Lasting from the late sixteenth century to the mid-seventeenth century, the Dutch Golden Age was a remarkable flowering of industry, trade, and wealth. From its monopoly on trade with Japan to its climate of tolerance for thinkers and scientists, the newly founded Dutch Republic flourished. As a result of the ensuing exponential increase in commercial capital, cultural capital grew as well via the production of art. This explosion in art is best known through the celebrated Dutch artists of the time like Rembrandt, Hals, and Vermeer, but just as important was the rise of the anonymous art market, with art catering to a much broader swathe of society than ever before.¹

However, this increase in wealth was by no means evenly spread across all sectors of society. The poorer groups of society continued to struggle to survive, working hand-to-mouth or depending on charity.² These groups might have felt the trickled-down effects of the Golden Age in the form of increased alms, an obligation of the rich, and slightly higher wages, but they certainly never enjoyed the privilege of being art owners. Moreover, the Dutch Golden Age was characterized by urbanization in the western provinces. Cities dominated economic, political, and cultural life; therefore, residents of cities were generally richer than residents of the countryside and also owned more pieces of artwork.³ Still, not all members of urban society were able to own artwork.

¹ The art market is called anonymous because artists created works for a general audience instead of tailoring them for an individual. Artists also often were anonymous, meaning that buyers bought a piece based on their attraction to the work itself as opposed to the fame of the artist.
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According to Jan de Vries and Ad van der Woude, there were five levels of Dutch urban society, defined by degrees of economic stability. The lower three levels, known as the *schamele gemeente*, literally “poor community,” accounted for roughly half of the urban population. Members of this sector struggled for basic survival and were thus unlikely to participate in the art market in any significant way. Meanwhile, the very highest social level, made up of the few individuals who held actual political power, would commission works rather than buy anonymous pieces produced for the market. It was therefore for the second level, the *burgerif* or burghers, the single largest group in urban society, that these anonymous artists who produced for the art market painted. The burgher class (is class the right word?) was by no means monolithic, with great diversity in wealth and status. Therefore, the market value of art pieces painted for them also varied, allowing non-burghers with incomes comparable to the *smalle burgerij* to buy art.

The comparison of city to country life and the differences in urban versus city interests are of critical importance in understanding the content and conventions of Dutch painting, in particular the reasons that artists frequently depicted certain items while ignoring others. Specifically, this paper will examine why artists in the western half of the Dutch Republic made the choices they did in paintings of fishing, livestock husbandry, horticulture, and marketplaces and bakeries. The first three subjects are discussed here because they were industries that were closely connected to the creation of Dutch economic dominance and prosperity during its Golden Age. Marketplaces are then discussed not only because they represented the ascendancy of the burgher class, but also they provided

---

4 The *het grauw* (vagabonds, beggars, paupers, and other transients) were at the very bottom. Market sellers, peddlers, and hawkers fared slightly better. Domestic servants, sailors, soldiers, and unskilled/low-skills wage earners were at the top of the poorer half of society because they had relatively more stable incomes. However, because the boundaries between these three groups were so thin—a servant might be fired during a bad trade year and become homeless—they will be alternatively referred to as “the urban poor” or “the common masses” in this paper. (De Vries and Der Woude, 561-562).

5 The *smalle burgerij* (burghers of slim means) included self-employed craftsmen, shopkeepers, government employees like clerks and supervisors as well as small businesses like shoemakers and smiths—all of whom made around 500 to 600 guilders annually. The broader middle swath of burghers was retailers, bakers, and more successful counterparts of *small burgerij* shopkeepers who made around 600 to 1,000 guilders annually. The *grote burgerij*, mainly merchants and high government officials, made over 1,000 guilders annually. (De Vries and Der Woude, 563-564).

6 The price of a painting could be based on its subject, its size, the fame of the artist, and/or the amount of time taken to complete it (conveyed through the level of fine details in the piece and its similarity to other pieces completed by the same artist) (Der Woude, 303-308).

7 In this paper’s discussion of urban versus rural interests, urban interests should be understood as synonymous with the interests of burghers.

8 The scope of this paper will be limited to the western half of the Dutch Republic, with an emphasis on Holland, because of a lack of sources regarding a functioning art market in the eastern provinces of Groningen, Drenthe, Overijssel, and inner Gelderland.
spaces where urban and rural lives interacted. Bakeries will be discussed in conjunction with marketplaces to contrast perceptions and portrayals of urban food-sellers versus rural food-sellers.

**Fisheries**

For centuries, residents of Friesland, Holland, and Zeeland who lived next to rivers, the Zuider Zee bay, and the North Sea, had depended on fishing for their livelihood. Advancements in technology enabled parts of this fishing industry to expand from domestic markets to international trade. The herring ship, called a buss, was also known as the “great fishery” because it was a factory unto itself, as herring were not simply caught but also processed (gutted and salted) on board. The herring trade generated wealth and established trade connections that were crucial foundations for later Dutch prosperity, as herring was one of the major goods exported to the Baltics.

This is not to suggest that inland or coastal fisheries were less important than the deep-sea herring fisheries. Only a small percentage of salted herring were directed at Dutch markets, and so other fisheries were required for local consumption. Located along rivers, the Zeeland Delta, and around the Zuider Zee, freshwater fisheries were an extremely important component of the domestic economy; the government of Friesland prohibited the export of freshwater fish, imposing heavy fines and forbidding the construction of ships that could transport fish out of the province. However, the trade-oriented prejudices of the Dutch Republic were evident in the language used to differentiate between the types of fisheries. Those who consumed or sold their catch locally were referred to as a lesser sort of folk (de schamele gemeente), transforming the economic hierarchy between domestic and international traders into a social distinction.

The intention behind such language was probably to elevate those who participated in the trade of fish, rather than the fishermen themselves. Within the herring industry, there were great disparities in income between the fishermen and the herring buss investors.

---

9 Zuider Zee means the “Southern Sea” and was a shallow bay in the northwestern region of the Netherlands. Land reclamation separated the Zuider Zee from the North Sea and formed Lake Ijssel. De Vries and Der Woude, 235.

