

*'Regis imago Rex est':  
Iconic Portraits of British Queens*

**Magdalena Ponce**  
[magdalena.ponce@gmail.com](mailto:magdalenaponce@gmail.com)

Universidad Nacional de La Plata  
2006

The aim of this paper is to analyze painted portraits of outstanding queens of Britain in order to gain an insight into the function each portrait fulfilled in its socio-cultural and historical context. Every aspect of each painting that provides a deeper understanding of its role and purpose will be studied, namely objects, symbols, references to the context or to other artistic fields, colours, posture, clothing, etc. Besides, the relationship between the artist and the sitter is exposed in the images portrayed, at times mirroring the relationship between the monarch and the vassals, and at times complying with the desires of the sitter.

'Regis imago Rex est': the image of the monarch is the monarch; the image of the monarch in a portrait is usually the way the monarch is going to be remembered and identified by the others. So the question is... what did these queens want us to see, or rather, what did these portraitists intend to convey?

*'If the man who paints only the tree, or flower, or other surface he sees before him were an artist, the king of artists would be the photographer. It is for the artist to do something beyond this: in portrait painting to put on canvas something more than the face the model wears for that one day; to paint the man, in short, as well as his features.'*

**James McNeill Whistler** (1834-1903) American painter and etcher  
(*The Gentle Art of Making Enemies*, 'Propositions' - 1890)

The word '*portrait*' derives from the Latin word '*protrahere*', which means '*to reveal; to make known*'. Strictly speaking, a *portrait* is the artistic representation of a subject — usually a human subject, although in a broader sense it might include other subjects, such as animals or dwellings. But there is much more than physical likeness to be found in a portrait: although the external appearance of the sitter constitutes a meaningful element of analysis, the background, the objects, and the garments portrayed are all interpretative elements. These provide a significant insight into the character, psychology and spirituality of the subject.

The painting of portraits has been present throughout the history of art, as it fulfils the natural human desire to contemplate one's own image, while at the same time transcending by means of a — usually — ennobling memento. The history of portraiture coincides to a large extent with the history of *mimesis*, as well as being heavily influenced by the socio-cultural context. Portraits may not aim at exact visual likeness, but the correct identification of the sitter is essential.

Curiously enough, the idea of exact replication was alien to the artist of the Middle Ages. The institutional, political and social contexts in which the king desired or was obliged to be seen mattered more than his truthful representation. Due to the widespread vision of royalty as divinity and of the individual as a spiritual being, the 'physiognomic' portrait (that is to say where not only is physical similarity important, but also penetration of the psychological

dimension) was eclipsed by the ‘typological’ portrait (in other words where the subject is recognisable by means of some special feature which labels him/her as belonging to a given category which would be clear from the context of the picture). In the words of E.H. Gombrich: *‘Even when he [the artist] was asked to represent a particular person, the ruling king or a bishop, he would not make what we should call a likeness. There were no portraits as we understand them in the Middle Ages. All the artists did was to draw a conventional figure and to give it the insignia of office — a crown and sceptre for a king, a mitre and crozier for the bishop — and perhaps with the name underneath so that there would be no mistake.’*<sup>2</sup>

The earliest known painted portrait of a British sovereign which aims at achieving physical likeness is that of Richard II, which was painted in 1398. This is because towards the end of the Middle Ages there is a revival of the representation of privileged or particularly esteemed personalities, a faithful representation of reality inspired in individualism, which had been repressed until then. The apogee of portraiture spans from the 13th century until the 18th century.

In the 19th century, painted portraits are replaced by photographic portraits. And it is undeniable that *‘the development of photography was bound to push artists further on their way of exploration and experiment.’*<sup>3</sup> The relationship between the artist and the sitter changes radically, the freedom to choose a subject and the freedom to portray subjectively much more than meets the eye is all-pervading.

All of these developments, vicissitudes and revolutions in portraiture have affected the portrayal of kings and queens. Each painting is in keeping with the times, each painting making a statement and leaving a legacy for us to learn more about these iconic British sovereigns.

