3: Famous for What?

A. So Who Gets Painted?

1. Class title 1 (Wall in the National Portrait Gallery, London)

In the first week, we looked at a whole bunch of different portraits, classifying them mainly by *purpose*: as a memorial, as a document, for commemoration, whatever. Today, I want to move from **why** to **who**, by looking at the question of who gets to be painted and who does not. The best place to start, I thought, would be with one of the **National Portrait Galleries**. I had hoped to split this between London and Washington, but had to abandon that. The London NPG has an incredible catalog, with every one of its 200,000 items online; the Smithsonian has nothing comparable. Anyway, this is a wall in the London gallery, with a dozen portraits from the Georgian era, the few decades before or after 1800. I have put together a little video: you will see the portraits come out of their frames to get arranged slightly larger on our screen. Then I will divide them into categories, showing a few at a time, first as thumbnails then larger. It's all rather quick, but we can look back at the enlarged versions after this first survey is over. The music is English, from the period: the *Symphony #7*, called *The Hunt*, by **John Marsh** (1752–1828).

2. Section title 1 (development of the above)
3. Wall in the National Portrait Gallery (opening slide without title)

Anyone got any observations about the style of those portraits in general, before we get to look at a few of them in particular? Before we go on, though, I want to make a general point that applies to *all* portraits. In general, you should judge a work of art in terms of what it brings to you, not what you bring to it; it may be true to say, for instance, "That reminds me of Aunt Mary's house, and she could be so *mean,*" but it says more about you than the picture. But portraits are different. Each of them in like a window onto some aspect of the real world, and the portraitist assumes that you already have some knowledge of that world, enough to put the person into context. Here is a little demo:

4. Pictures as windows opening out (in this case) to Trafalgar

So if one of these portraits represents Admiral Horatio Nelson, and you know that he was killed while winning the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805, that is not irrelevant information; it affects how we look at the portrait, and the portrait perhaps affects how we view the event. Of course we won't know much about many of these sitters, and I tell you now: I am *not* going to explain them all.

5. Wall in the National Portrait Gallery (as above)

I chose this particular shot because it is typical of the kind of balance you get in such a collection: a lot of politicians, aristocrats, and rich men, plus a some generals and admirals, a few ladies, and a small number of people distinguished in other fields. We'll look at a few of these, but having spent an entire class on royalty, I don't really want to go on by devoting equivalent time to the upper aristocracy—

provided we understand that these, on the whole, were the people who had their portraits painted. In the second hour, we'll look at some of the people who do *not* belong to that class, and actually there are a couple on this wall, both asterisked (*); I'll use them as bookends for this first hour, starting with the picture in the center, a magnificent portrait by **Sir Joshua Reynolds** (1823–92): a figure from a totally different world.

6. Reynolds: *Omai* (1776, London NPG), with pencil sketch

This is a Polynesian native from the Friendly Islands named **Mai** or **Omai**. He was brought to England by **Captain Cook** on his second voyage, becoming the toast of London for a while before returning home with Cook on his third voyage. To be painted by the Founding President of the Royal Academy, no less, is an unusual honor. The National Library of Australia has this pencil sketch; anyone care to compare it to the final picture? Let us assume that the face is an accurate likeness, both in the drawing and the painting—but what about the clothes and setting? All of this is surely highly idealized, turning Omai into **Rousseau's** *Natural Savage* or some figure from antiquity, without much reference to Polynesia at all.

7. Portraits of Captain Cook by Nathaniel Dance-Holland and William Hodges

Although there are no portraits of Captain Cook on this particular wall, the *Omai* does permit me to show two in the National Maritime Museum in Greenwich, by **Nathaniel Dance-Holland** (1735–1811) and **William Hodges** (1744–97). Both are from 1775–76. Let's compare them. There is no doubt that the Dance-Holland is a splendid picture; it may be the artist's best-known work. But Hodges. I think, has something special. While Dance shows Cook as a man of means and distinction, seated at his desk and looking over the map he had helped to draw, Hodges is less polished, seeming to catch the man in the grip of action. As well he might, for he traveled with Cook on his second voyage.

