

A TALK ON DRESS.

I.

THE object of dress may be said to be threefold—to cover, to warm, to beautify. It is from the point of beauty that we shall chiefly consider it. Beauty in dress, as in other things, is largely relative. To admit this is to admit that a dress which is beautiful upon one woman may be hideous worn by another. Each should understand her own style, accept it, and let the fashion of her dress be built upon it.

Because, my dark slender friend looks well in a heavy velvet with a high ruff, her rival, who is short and stout and blonde, tries to outshine her in a heavier velvet with a higher ruff. It is reason enough that the last should look ill in the dress because the first looks well in it.

To begin with the matter of color, which (given the sense for it) is easier to attain than perfect form in dress, as it takes less skill and time, we may easily divide people into types or classes of color, and say what colors must be avoided or chosen for each class.

Until very lately the red-haired class has been in modern times only admired by artists, though in the olden days of Venice dark-haired ladies used to dye their hair red to imitate their more fortunate sisters who were born thus decorated. To-day in Venice one sees sometimes the red-haired Italian with green or gray eyes, but more often one finds them in still more northern parts of Italy, and they are always admired.

Red hair has been contrasted with blue in almost all cases, and this is the one color that should never be brought near it. Red hair with blue eyes requires a different "treatment" from red hair with gray or green or brown eyes. Very often the blue eyes, which are not so fortunate as other colors with red hair, may be neutralized by the color of the gown, but as soon as blue is introduced into the dress, the blue eyes count for twice their value, and form too strong a contrast.

To assure yourself of this fact in color, take a fabric upon which are red, blue, and green spots or figures; fasten upon it a blue ribbon, and you will at once see the blue spots more prominently than the red or green; fasten a green ribbon upon it, and your eye at once selects the green spots; with a red ribbon, the red spots tell.

Many blue eyes are of a transparent quality, easily reflecting other color. A green dress will immediately impart some of its own tone to the transparent blue eye, and thus it will, to all intents and purposes, cease to be blue. The green must be by no means light, for a pale green is a very unfortunate color with really red hair, while the deep reds and yellows are very harmonious with it. One might set down the possibilities and impossibilities for the red-haired type as follows:

To be chosen for red hair: white of a creamy tone; black; invisible green; rich bottle green; rich blue-green; olive green; gray-green; stone gray; claret-color; maroon; plum; amethyst; brownish-purple; pale yellow; gold-color; pale amber; dark amber; reds approaching amber; brown. To be avoided for red hair: blue of all shades; blue-white; pale green; bright reds; bright rose pink; blue-purple; lavender.

There is a color to be used with red hair that requires almost an artist to use it, and then it may be very effective. It should be in small quantities, and contrasted with other tones. It is a pale yellowish-pink. All pinks approaching a violet shade are painful with red hair; but, especially where the eyes are brown, and the complexion of that shell-like beauty that often belongs to this type, such a pink as we have spoken of, used as a lining to a dull dark amber, almost brown, such as one may find in velvet, or a red that is as dark as a dark red hollyhock, seems to repeat very effectively the fair bloom of the complexion.

The blue-eyed women of this type do well to wear chiefly the greens, stone gray, and yellows, the creamy white, and the black. This gives them sufficient range, and they can not improve upon it. For ornaments, amber, gold, and pearls, and yellowish lace. The gray and green eyed may venture further upon the browns and purples; but the fortunate brown-eyed may run the whole gamut here set down from white to brown, but will find nothing better than the dark reds and ambers.

There is a type very frequent among us which is usually called ineffective, and women belonging to this type of color are usually set down as plain, though among them often we find delicacy of form and fine eyes. They have dull light brown hair and no brilliancy of complexion; the

eyes are often gray or blue. We find them making one of two mistakes in the color of their dress in hopes of mitigating this ineffectiveness: one is to wear reds, which, however, fail to produce either harmony or contrast; the other is to dress in fawn-colors and grays, as if by contrast to make the hair appear darker. All this is futile. Fawns and grays require a complexion either brilliant or delicate. Browns are out of the question. Soft pinks or blues well contrasted with white of a creamy tone, or black, are the best choice. If the eyes are green, dark green may be used, but they are not so frequently in this type. White, by casting reflected lights, clears the complexion. We indicate for this the following type: To be chosen: black, especially black velvet; creamy white; pale pinks and blues, never of a chalky tone; lace and muslin. To be avoided: tan-colors; fawn-colors; blue-white; grays; frank blues, yellows, and reds; brown.

