

YORKVILLE ENQUIRER.

ISSUED SEMI-WEEKLY.

A Family Newspaper: For the Promotion of the Political, Social, Agricultural and Commercial Interests of the People.

TERMS.—\$2.00 A YEAR IN ADVANCE.

NO. 45.

L. M. GRIST'S SONS, Publishers.

ESTABLISHED 1855.

YORKVILLE, S. C., TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1906.

SOUTH CAROLINA IN THE REVOLUTION

How the Spirit of Liberty Was Kept Alive By an Unconquerable People.

By REV. ROBERT LATHAN, D. D.

From the Yorkville Enquirer of 1876.

INSTALLMENT III.
Regulators and Scovillites.

The successful defence of Fort Moultrie against the British under Parker and Clinton, had a most decided effect upon all parties. The Tories and loyalists began to fear for their sovereign's power in America, and the Whigs came to the conclusion that it was possible for them to throw off the British yoke and be free.

For a period of about three years after the battle of Fort Moultrie, the state of South Carolina although she was one of the thirteen colonies which had solemnly pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to resist to death the unjust acts of the British government, enjoyed comparative ease. Her sons flocked by the hundreds to the northern colonies to aid in vanquishing the common foe. The distinction north and south did not then exist. Massachusetts loved South Carolina and South Carolina cherished no less love for Massachusetts. From June 23rd 1776, to January 1779, the war was carried on principally in the states north of the Potomac. It was not, however, during these three years, a period of perfect tranquility.

For more than ten years prior to the commencement of hostilities between the colonies and Great Britain there had existed in South Carolina two parties, which cherished toward each other bitter hatred. These parties were at different times known by different names; but the same individuals composed them.

When the up-country was settling up, a vast multitude of strangers were brought into contact with one another and still they were totally different from each other in their manners and customs, and especially in their notions of civil government. Some were intensely loyal, while others were as intensely republican. There was also not a few who came to the up-country for no other purpose than that they might live free from all the restraints of law and good order. They were a thieving set of fellows, and contemplated amassing fortunes by stealing horses and negroes. The order-loving portion of the inhabitants were kept in a state of constant dread by these desperadoes.

Prior to 1769 there was no general court, except in Charleston. There were magistrates' courts, the jurisdiction of which extended to all sums below twenty pounds. To catch and convey to Charleston one of these horse-thieves for trial, was no small job. The probability was that after being captured, he would be rescued by his partners in crime; or if brought to trial he would be saved from suffering the penalties of the law by the false swearing of his fellows.

As early as 1752, the inhabitants of the Pee Dee and Lynch's creek region, presented a petition praying that Craven county might be divided and that for the portion situated in the north twelve justices be appointed, without fee or reward, to hear and determine all cases as well civil as criminal. These petitioners of the Pee Dee region were laboring under a great burden in that they were surrounded by a set of horse-thieves and cut-throats. The western section of the state, that portion between the Broad and Saluda rivers, was full of these desperadoes. This was chosen by them as their headquarters, where they called out in all directions to the great annoyance of peaceable citizens.

Thomas Woodward, who lived in the region that is now embraced in Fairfield county, together with Barnaby Pope and Joseph Kirkland, got up an organization which was called the "Regulation" and the members of which were called "Regulators." The Regulators went to work to punish the evil-doers, while the county grieved. It was evidently their intention at first, to do good by punishing outlaws; but sometimes they permitted their judgment to be controlled by their individual feelings. Horse-thieves and other violators of the rights of others were hunted up, and according to the statutes of the Regulators, were given thirty-nine lashes in the naked back, when the instances more notorious characters were dealt with more severely, and some were shot when attempting to escape.

