came convinced that traditional psychological learning theory had little relevance to education. The book is the source of Bruner's controversial aphorism that "any subject can be taught to anybody at any age in some form that is honest." Later, with the help of a group of committed people such as he always has been able to inspire, he developed a curriculum, Man: A Course of Study, which is still the target of John Birchers and assorted creationists.

In 1972, after 27 years at Harvard, Bruner accepted a chair at Wolfson College, Oxford. The happiest part of that decision was his arrival—with friends he sailed his own boat to England. He found and announced that British psychology was parochial, its principal ties being to reductionistic biology. To counter these public criticisms his Oxford colleagues organized a seminar on Bruner's views called, not very affectionately, the Bruner bashing seminar. Still, he made overtures to the philosophers (he believes that cognitive psychology cannot be done without the involvement of philosophy of mind), to other social scientists, and to like-minded psychologists in Britain. His graduate students were international. He was much influenced by the Oxford philosopher John Austin and carried on a program of research on the pragmatics of language acquisition. His data came from the intensive observation of a few children during the early periods of learning to talk. His findings led him to emphasize the practical course of children communicating with their mothers in such homey games as hide and seek. He is unclear whether his conclusions supplement or replace Chomsky's genetic theory of language acquisition. The research does indicate a scientist who sees the importance of observing children and mothers doing things that are significant to them. This and his work on education are far cries from the Bruner who studied thinking by the way subjects sorted cards.

As a research practitioner, Bruner is an "in and outer." He likes to open a topic, skim the top, and let others take over. He is impatient with details and bored after he can see where the project is going. These habits of work fit well with the needs of psychology as a field, or perhaps of any field, where there are phalanxes ready to push forward when they have been shown the direction. There is an in-house adage, to know where psychology will be in five years see what Bruner is working on today. Though often said with a smirk, it is indeed an accolade.

Judging from their choices, it was one of the Sloan Foundation's criteria that their autobiographers write well. This book reads easily, and though its focus is personal it provides an excellent introduction to modern cognitive psychology and its 30-year history. Bruner writes as he researches—on a large canvas with broad brush. He is a polymath and his erudition is reflected in the range of knowledge displayed, from music to art history to single-cell recording in the brain. The writing is sometimes fevered: "I decided that the exercises that constituted Bach's *Art of the Fugue* bore the same kind of relationship to his *B-Minor Mass* that, say, spherical geometry bore to Copernicus's theory of the movement of heavenly bodies, or that combinatorial mathematics bears to gene coding, and so on ad infinitum" (p. 207). His intellectual biography shows why Jerome Bruner is today's best-known psychologist.

HARRY LEVIN
Department of Psychology,
Cornell University,
Ithaca, New York 14853

Correlates of Fame

Genius, Creativity, and Leadership. Historiometric Inquiries. DEAN KEITH SIMONTON. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1984. xii, 231 pp., illus. $20.

Why have so many dreamed of attaining fame? What explains the success of the comparative few who reach this elusive goal? Over the ages these questions have been addressed with considerable insight by the poets. Dante, for instance, was surely not far wrong when he linked the desire for fame to a hope of leaving a more enduring mark on history than does "smoke in air or foam on water." And Shakespeare, although he was only seeking to amuse, showed no little perspicacity when he had Malvolio declaim, "Some are born to greatness, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them."

Indeed, Simonton's central concern in the present book is to identify the respective contributions of birth, merit, and fortune in producing eminent people. However, dissatisfied with traditional approaches, he seeks to bring the study of famous men and women into the realm of science. In particular, he believes that the time is ripe for analyzing the quantitative studies of history's renowned creators and leaders that have appeared in the last century. His objective in doing so is to discern universal "laws" applicable to creativity and leadership. He goes about the task by reviewing the methods and findings of the "historiometric" literature in eight substantive chapters (on progenitors, genes, and generations; personality and character; education; productivity and influence; age and achievement; aesthetics and charisma; Zeitgeist; and political violence). The resulting volume, although fairly comprehensive, is insufficiently focused and self-contained to communicate a deep knowledge of its subject or to engender strong confidence in its claims.

A brief look at Simonton's chapter on the relations between education and ranked eminence illustrates the advantages and limitations of his approach. In the course of the chapter, he refers to some 30 inquiries, drawing empirical results from quantitative studies of various historical and contemporary populations, interpretations from more theoretical works, and illustrative quotations from two books on Einstein. He uses this material to address several issues—for example, the relations between formal education and ultimate fame for leaders and for creators; the connection between education and dogmatism in American presidents; the optimal educational levels for creativity in the arts and in the sciences; and the relation between academic honors and creative fame. The strongest claim to emerge from his discussion is that a "transhistorically invariant" arch-shaped curve relates educational level and ranked eminence in both the arts and the sciences; that is, among famous artists and scientists those with little or much formal training have been less likely to reach the pinnacles of renown than those of moderate educational attainments. Simonton's relation is certainly plausible, for it is easy to see how too little education can impoverish creativity and too much stultify it. But until someone carries out an investigation of the relation between training and eminence that takes adequate account of both national differences in educational systems and their historical evolution there is little reason to think that Simonton has made a genuine scientific discovery.

Simonton has performed a valuable service by reviewing the literature, raising issues, and advancing hypotheses. But he has not, in my judgment, taken the study of fame significantly beyond the insights of the poets, philosophers, and biographers.

KARL HUFBAUER
Department of History,
University of California,
Irvine 92717