



Impropriety, Informality
and Intimacy
in Vigée Le Brun's
Marie Antoinette en Chemise

Kelly Hall

The portrait *Marie Antoinette en Chemise* by Elisabeth Louise Vigée Le Brun was viewed as scandalously improper in its reception at the Salon of 1783 (Figure 1). This debut for Vigée Le Brun as a member of the Academy was noteworthy not only in that she was a woman receiving this honor but also for the response her submissions elicited. The negative reaction to the portrait prompted its removal soon after the Salon opened. The Queen of France was presented in a loose-fitting dress reminiscent of the garment typically worn under one's clothes. This costume was associated with the queen's retreat, the Petit Trianon, where she played hostess to an exclusive group of intimates. Frivolity of this nature had been ushered out in the preceding decade with the end of the Rococo style; the portrait therefore did not match the moral aesthetic associated with more recent Salon submissions. This study will closely examine the political climate at the time the portrait was made; compare this work to contemporary models of regal, especially female, portraiture; and explore the relationship of Vigée Le Brun and Marie Antoinette as expressed through the artist's memoirs written late in her life. In order to see beyond the initial negative critiques, the portrait must be looked at through multiple perspectives. This investigation will reveal how *Marie Antoinette en Chemise* came to be regarded by the Queen as her favorite likeness and how it served as the fulcrum for Vigée Le Brun's lifelong project of self-promotion.

Elisabeth Vigée Le Brun would come to be known throughout Europe and in history as a premier portrait painter for the men and women of eighteenth-century court life. However, her 1778 appointment as the portraitist to Marie Antoinette was nearly as surprising as her later *académicienne* status. Prior to her time with Marie Antoinette her subjects included the sisters of the king, various counts

and countesses, and artists such as Joseph Vernet. Portraits of queens were not yet in her repertoire. Nevertheless, the 1778 portrait of the queen, *Archduchess Marie Antoinette, Queen of France*, demonstrates that the artist was more than capable of fulfilling the demands of her new office (Figure 2). Marie Antoinette at this point was flirting with the good graces of those at court, often forgoing what was expected of her in favor of more entertaining prospects. In this context, her appointment of Vigée Le Brun as her official portraitist was yet another move to further her own motives and contradict the customs of French court life. This manipulation was evident at the 1783 Salon.

The Salon of 1783 was the debut of not only Vigée Le Brun but also Adélaïde Labille-Guiard. The significance of this is twofold; there were two new female members to the Academy and for the influence the queen had securing one of these positions for her court painter. In 1706 the regulation of membership in to the Academy barred any women from new admittance, prompted by the fact that, at that moment, there were six existing female members. The king however never sanctioned this rule and as a result a revision was created. In 1770 the statute was reworded, carefully stating that while the academy would reserve four spaces for women, those positions need not be filled at any one time. It is important to note that female artists were accepted on a case-to-case basis between 1706 and 1770; these exceptions were either wives of artists or foreign artists passing through.¹ When the new limitation was accepted in 1783 the female members included Madame Valleyer-Coster and Madame Vien, who would not show in the 1783 Salon. Despite the vacancies Vigée Le Brun's appointment was further challenged by director d'Angiviller who brought up her marriage to an art dealer. This was basis for denial as was in conflict with a statute that said artists of the Academy

could not participate in commerce. Marie Antoinette herself went to the king who consequently made an exception on behalf of her portraitist.² The benefits from this relationship with the queen did not end there for Vigée Le Brun; she would enjoy the reverberations from this time throughout her life. Marie Antoinette's clear involvement in this affair was indicative to the role she created for herself in the court of France.

Marie Antoinette was a “tool of Austrian foreign policy,” as historian John Hardman put it, a pawn caught in the middle of France and her homeland of Austria.³ In 1756 an alliance was struck between France and Austria. The manifestation of this partnership was the 1770 marriage of the dauphin of France to the Hapsburg Archduchess Maria Antonia. The Archduchess shed her Austrian heritage and was ushered into a new court as Marie Antoinette. Despite a French name and training in French customs Marie Antoinette would remain the “*L'Autrichienne*” in her new home.⁴ Her reception was not aided by the prolonged consummation of the union, which contradicted the mark of a consort: to bear royal children. In 1781, after producing a male heir and thereby securing the Bourbon line, she was free to skim the surface of court life. However, deeper motives were at work and officials at court suspicious of her allegiance marginalized her. Moreover, she did not help matters with her own machinations. As a foreign consort the public was wary of her role in court this was exacerbated by the history of France and Austria as enemies. Consequently placed in the margins of court life Marie Antoinette was urged by her mother, the Empress Maria Thérèse, and the Austrian Ambassador Mercy Argenteau to secure ‘favorites’ in influential court positions, thereby gaining influence in political affairs. This strategy was unsuccessful at *this* point in time. Marie Antoinette remained an outcast in her court

