

Hawk-Eyebrows.
There is one thing to be said in favor of the straw-berry shoe (aka), the berry department of the cake is never half so thin as the jokes that are made about it.

Doctor Dio Lewis declared, in an official paper, that the only trouble with women's shoes is that the soles are too narrow. There is one greater trouble than that. The price is too broad.

Our brethren of the Southern States can't mend their own levees, nor build their own railroads, nor take care of their own sick; but they can build more Confederate monuments in a month than we of the North could pay for in a year.

There is no need for us to despair of the reformation of Turkey. The Turks are learning to work. Five of them were thrown into the water by the capsizing of a boat in the Bosphorus the other day, and two of them worked like Trojans to get ashore.

Edward P. Ingersoll, D. D., is one of the contributing editors of the *Chronic*. He is not a brother of the famous Robert, and it worries him awfully to have good people, who are usually to be found in societies, look shocked and hold up both hands in silent horror when they hear his name.

They say that profanity was not known in the world until one day, somewhere about five hundred years before the Christian era, when Ariadne, chasing from his office in desperate haste to catch the last street car, was stopped by Themistocles, who wanted to tell him how the rheumatism had been troubling him nearly all winter and how many things he had tried for it.

Some Indian mounds, supposed to be three or four thousand years old or so, were recently opened near Beloit, Wisconsin, and the first thing the excavators dug out, were a couple of railroad passes and an autograph album. This we see the early dawn of remote civilization mingling with the gray shades of the mounds that are the mounds—the gray shadows of the mounds. *Eons. Gray shadows of the mounds.*

We think Canada is getting ready for annexation. Some of the papers over there talk about Lorne for all the world as American papers talk about the President, so uniformly respectful and supremely courteous, you know. One of our provincial exchanges gives the following account of the subject of half a column, just because he doesn't play cricket any better. Now, we consider it President Hayes' crowning glory that he never belonged to a base-ball club.

"The first Napoleon," remarked Mr. Middleber, "introduced into France the manufacture of beet sugar, and it is to-day an important branch in our own country." "Yes," said Master Middleber, in a subdued tone of countenance, "I tasted some of it to-day." "Tasted some of what?" inquired his father, sharply. "Beet sugar," said the boy, wearily, and then he drew closer to the table and sat more specifically on the edge of his chair. And silence fell on the family like a fog.

The king of Burmah is only twenty years old, and has been on the throne but four months. He was one year and four months, all of royal blood, and he was successfully "counted in." But all the same, no man in all Burmah dares call him a "prophet," and the only members of the opposition who intimated that he held a seat that rightfully belonged to another, are wearing wrought-iron jewelry in a stable not far from the palace. When a man gets himself elected President of an Oriental kingdom there is no subsequent nonsense about going behind the returns. What is the use of being the President if you can't claim the infallibility of the man who says you're not?

A young friend in Marshall county sends me many paragraphs, which he affixes the name of "Artemus Ward." Now, it may be that we are lacking in reverence. We have sometimes feared as much, and sometimes our friends have wept while they told us our besetting sin was irreverence. But we are not wholly irreverent. There are some things and some people and some memories that we do reverence, and if ever any man in free America publishes a joke wherein he brings in the "Pittsburg" or "E. G. gag and the Artemus Ward" name to it, it won't be in this department of *The Chronicle*. We return the young man his joke, and advise him to anchor it out in the river and let it soak over the next Presidential election, and as for himself, we suggest a less ambitious *nom de plume* until he has tarried long enough in Jericho to let his paragraphic beard grow.

The second A. Ward isn't born yet, and some along, people will recognize his name without having his name stenciled on it.