### ***Queen Elizabeth I (House of Tudor)***

It is undeniable that if there ever was a British monarch who made extensive use of portraits, it was Queen Elizabeth I. She was well aware of the importance of portraits in order to convey an image of confidence and power. It is said that she used portraits at first due to the impossibility of going on ‘a progress’, i.e. going on a tour of the land to show herself to her people to gain support and admiration. She had many enemies, but she needed to convince Catholics, Protestants, and even those who were certain that a woman could not rule a country on her own that she was more than capable. It was clear to her that to remain on the throne she had to govern well, but above all, to be loved and to present an image in keeping with the mood of the country:

*‘It was no coincidence that she [Elizabeth] emphasised her maiden state, becoming the Virgin Queen in an England that was no longer allowed to worship the*

*Virgin Mary. Later on, the Virgin Queen image was adjusted to encourage a revival of chivalry.*'<sup>4</sup>

Therefore, Elizabeth's image was a carefully concocted construction. It was specially designed for public consumption, so portraying the right image to impress the subjects became a state matter of utmost importance. Elizabeth had the final word, that is the reason why the government issued official portraits of the Queen, which were copied and disseminated throughout the reign. In 1563 William Cecil, Master of the Court of Wards, drafted a proclamation regarding the production of images of the Queen. '*It forbade artists from drawing the Queen's picture until "some special person, that shall be by her allowed, shall have first finished a portraiture thereof". Thereafter, all other painters or engravers "shall and may at their pleasures follow the said pattern of first portraiture".*'<sup>5</sup> The proclamation was never actually issued, but it proves to what extent Elizabeth's reign depended in part upon the effective use of visual imagery. But in 1596, the Privy Council ordered that a number of portraits should be destroyed, while new images should be approved by George Gower the Sergeant-Painter working for the crown.

A practice which is unique to the Elizabethan period is the fashion of wearing cameos or metal medallions — depending on the wealth of the bearer — with the image of the Queen. Moreover, on the issuing of a papal bull in 1570 which excommunicated Elizabeth, bearing or displaying her portrait constituted a mark of loyalty. Besides, as Tarnya Cooper — Curator of Sixteenth Century Collections at the National Portrait Gallery — states, '*Susan Foister has shown in her work on inventories (1981) that where Elizabethan households owned a painting at all, this was most likely to be a depiction of the monarch.*'<sup>6</sup>

The analysis of Elizabeth's portraits as queen reveals the goal of conveying an image of the monarch rather than her real appearance. Towards the end of her reign, her portraits portrayed the icon she had become — idealized like '*Queen Gloriana*' in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* — by following a pattern known as the '*Mask of Youth*' which becomes more evident as the Queen ages. There was no reference to her ageing features or to any detail which would disrupt the stereotypical image of the almighty Queen Elizabeth, and certain aspects were highlighted which contributed to the construction of the icon. For instance, she was extremely proud of her beautiful hands, which she considered to be her best feature, thus in all of her state portraits her hands are prominently displayed.

In order to comprehend fully the complexity of the construction of Elizabeth's portraits, two masterpieces were chosen: *The Sieve Portrait*, in which the idea of chastity is referred to, and *The Rainbow Portrait*, laden with symbols and significant allusions.

### **'The Sieve Portrait' (or 'The Siena Portrait')**

[Fig. 1]

**Artist:** Quentin Massys the Younger

**Year:** circa 1583

**Location:** Pinacoteca Nazionale di Siena, Italy

**Characteristics:** oil on panel

Elizabeth is portrayed with a sieve in a number of portraits. This version in particular is also referred to as *'The Siena Portrait'* as it was found rolled up in the attic of the Palazzo Reale in Siena. The sieve symbolizes chastity and integrity, and its source may be traced to the archetypal image of *Tuccia*, a vestal virgin of Rome who was accused of breaking her vow and whose story is retold in Petrarch's *Triumph of Chastity*. She proved she was chaste by carrying water from the Tiber in a sieve which miraculously held it as it was made whole by the power of her own wholeness. This reference reinforces Elizabeth's image as 'the virgin queen', which is also supported by the string of pearls, a symbol of purity and virginity. But this is not the only role of the sieve in the portrait. There is an inscription along the rim of the sieve: *'A TERRA IL BEN / MAL DIMORA IN SELLA'* ('The good falls to the ground / while the bad remains in the saddle'), which is an assertion of the Queen's wisdom and her capacity to rule. There is yet another reference to Petrarch to the left of the portrait: *'STANCO RIPOSO & RIPOSATO AFFANNO'* ('Weary I am and, having rested, still am weary'), which appears in the *Triumph of Love*.