The horse-thieves were more numerous than the Regulators at first supposed them to be. The line of demarcation between the Regulators and the horse-thieves, and horse-thief sympathizers, soon became clear and distinct. The people began to arm themselves, and a civil war seemed to be not far distant. To prevent this, Gov. Montague, appointed one Scoville to act as a kind of arbitrator, with unlimited powers, of the difficulties existing amongst the citizens. Scoville was a most consummate villain. He assumed the cause of the horse-thieves with whom he was no doubt in league, and as if he had been already declared, he prepared for the conflict. The horse-thieves and ruffians flocked to his standard. The Regulators armed themselves and determined to resist the government as administered by Scoville.

The two parties confronted each other on the plantation of John Musgrove, afterward a Tory colonel. It was on the Saluda river in what is now Newberry county. Scoville summoned the berry county to surrender. This they did not do and yet there was no one killed, although some shots were exchanged. It appears that some of the more prudent of both parties interfered and put a stop to the strife. The parties separated without a battle, but still their love for each other was not increased nor their hatred diminished.

Tradition has preserved a most laughable circumstance which took place while the two parties were drawn up in battle array. Amongst the Regulators was one who had but recently joined the party. He was a great braggart. He was absolutely

MR. CHILDS GETS MAD.

Columbia's Banker Refused to Tell Things.

SAYS JONES SHALL NOT BE REPEATED.

Remarkable Incident Before the Investigating Committee Last Friday—Witness Ruled to Show Cause Why He is Not in Contempt—Reason Why the C. N. & L. Railroad Gets Dispersary Freight and the Columbia Bank is the Centre of Dispersary "Business."

COLUMBIA, June 1.—"Well, by God, I would go to jail before I would tell the jokes."

This was the expression of Mr. W. G. Childs, one of Columbia's most prominent citizens, when Mr. Lyon pressed him to relate some of the "jokes" he had heard about whisky rebates. Mr. Childs stuck to his determination not to repeat what he had heard, because he felt that it might injure the Whigs who were entirely innocent and he did not think it right or proper to repeat conversations of this character.

He suggested that he would rather go to jail and rot there than repeat private conversations or jokes about whisky rebates or things of that kind, and being the man that he is he meant every word he said. Mr. Lyon was evidently disgusted, and said that he was through with Mr. Childs, and that the committee might take up the examination of Mr. Childs, Chairman Hay then promptly said, "Mr. Childs, you are excused."

That ended the incident. Mr. Childs got up, and while he was leaving the room, said that he would never answer such questions, but if the committee wanted any proper information from him, or wished to communicate further with him, that he could be found at his office at any hour.

But the committee evidently did not like the manner and the "by God" expression of Mr. Childs, and later on in the day the committee went into executive session and issued a rule to Mr. Childs that he should show cause on Tuesday, when the committee meets again, why he should not be ruled for contempt.

The committee will then hear Mr. Childs's position, and he will have the opportunity of making such statement or explanation as he may care to.

Mr. Childs, who is a man of most even temper and equable disposition, evidently got very much provoked when Mr. Lyon pressed him to know what the stories or jokes were. Mr. Lyon said that he had no idea what they were, but thought if they were related that the committee might then be the judge of the relevancy of the testimony; but Mr. Childs stood pat, and then ended the incident for the time being. Mr. Lyon suggested that the committee might determine whether or not the question might be pressed, but Chairman Hay said that he thought the matter had better be pursued, if at all, in executive session, and later on the rule against Mr. Childs to show cause why he should not be ruled for contempt was issued.

Mr. Childs is president of the Columbia, Newberry and Laurens railroad and also president of the Bank of Columbia. He is a man of force and character and his observations today are significant. Mr. Childs felt that he had no right to lug anything into the evidence he gave that was not necessary.

In order that his position may be fully understood and at the same time that there might be no possible misunderstanding of the incident, Mr. A. M. Deal, the official stenographer of the investigating committee, prepared for the News and Courier a verbatim copy of this entire incident and it is all well worth reading.

Mr. Childs was the first and only witness presented during the day. His testimony was as follows:

Mr. Childs, where do you live, sir?
Columbia, no, in Richland county. I am a countryman.

A farmer?
Yes, sir.

Do you have any other business, Mr. Childs?
Well, I am a railroad man and a bank man.

