

burden of one's self! What did that hymn say—

"He will save you just now?"

Not me! That couldn't mean me! I wish it did. I wish the Elder would take hold of my hand and lead me in and dip me under, as he did this morning, and say those words, and all these wretched years could slip off and float away, and I could rise up again washed clean, with a face like that girl's, and walk out and begin over! Oh dear! That would be good!"

She filled her hands with the water and poured it over her burning head. "That is nice," she said,— "nice and cool. Perhaps, if I went in and stood just there where Phil stood this morning, I should be cool all through, and this pain would go away. I'll leave my shawl here, though, to keep dry till I come out."

She threw the shawl upon the ground and waded in. The stream had risen since morning, fed by the mountain rains, but she never heeded the added depth. Intent upon reaching the middle of the pool, where the morning's baptism had taken place, she hurried forward. Now the water was at her waist—now above her breast. A hasty slip,—her footing gave way,—the water was over her head. Instinctively she struggled, for one moment grasped the air—then a sudden gladness possessed her: "Just now," she murmured, with a wild smile on her white face—then gave herself to the stream and sank. The moon plunged into sudden eclipse of cloud; the wind sounded with drearier moan,—then, ere the ripples of Sylvia's passage had

ceased in the brook, the silvery radiance again streamed forth and lit the eddying circles. The breeze died into stillness, and hush and night possessed the place.

They found her in the morning. The stream had floated her down a little way to where a tiny cape of yellow grasses arrested its flow,—and there, half in, half out of the water, she lay pillowed on the slope. The brown waves played lightly with her garments and lapped and caressed her form as a mother caresses her child. A smile of perfect peace rested on her lips. She was fair and young and innocent: the deep baptism of Death had washed away all stain of life's anguish, and she seemed as one fallen asleep.

"She looks dreadful happy, don't she?" said old Mis' Philbrick.

But Philip and Mary were heavy at heart. "We were going to help her—we were going to be so good to her on the morrow," they said to each other; "if she had only known—if she only had lived one day longer!"

In the meadow, not far from the water's edge, is Sylvia's grave. Rough hands laid her to rest and smoothed the brown sods over her; but many kind words were spoken, and no harsh ones, for the village folk were not ungentle at heart. The murmur of Bayberry sounds forever past her bed, and Philip's little children come sometimes to put daisies and pink mallow-buds on the mound. And sometimes, though rarely, Philip comes himself, and stands, and thinks, and stoops to brush a stick or a dead leaf from the grass. The blue sky arches her in, the curving mountain chain encircles her—and so Sylvia rests.

THE FALSE CLAIM OF MORMONISM.

SOME may have thought the statements of President Grant's Message on Mormon polygamy to be severe. There is not, however, a nation of Asia whose customs and laws would not justify these statements. The expressions of the Message are: "In Utah there still remains a remnant of barbarism, repugnant to civilization, to decency, and to the laws of the United States." To indicate one chief particular in which polygamy is opposed to the whole spirit of law, both in this and other nations, the President suggests: "It may be advisable for Congress to consider what, in the execution of the law against polygamy, is to be the status of plu-

ral wives and their offspring. The expediency of Congress passing an enabling act, authorizing the Legislature of Utah to legitimate all children born prior to a time fixed in the act, might be justified by its humanity to these innocent children." Yet further to indicate the cloak of religious hypocrisy under which these marriages are justified, the President declares: "Neither polygamy nor any other violation of existing statutes will be permitted within the territory of the United States. It is not with the religion of the self-styled saints, but with their practices, we are now dealing. They will be protected in the worship of God according to the dictates of

their consciences, but they will not be permitted to violate the laws under the cloak of religion."

As already remarked, these statements may seem to some dictatorial in tone; but they would be justified in any nation even of Asia, not to say of Europe.

The views of the Chief Magistrate have not been adopted and thus publicly set forth without thorough investigation and wise counsel.

Many years ago intelligent foreigners wondered that in this land, and in the nineteenth century, after Christianity had become fundamental law, people could be found who would be deluded by sophistries and absurdities worthy of the ignorance of the Middle Ages. Two things are to be remembered in regard to this suggestion. So extreme has been the American view that religion should not be interfered with, that practices have been tolerated which pertain not at all to duties to the Divine Being, but to the rights and welfare of present and future generations; these abuses being cloaked under the garb of religion. It is further to be remembered, that the people who are so ignorant as to be deluded by Mormon elders are nearly all from the dregs of European populations, with comparatively few native-born Americans.

