

THE UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE

NO. 3—JAN.-FEB., 1897.

I.—LITERARY.

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT IN THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The Oxford Movement in the Church of England began about 1833. It was a reaction against liberalism in politics, latitudinarianism in theology, and the government of the Church by the State. It was, at the same time, a return to Mediaeval theology and worship. The doctrines of Apostolical Succession, and the Real Presence—a doctrine not to be distinguished from the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation—were revived. And along with this return to Mediaeval theology, Mediaeval architecture was restored; temples for a stately service were prepared; not teaching halls. Communion tables were replaced by *altars*. And the whole paraphernalia of worship was changed; so that, except for the English tongue and the mustaches of the priests, the visitor could hardly have told whether the worship were that of the English Church or that of her who sitteth on “the seven hills.”

It must be admitted that there was some good in the movement. The Erastian theory as to the proper relation of Church and State is wrong. The kingdom of God should not be subordinate to any “world-power.” No state should control the Church. And certainly such latitudinarianism in doctrine as that of Bishop Coleuso and others called for a protest. But the return to Mediaeval theology and Mediaeval worship was all wrong.

We have no good ground for doubting the sincerity of many of the apostles of the movement. Unfortunately, more than

THE PROPER SPHERE OF WOMAN'S ACTIVITY.

This is the most important question that vexes the social mind—the most serious problem Sociology has to solve. These may seem to be sweeping statements, but I make them without fear of contradiction. I have no defense for them just at this point, but submit the following paper as an apology with a hope that it may contribute something to the solution of this problem.

I shall first endeavor to show what this "proper sphere" is, defined by the two great books of Revelation—Nature and the Bible. This done I shall briefly sketch her history while she filled this sphere in contentment; and then picture her career of emancipation and her conduct since. All this completed I shall close by asking a few questions which I shall leave for the advocates of "women's rights," so called, to answer.

In this discussion I wish to be perfectly fair and honest; absolutely free from all sort of bias and prejudice. In other words I wish every one to understand that I am an advocate of "women's rights" in the truest and highest sense; that is, I heartily endorse these words of our Catechism, (Q. 64) which say "preserving the honor, and performing the duties, belonging to everyone in their several places and relations" in every case where they apply.

The only point at issue between me and these advocates, so called, is wherein her rights consist. If I understand them aright they claim that woman is *equivalent* to man. She is capable of filling any place he is—can attain to whatever he can, therefore all vocations should be opened to her. I insist that this is wrong. I deny that woman is *equivalent* to man. But that she is his *equal* I admit; nay, I contend most strenuously. I go further, in many respects she is his superior.

But this contest cannot be settled by any study of woman in itself, however complete; but must be settled by a study of woman as related to man. She was not made to stand alone nor to act independently, but to be a "help-meet" for man—to fill a place "corresponding to or answering to" that filled by him.

To settle this controversy we have, as has been intimated

above, two sources of information to which we may confidently appeal, for both are infallible. I refer to the Revelation in Nature and in the Word. We shall appeal first to the Book of Nature and shall endeavor to learn what is there taught on this most vital question. On the authority of nature to be heard let me quote from an address delivered in the South-western Presbyterian University by the Hon. Wm. M. Cox. He said, "We cannot get away from nature. We will not if we are wise ignore her. She is a kind, but yet a stern mother, and her will must be obeyed. Our heedless neglect of her behests she may for a time but gently chastise, but contempt for her authority she smites with condign punishment; and visits upon open rebellion penalties which are lasting and disastrous." Following, for a little time, the plan of this speaker, I wish to lay emphasis upon one institution which is all-important—the family. It makes no difference what may come in the way of Revolution and reform, the family must remain the most potent factor in society. "As long," says Mr. Cox, "as the family remains our most important social institution, woman's relation to the world must be determined by her relation to the family and her offices and functions therein." Defining these "offices and functions" he goes on to say, "Woman's chief relation to the family is that she bear her child. Her grand office and function is motherhood. All others are incidental, collateral, subsidiary, and comparatively unimportant. This is supreme and indispensable. The God of nature has honored woman above all His earthly creatures in giving to her, chiefly, the guardianship and tutelage of immortal intelligences. He has committed to her keeping the life of humanity in the weakness, the tenderness, the helplessness, the utter dependence of infancy. In this she finds a work which demands her supremest affection, her unwearied devotion, her utter self-effacement, and which call into constant exercise all her mental faculties, and all the high instincts and sentiments of her heart. The care of the physical well-being of the child-life alone were no light burden nor trivial responsibility." But her duties to her child do not end here—nay, they only begin. She must care not only for the body, but also for the soul. "It is in the cultivation," says our author, "the right training and proper development of this immortal and spiritual part of us that woman finds her truest mission and does her best work for the world." She lays the founda-

