

Original Communications.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS.—II.

Rev. H.—W.—B. •

SIR:—As a first light for the subject. I will give you that of revelation: to which the Martineau philosophy is not particularly deferential, but which a Christian people cannot afford to disregard.

"Let us make man in our image," said the omniscient word. Not man and woman as two, but man, as both in one; foreshadowing, it seems to me, a unity of some sort in the practical career of the sexes. And, that there might be no mistake about it, an express decree was added, "they shall be one flesh."

What sort of unity, then, was it to be? Of course not literally physical. That was impossible. It was consequently to be moral, the only conceivable alternative. But in what bearing and extent?

One limitation is clear enough: it was not to merge the individualities of the parties with respect to the divine government; for they are everywhere spoken of in Scripture as responsible each for himself. "He that believeth shall be saved." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die."

Another limitation may be guessed: in things indifferent, which God's government allows, and man's pays no regard to, the parties are respectively free to do their pleasure; their intercourse with each other, and with society around them, bring in such things wholly unembarrassed.

Subtracting these particulars we perceive the range of action that remains under the two-one ordinance; that is, when the liberty of the conjugal pair is joint only; a liberty in which, as in business partnerships, there is but a single personality between them to any legal intent, and to all the ends of human government: the two, in the very terms of the ordinance, are one. It is the field of *practical economics*. And in this bearing, nothing could be happier for the peace and order of families, and through them, of the Commonwealth, than the divine arrangement so explicitly decreed.

The question then will be upon the allotment of the headship, as between the domestic partners, for conducting their affairs. For these partners bring permanently such, and by a bond which neither of them, nor both together, can dissolve, provision must necessarily be made for differences of judgment in regard to business measures; that is, to determine beforehand whose will or judgment shall be the controlling one; in other words, which partner shall be head of the concern for legal purposes. A point of great moment, to which the divine wisdom could not be indifferent. Accordingly the decretal announcement was made at once to the woman: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

Sir, I am afraid the skepticism of some of our females of the Martineau school, may be traced to a secret quarrel of heart with this announcement. Valuing personal power as the infinite mind does not value it, they regard the husband as *unduly preferred*; whereas, the arrangement is purely economical, designed equally for the good of both parties and their children; involving, consequently, no disparagement of the wife, no favoritism towards the husband, and only yielding to the plain exigencies of the case an indispensable conformity.

The skeptical objectors do not, in general, go back to the original institution of the marital headship, but feed their discontent with the fresher language of the Apostle: "Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands as to the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church." Or, as another Apostle has it, "Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that if any obey not the word, they also may, without the word, be won," &c., "while they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear." These Scriptures are read, it seems, with distaste and impatience. They are looked upon as injurious. Subordination is mistaken for degradation. And when the sacred penman goes on to some details of practical propriety under the rule, saying, "Let the woman learn in silence; I suffer not a woman to teach, not to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (i. e. in popular assemblies); impatience swells to bursting and rebellion, breaking out defiantly in public lectures and declamations, wherever listeners can be got together to hear them.

I do not stop to argue against this: I only say, at present, that it is contrary to the order of things established by the Most High, and made a basis of detailed instruction in the letters of his apostolical servants. To a Christian minister, Sir, the facts are their own argument.

With regard to the remaining topic, the division of labor, revelation rather adopts nature's law than advances one exclusively its own. Its teaching here is mainly by implication, and example. When Abraham had invited the angels to stay for some refreshment, "he hastened into the tent to Sarah, and said, 'make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make cakes upon the hearth.'" Her place was there, inside, and cooking one of her functions. Indeed, the household is spoken of repeatedly, in reference to the wife, as "her household"; never, I believe, as the household of the husband. And Jewish interpretation assigned her unreservedly to the home province of duty. In the language

of the Mishna, it was her business "to grind corn" (then an in-door employment), "to bake and wash, to cook, and suckle his child, to make his bed, and work in wool." Agreeable to which is Paul's direction to Titus, to have the young women taught to be discreet, chaste keepers at home (*ἀνυποχρίτους, ὡσεὶ οἰκιστρίδας*), good, obedient to their own husbands, &c.

