

THE

# Chinese Recorder

AND

MISSIONARY JOURNAL.

Vol. XIV.

MARCH-APRIL, 1883.

No. 2

## THE PROVERBS AND COMMON SAYINGS OF THE CHINESE.

By REV. ARTHUR H. SMITH.

(Continued from page 17.)

### IV.—PROVERBS CONTAINING ALLUSIONS TO HISTORICAL SEMI-HISTORICAL, LEGENDARY, OR MYTHICAL PERSONS OR EVENTS.

THE tendency in Chinese Proverbs to cluster, by a kind of crystallization, about a particular character, admits of numerous illustrations. The Sung Dynasty (A.D. 960-1278), produced many famous men, and great scholars, like *Chu Shi* (朱熹), the annotator of the Classics and historian, whose name is almost as familiar to the Chinese in every succeeding age, as those of Confucius and Mencius, whose works he interpreted. It is not, however, the name of *Chu fu tzu*, among men of his general era, which is most often heard in popular speech (although some of his reputed household words have become proverbial), but that of another individual who has become a national by-word and laughing-stock. *Chu fu tzu* is known principally to those who can read, but there is scarcely any one, whether he can read or not, who has not heard of *Wu Ta Lang* (武大郎). This individual was a dwarf. His wife was named *P'an Chin Lien* (潘金蓮), and is remembered for her intrigues with one *Hsi Wen Ch'ing* (西門慶), intrigues to which her husband was unable to put a stop. It is said that this precious couple finally put an end to *Wu Ta Lang*, by compelling him to take a drug in which poison was infused, which he dared not refuse, although aware of their purpose. Hence the proverb—employed in reference to one who is driven to the wall—'Wu Ta Lang's dose of poison—sure to die if he takes it, and sure to die if he does not,' 武大郎服毒。吃也死。不吃也是死。 *Wu Ta Lang* had an elder brother known as *Wu Sung* (武松), who was a general

**WHAT SHALL BE DONE WITH CONVERTS WHO HAVE  
MORE THAN ONE WIFE?**

**I**T is a long time since anything has appeared in the *Chinese Recorder* in regard to what shall be done with those in China who happen to have two or more wives, where they give evidence of having been converted by the Spirit of God and apply to be received into the Christian Church. I fancy that the number of such applicants will be more numerous each successive year. A greater number has come under my own observation the last year than any previous one. The practice of different missionaries in regard to them is still different. While some receive them allowing them to continue in the relation which had been formed before hearing the gospel, others require them to put away all but one before admitting them into the church. One who pursues the latter plan has given a statement of his experience which is well worth putting on record. I have met with it as referred to in an American newspaper. I send it to the *Recorder* for republication with some remarks on the subject.

“Among the difficult questions which missionaries in pagan lands are compelled to consider, none is more perplexing than that of polygamy. The rule of most Societies is that a man, before he can be admitted to membership, must put away all his wives but one; and such evils are involved in this act, that often natives of strong moral feelings will revolt from it. Dr. Ashmore of the Swatow (China) Baptist mission is fortunate in that only one such case has fallen to his lot in his long missionary service; but it is a very striking one, as he tells it in *The Baptist Missionary Magazine*. A applicant had two wives, and was told that he must put one of them away. Which one? The one he married last. But the first wife had no children, while the second had several. Was the mother to be separated from her children? Hear what the discarded wife said to the missionary:—

“But, teacher, he is my husband, and I am his wife. You say that he ought not to have taken me; but he did take me before he knew your new religion. He is the father of my children. I have a right to look to him for companionship and for protection. You make my children illegitimate. You should not do that; you have no right to injure my children that way. You have no right to put me in the position of a disreputable woman, for he lawfully married me according to the usage of China. I had a husband; now I have no husband. I had a home, now I have no home. If I go and

marry another man, I shall break the law. I had one to whom I could go as the father of my children; now I can go to my children's father no longer, nor may I dare to speak to him."

"We do not wonder that this made Dr. Ashmore feel like studying anew the New Testament teaching on the subject. When a man marries a second wife after he becomes a church member, the course of the missionary is plain. But where Christianity finds a man living according to the custom of the country and the sanction of its laws, with two or more wives, cannot he be accepted under protest rather than do irremediable injustice and injury to the innocent?"

