

7: We're Not Alone

A. The Significant Other

1. Class title 1 (Frans Hals: *The Meagre Company*, detail lhs.)

This class will be about portraits that contain two or more figures. In the first hour, we will consider portraits of people related by bonds of love or family: lovers, spouses, parents and children, even extended families. In the second hour, we'll look at groups connected by profession, affinity, or historical circumstance, as they are in this detail of a painting by **Frans Hals**,

2. Gwen Raverat: *John Maynard Keynes* (1906, London NPG)

This is the English economist, **John Maynard Keynes** (1883–1946) painted in 1906 by **Gwen Raverat** (1885–1957), Charles Darwin's granddaughter; the work is in the National Portrait Gallery. Both were members of the Bloomsbury Group and, like many of the other men in the circle, Keynes was homosexual; even in the Bloomsbury group, nobody painted portraits of such relationships. But in 1921, he met the ballerina **Lydia Lopokova**, star of the **Diaghilev Ballets Russes**, and married her, switching his sexual orientation apparently for the rest of his life. The National Portrait Gallery also has a later portrait of the two of them, painted in 1932 by **William Roberts** (1895–1980); Keynes is now Baron Keynes. It introduces my first section, **The Significant Other**, portraits of couples.

3. Section title A (William Roberts: *Baron Keynes and Lydia Lopokova*, NPG 1932)

4. — the above, with Roberts' self portrait with his wife (1942)

When I first saw it, I thought the Roberts portrait was rather comic, but then I saw that the artist, who started his career as a leading abstractionist, painted himself with his own wife in much the same way.

5. Rogier van der Weyden: *The Last Judgement* (c.1445, Beaune), closed

Husbands and wives do not always share the same frame; in earlier periods, in fact, it was the exception rather than the rule. You remember the *Beaune Triptych* by **Rogier van der Weyden** (1399–1464) that I showed in the first class? We know that the figures at the lower corners are husband and wife. The two panels together in effect make up a single picture, occupying a different scale and space from the other parts of the polyptych, linked by sharing an identical background.

6. Robert Campin: portraits of an unknown man and woman (c.1435, London NG)

So what do we make of these, from a slightly earlier Netherlandish painter, **Robert Campin** (1375–1444)? Are they the donor panels salvaged from some since-dismantled altarpiece? That argument is supported by the fact that the backs of both panels are marbled, suggesting that they were not intended to be hung against a wall. But they do not look like supporting characters in some larger work, either;

the faces are too large, too detailed, and too striking not to think that *they* were the point of the picture, not something else now lost. So perhaps they were intended to be displayed standing on edge on a table, either hinged or placed close together.

7. Piero della Francesca: *Battista Sforza and Federico da Montefeltro* (1474, Uffizi)
8. — reverse of the above

That is certainly the case with this pair of the **Duke and Duchess of Urbino**, painted later in the century by **Piero della Francesca** (1415–92). Husband and wife occupy separate panels, but they are linked by the landscape running continuously behind the two on both the front and back, and by the very similar treatment of their reverse sides, which show Duke and Duchess in procession on triumphal carriages, with their virtues proclaimed both iconographically and in text.

9. Two pairs of spousal portraits by Lucas Cranach

Matched portrait diptychs were not solely the province of princes; here are two husband-and-wife pairs by the German painter **Lucas Cranach the Elder** (1472–1553). You could figure out the German, I suppose, but without doing that, can anyone guess who they are? And more particularly, which face fascinated the painter the most? The man at the bottom is **Martin Luther**, with the wife he took after leaving the priesthood. The upper figures are his parents, and it strikes me that they have far more character, as though Cranach was trying to figure out where all that bulldog tenacity comes from!

10. Frans Hals: *Pieter Tjarck and Maria Lapp* (1635, Los Angeles and London)
11. Frans Hals: *Stephanus Geeraerds and Isabella Coymans* (1650, pc)

So far from being an archaic convention, portraits of husbands and wives were commonly painted in pairs through the Eighteenth Century at least, intended to be hung in symmetrical positions, such as on either side of a mantelpiece. **Frans Hals** (1582–1666) did almost three dozen of such pairs; here are two couples you might like to compare. Most of them match in a rather formal way, generally with the man having more character than the woman, as **Pieter Tjarck** does in the earlier of these paintings. But the later pair stood out for me, partly for the affectionate gesture the couple extend to one another across the space, but especially for the radiant smile with which the bride **Isabella Coymans** responds.

