Introduction

What is it about images of other people and, in particular, their faces, that makes looking at them so compelling? And why has the human face been such a prevalent theme throughout the history of art?

Poets and artists have often referred to the human face as a mirror of one’s soul or spirit. The 19th-century German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer said, “A man’s face...is a compendium of everything his mouth will ever say, in that it is the monogram of all this man’s thoughts and aspirations.”¹ Faces serve as an important means of recognition and identification. They are the first things to which newborn infants respond, having learned to recognize their mother’s faces intuitively, without language or conscious thought. Faces are also the primary subject seen in the earliest drawings of young children. During the pre-schematic stage of development, when three- to four-year-olds recognize that a drawn symbol can stand for the real thing, their first attempts will begin with a circle for a head, later adding two vertical lines for feet.²

Beyond the permanent physiognomy of the features, faces allow humans to communicate in a way that verbal language cannot. Facial expressions are often the basis on which we form impressions of such characteristics as friendliness, hostility, trustworthiness, arrogance, and status, which, in some instances, can be crucial to survival. The face also enables humans to perceive or imagine another individual’s emotional state of mind. Most importantly, the face is a key component of identity. Along with one’s unique given name, one’s social function, and one’s relationship to others, faces make one person distinctive from another. Of these components, only the face is visible to the world; the rest is conceptual and must be expressed symbolically.³ When we “know” someone, we tend to envision his or her face. Thus, portraits, with their emphasis on the face, invite us to “know” others in a unique and vivid way, even if these individuals lived in another era or across the globe.

It has been said that true portraits are unique among other types of art because they depict a real person.⁴ However, verisimilitude is not always the artist’s goal.⁵
**Power Portraits**

Power portraits are images of authority, most often used by rulers to reinforce their position, their strength, their leadership, and, sometimes, their divinity. They are intended to influence and impress others, such as diplomats and members of the government or court, as well as the people over which the ruler has power. Such portraits usually depict the subject in a formal pose, surrounded by emblematic symbols of power. 

In the idealized images of rulers, accurate likenesses of specific individuals are not as important as the look and trappings of monarchy. Several artistic devices were used to exalt a ruler’s image and distinguish him or her from “mere mortals.” These might include representing the ruler with a flawless, youthful, or vigorous body, excellent posture, and a dignified or otherworldly demeanor.

The portrait in Figure 1 (pg. 264) of the ancient Egyptian pharaoh Thutmose IV (r. ca. 1400-1390 BCE) appears as part of a mural painting from the Eighteenth Dynasty (1570-1314 BCE). The pharaoh is distinguished by his regalia and symbols of office, such as the elaborate neckpiece and the *khat* head cloth topped with the *uraeus*, an upright cobra that represented divine authority. The dark color of his skin was commonly used for males, as females were painted with lighter skin tones. The treatment of the eyes, accented by dark, extended lines of kohl, was the fashionable style for elite males and females. The profile view, devoid of any modeling, was standard convention for all faces. Although it appears that this youthful-looking man was an Egyptian pharaoh, the portrait does not convey what he really looked like or anything about his character.

A device sometimes used to convey a ruler’s power was to depict him as being taller and/or larger than others near him, who may be shown making subservient gestures. The Egyptian pharaohs took this idea to the extreme, creating colossal stone statues, such as those of Ramesses (Ramses) II (Figure 2, pg. 265), to signify their importance, their divinity, and their overall ability to maintain cosmic order.

Rulers have been portrayed with symbols of their conquests, often posed in a specified way, and wearing special headdresses, garments, or ornaments. In the case of the pharaohs, these kings are often shown with several symbols of royalty—the false beard, which would identify the pharaoh with Osiris, god of the earth and vegetation, who was also believed to have given Egypt civilization; a crown, or the *khat* headcloth; the *uraeus*, the upright cobra which stood for sovereignty and divine authority; and/or the crooked scepter, known as a *heka*.
Figure 1. Unknown artist; *Detail of Pharaoh Thutmose IV*; Egypt; 18th Dynasty, ca. 14th century BCE; Tomb of Thutmose IV, Valley of the Kings, Thebes, Egypt. Photograph © DeA Picture Library / Art Resource, NY.
Figure 2. Unknown artist(s) (Egyptian); *Colossal statues of Ramesses II, from the Temple of Ramesses II*; stone; New Kingdom, 19th Dynasty, ca. 1297-1185 BCE; Abu Simbel, Egypt. Photograph courtesy of Bildarchiv Steffens Hans-Joachim Rech / the Bridgeman Art Library.
Almost all ancient civilizations devised some means of portraying specific individuals. Some ancient societies used caricatures of the individual’s face, or accentuated a distinctive anatomical feature to facilitate identification. But most ancient images were comprised of generic depictions of a person who was similar in age and gender to the subject. The addition of symbolic details or accompanying text enabled the viewer to identify the specific individual. Examples of this appear in the sculptures and bas-relief friezes of ancient Mesopotamian kingdoms, where art was generally used to glorify dynasties and to project an image of the king as a powerful, divinely sanctioned monarch. Images were made in accordance with the stylistic conventions of simplification, repetition, and, to a certain degree, abstraction. In Neo-Assyrian (1000-625 BCE) friezes, for example, the king might be pictured along with a scribe or other court official, as seen in the relief depicting King Sargon II and Official in Figure 3 (pg. 267).

The facial features, bodies, and garments of both individuals look similar, but the truncated cone hat, the vertical staff, the prominent sword, and superior height indicate that the figure on the right is the king. Other works might depict a king dressed in symbolic attire, such as a horned headpiece, a knee-length tunic, and a long fringed cape—items that would associate him with divine beings.

