

The Home

The Real and the Fancied

It is rightly said that this is the age of woman. She certainly has been a discovery to some, and they have employed heralds to announce the fact. There is not the slightest danger, at present, that woman will be allowed to hide her light under a bushel. She will not even confine it to the housetop, but will bear it in procession along the thoroughfare.

There are a few women who still believe that every public question requires a little thought, and sometimes even careful study; there are women still so dull as to be puzzled for the answer to public problems even after they have spent thought and study upon them. These women are probably still burdened with the tradition that life is intricate, and that public questions cannot be handled like potatoes, one at a time—each to have its eyes rubbed off, all loose skin removed, and be put down an item by itself.

"What solution have you for the problems we are facing this winter?" was asked of a busy woman, in semi-tragic tones, at a reception given by another woman.

"None," was the answer, in all innocence of the deluge of contempt that would overwhelm her from the questioner at the insufficiency of her reply.

"Not any?" in great surprise, came at last. "Well, you amaze me! I have. If all this money had been put in the hands of women, these questions would have been settled long ago."

"But the best men in the city are struggling with, and only partly solving, the problems; not a few of them even doubt whether they understand how to meet the conditions, whether any of the plans they have helped to formulate are wise, are the best."

"Doubtless that is the state of mind of these men. Let them hand the questions and the money over to the women; they will soon settle the problems. Do you not agree with me?"

"I never have thought that judgment was a question of sex."

A look that would have wilted a grenadier was the only response as this forerunner of her sex turned in indignant silence.

Woman has discovered herself *en masse*. But the intelligent observer discovered her long ago. She took every opportunity offered her for education, and she used every opportunity to apply her education after it was her possession. The year 1893 was her opportunity to show what her education, her training in organization, her belief in her responsibility for the common fame and common good of her country, enabled and compelled her to do. Woman as woman centralized may have been a discovery to some, but woman as a positive influence, a common factor in national development, is not the discovery of a year ago.

She is not a phenomenon, but a human being, who needs education, experience, and natural endowment to use with wisdom the opportunities that come to her. She holds no patent from nature that saves her from error of judgment, nor endowment that frees her from the toilsome years of preparation, if she is to reach the position her true lover sees her filling.



If frankness, loyalty, and honor ought to reign anywhere, it is in the hearts of the children of the Gospel that they should find their seat of empire.—*Le Courtier*.

The Gospel of Giving

By Kate Upson Clark

The more one ponders the teachings of the Gospel, the more one is astonished at Christ's knowledge of human nature. He knew the men of his own day so well that he frightened them; he knows us better than we know ourselves; and he knows the man who will live in centuries to come, in cities yet unbuilt, better than his brother will know him. It was, therefore, to be expected that in his Word we should find, as we do, a clear statement of human duty in almost every conceivable relation, and applicable to the men of every age and country. This is especially marked in reference to the duty of giving. He could not express the case more strongly than when he bids us give because the poor are only a part of himself. "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these little ones, ye did it not unto me." Mohammed has put it in much the same way when he has said: "Allah stands begging of thee when thy brother asketh help."

And yet a writer in a religious journal some time ago advanced the idea that it was wise to check a child who showed an undue desire to give; that it was selfish to give because one liked to, and that such selfishness should be kept well in leash; and that the child who showed an undue appreciation of the benefits of accumulation should not be too severely dealt with.

This would seem like a general admonition to check the exercise of truthfulness, temperance, and loving-kindness, because one derives increasing pleasure from the practice of these virtues. One cannot help reflecting that the child who is miserly at six stands a chance of being infinitely "close" at fifty, and that he should therefore be at six most signally dealt with; and the whole sentiment is utterly against the spirit of the New Testament.

It is possible that over-generosity is the cause of the poverty of "the masses," though this is more than questionable. Whatever may be true of them, however, lavish generosity is not a noticeable fault among the members of our churches. Most of us are deplorably selfish. We keep the best ourselves and give away the fragments. The stingy, well-to-do church member is the bugbear of every pastor.

A distinguished clergyman, of whose veracity there can be no doubt, recently told of a good man in a great city, who, having become launched upon a promising career in early life, determined to cease amassing for himself when he had accumulated fifty thousand dollars, and to give to the Lord all that he made thereafter. The sum he had set for himself was soon gathered together, and during the forty years which had elapsed since then he had given his entire income from his business, which had never been less than sixty thousand dollars per year, to the Lord. This was a truly generous man—and yet he did no more than the New Testament enjoins upon each one of us.

The tenth commandment is just as important, possibly, in its effect upon character, as any other, and yet it is the one of which we hear the least. It would almost seem as though the Bible had been purposely made up without advising men to even a proper care for their own wants and the wants of those who are dear to them, in the knowledge that there was no need for such an injunction. Is there any such passage in the whole Scriptures, excepting that in Tim. v., 8—"But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel"?

On the other hand, look at the array of texts bidding us to give. It is no wonder that Count Tolstoi, and others who interpret literally the commands of Christ, consider it unscriptural to lay up anything for the future, and to provide more than bare necessities for the present.

In the first place, no nation was ever required to give like the Jews. A noted Hebrew student computes that in their various offerings and sacrifices they were compelled to bestow fully one-third of their yearly income upon the Lord. Modern Jews probably give very nearly as much.

Is this the reason why they have been blessed with substance far above any other nation?

