eigenfunctions (of fictitious Hamiltonians) and which as they stand give no information about the electron density distribution—are subjected to equivalent orbital transformations to give orbitals that so far as possible satisfy the strong orthogonality condition, one finds that the various descriptions are in essential agreement about the answer to this question: Are there or are there not in XeF_2 and XeF_4 five and six electron pairs, respectively, in the valence shell of xenon?

Arguments about whether xenon utilizes *d*-character in its bonding orbitals are probably specious. The suggestion made in one study that changes in nuclear repulsion may be balanced by changes in electron repulsion reenforces my prejudice that the results of molecular orbital studies are to be viewed as, at best approximate, *descriptions* of electronic structure, not as *explanations*.

In summary, the noble-gas episode has been chiefly a domestic affair—one for chemists by chemists. Simultaneously, however, it has been an impressive illustration of the congency of an observation about science made 38 years ago by Gilbert N. Lewis. Scientific theories, Lewis wrote, "are not those beautiful structures so delicately designed that a single flaw may cause the collapse of the whole. The scientist builds slowly and with a gross but solid kind of masonry. If dissatisfied with any of his work, even if it be near the very foundations, he can replace that part without damage to the remainder. On the whole he is satisfied with his work, for while science may never be wholly right, it certainly is never wholly wrong; and it seems to be improving from decade to decade."

Human Engineering

Anthropometric Survey of Turkey, Greece, and Italy. H. T. E. Hertzberg, Edmund Churchill, C. Wesley Dupertuis, Robert M. White, and Albert Damon. Published for NATO by Pergamon, London; Macmillan, New York, 1963. Illus. $15.

No previous study of as many as 3356 men has been as thorough as this description of the pilots and enlisted men of three Mediterranean countries; the study was prepared for NATO. Data include social background, body-build photographs, skinfold and body composition measurements, and 150 measurements of the diameters and circumferences of body, limbs, and head. The primary purpose was to ensure functional fit of the men's equipment, clothing, and workspace, but the somatotype and body composition records are intended for much wider use in comparing populations, in aging studies, and in study of constitution.

A complete visual index for all measurements is given in chapter 7B, and chapter 8 devotes one page to each measurement, including an exact diagram, a photograph, and a description of technique, the usual statistical parameters (M, σ, V, N) for all subgroups (country total, pilots, cadets, ground forces, Army, Navy enlisted man), and percentiles for Turkey, Greece, Italy, and the U.S. Air Force. Together with these, the succinct descriptions of instruments and methods (Hertzberg, chapter 2), of somatotyping (Dupertuis, chapter 4), of measuring skinfold or subcutaneous fat (White, chapter 5), and of statistical methods and sampling (Churchill, chapters 3 and 7A) make up the ultimate encyclopedia for objectively describing body shape. This elaborate set of standards will be invaluable to everyone working in descriptive human engineering. But it will also be most useful to physicians and public health officers who, in making surveys, intend to use a few critical measures for nutritional status or growth. The many uses of such data are made apparent in chapter 6 where Damon gives a critical worldwide outline of such surveys, from 1869 to the present, and considers the evolution of the use of body-build methods and studies in such fields as nutrition, physiology, disease susceptibility, and race and population differences. This discussion saves the book from being a purely technical manual.

The style is laconic and clear throughout. There are very few obvious errors—on pages 136 and 137 the diagrams for patella height (bottom) and for calf height are interchanged. Some purists will object to use of "nasal root depression" rather than "nasion" (naso-frontal suture) for face, nose, and forehead heights. But an interesting discussion of anatomic variability in vertebral spine protrusion (for the landmark cervicale) applies by inference to nasion and other bony landmarks.

The population conclusions (p. 275) are limited to the major trend—body size increases from Turks to Greeks to Italians (to Americans). But the data indicate much more. Weight-stature ratios show that Turks are relatively lightest, Italians stoutest, with Greeks and U.S. Air Force personnel intermediate. Greeks and Italians tend to be stocky in build and Turks thin and muscular in comparison with more elongated Americans. All four populations are more alike in bony dimensions of the trunk than in limb lengths and proportions, in fat, or in head and face proportions. One of the most creative possibilities mentioned in Appendix III, "Future plans," is the proposed sale, three or more years hence, of the coded data cards to qualified scholars in NATO countries. This will stimulate comparison with local civilian samples, analyses of growth and health trends, and genetic studies.

The most surprising thing about this book is that the entire collecting, processing, and publishing of these data took only 3 years. This speed and competence is a tribute to the ability of the American team and to the enthusiastic cooperation they inspired and received in more than a dozen different Mediterranean Air Force centers. The human contribution made by this work to knowledge and to friendship contrasts with current political tensions.

Competent fieldwork in physical anthropology is not easy with respect to techniques or human relations. This effort, under the leadership of Hertzberg, clarifies both.

J. LAWRENCE ANGEL
Division of Physical Anthropology, U.S. National Museum, Smithsonian Institution

German-English Dictionary

Dictionary of Pure and Applied Physics. vol. 1, *German-English*. Compiled by Louis de Vries and W. E. Clason. Elsevier, New York, 1963. viii + 367 pp. $9.95.

It might be assumed that the cooperation of two distinguished lexicographers would result in a nearly impeccable product; regrettably, this dictionary falls short of the high standards set by De Vries and Clason in their other volumes.

Certain aspects of the dictionary suggest an undue delegation of authority or inadequate editorial responsibility. Although I acknowledge the merit of including ". . . also . . . the most useful and commonly used technical