This is the most heart-rending appeal I ever read. It is very similar to one published some time ago from a woman in South Africa who had suffered from the same experience, but much more affecting. I hope Dr. Ashmore's studying anew the New Testament teaching on the subject, may lead to the adoption of a different course. Under similar circumstances I am free to say that after a long study of the subject and the reading of every thing I could find in relation to this perplexing subject I would not have inflicted such a trial upon that poor woman as to deprive her of her husband, her home and her children in the name of the merciful Redeemer whose gospel is best portrayed by his own words "come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest."

It is known to all who have studied the subject that we have no explicit teaching in the S.S. either from our Lord or his Apostles, in regard to this point. So we have to be guided in regard thereto by general considerations and by inferences. Some persons who are not much acquainted with the history of missions suppose that it is not a matter that needs much consideration to decide. They have all their lives been accustomed to consider polygamy as a great sin. No one who has more than one wife can possibly be the member of a church in Christian lands. Any one found guilty of bigamy there is condemned to the penitentiary as a felon. The polygamy of the Mormons has justly been held up as the monster evil of their wicked system. The natural feeling, therefore, of many by reason of these influences is, can any person think of receiving one in a heathen land who has more than one wife to the church with out requiring him to put these wives away? These persons forget the common adage, that "circumstances alter cases." Let us consider for a moment that Abraham was in the very same circumstances as this man was of whom Dr. Ashmore writes. Abraham, having no child, took Hagar to be his concubine at the wish of his wife Sarah, as this man did at the

prompting, very probably, of his wife who had no child. Who was Abraham? Is he not the Father of the faithful, the man whom God had selected to be the commencement of his chosen seed? Though polygamy is now forbidden both by the law of the Church and of the State in Christian lands, it was not forbidden by the law of God as given by Moses, nor by human laws among Eastern nations. Up to the time of Christ it was tolerated by the law of God among the Jews; and much more was it tolerated among the Gentiles. It was not therefore sinful in itself in Abraham to have a concubine. For that which is tolerated of God is not sinful in his sight. As polygamy thus existed in the time of Abraham, we suppose that it also existed among other Eastern people; and that it existed among them, as it did with Abraham, by the toleration of God. Hence the present practise of polygamy among the eastern nations has come down from the days of Abraham. The monogamy which now prevails in Christian lands comes from the teachings of our Lord. All those who know his teachings are under the highest obligation to follow them, and to obey the laws of the land in which they live. But this man, of whom Dr. Ashmore writes, when he took the second wife was living under the law as made known at the time of Abraham and which had come down in China by tradition to this time. As he had not heard of the law of marriage as given by our Lord, for it had not yet been made known to him, he violated no known law when he took the concubine, any more than Abraham did when he took Hagar. "For where there is no law there is no transgression." How did God do with Abraham when he took Hagar to be his concubine at the request of Sarah? Did he refuse to number him among his chosen people? No, not at all. He allowed him to suffer the *natural* evils which follow such marriages; but Abraham and the son of that concubine received the rite of circumcision on the same day, which was the seal of the covenant with God's chosen people. Abraham was not required by God to send away Hagar, and when she fled from what she regarded the harsh rule of Sarah, God sent her back to her mistress and also to her master. There was her home. There was the father of her child and there she was in duty bound to stay. By many, Christian baptism is considered to have come in the Christian church in the place of circumcision under the Old Testament. It would appear, then, to require a very clear and explicit command on the subject to justify any missionary saying to a man, who is in the very same circumstances that Abraham was in when he had Hagar as his concubine; who gives evidence of having received the renewing of the Holy Ghost and who applies to be received into the number of the chosen

people; you must send away the mother of your children; you must turn her out of her home; you must make her children illegitimate; you must make the woman who has been your wife a disreputable woman before I can baptize you. I unhesitatingly say our Lord has given no command that requires a missionary to say thus to a man in these circumstances. Is not the fact that the Holy Spirit has converted him the evidence that he is one of God's chosen ones? And can it be that one who is accepted of God, can not be received into His visible church?

But it is answered that Christ, by the law of marriage which declares it to be between *one* man and *one* woman, forbids a man having more wives than one. We admit it; but the rule does not apply to these cases. If any one who has known the law violates it and takes a second wife while the first is still living, though it may be still the usage of the people around him, we cut him off from the church. But when one who was living under the law as it existed at the time of Abraham and as it was tolerated by God in the Jewish church, and who had, in accordance with that toleration, married a second wife, and has lived with her and has children, and then comes to the knowledge of the Gospel and accepts Jesus as his Saviour, I hold that he may be received into the church as he was when the Gospel came him, with out putting away his wives, he promising obedience to the law of Christ and that he will not marry any other woman till all that he now may have shall be separated from him by death.

