Women Patrons and Collectors

Women Patrons and Collectors

Edited by

Susan Bracken, Andrea M. Gáldy,
and Adriana Turpin

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Women Patrons and Collectors,
Edited by Susan Bracken, Andrea M. Gáldy, and Adriana Turpin

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3464-5, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3464-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS

Alnwick Archive	Archives of the Duke of Northumberland, Alnwick Castle
ASF	Archivio dello Stato di Firenze
British Library, Add. MSS	British Library Additional Manuscripts
BPA	Buckminster Park Archives
DG	*Depositaria Generale*, Parte Antica
FM	*Fabbriche Medicee*
GM	*Guardaroba Medicea*
HMC	Historic Manuscripts Commission
MNM	Budapest, Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum
NPG	National Portrait Gallery
NRA	National Register of Archives
ÖNB, *Hss.*	Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, *Handschriftensammlung*
ÖStA, HHStA*, FAE*	Wien, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Haus-Hof- und Staatsarchiv*, Familienarchiv Erdődy*
RCHM	Royal Commission on Historic Monuments
SNA, *ÚAE*	Bratislava, Slovenský národný archív, *Ústredný Archív rodu Erdődy*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We as the editors of this volume would like to thank first of all the contributors to our third volume of collected essays for their articles and for their collaboration during the editing process. Most of these essays are based on papers given at the *Women Collectors* conference held in London in July 2008. As always they have benefitted from the participation of the audience; thank you for your feedback and for returning to our seminars and conferences. Our particular thanks go to Professor Sheila ffolliott for her *Introduction* to this volume. Her expertise and ability to pull together connections between and beyond the contributors' essays made this an even better book.

The conference was held at the Institute of Historical Research, University of London, whose continued support means much more than giving a home to the regular Collecting & Display seminars in London and for hosting two of the summer conferences and the recent methodologies workshop (July 2011) so far. We owe thanks to IHR administrative staff who have supported our seminars and conferences in the most helpful manner. We are also deeply grateful to the Henry Moore Foundation for generously sponsoring this and the two previous summer conferences.

Our thanks go to Nick Hess and Irene Campolmi for their readiness to lend each an extra pair of eagle eyes and to Sara King who greatly helped with the formatting of the bibliography. John Hoenig's help with the Index of the previous and with supplying Figure 5 to the present volume is also much appreciated. Carolyn Murin kindly helped with creating the Index to the present volume.

Finally, we would like to thank Cambridge Scholars Publishing for their wonderful collaboration and continued support at a time when multi-authored art historical studies are very difficult to place.

FOREWORD

> Joan heard her out, checking a strong disposition to giggle. Her viewpoint was that of the Average Person, and the Average Person cannot see the importance of the scarab in the scheme of things. The opinion she formed of Mr. Peters was of an eccentric old gentleman making a great to-do about nothing at all. Losses had to have a concrete value before they could impress Joan. It was beyond her to grasp that Mr. Peters would sooner have lost a diamond necklace, if he had happened to possess one, than his Cheops of the Fourth Dynasty.
>
> It was not until Aline, having concluded her tale, added one more strand to it that she found herself treating the matter seriously.
>
> "Father says he would give a thousand pounds to anyone who would get it back for him."
>
> "What!"
>
> [...]
>
> "It isn't really very much for father, you know. He gave away a hundred thousand dollars a year to a University."
>
> "But for a grubby little scarab!"
>
> "You don't understand how father loves his scarabs. Since he retired from business, he has been simply wrapped up in them. You know collectors are like that. You read in the papers about men giving all sorts of money for funny things."
>
> —P.G. Wodehouse, *Something Fresh* (1915), republished by Mayflower: London, 1961, 49-50

Today's readership may think it rather unfair of Mr. Wodehouse to ascribe these purely mercenary attitudes to the heroine of his novel. Her lack of appreciation for (in her eyes) the rather eccentric collecting preferences of Mr. Peters is, however, not only shared by her friend Aline, the collector's own daughter, but also the result of a long period of considerable poverty which has taught her the necessity of sufficient income. Hence, she, even less than Aline, can understand the squandering of large sums on "funny things" like scarabs. Expenditure on diamond necklaces and fashion items such as suits and hats made in Paris constitutes a very different matter.

