

The remark may be old, but it is new to us. It explains the whole of that exaggerated system of devotion that prompted the stronger sex to cast itself at the feet of the weaker; that system which gave birth to so much heroism and romance and poetry, and over whose downfall we behold Burke sixty years ago, lamenting with eloquent but irrational rhetoric. It seems most natural, if the book which guided the religious sentiments of mankind appeared to give such prominence to a female as that she became the prime object of their worship, that the idea should be extended, and the sex in general should receive part of that homage which one of its number seemed to claim by so high a title. We must not however, conclude, that men thought it necessary to *educate* what they considered it proper to adore. Their notions were not regulated by such ideas of severe reason. They did extravagant homage to women during centuries, without seeing the necessity of rendering them intelligent. It does not at all seem to have struck them as incongruous, that the objects of their chivalrous devotion could neither read nor write. In those primitive times, the mind did not see it to be at all incumbent that the being to whom they bent the knee should possess even moderate knowledge. In those ages then the female sex received homage, but not of that sort that should be acceptable to the feelings of thinking creatures. It seldom occurred to men then to contemplate that there was a mode of regard more real than that which they exhibited, and which would have consisted in cultivating the faculties of the being they revered. Moore, in a poem of great power, displays a region of Oriental worshippers doing the most lowly reverence at the footstool of a veiled prophet, who, when unmasked is seen to be a monster of ugliness and of vice. This is not an exaggerated view of what our forefathers must have been doing, when they were campaigning it through the earth, uttering the most fulsome compliments, and enduring the extremest dangers and hardships, that they might do homage to some female as ignorant and therefore as uninteresting, as one of those that is now found in a harem of Constantinople, or selling oranges at one of our street corners.

The writer makes repeated allusion to the question so much discussed in these modern times, "the rights of women;" but he leaves us in as much doubt as before with regard to their existence or advancement. We are not among those who think the position of women requires either elevation or redress. To our idea she has at the present day every legitimate exercise of her intellectual and social faculties, and the fault is her own, if she refrain from the use of either. She occupies the position which her Creator intended her to fill, that of "help meet to man," the only "right" she should ask for or require; and while the happiness of the wiser and stronger sex is in a great measure in her own keeping, she has the key of an influence and a power, fully as strong as can be deposited in so feeble a hold. We, therefore, consider all the Conventions called, and rant expended to prove that woman is kept in an inferior and degraded state, as absurd in the extreme, and fully agree with the author of the lecture under notice, that education alone is wanting to make the female character of general importance. Among the various departments of literature, in which women have distinguished them-