What position do you hold with the railroad?
President.

President of what road?
Columbia, Newberry and Laurens.

What connection have you with the bank?
President.

What bank?
Bank of Columbia.

That is in the city of Columbia?
Yes, sir.

You have the active management of this Columbia, Newberry and Laurens railroad?
Well, I am president. I suppose I am active manager.

You direct its affairs, and so on?
Yes, sir.

Have you any stock in the Richland Distilling company?
No.

Do you know of any one who has? I have heard men say that they have.

Well, sir, who are they?
It is only hearsay.

Who have you heard say that they have?
I have heard Mr. Lanahan of Lanahan & Son. I think I have heard Mr. Block say that he had stock.

Who else?
That is all I have heard.

Did you ever hear of Mr. Farnum having railroad in it?
No, sir.

Did you ever hear of Bernheimer Brothers having stock in it?
No, sir.

Mr. Childs, did you ever hold any stock in that distillery?
Richland Distillery?

Yes, sir.

As trustee or otherwise?
No, sir. Never been in it but once in my life; went down there through curiosity.

Do you know of any one holding stock in that concern in trust for anybody else?
No, sir.

Mr. Childs, have you heard the rumor—and you realize the fact that

we have to proceed on rumors—that you were supposed to hold any stock, a block of stock, in the Richland Distillery?

I have heard that. That is what the investigating committee brought out, and I was very much surprised to hear it.

And that that stock was transferred when the Olympia mill became involved and the parties who held it wanted it transferred?

No, sir; I never heard it until recently.

Did a transfer of that sort take place to your knowledge?
There has never been a certificate of stock in my name that I know of, and I have never endorsed a certificate.

Do you know of a party who has ever been connected with a transaction of that kind?
No, sir.

You have no knowledge or information on that subject?
No, sir.

Mr. Childs, wasn't that reported around Columbia a while before the investigating committee started?
I never heard anything of it until sixty or ninety days ago—since the investigating committee—and I could never understand how the report came through, because there is absolutely not one iota of truth in it. And I could not understand how it could be in my name and I do not know it. It would be a liability, and I would not carry stock for anybody.

You didn't make the remark that this stock was in your name and that you held it as a trustee and you really didn't know who you held it for?
Never made any such remark.

Did you ever hold any stock in the Carolina Glass company for anybody else?
No, sir.

Nor in trust for any body else, Mr. Childs?
No, sir.

You deny that, Mr. Childs?
Yes, I deny that.

Positively and emphatically?
Yes; never held it in trust for anybody.

Did you ever hold any stock for anybody in the Carolina Glass company?
Yes; held some for myself, in my own name.

How much?
Ten or twelve thousand dollars.

What sort of dividends did you receive on that?
I never received any. I sold out before—I think when I sold last it was at \$115. My recollection is that I sold before the dividend was declared.

That was your own individual investment?
Yes, sir.

And nobody had anything to do with it, was it?
No, sir.

And nobody shared in the profits?
No, sir; nobody but myself.

Who did you sell that to?
Mr. E. G. Setlens.

And he paid you—
One hundred and fifteen dollars in my recollection. It may have been \$120.

Have you made the statement to persons around Columbia that you did hold stock in this Carolina Glass company in trust, or that you held it for somebody else, or something of that sort?
No; never did.

Do you know whether any of the directors of the dispensary had any stock in there?
I do not know anything about it.

Do you know of anybody holding it in trust for them?
No, sir.

Oh, the Richland Distillery?
No, sir.

Have you ever heard anybody confess or acknowledge in any way that they received any profits or dividends arising from either of these institutions?
No, sir.

Now, Mr. Childs, you are in active business around here, very frequently?
I very seldom ever leave my office except to go to dinner or on business.

Your bank does some collecting for creditors of the dispensary?
I think so.

Don't the liquor drummers go to your bank there, or you have a good deal of correspondence or things of that sort with them?
Yes, sir; liquor drummers come around when they want checks cashed.

