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Abstract

The political significance of portraits of Charlotte of Saxe Coburg Gotha (1840-1927) has been obscured by her historical liminality and by romantic myths that have prevailed since the late nineteenth century and influenced interpretations of her visual representations. This thesis reassembles a wide range of images of Charlotte and analyzes these as sequential representations of an individual participating, across diverse cultures, in defining episodes of the nineteenth century. Strategies of allegory, programmatic intertextuality, and revisionism are revealed when these images are read within their political circumstances of production and complicate the dominance of a few late, iconic portraits of Charlotte and their entrenched associations. The use of costume, essential in certain portraits commissioned during Charlotte’s childhood in Belgium, is revisited in images depicting her during a brief position as Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia and in another dating from her role - of equal brevity but indelible historical resonance - as Empress of Mexico. The significance of dress is explored in relation to agency and political influence and as demonstrating compliance with, or negotiation of, gender conventions. Charlotte’s public life was abruptly terminated upon her 1866 return to Europe by a diagnosis of ‘madness.’ Napoleon III was withdrawing troops supporting the Mexican Empire and her journey was made seeking to reverse this decision. I speculate a painting by French artist Edouard Manet allegorically records this episode of Charlotte’s life and that other factors relating to this episode subsequently influenced the erasure of her imperial images until their reappearance in the twentieth century.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding for this thesis was received from Queen’s University in the form of Graduate Awards, a Queen’s Fellowship and Graduate Dean’s Travel Grant, and a Thesis Completion Grant. A Bader Fellowship from the Alfred Bader Foundation and Graduate Scholarship from the Province of Ontario facilitated research in Europe and a Ban Righ Community Foundation Grant the final stage of production. For all of these, I am immensely grateful.

The unflagging interest of Dr. Janice Helland, Professor of Art History & Women’s Studies was sustaining and her academic excellence and insights always stimulating. I also wish to acknowledge less direct contributions by other members of Queen’s faculty, Dr. Cathleen Hoeniger, Dr. Sylvia Soderlind, Dr. Bruce Laughton, and the late Dr. Vojtec Wasiutynski.

Particular gratitude is due Martine Vermeire, Henri Goffinet, Gery de Pierpont, and Gertrude Baelde for their generosity regarding images of Charlotte in Belgium, Grazietta Butazzi who shared her expertise in nineteenth-century Italian dress, and Miquel Enriquez whose knowledge of Mexican art and cultural institutions in Mexico City was vital. Additionally, the following individuals all provided valuable assistance:

- Eva Ayala Canseco
- Pablo Berrocal
- Stefano Bianchi
- Richard Boijen
- Manuel Canul Valle
- Gianguido Castagno
- Gasper Cauich
- Dorine Cardyn-Oomen
- Maria Cavaliere-Dossi
- Rosalinda Cobá Gala
- Birgit Hammerschmid
- Jerry Harrel
- Ilse Jung
- Georg Kugler
- Epéndira de la Lama
- Brigitte E. Leidwein
- Marina Lippolis
- Christopher Lloyd
- Constance McNair
- Dominique Marechal
- Carolina Ramirez Aznar
- Claudia Reyes Flores
- C.W. Ritter
- Magdelena Rosova
- Adelbert Schusser
- Robert Scrignari
- Barbara Schlafer
- Jana Seely
- Lubomír Srsen
- Robin Tosczak
The opportunity to undertake this research was an extraordinary privilege. It would not have been possible without the support and collaboration of my sons Kelby MacNayr and Noah MacNayr-Heath who participated at every stage of this ever-expanding adventure. Their encouragement and enthusiasm were inspiring throughout the writing process and their intellectual and aesthetic observations, and technological contributions, critically enriched the thesis; it is dedicated to them with love.
# Table of Contents

Title Page i  
Dedication ii  
Abstract iii  
Acknowledgments iv  
Table of Contents vi  
List of Illustrations vii  
Chapter One: Introduction and Literature Review 1  
Chapter Two: Early Images 37  
Chapter Three: Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia 106  
Chapter Four: Contingency Images 194  
Chapter Five: Empress Carlota 250  
Chapter Six: Afterimages 308  
Chapter Seven: Assimilating the Empress 389  
Bibliography 414
List of Illustrations

Figure 2.1. Sir William Charles Ross (unsigned), *Princess Charlotte*, 1840. Courtesy of the Royal Belgian Collections. (*Collections royales de Belgique. Copyright.*)


Figure 2.3. Charles Hunt, *The Wonder of Windsor: The Artist, Poet, Fiddler, here we see, and all is Tweedle-dum, and Tweedle-dee*, c. 1840. Museum of the Dynasty. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.4. Debruyyn F. Drisen, *Vers une plus Grande Belgique/Naar een Groter Belgï: Léopold I 1831-1865*, 1955. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.5. ‘After’ Sir William Charles Ross, *Princess Charlotte of Belgium when an infant*, c. 1842. Courtesy of the Royal Belgian Collections. (*Collections royales de Belgique. Copyright.*)

Figure 2.6. Hans Holbein the Younger (1497-1543), *The Artist’s wife Elspeth Binzenstock and her two children Philip and Catherine* (detail), 1528. <http://ourworld.cs.com/_ht_a/constancefairfax/htm> (10 June 2006.)

Figure 2.7. Pieter Brueghel the Elder, *Hay-Harvest* (detail), c.1525-1569. <http://ourworld.cs.com/_ht_a/constancefairfax/htm> (10 June 2006.)

Figure 2.8. Sir William Charles Ross (attributed to), *Princess Charlotte*, c. 1844. (Windsor Castle.) Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, London, England.


Figure 2.10. F. X. Winterhalter, *Princess Charlotte*, 1842. Courtesy of the Royal Belgian Collections, Brussels, Belgium. (*Collections royales de Belgique.*)

Figure 2.11. F. X. Winterhalter, *Princess Charlotte*, 1844. Courtesy of the Royal Belgian Collections, Brussels, Belgium. (*Collections royales de Belgique.*)

Figure 2.12. Markaert, *Damigella coperta colla faille a Brusselle*, 19th century. New York Public Library, New York, United States of America.

Figure 2.13. F. X. Winterhalter, *Queen Victoria and Prince Albert with the French Royal Family at Château d’Eu*, 1845. Collection of the Queen Mother, Royal Collections, London, Great Britain.

vii
Figure 2.14. Louis Gallait, *Untitled (Princess Charlotte in Greek Costume)*, c. 1846. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.15. Artist unknown, *La Famille royale de Belgique*, c. 1847. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.16. Artist unknown, *untitled (Belgian royal family)*, c. 1847. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.17. Artist unknown, *untitled (Belgian royal family)*, (cropped), c. 1847. Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.18. Artist unknown, Untitled (Belgian Royal Family and courtier), n.d. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.19. Signature illegible, *Leopold I offers to abdicate the throne in February 1848*, 1848. Royal Albert Library, Brussels, Belgium.

Figure 2.20. ‘After’ F. X. Winterhalter, *Famille Royale*, c. 1847-1849. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.21. F. X. Winterhalter, *Princess Charlotte*, c. 1849. Courtesy of the Royal Belgian Collections. (*Collections royales de Belgique. Copyright.*)


Figure 2.24. Artist unknown, *Derniers moments de S. M. la première Reine des Belges décédé à Ostende, 11 November 1850*, 1850. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.25. Artists unknown, *Prieres de la Reine Louise-Marie d’Orleans et de Son Altesse Royal La Princess Charlotte*, 1850. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.26. Edwin Landseer, *Princess Charlotte*, 1851. Courtesy of the Royal Belgian Collections. (*Collections royales de Belgique. Copyright.*)

Figure 2.27. Mayer & Pirson (& Gregorius?), *La Princess Charlotte en costume de bal*, 1853. Courtesy of the Royal Belgian Collections. (*Collections royales de Belgique. Copyright.*)

Figure 2.29. Artist unknown, ‘*Hommage au Roi*’, 1856. Royal Albert Library, Brussels, Belgium.

Figure 2.30. Artist unknown, *Leopold I, Léopold II, Marie-Henriette, Le Comte de Flandre et L’imperatrice Charlotte*, c. 1854. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie*.)

Figure 2.31. Nicaise De Keyser, *Portrait of H.R.H. Princess Charlotte*, 1857. Collection of City Hall, Antwerp, Belgium. (Copyright. *Antwerpen Städhuis*.)

Figure 2.32. Detail of Figure 2.31.

Figure 2.33. Mayer & Pirson, *Princess Charlotte et Archduke Maximilien*, 1856 or 1857. Courtesy of the Royal Belgian Collections. (*Collections royales de Belgique.* Copyright.)

Figure 2.34. E. Desmaisons (engraved ‘after’ Schubert), *La Princesse Charlotte*, 1857. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 2.35. Cesare Dell’Acqua, *The Wedding of Princess Charlotte and Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian*, c. 1857. Courtesy of Belgian Royal Archives, Brussels, Belgium. (*Archives royales belges.*)

Figure 2.36. Detail of Figure 2.35.

Figure 2.37. Detail of Figure 2.36.

Chapter Three:

Figure 3.1. Artist unknown, *Austrian Royal Family*, c. 1859. Private Collection.

Figure 3.2. Artist unknown, *Belgian Royal Family*, c. 1859. Courtesy of Gertrude Baelde.


Figure 3.4. F. Marbonn, engraved by E. Gervais, ‘*Charlotte and Maximilian*,’ 1857. Courtesy of Belgian Royal Archives, Brussels, Belgium. (*Archives royales belges.*)
Figure 3.5. Artist name illegible, *Charlotte and Maximilian as Vicereine and Viceroy*, courtesy *Collection Civica Raccolta di Stampe A. Bertarelli*, Milan, Italy.


Figure 3.7. Artist unknown, *Famille Royale de Belgique*, c. 1857. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie*).


Figure 3.10. Germano Prosdocimi, *Villa Lazzarovitch, Sala in stile moresco*, 1850s. Courtesy Ministry Culture, Arts, Archaeology, Trieste, Italy. (*Coltura di ministero, arti, archeologia*).

Figure 3.11. Germano Prosdocimi, *Villa Lazzarovitch, Sala in stile moresco*, 1850s. Courtesy Ministry Culture, Arts, Archaeology, Trieste, Italy. (*Coltura di ministero, arti, archeologia*).

Figure 3.12. Francesco Gonin, *Lucia Mondella*, 1840. Courtesy of the Alessandro Manzoni Museum, Milan, Italy.

Figure 3.13. Hippolyte Lecomte, *Young woman in Brianza dress*, 1818. Courtesy of Grazietta Butazzi.

Figure 3.14. Jean-François Portaels, *Viceregina Carlotta d’Asburgo* (known variously as *The Archduchess Charlotte in Milanese Dress, Charlotte in Brianza Dress* or *The fiancée*), 1857. Collection of the Historic Castle of Miramare, Italy. (*Museo Storico del Castello di Miramare*).

Figure 3.15. Photographer unknown (Disdéri?), *untitled (Charlotte)* c.1857-1864. Private Collection.

Figure 3.16. Detail of Figure 3.14.


Figure 3.18. Richard Parkes Bonington, *Basanio and Portia*, c. 1826. Yale Centre for British Art, New Haven, United States of America.
Figure 3.19. Artist unknown, *Portia*, c. 1860. <www.antique-print.com>  

Figure 3.20. Jean-François Portaels, *The Fiancée*, before 1868. Courtesy Royal Belgian Collections, Belgium. (*Collections royales de Belgique. Copyright.*)  

Figure 3.21. Photographer unknown, ‘Charlotte,’ detail, 1860s. Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée royal de l’Armée et d’Histoire Militaire.*)  

Figure 3.22. Photograph by Martine Vermeire. Detail of 3.20. Courtesy Royal Belgian Collections, Belgium. (*Collections royales de Belgique. Copyright.*)  


Figure 3.24 Erulo Eruli *I vespri Siciliani* Enruli, Galleria d’Arte moderna "Restivo" Palermo, Sicily.  

Figure 3.25. Designer unknown, *The Sicilian Vespers* (Montserrat Caballe as ‘Elena’), 20th century publicity image.  

Figure 3.26. J. F. Portaels, *Le Bouquet de Violettes*, before 1868. Courtesy Royal Belgian Collections, Belgium. (*Collections royales de Belgique. Copyright.*)  

Figure 3.27. Photographer unknown, (*Charlotte as Empress of Mexico*), (detail), c. 1865. Hachette Collection (?), Ghemar Frères. Royal Archives, Brussels, Belgium.  

Figure 3.28. Henry Lejeune, *Cinderella*, 19th century.  


Figure 3.30. Millicent Sowerby, *Cenerentola*, early 20th century.  

Figure 3.31. *Cenerentola* production; John Blyth as Alidoro, Erin Pogue as Cenerentola, 2002. Courtesy Brandon University, Manitoba, Canada.  

Figure 3.32. Photographer unknown, “*Cenerentola*”, 1997 Israeli Opera. www.israel-opera.co.il/.../cenerentolla1997c.jpg (20 June 2005).  

Figure 3.33. F. X. Winterhalter (attributed to), *Charlotte de Belgique impératrice du Mexique*, 1864. Courtesy Museum of the Arts, Fécamp France. (*Museé Centre-des-Arts.*)
Figure 3.34. F. X. Winterhalter, *Empress Carlota*, 1864. Courtesy of Courtesy of Hearst Castle Collection, San Simeon, California, United States of America. (Hearst Castle/CA State Parks. Copyright.)

Figure 3.35. A. Graefle ‘after’ Winterhalter, *Princess Charlotte of Belgium*, 1868. Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, London, England.


Figure 3.37. Artist unknown, ‘after’ Winterhalter, *Princess Charlotte*, 1859 (?). Courtesy Royal Belgian Collections. (*Collections royales de Belgique.* Copyright.)

Figure 3.38. Franz Schrotzberg ‘after’ Winterhalter, *Archduchess Charlotte*, c. 1859. Courtesy of Artstetten Museum, Lower Austria. (Copyright.)

Figure 3.39. Leopoldo (Tiburcio?) Sanchez ‘after’ Winterhalter, *Charlotte*, 1866. Historic Castle of Miramare, Italy. (*Museo Storico del Castello di Miramare.*)

Figure 3.40. Artist unknown. ‘after’ Winterhalter, *Carlota*, n.d.

Chapter Four:

Figure 4.1. Isidore Pils, *Charlotte von Sachsen-Coburg-Gotha*, 1859. Museum of Historical Art, Vienna, Austria. (Kunsthistorisches, Vienne.)


Figure 4.4. F. X. Winterhalter, *Archduke Maximilian*, 1857. Courtesy of the Royal Belgian Collections. (*Collections royales de Belgique.* Copyright.)

Figure 4.5. Ede Heinrich, *Albero Genealogico degli Asburgo Lorena*, 1860-1861. Historic Castle of Miramare, Italy. (*Museo Storico del Castello di Miramare.*)

Figure 4.6. Ede Heinrich, ‘Maximilian,’ c.1861. Collection of the Historic Castle of Miramare, Italy. (*Museo Storico del Castello di Miramare.*)

Figure 4.7. Ede Heinrich, ‘Charlotte,’ c. 1861. Collection of the Historic Castle of Miramare, Italy. (*Museo Storico del Castello di Miramare.*)

Figure 4.9. (Attributed to) Hanstemple/Ritzberger, *Emperor Franz Josef*, Miramar postcard, n.d. Historic Castle of Miramar, Italy.

Figure 4.10. Artist unknown, *Mária, Queen Regnant ....*, n.d. <http://www.guide2womenleaders.com/womeninpower/Womeninpower1350.htm> (14 June 2008.)


Figure 4.12. Artist unknown, ‘after’ Heinrich, *empressa Carlota*, early 1860s. Courtesy of *Museo Soumaya*, Churubusco, Mexico. (Copyright *Museo Soumaya*.)


Figure 4.15. Photographer unknown, *President Benito Juárez*, n.d. Collection of Radio Times Hulton Picture Library, United States of America.

Figure 4.16. Archduchess Charlotte, “*Voici mon salon*,” 1862. Reproduced in Victor Capron, 1959.

Figure 4.17. Ede Heinrich, *Empress Carlota*, c.1861-1863. Collection of the Historic Castle of Miramar, Italy. (*Museo Storico del Castello di Miramare.*)


Figure 4.19. Dell’Acqua, *Maximilian and the Mexican Delegation*, c. 1864. Historic Castle of Miramar, Italy. (*Museo Storico del Castello di Miramare.*)

Figure 4.20. Artist unknown. *Untitled. (Maximilian and Charlotte with members of the Mexican Delegation).* 1864. Private collection.

Figure 4.21. Cesare Dell’Acqua, *La Princesse Charlotte de Belgique Arcduchesse d’Austrie*, 1864. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty. (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 4.23. Based on A. Vuillemin (?), *Nouvelle Carte de Mexico* ..., Paris, 1862 prepared for the War Office, London, 1862.

Figure 4.24. Cesare Dell’Acqua, *La partenza di Massimiliano e Carlotta per il Messico*, 1866. Historic Castle of Miramare, Italy. (*Museo Storico del Castello di Miramare*.)


Chapter Five:


Figure 5.2. Photographer unknown, *Arco de las Flores*, 1864. Reproduced in Acevedo, *Testimonios Artisticos* ..., 1995.


Figure 5.4. Albert Graefle, *Empress Charlotte*, 1865. National History Museum, Mexico City, Mexico. (*Museo Nacional de Historia INAH.*)

Figure 5.5. Santiago Rebull, *Empress Charlotte*, 1866. Courtesy of Národní Museum, Prague, The Czech Republic. (Copyright.)

Figure 5.6. (Attributed to) Santiago Rebull, *Emperor Maximilian and Empress Charlotte*, n.d. Private collection.

Figure 5.7. F. X. Winterhalter, *Empress Eugénie*, (detail), 1853. Collection of Château Beloeil, France. (*Château de Beloeil.*)

Figure 5.8. Jean-Adolphe Beaucé, *Emperor Maximilian and Empress Charlotte receiving the Kickapoo Indians* (detail), 1865. Courtesy of Artstetten Museum, Lower Austria. (Copyright.)

Figure 5.9. Photographer unknown, *Untitled (Empress Eugénie)*, 1869. <http://www.napoleon.org/…/img-htm/imperatrice.html>

Figure 5.11. Antonio Ruiz, *The Dream of Malinche*, 1939. Collection Mariana Perez Amor, *Photo Galleria de Arte Mexicano*, Mexico City, Mexico.

Figure 5.12. Felipe Sojo, *Carlota, emperitriz de Mexico*, 1866. National History Museum, Mexico City, Mexico. (*Museo Nacional de Historia INAH.*)

Figure 5.13. National Art Museum, Mexico City, Mexico. (*Museo Nacional de Arte, INBA.*)

Figure 5.14. Photographer unknown, *La emperatriz Carlota en traje de amazona durante los primeros dias del imperio*, c.1865. Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée royal de l’Armée et d’Histoire Militaire.*)

Figure 5.15. J. A. Beaucé, *Campement du 3rd Zouaves à San-Jacinto, près de la lagun de Chapala, versant du Pacifique* (detail), 1866. Collection of the Historic Castle of Miramare, Italy. (*Museo Storico del Castello di Miramare.*)

Figure 5.16. Artist name illegible. *Daughter of the Regiment*. Date illegible.

Figure 5.17. George Baxter. *Daughter of the Regiment*, 1921.

Figure 5.18. A.E. Disdéri, *Portrait de l’Impératrice Charlotte, en deuil...*, 1866.

Figure 5.19. José Salomé Pina, *Carlota, emperatriz de Mexico*, 1866.

Chapter Six

Figure 6.1. Edouard Manet, *View of the International Exposition in 1867*, 1867. 108 cm. x 196 cm. National Gallery of Oslo, Norway. (*Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo.*)

Figure 6.2. Detail of Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.3. Detail of Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.4. Detail of Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.5. Detail of Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.6. Edouard Manet, *The Balloon*, 1862. Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon, United States of America.

Figure 6.8. Edouard Manet, *Mille VS in the Costume of an Espada*, 1862. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, United States of America.

Figure 6.9. Edouard Manet, *Battle of the Kearsage and the Alabama*, 1864. The John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia, United States of America.

Figure 6.10. Edouard Manet, *The Dead Man*, 1864-1865. National Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C., United States of America.


Figure 6.12. Edouard Manet, *Bullfight*, 1866. Musée d’Orsay, France.

Figure 6.13. Aubert ‘after’ Merrill (?), *Untitled (Benito Juárez as a Bullfighter)*, n.d. Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium. (Musée royal de l’Armée et d’Histoire Militaire.)

Figure 6.14. Edouard Manet, *The Fifer*, 1866. Musée d’Orsay, France.

Figure 6.15. Edouard Manet, *A Matador*, 1866-1867. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, United States of America.

Figure 6.16. Cesare Dell’Acqua, (detail of Figure 4.26), 1866.

Figure 6.17. Jean-Adolphe Beaucé, (detail of black and white image, possibly a study for Figure 5.15), 1866.

Figure 6.18. José Salomé Pina, (detail of Figure 5.19), 1866.


Figure 6.20. Emperor Napoleon III F. X. Winterhalter (unsigned). Musée national du château de Compiègne, France.

Figure 6.21. Edouard Manet, Detail of Figure 6.4, 1864.

Figure 6.22. Artist unknown (Victor Hugo?), *Untitled, (Maximilian)*, 1867. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (Musée de la Dynastie.)

Figure 6.23. François Aubert y Cla., * Craif du Martyres du Queretaro*, c. 1867. Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium. (Musée royal de l’Armée et d’Histoire Militaire.)
Figure 6.24. François Aubert (?) *Untitled (Emperor Maximilian/Empress Charlotte)*, c. 1867.

Figure 6.25. Kreslit K. Maixner, *Emperor Maximilian and Empress Charlotte*, c. 1867 or 1868. Courtesy of Národní Museum, Prague, The Czech Republic. (Copyright.)


Figure 6.28. François Aubert, *Our Lady of Guadalupe appearing to the Emperor and Empress ….*, 1867, c.1867. Commandant Spitzer Collection.

Figure 6.29. A. Péraire, *Untitled, (Our Lady of Guadalupe appearing to the Emperor and Empress …, c.1867. National Institute of Anthropology and History, Mexico City, Mexico. (Instituto Nacioinal de Antropologia e Historia, Mexico.)*

Figure 6.30. Jägern ‘after’ Karl Von Stur, *Miramare – Querétaro*, c.1867. Courtesy of Austrian Pictures Archives, National Library, Vienna. (*Bildarchives Öst Vienne.)*

Figure 6.31. Detail of Figure 6.30.

Figure 6.32. Detail of Figure 6.30.

Figure 6.33. George Shepheard, *Crazy Kate*, 1815. Clements Fry Collection, Yale University, United States of America.

Figure 6.34. Ch. Brillion ‘after’ Winterhalter, *S. M. l’Impératrice Charlotte*, n.d. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie.)*

Figure 6.35. Ch. Brillion after Winterhalter *La Princesse Charlotte*, n.d Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie.)*

Figure 6.36. (Verso) ‘J. Varenne, Photographe Bruxelles’ (etc.), *Tervueren*, 1879. Reissue. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Belgium. (*Musée de la Dynastie.)*

Figure 6.38. Marcus Stone, Ophelia, 1888. Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington D.C., United States of America.

Figure 6.39. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Beata Beatrix, c.1864. Tate Gallery, London, England.

Figure 6.40. Anonymous lithograph ‘after’ a photograph. Charcot lecturing in his clinic. c. 1875. National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Maryland, United States of America.

Figure 6.41. Photograph from Salpêtrière, “amourous supplication.” n.d. National Library of France, Paris, France. (Bibliothèque Nationale de France.)

Figure 6.42. Artist unknown, ‘after’ Disdéri, Empress Charlotte in Mourning, n.d. Reproduced in Acevedo, Testimonios Artisticos ..., 1995.

Figure 6.43. Artist unknown, ‘after’ Disdéri, Empress Charlotte in Mourning, n.d. Collection: Ignacio Condé, Norm Hueffer de Redo and Pedro Aspé. Mexico City.

Figure 6.44. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Pandora, 1878. Liverpool Museums, England.

Figure 6.45. F. Aubert, untitled, c. 1860s, Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium. (Musée royal de l’Armee et d’Histoire Militaire.)

Figure 6.46. F. Aubert, untitled, c. 1866, Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium. (Musée royal de l’Armee et d’Histoire Militaire.)

Figure 6.47. Photographer unknown, Empress Charlotte, c. 1866. Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium. (Musée royal de l’Armee et d’Histoire Militaire.)

Figure 6.48. F. Aubert, Carlotta Amalia. Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium. (Musée royal de l’Armee et d’Histoire Militaire.)

Figure 6.49. Detail of 6.48

Figure 6.50. F. Aubert with colour by Ghemer Frères (?), Empress Charlotte, n.d. Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium. (Musée royal de l’Armee et d’Histoire Militaire.)

Figure 6.51. Detail of 6.50.

xviii
Figure 6.52. Van Parys-Sygma, *Untitled (funeral procession of Princess Charlotte)*, 1927. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty.  (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Chapter Seven


Figure 7.2. Photographer unknown, *Untitled (Empress Charlotte)* c.1867. Private collection.

