riences from their viewpoint. Nonetheless, the encouraging message to young women that they can pursue their intellectual dreams, and with perseverance may even be able to 'have it all', does stand out as a strong statement throughout the book.

Since there are so few well written life stories of Canadian women scientists which do capture the excitement that is so much a part of innovative research and scholarly work, it is sad to see such a rare opportunity wasted. In fact, it is this work's weaknesses which reaffirm that writing herstories to vividly capture women's experiences is as important for the lives of scholars and scientists as it is for the rest of us.

WOMEN'S HISTORY REVIEW: v.1, no.1, 1992.

June Purvis, ed. Wallingford, U.K.: Triangle Journals, 1992

by Jo Vellacott

Reviewing a journal is a challenge. I seldom read any issue of any journal from cover to cover, but select those articles I need to read for my own current work and then set it aside, though often with good intentions of coming back to read all that other interesting-looking stuff. But I am glad to have been asked to cover the first issue of this good new publication, which has provided me with an opportunity to stand back and take an overview of some trends in the writing of women's history.

Characteristically, women's studies expects to be relevant as well as academically sound; I am prepared to claim that relevance for all good feminist history. In addition, several articles here are of direct contemporary importance to feminist historians. We have a fascinating report by Hanna Behrend on her personal experience of developments in East Germany since unification. Although what really is a horror story is told here to put the record straight and for its own sake, Canadian women may read in it a warning about what happens, under rampant capitalism, to the weaker partner of two hitherto separate economic "nations," and to women in the subordinated culture.

Behrend's article is good contemporary history, not written as a polemic, and I would have exchanged its position under the rubric "Viewpoint" (reserved, I understand, for controversial pieces), with the article by Rosemary Auchmuty, Sheila Jeffreys, and Elaine Miller on "Lesbian History and Gay Studies: keeping a feminist perspective." This too is an important article, timely and appropriate, and its main point, well taken, is that, as gay studies develops as a discipline, lesbians must make sure that they retain the power to define their own history, and to resist being made invisible or inferior within a male gay culture that has many elements in it which do not reflect their experience. The authors document the risk effectively from recent male gay writing. However, some of the opinions aired are controversial among lesbian feminists. And I feel obligated to record my view that it is seriously inappropriate in a feminist journal to find paedophilia listed as "one of a range of male gay sexual practices," a statement which, followed as it is by a claim that "for feminists paedophilia is the sexual abuse of children," barely stops short of endorsing the dangerous myth that every gay man is a child abuser, or at best finds paedophilia acceptable. And seeing the root of the evil as the abuse of power, I have trouble in contrasting and condoning, as the authors seem ready to do, "the kind of affair that sometimes happens between a woman teacher and her girl pupil."

A third article of current importance to feminist historians is David Doughan's short piece, "The End of Women's History? A View from the Fawcett Library," in which he describes the effects on resource collections of chronic underfunding, resulting in shortage of staff and the threat of the literal disappearance of significant documents left without the admittedly expensive protection needed to safeguard them from decay, or even from theft or misuse. Doughan speaks of what he knows (and many of us know *him*, and his work, with gratitude and respect). Implicit in his argument is the connection between the starvation of women's historical resources and the overall slapping down by the conservative backlash of many of the women-supporting institutions which have grown up in recent years. We should take seriously his suspicion that "once more, a serious attempt is being made, possibly deliberately, certainly systematically, to exclude women from the mainstream of history."

Other articles found me reflecting on the relationship between history and theory. At one end of the scale, a historian may be content simply to tell a story, at the other end she or he may take a theory and rework a body of historical knowledge to show how it supports or challenges that theory. Both may be of use, although I think we should beware of acting as if it is the theory that validates the history, rather than the other way around. My bias is towards a middle position, that of research-based history from which the writer draws certain analytical conclusions. Sandra Stanley Holton's article on "The suffragist and the 'Average Woman'" is a model of this kind of writing. On her examination of the autobiographical writings of three suffragists, she bases her conclusion that suffrage work was often grounded in the personal experience of the domestic position of women, and should not be regarded as an activity marginal to the social history of women in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Eileen Janes Yeo's article on "Social Motherhood and the Sexual Communion of Labour in British Social Science, 1850-1950," though more complex, is similarly soundly based, an interesting and readable contribution to the debate surrounding the gains and losses made by those of our middle-class forebears who accepted the social division of labour but managed to subvert it to gain entry into public life, and eventually into academic fields. Her thesis is that, successful as the (conscious or unconscious) strategy of social mothering was in helping women gain a foothold in the public life of the middle class, it did little to break down—indeed, helped to create—barriers between social workers and the working class. Yeo's examples support her thesis well, though I am uncertain whether so much of the blame should be laid on the concept of "mothering" rather than directly on middle-class values. However, Mary Paley Marshall is

short-changed—as she was by her husband—when she is described as active in social work "while Professor Marshall pioneered modern economics." Mary Paley indeed became known as a completely devoted domestic adjunct to her husband, but feminists need to be aware that before marriage she was a lecturer in economics at the nascent Newnham College, and that Alfred Marshall's *Economics of Industry* (1879) was to have been her book, commissioned as a manual for extension lectures. It was described by J.M.Keynes as having been "much the best little text-book available," with a clarity which we may guess owed much to Mary Paley's input. Marshall took it over, and later suppressed it, replacing it with a different book of the same title. Although, as far as we know, Mary Paley accepted the division of labour imposed on her, we have to question the felicity of the arrangement, or any gain for women implicit in it.