It has been generally supposed that the Mormon practice is justified by Asiatic and patriarchal customs, and by both Mohammedan and Mosaic statutes. No greater perversion of fact, as to existing society in Asia, and patriarchal practice, as well as to Mosaic laws, could be conceived than this. The *fact* being mistaken, no wonder the principle has been misconstrued. The facts of history will show that the Mormon polygamy is opposed to the customs of every age and nation; that it is contrary to the spirit and letter of Mosaic as well as American law; and that even the religious statutes of the Mormon Bible forbid the practice.

It should be understood, in dealing with Mormon polygamists, that they are professedly a *community* of men with more than one wife apiece—an absurdity and infamy such as was never dreamed of by the Orientals. Asiatic, as well as European nations, from the days of Aristotle, have known that there are substantially as many males as females born into the world by the Creator's appointment.

Of course polygamy, as a custom for a community or a nation, is an absurdity in itself; and, in our day, it is an infamy; since, as Aristotle argues, if all men are equal in their rights, he is a robber of the most villain-

ous order who appropriates more than one female as his wife.

Hence in all countries, China and Turkey being of the number, where polygamy as the *exception* is allowed, it is the special privilege of official rank to have a harem with a plurality of wives. There is not one man in ten thousand, therefore, that has more than one wife.

Three things conspire to make monogamy the law, and polygamy the rare exception. In the first place, very few men, if permitted, could meet the expenses of sustaining two families. Again, the law makes polygamy not simply the privilege, but the indispensable condition of official position, the plurality of wives being a part of the equipage of official rank; while, yet more, many persons entitled to the privilege, from preference avoid it, if possible.

These facts are seen illustrated in the following cases occurring in Turkey and China. The late Sultan of the Turkish Empire, Abdül Mejd, the eldest son of Selim, who was a man of great ability, came to the throne in 1839, at the age of about twenty. Prior to his accession to the throne he had a wife to whom he was tenderly attached. As the wife of his youth, he wished no other. By the precept of the Koran and the accordant law of the Empire, on becoming the Sultan he was compelled to divorce the wife of his sole attachment and take four Georgian slaves. It was the general conviction that this unnatural divorce and official connection preyed on his spirit, and led him to habits which shortened his life; his brother, Abdül Aziz, succeeding him at his death some years ago. A kindred case, so far as the fact of polygamy is concerned, occurred in China some years since. A promising Chinese youth, converted to Christianity, was promoted under the Imperial Government to a position whose perquisite—or encumbrance—was the taking of a second wife. The unnatural connection was, of course, in conflict with both the desire and the religious convictions of the young candidate for office.

These facts present the general law as to polygamy, both in Buddhist China and in Mohammedan Turkey. Such an idea as a *community* of polygamists, we repeat, never was dreamed of in Asia. On the other hand, polygamy is one of the most odious relics of Asiatic despotism,—no more to be tolerated in a country like ours than the plunder and hoarding of any universal privilege. The American people had a specimen of the spirit that such a monopoly

awakens even in the Chinese mind, when a vessel some months since came into San Francisco with a cargo of females designed for the exclusive appropriation of some few lordly merchant princes, whose superior success in money accumulations permitted them to set up as aristocrats. The mob thronged the ship and the carriages that brought up the women into the town; and it required all the nerve and force of a large American police to prevent another seizure like that of the Sabines.

And this calls attention to another fact: the indispensable accompaniment to polygamy, which the ancient Greek historian mentions as a feature of Asiatic custom in certain small and warlike tribes, is a kindred perversion of law on the part of both sexes. Polygamy is, indeed, a two-edged sword. In the Turkish army, while civil and military officers singly appropriate many women, many men appropriate in common one woman.

Here is a fact worthy of special notice: that nothing could be further from the truth than the idea that the pious patriarchs, before the days of Moses, were polygamists. Let the fact be noted, that of all the model men among all the patriarchs, commended during two thousand five hundred years of the world's history prior to Moses, there is but one polygamist to be found; and he becomes such by the fraud of a heathen father-in-law. To the record. The antediluvian history shows a line of ten generations of good men from Adam to Noah, every one of whom are monogamists. In the race descended from Cain even, it is not until the seventh generation that polygamy originates; when the severest of curses is pronounced on its author, and its influence is stated to be the principal cause of the deluge. Generation after generation of pure and true men succeed, among whom no one, from Noah to Abraham, is a polygamist. And it is not in this line alone, down to the era of Abraham, that this fact is true. Job on the Euphrates, and Melchisedek on the border of the Mediterranean, are not living in this practice. Indeed, Abraham was a true monogamist; for his brief and unwilling connection with a servant-woman was induced by the short sighted pride of his own wife, of which she soon bitterly repented. Isaac was the husband of one wife; and Joseph, while prime minister of Egypt, was not compelled, by the then existing court custom, to have more than one wife. Only Jacob, in the long history of two thousand five hundred years, is the husband of two wives; and he,

against his own wish and convictions, is tricked into the union by the fraud of his idolatrous and selfish father-in-law. Where is the honesty of men in reading this ancient history?

A new way this of showing that "the exception proves the rule." One poor, dependent young man, cheated by his avaricious employer, has foisted on him a daughter that he does not choose; and then afterwards marries, at the same suggestion, the daughter he does love. And this single case, met as an exception in a history of twenty-five centuries, proves the patriarchs to be a set of polygamists! If any other history were thus belied, the literary world could not restrain its just indignation.

Now since "custom" makes law, since the "common law" of every country, as of England, is nothing but the collated customs of a people, it is beforehand to be supposed that the *customs* of Asiatic nations as to polygamy find an echo in their laws. There is not, let it be distinctly noted, a single Asiatic code of laws, ancient or modern, that does not make monogamy the rule according to which men ought to live; while it only legislates about divorce and polygamy as abuses to be guarded by law, since the public morals of the day could not wholly suppress them. We cite three instances: the code of Mohammed, published about A.D. 550; that of Moses, given about B.C. 1490; and that of Menu, doubtless of a still greater antiquity.

Here the distinction must be drawn between *polygamy*, or association with more than one wife at the same time, and *divorce*, which is the changing of wives according to the whim of the husband. In confirmation of the truth that polygamy has always been an exceptional practice, and that divorce is unnatural, three facts are worthy of consideration as illustrative of the code now to be examined. First, Jesus Christ condemns divorce in the strongest terms, citing the fact that Adam lived when only one woman existed, so that divorce and remarriage was impossible; while to polygamy he has no occasion to allude as a custom of his day. Again, divorce is now despised by the Mohammedans; and the man who divorces his wives becomes a pest and an outcast from respectable society, since the instinct of all men, in any community, insists that each is entitled to a wife that has not been corrupted by the lechery of a beastly divorcer.

Taking up, then, first, the Koran of Mo-

hammed, we find the Fourth Sura, or chapter, devoted mainly to the laws of marriage; while allusions to its laws are occasionally made in subsequent chapters. It is to be remembered that for nearly twenty years Mohammed had lived the husband of one wife, whom he almost adored; and that it was not until after he wrote this chapter, and when the ambition of Oriental despotism possessed him, that he added other wives to his retinue. Among the Arab chieftains, and among the monarchs of Persia and Egypt, whom he sought to win to his faith, he found men, wedded to their official titles, to be polygamists. Hence, he begins with the primitive history which Christ cited; thus: "O men, fear your Lord who hath created you out of one man, and out of him created his wife." Then, alluding to the practical objection to polygamy, that it makes helpless orphans of the children of all the wives except the favored one, he adds: "If ye fear that ye shall not act with equity towards the orphans, take in marriage of such women as please you, two, or three, or four, and not more. And if ye fear that ye cannot act equitably towards so many, marry one only." Finding also divorce a practice of those who received his religion, he gave this stringent law; even for a divorce permitted virtually in all Oriental countries, from a betrothal made by parents, from which, when grown to maturity, it was certainly legitimate that the parties should be allowed to seek a release. "O believers, it shall be no crime in you if ye divorce your wives, provided ye have not touched them, nor settled any dowry on them. But provide for their temporary necessities what is reasonable; for this is a duty of the righteous. And if ye divorce them before ye have touched them, yet after ye have already settled a dowry on them, then ye shall give them a half of what ye have settled; unless they release any part." The case here is what modern law calls breach of promise; and certainly this law of Mohammed is quite as equitable as any statute of modern times. The fact that these cases are singled out as "no crime" implies that in the view of Mohammed's original law, divorce, after actual marriage, was a crime. That he himself departed from his own law, and that many of his followers, disposed to gratify their *lust*, have departed from it, alters not the fact that the moral sentiment of Asiatics has always, as a rule, anciently and now, regarded divorce, as well as polygamy, a violation not only of the rights of woman,—thus subject in the married relation to an in-

dividual caprice,—but even more, a violation of the rights of men, who feel that no one man is authorized thus to trifle with their common title to a wife uncontaminated.

