tion," by Harrah, while Meier presents a largely empirical analysis of a time-ordered sequence of 14 policies for the library system.

Social ecology is treated by physicalistic notions of gravity (Catton; Huff), long-tailed probability distributions (Mandelbrot), and latent structure analysis (Lazarsfeld and Henry), respectively.

Empirical studies are reported on the detection of repetition (Attneave) and on conformity in a picture arrangement test (Miner). Probabilistic models are suggested in two essays—"The effect of group size on group performance" (Solomon) and "Diffusion in incomplete social structures" (Coleman)—while integral calculus is used to develop equations in another essay—"The economic implications of learning by doing" (Arrow).

Pleas are entered for a "world information center for social sciences" (Churchman) and for "applications of stochastic and computer models to the process of free association" (Colby).

It is difficult to hypothesize what kind of reader such an uneven book should appeal to. Juxtaposition of such admittedly divergent "explorations" may serve largely to illustrate the vagueness and inappropriateness of "mathematics" as a unifying theme for studies in the behavioral sciences. In some papers, the impression is created that mathematics is being "applied to" behavioral problems, and does not *flow out* of them; other papers are not "mathematical." It may well be that when the problems of the latter are tackled more formally, this may lead to quite new branches of mathematics, and not merely to adaptations of old branches that flowed out of physics.

Four years elapsed between conference and publication; a third of the papers have already been published in other books or in journals. For many of the other papers, publishing in substantively differential contexts would also seem sufficient, and more appropriate than being reprinted together as in this volume.

LOUIS GUTTMAN
*Hebrew University*, and *Israel Institute of Applied Social Research, Jerusalem, Israel*

## Studies in Anthropological Method

Many students, and not a few professors, will welcome the publication of Ernest L. Schusky's **Manual for Kinship Analysis** (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1965. 92 pp., $1.50), a volume in the Studies in Anthropological Method series, edited by George Spindler and Louise Spindler. The manual, which is intended mainly for general anthropology and intermediate level courses in social organization, is compact and to the point. A brief introduction, in which the author sets forth some of the anthropological concerns for kinship, precedes the presentation of the basic conceptual elements in kinship analysis and the diagrammatic procedures for presenting them. The method used in the next section constitutes one of the real strengths of the manual—the student is lead into the intricacies of kinship systems and their classification by having his attention drawn first to American kinship. Concepts are then developed to explain descent, cousin relations, lineage, and sibs, and these phase logically into the explication of other bilateral systems, and permit special attention to the Crow and Omaha unilineal systems.

The second half of the manual is concerned with the patterned behavior that derives from kinship systems and with some of the linkages between kinship and other institutions. Special attention is focused on marriage, residence groups, kin-based groups, the sib, phratry, and moiety. In this section, as in the first, practical suggestions on the mechanics of recording kinship data are interspersed throughout the text. Examples are given where needed most, without, however, unduly burdening the student.

Schusky is to be complimented for resisting the labyrinthine theory of kinship and retaining the "manual-for-student-format" throughout. He does, however, note significant points of theory, and credits sources for students who seek further information. In addition, the student is reminded a number of times of the caution that modern anthropologists exercise in drawing causal inference.

As a manual, and for the level that it is intended, the present work is recommended. The development of the concepts is logical, practical exercises are included at the right places, and the glossary, which is complete enough, conveys that not all theorists are agreed on definitions. As a systematized introduction to the basics of kinship analysis, student and professor alike should find the manual very helpful.

ART GALLAHER, JR.
*Department of Anthropology, University of Kentucky, Lexington*

## Malthus Rerevisited

The study of population, which a generation or two ago was one important subdiscipline of economics, has been moved over to sociology departments almost entirely in the United States and in large part elsewhere. In the undoubtedly prejudiced view of one sociologist, this shift was on balance of great benefit. Economic Man, the repository of the psychological postulates underlying economic analysis, is too simplistic a being to help us understand such nonmarket activities as getting (or not getting) married and having (or not having) children. A price was paid for the transfer, however: with their notoriously ahistorical view of social reality, sociologists have usually managed to take the flow of life from generation to generation, as well as the succession of statistics from one census to the next, out of a meaningful historical context. And those relatively few sociologists who do use historical data generally take them from secondary sources and judge them with no special expertise.

An economic historian, in contrast, is typically trained in both of the disciplines relevant to his research. When he writes, as he often does, on a theme in demographic history, he works as a full professional. Thus, the demographic studies published by economic historians during the past two decades have become, in sum, the basis for a new interpretation not merely of Europe's population growth but to some degree of modern Western history. It was inevitable, given the state of academic publishing, that someone would compile some of these articles into a "reader," and it seemed to be our good fortune that two such eminent scholars as David Glass and David Eversley should have undertaken the task in **Population in History: Essays in Historical Demography** (Aldine, Chicago, 1965. 703 pp., $17.50). Although their effort is good in many of its parts, it is, unfortunately, disappointing as a whole.