Have any of them ever stated that they paid any graft to any of these dispensary officials?
I have no recollection of anything of that kind.

Let's see if you can't remember—? It would not be fair for me, in a joking conversation, to make a remark that would reflect upon anybody, and I never heard anybody say in seriousness that they paid rebates.

Tell us the jokes?
I cannot remember the jokes. It has been four or five years ago.

What was the nature of those jokes?
I would not be able to testify as to jokes in remarks made. I have never heard any remarks reflecting seriously upon members of the board of control.

We want to know the nature of the jokes.
I do not remember distinctly enough to specify.

You know distinctly enough to state whether they were complimentary, or whether they were not complimentary about that board?
No, sir; I do not.

And yet you recall that there were jokes?
Yes, sir; there always was and there is now.

And it impressed you sufficiently to remember that there were all kinds of jokes going on, but you cannot remember the nature of those jokes?
No, sir; I cannot remember, because it might reflect upon somebody, and it would be unjust to reflect on them.

Could you remember who the men were who were doing this joking?
No, sir; it was just some of those travelling men and not men who would be taken on the inside.

How can you reach the conclusion that these parties would not be taken into the nature of the grafting matter if anything was going on?
Because if anything was going on the heads of the concerns would be doing it, not the subordinates.

That is the opinion that you draw from the liquor drummers?
Yes, sir; I say if there was anything of that kind going on, the heads would not entrust it to any of their clerks or subordinate drummers. I know if there was anything going on in anything that I was the head of I would be the only one that knew it.

You cannot remember any of those jokes?
No, sir.

Now, Mr. Childs, this is a very important matter that I am questioning you about.

I think it is. If I know anything that would assist you in the matter I would be glad to give it to you.

Especially this matter of the Carolina Glass company. I wish to understand the matter fully and freely, and if I understand you, you know nothing about any stock being held in trust for anybody else?
No.

Oh, you have never been a party to any such?
No, sir.

That you have not transferred any stock for any one?
Yes.

You deny that without any mental reservation?
Yes.

You have stated everything fully and freely without any reservation?
Yes.

Now, did Mr. Lanahan ever discuss with you the matter of graft and rebates and so on?
No, sir.

He never made any statement to you in reference to matters of that kind?
No, sir.

Mr. Childs, how many miles are you president of in South Carolina?
Seventy-five.

Seventy-five?
Yes.

How many miles of railroad has the Southern in the state of South Carolina?
Oh, I have no idea.

Well, sir, you have a rough idea?
I think five or six or seven hundred. I have never figured it out. Of course I could do it.

How many has the Atlantic Coast Line?
Oh, I should think three or four hundred. Maybe more.

Well, sir; what about the Seaboard?
Well, the Seaboard has about three hundred or four hundred; about three hundred and fifty miles, I would say.

Now, Mr. Childs, you keep up, I presume, with the freights that pass over these lines; you have a general knowledge on that subject of the freights that come into the state of South Carolina?
I have a general knowledge of what comes in on my road. I do not know about anybody else.

What percentage of the dispensary business do you handle?
I haven't the slightest idea.

Have you any idea about what your road handles at all?
No; that would be a matter for the auditing department. He could figure it up for you without any trouble.

Is it not a matter of belief that your road handles the larger part of the freight that comes into the dispensary?
I think we ought to.

You think you ought to?
Yes.

Because we are the only Tillmanite road in the town, and it is a Tillmanite institution, and when the dispensary was started every other road boycotted the dispensary. When the Darlington road came the other roads cut it. I went right up to Governor Tillman and stood right by the administration and the C. N. & L. stood right up to it, and Senator Tillman and myself are personal friends, and we have been getting a big part, and ought to have a big part, and besides my road paid its taxes when the other roads refused to do so.

Are you sure you are accurate in those statements you have made?
Yes.

Are you positive of it?
I am. You never heard of any car being shipped ten or twelve miles out of town on the C. N. & L. and blind tigers unloading the whisky from it.

