

FANS AT PIQUA ENTHUSIASTIC OVER PROSPECTS

Two Thirds of the Stock in for
The Piqua Team in Indiana-
Ohio League Was Sub-
scribed in Short Order.

HAMILTON IS STILL AFTER SUITABLE BALL PARK.

As Yet the Management There
Has Been Unable to Secure
Satisfactory Location But
This Will Be Done Soon.

TURKISH TROOPS THREATEN RUSSIA

Mobilization in Armenia Ad-
mitted.

St. Petersburg, Feb. 8.—Reports of a Turkish mobilization in Armenia and the threatened movements of troops on the Russian-Persian frontier are admitted by the general staff. It is not known yet whether this action on the part of Turkey is directed against Russia, and measures so far taken by this country are confined to certain precautionary dispositions of units within the Caucasus.

Foreign diplomats here believe that Russia and Turkey are engaged in a game which neither is desirous of carrying to an extreme, although Turkey might be willing to go far, relying upon the supposed weakness of Russia because of her quarrel with Austria over the Macedonian question.

DIRTY TACTICS MARRIED THE GAME

Contest in City League Was
Interesting Chiefly Be-
cause of Scraps.

INTERESTING COMBINATION

PUGILISM AND POLO WENT HAND
IN HAND AND THROUGH THIS
THE GREEKS LOST ONE MARK-
ER ON FOULS.

City League Standing.
Won Lost Pct.
Kibbey's 3 0 1,000
Crescents 2 0 1,000
Krones 1 1 667
Empires 0 2 333
Beaulyview 0 3 1,000

(By Gaston)
GREEKS 2; KRONES 1.

In a combination of pugilism and polo, the Greeks defeated the Krones in the City league game last night by a score of 2 to 1. The Greeks team work was good and they had a good line on the cage. If they had omitted their dirty tactics and played polo they would probably have swamped the Krones. Beseke played the best game for the Greeks and Myers was the shining light of the Katy Harolds. Bulla played a nice game for the canny makers. About a minute after the gong sounded Haas let go a vicious drive and Lancaster failed to get his lamps on it. After a few flights had been pulled off, Bulla had one to rest. There was no scoring in the second and the mixers of soft drinks lost a marker on touts. In the third both Myers and Bulla counted. Lineup and summary:

KRONES
Krons First Rush Craighead
Bulla Second Rush Myers
Haas Center Ryan
Beseke Half Back Swain
Steinkamp Goal Lancaster

First Period.

Rush Caged By Time
Craighead Haas 5:20
Krons Bulla 9:05

Second Period.

Craighead No Goals

Third Period.

Krons Myers 3:15
Krons Bulla 7:20
Krons

Rushes—Krons 5; Craighead 2.
Stops—Steinkamp 13; Lancaster 28.
Fouls—Krons, Bulla, Haas, Swain.
Goal forfeited—Greeks 1.

Have you trouble of any kind arising from a disordered stomach? Go to your druggist and get a \$5c or \$1 bottle of Dr. Caldwell's Syrup of Aloe, which is positively guaranteed to cure you and keep you well.

A Wonderful Memory.

Hortensius, the great Roman lawyer and orator, had a memory of extraordinary scope and tenacity. After composing a speech or oration he could repeat it word for word exactly as he had prepared it. On one occasion he went to an auction, where the business was carried on during an entire day, and at evening, for a wager, he wrote down a list of the articles that had been sold and the prices, together with the names of the purchasers, in the order in which the purchases had been made.

Linens in Africa.

Dr. Arthur J. Hayes in his "The Source of the Blue Nile" tells how the linens come to drink out of the Atbara river: "They come with an undulating rush, and small as they are, the rushing of the wind as they beat the air makes a noise like thunder, and their numbers darken the sky. The weight of the throngs of them which at a time bends down the ends of the overhanging branches and twigs to the level of the water."

Practical.

"Why do you teach your children to recite and sing?"

"Well," answered the practical woman, "there has to be some way of starting people who come to see you and forget when it's time to go home."