Considering that this portrait was painted at a time when the feasibility of a marriage to the Duke of Alençon (later Anjou) — who was a French Catholic and therefore openly rejected by most — was on the wane, there is one element of paramount importance in the portrait. To the left there is a pillar which bears roundels depicting the story of Aeneas, who resisted the temptation of marrying Dido to pursue his destiny of founding an extremely powerful nation, Rome. Nevertheless, this is not the only interpretation of that element — and this multiplicity of allusions is a constant characteristic of all symbolism in Elizabeth's portraits. A jasper column was used by Petrarch to symbolize Laura's chastity and Romans also used columns to commemorate imperial victories. The globe continues this theme: ships can be seen crossing west, probably in allusion to England's first voyages to the New World. *'TVTTO VEDO & MOLTO MANCHA'* ('I see all and much is lacking') is inscribed on the globe.

Queen Elizabeth's relatively simple black and white dress is the perfect attire to stress the Queen's virtue and the sternness of her commitment to the ruling of England. She is portrayed as 'the Virgin Queen', who preferred her maiden state to losing her authority to a husband, and in the process, making use of her eligibility for marriage in order to gain political advantage.

### **'The Rainbow Portrait'**

[Fig. 2]

**Artist:** attributed to Isaac Oliver

**Year:** circa 1600

**Location:** Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, UK

**Characteristics:** oil on panel (?)

It is claimed that this portrait bears the most elaborate and inventive iconography of any Tudor portrait. Although the image of the Queen is that of a healthy, young woman, when this portrait was painted Elizabeth was in her late sixties, and some authors even state that the painting was completed after her death. Therefore, it is a perfect example of the *'Mask of Youth'*, a pattern used in the construction of illusory ideas of absolute power: the sovereign remains untouched by the ageing process.

In this portrait Elizabeth bears in her attire symbols that trigger a direct association with classical deities: her dress is embroidered with English wildflowers, which appeal to the myth of Astraea — the virginal daughter of Zeus who planted a seed on the summit of Mount Parnassus as a symbol of her mission of purity, and who was the goddess of justice and innocence. Moreover, above her elaborate headdress which supports her royal crown, there is a crescent-shaped jewel which is an allusion to Cynthia — the name given to Artemis due to her being born on Mount Cynthus —, who was the Greek goddess of the moon. The allusion to Artemis is threefold: this deity did not consort with or bow to the rule of men; and due to her connection with the moon it signified England's sea-power and the Queen's immutability and continuing power. The myriad of pearls that adorn the Queen's attire make reference to her virginity, as well as to the moon due to their spherical shape. In turn, the loose hair — which was a prerogative of unmarried maidens — is probably an allusion to the fact that Elizabeth was married to no man, echoing the *'sponsa Dei'* theme.

A jewelled serpent is entwined along her left sleeve, and holds from its mouth a ruby in the shape of a heart. The serpent symbolizes wisdom and prudence — through its reference to Minerva —and the ruby in turn is a symbolic depiction of the Queen's heart. In other words, Elizabeth's passions are controlled by her wisdom. The celestial sphere above the snake's head echoes the Queen's royal command over nature. There is also a small jewelled gauntlet hanging from her ruff, perhaps a memento from a joust honouring Elizabeth, or a reference to her title as *'Fidei Defensor, official champion of the Christian religion'*.

