

tions from doctors of divinity. They move on with calm, irresistible strength; and those who do not choose to join in them are soon left in the rear.

Dr. Crosby rather uncharitably insinuates that those who are urging an improvement in the Presbyterian service are disloyal or treacherous friends to that church. I reply, they are its very best friends. They desire to increase the strength and beauty in her sanctuary. They wish to augment her power to retain her own children, instead of leaving them to wander off to other folds. They wish her to keep up with the march of all true ecclesiastical and religious improvement. Why should Dr. Crosby's congregation worship in a church the superfluous ornamentation of which perhaps doubled the cost of the building? Simply because an improved taste and science in public architecture demanded it. Why should they not then equally yield to the demand for something warmer and richer in worship than the "bare" routine which they have inherited from the time of the Westminster Assembly?

I agree entirely with the distinguished writers in the March CENTURY in their estimate of Dr. Shields's scheme for a union of all Protestant denominations on the basis of a common liturgical worship. I read that article with a degree of interest until I came to the writer's sovereign panacea for the distractions of Christendom; when my admiration suddenly changed into a feeling of rather comic surprise. "No union on doctrinal grounds possible." I fancied we were tolerably united on that basis already. "No union on the ground of a common church government." True enough; nor is that necessary to a vital church unity. What then? Why, that, retaining each our own doctrinal diversities, running from low Arminianism to Supralapsarian Calvinism, retaining all our differences in church order, from low independency to high prelacy, we should make one church by agreeing to use the same prayer-book! I felt much as Doctor Faustus felt at the disproportionate outcome of the swelling and elephantine poodle behind his stove: *Das also war des püdel's kern? Der casus macht mich lachen.*

Any scheme of union among Christians which implies that the Presbyterian Church is to modify in the slightest degree her polity or constitution, with a view of approaching the platform of Episcopacy, is in the highest degree absurd. The Presbyterian Church is unalterably Presbyterian. She has not the least desire to unite herself in any outward way with the Episcopal communion. Whenever, let me hospitably say, the latter is sufficiently tired of her isolation to take Dr. Franklin's advice, given her just a century ago, and "turn Presbyterian," there is room enough for her in the ample bosom of the *μεγαλήν Ἐκκλησίαν*.

No possibility exists of organic union in any other way. But in perfect consistency with this the Presbyterian Church may go on improving her cultus in the line of her own history and traditions. Calvin, Melancthon, Luther, John Knox, all approved of and practiced liturgical worship. The Westminster divines have left us ample directions for public prayer, which, with a few connectives, make up a liturgical form. Stephen Marshall, in reporting to the assembly this part of the directory, expressly recommended it on that ground. The fathers of the American Presbyter-

ian Church, and especially the eminent Dr. Greene were, many of them, favorable to forms of prayer; and antedating all this, going back to the very origins of the church, we find in the "Didache of the XII. Apostles" (which Dr. Schaff assigns to a period not later than A. D. 100) the union of the simplest Presbyterianism with liturgical worship. In the Didache there is no threefold ministry. The only ordinary church officers recognized are bishops (or presbyters) and deacons; and side by side with this simple Scriptural organization appears a full liturgical form for the celebration of the Eucharist, and the injunction that the Lord's Prayer should be thrice repeated each Lord's Day. This should be quite sufficient, so far as authority goes, for any friends of improvement in the worship of the Presbyterian Church.

AUBURN, N. Y.

Samuel M. Hopkins.

Shall Women go to College?

THE "previous question," fundamental to the whole subject of the education of women, so central that the least divergence there will emerge as a large difference of view as to the usefulness of giving women a liberal education at all, is the question — to state it baldly and flatly — *What is woman for?* Has she, that is to say, an independent significance in the universe, such as man is assumed to have; or has she only a subordinate and merely accessory relation to him? It is useless to expect any agreement on the more superficial question of women's education between persons who hold the two opposite views of this underlying question. These two opposite views are:

1. That woman is for herself and for the community; for man, no doubt, but only in the same sense that man is for her. This view implies that the natural relations between the sexes in civilized society are relations of equality. However much they may be relations of difference and division of labor, the difference does not depend on any natural distinction in grade of intelligence, nor the division of labor involve any distinction in grade of education. It implies, in short, that one sex has just as much individual significance in the universe as the other. This may be called the modern view. It is, however, even in modern times, only the view of the most enlightened nations; and in those nations a view chiefly confined to the best-educated communities; and in those communities not apt to be the view of persons wholly unaccustomed to the society of superior women. For this is emphatically one of those subjects on which the old adage is true, that "seeing is believing."

