Players run toward the western goal, off the left edge of the photograph, in a football match of 1874.
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Introduction

Old Division Football\(^2\) was a rough, soccer-like game\(^3\) that students at Dartmouth College began playing by the 1820s and continued to play until the 1880s, holding on to an annual contest derived from the game until 1948. While Old Division might have permitted a player to bat or “knock” the ball with the hand as well as to make a fair catch, it was distinctly a kicking game rather than a running game in the style of rugby or its descendant, the gridiron (American) football of today. Students codified a set of rules for the Dartmouth game by 1871, contributing something of an evolutionary dead-end to the Anglo-American family of football codes, a contribution that has remained unexamined until now. If Dartmouth students ever considered playing a game against a team from another school, various explicit or assumed idiosyncracies in their game would have made such a meeting difficult: teams were unregulated in size, the kickoff was unidirectional and occurred from a particular non-central spot, and the field itself, although it measured a conventional 375 feet from goal to goal, was an astonishing 550 feet wide. The goals comprised the entire long sides of the field, and there were no goalkeepers.

Though the English rules of soccer and rugby were competing with, merging into, and diverging from local American games during the 1870s, Old Division did not seem to absorb much from them, and it almost certainly did not influence any of the prevailing codes of the period. Nor, importantly, did Dartmouth players switch from their game to
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The title page photograph appeared in the article by Edwin J. Bartlett ’72, “Mere Football,” Dartmouth Alumni Magazine 19, No. 1 (November 1926), 17, and is reprinted frequently. It was taken at the same time and from the same position as a photograph in the “Supplement to the History of the Class of 1874, Dartmouth College” (1904) labeled “Football in ’74.”


2 The game is known as “Old Division Football,” though that name describes only one of several methods that students employed to divide themselves into teams for the Dartmouth game. Using the phrase “mob soccer” in the title to describe an early-nineteenth century game obviously is anachronistic, since “soccer” is the name of the game played by the Football Association, which did not form until 1863 in London.

3 Mark Bernstein in Football: The Ivy League Origins of an American Obsession (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 23 n. 14, described the game as an “idiosyncratic hybrid of soccer and rugby,” which might explain how it looked but not where it came from.

---

rugby when some inkling of that game came to Hanover during 1876. Instead, the Dartmouth game faded away gradually as students lost interest in it. Students allowed the rules to atrophy over time, and eventually only a remnant of the Dartmouth game remained, an annual free-form fight over a football. The last of these “Football Rushes” took place in 1948.

Inventing a set of rules for a local foot-ball game was the standard practice at boys’ schools of all kinds well into the latter half of the nineteenth century. From the Colonial period to the Civil War, Americans schoolboys played kicking games on town greens and in schoolyards. Homogeneous groups of young men who were undergoing periods of arbitrarily enforced idleness, such as college students, explorers, and soldiers (a 10th Vermont surgeon prescribed football for an alleged Civil War shirker) would play boys’ ball games as well.

One guide to college student customs of the 1850s indicated that kicking games already were well established, stating that “[f]or many years, the game of football has been the favorite amusement at some of the American colleges, during certain seasons of the year.” Each college had its traditional game, following rules that were local and usually unwritten; in fact, students normally adopted as many as three different varieties of their local game over time, often playing more than one variety during a single year. First was the basic daily football itself, which the whole school played by dividing into teams by some simple system; second was the early-fall match between freshmen and sophomores, a game that originally could have the simple and unwritten rules of ordinary football but whose basis in interclass rivalry caused it to develop a particular violence and encouraged students to continue it for decades beyond the fading of the daily game; and finally was the “class rush,” eventually an annual fight that took the place of the freshman-sophomore match but lacked any rules barring handling the ball or kicking in the shins. Harvard, Yale, and other schools including Dartmouth followed this pattern.

Among the rules that Harvard upperclassmen enforced against freshmen during the eighteenth century was a ban on playing football in the College Yard, which implied that the school permitted football elsewhere. Upperclassmen required freshmen to supply footballs, bats, and balls in one 1741 set of rules. At some point, students began playing on the Delta, the triangular field that was the long-time home of student football in Cambridge and became the site of Memorial Hall after the Civil War. By the late 1820s,

---

7 Benjamin Homer Hall, A Collection of College Words and Customs (1856 revised edition).
8 Id.
the annual freshman-sophomore match on the Delta was scheduled for the evening of the first Monday of the year and already was becoming a violent “football fight” known as “Bloody Monday.” The authorities banned the annual fight during 1860, but students kept on playing, sometimes without the ball. President Eliot ordered students to stop playing after he took office during 1869, but a smaller form of the game apparently survived, moving to Holmes Field by the mid-1870s. During 1876, Horace Scudder described what he called only a “mock foot-ball match”: “the point of the contest was in the opportunity which the better organized Sophomores had of making foot-balls of the Freshmen, who had not yet learned to tell friend from foe.” The contest faded from Harvard around 1917.

Students at Yale also played football during the eighteenth century, as Charles Goodrich of the Yale class of 1797 wrote. The game was typically of contemporary college games elsewhere:

Foot-ball was our common sport, a[l]most every day in good weather and very often twice daily and I forget if more. We had three lines in front of the college buildings down to the road that crossed the Green by two meeting houses if I remember. Of the three lines the two outside were eight or ten rods apart. We would begin on the middle line and if the scholars were generally out on both sides, whenever the ball was driven over one of the outside lines, the party on that side were beaten, and the other party enjoyed the shouting. There was no delay of the game by choosing sides, the parties were divided by the buildings in which they severally roomed.

Later rules permitted players to run with the ball, and by the early 1860s the Yale game, sometimes called “roughhouse football,” had changed to focus on running with

---

12 Horace E. Scudder, “Harvard University,” Scribners Monthly, an Illustrated Magazine for the People 12, No. 3 (July 1876), 342.
13 Scudder.
14 Bethell, et al.

the ball and trying to avoid being caught rather than simply kicking.\textsuperscript{17} As was typical, freshmen and sophomores were playing an annual match by the 1840s, a contest that eventually became a scrapping “rush”\textsuperscript{18} and elicited a faculty ban, this one during 1857\textsuperscript{19} or 1860.\textsuperscript{20} Because Yale College did not permit playing in the college yard, the game always took place on the New Haven Green, and the town also came to ban disturbances, including football, during the late 1850s. Students apparently moved the game elsewhere, and an 1862 description of an annual game had the sophomores accepting a freshman challenge: “And thus, with much noise and dispute, and great confounding of umpire, they continue for three, four, or five games, or until the evening chapel-bell calls to prayers.”\textsuperscript{21} The game was revived during 1870 and continued as a rush into the 1880s.\textsuperscript{22}

Other schools had similar games. At Princeton, students were playing “Balloon”\textsuperscript{23} next to Nassau Hall\textsuperscript{24} by 1820.\textsuperscript{25} The game, as at other schools, permitted batting the ball with the fists.\textsuperscript{26} Residents of East College played those of West College, members of the Whig Hall literary society played those of Clio Hall, or those with last names beginning with A through L played those whose names began with M through Z.\textsuperscript{27} Students apparently were organizing intramural tournaments by the 1840s,\textsuperscript{28} and during the 1850s began playing against the adjacent Princeton Theological Seminary,\textsuperscript{29} though after the Civil War, matches more often followed the typical pairing of classes in the college.\textsuperscript{30} Brown University students played an interclass game that the school president banned
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during 1862 but that students later restarted.\textsuperscript{31} Amherst also had a ball game;\textsuperscript{32} Columbia students were playing football by 1824; and students at the University of Pennsylvania were playing local high school teams by the 1840s.\textsuperscript{33} At Cornell University, which opened in 1869, teams of between 20 and a whole class soon played a kicking game between goals about 250 yards apart. The ball started at the center of the field and the players rushed in to kick it, with the best three out of five goals winning. Interclass matches again were a favored form of the game.\textsuperscript{34} During 1870, Cornell students even demonstrated their game to Thomas Hughes, author of the rugby-popularizing novel \textit{Tom Brown’s School Days}.\textsuperscript{35} What distinguishes games of Cornell and the other schools is that students from one college did not normally play against those of another. They certainly did not select a ’varsity (i.e. “all-university”) team made up of the best players from every division within an institution to send against a similar squad from another school.

The intramural nature of local football also distinguished it from rowing and baseball, which had become venues for intercollegiate competition in the U.S. by 1852 and 1859, respectively. Rowing benefitted from simple rules, and baseball literally followed rowing’s example, as students began to hold intercollegiate baseball meets as part of the festivities surrounding existing regattas. The local inertia of schoolboy football, in contrast, kept it from being a natural choice for intercollegiate competition for several decades. The result was similar in Britain, where the codes of football rules were much better-developed but nonetheless did not initially lend themselves to inter-school play.

Dartmouth, too, had its own unique variety of football, a local kicking game played with a round ball by unlimited but usually equal undergraduate sides. Students played daily games and also held one or more annual freshman-sophomore matches. The elementary rules of the Dartmouth game did not require or demonstrate much evolution over time, and most of the rules could have been developed as early as the eighteenth century. During 1871, students codified the rules they were using at the moment and added a few more, creating a code that is reprinted at the end of this paper. Though Old Division did not last into the twentieth century at Dartmouth, one vestige of the annual match lasted until 1948, after which students replaced it with a tug-of-war.


\textsuperscript{32} Litterer, “An Overview of American Soccer History.”

\textsuperscript{33} Bernstein, 5.

\textsuperscript{34} G.H. Lohmes, “Athletics at Cornell,” \textit{Outing} 15, No. 6 (March 1890), 458.

\textsuperscript{35} Lohmes on 452 noted that Hughes, who was a Member of Parliament, gave a rowing talk, while Bernstein on 24 noted that the students demonstrated their game to a visiting M.P.

A Reconstruction of Old Division Football

The Field of Play

Old Division had only one field of play, the Dartmouth Green. Initially called the Common and later the Campus, the Green was a typical large rectangular New England town green, with a row of college buildings along one side and houses and shops around the others. Students played football across the Green in the narrow direction, which provided extremely distant sidelines and vast amounts of room for flanking maneuvers.

Perhaps uniquely, the Green was the property of the College rather than the town and thus was not public property, though it gave the appearance of a civic space. The College began clearing the tall pines from the Green soon after the institution opened during 1770, before the surrounding village of Hanover had developed. During 1771, a surveyor, probably Jonathan Freeman, laid out the central plot that the College trustees voted should be “opened for a Green.” Laborers finished burning and removing the standing timber from the Green during 1772.

Several physical flaws in the field would have made games difficult during the 1770s. The Green was cluttered with tree stumps, and for several years leading up to 1820, the school apparently expected each class to remove one stump. The playing field also was littered with cow patties, and Samuel Swift ’00 later wrote:

The college common was not enclosed or in any way ornamented with trees or shrubbery but was used especially in the night for yarding all the village cows. Whoever undertook to cross the common, especially in the night, was liable to soil his boots.

39 Chase, 230.
40 Clyde Edward Dankert, "Dartmouth College and Dartmouth University" [typewritten MS] (1979), citing Dartmouth Alumni Magazine (June 1937), 13.
41 Samuel Swift, in Francis Lane Childs, “Town and Gown,” in Childs, ed., Hanover, New Hampshire: A Bicentennial Book (Hanover, N.H.: Town of Hanover, 1961), 265. Henry Elisha Woodbury wrote that “[t]he presence of the cows on the campus naturally did not improve it as a football field, so the townsmen were informed that the thing must stop” in William Carroll Hill, Dartmouth Traditions: Being a Compilation of Facts and Events Connected with the History of Dartmouth College and the Lives of Its Graduates from the Early Founding of the College, in 1769, to the Present Day (Hanover, N.H.: The Dartmouth Press, 1901), 99.

