

Editor's Easy Chair.

MAIN difficulty with the Eternal Womanly has always been that she has to be temporally provided for. The care falls not only upon her, but upon her brother, the Secular Manly, who has a good deal to do in looking after himself in a sphere where he finds her intruded while awaiting her apotheosis. He does not complain of it; she is an agreeable guest, and he has a fine faith in the poet's notion that she will draw him beyond, draw him onward and perhaps upward, when she goes. But it is natural that he should be somewhat excited in looking out for her wants and tastes, and imagining occupations and amusements for her; and not unnatural that in certain circumstances he should be willing to let her do something to pay for her board. Where she greatly outnumbers him, as in the State of Massachusetts, it is almost inevitable that he should be so; and what was at first an unhandsome necessity of the case has become not merely a virtue of it but a grace. Women are there as well educated as men if they like. Elsewhere they are coeducated at least, and everywhere the modern will and deed has been to make them as independent as they could wish; sometimes, more independent.

I

It is the fatality of every good to present itself, for purposes of identification, as it were, together with its opposite evil, and woman's independence has now gone so far that it impeaches the value of her education. The very agents of her tremendous intellectual development are beginning to feel a subtle mistrust of their work in the presence of its attendant disadvantages, which the least and first of is that it has made her too wise if not too good, and so too unwholesome, for human nature's daily food. If we are to believe some of the scientific witnesses, civilization is finding the woman of the higher education the most indigestible morsel which it is obliged to assimilate; and the mere critical observer of its lighter society aspects has noted that they want a perfect gayety from the fact that the girls seem to know more, or at any

rate to have read more, and are altogether brighter and quicker, than the young men they meet. They make the best of it, poor things: they adapt their conversation to these lower minds, and their behavior to these ruder tastes. They not only dance gladly, but they golf, they paddle, they bathe, they ride, they climb with these inferior natures; they camp and cruise with them when they can; in the last resort they marry them.

The last resort is not ordinarily the summer resort, where the spectacle of the numerical disparity between the sexes is much more dramatic than it is in the census, and is adverse to the final mating. The intellectual, or cultural, disparity is doubtless not really so great; at any rate, in the sympathetic vacuity, the wide, generous inanity, in which the summer resort conditions all life, it is not so noticeable. But even there it is impossible not to feel that the young girls, not to mention the old girls, who swarm in the ideal proportion of sixteen to one upon the undergraduate youth and post-graduate age of the other sex, are their hopeless superiors; hopeless, in what a dark, double sense!

It is grotesque, of course, and one smiles, but it is tragical, and the question as to what shall be done with the women, or what they are going to do with themselves, is palpitating in the thoughts of many who are most reverent of the problem. The cold science of statistics represents that only about one out of three, or four, or five, educated or coeducated women marry, and of these as few again become mothers, or, if they do, survive the cares and duties of maternity. Perhaps because in such an inquiry one can proceed only by exclusions, the statisticians do not seem to concern themselves with the uneducated, or unco-educated woman, and we do not know what proportion of these become wives and mothers. It is not credible that the multitudes who toil in mills, and fag in factories, or wear their young womanhood out in shops, have a hopeful outlook in matrimony and maternity; but their case seems to be set aside, or postponed to

the consideration of what civilization has accomplished in the case of those women for whom it has done its best, not its worst. This is apparently so little, or so mistakenly much, that the old doubt whether women should be allowed to learn the alphabet is forcing itself into the foreground again in different amiable disguises; and we have prismatic glimpses of the educated woman as she presents herself to the serious doubt or the polite despair of some who have helped most to make her what she is, whether they would or not.

This is saying it roughly, and we must wish to refine still farther as to the involuntary part that the educators of the educated woman have had in her education. They are not singular in largely accepting a tendency and serving it, rather than devoting themselves to an ideal. Men work with what is at hand; and tendencies are often on the ground, while ideals are almost as often in the air. It is only some original thinker who has the courage or the fear to question the tendencies as well as their effects, and we have had to wait till a very few months ago for such a thinker in the president of Clarke University, who then opened his mind to a reporter in abhorrence of the actual method of woman's education.