2. That woman is for man, as subordinate and accessory. This may be called the mediæval, Asiatic, or Miltonic view. It implies that the unit and center of this world is man. The air was created for him to breathe, the herb of the field to furnish him sustenance, the beast thereof to do his bidding; and among these conveniences a bountiful Providence added woman. There have been many varieties of this general view, from that which admits that woman has a soul, and regards her as man's vizier, or housekeeper, or adviser in chief, down to that which regards her as his mere slave and drudge. Practically, all these varieties of the Miltonic view have a tendency to reduce themselves to the last. Theoretically, however, they usu-

ally take the form of regarding her in the conveniently ambiguous light of a "helpmate"—actual wife-beating not being popular, at least in this country, among the native population.

Even on this theory of the subordinate "helpmate," it would seem worth while so to educate a woman that she should be a "mate," and capable of "helping," in the higher activities of thought as well as in the lower ones of frivolity or drudgery. But the more radical question is, why should the man be assumed to be the unit, and the woman his "helpmate," any more than the reverse arrangement? Those who quote the Old Testament to support this view should remember that the same authority has been quoted, as every one knows, to sustain human slavery in its more obvious form; yet we have taken the liberty of extirpating that from modern civilization. Is it not time to admit in plain terms, since we have already admitted it in so many institutions of society, that the one sex has equal significance in the world with the other? To suppose that one sex is the integer, and the other a mere cipher having no value except as appended to it, is simply one final relic of barbarism. The unit of civilized society is not the man, or the woman,—it is the family. It is no more the chief end of woman to glorify man and serve him forever, than it is man's chief end to sustain that relation to her. It is her privilege, doubtless, to be the mother of his children; but is it not equally his privilege to be the father of hers? The higher any community rises in the scale of civilization, the more do men and women become equal "mates," equally "helpers," in the family and community life.

To both sexes, then, and to both sexes alike, the important thing in youth is that the mind should be helped to attain to its best possibilities. It belongs not to man's rights nor to woman's rights, but to human rights. The birthright of each—whatever the obstacles to laying hold of it—is a complete intelligence. And certainly the burden of proof lies with any one who asserts that the course of liberal culture productive of educated men would fail to produce educated women. Vague reference to some mysterious "difference" between the male and the female mind is of no value in supporting such an assertion.

It needs to be shown in what precise region of the mental faculties any given branch of liberal study would fail to form and inform a woman's mind as it does a man's. It would be interesting to know, for example, just what corner of the intellect would be affected differently in the two sexes by, say, algebra, or English history, or the science of astronomy.

To insist on definite statements in this way from the opponent of a liberal education for women, would be to discover in many cases that the wish is father to the thought. He is compelled to admit, at last, that he has no desire to see women completely rational. If he does not quite say frankly, as an intelligent foreigner once said to the writer, "Sometimes it is not good that a woman should know too much; it makes trouble in the family!" yet he evidently is apprehensive of some indefinable danger from the tendency of modern ideas on this subject. His fancy seems to cling to the primitive ideal of the silly and adorable thing, whose confessed inferiority mingles an element of self-complacency in his devotion.