But there are two elements that make this portrait of Elizabeth particularly striking and mysterious: the eyes and ears that decorate her cloak, and the rainbow her right hand holds. There are several interpretations of these two images, but the puzzle they represent is far from being solved if an unambiguous answer is expected. The eyes and ears seem to imply that the Queen watches and listens vigilantly, seeing from all perspectives, hearing in all directions, and together with the serpent they make a reference to vigilance and watchfulness. On the other hand, the rainbow symbolizes peace, and the Latin inscription *'NON SINE SOLE IRIS'* ('No rainbow without the sun') reminds observers that only the Queen's wisdom can guarantee

prosperity. Besides, the rainbow is an emblem of the Virgin Mary's chastity, allure, and beauty, her capacity to reflect and astonish, her sovereignty and capacity to reconcile and protect. All of these virtues were politically desirable during Elizabethan times. There is also much controversy as regards the lack of distinguishable rainbow colours. Some authors read it as an attempt of the painter to undermine Elizabeth, by implying that the rainbow does not shine because there is no sun — i.e., because her magnificence is declining. Others believe that it indicates her superiority over the natural world, her luminescence is highlighted by contrasting it with the pale arc she is holding.

All in all, this portrait — which is thought to be the last contemporary portrait of Elizabeth I — constitutes a synthesis of all the themes and all the traditional representations of this iconic Queen: *'The variations were sometimes subtle, sometimes bold: virtuous Queen, chaste goddess, mighty imperial monarch, all-powerful being at one with the cosmos; the changes kept the romance alive, and Elizabeth on the throne for 45 years.'*<sup>7</sup> And it also kept the formidable 'legend' of Elizabeth alive to this day.

## **Queen Victoria** (*House of Saxe-Coburg & Gotha*)

### **'Queen Victoria'**

[Fig. 3]

**Artist:** Lady Julia Abercromby, after Heinrich von Angeli

**Year:** 1883 (von Angeli's portrait, 1875)

**Location:** National Portrait Gallery, London, UK.

**Characteristics:** watercolour; 146 x 98 cm (not on display)

In Victorian times, art was deeply changed by the advent of the Industrial Revolution as much as any other aspect of British life. The art public became increasingly democratic, and this forced a radical change upon the artist/audience relationship and consequently upon the kind of art that was produced. In the past, portraits had been commissioned by the church, the state or the aristocracy, but in 'the age of the bourgeoisie' most of the patrons were merchants and manufacturers. Several changes took place to attract this new group of potential buyers: public exhibitions were organized as well as private shows, in which the artists or dealers charged the public for admission, thus depending economically on a larger number of people instead of on a single patron.

Yet this was not the only major transformation in Victorian society. As E.H. Gombrich states, *'the Industrial Revolution began to destroy the very traditions of solid craftsmanship; handiwork gave way to machine production, the workshop to the factory.'*<sup>8</sup> In art, this was reflected in an invention that would change the future of art forever: photography. According to Gombrich, the impact was as serious as had been the abolition of religious images by Protestantism. At first, the camera was used almost exclusively for objects and portraits, as the

exposure required was extremely long — to the extent that a head clamp had to be used for the sitter to remain in the same position. Still, posing for a painted portrait was much more of an ordeal compared to posing for a daguerreotype. Therefore, the social role of portrait painting was diminished, as this novel mechanical device could perform the same task better, faster and more cheaply.

As regards the monarchy, Queen Victoria and her consort, Prince Albert, took great interest in photography and they became pioneers in this new medium. It is during their reign that photographic portraiture of the royal household became established, overshadowing oil painting. It is interesting to compare the painted portraits and the photographic portraits of the Queen [Fig. 4]. The poses are similar and every angle of the Queen was recorded for posterity. But the fact that her reign was uncommonly long and that most of the photographs portray her as a middle-aged or as an elderly woman, the iconic image of Victoria is not that of a young Queen.

In Victorian Britain, family was regarded as a central institution in society. On the surface, Victorian society stressed the importance of duty, morality, and earnestness. In her portraits, Queen Victoria seems to be a perfect example of and upholder of these values. For instance, she was devoted to her husband, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg Gotha, with whom she had nine children, and in 1861 when he died of cholera she was so overwhelmed by grief that she sank into depression. That is the reason why she wore black for the remainder of her reign, that is to say, for 40 years. This had such an impact on the British society, that mourning clothing customs — although they were present before Queen Victoria's loss — became a cult-like phenomenon and the trend was set by the royal family. But underneath the surface, Victoria had ideas on motherhood and religion that strongly contrasted with the image she displayed. This duality was by no means unconventional in the Victorian era.

