

some of its adjectives, and supply their position by blank spaces!

In the *Anthropologist* I asserted that in his so-called 'Ethnology' Mr. Keane 'pursues the same plan, treating the same subjects in nearly the same order' as I did in my 'Races and Peoples,' published six years ago. Mr. Keane now professes to have 'but the haziest recollection' of the contents of that book (though in his note in the *Anthropologist* he acknowledges to have read it). Its very title he had quite forgotten! His 'treacherous memory' led him to mention it under quite a different name from the one it bears! How, then, 'can he truthfully say' (to quote his words) that the scheme of his book has *not* the singular similarity I noted to that of my own? He is convicted out of his own mouth of denying the charge I made, without pretending to ascertain whether it is true! I challenge comparison of the books by readers not disabled by a morbid self-esteem from deciding correctly. I challenge the production of any other work on this science, published in any language, since 1889, so obviously akin in plan and treatment to my 'Races and Peoples,' as is Keane's 'Ethnology.' I am quite willing to allow Mr. Keane the plea of 'unconscious memory;' but the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Keane makes the assertion that I brought a 'false charge' against him in reference to Virchow's opinion about the Neanderthal skull. He quoted Virchow as stating that the skull was 'possibly pathological.' I quoted Virchow's own words, giving them in the original German, that he had offered 'the positive proof' that it was pathological. The 'false' statement is unquestionably Mr. Keane's; but then he suffers from such a 'treacherous memory!'

Mr. Keane seems much disturbed at my statement that he had not consulted the best and most recent studies on American aboriginal ethnography. In reply, he makes no pretence that he did so, but follows the legal precept, 'When you have no defence, abuse the opposite counsel.' I turn to his index and look in vain for the names of Adam, Bandelier, Ehrenreich, Leon, Middendorf, Quevedo, Seler, Steinen and many others, without a knowledge of whose

excellent labors it is presumptuous in a writer to pretend to any but a second-hand and superficial knowledge of American ethnography.

It is needless to occupy more space with such a discussion. I reiterate the justice of my criticisms on Mr. Keane's book; and as a set off to his report of the 'acclamation' with which, he informs us, it has been accepted in England, I add that I have received letters from several prominent anthropologists in the United States telling me that I had dealt with its errors and crudities much too leniently.

D. G. BRINTON.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

TO PREVENT THE GROWTH OF BEARD.

IN March last, Dr. B. F. Egeling, of Monterey, Mexico, sent to the Department of Agriculture several specimens of the cocoons of a large Bombycid moth, with the statement that these cocoons are worn by the natives around the neck and are believed to prevent the growth of beard on the chin. Dr. Egeling wished to know the name of the species. Specific determination was impossible from the cocoons alone, but on May 18th a fine female specimen of one of the handsomest of the Central American Attacine moths issued and proved to be *Attacus jorella*, of Westwood, described in the Proceedings of the Zoölogical Society of London, 1853, pp. 150-160, and figured at Plate XXXII., Fig. 1. The locality given by Westwood is Cuantla, Mexico, and the statement is made that the type specimens were reared in August from cocoons spun the previous October. The use to which the cocoons are said to be put by the natives is new to the writer. Perhaps it has been recorded by some collector of facts of this nature.

L. O. HOWARD.

THE CHILD AND CHILDHOOD IN FOLK-THOUGHT.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The author of 'The Child and Childhood in Folk-thought' has no desire to enter the lists on behalf of his book, being willing to have its fate decided by those to whom it has appealed and for whom it was written. But against the general dogmatic tone of the reviewer (SCIENCE, N. S. Vol. III., No. 72) he ventures a mild protest. Hardly does the present state of the science justify the