

Dark Girl (1935), one of these works depicting a nude black woman, is one of Heward's finest paintings. How did she come to select the subject and why did she choose the exotic jungle locale? (Luckyj points out that the main plant featured is actually Canadian sumach!) Is there any social comment intended? What were Heward's views about the blacks' situation in Bermuda when she began to visit Isabel McLaughlin there in 1936? Many such questions remain to be answered, or at least to be speculated upon. One is even left feeling curious about Heward's ill health and death due to asthma. What was the state of medical knowledge on asthma at this time? Also, how did her own ill health and the illness and death of so many in her family colour her view of life and enter into her paintings?

Luckyj's main thrust in this section, "The Work," is to insist on Heward's individuality. While this is understandable, she has done so at the expense of giving a clear sense of Heward's context, both in Montréal and internationally. A more detailed discussion of how her work was similar to, but also differed from, that of her colleagues would have been in order here. I do agree with Luckyj that Heward's strongest quality as a painter was the compelling intensity of feeling, the strong sense of inner conviction conveyed in her works, thus Luckyj's title: *Expressions of Will*.

Technically, the catalogue is a fine piece of work. The book is nicely designed and easy to read. The only lapse in its logic is that the captions and entries for the catalogue are separate from the reproductions. The text is completely bilingual, and an exhibition history of each work has been compiled. Every painting in the show is reproduced, five in full colour, and effective use has been made of old photographs. Despite

all my criticisms, the catalogue is admirable in most ways. The research into criticism on Heward certainly seems exhaustive. Luckyj is to be commended on a successful effort.

Liz Wylie
Freelance art critic
Toronto, Ontario

**Further Comments on N. Luckyj's
Publication /
Autres remarques sur la publication de
N. Luckyj**

Probably the kindest thing I can say about this catalogue is that it is an impressive amassing of written and pictorial documents which will serve future writers well. How sad that Luckyj's additive, archaeological accumulations on Heward's life, critical reception, and work read as three boring, disembodied lists that manage to avoid anything approximating an integrated or contextualized presentation of a painter who, we gather, was very much a part of Montreal's avant-garde in the thirties. This artist's life and work raise pertinent questions about difference that Luckyj refuses to address. It is not enough to state and restate that Heward's work differed from that of the Group of Seven in subject matter in that she preferred nudes and portraits to landscape; rather, what matters is *why*. It is not enough to present lengthy formal analyses, nor to document changes in setting or paint application, without examining why these occur.

By working on women artists Luckyj styles herself as a feminist (the last exhibition she curated, in 1983, was *Visions and Victories: 10 Canadian Women Artists 1914-1945*). She is not. Luckyj insists on evaluating her female subjects according to the Romantic model of the artist as hero overcoming trials and tribulations, a model derived from, and still associated with, a male ethos. Her writing shows no awareness of contemporary feminist or post-modernist theory. Where is the discussion of gender, racial, and class difference? Heward's paintings of black Bermudean nudes seem to demand? Where is the examination of Heward's position on the nature / culture axis of which her 1931 *Girl under a Tree*, with its female nude reclining on a hill in front of and above a distanced town, seems a paradigm? Where is the analysis of the gaze that the huge, staring, inward focus of the eyes of her sitters compels? Why is there no mention of the female nude as a genre, with its concomitant implications for a given society's view of the body? I am not advocating a *pro forma* incorporation of such questions, nor do I suggest the substitution of one set of clichés for another. I am merely expressing my amazement at Luckyj's ability to neuter and neutralize her subject. Luckyj's use of the artist's first name, Prudence, throughout the text is not an acceptable alternative for writing herstory; it trivializes and further marginalizes the subject.

Reesa Greenberg
Associate Professor
Art History
Concordia University