As regards her portraits, her image was meant to infuse a sense of stability and continuity on her subjects, and it was extremely important for the Queen to earn popular respect. This is due to the fact that Britain was evolving into a constitutional monarchy, and the sovereign's powers were becoming more moral and symbolic than legislative. Her portraits show a woman who in time became the emblematic mother of her nation.

The portrait of the Queen analysed here is a copy of an original by von Angeli in the Royal Collection. The copy was approved by the Queen, who was pleased with the slight alterations introduced. The painter — Lady Julia Duncan, Baroness Abercromby — was one of Queen Victoria's Ladies of the Bedchamber, which shows the democratisation of art at the time. The Queen is clad in an unfailing black dress, and bearing the simpler everyday insignia of the members of the Order of the Garter, the most senior and oldest British order. She sports the blue sash, called the *broad riband*, and the star of the Garter, which is an eight-pointed silver badge with an enamel depiction of the cross of Saint George in the centre, surrounded by the Garter.



On her left shoulder, she is wearing the white ribbon in the form of a bow and the medal of the Royal Order of Victoria and Albert, an order conferred solely upon ladies. Besides, she bears a pearl bracelet with an inset medallion of Prince Albert, a small silver brooch and a pearl necklace.

In spite of the badges and jewels she is wearing, which remind the observer that the sitter is the British Queen, the lace head dress and the jet black lustreless gown present Victoria as a widow above all.

## **Queen Elizabeth II (House of Windsor)**

### **'Her Majesty The Queen'**

[Fig. 5]

**Artist:** Lucian Freud

**Year:** painted between May 2000 and December 2001

**Location:** the Royal Collection, UK.

**Characteristics:** oil on canvas; 23.5 cm x 15.2 cm

Due to the development of photography, artists have been forced to go beyond the merely 'photographic' depiction of objects and subjects, and have had to search for revolutionary and original techniques and modes of representations. Actually, *'modern art would hardly have become what it is without the impact of this invention.'*<sup>9</sup> This 'crisis' was also triggered by the development of science and technology, the new-found value of spontaneity and individuality partly due to the influence of psychoanalysis, and the acceptance by society of a rapid change in fashions, among others. Royal portraiture in particular, was very much affected by the relevance that other means of recording the sovereigns has acquired, means which at times create the illusion of being more 'real' and 'with no intermediaries', since the viewers can 'see for themselves', such as film and television. Monarchs seem to have become characters in soap operas and therefore the distinction between formal or informal, public or private, official or unofficial has become blurred to the extent that artists no longer seem to know what is expected of them.

Therefore, for portraiture to be successful today, artists must adopt a subversive approach, in particular as regards observation and technique. And at times the roles are reversed as well: artists might choose the subject they desire to portray as opposed to being chosen by a patron, since the availability of images makes sittings unnecessary. For instance, in 1985, Andy Warhol, whose work is the epitome of image manipulation, included Queen Elizabeth II in a series of silkscreen prints entitled *Reigning Monarchs*. Warhol used a photograph taken for the Silver Jubilee of 1977 and reproduced the Queen's image 16 times with numerous colour changes.

But the portrait of Queen Elizabeth II by Lucian Freud is peculiar in many respects. The painting was not commissioned, it was done as a gift to the Queen on Freud's request. The Queen agreed to several sittings for Sigmund Freud's grandson, even if she knew that while his grandfather explored the mind, Lucian explores the flesh and the body, revealing uncomfortable truths and unflattering visions. Yet, he is regarded as England's greatest living portrait painter, whereas Queen Elizabeth II is said to have sat for her portrait for more artists and on more occasions than any other living person. The conjunction of two individuals who arouse such a degree of interest generated so much media attention that *'Her Majesty The Queen'* received more publicity than any other new work in the history of art.

