

**BABY**

Good reason why you recognized as the materials, and the styles at from \$5



Rupabout

.....\$22.50  
 Good, finished green leather cloth, with Gear all steel tub-collapsible. Four wheels. Enamelled brake. Priced at



Carriage

.....\$25.00  
 Finished either in leather cloth, lined reversible. Brass joints. 20 1/2 in. rubber tire anti-friction Foot brake. Enamelled. Priced at \$25.00.



Carriage

.....\$27.50  
 Finished either in leather cloth, lined removable. Brass English strap, 16 x rubber tire wheels. Metal fastener. Priced at \$27.50.



Carriage

.....\$40.00  
 Finished dark finished. Upholstered leather cloth, lined, reversible. Brass English strap, 16 x rubber tire wheels. Metal wheel fastener. Priced at

FURNISHINGS  
 EVERYTHING  
 THE SUMMER  
 ATTAGE

**An Hour with the Editor**

**ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS**

Among the parliamentary leaders in the reign of Charles, John Pym and John Hampden were the most prominent. Pym was of good family, was educated at Oxford and a member of the Bar. His home was in Somersetshire, where the family had an estate. He was a man of great courage and eloquence. He was a member of two Parliaments. In the first he took a prominent part in the impeachment of Buckingham, and as soon as the second, known as the Long Parliament, met, he made a powerful speech in defence of the liberty of the subject. A few days later he preferred charges of high treason against Strafford. His resolution was such and his opposition to royal tyranny so intense that Charles was ready to make him Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he would abandon the popular cause; but he was inflexible, and in the strife that soon followed he took a highly important part in directing the policy of the parliamentary party. His death was sudden and occurred when he was in the very height of his mental powers and personal influence. He was at the time in his sixtieth year.

John Hampden was a man from the same class in life as Pym, his father having been a country gentleman of high standing and wealth. He also was educated at Oxford and admitted to the Bar. He entered the House of Commons when quite a young man, and attached himself to the party of which Pym was leader, but he took very little part in its proceedings. He became conspicuous in 1627, when he refused to pay his share of a forced loan which the King was endeavoring to exact from the people. For this he was imprisoned, but was not long detained in custody. On his release he went to his estate in Buckinghamshire and devoted himself to country sports and study. He came to the front again seven years later by refusing to pay the arbitrary tax imposed by Charles and known as ship-money. The Court of Exchequer decided against him, and it was doubtless this decision that convinced him of the necessity of taking an active part in asserting the liberties of the people. During the war between Charles and the Parliament, Hampden took a prominent role. He raised a regiment, which he commanded in person, and was prominent in several battles. He was wounded in a fight with a force commanded by Prince Rupert, and died six days afterwards. Hampden has always been regarded as the ideal type of an English patriot.

Charles brought matters to a climax in 1642, when he attempted to seize five members of the House of Commons because they had ventured to criticize and condemn his actions; but before that incident is related, the events leading up to it should be detailed. The chief grievance against Charles was his assertion of the right of arbitrary taxation. The King held to the ideas of his father, who, it will be remembered, asked the judges if he had not a perfect right to take any man's property without the formality of securing authority from Parliament, a view of the prerogative which a subservient court did not hesitate to sustain. The decision in Hampden's case was that no statute prohibiting arbitrary taxation could be pleaded against the King's will. Judge Berkeley said: "I have never read or heard that lex was rex, but it is common and most true that rex is lex." Chief Justice Finch laid down this principle: "Acts of Parliament to take away the King's royal power in the defence of his kingdom is void; they are void acts of Parliament to bind the King not to command the subjects, their persons and their goods, and I may say their money too; for no Acts of Parliament could make any difference." When the judgment was delivered, Strafford said: "I wish Mr. Hampden and others to his likeness were whipped into their right senses." Here we have the issue between Charles and Parliament distinctly defined. It was intensified by a religious enthusiasm prompted by the fear that the Queen, who, as we have seen, was a zealous Roman Catholic, would be able to employ her influence to subvert the Protestant religion. The first open clash between the King and any part of his subjects took place in Scotland, where the people asserted their right to freedom in religious matters. The King fared badly. Parliament refused to vote any money to pay for his operations against the Scots, and although Strafford brought over a levy from Ireland and a grant of money, things went from bad to worse, and Charles was forced to yield. Without money, without an army, for the force he had collected to oppose the Scots was little more than a rabble, and with England on the eve of revolt, the King refused to summon a Parliament, and called a council of the peers. The nobles understood the situation better than he, and refused to assemble, so that he was compelled to summon a Parliament. In the elections which followed, Pym and Hampden rode throughout England advocating the cause of liberty, and the result was that the new House of Commons was fully representative of the spirit that was abroad in the land. One of its acts, passed at the suggestion of Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon, was to declare that it should never be dissolved without its consent, and it has passed into history as the Long Parliament, for it existed from 1640 until 1653, when Cromwell dissolved what was left of it. The impeachment of Strafford quickly followed. The story of the several events of this critical period are worth telling, for they give better than can be conveyed in any other way an idea of the temper of the people in the hour when the destinies of the British race were being determined. Strafford was hated not simply because he was the adviser of the King to acts of tyranny and the willing tool by which they were carried into effect, but because, as Lord

