

The author has been egregiously eclectic in his scholarship. He has ransacked the Great Books and many of the lesser ones to provide well over a thousand references from just under 700 sources as diverse as *The Ladies' Home Journal*, Oscar Wilde, Black Hawk, St. Teresa, e. e. cummings, *The Thousand and One Nights*, *A Young Girl's Diary*, Emily Post and the U. S. Infantry School. One notes, however, the neglect of the non-monographic writings of most of the outstanding contemporary anthropologists and their colleagues in related social sciences.

Teachers of introductory courses will find this text poorly adaptable to divergent points of view. Discussion of social or cultural dynamics is omitted without comment by the author. Such topics as diffusion, invention, acculturation, and social change are not even listed in the index. Problems of personality and culture or cultural evolution are not touched upon, and the concept of ethos or cultural configuration is dismissed with the comment, "I . . . do not find it very useful" (p. 87).

Sections of the book, such as the discussions of economic worth on pp. 361-64 or of status and role are admirable; yet few would hold with statements like the following: "The earliest known art is body decoration, inasmuch as artifacts which were most likely used for the purpose have been found dating back to Lower Pleistocene 2" (p. 283); or, ". . . the most adequate culture is that by which the participants can satisfy the widest range of motives most completely" (p. 85). Many would quarrel with the simple dichotomy of cultures into folk cultures and civilizations (p. 132), the work of Redfield notwithstanding. And one detects an ethnocentric bias in applying canons of Aristotelian esthetics to all art (p. 273)—and this in spite of the author's own statement on p. 270 that, "A society's esthetic theory is its esthetics." This reviewer would not relish having to parry the questions of a few alert students in defense of all too many questionable passages in Dr. Slotkin's book.

It is perhaps gratuitous to carp about details, yet stylistic, editorial, typographic and other infractions pepper these pages and their cumulative effect is annoying. On p. 191 we read of "mature spirits" who on p. 208 become, as intended, "nature spirits." It seems unnecessary to cite a source for proverbs such as "a miss is as good as a mile" (p. 272) or "all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy" (p. 271). These seem reasonably well established in the public domain. On pp. 250 and 321 references that belong in foot-notes appear in the text. The table on p. 323 is aggravatingly referred to overleaf, and better composition would not have broken the table on pp. 424-425.

If this review seems unduly harsh, it may be tempered by noting that many of the criticisms given here would have been obviated by more responsible publishing practices. The fact that Dr. Slotkin wrote his manuscript during the war when he was not engaged in the normal practice of his profession as an anthropologist is only too apparent. It is regrettable that he has not been persuaded to air it in the classroom rather than bring it, in spite of the delay in publication, prematurely to press.

JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

*An Introduction to Social Anthropology*, Vol. 1. RALPH PIDDINGTON. (xxvi, 442 pp., 6 plates, 4 maps, 25 s., Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1950.)

Professor Piddington has accepted the role of a disciple propagating the faith of

the master. In *An Introduction to Social Anthropology* he has undertaken to formulate a general, systematic introductory anthropology, limited to social behavior, in the terms of the late Bronislaw Malinowski's Functionalism. Thus he assumes a task that Malinowski himself had started for an American publisher in the 1930's, but never lived to finish.

By virtue of its faithful dedication to Malinowskiism, the book presents marked worth and glaring weaknesses. It is a valuable addition to the textbook field of anthropological works in that it offers a concise presentation of Malinowski's system. Inasmuch as Malinowski's prolific output was scattered in many sources, it is definitely desirable for newcomers in anthropology to have access to its essence in a compact form.

In addition to repetition of Malinowski's basic ideas, which for the most part he has no more than thinly paraphrased, the author has included a number of fairly long abstracts, or condensations, of fragments of functionalist field studies from the reports of the better known Malinowski-trained field workers. These, too, will serve as convenient starting points in familiarizing the new student with some of the best current work in contemporary British anthropology.