While it is true that there is no passage in the New Testament that gives explicit instruction on this point, yet there are some passages that help us to see what is right—and proper to be done in relation to it. The Apostle Paul gives it as the law of the kingdom that “marriage is honorable in all” and that all Christians, whether men or women, may marry if they wish to—“*but only in the Lord.*” Does this law of the kingdom render void the marriage relation which has already been contracted with unbelievers, when one of the parties becomes a Christian? By no means. The Apostle says expressly “If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him *let him not put her away.* And the woman which hath a husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her let her not leave him.” I Cor. vii: 12, 13. Here is Apostolic direction in a case where conversion to Christ brings the member into contrariety with the law of the kingdom of Christ. There are two laws in regard to marriage, one is that a church member may “only marry in the Lord.” The other is that marriage is only between one man and one woman. In the one case

the Apostle teaches us that where a man or woman, who is already married according to the usage of the country in which he lives, is converted and becomes a Christian and his companion remains unconverted—the law which requires a Christian “only to marry in the Lord” does not set aside that marriage contracted before he was converted; he is not required to put her away. I have shown above that in these Eastern lands, where polygamy has existed from the earliest ages, in accordance with the usage which prevailed at the time of Abraham and with the toleration given to it by God among the Jews, the taking of a concubine is not a violation of the law which our Lord has established for his church. Is it not a fair and legitimate induction that, if the law of the kingdom requiring a Christian “to marry only in the Lord” does not require a converted man to send away the wife that believes not, neither does our Lord’s Law of marriage as existing “between one man and one woman” require a man, who, in the days of his heathenism had married a concubine, to put her away before he can be received into the Christian church and be baptized? But there are two passages in the New Testament which I think make known to us what was the usage of the Apostles in this matter. One is the passage in I Tim. iii: 2 in which Paul gives his directions for the choice of ministers for ordination. “A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife,” and again v. 12 “Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife.” The most obvious meaning of these passages is this—that persons with more than one wife might be admitted to the membership of the church, but they could not be set apart as officers in the church. On this interpretation of the passages there is, of course, the Apostles example in the matter, and that should settle the question. But all who have studied the question know that these passages have three explanations. One of these is advocated principally by the Roman Catholic commentators, which is that a Bishop or Deacon should only be married once; that if his wife dies he may not marry a second time. The Roman church has narrowed this supposed direction of St. Paul to mean that the clergy should not marry *at all*. The rule that if the wife of a Bishop or Deacon die he may not marry again is so contrary to all the teaching of the Apostle in regard to marriage that it is accepted only by a few Protestant commentators. II. Some hold that it may have been directed against the common practice of *divorce*, and that it was designed to exclude from the offices of the church those who had put away their wives without a justifiable cause and taken another. It may include these also, but this explanation would imply that such persons were received into the membership of the church, and that they could not be set apart

as officers in the church. This class of persons would be as clearly excluded from the membership of the church by our Lord's law of marriage, as those who had a plurality of wives, for it was in reference to persons who had loosely divorced their wives that our Lord declared the law of marriage. If, then, according to this interpretation this class of persons were admitted to membership in the church, then also might polygamists be admitted. But thirdly, most Protestant writers understand this passage to mean that Bishops and Deacons could not have more than one wife *at the same time*. Among commentators who hold this view we may refer to Whitly, J. Wesley, Scott, Macknight, Calvin, Peter Martyr and Barnes.

Whitly, in explaining the passage "the husband of one wife" writes, "For the Jews and Greeks" says Theodoret, "were wont to be married to two or three wives together. I approve of the interpretation of some of the ancients, which is also mentioned by Jerome and by Chrysostom, declaring that the Apostle does not here *oblige* the Bishop to be married, but only corrects the immoderateness of some, and because, among the Jews, it was lawful both to marry twice and to have two wives together, and it was common with them to divorce one and take another." Comm. on I Tim. III : 2.

Rev. John Wesley on the same passage of Scripture writes, "This neither means that a Bishop *must* be married, nor that he *may not* marry a second wife, which last it is just as lawful for him to do as to marry the first, and may, in some cases, be his bounden duty. But whereas *polygamy*, and divorce on slight occasions, were common, both among the Jews and heathens, it teaches us that ministers, of all others, ought to stand clear of these sins."

