

to his definition, if a fool chanced to express an idea better than it was ever expressed before, although often thought by others, it would pass for wit, even if it brought tears to the eyes, instead of laughter to the lips. I have listened to many attempts at defining the difference between wit and humor, but they were always distinctions without a difference, and so much alike that it was impossible to tell 't'other from which." The best definition I know of is that given by Melville D. Landon, better known as Eli Perkins. His theory is that humor is always the absolute truth, while wit is always an exaggeration. Humor is real; wit is the fancy of the writer. Humorous writings are correct descriptions of scenes and incidents that have occurred, but witty writings are purely fanciful descriptions of scenes and incidents which occur only to the mind of the writer. He illustrates his meaning in this way: A humorous artist can paint a picture of a mule true to life, and you will see little to laugh at. You will say, "that's a splendid picture of a mule." Schryer once painted the picture of a mule which sold for \$1500, because it was so life-like, but the mule from which he painted could be bought for \$200. People did not laugh at that mule but they stood in front of it and said, "what a great master Schryer is." But another artist—a witty fellow—painted that same mule as truthfully as Schryer did, and people saw nothing to laugh at more than they would at any other mule. Then he began to exaggerate it. He ran one of its ears up through the trees and made chickens roost on it. He spread the other on the ground and had boys skating on it. Then he set the mule to kicking—making him kick a thousand times a minute. And so irony, ridicule and satire are each a species of wit, because they are more or less untrue—exaggerations, and sometimes lying. Many of you have seen a very small man and saw nothing to laugh at but his insignificance. Suddenly he turned round and you noticed