The field sloped downward slightly to the southeast corner, an area that was wetter than the rest of the Green.\textsuperscript{42} In addition, the town laid its Main Street across the Green by 1775, aligning it diagonally from southwest to northeast.\textsuperscript{43} The College built several structures on the Green as well, placing its first two principal buildings (1770-1771), near the southeast corner of the space.\textsuperscript{44}

The school’s president and faculty frowned on games of all sorts, and president Eleazar Wheelock wrote during 1771:

In order that the channel of their diversions may be turned from that which is puerile, such as playing with balls, bowls, and other ways of diversion, as have been necessarily gone into by students in other places, for want of an opportunity to exercise themselves in that which is more useful, . . . it is earnestly recommended . . . that they turn the course of their diversions and exercises for their health, to the practice of some manual arts, or cultivation of gardens and other lands at the proper hours of leisure.\textsuperscript{45}

The College’s first code of “Laws and Regulations” (1775)\textsuperscript{46} did not mention games.

The Green became sufficient for games of various types by the end of the eighteenth century. The two largest buildings occupying the Green were demolished during 1789 and 1791, freeing up most of the full rectangle. By 1793, students were using their allotted leisure time\textsuperscript{47} to play cricket on the Green.\textsuperscript{48} Elisha Hotchkiss ’01 wrote of “the sports and amuseumts common to students at that time,” stating that “[t]heir pastimes consisted in the game of ball and other athletic exercises,”\textsuperscript{49} probably using “ball” to refer to baseball or a precursor game. By the 1820s, students also apparently reported that they were playing football on the Green,\textsuperscript{50} and during 1824 the village officials authorized:
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\textsuperscript{45} Eleazar Wheelock, quoted in Wilder Dwight Quint, The Story of Dartmouth College (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1914), 246. Hoefnagel and Close on 25, 33, and 68 cite Wheelock’s words in A Continuation of the Narrative (1771).
\textsuperscript{46} Hoefnagel and Close, 74-75.
\textsuperscript{47} Petition of the freshman and sophomore classes (November 1772), attributed to John Ledyard, quoted in Hoefnagel and Close, 70.
\textsuperscript{49} Elisha Hotchkiss, Shreeveport, Louisiana, to Professor Edwin David Sanborn, Hanover, New Hampshire (25 February 1853), in National Edition of the Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster (1903), 17:66.
\textsuperscript{50} Leon Burr Richardson, History of Dartmouth College (Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College Publications, 1932), I: 381, referring to the Memorial of the Class of 1827 (1869). Edwin J. Bartlett, in “Mere Football,” Dartmouth Alumni Magazine 19, No. 1 (November 1926), 17, put the origin of the game

the playing at ball or any game in which ball is used on the public common in front of Dartmouth College, set apart by the Trustees thereof among the purposes for a playground for their students.\footnote{J.K. Lord (1928), 23. The term “ball” may have referred to a bat-and-ball game by default, as distinguished from “foot-ball.”}

During 1836, workers put rough granite posts around the Green and bolted up the iconic two-rail fence, having the immediate effect of ending vehicle travel across the Green and the incidental effect of clarifying the bounds of the football pitch. (Henry Elisha Woodbury of the class of 1847, at school from 1843 to 1846, wrote that the fence “was kept in excellent condition for the favorable game of football.”\footnote{Henry Elisha Woodbury, quoted in William Carroll Hill, Dartmouth Traditions, 99.}) The College’s football ground then measured about 375 feet between the goals and 550 feet between the sidelines. For comparison, the Cambridge Rules of Football (1848) and their descendant Football Association Rules of 1863 (“F.A. Rules”) limited the pitch to 600 by 300 feet, played in the long direction.\footnote{Cambridge Rules (1848) and Football Association Rules (1863), in Tony Brown, “The Early Rules of Soccer” (2003), at http://asktheref.com/html/article060500.htm (viewed 1 December 2004).} The Intercollegiate Football Rules of 1873 (“I.C.F. Rules”), an American descendant of the F.A. Rules, would require a ground of 400 by 250 feet.\footnote{Intercollegiate Football Rules (1873) in PFRA, “No Christian End!”}

Football on the Green was recognized as a popular game by the early 1820s.\footnote{Richardson I: 381, referencing the Memorial of the Class of 1827 (1869).} Peter Thacher Washburn ’35\footnote{Peter T. Washburn, quoted in Richardson II: 493.} and future College president Samuel Colcord Bartlett ’36 played the game during the early 1830s. Bartlett wrote:

Consequently all the college joined in it every fair day. And a very picturesque and exciting game they made it. Now in a long array, now in solid knots, now in scattering groups, and now sweeping like a cyclone, with its runners even more effective than its rushers.\footnote{Samuel Colcord Bartlett, “Early College Sports,” in John Henry Bartlett and John Pearl Gifford, Dartmouth Athletics (1893), 7.}

President Bartlett’s son, Professor Edwin J. Bartlett ’72, a student rulemaker for the Dartmouth game and later its historian, provided a similar picture during his time as a student (1868-1872):

Football was simplicity itself. You ran all over the campus, and when, as, and if you got a chance you kicked a round rubber ball to the east or to the west. You might run all the afternoon and not get your toe upon the ball, but you could not deny that you had had
a fair chance, and the exercise was yours and could be valued by the number of hot rolls consumed at the evening meal. . . . It was glorious for exercise, and had enough excitement to make it highly interesting. It gave ample opportunity for competitions in speed, finesse, dodging, endurance, and occasional personal collision.  

(Edwin Bartlett also would come to recommend that students take up the sport of soccer as an appetite-inducing daily game during 1912.)

Goals

The two goal zones of Old Division Football were easy to see and aim for, since they comprised the entirety of the long ends of the field. The goals were thus about 22 times wider than the 25-foot dimension that the I.C.F. rules of 1873 eventually mandated. Such wide goals were too large for any goalkeeper to defend and did not require any vertical posts to aid in determining when someone had scored through the air, as in English football. One team simply would try to kick the ball east into College Street, while the other would aim west toward Main Street. A later account confirmed that the ball simply had to touch the ground outside the east or west fence of the Green to count as a goal.

Foul Lines

The Dartmouth Rules had no concept of the ball being “behind” the goal, as in the Cambridge and F.A. Rules. The narrow north and south sides of the Green were essentially the only sidelines.

Changes in Form over Time

Over its first sixty or more years, the only change in the bounds of Dartmouth’s pitch was a slight adjustment to its southern sideline. During 1873, the College permitted the village to realign Wheelock Street across the bottom of the Green, eliminating a jog at the College Street intersection. The new alignment required the village to move the fence northward, leaving a sliver of the Green in the middle of the widened Wheelock Street; students hastily destroyed the fence and then paid to rebuild it. This change from a

59 Edwin J. Bartlett, letter to the editor of The Dartmouth 34 (2 November 1912), 2.
61 Intercollegiate Football Rules (1873) in PFRA, “No Christian End!”
63 Tibbetts, 259.
64 Cambridge Rules (1848) and Football Association Rules (1863), in Tony Brown.
65 Childs (1961), 267

regular rectangle made the eastern goal slightly narrower than the western goal, but it did not appear to have any effect on how students played football.

William Edward Cushman ’83 gave a “Campus Oration” on the subject of the Green, saying:

This Campus of nearly five acres, is one of the institutions of which we of Dartmouth can truly boast. We place it first in the list of College campi. We shall not be disputed, if we assert that by promoting [character and health], the Campus performs as important a function as any other single institution in the College course.66

A national map company’s 1884 map of Hanover likewise described the Green with the legend “Campus / Students’ Playground.”67

The College removed the fence from around the Green during 1893.68 No evidence of student disappointment at the removal of their football boundaries has turned up, although the fence probably would have kept defenders from going out of bounds to return a disputed goal. Students ask the school to re-erect a short section of the fence as a place for conversation and singing, and the school initially placed a “Senior Fence” on the east side of the Green. Also during 1893, alumni built a new athletic park on farmland one block to the southeast of the Green. Students moved their intercollegiate contests to the new park, including both baseball and American Football. This move left the Green available for less-formal interclass games of baseball and Old Division Football.

---

66 Cushman, 21
68 Richardson, II: 681

The Ball

Using a round ball\textsuperscript{69} rather than an ovoid ball was a natural choice for students, who had access to the standard inflated animal bladder in a round leather case.\textsuperscript{70} Students switched to a ball of the same design with a rubber bladder during the early 1850s,\textsuperscript{71} a change in technology that required players to reorient the field temporarily.

Charles Goodyear’s 1838 process for vulcanizing rubber, which he patented during 1844 and then introduced into footballs around 1855,\textsuperscript{72} revolutionized a variety of sports. The Goodyear process created tennis balls whose rubber cores made them bouncy enough to play on grass courts and, as football historian Melvin I. Smith wrote, enabled players of indigenous football games along the East Coast to shift from a pure-power kicking game to a kind of football that valued dribbling and finer control.\textsuperscript{73} Princeton students, for example, acquired the new ball during 1858 and saw dribbling take off,\textsuperscript{74} while the University of Toronto saw the ball make its mark during the early 1860s.\textsuperscript{75} The U.S. college I.C.F. Rules (1873) specified that the challenging side supply a No. 6-sized ball that would be kept by the winner;\textsuperscript{76} the No. 6 was a 30-inch (circumference?) round rubber-bladdered ball that the London Football Association also used.\textsuperscript{77}

Dartmouth players started using a rubber ball during the 1850s\textsuperscript{78} and discovered that it would travel much farther than the old ball. The strongest players could even send it from the kickoff over the goal line and into the yard in front of Dartmouth Hall:

The modern rubber ball . . . was found at first too light for the sturdy muscles of Lord and Bell and Johnson, who were able to land it at a single kick from the warning ground,

\textsuperscript{69} Edwin J. Bartlett, \textit{A Dartmouth Book of Remembrance}, 22.
\textsuperscript{70} Bartlett and Gifford, 3.
\textsuperscript{71} Id., 4; Quint, \textit{Story of Dartmouth}, 246-247. Quint’s description of the shift to a rubber ball is easy to read as a statement that \textit{all} football ended during 1850, though that is not what he meant.
\textsuperscript{72} PFRA, “No Christian End!” The Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities still owns a ball from this era that a schoolboy team used during 1863 games on Boston Common according to National Soccer Hall of Fame, “Charles Goodyear’s Soccer Ball,” at http://www.soccerballworld.com/ Oldestball.htm (viewed 7 December 2004). Vulcanized rubber is not the same as the natural rubber or gutta percha, which was introduced into golf balls around the same time.
\textsuperscript{74} Smith, “What’s in a Game of Early Football?”, 13.
\textsuperscript{75} Smith, “The Audacity of Toronto,” 19.
\textsuperscript{76} Intercollegiate Football Rules (1873) in PFRA, “No Christian End!”
\textsuperscript{77} Intercollegiate Football Rules (1873) in PFRA, “No Christian End!”
\textsuperscript{78} Bartlett and Gifford, 3-4. The authors might be referring to Nathan Lord ’51, George ’51 or John Bell ’52, and Osgood Johnson ’52.
westerly of the centre of the Common, quite over the eastern fence, and into the college yard.\textsuperscript{79}

In response, students began to play the game in the long direction, making the north and south sides of the Green into the new goals.\textsuperscript{80} This reorientation lasted only a short time, however, and students were able to return to east-west play after the “champions consented to restrain themselves” on each kickoff, as John Henry Bartlett ’94 and John Pearl Gifford ’94 wrote – a rule that sounds implausible, but might have required only that the initial kick stay in bounds.

Older students required the freshmen to provide the ball for each interclass match, and the upperclassmen began to take pride in stealing the ball at end of each game in order to force the freshmen to buy a ball for the next match.\textsuperscript{81} A senior wrote of his freshman year, 1853-1854:

According to the \textit{mos majorum} we furnished footballs for the college, and occasionally, with a most praiseworthy philanthropy, we permitted our own \textit{bodies} and \textit{limbs} to be used as substitutes, in this way taking great \textit{pains} to furnish amusement for the upper classes.\textsuperscript{82}

Supplying new balls was not only costly for freshmen\textsuperscript{83} but was demeaning, which was its main purpose. By the 1860s, freshmen were being “bawled-out” when they were slow in furnishing a ball,\textsuperscript{84} a spectacle that one alumnus described in his account of the early weeks of September, 1862. One day the sophomores ordered the freshmen to hand over money for a dozen new footballs, and then:

Two or three days later the “Sophomores” came on the campus and shouted, “Football! Football! Pende! (pay over) Fresh.” So we dribbled out a football, and as time led on, we gradually used them up in many bulldog sorts of games, with the bodies of sixty boys mixed together on the grass for an hour of brutality.\textsuperscript{85}

New rules of 1870 attempted to eliminate the task of supplying the football (a newspaper noted that “[o]ld graduates will be surprised to hear that the faculty now furnish the balls”\textsuperscript{86}), but the job returned to the freshmen soon after.

