

to indicate that the *Yearbook* is a futile venture. Many of us feel that it performs a valuable function which could be improved by the exercise of more editorial clarity. Where previous *Yearbooks* had followed the practice of introducing each included paper with an evaluative comment by another scholar active in the same field, the current issue has dropped this in favor of a prefatory comment by the author himself or, in nearly half the cases, no comment at all. In more than one instance the reader is left wondering why the paper was chosen.

Of great value would be a paper length introduction discussing the year in review. As was done in 1963, this could take the form of a selected and annotated bibliography with the editors explaining their reasoning or, as an alternative, brief summary pieces by scholars in the various segments of the field explaining what happened during the year in question. If there is a lack of agreement in a specific area, perhaps the chief protagonists could be invited to prepare summary comments as each sees it. With the exercise of editorial prerogative, this could be kept quite brief and still be of great value to both the general and the specialized readership.

This could then be followed by the reprinting of important articles as in the present volume, but with an introductory paragraph or two by the editor explaining in each case the criteria used in selection. Review articles of high quality would be particularly appropriate; for instance, more like the brilliant one by Siniscalco et al. in the present volume. A separate segment of the volume could then be assigned to some of the other categories which Buettner-Janusch mentioned last year; e.g. topical symposia, reprints of early papers, and reviews of the field in countries where the language barrier tends to prevent interchange.

One final comment. In dealing with the fossil record, good photographs are worth more than the proverbial thousand words. The *Yearbook* should certainly have a section for the photographic display of crucial finds made in the year under review — and for previous years as well. Ma-Pa, Amud, Petralona, Vertesszöllös, *Aegyptio-*

pithecus and others have all made their way into the world with a minimum of recognition being given by the organs of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists. In the current *Yearbook*, graphic display of important fossil material is limited to redrawings of previously published illustrations, some of which were distorted or inaccurate when they originally appeared. Needless to say, this compounding of error now enshrined in the *Yearbook* can do the field no good. A section for photographs of good quality would be a most welcome addition.

This can all be done without an expansion of the size of the *Yearbook*. *Science* manages to do something like this weekly. Surely physical anthropology should be able to accomplish this once a year.

C. L. BRACE

Museum of Anthropology,
University of Michigan

HEREDITY, DISEASE AND MAN: GENETICS IN MEDICINE. By Alan E. H. Emery. 247 pp., 11 tab., and 42 fig. University of California Press, Berkeley. 1968. \$6.95.

British geneticists have warmed many hearts in recent years with short, stimulating, highly authoritative works, relished by amateurs, fringe scientists and specialists alike. The present work is too technical and detailed for this category, yet is too brief for a text book. As "an introduction to recent and challenging developments in genetics which are finding application in the practice of clinical medicine" — quoting from the cover sheet — it is most welcome. Its scope is broad, with chapters on history, biochemistry, chromosomes, ontogeny, pharmacogenetics, and radiation, surrounding the central theme of clinical genetics. Selective references follow each chapter, with a general bibliography of 15 titles and a glossary defining 119 terms. The author is chairman of the Department of Human Genetics at the University of Edinburgh.

RICHARD H. POST

Department of Human Genetics
University of Michigan