and even reflected on the futility of her political role in correspondence with Madame Campan, “...the Queens of France are only happy when they meddle with nothing, just keeping enough ‘crédit’ to set up their friends and few devoted servants.”⁵ This reveals that Marie Antoinette found issue with the ways of court and she even acknowledges how she would rather spend her time. This statement additionally supports her already-displayed tendency to become involved in the affairs of her artist, Vigée Le Brun. Marie Antoinette challenged the role of a ‘foreign’ queen that had been outlined in the previous century by Marie de’ Medici. The promotional tone of the Peter Paul Rubens Medici Cycle bolstered the reputation of the outsider consort, attempting to prepare France for a ‘foreign’ queen. While ultimately ineffective the propagandistic nature of this series shows the office an artist must fulfill to their patron and sovereign. Vigée Le Brun seemingly showed no concern for her queen’s position when pushing her 1783 portrait into the public arena. Eventually, Marie Antoinette’s foreign status would fuel the accusations that marked her as a catalyst of the Revolution.

While other studies have acknowledged the prophetic nature of this portrait and its neat situation at the dawn of Marie Antoinette’s status as the hated queen, an accurate political framework must be the basis for any subsequent understanding derived from this painting. The focus of the portrait and its negative reception being viewed as the harbinger of Marie Antoinette’s later difficulties has obscured our ability to understand it properly in its moment. At this time, despite the urging from her mother and ambassador, Marie Antoinette’s pull in court matters was minimal. Politically she would not gain influence until 1787 when Louis XVI, having suffered a near breakdown following a reform rejection, sought consolation and council from his

wife rather than exclude her from future decision-making.⁶ Regardless of this late-coming favor from the king, the early role of Marie Antoinette was fueled by contradictory messages. Her brother Joseph II urged her to maintain a low profile so as to not upset any ministerial politics. On the other side Ambassador Mercy thought it best if she had her hand in the goings on at court, specifically gaining the favor of the prime minister. These inconsistent instructions would no doubt have impacted the young queen, who sought refuge in frivolous intrigues, namely in exploits at the Petit Trianon. Consequently her failure to gain a political voice at this time, whether from being barred by court officials or through her own disinterest, has been reflected in the way she was presented.

At the Petit Trianon, Marie Antoinette entertained an intimate circle of friends with an apparent disregard for proper queenly conduct. Vigée Le Brun's portrait *Marie Antoinette en Chemise* captured the escape Marie Antoinette sought from political life. The queen is dressed in a loose fitting *chemise* that at this time was a popular style in England. This light garment was reserved for country picnics and other exploits that many would have deemed unsuitable for a queen to be engaging in. The fact that this was an unstructured *English* dress was outrageous to the precise, heavily powdered, and corseted French court. However, being depicted in such a fashion was not necessarily a calculated action undertaken by Marie Antoinette as a means to under-mind the court that shunned her. Incidentally a peace agreement was newly formed between France and England, having been signed on September 3, 1783. Therefore I suggest, that the wearing of a quintessentially English garment in a portrait that would be received openly in a Salon setting at this sensitive time for the two countries, could then be read as a metaphorical olive branch.

