

neath cellar and foundations, is built a shaft of stone, so firmly planted, so solidly laid, so compactly mortised, that no shock less than an upheaval of the earth will stir it. The serene gazer into the heavens has his feet on adamant. But how idle the column of adamant if there were no fine instrument to uphold and steady. How soon would men pull down the pier of granite if there were no telescope there it could serve! So the body is good while it can minister to the mind. But take away the man's human and divine uses, and you reduce the athletic exercises to an aimless amusement; you make the gospel of muscle absurd; nay, you make it revolting.

One mortifying fact forces itself upon us in these new times. It is this: the development of man as a perfect animal is a failure, so far as man's best uses are concerned. Harvard College forbids the racing of its boat clubs, and is inclined to discourage the boat clubs themselves, as occasions of idleness, if not of something worse. The physical development they give does not make amends for the loss of intellectual ambition and the detriment to refined morals. Carelessness, and vulgarity, and vice, instinctively gather about exhibitions of physical strength and trials of manly vigor. Weston's feat of pedestrianism stimulates betting, and has, no doubt, encouraged an amount of swearing and drinking that no development of muscle in the legs and no increase in the habits of walking will be the smallest compensation for. Brains will get smaller, hearts narrower, souls poorer, if this worship of animal perfection goes on unchecked by the teachers and censors of society. It may be a bad thing to have souls without bodies; but it is, to say the least, no better to have bodies without souls. We need souls and bodies both. We have fairly gained the point of bringing into honor the "world" and the "things of the world"—muscle, nerve, blood, organs, and functions. We have introduced into heavenly places health, vigor, cheer, animal spirits, and pluck. We must now see to it that these servants do not monopolize the heavenly places, so as to crowd out intellect, sensibility, culture, refinement, delicacy of moral feeling. If the old people made the mistake of thinking they could be perfect without lungs or stomachs, that is no reason why we should expect to be perfect with nothing except stomachs and lungs. If they blundered fatally in reducing the animal to a thin, unpleasant shade, we should be all the more careful not to allow the rational to evaporate.

The Family.

BY ELIZABETH OAKES SMITH.

WHEN we consider how carelessly the foundations for the family superstructure are laid, the wonder is, not that ruin sometimes ensues, but that it is not more general than it is now found to be. Two persons from two already established families separate themselves to establish a third, whose tastes, habits, and dispositions are little known to each other, and may prove totally dissimilar and at variance.

I do not intend to speak in this article upon exceptional cases of superior women and imbecile men, of widows or tyrants, whom nothing can humanize, but of the family or existing household, in which are laid the foundations of society—where are laid also the foundations of a thousand insidious diseases which baffle the skill of the most skillful physician; diseases often to be traced to "sickness of the heart; diseases that make us throw physic to the dogs," because it can not

"Minister to a mind diseased;

Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow;

Raze out the written troubles of the brain;

And, with some sweet oblivious antidote,

Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff

Which weighs upon the heart;"

all this for the present is to be ignored, and the simple fact of a household considered.

Webster defines a family to be: "The collective body of persons who live in one house, *subject to one head or manager* ; a household, including parents and children, servants, boarders, etc.

In every well-regulated household there must be a supreme head or umpire—one to whom all may appeal, and whose decisions must be final; from whom there is no appeal; a wise, loving, judicious center, who is to be looked up to as counselor, friend, judge. Where authority is divided conflicts will arise, dissensions will exist, and these will mar the harmony of the family, disarrange its domestic economy, and eventually endanger the happiness and well-being of the inmates.

Who shall be the head of the household? St. Paul decided the question nearly two thousand years ago, by asserting that "man is the head of the woman," and she ought to be subject to her husband, etc. I know the masculine arrogance of the Jew denied the equality of woman, and accepted her in the aspect of

sex mostly, as Paganism did entirely. The Jew excluded woman then, as now, from the main body of the tabernacle in worship, and yet in the earlier and better ages she had been recognized in the nation both as judge and prophetess.

Milton, whose mind was Judaic in character, is decided in regarding women as inferior to men; she must *look up to man*, as to a god. He says of the two, that he was subject

“To God only—she to God through him.”

My own opinion is this: that the man is the rightful, proper head of the family; that wife, children, and servants must and ought to yield not only respect but obedience to him as the head and ruler of the household; in his place there he should be king and priest, he should rule and worship in the altar-place of home.

There is something handsome and fitting in this, and it is apparent to the most casual observer that, when any circumstance forces this natural rulership aside, the harmony and dignity of the family are impaired.

There is a peculiar charm in contemplating the grand old patriarchs of the Bible with their great families and dependents, flocks and herds, wives and children, the whole presided over by one kingly man, were it not for the question of polygamy which naturally thrusts itself into the very foreground of thought. Abraham's jealous-minded wife could not endure a rival, hence her cruelty to Hagar and her child, Ishmael. Then the two wives of Jacob were equally discordant. These rich and manful old patriarchs could not well manage more than one woman. I am afraid they could hardly do even that in our modern days!

Brigham Young is said to manage *two hundred* with perfect ease; but he has devised a system of polygamy which converts every woman of his household into a servant. He pampers to no pride, vanity, or luxury in the woman “sealed” as under his protection and authority. She is bound to take care of herself and her children; she is entitled to the good offices of Brigham and her sister wives only as she wins them by her sweetness, industry, and discretion. It is said that not a single termagant is to be found in the whole territory of Utah!

But, putting aside this modern anomaly, the true idea of a family is one man and one woman—as husband and wife—with their children, servants, and dependents. The first law in the household is obedience, in its high sense, to the head and center.

The second is loyalty.

