RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne
Canadian Art Review

RACAR
Revue d'art canadienne | Canadian Art Review

Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard (eds.), *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany*. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 1982. 358 pp., 309 illus., $24.95 (paper)
Estella Lauter, *Women as Mythmakers: Poetry and Visual Art by Twentieth-Century Women*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1984. 267 pp., 15 illus., $16.95 (paper)

Janice Helland

Volume 13, Number 1, 1986

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1073566ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1073566ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (print)
1918-4778 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this review

Helland, J. (1986). Review of [Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard (eds.), *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany*. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 1982. 358 pp., 309 illus., $24.95 (paper) / Estella Lauter, *Women as Mythmakers: Poetry and Visual Art by Twentieth-Century Women*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1984. 267 pp., 15 illus., $16.95 (paper)]. *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, *13*(1), 75–78. https://doi.org/10.7202/1073566ar

vatively styled 'Week-End Cottage' with an 'Italian pattern iron roof' advertised in 1905 by the later famous aviation company Boulton and Paul of Norwich.

The vagaries of taste in the elite and the mass, spiced by a timely *soupçon* about the accommodation of single women, constitute the meat of Robert Thorne's report on the transformation of the inn and chop-house into the restaurant of mid-Victorian London. In another side dish, so to speak, Thorne contends that the compartmentalization of the late-Victorian pub was neither dictated by the innate class sense of the British, nor by the publicans' desire to discourage rowdiness, but in order to secure privacy for patrons worried by their shameful public image. Equally contentious is Francis Duffy's quest to 'reveal the values of those who build ... and work' in office buildings. He compares three pairs of offices, including the famed Larkin and Seagram high density, compartmentalized Temples of Mammon, but ending with the apparently liberalized, open plan Ninoflex office at Nordham, to assert that these 'tell us far more about the societies which built them than about their architects.' And so to Rapoport's contribution, which King summarizes in this sentence: 'Built environments encode or give expression to a particular set of cultural rules and also influence both social and cognitive environments.'

Yet Rapoport, unwittingly, undermines instead of reinforces the preceeding essays by proposing that 'Modern' societies have been 'ineffective' in manifesting and comprehending the 'cognitive schemata,' or cultural codes. Now, besides several questions concerning Rapoport's logic and language, and serious reservations about his belief in the relevance to the analysis of sophisticated societies of information culled from those essentially tribal, the process of 'coding' has ever been highly complex. The earliest historian of world architecture, James Fergusson, bewailed the disjunction between style and actual technical facility and cultural values in the Victorian era upon which most of the essays concentrate. The history of art as well as architecture is crammed with cases of erroneous assumptions about 'meaning,' especially related to style. Robert Mills, for example, liked to describe himself, and by implication his architecture, as 'altogether American,' even though it was solidly founded upon Colonial Georgian Palladianism. Contrary to Duffy's asseveration, architects and patrons have moulded the environment, not infrequently as much as social and economic factors. Thus the Larkin office at Buffalo was tailored around the unique mail order operation devised by its chief executive, but also according to F.L. Wright's expertise and idiosyncratic aesthetic. There is no evidence to support the inference in the latter part of the caption beneath the photograph of one of the clerical desks which reads: 'Here, design control is in league with work study; the seat hinged to the clerical desk restricts freedom of movement, saves space, is entirely rational, and effectively expresses the degradation of the clerk.' Prejudice has here supplanted objectivity, for if Wright's design might be criticized on the grounds of elevating efficiency above comfort, his intentions were quite the reverse of degradation. Like the European Modernists he was to inspire, Wright correlated functional form with reform in the workplace and a fairer social order. The Larkin Building included a public viewing area because the conditions of employment were then regarded as progressive and humanitarian; the employees of the Johnson Wax Company, for which he later designed a less grandiose open plan office at Racine, Wisconsin, reportedly preferred its environment to their own homes, notwithstanding the more recent adverse reaction to that type of architectural arrangement.