While in the margins, unable to engage in the roles the ambassador and her brother wanted, Marie Antoinette instead turned to the role that she saw herself capable of being a success. As a queen in an influential European court Marie Antoinette would have been privy to the high fashion of the day. The *chemise* style of dress was new to France and it would soon gain popularity like many of the queen's more outrageous fashion choices. Like the *pouf* hairstyle that garnered increased prevalence in France following the wearing of it by Marie Antoinette, by 1785 the *chemise* would be deemed an acceptable daywear ensemble.⁷ While critiques in the art and social realms would comment on indecency of this dress, within two years of Marie Antoinette being painted in one, it was regarded as a popular style. This was then a critique on a dawning fashion trend not rather the setting of a monarch's political favor. Though the animosity towards her was on the rise in 1783 it was nowhere near what it would reach in the years following 1787. Moreover when courtiers were condemning Marie Antoinette's actions a contemporary noted a popular theme and wrote, "They continued frenetically to imitate her. Every woman wanted to have the same *déshabillé*, the same bonnet, that they had seen her wear."⁸ Being an instrument of foreign policy, a politically active queen, or a maternal figure of moral uprightness were possible roles for Marie Antoinette to pursue. She went against these models and became an influential ambassador of fashion, changing the court of France to her liking, more so than any other French Queen did before her. Marie Antoinette eliminated the heavily structured garments of French court, notably the *paniers* and restrictive whalebone corsets. These formal modes of dress that were reserved for daily use by the Queen of France were even noted by the lady-in-waiting to Marie Antoinette as being "extremely bothersome and fatiguing."⁹ While the criticism over this break from tradition was

staggering in immediate years, the acceptance garnered from this move was liberating to the women of court.

A problematic aspect with *Marie Antoinette en Chemise* was that it was shown in a public venue. Marie Antoinette at this time would have known that her Austrian status made her situation at court precarious, as evident from Ambassador Mercy's insistence that she become better equated with the politics of France. The decision therefore to show the portrait was due to the myopic nature of Marie Antoinette's reading of her place in court. Additionally, the debut revealed the naïveté of both Marie Antoinette and Vigée Le Brun. Marie Antoinette would have needed to approve of the painting, the pose as well as the costume would have all come from her consent. Vigée Le Brun on the other hand, whose minimal experience with monarchical portraits was clear from her resume, would have not anticipated the implications read from a portrait of this nature. Representations of queens at this time were in some cases taking a more relaxed attitude but none so glaring as this avoidance of duty on the behalf of Marie Antoinette.

The representation of Marie Antoinette presented to the public was seemingly not of a queen at all; critics dwelt on the un-regal aspects of the portrait. Even Vigée Le Brun comments in her *Souvenirs* that criticism focused on the belief that the queen was depicted in her "underwear."¹⁰ Compared to her European counterparts, Marie Antoinette could be deemed lacking a quality of providing a moral benefit to society. Where other monarchs were represented as models of virtue, maternal sovereigns and undeniable authority, Marie Antoinette was rendered as an idle shepherdess. The garment was not the courtly dress of France's aristocracy and standards of formality were set aside to show a wayward queen set on her amusements

and follies. This atypical royal portrait therefore posed a problem. If the depiction of a queen was expected to exemplify the moral or social condition of the state, then comparisons made between Marie Antoinette's portrait and those of contemporary female counterparts could be interpreted as a precarious situation for France. A 1777 Benjamin West portrait of Queen Charlotte of England depicted the monarch as a stout pillar of noble responsibility. In 1783 Maria Carolina of Naples, Marie Antoinette's sister, was depicted by Angelica Kauffman in *King Ferdinand of Naples and His Family* (Figure 3). The queen is the central figure who encompasses her family, showing her as the balancing force both to the composition and to her family. The painting therefore stands to demonstrate that as she provides stability to her family so too she stabilizes her state. Formality as seen in the Kauffman was not necessary for a painting to render a message of stately duty. Allegorical representations could also translate to the audience a positive view of their sovereign. Catherine the Great of Russia was represented as a deputy in the Temple of Justice in 1783 by Dmitry Levitsky, the allusion to Catherine's ability to serve justice was important in affirming her ability as a ruler, and as a woman. These portraits represented models of austerity and duty to family and country that a queen should emulate. Political affirmations were absent in the Vigée Le Brun portrait of Marie Antoinette; instead a superficial image of a supposed vain queen was all that was offered. This apparent renouncement of obligation was staggeringly clear to the audience of the 1783 Salon.