There is hardly any type that has not its advantage over others. The one we have just mentioned may have a peculiar elegance from its very quietness. It is easy for the more effective types to look overdressed and conspicuous; let this less effective type take advantage of its deficiency, and turn it into a quiet elegance.

Black lace and white lace have a universal becomingness. Black silk has this reputation, but to my mind unjustly. It appears to me to possess a certain hardening effect. For the dull complexion, it has too much glitter; for the bright complexion, sometimes too much contrast. The more its surface approaches a satin, or is broken by an interwoven figure, the more often it is becoming. Perhaps the golden-haired type with roseate skin and blue eyes can bear it better than most; but even with these, other fabrics are often more beautiful. The rosy, golden-haired blonde is one of the few types that may wear blue-white. It is so rare a privilege that we can scarcely imagine any one who *can*, not taking advantage of it. Yellows, also, with the golden blonde whose complexion is brilliant, produce perhaps the most beautiful harmonies. Reds should never be worn, and the frank tones, however pale, of blue, green, or pink, chosen rather than the evasive tones which are best for the golden blonde with a pale complexion.

Colors for golden blonde with roseate

skin: blue-white; blue, from dark to light; rose pink; green, from dark to light; yellows, especially on gold tones; purples and lilacs; grays; black; brown, contrasted with pink. To be avoided: reds.

For golden blonde with pale skin: olive greens; mauve pinks; cream white; black; gray; amethyst; amber; stone gray; blue. To be avoided: reds; browns.

There are two other types that may wear the blue-white—the dark-brown-haired with roseate complexion and blue or green eyes, and the black-haired with pale complexion and blue or brown eyes. But in all cases it demands the brilliant rosy or the brilliant pale complexion, and the very dark brown, black, or golden hair.

Black velvet should be avoided where the contrasts are startling. With black hair and a high color, the effect is rarely in good taste, though often startlingly brilliant, while a dark green, or claret, or blue, would be more harmonious. Wherever there is red in the composition of the hair, green (*not* a pale green, which should be only worn by blondes) will be becoming, and the dark shades of red will bring out the red in the hair, and light blue may be very effectively worn with very dark hair that has red in its composition, especially when the complexion is pale or very delicate.

Colors that may be chosen for brown hair, eyes, and skin: reds; amber, and all yellows; brown; maroon; olive green; rose pink, with dark tones; very dark blue, especially in velvet; tan and cream colors. To be avoided: light blue or medium blue; light green; pale violets or violet-pinks; grays; purple; black; white.

Colors to be chosen for black hair, pale skin, and blue eyes: white, both cream and blue; black; blue, light to dark; reds, light to dark; pale pinks; blue-grays. With dark eyes, add yellows and amber. To be avoided: pale greens.

Colors to be chosen for chestnut hair, hazel eyes, and pale skin: olive greens; dark and light blues; purples; all evasive pale shades, pale yellows, old gold, and burnt creams; black; white of creamy tone. To be avoided: blue-white; red of any shade; brilliant yellows; medium blue.

Very often it is the quantity of a certain tone or color that makes it becoming or unbecoming. A bow or lining of any given color may be very effective, which, used in a large mass, might destroy the

balance and harmony. Sometimes a color that is inharmonious with the complexion in one material is perfectly in tone in another, on account of the different manner in which it takes the light. This matter of light and reflected lights has more to do with form than most people suspect, but we must speak of form in another chapter.

II.

We have said that one object of dress is to beautify; perhaps we should say, to emphasize beauty. A perfect proportion is the greatest beauty, but it is also the rarest. Usually the problem of dress is to bring into relief one or two fine points, and conceal the many deficiencies. That woman who acknowledges to herself her own deficiencies, and bases her dress upon her finest points, will make the most pleasing impression. Seeing that so many women devote a great deal of time to dress, it is a little remarkable that so few seem to meet the problem upon any radical principle. One woman has no beauty of figure, but a fine head and lovely eyes. She is sure to wear a tight-fitting gown that emphasizes the deficiency of her figure, and to come "with all her imperfections on her head" in the way of a massive coiffure, while the color of her whole costume is not chosen with any reference to the color of her eyes. If "capucin" be the fashionable tint, which can be effectively worn only by one person out of a hundred, and she be one of the ninety-and-nine, she doubtless has made that the prevailing tone of her dress, secure in her choice because it is "fashionable."