Figure 7.3. Reinach (?) *L’Archduchess Charlotte*, c. 1867. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium.  (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 7.4. Ghem Frères *Untitled (Princess Charlotte)* c. 1905. Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium.  (*Musée royal de l’Armée et d’Histoire Militaire.*)

Figure 7.5. J. da Cunha-Plon (?) *L’imperatrice Charlotte sortant du château, ayant auprès d’elle le colonel Van Echout*, c.1921-1925. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium.  (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)

Figure 7.6. Lithograph ‘after’ Schrotzberg/Winterhalter, n.d. Courtesy Museum of the Dynasty, Brussels, Belgium.  (*Musée de la Dynastie.*)


Figure 7.8. Montage/Lithograph artist unknown. *Charlotte and Maximilian en 1865*. Courtesy of Royal Archives, Brussels, Belgium.

Figure 7.9. mPhotographer unknown.  (*In situ photograph of De Keyser’s 1857 portrait*), Nicaise De Keyser (see Fig 231), *Princess Charlotte*, Antwerp. Courtesy of Dorine Cardyn-Oomen, Antwerp, Belgium.

Figure 7.10. Ghemar Frères photograph ‘after’ Malovich (?), 1864. National Botanical Gardens, Belgium.

Figure 7.11. Ghemar Frères ‘after’ Malovich (?), (*Empress Elect Charlotte*), 1864. Royal Archives, Brussels, Belgium.

Figure 7.12. Korty (‘after’ Disdéri ?), *‘Kaiserin Charlotte von Mexico ....’* Royal Museum of the Army and Military History, Brussels, Belgium.  (*Musée royal de l’Armée et d’Histoire Militaire.*)
Figure 7.13. Artist unknown, ‘after’ photograph, *Empress Charlotte*, c. early 1860s, copyright Hulton Archives, United States of America.


Figure 7.15. Designer unknown, ‘Juarez’ (sic) 1939/40 movie poster.

Figure 7.16. Designer unknown, ‘Juarez’ (sic) 1939/40 movie poster.

Figure 7.17. Diego Rivera, *Sueño de una Tarde Dominical en la Alameda Central* 1947 - 1948, revised and shown publicly 1956. Diego Rivera Mural Museum, Mexico City, Mexico. (*Museo Mural Diego Rivera.*

Figure 7.18. Manuel Amabilis Dominguez, designer, 1844; Rómulo Rozo, sculptor, *Monumento to La Patria*, 1956. Author’s photograph, Mérida, Mexico.

Figure 7.19. Rafael Gallur/Orlando Ortiz, ¿No “chupa” Vuestra Majestad? Illustration. *¡Adiós mamá Carlota! La intervención francesa y el imperio de Maximiliano* (México: SEP/Nueva Imagen, 1981).

Figure 7.20. Rafael Gallur/Orlando Ortiz, ‘En cuernavaca, en Junio de 1866...’ Illustration. *¡Adiós mamá Carlota! La intervención francesa y el imperio de Maximiliano* (México: SEP/Nueva Imagen, 1981).


Figure 7.22 *The Empress of Farewells*, 2001, book jacket illustration: cropped portrait of Empress Carlota by Albert Graefle and map montage.

Figure 7.23. ‘After’ Malovich photograph as it appears on The Grand Opera webpage. <www.grandopera.com/storyc3.html>

Figure 7.24. Artist unknown, ‘Empress Charlotte/Emperor Maximilian’ as straw effigies. Publicity image. <www.cincodemayomuseum.com>

Figure 7.25. ‘After’ Portaels, *(Untitled) Vicereine Charlotte.* <www.grandopera.com/storyc3.html>

Figure 7.26. Edwin Landseer, (detail), *Princess Charlotte*, c.1851. Royal Belgian Collections. (*Collections royales de Belgique*. Copyright.)
Chapter One

Introduction and Literary Review

Entente cordiale

Portraits of Charlotte, first Princess of Belgium, Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia, and Empress of Mexico, map her participation in definitive nineteenth-century political developments in Europe and North America.¹ Scholarly attention has been deflected from these portraits in their own right by their widely dispersed locations, the sitter’s marginality as an historical figure, and their absorption within entrenched myths presenting them as passive images.² This thesis disputes such an assessment by analyzing their engagement with political issues and gender norms characterizing their years of production (1840 to 1867), and investigating subsequent incidences of resistance and revision to these visual representations by means of altered versions in popular media and public displays. While it is necessary to acknowledge the partiality of reconstructed circumstances of production, I maintain details can be established which illuminate intended functions and retrieve inscribed meanings of the individual portraits; these functions and meanings in turn reveal unsuspected patterns of patronage and examples of purposeful intertextuality that complicate current understanding of portraits of Charlotte.

² Original portraits of Charlotte have been traced in Belgium, England, France, Italy, Austria, Mexico, the Czech Republic, and the United States; the majority are in royal or private collections.
as self-evident documents. Collectively these portraits form an anecdotal catalogue of major changes taking place in Western art concurrent with their production. More significantly for the present study, they constitute a unique cross-cultural resource through which to investigate nineteenth century intersections of portraiture with gender issues and the structuring of power. I contend they remain relevant, not least because they were produced amid rapid technological development, for analyses of twenty-first century visual representations of public figures.

My intention is to demonstrate childhood portraits of Charlotte were, primarily and initially, commissioned and circulated to reinforce the reign of her father, Leopold I (1790-1865), King of the Belgians, and that her portraits, from late adolescence and after her 1857 marriage to Habsburg Archduke Maximilian (1830-1867), were strategically produced and tactically deployed to display status and moral authority and negotiate or intervene in circumstances of political instability.

---

3 Miniatures, for instance, remained highly valued in the mid-nineteenth century but were replaced by photographs in the 1860s. Several early portraits of Charlotte were replicated as miniatures whereas certain later photographs were copied as paintings. There are instances of both painted and photographic portraits of Charlotte used on cartes-de-visite and photography and graphic art’s mutual influence is well represented in many of the late images. The painted portraits range in style from those in the tradition of European court portraiture, as established in the sixteenth century, to Orientalism and early Realism. The extensive distribution of portraits of Charlotte in various media and her involvement in selecting art for an international exhibition, speaks to both the impact of technology and the changing infrastructures of art in the nineteenth century.

4 For instance, I contend traditional regional or national dress worn by Charlotte in some portraits conveys association with ethnicities or values. Such visual acts of association continue today as in the case of Yulia Tymoshenko, Prime Minister of the Ukraine who has transformed her appearance to represent an idealized, folkloric, Ukrainian peasant girl - an image that “… chimes with her uncompromising nationalist views …” Kathryn Westcott “The queen of Ukraine's image machine” BBC News <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7025980.stm> October 2007 (4 October 2007).

5 I do not mean to deny motives of affection in the commissioning of early portraits of Charlotte but, rather, to suggest that circumstances in which these were displayed and
portraits of Charlotte were publicly displayed during the nineteenth century and her portraits dating from after her marriage were effectively replaced, following the end of her public life in 1866 and until the twentieth century, by amended copies, facsimiles, or montages and reproductions in popular art forms.\(^6\) I briefly explore this phenomenon and its ramifications and speculate on the contemporary absence of exhibited portraits of Charlotte in locales where they might be anticipated, the appropriation of her image in film, print, and plays, and several instances of cultural assimilation through derivative portraits incorporated into public art.

Born the third surviving child and only daughter to Leopold I and Queen Louise-Marie (1812-1850), Charlotte’s royal family connections provided ample opportunity throughout her youth to observe the potential of portraits for exerting circulated imbued them with political significance usefully enhanced by feelings of affection. Charlotte’s father was Leopold Georg Christian Friedrich, Prince of Saxe Coburg Gotha, Duke of Saxony. The title styling ‘King of the Belgians’ rather than ‘of Belgium,’ was chosen by the Belgian National Congress to emphasize the constitutional nature of this monarchy; King Louis-Philippe had described himself using this styling slightly earlier for the same reason in France. A lucid guide to important moments in Belgium’s evolution is provided in *Documents Illustrating the History of Belgium 1830-1848* (Brussels: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1978); see also World History at KLM: History of Belgium <http://www.zum.de/whkmla/region/lowcountries/bel18301848.html> (03 March 2007). Charlotte’s husband was HI & RH Prince Imperial and Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian Joseph Maria of Austria, Prince Royal of Hungary and Bohemia; Viceroy of Lombardy-Venetia (1857-1859); HIM Emperor of Mexico (1864-1867). Andrew Wheatcroft, *The Habsburgs: Embodying Europe* (London: Viking, 1995).

\(^6\) For example, popular art such as souvenir *crafs* in the nineteenth century and cartoons or fridge magnets in the twentieth century, each with an image of Charlotte. Regarding the nineteenth-century public display of portraits of Charlotte, Esther Acevedo notes an instance when a full-length state portrait of Charlotte as Empress of Mexico was shown to expatriate Mexicans gathered in Paris in 1865. Esther Acevedo, *Testimonios Artísticos de un Episodio Fugaz* (1864-1867) (Mexico DF: Museo Nacional de Arte, 1995), 62.
influence (see Figure 2.1). Among the more prominent of these family connections were her maternal grandparents, King Louis-Philippe (1773-1850) and Queen Marie-Amélie (1782-1866) of the French, and her cousins Queen Victoria (1819-1901) and Prince Albert of Britain (1819-1861). At the age of seventeen Charlotte became Archduchess of Austria and Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia when she married Habsburg Archduke Maximilian then Heir Apparent to the Austrian Empire (see Figure 2.35). Their Viceregal positions ended and they were left stateless when France, then ruled by Napoleon III (1808-1873), joined with Italian nationalists against Austria in 1859 and removed Lombardy from Austrian control. The birth of a son in summer 1858 to Maximilian’s older brother, Emperor Franz Josef (1830-1916) and Empress Elisabeth

7 Charlotte’s mother was Princess Louise-Marie Thérèse Caroline Isabelle of Orléans. Existing laws of secession excluded Charlotte from the Belgian dynastic line; the rule of primogeniture continues but a change enacted in 1991 has made it possible for female children to accede to the Belgian throne. The first child of Leopold I and Queen Louise-Marie, Louis-Philippe Leopold Victor Ernst (1833-1834), died in infancy. Two other sons were born: Léopold Louis-Philippe Marie Victor (1835-1909), Duke of Brabant, later Léopold II, and Philippe Eugène Ferdinand Marie Clément Baudouin Leopold George (1837-1905), Count of Flanders.

8 Louis-Philippe d’Orleans reigned from 1830 to 1848. He and Marie-Amélie of the Two Sicilies married in Sicily in 1809. He was eldest son of Louis-Philippe Joseph, Duc de Chartres and d’Orleans, and Louise-Marie Adélaïde de Bourbon-Penthèvre; Marie-Amélie was daughter of Ferdinand I, King of the Two Sicilies, and Archduchess Marie Caroline of Austria. <http://www.britannica.com/eb/topic-349203/Louis-Philippe> (16 February 2007); also Museum of Eu: <http://www.louis-philippe.eu/> (17 February 2007). Alexandrina Victoria was the daughter of Edward, Duke of Kent, and Victoire of Saxe Coburg, sister of Leopold I, and was granddaughter of King George III. She became Queen Victoria of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in 1837 (crowned in 1838); later also first Empress of India from 1876. Her consort, Albert of Saxe Coburg Gotha, was younger son of Ernest, Duke of Saxe Coburg Gotha, and Princess Louise of Saxe Gotha Altenburg.

(1837-1898) additionally and adversely affected Maximilian and Charlotte’s future prospects as the child replaced him in the Austrian line of succession.¹⁰

In 1863 Maximilian tentatively accepted an invitation to establish an empire in Mexico.¹¹ Generated primarily by exiled and expatriate Mexicans disadvantaged by the election of republican president Benito Juárez (1806-1872) and encouraged by the Catholic Church - which had also been adversely affected by this change - the situation was usurped by French emperor Napoleon III with an imperialist agenda.¹² The nascent Empire was to be supported largely by French military forces.¹³ Historians are divided over the extent to which Empress Eugénie, consort of Napoleon III, exerted influence in this venture but it is clear her opinions were not negligible to its inception or its

¹⁰ Crown Prince Rudolf (1858-1889). In 1881 Prince Rudolph married Princess Stéphanie (1864-1945), second daughter of Charlotte’s brother Léopold II and Queen Marie Henriette (1836 - 1902), Princess Imperial & Archduchess of Austria, Princess Royal of Hungary & Bohemia.
¹² Benito Juárez had invoked a temporary moratorium on interest payments of Mexico’s foreign debt. Britain, Spain, and France made a joint incursion into Mexico in an attempt to pressure Juárez into rescinding the moratorium but Britain and Spain withdrew when it became evident France had an alternate agenda. The concept of inviting a foreign prince to establish a regime in Mexico was not new, as demonstrated by the tentative offer of the crown of Mexico to Leopold I before he became King of the Belgians. Had the empire of Maximilian and Charlotte been recognized by the United States, and had troop levels been increased rather than decreased, it might have been successful as there was considerable desire among Mexican people for the political stability it potentially offered. The United States had no intention of doing so and only Guatemala, where in 1845 a thousand Belgian colonists had been deployed by Leopold I, and Brazil where the royal family was connected to those of both Maximilian and Charlotte, acknowledged Mexico as an empire. Regarding Guatemala, see Emerson, 1979, 25. Regarding accreditation of envoys, see Robert H. Duncan, “Political Legitimation and Maximilian’s Second Empire” Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos vol. 12, 1, winter (1996): 27-66.
¹³ There were additionally Mexican troops and Austrian and Belgian volunteer forces. A thorough military analysis can be found in Jack Autrey Dabbs, The French Army in Mexico 1861-1867 (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1963).
An official photographic portrait of Charlotte as Empress Elect, for which she sat to Giuseppe Malovich (n.d.) in early 1864, was an immensely popular image that was quickly reproduced internationally and widely collected as a carte-de-visite or cabinet card, copied by other photographers, and replicated in various media (see Figure 4.22). Maximilian officially accepted the role of Emperor in spring 1864 and he and Charlotte, mistakenly convinced French troops had pacified most of the country and the majority of Mexican people endorsed his rule, departed for Mexico. The Empire was already faltering when, at the end of 1865, Napoleon III reneged on his agreement of long-term military support and ordered French troops to be withdrawn by November.

14 For instance, Barbara Emerson acknowledges Eugénie’s participation but emphasizes the determination of Napoleon III, whereas Nancy Nichols Barker makes a convincing case for the devout Empress being more forceful in this regard because of what she viewed as abuse of the Church in Mexico. Barbara Emerson, *Leopold II* (sic) (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979); Nancy Nichols Barker, *Distaff Diplomacy* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967). Nichols Barker has modified her views on this matter but the literature generally makes a strong case for the influence of Eugénie. See, for example, the informed opinions of politicians and ambassadors at the time frequently quoted in Egon Cesar Corti, Count, *Maximilian and Charlotte of Mexico* trans. Catherine Alison Phillips [1924] (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1968).

15 Malovich took photographs of Maximilian as Emperor Elect at the same time. There were two sets, one of which depicts him wearing civil dress and another in which he wears his naval uniform. There are photographs of Charlotte in differing poses but she is not known to have additionally sat, as Empress Elect, wearing day dress. Two publications are exceptional in their authors’ attention to images of Charlotte although this occurs within the context of broader subjects. Details regarding the Malovich photographs and the need for a consistent public image are examined in Esther Acevedo, 41. Examples of official and popular images circulating in 1867 of Charlotte as Empress are included in Juliet Wilson-Bareau, et al., *Manet: The Execution of Maximilian; Painting, Politics and Censorship* (London: National Gallery, 1992). For an article with references to Empress Charlotte in relation to portraits of the Belgian royal family painted by Jean François Porteals, see Albert Duchesne, “Jean Portaels: Portraiture de la Famille Royale de Belgique” LIV *Revue Belge d’Archaologie et d’Histoire de l’Art*, Brussels (1985): 59-70. See also Elizabeth Anne McCauley, *A.A.E. Disdéri and the Carte de Visite Portrait Photograph* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
1867. In response to this action it was decided Charlotte should travel to Europe for three months and attempt to raise funds and secure reinforcements. She arrived in France in summer 1866 but was unsuccessful in her mission. Charlotte began to experience intermittent periods of delusion the cause of which remains undetermined. Her condition worsened and she was placed in imposed seclusion in Austria immediately prior to her scheduled return to Mexico. Maximilian was captured by republican troops loyal to Mexican president Benito Juárez in May 1867 and executed with two of his generals on 19 June. His death added, in the popular imagination, a dimension of romantic tragedy to Charlotte’s continued detainment. These dramatic events overshadowed her earlier life and she is written into history as a woman who unnaturally,}

---

16 Dabbs, 1963.
17 The resolution of inheritances left to Charlotte by Leopold I and former Queen Marie-Amélie was undoubtedly another point of concern. Information relating to Charlotte’s wealth can be found in Gustaaf Janssens and Jean Stengers, *Nouveaux regards sur Leopold 1er & Léopold II: Fonds d’Archives Goffinet* (Bruxelles: Fondation Roi Baudoin, 1997), 79.
and unwisely, involved herself with political power and suffered predictable consequences. She did not regain a public life and is thought not to have sat for portraits after this time.\(^{20}\)

Throughout the nineteenth century the Malovich photograph was ubiquitous and largely eclipsed other portraits of Charlotte.\(^{21}\) By the twentieth century it was emptied of its original meaning of imperial authority and, especially in its adaptations, came to flag instead a dangerous intersection of woman, political ambition, and insanity. The dominance of this photographic portrait is resolved and its singular interpretation problematized when it is viewed within the larger production of portraits of Charlotte. Her death in 1927 resonated internationally and influenced subsequent uses of her portraits. Even as these diversify the meanings and functions of her images, they have perpetuated frames of female hysteria and the French Intervention through which all portraits of Charlotte have been viewed since 1867. Dismantling this historical framing opens access to the potential represented by images of Charlotte. Reassembled and examined within their contexts of production, they allow an alternate perspective on events in which she participated and exemplify portraiture’s ability to reinforce, or re- vision, gender conventions and political authority.

---

\(^{20}\) A few later images are known to exist and are briefly addressed in the final chapter. 
\(^{21}\) Albert Graefle painted a full-length state portrait of Charlotte based on portraits by Franz Winterhalter that was sent to Mexico in summer 1865. It became increasingly well known in Europe from 1866 onwards. Graefle’s painting is discussed in later chapters within the context of Charlotte’s imperial image. Acevedo has explored the symbolic effect of such imperial images dating from the Mexican Empire. See especially, Acevedo, 1995, 64.
Literature Review and Methodology

The obscurity into which original portraits of Charlotte had slipped by the twentieth century is evident from standard portrait reference texts that cite a single painting by Isadore Pils (1815-1875) together with sparse compilations of illustrations and photographs (see Figure 4.1).\textsuperscript{22} Surveys of related nineteenth and twentieth-century publications, selected periodicals through the years 1840 to 1927, and twentieth-century exhibition catalogues yielded reproductions of further portraits; others were discovered through written enquiries and electronic searches.\textsuperscript{23}

Fieldwork was conducted in Brussels and Antwerp in Belgium, London and Windsor in England, Fécamp and Marseilles in France, Milan, Turin, and Trieste in Italy, Mexico City, Cuernavaca, Coyoacán, Puebla, Mérida, and Campéche in Mexico, and San Simeon in the United States.\textsuperscript{24} Substantial information was obtained through viewing portraits of Charlotte, consultations with collections officials, and archival searches.

\textsuperscript{22} For example, Hans Wolfgang Singer, *Neuer Bildniskatalog* [1937] (trans.) Karl W. Horseman (Liepzig, 1967), 240.
\textsuperscript{23} An especially useful online site is that of the Austrian National Library picture archives: <http://www.bildarchivaustria.at/bildarchiv.aspx> (4 September 2006)
\textsuperscript{24} Christopher Lloyd, Surveyor of the Queen’s Pictures (now retired) graciously accompanied me to Buckingham Palace and Windsor Castle; M. H. Desjardin, Director, and staff at the Fécamp Art Centre and Museum retrieving the portrait of Charlotte from offsite storage and arranging access to files; Martine Vermeire, of The King’s Civil List, Henri Goffinet, Archivist, and Geri de Pierpont, Director, Museum of the Dynasty, Gustaaf Janssens, Royal Palace Archivist, and Richard Boijen, Director, Royal Military Museum (all in Brussels) provided information and access to pertinent materials; Dorine Cardyn-Oomen, Scientific Director, Museum of Fine Arts in Antwerp, alerted me to sketches by Nicaise de Keyser (1813-1887); Francesca de Bei, Rossella Fabiani, and staff at the Ministry of Architecture, Art, and History of Friuli-Venezia-Giulia in Trieste responded to research requests despite snow and the Bora; Miguel Enriquez, Museum of the Revolutions, facilitated my research in Mexico City; and Jana Seely, Curator at Hearst Castle, San Simeon arranged a private viewing of the Winterhalter portrait of Charlotte in that collection, and Hoyt Fields, Chief Curator, permitted inclusion of this image.
Research was initiated in relevant collections, notably the Royal Palace archives, Museum of the Dynasty archives, and Royal Military Museum archives, Royal Albert Library, and Museum of Fine Arts, all in Brussels; the archival section of the Academy San Carlos, National History Museum, Museum of the Interventions, and Museum of the Revolutions in Mexico City, museums in Puebla, and Soumaya Museum in Coyoacán; and Miramare Castle and the State Archives in Trieste, Italy. Provenance records were obtained through the Brussels Royal Palace, Fécamp Museum, France, and Hearst Castle in San Simeon, California. A copy of a portrait of Charlotte, and a multiple figure scene in which she features, is at Schloss Artstetten in Lower Austria, another portrait is in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, and a study for a portrait of Charlotte is in the Národní Museum in Prague, Czech Republic. Information on these paintings was obtained through correspondence.

Surveys of published correspondence, collection inventories, site guides, and artists’ records expanded upon results obtained through fieldwork. Victor Capron’s

25 I am grateful to Eva Ayala for directing me to the unique miniature portrait bust of Charlotte and tinted photographic portrait in this collection and arranging for images of these to be sent to me.

26 Special credit is due Brigitte E. Leidwein and staff at Schloss Arstetten for discovering new information about this portrait in the course of their efforts to answer my enquiries. I thank them for this valuable contribution and for making available reproductions of this painting. Lubomír Sršen of the Národní Museum took an encouraging interest in this project and provided a catalogue, articles, and images relating to the portrait study.

published collection of letters from Charlotte to her brother Léopold from 1850 to 1868, and a compilation, published in 1987 by Luis Weckman and Emile Vandewoude, of materials written by Charlotte between 1861 and 1868 are valuable especially for her references to portraits and patronage. Selections from a collection of Charlotte’s letters housed in Rice University Archives are online as scans of the originals and typed transcriptions. References to artists and portraits, often indirectly important in researching portraits of Charlotte, are frequent in letters written by Queen Victoria of Britain and inventories of the British Royal Collection include valuable excerpts from correspondence between Victoria and Belgian Queen Louise-Marie pertaining to childhood portraits of Charlotte. Similarly, letters of Leopold I contain details relating to Charlotte’s childhood useful in confirming aspects of her portraits. Marie-Jeanne Chartrain-Hebbelinck cites a rare reference in a letter by the artist Jean François Portaels was augmented by, Jean Charlot, *Mexican Art and the Academy of San Carlos 1785-1915* (Austin: University of Texas, 1962) among other works.