What the exact ideal of a woman is, in the minds of

those who express such fears, we do not see distinctly stated. It is doubtful if they would like to state it in plain English, even in the bosom of their families; perhaps there least of all. But this ideal may be inferred from the character of the education to which they seem to look for its production. This mild form of education, favored by those who fear the effect on the feminine mind of the too robust college course, calls for courses of study somewhat tenderer and prettier, and especially somewhat easier. They are apparently expected to produce a fair being equipped about as follows. Her disposition should be soft and pillowy. Her will, or any rudiment of it that may have begun to show itself, should have been gently caused to disappear. Of the intellectual powers, perception would probably have been cultivated to whatever limited extent it is absolutely required in good society, but not to a degree that would force on her attention any facts unsuited to her sphere. The judgment would have been delicately stimulated, but not to any revolting extent. The memory would be expected to be well developed, as being convenient in housekeeping, but coupled with a certain felicity of forgetting any little matters that would not conduce to domestic peace. In the region of the feelings, the regulation of this special feminine education would be truly difficult. For, while sensibility in general would be the strong point in the highly specialized femininity, there are obviously certain feelings which she should not be permitted to have, even though surgery in the cerebral lobes were required for their extirpation,—the desire of knowledge, for example, or the aspiration after intellectual enlargement, or the sense of justice, or the desire of power. But the sweet sensibilities should be hers; the hunger for approbation and applause; the capacity for gazing upon sublime objects, notably upon the males of her household, with wonder, love, and awe.

Happily this is not the only extant ideal of what a woman should be. There is another ideal; one that has perhaps existed from the beginning of civilized history; one that certainly now exists in an increasing number of minds. It is the ideal of a woman having all the mental endowment that the most fully equipped man has ever had; and having this "capability of godlike reason," not latent, but trained by the most thorough-going education to complete activity. It has made it the easier for the world to retain this ideal, that all along, in spite of prodigious hindrances, it has persisted in revealing itself as an accomplished fact.

For those, then, who are disposed to believe that not one sex merely, but the human mind in general, is intended to be intelligent, the question arises, Is a college education, in the case of women as of men, the best available means to that end?

Underlying this inquiry, also, there is a "previous question" which needs to be asked and answered before we can see just where we stand on this matter of the college training. It is the question, *What is a college for?* This question is seldom raised, because the discovery is not often made that we differ upon it. But if we will take the trouble to look closely, we shall find that precisely upon this point there is the greatest diversity of opinion.

Many seem to suppose that the purpose of a college is to fit a man—being as he is—for some special pursuit. Its true purpose, on the contrary, is to take

the crude material of a man and make of him far more than he is, or ever would have been without some such liberal culture. It aims to determine, not what the man shall get in this or that pursuit, but what he shall be, whatever his pursuit. It proposes not merely that the man shall get a living, but that he shall get a life. The notion that the purpose of a college is to fit a man to get the greatest amount of money or reputation in the least amount of time in some particular occupation, belongs with that whole Philistine view which regards existence as only a vulgar "struggle" after political preferment or other squalid prize, and which looks upon education therefore, as but a sort of Fagin's training for this "struggle of life"; whereas, in fact, if a liberal culture has any one end more marked than another, it is to lift a man above the desire or the necessity for any such feverish and selfish "struggle." It sets before him higher aims. It makes it seem shameful and contemptible to "struggle" for the office or the reputation which should seek the man, not be "struggled" for by him. It equips him with powers that make the getting of an honorable living, or of respectable position and influence in the community, too easy a matter to seem very exciting as the prize of a life-long "struggle." If the purpose of a college were to fit a man for some one of three or four special pursuits, there might be an argument against the admission of women to college, in the assumption that these pursuits are unsuited to women. But the colleges would never have been any such power in the world as they have been and are, had they been built on that narrow basis. Their purpose is to give a man, as a preliminary to any or all occupations, that complete intelligence, that breadth of power and inner resource, which no special training ever could furnish; which, in fact, both a narrow special training and the special pursuit afterward, in our system of extreme division of labor, must (to the apparent present gain of society, no doubt, but to the loss of the individual) oppose and curtail. All the more need that, to begin with, the man should be broadly educated, no matter what bread-occupation shall claim and confine him afterward. The college courses have grown out of the instinctive hunger for this complete intelligence. They consist, therefore, not of occupative, but of educative studies. These studies have been chosen — and still are retained, notwithstanding the complaints of persons who seem impervious to this point — not so much with reference to their being convenient to the man hereafter in one or another pursuit, as with reference to their being necessary to him now, while still capable of organic mental growth, in that nearly miraculous change from a raw youth to an educated man. If, for example, the *literæ humaniores* are still retained in college courses, it is from a settled conviction, based upon both theory and experiment, that these studies are best fitted to "educate the man."