Artists of these ancient civilizations were concerned with technical mastery and symbolic iconography, rather than representing an accurate physical likeness of the person portrayed. One ancient civilization in the Americas that created portraits with individualized facial characteristics were the Olmecs (1400-400 BCE), who lived on the Gulf coast of Mexico and created both small ceramic heads and colossal stone heads with unique and expressive features. However, rather than portraying specific individuals who actually lived, the features may have been used to represent “types,” such as warriors.

A form of portraiture thought to represent features of powerful individuals developed in the Moche culture that flourished circa 100-800 in the dry deserts of the northern coast of Peru. The Moche created portraits, like the one in Figure 4 (pg. 268), in the form of ceramic vessels that they produced in massive quantities. This was achieved by making the clay heads in two-piece molds, which also enabled artists to model contours and create life-like images. Although the actual identities of the portrait heads are unclear, it is assumed that many heads represent high-ranking elites of the Moche warrior-priest ruling class. Individual heads each have distinctive expressions and anatomical facial features, such as scars, suggesting that these were likenesses of actual people who may have commissioned one or more of their own portraits at different points in their lives. The heads may have been sent to other parts of the kingdom to communicate an individual’s status and
Figure 3. Unknown artist (Assyrian); *King Sargon II and Official*, bas-relief from Sargon’s Palace at Khorsabad, Mesopotamia; ca.1000-625 BCE; Louvre, Paris, France. Photograph courtesy of Erich Lessing / Art Resource, NY.
Figure 4. Moche artist (Peru); Portrait Head; clay with paint; ca. 200-800 CE. Photograph © David Bernstein Fine Art, New York, NY.
power. Since many of the heads were found at gravesites or buried with the
dead, they may have represented the person whose likeness they bore in
Moche ceremonial functions related to life and death.²²

The brilliant military strategist Alexander the Great (356-326 BCE) also
understood that his image could be used as a powerful political tool, so he
developed an innovative means to circulate it. Driven by his ambition, he
conquered most of what was then the civilized world and was, but then was
faced with the problem of governing the many disparate peoples in his
empire. He disseminated the message of his rule by flooding his kingdom with
coins imprinted with his own portrait, many of which carried images of
mythological figures and deities, or bore symbols of his conquests in faraway
lands.³³ With their powerful image and recognizable symbolism, Alexander’s
“portrait coins” carried his message wide and far, influencing the future of all
subsequent coinage on three continents.¼

The sculpture, Augustus of Prima Porta (1st century), shown in Figure 5 on
page 270, embodies the essence of imperial Rome. While the facial features
may present an accurate likeness of Augustus (r. 31 BCE-14 CE), the
commanding gesture of the figure and the symbolism emblazoned on the
uniform represent the transformation of the Roman Republic into an empire.

The decoration on Augustus’s breastplate shows an allegorical scene of the
Pax Romana (“Roman peace”) for which Augustus was famed. The figure of
Jupiter, the chief of all Roman gods and the purveyor of peace, looks over a
scene in which a gracious Parthian chieftain returns standards that had been
captured from Rome—an allusion to the emperor’s diplomatic prowess.
Symbolizing prosperity are the cornucopias and the figure of the goddess
Ceres, Rome’s Alma Mater (or “bountiful mother”). The dolphin alongside
Augustus’s leg alludes to the emperor’s divine origins, while the Cupid on its
back refers to Venus, the goddess of love and fertility.

Augustus’s rule brought improvements to many aspects of Roman life and
peace and prosperity to the Greco-Roman world. This imposing statue
represents his leadership, authority, dignity, and humanity.¹⁵ A strikingly
similar classical pose—one in which the figure’s weight is on the right leg,
with the right arm raised in oratorical gesture—is seen in a 1796 portrait by
Gilbert Stuart (1755-1828) of the first American President, George
Washington (Figure 6), on page 271.
Figure 5. Unknown artist (Roman); *Augustus of Prima Porta*; marble; ca. 1st century; Vatican Museums and Galleries, Vatican City, Italy. Photograph of Alinari / the Bridgeman Art Library International.
Figure 6. Gilbert Stuart (American, 1755-1828); *Portrait of George Washington*; oil on canvas; 1796; H: 96.2 in. (244.5 cm), W: 60.2 in. (153 cm); Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, NY. Photograph courtesy of the Bridgeman Art Library.
During the 12th to 15th centuries, the Yoruba created a number of highly realistic portrait heads and figures in bronze and terracotta clay for the royal court of the kingdom of Ife. Unlike more abstract African sculpture, these heads are highly naturalistic and appear to be somewhat idealized portraits of individuals. The head shown in Figure 7 (pg. 273) depicts a queen, shown with delicately modeled features, a serene expression, and a regal upward tilt of the chin. The detailed crown is presumed to be a royal insignia.16

In Persia, Qajar ruler Fath ‘Ali Shah (1771-1834) used the arts to convey that he had power and wealth. He commissioned large portraits, like the one in Figure 8 (pg. 274), to send to foreign leaders or to impress visitors to royal buildings at home. Portraits were venerated like religious images were, prompting viewers to bow before them. The depiction includes stylized features, elongated proportions, rich colors and patterns, and opulent clothing and surroundings, which were features common to other Persian royal portraits of the time. However, this is an idealized image. In truth, Fath ‘Ali Shah’s reign was characterized by a succession of military failures and loss of territories.

Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres’s (1780-1867) portrait of Napoleon I on His Imperial Throne (1806), shown in Figure 9 on page 275, is the ultimate power portrait, glorifying a man who envisioned himself as the successor to the Holy Roman Empire.17 In his imperial robes and crowned with golden laurels, Napoleon Bonaparte (1769-1821), who crowned himself Emperor Napoleon I in 1804, sits on a magnificent throne in a deified image that recalls the Roman Caesars. Ingres’s portrait is filled with symbolism that audaciously links Napoleon not only to the vast history of Roman emperors, but also to Charlemagne, who, in 800, was crowned by the pope as the Holy Roman Emperor. To further emphasize Napoleon’s elevated status, Ingres positions the figure in a manner reminiscent of Jan van Eyck’s depiction of God in his famous work, the Ghent Altarpiece (1432).