II

We need not suppose that Dr. Stanley Hall is perfectly represented in the interview which resulted. No one ever is, in any interview, however faithful; for those who think closely think pen in hand; and the interview is a net which lets slip many precious things that one would have said, and keeps much rubbish that one did say. But upon the whole the quality of the interview with Dr. Hall is so good that we may suppose it largely his mind upon all the matters treated. These were the present methods of teaching by text-books, and the methods of instruction or of suggestion by the teacher himself, which ought to replace the books; the cart-before-the-horse system of giving the reason of things first instead of the things; the non-literariness of all schooling; the mistake of teaching boys and girls together after they cease to be boys and girls; the failure of women's colleges because the education they

provide does not include the strength for wifehood and motherhood; the physical break-down of most educated American women with the birth of one child; the small families that are now the rule among Americans.

Napoleon, as we all know, told Madame de Staël (she perhaps needed the snub) that the mother of the most citizens was the greatest woman. He was always anxious, the dreadful little man, that the provision of *chair à canon* should not fail him, and doubtless there was earnest in his irony. Of course Dr. Hall's opinions accuse him of no such insolence or inhumanity; they are, on this point, so far from solely his that they may be considered apart from his other ideas.

He will certainly not be inculcated by any denial of the exclusive virtue of large families, which were so well in their way and their day. Much may still be said in their praise, as that the children in them helped to bring one another up and to take the nonsense out of one another. They enlarged the boundaries of the home, which, however, did not perish with them in this intensely domesticated nation, and they were the fulfilment of a scriptural injunction. But if, as John Fiske so luminously taught, the prolongation of infancy in the tender vigilance of its guardians is the nursery of civilization, then the small family is better for the race; for every child in it can receive that devoted care which every child has a sacred right to from those who called it out of the cosmic unconsciousness into this being, pleasing or anxious, or both, as the witness chooses.

In any case, the small family has apparently come to stay, and so far as it is involuntary it may be a farther fulfilment of the divine purpose, a refinement upon the simple, crude obedience of the large family, which often made an inadequate drudge of the mother, even when an eager one, and a hopeless slave of the father, even when a happy one. In spite of all the cant and all the conscience about it, there are no signs of its coming back. The substitution of the old-fashioned hearth and brass andirons for the gloomy stoves of the early small-family period failed to effect the recall of the large family; a scattering child or two gathers before the open fire, as beside the air-

tight stove, and hangs its solitary socks at Christmas from the chimney-piece where once a score or a dozen dangled. A few enthusiasts in the cause have succeeded in restoring here and there a fleeting resemblance of the large family of the colonial times, or the first years of the republic, just as they popularized the reproduction of claw-footed furniture; but one feels a touch of amateurishness in their work; it is a pose, a fad; and it is safe to say that unless the State can abolish want, or the fear of want, or society can make itself less agreeable to young married people, the American large family must remain a thing of the past.

But why should the "girls' colleges educate primarily and chiefly for motherhood," as Dr. Hall is said to have said? Should the boys' colleges educate primarily and chiefly for fatherhood? The notion seems to be the same in both cases, and in either form a little offensive. It is more than a little grotesque in the case of the girls' colleges, and ignores the actual conditions with what seems at the last a touch of cruelty.

