

to, as usually they either sent their much-needed earnings back home to eastern Europe or gave it to their parents struggling on homesteads some distance away. Most saw marriage as their only alternative, as a means of gaining independence, of having their own land. Times had not changed much in this respect from the days Georgina was farming. These young women had the added disadvantages of not knowing English and lacking an education. And so, the choice of remaining single and farming was an alternative that did not present itself.

The celebration of the 75th birthday of Saskatchewan (1905-1980) is being marked this year by recognition of pioneer women by the Department of Agriculture. One can only speculate how much more these women might have accomplished had they been permitted to do so. Georgina Binnie-Clark was able to disprove the 'she can't' in her farming endeavours. Many others, even years later, were not so privileged.

Apolonja Kojder, whose home is in Saskatchewan, is a PhD student at OISE in Toronto.

New Feminist Scholarship: A Guide to Bibliographies, by Jane Williamson, *The Feminist Press, 1979, pp. 139.*

Sheila McIntyre

In 1974, when Jane Williamson began this work as an independent study project while a student of library science, there were no records of the proliferation of small press, 'underground', or institution-published bibliographies on feminist research in the standard authorized sources in library reference sections. Her book, then, grew out of both practical and political feminist goals. She sought to assist researchers in women's studies by providing a comprehensive, well-organized and 'authoritative' reference tool. (Being assigned a Library of Congress catalogue number for the headings 'Feminism,' 'Women's Studies,' and 'Bibliography' qualifies a work as authoritative). She also tilted at the established library world by challenging it to acknowledge the scope and

astounding quantity of bibliographic material on women rendered invisible by library reference guides.

Feminist scholars, researchers and activists should celebrate this work. It provides a long overdue reprieve from the hit and miss research techniques which have hampered (and often discredited) feminist research. With 391 references listed, one containing as many as 31,000 citations, *NFS* should become one of the feminist scholar's primary sourcebooks. With such a massive catalogue of work on women, it should also deliver a resounding rebuke to establishment scholars — librarians included — who have dismissed feminist research as a peripheral, unprofessional and inconsequential drops-in-the-buckets of paperwork generated by commercial and non-profit publishing institutions. Furthermore, by including in *NFS* lists of archival holdings, film catalogues, source book and survival guides in addition to bibliographies of academic scholarship, Williamson does the feminist cause an enormous service. She has not played to the scholarly establishment by defining feminist scholarship so narrowly that valuable research tools are inaccessible to interdisciplinary study.

As a research tool, *NFS* will bring a tear to the bloodshot eyes of overworked, isolated feminists. It's almost all here: (1) descriptive and evaluative annotations on 215 of the 391 sources cited, each numbered consecutively for easy cross-reference; (2) an author and title index; (3) a list of publishers, with addresses, for in-print sources (and helpful annotations on out of print sources); (4) straightforward subject headings for 30 fields of feminist studies ranging from the obvious academic disciplines to social issues — rape, life cycles and drug and alcohol use. (5) The sections on 'Art and Music,' 'Third World Countries,' and 'Philosophy,' are unaccountably small, however, and will have to be expanded in subsequent editions.

Williamson clearly states in

her introduction that *NFS* does not pretend to be comprehensive. Deliberately excluded were reading lists of basic feminist texts, catalogues of non-sexist books for young readers, bibliographies of individual women writers and source guides or bibliographies that are appended to major works, monographs or anthologies rather than published separately. With few exceptions, periodical articles were not annotated. Although this policy is practical, given restriction of time and availability, I wish Williamson had made an attempt to annotate articles which are the single source on a subject.

What Williamson tried to include are all bibliographies, resource lists and literature reviews she could find published in English (whether in or out of print) in Canada and the U.S. She opted not to classify Canadian material under a separate subject heading and to disperse them throughout the book under the relevant subject headings. Disperse is the key word. Though Williamson calls *NFS* a 'bibliography of U.S. and Canadian bibliographies,' at a rough count a scant 15 out of the 391 works cited were published in Canada.

Given that Williamson cites the *Canadian Newsletter of Research on Women* under the 'General' subject heading as 'an unequalled resource for research in progress, bibliography and book reviews,' it is difficult to bear with sisterly tolerance her failure to tap it as a source of Canadian materials. By contrast, 38 review essays published in *Signs* are cited under the appropriate subject headings in *NFS*. Williamson has completely ignored most of the original review essays and original bibliographies and annotated references to recently published bibliographies contained in each issue of the *Newsletter*. Although some of the Canadian materials cited in *NFS* are too important to ignore, Williamson should have identified them under a separate heading as a very incomplete listing of Canadian works, referred readers to the *Newsletter* and made no further claim to represent Canadian

scholarship.

Less serious an omission is Williamson's decision not to draw any overt conclusions from her research. Though by virtue of its novelty in library catalogues *NFS* reproaches the established library world for failing to cite feminist research in standard reference sources, Williamson could have been more pointed in her criticism. According to her digging, only 16 university and college libraries and four public libraries have published bibliographies of their own holdings on women or women's studies; only 11 libraries have produced reference guides on how to use their facilities to locate material on women. Although the vast majority of these 31 library publications were issued in the mid 1970s, 13 were out of print as this book was published.

It may be that government cutbacks, administration resistance to feminism or disinterest account for this dearth of vital cataloguing. There is no doubt, though, that professional librarians must build on Williamson's pioneering work — especially in Canada. They should stock her book, inform her of her omissions (her request), stock those in-print works she has cited which are not amongst their holdings, catalogue their own holdings, and so on.

In her introduction, Williamson refers to omissions and incompleteness as 'the bibliographer's nightmare.' If librarians lobby to reduce the obvious gaps in their own holdings, we might yet see bibliographies and catalogued resources which are the feminist researcher's fantasy.

Shakespeare's Sisters; Feminist Essays on Women Poets, edited, with an introduction by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *Indiana University Press, 1979, pp. 337, hardcover \$21.45.*

Sherrill Cheda

As Gilbert and Gubar say in their introduction, the essays in this anthology seek to find our 'grandmothers' and thus trace the outlines of a distinctively female poetic tradition — our matrilineal heritage — and they are successful.

In 'A lonesome glee,' the