10 This method of quickly processing herring on board had been invented in the fifteenth century to enable fishermen to travel deep into the North Sea and stay there for weeks without their catch rotting. However, it was not until the sixteenth century, when herring busses large enough to hold a crew of eighteen to thirty men were developed, that individual busses could really produce salted herring for the international market on a large scale (Ibid., 243-244).

11 Ibid., 235-6, 419. As will be discussing in the second and third parts of this paper, high importations of Baltic grain kept grain prices low and allowed Dutch farmers to focus on livestock husbandry and horticulture, both of which were better suited to the soil of the western Netherlands and more profitable.
who had rights to trade the catch. This is not to say that only a select few profited from the herring fisheries, or that fishermen were explicitly excluded from being investors. It was much more common for groups of ten to fifteen people to fund one herring ship together than for one individual to own a herring ship or fleet.\textsuperscript{12} Fishermen could technically be in partnerships but the amount of capital required to continually repair or replace herring busses could only be found in cities. Over time, an inbalance of power developed between the urban and rural parts of coastal provinces, as cities like Enkhuizen, Delft, Rotterdam, Shiedam, and Brill absorbed the profits of the herring trade while fishing villages remained among the poorest parts of Holland.\textsuperscript{13}

By the middle of the seventeenth century, it was much more profitable to invest in the trade than the production of herring.\textsuperscript{14} According to Emanuel van Meteren, a Flemish historian who represented Dutch trading interests in London during the late sixteenth century, few people would have been willing to work for the low wages of a Dutch fisherman.\textsuperscript{15} Of course, there were investors who fell from the ranks of the burghers into the common masses because their investments failed. But whereas investors only lost monetary investments when their ships were sunk, fishermen on those ships died, and their families were left without their main wage earner. The frequency of storms and privateers (especially during the Anglo-Dutch wars) threatened the stability, even survival, of many fishing villages. Holland’s fishing towns became so impoverished that they were granted partial remission of taxes. The large numbers of widows and children in these villages created a significant strain on the limited relief funds of villages; this in turn siphoned village funds from vital public works like maintaining harbors. Without usable harbors, villages had no means of supporting their only industry, creating a cycle of worsening poverty.\textsuperscript{16}

The incongruity between the increased profitability of herring and the plummeting living standards of herring fishermen was mirrored in the portrayal of each one in art; herring were ubiquitous in paintings, while the men who caught them were only rarely depicted. While the exact numbers of paintings with herring versus paintings with fishermen as the main subjects are unavailable, it is known that paintings of fishermen with their catch were

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Deursen, 20-21. Investors in the herring trade tended to be burghers, though they could also be individuals on the cusp between qualifying as a burgher and being a relatively well-off member of the common masses. In Rotterdam, herring investors included rope makers, pulley-makers, shoemakers, cooperers, bakers, butter merchants, and cheese merchants.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 21.
\item \textsuperscript{14} De Vries and Der Woude, 244-245.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Deursen, 21.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
relatively rare. Herring were pointed to as almost a symbol of Dutch prosperity, allowing the Republic to rise to wealth from humble origins. Fishermen, on the other hand, did not have such special meaning to consumers and were also less accessible to artists, who would have had to travel outside of city walls to observe fishermen at work.

Urban burghers constituted the majority of both investors in the herring trade and buyers in the art market—the centrality is thus unsurprising. When these burghers looked upon a breakfast scene such as Pieter Claesz’s *Still Life with Stoneware Jug, Wine Glass, Herring, and Bread*, they did not just see a plain fish surrounded by symbols of relative wealth (white bread that only the burghers could afford, a knife with a polished handle, an ornate römer goblet, a silver serving plate, and a silver-topped stoneware jug) (Fig.1). For them, the simple herring at the center could very well have been how they acquired the wealth to buy the peripheral objects. Even for potential buyers who had no direct ties to the herring trade, the herring was commonly held up as an example of “how great things (and profits) grew from humble beginnings.” Though one might have expected Claesz to devote the most attention to the wine glass, the most expensive of the items displayed, it is the herring that seems to have taken the most time. Every individual scale gleams; the silver plate reflects the bottom of the herring, emphasizing both the artist’s meticulous attention to realism and that the herring was deserving of such expensive dinnerware. This particular painting, with its small size, minimal details other than the herring, and uniform amber-brown tone, was one of Claesz’s quicker creations for the market; it would have been relatively inexpensive, affordable to the lower burghers as well as more affluent farmers. Repeated again and again in depictions of both wealthy and modest settings, the herring, ever shimmering and never garnished, occupied an important position in both art and society in the Dutch Golden Age.

The same cannot be said of the herring fishermen. While the herring was seen as foundational to the Dutch Republic’s economic dominance of the international market, this high regard was not extended to the people who toiled daily to catch and prepare the fish. Fishermen were not viewed in an especially negative light, but did not have any metaphoric value specific to them. For urban denizens, consumers and artists alike, the fisherman was only one of many occupations that represented the honest, hardworking ethic and modest

---

17 This does not include images of fish markets. Because fish vendors were of both genders and could be fishermen’s family members, conventions of how to portray fish vendors were likely different than of how to portray fishermen. Additionally, because the daily food markets were separate arenas in which people from different sectors of society interacted, fish markets and their portrayal will be discussed later in conjunction with other marketplaces in Section IV.

lifestyle advocated by Calvinist preachers. Artists had no incentive to specialize in the depiction of fishermen because there was no broad demographic that related specifically to fishermen. Those who would have been most drawn to paintings featuring fishermen, the fishermen themselves and their families, lived a meager existence and could not afford even relatively cheap works. This was all the more true for the widows and remaining family members of those fishermen who died at sea and who were utterly dependant on charity.