Early in his career, Ingres had won the prestigious Prix de Rome for his neoclassical history painting. Throughout his career, his portraits were notable for their fluid contours, luminous coloring, and superb academic technique. However, as a young, unknown artist, Ingres had no alternative but to base Napoleon’s likeness on other representations he had seen. But when this painting was exhibited at the Salon of 1806, critics found the resemblance unconvincing and the treatment inappropriate for a leader who was supposedly a man of the people.18
Figure 7. Yoruba head of a queen in profile; terracotta; 12th-13th century; Ita Yemoo, Ife, Nigeria; H: 9.8 in. (25 cm.), W: 6.7 in. (17 cm.); National Commission for Museums and Monuments, Ife, Nigeria. Photograph © Heini Schneebeli / the Bridgeman Art Library.
Figure 8. Mirza Baba (Persian, active 1789-1810); Portrait of Fath ‘Ali Shah; oil on canvas; 1798-99; H: 72 in. (188 cm.), W: 42 in. (107 cm.); private collection. Photograph courtesy of the Bridgeman Art Library International.
Figure 9. Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres (French, 1780-1867); *Napoleon I on His Imperial Throne*; oil on canvas; 1806; H: 102 in. (259 cm.), W: 63 3/4 in. (162 cm.); Musée de l'Armée, Paris, France. Photograph courtesy of the Bridgeman Art Library International.
Status Portraits

The expression, "status portrait," usually is associated with representations of elite individuals who are considered to have high societal standing as a result of wealth, lineage, position, achievement, or celebrity. However, while many gained status through fame, many others gained a different type of status through infamy. While the term status portrait is still generally used for flattering representations of luminaries and those in the upper social stratum, status portraits can also take different forms or refer to other aspects of society.

Prosperity during the European Renaissance (ca. 1400-1600) created a demand for portraits by wealthy patrons. Europe’s maritime powers expanded, and trade between Europe, Africa, India, Indonesia, and the Turkish Ottoman Empire flourished. This bustling, trade-fueled economy gave rise to a thriving merchant and banking class, especially in the Italian cities of Venice, Florence, and Genoa. Wealthy Italian families competed with one another to decorate their home chapels, commissioning artists to create portraits attesting to their religious devotion and patronage. As time went on, more patrons wanted, and could now afford, a new style of secular portraits with which they could decorate their homes or signify their level of culture and prestige.

These developments were accompanied by changes in intellectual life through the rediscovery of the classics, the development of humanism, and the search for scientific truths, spurred by the theories published by Copernicus (1473-1543) and Galileo (1564-1642). The 1445 invention of the printing press by Johann Gutenberg (1398-1468) made books readily available, disseminating new ideas such as those of Dutch scholar, Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536), who wedded concepts of humanism with the Catholic tradition.

Artists in Renaissance Europe were part of a complex guild system, through which they undertook many years of rigorous training and were apprenticed to a master before becoming masters themselves, with their own apprentices. Painters belonged to the same guild as physicians and pharmacists, perhaps because pigments were made primarily from organic materials such as plants and minerals, and were ground much in the same way as medicinal remedies.
As the demand for portraits grew, so did private commissions for artists. These entailed formal legal contracts, written in accordance with guild policies, clearly specifying the breadth and scope of the work. Contracts also spelled out the artist’s fee, which was based on his guild status, and adjusted to the new bustling economy. For powerful rulers and wealthy royals, costs were hardly a factor in enabling them to procure the best artists to create their portraits. Some rulers employed a stable of artists within their own court workshops, enabling them to choose from the most gifted of these to chronicle their reign. But some of the most famous artists could decide whose portrait they would paint; as a result, soon talented apprentices were in as much demand as their masters.20

The identity of the woman depicted in Antonio del Pollaiuolo’s (ca.1432-1498) Portrait of a Young Woman, shown in Figure 10 on page 278, is unclear. This style of portraiture was popular among the social elite in fifteenth-century Florence. The neutral background, which may represent purity in the case of an unmarried woman or virtue in a wife, also serves to dramatize the sitter’s face and luxurious garments. It is possible that the sitter’s appearance has been enhanced to conform to Florentine ideals of beauty. This and similar portraits of the period portray their sitters with hair bearing traces of gilding or with prominent overbites, which may have been considered an attractive trait.21

The Portrait of Jean de Carondelet (1530), shown in Figure 11 on page 279, was painted by Dutch artist Jan Cornelisz Vermeyen (1500-1559). Carondelet (1469-1545), an influential cleric and statesman, belonged to a prominent family whose members served the dukes of Burgundy and later the Hapsburgs.22 Vermeyen’s naturalistic oil portrait both depicts Carondelet’s serious countenance and his eminent stature. The pyramidal shape of Carondelet’s figure, dressed in a fur-trimmed black robe and black hat, occupies the canvas, with eyes and face illuminated against the dark background and clothing. Although Vermeyen adheres to the formality required for a portrait befitting of such a learned and prominent statesman, he enlivens the figure by energizing Carondelet’s hands. One hand holds a pair of gloves, while the other turns up toward his face in an enigmatic gesture.23
Figure 10. Antonio del Pollaiuolo (Italian, 1433-1498); *Portrait of a Young Woman*; tempera on wood; ca. 1475; H: 21.6 in. (55 cm.), W: 13.3 in. (34 cm.); Museo Poldi Pezzoli, Milan, Italy. Photograph courtesy of Scala / Art Resource, NY.
Figure 11. Jan Cornelisz Vermeyen (Dutch, 1500-1559); Portrait of Jean de Carondelet; oil on panel; 1530; H: 30 ¾ in. (78.1 cm.), W: 24 1/2 in. (62.2 cm); Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, NY, Gift of Horace O. Havemeyer. Photograph courtesy of the Bridgeman Art Library.
Flemish artist Sir Anthony van Dyck (1599-1641) had enormous influence on European portraiture. Van Dyck had been accepted as a full member of the Lucas Guild of painters at age 19, and soon after, he became the assistant to Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640). Traveling to London and Italy, he mastered his characteristically refined and elegant style by painting portraits of the Genovese aristocracy. An invitation by Charles I (1600-1649) brought the artist to England, where he painted flattering portraits of English society that supported the king's claim to absolute monarchy. In return, van Dyck was knighted, awarded a generous annuity, and lavished with gifts, including an apartment and a private studio.

