

Women Artists and Patrons in the Netherlands, 1500–1700

FOR PRIVATE AND NON-COMMERCIAL USE
AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

VISUAL AND MATERIAL CULTURE, 1300–1700

A forum for innovative research on the role of images and objects in the late medieval and early modern periods, *Visual and Material Culture, 1300–1700* publishes monographs and essay collections that combine rigorous investigation with critical inquiry to present new narratives on a wide range of topics, from traditional arts to seemingly ordinary things. Recognizing the fluidity of images, objects, and ideas, this series fosters cross-cultural as well as multi-disciplinary exploration. We consider proposals from across the spectrum of analytic approaches and methodologies.

Series Editor

Dr. Allison Levy, an art historian, has written and/or edited three scholarly books, and she has been the recipient of numerous grants and awards, from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Association of University Women, the Getty Research Institute, the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library of Harvard University, the Whiting Foundation and the Bogliasco Foundation, among others. www.allisonlevy.com.

Women Artists and Patrons in the Netherlands, 1500–1700

edited by
Elizabeth Sutton

Amsterdam University Press

FOR PRIVATE AND NON-COMMERCIAL USE
AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cover illustration: *Portrait of a Woman*, probably a Self Portrait, Catharina van Hemessen, 1548.
Courtesy of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

Cover design: Coördesign, Leiden

Lay-out: Newgen/Konvertus

ISBN 978 94 6372 140 0

e-ISBN 978 90 4854 298 7

DOI 10.5117/9789463721400

NUR 685

© E. Sutton / Amsterdam University Press B.V., Amsterdam 2019

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. Nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.

FOR PRIVATE AND NON-COMMERCIAL USE
AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

Table of Contents

List of Illustrations	7
Acknowledgements	11
1. Introduction: An Historiographical Perspective on Women Making Netherlandish Art History <i>Elizabeth Sutton</i>	13
2. Catharina Van Hemessen's <i>Self-Portrait</i> : The Woman Who Took Saint Luke's Palette <i>Céline Talon</i>	27
3. By Candlelight: Uncovering Early Modern Women's Creative Uses of Night <i>Nicole Elizabeth Cook</i>	55
4. In Living Memory: Architecture, Gardens, and Identity at Huis ten Bosch <i>Saskia Beranek</i>	85
5. Louise Hollandine and the Art of Arachnean Critique <i>Lindsay Ann Reid</i>	113
6. Reclaiming Reproductive Printmaking <i>Amy Reed Frederick</i>	143
7. Towards an Understanding of Mayken Verhulst and Volcxken Diericx <i>Arthur J. DiFuria</i>	157
Index	179

FOR PRIVATE AND NON-COMMERCIAL USE
AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

List of Illustrations

Figures

- Figure 2.1. Catharina Van Hemessen, *Self-Portrait*, 1548, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung, Basel, oil on panel, 32.2 cm x 25.2 cm.
- Figure 2.2. Ludger tom Ring the Younger, *Self-Portrait*, 1547, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig, oil on panel, 35 cm x 24.5 cm.
- Figure 2.3. Maerten Van Heemskerck, *Saint Luke Painting the Virgin*, c.1550, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Rennes, oil on panel, 206 cm x 144 cm.
- Figure 2.4. Sofonisba Anguissola, *Self-Portrait*, c.1556, Museum Zamek, Lancut, oil on canvas, 66 cm x 57 cm.
- Figure 3.1. Judith Leyster, *A Game of Tric-Trac*, about 1630. Oil on panel. Worcester Art Museum, Worcester, 1983.58 (Gift of Robert and Mary S. Cushman). © Worcester Art Museum, Massachusetts, USA / Bridgeman Images
- Figure 3.2. Judith Leyster, *Man Offering Money to a Young Woman*, 1631. Oil on wood panel, 30.8 x 24.2 cm. Mauritshuis, The Hague, inv. no. 564. © Mauritshuis, The Hague
- Figure 3.3. Judith Leyster, *A Woman Sewing*, 1633. Current location unknown, previously Collection Guy Stein, Paris, in 1937.
- Figure 3.4. Gesina ter Borch, *A Man Courting a Lady (Heer die een dame het hof maakt)*, 1658–59. Ink and brush on paper, 313 x 204mm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, BI-1890–1952–94(R). © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
- Figure 3.5. Gesina ter Borch, *A Couple Strolling by Moonlight (Wandelend paar bij maanlicht)*, in or after circa 1654 – in or before circa 1659. Ink and brush on paper, d 125mm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, BI-1887–1463–52A. © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
- Figure 3.6. Gesina ter Borch, *Night-piece: Couple walking behind a woman with a lantern (Nachtstuk: echtpaar lopend achter een vrouw met een lantaarn, van achteren)*, circa 1655. Ink and brush on paper, 71 x 98mm, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, RP-T-1887-A-1329. © Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
- Figure 3.7. Gesina ter Borch, *Night: A Couple Walking Behind a Woman with a Lantern*, c. 1655. Ink on paper, 165 x 212mm. Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, RP-T-00–60.
- Figure 4.1. Jan van der Heyden, *Huis ten Bosch, View of the Garden Façade*. Ca. 1668. Oil on Wood, 39.1 cm x 55.2 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Accession no. 64.65.2.
- Figure 4.2. Jan Matthys and Pieter Post, Title page of *De Sael van Orange, ghebouwt by haere Hooch. Amalie prinsesse dovariere van Orange etc.* 1655. etching/book illustration, 29.4 cm x 18.8 cm. Collection Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, RP-P-1905–6627