I own to a peculiar carelessness and forgetfulness in personal matters. I grieve and mourn over a chronic inability to remember names. I sometimes fear I would forget my brother's name, if it didn't sound so much like my own. I have sometimes when on the way been so forgetful that I have been compelled to write home to my wife to ascertain what it was. I have sometimes been introduced to a gentleman, and then, before he could get through with the customary introduction, I liked the town, I have found myself wondering, wondering, wondering until my head ached, what under the sun was that man's name. Since my return to my own peaceful residence—I forget, this isn't the freestone season—I mean, to my own protecting fly screen, I have, or rather, the members of my family have, in overhauling my effects, discovered seven autograph albums, evidently committed to me for the insertion of "a autograph." These albums possess the peculiarity of the autograph albums. They contain the names of all people, save those of their owners; and I, wretched man that I am, I won't and where I got them. If the confiding people who sent me their albums, trusting to my easy promise to leave them to their names, and address and a proper description of their respective albums, I will return them, if I do not forget about it. How heavy my guilt weighs upon me. If it doesn't feel any lighter in the morning, I will take it to the grocery and have it weighed, and sell it to some traveling doctor for the home tumor.

Traveling from the Diary of a Reformed Lout.

A Glance Over the Heads of Our Grandmothers.

In the good old days of ignorance and poverty, many hundred years before the introduction of barbed wire and opera bouffe, the hair was considered an amount almost to reverence. Fair women prized their tresses as they did their honor, and brave men valued their locks as dearly as they loved life. The hair of the head commanded the same respect as the beard of the faithful. It was something to swear by. An expression of politeness, it was the fashion to pluck a hair from the head—as we doff our hats or bow now—days, and the Indians rub now—by way of salute; and an uncomplimentary reference to the hair was considered an insult of an unbearable nature. Long and flowing hair was so much esteemed that the tussure of the clergy was regarded as an act of mortification and self-denial. The most degrading punishment to which a criminal or a sinner who had been banished in respect to his hair was condemned, was in shaving the head. A close crop was a token of subjection. Women who treated some of the commandments with contempt, too, were deprived of their ringlets. A king lost his crown when he lost his hair, and it was the custom among the natives of the tribes, when they wished to rid themselves of *ros facient*, to cut off his majesty's hair and send him to a convent. If he objected to this, they cut off his head instead.

A great value was attached to a fine head of hair, and all the resources of ingenuity were exhausted by the women to set it off to advantage. It was as much considered and cultivated as it was by the goddesses of Olympus; and, according to the poet, the painter, and the sculptor, the art of dressing the hair was not neglected by the mythological beauties of the East. Indeed, was accounted one of the most precious attributes of female loveliness by the gods, and mortals have always agreed with them in this opinion. Poets still sing of woman's hair as they did of old, and no poet of antiquity has expressed himself more enthusiastically on the subject than Mr. Swinburne, who is, blustered, as it were, with poetic fire, as soon as he touches this theme. The blood boils in his veins, and his eyes are lit up with a fine frenzy, when he stretches himself at the feet of one of his heroines and plays with the tresses of her hair. Cleopatra does not become nearly so warm when he describes Venus surrounded by the graces, combing out her "long, glorious locks." It was to Venus, by the way, that the Roman ladies prayed when they were afflicted with an epidemic malady which attacked the hair of their heads; and when the plague ceased they erected a statue to the goddess in gratitude. Ariadne, abandoned at Naxos, wandered by the shore, so Catullus tells us, with her luxuriant golden hair floating over her naked shoulders; and then she saw her, and became at once enamored of the love-lorn maid. And Bacchus was not a god to be denied; he took her in his arms, carried her to his chariot, and drove away with her before the very eyes of the satyrs. If he had met Diana when she hunted in the forest,

Her locks would have been fascinated, no doubt, in the same way. Jato, "by whose splendid hair," as the poet says, "all Olympians was perfumed," the god of wine dared not approach out of respect due to her as the wife of his father or the aversion due to her as the destroyer of his mother.—*N. Y. Home Journal.*

Peripatetic Professor.
Writing of the University of Berlin in *Scribner* for June, and especially of Ernst Curtius, Mr. H. H. Boyesen thus describes his interesting method of teaching history:

