

probable that women find the fine arts rather easy to reconcile with family duties, compared with literary, scientific or professional pursuits, owing to the large element of mechanical dexterity which enters into them. Save in exceptional cases human life is too complicated, the bringing-forth and bringing-up of human beings too absorptive of time and energy, to permit women to do anything else if they understand their own responsibility. This is true everywhere, but least apparent in crude communities where life is reduced to simple elements. It is part of the crudeness which still persists for good and evil in the United States that thoughtful men and women in large numbers will not accept the limitations here indicated, and persist in the endeavour to place women in politics and education on an exact equality with man. In Europe things are more complicated; the struggle for existence is keener; every waste of energy is guarded with jealousy; and women are kept to their side of the great male-female bargain without half the chance of entering man's domain that is afforded their American sisters. This, however, does not prevent female genius from expressing itself when it occurs in sufficient strength to make itself a place in the world.

Undoubtedly one result of the higher education in its effect on women is to make women more content with celibate life, more exacting in the choice of a partner, and more fixed in refusing maternity if the goal toward which their ambition points runs any risk of being missed by that road. On the other hand it widens their horizon, gives them better conversational powers, and quickens their brains, in whatever sphere they are to move. With proper attention to exercise and rest, there is nothing in the studies at Vassar, Wellesley, Smith, Bryn Mawr, or Wells College,

at Cornell, or any other institution for girls, to harm the pupil. False and antiquated ideas of instruction, if these occur, do not hurt the sister more than the brother. But unquestionably these institutions do not take into account marriage, maternity and housekeeping. The latter are either ignored, or, as grammarians say, "understood"—which in this case generally means that the girl does not understand them at all. They cannot be taught in a college; the previous family life is supposed to have inculcated them. The girl graduate is therefore turned out with a mind brightened by quite another order of things, and finds herself confronted with details which are not easy to reconcile with her studies. If she has shown ability, she will turn to solitary study rather than the frivolities of life; and if the idea of making a name seizes her, she is likely to perceive that only by preserving herself free of the responsibilities of a family can she hope to make her work "tell" in the great arena. College education for girls has thus the two inevitable sides—good or bad, as one chooses to consider them.

In the long run the wife and mother who has been to college will not regret it, though it made her existence bitter while she was adapting herself to the common lot. The studious and introverted girl is made less happy on the social side, but gains constant friends in her books. The woman who has genius or talent finds it easier to reject matrimony, after a college course. So we may at least say that there is more to be said in favour of the higher education of women than against it, notwithstanding many grave charges which have been made with reason by able disputants heretofore.

To co-education such as is found at Cornell, there are many objections. Boys instinctively dislike it, and their