

A HUMAN MONSTROSITY

ON May 1, 1912, at Fayette, Missouri, was born a female child (colored) having two heads and three arms. The monstrosity was still-born, but had apparently completed its intra-uterine development. It weighed about fourteen pounds.

The legs are two in number, properly placed, and perfectly normal. The trunk as seen from without is fully developed. Posteriorly it is entirely normal, but the breadth increases considerably toward the anterior end. The chest region is at least one half again as broad as it should be. Other than is suggested by the breadth of the chest, however, there are no signs of duplicity in the trunk. The breasts are two in number and far separated, being normally placed with reference to the sides. The spinal column is single and central as far as can be determined without dissection.

Three arms are present. Two show no signs of irregularity either in position or structure. The third is somewhat dwarfed, and is located on a level with the two normal arms and midway between them. It extends upward and backward, and is attached to an irregularly developed scapula resting between the normal ones. The structure of this third arm and its hand is quite abnormal. Both upper and lower arm bones are present, but reduced in size. The wrist bones are not regular or at least do not permit of normal movement. The bones of the hand are not all present, there being only the metacarpals and phalanges of the thumb and first two fingers. The distal segment in each case bears a thickened claw-like nail.

The most striking feature of this monstrosity is its two heads. Each is set at a slight angle with the general axis of the body, and rests close beside, but not crowding, the other. As far as can be observed, there is no abnormality of any sort in connection with these heads except for the position.

There are many problems of scientific interest suggested by this specimen and no doubt

many facts of interest and importance will be brought to light upon its dissection.

L. D. PEASLEE

PUBLIC MUSEUM,
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

THE OMAHA TRIBE

A REVIEW of "The Omaha Tribe," published in *SCIENCE*, June 13, 1913, calls for a few words from the authors, notwithstanding their disinclination to respond to a criticism which in some parts sounds more like vituperation. The opening sentences of the reviewer sound the keynote of his whole effort. He says:

The most obvious thing about this monograph is the authors' well-nigh complete neglect of the work of their predecessors. It is their avowed purpose (p. 30) to borrow nothing from other observers and to present "only original material gathered directly from the native people." Apart from any consideration of historical justice this principle is unjustifiable from the standpoint of the student.

Now, the paragraph in the preface in the work from which the above is quoted, reads as follows:

When these studies were begun nothing had been published on the Omaha tribe except short accounts by passing travelers or comments made by government officials. None of these writers had sought to penetrate below the external aspects of Indian life in search of the ideals or belief which animated the acts of the natives. In the account here offered nothing has been borrowed from other observers, only original material gathered directly from the native people has been used and the writer has striven to make, so far as possible, the Omaha his own interpreter.

By comparison of the two quotations it will be readily seen that the context has been willfully disjointed and that a segregated part of it was used as if it were the whole, an unjustified and unscholarly procedure.

The plan and purpose of the authors was to present the results of independent and original investigations on the Omaha, extending for over thirty years, and, as stated on p. 30, to avoid the criticism of other writers. The final adoption of this plan was due in a large degree to the regard which the authors felt for