29 In 1989 Weckmann and Vandewoude estimated that writings of Charlotte numbered 8,000 items. Previously unknown caches continue to appear and it now seems likely the total is much greater.


to a portrait he painted of Charlotte in 1857;\textsuperscript{32} letters of Prince Albert include a mention of Charlotte’s presence in Scotland the same year.\textsuperscript{33} More obliquely, keen observations of nineteenth-century diplomacy, abundant in the correspondence of Lady Augusta Stanley, Lady of the Bedchamber to Queen Victoria, contribute to an understanding of Charlotte’s childhood environment.\textsuperscript{34}

The most authoritative biographies of Charlotte remain \textit{Maximilian and Charlotte}, originally published in German as two volumes in 1924 by Austrian author Egon Corti, and \textit{Confesiones, memorias y biografía de Carlota} of 1925 by Belgian author H. de Reinach Foussmagne.\textsuperscript{35} As with virtually all publications relating to Charlotte, these emphasize events surrounding her participation in the Mexican Empire. Insofar as these events are concerned, a 1925 publication by another Belgian author, Camille Buffin, is valuable for his first-hand experience in Mexico.\textsuperscript{36} Corti and Reinach Foussmagne are critical for establishing context and both include considerable correspondence to, from, or pertaining to Charlotte. Corti adds appendices of letters between Maximilian and Napoleon III and Charlotte and Empress Eugénie whereas Reinach Foussmagne is unique in her emphasis on letters between numerous women closely associated with Charlotte, as

\textsuperscript{32} Marie-Jeanne Chartrain-Hebbelinck, \textit{Jean Portaels et ses élèves} (Bruxelles: Musée d’Art Ancien, 1979).
\textsuperscript{34} Sister of the then Governor General of India, Lord Elgin, and wife of Arthur Stanley, Dean of Westminster. Dean of Windsor and Hector Bolitho, eds., \textit{Letters of Lady Augusta Stanley: A Young Lady at Court 1849-1863} (London: Gerald Howe, 1927); Dean of Windsor and Hector Bolitho, eds., \textit{Later Letters of Augusta Stanley 1864-1876} (Jonathan Cape, 1929).
\textsuperscript{35} H. de Reinach-Foussemagne, Countess, \textit{Confesiones, memorias y biografía de Carlota de Belgica, emperatriz de México} (Brussels, 1925).
\textsuperscript{36} Camile Buffin, Baron, \textit{La tragédie Mexicaine: les impératrices Charlotte et Eugénie} (Bruxelles: A. de Wit, 1925).
well as some written by Charlotte during her enforced isolation at Miramare Castle and after. 37 An essential 1985 article by Albert Duchesne regarding portraits of the Belgian royal family painted by Jean François Portaels (1818-1895) contains references to Charlotte’s patronage of this artist. 38 Additionally, publications by Mia Kerckvoorde contain much biographical information and Kerckvoorde’s tendency to illustrate her books with little known portraits of Charlotte was helpful in early stages of research. Accounts of culturally and regionally specific events pertaining to Charlotte’s positions in Belgium, Italy, and Mexico were sought in journals, biographies and memoirs, and in periodicals, official reports, and history texts. 39

---

37 A vast number of publications have appeared in less scholarly form and inevitably draw heavily on Corti. (Reinach Foussmagne’s work is not widely available and whereas Corti’s has been extensively translated, the former is only available in the original French so far as I have been able to determine). Later publications frequently contain details not included elsewhere if, as is often the case, the author has access to material not otherwise known but establishing the veracity of these details is usually difficult. Whereas Corti was the first to gain access to private Austrian imperial files after World War I, H. Montgomery Hyde was in Italy when WWII ended and noted traces of Maximilian and Charlotte’s Viceregal tenure were still visible in Milan which is no longer the case. Hyde also conducted research at Miramare Castle while it still housed archival resources and in Mexico but his work is of limited use as he seldom cites sources. H. Montgomery Hyde, *Mexican Empire* (London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1946). Some unlikely books proved useful because the author writes from a unique perspective as in the case of a historical romance written by Martha Bibesco. Bibesco counted most of Europe’s heads of state among her personal friends and her writing on historical subjects was widely acclaimed although this example is far from rigorous. Martha Bibesco, Princess, [Lucile Decaux, pseudonym] *Carlota: the story of Charlotte and Maximilian of Mexico: a historical romance* [1937] trans. John Ghika (London: Heinemann, 1956). Bertida Harding lived in Mexico but returned to Europe with her siblings and Hungarian mother when the latter, reputedly, returned Habsburg jewels left in Mexico to Emperor Franz Josef in Austria in 1909. Bertida Harding, *Phantom Crown* (New York: Halcyon House, 1934).

38 Duchesne, 1985, 59-70.

Selection of research sites, materials, and literature was directed towards making close readings, as this term is currently understood, of portraits of Charlotte. When promulgated by Mieke Bal and Norman Bryson in 1991, this method of cultural analysis was meant to wrest the object of study from its context and invest it with consciously subjective interpretations.\(^{40}\) It was heavily criticized as an ahistorical approach resulting in meager and compromised results and Bal and Bryan Gonzales have since reversed the earlier exclusion of context and now emphasize self-reflective acknowledgement of subjectivity and stance.\(^{41}\) This later articulation of close reading, with its interdisciplinary possibilities and rigourous concern for particularities of context and

---


stance, valuably influences this study. I endeavour to read portraits of Charlotte askance, and to disassemble an accretion of myths and complacencies relating to her and often projected onto her visual representations. My approach has benefited from the work of scholars such as Walter Benjamin, Pierre Macherey, and more recently Lynne Pearce, who apply aspects of aesthetic and literary theory to visual texts, as well as from studies informed by postcolonial sensitivities and focused on implications of visual culture for hegemonic structures.\(^{42}\)

I employ the term portrait broadly to include drawings, paintings, prints, photographs, sculpture, and popular art. Cards and illustrations in periodicals are among popular art forms which convey the familiarity of Charlotte’s image to nineteenth-century audiences, while film and stage personifications, comic book illustrations, and computer imagery perform the same function for contemporary audiences. This range of imagery allows presentation of culturally specific features as well as revisions to representations of Charlotte occurring in the late nineteenth century and up to the present.\(^{43}\)


\(^{43}\) However, portraits of Charlotte in print media were not investigated to any substantial degree in the present study. These comprise a subject in themselves and the history of their being commissioned, print volume and formats ordered, means of circulation might clarify many points that remain unresolved. A focus on Charlotte’s public image as it was managed (by others) after 1866 (in particular through the re-issuing of prints with
academic value of popular art developed congruent with the inception of Cultural Studies in the mid-twentieth century and has since been reinforced by cross-disciplinary theoretical methodologies; similarly, renewed interest in portraiture grew out of recognition of its role in structuring society.  

Wendy Steiner’s article in which she applied semiotic theory to portraiture as well as literature was one of the first in this regard. Roy Strong’s vast investigations of portraits, portraiture, and spectacle in the age of Elizabeth I did much to expand investigations of social history and art, while portraiture as a genre was importantly addressed in Richard Brilliant’s 1991 theoretical analysis. Two years later, Marcia Pointon’s landmark publication demonstrated the integral relationship between the display and circulation of portraits and the organization added text) could especially afford a better understanding of their chronology and functions.


Strong expanded upon Marianna Jenkins’s 1947 investigation of state portraits through his examination of their central role in spectacle and pageantry during the Elizabethan Age. See for example Roy Strong, The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry (Thames & Hudson, 1977). Renewed public interest in royal portraits is evident from other publications during these years such as Richard Ormond, The face of monarchy (London: Phaidon, 1977); theoretical interest is demonstrated by Richard Brilliant, Portraiture [1991] (Harvard University Press, 1993).
of class, gender, and social structures in eighteenth-century England. At the same time that Pointon was researching the social dynamics of art in the eighteenth-century, gender and public image in nineteenth-century England was being investigated by Margaret Homans. Homans focussed on visual representations of Queen Victoria and analyzed constructed ‘domesticity’ in the Queen’s official and popular portrayals. Charlotte would have observed, throughout her childhood and early adulthood, Victoria’s extraordinary example of ‘purposeful’ public image. During her childhood especially, the relationship between the Belgian and British courts was very close. Portrait exchanges between Victoria and Leopold I, and Victoria and Louise-Marie, as well as details of sittings to which Louise-Marie accompanied the young Victoria, are described in Carrie Rebora Barratt’s account of the court experiences of artist Thomas Sully. Rebora Barratt’s and Homans’s texts were especially valuable in developing context for Charlotte’s earliest portraits with regard to this particular royal relationship. Other texts provided information on the social and artistic relationship existing between Belgium and France during the reign of Charlotte’s grandfather, King Louis-Philippe. The necessity of image management would have been apparent to Charlotte following the 1848 revolutions that forced Louis-Philippe to abdicate because his representations in public art, especially caricatures, contributed to the undermining of his moral and political

49 The American artist Sully traveled to England to paint a portrait of Queen Victoria in 1838. Carrie Rebora Barratt, *Queen Victoria and Thomas Sully* (New York: Princeton University 2001). This is also a good source for information on aspects of Queen Victoria’s patronage of artists. Some insights on relations between the British and French rulers can be gleaned from Sir John Richard Hall, *England and the Orleans Monarchy* (London: Smith, Elder, 1912).
Louise-Marie was deeply attached to her family and, as is apparent from letters of Leopold I, her siblings and Queen Marie-Amélie often visited the Belgian court; the Belgian King and Queen visited the French court but Louise-Marie also made independent visits and was frequently accompanied by Charlotte. Louis-Philippe’s patronage of the arts actively involved him in developing the museum of French history at Versailles where a replica portrait of Charlotte at two years of age was among royal family portraits commissioned by the King. Jo Burr Margadant assesses the vilification of Louis-Philippe that occurred in the press and analyzes the gender implications of images of the King in popular art forms. Images of other French royal family members are also considered, as is the political involvement of Queen Marie-Amélie, and Margadant’s conclusions assist in comprehending the social environment Charlotte would have experienced in France. Pointon’s exploration of the purposes of family portraits and their connection to gender norms, for example through visual motifs common to depictions of both women and children suggestive of vulnerability, were helpful in reading Charlotte’s early portraits but were also pertinent to images of her in the years after her public life ended in 1867.

---

51 Images and documentation pertaining to other portraits of Charlotte were undoubtedly lost when private belongings of the French royal family were destroyed in the tumult that ensued after their escape to sanctuary in England in 1848.
The circumstances of production, reproduction, and circulation of Charlotte’s childhood portraits are addressed in the first half of Chapter Two; those portraits commissioned during her early adolescence and up to the time of her marriage are considered in the second half. Her earliest portraits were painted by Sir William Charles Ross (1794-1860), Portraitist in Miniature to Queen Victoria, and Paris-based, German artist Franz Xaver Winterhalter (see, respectively, Figures 2.1 and 2.10). The extensive patronage of both artists by various European courts, but most particularly the Belgian, British, and French courts, reinforced a web of personal and political connections already existing at the time of Charlotte’s birth and into which her portraits were woven. This international dimension was matched nationally by reproductions of Charlotte’s portraits through drawings, engravings, or the newer method of lithography and circulation of these reproductions as cards, prints, or illustrations in periodicals. In so new a nation as Belgium, and in light of marked cultural and linguistic difference in its population, the monarchy was a critical focus for national identity. I argue early portraits of Charlotte

---

53 For information on Ross see James L. Caw, *Scottish Painting Past and Present 1620-1908* [1908] (Bath: Kingsmead Reprints, 1975). The most extensive publication on the career of Winterhalter is Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987.

54 The connections between British, Belgian, and French royal families - as these were expressed, and reinforced by, the exchange of portraits - are evident in Oliver Millar, 1977.

55 Belgium’s cultural divide is reflected in the continuing possibility of Flander’s potential secession. Recent news reports have questioned the nation’s future viability. For examples, Ian Traynor, “Belgium’s survival in question as ‘next PM’ quits the battle” Observer, 2 December 2007, online: <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/world/story/0,,2220544,00.html> (2 December 2007); “Belgian Prime Minister Yves Leterme has tendered his government’s resignation…” BBC 15 July 2008, online: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/europe/7506640.stm> (15 July 2008). Most recently, Eric Jones, “Belgium's dilemma is real: Time is running out to solve the country's many constitutional problems: Belgium's future is now seriously threatened.” This situation is discussed in Chapter Seven in relation to portraits of Charlotte.
fortified this aspect of the monarchy by facilitating a shift in its public image from one that was stoic, appropriate to threats facing Belgium in its first decade, to one that reflected newly attained peace as well as social change. One prominent social change was the increasing importance of the concept of family and the Belgian royal family, as a result, were seen as representative of national values. The case can be made that Charlotte’s placement within royal family compositions indicates recognition of this fact as she is seen most often at the centre of group portraits and her lace trimmed dresses contrast with her brothers’s uniforms further emphasizing her presence.56 An exhibition catalogue and a study by Patricia Hilden make clear the social and economic disparities associated with historical lace making in Belgium. The lace adorning Charlotte’s apparel emphasized her femininity but also served to display wealth and status and advertise an important national product.57 This significance of dress in early portraits of Charlotte is equally characteristic of costumes she chose to wear for later portraits.58 A list of gowns
and jewelry comprising Charlotte’s dowry was included in a recent publication by
Christophe Vachaude and allows tentative identification of jewelry and dresses depicted
in certain portraits and assists in establishing dates of commission.\textsuperscript{59} There is exhibition
documentation on lace making in nineteenth-century in Belgium and a study by Patricia
Hilden providing background on social and economic disparities surrounding its
production and wearing.\textsuperscript{60} Aileen Ribeiro has written extensively on dress in relation to
portraiture and her work is valuable to this discussion as is Lou Taylor’s comprehensive
reference work, \textit{Study of Dress History}.\textsuperscript{61}

Belgium’s culturally and linguistically distinct populations were also unique in
artistic traditions and the opportunity to study nineteenth-century collections and
undertake research in museum libraries in Brussels and Antwerp afforded a degree of

\textsuperscript{59} Christophe Vachaudez, \textit{Bijoux des reines et princesses de Belgique} (Bruxelles:
Editions Racine, 2004). I am grateful to Christophe Vachaudez for allowing me to read a
section of his manuscript prior to publication.
\textsuperscript{60} Daniel Cardon de Lichtbuer, ed., \textit{Les Dentelles Royales} (Bruxelles, 1990). I am
grateful to Gertrude Baelde for providing me with this information. Patricia Hilden,
\textsuperscript{61} Aileen Ribeiro, \textit{The Art of Dress: Fashion in England and France 1750-1820} (New
Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1995); Aileen Ribeiro, \textit{Dress and Morality} (Berg,
2003). See also Janice Helland’s essay “The Performative Art of Court Dress” in B.
Elliott and J. Helland, eds., \textit{Decorative Excess and Women Artists in the Early Modernist
Period 1885-1935} (Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate, 2002): 96-113; Lou Taylor, \textit{The Study of
Dress History} (Manchester University Press, 2002).
familiarity with this distinction. Monographs and exhibition catalogues provided more specific information relating to artists commissioned to paint portraits of Charlotte.\(^{62}\)

One Belgian artist commissioned to paint portraits of Charlotte while she was Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia was Jean François Portaels (1818-1895). These paintings by Portaels and the programmatic intertextuality I propose they incorporate are explored in the first section of Chapter Three.\(^{63}\)

Numerous features shared by the Portaels paintings imply that they were conceived as a series with each referencing a different female protagonist. The texts to which these paintings appear to allude are a novel, *I promessi sposi*, written in 1822 by Alessandro Manzoni (1785-1873), two operas, *The Sicilian Vespers* written in 1852 by Giuseppe Verdi (1813-1901) and *La Cenerentola* of 1817 by Gioachino Rossini (1792-1868), and a play, the 1603 *Merchant of Venice* by Shakespeare (1564-1616).\(^{64}\)

Marriage is a central theme in all four works and all feature young female protagonists; notably, each work is set in a geographic location to which Charlotte had a connection. A key element in each painting is costume and my efforts to identify these

---

62 A rare example of an exhibition featuring portraits from the Belgian Royal Collections was mounted at the centenary of the death of Leopold I and was accompanied by a small but important catalogue. I thank Nicole Walsh for providing a xeroxed version. *Leopold Ier et son Rène* (Bruxelles: Archives Generales du Royaume, 1965).

63 This exploration of a possible programme of intertextual allusion was facilitated by discussions in correspondence over many months with Martine Vermeire of the King’s Civil List, Belgium.

64 Manzoni’s novel is especially important in its 1840 edition written in Tuscan vernacular and is considered the first modern Italian novel. The enthusiasm for Italian opera and plays by Shakespeare in mid-nineteenth century was so pronounced a term has been coined to denote it: “bardolatry.” A richly informative book exploring the premise of Shakespeare’s play *The Merchant of Venice* as a lens through which British society viewed itself is Linda Rozmovits, *Shakespeare and the Politics of Culture in Late Victoria England* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).
benefited greatly from information provided by dress historian Grazietta Butazzi. Searches of nineteenth-century visual material illustrating these texts reinforced the premise of purposeful intertextuality. Publications detailing the history of opera in Trieste provided documentation indicating the attendance by Charlotte and Maximilian in 1857 and made meaningful a mention of their previously attending a politically significant opera in Belgium. Political and social circumstances were examined through memoirs, letters, and publications pertaining to the Risorgimento, and visits to the National Museum of the Risorgimento in Turin and regional Risorgimento museum in Trieste. Charlotte and Maximilian’s presence in the Italian provinces of Lombardy-Venetia at a time when nationalist fervour was mounting presented the fleeting possibility Maximilian might be made ruler of an independent Lombardy or Venetia. Investigation of these circumstances for their influence on representations of Charlotte suggests Franz Winterhalter may have painted two portraits that could have served as state images if this opportunity had come to fruition. While it has not been possible to date to verify such commissions, such paintings would help explain certain later portraits of Charlotte as Empress and constitute a precedent for others I suggest were motivated by political

---

65 Grazietta Butazzi generously guided me in efforts to identify costumes and their historical significance. (Electronic mail 2003-2004).
66 Stefano Bianco graciously interrupted his work at the Opera Conservatory in Trieste to search out relevant publications for me such as “Itinerari Teatralie Musicale a Trieste tra Otto e Novecentro” Qaderni Giuliani di Storia XIX, 2 (1998): 267-274.
contingency. One other portrait in this section is a painting previously known only from copies and which has been attributed to various artists. Research by staff at Artstetten Museum in Lower Austria in response to my enquiries regarding their version of this painting led to the discovery of a note indicating the original portrait was painted by Winterhalter. The importance of this information becomes apparent when it is considered in relation to letters of Charlotte to her brother, Léopold Brabant.

The second section of Chapter Three addresses portraits of Charlotte painted between the end of her role as Vicereine in 1859 and her departure for Mexico in 1864. Among the paintings investigated is a multiple figure scene featuring Charlotte, Maximilian, Emperor Franz Joseph and Empress Elisabeth commissioned by Maximilian for the History Room at Miramare, a residence built for him on the Adriatic coast (see Figure 4.13). The tenor of this painting in its presentation of events, demonstrations of gender norms, and careful inclusions of imperial symbolism are explored for their intended embellishment of Maximilian’s personal history. An 1859 portrait by French artist Isadore Pils is unusual in its sensuous depiction of Charlotte and early Realist style (see Figure 4.1). The nationality of the artist may relate to reasons for commissioning this painting. This possibility occurs again with portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian painted by Hungarian artist Ede Heinrich (1819-1885) (see Figures 4.6 and 4.7). An exploration of these within the context of political instability of the mid-1860s comprises Chapter Four. Their current designation as imperial images of Charlotte and Maximilian

---

68 I thank Alison McQueen for alerting me to relevant materials potentially held by the Munich Archives.
70 A recent book dedicated to visual representations of women’s faces was pertinent to analysis of this portrait. Tamar Garb, The Painted Face: Portraits of Women in France 1814-1914 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007).
as Empress and Emperor of Mexico is contradicted by the 1860 date of earliest versions. Instead it is likely these portraits were connected to a proposal made by British Foreign Minister, Lord John Russell (1792-1878) that Maximilian become ruler of a semi-independent Hungary.\textsuperscript{71}

The primary portrait of Charlotte as Empress produced in Europe prior to her departure for Mexico is the Malovich photograph taken when she was still Empress Elect in early 1864. Photographs of several poses are known from this session; the frontal image is the most familiar (see Figure 4.22). Although Winterhalter began state portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian as Empress and Emperor of Mexico, these were not completed by the time they left Europe and it has been conjectured the Austrian royal family retained the portrait of Maximilian.\textsuperscript{72} Imperial images associated with the Mexican Empire have increasingly attracted academic interest within the context of the French Intervention but the question of why official state portraits were not prepared earlier is unresolved. Animosity between Maximilian and Emperor Franz Josef (and between Charlotte and Empress Elizabeth) in years preceding the founding of the Mexican Empire, make it possible this omission resulted in part from reluctance issuing from Vienna. A consideration of portraits commissioned from Winterhalter for the

\textsuperscript{71} Activities of Maximilian and Charlotte through this period were directed towards securing positions of influence and Maximilian was put forward as candidate for several prestigious roles. These machinations remain largely unknown but general accounts of these years can be found in, for instance, Joan Haslip, \textit{The Crown of Mexico, Maximilian and His Empress Carlota} (New York: Holt Rinehart and Wilson, 1971). Haslip draws heavily on Corti’s earlier publication but is useful for additional material the author incorporates despite a scarcity of source material references. Corti’s work is rich in extracts from diplomat’s dispatches and letters between royalty. Corti, [1924], 1968. Intimations of Maximilian’s potentially subversive intentions are found in Reinach Foussmagne, 1925; see also John Bigelow, “Heir-Presumptive to the Imperial Crown of Mexico” \textit{Harper’s New Monthly} (1883) vol. 66, 395 April: 735-748.

\textsuperscript{72} Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987; Acevedo, 1995.
Mexican and Austrian courts yields circumstantial evidence for such a conclusion. Full-length state portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian did not reach Mexico until mid-1865, more than a year after their arrival.\textsuperscript{73} In the absence of such images an eclectic mix of portraits functioned as substitutes. The eclectic nature of these alternate images was undoubtedly due to in part to conflicting needs, for instance the need for images to display at the pending 1866 Paris International Exposition, for others calculated to establish their imperial presence in Mexico, and for conciliatory images to circulate in the United States. Esther Acevedo has valuably documented efforts of Mexican officials to obtain suitable images of the Emperor and Empress and her studies of the Empire demonstrate that cultivation of the arts, protocol, and symbolism were central concerns for Maximilian and Charlotte. In an article focusing on ceremony at the Mexican court, Erica Pani has drawn attention to associated racial and ethnic implications; Robert Duncan has examined the contribution of the arts, symbolism, and urban renewal projects to efforts to legitimize the Empire.\textsuperscript{74} Points made by both these authors are relevant to portraits of Charlotte produced in Mexico and these images, plus two others commissioned by Charlotte upon her return to Europe in 1866, are the focus of Chapter Five. Analysis of a painting by Mexican artist José María Velasco (1840-1912) draws upon Duncan’s comments regarding urban renewal projects in the Empire, Pani’s sensibility to prevailing class and race relations (see Figure 5.13) and, additionally, John

\textsuperscript{73} These were paintings by Graefle ‘after’ Winterhalter.

Barrell’s observations of patterns of shadow and light in images of the rural poor in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England. Barrell offers compelling reasons to believe the distribution of light and shadow in these paintings connotes class and economic disparity and this premise may be similarly applicable to Velasco’s multiple-figure scene featuring an image of Charlotte on horseback. Read in this manner, and mindful of cultural difference, the painting conveys tensions in sharp contrast to the pleasant recreation it initially appears to present. Rather there are encountered issues of ‘otherness,’ exclusions based on race and ethnicity, and questions of imperial morality implied by ambiguity of dress. The scene depicts public gardens restored through private funds of the Empress. It can be argued Velasco subtly subverts a painting meant to document imperial philanthropy to one inferring arrogant disregard. The ambiguity of dress, for instance, was integral to the ‘woman question’ and Charlotte’s unusually ‘feminine’ attire could easily be mistaken as displaying questionable morals. Another multiple-figure scene, in this case painted by French artist Jean-Adolphe Beauce and known to have been commissioned by Charlotte, depicts a Zouave camp with the Empress wearing uniform and seated on the ground (see Figure 5.15). Although a small section within a complex scene, it is startling in respect to nineteenth-century gender

---


76 The ‘woman question’ referred to gender role anxiety in nineteenth-century western culture provoked largely by shifts wrought by the Industrial Revolution to established social norms. In itself, the matter of dress would be a tenuous factor - but combined as it is with other elements of the composition, dress becomes a defining element. By her own accounts, and those of others, her usual riding attire was simple and formal and this description is confirmed by photographs; however, whether or not Charlotte actually wore a dress like this is not a point that enters into this assessment. An excellent reference regarding this subject is Aileen Ribeiro, 1986.
conventions. It is possible this depiction of Charlotte can be explained as referencing the comic opera *Daughter of the Regiment* then very popular in Europe. This premise gains credibility when evaluated against assertions of programmed intertextuality made for earlier paintings by Portaels when Charlotte was Vicereine and when it is established this painting was commissioned for a European audience. Details included in a publication related to Edouard Manet were helpful in teasing out this reference, in particular with regard to Beauclé’s movements and the painting’s history of exhibition. These ‘costume paintings’ are further rationalized by an inherent theatricality of privileged, increasingly urbanized society in Western Europe and Britain in the nineteenth century. The widely-held concept of “natural acting” blurred illusion with experienced reality and functioned, Lynn Voskuil asserts, as “an organizing typology for understanding the self and society …” A third Mexican imperial image dating from 1866, a marble bust by Felipe Sojo (c.1833-1869), contrasts with Velasco’s and Beauclé’s depictions of Charlotte in that it is reminiscent of busts of Roman emperors and so within an established tradition of images of authority, but also incorporates an anachronistic element of ‘costume’ in its toga-like draping (see Figure 5.12). Sojo’s sculpture appears on a list, written by Charlotte, of objects selected for display in the Mexican pavilion planned for a spring 1867 International Exposition in Paris.

When the Exposition opened Charlotte had been in Europe for more than a year and remained isolated within a structure on the grounds of Miramare Castle. As

---

78 In ‘natural acting’ a performance is inspired by previously experienced sensations that, as a result, stimulate genuine emotion. Lynn M. Voskuil, *Acting Naturally: Victorian Theatricality and Authenticity* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004), 21-22.
remarked above, the Empress left Mexico seeking funds and reinforcements to counter deteriorating conditions in Mexico arising primarily from terms of funding negotiated by the French Emperor Napoleon III and his decision to withdraw French troops. Disembarking at Saint-Nazaire in Brittany, Charlotte traveled to Nantes and then Paris where she remained some two weeks. During this time Charlotte met with Napoleon III and his Ministers of State and sat for two portraits; it is probable she also collected the Zouave painting from Beaucé. One of the two Paris portraits is a photograph by French A. A. E. Disdéri (1819-89) and depicts Charlotte wearing mourning as Leopold I had died at the end of 1865 and Marie-Amélie in March 1866. This photograph and a small portrait study in oil by Mexican artist José Salomé Pina (1830-1909), the other image from her sojourn in Paris, are rare artifacts from this crucial episode in Charlotte’s life (see Figures 5.18 and 5.19). They are considered separately and compared with one another within the context of her reception in Europe. A reading of the Disdéri image is informed by Heather McPherson’s unique study of nineteenth-century attitudes towards photography and the theatricality displayed by many sitters when posing for portraits (an

80 There are several outstanding studies of early photography in Mexico. Two that reproduce images of Charlotte are Arturo Aguilar Ochoa, *La Fotografía Durante el Imperio de Maximiliano* [1996] (México City: Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas, 2001), and Jesse Lerner, “Imported Nationalism” *Cabinet* 5 Winter (2001/02): 1-8. The Aubert and the Widy photographic collections in Brussels’s Royal Military Museum relate to Charlotte’s role as Empress; University of Texas in Austin collections hold duplicate materials of much of this photographic and written material but also additional correspondence and photographs relating to the reign of Maximilian and Charlotte. Other collections with photographs of Charlotte include the National Library in Mexico City which has a large format version of the 1866 Disdéri image. There likely exists a wealth of unknown photographs of Charlotte, including early childhood images (photography was invented in the years immediately preceding Charlotte’s birth and Leopold I took considerable interest in its evolution) and images from her brief role as Vicereine as well as late pictures. This is an area awaiting further research and could yield new information on obscure events and circumstances if it were possible to determine the date and place of production.
aspect related to the “natural acting” cited previously). Additionally, Harry Berger’s article “Fictions of the Pose” is valuable, especially for the Disdéri and the Pina portraits, for his deconstruction of complexities involved in posing for portraits whether painted or photographed.

Charlotte’s meetings with Napoleon III and his Ministers were unsuccessful, as was a later meeting with Pope Pius IX in which she sought to achieve a compromise on Church matters in Mexico. The most rational account of Charlotte’s actions in Europe (albeit biased in her favour) is *L’élèvage et la chute de l’empereur Maximilien* by Emile de Keratry. Initially published in serial form, it appeared as a book in late 1867. Most other accounts are highly suspect. Charlotte’s presence in Europe attracted a great deal of interest and her sudden disappearance, accompanied by extravagant and alarming rumours, aroused concern and confusion. Official silence regarding her circumstances blunted attention in the following months and the opening of the International Exposition the following spring effectively concentrated public interest to the benefit of the regime as this deflected criticism of the French Intervention in Mexico. Several authors have analyzed the artistic and political significance of this Exposition, among them Patricia Mainardi who in 1987 explored its ramifications on artistic production, display, cultural infrastructure, and related political policies. Mainardi’s analysis and a 1996 publication by Jane Mayo Roos addressing the intersection of this exhibition with the Impressionist movement, were especially helpful in establishing pertinent aspects of authority and

---

resistance associated with this event. With respect to Charlotte, the exhibition was notable for her absence - and that of Maximilian - as members of the Belgian, Austrian and most other royal families attended.

Vigilant censorship characterizing the Second Empire, and politically sensitive issues surrounding Charlotte’s return and its aftermath, make it essential to consult tangential published materials such as Gossip from Paris by Anthony North Peat and French Opinion by Lynn Case to reconstitute the social and political environment defining Paris during the Exposition. My concern in pursuing this is to contextualize a 1867 painting by Edouard Manet (1832-1883), View of the International Exposition of 1867, which may allegorically reference Charlotte (see Figure 6.1). This premise is the focus of the first section of Chapter Six. I propose the presence in Paris of artists to whom Charlotte had sat for a portrait or portraits and with whom Manet was, or may

---


85 Extracts from letters written by Charlotte from Miramare during the Exposition express interest in it. For instance, Charlotte wrote to Countess de Grünne 2 June 1867, saying she thought [the Countess] was leaving soon for the country, “if [she] was not already there, unless the Exposition attracted [her to Paris] where all the great of the world seemed to be gathering.” Extract quoted in Reinach-Foussmagne, 1925, 350.


87 The opportunity to consult many rare publications pertaining to the Mexican Empire and Charlotte’s return to Europe was provided by Henri Goffinet and Geri de Pierpont of the Museum of the Dynasty and greatly benefited the development of this chapter.
have been, acquainted, conceivably influenced him to create an allegorical figure
denoting her participation in the French Intervention and encounter with Napoleon III
upon her return to Europe. In making this argument I recapitulate the chronology of the
French Intervention from the perspective of citizens and authorities in France. Manet’s
antagonism to Second Empire policies and his close friendships with like-minded
republicans offer feasible motives for an allegory sympathetic to the circumstances of
Maximilian and Charlotte. There is a wealth of published material regarding Manet’s
career and many of these texts were of assistance in developing this premise. Of
particular significance were essays by Julie Wilson-Barreau, John Leighton, Douglas
Johnson, and John House in a publication accompanying a 1992 exhibition of Manet’s
prevailing political climate in nineteenth-century France was helpful in identifying
parallels between Manet’s convictions and those defining Republicanism and
Freemasonry, observations in a 1970s article by Eunice Lipton offered a surprising
feminist interpretation of Manet’s representations of women, and an article by Kristine
Ibsen convincingly demonstrated Manet’s employment of ambiguous and politically charged motifs.\(^{89}\)

Much remains to be established regarding the degree to which Charlotte exercised control over her visual representations but instances currently confirmed suggest her agency was considerable.\(^{90}\) (This study draws on two instances, documented by earlier authors, of Charlotte commissioning her own portrait. In Chapter Three I suggest these two instances support the likelihood Charlotte commissioned an additional three portraits. Circumstances surrounding the production of two further portraits imply these were also initiated by Charlotte. These latter works are discussed in Chapter Five.) All agency on her part was extinguished upon her removal from public life - and public view - 13 October 1866. Maximilian and his soldiers were outnumbered and ultimately surrounded by Mexican forces in May 1867. He declined to participate in schemes that might have allowed him to escape and together with Generals Miguel Miramón (1832-1867) and Tomás Mejía (c. 1815-1867) was executed by firing squad on charges of treason. As an ensuing flood of commemorative images testified, shock and horror reverberated throughout Britain, Europe, and much of North America. Immediately after the execution composite memorial images were produced which grouped a portrait of Charlotte with one of Maximilian, or of Maximilian and his Generals, thus inferring her alleged mental detachment from the ‘real’ world was equivalent to the physical departure


\(^{90}\) I thank Allison Morehead for alerting me to the value of exploring instances in which Charlotte did not exercise authority over her image. An example, recounted by Acevedo, occurred in Mexico when an imperial statue of Charlotte was cancelled apparently on orders from Maximilian. Acevedo, 1995.
of Maximilian, Miramón, and Mejía. Other images of Charlotte functioned as illustrations for widespread allusions to her as the Shakespearean character Ophelia (and Maximilian as Hamlet) (see Figure 6.36). Through later decades of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, female hysteria was an increasingly frequent diagnosis of wide ranging conditions and symptoms. This corresponded to changing conceptions and treatments of mental illness as well as increasing independence for women in relation to socio-economic factors. A fascination with images of ‘mad’ or dying women is pertinent to these elements and can be detected in visual representations of Charlotte subsequent to her ongoing detention (see Figure 6.30). Works by Sander Gilman, Bram Dijkstra, and Anne McClintock facilitated an attempt to disentangle sympathy, fear of contagion, and expedient image management from one another with regard to altered photographs of Charlotte and more subtly modified copies and reproductions of painted portraits. This discussion of images of Charlotte produced after the death of Maximilian and through to the end of the nineteenth century comprises the second section of Chapter Six.

---

92 An excellent examination of media responses to the fall of the Empire is provided by: John House, “Manet’s Maximilian: History Painting, Censorship and Ambiguity” in Wilson-Bareau, 1992: 35-86. Rumours that Charlotte gave birth to an illegitimate child in early 1867 seemed to some an explanation for her disturbed state of mind. This possibility continued to be raised in the twentieth century. For instance, Oscar de Incontrera, “L’Imper. Carlotta del Messico e la leggenda della sua maternità” N. 11-12 La Porta Orientale (1965): 300-319.
The significance of existing geographic distribution of Charlotte’s portraits in the twenty-first century is addressed within a summary and conclusions comprising Chapter Seven. I contend these portraits continue to exercise influence to quite different effect across the disparate cultures with which she was historically connected. In Belgium portraits of Charlotte are seldom publicly displayed and those that are accessible generally date from her childhood or, in one instance, are displayed within the context of an unpopular imperial venture. Her visual representations contributed to the beginnings of Belgian national identity and may again be invoked for this purpose as Belgium is currently confronting the challenge of possible Flemish secession. Charlotte’s slight presence in Lombardy-Venetia left almost no impression although several important portraits of her are found in the collection at Miramare Castle then in the Austrian Empire but now within the borders of Italy. In that setting they now function to ironically celebrate the heroism of her husband Archduke Maximilian of the Austrian royal family. Conversely in Mexico where there is marked ambivalence towards her imperialist role, representations of Charlotte are displayed in numerous museums and feature in major twentieth-century public artworks and books celebrating Mexican

---

94 It should be noted, however, that few images of other women from Belgium’s early history are displayed. On the disfavour that is in Belgium sometimes accorded the historical Charlotte, see Ghislan de Diesbach, *Secrets of the Gotha*, Margaret Crossland (trans.) (London: Chapman & Hall, 1964). Much remains to be addressed regarding the reign of Léopold II, the international approbation in relation to his colony in the Congo, and impact of these associations on the Belgian psyche. For many in Belgium, benefits accruing to the nation from the actions of Léopold II, and the fact that similar atrocities were committed under the mandate of other imperialist nations, complicate his legacy. Jane Block, *Belgium: the Golden Decades 1880-1914* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997); Neal Ascherson, *King Incorporated* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1963); Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold’s Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (New York: Mariner Books, 1999).
national identity (see Figures 7.14, 7.15 and 7.16, 7.17). I argue that close readings of portraits of Charlotte contribute to current understanding of the role of art in nineteenth-century politics with particular relevance for manipulation of gender conventions in a manner conducive to attaining or exerting political influence.

95 There are abundant and excellent published works on twentieth-century art in Mexico. Especially valuable for this section are Marta Traba, Art of Latin America 1900-1980, (specifically for information on Columbian sculptor Romulo Rozo who worked much of his life in Mexico), and Patrick Marnham, Dreaming with his Eyes Open (New York: Knopf), 1998, whose study of Mexican artist Diego Rivera includes a mention of Charlotte. The comic-book history is by Rafael Gallur and Orlando Ortiz, ¡Adiós mamá Carlota! La intervención francesa y el imperio de Maximiliano (México: SEP/Nueva Imagen, 1981).
Chapter Two

Early Images

“Raison de coeur ou raison d’etat?”¹

Princess Charlotte occupies an awkward place in Belgium’s history. Peripheral to the dynastic line, Charlotte is outside the dominant historical focus yet resists any discreet categorization like that of saintliness accommodating her mother, Queen Louise-Marie. Despite being the nation’s first princess and the only daughter of Leopold I and Louise-Marie, images of Charlotte are rare in Belgium beyond those contained in the Royal Collections, Museum of the Dynasty, and Royal Military Museum in Brussels and City Hall Collection in Antwerp. In part, this visual absence derives from an undefined mental illness that resulted in Charlotte’s imposed isolation throughout the last six decades of her life, but it is also because aspects of the reign of her brother, Léopold II, continue to hold this period hostage.²

¹ I borrow this phrase from Jean-Michel Bruffaerts’s chapter in which he examines motivations for royal marriages in the early decades of Belgium as it encapsulates my premise that design, timing, and distribution of appealing early portraits of Charlotte imbued them with (potential) political importance. Jean-Michel Bruffaerts, “Raison de coeur ou raison d’etat?” in Janssens and Stengers, 1997, 83-89.
² Léopold, Duke of Brabant, succeeded Leopold I in 1865. Under the guise of philanthropic motives, Léopold II purchased vast properties in African Congo in the 1870s. These constituted his private colony until 1908 when international outrage over atrocities committed there forced him to allow its sale to the Belgian nation. Massive architectural projects accomplished during his reign cause him to be referred to in Belgium as the “builder king” (in French le Roi-Bâtisseur, in Flemish Koning-Bouwer). Wealth enabling him to do so was acquired, for the most part, through brutal exploitation of the Congolese population. "Reforming The Heart of Darkness" (http://www.boondocksnet.com/congo/) The Congo under Léopold II. 4 November 1970 <http://www.ebroadcast.com.au/lookup/encyclopedia/le/Leopold_II_of_Belgium.html> (25 April 2005).

While these comments may appear to diverge from the subject of portraits of Charlotte, her wealth was accessed by Léopold II to fund, in part, his colonial aspirations. Subversion and obfuscation of her visual representations during the late nineteenth
Existing portraits of the Belgian royal children imply more were commissioned of Charlotte through her early childhood than of her brothers, Léopold Brabant and Philippe of Flanders.\(^3\) I suggest this was related to a shift from concerns of national defense to those of peace, increasing ties to the French and British royal families, and the relative malleability of her visual representations for reasons of gender and birth order. The monarchy was already assured of male heirs and Charlotte was almost an extravagance whose birth coincided with the resolution of hostilities with the Netherlands and ratification of Belgium as an independent nation state.\(^4\) Royal family portraits promoted the monarchy as a national symbol and point of coalescence for Belgium’s culturally and linguistically divided population while the development of new print technology and photography allowed these portraits to be produced in large numbers and various formats and widely circulated. The exchange of portraits with other royal families, especially

---

\(^3\) The commissioning of portraits of the royal children may not have been as disproportionate as extant images suggest but surviving collection records tend to corroborate this and portraits of Charlotte were given as gifts with decidedly greater frequency. (A portrait of Leopold, Duke of Brabant, as an infant and reference to another of him at three years of age is included in Barbara Emerson, *Léopold II of the Belgians* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1979), 148.

those of Britain and France, contributed to the maintenance of international ties essential to Belgium’s early existence and was especially prolific between 1840 and 1850.⁵

A habit of giving portraits as gifts to one another was established between Leopold I and his niece Victoria well before she became Queen in 1837.⁶ Louise-Marie and Victoria began corresponding in 1835 and by 1840, with both women actively commissioning portraits and arranging for their distribution, exchanges between them became increasingly prolific.⁷ 1840 was also the year King Louis-Philippe (father of Louise-Marie) visited the English court, Victoria married Prince Albert, and their daughter (Victoria the Princess Royal) and Charlotte were born - a combination of events precipitating an outpouring of images.⁸ This sharing of letters and images centred on a genre charged with intimacy, that of family portraits, comprised a discourse uniquely effective and resilient through times of personal or political discord.

⁵ Art outside the genre of portraiture was a component in many linkages between the courts. National cultural was promoted by encouraging the patronage of accomplished artists and all three courts commissioned or purchased works from Belgian, French, and British artists. On a more personal level, a fondness for animals shared by Queen Victoria and Leopold I contributed to the popularity of pet paintings in the mid-nineteenth century as William Seward has pointed out. William Secord, Dog Painting: The European Breeds (London: The Antique Collectors Club, 1980). For an edited extract of Seward’s assessment, see: <http://dreamdogsart.typepad.com/art/2008/03/william-secord.html> (23 July 2006).
⁷ Their royal counterparts, Leopold I, Prince Albert, and King Louis-Philippe, commissioned portraits but their cultural preoccupations were more often public and didactic art projects. For instance, statues and murals of Belgium’s battle for independence, the London Great Exhibition of 1851, and museum of French history at Versailles museum, respectively. They were less involved in details pertaining to the production of portraits, especially when these were not overtly political images.
⁸ This was the first time a reigning French monarch had visited the British court. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 188; for numerous related letters see Suzanne d’Huart, 1981.
In his role as uncle and surrogate father to his sister’s daughter, the future Queen Victoria, Leopold I (both before and after he became King) encouraged her enthusiasm for portraits while she was a child. His marriage to Louise-Marie linked English, French, and Belgian royal families and initiated circumstances favouring close connections between the women of these families. Louise-Marie, twenty years younger than Leopold I, was only seven years senior to Victoria; a friendly relationship developed between the Queen of the Belgians and the English heir to the throne. As Angus Holden observes, “by allying the Coburgs [Victoria’s maternal relatives] with the Orléans’ [through marriage to Louise-Marie] the King “compelled Victoria to regard the stability of the latter house from a personal as well as from a political point of view.” Victoria was barely eighteen when her uncle, William IV, died; she ascended the throne June 20, 1837.

---

9 Victoria’s first miniatures were portraits of her parents by George Hayter (1792-1871), an artist patronized by the Duke and Duchess of Kent, sister of then Prince Leopold, on the recommendation of Leopold, and a painting of Ischia by Leopold given to Victoria in 1827. (He had patronized Hayter since 1816 and the artist would later be appointed to the court by Victoria.) In 1830 he gave Victoria a miniature portrait of himself by Hayter; Victoria sat to the same artist three years later for a full-length portrait she commissioned as a gift for her uncle. This portrait in which she was depicted with her spaniel Dash was lost in a fire at Laeken but Victoria purchased a study for this work that remains in the English Royal Collection. For extensive background on the contents and development of Queen Victoria’s art collection see Oliver Millar, 1977.


11 Holden, 1936, 145. Leopold’s maintenance of his relationship with Victoria was regarded as by some as imperative for European matters of power as evident in a letter to the King from Emmanuel de Mensdorff-Pouilly. (The circumstances prompting this letter are not explicitly stated.) “There is apprehension that Queen Victoria may fall into bad hands … you must be her guardian angel (ange gardien) as I know through my brother and my wife [Leopold’s sister Sophie, Princess of Saxe Cobourg Saalfeld] what influence you have with her and with what complete confidence she listens to your counsels ….” 01 July 1837, Teplitz. Letter No. 67. Jean Puraye et Hans-Otto Lang, 1973, 303.
1837 with her coronation taking place June 28, 1838.\textsuperscript{12} Two years later Leopold I
arranged two marriages: that of his niece Victoria to his nephew Albert of Saxe Coburg
Gotha, and that of another niece, Princess Victoire of Saxe Coburg to a brother of Queen
Louise-Marie, Louis Charles, Duke of Nemours, thereby linking the royal houses
together still more intricately.\textsuperscript{13} Charlotte was born to Louise-Marie and Leopold I on 7
June 1840 and a daughter, Victoria the Princess Royal, was born to Victoria and Albert
on 21 November of the same year.\textsuperscript{14} Of numerous artists commissioned through these
years by these three courts (the Belgian, British, and French), it was the presence of two
individuals that most propelled this portrait-centred discourse. Sir William Charles Ross,
an English artist of Scots ancestry who was Miniaturist Painter in Ordinary to Victoria,
and Paris-based German artist Franz Xaver Winterhalter were highly accomplished
portrait painters and remarkable in their productivity and stamina through two decades.
Ross specialized in small portraits and miniatures; Winterhalter in portraits and large,
multiple-figure canvases documenting family and state events.\textsuperscript{15} Patronage of these

\textsuperscript{12} William IV (1765-1837), third son of George III and Sophia. He died leaving ten
children from his long relationship with Dorothea Jordan (1791-1811). As neither
doughter survived from his later marriage to Adelaide of Saxe Coburg and Meinengein,
his niece Victoria became heir to the throne. Although not a popular king (he was
expensively self-indulgent) his efforts encouraging passage of the Reform Act in 1832
was an important factor in the English monarchy surviving revolutions in 1848. See for
instance Ashdown, 1981.
\textsuperscript{13} 11 February 1840. Princess Victoire Franziska of Saxe Coburg Saalfeld (Kohary) and
the Duke of Nemours were married 27 April 1840. Louis Charles Philippe Raphael,
Duke of Nemours (1814-1896), was the second son of King Louis-Philippe and Queen
Marie-Amélie of the French.
\textsuperscript{14} Victoria Adelaide Mary Louise (21 November 1840-5 August 1901), the Princess
Royal; later Crown Princess of Prussia and Empress Frederich of Prussia.
\textsuperscript{15} Both Ross and Winterhalter experienced success at an early age and both planned
careers as history painters. The parents of Ross, William and Maria, were artists - his
mother a portrait painter who exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1833 - he excelled upon
entering the Royal Academy at the age of fourteen. Ross became an assistant to Andrew
artists by the British and Belgian royal families began with a portrait of Queen Victoria painted by Ross in 1837 and one of the Queen of the Belgians by Winterhalter the following year; Winterhalter portraits of members of the French royal family were initiated in 1839. These artists linked the three courts by their frequent attendance at each as well as by portraits they painted which circulated to all three courts and beyond as replicas or copies. The extent to which this was so can be inferred from a partial

Robertson, a prominent painter of miniatures, and quickly gained an impressive reputation for his refined work. He was knighted in 1842 and elected a Royal Academician 1843. Ross exhibited a total of 304 works at the Royal Academy during his career but painted at least several hundred more. His work was likened to that of Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792) who, in turn, described Ross as having “the gift to catch his sitters at their most genial and agreeable ….” Christopher Wood, *Dictionary of Victorian Painters* 2nd edition (Woodbridge, England: Antique Collectors’ Club, 1978), 406; also Caw, [1908], 1975, 90-91. See also “Sir William Charles Ross,” London National Gallery, 1-3, online.

Franz Xaver Winterhalter was born in Menzenschwand, Germany, trained in Freiburg im Breisgau and Munich, and was drawing master at the court of Baden. When first in Paris in 1834 he earned acclaim at the Salon with large, colourful scenes of Italian peasants; however, Winterhalter was soon so extensively patronized for his ability to impart a cosmopolitan modernity to court portraits that he was diverted from academic painting. “From 1839 onwards” Ormond and Blackett-Ord state, “Winterhalter painted an average of three to four formal portraits each year for Louis-Philippe … He came to England every summer or autumn for a stay of six to seven weeks, sometimes longer, in the early years” and ultimately painted “more than a hundred works in oil for Queen Victoria and Prince Albert ….” Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 36-37. The Belgian court commissioned fewer portraits yet it was Winterhalter who painted the state portraits of Leopold I and Queen Louise-Marie and most often painted portraits of the royal children. See also “Franz Xaver Winterhalter” online at <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article-9077237/Franz-Xaver-Winterhalter> (20 June 2004); and Stephen Levine, “Crisis of Resemblance” *Arts Magazine* (1978): 90-93. A brief assessment that focusses on Winterhalter’s depictions of women and differs from Levine’s opinion is found in Tamar Garb, *The Painted Face: Portraits of women in France 1814-1914* (New Haven: Yale University Press), 157.

16 Louise-Marie may have known of Winterhalter through a portrait he painted of Princess Alexandrine of Saxe Coburg Gotha in 1834. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 229-231.
itinerary of William Ross as I have attempted to trace it below for the years 1840, when Princess Charlotte was born, 1841, and into 1842 when a portrait of Charlotte was first painted by Franz Xaver Winterhalter. Early portraits of Charlotte by Winterhalter, together with a late painting by Ross and portraits commissioned from other artists, are considered in a later section of this chapter.

A Partial Itinerary of Sir William Charles Ross in 1840-1842

Figure 2.1. Sir William Charles Ross (unsigned), *Princess Charlotte*, 1840.
Charlotte was an infant of five months when William Ross first painted her portrait and replicated the image as a gift to Queen Victoria from Queen Louise-Marie (Figure 2.1).\(^\text{17}\) Two replicas remain in the Belgian Royal Collections and doubtless one was dispatched to Charlotte’s maternal grandparents, the King and Queen of the French.\(^\text{18}\) Ross painted portraits of other members of the Belgian royal family during this visit including a portrait of Charlotte’s father, Leopold I.\(^\text{19}\) Painting a portrait at the austere Belgian court presented fewer distractions in comparison to other courts where sittings were often lively occasions complicated by the presence of royalty, pets, and court members but other challenges were presented by the King (Figure 2.2).\(^\text{20}\)

\(^{17}\) Delia Millar, 1996.

\(^{18}\) Queen Marie-Amélie, Charlotte’s maternal grandmother, traveled to Belgium to be present at arrival of her granddaughter. Marie-Amélie’s affection for of her grandchildren was made obvious with a favourite bracelet comprised of miniature portraits of each child which she until her death. Suzanne d’Huart, *Journal de Marie-Amélie, Riene des Francais 1800-1866* (1935) (Paris: Librairie Académie Perrin, 1981) 561. The Belgian inventory lists two portraits entitled *Princess Charlotte as a Baby*, both watercolour on paper and attributed to Ross. I thank Martine Vermeire for this information.

\(^{19}\) “In recognition of his merit, the artist was awarded the Cross of the Commander of the Order of King Leopold.” Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 181.

Figure 2.2. William Radclyffe ‘after’ Sir John Gilbert, *Buckingham Palace: the Princess Royal sitting for a portrait by Winterhalter*, c. 1842. Queen Victoria is seen seated on the picture’s right side with Prince Albert standing behind her.21

Posing for Ross “bored” Leopold I “considerably.” “I flatter myself” he wrote to his niece Victoria, “that [the artist] will not want many séances and that I shall then have done with him.”22

In a letter to Victoria written soon after the arrival of Ross in 1840, Louise-Marie comments “[y]our little Cousin sitts [sic] quite like a person and Ross thinks her very pretty.”23 In another, written two weeks later, Louise-Marie describes the sketch Ross

---

21 A written description of this sitting is found in Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 37.
22 Watercolour portrait of Leopold I, Cat. No. 4738 RL13783; quotations are included in Delia Millar, *The Victoria Watercolours and Drawings in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (London: Phillip Wilson, 1996). See also Holden, 1936, 154-155.
23 Correspondence of Queen Louise-Marie to Queen Victoria, 2 November 1840, quoted in Delia Millar, 1996, 758. I thank Christopher Lloyd for alerting me to this material.
made of Charlotte as “certainly like although I think it gives the idea not of a fattie -, she is very fat, but of a larger Child. The head especially I think rather too large and the eyes – and hair – are not dark enough: but Ross said in a sketch he could not make them as dark as they really are.”24 Favoured artists occupied an unusual position of familiarity and exercised a degree of autonomy at the courts. Ross was more taciturn than the amiable Winterhalter whose German nationality made him an especially comfortable presence for Victoria and Leopold I.25 Carrie Rebora Barratt notes that Victoria thought Ross "silly" and "tedious" when first sitting to him but later came to regard him with affection. Queen Victoria was expecting her first child when Ross was painting his portrait of the infant Charlotte and Victoria, the Princess Royal, was born within days of the portrait sketch reaching England.26

Queen Victoria’s strong ties to the Belgian royal family were looked on with some disapproval in her homeland where it was considered Leopold I exerted too great an influence on her - that he was the ‘fiddler who called the tunes’ as he is depicted in a satirical painting from 1841 by English artist Charles Hunt (Figure 2.3). (Prince Albert is seated to the left of the central figure of the King, Prince Ernest, brother of Albert, plays accompaniment on a harpsichord to the right; Victoria is seen on the right of the picture.)

24 Queen Louise-Marie to Queen Victoria from Laeken, 18 November 1840. Quoted in Delia Millar, 1996, WRAY 3/15-18, 758.
25 Rebora Barratt, 2001, 17. Victoria spoke only German until she was three years of age.
In part because of this sensitivity, official paintings commissioned by the British court do not often include the figure of Leopold I although he is as prominent as Prince Albert in a depiction of the Christening of Victoria, the Princess Royal. It is the private exchange of images between the royal families in these years that document close ties between the courts. The King of the Belgians sought to establish further connections between the English, French, and Belgian courts and was keenly attuned to the force of emotion in propelling political actions and sealing international alliances; reluctant as he was to sit for portraits, acquiescence was a social obligation not without value for his aspirations of Coburg expansion (Figure 2.4).28

---

28 As the Coburg and Orléans royal families expanded - Leopold I had six siblings and Louise-Marie seven surviving siblings - so too did possibilities for the formal display of family portraits and the potential for political influence.
In 1841, the same year as the ‘fiddler’ painting was produced, Ross attended the French court to paint a watercolour portrait of Louise-Marie’s sister-in-law, Hélène, Duchesse d’Orléans. He returned to Belgium in late December where he remained until the end of January 1842.29

If portraits have a “talismatic and erotic charge” as Shearer West asserts, then portraits in miniature have special intensity because of their tactile aspect and “ambulatory” nature.30 Carried on the person as jewelry or precious objects their proxy

---

29 Hélène of Mecklenburg Schwerin (1814-1858).
value is private and intimate; worn to display association with prestigious or powerful individuals, they function as badges or symbols of status by association. Miniatures continued to be highly regarded into the late 1850s and were often organized into albums. This enthusiasm for collecting and organizing small portraits in albums was transferred to carte des vistes by the beginning of the 1860s. A miniature of Charlotte in Flemish costume dates either from this visit or earlier when Louise-Marie traveled with the princess to Paris. This picture, too, was added to Victoria’s increasingly extensive collection of miniatures and it was probably also copied for many other royal households. In summer 1842 Ross was again at the Belgian court, in this instance at Victoria’s command as she wished a further portrait of Leopold I as well as a portrait of


31 In Second Empire France, principal dames du palais wore a miniature of Empress Eugénie at their left shoulder. The miniature was encircled by diamonds and “hanging from a knot of ribbons,” and demonstrated their rank. Elizabeth-Ann Coleman, Opulent Era (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1989), 11.

32 Victoria amassed one of the largest known collections of miniatures and also assembled over one hundred albums of photographic portraits. Prince Albert had a large table-cabinet constructed for viewing these miniatures with drawers in the sides in which they were (and continue to be) stored. Pointon, 1993, and Perry, 2006, usefully comment on the curatorial aspect of such activities. See Chapter 7 regarding Charlotte’s collection.

33 After this time miniatures tended to be larger and were often displayed framed. French photographer Andre Adolphe Disdéri patented a process for producing small photographs (2 1/2” by 4” format, eight to each glass plate) in 1854 but they only gained widespread popularity in 1861. “Photography in the Nineteenth Century” <http://www.lib.udel.edu/ud/spec/exhibits.htm> (2005). Whether or not he was the first to produce these enormously popular images is debated. Robert Leggat cites Marseilles photographer Dodero as the first to successfully do so. <http://www.rleggat.com/photohistory/history/cart-de-.htm> (accessed 15 May 2006)

34 No. 614167. Collection of Miniatures, Windsor Castle.
Queen Louise-Marie. Ross also painted portraits of Victoria, the infant Princess Royal, in 1841 and 1842 (see Figure 2.2). In late winter 1842 Ross traveled back to France to make a further portrait of Hélène of Orléans in which she wears mourning for her husband, Louise-Marie’s brother Ferdinand, Duke of Orléans who died in summer of that year.

As this partial itinerary indicates, Ross moved constantly between the Belgian, English, and French courts and his portraits were artifacts commemorating royal births, deaths, or changes in social or political status and reified the rapport then existing between these courts. For larger portraits and still larger family scenes and paintings documenting events of political importance these courts most frequently commissioned Franz Xaver Winterhalter. Maintaining the scheduling of artists and portraits demanded attention to protocol and detail, as schedules for sittings had to be arranged and decisions made regarding dress and ornament, format and medium. Much of this appears to have been the prerogative of Louise-Marie, Victoria, and to a lesser extent, Marie-Amélie and the sisters of Louise-Marie. Correspondents apprised one another of pending portraits

---

36 In November 1839 Ross painted his first likeness of Prince Albert, then the fiancé of Queen Victoria. Writing to Leopold I regarding this image Victoria states the portrait “is now and always standing before me. It is quite a speaking likeness and is my delight.” Windsor, November 1839. Quoted in Millar, 1984, 167. The Princess Royal holds what appears to be a copy of this miniature in her 1842 portrait thereby quoting the earlier image, expressing her connection to Prince Albert, and making the picture a double portrait. The commissioning of portraits of Charlotte and Victoria the Princess Royal at about the same age and sometimes in similar dress seems purposeful and continued until 1850 and possibly as late as 1855.
38 I concentrate on exchanges between Victoria and Louise-Marie as portraits of Charlotte are frequently mentioned in their correspondence and existing versions of the same
and offered critiques of ongoing work. If a portrait was considered especially successful further arrangements were required to meet demands for replicates, copies, or miniatures and often, if the latter, for resulting images to be set into jewelry. Choice of frame and location of the picture’s display was considered with regard to existing portraits or, if the portrait was a gift, arrangements made to send it to the recipient. Much of this was undertaken at the direction of women of the royal families and was seldom without inherent political implications. While it was a pleasurable social activity, it was equally a parallel political forum underpinning official activities as the production of portraits and their exchange, display, and circulation made relationships visible and documented events. The international aspect did not preclude domestic consumption of these images, an aspect of special importance in the new nation of Belgium. Visual representations of members of the Belgian royal family were vital in positioning the monarchy as a national symbol and cultivating a sense of national identity. Rapid developments in print technology were vastly expanding capacities for circulation of images and reducing cost so that the market for these expanded. Meanings were incorporated through dress, pose, and symbolic motifs, and the timing of portrait commissions or choice of recipient.

portraits in the British and Belgian record their distribution. Queen Marie and the Orléans princes and princesses were frequent visitors at the Belgian court, as the Belgian royals were at the French (and British) court, and the lively exchange of portraits extended beyond immediate royal family members.

39 For descriptions of the reproduction of certain portraits of Queen Victoria (and other sitters) see Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987. Writing of the necessity to recognize “[m]odern-day criteria of originality and individuality need to be set aside … portraiture was the one genre in which copies increased rather than diminished the standing of the original. The portrait was a utilitarian object ….” Pointon is referring to eighteenth century portraiture but these attitudes continued into the 1860s. Pointon, 1993, 46.
**Beginning Belgium**

“A society is held together by the assumptions and images it carries in relation to the nature of power within its hierarchy.”

As recounted in an introduction to the Museum of the Dynasty, “[t]he Monnaie Theatre shook to the sound of the Revolution, announcing the birth of a new country ….” The “fabulous story that led Belgium to its international destiny” began 25 August 1830 in response to a performance of Daniel-François-Esprit Auber’s epic grand opera *The Mute of Portici*. With passionate lyrics by Eugène Scribe and Germain Delavigne and rich in spectacle, this story of revolt by the people of Naples against Spanish rule inspired the Brussels audience to rise against authoritarian policies “but also against poverty, unemployment, and the high price of bread.” There is artistic license in this version of events and the matter of religious differences is not mentioned, but economic neglect was a major factor in the revolt and secession of Catholic Flanders and Wallonia from the Protestant Kingdom of the Netherlands. Intervention by European powers resulted in an arbitrarily constituted nation in that its population was overwhelmingly Catholic but linguistically and culturally divided into Flemish-speaking Flanders in the north, French-speaking Wallonia in the south, and a small German enclave in the east. Efforts to discover shared elements of history rationalizing the nation as a separate geographic entity necessitated recourse to Roman times and the Belgaë peoples who had inhabited that part of Europe provided a name for the newly fledged nation. Throughout Belgium’s first decade, Willem I of the Netherlands continued to contest Belgian independence by

---

sending troops across the borders and laying siege to Antwerp. This latter action caused
France to intercede and England to threaten naval action on behalf of Belgium. The
Belgians and their allies decisively won the battle for Antwerp with the result that the
Treaty of London, which had recognized but not ratified the existence of Belgium in
1830, was finalized 19 April 1839.44

Prince Leopold of the German duchy of Saxe Coburg Gotha was not the first
choice of the Belgian National Congress tasked with finding a king acceptable to
Belgians and their European neighbours.45 Then forty years of age, Prince Leopold had
already been approached as a potential candidate for two thrones in 1830.46 The first
proposal regarding a possible monarchy in Mexico came to nothing; the second was the
vacant throne of Greece and Leopold initially accepted this but then rejected it when his
stipulations were not agreed to. He accepted the Belgian throne on the counsel of
Christian Stockmar (1787-1863), his personal physician and increasingly important
political advisor, became King in 1831, and ruled for fifty-four years.47 Politically
experienced and widely respected for his pragmatism, financial acumen, and diplomatic
skills, Leopold had lived in England for many years and had the support of Britain’s
parliament. His fatherly relationship with the future Queen Victoria was to Belgium’s

44 Arblaster, 2005; Arnonson, [1968] 1969; Documents Illustrating the History of
45 Other proposed candidates were the second son of King Louis-Philippe, the Duc of
Nemours, or Duke Augustus of Leuchtenberg. Documents Illustrating the History of
Belgium, 1978, 16-17.
46 England objected out of concerns that this would disrupt the European balance of
power to the disadvantage of its national security.
47 Leopold and Stockmar met in 1814 in their native Coburg. The latter became key
advisor to the King and later was transferred to the British court.
advantage while his German nationality distanced him sufficiently from Britain for France to view him as an acceptable choice.\footnote{At the age of twenty-six, on 2 May 1816, Leopold had married the English Princess Charlotte Augusta (1796-1817), granddaughter of George III and heiress apparent to the throne. (Charlotte Augusta of Great Britain, Ireland and Hanover was the only child of the Prince of Wales (later King George IV)). When Charlotte Augusta died after giving birth to a stillborn son, Leopold took the advice of Stockmar, then his personal physician, and remained in England. In the crisis of succession that followed the death of Princess Charlotte Augusta, Leopold urged the marriage of his sister, Princess Victoria of Saxe Coburg Saalfeld, to Edward, Duke of Kent, a son of King George III. The year after their marriage a daughter, Alexandrina Victoria was born. The Duke of Kent died in 1820 and Leopold, thereafter, carried much of the responsibility for his sister’s household and became mentor and surrogate father to his niece. Two useful works referencing the life of Leopold I are Holden, 1936 and Corti, [c. 1921], (1923). For references to Leopold I and financial management see Emerson, 1979, 21-22.}

As a young man Leopold was famous for his good looks and meticulous etiquette and early portraits of him as King of the Belgians frequently depict him with windblown, Byronic locks and on horseback.\footnote{Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 181. Leopold I was more practical than vain and, from an early age wore a thick wig to ward off head colds. This sober quality was reflected in both his private and political life.} He had little personal interest in art but understood its importance in creating national identity and appreciated its necessity in constructing a public image. His understanding was demonstrated in his choice to ride, on horseback and in uniform, to his inauguration ceremony in Brussels on 21 July 1831 from the royal residence in nearby Laeken and the event was duly commemorated in paintings. The King’s heroic representation was reinforced by the commissioning, shortly after his accession, of an “immense statue” of “Godfrey de Bouillon on horseback and clutching the flag of the First Crusade.” Its installation beside the royal residence of Château Laeken may have been meant to assuage concerns that the King was Lutheran and the
country decidedly Catholic. It was imperative Leopold I choose a queen of the
dominant faith and his marriage, in 1832, to Princess Louise-Marie provided Belgium
with this necessity and consolidated Belgium’s alliance with France. Of a deeply
spiritual character, Louise-Marie was also highly educated, fluent in French, English,
Italian, and German, had a passion for history, and exhibited a “lively, almost waspish,
sense of humour.”

Princess Victoria acceded to the throne on the death of William IV in 1837 and
was determined to establish her independence from both her mother, the Duchess of
Kent, and her uncle, Leopold I. Relations between Victoria and Leopold I became
strained as British Prime Minister Melbourne temporarily supplanted the King’s position

---

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/tyre-godfrey.html> (February 2006). Emerson
describes “Godfroid” de Boullion as one of two Belgian crusaders against the Turks
(Baudoin of Flanders being the other name noted) although Belgium did not exist then
and this reference likely relates to the general region. Emerson, 1979, 19.
51 Few portraits of Queen Louise-Marie were commissioned. As late as 1843 the King
responded to a request for an image of her by explaining “no good lithograph of Louise
yet exists but this will be remedied soon.” Note 8 p. 324 says this is probably the
lithograph of 1844 by de Grevedon ‘after’ Winterhalter. Leopold I to Emmanuel de
52 “Louise-Marie had wanted to marry the Prince of Calabria and regarded Leopold I as a
cold, morose man . . . .” according to Barbara Emerson; the relationship between the King
and Queen grew into mutual esteem. Emerson, 1979, 4. The birth of an heir to the
throne in 1833 relieved the Queen’s fears the infant would be female, and so not eligible
to inherit the throne, and brought a rare happiness to the King of the Belgians. Letter 48.
Jean Puraye et Hans-Otto Lang, 1973, 249. When the child died in 1834 he wrote from
Laeken to his sister Sophie, Princess of Saxe Coborg Saalfeld, “the beautiful baby that
you saw and who during his long sickness gave proof of a rare vital force, is no longer of
this world.” Leopold I was a “father of ashes” (“père de cendres”). (The King quotes
Puraye and Lang, 1973, 271. The subsequently arid environment of the Belgian court
was not alleviated by the birth of Léopold Brabant, less than a year later, nor by the birth
of Philippe of Flanders two years after that.
of mentor. The presence and diplomacy of Baron Stockmar, who had been sent to the British court as confidante and counsel for the young Queen, restored relations between niece and uncle and a lengthy visit to England by Queen Louise-Marie and Leopold I coinciding with Victoria’s coronation further reaffirmed family ties. Carrie Rebora Barratt states Victoria sat for portraits on seventy-two occasions between acceding to the throne and her coronation ceremony and Louise-Marie accompanied Victoria on several such occasions.

The Duchess of Kent had raised her daughter in a stringent environment and the young Queen Victoria exulted in such activities as sitting for portraits and made these “social affairs.” Having lacked “companionship for so long, [she] looked forward to spending time with her painters ….” Among artists to whom Victoria sat was Alfred Challon and she purchased his full-length watercolour portrait of herself in coronation robes as a gift for Leopold I - neatly declaring her affection for him while displaying her own imperial status. It was in this period that Victoria first sat to Ross and, pleased with the likeness, commissioned copies for distribution. As Richard Ormond and Carol

---

53 Lord Melbourne (1779-1848).
54 Stockmar continued to act on occasion as international emissary for the King of the Belgians after his transfer to the English court where he was appointed art advisor. Queen Victoria married Prince Albert at Windsor Castle, 8th December 1839. “I have received to-day (sic) an ungracious letter from Uncle Leopold. He appears to me to be nettled because I no longer ask for his advice, but dear Uncle is given to believe that he must rule the roast (sic) everywhere. However, this is not a necessity. As he has written to [Lord] Melbourne, ... [the appointment of Stockmar] will be a very good thing, because Stockmar understands all things English so well.” John Raymond, *Queen Victoria’s Early Letters* [1903] (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1963), 38-39.
55 In her discussions of a portrait of Queen Victoria by American artist Tomas Sully Rebora Barratt remarks on the political possibilities of his presence. “For a sovereign eager to spread her image across the globe, perhaps especially to former colonies, there could have been few more agreeable portrait opportunities.” Rebora Barratt, 2001, 18.
56 Ibid., 16-18.
57 Ibid.
Blackett-Ord recount, Louise-Marie first sat to Franz Xaver Winterhalter in 1838.58 She commissioned a double portrait of herself with her elder son, three-year-old Léopold Brabant, sending this painting as a gift to Queen Victoria. As a result of recommendations by Louise-Marie, her father, Louis-Philippe, and Victoria and Albert began to patronize Winterhalter. He was “an excellent man full of zeal for his art, of goodwill, obligingness and real modesty” Louise-Marie wrote to Victoria 16 May 1842.59 Winterhalter painted a half length portrait of Leopold I in civil dress in 1839 and was commissioned by Louis-Philippe in 1840 to paint a full-length portrait of Leopold “in the full dress uniform of a Belgian general in mounted order” for the museum at Versailles.60 The latter portrait was painted to hang as pendant to Winterhalter’s 1841 portrait of Louise-Marie. Winterhalter had also painted portraits of Louis-Philippe and of Marie-Amélie in 1840 and Victoria and Albert began to sit to him the same year soon after their marriage.61 Sitting to the “good and excellent” Winterhalter became an almost annual ritual for royalty and a right of passage for the aristocracy, especially as his paintings could be reliably reproduced through the studio managed by his brother Herman (1808-1891).62 By 7 June 1840 when Charlotte was born, Winterhalter had painted portraits of almost all her paternal and maternal relatives, as had William Charles Ross. It was a year in which Leopold I might have been expected to feel particular pride as it was the tenth anniversary of Belgium’s secession from the Netherlands, the nation’s first year as an officially acknowledged, independent nation state, and the year in which Queen Victoria

---

59 WRAY 977 78. Quoted in Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 37.
60 Ibid., 181.
61 Ibid.
62 “The marriage to Prince Albert revived the Coburg influence on the Queen’s tastes, an influence felt at once in the choice of portrait painters.” Oliver Millar, 1977, 170.
married Prince Albert, and Princess Victoire of Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld married the Duc de Nemours, both unions Leopold had brokered. He was nonetheless despondent, finding it tiresome to pose for a further portrait by Ross requested by Victoria and chafing at the limitations of his regal position. “Here one is shut up as if one was in a menagerie, walking round and round like a tame bear ….”63 The relationships he had established between the Belgian, French, and British royal families were flourishing regardless and the people of Belgium ready to embrace peace confident the monarchy was secured by the princes, Léopold Brabant and Philippe of Flanders.

**Exemplifying all Virtues**

In these circumstances Charlotte was particularly an asset to the Belgian monarchy’s public image. In 1841, the tenth anniversary of the Belgian monarchy, Ross painted a portrait of Charlotte wearing a dress that appears modeled on traditional Flemish costume though interpreted in richer materials (Figure 2.5). (Ross additionally painted a portrait of Louise-Marie for Victoria, a double portrait of Charlotte’s brothers on this visit.64 These paintings, or versions of them, were sent to Queen Victoria and others were produced for the French royal family.) In researching this costume, I have benefited from work done by Constance Fairfax who, in part, bases her interpretations on

---

63 The King continues “I wish I could have a *chassez-croises* with Otto” [Wittelsbach King of Greece] and ends on an unexpectedly vulnerable note, “… the more so as you do not any longer want me in the west.” Holden, 1936, 154-155.

64 WRAY 11/52. Delia Millar notes Victoria replied she wished separate paintings of the princes as these would better fit her album. The King and Queen of the Belgians retained the double portrait of the princes. WRAY 9/51-5. Delia Millar, 1996, 758.
paintings such as one by Hans Holbein and another by Pieter Brueghel which include figures wearing similar clothing (Figures 2.6 and 2.7).  

![Image of Princess Charlotte of Belgium and her clothing](image)

Figure 2.5. ‘After’ Sir William Charles Ross, *Princess Charlotte of Belgium when an infant*, c. 1842.  
Figure 2.6. (centre) Hans Holbein the Younger, *The Artist’s wife Elspeth Binzenstock and her two children Philip and Catherine* (detail), (1497-1543), 1528.  
Figure 2.7. (right) Pieter Brueghel the Elder, *Hay-Harvest* (detail), c.1525-1569.  

The significance of this apparel is its linking of the monarchy, through the figure of Charlotte, to Flemish culture and the popularity of this portrait is evident from the many copies made in formats varying from cards to sculptures. The type of front fastening on this dress is meant to accommodate a growing child and Charlotte appears to wear the same garment in a portrait which, based on her hair styling in other images, probably dates from 1844 (Figures 2.8 and 2.9). Millar includes an excerpt from a letter

---

65 I have borrowed Figure 6a and 6b from the website of Constance Fairfax. See: Constance Fairfax, “Ensemble for a Well-Off Peasant Child of Rural Flanders in 1560.” <http://ourworld.cs.com/_ht_a/constancefairfax/htm> (10 June 2006).  
66 Miniature versions ‘after’ Ross of Figure 2.5 and Figure 2.8 exist in the British Royal Collection (614167 and 420883). There is additionally an 18.4 x 16.6 cm watercolour replica by Sir William Charles Ross of the 1844 portrait of Princess Charlotte (RL I3806). Sculptures of this image were commissioned from G. Geefs and remain in the Belgian Royal Collections and the Museum of Fine Arts in Brussels.
by Louise-Marie indicating the later portrait was initiated by the King - Louise-Marie wrote Victoria requesting Ross be permitted to return to Belgium to “make a picture of Charlotte, your Uncle is anxious to have.” 67 The King of the Belgians had been initially indifferent to the birth of a daughter but by January 1842 was moved to declare “the great beauty of the family is little Charlotte; she is not yet two years of age but she is truly a little angel.” 68

The painting repeats the depiction of Charlotte in Flemish costume and its timing may have been motivated by a desire to display awareness on the part of the monarchy of the abject plight of people in the north of Belgium through the first half of the 1840s. 69 Flanders was experiencing widespread unemployment as machines replaced workers especially for mining and lace making. A famine from 1841 lasting into 1845 critically worsened this situation; the period is known as the Hunger Years. The choice of French as the language of education and government exacerbated unhappiness in Flanders, especially as French-speaking Wallonia was widely thought to be urbanizing at the expense of Flanders - a perception with continuing political resonance.

67 WRAY 11/52. Delia Millar, 1996, 759. (This portrait is sometimes mistakenly attributed to a sister of Louise-Marie, Princess Marie, Marie of Orléans (1813-1839) married to Duke Alexander of Württemberg).
68 3 January 1842. Letter No. 70. On 20 December 1843 the King writes, “Charlotte becomes from day to day more beautiful and more intelligent; a union of qualities of great importance.” Letter 74. Excerpts from letters 70, and 77, Leopold I to Emmanuel de Mensdorff-Pouilly husband of the King’s sister Sophie, Princess of Saxe Coburg Saalfeld. Puraye and Lang, 1973, 313, 331.
69 Documents Illustrating the History of Belgium, 1978, 357.
It is possible the princes, Léopold Brabant and Philippe of Flanders, were sometimes depicted in regional attire but I have not encountered examples of this - unless the black jacket, tasseled cap and wide white collar in an 1843 portrait of Prince Léopold have similar significance. If such costume images existed, gender expectations and class difference would have caused them to read quite differently. Regional dress was beginning to be worn on occasion by aristocratic women as fashionably exotic attire in the mid-nineteenth century but not by men of the same class.\textsuperscript{70} Growing concern among privileged classes was aroused by the discontent of peasant people and would have

\textsuperscript{70} There exists a double portrait of Prince Albert (1844-1900), second son of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, with Princess Helene (1846-1923), their third daughter, in which the five-year-old prince wears Highland dress. It was painted by Winterhalter in 1849 and a copy of the head of the young prince (from this painting) was commissioned as a gift to Victoria’s mother (sister of Leopold I) the Duchess of Kent. The authors note that after the death of the duchess in 1861, the latter painting “was given by the Queen, in remembrance of her mother to Baron Stockmar.” Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 193.
caused a portrait of the heir to the throne in regional costume to suggest an alarmingly liberal attitude.

Franz Xaver Winterhalter first painted a portrait of Charlotte in 1842 (Figure 2.10). Seated on a red velvet cushion, Charlotte holds hyacinths and roses, and wears a white dress (like a child’s version of adult court style) with large blue ribbons at the shoulders.71 With concepts of childhood still evolving from a widely held attitude of children as small adults towards one considering childhood as a distinct phase of life, allusions to adulthood in portraits of children were frequent.72 This, too, was an extensively reproduced portrait and, in addition to the replica commissioned for the museum at Versailles, two versions remain in the Royal Collections of Belgium and another is displayed at Miramare Castle.73 Queen Louise-Marie gave the original work to Queen Victoria as a Christmas gift in December 1842. In her accompanying letter Louise-Marie writes:

Your great kindness for us and Charlotte and your amiable wish so often expressed to have her picture by Winterhalter lithographed led me to believe, the picture itself might be agreeable to you. Your Uncle is not quite satisfied with it, but I must confess, I think the head very like and quite in the character of the Child. The Drawing of the figure is not good, but unfortunately Drawing is not the strong part of Winterhalter.74

---

71 Ibid., 182.
72 In Winterhalter’s painting of two year old Charlotte the two roses and single hyacinth she holds might have read, in a contemporary language of flowers, as portents of female ‘blossoming.’ At about the same time that Winterhalter painted the portrait of Charlotte seated on a cushion, he was commissioned to paint a portrait of the English princess, Victoria, and depicted her also wearing a white dress and seated on a red cushion. Reproductions of this portrait can be purchased on the web. <http://www.intofineart.com/htmlfind/artist-0500152.html> (2005).
73 Letter from the Queen Louise-Marie to Queen Victoria, WRA. 22 December 1842, quoted in Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 182.
Victoria wrote to Louise-Marie expressing her pleasure in the painting and saying it was “placed in the Queen’s Sitting-Room at Buckingham Palace.”

Figure 2.10. F. X. Winterhalter, *Princess Charlotte*, 1842.

---

Ibid. Buckingham Palace then served as residence for the Duchess of Kent (mother of Victoria and sister of Leopold I) and was used for official functions.
Queen Victoria and Prince Albert visited Belgium in 1843 and Leopold I took the opportunity to encourage his niece and nephew to purchase works by Belgian artists.\textsuperscript{76} Yet in a letter to Victoria the same year he warned it was necessary to exercise “great prudence” in dealing with artists as they “are acquainted with all classes of society and for that reason, dangerous; they are hardly ever satisfied, and when you have too much to do with them, you are sure to have \textit{des ennuis} ….”\textsuperscript{77} This caution was prompted by Victoria having turned to her uncle for advice when Prince Albert wished to invite artists and intellectuals to the English court. Perhaps as a compromise Baron Stockmar’s position changed at this time to art advisor and provided Albert someone reliable with whom he could converse and seek “guidance on a wide variety of artistic questions ….”\textsuperscript{78}

In 1844 two paintings by Belgian artist Gustave Wappers were added to Queen Victoria’s collection and Oliver Millar thinks it likely Leopold I also urged Victoria and Albert to patronize another Belgian artist, Louis Gallait (1810-1887).\textsuperscript{79} Wappers had painted portraits of members of the Belgian royal family before the birth of Charlotte but

\textsuperscript{76} For an authoritative account of the development of the art collection of Queen Victoria and The Prince Consort, as well as earlier and later sovereigns, see Oliver Millar, 1977. 
\textsuperscript{77} Leopold I to Victoria c. 1843, quoted in Holden, 1936, 149.
\textsuperscript{79} Millar, 1977, 147. Portraits also served to weave together members of the court when these were commissioned of retainers for royalty or, conversely, when royalty gave portraits of themselves to retainers as gifts. Stockmar sat to Winterhalter in 1847, as did Mlle d’Hulst, a close friend of Queen Louise-Marie and later governess of Charlotte. In 1849 Queen Victoria commissioned a portrait of her Lady of the Bedchamber, Lady Canning. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 129, 199, 194.
appears not to have made a portrait of the Princess.\textsuperscript{80} In 1846 Gallait painted a portrait for Victoria of Leopold I wearing the robes of the Order of the Garter.

Like Ross, Franz Xaver Winterhalter was commissioned to paint a portrait of Charlotte in regional dress in 1844 (Figure 2.11). Winterhalter depicts Charlotte in a black, hooded cloak over a white dress in the manner of ‘\textit{la coiffe brabançonne},’ a fashion popular in the French-speaking domain of Brabant, Belgium, as illustrated in a nineteenth-century ethnographic print by Markaert (Figure 2.12).\textsuperscript{81} As with the depictions of Charlotte in Flemish dress, this image was also reproduced for royal relatives and circulated in economical formats. A note on the back of the original states that it was painted in Paris.

\textsuperscript{80} Among early portraits by Wappers of members of the royal family is a ‘presentation of the heir’ double portrait of Queen Louise-Marie holding her first son, Prince Louis-Philippe, who must have died very soon after this was painted. It is possible it was a memorial painting commission after the death of the infant prince and this would explain the dry and stilted image in comparison to more Romantic large historical works for which Wappers was highly respected.

\textsuperscript{81} Mia Kerckvoorde also describes the dress of Charlotte in this painting in these terms in: Mia Kerckvoorde, \textit{Charlotte, première princesse de Belgique, dernière impératrice du Mexique: la passion et la fatalité} (Paris; Gembloux: Editions Duculot, 1981), op. 128. This book was made available to me through the generosity of Gertrude Baelde and I thank her for this and for sharing her other images of Charlotte. Depictions of regional dress were popular in the nineteenth century especially as coloured lithographs. ‘\textit{La Faille comincia a passar di moda}’ below Maekart’s image roughly translates as ‘faille is beginning to go out of fashion.’ Faille is a “[l]ight, soft, glossy silk or rayon cloth fabric with a cross-wise rib effect. Similar to grosgrain but much softer, faille has been used since the mid-19th century for many women’s garments, especially coats and dresses.” Georgina O’Hara’s \textit{Encyclopedia of Fashion} (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1986), 106. I thank staff at New York Public Library for providing this additional information relating to the copy of this image in their collection.
King Louis-Philippe returned the 1843 visit made to France by Victoria and Albert in 1844 and they in turn made a further, non-official, visit to the French monarchs in 1845.\textsuperscript{82} As the date for the latter visit drew close, Louise-Marie wrote to her mother, 

\begin{quotation}
Queen Marie-Amélie did not accompany King Louis-Philippe but sent two miniature portraits to Queen Victoria in that year. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 181. Victoria and Albert visited the Belgian court on the same journey. Queen Victoria subsequently wrote to Leopold I, “I hold up Charlotte as an example of every virtue ….” September 1843. Quoted in Holden, 1936, 149. The King did not think Victoria and Albert models of comportment or compassion during this visit. “My young visitors from England …
\end{quotation}

\textsuperscript{82}
Queen Marie-Amélie, stressing that Victoria wished an informal visit and social aspects should be emphasized over those of a political nature. Louise-Marie’s letters reveal her knowledge of matters of state and a subsequent portrait by Winterhalter documenting the visit indicates her advice was taken (Figure 2.13). On the left wall can be seen Winterhalter’s earlier painting commemorating Louis-Philippe’s visit to England and at the right, on the back wall, a copy of his state portrait of Louise-Marie. Winterhalter quotes one of his portraits of Victoria to the left of that of Louise-Marie, and what is sometimes referred to as his portrait of Albert (but which seems more to resemble one he painted of the Duke of Orléans who died the previous year) is to the left of Victoria’s portrait. Queen Victoria, Queen Marie-Amélie, and other women of the royal household are seated wearing day dress and bonnets in the Galerie Victoria at the Château d’Eu, children beside them or in their arms; their royal male counterparts stand behind them.

The figures of Louis-Philippe, left, and Prince Albert, right, frame Queen Victoria in the displayed prodigious bad grace” and were “churlish” in their disapproval of his sister Anna Fedorova, Grand Duchess of Russia, Princess of Saxe Coburg Saalfeld who was also visiting. Her life had been one of misfortune and was unconventional. “It is a real shame that such a beautiful personality, with many qualities ... has been put in a position where she cannot realize these and in which she has so little joy” wrote Leopold I. The King’s comments are of interest in relation to his later expectations of Charlotte. He would continue to be a major influence in Charlotte’s life until his death at the end of 1865. Leopold I at Laeken to Emmanuel de Mensdorff-Pouilly. 20 December 1843. Letter 77. Puraye and Lang, 1973, 329.

83 Holden, 1936, 147; Suzanne d’Huart, 1981, 530.

centre of the composition. Nearest the viewer on the left is the widowed Duchess of Orléans.

Figure 2.13. F. X. Winterhalter, *Queen Victoria and Prince Albert with the French royal family at Château d’Eu*, 1845.

Queen Marie-Amélie is seated on the middle right and, closest to the viewer on the right, is Clémentine, wife of Augustus. Included in Ormond and Blackett-Ord’s description of this painting are two quotes reproduced here for their pertinence to the production and circulation of art in the mid-nineteenth century. The gallery depicted by Winterhalter

---

85 A full description can be found in Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 188.
86 In 1843 the King of the Belgians had achieved a further liaison between his Coburg relations and the French royal family by arranging the marriage of Prince Augustus of Saxe Coburg Saalfeld (Kohary) - brother of Victoire, Duchesse de Nemours - to Princess Clémentine d’Orléans, sister to Queen Louise-Marie, 20 April 1843.
was described by Queen Victoria in her journal as “[a] pretty room, full of pictures representing our last visit here, & also the King’s visit to Windsor.”

Three weeks later the Queen of the Belgians wrote to Victoria: “I don’t know if you know that Winterhalter is painting a picture de la presentation of my Father’s grandsons to you.”

On the 19 October Queen Louise-Marie wrote again mentioning that she had been told preparatory sketches for the painting were “delightful.”

There was a precedent in regard to documentation of royal visits between the British and French courts as Winterhalter had previously been commissioned to paint the scene of Louis-Philippe’s 1844 reception at Windsor Castle. In that painting the British heir to the English throne, Prince Edward, was featured; in the Château d’Eu painting the young boy extending his hand to Queen Victoria is Louis, Count of Paris, who had become heir to the French throne on the death of his father, the Duke of Orléans.

Léopold Brabant and Philippe of Flanders are not among the grandsons of the King and Queen of the French who are presented to Victoria and Prince Albert but Queen Louise-Marie is included by means of her portrait. (The King of the Belgians and children of the Belgian royal family do not appear presumably because they represented another dynastic line). The protocol of who might be pictured with whom, on which occasion, and in what manner - whether as figure in a background portrait or a miniature portrait and in terms of

---

87 *Queen Victoria’s Journal*, 8 September 1845, quoted in Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 188.
89 Letter from Queen Louise-Marie to Queen Victoria, 19 October 1845, W.R.A. (*Ibid*).
90 It was Hélène, Duchess of Orléans, who sat, wearing mourning, to William Ross in 1842 as noted above.
placement in front or behind another figure - was complex and hinged on gender, status, and political exigencies.

In 1846 King Louis-Philippe sought to re-establish dynastic links between France and Spain in contravention of an agreement between France and England prohibiting marriages between the French and Spanish courts.91 As a result the Entente Cordiale between France and England was disrupted and while there were few repercussions for Belgium, it was a severe blow to the aims of Leopold I who had diligently connected the three royal families. Writing to Queen Victoria early in the 1840s the British Prime Minister, Lord Melbourne, commented “[t]he King Léopold [I] … still hankers after Greece; but crowns will not bear to be chopped and changed about in this manner.”92 Leopold I never fully resigned himself to the outcome of negotiations in 1830 when he accepted and then rejected the crown of Greece.93 A little known portrait of Charlotte by Louis Gallait in which she is depicted wearing Greek costume raises questions as to its meaning in this context (Figure 2.14).94 Charlotte is seated on the edge of a throne or ornately carved chair on the back of which can be seen part of a heraldic, standing-lion motif such as is included on the royal arms of Leopold I. A swath of lustrous fabric, possibly a train, spills over the chair arm onto the carpet. Behind the chair is a paneled

91 In 1846 the young Spanish queen Marie Isabella married her cousin, Francisco de Asís, and her sister, Luisa Fernanda, married a son of Louis-Philippe and Queen Marie-Amélie, the duc de Montpensier. The union provoked consternation in Britain where it was feared the existing balance of power had been jeopardized. Leopold I earlier attempted to arrange a marriage between Marie Isabella and a Coburg prince.
94 Belgian artist Louis Gallait was esteemed for his history paintings and patronized by the French court as well as the English and Belgian courts.
wall upon which a painting or tapestry appears to include the image of a boar.95 The precedent set by portraits of Charlotte in 1842 and 1844 by Ross (in which she wears Flemish dress) and in 1844 by Winterhalter (in which she wears regional Brabant costume) linked the monarchy to these main constituencies; this raises the possibility of political significance in the Gallait painting but a personal motivation is more likely. It seems only to have been reproduced in a 1927 publication commemorating Charlotte’s death, so was probably a private image with private meanings, perhaps related to the constitution King Otto (1815-1867) was forced to grant in 1843.96

---

95 Perhaps one of the Belgian royal family’s Gobelin tapestries.
96 Otto, alternatively Otho or Othon, of Wittelsbach (1815-1867). Reigned 1836-1862. Otto’s consort, Queen Amalie (1818-75), of Greece developed a national dress modeled on regional costumes but this is not what Charlotte wears in this image.
Figure 2.14. Louis Gallait, *Untitled (Princess Charlotte in Greek Costume)*, c. 1846.

The caption below its reproduction describes the portrait as painted in 1846 when Greece won its independence but this is inaccurate as Greece was independent from 1832. Charlotte’s long ringlets appear in other portraits documented as painted in 1844 and the original of this painting more likely dates from this year when the Constitution was promulgated. The King of the Belgians would have drawn some satisfaction from the

---

97 The Constitution was soon subverted and “patronage, manipulation, and, at times, outright force continued to characterize the politics of the postconstitutional period.” “Building the nation, 1832-1913”
repressive and unpopular King Otto being forced to grant a Constitution. A portrait of
Charlotte in Greek costume would have been inflammatory had it become public given
continuing interest in Greece on the part of Leopold I; while this seems not to have
happened, it is plausible at least two copies were produced.\(^9\) There is an uncatalogued
1846 painting in the Royal English Collection by Gallait and the painting illustrated in
1827 is from a private collection in Athens.\(^9\) It is likely these are copies made in 1846 of
an untraced earlier original that remained in Belgium.

**Revisualizing the Belgian royal family**

During Belgium’s first tenuous decade, visual representations of Leopold I conveyed the heroism or stoicism expected of a soldier-king through his expression,
posture and uniform. In double portraits produced following his 1832 marriage to
Louise-Marie, the modest pose and dress of the Queen had the effect of heightening his
stalwart demeanour. The tenor of these somber official images was little changed by the
additional images of the young princes as, being heir and heir apparent, their
representations were modeled on that of Leopold I. Belgium celebrated its tenth
anniversary in 1840 and the tenth anniversary of the monarchy in 1841. Together with its
formal ratification as a nation state in 1839, these events marked the beginning of a new
era and demanded a transformation of the public image of the monarchy reflective of
peace, stability and changing concepts of the family unit. In addition, trends toward

---

\(^9\) The inventory of the Museum of the Dynasty lists a painting entitled *Leopold, King of
Greece*. No date is given and I have not viewed this work but it was probably painted in
the short interval between Leopold’s acceptance of the throne of Greece and his decision
to reject this proposal. Xerox copy of Inventory, n.d.

\(^9\) Enquiries regarding this portrait in the British Royal Collection have not resulted in
information that would confirm or preclude this assumption.
Realism in art, the advent of mass production, and a growing market for collectable prints exerted their influence as depictions of the royal family became available to a more diversified and informed audience. Charlotte’s birth was fortuitous as her presence facilitated a revision of the imperial family image to one harmonious with these new circumstances. The changes were slight but significant. Images of individual royal family members all derived from portraits by Winterhalter paintings that were copied and rearranged as modules. Compositions became less rigid and less hierarchical and sometimes depicted gestures of affection. Occasionally Leopold I is shown seated and Louise-Marie is shown standing.  

Contrary to her liminal status, Charlotte occupies a central position in many compositions. In one example Charlotte, then about five years of age, leans against her mother’s knee (Figure 2.15). Her resemblance to the King is emphasized through the proximity of their faces, one above the other (a nimbus of sunlight emphasizes the head of Leopold I) and both in three-quarter profile. The sides of a settee contain the solid, triangular group formed by the King, Queen, and Princess. In this combination, the Princes are somewhat poignantly separated from their parents and sister by the settee and occupy the other half of the picture. In other versions the figures are regrouped and their changed positions shift the implied relationships between family members (Figures 2.16 and 2.17).

---

100 The authority of seated or standing poses - and comparative height - has implications for gender constructions as Homans describes in her analysis of double portrait photographs of Albert and Victoria. “[H]eight conveys power, so that portraits with both husband and wife seated or standing will “naturally” represent the husband as more authoritative … Typically in Victorian marital portraits the husband stands while the wife sits …. The poses emphasize their difference and perhaps also suggest her bodily weakness and his strength.” Homans, 1993, 35.
One unusual family grouping may have been produced after the time it portrays (Figure 2.18). Queen Louise-Marie is drawn almost the same height as the King and appears to rest her left hand on her husband’s back while his right hand rests on Charlotte’s
shoulder. The picture is drawn from a viewpoint to the side and behind the royal family, close-up and cropped, giving it a ‘snapshot’ quality more common to compositions from later decades of the nineteenth century. The gaze of a court attendant directs attention towards Charlotte who is again situated at the centre of the composition.

Figure 2.18. Artist unknown, *Untitled (Belgian Royal Family and courtier)*, n.d.

In 1847 rumours spread that the King of the Belgians was restless and considering an extended trip to Sicily and Italy. Queen Marie Amélie was the daughter of Ferdinand I, King of the Two Sicilies and Austrian Archduchess Marie Caroline and had been born at Caserta in Sicily. Marie Amélie and Louis-Philippe met in Sicily and married there in 1809. Their first son, Ferdinand, and two daughters, Louise-Marie and Marie of Orléans,
were born in Sicily and it was not unreasonable that Louise-Marie and Leopold I would travel to her homeland. When it became known, however, that Louise-Marie was to remain in Belgium as Regent, concerns were raised in Europe. This proposed arrangement was considered the “equivalent of giving the reins of the monarchy over to the King of the French, father of the queen.”

Ferdinand II of the Two Sicilies (1810-1859) “had introduced an “[a]bsolutist and coercive regime which flouted every principle of liberty that had been recognized in the Western countries” and Leopold I and the British government had attempted to intercede. The intentions of Leopold I in proposing to travel in this region remain uncertain as his plan was disrupted by the revolutions of 1848. Whereas in France Louis-Philippe had become less liberal in his policies, Leopold I had reluctantly recognized the need to respond to public demands for political reform, most importantly by expanding the franchise as had been done in Britain in 1832, and the Belgian and British monarchies survived intact. Louis-Philippe was forced to abdicate and the French royal family were given sanctuary in Britain. The ties Leopold I had diligently established with the Orléans now became a humiliating disadvantage. Leopold I offered his abdication but it was not accepted. So efficient was his constitutional monarchy that, in Egon Corti’s opinion,

---

103 Revolutions elsewhere in Europe in that year caused the abdication of the Austrian emperor in favour of his nephew, eighteen-year-old Franz Josef, brother of Charlotte’s future husband, Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian. In the Italian provinces of Lombardy-Venetia (where Charlotte and Archduke Maximilian would briefly become viceroy and vicereine) nationalists rose against Austrian control, the Risorgimento movement having given rise to an earlier struggle for independence in 1830, but were again suppressed.
And in the arena of international diplomacy Leopold I was well respected and an effective arbiter for Belgium. An illustration records the moment when the King’s offer to abdicate was rejected in a scene illuminated by light from a nearby window (Figure 2.19). Charlotte is seen as a diminutive figure standing close to Queen Louise-Marie and holding her arm. As the Queen stands slightly behind Leopold I the effect is to situate Charlotte prominently to the right of the King; Léopold Brabant stands to the left of the King.

Figure 2.19. Signature illegible, Leopold I offers to abdicate the throne in February 1848, 1848.

---

104 Corti, [1921], 1923, 20l.
105 In the assessment of Holden, Leopold I was “the greatest European of the nineteenth century” in terms of his dismissal of “stifling prejudices of nationalism” and because his “character and vision saved him from [an] intolerant and narrow outlook ….” Holden, 1936, 276.
Leopold I was respected for his political acumen and the stability of his reign but he was never as well liked as Queen Louise-Marie who was Catholic and whose marriage to the King was understood to have been a personal sacrifice. Ill-feeling generated by rumours in 1847 that Leopold I was dissatisfied with his position were exacerbated two years later when the King’s mistress provoked public disapproval by driving through town holding their newborn son.¹⁰⁶ Ashdown remarks Leopold I “knew that the Belgian bourgeoisie, the mass of his supporters, looked to the throne for an example of domestic piety” and kept his private life discrete with this exception. A royal family image produced about this time presents a visual affirmation of royal family solidarity. It remains the most familiar image of the first Belgian royal family (Figure 2.20).¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ Ashdown, 1981, 58.
¹⁰⁷ Arcadie Meyer von Eppinghoven, nee Claret de Viescourt (1826-1897). Two sons were born from this relationship: Georg von Eppinghoven (1849-1904) and Arthur von Eppinghoven (1852-1940).
In this group portrait it is only Charlotte’s image which differs from previous representations but all the figures derive from portraits by Winterhalter. Charlotte sat to Winterhalter for a portrait in Paris in 1847 given to Queen Victoria by Queen Louise as a birthday present (Figure 2.21).\textsuperscript{108} In that painting Charlotte is shown wearing a fitted

\textsuperscript{108} Several portraits of the British royal family by Winterhalter are major artworks with no equivalent in Belgium. On occasion Prince Albert involved himself in the creation of these images, insisting, for instance, that Winterhalter paint “fine turquoise-blue skies” in one family portrait, and proposing motifs and composition in another. Fulford, 1968, 281; Lloyd, 1992, 90. The opportunity offered by family portraits of portraying Queen
black jacket over her pink dress whereas she does not wear the jacket in the family portrait. It is unclear if there were two separate original portraits or if this difference was an artistic amendment to provide better contrast with Philippe’s dark uniform behind her.

Herman Winterhalter (1808-1891) is listed as the artist for the painting given to Queen Victoria’s but Franz Xaver is the artist for that in the Belgian Royal Collections according to inventory lists. The image in which Charlotte wears a jacket was copied as a miniature and also combined with portraits of the princes for a card (Figures 2.22 and 2.23).  

Victoria in a ‘domestic’ setting was significant in constructing a socially acceptable persona for a female ruler. 

Winterhalter’s brother Herman may have produced the original image or have copied one ‘after’ Franz Xaver. Both brothers sought refuge in Belgium during the 1848 revolutions and were in Belgium and in England through 1849 as a result.
Figure 2.21. F. X. Winterhalter, *Princess Charlotte*, c. 1849.

Figure 2.22. Artist unknown, ‘after’ F. X. Winterhalter, *Princess Charlotte*, n.d.
Figure 2.23. D.I. Desvachez, ‘after’ F.X. Winterhalter, *Léopold, Duke of Brabant (later Leopold II), Philippe, Count of Flanders, Princess Charlotte*, c. 1849.
Following the abdication of Louis-Philippe, and in defiance of assessments by Leopold I, Queen Louise-Marie staunchly believed France could revert to a monarchy and actively sought to achieve reconciliation between factions of the Orléans for the purpose of promoting this outcome.\textsuperscript{110} Louise-Marie also urged her parents to relocate to Sicily where she felt they would have greater dignity and security and a climate more conducive to their health but Louis-Philippe died on 26 August 1850.\textsuperscript{111} Already strained by the circumstances of her family and unwell for many months, Louise-Marie’s condition rapidly deteriorated and she died in Ostende, Flanders, 11 November 1850 (Figure 2.24).\textsuperscript{112}

Figure 2.24. Artist unknown, \textit{Derniers moments de S. M. la première Reine des Belges décédé à Ostende, 11 November 1850, 1850.}

\textsuperscript{110} Holden, 1936, 182-183.
\textsuperscript{111} Huart, [1935], 1981.
\textsuperscript{112} When Queen Louise-Marie died Victoria “implored Leopold to be allowed to write to him not only on her customary Tuesdays, but on Fridays as well, the day she had always written to Louise-Marie …” Prince Albert described Louise-Marie (with exaggeration understandable in the circumstances) as Victoria’s “only confidante, her only friend ….” Holden, 1936, 186.
A formulaic scene of Louise-Marie’s dying moments is characteristic of images produced immediately after her death. Ten-year-old Charlotte is central in the foreground and family, court and government members are seen gathered around the queen’s deathbed. The saintliness attributed to Queen Louise-Marie in life was magnified upon her death and the proliferation of death scenes was followed by images depicting her apotheosis such as her visual representation in the Brussels Museum of Fine Arts. Given the scarcity of portraits of the Queen, the choice to represent her in this manner glorifies her death over her life. Louise-Marie had been ‘the good little queen’ of the Belgian people; after 1850 this mantle of morality and feminine propriety passed to Charlotte (Figure 2.25).

113 This image reflects nineteenth-century attitudes towards death and presages the many depictions, prevalent through the next decades, of dying women such as examples by members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood. See, for instance, Pearce, 1991. The second section of Chapter Six includes a discussion of this theme and its significance in relation to portraits of Charlotte.
Images of Charlotte between 1850 and 1856 vary little from her image in the last royal family portrait prior to the death of Queen Louise-Marie. In most instances Charlotte’s images continue to be ‘after’ earlier portraits by Winterhalter but these often seem inflected by copyist’s sense of national tragedy.114 One exception is a portrait of her at the age of eleven painted by Edwin Landseer (1808-1873) when she visited Britain with

---

114 Signs of ‘incipient madness’ have sometimes been read into Charlotte’s early images with disregard for social or artistic conventions, preferences of the portrait’s commissioner, and style or inclinations of the artist. Haslip, for example, builds a case for mental instability with observations such as “… her eyes [which] had kept the look of melancholy that characterized them as a child ….” Haslip, 1971, 124.
Leopold I and Philippe, Count of Flanders (Figure 2.26). The purpose of their visit was to attend the Great Exhibition organized to a large extent by Prince Albert. Landseer and Ross were among the few British artists patronized by Queen Victoria and it is probable it was she who commissioned this painting as a gift for Charlotte or for Leopold I. While Charlotte’s contemplative and elongated figure, the rose she holds, and the atmospheric background probably reference the recent death of Louise-Marie, Charlotte is portrayed as a graceful figure and no longer a young child. The original painting is in the Belgian Royal Collections and a copy in the Royal Collection in Britain. It seems not to have appeared in other formats except for a newspaper reproduction; a painting of the head of Charlotte from Landseer’s full-length portrait of her may have been separately commissioned (see Figure 7.25).

115 From Buckingham Palace Leopold I wrote to Emmanuel de Mensdorff-Pouilly: “Here we find all in good health. The great exhibition is, in effect, marvelous and unique of its kind ….” Responding to enquiries regarding his family, Leopold continues “[t]he convalescence of Charlotte is progressing satisfactorily.” The King refers here to Charlotte’s grief at the death of Queen Louise-Marie seven months earlier. 19 June 1851. Letter 102. Puraye and Lang, 1973, 401.

116 Ormond, 1977; Rebora Barratt, 2001. This image of Charlotte, apparently ‘after’ Landseer’s painting, recently appeared on a private website. No information is available.

That so few individual or group portraits of the Belgian royal family date from the early 1850s may be attributed to the absence of Louise-Marie, who was integral to the production of such images, and to social and political circumstances markedly different from those of the previous decades. With the exile of the Orléans in Britain, followed by death of Louis-Philippe and that of Louise-Marie, the web of connections between France, Britain, and Belgium was in disarray. One consequence was a diminished exchange of portraits, commensurate with the political value of such exchanges. The
influence of Leopold I had lessened in Britain and, to some extent, in Europe; wary of the regime that Louis Napoleon, nephew of Napoleon Bonaparte, had abruptly established in France, Leopold I was contemplating other alliances, notably with Austria. Further, public interest in Charlotte was gradually diverted by the increasing public profile of Léopold Brabant as he began to participate in foreign and economic concerns.\textsuperscript{118}

Leopold I remained the major force in shaping Belgian foreign policy and this was usually in close harmony with that of Britain, especially on the issue of renewed nationalist agitation in Italian states. In 1848, Corti writes the

\begin{quote}
\ldots insurrection in Italy concerned (Leopold I) \ldots for England and France were interested in the question of the unification of Italy, and their interests were not identical; a fact, which, \ldots always made King Leopold particularly sensitive. Hence his interference in Italian matters was \ldots appreciable, and he drew up innumerable plans for the adjustment of differences and the establishment of a situation which should ensure peace, yet be in harmony with his own wishes \ldots.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{“[T]he idea of unification,”} Corti continues, “had spread far and wide” in Italy. It has been argued that while desire for independence was absolute in the Italian states, the idea of unification was less widely embraced as there was support for independent states retaining their identity.\textsuperscript{119} Leopold I, unlike Louis Napoleon, did not support nationalist concepts and his particular interests would have informed his perspective.\textsuperscript{120} Continuing
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{118} Emerson, 1979, 22.
\textsuperscript{119} See for instance, Ascoli and Von Henneberg, 2001; Whyte, [1930], 1962. Regarding the associated sense of betrayal felt by artists of the Macchia movement in relation to the outcome of the Risorgimento, see Boime, 1993.
\textsuperscript{120} “In Leopold’s opinion nationalism was a dangerous principle which might be universally applied \ldots.” Holden, 1936, 181.
British humanitarian concerns for the Italian populations were coloured by issues of defense and commerce.

The [Risorgimento] movement in Italy, which was inspired by Liberalism as well as Nationalism, was greatly encouraged by the Liberals of England, when, in 1846, Lord John Russell came to power, with Palmerston as Minister of Foreign Affairs … England had, for various reasons, embraced the idea of the unification of Italy. ¹²¹

Corti points out a united and independent Italy had the potential to be an important ally to Britain in case of French aggression. In 1852 Louis Napoleon fulfilled premonitions held by many in the British Parliament, and by Leopold I, when he staged a coup and declared himself Napoleon III, Emperor of the French. Any possibility the Italian states would act in Britain’s interest in the event of French threats against Britain was complicated by maneuvers of Camillo Benso (Count Cavour) Minister of Foreign Affairs in Italian Piedmont-Sardinia to engage the assistance of Napoleon III in winning independence from Austria.

The Orléans’s exile in England was ameliorated by close connections and frequent visits with the English and Belgian royal families and these ties continued to generate portraits. One unusual example is a double portrait commissioned from Winterhalter by Queen Victoria of herself and Victoire, Duchesse of Nemours.¹²² Victoire was a cousin to both Victoria and Albert and had been a childhood friend of the prince; the painting, a present for Albert, records the affection between Victoria and Victoire and, more broadly, royal family connections between the Coburgs and

¹²¹ Corti, [1924], 1923, 202-203.
Orléans. In the same year, 1852, the appointment of Countess Caroline de Grunne (1829-1913) as *dame du palais* for Charlotte commenced what would become an important and enduring friendship. The marriage of Léopold Brabant, to Archduchess Marie Henriette of Austria brought further changes to the Belgian court in 1853. On a personal level, for both the bride and the groom, it was the least successful alliance Leopold I ever negotiated. Initially, Charlotte enjoyed the presence of her sister-in-law and sought to defend her from the sarcasm for which Léopold Brabant was already infamous. But by 1856 Charlotte protested “I am being saturated with concerts. Marie has been arranging concerts with opera singers every two or three weeks. It is so dull.” Marie Henriette was passionate about Italian opera and Charlotte must have gained some appreciation of this genre despite her reluctance to do so as she later appears to have commissioned several paintings with operatic themes. As a constitutional

---

123 Victoire, Duchess of Nemours, was (patrilineal) cousin to Princess Charlotte as well as her (matrilineal) aunt since the Duke of Nemours was brother to Queen Louise-Marie. Franz Xaver Winterhalter continued to be Queen Victoria’s favourite artist, and a valued friend, until the end of his career though poor health prevented him from fulfilling all her late commissions as discussed in Chapter 4.

124 Reinach-Foussmagne, 1925, 80-81. Charlotte received as rigorous and broad an education as did the princes. She was expected to attain a position of authority and, perhaps as Leopold I was aware Victoria had been ill-prepared for her role as Queen, was permitted from the age of eleven to attend meetings of Ministers of State. For details on the education on the royal children see Emerson, 1979, 7-8; also Greet Donckers, “Een koninklijke poppenkast. Gender in het Belgisch koningshuis.” “Notes and Appendices: Royal household staff including educators.” (Ph.D. diss., University of Ghent, 2008). Online. <http://www.ethesis.net/koningshuis/koningshuis_bibliografie.htm> (August 2008).

125 Leopold I held this “*esprit taquin*” to have been inherited from the Orléans. “The three children, a good deal owing to Leo, have a trick of not admiring things, finding everything *ennuyeux*, which is very childish and, I trust, will wear off.” Leopold I to Queen Victoria, 18 November, 1853. Quoted in Emerson, 1979, 16-17. This was not the case with Léopold Brabant and a decade later Queen Victoria complained of Philippe, Count of Flanders, that he “laughs and ridicules everyone, and wishes to live only for himself.” Queen Victoria to Leopold I, 1863. Quoted in Holden, 1936, 252-3.

monarch, Leopold I officially held little power but his skillful negotiation of royal alliances effectively shaped Belgian foreign policy and extended Coburg influence.\footnote{Or to impede other’s attempts to gain influence, as Corti remarks in regard to Napoleon III. Leopold I “had also done much to prevent Napoleon III’s attempt to connect himself with the English Royal House by marriage.” Corti, [c.1921] 1923, 234. The King’s accomplishments in this respect were far-ranging and included the marriage of a nephew to the Queen Regent of Portugal and yet another to the Brazilian Princess Imperial; however, the marriage he orchestrated for his heir was a personal misfortune for Leopold Brabant and Marie Henriette to the extent that it impinged on the reputation of the Belgian monarchy.} The marriage of his heir to a cousin of the Austrian imperial family reflected his view that “Catholic Austria, with its numerous non-German population, [was] a valuable counter-poise to the dangerous pan-Germanism of Prussia.”\footnote{Holden, 1936, 171. Holden intimates that Leopold I initially hoped to arrange a marriage between Charlotte and Emperor Franz Josef of Austria. Franz Joseph had visited the Belgium court shortly after becoming Emperor and the King of the Belgians was impressed with him but Charlotte was then a child. Emperor Franz Josef became engaged in 1853, the year this photograph of Charlotte was taken, to his cousin Elizabeth of Wittlesbach (1837-1898) and they married in 1854. Ibid., 238.} A hand-coloured, photographic portrait of Charlotte in costume ball gown dating from 1853 is interesting for its medium and its indirect reflection of connections being constructed between Belgium and Austria (Figure 2.27).\footnote{Substantial planning and expense was involved in masquerade balls with elaborate Period costumes. The resulting effect was frequently recorded in a photographic or painted portrait. Of special note is Franz Xaver’s portrait of Empress Eugénie of France dressed as Marie Antoinette (Marie Antoinette was aunt to Queen Marie-Amélie), and Edwin Landseer’s 1842 depiction of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert in costume de ball on 1842. See Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, and Homans, 1993, respectively.} Martine Vermeire suggests Charlotte may be dressed as Maria Theresa (1717-1780), Archduchess of Austria and Queen of Hungary and Bohemia, Holy Roman Empress (consort), and grandmother of Charlotte’s maternal grandmother. An Austrian theme for the ball would also have acknowledged the
homeland of Marie Henriette.\textsuperscript{130} This earliest publicly known photographic portrait of Charlotte hangs with one of Marie Henriette who also wears costume.\textsuperscript{131}

Soon after the marriage of the younger Léopold to Marie Henriette, Leopold I began discussions with Queen Victoria and Prince Albert regarding suitable matches for Charlotte and for Victoria, the Princess Royal. In 1855 or early 1856 Leopold I

\textsuperscript{130} Like the Gallait portrait, this was a private image and seems not to have been copied.\textsuperscript{131} Given that Leopold I was intensely interested in technological developments (he sat to French photographer Nadar in the 1860s but was even more interested in the hot air balloon from which Nadar took photographs) it is likely many photographs were taken of the Belgian royal family. This is an area of research that does not to appear to have been considered to date.
commissioned Ross to paint a portrait in miniature of Charlotte (Figure 2.28). It is probable this was to be distributed as a means of introducing Charlotte to potential suitors and numerous copies were produced. Ross may have already been affected by the illness that caused him to become paralyzed in the late 1850s and unable to produce the copies himself as those traced are by other artists. Queen Victoria admired the painting and two copies are in the Royal Collection at Windsor while another, possibly the original, is in the Miramare collection.

Figure 2.28. Gugliemo Faja, ‘after’ Sir William Charles Ross, *Princess Charlotte of Belgium*, 1858 (original c. 1856).

In mid-1856, Emperor Franz Joseph sent Archduke Maximilian to Paris to pay respects on behalf of Austria to Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie. The official purpose was to convey congratulations on the birth of their son, but it was equally an opportunity

---

to improve relations between France and Austria which had been damaged by the refusal of Franz Josef to participate in the recent Crimean War as Napoleon III had anticipated. When leaving Vienna Maximilian had been firmly encouraged to look for a bride and he continued on to Belgium where his arrival coincided with the Silver Jubilee year of the reign of Leopold I. It is probable that the King had advised the Austrian court Maximilian would be welcome.

The Silver Jubilee was a major occasion marked by many images of the royal family. In some examples of such images, Charlotte and Marie Henriette are positioned with unusual visual equality in relation to their royal male counterparts (Figure 2.29). A printed example that may date from the Silver Jubilee year depicts Charlotte at the centre of the picture and seated beside, but slightly behind, the figure of the King (Figure 2.30). As the caption on this version refers to Charlotte as ‘L’Imperatrice’ and describes Léopold Brabant as Leopold II, it is clearly a reissued image.

![Image](image.jpg)

Figure 2.29. Artist unknown, ‘Hommage au Roi,’ 1856. (Charlotte lower left).

---

Among many events and actions celebrating and declaring loyalty to the monarchy, the commissioning of large, full-length portraits of the King, the Queen (posthumously), and Charlotte by Antwerp city officials held special significance (Figure 2.31). This major commission expressed allegiance to the monarchy on the part of city officials and was a meaningful gesture as Antwerp was the final site of resistance in Belgium’s battle for independence; it also recognized, as Dorine Cardyn-Oomen points out, the successful career of Antwerp native Nicaise de Keyser (1813-1887) as a court painter. De Keyser was especially admired for his paintings of women and his portrait of the princess is a

---

134 Portraits by Gustave Wappers of Léopold, Duke of Brabant, and Philippe, Count of Flanders, were already part of this collection and a copy of an 1863 Winterhalter portrait of Marie Henriette (1836-1902) was later added. The Stadůs or city hall in Antwerp houses a remarkable art collection. It is difficult to gain access to the portrait of Charlotte as it hangs in a private meeting room almost constantly in use. A rare glimpse of the portrait in situ published in a Belgian newspaper was obtained through the kindness of Dr. Cardyn-Oomen (see Figure 7.9).

135 Nicaise de Keyser was Director of the Academy of Antwerp of 1855 to 1879. His reputation extended across Europe and to the United States. See for instance “Nicaise De Keyser” Vol. 67, 401 Harper’s New Monthly (October 1883): 688-696.
tender and decorous confection of a girl/woman framed by a formulaic array of royal attributes.

Figure 2.31. Nicaise De Keyser, *Portrait of H.R.H. Princess Charlotte*, 1857. Figure 2.32. Detail.
This transitional image situates Charlotte in ‘her father’s house’ of Laeken and includes his presence by means of a miniature portrait set into the bracelet she wears on her right wrist (Figure 2.32).\(^{136}\) (A bracelet containing a miniature of Leopold I ringed with diamonds is noted as being among her dowry jewelry).\(^{137}\) As the engagement of Charlotte and Maximilian was announced at the end of December, it became the culminating event of the Silver Jubilee year. De Keyser’s painting was completed in 1857 when it would have been known that the Princess would soon leave Belgium for ‘her husband’s house.’\(^{138}\) Leopold I, Charlotte, and Maximilian visited Antwerp where they were honoured with a grand ball. A few days later they made a public appearance together in Brussels attending the Monnaie Theatre, the same theatre where, in 1830, a performance of the opera *Mute de Portici* is considered to have inspired the Belgian Revolution. The opera seen in 1856 by Charlotte and Maximilian was Guiseppe Verdi’s *Sicilian Vespers (Ivespri siciliani)* written two years earlier and would come to have similar significance for the Italian Risorgimento.\(^{139}\)

\(^{136}\) Haslip, 1971, 83-100, also see Corti, [c.1921], 1923, and Coppens.

\(^{137}\) Vauchaude, unpaginated ms. (Published as Vachaude, 2004).

\(^{138}\) Trieste was the Austrian Empire’s major deep sea port and also the closest to the Suez Canal, a lapsed endeavour then being revived. Pola was to take precedence as a naval port but the archduke’s connection to Trieste and his enthusiasm for the canal project would have been well received by the Léopold Brabant. The Duke of Brabant was urging a steamship trade route be established between the far east and Belgium and was interested in the Suez Canal project. Emerson, 1979, 22-23; Rossella Fabiani, *Miramare Castle*, 2001, 8-9. As noted, Leopold I and the government of Britain condemned the rule of Ferdinand II in Sicily and supported independence of the Italian states within the Austrian Empire and their interest was not purely altruistic. Regarding this aspect see H. Montgomery Hyde, *The History of Maximilian and Carlota of Mexico* (London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1946), 20.

Queen Victoria favoured Don Pedro, son of the Regent of Portugal as a husband for Charlotte.\textsuperscript{140} The Queen thought his personal and cultural interests to be much like those of Charlotte but was also apprehensive as to Prussian and Austrian relations since Victoria, the Princess Royal, was engaged to the Crown Prince of Prussia.\textsuperscript{141} Leopold I, seeing an opportunity to strengthen connections between Austria and Belgium (and the Coburg and Habsburg Royal Houses) preferred Archduke Maximilian. Appealing to Queen Victoria’s sentimentality, he promoted Maximilian as Charlotte’s choice but acrimonious marriage negotiations threatened to derail the proposed union.\textsuperscript{142} Financial demands made by Maximilian infuriated Léopold Brabant, who was adamant that no Coburg wealth should be transferred to the House of Habsburg. Baron Stockmar was engaged to negotiate Maximilian’s demands and Léopold Brabant was forced to accept the outcome. In return, Leopold I insisted upon a prestigious appointment for

\textsuperscript{140} Ferdinand of Coburg Koháry, a grandnephew of Leopold I. A letter written by Victoria is quoted in several sources; Haslip includes a longer excerpt than others: “I hope by your letter that Charlotte has not finally made up her mind, as we both feel so strongly convinced of the immense superiority of Pedro over any other young prince … besides which, the position is so infinitely preferable. The Austrian society is scandal-mongering, profligate and worthless and the Italian possessions very shaky. Pedro is full of resources, fond of music, fond of drawing, of languages, of natural history and literature, in all of which Charlotte would suit him and would be a real benefit to his country … if Charlotte consulted her friend [Victoria, the Princess Royal], I know what her answer would be, as she is very fond of Pedro.” Quoted in Haslip, 1971, 84. Marie-Amélie also expressed strong reservations regarding Charlotte’s marriage to Maximilian. Huart, [1935], 1981, 570.

\textsuperscript{141} This tension was increasing as a pan-Germanic movement gained momentum and the Habsburg Empire resisted. A marriage joining the royal families of Britain and Prussia had the potential to divide Britain and Belgium if the latter was linked with Austria. In 1866 Austria was badly defeated by Prussia. See Peter Young, \textit{A Dictionary of Battles} (New York: Mayflower Books, 1978). Corti notes that Leopold I may have previously approached Prussian King Freidrich Wilhelm IV with the intent of arranging a marriage between Charlotte and Prince Freidrich but been rebuffed.

\textsuperscript{142} Corti, [1924] 1968, 250-252. Harding claims that it was Austrian Archduchess Sophie, mother of Maximilian, who instigated this alliance with Belgium through marriage to Charlotte but gives no source for this statement. Harding, 1934: 37.
Maximilian and, to assuage the British court, that Maximilian would visit there before the marriage took place. Prince Albert was impressed by the affable Archduke and Queen Victoria diplomatically yielded in her objections towards the marriage so far as to allow Prince Albert’s attendance at the wedding ceremony in summer 1857.

A photographic double portrait, probably taken just before or just after the marriage of Charlotte and Maximilian (possibly earlier to mark their engagement) was produced in black and white and hand-coloured versions (Figure 2.33).

Figure 2.33. Mayer & Pirson, *Princess Charlotte et Archduke Maximilien*, 1856 or 1857.

Individual broadsheet lithographic portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian were also produced in delicately-tinted versions and in black and white. Maximilian sat for a portrait to Winterhalter at the British court and a widely known lithograph of the Archduke appears modeled ‘after’ this 1857 image. The portrait of Charlotte is described
as engraved ‘after’ a portrait by Schubert but it may be that Schubert’s image was also ‘after’ a Winterhalter portrait, or perhaps ‘after’ the painting by De Kaiser; the Schubert seems to have subsequently served as model for several related images of Charlotte (Figure 2.34). 143

Figure 2.34. Desmaisons (engraved ‘after’ Schubert), *La Princesse Charlotte*, 1857.

143 This may be the case as there was a history of portraits of Charlotte and Victoria, the Princess Royal, being commissioned at approximately the same time. Winterhalter painted a portrait of the Princess Royal about this time but no major portrait of Charlotte dating to this time is known.
A painting of the religious wedding ceremony of Charlotte and Maximilian by Austrian artist Cesare Dell’Acqua, an artist specializing in multiple portrait images, functions as a visual document of the occasion (Figure 2.35). Charlotte wears a gown of fabric woven in Ghent, Flanders, and a veil presented to her as a gift from Brussels. Haslip writes of the civil ceremony that preceded the religious service:

The most enthusiastic of the wedding guests, outnumbering the Imperial, Royal and Serene Highnesses, were the rich burghers of Brussels, who were devoted to their pretty little Princess, to whose dowry they had all contributed ….

It would be surprising if these generous gestures of affection towards the monarchy on the part of Belgium’s Flemish and French populations were not recorded in other significant depictions of Charlotte in her gown and veil, but none are presently known. Maximilian is seen beside Charlotte at the centre of the picture and wears the uniform of a Vice Admiral in the Austrian Navy, a position to which he had just been promoted. On the far left of the painting Leopold I stands beside the kneeling figure of the former Queen of the French, Charlotte’s maternal grandmother Marie-Amélie (Figure 2.36). Inclusion of members of the exiled Orléans family would have presented a delicate problem in associating the House of Coburg with the deposed monarchy of Louis-Philippe. Dell’Acqua positions Marie-Amélie’s lace-veiled head directly in front

---

144 Sometimes referred to as an Istrian artist; Istria was within the Austrian Empire.
147 Marie-Amélie (then known as the Countess de Neuilly) was accompanied to Belgium from Britain by four of her sons. Haslip, 1971, 99. As a wedding gift, Charlotte’s Orléans uncles and aunts gave her a bracelet inset with a miniature, framed with alternating diamonds and green, blue, and red enamel figures, of Queen Louise-Marie by Ross. Vauchaude, 2004, 25-35. This bracelet, and others also inset with family miniatures, features in many later portraits of Charlotte.
of a young woman’s shoulder with the trompe l’oeil affect that the motifs merge unless a viewer seeks out the former Queen. On the right can be seen the Prince Consort Albert and contemporary audiences would have recognized numerous other individuals including Archduke Karl Ludwig, younger brother of Maximilian, who represented the House of Habsburg (Figure 2.37).148 Dell’Acqua’s depiction of the religious service may not have been copied or reproduced. The original is part of the Miramare collection (although it is not exhibited) and a large watercolour study is in the Brussels Royal Palace Archives.149

Illustrations in this chapter of painted portraits of Charlotte represent virtually all those known of her from the age of five months until her marriage a few weeks after her seventeenth birthday; all except three (by Gallait, Landseer, and De Kaiser) were painted by Ross or by Winterhalter. The first, by Ross in 1840, and the last by him, painted in 1855 or 1856, bracket her childhood and early adolescence as well as first decades of Belgium as an independent nation state. Internationally, Belgium’s close association with Britain and France had peaked in 1846. The 1848 abdication of Louis-Philippe and

148 The title of Prince Consort was awarded to Albert in 1857. Dell’Acqua’s positioning of Leopold I on one side of the wedding painting and Albert, the Prince Consort, on the other side, was reprised when they accompanied Victoria, the Princess Royal as she walked down the aisle at her wedding in early 1858. Gifts from the Habsburgs included a bracelet from Archduchess Sophie, mother of Maximilian, with her miniature portrait in a locket-like setting containing a curl of Maximilian’s hair, as well as a miniature of Maximilian set into an heirloom brooch. Ibid.
149 I thank Gustaaf Janssens, Brussels Palace Archivist, for making it possible for me to view the watercolour study. Twentieth-century reproductions of the wedding painting are found, in black and white, in Eugene Bagger, Francis Joseph, Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1927), op. 321 and, in colour, in Carlo Chiurco, Miramare: Guida al Castello e al Parco (Trieste: Bruno Fachin Editore, 1997), 8.
1852 establishment of the French Second Empire under Napoleon III again threatened national security, a factor in the decision by Leopold I to align Belgium with Austria.

Figure 2.35. Cesare Dell’Acqua, *The Wedding of Princess Charlotte and Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian*, c. 1857.