Explain the situation.
If you read the papers you would have seen where a man got killed sending his wagon up on that road, to Blaney's, on the Seaboard.

Did you see that?
I read it in the papers.

So that is hearsay?
Yes; but you are making me give you hearsay.

Won't you give us hearsay on those jokes?
No; that is too serious; I would not tell a joke that would affect the character of somebody else.

Don't you regard that as serious—this man getting killed?
That is his own fault.

Well, he got shot down?
He wasn't shot down; the train ran over him and killed him. I suppose the courts will adjudicate that.

Don't you know that the Seaboard road paid those taxes along at the same time that you paid yours?
Yes; and did it at my suggestion because I was very close along with them.

I suppose you said that they paid yours first.
They didn't do it until I got them to do it. I wanted them to bring that western whisky in here.

I thought you said they protested?
The Seaboard did protest at first and afterwards reconsidered it and paid their taxes on my advice.

Who were these alleged jokes that you—?
Oh, I am not going to tell you anything about those jokes. I do not remember it definite enough to make—

Mr. Lyon: Mr. Chairman, of course, it is impossible to bring out information to know whether it is relevant or irrelevant. I did not expect that Mr. Childs would give me a conference before he did not go to him. I do not know what he knows about that at all, but evidently he has heard something, and it seems to me that he ought to be required to tell it.

Mr. Childs: Well, by God, I would go to jail before I would tell the jokes; and Mr. Lyon had a right to confer with me before, if he wanted to.

The Chairman (Senator Hay): You have not been required to answer yet, Mr. Childs.

Witness: Well, I will say right now that I ain't going to answer and, if

Miscellaneous Reading.

EARTH SPLIT OPEN.

Phenomenon of the Great California Quake.

The most remarkable phenomenon of the earthquake was reported today from Bolinas Bay, the first inlet on the coast north of San Francisco, where the violence of the shock appears to have been greater than at any other point. The earth was split open for twenty miles parallel to the shore, and in places the cleft was several feet wide and apparently hundreds of feet deep.

John K. Orr, a wealthy land owner, has returned to his home in Berkeley from a trip of investigation. He writes that President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, of the State university, today, suggesting that scientists should be sent at once to Bolinas Bay.

"So terrible is the sight in that region," said Orr today, "that I must be pardoned for declining to give the details of the destruction wrought, because I believe the truth told about the damage there would unduly alarm people and would help to give a black eye to the state."

Before making a personal inspection Orr received a letter from E. B. Nelson, of the Nelson Hotel company, at Olema, giving some details of the havoc wrought by the earthquake. This letter says the extraordinary chasm extends from Tomales to Bolinas Bay, twenty miles, and in some places 300 feet deep. On P. F. Shafter's dairy ranch the men were milking when the quake came. The fissure just missed taking the house and did swallow up a cow in the yard. Orr upon his return verified these statements of his correspondent, stating that he saw the back of the cow partly uncovered at a point where the fissure was about eight feet deep.

Mud and sand in the bay were thrown up into ridges by the upheaval of earth until they are now visible even at high tide. Sections of the town of Bolinas and Marshall, on the railroad, are now lying in the bay, and the town of Tomales is almost wiped out of existence. Three persons in this place lost their lives. The ground in some places sunk from two to ten feet.—San Francisco Correspondence to New York World.

FIRST CASE OF LYNCH LAW.

The Hanging of a Murderer by his Father in Ireland.

So many different versions and explanations of the term lynch law have at various times been given and occasionally are even yet added to, that it seems fitting to recount the tragic incident which has since given a name to so many calamitous occurrences not only in our land, but on occasion also in that of others.

