which he discusses at length emigration from southwestern Japan that included a high proportion of burakumin. His analysis (2009) has shown that this emigration, albeit Latin American-bound, was a Japanese state-promoted solution to political, economic and social problems surrounding the former outcasts and radicals in Japan. Endoh further argues that burakumin in the mining sector in Japan assumed multiple social identities such as “peasant[s], worker[s] and social outcast[s]”. Endoh’s arguments would have fundamentally deepened Geiger’s discussion, particularly in the section on coalmine workers (pp. 66-9).

With its many strengths and weaknesses, this book is altogether a welcome addition to the expanding field of Japanese migration and transnational American Studies. The book invites readers to think more critically across the national borders and class boundaries that have tended to confine the fields of our study until recently.

Yukari Takai
Glendon College, York University


European feudalism grew out of European circumstances, and when transplanted across the Atlantic was recontextualized in settings quite unlike those in which it had flourished in Europe. The press of people on land was absent; the relative value of land fell dramatically, the value of labour rose, and in new circumstances the relationship with authority could not be what it had been. The seigneurial system, the feudal system implanted in Canada at the beginning of French settlement, was built around hierarchical relationships between people and with land. A basic question is how these relationships worked themselves out in the non-French circumstances they encountered along the lower St. Lawrence. The question is central: land in early Canada was granted and held in seigneuries, and different types of landholding entailed different socio-economic obligations, responsibilities, and powers.

In Brève histoire du régime seigneurial, Benoît Grenier offers a synopsis of the large literature on the seigneurial system in Canada and of his own writing and thinking about it. His analysis lies somewhere between the two most common interpretative poles. If he cannot accept Aubert de Gaspé’s (or, for that matter, Marcel Trudel’s) paternalistic vision of beneficent seigneurs and appreciative censitaires, he does not deny that, here and there, such relationships existed. If he is uneasy with a Marxist emphasis on the seigneurs’ exploitation of their censitaires catching the sum of Canadian seigneurialism, he is well aware that seigneurial charges could be burdensome. He knows too, and insists repeatedly on the point, that feudalism is fundamentally hierarchical and inegalitarian. More broadly and like most writers on the subject, he considers the seigneurial system central to the history of early Canada.

Everything is interesting and relevant and much is excellent in this short, well-informed and well-argued book. The chapter on the European origins of the seigneurie is as fine a short summary of this complex topic as one will find. The chapter on the
introduction of the seigneurial system to Canada, on the rhythm and geography of seigneurial concessions, and on seigneurial charges and privileges is a useful, accurate summary of these basic matters. A chapter on the seigneurs makes clear the great variety of circumstances in which seigneuries were held and the difficulty of generalizing about seigneurs as a class or about the nature of seigneurial management. The changing legal position of the seigneurial system after the conquest, as well as the changing ethnicity and social standing of the seigneurs and the growing profitability of seigneuries as their populations increased, are well, if briefly, considered. A chapter that asks whether seigneurial society was harmonious or conflictual finds evidence of both tendencies while noting that the parish was the primary locus of rural sociability. A final chapter treats the abolition in 1854, sixty years after the abolition of feudal tenures in France, of what had become an anachronistic system.

This is all good material. Where my knowledge overlaps with Grenier’s I am generally in agreement, and where it does not, I learn. If one is thinking, teaching or writing about the seigneurial system in Canada, this intelligent little book is now the place to begin. But since I wrote about the seigneurial system myself many years ago, and since Grenier has stimulated me, I cannot resist responding to his assumption that the seigneurial system is central to an understanding of early Canada.

The geographical impact of the seigneurial system seems large, but one needs be cautious. While the system’s toponymic imprint is apparent, the long lots that increasingly defined the seigneurial landscape had, in themselves, no necessary relationship with Canadian seigneurialism. They were, rather, the cadastral system that seemed best to fit a riverine colony; had land along the lower St. Lawrence been conceded in *franc alleu roturier* (approximately fee simple) and held directly from the crown, the pattern of long lots would have been much the same. At Red River, there were long lots but no seigneuries; in France, there were some 40,000 seigneuries but very few long lots. It also cannot be assumed that Canadian seigneurs had much influence on the pattern of settlement. As Grenier points out, a few of them were active colonizers but the large majority were not. Settlement spread along the banks of the river and away from the towns without much reference to seigneurial boundaries. Seigneurs were agents of colonization to the extent that they conceded *rotures* (lots subject to seigneurial charges) to those applying for them. Nor, a few instances apart, were seigneuries loci of socialization. Most seigneurs lived in the towns. When in their seigneuries, they were entitled to favoured pews and to some measure of deference, but there was little institutional or geographical support for the seigneurie as a framework of social life. In this regard, parish, *côte*, and *rang* were far more important. Most seigneurs had the right to judge civil offences, a potential source of seigneurial power, but few exercised this right because of the costs involved and the availability of urban courts.

In 17th century France, the seigneurial system had largely become a means by which a fair percentage of the product of peasant labour accrued to seigneurs. In Canada, however, where the relatively low cost of land and relatively high cost of labour favoured the peasantry, the question is just how much burden the system actually imposed. Allan Greer and others have held that, somewhat like in France, Canadian seigneurialism yielded a burdened peasantry – to the extent, Greer suggests, of half of the surplus product of peasant farms. Grenier is inclined to agree.
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


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