The majority of the poses van Dyck used were inspired by artists including Titian (ca.1488-1576) and Anthonis Mor (ca.1517-1577), yet he had the keen ability to reveal the aspirations of his sitters, making them seem graceful, elegant, and splendidly alive. In addition to his technical mastery and refined style, van Dyck used suggestions of movement, elaborate settings, and symbolic accessories to enliven and characterize his subjects. He glamorized period fashions by highlighting the texture and sheen of their fabrics, and often elongated his sitters by portraying them from below to make them appear taller.

The family portrait in Figure 12 (pg. 281) presents James Stanley, seventh earl of Derby (1607-1651), with his wife Charlotte de la Trémoille (1599-1664) and one of their daughters. It is typical of the large group portraits van Dyck painted during his last English period. The countess appears radiant in her luminous pale dress and jewels, holding peonies in her hand, which were symbolic of their loving marriage. Her husband looks toward her as one hand points to a distant landscape, thought to represent the Isle of Man of which the Derbys were hereditary sovereigns. In response to the great demand for his portraits, van Dyck established a workshop system that turned out approximately 400 portraits in less than eight years.

Artists have used portraiture to comment on aspects of a society's social, cultural, or political complexities. American artist George Catlin, in response to the forced removal of Indians from their homelands, sought to document what he saw as a “vanishing race.” During several trips west in the 1830s, he produced more than 500 paintings depicting the “customs and manners” of American Indians and wrote about his experiences with them. Figure 13 (pg. 282) is a portrait of Buffalo Bull’s Back Fat (1832), chief of the Blackfoot Blood Tribe, wearing what appears to be ceremonial attire. Catlin, like other 19th-century artists, held a romanticized view of the American Indian as man in his natural state, uncorrupted by civilization. He was criticized for staging Native American performances at his exhibitions to attract audiences and generate revenue. Nevertheless, Catlin’s work conveyed a respect for his subject as an individual with dignity and a rich cultural heritage.
Figure 12. Sir Anthony van Dyck (Flemish, 1599-1641); James, Seventh Earl of Derby, His Lady and Child; oil on canvas; 1632-1641; H: 97 in. (246.38 cm.), W: 84 1/8 in. (213.68 cm.); the Frick Collection, New York, NY. Photograph courtesy of the Frick Collection, Henry Clay Frick Bequest.
Figure 13. George Catlin (American, 1796-1872); Buffalo Bull’s Back Fat, Head Chief, Blood Tribe; oil on canvas; 1832; H: 29 in (73.7 cm), W: 24 in. (60.9 cm); Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington, DC. Photograph courtesy of Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington, DC / Art Resource, NY.
Figure 14 depicts two different views of a famous kabuki actor, Ichikawa Danjuro VIII (1823-1854). Ukiyo-e, a Japanese term meaning “pictures of the floating world,” was a movement in Japanese art from the 17th to 19th centuries. In woodblock prints artists depicted subjects from ephemeral moments of everyday life, a favorite of which were theatre scenes and actors in well-known roles. Utagawa Kunisada’s double portrait presents the actor in two of his famous stage roles—the loyal samurai hero, Matsuo Maru, from the 18th-century tragedy Terakoya, and Abe-no-Yasuna, the legendary hunter and lead character from Ashiya dōman ōuchi kagami, a historical drama adapted for the kabuki stage from the original bunraku puppet play.

Figure 14. Utagawa Kunisada (Toyokuni III) (Japanese, 1786-1865); Matsuo-maru and Abe-no-Yasuna, from the Successful Roles of Ichikawa Danjuro VIII series; woodblock print; ca. 19th century; H: 9.5 in. (24.2 cm.), W: 14.5 in. (36.9 cm.); Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Great Britain. Photograph courtesy of the Victoria and Albert Museum, London / Art Resource, NY.
Historically, Western painters of society portraits have been more successful if they come from wealthy families or have obtained wealth and fame through their work. John Singer Sargent (1856-1925) born in Florence, Italy, to wealthy American parents, had an international upbringing, education, and career. His charm and sophistication, in addition to his artistic skill, helped him secure portrait commissions from patrons in both Europe and the United States.

Sargent painted the portrait in Figure 15 (pg. 285) of Virginie Gautreau, known as Madame X, in 1883-1884. Madame Gautreau was an American who moved to Paris with her mother after her father was killed in the Civil War. She became a member of the Parisian elite after marrying a wealthy French banker.

Madame Gautreau became well known for covering her body in lavender powder. Capturing her skin tone, which changed under different lighting conditions, was a challenge for Sargent. He produced a large number of sketches and studies that suggest he also had difficulty finding the right pose to convey her sensual beauty. When visitors to the Paris Salon found the original painting offensive because it showed a fallen dress strap, Sargent was forced to repaint it.

With the advent of photography, portraiture became less expensive and more widely accessible across the globe to those who might not otherwise be able to afford it. Early photographic portraits, such as daguerreotypes, were stilted and formal, but as technology improved, artists found new ways to harness it for portraiture.