The very name of "lynch" gives the direct clue to the land of its origin. "Lynch" is a name in the "Irish Book" in Chapter I, which treats of Galway; this speaks of an occurrence within its precincts which in 1842 bore the greswome "memento" so grimly described in the words following:

"Then there is Lombard street, otherwise called Dead Man's lane, with a raw head and crossbones and a memento mori over the door where the official tragedy of the Lynches was acted in 1842. If Galway is the Rome of Connaught, James Fitzstephen Lynch, the mayor, may be considered as the Lucius Junius Brutus thereof. Lynch had a son who went to Spain as master of one of his father's ships, and being of a wild, extravagant turn, there contracted debts, drew bills and alarmed his father's correspondents who sent a clerk and nephew of his own back in young Lynch's ship to Galway to settle accounts. On the 15th day Lynch threw the Spaniard overboard. Coming back to his own country, he reformed his life a little and was on the point of marrying one of the Blakes, Burkes or Bodkins or others when a seaman who had sailed with him, being on the point of death, confessed the murder in which he had been a participant.

"Hereon the father, who was chief magistrate of the town, tried his son and sentenced him to death, and when the clan Lynch rose in a body to rescue the young man and divert such a disgrace from the family it is said that Fitzstephen Lynch hanged the culprit from the gallows. A tragedy called 'The Warden of Galway' has been written on the subject and was acted a few nights before my arrival."—New York Times.

PROVERBS THE WORLD OVER.

Forms in Which Many Familiar to Us Appear in Other Countries.

The wit and wisdom of proverbs are clad in different garb in different countries, but they are all very much the same. Identical ideas arising independently in widely separated nations are not necessarily expressed in interchangeable forms. They usually derive, says the London Globe, a certain quaintness from the manners and customs of the people who use them.

Thus, the old Greek proverb, "The master's eye makes the horse fat," has many different renderings. The Haytiens express it with local coloring, "The garden far from the master's house," the gumbo pollos. Agna, the familiar idea which we select forward in the following way, "You can't get blood from a stone or from a beet, or breaks from a Highlander," is rendered in the West Indies as "The pumpkin vine does not yield the calabash." Even in regard to the matter of "going before the beam" the East Indian and the West Indian have parallel expressions, for where the former says of a friend that he was "pinned," the latter observes that they "pressed his cane."

In order to establish the sisterhood of proverbs it is only necessary to take a few touches of nature which make the whole world kin and regard them from the various national aspects. The classical but homely truth, "Drive out nature with a pitchfork, and she will return," crops out in many a negro tribe in quaint forms, such as the following: "A man that keeps the birds away keeps them away, but a pretty face cannot be kept away." The idea conveyed by "He needs must go whom the devil drives" is universally recognized. Some tribes put it, "The stomach has no ears," others, "The empty bag cannot stand upright."

The idea we express in the words, "Only the wearer knows where the shoe pinches," is conveyed quite as aptly by the Swahili in his proverb, "Only the dead man knows where the grave is too narrow." Seafaring tribes say "The bottom of the ship knows best how the sea presses." Our familiar sayings about "running after two hares" and "falling between two stools" are again paralleled and capped by the Zambesi proverb "The rider of two horses falls as well."

This quaintness of setting forth often "goes one better" on our homely proverbs. Our saying "Don't do as I do, do as I tell you" is good; but the Dutch "The monk preaches against thieves with the goose in his larder," or the American "When the lawyer gets the lowly stealer acquitted he is paid in fowls" is better, but the Spanish parallel is quaintest of all, "The friar condemns the thief with the pudding up his sleeve." Where we say "If you walk a thing done do it yourself" the West India gets a shade ahead of us with the advice "Send a dog, and the dog will send his tail."

The same advice is given in a still better form by the Armenian who observes, "If you send a messenger on an errand go with him." And the astute unbelieving Chinaman who, like his unbellying image maker, puts no faith either in the gods or the messengers of the gods, "for he knows what they are made of," sums up the situation in a way that is perhaps as correct as it is sweeping. "If you want a thing done," he says, "go yourself; if not, send."

There is probably no better proverb in the English language than "Shill waters run deep." No other nation goes over the top of the proverb, but two faith either in the gods or the messengers of the gods, "for he knows what they are made of," sums up the situation in a way that is perhaps as correct as it is sweeping. "If you want a thing done," he says, "go yourself; if not, send."