Rev. Thomas Scott writes as follows on I Tim. III ; 2. "Some have endeavored to infer a part of that (Roman Catholic) system from this clause, and have supposed that the Apostle meant to prohibit second marriages to the clergy. But this is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture. It is by no means contained in the words, and would certainly bring in a part of those evils, which long experience has found inseparable from the general prohibition. For as good reasons may often be given for marrying a second wife as for marrying at all. \* \* \* He (a Bishop) ought also to be the "husband of one wife." Christ and his apostles expressly condemned *polygamy*, as well as divorce, except for adultery. *Yet there was no direct command for a man, who had previously taken more wives than one, to put the others away when he embraced the Gospel.* But the rule that no man, however qualified in other respects, should be admitted to the Pastoral office, who had more than one wife, or who had put

away one to take another, tended to show the unlawfulness of *polygamy* and divorces on frivolous pretences, and their inconsistency with the Christian dispensation; and concurred, with other things, to bring them into total disuse in the Christian Church yet with out violence and confusion." Comm. on I Tim. III: 2.

Dr. James Macknight writes on the passage. "The husband of one wife. That the Gospel allows women to marry a second time, is evident from I Cor. VII. 9,39. By a parity of reasoning it allows men to marry a second time also. Wherefore, when it is said here that "a Bishop must be the husband of one wife" the apostle *could not* mean that persons, who have married a second time, are thereby disqualified for sacred offices. His meaning, therefore, in these canons is, that such persons only are to be entrusted with sacred offices, who, in their married state, have contented themselves with one wife at a time. As the Asiatic nations universally practise *polygamy*, the Apostle, to bring back mankind to use marriage according to the primitive institution, which enjoined one man to one woman only at a time, ordered, by divine inspiration, that none should be made Bishops but those who showed themselves temperate by avoiding *polygamy*.

It may be objected, perhaps, that the gospel ought to have prohibited *the people* as well as the *Ministers of Religion*, from *polygamy* and divorce, if these things were morally evil. As to *divorce*, the answer is, that by the precept of Christ, all, both clergy and people, were restrained from unjust divorce. And with respect to *polygamy*, being an offence against prudence rather than against morality, it had been permitted to the Jews by Moses, Deut. XXI, 15, on account of the hardness of their hearts, and it was generally practiced by the eastern nations as a matter of indifference. It was, therefore, to be corrected mildly and gradually, by example, rather than express precept. And seeing reformation must begin somewhere it was fit to begin with the Ministers of Religion; that through the influence of their example, the evil might be remedied by degrees, without occasioning those *domestic troubles* and *causeless divorces*, which must necessarily have ensued, if, by an express injunction of the apostles, husbands, immediately on their becoming Christians, had been obliged to put away all their wives except one. Accordingly, the example of the clergy, and of such of the brothers as were not married at their conversion, or who were married to only one woman, supported by the precepts of the gospel, had so effectually rooted out *polygamy* that the Emperor Valentinian, to give countenance to his marrying Justinia, during the life of his wife Severa,



whom he would not divorce, published a law, permitting his subject to have two wives at a time."

John Calvin writes on this passage "the husband of one wife" thus; "The only true exposition of these words is that of Chrysostom, that *polygamy* is here expressly forbidden in a Bishop, which, at that time, had almost become a law among the Jews. And so it is not without reason that Paul forbids this stain from the character of a Bishop. Here, however, it is objected that what is vicious in all, ought not to have been condemned or prohibited in Bishops only. The answer is easy, that *license* is not, on this account, given to *others* because this is expressly *forbidden* in Bishops. Nor can we have any doubt that Paul condemned generally what was repugnant with the eternal law of God. For the decree is fixed and sure. "They two shall be one flesh." But he might, however, endure in others what, in a Bishop, would have been too disgraceful and intolerable: but Paul repels all from the Episcopal order, who have committed such an offence. And so, compelled by necessity, he bears with that, which, being already done, could not be corrected but only in the common laity. For what remedy was there? Should those have put away their second and third wives who had entered into a state of *polygamy* under the Jewish dispensation? But such a repudiation would not have been *without wrong and injustice*. He left untouched, therefore, what was not new and entirely in his own power, and only provided that no Bishop should be soiled with such a stain."

