names under a genus were chronological it would facilitate matters, and while it seems to be thus in many cases, it is by no means uniformly so. Under *Gymnosporangium clavariæforme* four synonyms in the genus *Æcidium* are cited, dated as follows, 1801, 1808, 1801 and 1905; four are also given here under *Roestelia* in this order, 1849, 1887, 1880, 1815.

In the matter of illustrations the present part shows a considerable improvement over the preceding parts. The drawings of the spores show more accuracy in preparation and do not look so diagrammatical. The fact that other structures aside from the teleutospores, such as peridial cells, have had representation in these illustrations is a matter worthy of favorable comment. The printing of the plates on the regular paper makes them somewhat difficult to find. Since not all species are illustrated it is not always possible to tell from the plate and figure number in which direction from the description one should turn to find the illustration. This could be avoided by including the page number of the plate (they all have page numbers although they are not printed upon them) along with the plate and figure number where the reference is given at the end of a description. It is also very difficult to find the description of a figure if one sees an illustration and desires to look it up. Aside from the figure number there might also be given the number of the page where the description occurs. These items would increase the amount of labor in preparation, but would enhance the value of the work sufficiently to warrant it.

The authors are to be praised for the great amount of valuable work they are doing with this difficult group of fungi, and mycologists in general must be exceedingly glad that the preparation of this large monograph has proceeded so steadily. With the appearance of the present part the larger and more important genera have received treatment. The world-wide treatment of such complex plants must necessarily entail an enormous amount of labor and must necessarily involve the inclusion of forms concerning which first-hand information may be meager. These authors must be commended for the use which they make of the work of other specialists.

That they have drawn freely upon the observations of others is especially apparent in the arrangement of the keys, the form of descriptive accounts, the synonymy, and in the preparation of illustrations in this third volume. A deplorable feature is that the works of other writers and investigators may receive only slight or even no credit for the parts which are adopted by the authors or followed closely, whereas in minor portions, where there may be a difference of opinion they see fit to call attention to them in such a way as often to bring discredit upon the works which are really so largely utilized.

Frank D. Kern
Pennsylvania State College,
State College, Pa.

The Primitive Family as an Educational Agency. By James Arthur Todd. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London, 1913.

"The Primitive Family as an Educational Agency" is frankly a brief against "the family superstition" in education, a brief, let one in turn be frank enough to say, that is hardly needed by the ethnologist and that will not be heeded, I venture to predict, by the sentimentalist.

To him or her Professor Todd has undertaken to show that the past of the family is not all it is supposed to be, that monogamy, for example, is an acquired predilection, that in primitive circles kinship may be an uncertain notion and that the "natural bond" between parent and child is merely a latter day figment.

So sympathetic am I with Professor Todd's main undertaking, the cornering of the sentimentalist, and so much in agreement with his general contention that non-familial agencies may have been or may become much more efficient in education than the family that I am reluctant to criticize his method and regret having to question several of his minor arguments.

As to his method, it may be enough to merely describe it as the method of illustra-

tion, a method apt to be as satisfactory to those with you as it is unconvincing to those against you. Professor Steinmetz has pointed out for all time that haphazard instances are not ethnological proof. The soundness of the comparative method rests on the scrupulous raking through of ethnographic data. Data assembled uncritically may also be misleading. Some of Professor Todd's illustrations are misleading. In citing modern Mexicans (p. 42), for example, he is not citing, as the text would convey, a primitive people. On pp. 39 ff. he confuses the grounds of divorce with the extent of it. In referring to the *pirravru* relationship of the Australian Blackfellow (p. 35) as an affair of intermittent promiscuity he appears ignorant of the fact that it is quite as stable a relationship and as carefully regulated as the coexistent pairing relationship.

Fortunately in spite of this misconception Professor Todd has not fallen into the old promiscuity pitfall. Still he argues that in view of well verified sporadic cases of group marriage and of periodic license monogamy is not an innate instinct. To this contention it may be said that group marriage is still too obscure a fact to be called upon with much assurance in argument. Whether periodic sex license may not be more adequately explained as a phenomenon of the breaking down of habit than of the persistence of an old habit is certainly an open question. As for other deviations from monogamy, polygyny, polyandry, and prostitution, are they not due to social processes which have rendered monogamy inadequate, to considerations of social prestige or dominion, to wealth or poverty, to ancestor worship? More social processes are involved in polygamy than in monogamy.

In education through the family does the form of marriage matter at any rate quite as much as Professor Todd together with his sentimental opponents would have us think? Until very recently purposive education in or out of the family has invariably taken the form of discipline, and in the polygynous patriarchal family there has ever been a greater degree of discipline for offspring than in any monogamous type of family. Then too has not even brittleness in marriage been exaggerated as a pernicious effect upon offspring? Domestic education is essentially a matter of imitation, and one adult may be imitated as well as another. Family discord is of course pernicious, but brittleness in the marriage tie is likely to preclude discord, if anything.