However, it is in these very advantages that the disturbing weaknesses of Piddington's book also lie. Just as the master was prone to give the impression that he had a corner on "scientific" anthropology and, indeed, that all significant and meaningful anthropology began with him, so a reading of Piddington's book could easily impress the neophyte that all anthropology of consequence is the product of Malinowski and his followers. This is the complete list of those who are bibliographically cited for four or more titles—E. E. Evans-Pritchard, R. Firth, M. Fortes, C. D. Forde, J. G. Frazer, H. I. Hogbin, L. P. Mair, B. Malinowski, S. F. Nadel, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, A. I. Richards, C. H. Wedgewood. Furthermore, internal evidence indicates that the author has limited his own reading in large measure to the products of his own school. He seems actually to be unaware of a considerable number of truly significant studies done by Europeans and Americans. What he has read of the works of anthropologists in this country is, with a few exceptions, obsolete. And yet he makes bold to pronounce *ex cathedra dicta* as to the worthlessness of "non-Functionalist" work. He bandies the threadbare "thing of shreds and patches" phrase, and reiterates the idea that Functionalists (i.e., Malinowskiites) alone work with a realization of the fact that all aspects of culture are interrelated and interactive. He rules out historical considerations in the old, familiar terms, "Historical reconstruction cannot therefore be scientific, *in the sense in which the functionalist uses the term,*" allowing only that, "Sometimes, but only very rarely, is it possible to study historical problems contextually" (p. 29; italics ours). Professor Piddington has not moved a single step beyond Malinowski's backward looking orientation of twenty years ago, which was concerned with historical reconstruction in terms of its nineteenth and early twentieth century manifestations. What justification there can be for denying the usefulness of reconstructive historical techniques in the light, let us say, of such auxiliary utilization of them as aids in the analysis of the Pueblo complex in the Southwest, as done by Steward, Strong, Titiev and Hawley, is hard to see.

Of the culture area concept the author blithely declares, ". . . as an instrument of

scientific analysis it is useless and may even be dangerous as leading to an entirely wrong conception of culture as a mere agglomeration of traits" (p. 23). If used as a tool on the level at which the author proceeds to utilize it, assuredly it is useless. The reader, after an introductory chapter, is taken on "A Cooks' Tour of Primitive Peoples,"<sup>1</sup> or around the world in 45 pages—25 of which are devoted to a long stop-over with the Karadjeri tribe of Australia, a good summary of the author's own field work. North America is "Cooked" in 17 pages *a la* Wissler's 1923 food areas! Of Kroeber's refined and excellent use of the culture area concept in the analysis of the relations between cultures and natural areas, not an inkling.

As for the structure of the book at large, after the Cooks' tour is over, there follow two long chapters on "Social Organization." These present the standard facts of kinship practices, local, sex, age, political, totemic and voluntary groupings. For the benefit of the novice, each first introduction of a term from the anthropological lexicon is set in bold face type.

Chapter VI follows with "The Principles of Cultural Analysis." Its content consists of Malinowski's formulations of primary, derived and integrative needs and their relations to institutions and the universal aspects of culture. Successive chapters present "Food and Wealth," "Land Tenure," and "Primitive Law" in terms of Malinowski's formulations and as exemplified in Richards' subsistence studies of the Southeastern Bantu, Hogbin's report on Wogeo land tenure, Wilson's on Nyakyusa, and Hogbin's Wogeo and Schapera's Southern Bantu *re* law.

The author's conceptual treatment of primitive law rests exactly as Malinowski stated it in 1934 in his introduction to Hogbin's *Law and Order in Polynesia*. Seagle's penetrating criticism of Malinowski's approach (*American Anthropologist*, Vol. 39, 1937, pp. 275-290) is wholly ignored. It made no impression on the disciple—for he shows not the slightest inclination critically to re-examine what he learned from his great teacher at the University of London in the middle 1930's. More amazing is the fact that he apparently even lost touch with Malinowski's later thought. Malinowski's last essay, published shortly after his death, was a long and conscientious re-thinking of his entire approach to primitive law.<sup>2</sup> The author appears not to have read it; nor is it cited in his bibliography.

This review should not be read as an attack upon the contribution of Bronislaw Malinowski. True, his assertive dogmatism was often unjustified. But his originality and stimulating productivity were such that he greatly advanced our science on many fronts. My objection is to Professor Piddington's failure to sift the kernel from the chaff and to his serving up the chaff-laden product as though it were royal pudding.

A second volume is projected that will cover the subjects of geographical environment, material culture, the life cycle, individual psychology, culture contact and the application of anthropological methods to the study of modern communities.

E. ADAMSON HOEBEL

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
SALT LAKE CITY

<sup>1</sup> Title of Chapters II and III.

<sup>2</sup> B. Malinowski, "A New Instrument for the Study of Law—Especially Primitive" (*Lawyer's Guild Review*, Vol. 2, 1942, pp. 1-12; also in *The Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 51, 1942), pp. 1237-1254.