sponse; and then we wonder at it when young women in their junior and senior years in college elect music and literature in preference to mechanics and physiology; we wonder and we frame theories about feminine predilections.

Is there any other cause, operating perhaps with the one just described, that may account for the less than two per cent. Table X. in the statistical study gives the number of scientific men connected with institutions when there are three or more. Fifty-eight institutions appear in the list with a total of 762 men. Let us drop from this list the four colleges for women. They will scarcely be missed since they take only nineteen of the 762. Of this list of fifty-four institutions just which ones open their major positions freely and fairly to persons of gifts and attainments without regard to sex? By a major position is meant one that a man of the select first thousand would be willing to occupy. Women are quite welcome to become experts in washing bottles and adding logarithms and dusting specimens. Even in the case of high school science the best positions in physics and chemistry are reserved for men. A young woman, however strongly inclined to devote herself to science, may well hesitate to proceed to a science doctorate when she considers that Table X. There is indeed room for doubt whether we should have any thousand men of science if all gifted and ambitious young men were confronted by such barriers as a young woman is obliged to face to-day. We should find these young men going into literature, law, politics, business; but scarcely into science. It appears therefore difficult to avoid the conclusion that other factors besides innate sexual disqualification must be reckoned with in attempting to account for the insignificance of women's share in the advancement of science.

Ellen Hayes

EMINENCE OF WOMEN IN SCIENCE

To the Editor of Science: In Dr. Cattell's "Statistical Study of American Men of Science"[1] occurs the following comment on the fact that there are "only 18 women among 982 men:" "There are now nearly as many women as men who receive a college degree; they have on the average more leisure; there are four times as many women as men engaged in teaching." In view of a preceding statement (p. 675) that "the advancement of science depends mainly on those who hold chairs in our colleges and universities," I would suggest that, before drawing "the conclusion that there is an innate sexual disqualification," there should be added to the premises from which any conclusion is drawn the well-known fact that, except in some of the women's colleges where the opportunities for research are limited and the salaries notably low, women are not considered eligible for chairs in the sciences named. If they have any positions in the departments at all, it is chiefly as laboratory assistants.

Another conclusion which might be drawn is that women in larger proportions than men (p. 675) are in the class of "amateurs" or scientific persons who, not needing to earn their living, devote their lives to scientific research.

It is indeed "possible," as the author says, that "the lack of encouragement and sympathy is greater than appears on the surface." Until women are more generally given an equal chance with men in academic recognition and remuneration, it is futile to attempt to determine, in terms of statistical tables or even of scientific reputation or eminence, how much "they are able to do for the advancement of science."

Marion Talbot

The University of Chicago,
November 14, 1910

THE CENTURY DICTIONARY SUPPLEMENT

In the supplement to the Century Dictionary which has recently been issued, my name appears as the responsible editorial contributor for terms in plant physiology. This is an error which, I am informed by the editor of the Century Dictionary, will be corrected in subsequent copies of the supplement. I did revise the terms in plant physiology for the

[1] Science, November 11, 1910, p. 676.