While that is but one instance of arguable interpretation, the caption represents a serious problem which recurs throughout the text, namely insufficient concern for historical material. A closer reading of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century writings, legislations and records of the governing bodies concerned with the asylum, hospital and prison demonstrates that technical conventions, architectural and scientific, were certainly as important as social attitudes. Moreover, many of those who designed or financed the buildings were inspired by idealistic, if misinformed, motives and not merely by ideas of repression (cf. my *William Wilkins 1778-1839* [1980], or Pierre du Prey's *John Soane. The Making of an Architect* [1982]). And if the intention is to disclose the sociological determinants, where is the discussion of the many-faceted religious revival of the nineteenth century which exerted quite as fundamental an influence as secular and political radicalism. Beyond the factual constituent of history, necessarily embracing specialized matters such as the evolution of building types and stylistic fashion, the contributors tend to disregard that empathy for other times required to achieve fair judgment. In other words, their approach imposes as many restrictions as the method it presumes to supersede.

These criticisms, which apply to the misnamed 'New Art History' (Hauser, to cite but one, sought to confine the comprehension of artistic creativity within the bounds of social and political factors in the 1940s), should not be regarded as an entire rejection of the sociological and semiotic approach, instead of its presumption of superior truth. For these essays will serve to hone the thinking of those attempting to illuminate the fascinating and heterogeneous history of architecture.

RHODRI WINDSOR LISCOMBE
University of British Columbia

NORMA BROUDE and MARY D. GARRARD (eds.) *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany*. New York, Harper & Row Publishers, 1982. 358 pp., 309 illus., $24.95 (paper).

ESTELLA LAUTER *Women as Mythmakers: Poetry and Visual Art by Twentieth-Century Women*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1984. 267 pp., 15 illus., $16.95 (paper).

At certain times in the development of art criticism and art history there appear subtle sways or sudden shifts. Scholars and critics, examining works of art from given points in their culture, label and analyse, proclaim success or failure, while the artists themselves set standards or follow leads in the intricate pattern we eventually call art history. Often this pattern changes slowly but sometimes, as with the 'discovery' of primitive art at the beginning of the twentieth century, the shifts have dramatic and lasting effects. For example, the repercussions of the discovery of primitive art are still very much with us as evidenced by the interest (both praise and criticism) in the recent New York exhibition, *'Primitivism' in 20th Century Art*.

The growing concern for women's art is a new interest, or 'discovery,' that may also change art and the way we

view it. Although this concern is often related to 'primitive' or primal art, the focus differs from that of the early twentieth-century avant-garde. Feminists are asking: 'Who did the art?' Although the most diplomatic suggestion, as well as the most probable, is that both males and females created prehistoric art, past scholarship has overwhelmingly opted in favour of the male. Janson's *History of Art* begins with: 'When did men start creating works of art?' (p. 18). Thus Janson propagates the idea that the first artist was a male artist; and thus has history treated artists through the ages.

But these attitudes, perspectives and outlooks are beginning to change. This change is the focal point of two recent publications: *Feminism and Art History: Questioning the Litany*, edited by Norma Broude and Mary D. Garrard, and *Women as Mythmakers: Poetry and Visual Art by Twentieth-Century Women* by Estella Lauter. Both books raise questions about who did the art and how we perceive it.

Feminism and Art History is a collection of essays about objectivity. The book's subtitle, *Questioning the Litany*, is the central theme of each of the essays and the book provides the reader with approaches and methodologies to re-examine the discipline. The collection includes essays by Mary Garrard, Firma Fox Hofrichter and Alessandra Comini, among others, who discuss women like Gabriele Münter, largely absent from discussions of mainstream art, or like Judith Leyster and Artemisia Gentileschi, who have had their work attributed to relatives or colleagues.

Garrard's essay, 'Artemisia and Susanna,' establishes beyond any reasonable doubt the authenticity of the Artemisia signature on the 1610 painting, *Susanna and the Elders* (Pommersfelden, Germany), which has often been attributed to her father, and does so by analysing the work with a feminist perspective. She carefully reviews the content and iconography of Artemisia's painting, then compares and contrasts it with works by men on the same theme. Artemisia's frightened and horrified Susanna, writes Garrard, lacks both the erotic and the 'voyeuristic' qualities so evident in other paintings of the same subject. Gentileschi herself is a 'resurrected' artist, well known during her own era but forgotten in the annals of history. Hugo Munsterberg (*A History of Women Artists*, 1975) explained that although Gentileschi 'was the finest Caravaggesque painter in Italy and one of the greatest painters of her period,' she remained absent from the history books because critics 'had puritanical scruples about her life' (pp. 25-26). He also described the artist as having 'peculiarly male characteristics' and a 'basic hostility toward men' (p. 25). It is this narrowly subjective attitude that Garrard successfully confronts in her article and that Comini attacks in 'Gender or Genius? The Women Artists of German Expressionism.'

