

WHY?

I did not love him long ago;
Instead of "yes" I gave him "no."
I did not love him, but to-day
I read his marriage notice. Pray,
Why was I sad, when never yet
Has my heart known the least regret
Over that whispered "no"? And why,
Reading the notice did I sigh?
No analyst can guess the cause:
A woman's reason laughs at laws.
Sure I am glad to know the wound
I gave has healed—that he has found
Love's blessedness and peace, and yet
A woman never can forget
The man who once has loved her, and
To-day I seem to see him stand,
With every glance a mute caress.
Still pleading for the loveliest "yes."
His early love for me is dead—
Another lives in that love's stead!
And if he loves her well, as men
Should love their chosen ones, why, then,
He must be glad that long ago,
Instead of "yes" I gave him "no."
Perhaps that is the reason why
I read the notice with a sigh.

VILLANELLE TO HELEN.

Man's very voice is stilled on Troas' shore,
Sweet Nautilus and Scamander both are mute,
Thus hath the gods ordained forevermore!
Springs the rank weed where bloomed the rose before,
Unplucked on Ida hangs the purple fruit,
Man's very voice is stilled on Troas' shore
Where heavenly walls towered proud and high of yore,
Unharm'd now strays abroad the savage brute,
Thus hath the gods ordained forevermore!
And they, the wronged, that wasting sorrow bore,
Alas! their tree hath withered to the root,
Man's very voice is stilled on Troas' shore.
In Lacedæmon, loved of heroes' hour,
No trumpet sounds, but piping shepherd's flute,
Thus hath the gods ordained forevermore!
And thou, the cause through Aphrodite's love,
Unblamed, art praised on poet's lyre and lute—
Man's very voice is stilled on Troas' shore,
Thus hath the gods ordained forevermore!

CLINTON SPOLLARD

HOW ENGLISHMEN PRONOUNCE ENGLISH.

Do Englishmen or Americans the better speak their common language? Rev. Dr. R. L. Stanton asks the question in the Independent and thus answers it. I have been a sojourner in London for a year and a half. Both houses of Parliament I have occasionally attended, where I had the opportunity of hearing speakers of all parties. I have heard lectures on a variety of subjects at the Royal Institution, where leading scientists and literary men appear; also lectures at University College, London, and at other places. Political meetings, during the exciting canvass of April, 1880, scientific and educational conventions, literary and social science congresses, and conventions for all manner of moral reforms have engaged my attention. Preachers in all churches, and belonging to no church, I have heard, including women as well as men. My conclusion is that if the question were submitted to a jury of a dozen Englishmen and to an equal number of Americans, each body would decide in favor of their own countrymen. Whether this should be set down to prejudice, education, taste, or to patriotic feeling, such inevitably would be the verdict. While sitting at dinner in a hotel in Brussels, I entered in conversation with two intelligent Englishmen on the opposite side of the table. They were making their first continental tour. One of them inquired of me; "How is it that all you Americans have an accent in your speech?" He gave the sound of a about as it is in "ark," with a prodigious emphasis upon the first syllable, equalling what any Scotchman could have done. I replied: "We Americans think you Englishmen have an accent," doing my best to imitate his tone and manner. The two at first stared at me with apparent incredulity, and then we dropped the point with a friendly smile at our mutually patriotic complacency.

Mr. Thomas Hughes, author of "Tom Brown at Rugby," has been in the United States, establishing an American Rugby and doing some lecturing and other platform speaking. I have heard him in this country and in England. In one of his lectures he read extracts from Lowell's "Biglow Papers." He is a miserable reader, blundering and repeating. He illustrated a very common habit, which I have often noticed among some of the best speakers in London, and among both ladies and gentlemen in conversation—that of dropping the letter "g" at the close of such words as morning, evening, talking, speaking, thinking and the like. He used such words so frequently, uniformly "omitting" the "g" that it began to be almost "di-gustin'" in a man of such literary "standin'." That he occasionally called Mr. Lowell "Mr. Biglow," I charitably set down to a little absent-mindedness; but when he several times spoke of the "Southern States" as "Sowthern," pronouncing the first syllable as though "speakin'" of a female porker, I gave it up as a bad job. There were other marked blemishes,

some of which have passed from memory. I have heard many of our leading literary men; but I cannot recall one whom I ever heard commit such gross blunders in public speaking as did Mr. Hughes. Mr. Spottiswoode, also, President of the Royal Society whom I heard lecture in Memorial Hall, on "Light," discredited the "g" in "speakin'" with the same facility as did Mr. Hughes, and apparently with the same unconsciousness of the error.

There are, perhaps, no two words which are more commonly supposed to mark the palpable differences in pronunciation between Englishmen and Americans than "either" and "neither." An American is set down as an ignoramus by many Englishmen, if he does not follow them here at least, while the seem to be ignorant of the fact that some of their most distinguished men adopt, in these words, what is called "the American pronunciation." The English are supposed by many to give them uniformly the sound of *i* long in the first syllable, as though spelled "ither" and "nither"; and the Americans the sound of *e* long, as though written "ether" and "neither." Some of America's best speakers and scholars, however—as, for example, the late Senator Sumner—follow the supposed English pronunciation, denoting it the standard. But which is the English method with these words? It is by no means uniform. Earl Derby (and him Derby) ought to be a good example. He is not only a leading statesman and the head of one of the oldest families, but a cultivated gentleman of some literary pretension, and often appears upon the English platform as a popular speaker, on scientific as well as political occasions. At a meeting of the National Thrift Association, held at the Mansion House, London, the Lord Mayor presiding, I heard Lord Derby use both "either" and "neither" in the same sentence and he pronounced them as Americans commonly do.

The Archbishop of Canterbury as the head ecclesiastic of the English established Church, ought to be, from his position, as well as from his abilities and attainments an example in literary as well as in other things. For an archbishop, the late Dr. Tait was a fair speaker, and I have heard him at his palace at Lambeth and elsewhere. But he was by no means a good model in the use of his mother tongue. He spoke at Guildhall, the Lord Mayor in the chair, at the opening of the "Robert Rukes Sunday-School Centenary." He called it several times the "Cen-tee-nary." This provoked some smiling. It was quite too much for Sir Charles Reed, and so, on presiding at a meeting in Memorial Hall, the same afternoon, Sir Charles said: "We are met to celebrate the Sunday-School 'Cen-tee-nary,' as the archbishop calls it." His grace committed other similar blunders at that "Cen-tee-nary" meeting. I mention but one, that of a proper name. He pronounced the name of the Italian city "Milan," several times, and each time wrong. This must have excited surprise in many of his auditors.

The English clergy, as a rule—of the Established Church I mean; for only they are called "clergy-men" in England—are miserable models in speaking. Passing by their peculiarities in the pronunciation of single words, their ordinary use of the vowel sounds is such that, unless you give close and painful attention, you cannot understand them; nor always then. Indeed the average Englishman, in parliament and out, on the platform, in conversation, in the pulpit—with, of course, exceptions—never says "No." He is too accommodating for that. He seems incapable of giving the long sound of the letter *o*, except sometimes in the wrong place. Instead of saying "No" he says "Na-o," almost as though it were in two syllables, the first part of the sound being like a *in* mark. A Congregational minister said to me, with his infant son in his arms; "This is Willie; we call him 'Ba-o,' for short." I inquired, "Do you spell it Bough?" He replied: "Na-o; we spell it 'Ba-o,' Ba-o." I tried my best to maintain my gravity.

Dr. Joseph Parker is one of the foremost pulpit orators in London among Dissenters. He invariably pronounces "chepter" as though it were written "chepter," with *e* short. Many of the vowels have a peculiar twist as they come from his tongue, which cannot easily be described with the pen, and one has to be educated in his vowel sounds before he can follow him with ease. But the matter of his discourses, with his sententious style and powerful elocution always rivets attention. The English clergy are almost uniformly monotonous, often drawl in delivery, and end their sentences most commonly with the rising inflection, generally running them out on a sort of horizontal line at great length, with a little "turn-up" at the end, like a pug nose. This is so in reading the Scriptures, the hymns, the church service, or other meetings in the same way. An almost dead uniformity is observed in all these exercises, which has raised in my mind the question whether they were ever taught the simplest rules of elocution. What I now refer to is something wholly different from "intoning," which more largely prevails in the ritualistic churches. It is a painfully monotonous delivery and often a sing-song drawl or whine. Canon Farrar, while in many respects a popular preacher, has quite too much of it, while his rhetoric is florid and attractive, his manner earnest, though he rarely makes more than an embryo gesture. The Bishop of Rochester is a popular platform speaker, and is free than any from these faults upon the platform; but when he ascends the

pulpit, as I have heard him in St. Paul's, naturalness seems woe to forsake him and a "holly tone" settles down upon him. Dean Stanley I never heard in this country, nor anywhere in England, except in Westminster Abbey. His delivery there was always of the hum-drum order, illustrating that provision of the liturgy which allows certain things to be "said or sung," ad libitum.

