

served several archaic features, but the anatomical features making bipedal locomotion possible (like the hominid shape of pelvis) need certainly a long time to develop. Thus the bipedal locomotion appears much earlier than the production of tools and full development of the brain.

The question whether the Hadar finds represent one or more species remains open. The large differences in size are explained by T. White as sexual dimorphism. Series of objections were published last year by the French anthropologists. New discoveries in Middle Awash (see *Anthropologie XXI/No. 2*) and in Baringo seem to contain important contributions to the solution of this important problem in the near future. Both regions, with their layers older than the Hadar and Laetoli localities of *A. afarensis* shift the earliest hominid finds into layers older than 4 and 6 mill. years respectively. It is regrettable that some of the leading extra-American anthropologists were absent and thus this important exchange of ideas remained limited to American specialists only.

J. Jelinek

TWO MEETINGS OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND ARCHAEOLOGISTS IN XANTHI, GREECE

Two working-sessions of anthropologists and archaeologists took place during September 1983 in Xanthi, NE Greece. The participants were invited by N. I. Xirotiris and the International Demokritos Foundation.

The *Conference of Paleodemography* was organized from 4. to 8. September. The different specialisation of the participants (anthropologists/archaeologists) determined to certain extent the program of the session. The anthropological lectures concentrated on the methodological problems of working with the skeletal materials (J. Nemeskéri: Methodological correction of mortality age distribution of prehistoric populations; I. Pap—E. Susa: On the possibility of the paleodemographical examination; A. Maresik: Paleodemographical aspects of paleopathology). The archaeological lectures followed the reflections of demographic changes in the archaeological evidence (P. Patay: Demographische Probleme in der Vorgeschichte des Karpatenbeckens; D. Liversage: Demographic trends from the Bronze Age to the Migration Period — an archaeologist's view; M. Gebühr: Demographische Ursachen für eisenzeitliche Wanderungsbewegungen im westlichen Ostseegebiet). Between the both groups may be placed the papers taking into account larger demographic and even social aspects of the anthropological data (J. P. Bocquet-Appel: Small populations: Demography and paleoanthropological inference; K. Ery: Paleodemographic data and problems from the Roman Period; L. Szathmáry: The infant deficit and its paleosociographical reflections in the Early Middle Ages). The bipolar character of the lectures and the search for general explanatory conceptions was determining for the following discussions as well.

The lecture of J. P. Bocquet-Appel concerning demography of small populations in the Paleolithic led to a general hypothesis about evolutionary trends leading from homogeneity to heterogeneity. It was subsequently discussed from the viewpoint of the archaeological evidence. Methodologically it was interesting to compare the different results

obtained by D. Liversage and M. Gebühr, when studying the demographic situation in Western Baltic regions during the Roman Period. D. Liversage, taking into account the number of burial sites, observed a population decline. M. Gebühr, on the other hand, based his data on the number of single graves, and came to the opposite result. In D. Liversage's lecture it was suggestive to note the use of pollen analytical data and the effort to correlate them with the supposed demographic changes. The approach of M. Gebühr was very complex one as well, and it was characterized by efforts to exploit all of the available evidence, by interesting suggestions and by general interpretations.

The time from 9. to 11. September was devoted to the conference on *Morphogenetics and evolution*. Chronologically it concentrated on earlier periods of the human evolution, mainly the Paleolithic. Naturally, the near-by cave of Petralona presented an important subject for discussions. From this point of view, the paper of E. Vlček and N. Xirotiris concerning the Petralona endocranium was one of the most important. Both authors conclude that this skull of relatively archaic appearance contained more or less sapient-like brain. The morphological studies suggest rather more recent age of this important but unfortunately not precisely dated specimen (relations to Gánovce, Broken-Hill, Gibraltar, etc.). G. van Vark concentrated on the origin of Mongoloids. By using statistical methods he concluded about a very recent origin of this race, differing significantly from the Upper Paleolithic skeletal materials from Chou-kou-tien, Upper Cave. The lecture evoked discussion about the significance of morphological and genetical similarity. Another use of statistical methods was demonstrated by O. J. Grüsser and L. R. Weis, in studying the brain growth during hominid evolution. Further possibilities and limits of the quantitative methods were discussed by B. Jacobshagen.

R. Fenart and R. Deblock compared the skull morphogenesis of chimpanzee and man, B. Senut presented her last results in the study of the humerus of hominoid primates and H. Ullrich followed the possible family relationships in Paleolithic and Mesolithic skeletal assemblages. K. Jacobs concentrated on the evolution of postcranial skeleton in the European Upper Paleolithic and Mesolithic hominids. He noted several evolutionary trends (decreasing robusticity, increasing sexual dimorphism), requiring respective explanations (changes in environment, hunting techniques, etc.). The paper of K. Brunnacker, R. Grün and G. Hennig summarized the U-Th data for travertines and cave sintres of Central Europe and helped in this way to build a chronological frame for the hominid evolution in this region. E. Vlček presented a detailed morphological comparisons of several Middle Pleistocene human crania and J. Svoboda compared three lithic assemblages associated to Middle Pleistocene hominid finds: Arago, Vértésszölös and Bilzingsleben.

It must be noted that the approaches of anthropologists and archaeologists dealing with the earliest periods were more integrated than at the Paleodemographic conference. This is probably due to a longer tradition of interdisciplinary research in the Pleistocene studies. However the two meetings held in Xanthi encouraged further integration and showed some new perspectives in the research of human evolution, both in the Pleistocene and the Holocene times.

Jiří Svoboda