Turning to the New Testament, we find it bristling—especially Christ's own teachings, as reported in the Book of Matthew—with commands to give. It would be a work of supererogation to repeat these. They are familiar to everybody. But where do we find such injunctions as: "Do not give too freely. It may please you so to do, but beware of such indulgence. It is only selfishness;" or, "Beware how you get a reputation for generosity, or you will be annoyed constantly by appeals from all sorts and conditions of men"?

There is a singular lack of this sort of texts in the New Testament.

Mr. Howells shows a genuine sense of moral proportion when he makes Mr. Peck say in "Annie Kilburn:" "It is bad for the child to use naughty words and to scratch and bite, but it is worse for her to covet."

Miss Larcom, in her beautiful poem "Shared," wrote:

Rich by my brethren's poverty!
Such wealth were hideous. I am blest
Only in what they share with me,
In what I share with all the rest.

And in the same poem occur the beautiful lines:

Among the immortal gods
Unthrift is thrift.

George Herbert wrote:

Who shuts his hand, hath lost his gold.
Who opens it, hath it twice told.

The Bible and the poets—"the only truth-tellers left to God"—give no quarter to the covetous man; they are full of choice pledges to him who gives.



Practical Philanthropy

Mrs. John W. Sherwood, with a number of philanthropic women of New York, has organized a society in New York having in view the removal to country homes of girls and women who have been employed in factories in this city. The present financial depression has forced many factory-women to consider some other mode of self-support than that offered by factories in the overcrowded cities. The proposed society, "Kind Words," asks the addresses of people in the country who are willing to take untrained servants and train them. The society has organized an intelligence office, and may be reached by addressing Manhattan Athletic Club Rooms, Madison Avenue, New York.

There are many dangers on both sides. Comparatively few girls and women who have earned their living in factories have the slightest knowledge of housekeeping; the very habit of their lives is that of knowing but one thing and doing but one thing, and that without a sense of responsibility.

There are women all over the country who, when they read of the philanthropic efforts that have become a part of the city life, feel that they are living almost without object, because they cannot take part actively in these efforts. If this movement of Mrs. Sherwood's succeeds, every woman, no matter how remote her home from a busy center of activity, will have her opportunity to take one or two girls, and do for these one or two more than can be done by a whole engine of organization, for she will have them under her direct personal influence all the time; she will be able to enforce laws of cleanliness and order until obedience to these laws becomes habit; she will be able to train the intelligence, many times to awaken it; her task will not be easy; it will require rare tact and patience. Women in remote villages and hamlets, who now find it impossible to keep help, would better combine and secure from the city half a dozen or more girls at the same time. The wisdom of this course will be that the girls will have companionship, and the sense of loneliness, which is the greatest burden a city-bred woman feels when forced to live in the country, will, in a measure, be removed. It will take a woman of tact, of deep as well as broad sym-

pathies, to make a city-bred girl, with the habits of factory life fixed, happy and contented in a country home, but it can be done.



Another Library Table

1. Two five-cent pieces, one with an S on it, the other with a B.
2. Some doctor's old day-book.
3. An eye from a dress (without the hook), a toy cart, and a toy hoe.
4. A tart, the letter R, and the figure 8.
5. A tangled skein of twist on a card on which an olive is drawn.
6. A photograph of the wife and children of a minister.
7. A child's red mitt with a deep cuff.
8. The date, March the 15th.
9. A long, slender letter A cut from cardboard.
10. A lamp with the wick burned and oil consumed.
11. Two nut-meats from an English walnut and several silver coins.



A Basis of Contrast

Every citizen is, or should be, interested in the cost of maintaining public institutions for the care of the helpless poor. Under the old system, which gave the managers of insane asylums independence, the cost was over \$206 per capita. Last year, under the management of the Lunacy Commission, the cost was reduced to \$190, and is expected to become still lower. During the last few months the other charitable institutions spending State money have been investigated. The first result obtained by this investigation is that it costs to maintain the five thousand inmates of the several institutions \$271 per capita. To estimate the cost of maintaining an inmate at a charitable institution, rent must be counted in as one item; that is, there must be a basis of per capita calculation on the cost of building, land, and maintenance. The average citizen of New York State enjoys \$556.02 worth of real estate. The average inmate of some of the State charity institutions enjoys \$1,020 worth. This is due to the extravagant buildings. One institution under the care of the State has a gateway that cost \$30,000. Statistics of the National Bureau show that the average American family contains 5.17 persons. The examination into the New York State charitable institutions shows that for the average family to be supported by its own endeavors as the State cares for a corresponding number under its care in its charitable institutions, it must expend, if maintained on the basis of the best managed of these institutions, an average of \$660 per annum; to live at the rate maintained per capita in the worst managed of the State institutions, the average American family would have to spend \$1,550 per annum. The investigation shows that many of the institutions occupy less than 70 per cent. of the buildings erected. This, of course, means unemployed space, extravagance in the matter of heating and lighting, and in many cases of service. More inmates would not require more attendance, more heat, or more light. It is also claimed that large sums are spent in experimenting on methods of education. Were this the only extravagance, the intelligent citizen would be willing to bear his taxation without grumbling, for he well knows that scientific educational experiments on children, whose food, exercise, and bathing can be controlled, offer the best field for useful results—results which will be valuable to all educators. Extravagance in buildings, or in the care of those who often would be happier were they made to contribute, in a measure, to their own support, is intolerable. Whether this investigation will lead to permanent reform is a question which public sentiment, supported by intelligence alone, can decide. It is certain that no argument can be convincing in favor of expending more on the average family supported by the State than can be ex-