shape their own work experiences,"16 one could move beyond the limitations inherent in an "either/or" model and could move toward a more holistic framework.

These last three articles do make some interesting and important points about the nature of work and work experience as it varies by gender. However, their publication in 1987 seems somewhat dated in the context of much contemporary work.17 Their strength lies in their empirical contributions and, as with much of the other work, their weakness lies in their failure to utilize the empirical findings in such a way as to refine or reconceptualize the problematic dichotomy of the "public" and the "domestic."

Sandra D. Harder
Ottawa

NOTES
1. Rosaldo, "The use and abuse of anthropology: reflections on feminism and cross-cultural understanding," Signs, 5, no. 3 (Spring, 1980).
8. Ibid, p. 83.
10. Ibid, p. 158.
12. Ibid, p. 159.
17. An excellent contemporary discussion of households and work can be found in Paul, Divisions of Labour, London: Basil Blackwell Limited, 1984. See also, Redclift and Mingione (eds.), Beyond Employment: Household, Gender and Subsistence, London: Basil Blackwell Limited, 1985. Both of these works situate an analysis of work and households in the context of changing capitalist relations at the global, national and local levels. In addition, they draw upon and contribute to current feminist reconceptualizations of work, the economy and social reproduction.
If this all sounds very familiar, that is Patricia Thomp­
son's point. She is not simply substituting Hestian for
"women" and trying to give an old/new label to a feminist
perception of dualism and patriarchy. Nor is she trying to
beguile her listeners/readers into recognizing the domains
she describes so that she can then say, "You see, you are a
feminist after all." She is, instead, really talking about a
broader view of the gender-intensive discipline of Home
Economics itself and as her feminist, non-home economist
readers will find, to their surprise, she has something new
to say about the way we look at each other.

As she explains it, Home Economics has become a
target for feminist anger—it has seemed to embody the
values that have oppressed women: "Every bit of anguish
and anger that feminists have felt about their role and
status as women has been projected onto Home Econom­
cics uncritically" (p. 94). She introduces the Hestian
dilemma with words that must be considered in and out of
the academy as we assess the aptness of the metaphor itself:
"As a feminist and a home economist, I find feminist
theory helpful in explaining our present position. Our
devaulted, privatized, invisible world, the oikos, became a
'separate sphere.' The very thing that has happened to
women generally has happened to home economists par­
ticularly, and even to Home Economics as a profession!"
(p. 11)

Patricia Thompson's book/words are a challenge to
home economists and to feminists alike, but the very
nature of this challenge is in keeping with the reassuring,
positive attitude of the book. There is no angry finger­
pointing and fault-finding above or below the surface;
instead, her challenge offers a way to open the dialogue at
long last so that we can listen to each other. Patricia
Thompson sees Hestian feminism as a powerful answer to
the "current feminist dilemma about women and fami­
lies" (p. 6), and from reading her answers to the questions
of the women at Belcourt Centre, this reviewer thinks she
is taking us in the right direction.

The book suffers and benefits from being presented as
the proceeds of a conference workshop. The informal
questions and the comfortable dialogue make easy reading
and do stimulate thinking, but much of the heat and point
of the ideas must be lost in so much ease. There is no time
nor place in this format, in this setting, for deep explora­
tions. After the initial introduction of the Hestian/Her­
mean metaphor, the best of the book is found in the second
half of chapter three, "The Hestian Archetype." It is here,
and with the brief reference to Women's Ways of Knowing
at the end of the book, that more work will be done.

The book is not meant to be a deep exploration, after all.
It is meant to get the dialogue going, and that, I believe, it
will do. At the end of the third chapter, while making her
stand on integration clear, Thompson throws out a chal­

It is not that males are male. It is not our husbands or
our lovers or our sons that are the enemy. It is
patriarchy. It is the assumption that male privilege
is justified. Even for mediocre men! The men who
have ambitions, who are not our husbands, our
lovers, or friends, don't owe us anything. They
benefit from patriarchy. And it's a mistake for
women to transfer their loyalty to a Hermean system
that doesn't have Hestian interests at stake. That's a
lot different from arguing that patriarchy needs to
be replaced by matriarchy. The drive to dominate
and control is Hermean. The desire to connect and
collaborate is Hestian. We need a Hestian mani­
fest! (p. 84)

As women—and men—unite to counteract the injust­
tices of patriarchy, the dialogue will grow. Now these dia­
logues should welcome those who consider and wish to
explore the Hestian perspective.

Elizabeth R. Epperly
Memorial University of Newfoundland

NOTE

In writing this review, I have benefitted from conversations with Muriel
Houston, doctoral candidate at Dalhousie University.

On Education. Northrop Frye. Toronto: Fitzhenry and
Whiteside, 1988, Pp. 211.

The book is On Education by Northrop Frye. This
sounds innocuous to a feminist, even interesting, because
Frye has been a teacher all his life and is one of Canada's
great intellectuals; but, the book is not innocuous. It is
misogynist, with muddled thinking revealing its bias.
Frye actually has praise for women in one chapter (and
only one)—that which deals with culture and society in
Ontario. What else could he do, given the stature of
women writers in the province's history? In the other 18
chapters, women are ignored or demeaned.

The first alarm of his bias is in the sexist language. It is
pervasive. We learn all about the professional man, the
common man, the educated man, the young man, but
nothing about women of comparable status. We find that