ing is simply a mask for her hypocrisy and anti-Semitism. With this in mind, one must qualify Lindahl’s remark that Chaucer never explicitly judges the merits of his characters. While this is true, one must be aware of Chaucer’s satire. Explicit praise is not always genuine sympathy.

Despite the presence of a few questionable word divisions at ends of lines, some misspellings, and some minor errors in page references in the Index, the book is extremely well researched and very carefully written.

John Seland
Nanzan University
Nagoya, Japan


Rosemary Lévy Zumwalt’s useful study highlights a central theme in the emergence and development of folklore studies as an academic discipline in the United States. The conflict between those scholars who were drawn to folklore from literature and those who came to the study of folklore from anthropology was evident at the founding of the American Folklore Society in 1888, when William Wells Newell (an anthropological folklorist) became executive secretary and Francis James Child (a literary folklorist) became the first president. It continued throughout the first forty years of the twentieth century, with anthropological folklorists generally in control of the Society and its principal organ, Journal of American Folklore, and literary folklorists establishing themselves in academe through their teaching and research. Even after the awarding of the first doctorates in folklore in the 1950s, the conflict was still evident, and traces of it persisted into the 1980s.

Zumwalt has done a thorough job of delineating the issues in the conflict, identifying and characterizing the major personalities involved, and showing how each side contributed to the eventual status of folklore studies as an independent discipline. After an introductory chapter treating the professionalization of scholarship in the late nineteenth century and defining what she means by literary and anthropological folklorists, Zumwalt focuses on William Wells Newell, the primary force behind the American Folklore Society, paying special attention to his innovative inclusion of Native American mythology within the scope of an organization devoted to studying folklore—which, for most of his contemporaries, would not have included cultural material from so-called primitives. She then offers an overview of almost fifty years of schism among folklorists—from 1893, when a split between literary scholars and anthropologists produced separate folklore congresses at Chicago’s Columbian Exposition, until 1941, when the appointment of Archer Taylor, a literary folklorist, ended anthropological control of the Journal of American Folklore. Next Zumwalt traces the academic genealogy of virtually every major literary folklorist until mid-century, all of whom were scholarly descendants of Child and Harvard University. A similar treatment of anthropological folklorists shows their derivation from Franz Boas and Columbia University. The book then characterizes the differing approaches to folklore offered by
scholars from the literary side and those from anthropology, though Zumwalt perceptively notes that they were usually working toward the same goals and sharing the same concerns. Finally, she shows some of the ways in which the conflict persisted beyond the 1950s—in the disagreement over the myth-ritual theory, the origins of African American folktales, and the preeminence of text or performance.

The strengths of this study make it necessary reading for anyone concerned with folklore studies as a discipline. Zumwalt has clearly identified a central theme in the history of American folklore studies and has traced its effects in detail. She has drawn extensively on the writings of major figures in American folklore scholarship, but even more importantly she has quoted from unpublished materials: letters to and from Newell, Boas, Child—in fact, to and from virtually every major player in the drama. Although Boas's professional correspondence is available in microfilm, it is still difficult to gain access to, and reading the letters of most of the other scholars who figure in the formative years of American folklore studies requires visits to archives. Inclusion of this material makes the book even more useful.

The flaws of Zumwalt's study are minor and, for the most part, stylistic vestiges of its original format as a dissertation. She tends to quote too often from secondary sources that are readily available, a practice that interferes with the flow of her otherwise clearly written prose, and occasionally she dwells upon aspects of the folklorists' careers whose bearing to her argument is tangential. However, those small quibbles do not detract substantially from the overall value of a book that the international community of folklorists should find very useful for understanding the past and the present of American folklore studies.

William M. CLEMENTS
Arkansas State University
State University, Arkansas

JAPAN


Byron Earhart has for long been a major and influential figure in the study of Japanese religion, and this new book in which he presents a detailed discussion and analysis of one new religion, Gedatsu-kai, will certainly enhance that reputation as well as adding to our general knowledge and assessment of the phenomenon of the new religions. Originally Earhart studied Gedatsu-kai in a joint research project with Miyake Hitoshi and some of the results of this research and the findings of their Japanese research students were published in a volume of essays edited by Earhart and Miyake in Japanese (1983). This welcome cooperation has clearly enriched the current volume, which is meticulously researched and documented, based on an extensive survey and analysis of 3707 completed questionnaires along with in-depth interviews with ordinary members and leading officials, and observations of rituals and participation in Gedatsu-kai rituals and pilgrimages.

The book examines Gedatsu-kai, a medium-sized new religion that originated in the late 1920s and now has some 250,000 members, from several angles: discussions of