

more informative if she had provided a classification of the jokes, novellae, and tales of magic based on the AARNE-THOMPSON catalogue (1973). The tale "One Hundred Cows" (132-33), for example, is an anticlerical jocular tale already recorded as a fabliau and also known outside Europe (see AT1735).

Notwithstanding such shortcomings, Diane Tong has presented us with an interesting and varied body of texts from narrators of both sexes and of various ages, statuses, and professions. We are given a tale of Gothamites that has been transformed into an etiology of Rom cleverness, for example, and a tale about the twelve months that incorporates information about divination and explains why magical powers are attributed to the Rom. Tong also refers to the "Sitz im Leben" of these tales and situates them in the context of international folklore. As a result, Tong's collection avoids the error, frequently seen in such collections, of taking features that are common to oral narrative in general and interpreting them as unique to a certain national tradition. We cannot but wish her success in her efforts "to share many different Gypsy voices with a large audience."

REFERENCES CITED:

AARNE, Antti, and Stith THOMPSON

1973 *The types of the folktale: A classification and bibliography*. Second revision. FF Communications 184. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

BETTELHEIM, Bruno

1977 *The uses of enchantment: The meaning and importance of fairy tales*. New York: Vintage Books.

GROOME, Francis Hindes

1899 *Gypsy folk-tales*. London: Hurst and Blackett, Limited.

MODE, Heinz, with Milena HÜBSCHMANNOVA

1983-85 *Zigeunermärchen aus aller Welt*. [Gypsy folktales of the world]. 4 volumes. Leipzig: Insel-Verlag.

THOMPSON, Stith

1977 *The folktale*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Ines KÖHLER-ZÜLCH
Enzyklopädie des Märchens
Göttingen, Germany

ZGUSTA, RICHARD. *Dwelling Space in Eastern Asia*. Publications of Osaka University of Foreign Studies, No. 4. Minoo, Japan: Osaka Gaigo-daigaku Gakujutsu Shuppankai, 1991. 315 pages. Maps, figures, glossary, bibliography. Paper, n.p.; ISBN 4-900588-03-2.

According to one common view, the earthen floor in the entrance section of a Japanese farmhouse is a survival from the prehistoric pit-dwelling and is as such a Northeast Asian element, while the pile-construction of the rest of the house is a Southeast Asian feature. The house as a whole thus derives from a fusion of Northeast and Southeast Asian elements. In *Dwelling Space in Eastern Asia*, Richard Zgusta sets out to support this view through a new kind of study that deals with the question of how floor-space is used and what parts of it are areas of male or female activity, or dominance. Since he compares the Japanese dwelling with the dwellings of other parts of eastern Asia, more than half of his book deals with the use of dwelling space in Southeast and

Northeast Asia, about one third with Japan, and the rest with questions of method.

As regards method, Zgusta follows the structuralist approach of looking for binary oppositions relating to different parts of the dwelling. He does so in a particular way, however, basing his analyses on what he calls "the quadripartite pattern" of spatial organization (13-14). By this he means the pattern that results from dividing a space twice using two axes that intersect at right angles in the center, with the resulting quarters being qualified as overlaps. If the same opposition is associated with both divisions, two diagonally opposite quarters express this opposition with double intensity, so to speak, while the two others are "neutral" (mixed). As Zgusta puts it, the diagonal relation of oppositions is "the main characteristic feature of the quadripartite pattern, and may be the mark of its identification even in those cases where the quadripartite division is not readily discernible" (14).

In trying out this "methodological framework" (1), Zgusta starts with the theories of Gustav Ränk and Ivar Paulson, which hold that in northern Eurasia and North America the interior part opposite the entrance to a dwelling is the domain of man. Against this, Zgusta shows that for the islands of Southeast Asia the situation is usually reversed: "Throughout Indonesia, the housewife is identified with the physical house itself, especially its interior . . . part, while the masculine domain is the external veranda" (9-10). Moreover, Zgusta finds that in Southeast Asia the female character of the interior part of the dwelling correlates with the high status of women in the household and with their leading role in the agricultural ritual, rather than with the kinship system, as suggested by Paulson for North America (268).