Digby said, "he was the grand apostate of the Commonwealth." As we saw in the previous article, he was at one time the spokesman of the popular party, and for his desertion of the cause he could not, again quoting Digby, "expect to be pardoned in this world until he be despatched to the next." Pym preferred the impeachment, the Commons having decided upon its course behind locked doors. Pym went to the bar of the House of Lords with three hundred members of the Commons at his back. Strafford, who with all his faults could not be charged with cowardice, hastened to the chamber of the peers. "With speed he comes to the House," wrote Lord Clarendon. "He rudely calls at the door; with a proud, glooming look he makes towards his place at the board-head. But at once many bid him void the House, so he is forced to go to the door till he was called." The Lords acted with promptness and declared him guilty of high treason, whereupon he was recalled. He attempted to speak, but "was commanded to be gone without a word." Then the Usher of the Black Rod demanded his sword, and the great minister of the King "makes his way through a number of people toward his coach, no can capping to him, before whom that morning the greatest of all England would have stood uncovered." The imprisonment of Strafford was followed by the impeachment of Windebank, Secretary of State, of Finch, formerly Chief Justice, of Berkeley and of Laud, and in 1641, Parliament passed an Act declaring that it should be called together at least once in three years, and asserting "the ancient right of the subjects of this kingdom that no subsidy, custom, impost or any charge whatsoever ought or may be laid or imposed upon any merchandise exported or imported by subjects, denizens or aliens without common consent in Parliament." The King appeared to realize that it would no longer be possible for him to govern without the co-operation of Parliament, and an attempt was made to form a parliamentary administration, to which he gave apparently a ready assent; but the influence of the Queen frustrated all attempts to establish a permanent peace, for it secured his tacit attempt to bring the army into London to overawe Parliament. The Lords had grown apprehensive of the growing powers of the Commons, and had held aloof from co-operating with the elective body, but the news of the army plot led them to abandon the cause of the King, and to give a prompt assent to the Bill of Attainder preferred against Strafford, who was accordingly executed. This act was the turning point in English history, and, strangely enough, the King was urged to assent to it by his Queen, who had opposed Parliament in every way, but whose personal hatred of Strafford led her to induce Charles to give the far-reaching admission of the powers of the Houses implied in the proceedings against his ministers. If Charles had acted with discretion after the death of Strafford, the history of England would have been different; but he seemed to be incapable of learning the lesson of events. Buckingham, his first tutor in absolutism, had fallen early in his reign by the hand of an assassin, after he had been forced from power by an indignant Parliament. Strafford had been brought to the block. The judges that had upheld his arbitrary proceedings had been driven from the kingdom, but Charles was of a temper like that of the Bourbons, of whom it was said that "they learned nothing and forgot nothing." He might have ruled in peace, but his whole policy only tended to the precipitation of a crisis.

**NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS**

Guizot in his history of France, says: "Three or four centuries before the Christian Era, on that vast territory between the ocean, the Pyrenees, the Mediterranean, the Alps and the Rhine, lived six or seven millions of men a bestial life, enclosed in dwellings dark and low, the best of them built of wood and clay, covered with branches or straw, made in a single round piece, open to daylight by the door alone, and confusedly heaped together behind a rampart, not artistically composed, of timber, earth and stone, which surrounded and protected what they were pleased to call a town." Such were the aboriginal inhabitants of France, according to this historian, and yet there is evidence pointing to the fact that they have been preceded by a people more advanced in civilization, for it is said that fifteen hundred years before Christ the Phoenicians traded with what is now France, bringing merchandise and exchanging it for gold that was washed out of the sands. After the Phoenicians came the Greeks, the early story of France in many respects resembling that of Spain. In the time of Julius Caesar Gaul, as we all know, was divided into three parts, and the inhabitants of the several parts were Celts, the Belgians and the Aquitanians, to use their modern names. The Aquitanians are thought to have been the same as the Iberians, who are supposed to be represented today by the Basques. The Belgians, who occupied the north, are otherwise known as the Cymri. The Celts occupied the centre. The Cymri and the Celts are supposed to have been of the same family, although as we saw in our reference to the Celts, there is considerable doubt on that point. There were at this time some sixty tribal divisions of the population of Gaul, but the three main divisions of the population were very marked, and they have had their effect in determining the French character down to the present time.

The conquest of Gaul by the Romans was very complete. It is said that there is no record anywhere else of so complete an overthrow of one people by another as we find in

Gaul. The influence of Rome completely altered the character of the people, the new influence being even more pronounced than we have seen it was in Spain. It determined the type of the French race as well as its language, they failed to produce any marked impression upon it. These races were the Vandals, the Visigoths and the Franks, the last giving their name to the country; but these Teutonic tribes were assimilated by the people whom they subdued. The invasion of the Huns did not result in the occupation of any part of the country by this ferocious people; but the Normans effected a permanent lodgment along the southern shore of the English Channel. Going to make up the population of France, we have therefore in the south an aboriginal race supposed to be identical with the Iberians, intermingled to a slight extent with Phoenicians and Greeks. In the centre a Celtic race, and in the north the Cymri, all of whom, after having been Romanized, were subjected to infusions of Teutonic blood from the Vandals, Visigoths, Franks, Burgundians and Normans. The modern Frenchman is therefore a product of the amalgamation of many stocks and possesses the qualities of all of them to some extent, and yet the population of France continues to exhibit to this day traces of the distinctions which Caesar noted in the opening of his Commentaries.

In Belgium we find a modification of the French type, due probably to the greater infusion of Burgundian blood. Perhaps if we should say that the modern Belgian is a descendant of the ancient Cymri, who crossed Europe in prehistoric times, and the Burgundians, one of the last of the Teutonic tribes to make the transit of Europe, we shall not be far astray.

The Helvetii were a race of whose origin nothing is known. The first record of them is that they occupied the western part of Switzerland during the second century before Christ, but how long anterior to that they were in possession of the country is purely a matter of guesswork. They were an exceedingly warlike people, but proved unequal to the better trained legions of Rome. Later they suffered severely in war with the Burgundians, and thereafter ceased to exist as a distinct people. They handed down their characteristics to future generations, and from them the Swiss inherited their love of freedom. Although never very numerous, in the time of Caesar they numbered only a little more than half a million; they were a potent race and had a marked influence upon the other peoples with whom they came in contact.

Among the minor races contributing to the character of the inhabitants of Western Europe the Lombards must be mentioned. Like the Helvetii, they are of unknown history previous to the time that Caesar mentions the stock to which they are supposed to have belonged, and which he called the Suevi. It has been supposed that they came originally from Asia, but this opinion is based only upon the theory that Asia was the original habitation of the human race, and hence that all people came from there at one time or another, and also upon the fact that during historic times numerous races are known to have migrated across Europe from the East. But we really know nothing whatever of the origin of the Lombards. They were an exceedingly warlike race. The descendants of the Suevi occupied the country afterwards known as Suabia, a duchy that played an exceedingly important part in mediæval history.

**ORIENTATION**

When a fish is dead or dying in the water its body turns over, the back, which is the heavier part, being turned downwards. When a fish is alive and well, its back is turned upwards. This is because a fish possesses what is called the faculty of Orientation. All animals have it. It is a very wonderful faculty. It consists in the ability to keep the centre of gravity over the base, and do it automatically. Stand with your back against the wall, and you will feel your weight resting on your heels; lean forward and the weight on your heels will grow less and that on your toes will increase, until you know automatically that if you lean over any further you will fall. You do not have to think the matter out. If you were to try to do so, you could not. But fortunately you have the faculty of orientation, and what is known as an organ of equilibrium, and scientific folk say that the latter is situated in the ears. It consists of small nerve ends, which tell the brain that you are about to lose your balance. This seems, and is a very wonderful thing indeed. If you walk along a surface that is inclined in any direction you will without knowing it adjust your position so that your body will be properly oriented. Take the case of a ship that is listed. You walk along her deck from bow to stern, or the reverse, and you feel as if you were in the same relative position to the deck as you would be if it were level; but to a person behind you, you seem to be leaning towards the higher side