In result she is a plain woman. Many a famous beauty owes her reputation to the chance becomingness of the prevailing fashion, and many with equal charms hide them through ignorance of the first principles of dress.

Form is something less usually understood than color, and on the subject of proportion there is an alarming ignorance. Short women strive to give themselves height by building up their heads. It is not usually known that most people's heads are too large. They are often improved by the hair or some small ornament being worn on the top of the head; but it must not be so arranged as to seem to increase the *bulk* of the head, only to add a little in *height*. The size of the head in proportion to the entire height of the body should be one-eighth. Often

women with faces too long try to shorten the face by wearing the hair very low on the forehead. Whether the hair be worn low or high should depend principally on two things—the setting of the eyes, and the quality of the face. The eyes of a woman should be in the middle of her face. That is, drawing an imaginary line across the top of the head and another below the chin, it is on an imaginary line exactly half way between these two that the woman's eyes should be set; if they are placed higher, the effect approaches masculinity; if lower, the effect is toward the infantile type.

Now if the eyes are set too near the top of the head, often the case where the face is too long, the bringing the hair low upon the brow only increases this defect. The other thing to be considered is the quality of the face. Sometimes a strong face is brutalized by bringing the hair low, and spiritualized by wearing it high, for often with a strong face the modelling of the forehead is an important and fine feature.

The throat is apparently shortened by any hair or ornament hanging from the head, and only where the throat is long should any such fashion be indulged. The throat is shortened by standing ruffles, and the shoulders heightened by a "square-cut" dress. Yet where the point to be emphasized is a handsome neck and a brilliant complexion, one may sometimes sacrifice a faulty figure to these beauties, and let the ruff of lace form a complementary background to the complexion of face and neck, this being then made the central point of interest, and the rest going for nothing.

An artistic friend once told me that he remembered, in the period of hoops, being struck in a ball-room, for the first time, with the value of the fashion. The beauty of face and shoulders seemed doubly emphasized—nothing but masses of tulle and flowers and silk lay beneath. The short and dumpy women who had often fine necks appeared quite on the level of their more perfectly proportioned sisters, even sometimes outshone them.

Women are much oftener too short than too tall, and they try to gain height by high heels. These do undoubtedly, as long as their wearers stand still, give dignity; but they are most graceless for walking, even in a room, and deform the feet. Thus they administer to a very short-lived vanity, and we can not recommend them.

American women have very often the feet too small, and this is no beauty. The better shaped a foot is, the smaller it will look; but that it should really be too small involves an awkward gait. Again, it should be remembered (though it is usually forgotten) that the foot of a large woman should be large—not large in proportion to her size—but it is no beauty that it should be as small as that of a small woman. A heavily built woman should have a larger foot than a slenderly built woman, and usually, to her unnecessary sorrow, she has. The foot should be as long as the *ulna*, or chief bone of the forearm; that is, from the small head of the bone to be seen at the wrist to the point of the elbow, should be the length of the foot. Where the forearm is too short, the foot will be found to be also too short; where this is too long, the foot will be too long. Most people are surprised that the foot should be as long as the forearm, and are inclined to dispute the fact till they prove it by experiment; but an experiment will easily show that a straight line drawn from one point to another will appear a great deal longer than the same space filled by a line divided into curves.

Large women pinch their feet in tight shoes because they are ashamed of having them in proportion to their bodies, thus in time they deform and swell them until they are out of proportion to their bodies, but in the direction that they did not intend. Small women pinch their feet because they are vain of their smallness, and would emphasize it. Now in many cases they are not so small in proportion as the feet of tall women; but the public eye, being not critical of proportion, will, without their going to the pain of pinching their feet, consider them small because they are abstractly so; therefore they seem to us to make a poor exchange for a graceful motion and a dignified carriage—two essentials to the greatest beauty. In fact, anything else had better be sacrificed to ease of motion, and yet this is what one sees most frequently disregarded.