\textsuperscript{79} Bartlett and Gifford, 4.
\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Id.}, 13.
\textsuperscript{81} Richardson II: 492.
\textsuperscript{84} Edwin J. Bartlett, “Mere Football,” 18.
\textsuperscript{86} \textit{The [Amherst, N.H.] Farmers’ Cabinet} 69, no. 17 (10 November 1870), 2.

For the large annual freshman-sophomore game, which everyone expected to result in a fight or “rush” for the football, the upperclassmen bellowed a traditional chant of “Foot-ball, Freshie!”87 Even local residents picked up the chant, according to one account of the 1874 game: “Thursday night, when the fatigues of the day were over, the annual cry of ‘Foot-ball, Freshie! O, Freshie, trout [sic] out a ball,’ was made by Sophomores and townies.”88 At the match of the following year, one freshman related that “we were surprised – as it were terrified – by the sudden outburst of many voices; after attentively listening we were able to distinguish ‘F-o-o-t-b-a-l-l,’ ‘Rush, Rush,’ ‘Go in Freshie,’ and before we had time to calculate the consequences . . . in we went.”89

Wilder D. Quint ’87 described a freshman’s experience from his era similarly: “He heard a wail from out the gathering gloom / Of ‘football, Freshie; Oh, bring out your ball.’ / And, answering to that kindly caterwaul / He joined the shaky army of his class[.]”90 George Williams Boutelle ’93 wrote of the 1889 match: “Who of us will ever forget those terrible cries of ‘Foot-ball Freshie’ piercing the cool evening air, sending the hot blood tingling through all our veins[?]”91 In 1901, “‘Football Freshie’ was the challenge we heard on the opening night of our college life. Some of the wise ones had told us just how to win the rush,” wrote Alexander Rockwood Maynard ’05.92

As a frequent public disturbance, the noise of hundreds of students yelling for a football became one of the main aspects of the game to come under regulation by faculty. Historian Leon Burr Richardson ’00, reviewing the minutes of faculty meetings, wrote that “[t]he inability of the upper classes to ‘cease from the loud and annoying cry for the football,’ which the freshmen, by college tradition, were required to furnish, was highly disturbing to the cloistered quiet of the academic town.”93

The Number of Players and Their Sides

The number of players on an Old Division side was unlimited,94 with participants giving rhetorical examples of one, thirty,95 fifty,96 sixty,97 and a hundred or more players

87 “Editorial Notes,” The Dartmouth 4, no 9 (October 1870), 351.
91 George Williams Boutelle, “Address at the New Athletic Field,” Class Day Book of 1893 (1893), 34.
93 Richardson, II: 555.
94 Tibbetts, 259.
95 Spalding, 41.
97 Spalding.
per side. One historian of athletics described “the grand old game of foot-ball” as “the free, joyous, and exhilarating pursuit of the ball all over the Green by every student, according to the measure of his inclination and powers.”

“[A]ny young man five feet in height, and who should have mastered the other requisites for admission to West Point, was capable of joining in” according to Samuel Colcord Bartlett ’36. Edwin Bartlett ’72 emphasized the game’s formal malleability: “[t]he game was played by two or by two hundred. . . . [S]ome dropped out, others dropped in.”

One member of the class of 1876, comparing the game to rugby, wrote that the indigenous “[f]ootball was a more or less informal game in which an unlimited number of players took part. Intensive training was unknown.”

The teams drew their players from among the undergraduates of Dartmouth College and the later Chandler Scientific School (1852, absorbed 1892), which meant that the maximum size of a team changed considerably over the years, especially as the institutions grew. Between 1800 and 1815, the maximum side averaged about 75 men; by the 1840s, the maximum side was about 150; by 1895, the maximum side was around 175 men. Numbers began to go up rapidly at the end of the century, with maximum sides of 364 by 1899 and nearly 400 by 1900 numbers that probably never played together but could have if they had wanted. The I.C.F. Rules (1873), in comparison, would adopt the decade-old F.A. limit of 20 players per side.

Old Division Football mandated a variety of methods of selecting sides over its existence, usually with more than one method available at any given time.

I. Old Division Football (Freshmen & Juniors vs. Sophomores & Seniors)

---

99 Bartlett and Gifford, 3.
101 Edwin J. Bartlett, A Dartmouth Book of Remembrance, 22.
102 Samuel Merrill, “The Class of 1876 Fifty Years After,” Dartmouth Alumni Magazine 18, No. 8 (June 1926), 694.
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105 “The College and the Church,” New Englander and Yale Review 11, no. 44 (November 1853), 603.
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As a method of dividing into sides that was perceived to be old, the name of this type of match came to stand for the Dartmouth game as a whole. To divide students into sides by the old division simply meant to separate them based on the classes to which they belonged, with even-numbered class years forming one team and odd-numbered years the other:

The traditional division necessarily called into the game every student in college, for the most common contests were played according to “Old Division” (later known as “Whole Division”), bringing seniors and sophomores against juniors and freshmen.

During 1874, the school paper reported an Old Division match: “Foot-ball is in order just at present. Forty-two Seniors and Sophs, in a series of games on the afternoon of the 7th, beat an equal number of Juniors and Freshmen very neatly three games in succession, thereby winning the match.” The old division played up the friction between the classes, and Edwin Bartlett noted that students sometimes used other divisions in order “to avoid the excessive tension of the Old Division Football (often called Whole Division) game, which was Seniors and Sophomores vs. Juniors and Freshmen.” (Albert Perkins Tibbets of the class of 1907 wrote in 1915 that Old Division was “incorrectly called ‘Whole Division’ in the last years of the game.”)

The Old Division form of the Dartmouth game appears to have faded by 1890. Harlan Page, who entered during the fall of 1875 and remained through his freshman year, was still able to be especially active in the frequent Old Division Football matches, and classmate Clifford H. Smith ’79 wrote home that “I roll at ten pins some, and kick football most every day.” An engraving published in 1884 appeared to show a mass of students playing the game. Yet according to a lament of 1886, interest in the daily game was fading, a victim of an interest in tennis:

To the door of lawn tennis we may lay the gradual degeneration of the good old game of football, which has so long been a feature at Dartmouth. Three years ago the Frater and social games were the chief sport of the cool, breezy fall days; but now, alas! the game has become no more than a cheap imitation of Rugby, kept alive not for itself, but for the convenient opportunity afforded for the meeting of Sophomores and Freshmen. Many of the rules have been forgotten, the good “kick[er]s” are dropping out each year.

---

110 Quint, for example, generalized in his History of Dartmouth, 246-247, that “[f]ootball of the ‘Old Division Football,’ free-for-all, ‘kick-as-kick-can’ style flourished for many years.”
111 Id.
112 “Dartmouth Items,” The Dartmouth 8, No. 9 (November 1874), 349.
113 Edwin J. Bartlett, A Dartmouth Book of Remembrance, 15.
114 Tibbets, 259.
115 Necrology, Rev. Harlan Page, Dartmouth Alumni Magazine 23, No. 6 (April 1931), 422.
116 Clifford H. Smith ’79 to mother and sister (2 October 1875), quoted in Ralph Nading Hill, ed., 225.

and in five years more the game will have passed entirely away, to be recalled only as a tradition by gray-haired men.\footnote{118}

Bartlett and Gifford, who arrived as freshmen in 1890, wrote that the game was played “till very lately.”\footnote{119} As late as 1912, the newspaper described the “aimless kicking contests that crowd the campus,”\footnote{120} probably not a reference to soccer, since Professor Bartlett was proposing that students begin playing soccer at the time, but no later reference has appeared.

\section*{II. Social Friends vs. United Fraternity}

One late-nineteenth century writer on the Dartmouth game explained that “[a] second division was ‘between the two all-inclusive literary societies, ‘Social Friends’ and ‘United Fraters.’”\footnote{121} These groups were the dominant student clubs before the 1840s, the Society of Social Friends (1783) and its offshoot the United Fraternity (1786). The groups competed for new inductees among the members of each entering class,\footnote{122} and as early as 1790 they had to draw up joint rules to regulate their rivalrous membership selections. Their competition for members caused the school “extensive detriment,” and the College took over the selection process permanently during 1815 by assigning alternate names to a pool of potential members for each society to choose from. During 1825, the faculty eliminated any remaining choice and began to assign every freshman directly and automatically to one or the other society.\footnote{123} The groups obtained corporate charters from the New Hampshire Legislature during 1826 (UF) and 1827 (SF)\footnote{124} and they remained rivals until the mid-nineteenth century.\footnote{125}

By the 1860s, the groups’ main function seems to have been to manage their libraries, which together were larger than the library of the College and much more useful to students.\footnote{126} Football, however, continued to depend on the College’s automatic annual assignment of members to each society, a connection that Edwin Bartlett indicated in his description of the game during his student days (1868-1872):
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The United Fraternity, known as Fraters, and the Social Friends were still active organizations, and all freshmen were assigned to one or the other by alphabetical alternation. Thus they kicked football upon the campus[.]127 Bartlett also wrote:

You ran all over the campus, and when, as, and if you got a chance you kicked a round rubber ball to the east or to the west. . . . You always knew in which direction to kick because you were bound to know whether you were a Frater or a Social.128

By merging their by-then joint society library with the library of the College during 1874,129 the societies left themselves with almost no reason to exist. Yet the College kept assigning incoming students to one or the other group, as Charles Merrill Hough ’79 recalled:

During the whole of my course the Social Friends and the United Fraternity existed, so far as I knew or ever heard, solely for the purpose of forming a convenient division of the College into two approximately equal bodies of men who played football against each other. I became a “member” of the Social Friends (so far as I ever knew) by finding my name, with an “S” after it, posted on the Bulletin Board in front of the chapel during the first fortnight of my first Freshman term.130

The Fraters vs. Socials division appeared frequently in descriptions of football, recurring as late as 1886.131 It was also described as the typical alternative to Old Division.132 The two societies would not disband officially until 1905.133

III. New Hampshire vs. the World

Bartlett and Gifford ’94s, describing the game before 1893, wrote that “[a]nother favorite division of later years put New Hampshire against the world, in which the New Hampshire boys were usually quite able to hold their own.”134 Most accounts of the game do not mention this division. The number of New Hampshire students attending Dartmouth varied over time, but never was more than a minority. During the fall of

---

127 Edwin J. Bartlett, A Dartmouth Book of Remembrance, 15.
128 Id., 22. The formative English football codes also typically ignored uniforms, except for the red and blue flannel caps required by the 1857 Sheffield Rules as printed in Tony Brown.
129 Harding, 263-264, citing Charles M. Hough to M.D. Bisbee (9 November 1901).
130 Dartmouth Literary Monthly (October 1886), reprinted in Aegis 1926 (1926), 486.
132 Quint, History of Dartmouth, 171; see also The Dartmouth 24 (29 May 1903): 517.
133 Bartlett and Gifford, 3.

1868, for example, New Hampshire students made up about forty percent of students.\textsuperscript{135} Among the 103 freshman of 1894-1895, some 28 were from New Hampshire.\textsuperscript{136}

**IV. The Usual Game of Foot-Ball (Freshmen vs. Sophomores)**

Students singled out a small number of their football meetings each year for special treatment: instead of the casual daily all-school football of the rest of the fall and spring, this game was just between the freshmen and sophomores. Such a match could erupt when the upperclassmen walked out of an Old Division match for just that purpose:

> [I]Immediately after supper, would cries would be heard of “Football, Freshie,” continued until, under the tutelage of their Junior allies, the Freshmen produced the Ball; it was the old style rubber one, blown up with a key, and was put in play, *Whole Divisions* taking part. As daylight faded the cry would arise, “Seniors and Juniors out!” and the contest remained with the two lower classes.\textsuperscript{137}

The Usual Game also came about when one side offered a formal challenge. Juniors editing the 1859 class *Aegis* wrote:

> Our Freshmen brethren have, but recently, distinguished themselves for ‘moral courage’ in declining the kind invitation extended to them by the Sophomores, to allow their limbs to be used for football; and future sons of Dartmouth will, undoubtedly, soon listen to the traditionary romances of College life, with the same eager interest with which we now listen to Europe’s days of valor; while our esteemed Professors will bless forever the decline of College chivalry.\textsuperscript{138}

During the fall of 1864, the freshmen experienced a few weeks of ordinary matches before

about the middle of the term the grand match game came off. Hughes was stationed on the left, and kept his position faithfully during the whole game, which lasted about fifteen minutes. Having been “triumphantly” defeated, we left the field, magnanimously cheering for the victors.\textsuperscript{139}

Because interclass tension created a natural affinity between freshmen and juniors, members of the junior class would train and advise the freshmen for their big match against the sophomores. During the fall of 1877, for example, the juniors and freshmen played a practice match in which the juniors won the first, third, and fifth of five games. “After this, ‘whole-division’ was called for, and ’78 and ’80 won three straight

\textsuperscript{135} Bartlett, *A Dartmouth Book of Remembrance*, 12.
\textsuperscript{136} “The University World: Dartmouth,” *American University Magazine* 1, No. 4 (February 1895), 481.
\textsuperscript{137} Locke, 115.
\textsuperscript{138} *Aegis* 1859 (ca. 1858), reprinted in *Aegis* 1926 (1926), 485.
\textsuperscript{139} F.C. Hathaway, “Chronicles,” in “Exercises of Class Day at Dartmouth College, July 21, 1868” (Claremont, N.H.: 1868), 17.

games.”

Quint ’87 also wrote of a junior coaching a freshman by encouraging him to get in the game.

The sophomore class, though often smaller than the freshman class, typically won the Usual Game through superior teamwork and experience. The sophomores beat the freshmen in just four minutes during the fall of 1871, for example, and then they challenged the juniors, who refused to play. During the fall of 1873, The Dartmouth reported that “[t]he customary games of foot-ball have been played. The superior skill and discipline of the Sophomores was attended with a victory after a sharp contest.” The following year, “[t]he usual game of Foot Ball, between the Sophomores and Freshmen” was not much of a spectacle, as ’77 won two straight games — the first lasting less than one minute, the second six minutes.” After losing the Usual Game of 1874, the freshmen resolved to get to know each other in order to fare better in future games. During 1879, the sophomores seem to have been uncharacteristically weak and declined some freshman challenges, as a freshmen boasted later: “the two games that ’82 refused to play us during Freshman fall and spring, only deprived us of scoring two more victories.” That 1883 class beat the freshmen below them as sophomores, “the requisite three out of five being won in a little less than half an hour.” This game at Dartmouth was known as “the usual game at foot ball” or simply “the usual game” by the middle of the nineteenth century, a name it retained for decades.

The Usual Game outlasted the other forms of Old Division. Such annual matches were typical collegiate activities, and here as elsewhere they were prone to devolving into fights for possession of the ball, or “rushes.” Because the match involved the two classes with the most heated rivalry, each Usual Game tended to become a hands-on fight for the ball and eventually lost any pretense of even starting as a football contest. As the Usual Game became a scheduled rush, its the name was transformed to “the usual football rush” and then simply “the Football Rush,” an event that lasted until 1948.

140 “Dartmouth Items,” The Dartmouth 3, No. 1 (6 September 1877), 11.
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145 Walter Brown, 28.
146 Cushman, “Campus Oration,” in Exercises of Class Day at Dartmouth College, Tuesday, June 26, 1883 (Hanover, N.H.: Class of 1883, 1883), 21.
147 William White Niles, “Chronicles” in Exercises . . . 1883, 28. Niles presumably means three games won in a single half-hour, not three games of a half-hour each.
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The Players’ Equipment

It was faculty rather than students who regulated the players’ boots. The goal was to prevent students from adding spikes or other dangerous features, which was a significant problem. For example, Samuel Bartlett ’36 wrote about the game during 1832-1833:

And it had its kickers, too. I remember one of them, a senior when I was a freshman, and the stupendous boots he had made on purpose, with sole fully a half inch thick. I can seem to see him as he stood once on the extreme edge of a dense, surging mass of strugglers, the foot-ball far out of sight in the centre, but the boots going like a horizontal trip-hammer all the same; and in the sequel my belligerent classmate did not leave his room for some days after, and with a slight hitch in his gait.151

Eden Burroughs Foster ’37 was a football enthusiast, his biographer wrote, until the moment when

he was effectually stopped by the barbarity of a fellow-student, who deliberately had his boots prepared with iron soles, and then, on the foot-ball ground, kicked Mr. Foster with all his might upon the shin. The leg was nearly broken by the blow, and Mr. Foster was scarcely able to get to his room. He suffered from the injury for weeks, and was never able to play foot-ball again.152

The faculty banned football around 1869153 because of the expense of supplying new balls, a cost that fell to freshmen,154 and because of the game’s violence: “[f]or a year the faculty in its inscrutable wisdom debarred this highly useful game because of abuses, as they thought, in the manner of playing it.”155 Edwin Bartlett’s account of the ban does not indicate that students actually intended the spikes on their boots to harm others rather than simply to puncture the ball, however. In order to persuade the faculty to allow the game again, students proposed to eliminate all pointed instruments from the toes of their boots,156 and President Smith agreed to furnish each new ball. When the faculty lifted their ban on the game around 1870,157 students continued playing under a more stringent set of rules than had existed previously.158

151 Samuel Colcord Bartlett, “Early College Sports,” in Bartlett and Gifford, 7-8. Bartlett wrote that his unnamed schoolmate in the class of 1833 became an elector from Vermont who helped win Lincoln’s nomination.


153 Edwin J. Bartlett wrote in “Mere Football” at 18 that the ban came in 1868 but also stated that it lasted only a year and returned during 1870.


155 Edwin J. Bartlett, A Dartmouth Book of Remembrance, 22.


157 Edwin J. Bartlett, A Dartmouth Book of Remembrance, 23. Richardson II: 555 indicates that the ban was lifted during the year following 1868, i.e. as late as 1870.

158 Bartlett and Gifford, 7.

English football evidently dealt with a similar problem, as F.A. Rule 13 (1863) provided that “[n]o player shall be allowed to wear projecting nails, iron plates, or gutta percha on the soles or heels of his boots.”\textsuperscript{159} The equivalent American I.C.F. Rule 11 (1873) likewise stated that “[n]o player shall wear spikes or iron plates upon his shoes.”\textsuperscript{160}

**The Referee**

Accounts of the Dartmouth game are almost universally free of any mention of umpires. Faculty did have to intervene occasionally, as James Alfred Spalding ’66 wrote in his description of the arrival of freshmen in 1862:

> All through our college years football was played in the same incredible fashion, so that professors would intervene and pull us apart; and once the President himself came to the aid of the “under dog.”\textsuperscript{161}

During the annual rush of 1887, President Samuel Colcord Bartlett, a football veteran, dragged Paul Carson ’91 out of the fray, as one student wrote facetiously:

> While watching the rare sport he was so overcome by the scenes and recollections of his earlier years that,\textsuperscript{162} putting aside for a time his customary dignity, he entered into the contest with a vim and enthusiasm which only a practiced adept could manifest. ‘Kit’ Carson was inadvertently dragged from the melée, a performance ‘Kit’ repeated the next year, when he pulled out a classmate with much exertion and profanity, to the infinite delight of sundry Freshmen witnesses.\textsuperscript{163}

Thus it was with unrealistic hopefulness that the students’ code of 1871 stated:

> **Rule 1.** Five umpires, one from each class in the Academical, and one from the Scientific Department, shall be elected annually by the college. The senior umpire present shall settle all disputes which arise concerning the game.\textsuperscript{164}

The newspaper listed the names of the first umpires elected under Rule 1 when the rule was announced,\textsuperscript{165} but the paper noted when reprinting the rules three years later that

\textsuperscript{159} Football Association Rules (1863), in Tony Brown.
\textsuperscript{160} Intercollegiate Football Rules (1873) in PFRA, “No Christian End!”
\textsuperscript{161} Spalding, 41.
\textsuperscript{163} Id., 20.
\textsuperscript{164} “Editorial Department,” *The Dartmouth* 5, No. 9 (October 1871), 364.
succeeding students had not followed (only) Rule 1.166 (Umpires also were needed for the rule on fouls, so students might have ignored the foul rule as well.)

Creating a system of elected umpires was conventional, and the I.C.F. Rules of 1873, presumably borrowing from the F.A., similarly required the team captains to choose one judge from each college as well as one referee,167 a person to whom the partisan judges would “refer” their disputes. Later writers noted that the I.C.F. rules’ reliance on appointed judges was naïve, since it merely caused all the tough decisions to go to the referee.168

After the turn of the century, Dartmouth’s new uniformed society for the enforcement of traditions, Palaeopitus, became something close to a corps of referees for the usual freshman-sophomore Football Rush and would continue to police it until 1948.

The Duration of the Match

Old Division Football flourished during the fall,169 but students also played it during the spring. Whenever they played, it was during school terms, so students did not require any rule on time limits – they simply played when they did not have to be at meals, recitations, chapel, or in their rooms, studying. During the decades prior to the elective course system, most of the students in a particular class year would have the same schedule, and all would have at least the noon hour free. The class of 1827 played the Dartmouth game during their noon recreation hour, according to later reminiscences.170 Samuel Hopkins Willey ’45, lumping football in with all kinds of exercise, wrote that he and his fellow students “played [base]ball, and kicked football on the common, and went swimming in the river, and took long walks – sometimes ten or fifteen miles on Saturdays.”171 By 1849, the College laws stated that studies ended at noon and started at 2 p.m. Only during that midday period did the school rules not require students to remain indoors and “abstain from all loud conversation, singing, playing on musical instruments, and from all other noise which may cause interruption.”172

166 “FOOT BALL RULES.—At the request of many we publish the following rules which were adopted in the autumn of ’71, and, with the exception of Rule I, have been observed ever since.” “Editorial Department,” The Dartmouth 8, No. 7 (September 1874), 264, reprinted in Aegis 1926 (1926), 485.
167 Rule 10, Intercollegiate Football Rules (1873) in PFRA, “No Christian End!”
168 PFRA Research, “No Christian End!”
169 Bartlett and Gifford, 13.
170 Richardson I: 381, referring to the Memorial of the Class of 1827 (1869).
171 Samuel Hopkins Willey, “Dartmouth 1840-1845, A Reminiscence” (Hanover: Dartmouth College Library Archives Department, 1955), 12.

A graduate of 1866 recalled that “[d]inner came at noon and generally, about two in the afternoon, we played football. After that, we recited and had the rest of the afternoon and evening to ourselves.” A graduate of four years later reported that games took place during the half hour between noon and dinner each day, as well as on Wednesday and Saturday afternoons. “The game could be played half an hour or all the afternoon; . . . It was especially adapted to the half-hour between 12 when recitations closed and 12:30 when the dinner bell rang,” according to Edwin Bartlett ’72. Academic regulations of the late 1870s reinforced the grant of free time between noon and 2 p.m., adding additional free time after 2 p.m. following public speaking on Wednesdays, as well as on Saturday afternoons. A report of 1874 noted that nighttime games by moonlight were popular. Since scoring a goal counted as winning the game, and a match comprised several games of varying lengths, time was not a crucial factor in Old Division Football.

The Start and Restart of Play

The Start of Play

Players started the game with a kickoff, consistent with the rules of Cambridge (1848) and Sheffield (1857). But the form of the Old Division kickoff was different: it was both unidirectional and sited idiosyncratically.