- Figure 4.3. Jan Matthyss after Pieter Post., Floor plan of main (second) floor of Huis ten Bosch. From *De Sael van Oranje, ghebouwt bij haere Hoocht. Amalie Princesse Douariere van Oranje etc.*, 1655. Etching, 345mm × 396mm. Collection Rijksmuseum Amsterdam. RP-P-AO-12-96-4
- Figure 4.4. Willem Buytewech, Title page to *Merckt de Wysheit vermaert vant Hollantsche huyschouwen en siet des luypaerts aert die niet is te vertrouwen*. 1615. Etching with engraved text, 137mm × 176mm. Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam. BI-B-FM-053
- Figure 4.5. Jan Matthyss after Pieter Post. *Algemeene Grond van de Sael van Orange, met haere omstaende Timmeragie, Hoven, Plantagie, etc.* 1655. Etching, 295mm × 380mm. Collection Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, RP-P-AO-12-96-2
- Figure 4.6. Gerard van Honthorst. *Allegory on the Marriage of Amalia van Solms and Frederik Hendrik*. 1648–1650. Oil on Canvas, 300 x 750 cm. Royal Palace Huis ten Bosch, The Hague. photograph: Margareta Svensson.
- Figure 5.1. Louise Hollandine, *Self Portrait*, c. 1640–1655, oil on panel, Collection RKD-Netherlands Institute for Art History, The Hague.
- Figure 5.2. Louise Hollandine, *Self Portrait of Louise Hollandine Palatine as Benedictine Nun*, c. 1659–1709, oil on canvas, Collection RKD-Netherlands Institute for Art History, The Hague.
- Figure 5.3. Louise Hollandine, *Portrait of Three Women as the Daughters of Cecrops Finding the Serpent-shaped Erichthonius*, c.1635–1709, oil on canvas, Collection RKD-Netherlands Institute for Art History, The Hague.
- Figure 5.4. Mary Hotchkiss after Louise Hollandine, *Called the Prince of Denmark and Elizabeth, Viscountess Mordaunt, as Vertumnus and Pomona, but more probably Henry, 1st Viscount Mordaunt and Miss Taylor*, oil on canvas, © National Trust / Peter Muhly.
- Figure 5.5. Hendrik Jacobus Scholten, *Gerard van Honthorst Showing the Drawings of His Pupil Louise of Bohemia to Amalia van Solms*, 1854, oil on panel, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
- Figure 5.6. Gerard van Honthorst, *Meleager and Atalanta*. c. 1625–1655, chalk drawing, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
- Figure 6.1. Magdalena de Passe (?) or Willem van de Passe (?), after Hans Holbein the Younger (?), *Iana Graya* from *Heroologia Anglica*. 1620. Engraving, 15.7 cm. x 11.3 cm. British Museum, Museum no. 2006, U.776.
- Figure 6.2. Designed by Jan van der Straet, called Stradanus, *The Workshop of an Engraver (Sculpture in Aes)*, plate 19 from *Nova Reperta*. ca. 1600. Engraving, 20.2 x 27.1 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Accession no. 53.600.1823.
- Figure 6.3. Magdalena de Passe after Adam Elsheimer, *Apollo and Coronis*. ca. 1623. Engraving, 21.2 cm. x 23 cm. British Museum, Museum no. S.7458.

- Figure 7.1. Pieter Coecke van Aelst, *Ces Moeurs et fachones de faire de Turcz I*, 1553, 30 x 45.9 cm, ink on paper, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (Object Number RP-P-OB-2304K)
- Figure 7.2. Johannes Wiericx, *Portrait of Volcxken Diericx*, 1579, 15.9 x 12.4 cm, ink on paper, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (RP-P-OB-67.071).
- Figure 7.3. Unknown Artist, *Portrait of Pieter Coecke van Aelst and Mayken Verhulst*, c. 1550, oil on panel, 50.5 x 59 cm, Kunsthaus, Zurich.
- Figure 7.4. Quentin Massys, *The Moneylender and his Wife*, 1514, oil on panel, 70 x 67 cm, Louvre, Paris, Inv. no. 1444.
- Figure 7.5. Johannes or Lucas van Doetechum after Hans Vredeman de Vries, *Street with the Print Shop Aux Quatre Vents*, 1563, ink on paper, 21.1 x 25.9 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (Object Number BI-1897-A-972-3).

Color Plates

- Plate 1. Catharina Van Hemessen, *Self-Portrait*, 1548, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung, Basel, oil on panel, 32.2 cm x 25.2 cm.
- Plate 2. Ludger tom Ring the Younger, *Self-Portrait*, 1547, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig, oil on panel, 35 cm x 24.5 cm.
- Plate 3. Sofonisba Anguissola, *Self-Portrait*, c.1556, Museum Zamek, Lancut, oil on canvas, 66 cm x 57 cm.
- Plate 4. Judith Leyster, *A Game of Tric-Trac*, about 1630. Oil on panel. Worcester Art Museum, Worcester, 1983.58 (Gift of Robert and Mary S. Cushman). © Worcester Art Museum, Massachusetts, USA / Bridgeman Images
- Plate 5. Jan van der Heyden, *Huis ten Bosch, View of the Garden Façade*. Ca. 1668. Oil on Wood, 39.1 cm x 55.2 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Accession no. 64.65.2.
- Plate 6. Gerard van Honthorst. *Allegory on the Marriage of Amalia van Solms and Frederik Hendrik*. 1648–1650. Oil on Canvas, 300 x 750 cm. Royal Palace Huis ten Bosch, The Hague. photograph: Margareta Svensson.
- Plate 7. Mary Hotchkiss after Louise Hollandine, *Called the Prince of Denmark and Elizabeth, Viscountess Mordaunt, as Vertumnus and Pomona, but more probably Henry, 1st Viscount Mordaunt and Miss Taylor*, oil on canvas, © National Trust / Peter Muhly.
- Plate 8. Hendrik Jacobus Scholten, *Gerard van Honthorst Showing the Drawings of His Pupil Louise of Bohemia to Amalia van Solms*, 1854, oil on panel, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

FOR PRIVATE AND NON-COMMERCIAL USE
AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

Acknowledgements

This was my first foray into editing a volume of essays. I had heard that editing is more crazy-making than the process of publishing single-author scholarship. However, I have found that rather than feeling as though I were herding cats, editing the essays for this volume has reinforced my belief in the benefits of collaboration. So many people contribute to *any* published scholarly work; here most of those people, at least, get recognition as authors!