Seydou Keïta (1921-2001) from Bamako, Mali, shot photographic portraits of the middle class. Many of his sitters were civil servants and office workers. Although Keïta made clothing, costumes, and props available to them to use, many came to his studio dressed in their finest European-style attire or in traditional costume. More than merely documentation of the people and life in Bamako, the photographic portraits capture how his sitters saw themselves and how they wanted to be seen by others.
Figure 15. John Singer Sargent (American, 1856-1925); *Madame X (Madame Gautreau)*; oil on canvas; 1883-1884; H: 82 1/8 in. (208.6 cm.), W: 43 1/4 in. (109 cm.); the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY. Photograph courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Arthur Hoppock Hearn Fund/Photo by Max Yawney.
American Pop artist Andy Warhol (1928-1987) revived the traditional art of portraiture at a time when it had been abandoned by most other serious artists. In the 1970s, to offset the costs of filmmaking and other activities at his studio called “The Factory,” he began a series of commissioned portraits of his friends, collectors, art dealers, socialites, celebrities, and rock stars. His portrait of fashion designer Diane von Furstenberg (Figure 16) exudes sexiness and allure while capturing the spirit and excitement of the ‘70s. His signature style involved converting a Polaroid image to a silkscreen and shifting flat areas of colors to create off-register effects. The brilliant hues and vibrant color combinations seem to electrify the image, complementing his subject’s glamorous public persona.
The Artist and the Subject

Portraiture has presented a unique challenge to the artist, who must respond to another individual’s desire for an image that will endure. As the court painter to King Henry VIII, Hans Holbein the Younger (1497-1543) managed to rise to the challenge.

As a young artist, the German Holbein worked in Basel, painting mostly religious murals and altars, along with an occasional portrait. He was admitted to Basel’s painter’s guild in 1519, and was promoted to Chamber Master of the guild in less than a year. Holbein had become familiar with Italian Renaissance paintings during his visits to France and England. But when he returned to Basel, he found that philosophical concepts related to man as the center of the universe had loosened religion’s grip on Renaissance society. In Germany, Martin Luther’s (1483-1546) strong criticisms of practices within the Church had ignited intense theological debates. People questioned existing moral and religious values, and peasants revolted against tithes paid to the Church. Eventually, these events were the catalyst for the Protestant Reformation.

As a consequence of the Reformation, Basel issued a ban on all religious pictures, leaving Holbein without commissions. Thus, in 1532, Holbein again traveled to England, where he sought work. Building upon the reputation he had acquired in the humanist circle of the statesman and philosopher, Thomas More (1478-1535), Holbein gained the patronage of Anne Boleyn (ca. 1501-1536), the soon-to-be second wife of Henry VIII, and the king’s advisor, the Earl of Essex, Thomas Cromwell (1485-1540). Holbein’s portrait of Cromwell duly impressed the king, resulting in Holbein’s appointment to the position of “King’s Painter” for the Tudor Court in 1534.

Up until the time of Henry’s actions, most English art commissions emanated from the Catholic Church, with artists concentrating on portraying saints, apostles, and Biblical stories, rather than monarchs, their families, and courtiers. As the “King’s Painter,” Holbein was entrusted to visually chronicle many of the individuals surrounding Henry, who would play key roles in the history of England. This was a task far different from painting religious figures or narratives for the Church. This task brought with it more power and prestige, but also more responsibility and possible consequences. In the seven years following his 1534 appointment, the artist produced approximately 150 life-size and miniature portraits of Henry and his court. For example, following the untimely death of Henry’s third wife, Jane Seymour (1503-1537), the king sent Holbein to Europe to paint portraits of potential brides. In fact, it is said that Henry was extremely displeased when he met his fourth wife, Anne of Cleves (1515-1557), because he felt that the portrait sent to him by Holbein had presented a misleading impression of her...
beauty. It is amazing to consider that, as an artist, Holbein played a subtle, not often recognized role in the selection of the Queen of England.

While he was at the court, Holbein also designed furniture, tableware, banners, state robes, and jewelry for the king, as well as motifs that would appear on everything from book bindings to horse bridles. But his primary task was to document England’s royalty and nobility and, most importantly, to visually define the image of the king. Perhaps the most iconic portrait of Henry VIII is one that Holbein produced in 1540, Portrait of Henry VIII, King of England, shown in Figure 17 (pg. 289). Holbein depicts the king as a commanding and imposing figure, resplendent in luxurious garments and ornately adorned with gold, jewels, and fur—testaments of his enormous wealth. Henry’s massive form fills the entire canvas; a representation of his power, grandeur, and, of course, his large personality. The king’s expression is as commanding and resolute as his stance and, through pose and gesture, the artist asserts the confidence and conviction inherent in the king’s character. Pleased with Holbein’s ability to convey his air of authority, Henry used his portraits much as a publicist would today. Paintings were sent out to secure diplomatic alliances, and copies were purchased by members of the court to demonstrate their allegiance to the king. Even more copies were distributed as a matter of official policy, ensuring that Henry VIII, King of England, was more than an abstract concept, but a larger than life image in his subjects’ minds.

Holbein’s style of painting was particularly appealing to Henry VIII. Unlike Italian Renaissance artists who were concerned with the mathematical principles behind their compositions—proportion, anatomy, and perspective—Northern Renaissance artists such as Holbein were more focused on color and the meticulous depiction of numerous minute details, as evident in Holbein’s treatment of the spectacular garments Henry wears in his portrait.