12. Hals: *Wedding portrait of Isaac Massa and Beatrix van der Laan* (1622, Rijksmuseum)
13. — the same with Rubens: *The Honeysuckle Bower* (c.1609, Munich)

No doubt Hals found the smaller-format paintings easier to dash off and thus more profitable, but earlier in his career, he painted at least one wedding picture where the couple are shown together in an elaborate setting. He may not have known it, but a decade earlier, **Peter Paul Rubens** (1577–1640) painted a portrait of himself with his wife **Isabella Brant** in a similar setting. Compare the two backgrounds. The honeysuckle bower seems a nice symbol for the bliss of married love; by comparison, the Italian park of the Hals is strangely formal.

I could go on from here to a whole series of self-portraits in which artists paint themselves with their wives—we saw a couple two weeks ago with **Rembrandt** and **Corinth**—but I don't want to go back there

now. Instead, I would mention that, in the heyday of British portrait painting in the later Eighteenth Century, an outdoor setting became standard. Leading the way is this remarkable portrait of the East Anglian landowner **Robert Andrews** and his wife, an early work by **Thomas Gainsborough** (1727–88).

14. **Thomas Gainsborough: Mr. and Mrs. Andrews (1750, London NG)** — pause at start
15. — the same with detail of Mrs. Andrews

What do you imagine was his intent? It has been described as a **triple portrait**: of Mr. Andrews, his wife, and his land. Gainsborough may even have been intending to make it into a *quadruple* portrait; there is an unfinished patch on the lady's skirt that is surely reserved for the later addition of a baby!

16. **Gainsborough: Mr. and Mrs. Hallett ("The Morning Walk"), 1785, London NG**

Gainsborough continued to use outdoor settings for many of his portraits. If you move on 35 years and look at this portrait of **Elizabeth Stephen** shortly before her marriage to **William Hallett**, you can see that not only Gainsborough's painting style has changed, he is now using landscape in a different way.

17. *Gotha Lovers with the Arnolfini Wedding*

All of these so far have been marriages—but there are some exceptions. The *ne plus ultra* of a marriage celebration is surely the so-called *Arnolfini Wedding* by **Jan van Eyck** (–1441), that we saw in the first class; it is virtually a marriage certificate in paint. If you can't decipher the German, you would think that this much less sophisticated work from later in the century is more of the same, only with the documentary element literally conveyed through words. But in fact it is surprisingly different. It seems to be a portrait of **Count Philip of Hanau** and his concubine **Margaret Weisskirchner**. Philip's wife died young, and he took up quite openly with Margaret, but could not marry her because she was not of his class. Nonetheless, the inscription says that although their relationship is not sanctified by law, it is based on love.

18. — the same with portrait of *Louis XIV and Mme. de la Vallière*

I don't know any other portrait of a ruler with a woman not his wife. Many have had mistresses, but with the exception of this and the portrait of *Louis XIV and Madame de La Vallière* we saw last week—painted after her death—they have always been painted separately.

19. **Delacroix: Chopin and George Sand, with Green: Britten and Pears**

Portraits of princes, of course, were public documents; more ordinary people can have their portraits painted in private. But if they are artists, they are not bound by the same standards of propriety. So **Eugène Delacroix** (1798–1863) could paint a portrait of **Fryderyk Chopin** with his lover, the infamous **George Sand** (who appears strangely domestic in the portrait); it was never finished, however, but broken up to be sold separately; the Chopin portion is in the Louvre. And **Benjamin Britten** (1918–76) could have his portrait painted in 1943 with his life-partner, tenor **Peter Pears**, even though homosexual relationships were illegal at the time. The artist, **Kenneth Green** (1905–86), was from the same part of the country (Suffolk), so Britten probably met him through friends; the portrait now hangs in the

National Portrait Gallery. Green went on to design the costumes for Britten's first major opera, *Peter Grimes*. This is my cue for a movement from Britten's *Serenade for Tenor, Horn, and Strings*, which Pears premiered in the same year, 1943; this is that original recording (with some graphics by **Turner**).

20. Britten: *Serenade for Tenor, Horn, and Strings*, movement 2 (original recording)

B. Kids Will Be Kids

21. Section title B (the picture below)

22. Maerten van Heemskerck: *Pieter Jan Popperszoon and his Family* (c.1530, Kassel)

This family portrait by **Maerten van Heemskerck** (1498–1574) is often cited as the first family group. The parents are joined by their three young children. The two eldest of them seem as natural as you could possibly wish, but the mother and baby have distinct overtones of *Madonna and Child*. Which may well be intentional, for it has been pointed out that the meal set out so casually on the table is in fact a series of allusions to the **Holy Eucharist**. Which would make the picture not only a pleasant family group but also a testament to their piety. In this hour, we shall look at other portraits containing children—grown offspring in a couple of cases—not all of which may be as straightforward as they appear.

