
In *Bibliography of Feminist Criticism* ECW Press has published separately the checklist of Canadian feminist literature and criticism collected by Barbara Godard which also appeared in her essay collection *Gynocritics / Gynocritiques* (Toronto: ECW Press, 1987, pp. 231-350). Neither additions nor deletions appear to have been made to the original checklist, here duplicated even to line and page breaks.

In *Gynocritics* the bibliographical section was entitled ‘Bibliography of Feminist Criticism in Canada and Quebec.’ A reading of Godard’s numerous essays on feminist literary criticism would lead one to regard the implied exclusion of Quebec from the sphere of Canada as a literary rather than a political statement. Godard believes that feminist literary theory has taken a different turn in Quebec than it has in English-speaking Canada. In her essay ‘Mapmaking: A Survey of Feminist Criticism’ (*Gynocritics*, pp. 1-30), Godard outlines the necessarily different responses of feminist authors and critics to cultural traditions, predominantly English or French. For Godard, ‘The primacy of social action in the one contrasts with the theoretical traditions of the other.’ This emphasis on what she views as the unique response of French-Canadian feminists may account for what appears to be an imbalance in favour of French-Canadian material included.

Whatever the ratio of English to French material included, it is unfortunate that the Canadian identification was not carried forward to the title of the bibliography as published separately, since it is the Canadian content that makes Godard’s work so important. It is probable that any number of such checklists covering feminist literature in the United States and the international scene could be found. Two excellent bibliographies, for example, are Maggie Humm’s *An Annotated Critical Bibliography of Feminist Criticism* (Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1987) and Wendy Frost’s and Michele Valiquette’s *Feminist Literary Criticism: A Bibliography of Journal Articles, 1975-1981* (New York: Garland, 1988). The problem with these and other such works remains the lack of Canadian content.

Godard’s bibliography is bilingual in the sense that the introduction and all section headings are presented in both English and French. Unfortunately, this attempt to maintain a bilingual approach makes many of the directional references to other entries unnecessarily cumbersome. Indexes by author of article and by author treated as subject would have been more helpful. Material is presented alphabetically, by author or by title when there is no author, under several broad categories: bibliographies, feminist literary theory, general studies of several writers, individual writers, images of women in men’s writing, images of men, journalism, and feminist presses. Included are publications, where appropriate, in non-academic periodicals and interviews (‘even when – conducted by men’) where the issue of being both a woman and a writer is raised. Such unexpected routines of arrangement as locating bibliographies of individual writers in the writers’ section rather than with bibliographies would have been ameliorated by proper indexing.

The bibliography appears on the whole to be accurate, with only such minor errors as a consistent reference to Margrit Eichler as ‘Margaret.’ However, it is not
easy to discern the rationale behind the inclusion or exclusion of individual authors and critics. If, as appears probable from Godard’s introduction, the readings cited were gathered into her own private collection during the course of research, then the bibliography takes on an idiosyncratic character. Godard herself makes no claim of bibliographical completeness.

While it is possible to see why such ‘mainstream’ journalists as June Callwood are excluded, it is less easy to understand other omissions. Bonnie Kreps does not appear at all, nor do Susan Mann Trofimenkoff with her work on feminist biography, or Diana Relke with her feminist reading of Margaret Atwood. One might ask why Myrna Kostash rates only two entries. Conversely, if one is to include an author such as Sondra Gotlieb, why only one entry for her?

Bibliography of Feminist Criticism suffers by comparison with the bibliographies by Humm and Frost and Valiquette. The latter works are more comprehensive and include excellent indexes and annotations. However, given the dearth of reference works on Canadian feminism, Bibliography of Feminist Criticism should still prove to be a valuable addition to any research library. It has also the advantage of reflecting, however inadvertently, the bias and interest of a respected Canadian feminist critic.
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Où commencent et où finissent les idées? Dresser une bibliographie de ce champ de l’histoire n’est pas chose facile. Celle que Yvan Lamonde nous offre constitue incontestablement la plus réussie de ces tentatives jusqu’ici. Le compilateur connaît bien le terrain qu’il parcourt sans œillères ni exclusives. Bibliographe intelligent et non simple accumulateur de fiches, il sait même, à travers ses regroupement des titres, nous proposer subtilement une grille pour mieux saisir et comprendre ces matériaux bien éparpillés ‘et bien hétérogènes.’

À la vérité, on ne peut faire route avec meilleur guide. Depuis un quart de siècle, Lamonde traque les idées de la vallée du Saint-Laurent. D’une conception de l’histoire intellectuelle assez philosophique il a élargi sa curiosité au socio-culturel confinant volontiers à la culture populaire. Sur son itinéraire intellectuel qui fait comprendre ses paramètres successifs, il s’est ouvert dans deux pages du bulletin de la Bibliothèque Nationale du Québec de l’été 1989. Soulignons ici la fidélité de Lamonde à son dessein de jeunesse soit de raconter la fortune des idées d’ici. Si la vigne de l’histoire des idées a connu ses ouvriers nombreux autour de 1970, elle a été bien désertée depuis (comme preuve que les historiens ne sont pas immunisés contre les modes intellectuelles). L’entêtement fécond de Lamonde nous fait espérer la belle histoire des idées qu’il médite depuis quelques années. Lamonde vient de pub-