The complex relationship between Spanish painter Pablo Picasso and American writer Gertrude Stein was reflected in the portrait he painted of her in 1906. In the early 1900s, the Paris residence of Gertrude Stein and her brother, Leo, became a gathering place for avant-garde artists and writers including Henri Matisse, Georges Braque, Juan Gris, F. Scott Fitzgerald, André Derain, Henri Rousseau, Guillaume Apollinaire, and Ernest Hemingway. Leo was a connoisseur and avid collector of experimental art, who nurtured his sister’s growing interest. Together they amassed a substantial collection of modern art that they exhibited in their private gallery. As contemporaries of Leo and Gertrude, Matisse and Picasso became part of the Steins’ Saturday evening social circle. It was in this lively salon atmosphere that the friendship between Picasso and Gertrude Stein flourished.
Figure 17. Hans Holbein the Younger (German, 1497-1543) or Workshop; *Henry VIII, King of England*; oil on panel; ca. 1540; H: 225 in. (88.5 cm.), W: 189 in. (74.5 cm.); Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Antica, Rome, Italy. Photograph courtesy of Scala/Ministero per i Beni e le Attività culturali/Art Resource, NY.
Figure 18. Pablo Picasso (Spanish, 1881-1973); Gertrude Stein; oil on canvas; 1906; H: 39 3/8 in. (100 cm.), W: 32 in. (81.3 cm.); the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY. Photograph courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Gertrude Stein, 1946 © 1999 Estate of Pablo Picasso/Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York.
In the spring of 1906, Stein sat for Picasso’s portrait of her some 80 times. Dissatisfied with it, at one point Picasso painted out the face completely, leaving the portrait unfinished. He then left for Spain, where he had the opportunity to view early Iberian stone sculptures. When he returned to Paris a few months later, he finished the portrait without seeing Stein, incorporating elements from his encounters with the block-like facial and body types of Iberian sculpture and the simplified features of African masks and sculpture. Stein hung the portrait, Figure 18 (pg. 290), in the room where she held her salons. On seeing it, some of Stein’s friends complained that she did not look like the painted image. Picasso famously and succinctly predicted, “She will.” Although the likeness is not realistic, it has emerged as the picture by which she is remembered.38

In 1922, surrealist photographer Man Ray (1890-1976) photographed Stein sitting in front of Picasso’s 1906 portrait (Figure 19). Deliberately contrasting Picasso’s Stein with the actual Stein, who was now 16 years older, Ray the artist explores Picasso and Stein’s roles as artist and sitter.39 A year later, in a reversal of the artist-subject relationship in which Picasso seems to have dominated, Stein published a literary portrait of Picasso entitled If I Told Him.
Sometimes artists are given the task of visually constructing a subject’s identity for political purposes. Up until the middle of the 20th century, those who governed—or those who had ambitions to govern—were officially portrayed as strong, powerful, and well-equipped to fulfill their duties. Candid views of a candidate’s home life were fairly rare.

As the official Kennedy family photographer, Mark Shaw depicted JFK in a way that was very different from other presidential candidates. At first glance, the photograph in Figure 20 by Mark Shaw (1922-1969) of John F. Kennedy with his wife, Jackie, and daughter, Caroline, might be mistaken for a snapshot of an all-American family having fun together on the beach. Everything about the photograph exudes informality—the composition, the setting, the pose, the gestures, the casual clothing, and even the way the image is cropped. However, the Kennedys were well aware of the camera; the private moment of the man who aspired to be president was essentially staged to convey to the American public that this “perfect” American family is doing things “just like us,” or just as we imagine ourselves to be. This image and similar ones of John F. Kennedy upended the tradition of formal presidential portraiture.

Figure 20. Mark Shaw (American, 1922-1969); Kennedy Family on beach, Hyannis Port, 1959 (Caroline overhead); vintage gelatin silver print; 1959. Photograph © 2000 Mark Shaw/MPTV.net.
The work of American photographer Richard Avedon (1923-2004), created over six decades, includes fashion spreads, photojournalism, and portraits of celebrities, the social elite, the working class, and the unrecognized impoverished. Ronald Fischer, Beekeeper, shown in Figure 21 (pg. 294), is part of Avedon’s *In the American West* series. Begun in the late 1970s, the work continued for five years and resulted in more than 700 portraits, among them images of farm laborers, ranchers, coal miners, teenagers, prisoners, drifters, housewives and housekeepers, and oil field and factory workers.

All of the images from *In the American West* share a common aesthetic, one that can be found in other series by Avedon as well. Shot in close range (usually within four feet), the images generally depict the sitter from half to three-quarters length and facing outward. The subjects are never photographed in direct sunlight and, like Ronald Fischer, are always posed against white backgrounds, devoid of situational context. These elements not only assert Avedon’s full command of the works’ formal qualities, but also ensure that the sitter is the sole focus of attention.

Although Avedon’s images might appear to capture some essence or “truth” of the sitter, like all portraits, they are ultimately performances. Avedon chose Ronald Fischer as a subject out of hundreds of others and carefully thought through the kind of picture he would take in advance, even making sketches of the scene. On site, he determined the location of the shot, the height of the lens, and the subject’s position. The bees in *Ronald Fischer*, moreover, did not suddenly alight on the man. Rather, he was covered with the queen bee’s pheromone—a substance that attracted the bees to him while simultaneously protecting him from being stung.

Well aware of the performative aspects of portraiture, Avedon wrote in no uncertain terms that he did not consider his works to be likenesses. “The moment an emotion or fact is transformed into a photograph,” he explained, “it is no longer a fact but an opinion. There is no such thing as inaccuracy in a photograph. All photographs are accurate. None of them is the truth.” (Avedon, *In the American West*)

40
Portraits created by American artist Kehinde Wiley (b.1977) challenge assumptions and biases reflected in representations of African-American males in contemporary American society. Wiley paints large-scale portraits of young, urban, black men, posed as saints or heroic figures, inspired by paintings from the Renaissance, Baroque, and Rococo periods in art. Poses, imagery, and even titles are appropriated from works created by old masters, such as Velázquez (1599-1660), Titian (ca.1485-1576), and Tiepolo (1696-1770). The artist further empowers his sitters by allowing them to first select the painting and pose in which they wish to be represented.41

