In the preface Klaus Roth explains the extraordinary nature of the four authors' achievement. Their ambitious work was planned at the end of the 1960s, during the time of Bulgaria's isolation. Though completed in 1985, it was not until 1994 that it became available. Most of the authors' difficulties in classification were caused by the very vitality of the oral tradition, which has shown an amazing independence in its use of topics and themes. The Bulgarian tradition separates and blends motifs and even complete episodes at liberty. The authors managed to deal with the problem through close description and sympathetic understanding. This is the type of case that demonstrates the necessity of revising Aarne and Thompson's type index. The editor praises the exact descriptions and detailed analyses of the 5,500 variants of the 1,600 tale types classified, noting that this work will benefit all comparative folktale research (7).

The authors, who went along with the ticklish task of shortening the 827 pages of the Bulgarian edition to almost half that length, had to sacrifice a considerable amount of material, including the history of the Bulgarian research and the extensive subject catalogue. The final result, however, shows improvements in practical usability, and is better suited to those less acquainted with the history, geography, and culture of Bulgaria. It is an approach worthy of imitation. Since many tale types on the Balkan Peninsula are not seen in the West, the list of tale translations into German and English should be welcome. Even more welcome will be the painstaking explanation of how to use the catalogue. At the end of the book one finds a glossary; rules of pronunciation; information on towns, districts, and departments (including maps); and lists of tale collections, translations, and secondary literature on the Bulgarian folktale. There are even short biographies of the four authors.

All in all the reader will find this a careful, well thought out, and balanced work, in which even the type titles and analyses reflect the rich individuality of this story-telling landscape.

Walter SCHERF
Munich

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

JUILLERAT, BERNARD. *Œdipe chasseur. Une mythologie du sujet en Nouvelle-Guinée* [Oedipe the hunter: A mythology of the subject in New Guinea]. Le fil rouge. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1991. 292 pages. Figures, tables, photographs, bibliography. Paper FF188; ISBN 2-13-043407-X; ISSN 0768-5459. (In French)

The most common response from anthropologists regarding the psychoanalytic interpretation of myth is, "It may be so, but it may not be so." Such a more or less negative, noncommittal attitude is frustrating for those who advocate psychoanalytic approaches, and a variety of new theoretical frameworks have been introduced to make such interpretations as plausible as possible. No matter how plausible they become, however, it is quite unlikely that they will obtain general acceptance by anthropologists not of a psychoanalytic persuasion, for psychoanalytic interpretations of myth are in principle ethnographically untestable, even when the myths under study are still "alive." When latent meanings for a myth are discerned in the collective unconscious of a people, the people cannot be said to be "conscious" of these meanings unless they have learned to approach this collective (or their own individual) unconscious. The logical implication of this, I believe, is that the psychoanalytic analyses of myth need not make reference to local interpretations of the myth, as such references would be of little use

in discovering hidden meanings at the unconscious level.

Bernard Juillerat, who has conducted field research for many years among the Yafar people of West Sepik Province, Papua New Guinea, does not agree with this position, however, and actively incorporates local exegetic accounts into his psychoanalytic study of Yafar myths. Indeed, he claims that it was the secret local exegeses given him by several Yafar male ritual experts that inspired him to analyze the Yafar myths from a psychoanalytic perspective.

Thus in his detailed analysis of more than ten Yafar myths Juillerat reaches their latent symbolism (at the level of *signifié inconscient*), not directly from their explicit meanings (at the level of *narration publique*), but via local exegeses (at the level of *représentation secrète*). What is explicit and implicit in the Yafar myths is linked through the mediation of the local exegetic accounts. One would expect this approach to yield interpretations that are highly plausible in comparison to those of psychoanalytic approaches that link the explicit and implicit in myth only through theoretical analysis. Juillerat's analytical framework is, however, very classic Freudian. As the title of the book shows, what he discovers hidden deep in the Yafar myths is Oedipean symbolism (mother-son incest, patricide, castration, and so on). Thus, contrary to what his emphasis on local exegesis would lead us to expect, Juillerat finds the latent symbolism in the Yafar myths to be not local and Yafar-specific but quite general.

If symbolism (which in this case happens to be quite Oedipean) is extracted ethnologically from local exegetic accounts it does not matter whether it is universal or not. Juillerat nevertheless insists that the Oedipus complex *is* universal, and that this universality derives from the universality of the nuclear family, a view most anthropologists would question. This clearly shows that, contrary to his claim, it was his analytical framework, and not the local exegeses, that led him to interpret the Yafar myths in psychoanalytic terms.

Juillerat's emphasis on local exegesis, which gives his analysis its plausibility on the one hand, apparently poses a problem for him on the other: the problem of how to establish a link between personal and collective representations. Most anthropologists are well aware that the interpretation of a myth offered by a few specialists may have little to do with the way in which the mythical symbolism is understood by the population at large, and they thus avoid interpretations based primarily on local exegetic accounts. Juillerat is not concerned with this, since he assumes that the Oedipean fantasies inform both the public and esoteric (exegetic) versions of the Yafar myth. According to him, the difference between the two levels of symbolic projection was generated through the process of myth production. In the timeless past, he conjectures, fantasies regarding human ontogenetic experience first took shape in the form of secret knowledge, then entered the public oral tradition through narrative elaboration of this knowledge. He asserts that by following this process in the opposite direction one can reach the latent symbolism. The apparent gap between personal and collective representation thus disappears in his psychoanalytic scheme. This remarkable hypothesis of ahistorical mythical production obliges me to say, "It may be so, but it may not be so."

Juillerat has edited a book on the Yangis ritual (a Yafar counterpart of the well-known Ida ritual of the Umeda people analyzed by Alfred Gell) entitled *Shooting the Sun: Ritual and Meaning in West Sepik* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992). Contributions are from both supporters and critics of his psychoanalytic methods, including Gell. The Yangis ritual is closely related to some of the Yafar myths analyzed in *Œdipe chasseur*. I recommend that both of these books be read to assess the explanatory value of Juillerat's psychoanalytic approach.

KURITA Hiroyuki
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
Tokyo