Marie Antoinette's naïveté towards the portrait's public reception might be justified by a series of precedents of less formal portraits of her beginning in childhood. Her mother, Maria Thérèse, had kept these informal portraits for her own study and private rooms. These relaxed portraits

were reserved for non-official private collections often kept by family members; they were not publicly displayed, especially in a Salon setting. One of these portraits depicts another unconventional fashion choice. The pastel *Marie Antoinette en Amazone* (Figure 4) by Joseph Krantzinger from 1771 has the young archduchess in a costume reminiscent of a man's riding habit. Maria Thérèse herself was noted to have expressed her contentment regarding this painting in that it shows her daughter "enjoying her activities." The same can be expressed with regard to *Marie Antoinette en Chemise*. The queen having established her pleasure retreat at the Petit Trianon and the chemise as the attire of choice while there, represents a similar sentiment, i.e., being depicted "enjoying her activities."¹¹ This 'costumed' representation also follows suit with the portrayal of noble role-playing that was more common in Northern and Central European traditions than in France, in particular following an informal manner of nonchalant postures established by Van Dyck in England. Nevertheless traditionally the costumes of these subjects left nothing to be imagined in regards to their status. Sumptuous attire was worn regardless of how relaxed the pose was. While the court of Charles I produced paintings that embodied this less formal sensibility, France strictly adhered to the practice of representing their kings and queens in the most austere attitude. From Marie de' Medici in the 1620s until Marie Antoinette's 1783, portrait no French Queen was represented so casually where the pose and air of the painting would contradict the austerity of her status as sovereign mother.

In order to understand why *Marie Antoinette en Chemise* could be shown in the Salon of 1783, a return to the context of Vigée Le Brun's acceptance into the Academy is necessary. Marie Antoinette was responsible for the painter's admittance. She went to the king personally and asked for

an exception to be made, despite that the artist's marriage to an art dealer would normally have rendered her ineligible as it violated the commerce statute of the Academy. The *Mémoires* of the Academy never formally recorded Vigée Le Brun's reception piece, but her *morceau de reception* is noted in the Salon livret as *Peace Bringing Back Abundance* (Figure 5).¹² This redacted information comes along with the added affronts on Vigée Le Brun: Pierre, the first painter to the king, and d'Angiviller, the director of the academy, directly opposed the admission of Vigée Le Brun while favoring the admittance of Labille-Guiard. If this was of personal interest to Marie Antoinette her involvement could have prompted the two to select a piece that they knew would be received with much backlash. Marie Antoinette was even marked by Ambassador Mercy to have reacted more out her own volition, punishing those who she disliked, while helping those she admired.¹³ This sentiment leads back again to why Marie Antoinette would chose to employ a inexperienced monarch portraitist, and later retain her services even after one of her portraits proved to be detrimental to her reputation! With this explanation of events, then a flagrant disregard for the French court and its customs was the motivation behind submitting *Marie Antoinette en Chemise*.

The memoirs of Elisabeth Vigée Le Brun compiled near the end of her life in 1835, long after her service under Marie Antoinette, offer another portrait of the Queen, this one created through the artist's words rather than her brush. Caution must be used in discerning the truth of the *Souvenirs*, since it is a construct of a talented artist to augment her own reputation, but nonetheless it offers insights and parallels to her efforts as a painter in this case. In an effort to create an intimacy between herself and her most beloved queen the portrait serves as a link to the queen's most intimate circle of friends at the Petit Trianon retreat. The portrait suggests

that Vigée Le Brun had access to this idle time with the monarch, hence implying that she, above other courtiers, enjoyed unencumbered access. The bond is strengthened by the similarities among the portraits of the Queen, her “favorite” the Duchess de Polignac (Figure 6), and the artist’s *Self-Portrait with a Straw Hat* (Figure 7), that were exhibited together at the 1783 Salon. The three women are essentially undistinguishable from one another. The three portraits feature straw-hats with flower and feather accoutrements. The women are in the chemise dress, fitted with what appears to be the same sash around their mid sections. Their eyes look out of the picture plane directly at the audience, nearly challenging the viewer to second guess their close bond with one another. Nevertheless the relationship formed between these women was not imagined and was now clear in the paintings. With a reading of visual content along with study of the memoirs, *Marie Antoinette en Chemise* can be understandably viewed as suggestive of the impropriety suggested by the criticism.¹⁴

Souvenirs was an outlet of an elderly painter to recount her times under the patronage of one of the most memorable European monarchs of the eighteenth century. The endless anecdotes of portrait sittings with Marie Antoinette are infused with an air of nostalgia and awe for the queen who was the epitome of kindness and always accommodating towards Vigée Le Brun. Even when describing her times in other European courts Vigée Le Brun cannot help but draw comparisons to her most beloved patroness, especially when at the court of Maria Carolina in Naples. Her royalist loyalties run deep throughout the Memoirs, and the passion with which she regrets what happened to Marie Antoinette is palpable. However the compassion that she employs when talking about the queen is noticeably absent when discussion turns to the receptions of *Marie Antoinette en*