8. Cook's three voyages, map
9. Reynolds: *Sir Joseph Banks* (1773, London NPG)

Accompanying Cook on his first voyage was the other one-of-a-kind figure on this wall, the naturalist **Sir Joseph Banks** (1743–1820), who was to become President of the Royal Society for over 40 years. Banks had made his name two years before that with an expedition to Labrador and Newfoundland, but the trip with Cook enabled him to add to the tens of thousands of plant specimens he brought back that became the foundation for the **Botanical Gardens at Kew**, bringing back over 30,000 plant specimens from his own voyages alone.

10. Portraits of Humphry Davy by Phllips and Lawrence (both 1821, NPG)

Reynolds' portrait of *Sir Joseph Banks* follows the same pattern as Dance's *Captain Cook*; it would become a standard format for self-made men who had distinguished themselves through their own skills: seated at a desk with something relating to their particular field in front of them, and a window opening on a heroic sky behind. But what happens if you split the desk and sky ideas? Compare these two portraits of **Sir Humphry Davy**, the inventor of the miners' safety lamp, both from 1821; the artists are **Thomas Phillips** (1770–1845) and **Sir Thomas Lawrence** (1769–1830). Both include the lamp as a

prop, but whereas Phillips paints Davy in his study thinking. Lawrence shows him against that great sky looking right at us as a hero, a gentleman, as though proclaiming "I'm as good as any of you."

11. The Brunels, father and son, by Northcote (1813, NPG) and and Howlett (1857)

The Industrial Revolution would not have been possible without men like Davy or these two, father and son, French-born engineer **Marc Isambard Brunel** (1769–1849) and **Isambard Kingdom Brunel** (1806–59). The son died before the father, but had earlier helped him in building the first tunnel under the Thames and developing the first iron-hulled steamship, the *SS Great Britain*. As chief engineer himself, he built major bridges in the West of England, developed the **Great Western Railway**, and essentially extended it to America with two more transatlantic steamships, the *Great Western* and *Great Eastern*. This photographic portrait by pioneering photographer **Robert Howlett** (British, 1831–1858) makes a wonderful contrast with the more conventional sitting-at-a-desk portrait of the father by **James Northcote** (1746–1931), because it gets some of Brunel's actual work into the picture—the launching chains of the *Great Eastern*—and shows something of the scale of his achievement.

12. Three Prime Ministers: Bute, Liverpool, Pitt

I am not about to enter into biographies of all the politicians and soliders, but I will mention two in particular. Although I labeled this slide as three Prime Ministers, they are not in the right order. The central one is actually **Lord Hawkesbury**, the courtesy title he held before he succeeded to his father's title of **Lord Liverpool**; he would not become PM until 1812, well after Pitt's second administration.

13. George Romney: *William Pitt the Younger* (1783, Tate)

This is because **William Pitt the Younger** really was younger, as this portrait by **George Romney** (1774–1802) shows; he first became Prime Minister when he was only 24. Here is a contemporary satire on the situation, followed by a clip of a modern satire, from **Rowan Atkinson's** BBC comedy *Blackadder*, where Pitt is presented to the Prince Regent (**Hugh Laurie**):

14. Blackadder: Pitt meets the Prince Regent
15. Three Prime Ministers: Bute, Liverpool, Pitt (repeat)

Anyway, the portraits are shown in the order in which they were painted; I'd invite you to compare the changes in style. The shift from grandiose to sober may be more than a stylistic matter; it may reflect a general shift in attitude from privileged to professional that would change politics in the 1800s. [Note, incidentally, the Hawkesbury portrait, actually, is a nice variant on the great man's desk idea.]

16. Two Other Politicians: Fox and Brougham

I haven't a thing to say about Henry Brougham and very little about **Charles James Fox**. But I am interested by the portrait by **Karl Anton Hickel** (1745–98), who sets a scruffy, stout, and almost comical figure against another of those idealized backgrounds. I can only imagine tha Fox was one of those British politicians like Winston Churchill or Boris Johnson, who hid their considerable acumen under a dishevelled appearance. Anyway, that is how actor **Michael Gambon** plays him in the film *Amazing Grace* about the long campaign of William Wilberforce (**Ioan Gruffudd**); though an opponent of Pitt's, he

switches his vote to become a staunch abolitionist. This short scene shows the moment of change, followed by an exchange Wilberforce and Pitt himself (**Benedict Cumberbatch**).