First, I wish to express gratitude and acknowledgement to the hard work of the authors who contribute their scholarship here. It has been a pleasure working with you. I am so happy to bring this book to fruition.

Second, thank you to Erika Gaffney, editor at Amsterdam University Press. Erika helped me usher in my very first book – my revised dissertation – and has long been a supporter of ambitious projects. Now, as a more experienced writer, I can say that Erika is the best editor with whom I ever have worked. She is prompt, helpful, and supportive. Thank you, Erika!

I also want to acknowledge my father, who, as he often does, helped lightly edit my own writing and provided a Latin translation. And many thanks to Noah Doely for converting images to grey scale promptly and with pleasure!

As always, many eyes have tried to catch mistakes, but no work is perfect, even as we all do our best.

FOR PRIVATE AND NON-COMMERCIAL USE
AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

1. Introduction

An Historiographical Perspective on Women Making Netherlandish Art History

Elizabeth Sutton

Abstract

The introductory essay suggests that Netherlandish art historians need to explicitly utilize feminist theory in scholarship and pedagogy in order to relate content that is temporally and culturally distant to contemporary audiences.

Keywords: feminism; feminist historiography; collaborative art history; Netherlandish art; feminist pedagogy

The idea for this volume originated in the Historians of Netherlandish Art (HNA) affiliated session at the Southeast College Art Conference (SECAC), “Women Artists and Feminist Historiography in and of the Netherlands” held in Columbus, Ohio in October, 2017. Four panelists presented themes related to under-recognized women artists working in the Netherlands circa 1600. The papers shared a common theme of each woman’s prominence during her own time and their subsequent historiographical neglect. The speakers all expressed frustration over the continued promotion of male artists and their work in publications and curricula, the conventional narrative of the myth of the male genius artist and concomitant erasures of women’s contributions and experiences that Linda Nochlin revealed as a function of systemic discrimination over forty years ago.

Collaborative Knowledge-Making

As we learn when we come together at conferences, sharing knowledge through collaboration and inclusion is empowering. We learn, grow, and are enriched by difference of thought and manner. As a collection of essays, this volume is a collaboration of a kind – albeit still within the structures of the institutions of academia and publishing. I hope that it serves as a touchstone for future action towards structural change not only in scholarship, Netherlandish art history, and art history as a

Sutton, E. (ed.), *Women Artists and Patrons in the Netherlands, 1500–1700*, Amsterdam University Press 2019.
DOI: 10.5117/9789463721400_CH01

discipline, but also in the institutions that support it. While perhaps not radical, all the contributions here are important as we continue to deconstruct and reconstruct a foundation for inquiry.

Despite the presence of many female artists and art historians (my own institution boasts eighty percent women undergraduate art majors, and this is hardly an anomaly), the topics of research, courses, and methodologies employed continue to follow canonical (male) artists and the institutionalized norms of valuation, in biographies and monographs. The exhibition devoted to Clara Peeters in 2016 was the Prado's first ever exhibition devoted to a female artist. Although recently there have been multiple shows and interest surrounding the life and work of Maria Sibylla Merian, and in 2018, the Rubenshuis ran an exhibition on Michaelina Woutier, it is both shocking and striking that the recent *Ashgate Research Companion to Dutch Art of the Seventeenth Century* contains no category on feminism and Netherlandish art history, and worse, *not a single work by a female Dutch artist* (although Linda Stone-Ferrier does make mention of feminist contributions in her overview of Dutch genre painting).¹ As I write this introduction, *Historians of Netherlandish Art (HNA)* has distributed a call for papers for its session at College Art Association 2019 conference under the theme "The Female Impact: Women and the Art Market in the Early Modern Era." These contributions are important; but they are also not enough. They are, in a word, safe. Lisa Tickner wrote in 1988:

feminist art history [...] cannot stay art history: first because the conventional premises of the discipline destroy its potential for radical readings; second because feminism has to be *intersectional and interdisciplinary* (since it questions the structure and indeterminations of existing fields of knowledge it cannot remain simply a new perspective in any of them); and third, because feminism is politically motivated – it examines new tools for their use-value, not for their novelty.² (emphasis added)

As historians of Netherlandish art, we need to examine more closely – and be honest about – the structures around which this subfield of art history continues to re-invent itself, to reveal the ideologies we are each reproducing to reinforce that structure. Feminism encourages a multiplicity of voices, collaboration, and caring in the variety of ways humans create knowledge and interpret the world.³ Yet these are the very aspects of knowledge-making that are rarely legitimated in doing traditional western art history. We must make history live by finding the threads that tie together these

1 Franits, ed. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Dutch Art of the Seventeenth Century*.

2 Tickner, "Feminism, Art History, and Sexual Difference," 94.

3 Broude and Garrard confirm: "Essential to the practice of a feminist art history [...] is the postmodernist recognition that works of art can never have a singular meaning at all times [...] they become objects of contending and overlapping interpretations." *The Expanding Discourse*, 21.

temporal and cultural spaces. Art, indeed, can do that, as can the ways we think and talk about it together. As scholars and educators, we can talk about our experiences and create openings and invitations for our students and readers to our scholarship and with our own stories, and by elevating the stories of others. This is collaborative and inclusive, and takes conscious and continuous effort.