23. Gainsborough: *Portraits of his Daughters*

24. — enlargements of two of the above

We were looking at **Thomas Gainsborough**. Here are portraits of his daughters, **Mary** and **Margaret**. What do you think their ages are in each? My guess would be 7 and 5 (left, top), 9 and 7 (left, bottom), and 15 and 13 (right). The drawing lesson is so different from the other two that one wonders why. The National Gallery website suggests the reason is aspirational: the father hoping that his daughters would make a living through his own profession. In fact, however, both were beginning to show signs of mental instability. Mary returned to the family home after a brief disastrous marriage, and lived there for the rest of her life with Margaret, who never married.

25. — details of the three Gainsboroughs together

Taken as a set, these three portraits, along with the five others that Gainsborough did, are the equivalent of a family album, or even those marks on a wall to record your children's growth. And this is an important point about group portraits in general. Whereas solo portraits in general try to freeze time, revealing something about the sitter that is not momentary but lasting, *group portraits tend to involve the time element more directly*. At the very least, they pose the question of what has brought the people together in this place at this moment, and family portraits have the additional effect of stopping the clock in the all-too-brief period of one's children growing up.

26. — the two pictures below

27. Van Dyck: *Three Eldest Children of Charles I* (1635, Royal Collection)

28. Van Dyck: *Five Eldest Children of Charles I* (1637, Royal Collection)

Here is another comparison: two paintings of the same family a little under two years apart. They are in fact the children of **King Charles I**, painted by **Anthony Van Dyck** (1599–1641). The earlier of the two includes two future kings, Charles II and his brother **William II**. Yes, the shortest child is not a girl but a boy; in those days, young boys and girls were regularly dressed alike until they were 5 or 6. This is the second version of the three-child group that Van Dyck painted; in the first, he had painted both boys in dresses, as they would have been. But the king was angry, and the painter did it again, changing the costume; portraits of royal families, unlike ordinary ones, inevitably carried dynastic implications. You will see that James is still unbreeched in the later picture. In both, though, there is a tension between the children being allowed to be children, or posed as young adults, though the addition of the King Charles spaniels is a nice softening touch. But why the mastiff, do you think?

29. Van Dyck: *Charles I, Henrietta Maria, and their Eldest Children* (1632, Royal Coll.)

30. Family portraits of Sir Walter Raleigh and the Duke of Buckingham

Three more to emphasize the dynastic point: in this earlier Van Dyck, and the two portraits from earlier still, it is very clear that the purpose of showing the children is to make a claim on the future: the line will continue. Whatever artist painted Sir Walter Raleigh and his son has deliberately put the boy in exactly the same pose as his father: a chip off the old block!

31. Titian: *Ranuccio Farnese* (1542, Washington NGA)

Here is another child, a twelve-year-old called **Ranuccio Farnese**, in a very sensitive portrait by **Titian** (1485–1636). As we zoomed out, though, you will see that he is not dressed as a child at all, but as Prior of the Knights of Malta. In three years time, he will be appointed a Cardinal, at the age of 15. Why? Because his grandfather is **Pope, Paul III**. But surely Catholic priests are not supposed to marry? True, but if you are a member of a powerful clan like the Farneses, you can not only have illegitimate children but can advance them to powerful positions.

32. Titian: *Pope Paul III with his grandsons Alessandro and Ottavio Farnese* (1545, Naples)

Three years later, Titian painted the Pope with two of Ranuccio's older brothers. **Alessandro Farnese** holds the believe-it-or-not-official position of *Cardinal Nipote*, that is a close adviser to the Pope who is also a blood relative, called "nephew" for the sake of decorum, but often closer than that. **Ottavio Farnese** is Duke of Parma. It is clear from the picture that both younger men are engaged in a complex dance of courtship with their aged grandfather. But he would turn the tables, removing titles as easily as conferring them—which may be why Titian never finished the picture. [Pope Paul's sister, incidentally, **Giulia Farnese**, had been the mistress of a previous Pope, Alexander VI; go figure!]

