

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" occurs the following comment on the

<sup>1</sup> SCIENCE, November 11, 1910, p. 676.

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

new edition of the old dictionary, but did not write those in the supplement.

R. E. B. MCKENNEY

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

#### SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

*Diopetrographic Tracings in Four Normæ of Fifty-two Tasmanian Crania.* Transactions of the Royal Society, Victoria. Vol. V. (Part I.) 1909. By RICHARD J. A. BERRY and A. W. D. ROBERTSON. Pp. 1-11 notes, 211 plates.

The volume at hand is an exceptional publication, but perhaps justified under the circumstances. It consists of a large series of plates with well executed diopetrographic drawings of 52 Tasmanian crania, without measurements and with none or but the scantiest descriptive notes. Forty-one of these crania are new to science, having been discovered in private collections or excavated by the authors. As the total number of Tasmanian crania known before amounted to only 79, the new material can well be regarded as a precious addition. But the very value of it augments the wish for a thorough report. The plates will be useful and both the authors, as well as the Royal Society of Victoria, have earned the thanks of anthropologists for their publication, but they are by no means sufficient. Measurements on drawings or photographs, even though these be of "natural size," can never be taken with accuracy and be used with the confidence of those secured by accurate instruments and according to the standard methods on the specimen itself. Besides that, numerous measurements of importance, such as the surface arcs and the circumference, can not be even approximated on illustrations.

But it is specially the lack of descriptive notes which will be felt. The illustrations of Skull No. 9 may be cited as an example. In 9B, frontal view, and 9D, back view, there is visible a depression over the upper portion of the parietals. Such a feature may be due to the pronounced elevation of the sagittal region, but it may also be due to senile changes.

In the absence of description one is left in uncertainty. The sutures on the specimen are represented as if free from obliteration, but they are thus shown on practically every skull in the series, and yet some of the jaws indicate an age where more or less obliteration could be expected. The illustrations of the teeth, as general in drawings of this nature, are entirely unsuitable for study. The position of the dacryons does not seem in all the cases to be accurate—for instance in plates 12B, 15B, 21B and 23B. In a number of the cases, such as 36C, one would like to know more than the pictures show as to the characteristics of the supraorbital ridges or arch. Theinion point is difficult to determine with accuracy, it differs in position, and it does not generally represent the posterior terminus of the maximum glabella-occipital diameter, hence the prominent part given to it is scarcely deserved; etc.

It is to be hoped that the authors will furnish in time a good descriptive account of the valuable specimens in their hands and in their reach.

ALEŠ HRDLÍČKA

*The Plant Life of Maryland.* By FORREST SHREVE, M. A. CHRYSLER, FREDERICK H. BLODGETT and F. M. BESLEY. Maryland Weather Service, Volume III. Pp. 533, pls. 39. Baltimore, 1910.

This report on the plant life of Maryland is a valuable contribution to plant geography and ecology. The introduction by Shreve describes the general geography of the state together with a discussion of its climate and physiography, while he gives a statement of the purposes of the work from the botanic standpoint. Dr. Shreve in Part II. gives in detail the general results of the survey of the state, as to its floristic plant geography, while in Part III., the ecologic plant geography is discussed from the regional aspect. The vegetation of the coastal zone, eastern shore district, is given by Shreve, that of the western shore district by Chrysler, while Blodgett has written the section on the upper midland district of the state, followed by a description of the mountain zone by Dr. Shreve. Not the least valuable