—Washington Star.

The Best Proof.

"That surgeon, they say, has a remarkable touch."

"He has. If you don't believe it, I'll show you his bill for my operation."—Baltimore American.

Research on the effects of high pressure of radio-active phenomena has met with negative results. The Montreal scientists, Professor Eve and Adams, say that as a result of their experiments, they have found that radium generates heat by disintegration equally at the surface of the earth, and at pressures which obtain forty or fifty miles beneath the surface.

POLO NOTES.

The Bridgeport, Mass., fans want to know where Eddie Higgins of the Waterbury team got his reputation.

Tommy Holderness is up to his old tricks again. He was gently but firmly removed from the floor by the Bridgeport police.

Ted Lewis and George Cunningham Jr., are on the rush line for Bridgeport in the National league.

There were 1,800 fans at the Boston Providence game at Providence.

Flaxen Haired Davy Cusick is tending goal in Waterbury.

Phil Jason is one of the best goal getters in the National league.

Research on the effects of high pressure of radio-active phenomena has met with negative results. The Montreal scientists, Professor Eve and Adams, say that as a result of their experiments, they have found that radium generates heat by disintegration equally at the surface of the earth, and at pressures which obtain forty or fifty miles beneath the surface.

LOGANSPORT WAS DEFEATED BY THE RICHMOND TEAM

Polo Game at Coliseum Last
Night Considered the Best
Of The Season as It Was
Fast From Start.

QUIGLEY BROTHERS SHOVED IN LIMELIGHT.

The Work of the Two Men
Was of Sensational Order—
Two Men Injured Near the
Close of the Game.

(By Gaston)

Logansport, 1; Richmond, 5.

Last evening at the Coliseum, in the best game of the season, the Quakers took the Logansport pellet pushers into camp by the score of 5 to 1. The lads from upstate were the best attraction that has been offered the local boys this year. Their team work was of high order and their defense was good. Sheridan made some fauna stops in front of the cage. The locals' defense seemed like a little off color in the first period, but improved as the game went on. The Quigley brothers worked the floor nicely, but always bumped into the visitors' defense. After five minutes fast play, L. Quigley slipped one by Sheridan for the first marker and a couple of minutes later Martin banged one past Alexander for the second count. In the second period, O. Quigley coaxed the sphere around a few times and finally landed one in the draperies. Quigley counted on a pass from O. Quigley. In the third period, L. Quigley scored on a difficult angle drive and followed with another. Shortly before the gong sounded, Hayworth received a bad blow in the face and was forced to retire. L. Quigley also left the floor and each team finished with four men.

Line-up and summary:
Logansport (1) Richmond (5)
Martin rush L. Quigley
Hayworth rush O. Quigley
Ragan center Porter
Porter half back Williams
Sheridan goal Alexander

First Period.

Rush Caged By Time
L. Quigley L. Quigley 5:20
L. Quigley Martin 7:45
L. Quigley

Second Period.

L. Quigley O. Quigley 6:00
L. Quigley L. Quigley 14:05
L. Quigley

Third Period.

L. Quigley L. Quigley 3:15
Hayworth L. Quigley 4:10
Rushes—L. Quigley, 8; Hayworth, 1.
Stops—Alexander, 14; Sheridan, 47.

DECISION OF MUCH LOCAL INTEREST

Indiana Appellate Court Af-
firms Unique Judgment.

A decision of much local interest has just been handed down by the Indiana appellate court, affirming a judgment covered by the second divorced husband of a woman against the administrator of her estate, who was also her first (divorced) husband.

The judgment was for money which the second husband, Monroe Huntington, lent to his wife to pay a balance due on her house and to pay for painting the house and making other improvements while they were living together.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from his wife, and that a debt for borrowed money is not cancelled by the parties becoming divorced.

The evidence showed that they, respectively, sued each other for divorce, four or five times, and that they dealt with each other on a business basis in the meantime.

The court says there is nothing in the law to prevent a husband from lending money to or borrowing money from