

In short, Mr. Ross's cardinal fault is lack of historical-mindedness. He accepts as absolute the standards found or conceived in his own social environment and seems generally incapable of a Kantian critique of their validity. One need not wonder that he brands as decadent the noble efforts of the great critical thinkers of France and elsewhere. Yet with all its defects "The Principles of Sociology" remains a work of real utility. Though the author's resolute determination not to think anything through may deter the philosophical student, the vast scope of the book with its wealth of illustrative material may well commend it to the teacher of sociology.

ROBERT H. LOWIE

## Ladies and Women

*The Learned Lady in England 1650-1760.* By Myra Reynolds. Houghton Mifflin Company.

*The Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century.* By Alice Clark. Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

DOROTHY OSBORNE writes to her lover, about 1652: "The heat of the day is spent in reading or working, and about six or seven o'clock I walk out into a common that lies hard by the house, where a great many young wenches keep sheep and cows and sit in the shade singing of ballads." As befits a "learned lady," Dorothy is reminded of classic pastorals. Only now and then do the learned ladies throw light on the working life of their sisters. Had the Dorothy Osbornes and Dudleya Norths guessed that a twentieth century woman "research student of the London School of Economics and Political Science" would pore over household accounts, state papers, private letters, and the records of parishes, courts, and guilds, in the effort to picture woman's place in the economic organization of their day, they might have made her task easier by doing a little volunteer field work in sociology. Field work would perhaps have saved Dudleya North from that fatal "sedentary distemper" which carried her off after her conquest of Greek, Latin, and the Oriental languages. Most of the learned ladies whose achievements fill Miss Reynolds's rather formidable volume were of noble or gentle birth. A gardener's daughter or so does not destroy the general impression of class accomplishment. And though the economic motive for authorship emerges before the close of the period studied, and the desire to see themselves in print—even under a pseudonym—becomes common, their learning was mainly for the solace and delight of themselves and their circle of friends and relatives.

"Learned" signifies in seventeenth-century usage anything from the solid Anglo-Saxon scholarship of Elizabeth Elstob to a mere taste for books and a facility in the composition of slight poems. Ladies were learned if their chosen pursuits had to do with things of the mind, or if they were demanding new freedom of self-expression, new training, new opportunities. Actresses of the Restoration stage are caught in Miss Reynolds's net, because they opened up a new profession for women, though their pursuits (having to do largely with King Charles's courtiers) were far from intellectual. The accident of a favorable home environment fostered the learned lady's development. Schools for anything but deportment and trivial accomplishments—where one might learn to embroider in lively colors "four hundred new sorts of Birds, Beasts, Fish, Flies, Worms"—were virtually non-existent. The efforts of a Mrs. Makin or a Mary Astell to organize sound education for girls did little but promote discussion. But in homes of cultured leisure, like those of the Norths or the Evelyns, a studious girl met with encouragement. An archbishop might direct her training, or a John Locke teach her divinity and philosophy. At the least, she might, like Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, have the run of a fine library. Usually the "learned" bent revealed itself early. The "matchless Orinda" read the Bible through before she was four and carried away whole sermons in her memory. Amazing that her gift for gracious intercourse survived these appalling religious

performances! Mrs. Lucy Hutchinson as a child inflicted grave instruction upon her playmates and "plucked all their babies to pieces." On the whole, even in favorable cases, there was little of the systematic study, the exacting mental discipline, provided even for girls a century before in several great Tudor households. Miss Reynolds sums up the period as one of beginnings, promises with few results, "a lavish sowing of seed, a steady infiltration of new ideas, a breaking up of old certainties as to woman's place in domestic and civic life, and an accumulation of examples proving women capable of the most varied aptitudes and energies."

What held back the intellectual development of women? Why (as Lady Mary wrote from the safe refuge of Italy) was no art omitted to stifle their natural reason? Why does the eccentric Duchess of Newcastle hope that her book may be received "for the good encouragement of our sex, lest in time we should grow irrational as idiots"? The reason lies partly in the firm clutch on the seventeenth-century mind, male and female, of the terse Miltonic "He for God only, she for God in him." The most advanced demanded little more for women than freedom to read and study if they so desire. Even Mrs. Makin, educational pioneer, claims only that her training will make wives more reasonably and intelligently submissive. The Marquis of Halifax, it is true, admits that a weak husband must be controlled—but with all outward deference—for his own good: "You must be very undexterous," he advises his daughter, "if when your husband shall resolve to be an Ass, you do not take care he may be your Ass." To be submissive, however intelligently, to an Ass—little intellectual stimulus there! But if the husband happened to be a man of culture, a Sir William Temple, or a Colonel Hutchinson (who saw his future wife's Latin books before he saw her face and promptly fell in love), a wife might best please her husband by developing her mind.