Turning finally to the dwellings of Japan, the author discusses at length the seating order around the hearth and the "quadripartite pattern" in terms of front/back and lower/upper divisions of space, arguing that in the Japanese farmhouse, too, the "highest" spatial position was accorded the housewife. Thus the *nando*, the innermost ("upper-back") room diagonally opposite the entrance, is not only a sleeping room for the household head and his wife, but also a storeroom for grain, clothes, and other valuables. As such it is entirely dominated by the wife, who also worships within it a female deity that assists in childbirth and functions as an agricultural and ancestral deity (230-36). As this indicates a similarity in the use of the dwelling space with insular and eastern mainland Southeast Asia, Zgusta concludes that his results support the idea that in the Japanese house a hypothetical Northeast Asian substratum might have been overlaid with a Southeast Asian superstratum (263). However, while his arguments are convincing as far as the similarities with Southeast Asia are concerned, the same is not true with regard to the Northeast Asian substratum. Here Zgusta simply appeals to interpretations of archeological remains by other scholars (4), without presenting the readers with the evidence.

As far as the history of the Japanese dwelling is concerned, it would seem therefore that the main value of this book is in what it says about the use of space in the rural house, particularly with regard to the female character of the *nando* and the seating order around the hearth.

As for the aspects of the book that do not specifically concern Japan, it is impossible to do them justice in a few words. Zgusta's claim that the "quadripartite pattern" is an "indigenous category" (14) implies, according to his definition, that the boundary between two separate zones is conceived of as an abstract axis. I find it more probable that this kind of boundary is seen as a vague zone of transition between two spheres of influence that extend towards the middle, and that it is the investigator who substitutes an abstract line for this. Zgusta, in saying that the quadripartite pattern "is the result of the fact that the dwelling consists of four walls and four corners"

(12), seems to underestimate the impact of the spatial system of the wider environment on the spatial order in the house. Since the orientation of the large-scale environment does not always coincide with that of the small space of the dwelling, we sometimes meet with contradictions that Zgusta is unable to explain. A case in point is the position of the "spiritual entrance" (*ba'ba deata*) in the house of the Sa'dan Toraja (113). To Zgusta its position on the front side of the house appears anomalous, since among the northern Eurasians and the Ainu the sacred window is regularly situated in what appears to be the back of the dwelling (256-57). However, the position of this kind of ritual door or window is usually decided by the sacred direction in the outside world; the difference between the houses of the Ainu and those of the Sa'dan Toraja is that relative to this sacred direction the former are entered from "below" (from the side opposite the sacred mountains), the latter from "above."

In discussing the diagonal opposition of the stove and the holy corner in the houses of Eurasia, Zgusta rightly stresses that this results in a "decentralized space." But by adding that the "two focal points act as centers of the room/dwelling" (23), that "interiority is associated with centrality" (30), and that "the symbolic center shifts from the physical one to the 'top', . . . the interior-most area" (30, cp. 188-89), he misses a good chance to clarify the concept of the "center," which is too often used in an ambiguous sense (geometric and/or symbolic). Moreover, he implies that the evolutionary priority is due to the case where the symbolic center coincides with the "physical" one, an idea that would need elaboration. One might make similar objections to Zgusta's view of what he calls "the horizontalization of vertical symbolism in the northeast Asian dwellings" (176, cp. 164-66). However, the fact that his book brings such important topics into discussion at all is to be appreciated as one of its merits.

Unfortunately, the value of this thought-provoking study is considerably diminished by the poor quality of the schematic plans. These are all given without indication of the scale, and are often based on old publications despite the fact that more recent works would provide better information. Zgusta himself warns the readers when he says that his drawings "often represent a synthesized version of plans and verbal descriptions by various authors" (36). Accordingly, the specialist will find numerous inaccuracies and mistakes, both in the plan materials and in the texts commenting upon them, particularly in the sections dealing with Southeast Asia. To give here only three examples: the Toba house is treated as if it had the same floor area as the much bigger Karo house, a misunderstanding that explains the strange statement that its "large floor area" appears to be "a superfluous luxury" (110-11); in the plan of the Sa'dan Toraja house (fig. 40a), the single pillar shown is not the *a'riri posi*, but one of the three other pillars called *petuo*, the other two being omitted in the drawing; and in figure 34 Zgusta adapts a drawing from a book by first simplifying it, then turning it upside down, and then attributing the final arrangement to the Toba Batak instead of the Karo Batak. Disturbing features of another kind may be due in part to poor copyediting: the use of the old colonial name "Celebes" for "Sulawesi" (112), the appellation "the Solorese" for the Kédangese of Lembata (82), and such printing mistakes as "Batak" for "Bontoc" (264).

In spite of such shortcomings I do not hesitate to recommend this book to critical readers. It is an original study that has more interesting aspects than space has allowed me to comment on here.

Gaudenz DOMENIG
Zurich, Switzerland