Chemise. Having been aware of the removal of the portrait from the Salon and knowing the commotion it elicited from critics Vigée Le Brun could not have been ignorant to the effect the painting had on Marie Antoinette’s reputation at that moment, especially considering she claims to have been “on very pleasant terms” with the queen.¹⁵ The portrait, which brought to the public arena the aloofness of the monarchy, was not a shame to Vigée Le Brun’s reputation but rather a fuse to ignite her own status. The response to the painter immediately following the portrait’s reception was not all negative.¹⁶ She lovingly recounts a venture to the Vaudeville Theater immediately following the exhibition during which the actress who represented Painting appeared on stage as Vigée Le Brun painting a portrait of the queen. At that “moment everyone in the parterre and the boxes turned toward me and applauded to bring the roof down,” she wrote.¹⁷ This apparent pride in the response to her portrait is an apparent disregard for the person of Marie Antoinette when considering the effect the portrait had on the public reputation of the queen. The queen, stable in that position, was therefore to Vigée Le Brun a stepping stone, a dispensable casualty on her path to fame. At the core of this relationship a symbiotic correlation is evident: while Vigée Le Brun used the status of Marie Antoinette to bolster her own reputation, Marie Antoinette used Vigée Le Brun in order to further upset the French Court. Each woman gained from this relationship a self-serving end. Both were navigating predominately male worlds where the voice of a woman was qualified and censored. By using one another Marie Antoinette gained attention in the court in which she had been marginalized and Vigée Le Brun gained entry into the circles of the French elite and eventually other European courts.¹⁸

The closeness that Vigée Le Brun discusses at length

can be attributed to several motives, even if they are not entirely true or happen to be colored with nostalgia. Firstly the intimacy Vigée Le Brun enjoyed as a courtier, privy to the idle times of the queen, would have demonstrated her qualifications to other courts in Europe as a confidant to her patrons. Her skill as a portraitist coupled with her ability to be a close intimate while painting would have been an appealing characteristic. Secondly as much as the *Souvenirs* is a marketing tool of Vigée Le Brun's own career, it also works to paint Marie Antoinette in a more convivial light. Vigée Le Brun is never critical of Marie Antoinette in the memoirs with the exception of noting the queen's tendency of singing off key when they participated in duets.¹⁹ Marie Antoinette and Vigée Le Brun were both marginalized in the roles they found themselves. Marie Antoinette was forever known as an Austrian Archduchess before being a Queen of France. Vigée Le Brun was a woman in a man's world, getting by through her own machinations and taking advantage of every opportunity yielded to her. This included using the safety net of the permanence of a French crown in order to augment her good standing in society. Marie Antoinette could easily absorb the criticism resulting for this painting without risk of losing her position over something so trifling; after all it was not the painting in itself that would cause the public outcry against her.

Subsequent Marie Antoinette portraits done by Vigée Le Brun depicted the queen in formal poses, and even sought to fix the queen's damaged reputation. *Marie Antoinette and Her Children* of 1787 (Figure 8) is more fitting to standards of royal family portraiture. In this painting Vigée Le Brun promotes the maternal aspects of the queen, taking similar role depicted by Maria Carolina (Figure 3). The date of this painting is significant in that it demonstrates Marie Antoinette's attachment to Vigée Le Brun, otherwise the

painter's dismissal would have occurred after the responses garnered from *Marie Antoinette en Chemise*. Retaining Vigée Le Brun demonstrates the success of the 1783 portrait in regards to Vigée Le Brun's career. This choice also enforces the personal nature of the two women's relationship.

The role-playing that Marie Antoinette was engaged in at the Petit Trianon, now publicly confirmed in the portrait, to her critics was too obviously a shirking of responsibility. The intimacy of the costume, the informality of the pose and the question of improper relations with the closeness hinted at in the memoirs combine to create an understandable, and perhaps unavoidable, interpretation of inappropriateness. On the other hand, the levity of the portrait was what Marie Antoinette desired: to be captured in a state that was entertaining to her. The judgment of the success of this portrait can therefore be summed up in the words of the Queen herself who called the painting the "most life-like that has been made," showing that it pleased her very much.²⁰ Vigée Le Brun benefited from the portrait's reputation as an indicator of her privileged status in the court of Marie Antoinette, and it ultimately served to introduce her other European courts following the Revolution.