There can be, then, but one rational answer to our second question. The purpose of a college is to produce, first of all, a completely intelligent mind. It is a preparation, not for this or that special profession, but for the great common profession of living the intellectual life, no matter by what particular occupation this is to be maintained.

What is there, now, in woman's nature or woman's natural pursuits that should debar her from the privi-

lege of such mental development? Is reasonableness a different thing in the two sexes? Is intelligence a word of two genders? When we have once come out of the Asiatic view of the natural insignificance of half the human race, it is a little hard to see why the son should be instructed and the daughter left ignorant; why the husband should be a philosopher and the wife a fool. If a one-sided and cruel custom as to this matter has come down to us with all the absurd sacredness of a long ancestry, it is time now to do away with it. A woman should claim from life a completely developed intelligence, and life should claim it from a woman, no less than in the case of a man. She needs it as a wife no less than he as a husband. They need it equally as parents. It belongs to them alike, as members of the community, as makers of public opinion, as readers, thinkers, and writers, as partners in the common business of living.

And if it be agreed that it is as undesirable for one sex to be left ignorant and feeble-witted as for the other, and that the college course is, to say the least, one good way to prevent this, the remaining question is, *Shall the two sexes get this college training together?*

It certainly would seem natural and reasonable — unless some very serious objection to it is discovered — that the two sexes, growing up together in the family, studying together in school, associated together all the rest of their lives in the work and play of society, should also receive their liberal culture together. It would seem an obviously unwholesome contrivance that should, for this single period of four years out of a lifetime, compel an artificial separation into two flocks: a scholastic monastery on the one hand, a scholastic nunnery on the other. As if history had not plainly enough declared the results of such unnatural contrivances! And the question forces itself on the mind, Is not this whole superstition of a separate sex education a relic of the dark ages? Is it not a part of the mediæval plan of shutting women up in towers; a modified form of the Mohammedan custom of forcing them to muffle up their heads, or peer out upon the world with one eye?

Our conservative friends who still hold to some modified form of this mediæval and Asiatic view of "woman's sphere," have been able to retard the progress toward a full education for women, at complete or co-education colleges, by several ingenious objections.* One such objection, quite plausible some years ago, before the experiment had been thoroughly tried, was the fear that the health of young women would suffer by attending a complete college. It is too late to make this pretext prosper now. Experience has shown that a college is a peculiarly healthy place for young women. The fear that the use of the brain would endanger the health belonged with the old notion that an ignorant person has a better chance for life than an educated one. It was a notion that easily arose in simple minds. The brutes were seen to be healthy; "argal," the nearer a man could keep to the level of the brutes the better.

* Let us do justice to the usefulness of a conservative opposition during any reform. It would have been a misfortune if co-education had suddenly become the fashion, so as to drift a multitude of frivolous young women, without earnest aims or solid preparation, into the colleges. It was well for college faculties to learn gradually, by a few isolated instances, the impossibility of harboring any such class of persons.

Those who have sustained the prodigious toils of the college course in comparative safety, will not be likely to take these perils of brain-activity too seriously. They will be disposed to agree with the doctrine of the physiologists, that the brain, like other organs, is meant to be used. Not only is its use not detrimental to health, but it is conducive to health. It should not be overworked, neither should the muscles; but it should not be left torpid any more than the lungs or the liver. Thought is as natural and wholesome an activity as breathing is. And if for the one sex, it is difficult to see why not for the other.

At all events, the stubborn fact remains that the young women in complete colleges, where the two sexes pursue together a course of liberal study, enjoy excellent health. They are good eaters, good walkers, free from morbid states of either mind or body, cheerful, animated, industrious. Why should they not be, with their "plain living and high thinking," their regular habits, their freedom from the alternate excitement and *ennui* of society life? The daily contact with high-minded teachers; the dignified plane of occupations; the natural, open-air relations with fellow-students; the busy intellectual interests of the place,—these are all guarantees of physical as well as spiritual health. It is certainly a life that contrasts favorably, in both these respects, with either the feverish emptiness of the fashionable world, the dull home-life of "quiet families," where ideas do not greatly penetrate, or the bovine existence of the illiterate country girl.