Girls' colleges were imagined measurably out of dissatisfaction with the young ladies' schools that taught the accomplishments; but still more largely they arose from the sad sense of the necessity, the generous perception of the propriety, of qualifying girls to earn their living with their heads, since they were too proud to earn it with their hands, and seemed to have a lessening chance to earn it with their hearts. Now when that chance has dwindled to the vanishing-point for so many more of them, shall they be bidden go to, and get ready to be married, as the main end and aim of their education? "First catch your hare," the thoughtful author of the recipe for juggling it premised; and the girl who has no hope of the husband in the bush cannot be expected to qualify herself to meet the exigencies of wifehood and motherhood as she who has him in the hand. To require this of her as a chief and primary part of her education is to insult her modesty, to wound her just pride of self-helpfulness, and to suggest as unwholesome an ideal as could well be. Words either mean something or they mean nothing, and the inevitable implication of any such require-

ment is that the mind of the student shall be fixed upon her bridals instead of her books. The consciousness of it must spread electrically from the teachers to the taught, and the girls' colleges, however vigilantly kept against man, must become as rife with the purposes of matrimony as the worst enemies of any co-educational institution imagine it to be.

It can be said that this is in the scheme of Nature, who demurely winks her other eye at all attempts to keep the minds of the sexes off each other, and that it is well authoritatively to recognize that men and women are in the world for their reciprocal sakes, and that they should be strong and well, no less than learned and wise, in their mutual interest. But besides objecting that the burdensome consciousness of the fact should be left altogether to the women, we wish to make the friends of this ideal observe that we are facing conditions in which it would be ludicrous and oppressive to realize it. After a girl's education has chiefly and primarily fitted her for wifehood and motherhood, and she suddenly finds herself in a world where there is little, and seems to be less and less, marrying and giving in marriage, would not she think it had been kinder and truer if she had been primarily and chiefly fitted to teach school, or keep books, or study art, or journalism, or medicine, or law? The chances are even that she will have more use for her education in those directions than in rearing a family, and not because she *will* not marry any one, but because there is no one for her to marry.

This is the fact which the critics of the actual college education of women ignore; and it is not changed by the fact that there are plenty of nice stupid young fellows for the girls to marry if they had not been educated over and above them.

III

Women used to be told, when they ventured into some public fields where they are now such familiar figures, that their place was the fireside, the family altar (typified by the cook-stove and the wash-tub in most houses), and, in fine, the *home*. We do not remember that they were in the habit of openly retorting, "Whose home?" but surely their advisers were open to some retort. It is because

women have, in the hideously egoistic and erroneous development of our commercial civilization, been obliged so often to *make* the homes they were bidden keep to, that we now find them the rivals (alas! sometimes the victorious rivals) of men, not only in the graces, but the industries, the arts, the sciences. The part they play (it is very like working) has been less chosen than forced upon them by the brutal and entirely man-made conditions of the life which prevails throughout the world ironically calling itself Christendom; and their schools cannot do better than continue to fit them for it, until their brothers shall imagine some gentler and juster economy, in which they shall each be chosen a wife by a husband worthy of her, and dwell with him in a home of their common creation, safe from want and the fear of want.

Even this millennial vision should not involve any obligation to matrimony as to a state more honorable or more ideal than celibacy. The Apostle had something to say for that which will always commend itself to consideration, and no one can have lived long in the world, or met many maturely unmarried women, without questioning the right of matrimony to hold itself as the only holy estate, or the holiest. It is holy if the married pair behave themselves; and if they do not, why, celibacy seems rather preferable. In millennial conditions, even, it is doubtful if it ought to be commended as the chief and primary motive in woman's education. In this premillennial epoch (we now all know that A.D. 2000 is the *true* millennium) it certainly should not be suffered to bring ignominy upon any of the occupations in which women find prosperity.

IV

On the other hand, it should not be disparaged or discouraged (it might not be possible to discourage it), for it is one of several fields of usefulness in which woman shows her superiority. It cannot be limited without hardship to her, and no fact of our recent commercial expansion has perhaps given true patriots more pleasure than the prodigious success of the American female industry of marrying English noblemen. This has been so signally an achievement of the

