

But the informant-anthropologist relationship is unique in scientific research for yet another reason. Since theirs is a long, an intimate, and a widely ranging encounter, it almost necessarily becomes a deeply personal, and not merely a research, relationship. As such, it is characterized by all the ambiguity and ambivalence inherent in any personal relationship, multiplied by whatever factor must be introduced because of the wide cultural and intellectual differences between anthropologist and informant, which serve both to attract and to repel. I know of no better way of introducing students and laymen alike to both the rewards and the problems entailed by and encountered in this relationship than to recommend this volume.

Casagrande has obtained the cooperation of an important cross-section of American and British anthropologists who, on the basis of their extensive field work, have produced, with two or three exceptions, a series of skillfully and, in some cases, beautifully written sketches recounting their relationships with informants in 20 widely scattered parts of the globe. The candor with which most of these contributors have approached their assignments will enable the methodologically oriented reader to assess both the strengths and the weaknesses of informant-type research. Because of its limitations, this research technique has long been, and will continue to be, supplemented by techniques borrowed from the other behavioral sciences. Because of its strengths, it will never be replaced.

MELFORD E. SPIRO

*Department of Anthropology,  
University of Washington*

**A Conscience in Conflict.** The life of St. George Jackson Mivart. Jacob W. Gruber. Published for Temple University Publications by Columbia University Press, New York, 1960. x + 266 pp. Illus. \$6.50.

When a professional biologist remembers St. George Mivart (1827-1900)—if he remembers him at all—it is apt to be with some irritation and more than a little contempt. Irritation because Mivart used his considerable talents to obscure and confuse the developing theory of evolution, and contempt because he was too bigoted and intellectu-

ally dishonest to follow where the scientific discoveries of the late 19th century led. That this picture of Mivart is inadequate and in great part unfair is amply shown by this clear, interesting and skillfully written biography.

Mivart was a man of great courage and tactlessness. While he was personally pleasant, he spared no one when he wrote. He was exceptionally—even painfully—conscientious, and he always followed the directives of his conscience. But he could never conceive of the fact that he himself could ever be wrong in anything. Inevitably his life was tragic.

At the age of 16, and in spite of his family's opposition, he became a convert to Roman Catholicism. This was no light step for him to take because, at the time, his conversion excluded him from Oxford and Cambridge. Later on he became a student of Huxley's and for a decade—during the 1860's—he and Huxley were very close, even intimate friends. Mivart became an expert osteologist and comparative anatomist, specializing in the Primates. He joined the Darwinian circle and was considered an important ally in the controversy that arose over evolution. Mivart, however, became dedicated to the discovery of absolute truth, but he based his "truth" on a double foundation—on Revelation and on Science. For him true Revelation and true Science could never be in conflict, because all Truth was self-consistent. Revelation, he was convinced, was in the custody of the Catholic Church, but the understanding of this Revelation could be enhanced by Science, that is, when Science is interpreted by Reason. Having these clews as to where Truth was to be found, he could tell exactly when Revelation was misinterpreted and when Science presumed to wander out of its proper sphere. Mivart devoted his life to promoting the fortunes of a liberal, growing, and changing Catholicism guided in its progress by an advancing Science. His failure in what he considered to be his real reason for living had the inevitability of Greek tragedy.

Relations between Mivart and the Darwin group became strained when the theory of evolution was extended to include the human species. Mivart believed that the mind and the soul of man could never have been developed from a brute origin, and he sought to limit the effectiveness of Darwinian evolution. He even went so far as to

denounce natural selection as a puerile doctrine. The real break, however, came when Mivart attacked violently, personally, and mistakenly a rather tentative contribution to eugenics made by George Darwin, Charles Darwin's son. Even in his apology Mivart repeated what Darwin, Hooker, and Huxley considered to be personal libels, and all personal connections between Mivart and the Darwinian group were severed.

Mivart continued to believe in and to teach evolution, but an evolution of limited scope—one compatible with his religion. He remained the leading Catholic scientist in England. Indeed, the liberal Pope, Pius IX, conferred on him the degree of doctor of philosophy in 1876, but during the reaction that followed in the reign of Leo XIII, the Church line hardened and infallible authority stepped in. Mivart refused to accompany his liberal Catholic friends, who were told of their errors and who changed their convictions accordingly. His relations with the Church became strained. The breaking point came when Mivart invaded the field of theology and sought to modify the dogma of eternal punishment. He claimed that eternal torment seemed a trifle excessive for sins committed during a single lifetime, and he held that the Inferno, though very rugged indeed, need not be final, and that even in Hell sinners would be given the opportunity to repent. This was going much too far, and Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster, tended him a confession of faith which he refused to sign. He was excommunicated and died the next year.

Mivart could not be buried in consecrated ground, but 4 years later his body was moved and was finally buried where he would have wanted to be. His family and friends secured this favor by reporting that Mivart had been very sick during the last year of his life and that his delusions about Hell thus were due to illness rather than to sin.

Jacob Gruber has written an exceptionally readable and objective, but sympathetic, life of Mivart, who is presented as a real, three-dimensional human being, opinionated, intellectually cantankerous but, in his personal contacts, kind and pleasant. He had, however, an unyielding conscience, and he always knew that he was right, down to the last detail.

CONWAY ZIRKLE

*Division of Biology, Botanical  
Laboratory, University of Pennsylvania*