Any woman is too tightly dressed who can not raise her arms straight up above her head and clasp her hands; who can not stoop to tie her shoe, or pick up a pin, without heightened color. Yet probably not a dozen of our acquaintance can do this. Stupid as is the mistake of the tight shoe, it is wisdom compared to tight lac-

ing, which, less painful, is more unrelentingly indulged, and like a painless poison saps the beauty, the grace, the life, from its unfortunate victims.

The beautiful human body develops slowly toward its ripeness. Not until twenty-five is a woman entirely developed—that is, among our Northern nations. Indeed, there are slowly developing families that can not be said to reach the ripeness of their beauty before thirty, but five-and-twenty is the age set by the anatomists for the complete formation; and yet from the age of fifteen or sixteen the pliant, tender bones and muscles are compressed and flattened, till, instead of growing and making room for the wonderful system of organs which only in their full development can give us a worthy race, the beautiful skeleton is contracted and deformed, the young muscles weakened, the magnificent interior organs rendered incapable of conception, and the doctors' offices filled with nervous patients. Tight lacing is not only a stupidity, it is a crime—a crime that casts a heavy burden upon the next generation; but we have promised to write advice upon beauty in dress, not upon morals, and we must return to our theme.

We would like to convince every woman in the land that a small waist is unbeautiful. Look at the Greek statues. We have no more perfect standard for beauty. Imagine what they would be had they worn a tight corset. Why, we should turn away our eyes, shocked at the painful angular lines that would replace the graceful majesty of those flowing curves.

And this is not all that may be said against tight lacing as a destroyer of beauty. It ruins the digestion and the circulations, and consequently the complexion. Now we all know that a beautiful complexion is one of the greatest feminine charms. An ugly woman is made beautiful by it, and a handsome woman is often hid beneath an ugly complexion.

With educated people the modelling or finish of the race is often much finer than the type; with uneducated people, especially in handsome faces like the Irish, although among them very degraded types exist, we often find a very beautiful type both in face and figure; but never in the uneducated face is that final modelling, that subtle finish of little parts, that is the greatest charm of the educated face.

White muslin or lace about the neck casts reflected lights on the face, thus, if the complexion is not very dark, clearing the complexion, and lighting up the little modellings of the face. A face that is better in its delicate modelling than in its type or formation is apt to be better seen in full face than in profile, not only because the eyes are apt to be fine, but because the finish of the face is better shown. Where the type is finer than the modelling, a dress that eats up the light, like dark velvet, will be the most effective setting.

The geometric style of dress, that is, cut up into triangles and stiff forms, is trying for any kind of figure. Where the figure is handsome, the nearer to the simplicity of a bit of fabric draped about it in soft clinging lines the dress approaches, the more becoming.

It is not necessary to be conspicuously peculiar in order to avoid the slavery of fashion. We may so modify and select that a sort of "survival of the fittest" is what fashion attains in our hands.

Long lines from the shoulder to the foot give height; horizontal lines crossing the figure shorten the person. Short stout women should avoid basques, or any dress that makes a descriptive line about the hips; ruffles at the shoulders or hips that increase the bulk; or skirts of too great tightness, where looser draperies would give slenderness to the figure. Tall women who are too slender may use the horizontal lines with advantage, and increase the apparent size of arm or waist by a band that surrounds them. People appear more slender in black and dark colors, and stouter in light colors; slenderer in such stuffs as form masses of shadow with a few flashing lights, as velvet, for instance, and stouter in stuffs that reflect light and have fewer shadows, like cloth, satin, silk.

To break the masses in dress by very light lines of trimming, like a cord of light color introduced in the seams, has never a good effect; a lining designed to show may be as light as one pleases, and the effect never interferes in an unexplained way with the drawing or proportions.

A massing of color, and a gentle passing from one tone to another, are always more pleasing than violent contrast, which, if used, should be in one place, as in a bow judiciously placed, or a flower, or, as we have said, a lining.

The fashion that has prevailed within the past few years, of suits all of one material, is a move in the right direction—at least, it saves us from that bad effect of ill-chosen garment above garment, cutting the figure up into a sort of tile pattern, like a roof in two or three colors.