Peter Martyr, in his *Loci Communes*, asks "If a pagan were in our day converted to Christ, having two wives, could such *polygamy* be endured under the Christian dispensation?" His answer, is "Certainly *for the time*. For they contracted with each other in good faith. Nor must a wrong be done to the wives, for each of them has a claim upon her husband. The law, which Christ gave, ought, however, to hold for the future. But what has been done, and done with good faith, probably in ignorance, *cannot be rescinded*."

The Rev. Albert Barnes, on I Tim. iii: 2 writes, "'the husband of one wife' need not be understood as requiring that a bishop *should be a married man*, as Vigilantius, a Presbyter in the church at Barcelona in the fourth century, supposed. But, while this interpretation is to be excluded as false, there has been much difference of opinion on the question whether the passage means that a minister should not have more than one wife at the same time, or whether it prohibits the marriage of a second wife after the death of the first. On this the notes of Bloomfield, Doddridge and Macknight may be consulted. That the former is the correct

opinion seems to me to be evident from the following considerations: (1) It is the *most obvious meaning* of the language, and it would doubtless *so be understood by those to whom it was addressed*. At a time when polygamy was not uncommon to say that a man should have but *one wife* would be naturally understood as prohibiting polygamy. (2) There was a *special propriety* in the prohibition of polygamy. It is known that it was extensively practiced and was not regarded as unlawful." We might multiply quotations from commentaries showing that in the opinion of many Protestant writers, this passages in I Tim. III 2; and 12 prohibits those who had more than one wife being received into the office either of Bishop or Deacon.

The reasons which are given by these several writers whose words have been quoted commend themselves as words of "truth and soberness;" especially the first reason given by Mr. Barnes that this meaning "is the most obvious meaning of the words and that it would be thus understood by those to whom it was addressed." These considerations are *in all* matters of interpretation the most reliable ones for the right understanding of any passage. It is right to understand a passage in the most obvious meaning of the words and as those to whom it was addressed would understand it.

If it is accepted that these passages of St. Paul's direction to Timothy forbid him to induct any one into the office of Bishop or Deacon, who had more than one wife, then it *necessarily* follows by implication that there were those in the church who had more than one wife. That this follows as a necessary implication is clear from the following considerations. The officers of the church were selected only from those who were members of the church. If then, there were *no members* of the church who had more than one wife it would be entirely superfluous to forbid Timothy to induct any one into any office of the church who had more wives than one—for as there were no such persons among the members, then no one with more than one wife *could possibly* be presented for the office of Bishop or Deacon. On the supposition that there were among the members of the church those who had more than one wife, then the Apostolic injunction that such could not be ordained either as Bishop or Deacon is *pertinent* and *necessary*. But on the supposition that there were no members in the church who had more than one wife the injunction was entirely superfluous and unnecessary. As Prof. Goodrich in his letter to the American Board has expressed it, "We know that polygamy was a prevailing custom among the Greeks, as well as oriental nations, in the Apostolic times. As Timothy and Titus were sent to churches composed chiefly of Jews

and Greeks, it would seem hardly possible but that some of the members of those churches had become converts to Christianity while living in a state of polygamy. If, then, there was a rule in operation at that time, requiring that all such persons should cease to be polygamists on their admission to the church; that every married Christian man should be "the husband of one wife;" it would *seem unnecessary* at least to add such an injunction in respect to the clergy. It would be like soberly requiring that the Jewish Priests should be *circumcised* men, when without being circumcised they could not be Jews at all. It does, then, seem to be a legitimate inference, that if the rule given to Timothy was really directed against polygamy in the highest church officers, there *could not have been* another and broader rule in operation excluding polygamists from all access into the church." In other words we are warranted in drawing the inference that persons who gave evidence of conversion to Christ and who had more than one wife were admitted into the early Christian church without being required to put away the other wife. This being the usage in the early Christian church under Apostolic sanction, it is an authoritative rule for the guidance of missionaries, under similar circumstances in these eastern lands, as China and India. I hold, then, that the action taken by the missionaries of various denominations in Calcutta in 1834 was entirely in accordance with Apostolic usage. The Denominations represented at this Conference were these, viz; the English Baptist, the London, and the Church Missionary Societies, the Church of Scotland and the American Presbyterian Church.

It is stated that in this Conference after having had the whole subject frequently under discussion, and after much and serious deliberation, they *unanimously* agreed on the following proposition, though there had previously been much diversity of opinion among them on various points. "If a convert before becoming a Christian has married more wives than one, in accordance with the practice of the Jewish and early Christian churches, he shall be permitted to keep them all; but such a person is not eligible to any office in the church. In no other case is *polygamy* to be tolerated among Christians." (Brown, Hist. of Missions, III, 365, 366).

