Workshop Title: Accounting for Women: Collaborations, Networks, and Alliances in the Arts

Workshop Summary: At first glance, notions of agency, collectivity, and social networks seem like constructs of the twentieth- and twenty-first centuries. Common operating assumptions about gender in the early modern social, economic, and political realms usually preclude these considerations: women were expected to stay home, obey their husbands, and rear their children. While this may be true in some cases, however, we also know that women did participate in the economy, often working in family businesses, but also (albeit less frequently), striking out on their own. How did these women do it? What institutions or arrangements did they create and participate in to achieve success?

Organizers:
● Theresa D. Kemp, University of Wisconsin—Eau Claire, Critical Studies in English, and Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. Email: tkemp@uwec.edu
● Catherine Powell, University of Texas at Austin, Art History. Email: Catherine.Powell@utexas.edu
● Beth Link, University of Texas at Austin, Art Education, Cultural Studies in Education; co-founder HIVE Arts Collective (Austin, TX). Email: bethlink8@gmail.com

Workshop Description and Questions:
Our workshop takes as its starting point three case scenarios that will situate us across different locations in time and geography in order to examine the nature and necessity of female collaborations.

Our first case study involves the patronage of four female artists by Agnes Block in the late-17th century in Amsterdam. Block designed and developed a garden that was an aesthetic delight at the forefront of scientific discovery. She commissioned seventeen artists to paint four hundred watercolors of her most prized botanical specimens. These artists included four exceptionally talented women, who were well known in the area. Two of the women, Maria Sibylla Merian and Johanna Herolt-Graff, were a mother-daughter pair who worked together and marketed their work across Europe. The relationships amongst these women, which are both professional and familial, in the case of Merian and Herolt-Graff, provide an ideal setting against which to start our inquiry into collectivity and networks.

Our second case study encourages a re-reading of women’s roles in the business of 16th- and 17th-century London theater, by paying particular attention to Agnes Henslowe and her daughter Joan Alleyn as they appear in the diary entries of theatrical entrepreneur Philip Henslowe. In telling the history of Philip Henslowe’s and Edward Alleyn’s participation in the London theater scene, historians tend to tease out the predominantly androcentric threads from what remains in the fabric of the historical records. Nevertheless, as wives and daughter, Agnes and Joan played significant roles in the familial business enterprise. As the widow of a successful member of the Dyers’ Company, Agnes did not come empty-handed into her marriage with Henslowe, who had been her husband’s assistant. Later, her daughter (Henslowe’s stepdaughter) Joan would marry Edward Alleyn, thus transforming the financial partnership between the city’s premier theater-owners and a star actor into a familial endeavor as well. Throughout Henslowe’s diary, we see both women witnessing and otherwise assisting in various financial transactions.

As we consider the nature of early female collaborations it is useful to also examine modern conceptions and rationales for feminist collectivity. The Woman’s Building was a community space started by female artists Miriam Schapiro and Judy Chicago in the 1970s. This utopian collective
sought to empower women through art education, collaboration, consciousness raising, and community development. The Woman’s Building makes the case for why female spaces are necessary, how they have the potential to differ from co-ed/male dominated spaces, and the conflicts that may arise within these spaces. Women throughout time have been searching for a “room of one’s own” in various ways. The Women’s Building explores the terrible and wonderful possibilities inherent in the idea of a female collective space. Examining a 21st century model provides a fresh framework to consider the collaborations of early modern women.

Key Questions for Discussion:

Social and familial networks

- How do women identify the opportunity to work together?
- What kinds of relationships do they form?
  - Weak networks: transaction based, or
  - Strong networks: involve mutual trust, the sharing of critical information, and the creation of knowledge, even financial underwriting?
- What defines the family enterprise as a matriarchal affair?
- What role can women play in a family business that is male-dominated?
  - Is agency possible in these circumstances?
- In what contexts might women’s interests be more closely aligned with those of men of similar status or degree than with the interests of other women in general?
- How do women social networks open to or interact with male networks to take advantage of opportunities?

Feminism, community building, and collective spaces

- Why are there collective spaces for women? What is unique about a space for women? Why is this space needed?
- What compels women to come together? Is gender a sufficient unifying factor?
- Who is allowed in participate in the space and who is not? How do we designate and police gender boundaries within these spaces?
- What goals do women collective spaces seek to achieve?
- What are the ways in which those spaces are either successful or fall short?
- How does identity factor in setting the goals for these spaces?
- What are the external conflicts and forces that affect the success or failure of collective spaces?
- Can we think of women collective spaces as a mode of resistance?
- Are collective spaces necessarily a modern invention? Can we think of the early modern workshop as a collective space?
- Can we apply contemporary notions of what collective spaces are to early modern women? What modifications are appropriate?
- Does the creation of collective spaces reflect a certain ideal? Is decentralized organization contrary to a patriarchal community designs that are often authoritative and centralized?
- Are gender-normative behaviors effaced or exaggerated in these spaces?

Purpose of the pre-circulated readings/materials:
The readings give an overview of social network analysis and methodology to provide participants with a common terminology in order to facilitate engagement. They also contain examples of primary sources and of the application of feminist theory and network methodology.
Excerpted Readings:

Kinukawa, T. "Natural History as Entrepreneurship: Maria Sibylla Merian's Correspondence with J.G. Volkamer II and James Petiver," *Archives of Natural History* 38, no. 2 (2011): 313–327. *Kinukawa examines how Merian constructed her network by exchanging specimens with other naturalists in northwestern Europe, created a market for her publication *Metamorphosis insectorum Surinamensium* (Merian 1705), and had her book reviewed in major European literary journals. Through the exchange of rare samples, Merian solicited subscribers for her publication. Instead of dedicating her work to one patron, Merian chose to act as an autonomous entrepreneur-naturalist and directly marketed her work to potential purchasers.*


Pollock, Griselda. “Feminist Interventions in the Histories of Art.” *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism, and the Histories of Art*. London: Routledge, 1988. 1-17. *The introduction and conclusion will be useful to thinking about the implications of paradigm shifts that would move us from “feminist art history” to “feminist intervention.” Putting our three case studies in conversation might give us some ways of thinking about how to bridge what Pollock calls the “communication breakdown between art historians working still within the normative discipline and those who are contesting the paradigm” (17). Her critique of big business-sponsored art (she notes an exhibit at the Tate), for example, seems potentially relevant to the Shakespeare/Globe industry of the theatrical history of early modern London.*


Suggested Readings


Porras, Stephanie. "Keeping Our Eyes Open: Visualizing Networks and Art History." Artl@’s Bulletin 6, no. 3 (2017): Article 3. *Porras provides a concise analysis of the benefits and pitfalls of the use of digital visualization of networks, which is in its infancy in the humanities. She concludes that “As a discipline, we must recognize data amenable to computational software and network analysis is not equally available to everyone, everywhere. Network visualizations can often obscure power relations, the geographic mobility of people and objects. As scholars of visual culture, art historians should critically reflect on the paradoxical power of such...*
visualizations to both expand and to reinforce the canon. Data may be beautiful, but its biases must not go unexamined.”

Rackin, Phyllis. “A Useable History.” Shakespeare and Women. Oxford: Oxford, 2005. 7-25. Rackin’s challenge to certain current assumptions by historians of Shakespeare and early modern British theater is useful to re-examining how women counted—and how we count women—in history. Our workshop aims in part to respond to Rackin’s call to “interrogate history ..., not because it is necessarily incorrect but because it is incomplete” (9).

Schleif, Corine. “The Many Wives of Adam Kraft: Early Modern Workshop Wives in Legal Documents, Art-historical Scholarships, and Historical Fiction.” Saints, Sinners, and Sisters: Gender and Northern Art in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. Jane Louise Carroll and Alison G. Stewart, eds. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. Schleif starts from the proposition (first advanced by Griselda Pollock) that women have always been involved in the production of art, but that their contributions have been overlooked and/or dismissed, as incompatible with our culture. Schleif sets out to evaluate the role and importance of what she calls the "workshop wife", an issue that has received no systemic consideration, using the three wives of Adam Kraft (a Nuremberg sculptor) as a case study. Schleif concludes that while appreciated, the workshop wife was still considered a "necessary evil": she posits that it may have been because of the association of the role of the workshop wife with money and business, a morally repugnant (although necessary) facet of day-to-day life. Hence, this might explain why women and their roles were largely written out of art history.
Why Social Network Analysis might be relevant for art historians: a sociological perspective

Axel Marx

1. Introduction

Social networks can be defined in many ways but as a starting point for the paper we start from the definition of Castilla et al. who define a social network as a set of nodes or actors (persons or organizations) linked by social relationships or ties of a specified type. A tie or relation between two actors has both strength and content.¹

Social networks (and social capital) are crucial resources for people, organisations and society. This has been recognised by policymakers and academics from many different disciplines.² Social networks constitute structures of opportunity and constraint for individuals as well as corporate (including family) actors. Networks have proven to be crucial for learning, competitive advantage, reduction of uncertainty, increased quality of decisions, etc. Whether they will be enabling or constraining depends on the nature of the network and the governance of the network. Some aspects are of crucial importance in the functioning of networks such as the presence or absence of ties; the number of ties; the position of actors in a network (centrality) and the nature of ties. With regard to the latter a distinction has been made between strong and weak ties or between arm-length and embedded ties. This paper further explores and discusses the difference between embedded and arm-length’s ties for the analysis of different types of social phenomena. This focus is chosen since the difference between the two types of ties, namely embedded ties and arm-length ties, provide different types of information, commitment, bargaining power and liabilities.

2. The importance of embeddedness

Karl Polanyi famously analysed the emergence of the separation of social and economic relations.³ He argued that the embeddedness of economic action in pre-industrial societies was supplanted in modern life by the logic of efficient markets, which resulted in atomistic relations between the transacting parties. However, when Clifford Geertz visited the Bazaar of Sefrou in Morocco he noticed that certain buyers would repeatedly go to the same sellers without browsing the whole market and hence, many economic transactions had a recurring pattern.⁴ He identified groups/networks/cliques of buyers and sellers. Not only Geertz, but also other anthropologists and economists found similar patterns when they were studying ‘real’ markets.⁵

In all these cases, repeated interactions (social structures - networks) without authority structures governed market transactions and organised economic transactions. Hence, underlying the economic transaction was a social structure (and culture) which ‘guided’ these transactions. In other words, economic transactions were embedded in social structure. If this was true for Maroccan Bazaars, French fish-markets, and Peruvian traders would it also tell us something about how economies work more generally and how people and organisations interact? Granovetter in his seminal article on the problem of embeddedness claimed it would.⁶ Granovetter argued that all economic transactions and also inter-organisational actions are embedded in social relations. Moving away from an ‘oversocialised’ and ‘undersocialised’ view of economic transactions towards an embedded view he argued that the social structure underlying the transactions are crucial in understanding economic action.

In order to understand economic transactions and changes from the micro-level of sell and buy transactions to macro-phenomenon such as global industrial networks or distinct macro-economic identities, Granovetter argued, one must analyse the underlying social structure;
and the structural (network) and cultural properties of this structure. Structural properties include the number of exchange relations, the strength of relations, duration, etc. The cultural properties include the foundations of exchange such as trust, reciprocity, and instrumentalism. These properties, which can be very diverse, define the network as a social structure. An important difference in these properties concerns the strength, or embeddedness, of the ties.

The importance of embedded transactions and interactions is best illustrated by the booming literature on network forms of organisations and the broader market-network discussion. The network form of organisation (this can also be a family) can be seen as a group of agents who pursue repeated, enduring and reciprocal exchange relations with one another across organisational boundaries and, at the same time, lack a legitimate single organisational authority to arbitrate and resolve the disputes that may arise during the exchange. The stress on co-operation and collaboration comes from an empirical observation that many firms work and experiment with many different forms of co-operation and collaboration. This in turn is explained by changes in market incentives (i.e. cost spreading of product and service development, exploration of new possibilities, risk reduction, providing a window for monitoring technological advances, widening the organisation's breath of technological competence, increase of learning opportunities). Powell et al. for example argued that in the biotechnology and life sciences field the knowledge base is complex, fastly expanding, the sources of expertise are widely dispersed, possible gains from research very uncertain and research costs very high which forces companies to collaborate. In network forms of organisation, organisations are linked by strong or embedded ties which provide them with certain benefits/opportunities (infra).

The further development of embeddedness theory for empirical research was done by Brian Uzzi who elaborated on the important difference between arm-length ties and embedded ties for economic action. This paper builds on the work of Brian Uzzi by further exploring the differences between arm-length ties and embedded ties.

3. The difference between arm-length and embedded ties

Arm-length ties are characterised by lean and sporadic transactions and function without any prolonged human or social contact between parties who need not enter into recurrent or continuing relations as a result of which they would get to know each other well. In other words they are characterised by minimal information exchange (i.e. prices act as coordinating devices by signalling all relevant information to buyers and sellers). The fact that information in arm length ties is limited and most of the time publicly available is a result of the fact that arm-length ties have an increased likelihood of opportunistic behaviour. Because transactionists expect opportunism in relationships, they attempt to withhold unique resources to avoid unilateral dependence or they establish costly safeguards—often through third parties—to prevent acts of misappropriation in exchanges. In embedded ties—which are characterised by their strength, repetitiveness, transmission of tacit, thick and additional information and their grounding in norms of trust and reciprocity—the likelihood of opportunism decreases because transactions 'become embedded in webs of social attachments that change the distributive bargaining logic by which market transactions take place'. In addition, embedded ties transfer 'things' which cannot easily be priced such as fine-grained information on quality, special orders, urgent delivery, assurance of long-term availability, etc.

Embedded ties can be identified or measured in three distinct ways. A first indicator for embeddedness is duration. The longer a tie lasts, the greater the possibility that close bonds of trust and reciprocity are developed. A second indicator is multiplexity, which refers to the diversity of relationships involved between two actors. It can be a pure professional relationship, but also joint membership, neighbours, etc. The more diverse the relationships are the more embedded ties are becoming. A third indicator of embeddedness is the dispersion or concentration of an actor's network of ties. A proxy for this indicator is the size of a network. Large networks tend to be mainly constructed of arm-length's ties, while small networks are more related to embedded ties.
switching network partners resulting from the high cost of maintaining extensive communication systems with more than one network partner, the learning effects as the parties get to know each other, and the need for trust when exchanging proprietary information. This is an embeddedness strategy which can result in an increased liability of interconnectedness (cf. limited or non-existing input of new 'thin' information). An exit-based strategy, on the other hand, requires low commitment in order to maintain the credibility of the focal firm’s threat to leave (cf. strong bargaining position). Therefore, administrative coordination must be low. In this case, an actor needs to build a large network, with many arm-length ties. This is an arm-length strategy which can result in the liability of interconnectedness (limited or non-existing input of 'thick' information or lack of knowledge creation).

According to Helper the actor’s choice of method for problem resolution is an important one, because it affects both the actor’s and network partners relative bargaining power (control the cost factor) and their propensity to introduce new innovations. The exit/arm-length strategy gives an actor a great deal of bargaining power, because it requires little commitment to any one network partner. Conversely, the voice/embedded strategy reduces the actor’s bargaining power by increasing the cost of switching between network partners. However, the voice/embedded strategy is superior when significant investments are required in order to communicate about technical problems or to implement a solution to a problem or when close and continuous co-operation is necessary. Without the detailed information and long-term commitment characteristic of an embedded relationship resulting from a voice-strategy a network partner’s innovation may well be inapplicable to the customer’s need. In addition, Helper argues, that the exit/arm-length strategy maximises an actor’s bargaining power, whereas the voice/embedded strategy maximises the rates of most types of innovation. Hence, a trade-off exists between an actor’s bargaining power and its possibility for technical change. This trade-off is rooted in the distinction between embedded ties and arm-length ties.

5. Managing Liabilities and Opportunities via Social Ties

Social networks and network ties form structures of opportunity and constraint. Moreover, it is not only the presence or absence of ties which is important but also the nature of the network. The quality and structure of social ties among actors shape social action by creating unique opportunities and access to those opportunities, but can also constrain the functioning of institutions. Consequently, related to arm-length and embedded ties are a host of mechanisms which are crucial for actors, probably also in a family context. The strengths of one type of tie is often the weaknesses of the other type of tie (cf. trade-off between tie use). Hence, opportunities can transform into liabilities and the other way around. Table 2 summarises the most important characteristics and mechanisms related to the different types of ties.

Table 2. Comparison of different characteristics between arm-length and embedded ties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Characteristics</th>
<th>Arm-length</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of ties</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>High market uncertainty</td>
<td>Reduces market uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>‘New’ Ties</td>
<td>‘Old’ Ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplexity</td>
<td>Single-focused</td>
<td>Divers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>Large Networks</td>
<td>Small Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information characteristics</td>
<td>Arm-length</td>
<td>Embedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information vs. Knowledge</td>
<td>Information-transfer</td>
<td>Knowledge creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Information</td>
<td>Thin</td>
<td>Thick &amp; Tacit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of New Information</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction of Information</td>
<td>One-way</td>
<td>Two-way / Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information asymmetries</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of key-information</td>
<td>Limited / Non-existence</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic characteristics</th>
<th>Arm-length</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining power</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Faster / More profound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordination (costs)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability characteristics</th>
<th>Arm-length</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embeddedness liabilities</td>
<td>Underembeddedness</td>
<td>Overembeddedness (lock-in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative liabilities</td>
<td>Liability of opportunism</td>
<td>Liability of overcommitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk opportunistic behaviour</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence opportunistic behaviour</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence, interrelation and trade-offs of many of these characteristics generates additional research questions and areas for investigation and analysis, mainly in relation to the optimal mix of embedded and arm-length ties and the possibilities of developing certain types of ties.

First of all, embedded and arm-length ties clearly perform different functions. As a consequence, an optimal network is a network which balances arm-length and embedded ties, liabilities of under- and overconnectedness, new information and 'thick' information, exit strategies and voice strategies. The most innovative research on the importance of mixing ties is done by Brian Uzzi in the context of interfirm relationships. Uzzi argues, in general, that embedded transactions/ties are more functional than arms-length transactions. However he also posits that an inverted U-relationship between embeddedness and performance exists. That is, while embedded transactions are superior to unembedded ones, it nonetheless remains possible for an organisation to depend too much on embedded ties and hence become trapped in embedded ties. More specifically he states:

'I conject that, if arm's-length ties become embedded as firms enjoy the benefits of coordination and adaptation, then, once embeddedness increases beyond a certain threshold of intensity, the firms in the network may become sealed off from the market as they begin to trade with a confined set of network partners. When this threshold is reached, the flow of new or innovative information into the network begins to decrease; eventually it is closed off in highly embedded networks because there are few nonredundant links to outside members who potentially could introduce new ideas into the network. Over time, isomorphic processes can also decrease network diversity and increase organisational inertia so that change is difficult and costly for network partners'.

Hence, according to Uzzi, a theoretical optimum exists between the countervailing effects of under- and overembeddedness when a network is composed of a mixture of arm's length and embedded ties. His research results suggest that contractors who transact with low-embedded or highly embedded networks have an increasing likelihood of failure, while contractors that transact with moderately embedded networks have a decreasing likelihood of
6. Conclusion

As Mark Buchanan wrote in his much read book *Nexus: Small Worlds and the Groundbreaking Science of Networks*: ‘some of the deepest truths of our world may turn out to be truths about organization, rather than about what kinds of things make up the world and how those things behave as individuals’.

This organisation is based on social networks. And network consists of types of ties which can differ in nature due to duration, multiplexity, or grounding in trust. Differences in the nature of ties have implications for the functioning of networks due to the different characteristics related to the different types of ties. In this paper we explored the main characteristics which are related to a difference in embedded (strong) ties or arm-length (weak) ties in order to introduce a social network approach to analyzing economic behaviour.

The different characteristics related to embedded ties and arm-length ties such as information transmission, knowledge creation and bargaining power are of course interrelated and sometimes stand in a trade-off position to one another. One type of network tie provides certain benefits but also liabilities. New insights into the different types of benefits/opportunities and liabilities can increase our understanding of organisational and institutional dynamics also in an historical context. One can gain insights in how interactions (within institutions and organisations) generate different outcomes by analysing the nature of the ties which underpins these interactions and analyse the networks in which these institutions/organisations/families are situated. This paper summarises some of the main characteristics related to the difference in embedded ties and arm-length ties.

Network analysis offers a host of analytical techniques and concepts to analyse the different structures of social groups including families. This paper focused on the theoretical significant differences between different types. This is only a part of the toolbox which social network analysis offers to researchers. Other important concepts, not discussed in this paper, are for example different measures of centrality of actors in networks which include closeness centrality (in which central actors can more quickly interact with all others because they require few intermediaries to relay messages or exchange resources), degree centrality (in which central actors have higher total numbers of direct ties to all other actors, i.e. a large ego-centric network size), betweenness centrality (in which central actors, can control interactions between many pairs who lack direct connections, because the shortest indirect links between those unconnected pairs must go 'through' the more central actors), clique-analysis (finding out if there are groups of actors in which each is directly and strongly linked to all of the others), density of embedded and arm-length ties (the ratio of actual relations or ties among a set of actors in a network and the maximum possible number of ties) and the presence of structural holes (i.e. the absence of a relation among actors in a network). All these concepts can offer insights in on-going research and analysis of social relations. I hope this paper has stimulated the appetite of art historians to explore the tools social network analysis might offer.
Natural history as entrepreneurship: Maria Sibylla Merian’s correspondence with J. G. Volkamer II and James Petiver

T. KINUKAWA

Department of History, University of the Pacific, 3601 Pacific Ave., Stockton, California 95211, USA (e-mail: tkinukawa@pacific.edu).

ABSTRACT: The artist, naturalist and entrepreneur Maria Sibylla Merian (1647–1717) constructed her network by exchanging natural history specimens with other naturalists in Europe, created a market for her publication *Metamorphosis insectorum Surinamensium* (1705), and had her book reviewed in major literary journals in northwestern Europe. Two collections of letters provide information on this process: those exchanged between James Petiver (1664–1718) and his correspondents in Amsterdam and those between the German physician and botanist J. G. Volkamer II (1662–1744) and his friends in Amsterdam. Merian’s strategies demonstrate that patronage played a limited role in her success as naturalist, while her skill as an entrepreneur provided a chance to engage in communication with other naturalists and have other naturalists receive her work positively. Merian’s work epitomizes the growing role played by entrepreneur-naturalists in the accumulation of knowledge about the natural resources of overseas colonies and the distribution of this knowledge to European readers. Although her gender prevented her from obtaining membership of academies, Merian’s book was reviewed by major European literary journals, including *Acta eruditorum* in Leipzig. The article analyses her letters in the context of larger networks of correspondence between Holland, England and Germany.


INTRODUCTION

In 1697, the artist, naturalist, and entrepreneur Maria Sibylla Merian received a visitor from Nürnberg at her home in Amsterdam: Christoph Friederich Imhoff von Helmstatt (1666–1723), whose married sister, Clara Regina Scheurling, was her Nürnberg patron and pupil (Rückner and Stearn 1982: 64; Wettengl 1998: 264).¹ Merian had been out of touch with friends in Nürnberg for years and was eager for news. Imhoff showed her his *album amicorum*, which included Scheurling’s artwork; Merian was delighted to see her pupil, whose childhood she had oversee, using her artistic skill so well. The visit induced Merian to write a letter to Scheurling on 29 August 1697, asking to resume their old friendship (Rückner and Stearn 1982: 64; Wettengl 1998: 264). In the letter, Merian devoted herself to exploring ways to serve Scheurling and her family: she sent a gift of carmine red paint to show she could support Scheurling as she had done before in Germany.

Merian made an additional proposal: exchanges of natural history specimens. She wrote that there were many rarities from the East and West Indies in Holland. She could send these to lovers of nature and art in Nürnberg, if they would in return send her animals such as...
Foucault speaks of class sexualities but these fundamentally involved gendered sexualities. The making of masculine and feminine subjects crucially involved the manufacture and regulation of sexualities, radically different and hardly complementary let alone compatible, between those designated men and women. But these terms were ideological abstractions compared to the careful distinctions maintained between ladies and women in class terms, and gentlemen and working class men. The social definition of class and of gender were intimately connected. But the issue of sexuality and its constant anxieties pressed with major ideological significance on the bourgeoisie.

For through psychoanalytical theory we can recognise the specificity of visual performance and address. The construction of sexuality and its underpinning sexual difference if profoundly implicated in looking and »the scopic field«. Visual representation is a privileged site (forgive the Freudian pun).

There are significant continuities between feminist art practice and feminist art history for those dividing walls which normally segregate artmaking from art criticism and art history are eroded by the larger community to which we belong as feminists, the women’s movement. We are our own conversational community developing our paradigms of practice in constant interaction and supportive commentary. The political point of feminist art history must be to change the present by means of how we re-represent the past. That means we must refuse the art historian’s permitted ignorance of living artists and contribute to the present day struggles of living producers.

If modernist art history supplies the paradigm which feminist art history of the modern period must contest, modernist criticism and modernist practice are the targets of contemporary practice. Modernist thought has been defined as functioning on three basic tenets: the specificity of aesthetic experience; the self sufficiency of the visual; the teleological evolution of art autonomous from any other social causation or pressure. Modernist protocols prescribe what is validated as »modern art«, i.e. what is relevant, progressing and in the lead. Art which engages with the social world is political, sociological, narrative, demeaning the proper concerns of the artist with the nature of the medium or with human experience embodied in painted or hewn gestures. Feminist artistic practices and texts have intervened in alliance with other radical groups to disrupt the hegemony of modernist theories and practices even now still active in art education in the so called post modernist culture. They have done this not merely to make a place for women artists within the art world’s parameters. The point is to mount a sustained and far reaching political critique of contemporary representational systems which have an overdetermined effect in the social production of sexual difference and its related gender hierarchy. But equally importantly they are discovering ways to address women as subjects not masquerading as the feminine objects of masculine desire and fantasy and hatred.

Feminism-as-a-theory represents a diversified field of theorisations of at times considerable complexity. Their production and articulations is, however, qualified at all times by the political responsibility of working for the liberation of women.

What has art history to do with this struggle? A remote and limited discipline for the preservation of and research into objects and cultures of limited if not esoteric interest, art history might seem simply irrelevant. But art has become a growing part of big business, a major component of the leisure industry, a site of corporate
investment. Take for instance the exhibition at the Tate Gallery in 1984, *The Pre-Raphaelites*. Sponsored by a multinational whose interests not only involved mineral, banking and property concerns, but publishing houses, zoos, waxworks as well as newspapers and magazines. What were they supporting – an exhibition which presented to the public, men looking at beautiful women as the natural order of making beautiful things? Reviewing the exhibition Deborah Cherry and I concluded: »High Culture plays a specifiable part in the reproduction of women’s oppression, in the circulation of relative values and meanings for the ideological constructs of masculinity and femininity. Representing creativity as masculine and Woman as the beautiful image for the desiring masculine gaze, High Culture systematically denies knowledge of women as producers of culture and meanings. Indeed High Culture is decisively positioned against feminism. Not only does it exclude the knowledge of women artists produced within feminism, but it works in a phallocentric signifying system in which >woman< is a sign within discourses on masculinity. The knowledge and significations produced by such events as *The Pre-Raphaelites* are intimately connected with the workings of patriarchal power in our society.«

There are many who see art history as a defunct and irrelevant disciplinary boundary. The study of cultural production has bled so widely and changed so radically from an object to a discourse and practice orientation that there is a complete communication breakdown between art historians working still within the normative discipline and those who are contesting the paradigm. We are witnessing a paradigm shift which will rewrite all cultural history. For these reasons I suggest that we no longer think of a feminist art history but a »feminist intervention« in art’s histories. Where we are coming from is not some other fledgling discipline or interdisciplinary formation. It is from the women’s movement made real and concrete in all the variety of practices in which women are actively engaged to change the world. This is no »new art history« aiming to make improvements, bring it up to date, season the old with current intellectual fashions or theory soup. The feminist problematic in this particular field of the social is shaped by the terrain – visual representations and their practices – on which we struggle. But it is ultimately defined within that collective critique of social, economic and ideological power which is the women’s movement.

26 Deborah Cherry and Griselda Pollock, Patriarchal Power and the Pre-Raphaelites, *Art History*, 1984 vol 7 no 4, p. 494.
"What would happen if one woman told the truth about her life? The world would split open."

—Muriel Rukeyser, Kathe Kollwitz, 1968

The romantic image of the artist as striving and starving alone is one of the received myths of Western culture. This quaint paradigm of artistic creativity was never universally appropriate, certainly not for dancers, musicians, and architects, who by virtue of their craft, worked in concert with others. Nor did it fit the printmaker, who traditionally worked hand in hand with master printers. The stereotype of the lone genius was altered in the New York art world of the fifties and the sixties when such visual artists as Robert Rauschenberg, Grace Hartigan, Alfred Leslie, and Alex Katz worked with writers and choreographers on collaborative projects. But it was not until the seventies, with the renewal of feminism in America, that artistic collaboration became for many women a political act and a creative first choice. As a member of the San Francisco mural collective Las Mujeres Muralistas noted in 1974, "We feel this work is really important because it takes us beyond the level of individualism."

As women awakened to feminism, they began to redefine their relationship to each other, to society, and even to the earth itself. While women might experience the "click" of recognition when they were confronted by societal sexism, it was the communal process of consciousness-raising that became the feminist archetype. Here, the shared insights of individual contributors built on the other to effect social change. The personal became the political. For artists who now defined themselves as feminists, the power of art as a transformative agent had never been more apparent.

Feminist collaborations in the visual arts took many forms. For some, it was an aesthetic partnership, in which the participating women shared responsibility for a given work's form and content. Others updated the model of the quilting bee, where one artistic vision initiated and directed a given project, which was then realized and completed by the labor of many. Yet others took inspiration from the format of the potluck supper, where each guest contributes a culinary creation for the common good, the meal as a whole being greater than the sum of its parts. For those feminists who were social activists, the forum of the political demonstration offered a vehicle for communal performance events. Propelled by their redefinitions of "public" and "private," some feminist artists gravitated toward public art, by its nature a collaborative endeavor pairing artists, for example, with engineers and landscape architects. And finally, ecofeminists joined hands with Mother Earth to collaborate with nature itself.

Like the black and gay liberation movements of the late sixties and seventies, the women's movement sought out its own history. Women artists "collaborated" with their heritage, which was newly understood to include the decorative as well as the fine arts. Painter Miriam Schapiro was brought up believing in the romantic myth of secluded genius. But when she and Judy Chicago taught in the Feminist Art Program, they based their pedagogy on the communal process of consciousness-raising. As Schapiro began working on the collaborative Womanhouse project with her students, she became aware that "Collaboration was taking place right then and there in my brain and liberating me from the idea of being solitary."

As Schapiro began to educate herself about historical
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Terry Wolverton

The founding of the Woman’s Building in Los Angeles in 1973 was the culmination of several years of activity by women artists who were energized by the feminist movement in the United States. The Woman’s Building was a concrete realization of the dreams of women artists to find “a room of one’s own”—a room they could not find in the mainstream art world at that time.

To understand the origins of the feminist art movement in the United States, one must look to the foment of the sixties and early seventies, to the swarms of rebellions and leaps in consciousness that redefined American culture. In 1955, a seamstress named Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a Montgomery, Alabama, bus and thus gave rise to the Civil Rights Movement, which ignited a host of struggles for social liberation waged by women, African Americans, Chicanos, Native Americans, gays and lesbians, and others. These movements not only demanded more equitable distribution of power and resources, but also raised profound questions about the meaning assigned to these identities and the cultural representations of these groups.

Opposition to the United States’ involvement in Vietnam stoked an unprecedented youth movement that, in addition to the politics of protest, embraced “sex, drugs, and rock ‘n’ roll.” This fueled a thriving counterculture determined to forge alternatives to the economic, social, and moral structures of the mainstream.

Within the art world, too, began a challenge to the hegemony of formalism that had dominated the fifties and sixties, in which any concern for content in art was
disregarded or disdained. Questions of cultural identity incited a push for the democratization of art, a demand for greater inclusiveness with regard to both who could make images and who had access to them. Disenfranchised artists also began to create alternative institutions—later to be called artists’ organizations—that would better represent them.

In 1970, women artists in Los Angeles mobilized. The impetus was “Art and Technology,” an exhibition at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA) in which no women artists were included. Upon further investigation, it was found that of eighty-one one-person exhibitions at LACMA over a ten-year period, only one had featured the work of a woman artist.

Women began to meet together to protest their exclusion from the LACMA show; to share the difficulties they faced in getting their work shown, reviewed, purchased, or even regarded seriously; to discuss the concerns they as women wanted to express in their artwork; and to create strategies for what to do next.

Finding the gallery and museum system generally closed to most of them, women artists in Southern California decided to launch their own gallery: WomanSpace. Opened in an old laundromat in Culver City in early 1973, WomanSpace was dedicated to showing and documenting women’s artwork. It quickly garnered a membership of a thousand artists and supporters.

Meanwhile, several women artists teaching in college and university programs felt the need to provide new models for the next generation of women artists and pioneered the concept of feminist art education. Painter Judy Chicago started the Feminist Art Program, the first of its kind, at California State University, Fresno.

That first year, Chicago’s visionary Feminist Art Program drew fifteen women students, many of whom were new to both feminism and art making. It was from the work of this initial group of participants that many of the core principles of feminist art education evolved. These concepts would guide Chicago and her colleagues when they established the Feminist Studio Workshop in Los Angeles three years later.

It was in the Fresno program that women first employed the process of consciousness-raising in the classroom, both to understand more deeply their position as women and to generate material for their art. This strategy flew in the face of the art establishment; in 1970, women’s experience was considered trivial and frivolous, unsuitable as subject matter for creative work. Indeed, since the end of World War II, narrative content had become taboo in the New York art world; formalist concerns dominated the critical discourse. Serious art was, by definition, the province of men, and if a woman hoped to pass into this hallowed terrain, she could only do so by making herself as much like a man as possible. The rare female art student who called attention to her gender by daring to create a work about menstruation, marriage, motherhood, or household drudgery could fully expect to be criticized or mocked by her male instructors.
In order to create an environment in which women could explore their lives through art, participants in the Fresno program insisted upon a separate classroom environment for female art students, one in which women could create the context and control what happened there. Such separation would provide not only protection from corrosive or undermining feedback, but also would allow women to bond with one another and to define for themselves their paths as artists. Additionally, the women of the Fresno program asserted the importance of female role models, both in being instructed by women and in studying the long-buried history of women's art. Finally, Chicago and her students openly challenged the notion of art as a work of individual genius by engaging in collaborative creations.

In 1971, Chicago moved the Fresno program to California Institute of the Arts (CalArts). With the school still under construction, the twenty-five students of the Feminist Art Program launched a large-scale, site-based, collaborative project, called Womanhouse, spearheaded by Chicago and her colleague, artist Miriam Schapiro. Working together, they transformed the rooms of a slatted—for—demolition Hollywood mansion into art environments that eloquently protested the domestic servitude of women's lives. In Breast Kitchen, for example, the all—pink walls and ceiling were affixed with fried eggs—sunny side up—that gradually morphed into women's breasts, a trenchant comment on women's role as nurturers. Fear Bathroom contained the plaster figure of a woman in the tub, frozen up to the neck in cement, and addressed the
state of confinement and paralysis felt by women. *Linen Closet* displayed the torso of a female mannequin segmented by the closet shelves. This latter image was reproduced in *Time* magazine, which ran a story on the project. It galvanized me, and I sped around for the next week, showing the magazine to everyone at school. *Womanhouse* was, without question, the most publicly visible work of feminist art to date.

Art historian Arlene Raven had joined the faculty of the CalArts Feminist Art Program, and graphic designer Sheila Levant de Bretteville established the Women's Design Program at CalArts. In conversations with Chicago, they shared their frustrations about working within a male-dominated institution. Separate classes for feminist students could only be so effective, they observed; what went on in those classrooms was too easily dwarfed by the larger context. They would routinely spend their class sessions building up the confidence of women students, encouraging them to take risks, only to see those same students' works disparaged or dismissed by male instructors.

In 1973, frustrated with the limitations of working to educate women art students within the confines of a male institution, Chicago, de Bretteville, and Raven left CalArts to found an independent school for women artists: the Feminist Studio Workshop (FSW). The FSW focused not only on the development of art-making skills (in visual arts, writing, performance art, video, design, and the printing arts), but also on the development of women's identities and sensibilities, and feminist practices of art-making, and the translation of those elements into their art.

Central to the founders' vision was the notion that the arts should not be separated from other activities of the burgeoning women's community, and the three looked for a space that could be shared with other organizations and enterprises. The FSW opened in September. Initial class sessions were held in de Bretteville's living room, but by the end of November, the FSW was installed in the building that had once housed the old Chouinard Art Institute on Grandview Boulevard in the Wilshire District of Los Angeles. In November 1973, the Woman's Building opened its doors.

Eighty years earlier, another Woman's Building had existed in Chicago, Illinois. Designed by architect Sophia Hayden, that Woman's Building was part of the World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 and housed exhibitions of artistic and cultural works by women. After the exposition, the building was demolished, little documentation remains. The founders of the Los Angeles Woman's Building wanted to resurrect the lost memory of its predecessor and also create a public center where the current artistic and cultural accomplishments of women could be presented and appreciated.

Before the Chouinard building could be opened to the public, massive renovation was required. Hundreds of women, men, and children worked together to build walls, scrape and paint ceilings, sand floors, move furniture and printing presses, paint signage, and generally prepare the space to welcome the community. For many of the newly recruited FSW students, their initial introduction to feminist arts education involved getting dirty and learning to use tools.
Article 11. Letter from Edward Alleyn to his wife, from Bristol, 1 August 1593 (?). Alleyn was travelling with Strange’s Men, in which company Thomas Pope was an actor; he is mentioned once in the Diary, f. 38 v. R. Cowley and Pope are also named in the plot of 2 Seven Deadly Sins (1592). Harry of Cornwall first appears in the Diary, f. 7, as acted on 25 February 1592.

Emanell
My good sweett mouse I comend me hartely to yo* And to my father my mother & my sister bess hoping in god thought the siknes beroid about you yet by his mercy it may escape yo* house w* by y* grace of god it shall therfor vse this corse kepe yo* house fryr and clean w* I knowe you will and every evening throwe water before yo* dore and in yo* bakside and haue in yo* windowes good store of rwe and herbe of grace and w* all the grace of god w* must be obtaynd by prayers and so doinge no doute but y* lord will mercifully defend yo*: now good mouse I haue no newse to send you but this thart we haue all out* helth for w* the lord be prayd I resevd yo* letter att bristo by richard couley for the wich I thank you I haue sent yo* by this berer Thomas popes kinsman my whit wascote because it is a trobell to me to carie it resevae it w* this letter and lay it vp for me till I com if you send any mor letters send to me by the catiers of shrowsbere or to west chester or to york to be kept till my lord stranges players com and thus sweett harth w* my harty comend* to all o* frends I sess from bristo this wensday after saynt Jams his day being redy to begin the playe of hary of cornwall mouse do my harty comend to m* grigs his wif and all his houshold and to my sister phillyps Yo* Loving housband E Alleyn

such things as hapens att home as how yo* distilled watter proves or this or that or any thing what you will 
[vertically in left-hand margin]
y and Jurg I pray yo* lett my orayng tawny stokins of wolen be dyed a very good blak against I com hom to wear in the winter yo* sente me noott word of my garden but next tym you will but remember this in any case that all that bed w* was parley in the month of september you sowe itt w* spinage for then is the tym: I would do it my self but we shall nott com hom till allholand tyd and so swett mouse farwell and broke ou* long Jorney w* patienc

[addresed:]
This be delyvered to m* hinslo on of the gromes of hir maist chamber dwelling on the bank sid right over against the clink

Article 12. Letter from Philip Henslowe to Edward Alleyn, from London, August 1593 (?). Robert Browne, an actor with Worcester’s Men, was abroad in Germany at this time. For a further note on the bedstead, see Diary, f. iv.

Welbeloved sonne edward allen After owr hartie Comendationes bothe I & you* mother & syster bease all in generall dothe hartieley comend vs vnto you & as for you* mowe her comendationes comes by yt seallfe w* as she sayes comes from her harte & her sowle praize to god daye & nyght for you* good health w* trewley to be playne we doe soe alle hoopinge in the lorde Jesus that we shall haue agayne a mery meting for I thank ye god we haue be fliettet w* feare of the sycknes but thanckes be vnto god we are all at this time in good halethe in owr howsse but Rownd a bowte vs yt hathe bene all moste in every howsse abowt vs & wholle howsholdes deyed & yt my frend the bayle doth scape but he smalles monstrously for feare & dares staye no wheare for ther hathe deyed this laste weache in generall 1603 of the w* number ther hathe died of them of the plage 113 [5]–0–5 w* hause bene the greatest that came yet & as for other newes of this & that I cane tealle youe none but that Robart brownes wife in shordech & all her children & howshould be dead & heare dores sheat vpe & as for you* Joyner he hath brought
pray you for geat not you' mousse & vs for you seant in one latter that we Retorned not answere wheather we Receued y'm or no for we Receued one w'h you made at seant James tide wher in mackes mesyon of you' whitte wascote & you' lyve bockes & other things w'h we haue Receued & now lastly a letter w'h pet' browghte y'm you' horse w'h I wilbe as carfull as I cane In yt now sonne althowwe longe yt at the laste I Remember A hundreded comendations from you' mowsse w'h Is very glade to heare of you' health & præyeth daye & nght to the lord to contenew the same & lickewisse pryayeth vnto the lord to seace his hand from punyshenge vs w'h his crosshe that she mowght haue you at home w'h her hopinge hopinge then that you shold be eased of this heavey labowre & toylle & you sayd in you' latter that she scant you not worde how you' garden & all you' things dothe prosper very well thanckes be to god for you' beanes are grown to hey heage & well coked & all other things doth very well but you' tenantes weax very power for they cane paye no Rent nor will paye no Rent whil shall myellmas next & then we shall haue yt yf we cane geat yt & lyckewise you' Joyner comendes him vnto you & sayes he will mack you such good stufe & suche good peneworthes as he hopeth shall weal llyke you & conteynte you w'h I hope he will do because he says he will prove him selfe one oneste man & for you' good cownsell w'h you gaue vs in you' latter we all thancke you w'h wasse for kepinge of ou' howsse cleane & warringe of ou' denses & strainge ou' windowes w'h wormwode & Rewe w'h I hope all this we do & more for we strawe yt withe hartie prayers vnto the lorde w'h vnto vs Is more avysable then all things eallise in the world for I prayse the lord god for yt we are all in very good healthe & I praye ye sonne comend me harteley to all the Reast of you' falowes in generall for I grewe poore for lacke of them therfor haue no geatess to sende but as good & faythfull a harte as they shall desyer to have commen a monge thes now sonne we thanck you all for you' tockenes you seant vs and as for newes of the sycknes I cane not seand you no Juste note of yt be cause there is command ment to the contrary but as I thinke doth die w'h in the siteme and w'h owt of all sycknes to the number of seventen or eyghten hundreth in one weacke & this praynge to god for you' health I ende from london the 14 of aguste 1593

you' lovinge wife a comande tell death to owr powers P H . A

Johne Allen
[addressed:
Too my wealbeloued
husbande m’ Edwarde
Allen on of my lorde
stranges players
this be deleyuered
wth speade.

Article 14. Letter from Philip Henslowe to Edward Alleyn, from
London, 28 September 1593. Hudson is mentioned, in the Diary,
f. 1v. Sister Phillips’s husband may be the Edward Phillips concerned
in a lawsuit with Henslow, f. 41.

Righte wealbeloved Sonne edward allen I & you’ mother & you’ sister
bease haue all in generall ou’ hartie Comendations vnto you & as for
you’ wiffe & mowsse she desieres to send heare Comendationes alone wth
she says Comes ffrome heare very harte but as ffor you’ wellfare
& health we do all Joyne to geather in Joye and ReJoyse ther att & do
all to geather wth one consent praye to god longe to contenew the same
now somne leate vs growe to alytell vnkindnes wth you because we cane
not heare from you as we wold do that is when others do & if we cold as s
send to you as you maye to vs we wold not leat to vesete you often
ffor we beinge wth in the cross of the lorde you littell knowe howe we do
but by sendinge for yt hath pleased the lorde to vesette me Rownd a
bowte & almoste alle my nebores dead of the plage & not my howsse fiire
for my two weanches haue hade the plage & yet thankes be to god leveh
& ar welle & I my wiffe & my two daughtiers I thancke god ar very well
& in good heallth now to caste a waye vnkindnes & to come to owr newes
that is that we hade a very bade market at smyth fylld for no mane
wold offer me a bove fower pwn dfor you’ horse & therfor hauenot sowld
hime but to saue carges I haue sent him downe in to the contrey ther to
be keapte tell you Retorne & as for you’ clocke cloth ther wasse none
 sowld by Retaylle for all wasse bowght vp by whole sylle in to dayes
so the fayer lasted but iij dayes & as for you’ stockinges they are deyed
& yo’ foyner hath seate vp you’ portolle in the chamby & hath brothe
you a corse cobert & sayses he will bringe the Reaste very shortley & we
beare wth hime because his howsse is visited & as for you’ garden that
is very weall you’ spenege bead & all sowed & as for my lorde a
penbrocles wth you desier to knowe whereby they be they are all at home
and hauffe ben t(his) v or sixe weacks for they cane not saue ther carges
(wth tranell as I heare & weare fayne to pane the(par) parell for ther cage
(& w)hen I wasse in smythfell a sell

To aske for yt for yf we dead we wold haue sowght yt owt but
we never had yt & this I eard prayinge god that it doth
pleas hime of his mersey to slacke his hand frome visicjinge vs
& the sittie of london for ther hath abated this last two weacks
do the sycknes iij hundred thurtie and five & hath died in all
betwexe a leven and twealle hundred this laste weack wth I hoop
In the lord yt will contenew in seasyng eueru weacke that we
maye ReJoyse agayne at owr meatinge & this wth my hartie
comendation to thy owen seall & likewise to all the Reast of my
felowes I genereall I praye you hartily comende me from
London the 28 of [ag]septemb3 1593

you’ asured owne seallf
you’ lovinge father & frend to my power
tell deathe Jonne allen
tell death Phillipe Henslowe
comendinge to her mvnshen

you’ wiffe prayeth you to send her word in yo’
next leater what goodness man hudson pays you
yerley for his Reante for he hause the sealer and
all stille in his hand & as for you’ tenenantes we
cane geat no Rent & as for greges & his
wife hath ther comendations vnto you & you’
sister phillipes & her husband hath bered two or
thire owt of ther howsse yt they in good healt(h) &
doth hartily comend them vnto you

[addressed:
This be deleyuered vnto
my welbeloued husband
m’ edward allen one of
my lord stranges players geue
wth speade