Thus, Sir, we have three cardinal regulations in the matter, two of them expressly instituted, and all sanctioned, by the highest authority: they are, *unity of person* in married life; *headship of the husband*, representing that unity; and *industrial provinces so allotted to the parties* as to place timidity and weakness of frame within doors, out of harm's way, and send health and strength abroad to grapple with the sterner realities of existence.

Do you think, Sir, they are bad regulations? Do you doubt their connection with the divine government? Do you feel at liberty to disregard them?

But let us view the subject next in what our female malcontents probably deem its worst and most odious light, *the laws of the land*. If it will stand this test, we need not despair of it.

Well, Sir, the laws of the land, with all their "barbarism," adopt the precise order of things which infinite wisdom has established. In implicit deference to that wisdom, they regard the husband and the wife as a personal unit to all business intents, taking him for the sole representative of that unity, while her individuality is *covert*, that is, merged and out of sight. Her *will* of life, too, is, in their judgment, at home under the domestic roof; while of his active duties the external world is necessarily the main theatre. All which appears to me just as it should be; though the freethinking of the age finds fault with it, and some few of our State legislatures (who ought to be in petticoats) have made several inroads upon it.

The details of our jurisprudence on the subject are of vast extent and variety, and full of nice distinctions which it would take volumes to develop systematically; but as the complaints of the fault-finders turn mainly upon two or three particulars, they will not hold us long.

It is true, that when a woman has goods or chattels, and marries without reserving them to herself (which is always at her option) "they go with her into a man's hands," that is, they fall as of course under the marital headship. Not, however, for the husband's exclusive behoof, but for the common advantage of both, and their offspring. He is the legal provider for all; and if she contributes a mite to his means, it surely is nothing amiss. Her lands, if she have any, do not pass to him, save only as to the current rents and profits accruing from them; which again he receives rather as the family steward, than to any intent of undue personal enrichment; a resource in part, for the expenses of the household—*her household*.

And where, Sir, is the wrong of this? or the grievance? Cannot she trust him with the management of her pelf? He is bound to provide for the family; is she afraid he will misapply her contribution applicable to that object? or does she grudge him the relief of being permitted to add her pennies to the earnings of his own toil in fulfilling the obligation he is under? I thought he was her darling. If not, why marry him? Could she give him her body, her life, and yet fail to make him the custodian of her purse? I do not understand it. "Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" Who can solve me the riddle, of a woman more careful about "her property," than about the very tabernacle of her soul?

And then a curious question of fact: How many women bring property to their husbands; compared with those who do not? I suppose, not one in five hundred. Generally speaking, they are led to the altar young, and from beneath the parental roof; having expectations, possibly, but seldom much if anything in hand. As then the laws are made (or should be) for facts in their generality, and not in their caprices, I do not see that monied women, who are commonly of mature years, and can put their treasures under lock and key by antenuptial contract if they choose, deserve much commiseration, when, having chosen to omit that precaution, they find, too late, that instead of being monied women still, they have let fall their precious rhino "into the hands of a man with themselves." They have their choice; and what room is there for complaint afterwards?

But let us see, now what a woman gains by wedlock; and whether it be not equal, and a good deal more than equal, to any losses which the laws inflict.

In the first place she gains a *personal discharge* (during coverture) from all her *debts and liabilities*. The head partner takes that burden (sometimes not a small one) off her hands.

In the next place (if he is able to provide for her) she is freed from the necessity of *self-maintenance*. All that he has, or can earn, is pledged in law for the security of this advantage. And it is a thing of some moment. We may judge of it from the difficulty most single-life females are known to experience in securing a decent livelihood by their own exertions. We may also judge of it from the pitiable scramblings of myriads of the other sex after appointments in the public service, no matter what the grade; I had almost said, no matter what the compensation, provided only that it be enough to keep soul and body to-

gether; the vital point being, that it is a *certainty*, relieving the painful anxieties of a doubtful self-dependence.

