

A typical annual rent in Canada during the French regime for a *roture* of three by thirty *arpents* (1 linear *arpent* = 192 feet) was six *livres* (equivalent, roughly, to three days of manual labour, five geese, or half a sheep). Such rents imposed on settlers struggling to establish even a subsistence farm were undoubtedly burdensome. They could not pay and debts accumulated. But with thirty cleared *arpents* (1 superficial *arpent* = 5/6 of an acre), a farm usually produced a marketable surplus worth as much as 200-300 *livres* in good years, nothing in bad years. Such a farm usually could easily handle the seigneurial charges. The few *censitaires* who owned 100 cleared *arpents* could expect a yearly farm income of at least 500 *livres*. The point is that the burden of seigneurial charges was not intrinsic to the system but depended, rather, on the state of the holding on which they were levied. Any system of landholding other than free land grants would indebt impoverished settlers on meagre farms.

Does this add up to a system that is central to the understanding of early Canada? Hardly, I think, in the early years when there were too few settlers for too many seigneuries. In these circumstances, large ecclesiastical seigneuries near the towns were the most carefully managed; for want of settlers and seigneurial revenue, lay seigneurs often ignored their holdings. But the system survived in law, and eventually population pressures gave it more of its French bite. Seigneuries became profitable, seigneurs more attentive, more inclined to raise charges for new *rotures*, more inclined to live in their seigneuries. All of this was complicated by the British presence after 1760.

As Grenier shows, it is difficult to generalize about Canadian seigneurialism. The system changed in space and time, and in different seigneurial hands. Years ago I pushed the case too far but, impressed as I am by Grenier's book, I remain convinced that for a great many of the people living in the Canadian seigneuries, the system was not a large factor in their lives.

Cole Harris
Professor Emeritus
University of British Columbia

HUNEALT, Kristina, and Janice ANDERSON – *Rethinking Professionalism: Women and Art in Canada, 1850-1970*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012. Pp. 443.

The challenge to feminist art history has been to encourage and address a revisionist, rather than an additive, model of rethinking the patriarchal history of art and the art canon that sits at its centre. Early feminist art historians sought to revive the marginalized and often ignored history of women's participation in the arts by bringing forth works by these forgotten "Old Mistresses" as equal contributions to those by the celebrated "Old Masters." Feminist writers, artists, and curators began to challenge the exclusions of particular artists within different historical periods by highlighting women's artistic contributions, and fought to increase the visibility of women's art and the need to locate their cultural production within the canon of art history. While these projects from the 1970s and 1980s provided productive interventions into the art canon and questioned its

systematic exclusions of art by women, such projects were also limited in scope. The danger of projects that focus primarily on reclaiming and elevating women's cultural production to the status of art is that they leave intact the hierarchies of social relations on which the politics of exclusion are based.

More recently, the project of feminist art history shifted not only to highlight women artists and their works, but also to question the socio-political contexts within which these artists and works had been marginalized and, all too often, forgotten. That is, rather than primarily *adding* women artists and their work to the art canon, feminist art historians began to focus on challenging and *revising* the parameters of inclusion and exclusion that had historically governed the canon of art itself. These revisionist feminist critiques recognize that the value of a work of art—a value that determines inclusion in and exclusion from the art canon—is inextricably linked to the perception of the producer and production context of that work. And it is here, at the revisionist intersection of women, art, and production, that Kristina Huneault and Janice Anderson's edited collection *Rethinking Professionalism: Women and Art in Canada, 1850-1970* is located.

With a claim to be “the first published collection of scholarly essays on women, art, and history in Canada” (p. xix), *Rethinking Professionalism* developed out of papers presented at the 2008 inaugural conference of the Canadian Women Artists History Initiative (CWAHI). The CWAHI is a collaborative effort by academics and cultural practitioners to create a database of historical women artists in Canada, and the published essays in this collection reflect that goal. As the title suggests, *Rethinking Professionalism* offers a series of essays that address the history of women and art in Canada through the lens of artistic professionalism in order to disrupt and rethink the narrative of women's progress in the arts through a transition from amateur and professional practice. As Huneault writes in the introductory essay, each chapter in the collection deploys the concept of professionalism in relation to “time, place, and the different kinds of visual production that have structured the cultural field” (p. 4). Such analyses of “what to make of the criterion of professionalism,” Huneault asserts, are crucial for those “wishing to expand the history of that field [of art] to be more inclusive of women's production” (p. 3). The collection does not claim to offer a comprehensive or monolithic analysis in relation to the topic of women, art, and Canada; rather, it offers a series of in-depth studies to provide a critical history of but one art historical trajectory (that of professionalism) and to demonstrate how feminist revisions of art could be done as a more broad-based approach.

After the preface by Huneault and Anderson and the introductory essay by Huneault, the twelve assembled essays by a range of scholars provide careful analyses of case studies and are divided into thematic sections: Professionalizing Art, Careers for Women, and The Limits of Professionalism. The three chapters included in the first section of the collection, Professionalizing Art, approach the history of women, art, and professionalism by examining strands of populism and elitism that surrounded definitions of and conversations about artistic identity in the first half of the twentieth century. The case studies in this section address the factors that determined who was considered an artist and who got to define this position. In this way, these three essays broadly examine the socio-historical circumstances that governed the politics of inclusion and exclusion of women within professional art practices in early twentieth-century Canada.

The essays included in *Careers for Women*, the second thematic section of the collection, span a wide timeframe from the late nineteenth century to the second half of the twentieth century. Although varied in historical focus, each of the five essays broadly addresses different strategies implemented by working women in an effort to negotiate the professional terrain as a conventionally masculine realm. These techniques include referencing conventionally feminine spheres, such as the domestic space or working in handicrafts, or building alternative visual vocabularies. Additionally, many of the essays question the relationship of women cultural practitioners to the conditions of modernism, highlighting the contradictions of a period defined by its commitment to artistic freedom through the restrictions or limits placed on women's involvement.

While the previous two sections discuss the possibilities and limitations of women's participation by those who, to different extents, negotiated their inclusion (and, alternatively, limited their exclusion) within professional art environments, the essays in the third and final thematic section highlight particular groups and contributions that have been denied access to the professional art world. In *The Limits of Professionalism*, the four essays illuminate the limitations of the framework of professionalism specifically, but also art historical frameworks generally, in rewriting Canadian history as an inclusive narrative. As Huneault and Anderson explain in the preface to the collection, "the adoption of a discourse of professionalism by art historians effectively marginalizes certain women, certain kinds of contributions, and certain spheres of practice" (p. xxiii). Interweaving discussions of race and labour, these essays most fully express the complexities of art historical interventions through the lens of professionalization, because of the historically unequal access to professional institutions and practices for different women in Canada.

Taken together, the essays in this collection provide a powerful and convincing entry-point into a much needed conversation about the history of women's cultural production and the values of art practice in Canada. Already, this conversation has been continuing, most recently at the second conference organized by CWAHI in May 2012. This book would be a powerful addition to teaching and researching not just women's history in Canada, but history in Canada more broadly, by highlighting what has been marginalized or rendered invisible in dominant narratives.

Susan Cahill
Nipissing University

MACDONALD, Charlotte – *Strong, Beautiful and Modern: National Fitness in Britain, New Zealand, Australia and Canada, 1935-1960*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2011. Pp. 240.

Strong, Beautiful and Modern is an ambitious and stimulating account of programmes of national fitness which emerged in the United Kingdom and her former settler colonies of Australia, New Zealand and Canada in the late 1930s and 1940s. Although the state had previously been involved in efforts to encourage physical exercise and health among children through the establishment of parks and playgrounds and physical education in