FOR THE SAN JOSE SCALE.

New Kerosene-Lime Mixture Not Equal to Sulphur Washes.

One of the new insecticide combinations for treatment of the San Jose scale consists of a mixture of kerosene in water produced by the use of lime in very fine particles. This combination, with several modifications, has been strongly recommended by a few experienced horticulturists and has been of success by some orchardists. If as reliable as the lime-sulphur combination as a scale destroyer and as safe to use, it possesses advantages over these sulphur washes in being more easy to prepare, because no boiling is required.

But tests made at the Delaware experiment station during 1905 indicate that the lower strengths of the "K-L" mixtures are not sufficient against scale and that the stronger mixtures—those containing larger percentages of kerosene—are liable to injure the trees, because certain proportions of the mixtures contain much more of the kerosene than other portions. In other words, the mixture is not uniform or not permanent.

At the Delaware station tests were made in five orchards, on cherries, plums, peaches and apples, and applications were made in the fall, winter and summer. Some difficulty was met in applying the mixtures having the higher percentage of oil, because of the small quantity of water used in proportion to the amount of lime employed.

In the fall treatment, even with small percentages of oil, the first few trees of the series showed marked signs of injury from the spray, while trees receiving the last portions of the mixtures showed no injury. In one plum orchard where trees sprayed with sulphur washes served as checks the comparison was noticeably against the "K-L" mixtures. Four per cent oil combined with a hydrated lime bore only one-fifth of a crop of fruit, while the adjoining sulphur sprayed trees produced full yields.

The effect of the ten per cent and twenty per cent mixtures on scale was not satisfactory, as young scales on trees treated with these mixtures were as numerous as on the following year. The trees were smoother because of the removal of the old scale incrustations through weathering off of the wash. Even where the higher percentages of oil were used there were considerable numbers of young scales the following season. On the whole, the fall spraying with a lime-sulphur mixture produced much better results.—New York Sun.

PROVERBS THE WORLD OVER.

Forms in Which Many Familiar to Us Appear in Other Countries.

The wit and wisdom of proverbs are clad in different garb in different countries, but they are all very much the same. Identical ideas arising independently in widely separated nations are not necessarily expressed in interchangeable forms. They usually derive, says the London Globe, a certain quaintness from the manners and customs of the people who use them.

Thus, the old Greek proverb, "The master's eye makes the horse fat," has many different renderings. The Haytiens express it with local coloring, "The garden far from the master's house," the gumbo pollos. Agna, the familiar idea which we select forward in the following way, "You can't get blood from a stone or from a beet, or breaks from a Highlander," is rendered in the West Indies as "The pumpkin vine does not yield the calabash." Even in regard to the matter of "going before the beam" the East Indian and the West Indian have parallel expressions, for where the former says of a friend that he was "pinned," the latter observes that they "pressed his cane."

In order to establish the sisterhood of proverbs it is only necessary to take a few touches of nature which make the whole world kin and regard them from the various national aspects. The classical but homely truth, "Drive out nature with a pitchfork, and she will return," crops out in many a negro tribe in quaint forms, such as the following: "A man that keeps the birds away keeps them away, but a pretty face cannot be kept away." The idea conveyed by "He needs must go whom the devil drives" is universally recognized. Some tribes put it, "The stomach has no ears," others, "The empty bag cannot stand upright."

The idea we express in the words, "Only the wearer knows where the shoe pinches," is conveyed quite as aptly by the Swahili in his proverb, "Only the dead man knows where the grave is too narrow." Seafaring tribes say "The bottom of the ship knows best how the sea presses." Our familiar sayings about "running after two hares" and "falling between two stools" are again paralleled and capped by the Zambesi proverb "The rider of two horses falls as well."