In the third place she acquires a *right of dower in the husband's real estate*; inchoate while they both live, consummated by his death and her widowhood; a right that attaches upon all the land he has when she marries him, and upon every inch he adds to it by subsequent purchase or inheritance; an indefeasible right, which nothing can take from her, and which often crowns her with plenty for the rest of her days.

Well, Sir, putting these things together, and setting off against them the one instance in five hundred, in which the wife brings something noteworthy to her husband, please strike the balance, and tell me how it stands. I mean, the balance of substantial gain or loss in general average.

Deliverance from every kind of legal liabilities—debts, contracts, torts, misdemeanors, crimes even, not amounting to treason or murder—is secured by marriage to all wives without exception. To the far greater portion of them, marriage obviates the distressing care of self-maintenance, supplying them with, at least, the necessary wherewithal to eat and to put on. And finally, not a few of their number pass, by marriage, from a state of dependent existence to one of ease, and competency, if not of affluence; while others become affluent by the success of their husbands in business; their very widowhood, should it occur, being sure, in many cases, of an abundant provision for the whole sequel of life.

I ask you, Sir, have husbands any corresponding benefits? If so, please point them out, for I am not aware of them. Instead of that riddance of responsibilities, in which the weaker of the conjugal parties rejoices, the stronger is doubly encumbered; the relief on one side being effected by a mere transfer of burdens to the other: The husband has two to answer for now, in place of one before. So in the matter of livelihoods, her exemption from care is but a duplication of his troubles, for he has now to care for both. In the rare case of marrying a woman who has property, his duty as provider for the family, is of course facilitated by that circumstance. And if his wife bring him children as well as land, he will have, besides the issues of the land during wedlock, a life freehold in it after her death, should he survive her—a just arrangement, in case of his obligation to support and educate the children. These advantages may once in a while fall to his lot; but I can think of none else.

Verily, if the laws are partial, it is not to the husband. Verily, if they are cruel, it is not to the wife.

H. W. W.

FROM WILMINGTON.

BROTHER MEARS:—I felt deeply the remarks made at Synod regarding the great need of a revival of religion in our land, that the Church might have power to contend successfully against the increase of worldliness, recklessness and high-handed crime so rampant everywhere, not excepting even your own peaceful city. These facts confront us: 1. Intemperance, 2. frauds, 3. suicides, 4. horrifying murders were never more prevalent, 5. the church in many localities, especially in large cities, is abandoning the field, to Satan, and "wickedest men" are offering him reeking sacrifices of youth and virtue on the very platform where a crucified Redeemer was held up in the preached gospel. One such I could name in your own city where my honored covenant kinsmen pledged themselves in solemn league and covenant to stand up for Jesus.

When the enemy comes in like a flood, if all Christian hearts were only united in prayer for a revival, surely the Spirit of the Lord would lift up a standard against him. Isa. 59: 19. If the Church is ever to possess the land; if a nation is to be born in a day and multitudes to flock to Christ, it will surely be when God's Spirit comes down upon the church in great power.

We have no right to say how it shall come, whether in "a still, small voice" or in "a rushing, mighty wind," but we have reason, revelation, and encouragement to warrant in asking and expecting that it will come.

And now that the two (Presbyterian churches) have agreed in the fullest sense of that word, to ask for a new baptism of the Holy Ghost upon the united church may we not have this most needed gift? From the elevated, spiritual tone of our Synod—greatly fostered by the genial atmosphere at York, I have been expecting cheering reports from many of our congregations.

To the honor of our covenant-keeping God, I gratefully record His goodness to my own little flock. At our September Communion, forty members were added to our number. Among them I baptized a father and his married daughter. Last Sabbath morning thirty more were added; seven of these were baptized, among whom were a mother and her two grown daughters. Though the day was unfavorable, the house was densely packed, and for two hours the most absorbed interest was manifest in the whole communion service. At the close of the evening service, a husband and wife followed me into the street to ask if they could not now have the privilege of being enrolled among the Lord's people. Our church door is always open, and believers may enter at any time as well as at communion. Eighty have been received in the past six months.

The first anniversaries of the Church and Sabbath-school were most encouraging. A deficit

of \$100 was subscribed as fast as the people could write their names, and the year closed without a cent of debt.

