FEINTUCH, BURT, editor. *The Conservations of Culture: Folklorists and the Public Sector.* Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1988. viii+288 pages. Index. Hardcover US$27.00; ISBN 0-8131-1635-X.

To tell the truth, for someone like myself who lives in Japan, whose native language is Japanese, and whose principal area of research is his own folk culture, the writing of this review has weighed very heavily upon me. Let me begin by explaining, therefore, the reasons why the task has weighed so heavily upon me.

First of all, I do not think there exists in Japanese at the present moment the exact equivalent of the concept "public" as used in American-English contexts. Secondly, consciousness of the problem expressed in the subtitle is, unfortunately, almost nonexistent in present-day folklore studies in Japan. And finally, even though the contemporary information environments defining "culture" from its most grassroots level are, structurally, the same highly developed consumer societies in both cases, still, the differences between Japan and the United States are beyond imagination, with the result that complexities are involved that cannot facilely be expressed by simple comparisons or reflections on phenomena, even if one is dealing with museum administration or the everyday historical consciousness built up in local communities through museum administration. These are the three principal reasons behind my problem.

Even though documents recorded in writing have been so ubiquitous in Japanese society from quite early on in the modern age that they were nothing unusual, the concept of creating "archives" covering the period from the Meiji Restoration through to the twentieth century was weak. Even today, despite the appalling volume of printed works being produced and circulated daily, the lack of a society-wide information system to exercise comprehensive control over all of them and put them into a state in which they can all be referenced casts a deep shadow over everything. I imagine that anyone who has ever had the experience of trying to use the library in a Japanese university would have been amazed and appalled at the difficulties involved. The cultural and social sciences are the areas particularly woeful in this respect. If the situation is such with regard to written documents, I need not describe the sorry state of the collection and arrangement of the oral data that is the proper interest of folklore studies. For example, in recent years requests have occasionally come from overseas for the production and ready accessibility of a comprehensive data base on Japan's folklore, as a result of such international folklore comparison projects as those under way in the United States and other countries. On such occasions it has required a great deal of effort to explain to and convince the inquirers that, regrettably, folklore study in Japan does not have the history or the experience to make information accessible in a form that would be of any use to such projects. This has led to the painful misunderstanding among overseas researchers that "folklorists in Japan are not friendly." But folklore studies in Japan, and of course folklorists as well, are in reality not as seclusionist or anti-foreign as Japan's capitalists. If the bare truth is to be known, the real situation is that, because there is such a gap between the history of folklore studies in Japan and the history of folklore studies in the United States, nobody even knows how to begin bridging that gap.

As I read through this book, what I felt most keenly was this difference in traditions regarding folklore studies, this difference in attitudes toward dealing with "the present" on the basis of the continuity of tradition. Thus, to take a recent example, in the 1980s the Takeshita Cabinet passed some "hometown village revitalization" legislation, as a result of which many folklore museums were built throughout the

country, and jobs for folklore scholars were increased by the creation of posts for curators and researchers. Yet there was absolutely no move on the part of folklore scholars to do some constructive thinking about the meaning of what was being done. They had almost no consciousness of being involved in the preservation, management, and editing of "history" and in that sense of contributing to the maintenance of present society and the creation of the future. All they were thinking about was the kind of stimulus, or not inconsiderable sum of money, that had come to be paid for the routine work (whatever its quality) they had been doing so mindlessly till then—only about how much bigger a salary they would get, or in some cases how better their chances would now be of getting posts that had higher social prestige. Not a single researcher in the cultural or social science areas at the time, let alone folklore scholar, conceived of, or was even able to conceive of, folklore scholars joining hands with specialists in museology or library science and coming out with some constructive statements regarding the preservation and management of "history."

For someone like me who has experienced such bleak conditions, every one of the papers in this book contained enough to add to my depression. Since I do not have sufficient background to pass accurate judgment on each individual paper, nor sufficient grasp of the social and historical contexts of communities in the United States, I must perforce refrain from detailed comment, but I feel the mere fact that a conference on this kind of theme could be held at the level of a learned society, with so many different papers presented, covering such a wide range of topics, is proof that United States folklore study continues to be vitally involved in "the present."