Another reason for the low volume of fishermen-centered art was perhaps because artists had few opportunities to observe fishing, especially on the open sea. For example, in his series on the Four Elements, Claes Jansz Clock’s print Water featured a fisherman with his tools—a spike, a pail, a net on the end of a pole and a basket (Fig. 2). The appeal of the print was not in the fisherman, however, but in the collection as a whole. The other Four Elements—Earth, Fire, and Air—were respectively represented by a farmer, a blacksmith, and a falconer. Together, these prints’ occupations represented how the Dutch had conquered the elements and fashioned them to suit their needs, a notion of particular appeal for a country reclaimed from the sea. Additionally, the tools portrayed in Water are not those of the ocean-fisherman but rather of the inland fisherman—the net at the end of a pole, the small pail, the reed basket and the spike, these all would only have been useful for catching fish in close proximity. Arent Arentsz, one of the few artists to portray fishermen,

---

19 There was no guarantee that wage earners received a wage sufficient to support themselves, as wages were only set to be proportional to the value of the work completed. Tenant farmers and many menial urban laborers were also understood to be hard workers who lived the lifestyle they earned (Deursen, 58).

20 Most paintings produced for the art market were not created by famous artists and cost between one and fourteen guilders (Der Woude, 318).

21 Fewer rural families had paintings than urban families, and rural families who bought paintings were usually those who owned at least ten milking cows (or had the equivalent economic power thereof). Given that many fishing villages were forced to choose between supporting their widows, orphans, and needy or maintaining their harbors, the low number of families who would have had the same economic status as a farmer with ten milking cows can be imagined (Ibid., 292, 296).

22 This is not to say that there were absolutely no fishermen who owned paintings—whether they depicted fishermen or not. The dampness of houses in the Netherlands caused many paintings to be destroyed within one generation. In the moist, salty air of villages on the coast, perhaps there actually were more paintings that depicted life on the coast that merely do not survive to the present day (Ibid., 294).

23 At the turn of the sixteenth into the seventeenth century, there was a general trend in Dutch art to portray ideas using realistic figures rather than idealized personifications. This Four Elements series could be merely a reflection of the pervasive nature of Dutch Realism but even as an artistic trend, this belies a cultural need to use tangible items or people as a root on allegorical meaning. Christopher Brown, Scenes of Everyday Life: Dutch Genre Painting of the Seventeenth Century (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1984), 34-35.

24 This idea is derived from Simon Schama’s overarching theme in The Embarrassment of Riches, wherein he described the Dutch Republic’s parallel tensions between conquering the ocean and temptation.
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painted inland fishermen exclusively; in his *Fishermen and Farmers*, one can find the spike used for spearing coastal and river fish (Fig. 3). Ironically, though inland fishermen were nominally *de schamele gemeente*, Dutch citizens probably perceived them as more actively contributing to the Dutch economy than open sea fishermen. It was the daily catches of inland and coastal fishermen that burghers bartered over at local markets, not the preserved herring destined for foreign consumption. When Arentsz took his inspirational strolls around Amsterdam, it was river fishermen whom he encountered and sketched, not herring fishermen on their busses in the North Sea.\(^25\) Inland fishermen were integrated into Dutch society through local markets in a way herring fishermen were not.

Even in seascapes, where one might expect them to be featured more prominently, fishermen were often relegated to the background, as mere framing devices. In Willem van Diest’s *A Calm with Fishing Boats and Fishermen in the Foreground*, the rolling clouds and the calm sea are the main subjects, while the boats are given intricate details, from the rigging of the sails to the ripple in the canvas (Fig. 4). The fishermen were reduced to mere specks on the boat, easily overlooked if not for the title of the painting, their catch glorified just as they themselves are ignored.

**Livestock Husbandry**

Like the herring trade, the cattle industry was another financial backbone of the Dutch Republic. Cattle were raised for dairy products and beef, both of which were traded in domestic and foreign markets. The local beef in particular was supported by burghers’ higher living standards of living and by demand for salted meat, especially during the Anglo-Dutch Wars.\(^26\) The trade in cattle and dairy products created links between a number of the provinces, joining the inland farmers to the coastal merchants.\(^27\) Livestock husbandry, including breeding, the domestic sale of cattle between provinces, the production of butter, cheese, and commercial milk, and slaughtering, provided an example of the close

---

\(^{25}\) Since the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century, it had been a tradition amongst Amsterdam artists to draw landscapes based on what they observed in nature rather than construct landscapes from observing other masters’ works. Artists, including Visscher and Rembrandt, would take walks along established paths into the countryside of Amsterdam and later create paintings documenting what they saw. Many of these artists’ landscapes can be pinpointed to an exact location (Boudewijn Bakker, *Landscapes of Rembrandt: His Favourite Walks* [Bussum: Thoth, 1999], 16-21.)


\(^{27}\) De Vries and Der Woude, 209. Cattle sales were limited to farmers who could afford to raise a substantial number of cattle. In the provinces of Utrecht and Gelderland, small farmers and agricultural laborers—collectively referred to as cotters—survived on seasonal work provided by the larger farmers and through integrating their small household economies with the investments of urban burghers looking for cheap labor.
integration between the agricultural and trade sectors. The transition from arable farming to livestock rearing was the first step towards specialization in the rural sector; the cattle industry then specialized further by region, and by the mid-seventeenth century, different provinces had become known for specific products.

Because the peat and clay soils of the maritime zones of the Dutch Republic, including the provinces of Holland, Zeeland, and parts of Utrecht, were not suitable for growing wheat, many farmers in these regions chose to focus on livestock husbandry.\textsuperscript{28} The shift from attempting to grow grains in bogs to livestock farming was encouraged by the relatively high price of livestock products compared to grain.\textsuperscript{29} While populations across Europe increased from 1500 to 1650 and grain prices rose even higher, the Dutch Republic was able to maintain uniquely low prices through large-scale importation of Baltic grain.\textsuperscript{30} This stabilization of grain prices and supply enabled the success of the livestock industry on the maritime coast. The change in rural scenery was captured in landscapes like \textit{Polder Het Grootslag}. (Fig. 5) Het Grootslag was a small farming village near the city of Enkhuizen, so close that in the painting one can see the city in the top left corner. This is indicative of the close connection between agriculture and trade throughout the Dutch Republic. Agriculture in Holland was defined by livestock husbandry rather than arable farming, as evidenced by the presence of grazing cows interspersed by small lots that were dedicated to harvesting hay. From the large dimensions of this piece, one can infer that its owner was quite wealthy. Similar to the mindsets of burghers who owned paintings of herring but not of fishermen, the artist portrayed the prosperity of near-endless grazing grounds while downplaying the lives of the farmers.