Kicking the ball to start a match of the Dartmouth game was called “warning the ball,” and every “warn” (kickoff) was performed by the western team, kicking eastward toward the row of College buildings lining that side of the Green. Perhaps because a strong place-kick threatened to send any especially bouncy ball over the fence to an easy victory, the “warning ground” was not located in the center of the pitch as football rules typically required but was sited at a spot nearer the northwest corner of the Green.
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The site was marked by a bare patch of earth that represented second base each spring in the school’s official baseball diamond, making the site about ninety feet from the nearest football sidelines and roughly 250 feet from the distant eastern goal. (Dartmouth students were playing baseball by the 1830s and formed an intercollegiate Baseball Club in 1862, adopting the northwest portion of the Green as their official baseball ground and later adding a backstop and bleachers.) Using the permanent second base as a marker assured teams that the ball would be warned from the same spot for each game and from year to year. After each goal, the teams switched sides.

The rules of 1871 confirm the location for the “warning ground” and the unidirectional nature of the kickoff:

Rule 2. The ball shall be warned from the second base of the college grounds and towards the buildings. No warn shall be valid until both parties are ready.

Rule 3. Until the ball is kicked the warning party shall stand behind the ball and their opponents in front; the latter at a distance of at least two rods. These positions, and the warn as well, shall be changed each game.

The 1873 I.C.F. rules likewise required that “[i]n starting the ball it shall be fairly kicked, not ‘babied,’ from a point 150 feet in front of the starter's goal. The requirement that the sides switch after each goal was typical and appears in the Cambridge Rules and F.A. Rules.

Charging during the Warn

Dartmouth’s 1871 rules gave the receiving team a minimum distance from the kickoff of at least two rods or 33 feet. By comparison, the Uppingham School gave the kicker a distance of six paces and the Football Association ten yards. The Sheffield Rules were unusual among the various English rules in that they permitted charging.

The Restart of Play

The Dartmouth rules had no provision for a throw-in after a foul as other codes required. Under Dartmouth’s 1871 rules at least, it was an umpire who was to restart play:
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Rule 6. In case of a foul the ball shall be tossed up by the umpire at the place where the foul occurs, unless it be within two rods of either fence, in which case the ball shall be brought directly in a distance of two rods before umpiring.\(^{191}\)

Robert Fletcher, writing of his early years as the Dean of the Thayer School beginning in 1871,\(^{192}\) described a way of starting the game that seems close to this tossup:

[F]or playing the game, the two groups arrayed on opposite sides of the campus; a referee tossed the ball in the middle, and the scrimmage which followed determined which side would win the ball. There was no official in charge of athletics.\(^{193}\)

Harvard’s pre-Civil-War rules apparently permitted restarting the game after a fair catch or a kick out of bounds by the use of a maneuver called a “fair lick.”\(^{194}\) The 1873 I.C.F. rules, on the other hand, stated that committing a foul required that “the player so offending shall throw the ball perpendicularly into the air to a height of at least 12 feet and the ball shall not be in play until it has touched the ground.”\(^{195}\)

The Ball in and out of Play

The ball seems to have been in play at almost all times during an Old Division match, since very few occurrences were capable of halting play if the ball was still on the Green. The ball was out of bounds when it left either of the sides of the pitch and entered one of the streets surrounding the Green. The 1871 rules described the treatment of the foul ball:

Rule 5. It shall be considered foul . . . when it passes the fence at the north or south end of the common, or at either corner, or when knocked past the east or west fence.\(^{196}\)

The object of the game, of course, was to kick the ball past the east or west fence, so the Rule 5 prohibition against “knocking” the ball past the goals apparently prohibited using the hands to score. For comparison, the Cambridge rules also forbade the scoring of a goal if the ball was “thrown, knocked on, or carried.”\(^{197}\) the Uppingham School
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\(^{192}\) Fletcher became the first Dean of the Thayer School in 1871 according to the *General Catalog of Dartmouth College* (Hanover, N.H.: Dartmouth College, 1911), 138.

\(^{193}\) Fletcher, 1.

\(^{194}\) Hall, citing *Harvardiana* IV, 22.

\(^{195}\) Intercollegiate Football Rules (1873) in PFRA, “No Christian End!” For the foul of running with the ball, the site of the tossup was the site of the foul; for an out-of-bounds foul, the player had to toss the ball up from a spot fifteen paces in.

\(^{196}\) “Editorial Department,” *The Dartmouth* 5, No. 9 (October 1871), 364.

\(^{197}\) Cambridge Rules (1848), in Tony Brown.

(1862) barred goals achieved by throwing, and the F.A. (1863) also banned goals that were “thrown, knocked on, or carried.”

**The Method of Scoring**

Old Division Football made no fundamental distinction between goals, points, match scores or in some cases even seasonal records – a single goal simply won the game, and it was time to start another game, with several games comprising a single match. The 1871 rules explained how to achieve a victory in simple terms:

*Rule 7.* The game shall be won when the ball is kicked past the east or west fence.

The simplicity of the text also was inconsistent with the Cambridge Rules, which counted the majority of goals as winning the match. The 1873 American intercollegiate rules also were more complex, since they required six goals to win the game, or the highest number when the game was called.

The Usual Game was the form of the Dartmouth game in which students paid the most attention to a single match with a single overall score, even if they still described it in terms of “games” won or lost. By 1880, the format of the annual match was set at the best three out of five games, effectively creating a single game in which each goal counted as one point and the first team to three points was declared the winner. Because the games had no set time limits, the amount of time a team took to win each particular game became one of the main statistics used in describing Old Division.

**Fouls and Misconduct**

**Running with the Ball**

The main method of moving the ball was with the feet. Bartlett and Gifford in *Dartmouth Athletics* noted that the two purposes of any new rules were to prevent violence and restrict ball-movement to the feet. Tibbets stated that students avoided running with the ball simply because running did not pay. Later commentators distinguished the Dartmouth game from rugby by noting that the Dartmouth game was played with the feet only.

---
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204 Bartlett and Gifford, 4.
205 Tibbetts, 259.
206 Richardson, II: 492.

In North America, Princeton’s Ballown game and the kicking game at the University of Toronto (1850s-1870s) both apparently relied on “batting” the ball with the hands, though that method of movement became less important with the advent of the leather-cased rubber ball during the late 1850s, a change that enabled dribbling. After American games felt the influence of the F.A., however, the Intercollegiate Rules (1873) barred throwing or carrying the ball while still permitting other types of handling.

**Use of the Hands**

Although “knocking” the ball across the goal or carrying the ball was a foul, the rules did not ban other uses of the hands. Players might have been able move the ball by knocking or swatting it. The ball also might have been too heavy to move effectively with the hands. One of the probable authors of the 1871 rules, Edwin Bartlett, indicated that in some cases the game allowed a player to balance the ball on his open hand, or to toss it up to be received on the palm (his own palm, Bartlett implied).

Whether the Dartmouth rules allowed a player to make a fair catch is not certain. Eugene Locke ’70 wrote that if a player caught the ball in the air, he could place it on the ground and warn it again. Tibbetts, writing in 1915, also mentioned the fair catch:

> The one rule that was observed, and that had the most influence on the style of play, was that a fair catch entitled a man to a place kick without interference. If one of the defending side caught the ball before it hit the ground beyond the fence, he was allowed to bring it two rods inside the fence and to have a place kick. As the round ball could best be kicked from the ground each player tried for a fair catch.

Yet the 1871 rules stated unequivocally:

**RULE 5.** It shall be considered foul when the ball is caught on the bound, or fly, orpicked from the ground.[2]

In England, the fair catch was widespread during the formative decades of soccer. The Cambridge Rules (1848) permitted a player to catch the ball on the fly and then kick it; the Sheffield Rules (1857) permitted a fair catch in the air, to be marked on the ground and sent off with a free kick, and also permitted the pushing or hitting of the ball

---

209 Intercollegiate Football Rules (1873) in PFRA, “No Christian End!”
211 Locke, 115.
212 Tibbetts, 259.
213 “Editorial Department,” *The Dartmouth* 5, No. 9 (October 1871), 364.
with the hand;\textsuperscript{215} the Uppingham School Rules (1862) allowed a player to use his hands
to stop the ball and place it before his feet;\textsuperscript{216} and the Football Association permitted a
fair catch, though it banned running with or throwing the ball once it was caught.\textsuperscript{217}

\textit{The Off-Sides Rule}

There is no evidence that Old Division Football had anything like the concept of an
offensive player being unfairly ahead of the ball. Defenders receiving the warn were
required to be east of the warning ground,\textsuperscript{218} but nothing required them to contact the ball
before the offensive side was permitted to do so. Tibbetts wrote that “[a]t the ‘warn’ the
ball was kicked from the middle of the Campus toward the east fence, and as there were
no off-side rules practically all of both teams were ahead of the man who kicked off.”\textsuperscript{219}

Sheffield likewise lacked an off-sides rule, and players who were called “kick-
throughs” apparently made a practice of standing around the opponent’s goal, awaiting a
pass.\textsuperscript{220} In contrast, the Cambridge Rules of 1848 notably included an off-sides rule.\textsuperscript{221}
The concept would be essential to all later major rules, including those of the Uppingham
School (1862) and the Football Association (1863), which stated:

If the ball has passed a player and has come from the direction of his own goal, he
may not touch it till the other side have kicked it, unless there are more than three of the
other side before him. No player is allowed to loiter between the ball and the adversaries’
goal.\textsuperscript{222}

The American I.C.F. rules of 1873 only approximated this rule: “Until the ball is
kicked no player on either side shall be in advance of a line parallel to the line of his goal
and distant from it 150 feet.\textsuperscript{223}

\textit{Hacking, Pushing, and Holding}

Kicking an opponent’s shins (“hacking”) or generally fighting with him seems to have
been a highlight of the Dartmouth game. A national dictionary of college words of the
1850s listed “to shin” as a verb describing the act of kicking a person in the shins,
performed as “one of the means which the Sophomores adopt to torment the Freshmen,
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especially when playing at football,” and gave an 1846 example from Yale.\textsuperscript{224} A Dartmouth freshman wrote in 1846:

We have rare sport here at foot ball. Generally there are about 100 out at a time (daily) on the perfectly level common of six acres. Two classes kick against the other two. And such rushes you never saw. It is the rule to push over every opponent you are able & sometimes small folks stand a small chance in the crowd. The excitement is so great, at times, that they do everything but knock down. Blows are frequently given & the Fr[eshmen] have the insolent audacity to kick the Seniors when they dispute and shove each other.\textsuperscript{225}

After experiencing this violence, some students did not dare play again. Peter Thacher Washburn ’35 recorded in his diary that he played only twice during his four years, and he “got well kicked for his pains.”\textsuperscript{226} Samuel Bartlett’s son Edwin wrote “[m]y father, who entered Dartmouth in 1832, had his nose broken by some one’s casual elbow” while playing football.\textsuperscript{227} Everett Boynton ’45 wrote some thirty years after graduating:

And now I cross the common, famous for football in the olden times before gymnasiums provided for muscular development. What fierce, sanguinary, raiment-rending contests we did have! To this day I bear the marks of one desperate battle, on the most prominent part of my face.\textsuperscript{228}

During 1877, Osmyn Perkins Conant ’79 Chandler “sprained his ankle while playing foot-ball” and had to be helped to his room by classmate Charles Carroll Applegate.\textsuperscript{229}

The violence was a concern to faculty and prompted regulation,\textsuperscript{230} as in 1871:

\textbf{Rule 4.} No player shall kick, trip, strike, or hold another for any cause during the game.\textsuperscript{231}

Contrast the concerns of the English rules, which disagreed on what to ban: Cambridge (1848) did not bar hacking but prohibited holding; Sheffield (1857) permitted pushing but not holding or hacking; Uppingham barred hacking but not pushing or holding; the Football Association allowed none.\textsuperscript{232} The I.C.F. stated: “No tripping shall be allowed, nor shall any player use his hands to hold or push an adversary.”\textsuperscript{233}
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Changes in the Dartmouth Game, 1886-1948

Students played Old Division Football less frequently during the 1880s, a decline later blamed on the arrival of rugby.\textsuperscript{234} This explanation makes sense insofar as rugby was yet another distraction, along with elective classes, the generally increased civilization of the College, and the increased availability of other sports. Larger enrollments and some reduction in inter-class rivalries also may have had an effect. Students did not simply switch allegiances from the old football code to the new rugby code, however. Rugby was a small-team running game meant for careful rehearsal and suited to intercollegiate play, and Dartmouth students played rugby and its descendant American football for several years\textsuperscript{235} alongside Old Division and its descendant the Usual Game, just as Old Division had coexisted with other intercollegiate sports such as rowing and baseball.