This is a call not only to change which artists are included in surveys and conferences but to be explicit in drawing parallels to the present and modeling for students and colleagues how to do the same. Authors in this volume highlight women from the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries and the Southern and Northern Netherlands. They also draw attention to issues of class and accessibility to resources. Catharina van Hemessen (1528-c. 1565), Magdalena van den Passe (1600–1638), and Gesina ter Borch were privileged to be born into artistic families. Leyster and the princesses Amalia van Solms (1602–1675) and Louise Hollandine (1622–1709) had the means to learn art outside the family workshop. Mayken Verhulst (1518–1599) and Volcxken Diericx (active 1570–1600), like the other women, collaborated with their families to find success, and continued that success after their husbands died. Van Solms couched her self-expression in the building of what at first appears to be a mausoleum for her dead husband. Many of these women gave up making to assist their family in other ways – more often than not in the elevation of their respective husband’s work by managing the household as family business. Popular imagery served to connect women’s work, as we see, for example, in Gesina ter Borch’s watercolors influenced by nocturnal printed reproductions by Magdalena de Passe and others. Although little is known specifically about early modern women’s consumption of prints, news broadsides, or news-printed-on night caps (like those by De Passe), we do know that women of merchant and elite status – women artists and patrons – in the Dutch Republic were highly literate and purchased various-sized books and prints, just as their male counterparts did. So-called material, popular, or “visual culture,” was perhaps, as in the nineteenth century, important (and now too often overlooked) for a particularly *female* model of information-sharing.⁴

Additional contemporary parallels can be drawn. Nicole Cook particularly notes the parallel of women using the night both to complete the extra labor required of most women in patriarchal capitalism and to find individual freedom for creativity and introspection. Working at night is something many women still are obliged to do. Balancing work and personal life in this product and growth-oriented economy is not easy, as many have pointed out. Domestic labor and other labor in the care economy (labor done by teachers, social workers, counselors, nurses) continues to

4 There were many periodicals published by women within the male-dominated Arts and Crafts movement. See Zipf, *Professional Pursuits*, 12. See also the consumption by women of chromolithographs in nineteenth-century United States in Kinsey, *Thomas Moran’s West*, 8.

be devalued, and is largely taken up by women. The burdens of caretaking – whether paid or not – often are carried by women. Privilege operates on multiple levels – some women are domestic helpers, or the parent who makes the lunches, does the grocery shopping and laundry, cleans, and pays the bills – while others cannot afford help and have even less time to create.⁵ In the early modern period, like today, women not born into artistic families or families with means would have neither time nor resources to develop art skills – they would be the additional domestic labor for more well-off women, even as the well-off women were the caretakers of their men and children.

Feminist scholarship will be political because it necessarily addresses systems of power and its reproduction. Institutions and individuals reproduce power in multiple ways: approved research topics, methodologies, and corresponding curricula, exhibitions, publications, and pedagogy. As Griselda Pollock has identified, by pretending economic interests, institutional politics, and personal assumptions and privileges are not part of scholarship, a hierarchical dichotomy is set up between “political” (illegitimate) and “scientific” (legitimate) research and knowledge.⁶ Indeed, this is what we see in current trends towards neuroscience and art history, quantitative analyses of data sets (often economically oriented), focus on materiality, and so on, situating theoretical frames of class, ethnicity, gender (aka identity politics), as “adversarial.”⁷ The “Whither Art History” series in the *Art Bulletin* published in 2014–15 sought to address a “crisis” of disciplinary identity, inclusion, and method, a crisis fraught with the political weight of the reality of living in a globalized world with rampant inequality. Forays into postcolonial scholarship in Dutch art history by Rebecca Brienen, Julie Hochstrasser, and Dawn Odell imply the intersections of race, class, and gender, and sometimes explicitly engage with these issues.⁸ Multiplicity does not precipitate a crisis, it presents opportunities for re-evaluation. The nature of knowledge and its

5 See especially Briggs, *How All Politics Became Reproductive Politics*.

6 “If we quarantine certain kinds of art historical project as a priori political, then others can claim a different cover – science – for what is, from the former position, as ideologically framed as their own. Being ideologically framed, subject to beliefs and disciplinary protocols does not mean that genuine knowledge is not produced; it merely reminds us that there are always limits and pressures.” Pollock, “Unexpected Turns,” 26.

7 I write in solidarity with Griselda Pollock, who wrote in a 2012 article for *The Journal of Art Historiography* about the “adversarial turn” in art history, and with the other authors in the “Whither Art History” series. Pollock, “Unexpected Turns: The Aesthetic, the Pathetic and the Adversarial in the Long Durée of Art’s Histories,” 1–32; Pollock, “Whither Art History?” 9–23; Mukherji, “Whither Art History in a Globalizing World,” 153; Mattos, “Geography, Art Theory, and New Perspectives for an Inclusive Art History,” 259–264.

