Yet as the author mentions in the epilogue, the book is something of a response to Bloom's work in that Levine attempts to refute the idea that culture must follow a particular canon or be forever lost in mass tastelessness. He also comments that Bloom's cultural criticism is not a new one, being revived periodically by whichever echelon of society feels their position eroding. The author is also very clear in expressing his intellectual orientation to American cultural study, hoping that a "more careful understanding of what culture has been in our past and can become in our future" can be attained (259). All in all, Levine had created a useful tool for current and future scholars interested in investigating the facets and dynamics of the American cultural milieu.

Rosemary Levy Zumwalt. **American Folklore Scholarship: A Dialogue of Dissent.** Foreword by Alan Dundes. Pp. xiv + 186, notes, bibliography, index. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988. $35.00 cloth, $9.95 paper.

Reviewed by Linda Kinsey Adams

Anyone who enters a graduate program in folklore these days quickly learns what it is like to be caught in a tug of war between anthropological folklorists and literary folklorists. After hearing an anthropologically-oriented lecture, the literary faculty member will comment to a student, "Rather radical in his/her approach, don't you think?" After hearing a literarily-oriented lecture, the anthropological faculty member will comment to a student, "Rather conservative in his/her approach, don't you think?" Depending on how one responds to either of these feeler-comments, a student seemingly is placed in one camp or the other. A new student can feel almost like the object of a custody fight; the problem is, the student knows neither progenitor well enough to take sides, nor would the student *want* to take sides even if everything were known. Today's folklore student looks for a way to get along with members of both camps without having to commit exclusively to either.

Rosemary Levy Zumwalt, in a book adapted from her 1982 Ph.D dissertation at Berkeley (directed by Alan Dundes), traces the intellectual history of precisely this tension between literary and anthropological folklorists. The jacket notes are slightly misleading, stating that Zumwalt focuses on the period from 1888 to the early 1940s. Actually, she traces some elements of the split up through the early 1970s, when the performance school emerged. Her observations incorporate insights gleaned from previously unexamined personal papers.

A consummate historiographer known for her work on Schoolcraft, Van Gennep, and others, Zumwalt uses an alternating, point-by-point comparison in a chronological framework to highlight the differences that separated the two camps. According to the dichotomy she draws, anthropologists focused on people, their lives, and the cultural patterning in those lives; literary scholars on forms, genres, and written texts. Anthropologists saw folklore as "part of the

culture and a reflection of the culture," whereas literary scholars saw folklore as survivals, as "remnants of the unlettered portion of the European literary tradition." Anthropologists first studied myths; literary scholars first studied ballads. To anthropologists, the "folk" were members of non-Western tribal cultures, or American Indians; to literary scholars, the "folk" were peasants. Anthropologists emphasized contexts, native viewpoints and living traditions, whereas literary scholars emphasized texts and discovery of origins. The anthropologist's goal was to understand cultural themes, meanings, and functions of folklore, whereas the literary scholar's goal was to salvage, preserve, and reconstruct texts, to determine origins, and to provide literary analysis. Anthropologists took a holistic, inclusive approach, relying on fieldwork and cultural immersion, whereas the literary scholar collected, classified and indexed printed texts in order to compare individual items.

Among the anthropologists whom Zumwalt discusses are Newell, Boas, Kroeber, Lowie, Speck, Jacobs, Herskovits, Parsons, Benedict, Reichard, Radin, and Beckwith; among the literary scholars she discusses are Child, Kittredge, Taylor, Boggs, Hand, Thompson, Utley, Robinson, Lomax, Parry, Lord, Leach, and Espinosa. Fortunately, not everyone is painted as an "either-or" scholar.

Quoting from personal letters and papers of both anthropological and literary scholars, Zumwalt presents not only elements of the schism but also certain people's attempts to unify the warring factions. As she points out, from the beginning there were people who saw the discipline of folklore as bridging both camps. As early as 1898, Fletcher S. Bassett "envisioned folklore as independent of, and intermediate between, literature and science" (24). An American Folklore Society committee chaired by Melville Herskovits in 1940 recommended that "the points of convergence between the two fields" be stressed. Francis Lee Utley in 1951, William Bascom in 1953, Melville Jacobs in 1959, and Alan Dundes in 1965 were among others who deplored the dichotomy and attempted to draw the factions together toward common concerns. In contrast, Richard Dorson is painted as a person who emphasized the gap between the two factions rather than attempting to lessen the gap. "For Dorson, the anthropologists were not part of the folklore circle" (137).

The solution to the conflict? Obviously, Zumwalt prefers not to shed her neutral cloak, although it should be noted that she is an anthropology professor at Davidson College. Even though she does not come right out and openly endorse performance theory, she does state that "performance theory lays to rest the past concerns of both the literary and the anthropological folklorists" (139). In performance theory, she explains, the text and context "are united in the whole" (139). She quotes Richard Bauman's 1972 statement: "The kind of focus on the doing of folklore, that is, on folklore performance, is the key to the real integration between people and lore on the empirical level" (139). Zumwalt does not neglect the text-context controversy that has accompanied the new perspective. Most importantly, however, she reminds us that disciplines do not "own" theories; she emphasizes that the discipline of folklore draws from historical, sociological, psychological and political approaches as well as literary and anthropological ones, and that such an eclectic nature can be viewed as a source of strength (142).

We should look at Zumwalt's book as a heuristic device that helps us to understand the past. Postmodernist approaches would shun the dichotomizing and categorizing of people into one camp or another; certainly the situation is not as simple as saying that anthropologists focus on people while literary scholars focus on texts. The world, and the people in it, are much too complicated for such neat labeling. Nor should people think that one academic approach is better than the other; both approaches contribute to our knowledge.

Zumwalt, if she teaches as well as she writes, is a very good teacher indeed. She presents the issues succinctly and clearly, and she does not assume that the reader has been in the field for 15 years. Here is just one example of her succinct and lucid explanations:

> The literary folklorists adopted both an evolutionary and a devolutionary explanation for the origin of folklore. As Dundes explains in "The Devolutionary Premise in Folklore Theory," while people were said to evolve, folklore was said to devolve or to degenerate: it passed from the higher to the lower classes [Dundes 1969a]. (103)

In two short sentences, she has not only clearly stated a complex idea, but she has clarified it and delivered a bibliographical source as well. The book is rich reading, outlining the intellectual geneaology of American folklore and delivering many interesting historical tidbits. Folklore teachers will want to use this book in their introductory theory classes, while doctoral students will want to memorize the book before their qualifying exams.

Bohlman, Phillip V. **The Study of Folk Music in the Modern World.** Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988. Pp. xx + 159, bibliography, index. $10.95 paper.

Reviewed by Johnson A.K. Njoku

It is not often that one comes across a book that successfully ties the history and development of folk music scholarship with contemporary concepts, issues, and shifts, and which treats varied folk musics of the world cultures within the rubric of folklore and ethnomusicology with subtle generalizations making sense to serious minds, scholars and advanced students in both fields. Bohlman has succeeded in avoiding the pitfall of many contemporary researchers and authors who narrowly discuss folksongs, especially song texts, as if they were never sung, or as congruent entities from the societies that own, perform, appreciate, or dislike them.

This is not just another book on folk music. It is unlike many books about given societies that begin with a long introduction that usually leads nowhere, and catalogs of folk music characteristics that say virtually nothing about the social basis of music. By contrast, this book has been written, it would seem,