33. The two pictures below

34. Degas: *The Bellelli Family* (1858–67, Orsay)

35. Renoir: *Mme. Charpentier and her Children* (1878, NY Met)

Let's get back to real children, and a comparison from a more recent era. These are both family pictures by the Impressionist painters **Edgar Degas** (1834–1917) and **Pierre-Auguste Renoir** (1841–1919), though the Degas was begun almost two decades before the first Impressionist show. But we are not thinking

about style at the moment. What, other than period, are the similarities between the pictures? The differences? Which do you think would have pleased the families more? Why did the artist paint them? The answers to the last two questions are simplest in the **Renoir**: Mme. Charpentier was a well-known socialite, the portrait was a commission, and Renoir achieved a lovely intimacy while nonetheless painting lively pictures of mother, son (again yes!), and daughter, and also conveying a very good sense of the elegant room.

The **Degas** picture is more complicated. While studying at the Uffizi, the young Edgar Degas stayed in Florence with his aunt **Laura**, who had married an Italian journalist, **Gennaro Bellelli**. Laura is in black because her father (Edgar's grandfather) had recently died; he is shown in the portrait hanging behind her. There was apparently tension in the marriage, which is why Gennaro is shown off to one side, with his back half turned. One assumes that Degas painted it because the subjects were to hand, but he may also have welcomed the challenge of painting a unified portrait of a family that was not entirely happy. The point in both cases is that a group portrait has the additional function of showing something of the relationships among the sitters, and in a family portrait that may well be the main point.

36. Matisse: *Family Scene* ("The Music Lesson"), 1917, Barnes Foundation

One more French family picture, this time by **Henri Matisse** (1869–1954). Officially called *Family Scene*, it is more commonly known as *The Music Lesson*. Matisse himself is represented by the violin in the open case—he was an amateur violinist—and one of his paintings hanging on the wall behind. **Jean**, the elder of his two sons, is reading a paper; **Pierre**, the younger, is practising on the piano, helped by his half-sister **Marguerite**, Matisse's daughter by an earlier lover. **Amélie Matisse**, the artist's wife, sits outside in the garden sewing. It has been noted that the picture does not give much sense of family harmony, other than of the musical kind. This may be because it was done in wartime (1917); the entire family has relocated to a rented house outside Paris, and Jean is home for only one day before joining the army.

37. Debussy: *Children's Corner*

What music might Pierre have been playing? There is a score by Haydn on the piano, but another possibility is the *Children's Corner Suite* for young players published by **Claude Debussy** (1862–1918) in 1908. Here is a film from 1936 featuring **Alfred Corot** playing the opening movement, *Doctor Gradus ad Parnassum*, a take-off from the piano studies of that name by **Muzio Clementi**.

38. Debussy: *Children's Corner* (film, 1936)

39. Class title 2 (Sargent: *Boit Daughters*)

C. Colleagues in Conversation

40. Section title C (Frans Hals)

The first hour was families; this one is colleagues. And where else but in Holland, the most civic-minded country of the Seventeenth Century, positively awash with learned societies, governing boards, and volunteer militias—all commissioning group portraits galore. And among the many painters who supplied this need, one stands head and shoulders above the rest: **Rembrandt** (1606–69). Here is a quick overview of his three great group portraits, put to Dutch music of the same period.

41. Rembrandt: the three great group portraits (flip video)

Once again, I am going to repeat myself; most of the material in the next 20 minutes has been shown in other classes. But since these three works by Rembrandt constitute the **Everest, K2, and Kangchenjunga** of Dutch group portraiture, there is no way I can avoid them. The three works shown here are examples of well-known genres in Dutch art of the Golden Age; the subjects are not unique. Nonetheless, Rembrandt found solutions to each challenge that simply blew the competition out of the water. Let's look at them one at a time.

42. Aert Pieterszoon: *Anatomy Lesson of Dr. de Vrij* (1603) — pause at start

This is the Surgeons' Guild of Amsterdam in 1603. It is just a row of heads, and even when you include the central section—the annual anatomy demonstration by the official *Praelector*—it doesn't really hold together as a picture; it's just a row of heads like a school photo. This is by an artist called **Aert Pieterszoon** (1550–1612), painted in 1603.

43. Thomas de Keijzer: *Anatomy Lesson of Dr. de Vrij* (1619, Amsterdam Hist. Mus.)

When **Thomas de Keijzer** (1596–1667) painted the same event with the same lecturer in 1619, he at least managed to reduce the number of heads. Perhaps this was done economically, by raising the price charged to each, or perhaps the Guild itself made a heurastic decision. It at least avoids that row of heads, though I can't say it is much more successful as a picture.