I designedly limit the proposition to these eastern or Asiatic countries, excepting therefrom the Polynesian Islands and parts of Africa. Our knowledge of their matrimonial usages is not sufficient to justify us in expressing any opinion in regard to them. From some statements we have seen of the *polygamy* which prevails among them, it would appear that it is rather low and pernicious and temporary. If their marriage relations are not permanent and well

defined, then an entirely different action is required in regard to it from that taken by the missionaries in India in 1834. It would require that the marriage relation should be fixed *de novo* as all the institutions in Church and State have to be arranged anew. As it was among peoples in the condition of these uncivilized tribes that some of the missionary Societies, who have adopted "the rule that a man, before he can be admitted to membership, must put away all his wives but one" as stated in the quotation from the American paper, commenced their evangelizing labours, it was in view, perhaps, of the state of the marriage relation existing among these tribes that they were led to adopt this rule. And they have yet seen occasion to modify it to suit the different state of things in other lands. It is to be hoped that the wail of this distressed woman at Swatow, and the most heart-rending statement of her wrongs as written out by Dr. Ashmore, will lead every missionary and every missionary Society to study anew the teaching of the New Testament on this subject.

I hold (1) that the principles of the divorce rule in the old Testament church which recognized those who had a plurality of wives as members of that church, warrants the admission of converts who have more than one wife into the Christian church as a temporary measure without requiring them to put all away but one. (2) That as the rule of the Kingdom which requires a Christian "only to marry in the Lord," does not nullify the marriage between the convert and his unbelieving wife, and that he may be received into the church without putting away his unbelieving wife, so, by a parity of reasoning the law of the Kingdom, which declares "that marriage is between one man and one woman" does not affect the relation which a man may have contracted with a second wife before his conversion, and so he may be received into the church without putting away any of his wives. (3) I think, that, having the general consent of many learned and godly men of various ages from the fourth century to the present time, that the passage in the Epistle to Timothy, "the husband of one wife," in its most *obvious* sense means to prohibit any one who has more than one wife from being ordained as a Bishop, it follows as the obvious and necessary inference, that persons with more than one wife were received into the early Christian church under apostolic sanction. And hence we have the most certain warrant for receiving converts, in these Asiatic countries where *polygamy* prevails, who have more wives than one, into the church without requiring them to put away all of them but one. I hold therefore, that this woman was greatly wronged in the name of the Gospel of Christ; that the Gospel does not require the second wife to be torn away from her husband; to be driven

away from her home; to have her good name destroyed; her children declared illegitimate and deprived of her loving care and instruction. But, on the contrary, she has the right to continue in the enjoyment of the love and protection of her husband; to continue in the position and honor of a woman who has a husband; (which in China is no small blessing) to have the comfort and support of a home with children in it to honor her. That she has a right to all these now that they are purified and blessed to her and her husband by the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the influence of which is to bless and purify all the relations of life.

It was the wail of the slaves of America as voiced by Mrs. Stowe in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* that did much to attract the attention of mankind to the wrongs of the slaves. It may be that it is the purpose of God, in his good providence, to make the wail of this Chinese woman of Swatow as voiced by Rev. Dr. Ashmore awaken the missionaries and the missionary Societies to the wrong done to the innocent by requiring as a requirement to admission to the church what the Head of the church has not enjoined, and thus lead them to change the rule on this point for Asiatic converts; for this result I shall continually pray and most earnestly hope.

EVANGELIST.

---

## Correspondence.

---

### *An Open Letter to Dr. Dudgeon.*

SIR,

In an article published in the May-June number of the *Chinese Recorder*, headed *Opium and Truth*, and bearing your name the following passages appear:—

“Error and wrong, not truth, will suffer from agitating this dirty pool. Foreigners in China, living in concessions apart by themselves, including our Ministers, Consuls, and Merchants, see but comparatively little of Chinese private life and *of the result of Opium smoking. The latter have their trade interests at stake, and self interest is a wonderful blind to the evils of Opium.* It is after all medical men, missionaries, and travellers, who are most competent to pronounce decidedly regarding many important points involved in the discussion of such a subject, either as the result of their own observations, or as the expression, from long intimacy with them and a thorough acquaintance with their language, manners, customs and modes of thought, of the Chinese view, notwithstanding the charge to the contrary of their statements being loose.”—(*The italics are my own*).