American woman's genius that we may justly credit her with far the greater honor in it, though it must be allowed that her social enterprise and personal charm have, in every case, been solidly backed up by the financial resources of the American woman's father. He has stood nobly, some say ignobly, by her in those matters of settlement on which the high-born English lover keeps at least one impassioned eye in his wooing; and it may be safely said that without this backing not one of the matches which have shed such lustre upon the national name would have been effected. At the same time it must always be recognized that no amount of money would have alone sufficed, probably, if the American woman had not been so admirably equipped for conquest, so accomplished beyond all her insular rivals, so richly dowered with the gifts that win and the graces that fetch. This at least is what our whole proud nation believes; wherever the society column penetrates, it carries the conviction; the faith palpitates everywhere in the hearts of heiresses of millionaires yet only in the way of being, who think they would look well in coronets. It is not only in their beauty and their naïveté (with the gold lining) that they expect to vanquish, but also in the array of that peculiarly personal American breeding which they understand is preferred by English noblemen to the conventional manners of their own women. No one who loves and honors these heroic girls (as their countrymen all do) can help wishing them success, or trembling for their failure, and probably a thrill of tender anxiety mixed with hot resentment ran through the whole length and breadth of this fair land of ours (as the political orators call it) when it was lately cabled from London that one of the most unquestioned points of the American woman's superiority had been attacked in *The Dancing Times*.

Mr. Walter Humphrey is their critic, and he is as much enabled as disabled by the fact that he is not only the editor of *The Dancing Times*, but is the proprietor of a dancing-academy. If we taste a certain savor of self-interest in his censures, we cannot deny him the grounds of judgment when he says: "Englishmen cannot admire the art of the ball-room as taught

in the United States. It violates every principle of graceful motion. American ladies are especially ridiculous when they try to dance." But we do not suppose that Mr. Humphrey here wishes to imply that American ladies are otherwise ridiculous. He is probably confining his criticism in his mind if not his language to their dancing alone, which he faults in every particular. "Their vertical demonstrations are exaggerated, not to say grotesque. Their bodies sway about absurdly, and they attempt to lead rather than follow their male companions. American ladies never dance acceptably in smart circles in London without first getting instruction at the hands of capable teachers. Englishmen find it quite impossible to follow their vigorous and complicated gyrations. English ladies permit their gentlemen partners to lead absolutely. . . . They preserve an easy rigidity of body, and glide through the figures instead of leaping and hopping excitedly."

We do not know whether this is the whole body of Mr. Humphrey's offence; but it was quite enough to dash for the moment the pride of the republic in the dancing of our women. The attack was promptly repelled by several patriotic journals, but it cannot be denied that it has left wounds. Hereafter none of us can exult as before in this dancing with the strong faith that how bad soever our women's voices and manners might be, their dancing was as unimpeachably superior as their dressing. An odious picture remains of their jumping up and down (for it must be this that Mr. Humphrey means by their "vertical demonstrations"), of the absurd swaying about of their bodies, and their bold desire to lead rather than follow their male companions; of their total failure to preserve an easy rigidity, as English ladies do, and to glide through the figures instead of leaping and hopping. Whether the fact that the dancing-academies of London are full of American women struggling to unlearn "the terpsichorean vulgarisms picked up in the United States," as obliquely reported from Mr. Humphrey, will avail to blot the sight, time alone can tell.

What is certainly consoling, however, is that our women are qualifying them-

selves for success in London by even the sacrifice of national pride, if they are making the effort ascribed to them. Their behavior shows them to be truly *business* in this as in all other things; and we may trust them to practise the meekest obsequiousness to their male companions in the dance, and the easiest rigidity of body, if that is what is wanted, in order to be in with the first at the coming coronation festivities. Some "new movements" are announced by the London dancing-masters, who profess alone to be in the secret of them; but we venture to believe that these will cross the ocean and be taught in all our own academies long before Edward VII. wears the crown which has bound the brows of so many of the wise and good in the past.

