

**27, 2 (2016) – Gärten (*Gardens*)**

**Hg. von Gunda Barth-Scalmani und Gisela Mettele**  
*Edited by Gunda Barth-Scalmani and Gisela Mettele*

182 Seiten/pages, ISBN: 978-3-8471-0600-5, ISSN: 1016-362X

### **Abstracts**

#### **Anna Oleńska, Creating their own domains. Polish female aristocrats and gardening during the eighteenth century**

The text examines the meaning of gardens for Polish enlightened female aristocrats at the turn of the eighteenth century, in relation to their personality and against a socio-historical background. Noblewomen such as Izabela Czartoryska and Helena Radziwiłł considered gardens as their own domains; due to their activities the landscape garden became part of the emerging aristocratic culture. In search of the individual character of these gardens the text analyses the combination of various decisive factors: specific property rights granted to noblewomen, the national ideal of a country life and the exchange of ideas with like-minded European intellectuals, in which aristocratic women participated. Their gardens had open or hidden agendas, which initially alluded to literary, philosophic or freemasonic topics; by the end of the century they focused on patriotic clues expressing devotion to national traditions. This became all the more important after the partition of the Polish-Lithuania Commonwealth in 1795. In so doing, women actively contributed to the reinvention of national culture at a time of lack of statehood.

#### **Karin Seeber, “Clever Women”: Cultural historian Marie Luise Gothein’s (1863–1931) personal emancipation and her portrayal of women in garden art history**

Marie Luise Gothein is known as the author of the two-volume exhaustive book “A History of Garden Art” (first published in Germany in 1914, English translation in 1928). As she was born in 1863, she could not obtain a formal academic education, although she published books and articles all her life. The article seeks to describe two factors of Gothein’s academic success: education and imitation of male-dominated scientific discourses. In this, Gothein depended on her husband’s acceptance and support. The article sheds light on these aspects in the context of the women’s rights movement around 1900 and analyses Gothein’s shift from initial support to later opposition. In a second part the article will connect Gothein’s personal concept of emancipation with her portrayal of women in garden art history.

#### **Ulrike Krippner and Iris Meder, Modern gardens for modern women and men. Jewish Viennese women garden architects of the 1920s and 1930s**

In the 1920s and early 1930s, seven women designed private gardens in and around Vienna, published articles on modern garden design, enlarged the range of perennials in Austria and supported the horticultural training of women. Within the liberal Viennese bourgeoisie, they cultivated a private and professional network – among them artists and architects – which

helped them to gain professional independence in a male dominated field. Significantly, all these women were of Jewish origin and, thus, could not pursue their brief professional careers due to Nazi persecution and expulsion. Many contractors were Jewish as well; their gardens – per se fragile structures due to their natural material – were “aryanized” and endangered. Expulsion caused not only an immense loss to Austrian garden architecture; ultimately, the profession lost these women pioneers as important protagonists and role models for the post-World War II generation.

### **Elisabeth Meyer-Renschhausen, From the Commons to Urban Agriculture: smallest-scale farming and gardening as female economy**

Sixteen years after its inception, a lot of hype has developed around the term ‘urban gardening’. In order to underscore its importance for a subsistence economy, the author therefore prefers the term ‘urban agriculture’ (*Agrarkultur*). The thesis of the article is that community gardening is a social movement dominated by women that brings previously hidden housework back into public view. In older European societies, the house and garden of a homestead were women’s domains. The garden was part of the ‘household economy’. The significance of both female housework and the subsistence economy is often overlooked. The Stein and Hardenberg reforms of 1806–1813 promoted the suppression of peasants’ rights to use the commons: land, meadows, woods, lakes. One result was that widows lost their means of homesteading (subsistence farming) and poverty drove them into cities and towns. But a female-dominated subsistence economy would return. In the late nineteenth century, Max Weber described how farmhands’ wives managed an autonomous subsistence economy, which gave them some degree of independence. Interestingly, homesteading reappeared in the 1960s in the context of so-called ‘real socialism’ under the label of ‘individual household economy’ (*individuelle Hauswirtschaft*). The Imperial Allotment Garden Regulation of 1919 demanded the right to allotments for people in need. To this end, municipalities were entitled to seize land. During the Second World War, women throughout the country were forced to contribute to the nation’s supply of fresh vegetables from their home gardens, allotments and from newly set up ‘victory gardens’. Today, urban gardening helps voiceless immigrants and refugees to settle in their new surroundings and to feel at home in a foreign country. In times dominated by financial concerns, it is artists who are experimenting with a life of simple housework and gardening that focuses on the essentials of life.

### **Thilo Neidhöfer, Popularity and prestige. Margaret Mead and the boundaries of science**

Margaret Mead (1901–1978) was arguably the most prominent anthropologist of twentieth century US America (regardless of gender). She established herself between academia and the public. As a public intellectual, she was outspoken on many different issues from child rearing, sex roles and education to nutrition and social change, to name only a few. This article discusses how Mead was balancing her roles as a scientist and as a public intellectual. It explores her publication strategies, analyses her standing within the scientific community in the US, looks at an exemplary dispute with her friend and colleague Geoffrey Gorer, and, finally, examines her understanding of mass media and the public. I will argue that Mead knew how to skillfully handle the public, and, at the same time, had a sure feeling for the boundaries of science.