

Position of Women.

It is most certain that among the women who have been distinguished in literature, three-fourths have been, either by nature, or fate, or the law of society, placed in a painful or a false position. It is also most certain that in these days when society is becoming every day more artificial and more complex, and marriage, as the gentlemen assure us, more and more expensive, hazardous, and inexpedient, women *must* find means to fill up the void of existence. Men, our natural protectors, our lawgivers, our masters, throw us upon our own resources; the qualities which they pretend to admire in us—the overflowing, the clinging affections of a warm heart; the household devotion; the submissive wish to please, that fools 'every vanity in fondness lost'; the tender shrinking sensitiveness which Adam thought so charming in his Eve—to cultivate these, to make them, by artificial means, the staple of the womanly character, is it not to cultivate a taste for sunshine and roses, in those we send to pass their lives in the arctic zone? We have gone away from nature, and we must, if we can, substitute another nature. Art, literature and science, remain to us. Religion, which formerly opened the doors of nunneries and convents to forlorn women, now mingling her beautiful and soothing influence with resources which the prejudices of the world have yet left open to us, teaches us another lesson that only in utility, such as is left to us, only in the assiduous employment of such faculties as we are permitted to exercise, can we find health and peace, and compensation for the wasted or repressed impulses and energies more proper to our sex—more natural—perhaps more pleasing to God; but, trusting in his mercy, and using the means he has given, we must do the best we can for ourselves and for our sisterhood. The cruel prejudices which would have shut us out from nobler consolations and occupations have ceased in great part, and will soon be remembered only as the rude, coarse barbarism of a by-gone age. Let us then have no more caricatures of methodical, card-playing, and acrimonious old maids. Let us hear no more of scandal, parrots, cats, and lap-dogs—or worse! these never-failing subjects of derision with the vulgar and the frivolous, but the source of a thousand compassionate and melancholy feelings in those who can reflect! In the name of humanity and womanhood, let us have no more of them! Coleridge, who has said and written the most beautiful, the most tender, the most tender, the most reverential things of women—who understands better than any man, any poet, what I will call the metaphysics of love—Coleridge, as you will remember, has asserted that the perfection of a woman's character is to be *characterless*. "Every man," said he, "would like to have an Ophelia or a Desdemona for his wife." No doubt; the sentiment is truly a masculine one; and what was *their* fate? What would now be the fate of such unresisting and confiding angels? Is this the age of Arcadia? Do we live among Palatines and Sir Charles Grandisons, and are our weakness, and our innocence, and our ignorance, safeguards or snares? Do we indeed find our account in being

'Fino by defect, and beautifully weak?'

No, no; women need in these times *character* beyond every thing else; the qualities which will enable to endure and to resist evil; the self-governed, the cultivated, active mind, to protect and to maintain ourselves. How many wretched women for a maintenance! How many wretched women sell themselves to dishonor for bread!—and there is no small difference, if any, in the infamy and the misery! How many unmarried women live in heart-wearing dependence; if poor, in solitary penury, loveless, joyless, unendeared; if rich, in aimless, pitiful trifling! How many, strange to say, marry for the independence they dare not otherwise claim! But the more paths opened to us, the less fear that we should go astray. Surely, it is dangerous, it is wicked, in these days, to follow the old saw, to bring up a woman to be 'happy wives and mothers'—that is to say, let all her accomplishments, her sentiments, her views of life, take one direction, as if for women there existed only one destiny, one hope, one blessing, one object, one passion in existence: some people say it ought to be so, but we know that it is not so; we know that hundreds, that thousands of women are not happy wives and mothers—are never either wives or moth-

ers at all. The cultivation of the moral strength and the active energies of a woman's mind, together with the intellectual faculties and tastes, will not make a woman a less good, less happy wife and mother, and will enable her to find content and independence when denied love and happiness.—Mrs. Jameson.

National Dietetics.

"HIPPOCRATES," says Mr. Warren, "considered diet to be every thing in the cure of all chronic diseases. Afterward came Celsus and Galen, who both admitted the importance of diet in the cure of chronic disease." He affirms that we have the history of scrofula from the time of Moses to the present day, yet no writer in any age or part of the world has so accurately described its symptoms as the great Jewish lawgiver. "One great obstacle to an understanding of the writings of Moses," says Mr W., "is the notion generally entertained that with him originated the laws which he enforced. This is not the case; but the giving of the law at Mount Sinai, consisted of a holy sanction, a divine ratification of that law, in letter, which had aforetime been given in speech only."

"There is great simplicity and clearness in the dietetic precepts which Moses laid down for the people, while those given for the guidance of the priests are somewhat more complicated, but not contrary to the former. Those precepts for the most part are resolvable into these few plain practical maxims: First, to eat no blood, and very sparingly of fat. Second, to eat nought among beasts that divideth not the hoof, and cheweth not the cud. Third, to avoid flesh of certain birds of which universal assent admits the unwholesomeness, as the owl, bat, eagle, hawk, &c. Fourth, to eat no fish that hath not fins and scales.—The diseases of Egypt, as we may easily glean up from Diodorus Siculus, the historian of Egypt, were particularly those which arose from foul and polluting diet. Christians differ from the Jewish dietician in eating blood, swine's flesh, fish without scales and fins, and in some other minor particulars.

"Beside that supply of crude material which the blood receives from the digestive organs, there is derived by means of the absorbents, matter from every internal and external surface of the body, this is frequently of a highly poisonous and destructive nature, and becomes the exciting cause of the most alarming and painful disorders, as typhus fever, small pox, measles, hydrophobia, &c." Mr. W. shows that the Mosiac prohibition of swine's flesh is founded in the nature of things, and is at all times and every where valid; and that the flesh of no animal ought to be eaten after the second day from the time the animal is killed, as flesh is exceedingly deleterious after decomposition begins to take place. The term 'scrofula,' he says, is derived from a term signifying pig. "Among the native Indians of America, the connection of pork eating and glandular diseases is, from mere experience, known and admitted."

"Among the older surgeons and physicians there prevailed a general opinion that the great mass of disease coming under the terms of scrofula, consumption, gout, erysipelas, inflammation, and many other burnings, was dependent upon recondant or peccant humors." By a close observation, and that done by a mind particularly qualified for it, it was found by Abernethy that the prime or original departure from health appeared in most cases to be in the first passage, or stomach and bowels; and thus the first traceable cause of local disease was determined, in the judgment of that gentleman, to be in the organs designed for digestion. "The palpable fact witnessed by Dr. Wilson Philip, is, that disorder of the first passages terminates in local disease." "Dr. Marshall Hall confirms this opinion." "There is indeed a general agreement at this day among scientific men in the opinion that the prime traceable cause of disease is in the digestive organs.

"Moses is of opinion that the cause to which I have alluded, is to be found in the improper food or ingesta, against which he forcibly warned his people, and in this, both ancient and modern physicians virtually agree with him; for the first principle or basis of cure in the diseases alluded to is the management of the patient's diet; this, all contend to be the *sine qua non*, and this opinion has prevailed uninterruptedly since the days of Hippocrates."