THE PRIMITIVE DINNER.

At first the flesh of animals was eaten raw, but once possessed of fire, man could cook his food and thus render it easier of digestion, and even make use of a number of animal and vegetable substances unsuited for food unless cooked. Besides, everywhere and at a very early date primitive man was forced to obey the laws of custom and of climate, and to content himself with such nourishment as nature provided for him; thus we know of hot-eating, fish-eating, earth-eating tribes. Often he was obliged to destroy his fellow men and feed upon their quivering flesh, a custom which still prevails among the aborigines of New Zealand, Australia, etc.

The dwellers in caves, the Domes of the kitchen middens, and even the inhabitants of the earliest lake cities of the age of the mammoth and the cave bear, were not acquainted with any of the cereals nor with the mode of cultivating them.

But Robenhuisen and Waugen have furnished not only the cereals used by the later like dwellers, but also a number of specimens of the bread which was made from them. This bread, which was baked between two red hot stones, is found in the form of little circular cakes, four or five inches in diameter by an inch or an inch and a quarter thick. A whole cake made from the seeds of the garden poppy reduced to a cinder, has also been found. The bread of the lake cities was unleavened, and often contains grains entire or hardly bruised by the hand mill in which they were ground or rather crushed, exactly as in the days of Olyseus, King of Ithaca, when unhappy female slaves crushed the wheat destined for the food of the chaste Penelope and her fifty suitors. A complete hand-mill of the neolithic age was shown at the Paris Exhibition of 1867.

It is probable, not to say certain, that the use of sea-salt as a seasoning was very early known among primitive races. This custom is, moreover, founded upon a law of nature so impious, that even animals, at least domestic cattle, cannot be completely deprived of it with impunity. The use of salt, on the other hand, favors their growth, renders the secretion of milk more copious, the milk itself more nourishing, the flesh better and easier of digestion, and the wool of the sheep finer and more fleecy. Sea-salt appears to be also necessary to man. In countries where it is rare, it is used instead of coin as a medium of exchange. Among the Gallas and the savages of the Gold Coast, Liebig asserts that one and even two slaves were given in exchange for a handful of salt.

Primitive man was thus enabled to obtain this seasoning by barter, as he obtained Mediterranean and ocean shells for the adornment of his head-dress, his person, or his clothing. It appears that the ancient inhabitants of Denmark procured this substance by burning the Zostera marina, which abounds upon the coasts of the Baltic, and sprinkling sea-water upon the ashes.

MM. Lartet and Christy found in the caves of Périgord a kind of spatula or spoon, made of reindeer-horn, with a conical handle elegantly carved, and widened and hollowed at the other end for the purpose of extracting the marrow from the bones. There is but a step from this instrument to the use of spoons properly so called. As far as I know, however, none of the latter have ever been discovered in the bone-caves of the stone ages.

We have already said that frequently meat and other aliments were eaten without having been previously cooked, and often also they were roasted upon red-hot coals. The numerous hearths found in the caves and the half-charred bones bear witness to the fact. But it is an open question whether or no mankind during the ages previous to the invention of pottery knew how to obtain boiling water for culinary purposes.

Before coming into contact with Europeans the inhabitants of Tahiti had no conception of boiling water, or of water in the condition of steam. If we may rely upon the accounts of the most trustworthy travellers, among others, Cook and Kotzebue, who all attest that the means used by us for obtaining boiling water are now or were until lately unknown to a number of tribes in all parts of the globe, we have good grounds for returning a negative answer to the above question. Moreover, the complete absence of earthenware vessels throughout the earlier stone period seems to confirm this opinion. It is averred, however, that many savage tribes, and even some in a fairly advanced state of civilization, procured boiling water by dropping red-hot stones into water contained in vessels of potstone, wood, bark, or leather.