There is a suggestion in all this which is more hopeful than anything we had expected to reach with respect to the education of women. If it is not quite practicable to make wifehood and motherhood the primary and chief ideal in women's education, why should it be impossible to embody something like it on a limited scale? Our girl's colleges might continue to educate our women to earn their living; but there might be post-graduate schools in telepathic touch with London which should teach the branches necessary to the American woman's success in English society. The American woman might be trusted to study these with a zeal which would eventuate in the eclipse of all her English sisters. The danger would of course be that the English lover might miss in these proud vic-tresses, bearing themselves with an easy rigidity in all the exigencies of social life, something wild and sweet that he fancied in the unconventional product of New England, or California, or the great Middle West, or the New South. It is a danger that could be guarded; and the Easy Chair is not pretending that it is a serious aspect of the educated-woman question. This may perhaps be safely left to the educated woman herself. She was not a fool to begin with, in most cases, and it is to be doubted if her college has made a fool of her. It has looked honestly after her mind, and in the favor which athletics now find among our students, it seems not to have ignored the fact that she "is not wholly brain."

Editor's Study.

I

THE strongest appeal to the human imagination is that which answers its deepest questionings, its large curiosity. Things merely hidden on the earth or beneath it, or that—like the sources of the Nile or the north pole—have for generations baffled all attempts at their disclosure, are in themselves minor and superficial mysteries, the interest in whose solution has dignity only through association with economic, historical, or scientific problems. Sometimes not the thing sought is found, but something greater; not the philosopher's stone, but the great realm of chemistry; not the new road to India, but the American Continent.

The most marvellous disclosures of our time, and those most profoundly affecting our imagination, are the result of scientific investigation. These disclosures are psychical as well as physical, as was shown in Dr. Stanley Hall's article in our October number on "The New Psychology"—the new aspects of that science arising from its connection with physiology, and particularly with neurology. Dr. Hall has become an adept in philosophical as well as in scientific deductions in this field. It is only a few years since psychology began to be illuminated from experiments in the laboratory. Some of the earliest experiments were those conducted by Michael Foster, the eminent English physiologist, with special reference to his own science, but having important psychological bearings. He made an exposition of weariness, showing that the exertion of every organ, including the brain, precipitated poison, thus giving to exhaustion a toxical character, and finally, from its oppression, inducing sleep.

All the phenomena of sleep are of psychological interest. Even in ordinary sleep, as was shown in the Hon. John Bigelow's work entitled *The Mystery of Sleep*, there is something more than its reparative function. Mr. Bigelow illustrated his theme from striking Biblical instances, in which spiritual revelations were communicated in sleep. Modern in-

stances, in which the hypnotic sleep and the trance play an important part, seem to suggest a state quite different from that of ordinary sleep. The scientific importance of the subject has led us in this Magazine to give place to articles by Professor Hyslop and Dr. J. D. Quackenbos; and Dr. Joseph Jastrow has promised one dealing with this class of phenomena in the strictly scientific manner so characteristic of all his work.

There can be no explication of a mystery, but the co-ordination of facts may help us to divine the implication, and only this divination will clear our psychical vision and convict jugglers.

II

And in the field of physics and biology it is the implication we are seeking—the largest co-ordination. An explanation of the universe is a futility. We can make no equation even in which the known quantities shall balance the unknown; nor can we define the creative power in terms of the sensible phenomena, and by what a vast range do the evidences of this power lie beyond our sensible perception! By various devices we have enabled our observation to transcend the ordinary limitations of our senses; but whatever our scope, we are dealing for the most part with processes and facts so wholly unlike the phenomena of our own consciousness as to seem alien, and untranslatable into familiar speech.

Even the data of consciousness are disguised by consciousness itself, and are delivered as notions rather than as reals, and the psychological classifications that co-ordinate them must lay as much stress upon the analysis that separates as upon the generalization that unites. Professor Holden, in his brief essay on "Phenomenal Memories," published in this number, shows the insistence of this analysis, so that we speak of several memories—the musical memory, the mathematical memory, etc. Memory itself is treated as a separate faculty, whereas it is inseparable from any conscious perception or action. We shall