The ladies held a festival for three evenings, and received \$900. Preparations are going on for the erection of a new edifice as soon as spring opens. "The General Assembly's Missionary Society" has been organized, and the West church is falling into line with all the spirit and promptness of a young recruit.

On the sixteenth inst. the Presbyterians of Delaware are to celebrate the late marriage at Pittsburgh by a prayer-meeting at the First church in the morning; a communion service at Central in the afternoon, and a mass meeting at Hanover street church in the evening.

Dec. 6, 1869.

GEO. H. SMYTH.

REV. A. M. STEWART'S LETTERS.—LII.

JOHN CHINAMAN.

That we are a great people, a nation highly favored and holding a position in the world's history not only in advance, but above any and all others, is manifest from the burdens laid upon us by the Governor of the nations. To us,—"E Pluribus Unum"—seems allotted by Providence the solving of nearly all the knotty problems accumulated through man's waywardness—problems, too, which for many generations have occupied the minds and perplexed the judgments of earth's wisest children. Such as:—Whether man, in large societies, was capable of self government; whether Church and State could be entirely separated, yet work together in harmony, an imperium in imperio; whether the safety of the community could tolerate the freedom of the pulpit, the bar, and the press; whether every man has a right to himself and the pursuit of his own happiness—which problem has been solved within the last decade so effectually and by such profuse blood letting that there will be no need for its repeating in the future history of the nations. A seemingly greater problem than the latter remains, and by an increasing pressure demands a solving, and this strongly in our own Republic. Spiritual freedom or despotism. The subjection of conscience to man or to God—Popery or Protestantism. How this solution is to be reached without a more profuse shedding of blood than in connection with physical slavery, our limited foresight is unable at present to discern.

CHINAMAN.

The caption for this and a few succeeding letters: These people also obtrude themselves for an American solution. And this, too, in a manner at once new, bold, persistent and perplexing. Much has hitherto been said and written on this prolific theme, and much continues to be spoken and printed. Hitherto, in my communications for the press from the Pacific side, this great theme has been left with scarce a reference; yet not without careful observation and noting. All which may at present assist in writing with more intelligence.

WHO, AND WHAT IS JOHN?

Westward from this harbor of San Francisco some five or six thousand miles, across and through the Islands of the Pacific, is an empire whose origin current history does not chronicle. Such a hive of humanity is it, as to comprise a third of earth's peoples. "A race, not of 'celestials' as fancifully claimed by themselves; but who might be more fitly designated 'unchangeables.'" When book makers whitto largely multiply any volume, they cast its letters in solid metal and call it "stereotype"—"unchangeable type." For a thousand or two of years these countless millions of the East have been stereotyped; guttered, grooved, immobile. Yet did the land seem no longer able to bear its multitudes or furnish them with even the simplest food.

In the advance of civilization from East to West, led and guided by the Star of Bethlehem, two immense ocean steamers cross from San Francisco, monthly, to China and return. As the breaking out of waters, so have her crowded, cramped people thus found an outlet to this Pacific coast. As never before, the old and new world meet. The effete civilization of the East comes in contact with the vigorous life and the advanced energies of the Caucasian race and of the Christian's God. All the results of this strange contact, the keenest eye cannot now see nor the shrewdest intellect guess.

CHARACTER.

The true characteristics and condition of these hordes from the East seem hardly to have been fairly or fully written, either by friend or enemy of Chinese emigration.

They are verily and emphatically heathen; bringing with them to our shores all the filthy habits and abominations pertaining to every nation which knows not God. The living, lasting portrait of such a people is drawn by Paul in Romans 1: 21-32. From one vice in Paul's sad catalogue these celestials do seem to be exempt, and it covers a multitude of sins. They "Honor Father and Mother," which is the first, yea only commandment with promise; and hence they have been long upon the land given them.

They are poor, scraggy, inferior specimens of physical humanity compared with Anglo Saxons. Their females are pitiful-looking, even contemptible specimens of womanhood—cramped and dwarfed both in body and mind. Far more of these miserable women have come or been brought to our Pacific side than seems generally

to be understood. Brought not as wives but for the worst of all purposes. And this not as unwilling subjects of deceit, of violence and of lust; but of seeming choice, as they unblushingly glory in their shame.

