FROM FLASH FICTION.

France and Paris Owe Their Bad Reputation Here to Yellow Novel Writers.

It appears that Paris has a shocking reputation in America. Such is the discovery made by M. Deschamps, the literary critic of the Temps, while touring through the states, where he had been invited to lecture at a number of universities, says the Pall Mall Gazette. M. Deschamps gives an amusing illustration of the sad repute in which our capital is held in the land of Tammany and express divorces. When he reached New York he was at once the prey, as became his celebrity, of the interviewer. Thinking to be polite, he worked off a neat reference to the many persons he had met on landing whose acquaintance he had previously made in Paris. He remarked that it was impossible not to feel at home among so many old friends, and as a supreme compliment he affirmed that he had scarcely left Paris, since before he enjoyed the pleasure of genuinely Parisian conversation. To his surprise, a friend at his elbow was piloting him through the ordeal of his first encounter with the American reporter started off in evident alarm on a flood of explanations tending to set forth the revolting innocence of the delights involved in a "genuinely Parisian conversation." M. Deschamps was naturally astonished at the necessity of this precaution, but it was explained to him that in American parlance, a Parisian conversation is a euphemism for small talk of the order to which hardened ears are alleged to listen in the smoking-room.

Indications abound, M. Deschamps found, of the low idea which prevails in the states of Parisian and more generally of French morality. The preachers are never tired of inveighing from their pulpits against the iniquity of the modern Babylon, which is denounced as a sink of untold corruption. Good Americans may go to Paris when they die, but if they visit the city in their lifetime it is in spite of the most urgent warnings. Nor are the gentlemen of the press alone in their belief in the shameless frivolity of the French capital. The critic of the Temps was assured that to confess you have returned "from the gay Paris"—as he quotes—is to provoke the leers of your listeners, and to expose yourself to being treated as no end of a gay dog. People dig you in the ribs, grin, and are persuaded that you have been in the wildest mischief. M. Deschamps ascribes the deplorable reputation of Paris in America to the French novel. As depicted by the writers of boulevard fiction, French ones and French women would seem to have no other occupation than the breaking of a certain commandment. Americans accept these pictures as representing the truth. They fancy every Frenchman to be a professional Don Juan, and they put the women down as incorrigible bagguges. They are unaware that the French novel has presented of late years, with rare exceptions, the most grotesque caricature of the national life. It may be added that the novelists are paying the penalty of their misguided predilection for the unsavory. At home nobody reads them. Every publisher will substantiate that the novel in France is in as bad a way as possible; there is no sale for the indigenous production, and the public is falling back on translations. As to the more limited point of the reputation of Paris, it is the curious fate of our capital to be symbolised for the average tourist by a choregraphic establishment. As there was ample opportunity of observing during the exposition, Paris for the international multitude is the city of the Moulin Rouge. It would have been as just that London in days gone by should have been known to the universe by the Cremorne gardens.

An English Prizefight in 1860.

Men not so very much past middle age were startled by the change of manners when they were reminded of the anniversary of the prize fight between Sayers and Heenan, which came off on April 17, 1860. Only those who are old enough to remember it, or who turn up a file of papers of the period, can imagine the excitement it created. Even the Times, under the direction of the great Delane, devoted three columns of close print on the page opposite the leaders to an account of it, the remaining columns on the same page in larger type sufficing for the foreign correspondence. One sentence in the description strikes one as delightful. "In the outer ring were gentlemen of all ranks—members of both houses in plenty. Authors, poets, painters, soldiers and even clergymen were present." One hopes that even the clergymen went in mufti.—London Chronicle.

The Rod and the Child.

Once upon a time there lived in Chicago, Ill., a little boy who would not go to school.

Instead of beating him, his parents appealed to his civic pride.

"Unless you go to school," said they, "you won't be counted in the school census, and the school census is often used as a basis for estimating the population of our beautiful city!"

At this the little boy went to school so assiduously that his mind became affected.

"Alas!" cried his parents, for now when it was too late they perceived the unwisdom of sparing the rod.—Detroit Journal.

Merely a Day Dream.

Rev. Preachem—I see that the Chinese have to pay $100 apiece for our sermons they have destroyed.

Mrs. Preachem—Yes, and I remember when I urged you to accept a call to Peking.—Baltimore American.

FAMOUS WEEPERS IN HISTORY

Andrew Lang Discusses Tears as an Expression of Feeling by Great Men of Past.

The heroes of Homer, great, strapping fellows, weep on the slightest opportunity. Menelaus cries when he is wounded—not badly. Mr. Kipling, I think, writes Andrew Lang, in London Post, is my authority for saying that everyone cries when he is shot in the hand. The Greek seems quite apt when injured to cause tears. I lately met a young gentleman who, after adequately bayoneting a Boer, was himself shot in the foot. But, from his description of the sensation, it was as if somebody had thrown a stone at him, and he did not weep.