8 For example, Hochstrasser fruitfully used phenomenology to integrate historical memory and contemporary global injustice through her presentation of forts on Banda (and included videos in so doing), in her contribution to Kettering’s retirement *festschrift*. The Historians of Netherlandish Art (HNA), following inroads in digital collaborative and accessible website and archives by Dutch institutions, is currently sponsoring such scholarship through its online journal, JHNA, and digital projects. Hochstrasser, “The Bones in Banda: Vision, Art, and Memory in Maluku.”

relation to power, class, and wealth affected what was – and continues to be – consumed, whether popular cheap broadsides and illustrated quartos or lush scholarly treatises.⁹ As Art DiFuria asserts in this volume: “Although history writing itself may not be the prime mover of historical events, its content – not to mention its gaps – does indeed exert a considerable force on subsequent historical works. It thus determines the formulation, perpetuation, and reformulation of consciousness, which in turn does indeed spark cultural productions.” Productions which, I would add, are subsequently noticed and valued or diminished across and in time.

Here is a related issue: that of the often implicit reproduction of valuations of media, often also still associated with gender. Amy Frederick elucidates this further in her essay here on Magdalena van de Passe’s reproductive prints. In 2002, Elizabeth Honig rightly noted that women working in the early modern Netherlands mostly worked in a space between amateur and professional, as Frederick’s and Nicole Cook’s essays elaborate, and that this space allowed them to explore a variety of media and be, perhaps, more creative and innovative than in a specialized market niche that professionalism required. The range of media – from needlework, paper cutting, watercolor, pastel and chalks, and prints on textiles – includes mostly media that the institutionalization and professionalization of art and art history have relegated as amateur and craft (or, visual culture, that which is “popular”). Concurrent with the denigration of femininity (and non-white/western), such art has largely been overlooked, with notable exceptions such as the work on Joanna Koerten by Martha Peacock and the foray into color and gender in seventeenth-century art theory by Thijs Weststeijn.¹⁰ Art history continues to privilege painting, sculpture, or prints; to wit, the divide between “visual culture” and art history is perhaps an indication of art history’s continued attempt to create boundaries that distinguish “Art History” as the superior discipline.¹¹ But women did not have the same opportunities that men did to ensure either the endurance of their work or their reputations over time.¹² As many feminists have pointed out, the separation of art and craft was institutionalized during the nineteenth century because of the need by (white) men to retain dominion over who makes and what constitutes “fine” art and was concomitant with the construction of and power over “legitimate” knowledge: who was considered to have the capacity for rational intellect.

9 See especially Sutton, *Early Modern Dutch Prints of Africa*, and *Capitalism and Cartography in the Dutch Golden Age*; see also Dackerman, et al., *Prints and the Pursuit of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe*, and De Jongh and Luijten, *The Mirror of Everyday Life*.

10 Hofrichter, *Judith Leyster*; Peacock, “Paper as Power: Carving a Niche for the Female Artist in the Work of Joanna Koerten;” Weststeijn, “The Gender of Colors in Dutch Art Theory.”

11 I acknowledge Pollock’s misgivings about some practitioners’ underdeveloped appreciation for intellectual history in “Visual Culture,” but also see this critique as potentially exclusionary itself. Pollock, “Unexpected Turns,” 27–28. See also Kerrin and Lepage, “De-Centering ‘The’ Survey.”

12 Honig, “The Art of Being ‘Artistic’: Dutch Women’s Creative Practices in the 17th Century,” 33; 36–7.

Not only do we still need more research on women and undervalued media (difficult to undertake because the physical products often have not survived), we are still trying to get more information disseminated about the women artists and the work that we *do* know about. Lynn Jacobs and Els Kloek's contributions to the *Dictionary of Women Artists* (1997) provide important summaries of the context for and potential sources – or reason of their lack – on women artists.¹³ Els Kloek, Catherine Peter Sengers, and Esther Tobé's edited volume *Vrouwen en kunsten in de republiek* is, as stated in its subtitle, an overview.¹⁴ Significantly, it provides a list of women artists, and students' research make up the brief essays, a collaborative approach that is commendable in its difference from the single-author monographs by established scholars. In English, Jane Carroll and Alison Stewart provided a foundation for further studies in *Saints, Sinners, and Sisters* (2003), also including an index of the essays categorized by time period, theme, and media so that instructors could use the readings to excite their students and encourage wider scholarly research.¹⁵ The focus of essays includes not only painting and prints, but also gems, ivories, and tapestries – media historically gendered and associated with class.

In his essay, DiFuria uses the examples of Mayken Verhulst and Volcxken Diericx to put into relief what was, is, or was not or is not seen or written about shapes history. As scholars and teachers with power to produce and legitimate knowledge, we need to make an effort to be visible and clear about elevating voices that historically have been minoritized, or erased altogether. These are women artists and patrons, but perhaps even more important are today's voices. Employing inclusive (feminist) methodology and pedagogy is egalitarian and requires us to listen. The networks and mechanisms employed by women artists and patrons in the early modern period leveraged to their advantage are systems of mutuality that we would do well to underscore and reproduce today as a counter model to the hierarchies of capitalism and academe. Contemporary art collectives and contemporary art theory might be additional sources at which to look.¹⁶ Pollock has suggested that a double (or multiple) perspective is needed:

The tension between the discipline and the field it invents, charts, and possibly deforms through its historically generated and politically effecting protocols requires a double perspective that can draw on the otherness of history to make visible the lineaments of the present and to use the urgencies of the present to elucidate new aspects of the otherness of the historical.¹⁷

13 Jacobs and Kloek, "Guilds and the Open Market: The Example of the Netherlands."

14 Kloek, Sengers, and Tobé, eds. *Vrouwen en kunst in de republiek: een overzicht*.

15 Carroll and Stewart, *Saints, Sinners, and Sisters*, xvi-xxiv.

16 Kester, *The One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context*.

17 Pollock, "Whither Art History?" 21.

To paraphrase: we need to look back from within – not anachronistically, but acknowledging the space(s) we inhabit at present. History can illuminate current politics, as aspects of the present can enrich and disclose the past. History is strange because of its temporal distance. It is especially strange to those with limited experiences (for example, students). We can become closer with/more intimate with an “other” – be they student, art object, another scholar, or alternative way of knowing – through this coming together. These threads across time – and in our own time – create a complex interwoven matrix that *is* each object or idea studied. To be sure, I am grateful for scholarship based in archives, on technique, and on materials and other specialized elements that many of us use to support our meaning-making. The object must always be part of the study, be it political, phenomenological, technical, socio-economic, or whatever one’s interpretive framing. But consider Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood’s argument that art is potentially recursive, where the “idea of art can open up the possibility for looking at past and forward to present.”¹⁸ Art has meaning in every moment, its constant being co-creating meaning with each viewer across time:

The artwork is made or designed by an individual or by a group of individuals at some moment, but it also points away from that moment, backward to a remote ancestral origin, perhaps, or to a prior artifact, or to an origin outside time, in divinity. At the same time it points forward to all its future recipients who will activate and reactivate it as a meaningful event.¹⁹

Although the object itself is of a moment, it extends outward on either side of that moment of creation. As Nagel and Wood suggest,

‘Art’ is the name of a conversation across time, a conversation more meaningful than the present’s merely forensic reconstruction of the past [...] The ability of the work of art to hold incompatible models in suspension without deciding is the key to art’s anachronic quality, its ability really to ‘fetch’ a past, create a past, perhaps even fetch the future.²⁰

Therefore, as Nagel, Wood, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, and other theorists recognize, learning to see within historical context and from our own moment are absorbed together within the object.²¹ This meaning-making is enriching in its inclusivity – of time, people, and perspectives.

¹⁸ Nagel and Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, 17.

¹⁹ Nagel and Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, 9.

²⁰ Nagel and Wood, *Anachronic Renaissance*, 18.

²¹ Deleuze and Guattari’s definition of art is that it is a block of sensations: affects and percepts altogether, the accumulation of all percepts possible from its affective potentiality. See Deleuze and Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* 163–199.

The openness of the art object across and in time – an inclusivity that can be daunting because of its complexity, impermanence, and ungraspability – can be a model for scholarship, content presentation in curricula, conferences, and exhibitions, and pedagogy by using the art object to think-with and co-create meaning among and with others. In order to combat assumed foundational structures, perhaps even more important than the content are the methods for how we produce knowledge, acknowledge the bounds in which we operate, and attempt to permeate and dissolve those boundaries to broaden our knowing and share in knowledge-making.

This is a call to change our scholarship, curricula, and the way we teach – to listen to our students, to hear, see, and acknowledge their experiences in order to find resonance with others, and with the past. We can reflect the past in the present we acknowledge and show by including various stories and interests in the co-construction of knowledge. We can approve dissertation topics that may seem to be outliers in content or that take methods from other fields. We should question what *really* is important. What do we *really* want students to know and be able to do when they leave our classes? I want them to see the complexity and interconnectedness of the past with the present, manifest in the phenomenon of the object. I try to model reflective and reflexive scholarship and explicitly validate their interests and experiences. The structural challenges are great, and may vary by degree across institutions and countries. We may be challenged, told that what we are doing is “not art history” – but perhaps a radically inclusive method and pedagogy will be how Netherlandish art history – and art history at all – survives. Perhaps it will be how we evolve and thrive.

Each of the authors in this collection highlight the agency of the women in their own time. Scholars today also have agency and now we are able to be explicit about the motivations that undergird whatever our creative products and how we pursue them. A feminist perspective is one of inclusion and is receptive to the diversity of experiences. It is not a monolithic domain, and does not deal only with women, or only gender. Feminism is an egalitarian ethos; I take that ethos to present this brief historiography to address both content and method. First, we need to identify who we are individually, then as “scholars of Netherlandish art.” We must each individually and collectively embrace our ignorance, seek out different ways of thinking, take risks, and challenge ourselves to listen, to grow intellectually and emotionally. Second, in discussion and collaboration we can discover shared resonances. In the essays collected here, authors share how women worked with others – family members, other artists, poets, and advisors – to learn from, teach, and refine their own self-knowledge and self-expression. Collaboration and flexibility, in fact, helped empower them and allowed them to achieve success in their own time. Here I call for collaboration and co-creating knowledge from individuals’ varieties of experience. In that spirit, in addition to elevating the stories of early modern women artists and patrons, this volume aims to include and elevate the early-career scholars,

contingent faculty, students, and questioners whose carefully-thought out perspectives matter as much as any other honest inquirer's.

Painters, Princesses, and Printmakers

The six essays that follow highlight the creative agency of early modern women artists, patrons, and publishers. Notably, these women often purposefully – and necessarily – used ambiguous visual mechanisms to reference their subjectivity and knowledge, within distinctly visible products. Coding can be complicit, explicit, or implicit, and demonstrating evidence of coding in material culture is necessarily part of the feminist enterprise because coding makes interpretation of women's work more difficult than that of many male artists. Scholars of nineteenth-century material culture have suggested that handcrafts like needlework (such as quilting or lacemaking) and their designs could convey meaning that evaded detection by those otherwise acculturated.²² The early modern women discussed here “coded” their creative power in allegory by using mythological parallels like Artemisia, Procris, and Arachne as a kind of aegis for creative agency. They veiled their ideas through blending convention and innovation, within scenes of night, or with subtle references in color palette.²³ The purposeful layering of and potential for multiple meanings enhanced the appeal of these women's creations and broadened their audiences. For Verhulst and Diericx, their contributions and collaborative powers became dulled and lost; sublimated, rather than encoded, within the conventions of patriarchal history writing. Male artists' work has not only survived over the centuries in greater numbers, their corresponding documentation also further legitimates and provides the basis for scholarly reproduction of the notion of male creative superiority.