Freud was concerned about finding it impossible to have a vision of the inner life of the woman behind such an instantly recognisable face. Besides, he seemed to be unwilling to succumb to the clichés which abound in royal portraiture. Therefore, instead of resorting to monumental proportions to impress the observer, he decided to adopt what he termed a 'small large painting'. By using a canvas that is significantly smaller than an A4 sheet, he portrays an extremely powerful image in almost miniature scale, which makes the portrait intense and disconcerting. Freud's brushwork is precise and characteristically dense, almost sculptural, creating the effect of observing the Queen in the flesh. This is enhanced by the close-up viewpoint and the light creating a chiaroscuro which emphasises the features of the face.

A significant clue to the changes in the relationship between sovereigns and artists is the fact that Freud requested that the Queen wore the Diamond Diadem, the crown she wears only for the State Opening of Parliament and in her portrait on stamps and bank notes. The artist was quoted as saying this was due to the fact that he *'had always liked the way her head looks on stamps, wearing a crown'* and he *'wanted to make some reference to the extraordinary position she holds, of being the monarch.'*<sup>10</sup> In order to embellish her perfectly coiffed head with this astonishing crown, which is regarded as the most familiar and iconic piece of the Queen's jewels, the canvas had to be extended in height by 3.5 cm. Still, the cropped top of the crown and side wings of hair are an allusion to the limitations of royalty rather than its power.

The depiction of the Queen's face according to Freud's vision has sparked off a very interesting debate which divided public opinion, art critics and the press. It has been qualified as a meditation upon humanity and mortality, as well as closer to caricature than to portraiture. Some British newspaper headlines reflected this last stance: the title in the Evening Standard read *'Queen Grumpy'* and The Sun's *'A Travesty, Your Majesty'*.<sup>11</sup> All of this attention was devoted to a painting almost nobody had seen at the time except through the press — an image was released to the media on 21 December 2002 while the painting appeared in public in an exhibition during the Golden Jubilee Celebrations on 22 May 2003.

Precisely due to the amount of media coverage and to the ‘unflattering’ and disturbing portrayal of a reigning sovereign, Freud’s portrait of Queen Elizabeth II will probably constitute a significant landmark in the history of British portraiture.

The history of royal portraiture is the history of the portrayal of power, whether it be divine, absolute, democratic or symbolic. A portrait is a synthesis of the relationship between a monarch and the artist, the subjects, and his/her socio-cultural context. It is a complex equilibrium between desires and duty, visions and reality, ambitions and limitations, aesthetic conventions and exploration. Not very often, the right combination of factors takes place, and the result is a sublime masterpiece, an iconic portrait of a sovereign which will transcend the barriers of time.

The portraits which appear in this paper are either paintings which have left an everlasting trace in the minds of both contemporary observers and those of subsequent generations, or paintings of iconic sovereigns who have changed the course of British and world history.

Elizabeth I as England’s chaste bride and almighty Queen; Victoria as the apotheosis of a mourning wife, devoted mother and exemplary woman; and finally Elizabeth II as an ageing woman whose real self is blurred by the burden of a crown. These visions that the brushes of artists — either remembered or ignored by art historians — have turned into palpable realities for the world to see are the undeniable proof of the need of humankind to transcend. These queens were powerful, but they were also human, and they had within their reach a privilege denied to most: a portrait, the ultimate glimmer of hope against obscurity. If the portrait of the sovereign is the sovereign, then their reigns will continue beyond death, beyond oblivion.

## ***Bibliography***

DELAMARE, François and GUINEAU, Bernard. *Los colores. Historia de los pigmentos y colorantes*. Translated by José Francisco Arconada. Barcelona. Ediciones B, 2000.

ECO, Umberto. *Historia de la Belleza*. Translated by Maria Pons Irazazábal. Barcelona. Lumen, 2004.

FONTANA, David. *El Lenguaje de los Símbolos. Guía visual sobre los símbolos y su significado*. Translated by Carmen Gómez Aragón and María José García Ripoll. Barcelona. Blume, 2003.

GOMBRICH, E.H. *The Story of Art*. London, 16th edition (revised, expanded and redesigned). Phaidon, 1995.

MONTAGUE-SMITH, Patrick W. *The Royal Line of Succession*. Great Britain. Pitkin Guides Ltd., 1986.

SCHNEIDER, Norbert. *El Arte del Retrato*. Translated by José García Pelegrín. Colonia. Taschen, 2002.