Thus prepared, we may, perhaps, be ready for an impartial examination of the Mosaic law. Here it is to be remembered that Moses, though brought up as a courtier in Egypt, was the husband of but one wife; and for a reason presently to be cited, at a court where probably polygamy never had existed. It is, then, beforehand unlikely that he would legislate in favor of polygamy. Everything in his law, on the other hand, goes to show that he legislates for monogamists, and them alone. In the first place, the Moral Law, placed at the head of his code and repeated elsewhere in it, is based on the idea, as seen in the Tenth Commandment, that men have but one wife. Beginning with the code proper, whose epitome is condensed into three chapters of Exodus, then reading through the entire body of laws in the Levitical statutes and in the revised code called Deuteronomy, we find hundreds of statutes alluding to the "wife," but *never* to the "wives," of a citizen of the Hebrew commonwealth. Pausing at the statutes relating to inheritance, again we find that they presuppose as truly as does the English Common Law, which rules in the American States, that a man has but one wife; and it would be as impossible to apply the Mosaic code in this particular to a community of polygamists as American jurists find our common law for inheritance inapplicable to the wives and children of Mormons.

There are two or three statutes which Mormon prophets have sought to wrest to their purposes; but these statutes, which might, perhaps, be doubtful if found in the Koran of Mohammed, are clear in the statutes of Moses from the prevailing spirit of the whole as just cited. Thus we read (Dent. xxi. 15-17): "If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born son be hers that was hated, then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born." The inference is here illegitimately drawn that the husband might have two wives at the same time; whereas violations of the spirit of this statute may be found under English and American law, in cases where a widower on second marriage makes favorites, both during life and at his death, of the children of the second wife.

This is made more manifest by the provision recorded Deut. xxv. 5-10; a case illustrated in the history of Ruth, and alluded to in Christ's teachings. From this it is apparent that a younger brother of one betrothed only, but not married, who dies before marriage, and therefore without an heir, should enter into the betrothal engagement of the first-born son and heir to the homestead, so as to prevent a disputed succession under the right of primogeniture. The declining of such a succession and betrothal was regarded only an apparent disgrace, though not a real dereliction from duty.

Strangely enough, the statement (Lev. xviii. 18): "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her lifetime." has been construed into an indication that Moses' law recognized polygamy; as if any other woman than a "wife's sister" might be a second wife during the life of the first. The Presbyterian and some other branches of the Christian Church have thought they saw in this statute the suggestion of danger to a husband's fidelity in the close intimacy into which a wife's sister would be brought during the period of child-bearing; and hence their rule of second marriages drawn from this statute. Certainly this, like the single other disputed statute just considered, gives, when fairly weighed, no ground whatever for the idea that Moses legislated for polygamists. The statutes are clear enough in themselves, aside from the fact that they are part of a code which in all its allusions and special statutes is adapted only to a nation of monogamists.

It may be added that divorce is only three times mentioned in the Mosaic writings; that two of these are mere irrelevant allusions; while the special statute justifies Christ's unanswerable declaration that Moses condemned instead of justifying divorce. The statute is as follows (Deut. xxiv. 1): "When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house." In reference to this, three points are to be observed. The statute is found in Deuteronomy; as the name implies, the Revised Code, written forty years after the original code given on Mount Sinai. As that does not anywhere allude to divorce, there is reason to suppose that the practical experience of Moses led him to give a statute for the protection of society as well as of the

divorced woman. This is more manifest from the fact that the cause of divorce cited is one which would under Christian law either justify a divorce, or at least lead a husband of sensitive spirit to the course suggested, as Matthew states, to the mind of Joseph, the betrothed husband of Mary, before the birth of Jesus. The meaning of this statute as to divorce is made more apparent by the severe judgment (Deut. xxii. 15-19, mentioned just before the statute) of the man who should mis-judge the virtue of his newly married wife. Surely Mormon prophets are too far down in the scale of moral convictions to be intelligent interpreters of the laws of Moses. This becomes yet more apparent when we take up for examination the code of Menu, which there is reason to believe was known to Moses as a student in the colleges of Egypt.