44. Rembrandt: *The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp* (1632, The Hague, Mauritshuis)

So when young Rembrandt comes to Amsterdam in 1632 and lucks into such a commission, what does he do? He turns it from a posed picture into one of *action*. This is now a dynamic grouping, with each of the six spectators reacting with fascinated interest to whatever it is that **Dr. Tulp**, that year's *Praelector*, is doing. Rembrandt's dramatic tendencies serve him well, turning the formal occasion into a real event.

45. Eakins: *The Gross Clinic* (1875, Philadelphia)

Interestingly, there is at least one more modern painting with a similar theme, the *Portrait of Dr. Samuel D. Gross* painted in 1875 by pioneering realist **Thomas Eakins** (1844–1916) and commonly known as *The*

Gross Clinic. I shouldn't make too much of it, however, because although it is a portrait, only one figure is significant; the others were not paying a fee to get their faces in too.

46. Hals: *Regents of the St Elizabeth Hospital of Haarlem* (1641, Haarlem)

47. Hals: *Regentesses of the Old Men's Almshouse* (1664, Haarlem)

With board meetings, we get on to something more subtle. The picture I animated with the cartoon speech bubbles is one of the many group portraits by Frans Hals you will see if you go to Haarlem. The town seems to have been crammed with charitable institutions, all of which commissioned portraits of their boards from time to time. It seems that the men had a good deal more fun at their meetings than the women, who are generally older and solemnly godfearing!

48. Ferdinand Bol: *Governors of the Wine Merchants' Guild* (1663, Munich)

49. Rembrandt: *The Syndics of the Cloth Guild (De Staalmeesters)*, 1662, Rijksmuseum

50. — the two paintings together

But that was Haarlem. Life in Amsterdam was more concerned with business, and the board portraits you get tend to be of the people in charge of quality control. Rembrandt's last group portrait, the *Syndics of the Cloth Guild*, is his least original solution of the three, but it may also be the best picture. You can see by comparing it to a very similar subject by Ferdinand Bol (1616–80) done at almost the same time. I said that in *The Anatomy Lesson*, Rembrandt turns a pose into action. Well Bol implies some action in his group too, but Rembrandt's is the more natural, the more unified, and the one that most daringly breaks the fourth wall, as though we ourselves were a welcome guest being shown in. Beyond that, it is the difference between a great painter and a merely good one—and the great painter no longer merely observes, but sees *inside* his sitters as human beings.

51. Stuart Pearson Wright: *Presidents of the British Academy* (2001)

Such commissions today are generally given to photographers rather than painter. But when a painter does get such a gig, who can blame him, if like **Stuart Pearson Wright** (1975–) he takes a tongue-in-cheek view of the history and obvious artifice of such paintings and plonks it down on the table like a rubber chicken?!

52. Frans Hals: *Banquet of the Officers of the St. George Civic Guard* (1616, Haarlem)

The idea of sitting a lot of guys down for dinner is not original, of course. You get it especially in group portraits of **civic watch groups**, whose function was mainly ceremonial. If the officers get together for a dinner once a year to dress up and break out a few flags, then show it like that. Here is one of the best of such solutions, by **Frans Hals** in 1616; he makes it work because of the angle he has chosen for the table and the interplay of all those pink diagonals of banner and sashes.

53. Thomas de Keijzer: *Militia Company of Captain Allaert Cloeck* (1632, Rijksmuseum)

54. Rembrandt: *The Night Watch* (1643, Rijksmuseum)

But if the group has a quasi-military function, should you not show them at least on parade? To be fair, Hals has a few splendid portraits of this kind too, such as the one I used for my title, but the closest

comparison to Rembrandt's *Night Watch* of 1642 is probably this painting from ten years earlier by our friend **Thomas de Keijzer**, which hangs in the same room at the Rijksmuseum. I'd like you to compare them. But as you do, remember that "The Night Watch" is only a nickname. Rembrandt's work is simply another commission from a largely social group, some of whose members paid a lot and others less for their place in the picture. Its official title is *Militia Company of District II under the Command of Captain Frans Banninck Cocq and Willem van Ruytenburch*.

Let's end this section with a video tour of the painting, which I have set to a Dutch tune from around 1626, orchestrated by the founder of the National Symphony Orchestra in Washington, **Hans Kindler**.

