In Dundes' hands this almost mystical notion is made plausible by the examination of a few simple toys.

As its title suggests "The Psychoanalytic Study of the Grimms' Tales: 'The Maiden without Hands' (AT 706)" is a detailed analysis of a famous folktale in which Dundes relies almost entirely on orthodox Freudian interpretation. Part of the general intellectual perspective on psychoanalysis today is that it is a mediocre clinical tool, without an impressive cure rate, and that it is irrefutable and thus not scientific. On the other hand, if science has taught us anything in the last 400 years it is that things are not as they seem, and I for one am prepared to accept that a science of mind will also show that even our own feelings and cognitions are not what they seem. Nevertheless, I can follow Dundes only so far in his analysis of these tales. I have similar reservations regarding his interpretation of "The Good and Bad Daughters," the other tale covered in this article but omitted from its title.

Freudian overtones can be heard again in the last article, "The Building of Skadar: The Measure of Meaning of a Ballad of the Balkans," but these are minor. Here Dundes truly exhibits his great forte, the ability to provide penetrating and far-reaching interpretations of folktales, interpretations which seem disarmingly simple and sensible, but have nevertheless escaped the efforts of all previous workers. From the sacrifice of a young wife in the building of a fort or castle Dundes draws an illuminating picture of the role of women in Balkan society, their figurative immurement in traditional marriage, and draws parallels between this role and that of women in India on the basis of a similar tale found there. In the course of this brilliant analysis Dundes discusses nationalistic forces and sentiments and their role in folklore, while also refuting the theory that ballads and myths arise as the oral counterparts to rituals. In fact there is no archaeological evidence that immurement was ever practised in the Balkans, and this independent fact lends strong corroboration to Dundes' already powerful interpretation. In this last article one has the feel that folklore has almost taken on the force of hard science.

American Folklore Scholarship: A Dialogue of Dissent
Rosemary Lévy Zumwalt
Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana: University of Indiana Press, 1988. xiv + 186 pp. $35.00 (cloth), $9.95 (paper)

Reviewer: John Colarusso
McMaster University

Zumwalt's book examines in detail the academic struggle to dominate folklore that has been waged in North American academic circles from the end of the 19th century well into the 20th. This book is a well-written and prodigiously researched work. It has an enormous bibliography and a useful index. Future editions would be improved if portraits of some of the *dramatis personae* were included. The book is informed by the notion of disciplinary matrix (Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* [University of Chicago Press, 1970]), and is one of the best case studies of academic struggle and the social dynamics of science that I have ever read. It is no exaggeration to say that every student or professor of anthropology and folklore would do well to read it.

Near the end of the 19th century folklore studies had reached a sophisticated stage in Europe, and this attracted the interests of some American and Canadian academics and intellectuals. These scholars, such as Francis James Child and his student George Lyman Kittredge, were literary scholars who adopted a 19th-century evolutionary vision of folklore as a doomed remnant of the progression from savagery through barbarism to civilization that had characterized European culture. The academic fortunes and legacies of such men and women are traced out in fascinating detail. Their influences still dominate at such folklore centres as Indiana University, the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard and UCLA.

Intellectually and temperamentally opposed to them were others, such as William Wells Newell, who founded the American Folk-Lore Society in 1888. Newell was a revolutionary in that he insisted that folklore was a living on-going activity and that the lore of the American Indian had to be an important component of the North American folklore enterprise. Another gifted amateur, Fletcher S. Bassett, founded the Chicago Folk-Lore Society around the same time. Bassett's society was open to all interested parties and enjoyed enormous success at the 1893 Columbia Exposition. Nevertheless, because of a stroke of ill luck—Bassett died shortly after his congress—the Chicago Society soon dissolved. Newell, with the help of the young Franz Boas, set out to dominate the field, first by excluding amateurs, and then by excluding the "non-scientific" literary folklorists. Both Boas and Newell laboured under the notion that for folklore to be respectable it must be seen as receiving scientific legitimacy from anthropology, and must abrogate any allegiance to the "soft" humanistic fields of literary study. I myself had laboured under the notion that such a peculiar opposition between sciences and humanities was a 20th-century folly, but Zumwalt has dug through all the papers of the major figures involved and shows that this fatuous notion is old.