One element of culture, at least, can never be gained elsewhere so well, either by man or woman, as in a great college of both sexes; an "element" of culture that might better be called its very soul. It is the breaking-up of provincialism; the learning of the existence of the other point of view; the perception of the common human egotisms and limitations, and so the inference of one's own. And one final provincialism of the mind there is, which a unisexual college certainly never would have any power to eradicate; it would rather have an influence to strengthen its growth. It is the provincialisms of the exclusively sex point of view itself. It is the tendency, that is to say, characteristic of the crude and brute condition of both men and women, to see in the opposite sex only an opposite sex.

No one has any business with this subject who fails to appreciate its gravity. It is not a question to be treated flippantly or dogmatically. The whole matter is still in the stage of experiment, and it is one of those experiments that need careful handling. But we are already in a position to see that many supposed risks attending co-education were fanciful, not real. Its difficulties and dangers may almost be said to resolve themselves into a single one—a great one, but it may be and has been met. It is the danger that, through some easy shifting of responsibility, or some happy-go-lucky good-nature, the college will suffer itself to be a mere play-ground for idle and frivolous young men and women.

If it is to attempt to be a complete college—that is to say, a complete family—it must throw to the winds the sentimental idea that anybody, no matter what his or her morals, manners, pursuits, or purposes, must be permitted to dangle about the institution indefinitely. Its governing body must stand *in loco parentis*, at least

to the extent of excluding flirts and other fools, of whatever age or sex, both from the students and (let us dare to say) from the faculty. And be it always remembered that, in this matter of co-education at least, no college can hope to succeed with a cartilaginous backbone in its highest official position.

We have alluded to one embarrassment in discussing this question of co-education. It is, namely, the disposition in the opponents of the modern idea to escape the frank expression of their fundamental objection to it. Other reasons are put forward by them, such as anxieties concerning health, morals, etc.—anxieties wholly unsupported by the results of actual experiment—when the real point often is that they do not heartily approve of the thorough education of women anywhere, or by any plan. So that it would always be as well, before wasting breath in a discussion of ways and means, to get a categorical answer to the blunt inquiry, "Do you believe in women's knowing as much as men, anyway?"

But there is a second embarrassment. It lies in the fact that the most influential opposition to co-education, after all, is not open to any reasoning whatever on the subject. For it is an open secret, to those who are familiar with the really dominant forces in our great educational establishments, that the power behind the throne is not altogether an intellectual, but partly a social power. It consists, namely, in the instincts, the prejudices, the convictions—if we choose to dignify them by that term—of those estimable leaders of the best academic society, who are accustomed to a social supremacy based on quite other sorts of prestige, and who naturally shrink from the inauguration of a new régime. This conservative social power is armed with many gentle ferocities for both male and female reformers, and will be apt to yield but very slowly to the march of events and ideas.

What the condition of human affairs will be when they shall have, not as an exception in a privileged class, but as a rule in all classes, the advantage of two completely intelligent and rational sexes, instead of one, it is impossible accurately to know; but that the world will then enjoy a more symmetrical and steady progress, it seems safe to predict.

E. R. Sill.

The Labor Question.

WHAT is called the Labor Question is a question of fact. Is the laborer's condition better now than formerly? Are the real wages of labor larger at the present time than they have been in past times? Will the average annual earnings of the man who works for wages to-day purchase for him a larger amount of the necessaries of life than the average annual earnings of the man who worked for wages in any given past time would have purchased for him?

This question is vigorously discussed by economists and statisticians, especially in England; but it is so large a question, and points of comparison are so often unfairly taken, that the conclusions reached are sometimes misleading.

The condition of the English laborer, as history shows, has been greatly affected by political and social changes. At some periods he has been in far better case than at others. Within the memory of men now living the degradation of the workingmen of England