In Holland and Friesland, between the end of the sixteenth century and the middle of the seventeenth century, the average heads of cattle per farm rose from fourteen or fifteen to around twenty-five.\textsuperscript{31} Livestock husbandry was by no means an assured road to prosperity but the high demand for dairy products both domestically and internationally meant that dairy farmers had relatively stable livelihoods.\textsuperscript{32} In order to maximize profits, dairy farms in the maritime zone began to specialize in certain types of dairy production and even stopped raising cows altogether. This created a large demand for heifers and young dairy cows and a small supply of calves (as calves were born annually to stimulate

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 203

\textsuperscript{29} Bieleman, 49-50.

\textsuperscript{30} This price status was the most evident in Holland—the majority of imported grain was delivered to Amsterdam, where it was stored until it was disseminated to the rest of the Dutch Republic through the market system (De Vries and Der Woude, 198).

\textsuperscript{31} Fifteen of them tended to be milk cows (Bieleman, 50-51).

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 51-52.
milk streams but sold immediately afterwards). Therefore, the farmers in certain provinces or neighboring regions specialized in breeding and selling cattle.\(^{33}\) Friesland and Groningen provided the bulk of heifers and young dairy cows for Holland cattle dealers.\(^ {34}\) Young oxen came from Jutland, though dairy cows were also sent to slaughterhouses after a few years.\(^ {35}\)

Milk, cheese, and butter were the main products of the cattle industry and were accessible to many sectors: farmers themselves, non-farming residents of village (innkeepers, surgeons, shopkeepers, bakers, etc.), local city residents, and even international consumers.\(^ {36}\) The dairy industry thus brought the eating habits of people from a variety of economic backgrounds into parallel. Farmers could use the income from selling these dairy products to buy other food items, such as pricier fruits and vegetables, enjoyed by burghers. Beef production became important, as a rise in urban standards of living meant more burghers could afford to eat fresh meat regularly. Salted or smoked meats were also in high demand for naval ships and trade merchants’ ships.\(^ {37}\) Rural residents all benefited from the increased prevalence of cattle throughout the countryside. While they might not have been able to buy meat on a regular basis, owners of livestock would enjoy fresh meat during slaughter season each year and store smoked meat for the coming year.\(^{38}\) Though there is less research about the prevalence of small livestock on farms, it is known that sheep and pigs must have been even more common than cattle. Cattle were a risky investment because the high profits were paralleled by high costs of maintenance, and cattle often did not survive the extreme seasonal temperature changes in northern Holland. Indeed, many farmers chose to raise flocks of sheep instead and sold green sheep cheeses.\(^ {39}\) Pork was the most commonly eaten meat so at least some livestock farmers must have either raised large numbers of pigs in addition to their other specialty (cows or sheep) or specialized in raising pigs.\(^ {40}\)

Hubert Van Ravesteyn’s *Barn Interior* records the wide variety of livestock a farming family might have: a few heads of cattle, a couple goats, some sheep, a chicken, and a chicken.\(^{33}\) Breeding was based on rudimentary knowledge at best; there were vague conceptions about a connection between a cow’s color and character. Dutch cows owed their health and vigor to the mixture of many gene pools because cows came together in Holland from such a wide region (Donna R. Barnes and Ruud Spruit, *Food for Thought: Food and drink in seventeenth-century Dutch art and life* [Hoorn: Westfries Museum, 2010], 32).

\(^{34}\) Bieleman, 54.

\(^{35}\) Barnes and Spruit, 25-26.

\(^{36}\) De Vries and Der Woude, 517-519.

\(^{37}\) Bieleman, 55.

\(^{38}\) Barnes and Spruit, 26-28.

\(^{39}\) Deursen, 16.

\(^{40}\) Barnes and Spruit, 77.
and even a dog. (Fig. 6) Though specialization may have occurred on a provincial scale, individual families and farms could not afford to bet their livelihood on a single type of livestock. The milk from the two heads of cattle, assuming that they were cows, could be made into high quality cheese and butter for the market. If they were bulls, then in the fall, they would have been slaughtered and their meat preserved to provide the family with meat through the winter. The chickens would have provided the family with fresh eggs that enriched an otherwise plain diet. The greater numbers of goat and sheep meant that they were the chief source of this family’s income and personal diet: drinking goat milk meant cow milk could be saved for the market, and sheep cheese was also sold in the marketplace.\footnote{It is unknown whether goat cheese was made and sold during this time.} *Barn Interior* is a medium sized painting with a fair amount of bright colors and details like the wool of the sheep and individual hairs of the goats. It was clearly intended for the home of a burgher, not the farmers depicted. It was not a simple depiction of farming life, but rather a painting with layers of meaning. There is a playful element to the painting; the child dismounting from the goat combined with the disarray of pots and spoons suggests that some rambunctious mischief just occurred, while his mother looks on with displeasure. There is also a moral aspect to the depiction, as the presence of so many animals alongside the hardworking farmer’s wife highlights the necessity of hard work for acquiring material wealth, a message of particular appeal for the Dutch Calvinists.

The range of avenues by which one could make a decent living from livestock husbandry meant that these farmers of the western provinces were generally able to participate in the art market. They might not have been able to afford the more expensive paintings but they could have certainly afforded prints, drawings, or very cheap paintings on wood, costing no more than a few stuivers.\footnote{Der Woude, 297.} Artists would thus have had more incentive to create paintings of and for livestock farmers than of or for fishermen. Paintings produced for farmers to hang in their homes were not necessarily always related to farms but shared limits on the complexity and details. Paintings of farmers and dairy products were equally in vogue with burghers.\footnote{That is, paintings that mainly depicted farmers, livestock, and/or dairy products were roughly equal in volume to each other, unlike the large disparity between paintings of herring and paintings of fishermen. Ultimately, landscapes were more popular and common than any of these genre or still life paintings (Ibid., 320).} This was because there was a much greater degree of overlap between the lives of burghers and farmers than there was between the lives of burghers and fishermen. Fishermen and burghers really only interacted through fish markets but farmers lived and worked in greater physical proximity to cities. Burghers might even own land in the countryside and have tenant farmers. Every autumn, wealthier burghers would pick a
head of livestock from the flock of a farmer and pay the farmer to slaughter the animal and smoke the meat for them. As each province became renowned for different products, cities took pride in the quality of butters or cheeses sold in their stores.\textsuperscript{44}

Paintings of farmers depicted both men and women engaged in agricultural work. Farmers were potent metaphoric symbols, representing the virtues of honest work and frugal living because production still occurred on the scale of small family farms.\textsuperscript{45} Women in particular were in charge of the production cheese and butter.\textsuperscript{46} The dairy industry was thus a way for women to demonstrate their importance in Dutch society and their contributions to economic prosperity. A series of twenty-four anonymous painted panels, from the second half of the sixteenth century, depicts women with a variety of props that related to agriculture or dairy products. Woman from Hoogwoud, Woman from Oudendijk, and Woman from Benningbroek each show a well-dressed woman carrying one or two rounds of cheese (Fig. 7, Fig. 8, Fig. 9). Woman from Wadwaay features a woman with a butter churner, and Woman from Jisp features a woman hold a cheese mold (Fig. 10 and Fig. 11).

Theoretically, all these women could be farmer’s wives; however, some of them are so ornately dressed that it is hard to imagine them actually making the cheese they hold or using the tools in their hands.\textsuperscript{47} The three women holding rounds of cheese have especially lavish dresses—gold clasps and buttons decorated their collars and sleeves. The two exceptions are the woman from Wadwaay, whose small gold clasps on her collar are to an extent balanced by her apron negated any sense of extravagance, and the woman from Jisp, who wears no accessories and is dressed in somber black.\textsuperscript{48} The differences may

\textsuperscript{44} Bieleman, 51-53. Alongside livestock husbandry, farmers on peat lands reserved a small plot of land from growing grass to grow hemp, an important crop for the creation of fibers used to make canvas, fishing nets, and ropes. Therefore, there was also an increased amount of integration between the various sectors of agriculture (fishing with farming with livestock husbandry).

\textsuperscript{45} Deursen, 12-13.

\textsuperscript{46} Women processed milk twice a day, immediately after it was milked from the cows. Morning milk tended to be sweeter and fuller than evening milk. Cream was skimmed off the top to make churn butter, and some of the milk was sold to households of nearby towns. A milkmaid carried two buckets of milk on her shoulders using a yoke and went door to door until they were sold. The rest of the morning milk and most of the evening milk (which tended to be less creamy) was used to make cheeses. This was a laborious process and not always rewarding. If bacteria got into the cheese at any point, it might generate gas within the cheese and cause it to burst within weeks. And though the Dutch were meticulous with cleaning their tools, the very water they used often was contaminated (Barnes and Spruit, 35).

\textsuperscript{47} The conclusion that these women are dressed better than an average farmer’s wife is based on a comparison with the clothing of the woman in Van Ravesteyn’s Barn Interior.

\textsuperscript{48} This does not mean that the clothing was cheap; black satins and silks were popular with burghers because they appeared to be in line with Calvinist dress prescriptions while demonstrating the wearers’ affluence.
Inequalities in Art

stem from the fact that these were commissioned portraits, but the fact that they are part of a larger series of panels suggests that they were not meant to represent specific women. Additionally, very few farmers’ wives would have been able to afford the dresses depicted in these paintings or to commission portraits.\textsuperscript{49} Indeed, the labeling of the women by city name rather than name indicates that the portraits were meant to depict something unique about each of these cities, perhaps the cities themselves.—all five of the towns are located on the Northern Holland peninsula, which was famous for it high-quality cheese.\textsuperscript{50}

These panels may have been meant to be a reflections of the relative prosperity of these cities. Hoogwoud, Oudendijk, and Benningbroek were cheese-making regions (as the cheese was really produced in the rural area surrounding the city), so perhaps their female personifications were dressed better because these cities were richer. If Wadway did specialize in producing butter, then it could have still been relatively prosperous as there was always a market for butter, but since butter was considered the specialty of southern Holland, Wadway butter likely did not fetch the highest prices.\textsuperscript{51} Lastly, Jisp appears to be an anomaly because the woman holds a cheese-making tool but is not dressed very ornately. However, Jisp was the furthest from Hoorn, the town to which all cheese was transported before being exported to France and southern Europe.\textsuperscript{52} It may then have been more difficult for its farmers to transport cheese to Hoorn, and Jisp’s cheese was probably sold in the domestic rather than international market. These sales would still have been profitable because there was great domestic demand for cheese and butter but not to the same degree as sales on the international market. The difference between the dress of the women from Hoogwoud, Oudendijk, and Bennenbroek and the dress of the women from Wadway and Jisp could have also been indicative of socioeconomic differences. The three women who held rounds of cheese had gold adornments on their cuffs, which would have been highly inconvenient for working. The other two women with tools had plainer sleeves that conceivably could have been rolled up, enabling the women to actually make butter and cheese. The first three women represented the wives of burghers, perhaps showing a recent purchase, while the other two women represented farmers’ wives displaying their trade tools.

The questions of who would have bought these panels, whether they were collected as a set, and where they would have been displayed are difficult to answer since the

\textsuperscript{49} Der Woude, 311.
\textsuperscript{50} For example, Woman from Enkhuizen showed a similarly well-dressed woman holding a herring, and the majority of profits from the herring trade went to Enkhuizen. (Not included in figures list but available at http://www.rijksmuseum.nl/collectie/zoeeken/asset.jsp?id=SK-C-1503&lang=en); Bieleman, 51-53.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 53.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 51-53.
provenance of the series is unknown. As the panels are not attributed to any individual artist or artists, they were most likely produced for the art market. If so, perhaps there was a female audience to whom these works would have appealed—that is, women who had both the money to buy art and control over their household’s interior decoration. They may have been hung in kitchens, placing pieces that featured women in women’s typical domain. Alternatively, these paintings might have transcended this connection between a domestic topic and domestic physical space if their owners valued them as depictions of wealth (the cheese and the butter) that could be showcased in more public realms of the house. In either scenario, it is striking that depictions of women from one sector of society could appeal to any other sector of society. It is more difficult to imagine similar depictions of men—merely posing and not engaged in any activity—being popular. Generally, men were shown in the act of working, as Calvinist ideals greatly emphasized hard work, and thereby invariably had agency. The five paintings in a sense capture the tensions of Dutch society, as the women hold with their contributions to the economy while they themselves are objectified as items of display. Women were crucial to the productive ability of rural families, but giving women too much agency and responsibility had the danger of upsetting existing gender roles. Paintings such as these were a compromise between documenting women’s contributions and preserving their subordinate role.

**HORTICULTURE**

Vegetables had always played an important part in the Dutch diet. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the rural and urban sectors were each responsible for growing their own vegetables. Farmers consumed what they grew on their private gardens and orchards while those in the cities cultivated their own vegetables within the city walls. However, as the urban population increased, urban gardens and orchards were cleared for building new homes and storefronts.

In Holland, horticulture arose as a type of farming clustered around the vicinity of cities. Professional market gardens were first established around Leiden and Delft and later around towns including De Langedijk, Enkhuizen, Amsterdam, and Rotterdam. Each of
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53 Brown, 88.
54 Ravesteyn’s *Barn Interior* also showed both a man and a woman working together to complete the daily farm chores. The woman is actually in the foreground, actively scrubbing a deep dish while the man tends to the animals in the background. Both partners played crucial roles in successfully maintaining the business of their farmstead.
55 Barnes and Spruit, 35.
these zones specialized in certain vegetables: De Langedijk cultivated onions, horseradish, carrots, and parsnips; Enkhuizen cultivated cabbage and carrots.56

More so than fishermen or livestock farmers, horticulture farmers were concerned about orienting their crops to the market than for self-sustenance. Farmers focused on the development of new crops like the Horn (orange) carrot and huge heads of cabbage that could be green or pink; these new crops first appeared in paintings in the middle of the sixteenth century.57 From the beginning to the end of the seventeenth century, Leiden and Delft horticulture farmers changed from growing “coarse” vegetables like cabbages, carrots, turnips, and onions to “fine” vegetables such as lettuce, spinach, and cauliflower.58 This change reflected the increased wealth of city burghers, who could now afford the more expensive vegetables. Vegetables’ prices depended on their ease of cultivation as well as their seasonal availability. Hardy fruits and vegetables like apples, cabbages, onions, white turnips, and carrots which did not spoil easily and were sold almost year-round were the lowest in price. Only burghers could afford the more expensive fruits and vegetables, which included melons, berries, peaches, cherries, plums, peas, artichokes, green beans, cauliflower, and cucumbers.59 Imported items like citrus fruit, pomegranates, figs, and olives were even more expensive.60

Still life paintings of vegetables and fruit were popular among both burghers and farmers; after landscapes, still life was the most prevalent category of paintings.61 After examining a sample of paintings of horticultural products, one will notice that certain items appear much more often than others: onions, cabbages, and carrots.62 It was accepted that painters of vegetables and fruits often took artistic license and depicted items that ripened

58 Stone-Ferrier, 39.
59 Barnes and Spruit, 53.
60 Ibid.
61 Der Woude, 320.
62 Examples include Floris Claesz van Dijck’s Still Life with Vegetables and Fruits, which can be found in William A. Brandenburg, “Market Scenes as Viewed by a Plant Biologist,” in Art in History. History in Art ed. D. Freedberg and J. de Vries (Santa Monica: Getty Center for History of Art and the Humanities, 1991), 61. In this painting, a woman is surrounded by many baskets of fruits and vegetables. In the background, Jesus is shown in deep discussion with two men but the emphasis of the painting is definitely the abundance of horticulture products in the foreground. Expensive bunches of asparagus and heads of artichokes are shown along with carrots, enormous heads of lettuce, and a hanging bundle of onions. The juxtaposition of expensive and inexpensive produce in the same setting demonstrated that both types of goods were equally valued: one as a demonstration of economic ability and the other as an acknowledgement of modest roots.
in different seasons together for aesthetic effect. But given this freedom, why were these three produce items so popular with still life artists?\textsuperscript{63}

Onions, cabbages, and carrots had moral resonance for Dutch viewers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As a group, these three “coarse” vegetables made up the core of the farmer and the urban poor’s diet. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, wealthier burghers elected to eat these vegetables to demonstrate an attachment to the virtue of modesty. As the prices of the fine vegetables continued to drop until the price difference between coarse and fine vegetables was negligible to a burgher, though, it became much more tempting to indulge in the fine vegetables.\textsuperscript{64} Hanging paintings of onions, cabbages, and carrots was a way to indicate that one remembered the virtues of a modest livelihood even if one chose to consume more expensive foods. Cabbages and carrots were popular in particular because they represented Dutch innovations in breeding new varieties; for instance, both items occupy a prominent place, nearly in the very center, in Van Ravesteyn’s \textit{Barn Interior}, discussed earlier.\textsuperscript{65}

Onions and carrots were featured in \textit{Woman from Broek}, a piece from the series of women holding agricultural products, indicating that the relatively low prices of these crops did not mean hinder the city’s prosperity (Fig. 12). The woman was just as well dressed as her counterparts from the previously discussed cities of Holland, though Broek is actually located in Friesland. She holds a bunch of onions in her right hand, tied together by their stalks just as they would have been when sold in the market.\textsuperscript{66} In the crook of her left arm, she carries a basket brimming with orange carrots. One thus has visual evidence that horticulture spread from Holland to the other western provinces and that innovations like the Horn carrot disseminated rather quickly. Given her expensive dress, adorned with gold clasps and buttons, it is unlikely that she is intended to represent a market vendor; instead, she appears to have just returned from her daily shopping at the marketplace. The contrast between her costly dress and the inexpensive produce underscored the ideal that even the affluent could choose to live modestly. Her left finger points to the onions, perhaps meaning to indicate that she had made these “lowly” vegetables were bought not out of necessity by conscious choice.

Dutch artists did not always rely on flooding the canvas with food to convey prosperity. Adriaen Corta’s \textit{Still Life with Asparagus} is an example of simple still life

\textsuperscript{63} Artists also showed out-of-season fruits and vegetables next to each other to demonstrate the overall abundance of the Dutch Republic, and the range of produce Dutch citizens enjoyed (Barnes and Spruit, 58).
\textsuperscript{64} Stone-Ferrier, 39.
\textsuperscript{65} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{66} Barnes and Spruit, 53.
paintings focusing on a single luxurious item (Fig. 13) Asparagus, one of the more expensive produce items, could stand on its own and still radiate a sense of wealth. It is a rather small piece of art, painted on paper and then mounted on a panel. It is unclear whether or not the piece was sold as a work on paper and was later mounted or was sold pre-mounted. If it was sold as a work on paper, then it was likely intended for a more modest sector of the economy than the previously discussed paintings, especially given its size. The extreme focus on the asparagus along with its bright illumination in contrast to the otherwise pitch-dark setting suggests a glorified, even altar-like setting. This sort of piece would have appealed either to a wealthy art collector who appreciated the aesthetic qualities, or to individuals who regarded asparagus as something to be looked up to, representing a type of lifestyle they could not afford. Poorer burghers and farmers would very occasionally splurge on fine vegetables, and so would be somewhat familiar with them, but normally made do with the coarser ones. Rich burghers would probably have regarded the asparagus as a rather normal part of their diet and would likely have thought such veneration excessive. Thus, in many instances, what vegetables one ate and what vegetables one displayed were often quite different.

**Marketplaces**

The open-air markets of cities, like Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and Delft, created a shared space in which urban and rural populations interacted with one another. Markets were important places of public life; even in the seventeenth century they were recognized as landmarks, with Tobias van Domselaer devoting an entire section of his 1665 history of Amsterdam to the vegetable and carrot market. Every morning, the wives of farmers and fishermen, though occasionally the men as well, would enter the cities to sell their goods. People had incentives to form personal relationships, vendors wanting to maintain regular customers and buyers hoping for discounts.

However, though markets were shared locales, differences in urban and rural interests pervaded. The growth of markets should be seen as the extension of urban power into the country, as their control of trade networks and ownership of much of the rural land
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67 Asparagus was not so expensive that one could afford to buy a painting of them before being able to afford the actual product.

68 This negative correlation of higher wealth and displaying more modest vegetables was not perfect. Urban residents could usually afford more paintings and larger paintings than rural residents, so they might have had paintings depicting both expensive and inexpensive produce and foodstuffs.

69 Stone-Ferrier, 37.

70 Ibid., 31.

71 Barnes and Spruit, 55.
bound together large segments of the population through commerce. Though sellers and customers may have developed friendships, whether class divisions were actually bridged is difficult to assess, since members of the urban population had the choice of where to spend their money while members of the rural population vied for their attention. Indeed, some villagers desired to create their own marketplaces because their needs were not being met in the city market, vendors hoping for less competition and buyers thinking they could get lower prices in a more localized market. All efforts to establish village markets were met with strong resistance from the urban sector, and in some regions, legislation forbid villages from holding market transactions independent of the city. Some rural markets were set up but most lacked the infrastructure and governance that made urban markets so appealing.

Urban markets were governed by city administrators, with regulations dictating the days and times when markets were open and the responsibilities of vendors. Ideally, there were separate markets for the sale of vegetables and fruits, freshwater fish, saltwater fish, and poultry. In reality, not every city or village had the money or the space to be so precise with its differentiation of markets. Amsterdam was perhaps the most famous of the Dutch markets and was one of the most stringent in terms of market regulation. Amsterdam city officials imposed strict regulations to maintain high quality standards of foodstuffs sold in markets and cleanliness. The boundaries of each sub-market were carefully observed and the sale of rotten or “defective” vegetables or fruits was not allowed. Fish markets were only allowed to operate in the mornings because the afternoon sun would have rotted the fish.

Rural and urban food vendors fared quite differently in terms of income and social regard; this is evident when one compares bakers to marketplace vendors. Bread was the core of the Dutch diet; everyone ate bread at least once a day, usually for three out of four meals. People of modest means and people on charity ate a coarser, darker bread made from rye while richer families ate white bread made from wheat flour. Unlike other parts
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72 De Vries and Van der Woude, 507.
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74 Barnes and Spruit, 54-55.
75 Ibid., 53-61.
76 Stone-Ferrier, 42.
77 Peter G. Rose, ed. and trans., The Sensible Cook (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1989), 6. Overall, the Dutch enjoyed a higher standard of living that the rest of Europe. With the exception of the extremely poor, everyone consumed four meals a day: breakfast, a meal at noon that was the main meal of the day, an afternoon meal, and a light evening meal. Bread was consumed at breakfast, the afternoon meal, and the evening meal. Barnes and Spruit, 87.
78 Barnes and Spruit, 63.
of the meal, which were prepared at home, bread had to be bought from bakers because most people did not have an oven in their kitchen. While some people—mostly rural folk who did not have access to a professional baker—may have baked simple rolls themselves, the vast majority of the population bought their daily bread from bakeries.\textsuperscript{79} Bakers belonged to a guild, and their recipes were guarded secrets, relayed to apprentices only orally in order to keep them from slipping into cookbooks.\textsuperscript{80} Thus, to be a baker was a sort of honor, and to become one required access to privileged information. Rural individuals with ovens could not become professional bakers even though they had the equipment as baking guilds pressured city governments to suppress commercial bread production outside of city walls.\textsuperscript{81} A beginning baker would have needed a substantial amount of capital to purchase the differing types of rye and wheat for making dark and white bread and the various tins and dishes needed to bake them.\textsuperscript{82}

The disparity in income between bakers and market vendors (farmers) becomes apparent when one learns that a baker could afford to commission a portrait. Around 1658, Arend Oostwaert, a Leiden baker, and his wife Catharina Keyzerswaert contracted Jan Steen to paint them a marriage portrait-genre (Fig. 14). The couple is shown at work, displaying the fruits of their labor: pretzels are hung from pegs, rolls stacked on a rack, the wife holding a piece of rusk, a hard bread that was baked twice while the husband carries a duivekater loaf, a bread made for special occasions, on a large baker’s peel, as if he had just taken it out of the oven.\textsuperscript{83} A young, almost cherub-like boy blows a horn on the right, a departure from how bakers were depicted, as it was usually they who blew the horn to announce the arrival of freshly baked bread.\textsuperscript{84} This job was cast onto this little helper presumably in order to fully depict the baker’s face.

In contrast to this portrait-genre piece, depictions of marketplaces and vendors were not as idealized. Artistic license was usually taken so that out-of-season items could be displayed side-by-side or so that salt and freshwater catches could be shown next to each other, but depictions of the vendors were rarely altered.\textsuperscript{85} Gabriel Metsu went even

\textsuperscript{79} In order to bake bread, one also had to have an oven, which most urban households lacked. Urban households that did have ovens had them built into a wall of the fireplace. Rural households built ovens that were a separate structure from the house (Barnes and Spruit, 63; Rose, 16).
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{81} Inferred from the high level of city resistance to the Wormer biscuit makers (Van Deursen, \textit{Plain Lives}, 17).
\textsuperscript{82} Barnes and Spruit, 63.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{85} Barnes and Spruit, 58, 60.
further, refusing to combine products from different seasons or idealize them.\textsuperscript{86} Given that Metsu lived on the street where the Amsterdam vegetable market took place, snapshots of regular marketplace interactions can be found in his works, such as \textit{The Vegetable Market in Amsterdam} (Fig. 15).\textsuperscript{87} The piece is based on an excerpt from Gerbrand Adriaensz Bredero’s play, \textit{Moortje}. Metsu depicts one of the play’s characters, Monsieur Cockroach, walking through the Amsterdam market bragging about how he could easily manipulate the wealthy by flattering and fawning on them; he demonstrates the skill in the center of the painting by wooing a well-dressed housewife. However, \textit{The Vegetable Market in Amsterdam} is not simply an illustration of a fictional sotry, but also provides a window into every day happenings at the markets. While both Monsieur Cockroach and the lady he encounters are dressed in their theatrical costumes, the rest of the scene is populated with realistic marketplace occurrences.\textsuperscript{88} In one corner, a housewife appears to be haggling quite heatedly with a vegetable vendor. The vendor looks at the viewer incredulously, as if she cannot believe the unreasonableness of her potential customer. The vendor’s stand is loaded with the large cabbages and orange carrots that were such a source of Dutch pride.\textsuperscript{89} In the lower right hand corner, a dog stares at a chicken that has escaped its coop; not too far away, another chicken has comfortably tucked itself onto the ground.

A more fictionalized market scene is Joachim Wtewael’s \textit{The Market Woman}, showing an extravagant overabundance of fruit and vegetables that is unlikely to have actually existed in reality (Fig. 16). While the actual produce the vendor is selling, including cabbage, carrots, onions and apples, all of which were available year-round, is reasonable, the arrangement in a jumbled mess, especially the more luxury vegetables like artichoke and dill peppers, is unrealistic. Such a mixture of different items was useful aesthetically for paintings, but in reality would have been perplexing to buyers. Indeed, the goal of \textit{The Market Woman} was not to accurately portray a market stall but to convey a moral message. The customer’s child has just found a dented apple in the lot, and though the vendor attempts to explain this, the customer remains skeptical of the vendor’s honesty. This scenario is mirrored in an emblem from Jacob Cats’ \textit{Moral Emblems}; it is paired with a poem titled “One Rotten Apple Infects All in the Basket.”\textsuperscript{90} As a social proverb, it is a

\textsuperscript{86} Stone-Ferrier, 39.
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 49.
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 46-47.
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., 39.
warning to avoid bad company; as a market-specific idiom, it is also a warning to only buy from vendors with stringent quality control on their products, justifying strict urban regulations. The large size of *The Market Woman* set it apart from works like *Still Life with Asparagus* that farmers could have afforded, but even without this size differentiation, the message of the piece was obviously directed at urban residents. The selection of someone from the rural community to represent bad company and dishonesty shows that it was socially acceptable and economically safe to vilify rural vendors in art because they did not make up a significant percentage of the buyers.

**Conclusion**

Lodovico Guicciardini, an Italian resident of Antwerp, described sixteenth-century Holland as a place of “many fine towns and lovely villages, great men and women, excellent cattle, immense riches and power.”\(^91\) He emphasized that though the Netherlands did not produce much wheat, wine, or lumber, its mastery and control of trade networks meant that it could import these items and enjoy them in greater abundance than even the producing regions.\(^92\) With the creation of these trade networks, cities rose to great prominence within the Dutch Republic as they were the centers of economic power and housed the highest members of the social hierarchy.

The art market exemplified how the interests of the rest of the country were brought into alignment with the interests of the cities. The first concern of artists when they created works was what would appeal to the burghers. Therefore, herring fish—an investment of many burghers—was emphasized over the fishermen. Women, who played a vital role in farm economy, were more passive in burghers’ circles so they had to be objectified and made secondary to their work in paintings. Burghers could afford expensive and hard to grow “fine vegetables” in their daily meals but wished to demonstrate their more modest roots, so onions, cabbage, and carrots were prevalent throughout still life paintings of vegetables. When paintings held moral lessons, a transgressor or violator of that moral value needed to be present; because burghers who bought these paintings would not want to be identified as a villain, members of the rural community were cast into that role instead. Overall, the Dutch Golden Age did see a rise in living standards for most Dutch citizens, but that increase in wealth benefited the urban classes much more than the rural ones. And with that imbalance in wealth came an imbalance in artistic representation evident even today.
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