of the deck. If you carry a heavy weight in one hand, you either lean in the direction of the other hand or extend the other arm; perhaps you do both; but whether you do one or both, you do it automatically. The little nerve ends do their work, if you are in normal health, without any attention on your part, and the case is an extreme one in which they do not. Even in sleep they serve their purpose to some extent at least, if not as fully as they do in our waking moments. Thus somnambulists maintain their equilibrium in most remarkable situations. This shows that the faculty of orientation is independent of sight, hearing, or our reasoning faculties, which is a fortunate thing for us, because if we had to stop and think out the precise point at which we would lose our balance we would hardly be able to stand up, not to speak of walk.

The faculty of orientation in the lower animals seems to be fully developed from birth; and possibly it is so in the case of mankind, for as soon as an infant has grown strong enough to hold itself erect, it will make efforts to maintain its equilibrium, although they may not be successful. The faculty is sometimes lost or greatly impaired, as in the case in the disease known as locomotor ataxia. But the term orientation is applied to other things besides the power to keep one's equilibrium. A general definition of it is "the power to maintain a proper relative position, to comprehend direction and to control locomotion." It seems to be a faculty capable of indefinite development. For example, certain savage races possess the ability of determining direction to an extraordinary degree, and occasionally one meets a civilized person who has the same faculty. Three men were walking through a forest on snow shoes. They were in single file, the man at the head acting as guide, for although he had never been in that particular part of the country, he was supposed to have a general idea of it. The day was overcast, and there was absolutely nothing by which direction could be determined. After they walked several hours, the guide confessed that he was lost, and thereupon another member of the party, who had never been in that part of the country before, but who knew the general direction of the destination from the point of departure, volunteered to act as guide. He turned off at nearly right angles from the course they had been taking, and although they were in the midst of a forest, which looked alike in every direction, he chose the right course. He had no explanation to offer, except he felt that it was the right way, and he said that he always seemed able to tell direction. This sense of direction is possessed to a certain extent by every one, and there is no doubt that it can be cultivated. It is a sort of sixth sense, which civilized races do not employ because they have not much necessary use for it. It is marvelously developed in the lower animals. By it fish find their way back to rivers in which they were spawned, birds find their way through the air by night as well as by day, and "the cat comes back" no matter how closely she has been secured in the basket within which she was carried away.

Orientation and the means whereby it can be developed are worthy of much closer observation and study than they have received. It has only received scientific attention in recent years and chiefly from a few German and French scholars. Indeed the word is not found in many of the dictionaries, except in the latest editions. In the 1883 edition of Chambers' Encyclopedia the term appears, but it is applied only to certain ecclesiastical matters. The faculty seems to have developed to an extreme degree in some Asiatic countries, and it is just possible that, if it were investigated thoroughly and systematically cultivated, it would be found to be of inestimable value along lines not at present considered.

**Some Famous Dramatists and Their Master-Pieces**  
 (By de Bertrand Lagren)

**Sophocles**

Sophocles is likened by one of his biographers to Shakespeare, inasmuch as the personality of the man lives for us only in his works. Ancient history furnishes such various and contradictory accounts of this great poet, that we do not know which stories to credit and which to discredit. We can be pretty certain that he was born about thirty years after his famous contemporary Æschylus; that he figured more or less brilliantly in the dramatic events of that time; that he numbered among his friends most of those of intellectual accomplishments; that he was not distinguished for any evil qualities, or time would certainly have borne some record of the fact; that his family was in no way remarkable, though there is a story to the effect that he showed so little practicability that his children tried to deprive him of the management of his property. Sophocles had the good fortune to live during the most brilliant and prosperous years of the Athenian Empire; a period that was ushered in with the glorious victory of Marathon, 490 B.C., and which, alas! was brought to an inglorious end at Ægospotami, 405 B.C. Among his contemporaries, besides Æschylus, were Euripides, hardly less renowned, silver-tongued Pericles, Phidias, Herodotus, Thucydides, the great Socrates, Anaxagoras, and many others

whose records have come down to us almost without parallel in history; it was the Golden Age of Athens, and Pericles the greatest personality of them all. It was his eloquence that served to inspire to deeds of matchless courage. It was his example that the best and bravest strove to emulate. Some commentators, who like to draw ethical lessons from prominent periods of history, tell us that the reason of Athens' greatness was because of the statesmanship of her citizens. No man lived unto himself alone, but each did his utmost for the good of the whole. Individual interests were merged in the concern for the prosperity of the state, and consequently the history of this period is not the history of its different great men. "Each man (was) valued for his contribution to the public life of the city; and therefore each great artist of that day, whatever the species of his art, strove mainly to express Attic purity, Attic grace, Attic power."