At any emotion Homer's men cry, without any of our false modesty. In our place a hero is described by the great poet as "weeping like a waterfall," which to us northern people seems rather absurd. The heroes of the old French epic, "The Song of Roland," weep, the whole army, without exception, blubber when they think of sweet France during a penisular campaign. On the other hand, I do not remember a single instance in which the tough warriors of the Norse sagas weep. Our early Norman kings, pot-bellied men, rolled on the floor and gnawed at straws instead of crying, and they also swore terribly, especially at William Rufus.

Now, if you come to think of it, the Romans, and still more the Greeks, appear to have been practically ignorant of profane swearing. Homer never tells us that "our men swore terribly in" Troia. They would curse, I admit, but to curse was rather an elaborate affair (usually resorted to by injured mothers), not a mere explosion of irritation. No Homeric hero, however angry, exclaims, "You go to Tartarus." They had not even a word for our brief popular expression of hostile interest in the future life of an irritating person. Fielding makes the village boys say to Phaethon, the son of the sun: "You, the sun's son, you rascal—you be d—d!"

But here the learned author of "Tom Jones" permits himself to enjoy an anachronism. The inference from these considerations is that the early Greek warriors cried so much because they did not know how to swear, a practice far more military and manly. Swift tells us that when all London expected the last day the officers of her majesty, Queen Anne, swore even more than common, lest their men should think that any occasion, however serious, could daunt a gentleman who wore the queen's uniform. The intention, by itself, was excellent, but Achilles and Agamemnon would have sat down and cried, a thing detrimental to discipline.

The next best weepers known to history are the philosophers of the eighteenth century. Their great idea was to return to a state of nature, which was presently done in the savage atrocities of the glorious revolution. But before blood was shed in rivers the philosophers returned to a state of nature by weeping like waterfalls. Rousseau, especially, outdid Job Trotter. Mr. Jingle's servant in "Pickwick," a gentleman whom this lackey genius greatly resembled.

Rousseau tells us that he used to walk along the road weeping when he thought what a fine old fellow the earl marischal was. Even Agamemnon would not have cried at the reflection that Nestor was a fine old fellow. On the broad shoulder and velvet coat, adorned with yellow butterflies, of Mr. David Hume did Jean Jacques also shed the tears of sensibility, greatly disconcerting Mr. Hume. A daisy, a pretty girl, "a bird in the branches, a flower by the way," were enough to set the lachrymatory glands of the philosopher at work. "He went on on the main and did the briny." The practice became fashionable, as the novels of the period show, if we can trust the novels of the period.

King Edward's Queer Clock.

There is a clock now in the possession of King Edward VII. at Marlborough house to which a somewhat curious story is attached. It was presented to the then prince of Wales on the occasion of his visit to India, and was said to have been made by a priest of the greatest sanctity. It was so constructed as to show the hours in Sanscrit figures, the changes of the moon and other things. After it had been brought to London the clock remained quiescent for some years, and, eventually the prince desired that it should be put in working order. When it was taken to pieces there was found on the interior of the case which covered the mainspring the name of a Clerkenwell firm.—N. Y. Tribune.

Result of His Study.

"I suppose you have made a study of human nature," remarked the friend.

"I attribute my success in life to that fact," answered Senator Sorghum.

"Were you never tempted to give the world the benefit of your observations; to put them into book form as a human comedy, or something of that sort?"

"My dear sir, it wouldn't take a book to do it; I have figured on the problem of human nature until I know the answer. I should just say: 'Human nature loves money,' and let it go at that."—Washington Star.

Sure of It.

Jack—I made two calls this afternoon, and I must have left my umbrella at the last place I called.

Tom—How do you know but what you left it at the first place?

"Because that's where I got it."—N. Y. World.

A QUESTION OF INTENT.

How a Subchief Obeyed His Superior's Orders in the Very Letter.

In one of the executive departments not a thousand miles from the Star building, a young man fresh from the plains of the southwest was appointed a subchief in one of the divisions, says that Washington paper.

He had a misunderstanding with one of the clerks a few days after his advent, and he was instructed by his superior to discipline the clerk, as the latter happened to be in the wrong.

"You must discipline him. Not harshly, but sit down on him properly," said the chief of division.

"I don't like to do that," replied the Texan.

"We can't take our likes and dislikes into consideration in government service in the administration of our duties," advised the chief. "Give him a gentle dressing down, and then sit down on him quick and hard."

"I hate to do it."

"Can't help it. It's your duty. He is in a room by himself. No one will hear or see you. It will be good practice for you, as you will have to do it often. He's a little fellow, too."

"That's the worst of it. If he were my size, I'd like the sport better than branding and roping steers. However, having been a deputy sheriff, I know what my duty means. When I was told to go out and get a cattle rustler or a bad cowboy, I usually got him down and then sat