Here a statute of Moses is to be noted, which is a hinging confirmation of the view just taken of the Mosaic code; while at the same time it is an explanatory transition to the Indian code, now to be considered. Even polygamy as the official prerogative of an Oriental king is forbidden by Moses, on the supposition that the Hebrew nation, for whom he legislated, should in future days seek a king. His words are (Deut. xvii. 17): "Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away." Just before Moses had said (Deut. iv. 6-8): "Keep therefore and do them: for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?" This he could not have said unless the Hebrew people, as well as he, were familiar with other nations and other codes.

And now, after this positive statute of the Hebrew legislators against polygamy, even as the prerogative of an Asiatic despot, no fair mind can fail to dispose aright of the practice of David, Solomon, and other Hebrew kings. Their polygamy was just like the exceptional vices of a few truly Christian men in our day. The penalty of this violation of law was sufficiently severe upon David in the revolt of his sons, Absalom and Adonijah, in his own disgraceful conduct and the humiliation it brought, and in the bitterness of his lament

over children ruined by his fault. As for Solomon, his case was a counterpart of that of Abdül Mejid, the late Sultan above alluded to. His sweet "Song of Songs"—so little comprehended by lustful modern minds supposing themselves specially refined—pictures a sincere and deep attachment which he had formed in early youth for Abishag, the Shulamite brunette, who had nursed his father in old age; whom he, like Abdül, could not, as a sovereign, wed, but who had so won his true love that when Adonijah asked her hand his passion was stirred more than if he had asked the kingdom. To that pure and genuine affection, which could hold only one object, his mind turns when in mature manhood he writes: "Rejoice with the wife of thy youth. Let her embrace satisfy thee at all times. Be thou always ravished with her love." To this he sadly reverts when in his harassed old age, with his three hundred wives and seven hundred concubines about him, he pens the exclamation: "One man among a thousand have I found; but one woman among them all have I not found." Of this pure transport of early love it is that in his youth he sings in the "Song of Songs." If any human mind can extract a law for polygamy out of these histories, that mind must be strangely constituted. Americans have too much common sense—it is to be hoped too much high-toned honesty—to be beguiled by special pleading from such cases.

The Laws of Menu, the most ancient code of India, were translated by Sir William Jones at a time when a part of Hindostan was by conquest brought under British sway. The question then arose in the British Parliament whether the people of the conquered province should be subjected to the sway of the English Common Law, or be left under the authority of their own time-honored code. The conclusions of Sir William Jones are, that this code was earlier than that of Moses. The evidence is ample that by commerce and national intercourse India, Egypt, and Assyria were from the earlier times brought into the closest contact; that the Brahmins, one of whom wrote the laws of Menu, ruled in Egypt as well as in India, and that this body of laws was known to Moses when he claimed superiority for his own code. All this, however, is of no present force, except as the laws of the two great sages illustrate each other in the special question here considered. The laws of Menu relate to four classes of men: the Brahmins or sages; the military class, whose head was the king; the middle, or mercantile class;

and the lower, or laboring class. The statutes as to marriage apply to all these classes.

After a chapter on "Education," called the "First Order," the second chapter relates to "Marriage," or the second order. Here the laws of marriage are embodied; and they are also referred to in several succeeding chapters of the code. No statute is found as to divorce. Polygamy is not recognized; though concubinage is referred to as a perversion of the true law of the married relation. The following statutes sufficiently indicate that *monogamy* is the law, divine and human, of this most ancient Asiatic code. As soon as the young Brahmin, says the code, has so studied the Vedas as "perfectly to comprehend them," let him, as a "twice-born man," "espouse a wife of the same class with himself, and endued with the marks of excellence; and let him constantly be satisfied with her alone." As the law of this mutual relation for all classes, the statute is, "Let mutual fidelity continue until death; this, in a few words, may be considered as the supreme law between husband and wife." "Let a man and woman united by marriage continually beware lest at any time, disunited, they violate their mutual fidelity. Thus has been declared unto you the law, abounding in the purest affection, for the conduct of man and wife."

