series, placing it in the Eastern Ghats cycle of India.

The Seychelles archipelago, a group of rugged islands in the western Indian Ocean, consists of almost wholly Precambrian granites (650 million years old). It has been suggested that these granites are remnants of Gondwanaland left behind after continental drift. Further geophysical and marine geological research will shed more light on this speculation.

Precambrian rocks occupy two-thirds of the island of Madagascar. The island has been extensively surveyed and completely mapped in less than 40 years. Six cycles of geological evolution in the Precambrian are recognized, ranging in date from more than 2420 million to 1060 million years ago.

The chapter on the Precambrian of the Congo, Rwanda, and Burundi is extensive and makes up more than half of this volume. The authors of this chapter divide the area into five districts and recognize five cycles, ranging in date from more than 3000 million to 500 million years ago. One of the cycles (Katangan cycle) in Katanga is world renowned for its mineral deposits (Cu, Co, Zn, and U). The senior author is coauthor of *The Geochronology of Equatorial Africa* (1966), which presents more geochronological data.

English-speaking geoscientists will welcome the reviews on Madagascar, Congo, Rwanda, and Burundi, since much of the existing literature is in French and in journals that are not readily available. It is convenient to have the reviews of the Precambrian of Gondwanaland collected in one volume.

POW-FOONG FAN
Hawaii Institute of Geophysics, University of Hawaii, Honolulu

Anthropology Today

Biennial Review of Anthropology, 1967. BERNARD J. SIEGEL and ALAN R. BEALS, Eds. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif., 1967. x + 368 pp. $9.

Anthropology is fortunate that Bernard Siegel (joined now for the first time by Alan Beals) devotes so much care to his series of biennial reviews. Having said that—and it is true—I must record finishing the 1967 volume with considerable malaise. The discomfort has two sources, as far as I can tell: the editors have, by sticking to the recognized subdivisions of anthropology, missed the main point; and most of the contributors have, by looking at the diversity within their specialties rather than the way they fit into the rest of the subject, obscured it even further. Individually, editors and authors have done their jobs well. But what emerges is a discipline suffering from hyperdevelopment of isolated nuclei.

In the first decade and a half after World War II—before general systems theory had diffused and before primatology and the new archeology had flowered—it was stylish to argue that the unity of anthropology was an artifact of men such as Boas and Seligman, who could make sweeping contributions to the several branches of the subject because it was an infant subject. What good, some of us asked, could physical anthropology do a social anthropologist? What use linguistics to an archeologist?

But things look different today—and that difference is not reflected in this book. Most branches of anthropology have not quite caught up with the new unity sufficiently to create the broad generalizations that will make that unity obvious to all. But unity is nevertheless coming on strong. Therefore, one has the feeling that these up-to-date summaries are out of pace with the times.

Three articles ably summarize contributions on language and the relationships between linguistics and anthropology (Durbin), on physical anthropology (Bleibtreu), and on social organization (Tyler). There is no need, in any of these fields, for a "new view."

Two articles do provide needed new views: MacNeish on Mesoamerican archeology and Halpern and Brode on peasants. MacNeish's new view emerges both from a great deal of new work and from methodological innovation. It is made clear that one of the problems in archeology is that progress necessitates not merely the rewriting of the subject but the rewriting of history itself. The long article on peasants needs special comment because, I suspect, it will come to be a "funnel" through which all future research will pass. As such it is useful—and demands high standards when we criticize it. Brode's contribution to the article is a review of economic anthropology which unfortunately will prolong the myth of serious breach between the followers of Karl Polanyi and everybody else. It is a great pity that this fuss (there is no other word for it) should not, in this of all contexts, have been cleared up. The dispute grows out of a failure to distinguish unstated assumptions about peasant economy on one hand and "primitive" economy on the other. Halpern's part of the article deals with a summary of everybody's—but *everybody*'s—definition of "peasant," with the political aspects of "peasant society," and with the place of "peasants" in a continuum between tribal peoples and urban peoples; there is a review of peasants in the Soviet setting and elsewhere, and some comments about American attitudes toward peasants.

Finally, there are two articles that prove conclusively that at least two of the subdisciplines of anthropology must either reform or perish: Pelto's on the wasteland of psychological anthropology and Murphy's on the lumber room of culture change. Murphy does the sensible thing—he gives the bibliography and reviews briefly four of the contributions he most admires. Pelto has more stamina: he tries to arrange the contributions of psychological anthropology in some sort of order to bring sense into the field. He notes that this specialty is becoming constantly less enchanting. I agree, and would add that perhaps the reason is that comparatively few contributors to it (from either side) know both anthropology and psychology. He says that interest in psychoanalysis is waning; that may be true, but I suspect that the number of anthropologists who actually know something about psychoanalysis rather than merely are "influenced" by it is growing. Pelto's arrangement is an admirable tour de force, but I think he has not been firm enough in his judgments or harsh enough in his criticisms.

The good of the biennial review is that the articles set a useful bibliography into context. Specialists can and will use them. But the book, taken as a whole, does not give an overview of anthropology during the years that are covered. I hope every specialist whose subfield is covered in this book will buy a copy. I also hope that nobody will judge the condition of the entire discipline by it.

PAUL BOHANNAN
Department of Anthropology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois