

tested is not specifically related to genetics, the chapter fully deserves its place in the book since it illustrates one of the uses—the study of differences in identical twins is another—to which genetically derived material can be put. As most contributors realize, the calculation of numerical estimates of heritability is only one of the goals of human behaviour genetics.

One hopes the book will encourage a growing interest in genetics among psychologists and a reciprocal interest in psychology among geneticists.

JAMES SHIELDS

HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY

A Source Book in the History of Psychology

Edited by Prof. Richard J. Herrnstein and Prof. Edwin G. Boring. Pp. xvii + 636. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1965.) 100s. net.

THERE are very few books dealing with the history of psychology, and most of these have been written by Boring. The present *Source Book in the History of Psychology* is no exception, except that Herrnstein, also from Harvard University, has been made co-author. The book contains 116 excerpts from short to middling in length, and ranging in time from Epicurus (c. 300 B.C.) to the turn of the present century—and sometimes a little beyond. The arrangement is by topic; there are fifteen of these, covering such aspects as psychophysics, visual perception, cerebral localization, the reflex, association, and learning; within each topic the arrangement is in date order. The sections are preceded by a general statement in which the authors provide a setting for the reader, and individual excerpts are preceded or followed by quite brief notes which again are invariably helpful to the reader in directing his attention to points of interest, premonitions of later experiments or connexions with other authors.

It is very difficult to review a book of this kind; all that a reviewer could say after all would be whether he liked or disliked the particular choice made by the two authors. There can be few psychologists with sufficient temerity to argue the case with Prof. Boring, and in someone who does not have one-tenth of his historical knowledge or learning it may even seem presumptuous to say that on the whole the choice is excellent. However, taking courage in both hands, a few criticisms may perhaps be voiced, if only *sub voce*. In the first place, while we must welcome the inclusion of a section dealing with individual differences, these all deal with intelligence. Surely something could have been provided on personality? Excerpts that come to mind are Kant's chapter on temperament in his *Anthropologie*, which was extremely influential and has found modern support in many factor analytic studies; Wundt's adumbration of the dimensional approach in his *Physiologische Psychologie*, and Binet's very important description of the personality differences between his two daughters.

These omissions are perhaps symptomatic of the tendency of the authors to restrict the term 'psychology' somewhat unduly; we have Fechner on Fechner's Law (predictably enough!), but why not Fechner on experimental aesthetics? His discussion of aesthetics (*Von Oben Und Unten*) is a classic which should not be omitted in a book like this. In a similar way we are given Hartley on association but we are not given his extremely interesting and forward-looking discussion of the application of associationist principles to criminology and other important human activities. It might be objected that where something new comes in, something else has to go out, but in answer one might perhaps feel that some of the selections are more relevant to physiology than psychology.

It will be seen that even these criticisms are more a reflexion of my own preferences than firm indications of the dereliction of the authors; they certainly do not for a minute diminish the importance of this book, which may serve to lead many psychologists into an appreciation of historical writings which at the moment is so sadly lacking. We already owe so much to Boring that it is a pleasure to welcome this latest Harvard effort, and to wish it the success it so richly deserves.

H. J. EYSENCK

INVESTIGATION OF SOCIAL STATUS

Roles

An Introduction to the Study of Social Relations. By Michael Banton. Pp. ix + 224. (London: Tavistock Publications, Ltd., 1965.) 21s. net.

WRITERS who concern themselves with social class are legion; few approach their chosen causes in any spirit of scientific enquiry. Yet better regard for this complex field of social relations is essential for human and social development and, in *Roles*, Prof. Michael Banton has not only made a timely and conspicuous contribution to existing knowledge but has also provided a great stimulus to further investigation.

Using material obtained from studies of primitive, peasant and industrial societies, he analyses different kinds of social structure in terms of roles. Banton's approach is different from that of other sociologists, however, in that he is less concerned with the behaviour of people who occupy various roles (their 'context') than in the implications of the inter-relations between roles. Various definitions of concepts like status, class, prestige and esteem are examined and from these Banton builds up a theory of roles involving a rough, threefold classification into basic, general and independent. His basic roles are concerned with distinctions of sex and age, race and rank, and "are those which predetermine most of the positions open to an individual and which have implications for the way the parties behave towards one another in a correspondingly large proportion of social situations". General roles are usually allocated to individuals in accordance with their qualifications and are frequently associated with activities of a religious or political character. Independent roles are associated with individual merit, examples being most leisure roles and many occupational roles in industrial societies. From these definitions, Banton expands to examine, in greater depth, the connexion between economic development and role strains; role signs; role-changing; roles and the self; the compatibility of roles; the prestige of roles; and the relation of social density to order and progress.

Such a thoughtful and original work could scarcely be free from error or issues where different observers would place different emphasis or interpretations. Banton, for example, has misjudged the pace at which men are taking over home roles of women (for example, matrons in hospitals) and the reason that doctors prefer not to treat members of their own families. He labours the psychological ramifications of incest and neglects genetic drawbacks. He also needs to delineate more clearly the difference between job status and personal prestige and their significance for all kinds of workers in industrial communities. In a book which is based on wide survey and scholarship in many disciplines, however, Banton expostulates so persuasively that most readers should welcome *Roles* as a worthy descendant of T. H. Marshall's study of social class in 1934. The transparent simplicity of the writing adds value to the text and altogether makes this one of the most outstanding contributions to sociology during the past three decades. It could profitably be used in the education of all who are concerned with people, whether primitive or from industrial societies. This