

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.

ÔTSUKI 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

collective interests by overcoming inner inhibitions" (223). "Real" men give their people more than they take and serve them even to the point of self-sacrifice. Hence manhood might be seen as a nurturing concept (229).

The author says there are two kinds of survival strategies: fighting against dangers, and avoiding confrontation. When men are conditioned to fight, manhood becomes important. If men are conditioned to flight, the opposite is true. That is why men in androgynous peoples have selected a strategy of avoiding confrontation (212). Hence, the author concludes, male ideology (manliness) is a symbolic script, a cultural construct, endlessly variable and not always necessary (230).

As the author says, gender is a "symbolic category," "ascriptive and culturally relative—potentially changeable" (22). Therefore, it is necessary to analyze manhood from both a social and a historical perspective. Although this book falls somewhat short of such perspectives, I believe it is extremely valuable and significant in regard to the following two points.

First, manhood and masculinity, which have been taken for granted and were virtually untouched for a long time in today's male-dominated societies, have been taken up as an object of study for the first time. As a result of this provocative cross-cultural study a continuum of manly images and codes, or a sliding scale, was found to exist rather than a monolithic code. This finding will serve as a valuable criterion in comparing manhood ideals in different cultures.

Secondly, the author is careful to analyze feminist studies as objectively as possible, although he criticizes many of them for being written only for women. Convinced that the study of gender should consider both sexes, men and women, he specifically insists that "this book is about men but certainly not for men only" (2). This objective and inclusive perspective makes the book all the more persuasive and valuable.

Finally, the author's selection of ethnographical data calls for comment, but I shall refer only to those on Japanese culture. Gilmore, when he describes Japanese manhood ideals, is relying on Ian BURUMA's *Behind the Mask* (1984). Accordingly, he takes Japanese culture to provide two alternative traditional pathways, the "hard" school (*kōha*) and the "soft" school (*nampa*). The former is one variation of machismo, highlighted in bushidō and the kamikaze heroes. The latter "involves more placid but always 'useful' pursuits, or . . . the selfless industriousness and moral conformity" associated with today's common "salary man." It is idealized in "Torasan," the movie hero who, gentle and sincere, helps the weak and upholds all the traditional family virtues. The author says the feature common to both schools is the emphasis on self-abnegating performance in the service of collective goals or on surmounting oneself for the good of the collectivity (189).

In my opinion, the Japanese never abnegate themselves in the service of collective goals; rather, they hope to take advantage of them. The achievement of an individual is not reached in opposition to the collective goals of the group, as Westerners might think, but it is coincident with them. To achieve personal advantage, each individual must first achieve the advantage of the group. For this reason the Japanese try to work devotedly for their group and value relationships with persons in their collectivity. This has been called "contextualism" (*kanjinshugi* 間人主義) by HAMAGUCHI Eshun (1982). The Japanese act mainly on the basis of this principle.

In addition, Japanese male imagery, I think, has been built up historically within the "ie" institution and "ie" ideology. Modern young people, however, have followed behavioral patterns different from the traditional ones. Therefore we shall need to examine both patterns in order to do justice to the Japanese situation.

The author himself recognizes the lacunae in his data, saying, "This book was

hard to research because there is no recognized place to look up 'manhood' as a cultural category and compare notes" (xii).

Though this book is not without problems, it still is very fascinating and significant, because it gives us a holistic image of what it means to be a man.

REFERENCES CITED:

BURUMA, Ian

1984 *Behind the Mask*. New York: Pantheon Books.

HAMAGUCHI Eshun 浜口恵俊

1982 *Kanjinchugi no shakai Nihon* 間人主義の社会日本 [Japan, a society of contextualism]. Tokyo: Tōyō Keizai Shinpōsha.

MEAD, Margaret

1949 *Male and Female*. William Morrow & Co.

MAEDA Toshiko

Aichi University of Education

Nagoya

JASON, HEDA. *Whom Does God Favor: The Wicked or the Righteous? The Reward-and-Punishment Fairy Tale*. FFCommunications 240. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1988. 156 pages. ISBN 951-41-0510-2; ISSN 0014-5815.

With her strict method of analyzing each aspect of a text's comprehensible structure in a thoroughly logical manner, the author tries to prove that fairy tales, through their poetic picture language, are dealing with general human problems, and what is more, that their sub-genres are "each built according to a different plot model and have different semantic features" (9) but aim at the same idea. This coherence would be demonstrated by analyzing four popular and widely spread tale-types of the reward-and-punishment group. And she concluded that this sub-genre is governed by the elementary desire to maintain the general order of the human world. The materials explored are texts of Jewish immigrants from Muslim countries of the Near East. The four main chapters of her book, followed by a general conclusion, are thoroughly argued exemplary pieces of high instructive value. For those who accept her manner of proceeding, the work may be quite fruitful: surface structure analysis will give insights into the relationships between storytelling and the traditional expectations of the listeners.

Investigations that are limited to narrative patterns, semantic features, and underlying principles may make it unnecessary to take into account the listeners' unconscious participation. But is this really sufficient for understanding reward-and-punishment tales as inverse to heroic tales, as, indeed, Vladimir Propp has described them? (Here, it should be noted, the author fails to refer to PROPP [1946]; this publication on the historic roots of the fairy tales should have been taken into consideration.) Would it not be of basic concern to distinguish the kind of emotional engagement and the category of the fantasmatic layer, where the process of individual reception takes place? Do we look for insight, behavior instruction, confirmation of our society's values and norms—or would we like to be engaged in unconscious processes of working up elementary conflicts? Heda Jason follows Max Lüthi's statement: "A tale's figure does not have any inner life." Right, but only insofar as the tale's figures do leave the rest of the happening to us, to us readers' and listeners' projections. The