But discipline is not education, I shall be told, nor is imitation. True, not in the modern meaning of the term education; but is that meaning to be reckoned with in considering any type of familial education as yet known? In all kinds of primitive education and in all kinds of familial education, primitive and modern, there has been but one purpose, the producing of conformity to type. If Professor Todd had taken this thesis as a basis for his arraignment of the rôle of the family in education, not merely pointing to it from time to time (pp. 146, 171), he would have been on safer and, I may say, more fertile ground. Moreover if he had stuck to the proposition he himself laid down at the outset that the bond between husband and wife or between parent and child is a primeval tropism based on the satisfactions resulting from safety and pleasure contacts he would have been under no necessity to show that monogamy was not an instinct, or that in view of the practise of adoption there was no natural bond in parenthood. Habitual association is the natural bond in parenthood whether adoptive or not. It is also the natural bond in marriage, whether brittle or lax. The pull of habit, whether in parentage or in marriage, Professor Todd together with many other students has overlooked.

Had he allowed for it, he would have escaped making several false generalizations. He would not have said that any sort of sex conduct was allowable among primitive men provided it did not infringe on the rights of others (p. 35)—unless of course he included among rights the right not to be discomfited by innovation, a right most jealously safeguarded by primitive man. He would not have argued that the family in which indefinite notions of kinship existed could not have exerted any great disciplinary force (p. 86).

(How about the coexistence of juridical parenthood and of discipline in the patriarchal family?) Nor would he have concluded that sex taboos, the demarcation of masculine and feminine interests, resulted in social discord (p. 54). He would have realized that sex taboos have quite the opposite effect, protecting the habits of one sex against the habits of the other. He might also have realized that age class similarly protects itself against age class and that respect for age is merely a survival of the rigid age class demarcations of primitive circles, in no sense a development (p. 131).

Until comparatively recently, "the formation of a body of habits," sex habits, age-class habits, family, clan or tribe habits was the goal of all education. As Professor Todd has well pointed out (pp. 143–4), primitive education planned to adjust youth to a static environment, to fit each boy and girl into a set place from whence no departure was possible, except into another set place. Modern education at its best plans to develop in all of us adjustability to a changing environment, together with a capacity to control our environment, *i. e.*, it plans to develop personality. To its part in this new venture of education the modern family is not yet awake. Hence its discredit in the eyes of Professor Todd and other modern educators. Once it realizes that of all educational agencies it has unique opportunities to develop personality, that far better than the school or the club it may lead a child to think for himself and to have the courage of a minority, once the family becomes alive to this new rôle—perhaps the coming "transcendent and valuable" rôle Professor Todd has in mind for it, it may assert with success its old claim to educational prestige—and not before.

ELSIE CLEWS PARSONS

NOTES ON THE SEA ELEPHANT (MIROUNGA LEONINA)

MR. ROBERT CUSHMAN MURPHY has published in the *American Museum Bulletin*[1] an interesting and splendidly illustrated paper entitled "Notes on the Sea Elephant *Mirounga leonina*" (Linné). This article embodies the observations made by Mr. Murphy during a whaling and sealing voyage to the South Georgia Islands on the brig *Daisy* of New Bedford. Although sea elephants have been hunted for many years and thousands have been killed for commercial purposes, but little accurate information as to their life history is to be found in the literature of the species. This is perhaps partially due to the fact that their habitat lies on the desolate, storm-swept islands of the South Atlantic, in a region which holds out few inducements to the traveler and that almost the only visitors to their uninviting breeding grounds were those who came to slaughter the animals for commercial gain.

Too few of these hunters were interested in anything but the number of gallons of oil which could be tried out from each carcass, and ship after ship returned loaded to the gunwales with oil but empty of information concerning the habits of the greatest of all the seals which they were sweeping from off the earth. This relentless slaughter has long since passed the bounds of safety and the sea elephant bids fair to soon be numbered with the Steller's sea cow, an animal which has been swept away, leaving little but traditions behind.

Mr. Murphy's notes, taken with the care and interest of one who came to study and not to kill, are thus especially interesting, and combined with his splendid photographs form a valuable contribution to the life history of the elephant seal.

Dr. C. H. Townsend's rediscovery of the northern sea elephant (*Mirounga augustirostris*) on Guadaloupe Island, and the valuable collection of specimens and photographs which he secured, have done much to elucidate the life history of that species and Mr. Murphy has well supplemented his work by this study of the southern animal.

ROY CHAPMAN ANDREWS
AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

[1] *Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.*, Vol. XXXIII., Art. II., pp. 63–79, pls. I.–VII.