

road to knowledge. The book thus contains many suggestions — some explicit and some not — on where further research effort is still sorely needed.

EMIL W. MENZEL, JR.
Delta Regional Primate Research Center
Tulane University

YEARBOOK OF PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY 1966. Edited by Genovés T. Santiago with Gabriel W. Lasker and Jack H. Prost. v + 320 pp. American Association of Physical Anthropologists in cooperation with the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México and the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Córdoba 45, México 7, D. F. 1967. \$4.50.

The 1966 *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology* includes 15 papers covering the various areas traditionally the concern of physical anthropology. The first three, on non-human primates, include a Harlow and Harlow paper on the basis for primate social bonding, which appears to involve far less sexual attraction than once thought; a paper by F. Dunn on parasites in primates, with phylogenetic implications suggested; and an extremely valuable paper by C. B. G. Campbell (not the British B. G. Campbell) on the affinities of *Tupaia*, clearing up many of the confusions which formerly existed. Two paleontological papers follow: a brief consideration of the Bering land bridge and Pleistocene mammals by Kurtén, and a perfunctory review of the hominid fossil record by Straus.

The remaining 75% of the volume is devoted to papers dealing with living human populations. These are introduced by a paper by Coon (really a slightly modified section from his well-known 1965 book), vigorously defending traditional *a priori* typology as an end in itself and damning as "heresy" the attempt to deal with human variation in terms of trait and selective force clines. Dealing with specific topics are: Hanihara's work on Mongoloid deciduous teeth; Garn and colleagues on skeletal growth and protein-calory malnu-

trition; Bourlière et al. on aging in rural France; Rosen on the ties between hearing loss, diet, and heart-circulatory disease; Giles et al. on blood groups in New Guinea; Ruffié et al. on immuno-electrophoresis and blood serum components; and Siniscalco et al. on hemoglobin, Thalassemia, G-6-PD variants and malaria in Sardinia.

In a slightly different vein there is a paper by Benoist which, with illustrative examples, articulates the case for continuing interchange between biological anthropologists and ethnologists. This is the best rebuttal to the recent acerbic and rather jingoistic broadside which Roberts has aimed at American physical anthropology, and gains strength both from the tolerance of tone and from the fact that the author has no personal stake in defending the group which was the object of Roberts' attack. With such a well expressed statement of the feelings of many physical anthropologists, this would have been an excellent place to end the volume, but one final paper by Charles E. Smith is appended for no apparent reason. It is a perfectly good sociology paper, but, dealing with conflict and social adjustment in a tiny sample of interracial couples in New York, one wonders just why it was included.

Concluding his review of the 1965 *Yearbook* Buettner-Janusch expressed the hope that it could be made into something more than just a haphazard collection of reprints. Unfortunately this has not really been done and the 1966 *Yearbook* is, if anything, more haphazard than ever.

In a brief preface the editors claim that the editorial policy of the *Yearbook* has remained the same since 1964, apparently overlooking the statement in the preface of the last *Yearbook* that a modification of editorial policy had been introduced in response to comments from the membership of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists. In the preface to the current edition, the eleven principles of 1964 are quoted again. Actually, either the stated policies of 1964, 1966 or the modifications of 1965 are most admirable, but from an appraisal of the contents of the *Yearbook* over the past several years, it is apparent that there is no priority order used

in applying the criteria, if in fact they were even considered at all in some cases. With one exception, all of the criticisms Buettner-Janusch aimed at the previous issue of the *Yearbook* can be repeated and amplified when the present one is considered. The only respect in which the current issue shows a clear improvement over past volumes is reflected by the fact that articles from readily accessible journals have not been included (with the possible exception of Coon's paper).

But if this is an improvement, there is another aspect that represents a more than compensating deterioration. This concerns the non-English papers. Once again these are all in French, and while one must agree with the previous reviewer that it is indeed good to see a number of papers in French (and two are of great value), one wonders which of the announced criteria for selection can be invoked to justify the fact that they constitute fully 50% of the contents of the current *Yearbook*. Are we to infer from this that nothing of value was published in German? Or Japanese or Polish (just to name a few countries where there has been substantial activity in physical anthropology)? Even in French there are important reports on specific research in physical anthropology which certainly fulfill the criteria rather better than some included — for instance, Thoma's report on the Vertesszöllös find which is as valuable as his Neanderthal ideas are archaic. And why not include one of the brief notes from the German literature reporting on the rediscovery of the Le Moustier skull in a collection of material that had been taken to Russia after the fall of Berlin? To those of us who teach introductory courses in physical anthropology, the description of an eastern European Pithecanthropine and the re-emergence of Le Moustier are events of far greater significance than the difference in vital capacity, age of menopause, psychomotor response etc. in farmers vs. fishermen vs. shopkeepers in a small segment of rural France. The evident bias towards French among the non-English sources demonstrated by the editors over the last several years might lead one to suspect that ignorance was the

reason for overlooking the resurrection of Le Moustier, but even this will not suffice since this reviewer called the editors' attention to this event and volunteered to make the translation.

Actually, in spite of the space occupied, only three papers in French are included. One is a long account by Bourlière, Cendron and Clément. The research is evidently sound and worth reporting, but hardly deserving of 60 pages in the only yearly review of the field. The same material could be presented by summary comment and tabular supporting data in two pages after the fashion of *Science* or *Nature*. No translation is offered except for a one page summary in English.

This raises the issue of translation. Why are some non-English papers translated and others not? The editors offer no reasons, and no policy relating to this is set forth in the guiding criteria mentioned in the preface. Are papers reprinted in the original and followed by a full translation judged more important than papers simply offered in the original without translation? And if a paper is not judged sufficiently important for translation, why is it still regarded as then significant enough to occupy 20% of the volume?

Even more important, why must both versions of the paper be present? The assumption is often made that professional physical anthropologists read both French and German, but it remains true that they tend to avoid the effort. Furthermore, others using the *Yearbook* may not command the language in question so why not simply include the translation? To argue that nuances of meaning, delicacy of expression and subtleties of phrasing often get lost in translation is only a valid objection where the essence of a subject is at least in part literary. Hopefully this is not the case for most of physical anthropology. Even articles discussing research policy, such as that of Benoist, where persuasiveness of expression plays a role, come through nearly unscathed in translation. Eliminating the unnecessary duplication would free a good deal of space for the inclusion of other items of value.

The critical comments made above (and by others elsewhere) should not be taken

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, *Aegypto-*

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*