tion for that divinest of human structures—character. “She can make it largely what she will. The child life is committed to her, not only innocent and lovable, but pliant and plastic. It is a twig which she may bend, clay which she may mould, marble which she with tireless effort may chisel and polish into beauty. The child must learn from her, if ever he learns it well, the great lesson of obedience to, and reverence for, rightful authority. He must learn from her to restrain the appetites, passions, and impulses of his animal nature, and to place them under the dominance of reason and conscience. He must learn from her honor, truth, justice, integrity and duty. She must teach him to be gentle, generous, magnanimous. Nor can she leave off here. If she does her highest, holiest, and most needed work will remain undone. The child must be taught of God; His awful majesty, His power, His holiness, His inflexible justice, that will in no wise spare the guilty. He must be taught of sin; its heinousness, that he himself is a sinner, member of a fallen race, involved in its guilt and depravity, exposed to the vengeance of God’s violated law, and utterly unable, of himself, to do anything to merit God’s favor and forgiveness.” Is her field then not wide enough? Is her work then not important enough? We might adapt one of our familiar hymns so as to express the dignity of her calling:

“ ’Tis not a cause of small import,
The *mother’s* care demands;
But what might fill an angel’s heart,
And filled a Savior’s hands.”

We must feel somewhat loth to turn away from this, to the more prosy subject of woman’s sphere in relation to man’s. But he has his duties in the family as well as she. What is his work in the family? Or rather, what are their respective duties? Let us hear the answer of an eminent physician. Dr. H. S. Pomeroy of Boston says: “Nature arranged that man should be the provider of means of subsistence, and that woman should be the dispenser of these means.” Excellent, we must all admit, and I need only add that this is substantially the answer given by philosopher and poet; in science and history. This verdict has been reached after long and thorough study of the subject in all its bearings. That nature intended man and woman to fill a different place is evident

from their different endowments and qualifications. Different endowments and qualifications always mean different spheres of activity. We find differences in man and woman which are physical, mental, and moral. That there are physical differences none will question. That there is a difference in their moral natures need be disputed by none; and that the balance is in favor of woman had as well be conceded. But as to their mental endowments there is a great variety of opinions. This may be called the battlefield of psychologists. The forces are arrayed on the one side under a banner bearing a strange device, "no sex in mind." On the other the watchword is "Essential difference." Again I shall quote at length from the address already mentioned. "The mind of woman is not as the mind of man. It, like her nervous organization, is finer than his. It is more sprightly and imaginative, more vivid, and in the better sense of the word, more sentimental. If the reason proper ever acted alone, absolutely dissociated from all other mental states and operations, it might be true that in the process of ratiocination, in the drawing of inference and conclusion, the mind of woman would be precisely as the mind of man. But this is a condition which does not and cannot exist. Every act of the reason is accompanied by, blended with, colored and modified by imagination, memory, sensation, some degree of sentiment and feeling. And herein lies the grand distinction between the masculine and feminine intellect. Woman's mind is more enlivened by sentiment, more swayed by emotion; and hence she is mentally more charming and attractive than man. Her mind is more specially adapted to deal with the concrete, with things in detail, and, within her sphere, is more practical than man's, and more to be trusted in the guidance of the individual life, and especially of the child-life. But while this is true, it is equally, and, from the premises, necessarily, true that her mind is not so well fitted as man's for dry abstraction, for patient analysis, for broad generalization. Here imagination and sentiment must be held in abeyance, and all feeling, as far as possible, suppressed; here is needed to insure truth and certitude, as far as can be had, the dry, cold light of reason; here sentiment may prove misleading, and partiality, predilection, passion, and prejudice rush the judgment headlong into error; here the mind of man, because less quick and of somewhat coarser texture, because less imaginative and less swayed by sentiment and feeling, is

generally the safer guide. Hence his judgment is more to be trusted in the larger and broader affairs of life; in the building of states, the founding of institutions, the framing of laws, the administration of justice, the adopting of great social and civil policies. Nor is this disparaging to woman, nor does it argue her mental inferiority. Equal, unequal, can be predicated only of those things which, resembling each other in kind, differ, if at all, only in degree. Between things which differ in nature and in the uses they were intended to subserve, such a comparison cannot be properly instituted. The swan is not equal, nor is it unequal, to the eagle, the rose to the cabbage, the fleet courser to the draft-horse; and so the mind of woman is not equal to that of man, nor is it inferior, nor yet superior, but diverse." These differences, so numerous, so striking, and so radical, can only mean a different sphere of work. A little thought should convince everyone that Dr. Pomeroy's division of labor is that of nature—man seems fitted to *provide* and woman to *divide*.

