gained high places in the recent list have passed before, and complaints were made that their second candidature was an injustice to other competitors. They were certainly strictly within their rights in so doing. There is as yet no regulation forbidding matriculated students matriculating again, and nothing to render impossible the pleasing picture drawn by one of our correspondents of grey beards sitting round the tables year after year. The Head Master of Prince Alfred College, from which school these three boys went up, thinks there is much to be approved in the proceeding. We fully agree with him as far as one of the boys is concerned, because it was necessary in this case that a place should be secured in a subject which had not been presented on the occasion of his passing before. The other two simply wanted, as Mr. Chapple puts it, “to compete for a better position, and for a certificate of adequate acquaintance with more advanced studies.” It is to be observed that the boys did not want to know more, but to have credit for knowing more. If they had desired really to enlarge their knowledge they ought to have been encouraged to proceed with their University course. If Professor Kelly was right on Wednesday when he said that matriculation was, as it were, but the vestibule to the halls of learning, the folly of entering a vestibule again and again without wishing to go further is self-evident. Boys who go on learning instead of falling back to grind the old bones over again may not have as high certificates to show and may not reflect so much honour on their schools, but they will be doing much better for themselves. We trust that the University will see their way to prevent matriculated students presenting themselves a second time, and thus make some advance towards emphasizing the true value of matriculation. It is merely a beginning, and should in no wise be regarded as an end.
One of the subjects which has of late occupied a good deal of attention is the "subjection of woman," the question whether her place in human society is merely and only that of the help-meet of man; whether for one sex, as for the other, we have a right to claim perfect independence of action and equal rights. Much that has been written about "woman's rights" it may be admitted has been foolish and vulgar. The effect of the establishment of the extremer doctrines would be to diminish her influence on society by making her less womanly. But the question remains whether with perfect consistency with womanliness there may not be properly opened to the weaker sex a much wider sphere of personal action. This, amongst other subjects, has been lately treated by the Rev. J. D. Davies in his volume on "Social Questions" with characteristic clearness of thinking and equity of mind. His paper on this subject is on the "Advance of Women," by which he means the steps that have been taken in our own generation for placing women more nearly on an equality with men.

Absolute equality is not to be looked for, since nature itself has made a difference between the sexes. If there were no other point on which this difference must continue to exist there is that of physical strength. Women have not a frame capable of enduring the same kind and amount of bodily and mental labor as men. There are also peculiarities in the female constitution unfitting them from at all times bearing with safety the same strain on the nervous system. But whilst inferior in some qualities, there are others in which they have a natural superiority; for instance, in all occupations requiring fineness of touch and skill in manipulation. The question has of late been discussed with increasing earnestness whether women are to be denied the right of pursuing an independent vocation and career if they choose. And certainly the tendency of modern thought and practice has been to enlarge their liberty, to recognise the
fact that married life is not the only kind of life to which women may look forward; and since there are in fact many who live and die unmarried, to open up to them new avenues by which they may pursue an honorable and useful existence. Mr. Davies points out that this advance has been "mainly along three lines—that of education, that of employments, and that of civil franchises." He intimates that even a fourth may be properly specified, "that of religious activity, or that of the enthusiasm of humanity." The last phrase is one of Professor Seeley's invention, and seems to be intended to satisfy those who look with misgiving on any activities imputed of a theological purpose; since there are energies of sympathetic action which even "natural religion" cannot ignore.

With reference to the first of these things we have perhaps been almost unconscious of the extent to which our schemes of public education have helped forward the cause of the liberation of women. Insensibly, and perhaps without intending it, the range of female study has been enlarged. Female teachers have been subjected to the same training as men, the same studies, the same system of examination and inspection; whilst they have also had their own special and peculiar training for branches of instruction which men are not fitted to undertake. As an inevitable consequence their professional status has been raised, and there has been a corresponding improvement in the scale of remuneration for their services. But this has been only