Among the most powerful poses in historical paintings are those representing military commanders. Figure 22 (pg. 296), is Diego Velázquez’s celebrated 17th-century portrait of Don Gaspar de Guzmán, Count-Duke of Olivares (ca. 1635), the chief military strategist of Philip IV of Spain (1605-1665) and the most powerful figure at the Spanish court. In Wiley’s version, shown in Figure 23 (pg. 297), the count is still represented in a classic and striking equestrian pose—mounted on a magnificent white horse that rears up on its hind legs, ready to forge ahead into battle. But in place of the original figure and face of the count, Wiley substitutes the image of a young black man dressed in contemporary urban street wear. The figure’s red-hooded sweatshirt clearly shows the logo of a commercial brand popular in hip-hop culture, suggesting a different type of protective and identifying armor. By transposing the image of this young man with that of his historical counterpart, Wiley has symbolically redefined the identity of his contemporary sitter, now envisioned as a brave, noble, and triumphant hero who, literally and figuratively, rides in on a white horse in a seat of traditional white male power.
Figure 22. Diego Rodríguez de Silva y Velázquez (Spanish, 1599–1660); *Don Gaspar de Guzmán* (1587–1645), *Count-Duke of Olivares*; oil on canvas; ca.1635; H: 50 ¼ in. (127.6), W: 41 in. (104.1 cm); the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY. Photograph courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fletcher Fund.
Commemorative Portraits

In many cultures, commemorative portraits of the deceased have marked gravesites and been placed inside or outside of tombs. Frequently, these portraits present an idealized image of the departed individual.42

Ancient Egyptian death masks were put on the faces of the deceased because it was believed that they provided the dead with a face in the afterlife and enabled the spirit to recognize the body. Almost life-size, colorful and highly detailed ancestor portraits were commissioned from the 15th to 20th centuries by wealthy, often imperial Chinese families to invoke the presence of deceased forbears in religious ceremonies, principally because it was believed that the ancestor could bring good luck and wealth.

Highly realistic funerary portraits were prevalent during the 1st to 3rd centuries in Roman Egypt. Often called Fayum portraits after the region in which they were made, they were painted on wooden panels in encaustic (a pigment of melted wax) and tempera, attached to the linen shrouds covering the faces of mummies, and included in Egyptian burials with other funerary trappings. Painted for men, women, and children, the focused eyes of these portraits seem to stare directly at and through the viewer. These sensitive portraits reflect the multicultural populace living in Roman Egyptian cities during this period. The three-quarter view is stylistically typical of Greek painting tradition, while the jewelry, clothing, and hairstyles represent Roman fashions of the times, rather than traditional Egyptian customs.43 An example is shown in Figure 24 (pg. 299).
Figure 24. Unknown artist (Egyptian); *Funeral Portrait of a Woman*; encaustic wax painting on wood; Roman Period, 1st-3rd century; Musée du Louvre, Paris, France. Photograph courtesy of Art Resource/Photo by Erich Lessing.
Figure 25. *Memorial Head*; terracotta; H: 9.1 in. (23 cm.); Akan Culture, Ghana; n.d.; private collection. Photograph © Heini Schneebeli / the Bridgeman Art Library.
Dating from the 17th century, the tradition of creating clay memorial portraits, called *mma* (Figure 25, pg. 300), still exists among the Akan peoples in present-day southern Ghana and the southeastern Ivory Coast. Created in a variety of regional styles and sizes, the terracotta heads combine both individualized and idealized features of Akan rulers, such as serene expressions, symmetrical facial features, and rings around the neck—all of which are characteristically associated with principles of beauty and leadership. Many also have marks or raised areas on the faces that are reflective of tribal scarification practices. The clay heads, believed to have been made by women, are created posthumously. They are placed within sacred areas of the cemetery, along with other portraits of ancestral rulers, called *mmaso*, to honor the dead and preserve the memory of royal lineages.44

In Japan, the Kamakura (ca. 1185-1333) and the subsequent strife-filled Nanbokucho eras (ca. 1336-1392) gave rise to a transformation in politics, society, and culture. Power was gradually shifted from the nobility in Kyoto to the landowning *bakufu*, a government ruled by shogun, feudal warlords who controlled the country from Kamakura, a province near to what is now called Tokyo. Starting at this time, a binary system of government was established in which emperors reigned as titular heads of state, but the shogunate exercised power throughout the provinces. During this period, religion also experienced a resurgence because Buddhism was actively proselytized among the masses for the first time.45

A shift also occurred in aesthetics during the Kamakura and Nanbokucho eras. During the Kamakura period in particular, the prominent trend in sculpture emphasized truth and honesty, with works exhibiting strong realism and highly naturalistic detail. Japanese master sculptors attempted to convey religious intensity by portraying spiritual figures, such as monks, as having solid mass, believable garments, and props, with life-like poses and gestures.46

An example of this is the *Portrait of Musō Kokushi*, a.k.a. Musō Soseki (1275-1351), a Rinzai Zen Buddhist monk, teacher, calligrapher, poet, garden designer, and founder of the Zuisen temple. The name Musō Kokushi, which translates as “national Zen teacher,” was given to him by Emperor Go-Daigo (1228-1339). Originally from Ise province, the monk was a 9th-generation descendant of Emperor Uda (867-931). Emperor Go-Daigo appointed him head priest of the great temple of Nanzenji in Kyoto, and the following year, he founded Zen'o-ji in his native Ise. Musō Kokushi is perhaps best known today for his garden design, which he felt was integral to the practice of Zen.47 The seated pose and life-like facial features on the sculpture in Figure 26 (pg. 302) represent his faith-based serenity, as well as the prevailing artistic practices of the era.
Figure 26. Unknown artist (Japanese); *Portrait of Muso Kokushi*; Kamakura period (ca. 1185-1333); Zuisen-ji Temple, Kamakura, Japan. Photograph © Werner Forman / Art Resource, NY.
Figure 27. Kosho (Japan); Kuya-Shonin (Saint Kuya); wood; Kamakura Period, early 13th century; H: 46 in. (117 cm.); Rokuharamitsuji Temple, Kyoto, Japan.
The Portrait of Musō Kokushi was created during or soon after the same time period in which the subject lived. In contrast, the extraordinary wood sculpture, Kuya-Shonin (Saint Kuya) (903-972), shown in Figure 27 on page 303, was created three centuries following his death. Saint Kuya was a monk responsible for the spread of Jodo, or Pure Land, Buddhism during the Heian period (784-1185). Here, Kuya is portrayed chanting the six syllables of the nembutsu, an offering of praise and gratitude to the Amida Buddha, which was thought to ensure salvation. The physical process of chanting is represented conceptually by the six small Amida Buddhas emerging from Kuya’s mouth. Although the depiction of the monk is naturalistic, its intent was not to realistically depict the subject who lived centuries before. Rather, the portrait was intended to inspire devotion.

