

Investigate and discuss how relationships between men and women are represented in three eighteenth-century paintings, each by a different artist.

The three paintings to be discussed are William Hogarth's "The Tête à Tête", which is scene two from "Marriage A-la-Mode" [c.1743, Oil on Canvas, National Gallery, London], J-M Vien's "The Cupid Seller" [1763, Oil on Canvas, Musée National du Château, Fontainebleau] and J-L David's portrait of Antoine-Laurent and Marie-Anne Lavoisier, [1788, Oil on Canvas, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York].

Hogarth's painting is a satire on modern life. It was intended to poke fun at the way of life of the nouveau riche and the aristocracy of the time and also, as part of the series, to become a print that would make Hogarth lots of money. Although it did not make him much money, it does illustrate what he saw to be wrong with one aspect of the society of his time. The work shows "Viscount Squanderfeld" and his wife, the rich Alderman's daughter, in their new home, decorated regardless of expense or taste thanks to the Alderman's money. It is just after midday and the couple are supposed to be having a "Tête à Tête", a pleasant private conversation, which is what might be expected from a young newly married couple. However things are not right: the Viscount has clearly just staggered in from a night on the town: he is still wearing his hat, he has just unbuckled his sword and his dog is sniffing at a muslin cap in his pocket, which suggests that the Viscount has been seeing another woman. Similarly his wife is posed in a way designed to suggest that she has only recently had sex and not with her husband. She has been entertaining and the overturned chair in the foreground and the two fiddle cases one on top of the other are a clear indication that she has been entertaining a lover.

What Hogarth is showing us are the consequences of a marriage arranged purely for money [on the side of the Viscount's father] and status [on the Alderman's side]. Hogarth makes his points through the sophisticated use of symbols and of poses and expressions: he takes the popular "conversation piece" as his starting point and then transforms it into satire by changing key aspects. For example, in a conversation piece you might expect to see the man sitting upright with legs crossed and the woman sitting also straight-backed and perhaps making an elegant gesture with her hands. In Hogarth's work the two main characters are sprawled in their chairs in grossly inelegant poses.

While Hogarth's painting attacks the foolishness of arranged loveless marriage, J-L David's portrait of Antoine-Laurent and Marie-Anne Lavoisier praises a couple seemingly in love and at the same time points to why their marriage appears to be so successful. In David's painting Marie-Anne "leans like an inspirational muse against her husband's shoulder." Her husband rather than being inspired seems instead to be drawn away from his work by her beauty. He has stopped writing and instead is looking up at her. She, on the other hand, is looking out at us, suggesting to us that she is doing her inspirational duty. David seems to be suggesting that Marie-Anne, who married Lavoisier when she was fourteen to escape the prospect of another arranged marriage, is nothing more than a pretty wife and muse who is happy to be just that. Certainly her half of the painting with its classical pilasters and Louis

Quinze chair contains no reference to her husband's chemical experiments. His half of the painting on the other hand is full of such references.

This reduction of Marie-Anne's status is quite typical of the attitude towards women of radical thinkers of David's time. After the first year or so of the French Revolution the status of women declined quite rapidly and finally their subservient status was put into law by the Code Napoleon. In fact, Marie-Anne was much more than a "pretty face". She was Lavoisier's assistant and she used her drawing skills to illustrate many of his experiments. David would have been well aware of her role since she had been one of his pupils and his failure to give her proper credit in this painting sums up very well the attitude of the time: women should not be thought of as equal to men.

Vien's "The Cupid Seller" also suggests that women are not equal to men, although this time it could be argued that Vien suggests that they are better than men. The painting shows, on the left, a kneeling young woman holding a basket of cupids, one of which she is offering to an elegant aristocratic lady seated in the right half of the painting. This aristocratic lady is accompanied by a companion or a maid, and it seems that they are considering whether or not to buy the cupid. The whole work has a classical feel to it, with a frieze-like composition, classical dress and classical touches like the pilasters and the urn.

However the painting is still essentially Rococo in its lightness. Vien is probably doing nothing more than producing a gentle satire on how women look for love, but it could be suggested that he is also commenting on how arranged marriages among the aristocracy bring little happiness and how women have to look for love elsewhere. It would be interesting to know why the aristocratic lady in blue wants a cupid: is she trying to make her husband love her? Or is she trying to find a husband who will love her? Obviously we will never know, but the fact that Vien seems to be asking these questions shows us quite a lot about the relationship between men and women in Rococo France.

An excellent response that combines detailed and appropriate sourcing with sustained analysis and discussion.

26-30

HART4 Topic 3 Art and Architecture in eighteenth-century Europe

Question 4

Analyse the architectural characteristics of **two** churches, one Protestant and one Catholic, built in the eighteenth century. What differences and similarities do you find between your chosen churches?

Two appropriate examples are selected and the architectural characteristics of both churches are generally well recalled, although the respective plans of each building could have been considered in more detail. The essential differences of function are identified and the contexts of both buildings are understood- one as a post-plague votive church, the other a response to the 1711 Act (actually given by the candidate as 1710).

Differences and similarities are not always made explicit, although there are occasional useful insights, especially when concerning function.

Some meaningful argument and judgement. Overall a competent response that could have been improved by addressing the demands of the question more closely and by providing more details of the architectural characteristics of both churches. Perhaps it is significant that the candidate, in writing out the question, omitted the 'architectural' of 'architectural characteristics'.

16-20

HART4 Topic 4 Art & Architecture in twentieth Europe and America 1900-1945

Question 1

Investigate and discuss why some sculptors used found objects in their work during this period. Make reference to three sculptures, each by a different artist.

Three relevant examples are selected and a solid understanding of what constitutes a 'found object' is given.

The discussion of Duchamp's Fountain is very full and articulate and combines an acute visual analysis with the reasons for the object's selection by Duchamp.

The Haussmann and the Dali are both well described although neither are fully developed in relation to the 'why' of the question.

An uneven response. At its best it is excellent, although there is a slight tendency to ramble off the point- eg the section on colour is something of a digression.

21-25