

trolled the inadvertent admission of physicality. A telling example is the indecency attributed to "the feet," although one could safely speak of "a foot." Thus one broke "the right foot and the left foot" (224).

The middle class's anxiety over verbal indecencies, hygiene, modesty (even among members of the same sex), and children's sexuality (masturbation sent one on the road to hell) all became ways of keeping the lower classes at a distance. The servants and other members of the working and peasant classes were seen as polluting. The bourgeois household thus embodied a dilemma: servants were indispensable to genteel life, yet their presence constituted a threat to purity.

At points, the authors refer to the importance of bourgeois culture building in the context of social unrest and the necessity of regarding it in terms of "cultural domination, subordination, and resistance" (265). However, the book replicates some of the weaknesses of a Foucault-like approach by not identifying the conditions, resources, and strategies by which a bourgeois order of things said to be morally superior took on hegemonic status (perhaps these issues are taken up in the 1985 sequel, yet to be translated). Nonetheless, the authors' innovative decision to attack homogeneity through the comparison of class-based cultures results in a vital contribution to the anthropology of European society that transcends the limitations of localist analysis and suggests a promising direction for future research.

*Ethnohistory* 37(1):76-78 [1990]

**The Monkey as Mirror: Symbolic Transformations in Japanese History and Ritual.** By Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987. xvi + 270 pp., figures, photographs, references, index. \$29.95 cloth.)

William Kelly, *Yale University*

Among the popular amusements of strollers in Tokyo's Yoyogi Park are comical and acrobatic performances by a monkey, Jirô, and his trainer, Tarô. Tarô leads the monkey through agile gymnastics, staged miscues, and clever parodies of human movements. Yet what seems light entertainment is in fact a playful challenge to contemporary social conventions. The monkey and his trainer, who is of the discriminated "special status people," are trickster-clowns, figures rich in historical depth and symbolic significance for the anthropologist Ohnuki-Tierney. Her book explores the transformations in the meanings of this performance, its performers, and its simian symbolism over a millennium of Japanese history. It offers an eclectic blend of structuralist analysis, literary interpretation, performance theory, and historical scholarship.

The monkey has long been a mediating deity in the Japanese spirit

world. As the guardian of horses in early Japan, it was prominent in health and healing rituals performed in the stables. By the sixteenth century, the monkey had come to be seen more ambivalently as a trickster-scapegoat figure; by the late twentieth century, as a clown. Similarly, Ohnuki-Tierney argues, the "special status people" originally included healers, diviners, artisans, and entertainers; by the early seventeenth century, this category had narrowed to those of devalued, "defiling occupations." These included monkey trainers, and sacred stable rituals moved out onto the street as secular, popular entertainment. In the twentieth century, such outcasts have been legally emancipated, but they remain subtly stigmatized. A few have revived the monkey performances to resist assimilation into mainstream Japanese society, although they skillfully adapt their shows to the tastes of middle-class culture.

Ohnuki-Tierney plausibly traces related shifts in the central meanings of monkey lore, monkey rituals, and monkey trainers; her efforts to situate this symbolic analysis historically, however, are problematical, in two respects. She argues (12-16, 41-127) that these transformations in meaning correspond to the two periods of fundamental sociocultural change in Japanese history: the fourteenth to sixteenth, or late-medieval, centuries, and the early 1970s to the present. No doubt these are major fault lines in Japanese history, but there are others of equal significance; even these two are so different in depth that the argument seems forced.

Moreover, Ohnuki-Tierney posits a deeper structure, a permanent "Japanese" worldview, underlying and grounding this history, which she finds already developed in the earliest written collections of the eighth century. It is an enduring cosmology whose first principle is, ironically, impermanence: "a universe that constantly ebbs and flows between two opposite principles: purity and impurity, good and evil, order and its inversion" (130). Within such a fixed and fluid mental universe, the historical shifts in the meanings of monkeys and their rituals become "permutations," and history is contained by structure. This is a critical proposition for Ohnuki-Tierney, for it allows her to generalize about the more profound significance of the monkey in symbol and ritual as a constant, reflexive commentary on Japanese selfhood. The monkey is the mirror, not of the Japanese soul, but of the Japanese self. This is a provocative claim, but the cosmological bedrock on which it rests is not a demonstrated "finding" (225) of the book, but actually a central premise. I am not convinced that an Asiatic mode of symbolic production is the most promising postulate for a genuinely historical anthropology of Japan.

Nonetheless, as a study that is avowedly exploratory and speculative, it is to be applauded and encouraged. The applause is for Ohnuki-Tierney's salutary efforts to bring structuralist analysis to Japanese folklore and cultural analysis to Japanese history; the encouragement is for

her to develop her argument in at least two directions. First, as she herself indicates, multiple transformations of forms and transgressions of boundaries are fundamental to Japanese cultural logic. The monkey is but one of a myriad of operators, and we will need a better sense of the larger field to assess the monkey's significance. Furthermore, although Ohnuki-Tierney is concerned about the paucity of the historical record, I am more anxious about the limited considerations she gives to power relations. There may be a neat symbolic balance in a harmony of yin and yang, order and disorder, but this cultural symmetry has long served social relations of domination and subordination. Symbolic power is not always politically efficacious, a point she recognizes (216-17) but might pursue further. What we now need, and what Ohnuki-Tierney's work has prepared the ground for, is a fuller exploration of that which Peter Stallybrass and Allon White have termed "the politics and poetics of transgression."

**After Removal: The Choctaw in Mississippi.** Edited by Samuel J. Wells and Roseanna Tubby. (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1986. x + 153 pp., photographs, illustrations, tables, notes, bibliography, index. \$22.50 cloth.)

Daniel H. Usner, Jr., *Cornell University*

The Ethnic Heritage Program of the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, directed by William Brescia, has produced some useful materials for students at various levels of inquiry: an introductory text on the tribal government, interviews with Choctaw craftspeople, and now two anthologies of essays on Mississippi Choctaw history. The first, *The Choctaw before Removal*, edited by Carolyn Reeves, appeared in 1985. *After Removal: The Choctaw in Mississippi*, its sequel, adds new information to the literature on southeastern Indians and awakens us to the opportunity for scholarship on postremoval communities. In particular, it enhances our appreciation of how those Choctaws who remained in Mississippi after removal endured against great odds to become one of the most vigorous Indian nations in the United States.

The quality of essays in this collection is very uneven. Only a few can satisfy the scholar's standards of analysis and coherence; the others are tentative approaches to topics that invite closer scrutiny. Chronological gaps remain, especially in the twentieth century. But these shortcomings do not appreciably detract from this effort to gather together the recent work of historians, geographers, anthropologists, educators, and community researchers; as Wells points out in his introduction, the overlap and lacunae in periods and topics simply indicate where there is an abundance of resources and where future investigation is needed.