

multiplicity of professional and scholarly disciplines, such as philosophy, physical and social anthropology, medicine, genetics, biochemistry, evolutionary biology, aesthetics and, of course, cognitive psychology. Such wide-ranging interest in a topic is necessarily stimulating; but it is also confusing in that none of us have all of the necessary intellectual skills to assess the contributions of these disciplines; and it is worrying in that some areas of the subject have been taken over by what might be called a lunatic fringe, who perpetrate notions which vary from plain silly through to the almost downright dangerous, invoking what has been called 'neuromythology' or 'neurophrenology' to provide quasi-scientific support for for reaching policy changes (or for instance in much of the

rest of the literature on familial trends in handedness, and gives undue precedence to their own study, which is, by genetic standards, relatively small. Indeed the chapter on genetics is perhaps the weakest in the whole book; thus the authors seem never to have heard of dominance variance in their account