However, women expressed their power and undermined conventional ideas and simple binaries through seemingly self-effacing visual mechanisms. Catherina van Hemessen seems to have hedged her bets, maintaining an overall conservative presentation of herself in her *Self-Portrait*, but also subtly alerting a careful viewer to notice that she was aware of contemporary innovations and artistic discussion regarding naturalistic representation, via the flesh tones she displayed on the palette in her self-portrait. Judith Leyster created purposefully ambiguous compositions, combining a female protagonist with apparent agency within what otherwise might be a conventional subject of female objectification. Magdalena van de Passe too, layered her work. In her signed *Death of Procris/Apollo and Coronis*, she seems to identify with Procris as a fertile (reproductive) creator whose legacy will last beyond

22 For coded messages in quilts, see especially Hafter, “Toward a Social History of Needlework Artists,” 25–29; in crochet and lace, see Maines, “Fancywork: The Archaeology of Lives,” 1–3.

23 Radner, and Lanser, “Strategies of Coding in Women's Cultures,” 10–17.

death. While scholars have long associated Amalia van Solms with the mythological Artemisia, Saskia Beranek suggests how she added further complexity to her self-promoting visual propaganda through the built palace and gardens at Huis ten Bosch. At the same time that Richard Lovelace wrote about her as a modern Arachne, Princess Palatine Louise Hollandine also used allegory to present a place of female acceptance in her paintings, thereby transforming traditional subject matter to echo the feminine intimacy of her court in exile. Because of the visual culture they enacted, each woman was consistently seen, if not always fully heard, in her own time. The authors here continue to elevate the women and help us “listen” and see them as individual people today.

In “Catharina Van Hemessen’s *Self-Portrait: The Woman Who Took Saint Luke’s Palette*,” Céline Telon suggests that Van Hemessen safely depicted herself using conservative, if not old-fashioned, modes to denote her status as painter, but showed her awareness of artistic innovation in her palette. In “By Candlelight: Uncovering Early Modern Women’s Creative Uses of Night,” Nicole Cook shows how Judith Leyster (1609–1660) and Gesina ter Borch (1633–1690) used the night to set the stage for their most innovative compositions. Cook sets these women painters’ experiments within the seventeenth-century rise of nocturnal culture in the Netherlands. Artists investigated the aesthetics of artificial light and night’s associations with creative practice. Leyster’s and Ter Borch’s nocturnal paintings suggest the advantages that night might have held for women creators. Night was a time that offered privacy and refuge from daily labor. Women could use nighttime to be alone: free from suitors, husbands, and children, and free to pursue their own interests, including reading, creating art and poetry, and significantly, personal introspection.

Amalia van Solms was a noblewoman. At Huis ten Bosch, she helped commission a formal layout that asserted her status and her identification with fertility and victory during a period fraught with conflict over Dutch national identity. Through a built iconography, she associated herself with the ancient Greek queen Artemisia and the Dutch garden maid that appeared in popular political prints. Saskia Beranek uses historically-grounded phenomenology to form her interpretations of Huis ten Bosch. “In Living Memory: Architecture, Gardens, and Identity at Huis ten Bosch,” explains how the palace became a stage on which Van Solms used both house and garden to construct deliberate views to emphasize her dynastic narrative as guardian of the Dutch Republic. In the microcosm of her palace and grounds, she recasts herself as cultivator of a new Dutch Garden, a fertile and protective mother of the Republic.

Lindsay Reid demonstrates how the English poet Richard Lovelace compares Louisa Hollandine, the Princess Palatine, to Ovid’s Arachne in his seldom-remarked “Princesse Löysa Drawing” (first printed in *Lucasta* of 1649 – a fifty-three line poem about the princess’s Ovidian paintings. Reid describes how the Princess herself may have used her painted creations to show the “*communitas* of a gyno-centered Bohemian court-in-exile.” In “The Arachnean Artist in Lovelace’s ‘Princesse Löysa Drawing,’” Reid

sheds light on Hollandine and her work through the poetics of Lovelace and the context of Hollandine's production. She illuminates Hollandine's networks of privilege within the English and Dutch courts and then considers how Hollandine's Ovidian paintings complement Lovelace's ekphrastic poem, and significantly, how both poem and paintings draw upon Ovid's Arachne as an empowered female-creator prototype.

From two essays on painters to two essays on princesses, the last two essays in the volume focus on women printmakers and print publishers. In "Reclaiming Reproductive Printmaking," Amy Frederick recontextualizes reproductive printmaking with a focus on the gendered, but still privileged, status of the individual inventor. She reclaims Magdalena van de Passe within the collaborative space of the print workshop. Frederick asserts De Passe's successes during her lifetime, both within her family workshop as an engraver, and suggests her signed reproductive prints could also be self-effacing triumphs of emulatory skill *and* ingenuity, thereby contributing to the family brand and her own identity as a reproductive engraver.