The flints blackened by the action of fire found beside the hearths in the bone-caves have perhaps served this purpose. Everything tends to show that this custom was commonly practiced before the invention of clay pottery. The art of boiling water in earthenware vessels exposed directly to the action of fire is a real advance on the employment of red-hot stones for this pur-

pose. The discovery of pottery necessarily put an end to this most inconvenient process.

Before the discovery of the use of metals, knives were merely splinters of flint, of which a remarkable specimen was shown in the Paris Exhibition of 1867, the knife of Pailhac (Gers), about a foot long by three inches wide.

As regards the mode of eating, the incisors of the primitive inhabitants of Switzerland, Aquitaine, Belgium, and Denmark, prove that these people chewed their food in a manner completely different from ours. Their incisors, instead of being shaped like a chisel, presented a flat surface like the molars. The explanation of this peculiarity is perhaps to be found in the fact that roots and coarse bread formed the staple diet of primitive man in the neolithic age.

In the action of mastication the two jaws were placed one above the other in such a way that the incisors of the upper and lower jaws corresponded exactly and did not cross. It appears that the ancient Egyptians ate in this manner, as the modern Esquimaux and the Greenlanders still do.

The primitive European races shared an advantage still possessed by savage American tribes in that their teeth were sometimes worn away even to the root without decaying. At least this has been observed to be the case in a great number of human jaw-bones discovered in the caves of France and Belgium. However, there are many exceptions to this rule.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

An interesting discovery, of much importance for geological and archaeological science, has recently been made in a coal mine at Bailly-Grenay, in a French department of Pas-de-Calais. A new gallery was being pierced, when a cavern was broken into, which discovered the fossil remains of five human beings in a fair state of preservation—a man, two women, and two children composed the group. The man measured about seven feet, the women six feet six, and six feet, the children four feet and rather less than this. In addition, some fragments of arms and utensils of petrified wood and of stone, with numerous remains of mammals and fish, were brought to light. A second subterranean chamber enclosed the remains of eleven human bodies of large size, several animals, and a large number of various objects, with some precious stones. The walls of the cave exhibited drawings representing men fighting with gigantic animals. Owing to the presence of carbonic anhydride a third and larger chamber, which appeared to be empty, was not searched. Five of the petrified human remains will be exhibited at the majority of fairs. The remainder of the bodies which have been brought to the surface are to be conveyed to Lille, there to await a thorough examination by the experts of the Faculté des Sciences. Information has been telegraphed to the representatives of the Académie des Sciences of Paris and to those of the British Museum. If the discovery be a real one, no doubt can be entertained of the value of the find, which would on the face of it seem to show that prehistoric man is anything but a myth.

FOOT NOTES.

It was expected that on the four hundredth anniversary of the dukedom of Norfolk, which fell on the 23rd of June, there would have been some ceremony of celebration at Arundel, Sheffield and Drwent Hill. Nothing of the kind, however, took place, the Duke and Duchess of Norfolk being at present on a tour in Bohemia.

Mr. BYRON says of Mr. Robertson's play "Society," that Mr. Buckstone took the trouble to write to the author, saying that "not only was it unsuitable to the Haymarket, but that it could not, in his opinion, succeed anywhere." On the hundredth night of its performance at the Prince of Wales's Theatre Mr. Robertson sent Mr. Buckstone a private box with his compliments.

THERE was an amusing innovation at a late ball in the shape of a spoken quadrille. The mistress of the house performed the part of an inconsolable widow, the Comtesse de Cézincourt that of a gay young married woman; two other ladies were respectively a sentimental old maid, and a very naive young girl. The four men performed the characters of a husband, a young magistrate, a dashing officer, and a philopoe des salons. The usual figures of a quadrille were gone through while a lively conversation was being held between these different characters, which were most successfully impersonated.

AMONG the archives of the Este family at Modena there has recently been discovered a planisphere dated 1502, which is not only a curiosity in itself, but throws a fresh light on geographical discovery. It was sent to Hercule d'Este by his agent at Lisbonne Cantino, and represented lands newly discovered, more particularly by Gaspard Corte Real, in the New World. Geographers may recognize in the western outlines the prototype of the delineations of the New World remarked in all the editions of Ptolemy up to the middle of the sixteenth century; but they will see with surprise that the coast of the peninsula of Florida and of the east of the United States was discovered, explored, and named by navigators whose names and nationality are unknown, at least a dozen years before the earliest expedition in those regions of which there is any record.