Endnotes

- ¹ Mary Sheriff, *The Exceptional Woman: Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun and the Cultural Politics of Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1996), 79. This courtesy would be extended to Vigée Le Brun herself when she was in exile. Additionally only one third of one percent of the artists admitted to the Academy were women.
- ² Ibid, 82, Sheriff questions the nature in which Marie Antoinette was beseeching the King on her artist's behalf confusing the terms 'request' and 'insistence' thereby questioning the sincerity of Marie Antoinette's actions: was this a personal request to her husband, or an insisting command as a peer and queen?
- ³ John Hardman, *French Politics 1774-1789: From the Accession of Louis XVI to the Fall of the Bastille*. (London: Longman) 1995, 198.
- ⁴ Ibid, 198.
- ⁵ Madame Campan, *Memoirs ser la vie privée de Marie-Antoinette, Reine de France et de Navarre*. (London, 1823) 2 vols, II, 29.
- ⁶ Hardman 198-199.
- ⁷ Laura Aurricchio, "Self-Promotion in Adelaïde Lebille-Guiard's 1785 *Self-Portrait with Two Students*," *The Art Bulletin* 89.1, 2007, 51.
- ⁸ Félix Montjoie, *Histoire de Marie Antoinette Joséphe Jeanne de Lorraine, Archiduchesse d'Autriche, Reine de France*. (Paris, 1797), 101.
- ⁹ Henriette-Lucie Séraphin Dillon, Marquise de La Tour du Pin de Gouvernet, *Mémoires: Journal d'une femme de cinquante ans (1778-1815)*, ed. Christian de Liedekerke Beaufort, (Paris: Mercure de France), 1989 [2007].
- ¹⁰ Vigée Le Brun, *Souvenirs*, 24
- ¹¹ *Correspondance secrete entre Marie-Thérèse et le Comte de Mercy-Argenteau*, Introduction and Notes by M. le Chevalier Alfred d'Arneht and M. A. Geffroy, 4 vols (Paris: Didot, 1874), 1:196.
- ¹² Sheriff, 77.
- ¹³ Hardman, 198-19.
- ¹⁴ Later Marie Antoinette's reputation would be sullied once again by lascivious gossip involving lesbianism and a relationship with the Duchess de Polignac
- ¹⁵ Vigée Le Brun, *Souvenirs*, 24.
- ¹⁶ As previously mentioned the authorship of the artist's work was questioned at the Salon; critics denied that she could have been a female creating such works.
- ¹⁷ Vigée Le Brun, 24.
- ¹⁸ Much in the way Diego Velázquez was influenced by Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Libro del Cortegiano* (Book of the Courtier) of 1528 to manipulate his career through the Spanish court during the 1600s, Vigée Le Brun employs similar stratagems to forge her way both as a woman and a painter.
- ¹⁹ Vigée Le Brun, 24.
- ²⁰ Iconically, in regards to the controversy *Marie Antoinette en Chemise* raised, the final portrait of Marie Antoinette was completed in a sketch by Jacques Louis David as the queen was being brought to the guillotine in none other than a white *chemise*.

1.



2.



3.



Figure 1 Vigee Le Brun. *Marie Antoinette en Chemise*. Oil on canvas. 1783.

Figure 2 Vigee Le Brun. *Archduchess Marie Antoinette, Queen of France*. Oil on canvas. 1778.

Figure 3 Angelica Kauffmann. *King Ferdinand of Naples and His Family*. Oil on canvas. 1783.

Figure 4 Joseph Krantzinger. *Marie Antoinette en Amazone*. Pastel on canvas. 1771.

Figure 5 Vigee Le Brun. *Peace Bringing Back Abundance*. Oil on canvas. 1780.

Figure 6 Vigee Le Brun. *Duchess de Polignac*. Oil on canvas. 1782.

Figure 7 Vigee Le Brun. *Self-Portrait with a Straw Hat*. Oil on canvas. 1782.

Figure 8 Vigee Le Brun. *Marie Antoinette and Her Children*. Oil on canvas. 1787.

4.



5.



6.



7.



8.