

be added that Dr. Svarlien takes cognizance elsewhere of the points made in this paragraph (e.g., pages 42-45, 64-65), thus manifesting in this instance the inconsistency noted earlier.

The chief importance of the Eastern Greenland Case, as the author observes, lies in its precedent-setting quality in the determination of requirements for territorial sovereignty in the polar regions. As he rightly points out, effective occupation has always been important, and was generally recognized as a requirement after the Berlin conference on Africa in 1884-1885. However, controversies such as those over Bouvet, Palmas, and Clipperton Islands showed that in cases involving small, remote and uninhabited insular territories the requirements might be modified or reduced. Faced for the first time with the responsibility of adjudicating a case involving polar territory, the majority of the Court came to the conclusion that in such circumstances also the requisites for sovereignty might be reduced. Dissenting judges Anzilotti and Vogt argued impressively that in the particular case at hand Denmark had failed to meet the test of sovereignty, but nevertheless, quite apart from the merits or demerits of Denmark's claim, the majority view would appear to be reasonable as a general principle applicable to polar areas. Such adjudications evidently must take into account differing conditions and changing circumstances — if the law is not to be the "ass" that Mr. Bumble said it was — and this in turn necessitates what Dr. Svarlien calls the generally accepted aspect of intertemporal law, that the validity of a particular act or arrangement must be ascertained according to the law of its time. The issue of retroactivity is something else again, and is less clear cut. The conditions laid down in 1885 for effective possession in Africa — a habitable, inhabited, and productive region — were appropriate for the time, place, and circumstances. So, in general, it seems to me, were those judged sufficient fifty years afterwards for sovereignty over a polar territory such as Eastern Greenland — remote,

uninhabited, and unexploitable except on a small scale. In both cases the test was the pragmatic one of what was reasonable in the circumstances, and in both cases the law applied was just.

This review, although attempting to subject the monograph under discussion to critical evaluation, is by no means intended to convey the impression that it amounts altogether to an inferior piece of work. Quite the contrary, in fact. It is painstakingly researched from an impressive collection of sources, Scandinavian and French as well as English; and, apart from what seem to me, at least, to be weaknesses, it is very well written and thoroughly interesting. It should help to publicize an important case, which has probably not received the attention it deserves from non-legal people interested in the polar regions.

GORDON W. SMITH

THE PEOPLES OF SIBERIA. M. G. LEVIN AND L. P. POTAPOV, eds. *Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. 1964. pp. 948. \$20.00*

This work was originally published by the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences in 1956, under the title of *Narody Sibiri*. It was translated and printed by Scripta Technica, Inc. The translation was edited by Stephen P. Dunn.

The book may be divided into seven sections. The Introduction by the Editors is brief (12 pp.), but important for the average reader because it points out the ethnic and linguistic affiliations of the various groups, and both descriptively and by use of a map, their geographic distribution, and thus prepares him for the rather complex subject that follows. The next section was written by A. P. Okladnikov, the eminent and pioneering archaeologist who over the past 30 years has archaeologically discovered and re-discovered large parts of eastern Siberia and the Soviet Far East. He summarizes in 97 pages the then (mid-1950's) known principal archaeological materials and periodizations, from the Upper Paleolithic to the end of the first millennium A.D. This is followed by M. G. Levin's short (7 pp.) summary of the physical types of aboriginal Siberians. The fourth section, written by L. P. Potapov, with the assistance of others, is a historical-ethnographic survey of the Russian population of Siberia prior to the 1917 revolution.

The bulk of the book is taken up by descriptions of some 31 tribal and national groups. These are divided into the "Peoples of southern Siberia"—Buryats, Yakuts, Altays, Khakasy, Tuvsans, West Siberian Tatars, Shors, and Tofalars—and "Peoples of northern Siberia and the Far East"—Khanty, Mansi, Nentsy, Nganasans, Entsy, Selkups, Kets, Evenkis, Dolgans, Evens, Negidals, Nanays, Ulchis, Udegeys, Orochis, Oroks, Nivkhis, Yukagirs, Chukchis, Eskimos, Koryaks, Itelmens, and Aleuts.

The Appendices contain an extensive bibliography, a useful but incomplete glossary, and an index.

Even though it suffers from many shortcomings, this is an important work, an important translation. It brings together information that hitherto had been available in scattered publications, of which few had been translated or written in English. (The exceptions are the works of Bogoraz and Jochelson.) The year of its publication in the original Russian, 1956, expresses a transitional,

early post-Stalinist era, with still too many odes to the Marxist pantheon evident. As a result of this, we find that at least one-third of the text is devoted to the descriptions of "socialist" advances among the aboriginal peoples of Siberia. Yet, despite this, I repeat, that it is an important work and will remain so, until more recent works of Soviet authors are translated and published in a single volume or series.

