim's chorus was rendered on the train coming home by fifty hoarse voices. Tune, "Romulus killed Remus."

Iowa was not represented to any great extent in the audience but had a very respectable representation on the field.

A problem in algebra, copyright 1891 by Q. Backe Pierce. $abc + mnl + p + 247$ equals five yards.

The referee invariably referred to Nebraska as "Grinell." Once he said "Minneapolis."

Ah! those specks!

EXCHANGE.

In the Hillsdale College Herald we notice a comparison of Peter the Great of Russia and Frederick the Great of Prussia. If anyone, having never heard of these two men, were to read the article he would be impressed more with the idea that they were simply two ordinary men that the writer had seen fit to compare, instead of two of our really great men in history. Both Peter and Frederick stand out with a very marked prominence above their contemporaries. This fact the writer of the article does not make clear. The general trend of the article is to praise Peter the Great for his moral, economical, and political ideas and works, and to convey the idea that Frederick, although he devoted his life to the military and political aggrandizement of his country, did it because of selfish motives. We will quote a few sentences from the article in question: "So far as a life devoted to the military and political aggrandizement of a country makes a man a patriot, Frederick the Great will receive the plaudits of those who worship success. While, on the other hand, so far as the qualities combined with love of country and a desire to labor for a purer civilization makes a man noble, Peter the Great will receive the praises of those who admire a true character. He may have been despotic, but the times demanded such a ruler.

"What Silesia was to Frederick such was the part of Azof to Peter. The one was siezed for personal motives, the other for good of country. We cannot understand the secrets of Providence."

Now in the first place did Frederick the Great devote his whole life to the military and political aggrandizement of his country? Is it true that we are only to remember and applaud him for being a patriot? Frederick, like the great founder of St. Petersburg was as much interested in governing his country well and in introducing reforms as he was in making it strong in force of arms. He administered his government like a proprietor of a great estate. He watched everything himself. His fault was perhaps in not trusting more to his subordinates. We cannot blame him so much for this. He wished to build up a model form of government. Because he was not endowed with a supernatural power to foresee the future which, had he been so endowed, would have enabled him to adopt the best means for his success, is no reason why he should receive our censure for adopting the poorest means. As far as Peter the Great is concerned, all the writer has said is true but he has not said enough. Leaving out his acts of barbarous cruelty which seem indeed to be freaks of his, come to mar his otherwise extremely pacific nature, Peter did a