**The Arrival of the Football Association Rules (1863) in the U.S.**

Not until 1863 did the members of the Football Association join together in London and codify a kicking game that a significant number of other clubs could agree to play. Those rules came across the Atlantic, where students at several colleges picked them up. They might have influenced Dartmouth’s 1871 code, if only by giving students the idea of writing down their rules.

The Football Association's code, descendants of which eventually gave rise to global soccer, initially called for 25 players per side, a field of 110 meters by 70 meters, a goal 24 feet wide, and the movement of the ball by all parts of the body, including by batting or holding with the hands. Only carrying or throwing were not allowed. The first team to score 6 points won.\textsuperscript{236} Students at Rutgers University adopted the F.A. rules, either wholesale\textsuperscript{237} or with adaptations, playing with teams of 25 that allowed both batting and the use of Sheffield-style kick-throughs loitering near the goals. Rutgers players challenged students at Princeton to a set of matches, and on the common in New Brunswick, N.J.\textsuperscript{238} on November 6, 1869,\textsuperscript{239} the teams played what appears to have been

---

\textsuperscript{234} Tibbetts, 259. Tibbetts relied for evidence on a temporary lull in the Usual Game, which in fact continued for decades; Old Division, however, did seem to fade around this time.

\textsuperscript{235} Rugby was not necessarily a competitor to a local game. Many local games in U.K. public schools survived in the face of similar pressures. For example, though students at Eton today play the globally-popular rugby and Association Football, they also participate in the indigenous Field Game and the Wall Game. Eton is of course a public (preparatory) school and older than any college in the U.S., factors that encourage it to keep playing well-cemented indigenous games.

\textsuperscript{236} Litterer, “An Overview of American Soccer History.”

\textsuperscript{237} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{238} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{239} The [Rutgers] \textit{Targum} (November 1869), quoted in [Rutgers] \textit{Scarlet Knights Football}, “History: The First Intercollegiate Game,” at http://www.scarletknights.com/football/history/first_game.htm (viewed

the first inter-university soccer game\textsuperscript{240} in the world (Oxford would not play Cambridge until 1872, using the F.A. rules).\textsuperscript{241} Rutgers won the match six games to four. The second meeting took place at Princeton on November 13 under Princeton’s rules, which students apparently had published in 1867.\textsuperscript{242} Princeton’s code, which also have been described as a variant of the F.A. rules, allowed fifteen games in a match and let a player make a free kick if he caught the ball in the air.\textsuperscript{243} The home team won this second match eight games to none.\textsuperscript{244} Students at Princeton formed their own Football Association and adopted another official set of rules, presumably also F.A.-based, within two years after the Rutgers match took place.\textsuperscript{245}

One influence on the general impulse to start football competitions between schools actually was rowing,\textsuperscript{246} which had been the subject of the first intercollegiate sports meeting of any kind in the U.S.\textsuperscript{247} in 1852. That event saw two boat clubs of Yale (1843) and one club of Harvard (1844) meet on Lake Winnipesauke, N.H. Dartmouth students established several boat clubs around 1856\textsuperscript{248} and had five clubs by 1862, first entering intercollegiate competition four years later.\textsuperscript{249} Meanwhile, Amherst and Williams played the first intercollegiate baseball game in 1859, and the sport of baseball became part of the annual Harvard-Yale regatta in 1864.\textsuperscript{250}

Yale students picked up the association or soccer game as those at Rutgers and Princeton had,\textsuperscript{251} and during October of 1873, the captain of the Yale team invited four schools to play soccer against his in an Intercollegiate Football Association. Harvard did not join,\textsuperscript{252} but Princeton, Columbia, and Rutgers sent representatives to join Yale in New York that fall and draw up a uniform set of rules based on the F.A. rules of 1863. The IFA rules described sides of 20 players each, a field of 400 feet x 250 feet, a goal of 25

---
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feet in width, a minimum of six goals to win, and a rule awarding one point for sending the ball past the goal posts. The rules prohibited carrying the ball. In the first game played under the new rules, Yale beat Princeton. The Yale team later met a visiting team called the Eton Players in New Haven, playing the first Anglo-American soccer match (2-1 Yale, presumably using concessionary rules). Soccer took off in the U.S. over the next decade, becoming big enough that players in Newark, N.J. formed a (non-collegiate) American Football Association in 1884.253

Caught up in interclass rowing enthusiasm,254 Dartmouth students did not pay much attention to soccer. News of a football match reached Dartmouth by 1872,255 but students in Hanover did not join the Association Football movement. In 1874, some students did offer an apparently untried hybrid proposal that each class supply a football twelve to play under Old Division rules:

Foot-ball has been exciting considerable interest of late,—shins and the ball being kicked indiscriminately. Why not select a dozen men from each of the classes, and give us some foot-ball matches, as well as boat races.256

Soccer did not last long as a college sport in the U.S., generally fading from colleges during the early 1880s. Interest remained in eastern cities, however, with regional and national soccer leagues forming during the 1890s and early 1900s, some of them including professional teams. Semi-professional teams in New England created the Southern New England Football league in 1914,257 as the game began to emerge again at colleges. Dartmouth students started playing soccer during 1914.258

The Arrival of Rugby Football at Dartmouth (1876)

Rugby football, which English players codified as early as 1846 in the oldest known football code,259 was popularized in the U.S, at least through Tom Brown’s School Days (1857) and The Book of Rugby School, Its History, and Its Daily Life (1856), reviews of which appeared in U.S. magazines during 1857.260 U.S. college students acquired copies

254 “Dartmouth Items,” The Dartmouth 8, No. 7 (September 1874), 265.
256 “Dartmouth Items,” The Dartmouth 8, No. 8 (October 1874), 307.
258 Andres and Roberts, in Ralph Nading Hill, ed., 286.

of the rugby rules\textsuperscript{261} and began imitating the practices of the schoolboy character Tom Brown.\textsuperscript{262} When the decision of the London Football Association to bar running with the ball in its code of 1863\textsuperscript{263} created the decisive split from rugby, representatives of clubs that preferred the running game walked out of the meeting. Now two competing codes existed, each of which would become popular around the world. In 1866, Beadle & Company of New York published sets of rules for both Association Football (soccer) and the “handling game” (rugby),\textsuperscript{264} and individual American colleges would adapt first the former and then the latter during the 1860s and 1870s. The creation in Britain of the Rugby Union in 1871 solidified the rules of the running game.\textsuperscript{265}

McGill University of Montreal is the source of American football. \textit{The Dartmouth} reprinted a notice presaging the first rugby football match in the U.S.\textsuperscript{266} during the spring of 1874:

\begin{quote}
McGill University, Montreal, proposes to engage in a foot-ball match with Harvard about the first of May, and afterwards to (kick) with the rest of the New England colleges. – \textit{Vidette}.\textsuperscript{267}
\end{quote}

Teams from McGill and Harvard played each other at rugby in Cambridge on May 15, 1874. McGill brought the oval ball and the rules of the game, and those rules became the direct ancestor of the rules of American Football. (The teams’ match of the previous day did not influence American Football: it used a modified version of Harvard’s own unsophisticated round-ball kicking game, a game that might have been based on Harvard’s interclass contests\textsuperscript{268} or the grammar-school\textsuperscript{269} “Boston Game” played by the Oneida Football Club on Boston Common from 1862 to 1865.\textsuperscript{270}) \textit{The Dartmouth} reported the results of both McGill-Harvard matches:

\begin{quote}
In the recent football matches between Harvard and McGill University, the former was victorious. The first match was played according to the rules in use at Harvard; the second according to the Canadian rules. In the first match Harvard won three straight games in about twenty minutes, and in the second they did not get away with the Harvard Eleven.\textsuperscript{271}
\end{quote}
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Whatever their skill with their own game, Harvard players quickly recognized the merits of rugby and adopted it exclusively. They played Yale in 1875\textsuperscript{272} under rugby rules with concessionary modifications\textsuperscript{273} that allowed fifteen on a side\textsuperscript{274} and encouraged both goals and tries (i.e. touchdowns).\textsuperscript{275} The Yale players, taking up the message that Harvard had received from McGill, switched to rugby and dropped their I.F.A. soccer rules. A couple of Princeton students watching the first game of college football between U.S. teams also liked rugby and took it back to New Jersey,\textsuperscript{276} convincing students at a mass meeting there to adopt rugby instead of the existing soccer-style rules.\textsuperscript{277}

Although Dartmouth students declined a challenge from Tufts College during 1875,\textsuperscript{278} they too took some inspiration from the Harvard-Yale game.\textsuperscript{279} Rugby activists John E. Ingham ’77, Chalmers W. Stevens ’77,\textsuperscript{280} Lewis Parkhurst ’78,\textsuperscript{281} and others set up a single set of rugby-style goalposts on the east side of the Green during 1876. No one owned an oval ball, so the rugby experimenters had to make do with a traditional round ball of Old Division. Most students merely used the goal to hone their kicking skills for the Dartmouth game, and the goalposts lasted less than a year.\textsuperscript{282} An 1876 report noted that “[b]ase-ball has this fall been rarely seen upon the Dartmouth campus, foot-ball entirely taking its place,”\textsuperscript{283} although it is not clear which kind of football was meant.

Meanwhile, the rest of the intercollegiate world was adopting rugby. Students representing Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale met on November 23, 1876 to form another Intercollegiate Football Association, adopting a rugby code with some modifications. Wesleyan, Stevens, and Penn soon joined the league.\textsuperscript{284} Soccer was
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definitely dead, although Yale would hang on to eleven-man sides for non-league matches for a few years.\(^{285}\)  

On April 25, 1878, Dartmouth’s student paper published the “scrimmage” or rugby rules of the Intercollegiate Football Association\(^{286}\) and agreed with the proposal that Dartmouth students learn the game and join the league, noting that a movement already was afoot to select class elevens for “the English game of football.”\(^{287}\) By May 2, the paper was commenting that no one could interpret the I.F.A. rules.\(^{288}\) Students erected two pairs of goal posts the proper distance apart on the east and west sides of the Green,\(^{289}\) placing them at the south end of the field despite its slope at that spot.\(^{290}\) (The players might have tried to keep the game out of the way of Old Division, which emphasized the north part of the Green.) Students also bought a proper oval\(^{291}\) ball of rubber,\(^{292}\) and on May 16, 1878, two rugby sides known as the Blues and the Reds met on the Green to play Dartmouth’s first game of rugby.\(^{293}\) The rugby rules would remain an alien and confusing regime, however, until someone who had actually played the game came to Hanover.

Just as new sports typically arrived at Oxford and Cambridge in the minds of public schoolboys who had played them at the schools where they were popularized, rugby came to Dartmouth with four graduates of the Phillips Andover preparatory school during the fall of 1878.\(^{294}\) The four students raised interest in the game, and during 1879 students formed class elevens\(^{295}\) before three of the new players withdrew from College prior to their sophomore year.\(^{296}\) The fall of 1879 marks a turning point in the overlapping histories of Old Division and rugby: though the freshmen seem to have declined to play the Usual Game against the sophomores (they “never came to the scratch”), a rugby side representing the freshmen beat the sophomores by scoring one goal and two touchdowns to nothing.\(^{297}\)
The arrival in 1880 of the enthusiastic Clarence “Cap” Howland ’84, who had learned rugby at Williston Seminary, reinvigorated interest in the game and led students to form Dartmouth’s first all-university (‘varsity) eleven that fall. Samuel Worcester Robertson ’83 wrote that the first football squad was mostly sophomores and juniors. The club bought football suits from Princeton and in 1881 had a team photo taken on the steps of the gym, Bissell Hall (since demolished). The faculty was reluctant to give the rugby team permission to travel, denying requests on November 8, 1880 (fourteen players to Andover) and September 14, 1881 (Cambridge).