A. P. Okladnikov's contribution to this book "Ancient population of Siberia and its cultures," had been translated and published earlier in the *Russian Translation Series of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Vol. 1, No. 1 (1959)*. A review of it by this reviewer was published in *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 721-722. At a distance of five years, I only add that the translation of Okladnikov's article in the work under review reads better and contains fewer mistranslations and typographical errors.

L. P. Potapov's historical-ethnographic survey of the Russian population of Siberia contains many new bits of information not commonly known to the Western reader. We learn that the first written reference to the West Siberian Ugrians occurs in the *Novgorod Chronicle* for 1096 A.D., referring to the year 1032 A.D. By the 12th century the Ugrians were paying tribute to the Novgorod overlords in the form of animal skins and "fish-teeth" (walrus ivory). By the beginning of the 16th century the Russians were exacting tribute from the northernmost inhabitants of the world, the predecessors of the present-day Nganasans of the Taymyr peninsula.

There are some 800,000 non-Russians in Siberia. Linguistically and numerically they are very unevenly divided, the majority (58%) being Turkic-speaking. Two large groups, the Yakuts (236,000) and the Tuvinians (about 100,000), are the major Turkic peoples. The Buryats are the single large (253,000) Mongolic-speaking group of Siberia. Thus these two linguistic groups account for the preponderant majority

of Siberian peoples — 85%. The remainder, mostly inhabiting the extreme northern and eastern parts of Siberia speak Tungusic-Manchu languages (6%), Samoyedic and Ugric languages (about 5.5%), and miscellaneous Paleoasiatic languages (about 3.5%). The above-cited statistics are from the 1959 census; the original Russian book having been published in 1956, quotes the 1926 census, and, in this respect the translation was not brought up to date. By comparing the two censuses, we discover that while the large groups (Buryats, Yakuts, Tuvinians) have increased in numbers, the small groups of northern Siberia have decreased and some have disappeared.

As mentioned earlier, about 250 pages of the book are devoted to the people of southern Siberia, and nearly 400 pages to the less numerous peoples of northern Siberia. The eight articles on the peoples of southern Siberia were written by six authors, with L. P. Potapov accounting for four. Most start with a general description of language, physical type and distribution. This is followed by a presentation of the economy, housing, clothing, social structure, folk art, and religion. In nearly all of the articles these facets of culture are described as they existed in earlier times — toward the end of the 19th or the beginning of the 20th century. The articles are closed with a description of changes, preponderantly economic ones, which have taken place among the various groups since the revolution of 1917. A similar pattern is found in the 22 articles describing the 23 northern tribes. They were written by 15 specialists on the region with V. V. Antropova, E. D. Prokopyeva, and M. G. Levin being the heaviest contributors.

In the opinion of this reviewer, the articles on the peoples of northern Siberia are better balanced than those which describe the peoples of southern Siberia. This is perhaps due to more recent information about the "living" cultures of the north being available to the authors than in the case of the southern Siberian peoples.

The shortcomings of the book, besides the lack of recent statistical information and the repetitious rendering of post-revolutionary advances for the individual peoples (even though M. A. Sergeyev covers the subject adequately in a separate chapter), lie in the translation, the inordinately large number of typographical errors and, in part, the uneven editing. The reader can readily reorient himself when he learns that reindeer have "horns" (p. 17), that the red deer has "deerhorns" (p. 27), or that a shaman accompanies his performance with a "tambourine and a club" (p. 464). Reorientation becomes more difficult when such terms as *uyezd*, *rayon*, and *kray* are transliterated without explanation either in the text or in the glossary. Similarly with "tsentner" (why not hundred-weight?). When such terms as "vedomstvo" (p. 367) or such misprints as "sermon" (for *sumo*, cp. pp. 381 and 385) are encountered, the reader becomes lost. The translation of Russian geographic place names has been largely resolved and there is no reason to render "Minusinsk" as "Minusa" or "Barabinsk" as "Baraba" (p. 423), or worse "Acha" for "Achinsk" (p. 349). Generally, there are inconsistencies in capitalizations and adjectival endings. All of this detracts from the value of the translation. Additionally, the fact that the translation and publication of this work was handsomely supported by the National Science Foundation is nowhere mentioned. In view of this support, the price of \$20.00 for the book is extravagant.

Because the subject matter of the book is so important to the student of arctic and subarctic cultures, I appreciate the fact that it has been made available in English translation. Yet, I would hesitate to use it as a textbook for an undergraduate or mixed survey course. Its principal value is that of a library reference source — the index is good.

HENRY N. MICHAEL*

* Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.