Focusing upon the historical preeminence awarded the male Expressionists, Comini compares the artistic careers of Munch and Köllwitz. Both artists were active before, during and after Expressionism. Both expressed suffering, dying and pain. Munch, however, writes Comini, 'grieved for himself,' while Köllwitz 'grieved for humanity' (p. 274). Munch was preoccupied with a personal battle between the sexes. Köllwitz's preoccupation, on the other hand, was a universal concern: the senseless destruction wrought upon humanity by armed conflict. Should we not then, considering the scope, importance and quality of her work, give Köllwitz equal billing with Munch as one of the 'Mothers' if not 'Fathers,' of Expressionism? And where do other precursors, like Paula Modersohn-Becker and Gabriele Münter, appear in the 'exclusionist, one-gender litany' (p. 281) of Expressionism?

Carol Duncan, in her provocative essay 'Virility and Domination in Early Twentieth-Century Vanguard Painting,' answers some of the questions posed by Comini. She writes that although the enlightened artists of the early twentieth century rejected the 'virgins and vampires of the 1890s' (p. 294), they upheld and portrayed the dichotomy man/culture versus woman/nature and, at the same time, panegyrized male sexuality. This 'vogue for virility' was among the major obstacles for women artists. Duncan lauds Modersohn-Becker's 1906 *Self-Portrait* (Basel, Kunstmuseum) as a successful rejection of the 'vogue for virility.' The artist presents herself to the viewer as a woman, not as a commodity. She puts 'herself back together as a fully conscious and fully sexual being' (p. 302).

This is not to say that only women suffered from exclusion or misunderstanding. In 'Degas's Misogyny,' Norma Broude writes that J.-K. Huysmans and Paul Valéry, both of whom were appalled by Degas' refusal to portray women as 'smooth and slippery' goddesses, branded Degas misogynist. Until recently their label stuck. Broude suggests that research which relies exclusively upon earlier art historians tells us 'far more about the art historians themselves – about their own social conditioning and sex-rôle expectations – than it does about either the artist or his subject' (p. 157). This article, perhaps more than any other in the book, could serve as a model for intellectual rigour and methodological sophistication and, while inspiring more revisionist work along these lines, should not be objectionable to the scholar far removed from feminism inquiry.

The objectivity of historians, or the lack thereof, is further questioned by Madlyn Miller Kahr in 'Delilah' when she looks at the eternal temptress who epitomizes deception and betrayal as she causes the fall of the heroic male. Kahr's psychological analysis of Rubens' *Samson Taken Prisoner*, 1609-10 (Art Institute of Chicago), which relates the 'nocturnal scene of sex and violence' (p. 133) to a child's fantasy of the parents' bedroom, may be too speculative an interpretation. However, the treatment of the theme in general adds to the art historical literature about the visual depiction of the rôles of women.

Another typological analysis, Carol Duncan's 'Happy Mothers and Other New Ideas in Eighteenth-Century French Art,' examines the social history of change in the family and indicates when and how art began defining woman's rôle as wife and mother. The influence of the philosopher Rousseau, who insisted that the natural lot of women was to be subject to the will of men, and the moralist Diderot, who reviled the libertine women of the *fête galante*, led to works such as Greuze's *The Beloved Mother*, 1765 (Paris, De Laborde Collection), or Prud'hon's *The Happy Mother*, ca. 1810 (London, Wallace Collection). By the nineteenth century, writes Nina Auerbach in her recent book on literary history, *Woman and the Demon: The Life of Victorian Myth* (Harvard, 1982), the 'fallen' woman, so frequently portrayed in art and literature, escapes the eighteenth-century scene of domestic bliss.

The 'fallen' women were those who had been tempted out of their dutiful rôles as 'happy mothers' or their virtuous rôles as beautiful virgins. Linda Nochlin's 'Lost and *Found*: Once More

the Fallen Woman,' while analysing the intent and content of Rosetti's unfinished painting, relates the work to the artist's own life and frustrations as well as to the attitudes and conventions of society at that time. Fortunately for scholars, Nochlin's pioneering work on this topic has been picked up and expanded upon by writers such as Nina Auerbach. As such themes are developed, as the literature grows, these new points of view and reassessments emerge. We enter one of those periods when the very ground of art history starts to sway and shift.

Further exploring socially-assigned rôles for women, Henry Kraus, in 'Eve and Mary: Conflicting Images of Medieval Women,' and Claire Richter Sherman, in 'Taking a Second Look: Observations on the Iconography of a French Queen, Jeanne de Bourbon (1338-1378),' look at the stereotyped images of virgin and whore as well as the neglect of woman's rôle during the Middle Ages. Kraus suggests that the 'softening' of the depiction of women which took place in the fourteenth century may have been in response to changes in women's social situations. Sherman suggests that the rôle of the French queen, although visually well-documented in the *Coronation Book of Charles v of France*, 1365, has been neglected because of Jeanne de Bourbon's assumed unimportance.

The fourteenth century also produced one of the most important women writers of the Middle Ages, Christine de Pisan, who, as Charles v's biographer, provides us with a great deal of insight into the life and rôle of Jeanne de Bourbon. Pisan's illustrated work, *The Book of the City of the Ladies*, 1405, was translated recently (1982) into English for the first time since 1521. This book as well as Pisan's other writings, in correspondence with articles such as Kraus's and Sherman's could begin an entirely new look at mediaeval women.

Tapestry and embroidery were also important in the Middle Ages but here we find yet another stumbling block faced by scholars wanting to study and research that area and by twentieth-century artists wanting to continue the tradition: the glorification of 'high art.' The concept of 'high art,' its origins and its problems, is explored by Svetlana Alpers in 'Art History and its Exclusions: The Example of Dutch Art.' She argues convincingly that the elevation of 'masculine' Italian art of the Grant Manner has relegated women to second place as well as diminished the stature of those artists who chose to paint gentle, loving and therefore 'feminine' art, for example Vermeer. She writes: 'It is not the gender of makers, but different modes of making that are at issue' (p. 198). Different modes of making must be extended to include those arts that have been traditionally assigned the adjective 'decorative.'

'Decorative' arts done by women are discussed by Norma Broude in 'Miriam Schapiro and "Femmage": Reflections on the Conflict Between Decoration and Abstraction in Twentieth-Century Art,' and by Patricia Mainardi in 'Quilts: The Great American Art.' Mainardi sums up the thrust of both articles when she quotes the catalogue for the Smithsonian exhibition *American Pieced Quilts*, 1972. The catalogue states unwittingly that nineteenth-century quilts 'mirror in startling ways contemporary painting trends' (p. 344). Mainardi points out that this statement turned 'the innovators into the followers and used quilts to legitimize contemporary formalist painting, while managing to dismiss these women as artists at the same time. It is a historic impossibility to "mirror" *forward* into time – when male artists are ahead of their time, they are called the avant-garde' (p. 344). Recently this play down of women's art has been seriously challenged on two fronts: in the realm of art historical research by Rozsika Parker's *The Subversive Stitch: Embroidery and the Making of the Feminine* (London, 1984), and in the realm of visual art by Judy Chicago's *The Birth Project* (New York, 1985).

The first two articles in *Feminism and Art History* move away from women's art to look back at the dawning of our civilization and at the rôle that women played in prehistoric societies as evidenced by the art. Nancy Luomala looks at woman's place and goddess worship in Egypt in 'Matrilineal Reinterpretation of Some Egyptian Sacred Cows.' Then a chapter from Vincent Scully's *The Earth, the Temple and the Gods: Greek Sacred Architecture*, 1962, suggests environmental siting of Minoan architecture in relation to Minoan worship of the Goddess.

Scully's and Luomala's references to the Great Goddess raise questions about prehistory that may never be resolved. Along with questions about the gender of the first artists, new queries are being voiced about prehistoric societies that worshipped a Great Goddess and how this belief affected the cultures. Contemporary art historians must start looking at those artists – called 'cultural feminists' by Lucy Lippard (*Get the Message*, New York, 1984, 88) – who are convinced of the existence of goddess worshipping cultures and, in addition, fully intend to continue these traditions. If we cannot know what happened 5000 years ago, we can know what new myths are being created. It is this area of 'new myth' that Estella Lauter grapples with in *Women as Mythmakers: Poetry and Visual Art by Twentieth-Century Women*.

Lauter's exploration of the realm of contemporary 'created' myth approaches two fields in two different ways. First, she examines poetry by Margaret Atwood, Anne Sexton and Diane Wakoski, and the visual art of Kathe Köllwitz, Remedios Varo and Léonor Fini. Second, moving from the particular to the general, she discusses works by a number of visual artists and poets in the United States in two consecutive chapters. The task is admirable. It is also difficult. She relies heavily upon Jungian analysis (although she does point out its inadequacy for the feminist mode), as well as upon writings by women, such as Mary Daly (*Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*, Boston, 1973), who have already discussed the psychological damage wrought upon femaleness by belief in an omniscient male deity.

In an attempt to correct such damage and swing the pendulum toward the feminine, emerging mythic statements declare a relationship with prehistory. These range from a rewriting or 're-vision' of patriarchal myths to the creation of an entirely new set of beliefs. For example, Margaret Atwood, in 'Circe/Mud Poems,' both recreates and revises Homeric legend from Circe's point of view. Circe does not turn men into swine; rather she possesses a magic which shows men their own natures. 'Men may find Circe seductive,' writes Lauter, 'but that is more a product of their own lust than of her intent to seduce' (p. 15). Circe emerges from the poem as the seer, as an independent but nuturing woman who both disapproves of and provides an alternative to the 'defeat of foes' type of quest common in patriarchal myth.

Lauter suggests that modern women are 'repeating an experience of collectivity' (p. 208) familiar from

FIGURE 3. Remedios Varo, *Born again (Nacer de nuevo)*, 1960 (Private collection, Mexico City). Lauter, p. 93.

prehistory, that artists such as Remedios Varo and Léonor Fini create images of female questors, counterparts to the male heroes of so many myths. In our society, however, the female must not only rearrange this quest myth, but must also undertake her journey without the social sanction awarded to the male questor. Even more basic, the woman's quest is not a conquest but a search through nature for a merging and a oneness, a seeking to find herself in the natural world. Varo's *Born Again*, 1960 (Fig. 3), shows a naked female merging/emerging from the vaginal imagery of a torn wall as she discovers the grail and the moon. Léonor Fini's *The Oval Lady*, 1959, symbolizes rebirth by human pregnancy. Fini creates a new myth (or recreates an old one) by identifying herself with the female deity. For example, in *The Ideal Life*, 1950, she is Bast, the Egyptian cat goddess; in *Héliodora*, 1964, she is a new created goddess.

The controversial, indefinite and speculative quality of looking at these created myths as 'repeated experience' and 'collective re-visioning,' however, might be eliminated by utilizing Lucy Lippard's approach, the 'overlay.' Lippard's book of that title, *Overlay: Contemporary Art and the Art of Prehistory* (New York, 1983), explores the complimentary characteristics and relationships between prehistoric art and contemporary works rather than entering the Jungian world of collective myth.

The second part of the book, with this theme of female deity and its relevance to women, moves from a discussion of specific artists to an examination of the work of many artists, as Lauter continues her search for 'evidence of a collective project' (p. 131). Although Lauter successfully discusses individual artists and the evident mythic qualities of their work, the task becomes much more difficult when she sets out to examine the birth and development of collective myth. If, as Lauter suggests, women creating myth have to 'overcome the restrictions on being we have built into our symbolic code' (p. 212), then perhaps ritual performance or performance art more appropriately accomplishes this than the traditional high art forms Lauter chooses to write on most often. We find some of the most emphatic feminist statements in performance art. Lauter mentions Mary Beth Edelson's ritual performances but leaves out three important works that strongly support the author's thesis: *See for Yourself*, 1977, *Your 5000 Years are Up!* 1977, and *Goddess Head/Calling Series*, 1975. She makes passing reference to Michelle Stuart's archaeological works (photographs) and to Ana Mendieta's earthworks/photographs, choosing to concentrate instead upon the traditionally male dominated high art forms, painting and sculpture. An added advantage to the inclusion of mythic qualities inherent in many women's performance pieces or environmental works lies with the primary material available to the researcher. Because the artist usually adds written statements to her visual work, we are informed of the intent and content of the work without relying upon secondary sources or resorting to interpretive speculation. This becomes particularly important when discussing controversial theses.

Choice of sources or use of terms aside, women artists are in fact, as Lauter suggests, creating 'new myth,' and the area requires research, exploration and exposition. Lauter's book provides a beginning for questions about the motivation of certain feminist works, just as *Feminism and Art History* provides us with frameworks for seeking new answers about visual history. Despite all difficulties, we require new approaches, new methodologies and new ways of seeing as women obtain equal status in history and myth.

JANICE HELLAND
University of Victoria