

draw on the same fund of nervous energy, which is not sufficient to feed both; and a man exhausted by study requires relaxation, not toil. Some people seem to fancy that the labour of the hands alone is worthy of the name, and that there is something despicable in working with the brain; they might as well despise an engraving tool for not being a ploughshare. That university graduates will go back to the farm seems, under the present conditions of society, to be a dream.

8. Lastly, there is co-education. The University of London has admitted women, not without strong opposition by a part of its governing body; but the University of London, as has been already said, is nothing but an examining board. Oxford and Cambridge have undertaken the examination of women who wish to become teachers; they have always allowed every one, whether students or not, and without distinction of sex, to attend the public lectures of professors; but they still hold out against the admission of female students, though Cambridge is closely besieged by an outpost of the invader, Girton College, planted at its very gates. Every engine is plied, appeals are made not to reason only, but to sentiment, and enforced by a gentle intimidation, to which those who cherish a reputation for liberalism especially are apt to yield. Clearly enough not only this special question, but the more general and far graver question as to the future relations between the sexes, is likely to be settled by other influences than that of argument. Nature will break a settlement which reason has not dictated; but the experiment may cost us dear: we may find that it is possible to unmake women, though it is not possible to make men.

That the education of women ought to be high we are all agreed. But unless the functions of the two sexes are the same, high is not necessarily male.

If the function of men, as a sex, is labour, that of women maternity and the management of a household (and it is difficult to see how the species can be preserved under any other arrangement), the presumption is in favour of some corresponding difference in final education, and there can be no illiberality in assigning to each sex that which it needs, not that which it does not need. If the two are destined by nature to be complements of each other, to train them up as competitors is not large-mindedness but folly. The wealth of marriage will certainly not be increased by the change. No man or woman can master the whole circle of knowledge and accomplishments; the more diverse, therefore, the acquirements of the two partners, the richer the union will be. Thoroughgoing radicals spurn the idea that the interest of wedlock is to be allowed to regulate these questions; but they will find themselves in collision with very deeply-rooted prejudice. Physiological questions we leave to physiologists, who are certainly not unanimous in pronouncing that the full male burden of intellectual labour can be safely imposed on the future wife and mother. The danger would of course be greater under the competitive system of examination at Oxford and Cambridge than under the system which prevails in the United States. But it is hardly conceivable that the feelings of young men and young women towards each other in England should undergo such a change as to admit of their competing against each other. Nor are there many who would wish to awaken in the breasts of women the feelings which rivalry awakens in those of men, and which, it must be allowed, are a drawback on the good effect of the prize. No cast-iron rule need be laid down: our system must be framed not for Mrs. Somerville or Miss Martineau, but for women as a sex.