The following is the law laid down for a king even: "Having prepared his mansion for this end, let him choose a consort of the same class with himself, endued with all the bodily marks of excellence, born of exalted race, captivating his heart, adorned with beauty and the best qualities." These are the principles ruling marriage in the purest and best days of the noblest country of Asia, in a code never since abrogated: union to one person, and that for life; fidelity unwavering to one consort; and the rule of all domestic ties mutual affection. Not a word of polygamy or divorce is to be found in this time-honored code.

To confirm all, and yet indicate one point of difference made between the wife and husband, the statute of marriage enjoins that, while the widow, on the death of a husband, shall never "even pronounce the name of another man," it is permitted that the husband, if he "has lived by these rules" of marriage already cited, "having performed the funeral rites of his wife who dies before him, may marry again." Surely the Mormons have little ground for their *Community* of polygamists in either the customs or codes

of ancient or modern Asia. No religion on earth was ever found that denied manifest Divine ordinances, and that outraged all human instincts, natural, moral, and religious, by such a perversion of all the laws of human nature as does polygamy.

Where then, pray, did the Mormons find the sanction now pleaded before an intelligent world for such a profanation? Not even in the Book of Mormon, nor in the law of their own Community, strange as the fact may appear. The Book of Mormon is generally known to have been published from the manuscript of a romance written by a clergyman named Spalding, which, having been left with a printer for some years unpublished, was bought for his purposes by Joseph Smith about 1830, and thus fell into hands that were guided by more of cunning than of shrewdness.

The idea of this clergyman was that the American Indians were descendants of an old patriarchal family mentioned by Moses, which—possessing a knowledge of much of the Mosaic and prophetic writings, as well as a clear promise of the religion of Christ—crossed from the Eastern to the Western continent, and wandered on to the region now known as the State of New York. It is not wonderful that the good pastor, writing to strengthen the faith of his readers in the Old and New Testaments, should have introduced a precept of Mormon, the professed author of this book, binding his people always to

have but one wife. The prohibition, however, was too incidental to arrest the attention of so dull a student as Joseph Smith, and so bookless a manager as Brigham Young. There, however, it stands, to forbid any appeal to "religious scruples" and their "sacred volume" as sanctioning the outrage on humanity in the customs and laws, which this "community of polygamists" have for a generation inflicted upon a few deluded souls.

Where, again, is the "civil law," even of their own enacting, to sustain their practice? It is well urged before the court now trying polygamists, that no statute ever enacted by themselves as an independent State, or as a Territory of the United States, gives any sanction to polygamy. What, then, have these men to plead before any bar, human or divine? Under what constitution or code can they defend their practice?

It is enough to say, in summary, that polygamy never could exist except as the privilege of a despotic aristocracy. In every republic men certainly have an equal right to the one woman for each man which the Creator persistently sees fit to provide. That Constitution which pledges a republican government to each State in the Union must put an end to this worst of aristocracies. Yet again, neither the common law nor any code ever made could legitimate and provide an inheritance for the orphans that in the second generation of Mormondom will be left destitute by their beastly fathers.

STATISTICS OF STATIRA.

STATIRA was the last of a noble race. She was one of those wonderful old New England servants who could do everything, and, like the parson who was "passing rich on forty pounds a year," she was content with one dollar a week, and would take no more.

She was a fixture in our house when I was born, and I remember no childhood without Statira. I have often been told how my beautiful young mother was struggling, as New England housekeepers struggled forty years ago, with those appalling giants—winter, with its unyielding severity; houses in which there were yet no furnaces, and through which scarlet-fever, croup, and consumption wandered at will; spring, with its backward garden; summer, with its unfulfilled promises and its typhoid fever; autumn, with its "pickling and preserving;" and all seasons with their cry, which has continued ever

since, "Help! more help!"—when she found Statira. Plymouth Rock, and Republicanism, and Equal Rights (miserable misnomer) have given us many good things, but they have taken good servants away from us forever.

Often have I been with Statira to the melancholy farm-house where she was brought up. Often have I wondered how the large family were reared in its miserable boundaries, under its incomplete defense against winter's snow and summer's heat, in its atmosphere of utter and hopeless poverty and misery,—and have heard her tell the story of my mother's finding her.

Statira had had a disappointment in love, which meant as much to her as it would have done to an Italian countess, and she was suffering all that cruel disgrace which the people of a rustic neighborhood visit upon the "jilted."