17. *Amazing Grace:* Wilberforce, Fox, and Pitt

B. Beyond the Smoke of Battle

18. Section title B1

That was the 1812 **Lawrence** portrait of the *Marquess of Londonderry*. In terms of color and sheer bravura, it is probably my favorite picture on the wall. "The Smoke of Battle" was my title for a proposed section on all those military men on the wall I showed at the beginning. I'll say a bit more in the second hour, but for now it is just a nod to all those military men on the gallery wall. Instead, I have chosen an entirely different title, virtually the opposite of the first. So here is a second video with another portrait in the NPG, though not displayed on the wall I showed you. Can you guess what sort of a person it is?

19. Section title B2

You may have read the handout, you may even recognize the face, but the question was "What *sort* of a person do you think this is?" I would say a private person, someone of great sensitivity, a clergyman possibly, or more likely a philosopher. Instead:

20. Portraits of Nelson by Abbott and Füger

Yes, it's **Lord Nelson**. The picture I first showed, by **Friedrich Heinrich Füger** (1751–1818), is listed in the NPG as the only known portrait of Nelson in civilian dress. The one on the left, by **Lemuel Francis Abbott** (1760–1803), is probably the best-known image of the naval hero. It's easy enough when you have a military character in full dress uniform with decorations; the props and costume do most of the work. But portraying the inner character is harder.

21. William Beechey: *Horatio Nelson* (1800, Norwich, with sketch in the NPG)

The portrait of Nelson on the wall I first showed you is by **Sir William Beechey** (1753–1839). It is actually a sketch for a full-size painting in Norwich, which uses the same technique as in the Lawrence picture, of surrounding the hero with the paraphernalia, colors, and smoke of battle. The NPG claims that theirs is the more insightful version, because it shows the artist's second thoughts as he worked to get the head and expression just right; I'm not sure I agree.

22. Portraits of Nelson by Rigaud and Head

Here are two more portraits. On the left, Nelson painted by the Anglicized French-Italian artist **John Francis Rigaud** (1742–1810), when Nelson was only a lieutenant (the captain's braid was added later). The other shows the now-Admiral Nelson after his most famous victory that he survived, **the Battle of**

the Nile in 1798, when he reversed Napoleon's control of the Mediterranean. Here the setting does more of the work, and we also have a second figure. What does each tell you about the character?

23. Fanny Nelson and Emma Hamilton

But now things get complicated. Nelson, who is already married, falls in love with another woman, who is also married: the celebrated **Lady Hamilton**, wife of **Sir William Hamilton**, the British Ambassador to the Kingdom of Naples. So we have the making of not just one triangle but two. In fact, though, it did not turn out that way. Nelson divorced his wife and never saw her again, and Hamilton (who may have been impotent) accepted the situation to the extent of even moving in with the couple when they returned to London. Even so, this would have been a disaster for most public figures today, but not for Nelson. He was so much a hero as to be almost a god, and Emma was as famous as a pop star.

24. George Romney, Sir William Hamilton, and Emma
25. Emma timeline

Here are portraits of Hamilton, Emma as a teenager, and the artist who painted them both, **George Romney**. And here is a timeline of her meteoric rise from housemaid and brothel dancer to become the toast of Europe. While she was undoubtedly a person of great charm and beauty to have become the obsession of so many men, she also fits into our course because her social triumph was in a very real sense the **triumph of portraiture**. Perennially short of money, her lover **Charles Greville** got Romney to paint her in whatever poses the two of them came up with, and arranged to share the profits. The paintings were successful; Emma soon became as famous as any actress, and by the time Greville needed to pass her on to Hamilton, she was a coveted acquisition sure to please his taste as a connoisseur. And Nelson, who came to the Hamiltons to recover from a head wound suffered at the Nile, fell for her charm like so many before him.

26. Images of Emma

It was not just Romney who fell for Emma and her *attitudes*, or charades of famous characters that she would put on to entertain her guests. Goethe fell under her spell. Two artists, women who ought to have been impervious—**Angelica Kauffmann** (1741–1807) and **Elisabeth Vigée Lebrun** (1755–1842)—each made several pictures of her in various guises; because they are acted, these are not strictly portraits, but together they tell us a great deal about her charm. And of course, she has been frequently portrayed on stage and screen: **Vivien Leigh** opposite **Laurence Olivier** in *Lady Hamilton* (1941), and here in a short clip from *A Bequest to the Nation* (1973), **Glenda Jackson** with **Peter Finch**. It is a few days before the Battle of Trafalgar. Nelson, at Emma's request, has declined the command, but she knows that he really wants to go back . . .

27. *A Bequest to the Nation*: Emma accepts that Nelson must leave once more
28. Samuel Drummond: *The Death of Nelson* (c.1812, Liverpool)

Nelson, as we know, was victorious at Trafalgar, but was fatally wounded by a French musket shot. Here, rather after the event, is a depiction of him being carried belowdecks. The Liverpool gallery, where it resides, points out that **Samuel Drummond** (1766–1844), the artist, uses elements of the traditional

Christian depictions of *The Descent from the Cross*. But that is nothing like so over the top as this *Apotheosis of Nelson* painted a year or so after the event by an artist I know absolutely nothing about.

29. Sicot Pierre Nicolas Legrand *Apotheosis of Nelson*.

All this religiosity, however, allows me to close the story with something altogether greater than my last few examples. **Franz Joseph Haydn** (1732–1809) wrote his *Missa in Angustiis* (Mass in Difficult Times) in 1798, at a time when Napoleon seemed about to overrun all of Europe. It was not dedicated to Nelson, but on the day of the first performance news arrived of Nelson's victory at the Battle of the Nile. So the work took on the nickname of the *Nelson Mass,* and that name has stuck—reinforced by the fact that in 1800, Nelson and Emma visited **Esterhazy**, the palace where Haydn was employed, met the composer, and probably heard a repeat performance. I shall play the opening movement in a performance from Sweden. The video quality is not the best, but the period setting seems totally appropriate and the performance is stunning. So no, this is not a portrait of Nelson. But it is a portrait of its time, and an expanation, perhaps, of why Nelson's victories were seen as the work of God. Don't worry about the Swedish titles; the words are simply "Lord, have mercy! Christ, have mercy!"

30. Haydn: *Nelson Mass*, Kyrie
31. Class title 2 (record cover)

C. Into the Action

32. Section title C (*The Skating Minister*)
33. Raeburn: *The Reverend Robert Walker Skating* (1890s, Edinburgh NG)

That was the portrait of **the Reverend Robert Walker** by **Sir Henry Raeburn** (1756–1823), the leading Scottish painter at same period as the artists we were seeing in the first hour, and fully their equal. It is more commonly known as *The Skating Minister*. [The *Skaters Waltz* by Émile Waldteufel (1837–1915) comes from exactly a century later, so is way out of period, but I couldn't resist!] I am showing the Raeburn for two reasons, which set the theme for the second hour: it is not a portrait of an aristocrat or famous individual, simply a friend of the artist's; and it involves a figure in action, not a passive sitter.

34. Gilbert Stuart: *Sir William Grant* (1782, Washington NGA)

Raeburn was not the first to paint a skating portrait. American **Gilbert Stuart** (1755–1828), who came over to Britain relatively early in his career—before going back to paint his iconic portraits of **George Washington** and the five Presidents after him—had a reputation as a head-and-shoulders-only man, as these earlier portraits suggest; one contemporay said that Stuart "*made a tolerable likeness of a face, but as to the figure, he could not get below the fifth button*." But his painting of Scottish landowner **Sir William Grant** changed all that; Stuart later remarked that he was "*suddenly lifted into fame by a single picture*." Grant would soon make a brilliant career in politics, but at that moment he was just a private

individual. One wonders if Stuart could have chosen such as pose if his subject was already a holder of high office. But then, if he had not had *some* renown, would anyone have cared about his portrait?

35. Raeburn: *The Archers* (Portrait of Robert and Ronald Ferguson, 1790, London NG)
36. William Powell Frith: *The Fair Toxophilites* (1872, London, Royal Albert Memorial)

One of the reasons why skating works so well in a portrait, I think, Is because the action itself involves pauses between strokes, moments when the skater glides apparently effortlessly across the ice; it would not be at all the same to paint the figures running. This is true also of the only other Raeburn portrait I know that depicts action: his 1790 portrait of the brothers **Robert and Ronald Ferguson**, known as *The Archers.* For archery too has this moment of stillness before the arrow is released. I am surprised there are not more such portraits. I only know of one, *The Fair Toxophilites* (1872) by **William Powell Frith** (1819–1909). But as the models were his own daughters, the subject was the sport, not the sitters.

37. Raeburn: *William Hunt* and *Sir John Sinclair*

Not that other Raeburn portraits are without at least implied movement. On the right we have **Sir John Sinclair**, the Laird of Ulbster, wearing a rather absurd military uniform that apparently he designed himself! Note Raeburn's use of the wild Scottish scenery and that turbulent sky; it is exactly the same approach as Lawrence's portrait of Lord Londonerry that we saw in the first hour; it would soon become a cliché for military portraits. But the man in the left-hand portrait is a civiliam, **William Hunt of Pittencrieff**. The sky may be marginally less dramatic, the scenery less craggy, but the implication of action is even stronger. The man is clearly out hunting in some way, and has sat down for a moment's rest; the dog is still panting. Again, it is the trick of painting the pause in the activity, rather than the activity itself.

38. Anthony Van Dyck: *Charles I at the Hunt* (c.1635, Paris Louvre)

For this too, Raeburn had a precedent, in this case a much older portrait of King Charles I out hunting by **Anthony Van Dyck** (1599–1641). It uses the same principle: a moment of repose in an otherwise energetic activity. Michael Levey (who used to be a Hopkins) writes "*Charles is given a totally natural look of instinctive sovereignty, in a deliberately informal setting where he strolls so negligently that that he seems at first glance nature's gentleman rather than England's King*."

39. Anthony Van Dyck: *Charles I with M. de Saint Antoine* (1633, Royal Collection)

Compare this slightly earlier Van Dyck portrait of Charles. This time it's not a moment of repose at all. The thing is slightly over life-size, and the King seems be riding through the wall of the room right into the hall. But it works because it is so blatantly artificial: not even kings have their armorial bearings propped casually against a wall.

40. Copley: *Paul Revere* (1770) and Neagle: *Pat Lyon at the Forge* (1827)

I promised I'd done enough with kings and queens; let's turn to more ordinary folk. And let's drop my exclusive focus on Britain so far. When we talk of action in a portrait, it need not be some strenous activity. These two American portraits both show craftsmen doing what they do; working at an anvil

might be hard, but burnishing a teapot wouldn't rise a sweat. The artists are **John Singleton Copley** (1738–1815) and **John Neagle** (1796–1865). I wrote about them on the online syllabus site, so needn't elaborate here. Both people were at one time craftsmen as they are shown. Copley painted **Paul Revere** five years before his Ride, but I bet he was already well-known as a patriot. **Pat Lyon** had long since left the forge to become an engineer, inventor, and entrpreneur, but he wanted himself depicted as he was when he was wrongfully imprisoned years before.

41. Giovanni Battista Moroni: *The Tailor* (1565–70, London NG)

With those two in mind, what do you make of this? It is a painting by the Italian artist **Giovanni Battista Moroni** (1520–78) called simply *The Tailor*. He is cutting cloth, certainly, but his clothes and grooming are those of a gentleman. The National Gallery site suggests that it might be a member of a family of artists who gave up the studio to become cloth dealers, a higher status than mere tailors. However it would not surprise me to learn that this was a portrait of a rich man, and his depiction as a draper had some sort of symbolic function now lost to us.

42. The two pictures below
43. Fernand Khnopff: *Jeanne Kefer* (1885, Getty Museum)
44. Mary Cassatt: *Little Girl in a Blue Armchair* (1878, Washington NGA)

I had hoped to do an entire section on portraits of children, but these will have to do, one by the Belgian **Fernand Khnopff** (1858–1921), the other by American-in-Paris **Mary Cassatt** (1844–1926). I put them on the class website, so you will already have had time to think about them. They were painted within three year of one another, and they both show a little girl from a well-to-do family. But how are they different in terms of action? The upper picture is so still that it might almost be a photograph; the girl in a Sunday outfit so formal that she scarce dare to move in it; and the horizontal and vertical lines of the background only emphasize the stillness. Mary Cassatt's child has obviously thrown herself into the chair in a fit of boredom; there is nothing composed about her; you suspect that she will equally soon leap up again. And compare the free brush stokes on the furniture with the smooth surfaces of the Khnopff. It is almost **action painting**… which rather tenuous connection takes me to the clip I am using as an interlude, a short sequence from the film *Pollock* (2000) in which **Ed Harris** as **Jackson Pollock** (1912–56) locks himself away from wife **Lee Krasner** (Marcia Gay Harden) to tackle the first of his trademark works.

45. *Pollock*, the creation of the Peggy Guggenheim mural

D. The Sitter Unclothed

46. Section Title D (Bronzino portraits of Cosimo de' Medici)

I'm rather proud of that, although it was easy enough to do. Both paintings are portraits of **Cosimo de' Medici** by his count painter **Agnolo Bronzino** (1503–72); the music is from the Medici court. There are numerous copies of the one of the Duke in armor, but the nude is truly original. It shows him in the

guise of Orpheus, the fabled musician who could charm the animals, and being a classical subject of course he is naked—heroically so, like a Michelangelo sculpture. Is it also erotic? I leave that to you. I'm starting with it because he is a man, and all of my other examples of the comparatively rare genre of nude portraits are of women, and with most them, the eroticism is part of the package.

47. Gallery of female nude portraits, 1491–1752

Here is the gallery: five portraits from 1491 to 1752. All are nude down to the waist; one totally so. But the nature of that nudity and relationship to the artist is different in each case. I'll show the first two without titles at first, and invite you to guess about each before I explain.

48. Piero di Cosimo: *Simonetta Vespucci* (1491, Chantilly), untitled
49. — the same, with title

What about this Renaissance beauty? Why is she bare-breasted? What is that curious necklace? This one has a name written right on it: *Simonetta Vespucci*, reportedly the most beautiful woman in Florence. The trouble is that the painter, **Piero di Cosimo** (1462–1521), was only 14 when she died, so it her image is either taken from a medal or entirely invented; it is not a portrait. In which case, he would have chosen her as the depiction of the Ideal Woman; the breasts would be a symbol of purity rather than lust; and the snake biting its own tail in entwined in her necklace a symbol of eternity or rebirth.

50. Anonymous: *Gabrielle d'Estrées and one of her Sisters* (1594, Louvre), untitled
51. — the same, with title and additional images

This one from over a century later is even odder; what on earth is going on? Is it even a portrait? The image has been used in posters by gay rights activists, but it is curiously public for such a private act. No, the left-hand woman is clearly trying to indicate something. And although we don't know the name of the artist, we do know the sitters because we have other portraits of both of them. The woman at the right is **Gabrielle d'Estrées**, the mistress and political adviser to Henri IV. The other woman is her sister. It was Gabrielle who convinced the king to convert from Protestantism to Catholicism (the occasion for his remark, "Paris is worth a mass"), and laid the groundwork for the **Edict of Nantes**, which ended the religious wars between the two factions. Henri in fact had obtained an annulment from his marriage to his official wife, and declared his intention of marrying Gabrielle—hence probably the ring she is holding—though she died before he could go through with it. And that gesture to the nipple? It is her way of announcing that she is pregnant, as that second version of the picture demonstrates.

52. Raphael: *La donna velata* and *La fornarina*

We won't play the guessing game with this one, except that the interpretation of this picture and its companion, *La donna velata* or *The Veiled Lady,* has been filled with guesses from the beginning. Both are portraits by **Raphael** (1483–1520) of the same woman, traditionally identified as one Margarita Luti. In the hagiography that accumulated after Raphael's death, she is *La fornarina,* or the baker's daughter who allowed herself to become his mistress but refused to marry him. So she is his model, and he does what painters have always done: dress her up in finery, and paint her nude. I personally prefer the

clothed version, because the fabric has a sensuality that I don't find in the flesh. But I would ask you, is there anything in the nude version to indicate that she is more than just a model?

53. Rubens: *Hélène Fourment in a Fur Coat* (1635)

There is no need for stories and speculation about this one; we know the facts. This is **Hélène Fourment**, the second wife of **Peter Paul Rubens** (1577–1640). She had married him about five years before, when he was 53 and she only 16; Isabella Brant, the artist's first wife had been her sister-in-law (Hélène's brother married Isabella's sister). Anyway, there is no doubt what is going on: this is a painter who loves women painting the woman he loves.

54. François Boucher: *Reclining Girl* (1752, Munich)
55. — the same, with alternative title

I don't imagine that anyone would think that this *Reclining Girl* was anybody's wife: **François Boucher** (1703–70) paints her with frank eroticism as a sweetmeat served up on a platter; she could have been any one of his numerous anonymous nudes. Boucher did not include her name in the title, so it is not a portrait. But we have good reason to believe that this is indeed a portrait, of a young girl from an Irish family named **Louise O'Murphy**, who became for a while the *petite maitresse* (unofficial mistress) of Louis XV, until she made the mistake of challenging the official one, **Madame de Pompadour**, and was quickly pensioned off. It was Boucher himself who unwittingly served as Miss O'Murphy's pimp. According to a source at the time, he sold the painting the Madame de Pompadour's brother; the King saw it, and wondered whether the model was a delicious as the picture; an introduction was arranged, and he found that she was even more appealing in person. The rest is history.

56. Donne: *To his Mistress on Going to Bed* (Tom O'Bedlam)

There may not be time for an interlude, but I am thinking of the poem *To his Mistress on Going to Bed* by **John Donne** (1571–1631), read by **Tom O'Bedlam**. It would be pointless for me to point out that Donne was the Dean of Saint Paul's Cathedral and one of the greatest writers of religious poetry in history; there is no denying the X-rated eroticism of this poem. We'll see.

E. In the Spotlight

57. Section title E (Chopin*: Ballade #2*)
58. All five portraits

That was part of the *Second Ballade* by **Fryderyk Chopin** (1810–49), with his actual manuscript on the screen. The portrait was by **Eugène Delacroix** (1798–1863). I have highlighted the face to fit my Spotlight theme, but the Chopin music really does come to a brief halt there. For this final section, I am going to stop lecturing and give you five portraits of performers—another special category—each with the most appropriate audio clip I can find. Chopin was the first of them, and I shall end with another

Delacroix portrait of a musician, **Paganini**. In between, we have a fiddler, a Shakespearean actor, and a dancer, all in portraits by major artists.

59. Raeburn: *Niel Gow* (1787, Edinburgh NGS)

This is Henry **Raeburn's** portrait of **Niel Gow** (1727–1807), a Scottish fiddler and composer. [That's not a typo; the I really does come before the E.] I had never heard of him, but there are several excellent videos on YouTube. I'll give you a link to a live performance of his *Lament for the Death of His Second Wife;* here is a minute of it in audio.

60. Niel Gow: *Lament for the Death of his Second Wife,* excerpt
61. Lawrence: *John Philip Kemble as Coriolanus* (1798, London Guildhall)

As you can imagine from his dramatic painting of Lord Londonderry, **Sir Thomas Lawrence** reveled in the dramatic, and he painted the great actor of the day, **John Philip Kemble**, in his greatest role, Coriolanus. Now of course we don't have a recording of Kemble; the earliest recording of one of the grand old Shakespeareans is **Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree** a century later, but it is so old that it is practically unlistenable. But the relatively modern actor **Edward Petherbridge** studied it and included an imitation in part of a one-man show. It is not Coriolanus but another of Shakespeare's Roman characters: **Mark Antony's** funeral speech over the body of *Julius Caesar*. So this is third-hand at best, but it is still pretty terrific, and absolutely matches the brooding melodrama of Lawrence's portrait.

62. Edward Petherbridge as Tree as Mark Antony
63. Toulouse-Lautrec: *Marcelle Lender in "Chilpéric"* (1895, Washington NGA)

Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec (1864–1901) loved night life, *any* kind of night life. Here he is at the operetta, painting one of his favorite performers, Marcelle Lender, dancing (and presumably singing) the Boléro in a revival of the operetta *Chilpéric* by **Florimond Hervé** (1825–92). I think he was more interested in Lender's body, but the voice part is pretty spectacular too; the soprano here is **Lina Dachary**.

64. Hervé: *Chilpéric,* Boléro
65. Delacroix: *Paganini* (1831, Washington, Phillips Collection)

Finally, the Delacroix portrait of **Niccolò Paganini** (1782–1840), whose violin playing was so astounding that he was said to have made a bargain with the Devil. This time, I won't give you an audio track but a clip from the 2013 film *The Devil's Violinist*. German violinist **David Garrett**, who's quite a hunk himself, shows not only the performer's skill, but his rock-star effect on young women. Delacroix paints not so much as portrait as a twisted heiroglyphic of his uncanny possession.

66. *Paganini, the Devil's Violinist*, Caprice XXIV
67. Class title 3 (Paganini)