This involves perfect confidence and candor in the various members. Where the great law of the household is love, this needs not to be enjoined; where each member is bound by the spirit of genuine good will, loyalty or fidelity, each to each, is comparatively easy; it assumes the aspect of an instinct, rather than of moral obligation; but where, as is too often the case, discordant elements are introduced, this sentiment of loyalty, or a *high sense of honor*, must take its place.

The four walls inclosing a household should be regarded as sacred now as in the olden time, when the hearthstone was sacred to the genial, peace-loving Hestia, and the Penates were worshipped in the penetralia of every dwelling. Here was set up the domestic altar, distinct from all outward and external observances, and regarded by the family alone.

If every household has its *skeleton*, as is often asserted, no one has a right to insult and horrify his guests by bringing the ghastly appendage to the feast table, or to parade it in the face and eyes of his neighbors. Let it be locked up in reverent silence and patient seclusion.

What transpires within the four walls of a dwelling should be veiled from the view of all others. No member of a household should be a traitor to it.

No member of a household should hold up any of its inmates to scorn or odium, and then turn around and break bread, like Judas, with the assembled members. It is the height of meanness and dishonesty to be a part of the family circle and then to speak ill of it; to be dependent thereon, and traduce it.

The head—husband and father—ought to hold not only a protective and provident care over the family, but a beneficent authority also; as a general rule he is supposed to supply all its material wants; his toil, his talents, his purse hold the household together, and give it dignity in the eyes of the world, therefore he should magnify his office and make it honorable; he should be right royal in his demeanor, exempt from *shams* at home and abroad, true and manful, that his example be a safe model for the younger members of the household; and, in turn, the family should cheerfully uphold his authority, for whatever enhances his dignity is reflected upon the family.

A woman should not marry till of an age to know and appreciate the importance of the step she is about to take, but once married, she must not only make the best of her “bargain,” be it good or bad, but she must also bear in mind

that she has positive and solemn duties to perform.

A woman's part is generally a subordinate one. Her marriage contract involves the condition of obedience as well as chastity; it rests with the wife to preserve order, cheerfulness, and frugality in the household. She is to see that what the husband provides is not wastefully squandered; she is to look well to the ways of her household, and not eat the bread of idleness.

Further than this, let the husband's faults be what they may, his good name is in part in her keeping, and she and her children must sink or rise to his level. The woman who proclaims the errors of her husband is the meanest of all traitors.

I know of nothing more base than for a woman to take the name of a man, eat his bread, and mother his children, and then go about to abuse and villify him. She is like an unclean bird, which has crept over near to the precincts of chaste love and divine purity.

The husband is obliged to brunt the world with its manifold trials and temptations; to meet the sharp encounter of men in the competition for wealth, fame, and position. He has much to annoy and distress him, hidden wisely from her eyes, it may be; for I know of nothing more contemptible and imbecile than the whining complaints with which some men come into the family circle, and cover it over like a wet blanket. He has much to exasperate him, also, and woe to the men who, after this hard contest with the outer world, comes home to a moody and discordant household—a selfish, idle-minded, or discontented wife!

It is my solemn opinion that more than half of the shortcomings, the sins and crimes of the other sex may be traced home to their ill-assorted wives and disorderly households.

The cares of a wife, I admit, have a tendency to belittle her; but if she be capable of any nobility of sentiment, she can invest the humblest duty with beauty, as well as dignity. The position of a married woman is always more commanding than that of the spinster or old maid, and the sentiment of widowhood is broader and more responsible than that of maidenhood. Nothing is lovelier or more holy in our sex than a thoroughly *wifely* woman.

A wife is not without authority in a family; she must be obeyed in all household matters; the husband will uphold her authority, and sustain her in exacting obedience from her children and dependents.

If she would have individual respect, she

must have a wise discretion that may be relied upon, a self-poise and equanimity at once firm and gentle, and an unflinching, reliable integrity, above suspicion or reproach.

We sometimes hear quite estimable women appealing to their husbands to insist upon the obedience of children or dependents. This is a great mistake, and the cause of much domestic disquiet, and indicates not only pettiness, but imbecility, on the part of the wife. Her children should obey from spontaneous love and deference; it is all over with her when she is obliged to say to them:

"I will tell your father if you do not obey me."

Such a woman is either weak or wicked; either is bad enough in a family.

BEECHER AND SPURGEON.—A writer in *The New York Gazette*, contrasting Spurgeon and Beecher, says: "No man in the world understands his physical system better than Henry Ward Beecher. His eating, sleeping, exercise, all conform to the laws of health. He is thoroughly temperate in all respects. He has reached a half century with a sound constitution in a healthy body, and has twenty-five years good service in him yet. Spurgeon is a young man. His fleshy appearance and the gout that has overtaken him show that physical laws must be obeyed as well as moral. Mr. Beecher lives plainly, is simple in his dress and in his habits, and if met in the street would sooner be taken for an expressman in a hurry for the cars than a minister. Spurgeon dresses in pure English clerical style, is a free liver, dispenses an elegant hospitality, keeps his coach and coachman, lives in a fine mansion, and boasts of as good a turnout as the Archbishop of Canterbury.

USEFUL HINTS.—A bit of glue dissolved in skim milk and water will restore crape.

Ribbons of every kind should be washed in cold suds and not rinsed.

If your flatirons are rough rub them with fine salt and it will make them smooth.

If you are buying a carpet for durability choose small figures.

A bit of soap rubbed on the hinges of doors will prevent their creaking.

Scotch snuff put in holes where crickets come out will destroy them.

Wood ashes and common salt wet with water will stop the crack of a stove.

Strong lye put in water will make it soft as rain water.

Half a cranberry, it is said, bound on a corn will soon kill it.