**Behind the Face: Psychological Portraits**

Psychological portraits are highly expressive in that they are deeper explorations into aspects of the subject’s identity. They can convey how an artist feels about his or her subject, project a specific aspect of the subject’s personality or character, or depict emotions, aspirations, or a state of mind.

Thomas Eakins (1844-1916) is considered by many to be one of the outstanding American painters of the 19th century and among those who helped shift the focus of American art from landscape to figurative subjects. From 1887 until the end of his career, he focused almost exclusively on portraiture, usually depicting isolated figures captured in quiet, solitary moments of reflection. Eakins was committed to realism in his painting, often working at life-size scale and eschewing external lighting. His portraits are highly expressive, seeming to capture the mood and thoughts of his subject’s private moments. Since his depictions were not always flattering, he rarely received portrait commissions.

*The Thinker: Portrait of Louis N. Kenton* (1900), shown in Figure 28 on page 305, is a portrait of the artist’s brother-in-law. The figure is posed as though he is unaware he is being painted, and with a mood that seems pensive and somewhat melancholy. The image is less about the exterior that is visible than the interior that is not. Critics praised the work, and the artist included it in many exhibitions, which suggests he was especially proud of it.

Until the 1930s, the impact of World War I (1914-1918) was a dominant theme in the work of German painter Otto Dix (1891-1969). Post-World War I Germany was a shattered world in which traditional class structures collapsed, unemployment was rampant, debauchery prevailed, and pervasive malaise engulfed a crippled society. To explore cultural truths about life’s ugliness, Dix painted gruesome images of war, scenes of brothels, distended
Figure 28. Thomas Eakins (American, 1844-1916); *The Thinker: Portrait of Louis N. Kenton*; oil on canvas; 1900; H: 82 in. (208.3 cm.), W: 42 in. (106.7 cm.); the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY. Photograph courtesy of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, John Stewart Kennedy Fund.
Figure 29. Otto Dix (German, 1891-1969), *Lady with Mink and Veil*; oil and tempera on canvas mounted on cardboard; 1920; H: 28 ¾ in. (73 cm.), W: 21 ½ in. (54.6 cm.); private collection. Photograph © 2009 Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York / VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn.
corpses, and depictions of legless or drastically disfigured war veterans. He also painted portraits of friends and working class models that echoed a society in the midst of dire circumstances. Part of the Neue Sachlichkeit, or New Objectivity movement, his political artwork was a response to the social suffering he witnessed during the chaotic Weimar Republic (1918-1933) years in Germany. Lady with Mink and Veil (1920), shown in Figure 29 on page 306, is a brutal portrait of a ravaged older woman. Perhaps she is one of the many war widows forced to turn to prostitution in order to keep afloat during hard times. It is a tragic image of deterioration and hopelessness, reflecting a society’s depravity and pain. Dix later commented, “War is something so animal-like: hunger, lice, slime, these crazy sounds…War was something horrible, but nonetheless something powerful…Under no circumstances could I miss it! It is necessary to see people in this unchained condition in order to know something about man.”

The photographic portrait of 32-year-old Florence Owens Thompson by American artist Dorothea Lange (1895-1965) has become an iconic image of the Great Depression in America. The 1936 photograph, taken just 175 miles north of Los Angeles, documents the plight and suffering of agricultural workers living in seasonal camps during that era. A weary, weather-beaten woman with two children leaning on her shoulders and an infant in her lap, Thompson told the photographer that she had just sold the tires from her car to buy food for her family. Lange’s portrait, which became known as The Migrant Mother, is an emblematic image representing the severe hardships of the times. It captures the desperation felt by many impoverished American workers and their families who were living in inadequate rural conditions.

Another American female artist, Alice Neel (1900-1984), selected her subjects based on outward attributes that, she believed, revealed their inner selves. Her portraits affirm each sitter’s individuality, capturing their essence through their posture, gestures, costumes, and faces. Her 1970 portrait of Pop artist Andy Warhol, shown in Figure 30 on page 309, depicts the famous artist and impresario not in the persona of an international icon who was frequently surrounded by the rich and glamorous, but rather as a fragile and solitary figure. Neel exposes his vulnerability. Warhol sits shirtless, eyes closed, revealing the surgical scars that cross his torso, a result of wounds inflicted upon him during an attempt on his life.

Neel’s depiction of Warhol’s compromised psychological state is the polar opposite of the way Warhol portrayed the rich and famous in his portraits. Warhol was continuing a centuries-old tradition of collaborating with the subject to create an idealized likeness that exudes power, wealth, and/or charisma. For many rulers who commissioned portraits – Alexander the Great, Moche leaders, Henry VIII – the works served to reinforce the power
they held. In his portraits of young contemporary African-American men, Kehinde Wiley draws on conventions and poses used by the old masters to imbue the subjects with the power and prestige of royalty. For most portraitists throughout history, verisimilitude has not been a priority.
Figure 30. Alice Neel (American, 1900-1984); Andy Warhol; oil on canvas; 1970; H: 60 in. (152.4 cm.), W: 40 in. (101.6 cm.); Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, NY. Photograph courtesy of the artist’s estate. © Alice Neel.
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