Miss Clark gives due weight to this doctrine of female submission in accounting for the decline in the standard of woman's education and in her social and economic position during the century. But her study reveals the operation of economic forces as well. The basis of production was beginning to shift from the still predominating "family industry" organization to the capitalistic. Family industry offered wide scope for woman's energies; the family (including servants and apprentices) was a productive unit for goods to be sold or exchanged; the workshop was within the home precincts, the family owned stock and tools. Wives of independent farmers and of husbandmen, who supplemented the family income by day labor but worked their own little plots of ground as well, fed and clothed their families—spinning wool and flax, brewing, baking, gardening, raising poultry, managing dairies, helping in the harvest. Woolen and linen thread not needed by the family was sold. In the towns the wives of craftsmen in skilled and semi-skilled trades and of shopkeepers and retailers were the business partners, assistants, and frequently successors of their husbands. Servants relieved them of mere domestic drudgery. Though specialized training in the trades was seldom given to women, there was ample scope for their general intelligence and common sense. Women were engaged in the provision trades; we read of the unruly oyster wives, tripe wives, and herb wives of London. And up and down the bad country roads went women peddlers, pack on back, and buyers and sellers of butter, eggs, and poultry. Laws to curb profiteering and prevent corners in food were often enforced against these poor women, in the interest of their strong competitors, the shopkeepers; while the "great Ingrossers," quite in the modern fashion, escaped.

The woolen industry was already organized on capitalistic lines and drew largely on women for its supply of spinsters. Women who had to depend upon their spinning for subsistence were unorganized and badly exploited, and in the frequent seasons of depression starving women and children came on the parish. Linen spinners were also mainly women, of the pauper class, recruited from the undernourished wives of the landless day laborers. Women were thus beginning to be forced into the

open labor market, without organization or specialized training, and their product diverted from the family to the benefit of the capitalist or consumer. The sweated woman wage earner at the bottom of the scale is a portent of change. Equally significant is the appearance at the top of the parasite leisure class woman. Though the records of the century show able business women in every class (many ladies of the aristocracy managed large estates, especially during the troubled Civil War days), they also reveal a diminishing contact with business and affairs as the century progresses. Wives of men who became capitalists withdrew from productive activity. The rapid growth of wealth opened up possibilities of idleness to women of the upper class. New theories of the state made no place for women in public affairs. Fortunately considerate husbands like Pepys saw the necessity of "making" work for wives who were not always duly appreciative. Mrs. Pepys, in fact, became convinced, he tells us, that "my very keeping of the house in dirt . . . is but to find her employment and keep her within and from minding of her pleasure, which, though I am sorry to see she minds it, is true enough in a great degree."

DOROTHY BREWSTER

## A Slav in the Austrian Consular Service

*The Inside Story of Austro-German Intrigue: or, How the World War Was Brought About.* By Dr. Joseph Goricar, formerly of the Austro-Hungarian Foreign Service, and Lyman Beecher Stowe. Doubleday, Page and Company.

IN the spring of 1914 Professor William M. Sloane of Columbia University published a volume in which he ventured to depart from the field of history into the dangerous realms of prophecy so far as to say: "This [Serbia] is the land which by reason of its name and language aspires to leadership and control in the creation of the Greater Serbia. The passion for this ideal among all Serbo-Croats is a species of imperial insanity. The Serbians of little Serbia expound it in their newspapers, they set it forth in their school-books, nourishing their young on wind; it is the stock in trade of the demagogue, the theme of the rhymers, the subject of baby talk and cradle song." Before the end of that very year the age-old dream of the oppressed Slavs of Austria-Hungary and the theme of the rhymers of little Serbia had been converted into action, and the eyes of the world were opened as to the manner in which the Yugoslavs could fight and endure for the accomplishment of a national ideal. Which simply proves how far one can go wrong, even if one is a distinguished authority, in deciding off-hand that shadowy national aspirations are always vain. It is not as a scoffer, therefore, that one must approach the main theme of Dr. Goricar's interesting book—the theme of a great Pan-Slav union, reaching from Siberia to the Adriatic, from the Baltic to the Aegean. Yet it must frankly be said that it is, and probably will remain, a dream—and nothing but a dream.