The matter of shoes is an important one—"bien gantée, bien chaussée, c'est bien habillée," runs the French saying ("well gloved and well shod is well dressed"). The glove, like the shoe, should be large enough. A small glove is as graceless, though by no means as harmful, as a small shoe. Alike, the shoes and the gloves should be harmonious with the dress. Across the room the gloves should not appear like spots upon the dress. They are frequently worn too light, and when too light for the dress, have not even the advantage of bare hands, which at once repeat the color of the face, and so fall into harmony. Where a colored shoe is worn, it must be very judiciously chosen. In the street, no shoe looks so well as a black. In the house, one the color of the dress is more elegant. Black shoes and stockings with a black dress; and with a light dress, unless the foot be very small, a shade darker than the dress, if exactly of the same tone, will seem to be more closely the color of the dress than a shoe of the same shade. Shoes of a distinctly different color are only admissible with a white dress, and then the contrast should not be too startling. A faint tone of color is usually best, unless the shoes be the one touch of color in the whole costume. It may be used in this way with a dress all of gray also. Where the foot is handsome, a sandal slipper with a very small button on each band is far more becoming than any slipper trimmed with bows, which may only be used advantageously when the instep is low and the foot shapeless.

One word, before we close, on what would artistically be called "composition." This is, perhaps, not as easy to explain as any of the points that we have already treated, yet it is one of the most important. The idea is the same in composition of line as in balance of color, which we explained in the first part of our first section. The lines of the dress, and especially those of the dressing of the hair, or of the bonnet, should be such as to bring into prominence the best lines of the face. Sometimes the lines are too cir-

cular, sometimes too angular. We sometimes see faces where the eyes are too round, the nose inclined to a snub, the mouth too small and round, the eyebrows arched. This is sometimes a piquant and pretty type, but not when exaggerated, as it easily may be by repeating the circular lines in the head-dress by curls where the hair should be worn smooth, or by a wreath of round flowers where a more angular bow should be placed. The line of the bonnet should not be circular; feathers are not favorable to this style. Feathers, on the contrary, make a softening setting to a face inclined to angularity; jet fringe, or any surrounding that forms straight lines, is unfavorable; the hair turned off the face, or worn in curls (so that they are *not pendent*), relieves the severity of the face.

Of course in treating the matter thus abstractly it is difficult to do more than generalize, but we may hope that we have not failed in suggesting some useful trains of thought, which may, where there is so much beauty as among our women, not be without their effect.

III.

Our young girls in America do not seem to have the sense of the beauty of simplicity in dress. No young girl looks as young or as lovely in heavy velvets and loaded trimmings as in simple muslins and soft, clinging materials. They detract from their own fresh charms by calling attention to their adornment. I should be inclined to say that no jewels, unless a single row of pearls about the throat, no lace but simple Valenciennes, should be worn by any girl younger than twenty-one. A dress perfectly fresh, light in color (where the complexion permits), beautifully cut, and almost entirely untrimmed, can not be improved upon for a young girl. It is the sweet rounded forms, the dewy bloom of the cheek, the clear young eyes, the soft tender lips, that we want to see. Where silks are worn, they should not be of heavy quality, but soft. Our young girls wear dresses like dowagers. It is a futile waste of money; no beauty is attained.

We would like to call attention to the fact that the style of dress influences the manners, the carriage, of the woman. The masculine style of dress has this objection. It is a little difficult to say what we could substitute for the Ulster that we have all

adopted. It is surely a very convenient garment for our streets, and for rain and mud and snow; but there is a difference in the cut of Ulsters, and they should be as little like a very bad overcoat as possible. Where a young girl has side pockets, she is apt to put her hands in them, and where she adds a Derby hat, how often the swagger follows!

The Derby hat appears to me to have no excuse. It is unbecoming even to a man, and absolutely hideous upon a woman. It is surprising to see them adopted by well-bred ladies. They have had great countenance, to be sure, but we think that if we should hand over all the younger generation to an exclusive costume of the Derby hat, the Ulster, the Jersey, and the short skirt, it would not take more than one generation to make us lose all grace of manner.