When the faculty granted a half-holiday for a home game on November 16, 1881 against Amherst, a team made mostly of Howland’s original eleven beat the visitors on the Green in Dartmouth’s first intercollegiate football match. Player Charles Weston Oakes ’83 wrote home about his part:

This has been quite an exciting week for Dartmouth. We played a game of foot-ball Wednesday with Amherst, it was the first game we ever played. We beat them one touchdown to nothing. Surprising everyone.

I ’spect I was the hero of the occasion. I made the touchdown and several good runs, and at the end of the game the boys rode me around the campus on their shoulders.

Everyone was nearly crazy during the game. The Professors ran around, clapped their hands, shouted, jumped up and down and fairly went mad. One Professor was overheard to say . . . when I was running the ball, “Go it, Charley! Run right through them, that’s good, dodge that man, Charley, do run it in! Hurrah! Hurrah!”

One of the Amherst players complimented me on my playing and said I could play as well as Camp of Yale. Camp is the best player in the country.

---

298 Pender and McPartlin. The varsity distinction, while not as relevant as the distinction used to select an all-Oxford team to represent the various colleges, had more meaning at Dartmouth in 1881 than it does today. For example, the best-established sport to that point, baseball, was played by nine teams in Hanover from which the “university nine” could draw its members. Each class in the College and each of its associated colleges (the Chandler Scientific School and the agricultural New Hampshire College) had a class nine that fed each school’s all-school nine.
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With a touchdown counting as one point, the score was 1-0 Dartmouth. The second game of this Dartmouth-Amherst series took place in the snow at Hampden Park in Springfield, Mass., on Thanksgiving and was a defensive struggle that ended in a draw.\footnote{Pender and McPartlin, 92.}

The Dartmouth rugby team continued to learn the game and to attempt to travel. Students requested during the fall of 1882 to be allowed to practice on the Green until 3 pm,\footnote{Edwin J. Bartlett, “Mere Football,” 18.} but the faculty replied that they would allow this privilege for only one sport, either football or baseball. Later the faculty allowed William White Niles ’83 to make a statement to them about rugby, and the faculty finally allowed the team to travel to out of town games,\footnote{Richardson II: 640.} granting permission for a game against Yale to be paired with a Hanover meeting. Neither game occurred.

On October 30, 1882, the faculty allowed the team to plan a Harvard match and let students out of their afternoon recess so the team could play McGill in Hanover.\footnote{Edwin J. Bartlett, “Mere Football,” 19.} Even though McGill had been the initial filter through which rugby had reached American schools during 1875, by 1882 the rules of the I.F.A. differed significantly from those McGill was using. Dartmouth and McGill had to work out concessionary rules when they played on the Green, compromising at thirteen players instead of McGill’s normal fifteen. McGill also apparently got permission to put the ball in play using some unique method, a concession that did not prevent Dartmouth from winning. The Harvard game of 1882 at Cambridge, however, was a loss for Dartmouth at 53-0,\footnote{Pender and McPartlin, 93.} causing the student paper to complain of the team that “[w]ith one slight failing they are all we could wish. That failing is that they cannot play Rugby any to speak of.”\footnote{Richardson II: 641.} During 1884, “[t]he entire team was a group of husky youths. They ate together at a Conant Hall training table, the chief articles of diet being roast beef rare three times a day, and for dinner two mugs of Bass's Ale from a keg kept in the cellar of the building.”\footnote{Pender and McPartlin, 95-96.} (Conant Hall is now Hallgarten Hall.) Yale came to Hanover with an eleven in 1884, and “[t]he visitors romped and frolicked over the Green without intentionally mutilating any of our men, and ran up a marvelous score in touchdowns and goals.\footnote{Edwin J. Bartlett, “Mere Football,” 20.}

Though Dartmouth did not field a team during the 1885-1886 year,\footnote{Id.; Pender and McPartlin, 97.} and though the team it fielded during 1886 lost on consecutive days to Andover, MIT, and Harvard,\footnote{Richardson II: 641.}

\footnotetext[307]{Pender and McPartlin, 92.}
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\footnotetext[310]{Edwin J. Bartlett, “Mere Football,” 19.}
\footnotetext[311]{Pender and McPartlin, 93.}
\footnotetext[312]{Richardson II: 641.}
\footnotetext[313]{Pender and McPartlin, 95-96.}
\footnotetext[314]{Edwin J. Bartlett, “Mere Football,” 20.}
\footnotetext[315]{Id.; Pender and McPartlin, 97.}
\footnotetext[316]{Richardson II: 641.}

students built up enough interest in rugby\textsuperscript{317} to make the game permanent in Hanover. As the scrimmage replaced the scrum, the 1882 “series of downs” rule\textsuperscript{318} and its consequent yard lines were required to prevented the ball-hogging that resulted from the scrimmage, and gridiron football\textsuperscript{319} diverged thoroughly from rugby. That divergence gave students room eventually to take up the latest English version of rugby during the twentieth century, as the Dartmouth Rugby Football Club formed in 1953\textsuperscript{320} and the Dartmouth Women’s Rugby Club in 1978.\textsuperscript{321}

The Survival of the Usual Game as the Usual Rush

The symbolic annual football match between sophomores and freshmen was a different story from standard Old Division, which was not heard of much after 1886. Students attached bragging rights and even dress privileges to this heated and highly anticipated contest. During the early 1870s, the paper continued to call the annual match “[t]he customary games of foot-ball”\textsuperscript{322} or “[t]he usual games of Foot Ball,”\textsuperscript{323} though by this time the match already was devolving into a rush. Eventually the game lost all pretense of football and the ball, a mere trophy, no longer needed to be a round football.

A “rush” was a collegiate fight, usually between classes, and was liable to erupt during any gathering when students were in high emotion. The two symbolic objects over which Dartmouth students most often held rushes during the latter part of the nineteenth century were the cane and the football. As spontaneity declined over the years, the fight over each object became a highly-organized annual event. One member of the class of 1866 named the three elements in the smorgasbord of violent activities available to him: cane rushes, football rushes, and (Old Division) football itself.\textsuperscript{324}

Every ordinary game of football at Dartmouth ran the risk of degenerating into a fight over the ball, and the games thus “were sometimes made the occasions for rushes,”\textsuperscript{325} as Richardson wrote. Particularly in the fall, when interclass tension was highest, the upperclassmen playing in the game would walk off the pitch in order to leave the freshmen to go against the sophomores in a tense struggle. The mood of the mob invariably would shift at some unplanned moment, as the players stopped trying to kick a

\textsuperscript{317} Id., 640.
\textsuperscript{318} Mel Smith, “What’s in a Game of Early Football?”, 11.
\textsuperscript{319} Hallett.
\textsuperscript{320} Andres and Roberts, in Ralph Nading Hill, ed., 287.
\textsuperscript{322} “Dartmouth Items,” The Dartmouth 7, No. 7 (September 1873), 297.
\textsuperscript{323} “Dartmouth Items,” The Dartmouth 8, No. 7 (September 1874), 265.
\textsuperscript{324} Dr. James Alfred Spaulding ’66, “The College in the Sixties,” ed. Dr. William Leland Holt, Dartmouth Alumni Magazine 32, No. 4 (January 1940), 42.
\textsuperscript{325} Richardson II: 555.

goal and started struggling with their opponents to grab, deflate, or run away with the football. This potential of the ball to shift instantly from a piece of game equipment into a trophy made sense in part because the ball was a symbol of freshman subjugation. One freshman wrote facetiously of the fall of 1864, “[d]uring the first few weeks we all distinguished ourselves by eighteen unsuccessful attempts to carry off the foot-ball” before the annual match occurred.\textsuperscript{326} The following year, the sophomores had to hold a class “conference” with the Professor of mathematics, on the subject of foot-ball rushes, and the “inconveniences” attending them. After a prolonged session, and numerous adjournments, it was unanimously resolved that “rushes;” during study hours, were deleterious; that all disturbances, during recitations, were “wrong;” and all declared their “present intention,” not to disturb the recitation except in cases of extreme excitement.\textsuperscript{327}

An entry in a memorial book written by a sophomore around 1867 read:

We rushed the football Tuesday night and then gave it back to them; then the next night we had an old-fashioned rush, cut the ball, and I got it out, and had it between my legs for some ten minutes, while a dozen groups were fighting to find it; at last I dropped it to the ground and put my foot on it. As I couldn’t get away with it, and the Freshmen were watching me, I sneaked it to Drew and started off, the Freshmen following in and rushing me while Drew went another way. Some followed him, though, and after they had searched me, we followed Drew and found a lot searching him up in front of Wentworth Hall, in the mud. We all went in, and Chandler Parker got it. The Freshmen felt “riled,” [t]hey had gone in rough and some of them got hurt, struck, slung, choked, etc., for not rushing fair! Folsom slung one a rod or so; Wilson choked Clay, a Junior, till he was senseless, put his fist in Mike Rogers’ face, and Drew about killed Brewer for choking him.\textsuperscript{328}

These rushes usually started as proper football games, however predictable may have been their falling apart. Eugene Locke ’70 reminisced about football matches during the same period:

The outstanding contests were the ones during the first evenings of freshman fall, on account of the ‘rushing’ between Sophs. and Freshies . . . . Soon, in the scramble, some Sophomore would fall on the ball, cut a hole and deflate it, and try to carry it off, which of course was resisted by the Freshmen, and a scrimmage for possession of the ball would result, which sometimes lasted for hours! I remember one occasion when a dozen ‘rushes’ were going on in different places, while the ball was safely stowed away in the

\textsuperscript{326} Hathaway, 17.
\textsuperscript{327} Id., 19.
\textsuperscript{328} Unnamed member of class of 1870, entry in memorial book, quoted by Locke, 116. Locke apparently added editorial information that has been removed here: “we followed Drew (afterward U.S. Senator) . . . Folsom (afterward State superintendent of Schools for N.H.) slung one a rod or so. . . . Drew about killed Brewer (who afterwards did such good work in Cuba and died there.).”

bosom of a flannel shirt of a freshman who was prone in the ditch which at that time ran along the street in front of Wentworth Hall.  

Bartlett ’72 agreed that the rush was a spontaneous event within a football match:

[A match] began after supper in the gloaming which soon faded into darkness. Without referee or timekeeper the round rubber ball was for a short time kicked about the field with increasing excitement and incipient fights. Then suddenly the ball disappeared. It was under some one’s shirt in a deflated condition. Dazed groups rushed hither and yon. The next day bits of the much-divided ball were triumphantly but guardedly shown to the losers and were held as precious trophies for a while – such a little while.

Bartlett still was able to differentiate the regular Old Division game from the Football Rush, reminiscing that a standard round rubber ball left nothing to be desired for football games “and for class rushes.” Around the time the daily game faded during the 1880s, however, the Usual Game of Foot-ball between the freshmen and sophomores lost all pretence of being a football game. The 1886 account quoted above, for example, complained that football was by then “kept alive not for itself, but for the convenient opportunity afforded for the meeting of Sophomores and Freshmen,” and that the rules also were fading away. The game became remarkably like Shrovetide football in England, a long-standing annual fight between two conflicting polities that strive for hours to move an object in space by almost any means.

The Usual Game, and especially the Football Rush that it became, created a large class of potential spectators among the upperclassmen and town residents. In his poem about an early-1880s freshman who heard the call of football for an annual match, Wilder D. Quint wrote:

And, answering to that kindly caterwaul
He joined the shaky army of his class,

---
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334 Walter Brown, 27.