Finally, Art DiFuria's contribution, "Towards an Understanding of Mayken Verhulst and Volkcxen Diericx," will return readers to the question of historiography by examining the legacies of print publishers Mayken Verhulst (1518–1599) and Volkcxen Diericx (active 1570–1600). Scholars have designated Verhulst as adjunct to the endeavors of the famous males in her orbit: husband Pieter Coecke van Aelst and the Bruegels. However, her campaign on the print market after Coecke's death recommends her as an artistic entrepreneur of the highest order, a woman possessing a nuanced understanding of which subjects and prints would capture the imaginations of erudite collectors. Likewise, Diericx usually is understood in conjunction with her husband, famed *Quatre Vents* publisher Hieronymus Cock. Diericx's continuation of their publishing house after his death, however, suggests their collaboration and her mastery of the pictorial and entrepreneurial intelligence was crucial to the operation of a thriving print enterprise. Elaborating the fragmented literary and visual evidence surrounding these two important women against the backdrop of patriarchal Netherlandish art history's canon of praise and individualism suggests just how open the pathways are for further investigation of their respective entrepreneurial creativity, and indeed, how open the pathways are to do art history differently.

Bibliography

- Alpers, Svetlana. "Art History and Its Exclusions: The Example of Dutch Art." In *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany*. Eds. Norma Braude and Mary D. Garrard, 182–99. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Briggs, Laura. *How All Politics Became Reproductive Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017.
- Broude, Norma and Mary Garrard. *The Expanding Discourse: Feminism and Art History*. New York: Harper Collins, 1992.
- Carroll, Jane and Alison Stewart. *Saints, Sinners, and Sisters: Gender and Northern Art in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

- Dackerman, Susan, Claudia Swan and Suzanne Karr Schmidt, *Prints and the Pursuit of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- De Jongh, Eddy, and Ger Luijten. *The Mirror of Everyday Life: Genreprints in the Netherlands 1550–1700*. Trans. Michael Hoyle. Amsterdam and Ghent: Snoeck-Ducaji & Zoon, 1997.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press, 2014.
- Frantis, Wayne, ed. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Dutch Art of the Seventeenth Century*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Hafter, Daryl M. "Toward a Social History of Needlework Artists." *Woman's Art Journal* 2:2 (1981–82): 25–29.
- Hochstrasser, Julie Berger. "The Bones in Banda: Vision, Art, and Memory in Maluku." In *Midwestern Arcadia: Midwestern Arcadia: A Festschrift in Honor of Alison Kettering*, eds. Dawn Odell and Jessica Buskirk, 2015. <https://apps.carleton.edu/kettering/hochstrasser/> DOI:10.18277/Makf.2015.14 [accessed December 14, 2018].
- Hofrichter, Frima Fox. *Judith Leyster: A Woman Painter in Holland's Golden Age*. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1989.
- Honig, Elizabeth. "The Art of Being 'Artistic': Dutch Women's Creative Practices in the 17th Century," *Woman's Art Journal* 22:2 (2002): 31–39.
- Jacobs, Lynn and Els Kloek. "Guilds and the Open Market: The Example of the Netherlands." In *Dictionary of Women Artists*. Ed. Delia Gaze, 28–36. London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1997.
- Kerrin, Melissa and Andrea Lepage. "De-Centering 'The' Survey: The Value of Multiple Introductory Surveys to Art History," *Art History Pedagogy & Practice* 1:1 (2016): 1–15. <https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ahpp/vol/iss1/3/> [accessed March 21, 2018].
- Kester, Grant. *The One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2011.
- Kinsey, Joni. *Thomas Moran's West: Chromolithography, High Art, and Popular Taste*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006.
- Kloek, Els and Catherine Peters Sengers, and Esther Tobé, eds. *Vrouwen en kunst in de republiek: een overzicht*. Hilversum: Verloren, 1998.
- Maines, Rachel. "Fancywork: The Archaeology of Lives," *Feminist Art Journal* 3:4 (1974–75): 1–3.
- Mattos, Claudia. "Geography, Art Theory, and New Perspectives for an Inclusive Art History," *The Art Bulletin* 96:3 (2014): 259–264.
- Mukherji, Parul Dave Whither Art History in a Globalizing World, *The Art Bulletin* 96:2 (2014): 153.
- Nagel, Alexander and Christopher Wood. *Anachronic Renaissance*. New York: Zone Books, 2010.
- Parker, Rozsika and Griselda Pollock. *Old Mistresses: Women, Art, Ideology*. New York: Pantheon, 1981.
- Peacock, Martha Moffitt. "Paper as Power: Carving a Niche for the Female Artist in the Work of Joanna Koerten," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 62:1 (2012): 239–65.
- Pollock, Griselda. "Whither Art History?" *The Art Bulletin* 96:1 (2014): 9–23.
- Pollock, Griselda. "Unexpected Turns: The Aesthetic, the Pathetic and the Adversarial in the Long Durée of Art's Histories," *Journal of Art Historiography*, no. 7 (2012): 1–32.
- Radner, Joan N. and Susan S. Lanser. "Strategies of Coding in Women's Cultures." *Feminist Messages: Coding in Women's Folk Culture*. Ed. Joan N. Radner, 10–17. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Sutton, Elizabeth. *Art, Animals, and Experience*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Sutton, Elizabeth. *Capitalism and Cartography in the Dutch Golden Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.
- Sutton, Elizabeth. *Early Modern Dutch Prints of Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012.
- Tickner, Lisa. "Feminism, Art History, and Sexual Difference," *Genders* 18:3 (1988): 92–128.
- Weststeijn, Thijs. "The Gender of Colors in Dutch Art Theory," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 62:1 (2012): 176–201.
- Zipf, Catherine W. *Professional Pursuits: Women and the American Arts and Crafts Movement*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2007.

About the Author

Elizabeth Sutton obtained her Ph.D from the University of Iowa and has published widely on Dutch prints, maps, and animals in art. She is Associate Professor of Art History the University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls.