

# 5: The View in the Mirror

---

## A. Why Do They Do It?

1. Class title 1 (Gumpp self-portrait)
2. Section title A (transformation to Uffizi corridor)
3. Johannes Gumpp: *Triple Self-Portrait* (1646, both versions)

This is a small section of the huge collection of artists' self-portraits in the Uffizi Gallery in Florence. To be asked to contribute is an immense honor, and nobody refuses. But the painting I started with is by an artist—the Austrian **Johannes Gumpp** (1726– )—so obscure that he is known only for his two versions of this self-portrait: the circular one in the Uffizi and the other in private hands. All the same, the picture jumped out as the ideal title image for this class. A painter looking in the mirror and painting himself, that's what it's all about, isn't it? Only there are *four* painters in this image, not just one: the portrait on the canvas, the face in the mirror, the back of the painter looking in the mirror and painting what he sees—and by implication, the real painter, looking on from where we are standing and painting the other three!

4. The two pictures below
5. Parmigianino: *Self-Portrait in a Convex Mirror* (1524, Vienna KHM)
6. Johannes Gumpp: *Triple Self-Portrait* (1646, rectangular version)

The circular format (known as a **tondo**) suggests a comparison with another famous self-portrait from over a century earlier. This one is by **Parmigianino** (Francesco Mazzola, 1503–40), an artist whom we know a little more about from his several religious paintings. So a question: what do you think each artist was after in painting his self-portrait? One answer is probably obvious: the self-portrait relieves the artist of having to hire and model and arrange formal sittings. Using only himself, he is free to experiment in private. Both artists are young, around 20, and still flexing their artistic muscles. These may not be student works, but psychologically, they are graduation pieces. In each, the artist has set himself a challenge and proved that he could do it.

Look at the bottom of the Gumpp picture; we see **two animals, a cat and a dog**. They are more than a filler; they are there in the round version too, just harder to make out. So why are they there? The Uffizi website suggests that they represent the two sides of the human personality, perpetually at war with one another. I can't help thinking that this is a post-Freudian view, though, especially as I can't see such a conflict reflected in the portraits above. But it is an important reminder that a lot of self-portraits do seem to be **studies of personality** quite as much as appearance.

7. The four portraits below
8. Dürer: *Self-Portraits at 13 and 22* (Albertina, Louvre)

Let's turn from minor painters to a truly major one. Here are four self-portraits by **Albrecht Dürer** (1471–1528), drawn or painted when he was 13, 22, 16, and 28. So like the Gump and Pamigianino, the first two are the work of a young artist, and he is hardly much older in the second two. Again, my question is: Why do you think he painted them? The drawing—and Dürer was an even greater draftsman than he was a painter—a clearly a young man practising his craft with the resources he had on hand. The 1493 one is notable for the plant he holds in his hand; it is usually called a thistle, though it is not like many thistles I know. However, this particular plant is a symbol of male conjugal fidelity, and it may be significant that the artist has just completed his apprenticeship and is engaged to be married; maybe this was a gift for his bride.

#### 9. Dürer: *Self-Portraits at 26 and 28* (Prado, Munich)

In the third of these, he has dressed himself in the clothes of a Venetian aristocrat and painted himself in the Venetian manner, against an open window with landscape beyond; there is no sign that he is a painter, simply a gentleman. And what about the fourth? The full-frontal pose and the hand gesture are very similar to traditional references to Christ as *Salvator Mundi*. So is Dürer being blasphemous? The ideal of the “Imitation of Christ” has had a prominent place in Christian theology since the early fathers, and it received a new boost with **Luther** and his emphasis on personal responsibility. So this is a declaration of faith as well as a personal statement.

#### 10. The four portraits again

One more question, do you see any difference in purpose between the first two and the last two? The early drawing is clearly a personal exercise, not for publication. But Dürer presented his 1500 picture to the Nuremberg City Council; it was a public statement, intended to be seen. If the thistle portrait is indeed a betrothal gift, that would again make it personal, while the Venetian-nobleman one could be seen as an attempt to depict himself, not as a workman, but a gentleman of means and fashion. The division between self-portraits intended for **personal** reasons, and those for **public** display offers a nice classification scheme that I can pursue for the rest of the hour.

## B. No Longer Invisible

#### 11. Section title B (Ghiberti self-portrait)

This is the Florentine sculptor **Lorenzo Ghiberti** (1378–1455), putting his self-portrait right in the middle of his celebrated *Gates of Paradise* around 1437; I'll come back to him in a moment. In fact a number of large-scale works from the Italian Renaissance include self-portraits of their artists as a kind of signature. Here are two of them, by **Masaccio** (1401–28) and **Raphael** (1483–1520).

12. Masaccio: Self-Portrait in *St. Peter Enthroned* (1428, Florence, Brancacci Chapel)

13. Raphael: Self-Portrait in *The School of Athens* (1511, Vatican)

14. Ghiberti: Self-Portrait on *The Gates of Paradise* (1437, Florence Baptistery)

You will notice that both of these are modest, even obscure; even after seeing the close-up, I had to look quite closely at the picture to find it. Not so the Ghiberti, which is right in the middle of the doors, at eye level. All the other heads are figures from the Bible; he is the only contemporary figure. Ghiberti is a forerunner in a trend we saw with Dürer, and will see more and more often in later centuries: the artist asserting his status as a creator in his own right, and not as some technician laboring out of sight. Hence my title for this section, **No Longer Invisible**.

#### 15. Velázquez: *Las Meninas* (1656, Madrid Prado)

This is *Las Meninas* (the Maids of Honor, 1656), the masterpiece of **Diego Velázquez** (1599–1660). Showing himself painting the 5-year-old *Infanta*, he dominates the picture, even though he is in shadow. The princess is accompanied by her attendants and two dwarfs; the court chamberlain looks in at the back; and the King and Queen are shown in a mirror, looking on. Velázquez is shown wearing the cross of the Order of Santiago, although this must be a later addition; he was not granted it until three years later. But it is clear that this is a man accorded great respect and in perfect mastery of his craft.

#### 16. Courbet: *The Meeting* (“*Bonjour, M. Courbet*”), 1854, Montpellier

#### 17. Courbet: *The Painter’s Studio* (1855, Paris Orsay)

What would you say about the relative status of the two main people shown here? It is a painting by **Gustave Courbet** (1819–77) called simply *The Meeting*. It shows the painter arriving in Montpellier (where the painting still is) being greeted by his patron, Alfred Bruyas, who has come out on the road to meet him. One figure is clearly richer than the other, but the flow of respect is entirely to the artist. The next year, Courbet went on to paint a huge picture of himself in his studio. It is an allegory, not realistic. The figures on the right are the great and good of Paris (Baudlaire is at the extreme right); those on the left are some of the ordinary working people whom he painted; but the sense of adulation accorded the great master is unmistakable.

## C. Her Hand at the Easel

#### 18. Section title C (Hemessen, Anguissola, Leyster, Kauffmann, Knight)

If men used the self-portrait as a means of proclaiming their status, how much more so would it be with **women**, comparatively latecomers to the profession, and still struggling to achieve parity with men. Most of the rest of the hour will be about them. There have been female painters for centuries; here are five of them: **Catharina van Hemessen** and **Sofonisba Anguissola** in the 16th century, **Judith Leyster** in the 17th century, **Angelica Kauffmann** in the 18th, and **Laura Knight** in the 20th. The only one of these I am going to focus on now is **Sofonisba Anguissola** (1530–1625).

#### 19. Sofonisba Anguissola: two portraits at the Spanish court (c.1600)

Velázquez was by no means the first resident portrait painter at the Spanish court; there had been one or more with every generation. And one of these was an Italian woman, Sofonisba Anguissola, though

she was not recruited as such. Elizabeth de Valois, the young French queen of the widowed King Philip II (as in Verdi's *Don Carlo*) was apparently an amateur painter, and the Spanish ambassador to Italy recruited Sofonisba to be her tutor and companion. One of the portraits here is of the Queen, the other is Sofonisba herself; I have trimmed them to the same size. Which is which, and why do I even ask? In fact Sofonisba is on the left, but the extraordinary thing is that she is dressed to the same status as the Queen herself—though she did come from a noble family. Hers strikes me as the more characterful, the more confident of the two portraits.

#### 20. Sofonisba Anguissola: *Self-Portrait Being Painted by Bernardo Campi* (1550s, Siena)

The Anguissola family in Cremona sent Sofonisba to a local painter, Bernardo Campi, for training. And she painted a self-portrait of him painting her, an extraordinary conception for such a date. But there is an even odder thing about this, do you see it? Her left arm has two separate positions: hanging by her side, or apparently guiding his hand. The second was discovered only during cleaning, but it does raise the question: did she have a sense of the talented pupil taking over from the merely competent master?

#### 21. Anguissola: self-portraits in youth and old age

Sofonisba moved back to Italy when the Queen died in 1568; the King arranged a noble marriage for her to give her status, and provided a pension. She lived to 93, an unusually advanced age for the time, but painted herself as unstintingly in old age as she had in her teens.

#### 22. The two pictures below

#### 23. Artemisia Gentileschi: *Self-Portrait as La Pittura* (detail; 1630, Royal Collection)

#### 24. Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun: *Self-Portrait in a Straw Hat* (detail; 1782, London NG)

Let's go back to the comparison I put on the website. Here are two female artists, a century and a half apart, and from different countries, though both pictures have ended up in London. How would you describe the mood of each? What do we learn about each as a person? How has each chosen to present herself to the public? If each had an old-master influence in mind, who might it be?

#### 25. Artemisia Gentileschi, with Michelangelo

The strength of the painting by **Artemisia Gentileschi** (1593–1653) makes me think of **Michelangelo**. The comparison may be excessive, but there is nothing of Vigée-Lebrun's femininity in this painting. I think it significant that Artemisia has stripped away all the trappings; this might be a huge canvas, it might also be a blank wall. Like God in Genesis, she is creating something out of nothing. The reason the painting is in London is that it was there that she painted it. Her father **Orazio Gentileschi** had a commission to paint the ceiling of the Queen's House in Greenwich, and she came over to help him. Perhaps it irked her to see him, old and frail, entrusted with such monumental projects because he was a man, while she, young and strong, was confined to small cabinet pictures. Although not strident in its feminism, this is undeniably a claim to a place at the men's table.

26. Rubens: *Le chapeau de paille* (1622, London NG), with the Vigée-Lebrun

The old-master influence is much clearer in the case of **Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun** (1755–1842). She was paying explicit homage to a portrait by **Peter Paul Rubens** (1577–1640) of his sister-in-law Susanna Fourment, possibly on her marriage to Arnold Lunden in 1622 (though the identification is not certain); although the hat is not straw, the painting acquired the nickname of “The Straw Hat” quite early on. The homage to Rubens is itself a form of self-assertion, claiming her place as if by apostolic succession. But it is understated. She has no qualms about making herself probably more beautiful than she actually was, and emphasizing her femininity. She has no need to compete against men; the clientele she is courting are women of rank and privilege, and she needs them to know that she can make them as lovely and striking as she depicts herself. And she succeeded; here is her self-portrait in the Uffizi painting *Marie Antoinette*, with one of the ladies at the court of **Catherine the Great** she painted in Saint Petersburg later in her career.

27. Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun: *Self-Portrait Painting Marie Antoinette* (1790, Uffizi)

28. Adélaïde Labille-Guiard, *Self-Portrait* (1785, NY Met)

Here is a woman so close to Vigée-Lebrun in appearance—even down to the straw hat—that you might think one was a take-off of the other. The artist is **Adélaïde Labille-Guiard** (1749–1803). Both painters were French, both of a similar age; but one was working in London and the other in Paris, so it is probably just a matter of fashions of the time. It leads to a question: what do you think of those two women looking over the painter’s shoulder? For me, they make it into a domestic picture: two friends paying a visit to keep her company. But in fact it seems to have been a professional one. Labille-Guiard, who was already a portraitist at Versailles, had recently been given privileges at the Louvre, after a long struggle. The women apparently are her pupils, and she was quite active in campaigning for women’s recognition. However, the picture may be too non-confrontational to have much impact on the cause.

## D. Private Made Public

29. Section title D (Modersohn-Becker and Kahlo)

30. — still of the above

The pregnant woman on the left is the German Expressionist **Paula Modersohn-Becker** (1876–1907). She may be the first artist to paint herself nude; she is certainly the first to paint herself pregnant. Only she wasn’t. She was separated from her husband **Otto Modersohn** and living on her own in Paris. The portrait was not intended for public display; I rather think it was her personal way of working out her mixed feelings about marriage and motherhood. At any rate, she returned to her husband shortly after, and they started a child. She died ten days after the birth from a deep-vein thrombosis.

31. Frida Kahlo: *The Two Fridas* (1939, Mexico City)

The Modersohn was essentially a private picture that only entered the public sphere after her death. You would think that this picture by **Frida Kahlo** (1907–54)—a grotesque self-portrait as both mother and child—would be even more private still. But in fact this Mexican surrealist made her body and sufferings, both mental and physical, the chief subject of her art. Almost half her paintings are either self-portraits or self-referential. With her, the private *became* public. Rather than narrating my own slide-show, I will give you a video by an Englishman called **James Payne**, focusing upon the picture here, *The Two Fridas* (1939). I have shown it before—indeed most of the rest of this class is recycled from other courses; self-portraiture is a subject that keeps coming up. As the original video is 15 minutes long, I have made some cuts and may well stop before the end. But I think you will find it informative.

32. *Frida Kahlo: The Two Fridas, video by James Payne*

33. *Class title 2 (many Kahlo self-portraits)*

## E. Rembrandt's Eyes

34. *Section title E (Rembrandt's Eyes video, at quadruple speed)*

35. *Rembrandt self-portraits around 1630*

That was a little funky, I know. It is one of two videos about **Rembrandt** (Rembrandt Harmenz. van Rijn, 1606–69) that I made some years ago, speeded up four times and given new period-appropriate music. I'll show the other video at its proper speed in a couple of minutes. While many artists have painted occasional self-portraits, a few appear to have specialized in the subject; Kahlo is one and Rembrandt is another. Over ten percent of his work consists of self-portraits, including 7 drawings, 31 etchings, and 40–90 paintings (many original attributions turn out to be copies by his students).

36. *Rembrandt painted self-portraits from 1632 and 1650*

My intended structure for this class was going to be public self-portraits in the first hour and private ones in the second. Kahlo's tendency to make public art out of private moments has already confused the classification, and Rembrandt will do so even further. His big painted self-portraits, for example, are clearly for public display; there was already a good market among collectors for self-portraits by famous artists. Clearly, this applies to the earlier of the images shown here; it is obviously a sampler of the kind of portraiture that was providing his bread-and-butter at this stage in his life. But the later picture, together with half-a-dozen others from late in his career, no matter how monumental they may appear, would seem to have a personal, introspective quality that is very private indeed.

37. *Rembrandt self-portrait etching and drawing*

Or there is the question of what constitutes a "self-portrait" in the first place. Does a casual drawing count? Probably not, but the best of them capture something very true. Then what about the etchings? Many of them seem to catch a fleeting expression, sometimes wildly exaggerated. So are they private psychological studies of a conflicted personality like **Gump's** snarling cat and dog or even **Géricault's**

madmen? Had they been drawings, I might have said so, but etchings were produced to be sold in the dozens or even hundreds. It is much more likely that they were produced to satisfy a particular Dutch market for head-and-shoulder character studies, which they called *tronies*.

### 38. Rembrandt: *Belshazzar's Feast* (1636, London NG)

The important thing to remember is that Rembrandt was always highly dramatic, even *melodramatic*, as you can see from this picture here. All his life, he was trying on roles, dressing up—acting, in short—and you can see it in everything in which he appears. Only towards the end of his life does this acting change its nature from putting on a role to simply exploring himself. I hope my second video will explain this, and even give you something to discuss. I call it *Rembrandt's Moods*.

### 39. Video: *Rembrandt's Moods*

## F. Alone Among Friends

### 40. Section title F (Van Gogh, Gauguin, Bernard)

Here is a feast of self-portraits! In 1888, **Vincent van Gogh** (1853–90) was working in the South of France, at Arles. He had dreams of setting up an artist colony, and the first step was to get his friends to engage in an artistic Round Robin. He wrote to **Paul Gauguin** (1848–1903) and **Émile Bernard** (1868–1941), both of whom were already working in a kind of artist colony at Port Aven in Brittany, and asked for self-portraits. Each artist went one better, and included a sketch portrait of the other in the background of their own selfie. Bernard dashed his contribution off rather quickly; it is inscribed “To my chum (copain) Vincent.”

### 41. Gauguin: “*Les Misérables*,” *Self-Portrait with Bernard* (1888, Van Gogh Museum)

Gauguin, who was the one who eventually came to Arles in person, produced one of his masterpieces. Inscribed “**les misérables**,” he clearly identifies himself with the hero of the **Victor Hugo** novel, an outsider, misunderstood and even persecuted. Normally, Gauguin paints himself in a comparatively neutral manner, leaving the background and accessories to give the picture resonance. But in this picture, there is more—much more—in his face; perhaps the idea of acting the role of a fictional character enabled him to show more of himself, much as with Rembrandt.

### 42. — details of the Van Gogh and Gauguin Self-Portraits above

I had always assumed that the break-up of the Arles household after only a couple of months was due Vincent van Gogh's illness. Now I am not too sure; put them together like this, and they look like the roommates from Hell! We tend to look at Van Gogh's self-portraits with the hindsight knowledge that he went insane. Might not a psychiatrist have predicted much the same looking at Gauguin's?



#### 43. Géricault: *Portrait of a Kleptomaniac* (1822) with *Van Gogh Self-Portrait* (1889)

Remember these portraits of madmen by **Théodore Géricault** (1791–1824) that we looked at in the first class, painted for his friend who ran a mental hospital? Géricault was being entirely objective; his aim was diagnostic. If one can make an exact record of what these tormented people looked like on the outside, perhaps it is a step towards understanding them on the inside too? Knowing what we now do of Van Gogh's illness, it is tempting to look at his self-portraits as similar diagnostic tools—but it is difficult to be sure how much was his psyche, and how much merely his style.

#### 44. Van Gogh: various portraits (Arles)

This self-portrait has the popular nickname *Vincent in Flames*. But if you look at other portraits he painted at the same time, you will see the same style applies to them. Are they too to be seen as lost souls; has Vincent's madness now infected all his work; or is this simply what he likes to do with paint?

## G. Norwegian Moods

#### 45. Section title G (Solveig's Song)

#### 46. Munch: *Self-Portrait with Cigarette*, detail (1895, Oslo NGA)

That was a snatch of the *Peer Gynt* suite (1888) by the Norwegian **Edvard Grieg** (1843–1907). It was accompanied by some paintings by his countryman **Edvard Munch** (1863–1944), twenty years his junior. Only the first of them was a self-portrait, but in a sense *everything* Munch painted was a reflection of his depressive mind. So here is Munch—the psychological painter par excellence—caught in the lamplight against a dark background. You cannot tell if the vague forms swirling around him are solely cigarette smoke, or a painterly effect similar to many of Van Gogh's backgrounds. We tend to think that Munch's darkness is mainly a result of Nordic isolation, but he was quite a traveler. He lived for 14 years in Berlin, exhibiting with the most advanced German artists, and honored among them. He made several trips to Paris, knew the work of Gauguin, Toulouse-Lautrec, and Van Gogh, and later exhibited with the Fauves.

#### 47. Munch: *Self-Portrait at Age 19* (1882, Oslo, Munch Museum)

#### 48. Munch: *The Sick Child*. Second version, 1896, Gothenburg

But we do see this play of light and darkness even in this *Self-Portrait* he made while still a student. He himself traced his vulnerability to both mental and physical illness back to childhood. His mother and favorite sister died of tuberculosis while he was still young, and in reaction his father turned to an excessive moralistic piety. "Illness, madness, and death were the black angels that kept watch over my cradle," he would later write. His first major success was a painting called *The Sick Child*, which he exhibited in 1886; I am showing it in a later version, which reproduces better; Munch would make multiple versions of his major themes throughout his career.



49. Munch: *Love and Pain / The Vampire* (1895, Oslo, Munch Museum), untitled  
50. — the same, with titles

This picture has two alternative titles; can you guess what they might be? *Love and Pain* and *The Vampire*, both speaking to the conflicted attitude to women and sexuality in general, which stayed with him his entire life. If it is indeed a Vampire, is it the traditional situation of a man sucking the blood of a young woman? Or is it the opposite? All the way through his life, though Munch was to have many affairs including some of long duration, he always shied clear of commitment.

51. Munch: *Self-Portrait under a Female Mask* (1893) and *Self-Portrait in Hell* (1903)

Munch's self-portraits, like most of Gauguin's, tend to be **situational** rather than **internal**; they rely on their context to make their effect. Perhaps the female mask leering over his head in this 1893 *Self-Portrait* reflects his simultaneous desire for and fear of women, but his face reveals almost nothing. His *Self-Portrait in Hell* of ten years later is more explicit—he was beginning to suffer from alcoholism and mood swings—but hardly has a face at all.

52. Munch: *Self-Portrait with Wine Bottle* (1896, Munch Museum)

He doesn't always need the violent colors. This one, *Self-Portrait with Wine Bottle* of 1896, is bright and untroubled. But its extreme perspective, the unnatural stillness of the people at the back, and the prominence of the bottle all speak volumes. There is a distinct foreshadowing here of **Edward Hopper**.

53. Munch: *Self-Portrait with Hand Under Cheek* (1911)

Munch's drinking and mood swings became so severe that he suffered a major breakdown in 1909 and committed himself to a clinic. The effect was to change his life. He abandoned most of his obsessive themes of gloom and embraced the brighter colors he picked up from French painting; this might almost be a Bonnard. He bought a property outside Oslo, and retired there, though going off at various times to paint large-scale mural decorations on uplifting themes.

54. Munch: *Between the Clock and the Bed* (Self-Portrait, 1944)

All the same, some of the late self-portraits he made for himself alone, though still situational rather than internal, have a touching pathos.

## H. The Birthday Painter

55. Section title H (Corinth self-portraits, 1911–14)

56. Corinth: *Self-Portrait with Skeleton* (1896, Munich Lenbachhaus)

The music was part of the *Bourgeois Gentleman Suite* by **Richard Strauss** (1864–1949); I'll have more by him to end the hour. He is a contemporary of the prematurely-middle-aged art teacher shown here, **Louis Corinth** (1858–1925). But unlike the child prodigy Strauss, Corinth was a late bloomer. The date of

this is 1896. Two things had yet to happen; in 1900, he would start a series of annual self-portraits painted each year on his birthday—you have just seen four of them, from 1911 to 1914—and in 1902, he would open an own art school in Berlin, fall in love with his first student, **Charlotte Berend** (1880–1967), and marry her. Twenty-two years younger than he was, she brought new life to the older teacher, and remained his muse to the end of his life. Let's take the love story first.

57. Corinth: *Self-Portraits with Charlotte Berend-Corinth* (1902, 1903, and 1908)

58. — larger versions of the later two of the above.

59. Corinth: *In the Mirror* (1912, Worcester MA)

Here is the evidence: a *Self-Portrait* the year he met her; a *Self-Portrait with Model* the year after that; and a *Bacchante Couple* still happily living it up five years after that. Even ten years on, he is still standing admiringly behind her, painting his own self-portrait at the same time as two views of her. It is nice to be able to tell a happy story for once—especially as I too have been in the position of a forty-something teacher brought back to life by a much younger wife!

60. Corinth: *Self-Portraits in armor* (1911 and 1914)

Here are two in which Corinth is playing Rembrandt, dressing up in armor. What are the differences between them, in attitude or technique? What do you imagine might have caused them? On the left, before the stroke, he is bold and assertive. Whether he sees himself as a standard-bearer for art or politically as a proud Prussian, it is clear he is ready to fight (though not literally; he is 55). The later picture is almost as accomplished, but with looser brushwork, especially in the background; the real difference is in the attitude of the face; what would you think he is feeling? Quite apart from any reaction to the oncoming War, there has been a major event in Corinth's life—

61. Corinth: *Self-Portrait as the Blinded Samson* (1812, Berlin)

Look at these two self-portraits of 1912. How is it possible to believe that the dapper figure of the self-portrait at the left could depict himself as the ravaged, blinded Samson? He had suffered a stroke. He recovered fairly quickly, but he had lost most of the use of his left side—a crippling blow, since he was left-handed. But, doubtless with Charlotte's encouragement, he learned to paint again with his right hand, and was soon becoming almost as proficient, but more free technically.

62. Corinth: *Self-Portrait in a Straw Hat* (1922, Bern)

Yes, he did recover. You can see his later style in this *Self-Portrait* from 1922, relaxing at the family's summer cottage in the Bavarian Alps. It is almost Impressionist in comparison to the hard-edged modernism of his contemporaries **Ernst Kirchner** (1880–1938) or **Max Beckmann** (1884–1950), a self-portrait of 1922, at their summer cottage in the Bavarian Alps. Is this a great picture? Not compared to the *Self-Portrait with Model* or *Blinded Samson*. But we do not need to deal in *Angst* all the time. So I will end with him bringing his wife breakfast in bed, which I have accompanied with the little waltz from the breakfast-in-bed scene in the exactly contemporary *Rosenkavalier*, again by **Richard Strauss**.

63. Strauss: *Der Rosenkavalier* Breakfast Waltz (1911), with Corinth: *Morning Sun* (1910)