An atom in a squirming, smothering mass,
Once, tossed aside by physics’ natural rule,
He heard a bearded Junior’s: “in, you fool!”
And venturing to ask the reason why,
“It’s Dartmouth spirit, boy; get in, or die.”

Quint himself had been tossed aside during the rush of 1883 and had heard the bearded and cowboy-like junior Richard Hovey ’85 say in a rich voice “[u]p, boy, and at them,” Quint wrote later. Apparently the same rush affected Charles Alexander Eastman (Ohiyesa) ’87, who wrote that the event took place after supper on the day of the first meeting of the freshman class and that he mistakenly “held up” a professor instead of a sophomore. The Boston daily papers made much of his error, Eastman recalled.

Students traditionalized and regimented the Football Rush as it became divorced from its origins in a kicking game. No longer a spontaneous event, it gained an official date and time: the evening after the freshmen held their first class meeting of the year as Eastman and others noted. During the meeting of 1888, the freshmen voted to take on the sophomores and “[t]he regulation ‘rushes’ followed, in which, it is needless to say, ’92 covered herself with glory.” Freshman victories were unusual but became less so as entering classes grew larger. The freshmen won, among other matches, those of 1893, 1895, 1898, 1900, 1902, 1906, 1910, 1916, 1918, 1926, 1929, 1934, and 1946.

---
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The growth of American football actually helped to structure the Football Rush. Organizers adopted the readily-available oval football, which was made for carrying. At its first class meeting, the freshmen would elect a football captain who typically served as their leader both during the rush and for the American-rules football team that would represent the freshman class. Eastman ’87 was selected such a captain;[342] “Dave” Austin ’04 was elected the captain “for the football rush” during the fall of 1900.[343] The job of starting and stopping the rush had to be filled by someone who had access to footballs, such as the manager of the College’s football team: in 1898, “Willis Hodgkins, the football manager, carrying a football under his arm, was rushed off the campus before the ambitious Freshmen could be made to understand that he was a Senior & a dignitary.”[344]

The growth in gridiron football likely prompted students to shift the name of “the usual game of foot-ball” to “the usual football rush” in order to avoid confusion, and the event became simply “the football rush.” Entering classes would play both games: although “the usual football rush” did not interest the sophomores much during 1895, and they lost, their American football team did manage to defeat the freshmen on the gridiron of Alumni Oval.[345] Similarly during 1896, the lower two classes held both the usual rush (which the sophomores won)[346] and a gridiron football game (freshmen 18, sophomores 6).[347] Freshman Douglas VanderHoof ’01 likewise reported seeing both an American football game (10-6, sophomores) and the usual Football Rush.[348] During 1901, the sophomores won the Football Rush but tied the freshmen in gridiron football.[349]

The Football Rush owed some its survival to the advent of Palaeopitus, a student government body that alumni established in 1900 largely for the purpose of preserving traditions. The secret group began to operate publicly in 1902[350] and soon enforced rules for the hazing of freshmen. It took over the management and scorekeeping for the annual freshman-sophomore Football Rush.

---

[345] Spring.
[349] Maynard. The sophomores won eleven-man football during 1906 (12-6) according to Aegis 1910 (ca. 1908), 302-303; other lineups listed 17 sophomores to the freshman team’s 18, as during 1907 (24-0 sophomores), according to Aegis 1909 (ca. 1907), 228; and 1909 (6-0 freshmen), as noted in Aegis 1911 (ca. 1909), 221.
[350] Leavens and Lord, 222, paraphrasing The Dartmouth (3 October 1903).

---

As College enrollments grew, Palaeopitus had to modify the rules of the rush to accommodate the growing teams. While freshman James Harrison Cavanaugh ’14\textsuperscript{351} won the 1910 rush by crossing the Green in the traditional narrow direction, carrying the football to College Hall,\textsuperscript{352} Palaeopitus soon switched the direction of play. By 1918, the contest ran the longer distance from north to south, requiring the freshmen to cross the narrow north side of the Green and reach Webster Hall. Clifford Burrowes Orr of the class of 1922 described the 1918 match:

And then tonight the great annual rush came off. The Freshmen were lined up on one side of the campus, with the Sophomores on the other. Then Paleoipus (11 picked Seniors who practically run all non-academical activities), dressed in their white flannels and white sweaters and bearing lighted torches, marched down the center of the campus to the steps of Webster Hall, where they took their stand. A whitewashed football was kicked off, and with wild Indian-like yells, the whole six-hundred of us piled on top of it, and pushed, fought, kicked, bit, tore, punched, and yelled our way the length of the campus, and gave the ball, entirely deflated, into the hands of the waiting Paleopitus. It took almost forty-five minutes of frantic struggling, merciless trampling, and unprecedented howling, but for the first time in seven years, the Freshmen won the rush, and the battle was over.\textsuperscript{353}

Another Palaeopitus innovation was addition of multiple footballs to the rush. By 1926, the freshmen and sophomores were fighting over not one but three whitewashed footballs, a number that did not prevent the freshmen from winning in 20 minutes.\textsuperscript{354} In 1934, the school’s official admissions booklet mentioned “the day when the entering class masses on the College green for the traditional freshman-sophomore rush.”\textsuperscript{355} By 1936, Palaeopitus conditioned the privilege of removing the obligatory beanie while in the Nugget Theater on a victory in the football rush.\textsuperscript{356} (Palaeopitus had come up with the mandatory beanie in 1911\textsuperscript{357} to replace the prohibition on carrying a cane, since canes had lost their cachet.\textsuperscript{358}) In 1939, the Football Rush involved five footballs,\textsuperscript{359} and one victorious freshman wrote:
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The rush had hardly got started when three of the five footballs were resting peacefully on the far side of the field. One more went over before the rush ended, and following the massacre several group fights resulted in the further humility of the Class of ’42.\textsuperscript{360}

By the Second World War, the idea of welcoming new students by effectively inviting them to rumble with a rival gang seemed unwise. President Ernest Martin Hopkins and officials at the Dick’s House infirmary requested a halt, and in 1949 the Undergraduate Council voted to substitute a tug-of-war for “the ancient football rush” (or “the barbarous Freshman-Sophomore Rush”).\textsuperscript{361} The \textit{Aegis} editor wrote that “[c]ertainly few wept over the fall of a tradition which required a corps of medics on the sidelines to pick up the wounded and extract whistles from the throats of conscientious referees.”\textsuperscript{362} Though interclass tug-of-war teams had been around since at least the 1880s,\textsuperscript{363} the new tug-of-war was at first anything but conventional. To permit hundreds to pull at once, planners used several ropes, passing each one through a hole in the side of a log. The idea was that the log would mark the progress of the match and afterward would bear the numerals of the winning class.\textsuperscript{364} The log flew dangerously toward the hundreds of men pulling on the winning side when the losers succumbed suddenly,\textsuperscript{365} and a standard tug-of-war rope replaced the log in subsequent years.\textsuperscript{366} Apparently during the 1970s\textsuperscript{367} students lost interest in the tug-of-war as well, dropping the last remnant of more than a century of Old Division Football on the Green.
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The 1871 Football Rules

The Bartlett Committee (1870)

The faculty banned football during 1868 as part of a series of crackdowns on hazing and violence of all kinds. One student wrote during 1868:

Last night, April 3d, there was a ball out, and Frank Johnson '70, Chandler, run it off before their eyes. They followed him and tried to rush the Walker House where he roomed. It was an exciting rush. Fifteen of us stood in the door way and held the whole Freshman Class at bay while four or five went in, locked the door and kept them out of the windows, while the Seniors, in the second story windows, by leaning out and taking their hands hauled them up. Soon Prof. Sanborn came down and got us to stand back from the door, and then we rushed, for fun, at the gate and held that. Then Prexy came down and made us disperse, but we kept the ball! It was a rough time, in a small yard, with a picket fence. Folsom and Page '71 would have fought, if Page had done it. Drew put Brewer '71 over on the fence with his whole weight on the pickets, slug Sam Page '71 in the middle of the street, head first. Woodbury slug Bates '71 down with one arm; Pike took Mike Rogers, '71 in the face with his elbow, to make him let go of Brockway, tore Thompson’s '71 coat off; Smith blacked Page’s eye. . . . Next morning the Freshmen hissed Johnson when he came in Chapel, and we cheered him. Prexy got “riley” and gave us a talking to about it, and about last night, and totally forbid rushing! Well, we are willing; '71 hasn’t got a ball yet.

A larger cane rush followed on April 9, 1869, and the faculty took it upon themselves to permit the freshmen to carry canes. The sophomores forced another cane rush on April 10, and the school reacted byrusticating nearly half of the men in the two lower classes. The disciplinary action also banned other forms of hazing, including football.

Students formed a committee to return the game during the fall of 1870, placing a second-generation football player and future professor Edwin J. Bartlett '72 in the chairmanship. He wrote later of the 1870-1871 school year:

In my junior year I was one of a committee sent by the College to ask the President please couldn’t we play the game again if we would be good; and he, after taking counsel, said yes.

---
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Bartlett reached an “understanding” with President Smith, and the faculty lifted their ban during the fall of 1870, allowing the game to return as a “foot-ball experiment.” A newspaper in Amherst, New Hampshire reported that “[t]he faculty of Dartmouth College have restored the game of foot-ball to the students, on their agreeing to comply with the faculty regulations of the game, and be governed in disputes by an umpire.” Specifically, the regulations banned pointed instruments from students’ toes and allowed the president to supply the balls, rather than the freshmen, since the task had become a form of hazing and created public disturbances.

The first game under the new rules took place on November 5, 1870 and the experiment succeeded during the remainder of the term. “There were no rushes or rows to speak of; the games were fairly conducted; and we see no reason to doubt that the difficulties attending foot-ball in previous years, have now been so far obviated that it can go on in future without any squabbling,” according to The Dartmouth. The paper commented that “[t]he startling cries of ‘foot-ball, Freshie,’ no longer greet our ear.”

Students reduced the new rules of the Dartmouth game to a formal code that they printed during the fall of 1871. The student newspaper The Dartmouth printed the seven tenets with an introduction:

The necessity of definite rules to govern our foot-ball contests has been a subject of frequent comment. To supply the deficiency in this respect, the following rules were prepared by a committee appointed for the purpose and adopted by the College. That they may be on record and accessible to all, it is judged proper to give them insertion here.

The most notable element of the rules is a feature they lacked: the capability of supporting an intercollegiate match. Though students proposed playing an intramural version of the Dartmouth game with eleven-man class sides in 1874, probably in
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imitation of rugby, the idea did not catch hold. Meanwhile, the codes that other schools were using, even where they required pairs of matches under differing rules or the creation of “concessionary” rules, were limited of necessity to representative sides of 25 or fewer men. Those rules derived from imported soccer, and during 1873, representatives of students at Yale, Columbia, Princeton, and Rutgers agreed on the first intercollegiate soccer rules in the U.S.\textsuperscript{383}

The Dartmouth Football Rules (1871)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textit{Rule 1.} Five umpires, one from each class in the Academical, and one from the Scientific Department, shall be elected annually by the college. The senior umpire present shall settle all disputes which arise concerning the game.  \\
\textit{Rule 2.} The ball shall be warned from the second base of the college grounds and towards the buildings. No warn shall be valid until both parties are ready.  \\
\textit{Rule 3.} Until the ball is kicked the warning party shall stand behind the ball and their opponents in front; the latter at a distance of at least two rods. These positions, and the warn as well, shall be changed each game.  \\
\textit{Rule 4.} No player shall kick, trip, strike, or hold another for any cause during the game.  \\
\textit{Rule 5.} It shall be considered foul when the ball is caught on the bound, or fly, or picked from the ground; when it passes the fence at the north or south end of the common, or at either corner, or when knocked past the east or west fence.  \\
\textit{Rule 6.} In case of a foul the ball shall be tossed up by the umpire at the place where the foul occurs, unless it be within two rods of either fence, in which case the ball shall be brought directly in a distance of two rods before umpiring.  \\
\textit{Rule 7.} The game shall be won when the ball is kicked past the east or west fence.  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{383} PFRA Research, “No Christian End!”