## ***Internet sources***

COOPER, Tarnya. *Queen Elizabeth's Public Face*. *History Today* [online]. May 2003, Vol. 53, Issue 5. In <http://www.geocities.com/queenswoman/elizacooper.html> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

DAMASCENE, St John. “*Apologia Against Those Who Decry Holy Images*” In *On Holy Images*. [online] Internet Medieval Source Book. Translated by Mary H. Allies. London. Thomas Baker, 1998. In <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/johndamascus-images.html#PART%20I> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

DEDIJER, Stevan. *The Rainbow Scheme*. In <http://itis.volta.alessandria.it/episteme/ep2ded.htm> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

DORAN, Susan. *Elizabeth I. Gender, Power & Politics*. *History Today* [online]. May 2003, Vol. 53, Issue 5. In <http://www.geocities.com/queenswoman/elizadoran.html> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

FISCHLIN, Daniel. *Political Allegory, Absolutist Ideology, and the “Rainbow Portrait” of Queen Elizabeth I*. *Renaissance Quarterly* [online]. Spring 1997, Vol. 50, Issue 1. In <http://www.geocities.com/yskretz/elizafischlin.html> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

GREGG, Christopher. *The Ermine*. *The Minerva Britannia Project* [online]. In <http://f01.middlebury.edu/FS010A/STUDENTS/n075.htm> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

LLOYD, Christopher. *Royal Image Makers. Breathing New Life into Royal Portraiture*. *Art Fund Magazines, Art Quarterly* [online]. Summer 2002. In [http://www.artfund.org/main\\_site/artfundmags\\_backindex.asp?id=17](http://www.artfund.org/main_site/artfundmags_backindex.asp?id=17) [accessed on 28 July 2005]

PALMER, Heather. *Queen Victoria's Not So 'Victorian' Writings*. *The Victorian Era Online* [online]. In <http://www.victoriana.com/doors/queenvictoria.htm> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

PETRARCH, Francesco. *Trionfi*. [online]. In [http://www.petrarch.petersadlon.com/read\\_trionfi.html?page=I-I.txt](http://www.petrarch.petersadlon.com/read_trionfi.html?page=I-I.txt) [accessed on 28 July 2005]

SPIVACK, Carla. *The Conscience of the Queen: Lady Macbeth, Queen Elizabeth, and the Transparent Female Body in Jacobean England*. *ExpressO Preprint Series – The Berkeley Electronic Press* [online]. Year 2005, Paper 558. In <http://law.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2745&context=expresso> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

TOMASI, Stephanie. *Widow's Weeds. Mourning fashions of the Victorian Era*. *Mourning Matters. Educational and Special Programs Dedicated to Victorian Mourning* [online]. In <http://www.mourningmatters.com/mourningmatters-article.html> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

WATKINS, Susan. *The Art of Adoration. The Role of the Visual Arts under Elizabeth I*. *Art Fund Magazines, Art Quarterly* [online]. Spring 2003. In [http://www.artfund.org/main\\_site/artfundmags\\_archive.asp?id=225](http://www.artfund.org/main_site/artfundmags_archive.asp?id=225) [accessed on 28 July 2005]

## ***Museums and Image Archives***

The Royal Collection

<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/>

National Portrait Gallery

<http://www.npg.org.uk/live/index.asp>

Artcyclopedia

<http://www.artcyclopedia.com/index.html>

Web Gallery of Art

<http://www.wga.hu/index.html>

## ***General and Historical Sources***

Encarta Encyclopedia [online]

[http://au.encarta.msn.com/artcenter\\_/browse.html](http://au.encarta.msn.com/artcenter_/browse.html)

Official Website of the British Monarchy

<http://www.royal.gov.uk/output/Page1.asp>

## ***Newspaper articles***

About. 'Lucian Freud Paints Queen Elizabeth II'

[http://painting.about.com/od/famouspainters/a/LucianF\\_Queen.htm](http://painting.about.com/od/famouspainters/a/LucianF_Queen.htm)

The Spectator. 'Painting Still Counts'