Antoinette Burton's article ("'History' is Now: feminist theory and the production of historical feminisms") specifically addresses one of the problems in writing and using women's history. Burton's interest is in the grounding of feminist theory in the feminist past, and feminists well know that history is filtered through the reality of the writer. She raises questions about the difficulty of defining feminism—in effect, would some nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century feminisms, conditioned as they were by the prevailing imperialist and racist assumptions of their time and the class of their proponents, be legitimately considered feminist in our time? The caution is justified, and we should not write our forebears larger or more all-seeing than they were; however, historians need also to avoid an anachronistic or condescending critique of their subject matter, and Burton is right in directing her caveat mainly to the theorists who build on the feminist past.

The remaining two articles both have theory up front. Sara Delamont ("Old Fogies and Intellectual Women: an episode in academic history") presents a structural analysis of the exclusion of women sociologists from the mainstream of Chicago sociology. Put off by the weight of the theoretical apparatus, I was dragged reluctantly along, but, I confess, with increasing interest, particularly given the opportunity to read Delamont's article together with Yeo's reflections on another aspect of the same problem. For me, the main interest is in the account of the women's experience, and a straightforward analysis would have been as enlightening, and much more accessible than the elaborate model used here. This kind of work, complete with diagrams, has its own appeal, but I hope that feminist history is not going to set its feet on the (alas, well-trodden) primrose path that leads to an exclusive academic heaven to which only those will be admitted who express themselves in words and formulae not to be understood by the woman in the street.

Elizabeth Edwards' article on Alice Havergal Skillicorn, Principal of Homerton College, Cambridge from 1935 to 1960, tells of the way in which Skillicorn—seemingly in self-defence—developed a masculine persona which facilitated her survival and success in the competitive public academic world, but may have cost her dear in terms of emotional life. Edwards applies the post-structuralist feminist concept of masculine and feminine discourses, which would be apt and illuminating here were it stated once and then developed by her example. But the word "discourse" occurs over forty times (ending with a flourish of ten times on the last page), apparently in an attempt to raise an interesting and instructive story to a higher intellectual plane; the effect is only to distance us from the fascinating woman who is her subject, and even to muddy the analysis. Tighter editing could have helped here. Mercifully, Edwards gives us enough vivid detail that, despite the obtrusive terminology, we end up knowing and understanding Skillicorn better.

The issue concludes with a good selection of book reviews, which we may expect to become an even more useful section as the journal becomes known. I particularly enjoyed Naomi Black's review essay, "Notes for a future historian." Readers of my opinionated comments above will not be surprised to hear that I resonate to Black's unhappiness "with the increasing tendency to assume that the rhetoric (discourse) or logic (problematisation) of feminism is its most important dimension," and I share her liking for "accounts that simply set down what happened." In history, analysis should emerge organically from the story, not provide a mould for it.

Two nit-picks occur to me. There are, as in so many publications in this technological age, too many small printing errors. And I am sorry that the external appearance so closely resembles the three-year-old *Journal of Women's History* (Indiana UP); if this is not altered, I can see it causing a lot of grief and confusion.

This new venture is to be welcomed, and the editors have provided us with a range of stimulating articles.

PAROLES REBELLES

Marguerite Andersen et Christine Klein-Lataud, Eds. Montréal: Les Éditions du remue-ménage, 1992.

par Jeannette Urbas

Dans son introduction, Christine Klein-Lataud explique que ce livre « veut rendre hommage à toutes celles qui eurent le courage de prendre la parole et à toutes celles qui aujourd'hui luttent pour faire naître une parole vraie. » C'est la « parole» rebelle des femmes depuis la Renaissance jusqu'à nos jours qui se révèle dans les dix chapitres du livre, par des auteures de différentes disciplines. La plupart de ces rebelles sont francophones, originaires essentiellement de la France et du Québec. Chaque chapitre est suivi d'une bibliographie, à l'intention des lectrices et des lecteurs qui désirent faire des recherches supplémentaires.

Les quatre premiers textes comprennent une étude historique des auteures françaises des XVIe, XVIIe, XVIIIe et XIXe siècles, dont maints noms commencent seulement à être tirés de l'oubli par un travail de recherche assidu. Comme l'indique Jane Couchman dans son texte sur la Renaissance, pour définir un acte de rébellion, il faut toujours prendre