Zumwalt gives a thoroughly even-handed account of the rise of anthropology in North America, particularly of events centred about the imposing figure of Franz Boas. Yet it is almost chilling to read quotations from the original letters detailing the machinations by which anthropologists came to dominate folklore. Central to this program was Boas himself, who systematically set out to dominate academic activity, publishing organs and museum positions so as to insure the quality of anthropology in the main, and folklore incidentally. Despite strong opposition, he succeeded in his goals in the first two, failing only in that he never came to dominate museum activity. As part of his efforts he produced several generations of famous anthropologists. He also left behind an enormous testament of ethnography, much of it containing invaluable accounts of American Indian lore. His efforts to pull together the work of a large number of specialists into a folklore index was never fulfilled. There is irony in this particular failure, because the scholars that Boas managed to exclude or marginalize achieved their greatest success in the areas of compilations and indices.

The anthropologists under Boas saw folklore as part of a cultural whole and offered interpretations of this lore within the context of that culture. The literary folklorists were preoccupied with collection and comparisons of lore only. They persisted in their careers despite Boas and compiled some of the true monuments of folklore, not merely the enormous collections of lore, in all its variants, but also such enormous and invaluable works as the tale-type index of Kaarle Krohn's student Antti Aarne, updated and expanded by Kittredge's student, Stith Thompson, and Thompson's own six-volume *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955-58). Their goals were and largely remain the comparison of variants and the identification of the general lineaments of a proto-tale and its point of origin.

The wall between anthropologists and folklorists was a permeable one, with both groups participating in the American Folk-Lore Society, though with the anthropologists generally in ascendancy, at least until the early 1940s. Zumwalt makes it clear here too that Boas sought the membership of the putatively unscientific literary folklorists in order to bolster the numbers of his society. It seems that there were more folklorists than there were anthropologists, despite the fate of the former to be members of English or literature departments. Further, some of these folklorists also collected and studied American Indian lore, so that their exclusion would have been without ostensible grounds.

The main thrust of her conclusion is that the time for this strife is past. Folklore can benefit from the temporal and geographical perspectives provided by the folklorist, and by the interpretative cultural context offered by the anthropologist. As in some of the hard sciences, it is time now for folklore to be investigated by teams of scholars made up of individuals with complementary training and talents.

I was not prepared for the sort of ugly politicking that Zumwalt has documented, though I hasten to add that she has done so in the most objective light. Yet herein lies the importance of the book for it will force the reflective reader to assess the course of her or his own career, and to ponder the nature of academic achievement and the significance of scholarly work. Until I had read this book I had little appreciated how much we and our academic environment are the products of a few lucky individuals, not only intellectually gifted but also politically ambitious, who asserted their egos and visions at the expense of those of their colleagues.

Anthropology and Politics: Visions, Traditions, and Trends
Joan Vincent
Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990. x + 570 pp. $40.00 (cloth)

Reviewer: Sally Falk Moore
Harvard University

A large, encompassing account of the work in anthropology that addresses the political domain has long been needed. Since Balandier's very useful and brief *Political Anthropology* (Presses Universitaires de France) of 1967 (English version 1970), there has been one attempt at a text-like review, Lewellen's 1983 book, also entitled *Political Anthropology* (Bergin & Garvey Publishers). Apart from a somewhat updated bibliography, Lewellen's essay represents no particular advance over Balandier's version of the field. Balandier divided his book into a brief history of the subdiscipline, a chapter on the political sphere, three on the relationships between power and, respectively, kinship, social stratification and religion, one on the traditional state and one on modernity and change. His presentation was incisive and in the context of the period, critical.

Vincent's book is an entirely different project. The presentation is somewhere between that of a compendious chronological annotated bibliography (see p. 9 where Vincent indicates that that was her initial purpose), and an attempt to sketch the sequence of historical settings in which anthropological writing on political subjects took place. Vincent starts in the 19th century and ends somewhat abruptly with a short chapter on works from 1974 to the present. Given the length of the book, it is not a