So much for nature's testimony; what says the Bible? In seeking to determine the status given her by Bible writers, I shall confine our investigation chiefly to a part of one chapter, Prov. 31:10-31. Other scriptures are not silent, but this may be regarded as a summary treatment from the Bible standpoint. Commenting on this passage Rev. R. F. Horton says: "The place she fills in life is so important that if she fails in her duty human life as a whole is a failure. In her hands are the issues of life for mankind. 'The wisdom of woman builds her house, and the folly of woman plucks it down with her own hands.' What the homes of a nation are, the nation is; and it is woman's high and beautiful function to make the homes, and within her power lies the terrible capacity for marring them. She, much more than the king, is the fountain of honor. The honor she gives and the honor she commands will decide the whole tone of society. Pure, true, and strong, she makes men worship purity, truth, and strength. Corrupt, false, and vain, she blights and blasts the ideal of man, excites his evil passions to a frenzy of iniquities, degrades his soul to the level of the brutes." Coming now to look at the passage somewhat in detail we see that the virtuous woman is here a wife—vs. 11; and here let me observe that the "modern conception of woman as an independent person, standing alone, engaged in her own business or profession, and complete in

herself," is altogether foreign to the Bible. The key-note was struck when Jehovah said, "I will make a help meet for him," and the same harmony sounds through the entire book. How she fills this place, how she helps her husband, the writer now sets forth. She is his guide and counselor; "his heart trusteth in her."—vs. 11. She may not be brilliant; maybe she is uneducated; but she is true to her convictions and he is not afraid of her counsel. By her industry and application she is his financial helper; "he shall have no lack of gain"—vs. 11-19. Thus she becomes a source of wealth to him and more than one successful man can credit an economical and industrious wife with all his gain. In this same passage we see her moving among her children, ministering to the poor and doing countless deeds of love and charity. One other point calls for a remark; her work is by no means confined to her home and community. Her influence goes abroad and is felt by the rulers of the land.—vs. 23. "Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land." "It is this strong, sweet core of life in the home," says Horton, "which gives the man dignity and honor in public." Why then does she clamor for a place in the state when she holds the highest? Why does she demand the ballot when she sways the scepter and wears the crown? There is just one other point to be considered. Paul says, "Wives obey your husbands," and by saying it has brought harsh criticism upon himself. Among a certain class he is styled a "narrow-minded biggot," or a "crusty old bachelor." This has been a sore point with a great many and only because of their own ignorance and misunderstanding. They associate obedience with tyranny and hence imagine that the Bible has created a place of oppression for women. From what has been said we can easily see that man must, being the bread-winner, stand between the family and the world and be its representative in society, "and hence he must be vested with authority, he must be the recognized head of the family, he must be its duly accredited representative in all its relations with the outer world; and his authority as such head of the family and as its representative must, of necessity, within a legitimate sphere, be revered and obeyed." This is what is meant by the injunction, "wives obey your husbands," and this is what some object to so seriously. We must then, I think, sanction the terse, yet blunt, lines from England's greatest poet:

“Man for the field, and woman for the hearth ;
Man for the sword, and for the needle she ;
Man for the head, and woman for the heart ;
Man to command, and woman to obey ;
All else confusion.”

Thus, having defined her sphere, let us glance at her as she moves within it. Among ancient peoples the Israelites alone recognized and respected her rights. Among pagan nations wives were bought, sold, and treated as slaves. I deem it unnecessary to say anything in reply to the remarkable claim of some that the first type of society was the “matriarchate.” If such ever existed it was when men were no more moral than brutes, hence has no place in the present discussion. The Israelites gave her a place of dignity and honor such as nature intended for her and reaped a lasting reward in the elevated tone of their moral life. The pagans denied her this place and suffered accordingly. Among modern nations the same is true. Those which have recognized her rights and have honored them have prospered and *vice versa*. It is a pleasing contrast when we compare Germany, England, and the United States with China, India, and Turkey. In short, those nations and ages which have done most to uplift mankind are those which have given the highest place to woman and the home. “The position of woman is the touch-stone of civil society.”

But in these latter times new forces are at work which threaten all existing institutions and indicate a movement backward. The spirit of unrest and fretfulness, so rife in the land, has reached the quiet sanctity of the home. Woman seeks her “emancipation, as she calls it—her degradation, shame, and ruin when looked at from the standpoint of philosophy, common sense, and religion. Lead on and incited by such women as Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, she clamors for recognition in the trades, in the professions, and all places of employment. The careful observer must stop and ask himself to what this will lead ; where will it all end ? The ominous answer which forces itself upon him is : “In the breaking up of the home ; in the ruin of society.” This is no fancy nor hallucination, not at all. I contend that things have gone far enough for us to see the end by no uncertain light. We have already seen that nature has given her sufficient to occupy all her time in the home. If she undertakes more her natural work must be neglected—the home go

to ruin and the children grow up immoral and illiterate. It is a well known fact that many mothers devote their time and energies to the causes of charity and temperance to the utter neglect of their homes and children. The same is true of working women by actual experience and must be true of all those who overstep the bounds set by nature. I am free to admit that these women may succeed fairly well. The temperance advocate may rescue a few drunken sots; the professions may be ably filled by women; and business may prosper in her hands; but this is only one side. The home is gone. Her own boy has learned to drink or has dispaired of doing any thing in life. Who has been benefitted? "The children's bread has been cast to the dogs."