The short skirt deserves to be commended for the street, but in the house it has neither beauty nor elegance. Even to shorten a long skirt in front for the better display of a pretty foot is a great mistake. It is neither becoming to the foot nor the figure. It gives an intentional look of display, which is unrefined; and surely the dress that leaves something to the imagination is more coquettish and more dignified.

The scarf for a married woman is a fashion that should never die. To wear it well is a proof of grace, and it imparts an elegance, especially to a tall woman, that is very desirable. In the old portraits by Sir Joshua Reynolds and Gainsborough, by Stewart and Copley, the scarf has been very elegantly used—the long straight scarf drawn tightly across the small of the back, passed over the elbows, and dropping down in front as low as the knee, or lower. Nowadays one sees them occasionally worn by ladies who have relatives in the East, who send them scarfs of crape or camel's-hair; and occasionally the French approach the scarf in the style of their light outer wraps for spring or autumn. I think that it would only require half a dozen ladies, whose reputation for good dress is high, to persistently adopt the scarf, for others to recognize its grace and elegance.

The wearing of jewels is not often well understood. One does not see many handsome jewels worn in America, with the exception of diamonds. It is said that the value of the diamond fluctuates less

than that of any other precious stone, and that they therefore recommend themselves to the practical masculine mind as an investment, and that this is the real reason that our women wear diamonds so exclusively. This is to be regretted, as the diamond, from its excessive brilliancy and hardness of light, is not becoming to many women. To the blue-eyed, the sapphire, or even the inexpensive turquoise, is often far more harmonious and decorative. A little pale woman in flashing diamonds is absurd; the silent pearl, the dull, soft turquoise, the evasive, mysterious opal, even the little moon-stone, a green chalcedony, the topaz, an amethyst with a velvet surface for finish (what the French call *défacée*), even amber, or pale tea-colored coral—all these as ornaments are becoming to ninety-nine women, where the diamond is becoming to the one-hundredth. Let us emancipate ourselves from imagining a thing beautiful because it is costly, or beautiful as an ornament because it is beautiful in itself, or ornamental in the dress of one person because it is so in the dress of another.

We knew once a charming little lady who, being in very moderate circumstances, dressed in such simple materials as she could easily procure—in winter often in soft gray woollens, in summer in light-colored muslins, with a white scarf, a straw bonnet, with the plainest pale ribbon neatly tying it down. Her complexion was like a wild rose, and with her soft fair hair and blue eyes, her figure delicate even to the point of fragility, no dress could have been more coquettish and exquisitely appropriate. Later her husband came into a fortune. She eagerly adopted heavy velvets, beneath whose weight she seemed to totter, diamonds of great size and brilliancy. They made her at once a plain woman; and as her freshness began to fade, we wondered how we could ever have thought her exquisitely pretty; and it seemed to us that with soft lace and the tender dullness of pearls, with crapes of gray or white as material for her gowns, even faded she would have been charming.

We know a very plain woman, of much grace of manner, who knows how to make her plainness effective even in this country, where we are spoiled, and demand that every woman shall be pretty. She is small and delicate, but the bony structure of the face is bold, and it is most be-

coming to her to dress richly, or, rather, she is capable of wearing with elegance a rich dress and jewels. One can hardly say that they become *her*. She is in no wise more beautiful for them, but having no beauty, would appear insignificant without them. This seems to be, artistically considered, a case of good judgment; but that a woman with delicate personal charms should utterly extinguish them by the brilliancy of her dress, seems like the blind taste of a savage.

Some people who know how to choose the appropriate jewel or ornament, wear too much of it. There should be design in this as well as in the dress, and the least sense of overloading becomes at once savage; nor is any richness attained by a great number of inexpensive ornaments. For most women a single jewel, if it is handsome, which shall be the key-note of color of the dress, is more effective than necklace and bracelets and rings.

Fancy a tall slim woman, with black hair and blue eyes, and a pale, clear complexion, wearing a dress of white crape, about her throat a narrow black velvet ribbon fastened with a fine sapphire of some size, set clear, and with none of the diamond surroundings that we see them often ruined with. She may wear another smaller sapphire in a ring upon one hand, and no other ornament, unless a natural white rose. With the same ornaments—the sapphire clasp and the sapphire ring—she might wear a dress high in the throat, composed of various shades of the sapphire, from light to dark. Thus the jewel is the concentration of the whole.