While passing through the Chinese quarters in various towns in Nevada and California, once and again has been witnessed the precise counterpart of the "Foolish Woman," as described by Solomon, Prov. 9: 13-15. Nor can the morals of the men be much in advance, else would not so many of those poor women be here under such conditions. Secret and abominable vices are common among them.

With all their quiet drudgery and money-making, their increase in worldly means, comforts and appearance is but little apparent, save among a very few. Their earnings are largely squandered in the practice of various degrading vices. They are eager and reckless gamblers. They look and act as an inferior race. They are sycophantic, yet evidently conceited, proud and quietly vindictive. My interpretation of their feelings is, that we are the barbarians, and should be learning of them and not they of us; and that no gentleman can be dressed without his head closely shaved and his pig-tail dangling behind him.

This is a partial description of John as seen by the writer. Other sides, phases, conditions, coming aspects; with theories and speculations will be given hereafter. Enough surely already to show what an additional weight our American Christianity is called to carry in moulding all this accumulating mass of debased heathenism into the family of Jesus.

San Francisco, Nov. 19, 1869.

NORTHERN OHIO.

RE-UNION, HOW IT WORKS.

By invitation of the Presbytery of Western Reserve, the Presbytery of Cleveland and Portage met them in joint session in the Lecture Room of Westminster church, Cleveland, Nov. 24th, 1869. After a season of devotion together, and of congratulation over the union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in these United States, they proceeded at once to consider the work that now devolves upon the united Presbytery. Dr. Goodrich gave a statement in regard to the condition of the field hitherto occupied by the Presbytery of Cleveland and Portage. The field is large, including the three counties of Cuyahoga, Summit, and Portage, and a portion of the county of Medina. There are three churches formally connected with us; which are, so reduced, that they have made no effort to live for years past. They are probably too near death to be revived. There are, perhaps, two that will make re-union an excuse to leave us. The rest are strongly attached to Presbytery, and some of them are contemplating a change of organization, so as to be fully Presbyterian. There is much work needed upon this field. And the united Presbytery should endeavor to cultivate it better than it has been in the past.

Rev. F. Maginnis and others gave some account of the work in the Presbytery of Western Reserve. It extends over a much larger field than the Presbytery of Cleveland and Portage. Attention was called especially to the condition of the Westminster church, Cleveland. It is weak and somewhat embarrassed. Its pastor, Rev. Mr. Lewis, has just been dismissed, and the members of the church are rather discouraged.

The pastors and elders of the city were appointed a Committee to consider the case and recommend some course to be pursued. There are two or three points in the city where efforts have been made to establish Presbyterian churches. If the members of the Westminster church will consent to occupy one of these points, they can become a self-sustaining church at once. Members of the other Presbyterian churches would join in sufficient numbers to make them independent. Perhaps the same thing can be accomplished in its present locality; but it is not so hopeful of immediate success.

Another small church, seven or eight miles east of the city, was also commended to the sympathy and aid of the united Presbytery. Their case was referred to the Committee appointed to consider the claims of the Westminster church.

Installation.—The Presbytery of Cleveland and Portage made arrangements for the installation of Dr. Ellis as pastor of the 2d Presbyterian church of Cleveland, on the 16th of Dec. 1869.

Rev. D. W. Sharts, of Wessonville Mission church, is so far recovered from the effects of his late sickness, as to be able to resume his labors.

Rev. E. Curtis, pastor of the Presbyterian church of Newburgh, has been laid aside from labor for several weeks, and is not yet able to resume it.

—A Baptist pastor, who has seen long and honorable service, writes to *The Watchman and Reflector*, that "the number is constantly increasing in the ranks of the clergy and laity of our denomination, who long to see a closer union of all Christians, and who, because they can find no injunction to the contrary either in the law or the Spirit of Christ, believe that there is no more fitting place to show forth this union than at the sacred table of our common Lord.