Only men are inclined to give "all sorts of money for funny things" —that is a well-known fact in the world of Joan and Aline. Collecting is, therefore, a pastime for men, such as Mr. Peters, the former owner of the Cheops scarab of the Fourth Dynasty. Women, to the contrary, are

practical, down-to-earth, and have neither the time nor the money to spare for building collections; certainly not for collections of "grubby" little things such as scarabs.

Although we may not share this view, collecting has traditionally been regarded as a hobby not all that attractive to women. There were, of course exceptions among the great collectors of the past, for example Isabella d'Este, who was a dedicated and successful collector. Her treasures and the settings in which they were displayed have long been the object of careful study. While she was hardly the only one, she seems to be among those best remembered, while a considerable number of other female collectors has been largely forgotten, despite the interest, substance, high quality and peculiar display of treasures.

Why should the collection of a female owner be less worthy of regard and study than that of a male equivalent? Has it to do with past role models for women, in particular for dynastic brides whose main task in life was to produce an "heir and a spare" and who were not supposed to be distracted from this important goal by intellectual pursuits? Or could it be the case that the close philosophical connection made since Classical Antiquity between princely rule and princely collecting had perhaps more to do with the ideological exclusion of women from the realms of high-end collecting?

As the present volume shows, women—particularly aristocratic women—have not only resisted this discrimination through the ages, they also built important collections and used them to their own advantage: whether to make a statement of lineage, power, cultural heritage or of their religious preferences. Not to forget that an increasing number of middle-class women became draughtswomen, painters and natural scientists and developed a professional interest in collecting. Through the ages, female collectors, whatever their rank in society, chose to collect and what to collect; they chose how and where to present the collection; they also decided if to preserve and when to dispose of objects, thereby taking on a curatorial role.

Women have nonetheless been seen as gatherers of furnishings, jewellery, dress and objects of domestic life. This volume challenges these perceptions by the detailed analysis of different types of collections amassed by women and thus seeks to give a voice to a group of important female collectors from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth century whose importance for the history of collecting has not yet, or not sufficiently, been acknowledged. Not only are the authors of each essay trying to establish the composition of the respective collection but also to present the relevant forms of display and the raison d'être and significance of the objects and

their context.

Collecting & Display are the keywords in the name of the working group founded by three scholars in 2004 (www.collectinganddisplay.com). The group has been running a research seminar at the Institute of Historical Research at the University of London since 2005 and in Florence since 2008. Collecting & Display has organised summer conferences in London, Ottobeuren and Florence since 2006. We would like to present, with this book, the third volume of proceedings of these conferences and hope that it will be followed by many more tomes dedicated to different aspects of collecting and display. At the time of writing, the papers of our fourth conference, held in June 2009 and entitled *Collecting East & West*, are being prepared for publication.

London and Florence, July 2011

INTRODUCTION

SHEILA FFOLLIOTT

Francis Haskell's authoritative *Patrons and Painters* (1963, 1980), the first compendium of work on the topic of early modern patrons, set the standard for this line of inquiry.[1] Haskell surveyed the Italian élite—the affluent and the powerful—and what he saw as their proper quarry. In his related *Rediscoveries* (1976), he complicated the issue, investigating changes in taste together with the constant desire to establish universal aesthetic values.[2] Considerable research on women patrons and, to a lesser extent, collectors, has emerged since the appearance of Haskell's books and we now know that many sixteenth- to eighteenth-century women commissioned and collected artworks.[3] Exhibitions have featured the collections of Empress Josephine; Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia; governors of the Netherlands Margaret of Austria and Mary of Hungary; Catherine of Austria, queen of Portugal; Isabella d'Este; Christina of Sweden; Caroline Louise of Hesse Darmstadt, margravine of Baden-Durlach; Juliette Récamier; and the duchesse de Berri, among others: a very small number compared to the great quantity on male collectors.[4] It is still worth remembering, therefore, that few women appeared in Haskell's narratives and some of his assumptions about patronage and collecting persist. Perhaps two assessments of a sixteenth-century woman patron and collector, Catherine de' Medici, will indicate why.

> Catherine's patronage was by no means outstanding. (Knecht 1998).[5]

and

[1] Haskell 1963, 1980.
[2] Haskell 1976.
[3] Collections of essays include: Anderson 1996; Lawrence 1997; Johnson and Matthews-Grieco 1997; King 1998; Matthews-Grieco and Zarri 2000; Reiss and Wilkins 2001; Hills 2003; Wilson-Chevalier 2007 and Strunck 2011.
[4] Di Gioia 2003; Duerloo 1998; Eichberger 2002; Ferino Pagden 1996; Vergara and Cabrera 1999; Jordan Gschwend and Beltz 2010; Lauts 1983; Pougetoux 2005; Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana 1989; Réthelyi and Basics 2005; Zvereva 2002; Paccoud and Ramond 2009; Kiefer 2005.
[5] Knecht 1998, 244.

> Catherine de' Médicis (1519-1589) fut sans doute le plus important mécène français de la seconde moitié du XVI[e] siècle. (Turbide, 2007).[6]

Such opposing views are typical of historians writing about this controversial queen of France during the period of the religious wars, but they also demonstrate differences in attitude about patronage. Knecht drew from Haskell's model in which choice of artist and genre determines a patron's merit. Rose Marie San Juan's work on Isabella d'Este made an important contribution in helping to define an appropriate context for Renaissance women collectors.[7] Turbide's assessment, similarly, more fully considers the larger milieu in which Catherine operated. She notes, moreover, that we no longer realise the extent of Catherine's vast collecting and patronage: her sumptuous and sophisticated court fêtes were ephemeral, her buildings have been altered or destroyed, and her varied collection dispersed. To notice the range of women's involvement, as contributors to this anthology have done, one must question some traditional assumptions about where and what to look for in patronage and collecting, seek alternative explanations, and consider legal, societal, and circumstantial constraints on women's behaviour.

The essays in this volume treat women patrons and collectors from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries. Some chapters introduce figures like the Hungarian noblewoman, Erzsébet Rákóczi, to English-speaking audiences, while others bring up unfamiliar aspects of better known patrons like Eleonora of Toledo. In this introduction, I shall try to identify some collecting patterns among women and provide context for understanding their actions, referring to the individuals under discussion here, as well as to other collectors. I shall also try to point out some issues bearing on how collecting is interpreted that have helped to marginalise women's contributions. But it is important to acknowledge that, in most respects, patrons and collectors exhibit shared behaviours regardless of gender. Salvation was everyone's concern and in Catholic Europe patronage of religious institutions and art and architecture was one way to help both men and women achieve it. Piety was a virtue seen as appropriately female; thus women with means could openly practice charity in the form of religious patronage. Although not the focus of these essays, many of the women discussed here, e.g. Duchess Eleonora and Countess Erzsébet, operating within a Catholic sphere, engaged in visible charitable patronage, as did Marie Caroline, duchesse de Berri, on her tours around France in the 1820s. In addition, Rákóczi, like other royal

[6] Turbide 2007, 511.
[7] San Juan 1991, 67-78.

and aristocratic women across Europe, supervised the construction of her husband's tomb. But religion is never entirely absent, for Protestant women commissioned religious paintings for display in private—possibly indicating Catholic leanings, as Christopher Rowell suggests here for Elizabeth Murray, countess of Dysart and duchess of Lauderdale, in England and Scotland. Heike Zech recounts the history of a jewelled cross that Otto von Wittelsbach gave his Protestant mother, Queen Marie of Bavaria (1825-89), at the time of his Catholic confirmation, which she, in turn, gave a lady in waiting at the time of the latter's and her own conversion to Catholicism.

With the exception of holy relics, which some women collectors avidly sought, collecting *per se* is neither a charitable nor a pious act. So what is (or was) collecting, precisely, and what other terms made collecting possible and acceptable, but also left it relatively unheralded, for women? Charlotte Gere and Marina Vaizey proposed the following definition: "collecting (as opposed to accumulating) must significantly alter the repute of the objects collected, not only by adding to knowledge and expanding appreciation, but perhaps even more by conferring status"[8] For the Renaissance and Baroque eras, however, accumulation in itself was not necessarily a bad idea. Witness the extensive inventories of Henry VIII, Charles V, or the Medici documents to get a sense of the sheer quantities deemed necessary for prestige.[9] Drawing from Aristotle's theory of Magnificence, patronage and collecting, practised properly, was, in fact, a virtue; necessitating spending to create splendour, tempered with sufficient judgment so the results appeared neither vulgarly ostentatious nor overly mean.

Such a view moderated in the Enlightenment, "forceful reasoning" replacing simple dazzling as Paula Rea Radisch noted.[10] But other forces were also at work that complicated the perception of collecting. A nineteenth-century observer, Anna Jameson, characterised various well-known collectors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as follows: "What had been *taste* in Arundel, *magnificence* in Buckingham, *science* in Lely, became in the next century a *fashion*, subject to the freaks of vanity, the errors and absurdities of ignorance, the impositions of pretension and coxcombery."[11] Contemporaries like John Ruskin did not respect her

[8] Gere and Vaizey 1999, 10.
[9] Starkey 1998; Hayward 2004; Checa 2010; The Medici Archive Project (www.medici.org).
[10] Radisch 2003, 48.
[11] Jameson 1844, 69.

judgment, declaring that she "knows as much about art as the cat."[12] Nevertheless, she hit the nail on the head with this remark, for by the eighteenth century, because more people, including women, had access to the market, collecting had become fashionable. Writing at the end of that century, Lady Mary Berry made the connection clear, dismissing one of London's art display venues as unlikely to be a major player, being inconvenient to female and male viewers alike as it was near neither the "great haberdashers" nor "Bond Street or St. James's" for the men.[13]

Any would-be collector needs money, position, and access in order to pursue the various goals of collecting: building and decorating spaces, gaining prestige—through the acquisition and display of what the individual collector or peer group desired, or pursuing scientific interests. Are women's motivations essentially different from men's or, rather, is it commentators who have cast those activities in different lights? There is certainly nothing conventionally feminine in Queen Christina's urging Swedish troops in 1648 to raid Prague Castle for its art, as did some of her male counterparts, notably Napoleon. Although most well-known collectors are male, there is nothing essentially masculine about collecting. In fact, Sir Thomas Roe, English ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, wrote to Henry Howard, Lord Arundel in 1621: he waxed lyrical about the interesting things he was finding in Constantinople, but at the same time expressed fears that collecting might be thought effeminate.[14] Such qualms persisted into the early eighteenth century, in the context of women's increasing participation in purchasing art. Women had, in fact, been buying at estate sales in sixteenth-century Spain and they regularly attended auctions in seventeenth and eighteenth-century London.[15] Purveyors there, such as Edward Millington, advertised "galleries set apart for ladies and gentlewomen."[16] Such public auctions served also as sites for art education for middle class women who lacked access to private collections but were desirous, nevertheless, of observing what was being bought in order to acquire sophistication.[17]

As a result, Lord Shaftesbury proposed, in effect, an important distinction: that connoisseurship, entailing judgement and knowledge

[12] Haskell 1976, 106. Haskell himself disparaged Mrs. Jameson, introducing her as a "one-time governess and jilted wife … no connoisseur;" but does acknowledge her contributions to iconographical studies.
[13] Ibid., 25.
[14] Peck 2005, 183.
[15] Álvarez 2008, 35.
[16] Cowan 1998, 160.
[17] Ibid.

(Mrs. Jameson's "*taste*" and "*science*"), required "real men" as opposed to simply acquiring paintings for domestic interiors, which involved feminine taste and reflected the luxury market generally.[18] Here we see something typical of gendered discourse: brain activity is aptly male while the more vulgar pursuits pertain to women. In addition to de-emphasising market forces, stressing individual choice and connoisseurship seeks also to remove collecting from the full spectrum of patronage practices informing early modern society. Many objects, moreover, circulated as part of gift exchange. As such, they are not a collector's choice (unless a specific gift was solicited), but nevertheless, many presents remain treasured components of collections, adding to the complexity of analysis.

Research on consumption by historians like Richard Goldthwaite and John Brewer, among others, has made a significant impact on collecting studies.[19] Many scholars of patronage and collecting now orient their work to the inevitability of the market.[20] Welch reminds us, however, that, "court expenditure is still presented as élite and individual, rather than as market-led or market-driven. But the division of purchase and patronage was often a matter of degree."[21] An uneasy tension remains, nevertheless, between views of élite art collecting and consumerism: in Marcia Pointon's words, it remains a "contradiction, and competition—between displayed artefacts and known but repeatedly disavowed discourses of money."[22] The additional role of artworks as fungible assets, often included in dowries, will be discussed below.

"But is it Art?"[23] Distinctions like Shaftesbury's further disparaged women collectors by relegating their activity to the domestic sphere: what Gere and Vaizey called "a by-product of homemaking in the form of furnishing and decorating."[24] Collections of paintings now have the greatest cachet and women like Christina of Sweden and Catherine the Great, but also less famous ones like Barbara Sanseverino Sanvitale (1550-1612), Cristiana Duglioli Angelelli (1614-1669), and the countess of Verrue (1670-1736) formed impressive paintings collections on a par with their male counterparts.[25] Paintings, however, were not always the

[18] Peck 2005, 185.
[19] Goldthwaite 1993; Brewer and Porter 1993; Brewer and Trentmann 2006.
[20] North and Ormrod 1998; Welch 2002, 2005; Fantoni,, Matthews-Grieco, and Matthews 2003; Cavazzini 2008; Spear and Sohm 2010.
[21] Welch 2002, 306.
[22] Pointon 1998, 202.
[23] See Kipling's poem "The Conundrum of the Workshops" (1890).
[24] Gere and Vaizey 1999, 11.
[25] For Angelelli, see Curti 2007; for Verrue see Oresko 1996, XXXII, 368; she

most prized objects for collectors of either sex who may have preferred the prestige and monetary value of sculpture, whether ancient or contemporary and of luxury fabrics or tapestries. In fact, in the early modern era, notably Elizabeth Percy, duchess of Northumberland, and Catherine Questiers in this volume, plus many collectors (e.g. Pope Paul II, Lorenzo de' Medici, Isabella d'Este, and Peter Paul Rubens *inter alia*) valued small objects made of precious materials, like cameos, engraved gems, and medals. These small objects were often stored in cabinets, which could be viewed by a select company in a small, therefore exclusive, space.

Women's supposedly natural affinity for the domestic sphere was sufficient to "explain" why, when presented with the opportunity to collect, they chose porcelain, metalwork, furniture, embroidery, dress, jewellery, fans: what are now lumped into the category "decorative arts," often placed lower than painting in hierarchies of aesthetic value. Joy Kearney relates how Mary Stuart, wife of William III of Holland, collected blue and white Delftware and, with the aid of the Dutch East India Company, imported a variety of Asian ceramics. When she and her husband William ascended the English throne in the late seventeenth century, she brought this taste to England, seen most notably in Kensington Palace and Hampton Court. In the nineteenth century Lady Charlotte Schreiber gained real expertise in ceramics and formed an important china collection.[26] Many women collectors focused on gems, which combined the intrinsic worth of materials, an early modern priority, and craftsmanship. Electress Anna Maria Luisa de' Medici's main collecting focus was jewellery: she formed one of the richest collections in the eighteenth century (now Florence, Pitti). But to limit such interests to women is fallacious, as men such as August the Strong also eagerly collected decorative arts.

Collectors can confer status on their objects if they are deemed to be trend setting, to return to what Gere and Vaizey state are criteria for differentiating a collection from simple accumulation. In this volume, Christopher Rowell characterises Elizabeth Murray's employment of the painter Verrio as avant-garde and Philip Mansel uses the same term to describe the duchesse de Berri's patronage. But there were many other innovative collectors including two sixteenth-century Habsburg women, Margaret of Austria, governor of the Netherlands, and her niece Catherine, queen of Portugal, among the first to amass exotica newly coming into

owned van Dyck's *Le Roi à la Chasse* (*c.* 1635; Paris, Louvre) and Claude Lorrain's *Landscape with Aeneas at Delos* (1672; London, National Gallery).

[26] Herrmann 1972, 330. She referred to it as her "china mania".

Europe.[27] The former eagerly sought objects from Habsburg possessions in America and the latter was the greatest collector of Asian objects in her century. As Anne Marie Jordan has amply demonstrated, her collection included ivory caskets made in Sri Lanka, prized by many collectors, and she was an innovator in importing Asian fans, the envy at courts in the Iberian Peninsula and beyond.[28] In this volume, we learn about Agnes Block in Holland who used her connections with the Dutch East India Company to procure botanical specimens and then hired artists to depict them. Other women also maintained an avid interest in botany and plant collecting.[29] Elizabeth Percy set up her own museum incorporating objects of all sorts and wrote a catalogue divided into volumes by classification. As Adriano Aymonino informs us, her *artificialia* consisted of pictures, prints, medals and coins; ethnographic materials, primarily utensils; then "everything carved or sculpted"; then a hodgepodge of items not easily subsumed into other categories; then her *naturalia*, fossils and stones, and finally books. Coincidentally, it was James Smithson, her husband's illegitimate son, who left money to found the great American research institution that bears his name. In the nineteenth century, the duchesse de Berri maintained a menagerie and garden with exotic plants at her château of Rosny.

Notwithstanding the concept of Magnificence, unlike their male counterparts, it seems as though women collectors are more often accused of greed: claims of extravagance were levelled at Madame du Pompadour and Empress Josephine, among many others.[30] In this volume, for example, Elizabeth Murray, duchess of Lauderdale, was said to have "a ravenous cormorant appetite in her to devour all," upon receipt of her husband's movables at his death. Such views persist when modern commentators find ways to insert jabs even while praising. Oliver Millar, as Rowell points out, describes Murray as "one of the most acute, politically minded and rapacious ladies of her day." Do modern scholars seem more willing to excuse males who spend and spend? Jonathan Brown said of the king of Spain: "Despite the parlous state of the royal treasury, depleted by almost four decades of war, Philip [IV] continued to buy whenever a good opportunity arose. The dedication of scarce funds for this purpose is quite remarkable when, as one observer noted, there was not enough ready money for food."[31] Words like passionate, flair, or

[27] Eichberger 2002, 2003 and Jordan, "Mujeres," 1999 and 2010.
[28] Jordan, "Exotic," 1999 and Jordan Gschwend, 2010.
[29] Gere and Vaizey 1999, 77.
[30] Ibid., 61.
[31] Brown 1995, 141.

magnificent, are ascribed to George IV's collecting, despite the effects of his extravagance on the national balance sheet. Those discussing collecting by and large excuse such behaviour and, in fact, just regard these kings as among the greatest collectors.

An interesting solution was proposed (and justified) for one male collector whose spending habits merited remark: "[Ramiro Núñez de Guzmán, Duke of] Medina [de las Torres] was a profligate spender … and supplied his needs by marrying a succession of rich women."[32] Marrying heiresses is, of course, a practice of long-standing for families needing infusions of cash, but more than one collector found it useful. Archduke Ferdinand of the Tyrol's marriage in 1557 to the wealthy commoner Philippine Welser added sufficiently to his coffers to enable him to assemble his extensive collections at Schloss Ambras, near Innsbruck. Thomas Howard, earl of Arundel, only started collecting after his marriage in 1606 to Aletheia Talbot, daughter of the wealthy earl of Shrewsbury.[33] But it worked both ways, for Aletheia's grandmother, Bess of Hardwick, had amplified Shrewsbury's fortune through a series of marriages (and widowhoods), which permitted her to build, commission, and collect.[34] And, like her fellow noblewomen, Elizabeth Murray and Elizabeth Percy, Aletheia was herself a collector, in tandem with and independently of her husband.

Another means of denigrating women's collecting is to assert that it is motivated by sentiment; the objects acquired for personal meaning and not for some abstract and intellectually based higher purpose (whatever that might be). In this volume, Zech investigates princely mothers in seventeenth to nineteenth-century Bavaria. Acknowledging that mothers do collect items relating to their children, she seeks to find what artworks and precious objects might fit into such a category without belittling its implications. Catherine de' Medici's collecting of portraits of her offspring has been dismissed as comparable to what a more modern mother or grandmother might do in assembling a photo album.[35] While I do not wish to deny her motivation in wanting depictions of her family, who, like most royal children, lived in a separate household at some distance, at the same time, it must be noted that in collecting these materials, she was a trend-setter, cultivating a new appreciation for the type of pencil drawing produced by François Clouet and others, generally held in reserve by the artist to use in making painted portraits which were

[32] Ibid., 134.
[33] Ibid., 17.
[34] Howarth 1998.
[35] Knecht 1998, 244.

often ordered in multiples. Catherine herself kept and treasured portfolios of these drawings, not just those of her children, but of relatives and courtiers, dead and alive, and she pored over them, sharing them with her ladies.[36] She was not alone: we learn here that Elizabeth Murray also collected pencil portraits of family members. Portraits typically decorate public spaces in palaces, but looking at them in a smaller domestic environment provides more intimate memory experiences, perhaps more genuinely a concern for élite women than men.

Married women moved to their husband's house, sometimes as early as their mid to late teens, and some royal women never saw birth family members again. Portraits reminded them of those left behind. Fifteenth-century Ippolita Sforza, the bride of Alfonso II of Naples, wrote to her mother in Milan about what she wanted for her *studiolo*:

> I pray your Illustrious Highness . . . to have made for me portraits from life of His Excellency my father and of Yourself, and of all my Illustrious brothers and sisters, for beyond the adornment of my studio, looking on them would give me continual consolation and pleasure.[37]

Most of the women treated in this anthology collected and displayed portraits, e.g. Elizabeth Murray in her Private Closet at Ham. Susan James has demonstrated how several other aristocratic Englishwomen collected paintings, primarily portraits: Lettice Knollys's rooms were well furnished with portraits, some of herself, as were those of Anne Parr, younger sister of Queen Catherine and second wife of the earl of Pembroke.[38] As Dagmar Eichberger and others have demonstrated, such women collected portraits—not just of their immediate families, but their enlarged kin network—and hung them in spaces under their control, such as their apartments, to enhance their status.[39] Margaret of Austria and Catherine de' Medici, for example, filled their living spaces with portraits of powerful relatives: ammunition in case a visiting ambassador had doubts about their authority. In this collection, Zech discusses a print depicting the Electress Kunigunde Therese (1676-1730) in which family portraits hang on walls around her in an imagined *studiolo*, creating a family unit that did not reflect the reality of a mother living on her own in exile. Zech also describes nineteenth-century Queen Caroline of Bavaria's disseminating portraits of her children on factory-produced porcelain. So

[36] Zvereva 2002, 2007, 2011.
[37] Thornton 1997, 90.
[38] James 2009, 55.
[39] Eichberger 1996, 259-79; Eichberger and Beaven 1995, 225-48.

many manifestations demonstrate how the larger family is stronger than the individual.

Portraits are the common denominator of aristocratic and royal collecting. In public spaces, they define family lines and kinship ties. The dynasty may bear his name, but it is also hers. Several women patrons, in fact, saw the benefits of demonstrating the expansion of dynastic connections through the female line. The decoration of Catherine de' Medici's Parisian hôtel, and her small book of hours, contained portraits of her children of both sexes and the families into which they married, and the decoration of the Innsbruck Hofburg, supervised by Empress Maria Theresa, similarly included the dynasties into which her daughters married. Dynastic continuity makes the state stable, whence the anxiety to produce an heir. Mansel sees "an obsession with family life" in the collection of another princely mother, the duchesse de Berri in the nineteenth century. Her paintings collection featured many domestic subjects, including depictions of mothers with children, not only portraits of herself with her own children. Inventories indicate that some were by women painters, including Marguerite Gérard and Jeanne Marie Catherine Desmarquest, known as Madame Auzou. The latter's work (untraced?) depicts a woman surrounded by her healthy family watching Louis XVIII return to Paris. Mansel points out how this domestic theme has much greater implications: what it takes to keep a family healthy is a healthy nation, and vice versa. In this case, as the duchesse's son was in line for the restored throne and she, like other mothers of heirs presumptive before her, e.g. Louise de Savoie, mother of the future François I, wanted to present him (and herself) in the best possible light.

Another problem in determining women's roles in collecting is that narratives tend to present males as the sole protagonists, even when they act with the dynasty in mind. If their female relatives played a part, their activity is often submerged.[40] Women with a paper trail might more openly acknowledge their familial role. Returning to the domestic sphere, early modern behavioural treatises advocated a custodial responsibility for élite women regarding family property.[41] This normally meant the property of the patriline, for the patrician residence and its contents embodied family identity. Significantly, most women neither selected nor owned the majority of objects in their care and with which they spent most of their time. We know from inventories that in the early fifteenth century,

[40] Southron 1988, passim. This book, like similar compendia, contains information on women collectors, but one must hunt for it as the sections are organised by the men in the family.
[41] Alberti 1969, 202.

for example, when she married Gianfrancesco Gonzaga, marquis of Mantua, Paola Malatesta received "217 pieces from the … storerooms for her own use: metalwork, jewellery, books of hours, but [these] remained inalienable Gonzaga possessions."[42] While the collectors treated in this volume are exceptional in their ability to collect, when compared to women in general, documents also suggest that a range of women possessed some property, including pictures, which they could bequeath.[43]

Occasionally women used their custodial role assertively to preserve family honour and memory through attention to material vestiges even when they may not have assembled the collection themselves.[44] This impetus is the main thrust of Orsolya Bubryák's essay on Erzsébet Rákóczi. Zech demonstrates how in the nineteenth century, Queen Marie of Bavaria acted as a sort of family curator, labelling objects to preserve their context for future generations. Even in the early twentieth century the idea persisted, the countess of Radnor having stated in the preface to a catalogue that "it has been the privilege of … (the present writer) to arrange and classify the family Collection of Pictures," meaning those of the family into which she had married.[45] Significantly, one of the greatest acts of female guardianship was the feat of Electress Palatine Anna Maria Luisa de' Medici, last of her line. With the Family Pact of 1737, she ensured that her birth family patrimony remained in her native Florence and did not transfer to her husband's family or her nearest male kin, either of which eventuality would have removed many treasures far away from Florence.[46]

Although the women themselves may not have been active collectors, it must be noted that many artworks entered their husband's family collections via dowries or when their brides were their parents' sole heir. Part of Claudia de' Medici's dowry, when she wed Habsburg archduke, Leopold V in 1626, was an Antonio Rossellino *Madonna* (Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum).[47] Among the better known works that Olimpia Aldobrandini brought, upon her marriage to Camillo Pamphili in 1647, were some of the contents of Alfonso d'Este's Alabaster Chamber [e.g. Bellini's *Feast of the Gods* (Washington: National Gallery of Art) and Titian's *Bacchus and Ariadne* (London: National Gallery)]; also Raphael's *Aldobrandini Madonna* (London: National Gallery), and Annibale Carracci's, *Coronation of the*

[42] Welch 2002, 308.
[43] Weatherill 1986, 150.
[44] ffolliott 2007, 32.
[45] Herrmann 1972, 122; Chaplin 1910.
[46] Ciletti 1984, 23-7.
[47] Holst 1967, 161.

Virgin (New York: Metropolitan Museum).[48] Similarly Vittoria della Rovere's inheritance included paintings from her family's collection that transferred to the Medici with her wedding to Ferdinando II: works like Piero della Francesca's *Portraits of the Duke and Duchess of Urbino* and Titian's *Venus of Urbino* now appear at the Uffizi rather than in Urbino. Once in Florence, Vittoria pursued her own patronage and collecting interests.[49] In France, similarly, Louis XIV's brother, Philippe, duc d'Orléans received paintings collected by his first wife, Henriette-Anne, daughter of Charles I.[50] Further paintings formed part of the inheritance of his second wife, Elisabeth-Charlotte von der Pfalz at the death of her brother, the elector palatine, in 1685. A mortified Lieselotte had to watch her brother-in-law's troops invade the Palatinate so that her husband could pursue her inheritance in her name. Catalina Méndez de Haro y Guzmán's marriage to the tenth duke of Alba in 1688 brought paintings that now bear his name, including the National Gallery in Washington's prime Raphael, the *Alba Madonna*.[51]

It is not always clear what, if any, affinity these women had for the objects that transferred with them, but it is evident that many carried on with their fathers' collecting priorities. In this book, we learn that Eleonora of Toledo's love of luxury textiles came from her father's similar penchant, that Elizabeth Murray's father had been a collector in the circle of King Charles I, that Erzsébet Rákóczi dedicated herself to carrying on her father's metalwork collection, while Elizabeth Percy built on her father's numismatic collection and that, in Holland, Maria de Wilde (1682-1729) both recorded the appearance of her father's *Kunstkammer* in drawings and added items to his collection. At the same time in Rome, Maria Camilla Pallavicini, princess of Gallicano and wife of Giovanni Battista Rospigliosi, was an active collector of contemporary works, e.g. Lanfranco and Luca Giordano, adding to the Rubens works left her by her father and resulting eventually in the extensive group of works in the Galleria Pallavicini in Rome.[52] Other paintings entered this collection through additional marriages: Maria Camilla's son married Giustina Borromeo, whose family had given her paintings and at the end of the eighteenth century a Colonna bride's dowry further enriched the collection.

Some women worked closely with male relatives to form collections. Aletheia Talbot, informed her husband about available works while she

[48] Rossi 1996, I, 594 [and in Grove Art Online] on Olimpia Aldobrandini.
[49] Straussman-Pflanzer, 2010.
[50] Brown, 1995, 225.
[51] Pita Andrade 1965, 274.
[52] Zeri 1959, 11-9.