[http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_ga3724/is\\_200201/ai\\_n9040816](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_ga3724/is_200201/ai_n9040816)

## ***Citations***

<sup>1</sup> DAMASCENE, St John. "Apologia Against Those Who Decry Holy Images" In *On Holy Images*. [online] Internet Medieval Source Book. Translated by Mary H. Allies. London. Thomas Baker, 1998. In <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/johndamascus-images.html#PART%20I> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

<sup>2</sup> GOMBRICH, E.H. *The Story of Art*. London, 16th edition (revised, expanded and redesigned). Phaidon, 1995. p. 196

<sup>3</sup> Op. Cit., p. 524

<sup>4</sup> WATKINS, Susan. *The Art of Adoration. The Role of the Visual Arts under Elizabeth I*. *Art Fund Magazines, Art Quarterly* [online]. Spring 2003. In [http://www.artfund.org/main\\_site/artfundmags\\_archive.asp?id=225](http://www.artfund.org/main_site/artfundmags_archive.asp?id=225) [accessed on 28 July 2005]

<sup>5</sup> Encarta Encyclopedia [online]  
[http://au.encyclopedia.msn.com/encyclopedia\\_761555497\\_2/Elizabeth\\_I.html](http://au.encyclopedia.msn.com/encyclopedia_761555497_2/Elizabeth_I.html)

<sup>6</sup> COOPER, Tarnya. *Queen Elizabeth's Public Face. History Today* [online]. May 2003, Vol. 53, Issue 5. In <http://www.geocities.com/queenswoman/elizacooper.html> [accessed on 28 July 2005]

<sup>7</sup> WATKINS, Susan. *The Art of Adoration. The Role of the Visual Arts under Elizabeth I. Art Fund Magazines, Art Quarterly* [online]. Spring 2003. In [http://www.artfund.org/main\\_site/artfundmags\\_archive.asp?id=225](http://www.artfund.org/main_site/artfundmags_archive.asp?id=225) [accessed on 28 July 2005]

<sup>8</sup> GOMBRICH, E.H. *The Story of Art*. London, 16th edition (revised, expanded and redesigned). Phaidon, 1995. p. 499

<sup>9</sup> Op. Cit., p. 525

<sup>10</sup> About. 'Lucian Freud Paints Queen Elizabeth II'  
[http://painting.about.com/od/famouspainters/a/LucianF\\_Queen.htm](http://painting.about.com/od/famouspainters/a/LucianF_Queen.htm)

<sup>11</sup> The Spectator. 'Painting Still Counts'  
[http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_ga3724/is\\_200201/ai\\_n9040816](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_ga3724/is_200201/ai_n9040816)

*Fig. 1*  
**'The Sieve Portrait' (or 'The Siena Portrait')**  
**Artist:** Quentin Massys the Younger  
**Year:** circa 1583  
**Location:** Pinacoteca Nazionale di Siena, Italy  
**Characteristics:** oil on panel



*Fig. 2*  
**'The Rainbow Portrait'**  
**Artist:** attributed to Isaac Oliver  
**Year:** circa 1600  
**Location:** Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, UK  
**Characteristics:** oil on panel (?)



*Fig. 3*

**'Queen Victoria'**

**Artist:** Lady Julia Abercromby, after Heinrich von Angeli

**Year:** 1883 (von Angeli's portrait, 1875)

**Location:** National Portrait Gallery, London, UK.

**Characteristics:** watercolour; 146 x 98 cm (not on display)



*Fig. 4*



*Lady Julia Abercromby  
(after Heinrich von Angeli)  
Watercolour*

*Robert Jefferson Bingham  
Hand-coloured albumen print  
circa 1860*



*Heinrich von Angeli  
Oil on canvas*

*Bassano  
Half-plate glass negative*







*Malcolm Stewart  
(after Heinrich von Angeli)  
Oil on canvas  
1899*



*Bassano  
Half-plate glass negative*

*Fig. 5*

**'Her Majesty The Queen'**

**Artist:** Lucian Freud

**Year:** painted between May 2000 and December 2001

**Location:** the Royal Collection, UK.

**Characteristics:** oil on canvas; 23.5 cm x 15.2 cm

