

requirements of the species, and his actual analysis of social institutions reveals a quite different theory. This is the above-mentioned view of function as pertaining to the interrelatedness of institutions and the contribution of any part of a culture to the persistence of the whole. This kind of functionalism was pervasive in the development of both anthropology and sociology, and it was clearly enunciated by Durkheim, who long antedates Malinowski. Malinowski's meticulous functional analysis of the institutions of Trobriand society set a high standard for ethnographic reporting and synthesis, however, and his lasting contribution lies here and not in his theory of needs.

One aspect of Malinowski's theory dealt with the obvious and the other with the tried, and Goldschmidt's book suffers from the same problems. Terminological confusion is hardly swept away, nor is any underlying unity disclosed, by his grand inclusion of the stock market and primitive gift-giving under the rubric of the "sharing function." And when Goldschmidt goes on to show that the differences between "goods-sharing institutions" in different societies are functions of the imbeddedness of these institutions in other institutions, we may well ask where lies the "bold, new approach." The basic dilemma arises from the juxtaposition of two unreconciled concepts of function, and this is aggravated by a failure to provide a rigorous definition of function or even a partial inventory of functions. The reader's quandary as to "functionalism" is intensified by the fact that the "comparative" half of Goldschmidt's title is hardly brought into question. We are left in doubt not only as to what he is comparing, but how and why as well. *Comparative Functionalism* is best understood as a long programmatic statement and not the promulgation of a theory. That this is not just a critic's interpretation is attested to by the author, who writes: "Indeed, what will be presented here is not a model in the true sense, but rather a schema for a model, a general plan or program within which the detailed model—or sectors of such a model—can be constructed" (p. 33). Now that Goldschmidt has written his prolegomenon, we may look forward to the book he has promised us.

ROBERT F. MURPHY

*Department of Anthropology,
Columbia University, New York City*

Development of Psychiatry

Franz G. Alexander and Sheldon T. Selesnick are both psychoanalysts. They consequently divide their **The History of Psychiatry: An Evaluation of Psychiatric Thought and Practice from Prehistoric Times to the Present** (Harper and Row, New York, 1966. 487 pp., illus. \$11.95) into three parts: the dark ages ante Freud (164 pp.), the Freudian age (186 pp.), and the present (135 pp.). In the same vein, so-called predecessors of Freud—St. Augustine (8 pp.), Spinoza (4 pp.), the romantic Heinroth (3 pp.)—fare much better than such essential psychiatrists as Pinel (1½ pp.), Kraepelin (2 pp.), or Griesinger (3½ pp.). Bias is not a good foundation for history writing.

It is obvious from the contents that the authors only rarely have read all the "predecessors" and nonpredecessors they discuss. They have mostly compiled from older histories of medicine and psychiatry. Unfortunately, the actual historical part of this book—about one third of it—cannot even be called a successful compilation. Sometimes the sources are bad, sometimes things have been mixed up while being copied or seem invented to fill the numerous gaps in actual knowledge. Thus we "learn," for example, that the cult of Aesculapius declined in the 7th century B.C. (p. 27), whereas actually it flourished 200 years later, in the 5th century B.C.; that Thessalus "promised a doctor's degree" in the 1st century A.D. (p. 42); that Soranus of Ephesus (2nd century A.D.) was a Roman and the teacher of Caelius Aurelianus (5th century A.D.) (p. 47); that the older Vesalius was a Belgian from "Wessale" (p. 73). Even the exile of Freud is incorrectly dated (p. 210).

The second part, The Freudian Age, which properly speaking is no longer history, is better. Here the authors are familiar with the material they handle: Freud's own evolution, the psychoanalytic pioneers (Abraham, Jones, Ferenczi), the "dissenters" (Adler, Jung, Rank), and the "contributors outside psychoanalysis" (E. Bleuler, Piaget, Binet, Rorschach, A. Meyer). Especially the two latter groups are handled with a commendable and benevolent objectivity.

The third part, Recent Developments, is the most undogmatic, readable, and informative part of the book. Seven main trends are reported and discussed: the organic approach (includ-

ing among other things biochemistry, neurophysiology, and psychopharmacology), psychological developments (learning theory, psychotherapy), social psychiatry (with important chapters on addictions and law), child psychiatry, psychosomatic medicine (which has been strongly influenced by Alexander in the United States). Short chapters deal with existentialist psychiatry and the "culturalist" school. The authors leave open the question which of these channels the main stream of development will turn into.

ERWIN H. ACKERKNECHT

*Medizinhistorisches Institut,
Universität Zürich,
Zürich, Switzerland*

Environmental Carcinogenesis

Cancer of the respiratory system occupies a unique position in the field of environmental cancer in that it is the first major instance in which an etiological association of environmental agents with cancer involves more than just a unique population group or a restricted geographical area. Further, economic considerations have had an unprecedented influence on the initiation and implementation of measures to control what is essentially a problem in public health. Finally, the habit of cigarette smoking, certainly a significant factor in the increasing incidence of cancer of the respiratory tract, has broad social, physical, and legal implications. Because of these as well as other reflections of the problems of respiratory cancer, publications purporting to evaluate the problem scientifically should be rigorous and disciplined in their facts, assessments, and conclusions.

Occupational and Environmental Cancers of the Respiratory System

(Springer, New York, 1966. 226 pp., illus. \$8.50) by W. C. Hueper would more appropriately be titled "Occupational Cancer of the Respiratory System" because of its glaring failure to discuss and assess the role of cigarette smoking, a major environmental, respiratory, carcinogenic experience. Hueper, an acknowledged pioneer and authority in the field of occupational cancer, has written a book that, though comprehensive, is uneven in its critical approach to the several areas of the subject. It is understandable that in a relatively brief text many complex mat-