

advanced by the pre-Darwinian evolutionists, namely Buffon, Lamarck, St. Hilare, Lyell and Erasmus Darwin gradually replaced the theory of catastrophism of Cuvier and his school who would not, under any circumstances, admit the possibility of the mutability and gradual evolution of species.

It is apparent that the author has delved deeply into the primary sources which form the basis for his synthesis and all those who are interested in the development of the theory of organic evolution will find this book most stimulating. Perhaps the author might have dealt more fully with the debt which the post-Renaissance scientist owes to such Greek and Roman thinkers as Xenophanes, Democritus, Epicurus and Lucretius. The illustrations are poorly reproduced and do not accord with the otherwise high standard of the publication.

Lawrence OSCHINSKY,
Human History Branch,
National Museum of Canada.

*

*

*

Human Evolution. Noel HORN, and Harry S. SMITH. New York 17: Henry Holt and Company, 1959, 447 pp, illustrated. \$5.50.

Those of us who teach or have taught physical anthropology will almost certainly welcome the appearance of this book of readings extracted from various publications dealing with human evolution and racial differentiation. The work is divided into seven parts or sections including discussions on the scope of anthropology, genetics, fossil man, and theories of racial origin. There is an equal emphasis on the processes as well as the products of evolution which reflect the contemporary trend in this field.

Many readings quoted are taken exclusively from American, English, and French sources but none are given from Italian, Spanish, Belgian, Dutch, German or Scandinavian works. Often the readings are extracted from accessible books such as Boule and Vallois "Fossil Men", and Hooton "Up From the Ape" rather than from the original monographs and papers.

It would have been interesting if Weidenreich's and Hooton's criticisms of the limitations of the serological-genetical approach had been included since otherwise the uninformed reader might erroneously assume that morphology has no place in modern racial taxonomy. Since morphology is still regarded as a valid criterion in palaeontology and zoological taxonomy it is strange that some anthropologists and haematologists are of the opinion that it is inapplicable to study studies of human racial taxonomy.

Lawrence OSCHINSKY,
Human History Branch,
National Museum of Canada.