Professor Curtius has a very agreeable voice and a clear and lucid manner of lecturing; he is frequently in the habit of conducting his auditors through the Greek division of the Royal Museum, and illustrating by the variable objects, many of which he has himself excavated at Olympia, the manner of life and thought among the ancients. It is needless to add that these peripatetic lectures are very popular, being really themselves a venerable tradition from the days of Plato and Socrates. You seem to breathe the breath of Greece. These objects—some of them two or three thousand years old—may have been touched by the fingers of who came to participate in the Olympian games. Here, for instance, is an urn of pitcher of burnt clay, or terra cotta, the fragments of which Professor Curtius discovered in an Olympian tomb. It has now been carefully joined together, and no piece was found lacking. The form is light and elegant, and the colored sketches, representing scenes of every-day life. There is the picture clearly drawn, and the colors yet bright and warm. Notice the wonderful grace and the soft distinctness of the simple lines which go to make up this figure; and these figures were made and decorated by common artisans, not by men who laid claim to the title of artists. Imagine, then, what the average artistic culture must have been among a people whose artisans could draw lines like these. The fact that they are not the work of educated artists is proved by various circumstances; in the first place, the material is very cheap; and, secondly, the pitchers are found in great abundance in the tombs of a certain period. They are a kind of mortuary vessels, which were thrown into the grave, and thus purposely broken; and being a part of the symbolism, and being a part of the whatever Professor Curtius touches is made to tell, not only its own history, but the history of the people who fashioned and used it. Antiquity lives under his hands, and begins to breathe and move in a human and individual manner. We feel our own blood pulsing in its veins, our own emotions and passions animating its actions.

The business manager of Adelina Patti complained to the hotel proprietor at Naples that the prima donna's rooms were not up to her standard of luxury. "But, monsieur," said the hotelier, "the rooms have been here for a long time, and they are not to be changed." "I am satisfied with the rooms," said the manager, "but I don't like the furniture." "I will take it to the grocery and have it weighed, and sell it to some traveling doctor for the home tumor."

Traveling from the Diary of a Reformed Lout.

Blind fruit is a thing to be studied.

Concerning Diamonds.

It is not generally known that there is in Georgia an immense ledge, the form of which is a diamond, and which is the matrix of the diamond. It is described by Mr. M. F. Stephenson, in his book, now almost out of print, *The Mineralogy and Geology of Georgia*. It extends for many miles. A few splendid diamonds were found there years ago by gold-washers, who were ignorant of what they found. Some of these were cut in England and sent in jewelry, but most of them were lost. They were of weight from two to six carats, and three are remembered which were of large size. One of these was broken up by the miners to learn the cause of its luster. Another was used for years by the boys in playing marbles. By far the largest one was lost by a Dr. Loyd, who was employed to examine the mine, and was one day working in the pit that his place of a sick hand. He says that the stone, which was bright and shiny only on one side, lay on the other side being covered with a crust of brown stuff. It was about the size of a hen's egg. He laid it out on a bank under a tree, intending at night to show it to his wife and children as the largest of the "pretty stones" which had been found. But he forgot all about it. Twelve years later, he learned from experts who took his description, that a "guinea egg" was a diamond, which, if true, must have been worth about twenty-five millions of dollars.

The kook-i-noor and the mogul are two of the most notable diamonds in the world. The first, as is well known, belongs to Queen Victoria, by the conquest of Punjab in India, who, to gratify a caprice of her own, has quite destroyed its historic value. It was found four thousand eight hundred and seventy-two years ago (this date is not verified), and when cut by an Indian lapidary, weighed only one hundred eighty-six and one-half carats. If honestly cut it would have been worth thirty million dollars. But by taking off slabs from the facets of a hundred carats they reduced it to a value of three millions. Afterwards the diamond was cut by a Frenchman, and the Indian lapidary, who had cut it, fled to Amsterdam, where he reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half carats, and of course totally obliterated its historic value. Still it values it at three millions, when, by the laws of the diamond market, it is worth only one hundred and ten and a half carats, and the stone recut by Amsterdam jewelers, who reduced it to one hundred and ten and a half