55. Kindler: *Two Dutch Tunes of the 16th Century*, #2 "Our Country is Strong"

D. On the Canvas of History

56. Section title D (Trumbull: *Declaration of Independence*, 1819)

57. — still of the above

That of course was the *Presentation of the Draft of the Declaration of Independence* by **John Trumbull** (1756–1843); the music was the Revolutionary War hymn *Chester* by **William Billings** (1746–1800). Although Trumbull did not begin the work until 1817, 41 years after the date he depicted, he was able to obtain likenesses of almost all the original signers. In the end, he omitted the few he could not paint accurately, but also included a few non-signers whom he could paint. I want to devote this short closing section to depictions of historical events in which the artist has taken trouble to depict the real likenesses of most or many of the figures. Let me show you another painting of Revolutionary history, one which he witnessed and that involved people he knew, although it was also painted decades later.

58. Trumbull: *The Death of General Mercer at Bunker's Hill* (1815, Boston MFA)

This is the death of **Joseph Warren** at the **Battle of Bunker's Hill** in 1775. A patriot and political activist, Warren had recently been promoted general, but preferred to fight democratically, as a private soldier. The other important figure is **Major John Small**, an Englishman whom Trumbull met later in London and admired for his humanity; he is shown preventing a fellow-soldier from delivering the *coup-de-grace*.

59. The two Trumbull paintings together

Let's compare the two, especially in terms of what I was saying about **time** in group portraits, which seldom have the sense of transcending time that a solo portrait does. How does time work in each of these two? The *Declaration* is entirely static; *Bunker's Hill* is a brief moment in a whirlwind of action. I find it far the more exciting picture, although I have virtually no sense of the importance of the event. But the US Capitol painting has virtually the status of a foundation document; its significance indeed transcends time. Which gives me a cue to show once again this brief ad from **Ancestry.com** that shows what has happened in the intervening centuries.

60. Ancestry.com video

61. Thomas Barker: *The Relief of Lucknow* (1859, London NPG)

62. Jerry Barrett: *Florence Nightingale receiving the Wounded at Scutari* (1857, NPG)

Here are two scenes from British history, painted at almost the same time, and both classified by the National Portrait Gallery as *portraits*. The question is: should they be? *The Relief of Lucknow* by **Thomas Barker** (1815–82) represents an action in the **Indian Mutiny** in which British forces put down a rebellion by Sepoys (Indian soldiers), characterized by savagery on both side. The National Portrait Gallery lists 28 people represented. *The Mission of Mercy* by **Jerry Barrett** (1824–1906) commemorates the work of **Florence Nightingale** (1826–1910), the pioneering medical reformer who transformed the nursing profession and became a national heroine through her work in the Crimean War, becoming known as “The Lady with the Lamp” for her habit of visiting the wards at night to check on her patients. So again, do both qualify as portraits?

63. — details of both paintings

I think the Nightingale picture does, while the Lucknow one does not. But this may simply be that I am British and have been raised on Florence Nightingale as an iconic figure, which she still remains for many of my countrymen, while I can’t imagine that anybody cares much about what military commander raised the siege at Lucknow. But truth to tell, neither picture seems iconic in and of itself. Both were painted with an eye to the market in engraved reproductions, and that in turn depends upon showing the figures as they actually were. So both artists have tried to find a way to freeze time enough to make such a display of portraits possible (much as Trumbull did in the *Declaration of Independence*); I just think that Barrett came closer to success than Barker.

64. *The Angel of Mercy and The Lady with the Lamp*

Yet I would say that accuracy of detail matters. Look at these two chromolithographs perpetuating the Nightingale icon, one from slightly before the Barrett painting, the other from well after. They seem generic, don’t they, even preachy. Barrett at least traveled to Scutari in 1856 after the war was over and captured the setting and several of the minor characters. **But Nightingale herself refused to sit for him**, though he pleaded with her in no less than three interviews. He did, however, dash off a few sketches from memory, and it was these he used in painting the final portrait, plus a photograph taken by somebody else.

65. Jerry Barrett: *Sketches of Florence Nightingale, 1856*

So how can we find the authentic portrait of a woman who notoriously resisted having herself depicted? We can’t. The best we can do is listen to her voice recorded on a wax cylinder for a fundraiser shortly before she died, or see her portrayed in numerous films and television programs. In 195, my mother took me to see the film, *The Lady with the Lamp*, starring **Anna Neagle**; I’ll end with a clip from it.

66. Florence Nightingale’s voice

67. Anna Neagle in *The Lady with the Lamp* (1951)

68. Class title 3 (Embarkation of the Sick at Balaklava)