Dr. Goricar tells us that the new Yugoslav state is to be the prototype for all Slavdom hereafter. But making one state out of the Southern Slavs is a very different thing from making one state out of the Southern Slavs and the Western Slavs and the Eastern Slavs. Between the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (who compose the South Slav bloc) there are, indeed, differences of religion, customs, and orthography; yet the spoken language of all three is identical, the national traditions and ideals are identical, the sufferings of the various sections of the people under foreign masters, Turk and Magyar and Austrian, have been identical, and in addition there are no geographic or economic factors which make union really difficult. But consider uniting the various nations which own themselves as Slavic; imagine, for example, a union of the Bulgars with the Serbs, of the Ruthenes with the Poles, of the Ukrainians with the Poles, of the Poles with the Russians. Not only are there present great differences in religion and in written language, but the speech of one section is entirely incomprehensible in another, there are utterly dis-

similar customs and ideals, there is a history of bitter strife and persecutions, a present of jealousies and exploitations, and a future of antagonistic ambitions. With the original components of the Southern Slav bloc there have been comparatively few admixtures of alien stocks—some Turkish (but the Turkish strain is not enduring like the Semitic), some Albanian, a little Austrian, and that is about all. But literally over fifty non-Slavic stocks have mingled to a greater or less degree with the tribes that go to make up Slavdom as a whole. The Bulgars were originally Turcoman and so remain, despite their adoption of a Slav dialect; the Albanians are not Slav, and would be included in Pan-Slavia only over their undying protests; the Poles are very largely Germanized and the Serbs of Lusatia completely so. Then there has been a considerable admixture of Turkish and various Caucasian bloods in the south, of Finnish, Lithuanian, Esthonian, and a dozen other non-Slav strains in the north, of Tartar, Mongol, and Kirghiz stock (there are over four million Kirghiz dwelling compactly in the southern Siberian steppes) to the west, not to speak of the vast and widespread masses of Jews (about five millions) who cling to their religion and preserve their separate habits and ideals with the greatest persistence. Slavdom, which Dr. Goricar tells us would comprise well over a hundred and fifty million persons, is a mighty but unhomogeneous collection of peoples, and the possibility of their ever submitting to union under one strong government cannot but be considered as remote—to western European peoples, comfortably remote.

Dr. Goricar is a Yugoslav from the mountainous province of Styria, formerly a part of the Hapsburg Empire. We are informed that he entered the Austro-Hungarian consular service with the idea that as many representatives of the oppressed races as possible should have a share in executing the policies of the government under which they were forced to live. He was sent in 1907 to be Austro-Hungarian consul at Belgrade, where at that time the notorious Magyar nobleman, Count Forgach, was minister. It was while Dr. Goricar was in Belgrade that the Nastich "revelations" of supposed anti-Austrian plots were framed as a hopeful *casus belli* against Serbia; and the next year, when he was consul at Nish, Austria-Hungary turned its "temporary administration" of Bosnia-Herzegovina into outright annexation, thereby throwing the whole Slav world into a ferment and creating a situation where war was averted only by Russia's and Serbia's moderation. Apparently during the Bosnian crisis Dr. Goricar allowed some of his Slav sympathies to find expression, for he was recalled from Serbia and ordered to a quiet post at Denver, Colorado, on the eve of a third Austrian attempt to provoke war, this time by means of new "revelations" which were vouched for by a celebrated Viennese historian, Dr. Friedjung. Dr. Friedjung alleged that the Serbian Government was engaged in planning with the leaders of the Serbo-Croat Coalition party in Croatia for the overthrow of the Hapsburgs, and to support the accusation he produced a set of documents which, when published in the *Neue Freie Presse*, provoked a wave of chauvinism across the two Central Empires. The entire Serbo-Croat coalition promptly sued him for libel, but dropped the charge under pressure from the government when Dr. Friedjung admitted the documents to be forgeries and made a public retraction of his wild statements. There is no opportunity here for a review of the closely-woven chain of Germanic intrigue on which Dr. Goricar establishes his thesis that the Central Powers had determined not to postpone a decisive war with Russia and Serbia beyond 1916, and if possible to provoke it in 1914 or 1915. The various steps in the plan, culminating in the excellent opportunity for aggression furnished by the murder of the Archduke, are interestingly though repetitiously described.

Although the greater part of the historical material introduced by Dr. Goricar is not new, he manages to throw a number of fresh side-lights on the general program of the German-Austrian-Magyar war parties, especially by making use of numerous quotations from the press of Vienna and Berlin. Reliance on newspaper opinion is notoriously dangerous, but Dr.