The two editors contribute separate

introductions which together take up the first 70 pages. The notion given the reader that they are introducing separate, if somewhat overlapping, books is reinforced as he continues through the volume. For Eversley, the "starting point of the wave of research which gave rise to the present collection" is a 1946 paper by the French demographer, Louis Chevalier, which is duly translated and presented with a prefatory editor's note (*not* editors'). On Professor Glass's initiative, however, there is also reprinted (again with an editor's note) an article by T. H. Marshall on "the present state of the controversy" as of 1929, as well as a previously unpublished paper by Glass himself written in 1945. There is also an article entitled "The Vital Revolution Reconsidered" by K. F. Helleiner, which consists largely of a critical survey of prewar studies. In short, the volume has no less than six introductions, and after so much preparatory throat-clearing, even the most indulgent reader must become a bit impatient.

The volume is divided into three parts, "General" (143 pp.), "Great Britain" (272 pp.), and "Europe and the United States" (265 pp.). The first of these has no structure, and the third is as miscellaneous as its title suggests, with four articles on France, two on Scandinavia, and one each on Ireland, Finland, Italy, the German town of Barmen, Flanders, and the United States in its colonial and early national period. There is no grouping by chronology, or by topic within demography, or by any other system; there is no indication why these articles and not two dozen alternatives were selected. This hodge-podge impression is reinforced by the lazy editing of some of these articles. Glass's "Two Papers on Gregory King," for instance, are printed as they originally appeared, including a footnote reference to the first as the introduction to the second; yet it would have taken no more than a few hours' work to incorporate them with the long introductory note into a truly integrated article on their joint subject. Similarly, there are "three essays" on the Midlands by Chambers and "two essays" on Scandinavia by Utterström.

The meat of the volume is the section on Great Britain. Apart from Hollingworth's "Demographic Study of the British Ducal Families," which goes back to the 14th century, these articles pertain to a leading professional interest of both editors—the population changes in Britain during its transition to a modern industrial state. According to the section's first sentence (in an essay by Habukkuk), "There is now a rough consensus of opinion among English economic historians about the broad chronology of English population history"; but as we read farther, we see that very few of the debates focusing for the past century and a half on the figure of Malthus have really been settled. As Malthus insisted against such critics as William Cobbett, and as we now agree, there was a sustained cumulative increase beginning in the latter decades of the 18th century. But the components of this growth of population are still something of a mystery. As one would expect, the volume reprints the masterly essay in which McKeown and Brown conclude that there is little or no medical evidence for a decline in mortality during the 18th century. Habukkuk infers, then, that the increase in population must have been the consequence of a rise in fertility. Krause's much more forceful argument for this position [say, in his article in *Comparative Studies in Society and History* (January 1959)] is not only not included, but is repudiated in Glass's introduction as "no more than not unreasonable speculations"—even though Krause is represented in the volume with a technical note on the English registration system. In short, the "consensus" that Habukkuk refers to does not include either a fall in mortality or a rise in fertility to explain the growth of numbers. We must hope that the debate will continue to a more comfortable resting point.

A more striking deficiency of the book is that, apart from a greater attention to the reliability of statistical sources, the problem is analyzed almost solely in Malthusian terms. In the best single contribution to the volume, J. Haynal argues that the institutionalization of late age at marriage, the "moral restraint" that Malthus advocated, indeed set off modern Western Europe from the rest of the world. But there is far less of such sociological analysis than one would hope to find: I will cite only two obvious examples—the work of Neil Smelser on the conditions of family life during the early period of English industrialization and that of J. A. Banks on those of the English middle class two generations later would have added a new dimension. Eversley mentions "a new kind of social history" that includes such material, but he soon reverts to the dogma that "for any given group of human beings, the circumstances which we call 'economic' are clearly the most important." As a general dictum, I find this no more than the professional bias of an economist.

WILLIAM PETERSEN
*Department of Sociology,*
*University of California, Berkeley*

## Ceramic Studies and Ethnological Investigations

For the purpose of formulating a critical stocktaking of contributions made by ceramic studies to archeological and ethnological research, and of defining areas in which further investigations could fruitfully be made, a conference of specialists was sponsored at Burg Wartenstein, near Vienna, by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research in the summer of 1964.

Seventeen archeologists and ethnologists participated, and the results of their contributed papers and discussions are presented in **Ceramics and Man** (Aldine, Chicago, 1965. 301 pp., $7.50), edited by Frederick R. Matson. The discussions, which were concerned only with unglazed pottery, are arranged regionally and deal with ceramic problems in the New World, Europe, North Africa, the Near East, and Southeast Asia, from the earliest archeological evidence of pottery making to modern ethnological observations.

Naturally, a symposium of this character will be uneven in quality, significance, and style, but thanks to the careful organization of Fejos and the editorial virtuosity of Matson, the several papers complement each other nicely. It was a function of the conference to emphasize that ceramic studies should and can transcend mere description and classification, and that pot sherds have a greater potential for elucidating cultural problems than serving merely as dating fossils or trade indicators. The result, as Fejos says, was "an appraisal of the significance of ceramics for man—what ceramics has made possible for man to do."

Substantively the papers fall into four major groups: (i) methods of studying pottery; (ii) functions of pottery objects in the cultural context of