

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL

DE CARO, FRANCIS A., compiler. *Women and Folklore, A Bibliographic Survey*. Westport, Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press, 1983. Xiv+170 pp. Index. Hardcover US\$27.50. ISBN 0-313-23821-9

In this volume Francis de Caro has compiled 1,1664 items, mainly in English, on women's folklore, folklore about women, and related topics. The entries are arranged alphabetically by author, and locating items on a specific topic is facilitated by a subject index. The bibliographic entries are preceded by a detailed essay on the separate topics covered, such as ethnographies, sex roles, psychology of women, life history, female folk figures and heroes, oral history, healers, material culture, fieldwork, and others as well. The essay is quite comprehensive and provides a thorough guide to the bibliography that follows.

The author does not pretend to have compiled a complete listing of all extant literature in the field, and surely such a task would be impossible in a single volume. It is unfortunate, however, that the reader is given no list of the journals searched nor any account of the principles of the book's compilation. The volume is strongest in its treatment of North American material.

Readers of this journal will be disappointed by the minimal treatment of Asian materials. Some attention has been given to India, and there are scattered references on South East Asian societies and China, but Japanese and Korean materials are virtually absent. Although the author includes dissertations as well as journal articles and single-volume works, he evidently overlooked recent, important dissertations by folklorists and anthropologists on Korean materials, such as Dawnhee Yim Janelli, "Logical Contradictions in Korean Learned Fortune-Telling—A Dissertation in Folklore and Folklife" (University of Pennsylvania, 1977), Barbara Young, "Spirits and Other Signs: The Practice of Divination in Seoul, Republic of Korea" (University of Washington, 1980), and Laurel Kendall, "Restless Spirits: Shaman and Housewife in Korean Ritual Life" (Columbia University, 1979), to say nothing of the important volume by Youngsook Kim Harvey, *Six Korean Women: The Socialization of Shamans* AES Monograph 65 (New York: West Publishing Company, 1979). Roger Janelli's *Ancestor Worship in Korean Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983) would probably not have been available to de Caro at the time of writing.

Had the author consulted Hesung Chun Koh, editor of *Korean and Japanese Women: An Analytic Bibliographical Guide* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982), item 906, he might have considerably increased the usefulness of the volume to students and scholars of Asian folklore. Had the author only made the effort to survey this journal, *History of Religions*, the *Journal of Japanese Religions*, and the *Korea Journal*, he could have provided numerous entries related to Korea and Japan, even within the limits of material available in English, including the works of Batchelor, Munro, Kindaichi, and Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney on the Ainu, the works of Hori Ichirō and Carmen Blacker on Japanese shamanism, William Lebra on Okinawan religion, and Fanny H. Mayer on a variety of subjects related to women's folklore.

Glaring as these omissions are, they would be forgivable if the few entries on Japan were at least accurate. However, in fact, Liza Carihfield's dissertation, "The Institution of the Geisha in Modern Japanese Society" (Stanford University, 1978) concerns not "entertaining girls of Taipei," as the author has it on page 13, but exactly what the title suggests. He would have done well to include her first book, *Ko-uta, Little Songs of the Geisha World* (Rutland, Vt. and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1979), while her second, *Geisha* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983) is too recent to have been included. Another necessary correction concerns item 605, the author of which is Naomi Goldenberg, not Goldenberry.

The bibliography is still, however, with the above qualifications, a welcome bibliographic aid which fills a genuine need for a ready reference to the increasing volume of sources on women and folklore. It should be useful to folklorists, historians of religions, anthropologists, and sociologists.

Helen Hardacre
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ

TURNER, VICTOR, and YAMAGUCHI MASAO, editors. *Misemono no jinruigaku*
見世物の人類学 *Spectacle—An Anthropological Inquiry*. Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1983. 429 pp., photos and illustrations. Cloth, Yen 4,300. ISBN 4-34827-8. (In Japanese)

When Gary Snyder was teaching as poet-in-residence at the University of Cincinnati a few years ago, a student sought his advice on the most auspicious undergraduate major for an aspiring poet. The student wondered if literature would be the best choice. Hesitant to make extra-poetic pronouncements, Snyder nevertheless offered his conviction that bad things befell literature in classrooms and suggested instead anthropology as particularly appealing. If the volume here under review is any indication, Snyder surely was correct in his assessment. For through the pioneering scholarship of several of the contributors to this book, principally Victor and Edith Turner of the University of Virginia, anthropology today, with its exciting exploration of the notion of liminality in human behavior, is vigorously blazing new and enticing trails.

What exactly is liminality? Given currency by the French folklorist Arnold van Gennep early in the twentieth century, liminality refers to the second of three phases which mark all rites of passage: separation, in which one behaves as though detached from one's group; limen, in which one traverses a realm that has few or none of the familiarities of past experience; and finally, aggregation, in which one completes the passage and returns to mundane life within the social group. Anthropological research has been preoccupied heretofore with the first and third phases. But, as the Turners point out, the limen, or margin, involves a crucial, ambiguous state. The "passenger" or "liminar" in this state has completed one stage but is not quite ready for the next. It is a state where lines of classification dissolve, where prior patterns of human behavior are open to change, where, in fact, change becomes eminently possible, even desirable. In short, liminality refers not only to transition but to potentiality—to the very dynamics of culture.

Perhaps because of the ambiguity of (or perceived lack of significance in) the liminal state, the notion of liminality until recently has not been a prominent subject in an-