We should like to say a word about the dress of children. No child is prettier for an elaborate design of dress. A single ruffle at the edge of the skirt does very well, but it is quite as well without it. And to cut up the tiny space of a child's dress with loopings and trimmings and ornament seems to us to make them look like monkeys. Not even the sash is beautiful for a child. A child is constructed first of all to eat that it may grow, to receive impressions that it may learn: therefore the head and the stomach are large in proportion to the rest of the body. When the little figure is nude, so that the soft fleshy forms can be well seen, all this is beautiful; but to emphasize in the draped form of the child the large stomach by a broad sash, is utterly against all rules of beauty.

The legs and arms are often beautiful, but to show the legs by cutting off the dress at the hips is immensely awkward, and seems chiefly to serve to display the drawers, which are not a beautiful garment, and should be entirely hidden. Besides this, in winter our climate is wholly inappropriate for any such exposure, and we shall best see the beauty of a healthy child in its easy, untrammelled motion as it moves about in a simple dress (of as handsome a material as you like, provided that it is untrimmed), which is long enough to be warm and loose enough to be comfortable. If you want your children to be graceful, let them be unconscious; if you want them to be healthy, let them be sufficiently warm. No woman can have a fine complexion who as a child has been habitually chilled, and we see in the winter many children who seem literally to have nothing on from the waist down. They could much better afford to put it the other way, and wear nothing from the waist up, the lungs and heart being at less expense to warm the upper portion of the body than the legs, which are further away from them.

A HELPMEEET FOR HIM.

I.

HIS name was John Detmold. Judging by his name, he must have been of German descent, and he was merely a country boy, living a hard life upon a farm in what was then the wild interior of Ohio. For years he had grubbed and ploughed, had hoed and reaped, with eyes fastened upon a harvest beyond that of his corn and yellow pumpkins, more than that of his summer hunting and his mid-winter trapping. And now the long-looked-for Christmas had come at last, and he was on a visit to the town which was at that date the metropolis of all that region. He was nothing but a coarsely clad rustic, as thickset, sunburned, utterly uncouth and awkward, as could be found, and he had driven to town in a cart laden with the carefully dried skins of many a squirrel and rabbit, raccoon and deer. Ignorant as the lad was, he had, where money was concerned, a skill which amounted to science. His lumpy hand had a hunger for cash which was surpassed only by the grip with which it closed upon and kept whatever coins came within its grasp. Possibly he inherited this from parents

who, in Germany, most likely, had to struggle for life, with the wolf of poverty forever upon the threshold. Certainly his farm experiences had deepened and hardened in him any such tendencies. Indulging now in none of the temptations of the town, he gave himself diligently to getting the highest price in the market for his wares, and persisted until he had sold the last skin, and buckled the last cent obtained therefor about his waist, and next his person, in a belt which he had himself made for the purpose.

But his long-anticipated object in coming to town was a something beyond even that. He had been born with, or had in some queer fashion developed within himself, an appetite which money was but a means toward appeasing. When he first came, he had put up at the cheapest tavern he could learn of, and the clerk thereof had been greatly amused at the frequency with which he had drunk at the water faucet, drawing cup after cup thereof for himself. After that it seemed as if he would never be done washing his face and hands, filling and emptying the tin pan, and filling it again. Greatly refreshed, he went out to make his sales. Immediately upon his return to the tavern he again exhibited a strange fondness for water, considering how cold the weather was. Again he washed his hands and face at the sink in the little room adjoining the bar, turning on the water for the purpose from the brass faucet. He took a long time at it, letting the water off and on, off and on, as if he never would get through. When he had dried his face and hands upon the brown roller-towel, he found himself obliged to take yet another drink, holding the pewter mug under the faucet, and watching the rush and foam of the liquid as a toper might have done the pouring out of whiskey. "How far is it to whar it comes from?" he asked the office clerk. But that gentleman was too busy with his cigar to do more than reply, "Up street"; and John Detmold hastened in the direction indicated, until, having climbed the hill which overlooked the town, he found and lingered long upon the banks of the reservoir which supplied the fluid in which he seemed to find such pleasure.

As he came back at last he hardly looked in at the windows of the stores. There were signs along the street telling where, to judge from the delineations thereof