This quaintness of setting forth often "goes one better" on our homely proverbs. Our saying "Don't do as I do, do as I tell you" is good; but the Dutch "The monk preaches against thieves with the goose in his larder," or the American "When the lawyer gets the lowly stealer acquitted he is paid in fowls" is better, but the Spanish parallel is quaintest of all, "The friar condemns the thief with the pudding up his sleeve." Where we say "If you walk a thing done do it yourself" the West India gets a shade ahead of us with the advice "Send a dog, and the dog will send his tail."

The same advice is given in a still better form by the Armenian who observes, "If you send a messenger on an errand go with him." And the astute unbelieving Chinaman who, like his unbellying image maker, puts no faith either in the gods or the messengers of the gods, "for he knows what they are made of," sums up the situation in a way that is perhaps as correct as it is sweeping. "If you want a thing done," he says, "go yourself; if not, send."

There is probably no better proverb in the English language than "Shill waters run deep." No other nation goes over the top of the proverb, but two faith either in the gods or the messengers of the gods, "for he knows what they are made of," sums up the situation in a way that is perhaps as correct as it is sweeping. "If you want a thing done," he says, "go yourself; if not, send."

PROVERBS THE WORLD OVER.

Forms in Which Many Familiar to Us Appear in Other Countries.

The wit and wisdom of proverbs are clad in different garb in different countries, but they are all very much the same. Identical ideas arising independently in widely separated nations are not necessarily expressed in interchangeable forms. They usually derive, says the London Globe, a certain quaintness from the manners and customs of the people who use them.

Thus, the old Greek proverb, "The master's eye makes the horse fat," has many different renderings. The Haytiens express it with local coloring, "The garden far from the master's house," the gumbo pollos. Agna, the familiar idea which we select forward in the following way, "You can't get blood from a stone or from a beet, or breaks from a Highlander," is rendered in the West Indies as "The pumpkin vine does not yield the calabash." Even in regard to the matter of "going before the beam" the East Indian and the West Indian have parallel expressions, for where the former says of a friend that he was "pinned," the latter observes that they "pressed his cane."

In order to establish the sisterhood of proverbs it is only necessary to take a few touches of nature which make the whole world kin and regard them from the various national aspects. The classical but homely truth, "Drive out nature with a pitchfork, and she will return," crops out in many a negro tribe in quaint forms, such as the following: "A man that keeps the birds away keeps them away, but a pretty face cannot be kept away." The idea conveyed by "He needs must go whom the devil drives" is universally recognized. Some tribes put it, "The stomach has no ears," others, "The empty bag cannot stand upright."

The idea we express in the words, "Only the wearer knows where the shoe pinches," is conveyed quite as aptly by the Swahili in his proverb, "Only the dead man knows where the grave is too narrow." Seafaring tribes say "The bottom of the ship knows best how the sea presses." Our familiar sayings about "running after two hares" and "falling between two stools" are again paralleled and capped by the Zambesi proverb "The rider of two horses falls as well."

This quaintness of setting forth often "goes one better" on our homely proverbs. Our saying "Don't do as I do, do as I tell you" is good; but the Dutch "The monk preaches against thieves with the goose in his larder," or the American "When the lawyer gets the lowly stealer acquitted he is paid in fowls" is better, but the Spanish parallel is quaintest of all, "The friar condemns the thief with the pudding up his sleeve." Where we say "If you walk a thing done do it yourself" the West India gets a shade ahead of us with the advice "Send a dog, and the dog will send his tail."

The same advice is given in a still better form by the Armenian who observes, "If you send a messenger on an errand go with him." And the astute unbelieving Chinaman who, like his unbellying image maker, puts no faith either in the gods or the messengers of the gods, "for he knows what they are made of," sums up the situation in a way that is perhaps as correct as it is sweeping. "If you want a thing done," he says, "go yourself; if not, send."

There is probably no better proverb in the English language than "Shill waters run deep." No other nation goes over the top of the proverb, but two faith either in the gods or the messengers of the gods, "for he knows what they are made of," sums up the situation in a way that is perhaps as correct as it is sweeping. "If you want a thing done," he says, "go yourself; if not, send."