Sophocles has been termed an intermediate dramatist between Æschylus and Euripides. Æschylus was the most powerful, the most dignified, his conceptions the most colossal, of all the Greek poets; Euripides' themes, while not so majestic in order, embraced a wider range of subjects, but were not always worthy of dramatic portrayal; Sophocles adopted a halfway attitude between these two extremes, his plays were models of art, not beyond the understanding of the people; and in no sense irreconcilable with the refinements of the most fastidious.

He wrote prodigiously, but as the case with Æschylus, we have only seven of his plays left. In those days the merits of a dramatic work were decided according to the popular opinion of the people, judgment being determined by the casting of lots. A poet was supposed to compete every two years, and submit three plays, an exacting which meant an enormous amount of intellectual labor to the competitors. Sophocles obtained first prize for at least two of his tragedies, "Antigone" and "Philoctetes," and in one of the tests is said to have defeated Æschylus.

In his masterpiece, "Antigone," we are introduced to the woman who served as heroine for countless of the ancient tragedies. "Polynices, the brother of Antigone, had invaded his own country at the head of an army, and had been slain in combat with his own brother, Creon, the new head of the state, refuses honorable burial to the perfidious soldier, and Antigone, outraged in her love for her brother, refuses to submit to the State's decree. She is taken prisoner and brought before Creon by a soldier, who had caught her in the very act of performing the sacred funeral rites over her brother's body. Though she is betrothed to Hæmon, Creon's son, this does not condone her offense; she is condemned to death. Hæmon, after vainly pleading for her, commits suicide, and her death soon follows:

**Antigone to Creon**

Nowise from Zeus, methought, this edict came,  
 Nor Justice, that abides among the gods  
 In Hades, who ordained these laws for men.  
 Nor did I deem thee edicts of such force  
 That they, a mortal's bidding, should override  
 Unwritten laws, eternal in the heavens.  
 Not of today or yesterday are these;  
 But live from everlasting, and from whence  
 They sprang none knoweth. I would not, for  
 the breach

Of these, through fear of any human pride,  
 To Heaven atone. I knew that I must die:  
 How else? Without thine edict that were so;  
 And if before my time,—why, this were gain.  
 Compassed about with ills,—who lives as I,  
 Death to such life as this must needs be gain,  
 So is it to me to undergo this doom.  
 No grief at all, but had I left my brother,  
 My mother's child, unburied where he lay,  
 Then I had grieved; but now this grieves me  
 not.

Senseless I seem to thee, so doing? Belike  
 A senseless judgment finds me void of sense."

The story of "Elektra" is also dramatized by Sophocles, and he takes a different view of Orestes' crime than did the other poet, Æschylus.

One of the prettiest and most artistic of all his plays, though it is not as well known, perhaps, as the rest, is the story of Heracles and Dejanira.

Heracles departs for his travels and leaves his faithful wife for many years. All through their separation she cherishes tender thoughts of him, and, no less loving than Penelope, watches for her lord's return. In the meantime she grows old and worn with waiting, and when he does come back he brings a lovely young slave girl with him, and makes no secret of the fact that he has experienced a change of heart. But Dejanira has no word of reproach to offer. She has made a present for Heracles during his absence, "the shirt of Nessus." She is unaware of the deadly effect it must have upon its wearer, as it has been secretly anointed with the poison of the Centaur's wound. Heracles, donning it, dies, and Dejanira, overcome with sorrow and horror, commits suicide.

There is not space within one article to do anything like justice to this great poet and his works. The account will be finished next week.

"How did it happen that Miss Singleton refused to marry the young clergyman?"

"Why, when he proposed to her she, being a little deaf, thought he was asking to subscribe to the organ fund. So she told him she had promised her money in some other direction."