

and a broader civil liberty in England added a more general consciousness of right, a general esteem for candor, self-respect, and dignity; together with native English manliness and calmness to the spirit of chivalry. And it is not the religion of the Bible, either directly or indirectly—the foundation and precursor of all true civil liberty. The character of the cavalier was essentially aristocratic; that of the gentleman is rather of a popular cast; showing in this, that it belongs to modern times. The cavalier distinguished himself by his dress—by plume, lace, and cut; the gentleman shuns external distinction, and shows his refinement within the limits of plain attire. Untarnished honor, we repeat, depends in a great measure upon *truthfulness*. Whatever of external courtesy has not its foundation here, is counterfeit. Francis Leiber says the peculiar character which we call the gentleman, is of comparatively late development, and showed itself first, fully developed, with the English people. So far are we then from being indebted to chivalry for that refinement of taste and nice sense of honor, which characterise the true gentleman, and which contribute so much to the comfort and happiness of modern society, that the most rigid scrutiny may be challenged to detect in its spirit and institutions, a single element of genuine nobility of feeling, or refinement of manners. No, we find in these institutions the shadow without the substance—the *sensitive honor* of the gentleman counterfeited in the inflated duelist; his calmness of mind by supercilious indifference, or a fear of betraying the purest emotions; his refinement of feeling, by sentimentalism, or affectation; his polished manners by a punctilious observance of trivial forms. What a pity that writers should attribute the pure and delicious fruits of christianity, to the mimicry and mummery of chivalry. The sentiment, I think, will find a cordial response in every truly polite and refined mind; that, in Him to whom we look for the model of every perfection, we also find the perfect type and patron of courtesy and gentility. Nor does the popular notion that the chivalrous spirit has tended to improve the character and condition of woman, rest upon any better foundation. Woman has indeed been taught to look to those days of gallantry and knight-errantry, as a time when she was peculiarly blessed; when her will was law, and must be obeyed, though at the sword's point.

Little, however, in all this wild and senseless homage, paid to women of the middle ages, presents itself to the discerning mind, that is ennobling to the female character, or cause of congratulation. The whole may be clearly traced to the mad, but refined ravings of a polluted imagination. Even Hallam, himself, who speaks in terms of the highest commendation of chivalry, says that licentiousness was the reigning spirit of the age. It is true, woman's wishes were gratified, but was it because of her intellectual and moral character, which alone constitutes her "a help-mate for man?" or because she was regarded as a pretty pet, which many men of the present day would fight over? She was petted and caressed as inferior, but pretty beings always are. If, however, it be objected, that she was rather worshipped as a superior being, we reply, that so far from her having been regarded by chevaliers as intellectually superior, there is the strongest evidence that she was considered in this respect, and in all other respects, excepting personal beauty, as far inferior to her gallant, so called, protectors. Indeed, the supposed inferiority of woman, in intellectual, as well as in physical strength, may be considered as one of the chief corner stones of the chivalrous fabric. No, the very tendency of chivalry, was rather to degrade than to exalt woman intellectually and morally.

Would that the spirit of chivalry had died with the middle ages; and that woman had then ceased to be regarded as forming a class of beings, separate, distinct, and inferior to man; whether under the appellation of angels, gazelles, or birds of paradise. Could woman see all the deceit that lurks beneath the drapery of etiquette, her voice would not be heard in praising those much talked of graces of chivalry, as illustrated in the polished society of modern drawing-rooms.

Whenever a public speaker, having finished his address to the intellectually human part of his audience, changes his discourse, and begins to use words, and present motives, adapted to the angelic part of his hearers, we find ourselves, in imagination, car-

ried back to the palmy days of chivalry; can almost feel the heaving tide of emotion, as some gallant knight presents his challenge in behalf of his lady-love; and how do our hearts throb with high emotion, as the conviction is over and anon forced upon our minds, that we "rule the world;" that "one woman is equal in influence to half-a-dozen men;" that "no enterprise can be successfully carried forward without the ladies." Surely, have we often thought, after listening to such lofty sentiments concerning our sex, from one, whose character and office raised him above the suspicion of flattery and deception, something will now be done, worthy of our estimated position, for our intellectual and moral training, and a high-way will soon be opened up for us to the fountains and groves of Parnassus; that by appropriate culture and training, our influence may be directed into right and effective channels. No, if ever woman is elevated to the true dignity of her nature, and heaven-appointed sphere, it must be through the religion of the Bible—not through the religion of chivalry. Chivalry had a religion; for man is a religious animal, and will worship. But its religion was so flexible, that it adapted itself to every variety of human passion. How different from the sublime and uncompromising spirit of Bible religion.

It is said by some, that chivalry was only a copy of the christian religion, in gentleness, charity and kindness. If these noble qualities had their seat in the selfish possessions and propensities of the unrenewed heart, and consisted in flattering words and titles, then did they belong to chivalry. But these are the brightest ornaments of christianity, and in vain do we search for them, in their purity and sincerity, in the institutions of chivalry. These whisper peace and pardon to the penitent; breathe consolation to the wanderer; weep over the distresses of fallen man; and may, in their legitimate spirit and influence, be summed up in this one expressive and comprehensive rule, "do unto others as you would they should do unto you."

The religion of chivalry sinks mankind in sensual pleasures; giving a taste for all that is degrading; while christianity elevates the soul in pure communion with its glorious Creator, and gives it a foretaste of heaven.

The age of chivalry was emphatically an age of romance, and whether any direct connection can be traced between the spirit of that age and that of the present, or not, it is quite certain, that to the same origin may be referred the flood of novels and romances, that are now inundating and cursing the world with their sickly sentimentalism—turning the imagination into polluted channels, and giving to life the appearance of a dream; a gay and fascinating one, in which the vices of heroes are presented in such enchanting forms, as to creep slowly and almost imperceptible, "to the very vitals of virtue, and stamp deep stains upon the spotless tablets of innocence." The infamous practice of duelling had its origin in, and is a remnant of chivalry.

Christianity and the spirit of chivalry being antagonistic, as the one advances the other must decline; and when that happy day arrives, in which truth and sincerity, under the benign influence of Messiah's reign, shall have regained their dominion in the human heart, then shall honor and courtesy become living verities; and woman shall again assume the position in which her Creator placed her—the intellectual companion of man.

---

ON EDUCATION.—I think we may assert, that in a hundred men, there are more than ninety who are what they are, good or bad, useful or pernicious to society, from the instruction they have received. It is on education that depends the great difference observable among them. The least and most imperceptible impression received in our infancy, have consequences very important, and of a long duration. It is with these first impressions, as with a river, whose waters we can easily turn, by different canals, in quite opposite courses, so that from the insensible direction the stream receives at its source, it takes different directions, and at last arrives at places far distant from each other; and with the same facility we may, I think, turn the minds of children to what direction we please.—Locke.