I am working on the intellectual history of the development of any social science (therefore, not folklore study only) in Japan in which fieldwork is the principal method, and for this reason I found the papers by Erika Brady and Jerrold Hirsch very interesting. The paper by Elaine Eff, based on her experiences in Baltimore, was a stimulating one; among other things, it brought home the differences in social and historical background between the situation there and in Japan, where, though the same task of urban folklore was tackled over the past ten years and more, folklore study took part in the "invention of tradition" only through advertising data and through leaving things to advertising agencies. The paper by Miriam Camitta, given a title with a somewhat poetic image, "The Folklorists and Highway," provided much food for thought, fitting in as it did with a problem of the past ten years or so here in Japan, where asphalt surfaces are laid down on even the remotest mountain roads. And the unpretentious paper by Mary Hufford, which touches upon even the ethics of fieldworkers, is suggestive in regard to the problem of journalism and the media.

At the end I would like to bring up a personal doubt. Although we are dealing with folklore studies, which similarly uses fieldwork as its weapon and takes as one of its principal objectives ethnographic output, I had the impression that all the folklore scholars in the United States whose work is contained in this book possess in common an all-embracing confidence in the word *people*, as well as in the word *public* that presumes it. Why is this? What sort of thing is that ideology that still supports American democracy so firmly, a concept that, seen from the perspective of a resident on this distant island country in the Far East, is so very typical? For me, whose place of work is present-day Japan, which has, by means of a shortsighted rush into modernization, brought into being a mass society densely populated by people with a school education that is as systematic as a factory and who have, as a result, an improvidently high rate of literacy, what it is that is behind that feeling of confidence was a problem of understanding another culture, and in that sense an ethnographic puzzle. Perhaps the kind of heaviness of spirit I referred to at the beginning of this review is closely connected

with the fact that intellectuals living in Japanese society today are quite unable to have the same all-embracing confidence in regard to the realities that correspond to words like *community*, *society*, and *people*.

In a society in which there cannot be a complete trust in *community*, *society*, and *people*, what does "public" mean? Perhaps this is not just a problem for folklore study.

Ōtsuki Takahiro
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
Tokyo

Gilmore, David D. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1990. xiii+258 pages. Bibliography, index. Cloth, no price given. ISBN 0-300-04646-4.

The study of gender began with Mead (1949), who insisted that it is a problem of cultural determinism, not one of biology. Today, feminist studies on sex and gender have much advanced our knowledge of women's roles. However, the problem of masculinity still suffers from the "taken for granted" syndrome.

What does it mean "to be a man" in different cultures around the world? *Manhood in the Making* aims at answering this question through a cross-cultural study of manhood and masculinity. Extended cases of male ideologies are taken from ethnographies covering hunting-gathering bands to postindustrial civilizations. The peoples taken up hail from the Mediterranean, Japan, China, India, aboriginal South America, Oceania, East Africa, ancient Greece, and modern North America. Finally, two androgynous peoples are taken up as exceptions.

The author suggests that in many societies (but, significantly, not in all) certain convergences are found in concepts, symbolizations, and exhortations of masculinity; ubiquity rather than universality exists in male imagery around the world (3). Ubiquity means that ideas such as being a "real man" is a prize to be struggled for, a rigorous test of skill, power, or endurance, and the exhortation to act like a man can be found in a great number of societies. He finds the raison d'être of this ubiquity in what he calls the manhood puzzle and suggests that the answer to it must lie in culture, and that "we must try to understand why culture uses or exaggerates biological potentials in specific ways" (23).

Gilmore begins with a study of "machismo" in Andalusia in South Spain, which is his own field of research. He insists that men are made, not born, because he argues that manhood ideals make an indispensable contribution both to the continuity of social systems and to the psychological integration of men into their communities (3). He also finds a continuum of manly images and codes, a sliding scale or polychromatic spectrum. Many societies emphasize male ideology, and machismo represents but one extreme on this scale. Next, some peoples like the Chinese, the Japanese, and modern urban Americans fall somewhere nearer the center. The androgynous peoples represent the opposite extreme (222).

Many societies fostering a male image of machismo are relatively competitive and egalitarian. There, men must fight for the scarce resources on behalf of their groups. The male roles are to impregnate women, protect dependents from danger, and provide for kith and kin (223). Male ideology functions as "an inducement for high performance in the social struggle for scarce resources, a code of conduct that advances