The point I now approach I wish to make very emphatic. It is this: I am convinced that the present depression in business is in great measure due to the unnatural system recently established, viz.: the employment of female labor in so many places. The tariff may be responsible in part. An unsound monetary basis may have had its influence. The great cause I have stated above. I give a single example to show what I mean. Most of our great stores have *sales-women*, not *sales-men*. Twenty years ago all of these places were filled by men who commanded a salary of eight to fifteen dollars per week. On this they were able to support a family. To-day these places are filled by girls working for four to seven dollars per week—not more than enough to support themselves. The place which yielded a support for four or five twenty years ago now supports one! What has become of the others? But the spirit of unrest to which I referred above is not alone responsible for this state of affairs. Put the blame where it belongs and be it said to the shame of men that all of these women do not work because they prefer it—some do it because they are forced to do it. Indolent men have driven women to take places they would not fill. Men have forgotten that they are the bread-winners and that they are responsible for failure. I believe with one of the authors whom I have quoted that a woman who is forced to win her own way in the world is a blot on creation. I also believe that a man who cannot or will not do more than support himself is not only a blot on creation, but a disgrace to mankind and an abomination in the sight of God. This is a duty in which men have been entirely too lax. They have married or not,

just as they fancied. They have proceeded on the theory that a man has a right to marry or not according to his wish. He has not. Every man who can support a wife, and is free from other encumbrances, is bound, in the economy of God, to do it. I believe this just as firmly as I believe that he has no right to marry till he can provide for his wife an adequate support. Every man has the right to the love and confidence of a good woman. Every good woman has the right to the love and support of a true man.

But be this as it may, something has gone wrong. This is certain. What? Is the trouble not along the line indicated? Is it not that we have defied nature's laws? "Nature must be obeyed." I might assay to improve on her ways. I might pluck up a tree by the roots and plant it branches downward, but it would not grow. We have done a similar thing in society. We have uprooted the tree, reversed ends, and yet expect to thrive. It's all folly; as much as to expect the tree planted top downward to grow. It is very striking—what God said to our first parents when they were driven out of the garden. Unto the woman he said, "I will greatly increase thy sorrow and thy conception." To the man he said, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread." The woman was sent to rear the children and the man to find them a support. Just a word to those who may think that it is necessary for some women to earn their support. It may be necessary, doubtless is, under the present artificial system; it is not in nature's scheme. The two classes which seem compelled to labor are, first, those who have indolent providers—fathers, brothers and husbands. Of this class I have this to say: the laws of the land should be such as to compel these men to do their duty. Secondly, there are many who have no providers, orphans and widows. Of this class I have this to say: they should have been provided for by their natural supporters. In other words, I believe every man is under a sacred obligation to lay by for those who are dependent upon him. It is practicable. With the numerous Insurance Companies, Guilds and Orders every man should leave his family at least a small support. Within the last month a case has come to my notice. A man who worked for one dollar per day left policies to the amount of six thousand dollars.

It is high time that reform should be instituted. It is high time for men to awake to their responsibility and for women

to learn that they must fill the place which God intended. And even now there are signs of a return to nature's scheme. Many of our most influential agencies in this city—lawyers, brokers, and bankers—employ young men as stenographers—a position now almost entirely given over to girls and young ladies. Recently some of our state legislatures have denied her the use of the ballot; not because she is unable to vote intelligently, but because those men love their homes and adore their wives. Some prominent women, too, have raised a warning voice; for example, Mrs. Ella W. Winston, in the "Forum," and Mrs. Amelia E. Barr, in the "North American Review." These women see by no uncertain light and speak with no uncertain sound. May we hear the voice and heed the warning!

Men who are really interested in the welfare of the race stand ready to sustain the dependent sex. They are ready to provide them homes. They are ready to listen to their counsel. They are ready to worship and reverence them as they do nothing this side of Heaven. They are ready to do her every bidding, to respond to her every call, if she will only give them the support of her love and confidence and help. What more can she demand? She may persist in her new and strange demands, but if she does she must take the consequences. She must see her counsel set at nought; her desires unheeded; herself a little less honored, a little less loved, a little less esteemed.

In conclusion, can we hope to reform nature's laws? Will mankind gain anything from this new scheme? Will woman be any more useful or any happier than when she was "the household's queen, religion's priestess, childhood's guardian, and man's chief solace and helper?"

Let the advocates of "Women's rights" answer!

C. M. CHUMBLEY.

Richmond, Va., Jan. 14, 1897.