Like portraits of Charlotte painted by Ross through her early years, those painted by Winterhalter were replicated for royal relations and reproduced in popular formats for
Neither the portrait by Gallait of Charlotte in Greek costume, nor the De Kaiser portrait circulated; the portrait by Landseer was reproduced in print but may not have appeared in card format. Images of Charlotte in the examples of popular art reproduced here most often derived from her portraits by Winterhalter. During her childhood Charlotte was more prominent than were the princes as she was more often in the company of the King and Queen than were the princes and her image more frequently commissioned and distributed. As an adolescent her images were significant as she was the only female representative of the Belgian royal family. Her marriage and departure for Lombardy-Venetia, and the birth of a daughter to the Duke and Duchess of Brabant in 1858 and a son in 1859, deflected Belgian interest in Charlotte and images of her appeared less frequently in Belgium after 1857; when her image circulated after this

---

150 Winterhalter continued to paint into the late 1860s. His painting style is provocatively reassessed by Stephen Levine who argues that Winterhalter’s palette, selective use of chiaroscuro, and tendency to flatten the pictorial space should be considered within the development of modern art. Stephen Levine, 1978.

151 “It is Charlotte we miss most because it is she who is most often with us.” Leopold I to Emmanuel de Mensdorf Pouilly. 10 January 1845, Laeken. Letter No. 80. Jean Puraye et Hans-Otto Lang, 1973, 341.

152 Social and political importance attaching to the participation by United States presidential primaries candidates’s daughters (it happens that it was daughters and not sons participating at the time) in recent campaigns speaks to the need to factor Charlotte’s presence and portraits into larger historical matters of state. The political ramifications of the daughters’s presence (and their behaviour and physical appearance) are clear in a recent article. Jude Sheerin, “Wannabe first daughters woo youth vote: A US television network's recent suspension of a correspondent for suggesting Hillary Clinton had "pimped out" her daughter, Chelsea, to win votes has cast a spotlight on the role played by would-be first daughters on the campaign trail.” 22 February 2008 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/7250458.stm> (22 February 2008).
its significance - as Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia and Archduchess of Austria - was no longer exclusive to Belgium.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{153} Louise-Marie-Amélie (1858-1924), Léopold Ferdinand Elie Victor Albert Marie (1859-1869). Two other children were born later: Stéphanie Clotilde Louise Herminie Marie Charlotte (1864-1945) and Clémentine Albertine Marie Léopoldine (1872-1955).
Chapter Three

Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia

Prints and Images in Popular Art

Pictures relating to the marriage of Charlotte and Maximilian document a union reinforcing links already established between the Coburgs and Habsburgs as it was a second marriage between these royal families and one closer to imperial power than the former. This difference was made explicit through the incorporation of images of Charlotte and Maximilian into Coburg and Habsburg family portraits (Figures 3.1 and 3.2). Most of these, like portraits of the Belgian royal family, are taken from earlier painted portraits or photographs, or both, and formulaically reassembled in popular art forms. The inclusion of Charlotte’s image among those of the ruling Austrian royal family carried a political impact as had those produced after the marriage of her brother and sister-in-law, the Duke and Duchess of Brabant. While the marriage of the Belgian heir apparent to a close relative of the Austrian Habsburgs was seen as “an enormous diplomatic triumph,” Charlotte’s marriage placed her within the immediate Austrian royal family.¹

¹ “[N]o-one appreciated [the significance of this diplomatic coup] more than Napoleon III ... [who had] been for some time looking for a suitable royal wife ....” Napoleon III was at that time recently married to Eugénie de Montijo. Marie Henriette, the daughter of Palatine Joseph of Hungary and Princess Marie Dorothée of Württemberg, was sufficiently highly placed within the Hapsburg hierarchy that it was necessary for her to renounce any claim to the Austrian throne before she could marry Léopold Brabant. Emerson, 1979, 13-15.
Figure 3.1. (Left). Artist unknown, *Belgian Royal Family*, c. 1859. Archduchess Charlotte is seen lower left and Archduke Maximilian at the lower right. Figure 3.2. (Right). Artist unknown, *Austrian Royal Family*, c. 1859. Emperor Franz Joseph and Empress Elisabeth, centre; Archduchess Charlotte and Archduke Maximilian to the right of centre. Note the similarity of several poses to those in photographs, Figures 4.2 and 4.3.

Charlotte and Maximilian left Belgium a few days after their 27 July wedding ceremonies and traveled first to the Hapsburg court in Vienna, then to Trieste, near the site where Miramare Castle was being built, and to Venice, capital of Venetia before making an official entry into Milan, capital of Lombardy (Figure 3.3).²

² Corti, [c. 1921], 1923. Haslip, 1971, 100. *L’indépendance Belge* of July 31st, 1857, carried an article recounting Charlotte’s departure from Laeken the preceding morning and describing her as distraught during a visit to the mausoleum of Queen Louise-Marie. *Voir & Lire*, 1927, 272.
Among images produced to commemorate their engagement or marriage, is a double portrait drawn by Belgian artist Ferdinand Marbon and engraved by E. Gervais. They are seen in the grounds surrounding the royal residence of Laeken close to Brussels with Charlotte seated on a rustic bench and Maximilian standing behind her (Figure 3.4). Read against tensions circumscribing their Viceregal positions, it is instructive to
compare this popular image with an official adaptation produced for Italian consumption (Figure 3.5).\(^3\)

Figure 3.4. F. Marbonn, engraved by E. Gervais, ‘Charlotte and Maximilian,’ 1857.
Figure 3.5. Artist name illegible, Charlotte and Maximilian as Vicereine and Viceroy, 1857.

While they share many motifs, the Italian version more directly cultivates the romance associated with their marriage. As the name of the artist is illegible in the Italian version it is referred to here as the ‘Bertarelli,’ the Bertarelli Print Archives being the source of this print.\(^4\) In this latter image Maximilian tucks his Vice-Admiral’s hat under his left

---

\(^3\) This image accompanies the article relating to Maximilian and Charlotte in *Il Storia Milano*, the history of Milan; most other depictions of them, singly or together, from this period and region are variations of this double portrait. *Storia di Milano* (Milano, 1960), vol. XIV 605.

\(^4\) This print is in the Belgian section of images of the *Civica Raccolta di Stampe A. Bertarelli di Milano*. I thank Maria Teresa Fiorio for providing this image.
arm and his sword hilt, prominent in the Marbonn portrait, is not visible. Charlotte is shown standing and closer in height to Maximilian than she was in fact. Their pose is affectionate with Charlotte’s left arm looped through Maximilian’s bent right arm that is, in Marbonn’s picture, awkwardly truncated. Her dress is less lavish and instead of the jeweled bouquet she holds a fan and carries what seems to be a shawl of silk rather than lace as in the Belgian version. As there is no background scene, the association with Belgium’s royal family is removed. The deletion of Maximilian’s sword avoids any implication of aggressive authority, while a single rose pinned to Charlotte’s bodice and her simple hairstyle suggests an effort to avoid ostentation.

On 13 August 1857 Charlotte wrote to her brother Léopold Brabant, recounting the journey to Trieste. Nuremberg was especially pleasurable, she writes, because of its medieval architecture, sculptures, and picturesque residence of artist Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528). Of their visit to the Habsburg royal family at Schönebrunn, Charlotte says little other than describing it as charming and dignified. She makes no mention in this letter of the death, occurring shortly before, of the first child of Empress Elisabeth and Emperor Franz Joseph or of the consequent tensions during this visit.

Charlotte continues her letter with an enthusiastic account of touring a quartz cave and happily relates the impressive welcome with which she and Maximilian were met in Trieste. There she and Maximilian were taken for a cruise of the harbour on board a

---

5 It can be speculated that, if the lace shawl of Charlotte in Marbonn’s double portrait displays a luxury item characteristic of Belgium, the silk shawl may reflect the importance of Lombardy’s silk industry then in decline. Haslip, 1971, 107.
6 Archduchess Sophie of Austria (1855-1857), mother of Franz Josef and Maximilian, attributed the child’s death to poor judgment on the part of the Empress; the Archduchess subsequently controlled the upbringing of Elisabeth’s other children.
steamer bearing her name. A photograph for which Charlotte sat in 1857 was probably taken in Trieste by photographer Guiseppe Malovich (Figure 3.6).  

Figure 3.6. Guiseppe Malovich (?), Carlota, 1857

In a postscript Charlotte describes her delight at two gifts received in Trieste. One was presented on behalf of Lloyd’s Adriatic, the maritime insurance company founded by Baron Pasquale Revoltella, a prominent citizen of Trieste. This was a

---

8 What appears to be the same lamp can be seen in an uncropped Malovich photograph of Charlotte from 1864.
painting of the Austrian fleet by Bernard Fiedler (n.d.) and was set into a frame with lapis and pearls. The city of Trieste generously expressed their affection, Charlotte continues, with a “magnificent” jeweled album of which the “… interior is no less beautiful, being all watercolours by artists of Trieste such as de Fiedler, and Cesare Dell’Acqua ….”

Still in Trieste on 18 August, Maximilian and Charlotte attended the new Theatre l’Armonia. Rudolfo Krause includes a description of them on that occasion in his 1931 historical survey of the city. They arrived, Krauss recounts, without regal trappings or pomp, Maximilian in uniform and Charlotte “fair and smiling” for the dress rehearsal of the inaugrating work, Donizetti’s opera Poliuto. Donizetti (1797-1848) composed Poliuto in 1838 but it was banned by King Ferdinand II of The Two Sicilies as politically subversive until 1848 when protests forced him to temporarily lift censorship. Poliuto was performed in Naples, Sicily, shortly after Donizetti’s death.

The population of Trieste and surrounding Friuli region (predominantly Italian with considerable Austrian and Slovakian minorities) was generally hostile to Austrian rule. Resentment in the region at Austria’s imperial presence was aggravated by what the populace felt to be neglect on the part of Vienna. (Friuli was spoken of locally as the Cinderella

11 Rudolfo Krauss, Briciole de storia triestina: Grandessa e decadenza d’un teatro scomparso (Trieste, 1931) ix. See also Bianca Maria Favetta, Vita Musicale nella Trieste Settecentesca e Ottocentesca (Trieste, 1964) 16-22; and Stephano Bianchi, “Itinerari teatrali e musicali a Trieste tra Otto e Novecento,” XIX 2, Quaderni Giuliani di Storia, 1968, 271.
(Cenerentola) of the Austrian Empire.) As Maximilian’s extravagant plans for Miramare had stimulated the local economy, and as he was known to be critical of harsh Imperial policies, Maximilian and Charlotte may have been spared some animosity. Nonetheless, the decision to attend a dress rehearsal rather than a performance of Poliuto was likely taken to circumvent any possibility of an awkward absence of other patrons. It was a common form of protest for Italian nobles and intellectuals to boycott events when it was known Austrian royalty would attend.

There is also the fact that this was an opera considered politically subversive and Maximilian and Charlotte’s attendance could be construed as a public statement in sympathy with Italian complaints. This interpretation gains credence when considered in relation to the precedent set December 1856 by their attendance at the performance of Verdi’s Sicilian Vespers soon after their engagement. The significance of their attendance at the Sicilian Vespers has gone unremarked by twentieth-century authors but it would have been clear in the nineteenth century when the struggle for Italian independence was highly topical. Verdi’s opera pointedly focuses on an historical incident when the people of Sicily expelled an imperial power and its meaning for the

---

13 Trieste and the nearby site of Miramare were then in the region known as Friuli. From 1963 the region in which Trieste is located has been known as Friuli-Venezia Giulia. It is still sometimes referred to by inhabitants as the ‘Cinderella’ region. The persistent sense of unfair treatment of the region found expression in 1882 when Guglielmo Oberdan (1858-1882) attempted to assassinate Emperor Franz Josef in Trieste an end Austrian control of the region. Unsuccessful in his attempt, Oberdan was hanged and he is considered a martyr for Italian liberty. Laura Ruaro Loseri and Bianca Maria Favetta, *Il civico museo del Risorgimento di Trieste* (Venezia: Electra Editrice, 1980), 13, 17. An annual procession to the grave of Guglielmo Oberdan continues in present day Trieste.

14 In an “hommage” addressed to Charlotte as she is about to leave Belgium, Italy is described as “pauvre” and the author anticipates her presence will alleviate suffering among the Italian people. Fond II 18755 (44) Charlotte, *Hommage à la princess*. Royal Albert Library, Brussels, 1857.
Risorgimento movement was already established in 1856. While Maximilian and Charlotte’s empathy was genuine, they were not without expectations of securing a more prestigious role in Lombardy, a possibility anticipated and desired by others in England and in Belgium. Their public attendance at the Poliuto rehearsal would have signaled a departure from official attitudes of imperial Austria.

Maximilian had impressed Queen Victoria and Prince Albert with his tolerant views and frankness regarding repressive Austrian policies during his visit to the British court shortly before his marriage to Charlotte. This openness, and vocal criticism of what Emperor Franz Josef viewed as private matters, worsened relations between the brothers that had been strained since the 1848 revolutions. The visit of Maximilian had been equally an opportunity for British statesmen to develop a rapport with the Archduke whose position as Viceroy of Lombardy-Venetia had potential to complement British interests in the Italian states. Opposed to the concept of Italian self-rule, and believing prospects were promising that Maximilian would eventually become ruler of an

---

15 For example, Corti quotes from a letter by the French Consul in Mexico on the danger caused to French citizens when Napoleon III ordered troops withdrawn. “It looked,” the Consul wrote, “as if there might be a second edition of the Sicilian Vespers.” M. Roger Dubois to Edward Pierron, French Secretary to Maximilian, 7 August 1866. Corti [1924], 1968, 652.

16 Franz Josef had become Emperor at eighteen and his policies were shaped by reliance upon military advisors. A revolution in Hungary had been brutally suppressed and the punishments inflicted upon the instigators outraged Maximilian and much of Europe. See Sked, 1979. The Archduke provoked further antagonism by subsequently competing with Franz Josef for popularity, especially in Hungary.

17 Leopold I to Queen Victoria, 31 October, 1856. Quoted in Hyde, 1946, 64. Holden offers his assessment of Lord Palmerston’s attention to agitation in the Italian states in 1848 and “the advantage to England of having a strong and united Italy to balance France in the Mediterranean and was determined to encourage the movement with all his power. So once again, under her astute Foreign Secretary [Palmerston], England could pose as the champion of the oppressed nationalities and at the same time serve her own particular ends.” Holden, 1936, 177-181.
independent or semi-independent state, Leopold I was closely monitoring international opinion in this regard.\textsuperscript{18} During negotiations over Charlotte’s dowry, Leopold I wrote to Queen Victoria the “[i]f the thing [the marriage] takes place” Maximilian might become “head of Venice.”\textsuperscript{19} Such a possibility was not lost on those agitating strongly for Italian independence and consolidation; these nationalists viewed the British connection as threatening since Britain could benefit from alliances with Italian provinces should Maximilian gain a position of real influence.\textsuperscript{20} Franz Josef countered the possibility of being forced, through machinations of Leopold I and Britain or the popularity of his idealistic brother, to grant greater autonomy to Lombardy or Venetia by restricting Maximilian’s authority in civil affairs and denying him any military control. At the time of his 1856 sojourn in Paris Maximilian had been flattered by the attentions of Emperor Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie, but he considered the Emperor disposed to act for the Italian states against Austria. Maximilian concluded the motivation of Napoleon III was related to both territorial acquisition and national security interests and he was ultimately proven correct in this regard. The Prime Minister of Lombardy’s neighbouring state of Piedmont, Count Cavour, Camille di Benso (1810-1861) was, meanwhile, determined to engage France on behalf of the Italian states.\textsuperscript{21} These political complexities jeopardized

\textsuperscript{18} The King of the Belgians actively advised Maximilian and Charlotte regarding negotiations in political matters and campaigned for positions for them up to his death in November 1865. See, for example, Haslip, 1971.

\textsuperscript{19} Leopold I to Queen Victoria, 31 October 1856. Quoted in H. Montgomery Hyde, 1946, 64.

\textsuperscript{20} Visconti, 1914; Whyte, [1930], 1962, 233.

\textsuperscript{21} Cavour’s tactics were unorthodox and Maximilian witnessed the triumph of one such tactic on his 1856 visit to the French court before he traveled to Belgium. Aware of the French Emperor’s susceptibility to attractive women, Cavour arranged for his cousin, the Countess di Castiglione, to be presented at court. Gene Smith notes that Castiglione had been in Paris four months when Maximilian arrived. In reports written to Emperor Franz
the role of Maximilian as Viceroy and his lack of experience in governing, as well as reluctance to leave a pleasant career in the Austrian navy for administrative responsibilities, made his tenure precarious. Hyde writes of Maximilian’s apprehensions regarding these new, imposed responsibilities; for her part, Charlotte thought “the prospect appealing” though she expected to suffer “thorns” in committing herself to the cause of improving conditions in Italy. 22

Growing hostility in Lombardy and Venetia towards Austrian control had manifested in acts of insolence towards Emperor Franz Josef and Empress Elisabeth during a spring tour through Lombardy-Venetia earlier in 1857. Some of the means by which grievances were expressed are pertinent for the concept of dress as a symbol of resistance, a connection I suggest is relevant to a later portrait of Charlotte. In addition to boycotting events as mentioned above, another tactic employed to express dissent was to wear mourning to events Austrian royalty were attending. Yet another tactic was adopted by nobles and notables in response to invitations to an opera at which Franz Josef and Elisabeth would be present. In that instance servants of those invited were dressed in the finery of their employers and attended in their stead. Maximilian and Charlotte fared better on leaving Trieste for Venice than had the Emperor and Empress but elaborate

22 Hyde, 1946, 67. See also Haslip, 1971, 112. The literature widely supports interpretations of Maximilian actions through the late 1850s and early 1860s as resulting from his intent to become ruler of Lombardy or Venetia and, later, to establish himself in another position of power in opposition to the authority of Franz Josef. Reinach Fousmagne quotes French historian Ollivier in reference to this. “Il l’était d’autant plus qu’en Autriche on accusait Maximilien ‘d’avoir songé à se constituer une souveraineté indépendante en Lombardie, de poursuivre par ses intriques les mêmes visés en Hongrie et de se poser en compétiteur de son frère.’” Emile Ollivier, L’Empire libéral (Paris: Garnier, 1895), quoted in Reinach Foussmagne, 1925, 147.
ceremonies along the route they traveled were seldom genuinely expressions of
enthusiasm.\(^{23}\) In Venice elaborate firework displays were staged for Charlotte and
Maximilian and they rode in an ornate gondola through torch-lit canals before continuing
continued on to Milan where they arrived 2 September 1857 to make their official
entrance.\(^{24}\) In contrast to the modesty of their visual representations, this was a grandiose
occasion featuring antique gilded carriages and with attendants in “powdered wigs and
eighteenth-century liveries.”\(^{25}\) Maximilian wore the uniform of Vice Admiral and
Charlotte a scarlet velvet mantle over a cerise coloured gown with pink roses in her hair
and others entwined in her diamond coronet.\(^{26}\)

A list included in Christophe Vauchaude’s recent publication details Charlotte’s
dowry wardrobe and confirms she possessed a cerise velvet dress and red velvet mantle.\(^{27}\)
Details of Charlotte’s attire are too similar to her appearance in a 1864 portrait for which
she sat to Winterhalter to be dismissed, and another painting, thought to be a study for
this portrait, matches still more closely this description of her in Milan in September

\(^{23}\) Haslip, 1971, 94.
\(^{24}\) Eager to patronize Italian artists, they purchased a painting, perhaps depicting this
event, from Ippolito Caffi. This painting “... a large oil painting by Ippolito Caffi
depicting a nocturnal feast thrown on August 2, 1857, in honour of Maximilian and
Charlotte’s official visit to Venice” is in the Miramare Collection. Fabiani, 2001:40
\(^{25}\) Haslip, 1971, 105.
\(^{26}\) Reprinted in \textit{Voir \\& Lire}, 1927 and included in Suzanne Desternes and Henriette
\(^{27}\) “… 44 robes (batiste écossaise, mousseeline brodée, organdi, velours pourpre, noir,
vert moiré, blance bleuté, couleur cerise, crépe bleu avec marabout, crêpe de chine
ponceau, coquelicot), 30 douzaines de chemises ou robes de dessous, 6 douzaines de
bonnets de nuit, 77 robes de chamber, 81 fichus, 40 douzaines de gants dont trois
douzaines pour la nuit, dix-huit douzaines mouchoirs aux initiales brodées et borde’s de
dentelles, 288 paires de bas et 100 paires de chaussures en cuir noir, une parure de
zibeline et un grand manteau de cour en velours rouge ….” Vauchaude, unpublished ms,
1857. These paintings and the possibility they derive from an earlier portrait of Charlotte are discussed in a later section of this chapter.

**Milan, Venice, Trieste**

Lombardy was efficiently governed in comparison to other foreign-controlled Italian provinces but the existence of peasant people was equally one of poverty. An appetite for independence was fuelled by its juxtaposition to Piedmont where the influential Cavour relentlessly promoted nationalism, and by the presence in Milan of respected, and Risorgimento-inclined, author Alessandro Manzoni (1785-1873). Charlotte’s ancestral connection to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies through her grandmother, Marie-Amélie, and mother, Louise-Marie, imparted a trace of legitimacy to her role as there existed an historical relationship between Lombardy and Sicily resulting from recurrent migrations of workers. Ferdinand II, King of the Two Sicilies died in May 1859 and it may be that the King of the Belgians detected pending opportunities and conveyed this to Maximilian and Charlotte. Such a possibility has significance for a painting by Portaels discussed below.

Maximilian had taken up his role as Viceroy early in 1857 before his marriage to Charlotte and chose to use the vast Milan palace for administrative purposes and establish the Viceregal court at nearby Monza. Following their arrival he resumed his duties in Lombardy energetically engaging in efforts to improve conditions and fund cultural projects, to the extent he could do so with his minimal authority, and resisting what he

---

28 I thank Grazietta Butazzi for alerting me to this important connection between Lombardy and Sicily.
29 At about this time Leopold I had tried, unsuccessfully, to arrange a meeting in Belgium of various heads of state with the goal of resolving the grievances of the Italian states. Egon Caesar Corti, [1924], 1968, 253-254.
deemed counter-productive orders from Vienna.\textsuperscript{30} Little is known of Charlotte’s actions throughout her tenure as Vicereine but in a letter Prince Albert wrote 29 September 1857 from Balmoral, Scotland, the Prince refers to “Uncle Leopold, with his daughter and second son” being there three days.\textsuperscript{31} There is no other known reference to Charlotte being in Britain in 1857.\textsuperscript{32} The presence of Leopold I and Philippe infers Charlotte may have been in Belgium before going to Scotland; she would seem to have left Milan approximately two weeks after her arrival there with Maximilian. This visit to Scotland, and perhaps Belgium, in late September 1857 may explain one of three enigmatic print images of her. It depicts Charlotte, Philippe, and Leopold I and was printed by Imperial Lithographer Olivier Pino likely in response to an announcement that they would travel to Britain (Figure 3.7).\textsuperscript{33} Prince Albert begins the sentence in which he mentions their presence with the phrase “[t]o-day (sic) we are going to Manchester ….” There was little reason for Victoria and Albert to visit Manchester, an industrial cotton mill town, but it is known they attended a remarkable art exhibition held there in 1857, the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition. “[A]n estimated one-third of all the art in the country at the time” was shown at this event and it “brought together … 16,272 works of art - including 2,248 oil paintings, 969 watercolours, 323 drawings and 160 sculptures.” Not only that, it was the first time works had been hung chronologically in Britain and “set a trend, …

\textsuperscript{30} Haslip, 1971; Corti, [1924], 1968.
\textsuperscript{31} Prince Albert was writing from Balmoral Castle to his brother Ernest on September 29, 1857. Hector Bolitho, ed., \textit{Correspondence of the Prince Consort and his Brother} (D. Appleton & Century Company, 1934), 178.
\textsuperscript{32} Corti writes that Maximilian sent Charlotte to Belgium “under colour of visiting her homeland for the first time since her marriage” in autumn 1858 through to spring 1859 as circumstances had worsened in Lombardy and Venetia. For his part, Maximilian ordered that their belongings be “packed and sent out of Italy.” Corti, [1924], 1968, 84.
\textsuperscript{33} The image is known only from a clipping in the Museum of the Dynasty archives.
establish[ing] in the popular imagination the idea of art history ….” If Charlotte did attend it would have enhanced her already generous exposure to art and culture at the courts of France, Britain, and Belgium, collections at country houses of her extended family in several countries, the Great Exhibition of 1851, and certainly at many other exhibitions and performances and may have given rise to certain singular portraits she commissioned of herself through the next decade.

---

Figure 3.7. Artist unknown, *Famille Royale de Belgique*, c. 1857.

34 According to Joanna Moorhead, this was the largest art show ever held in Britain. The author suggests class prejudice has caused this exhibition to be “written out of history ….” Joanna Moorhead, “The great art exhibition that nobody knows about” *The Guardian*, 18 October 2007. Online. <arts.guardian.co.uk/art/visualart/story/0,,2193545,00.html> (18 October 2007). With regard to this exhibition and to broader issues of collecting and interpretation, I thank Allison Morehead for alerting me to the important recent publication by Francis Haskell, *History and its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).
Another portrait of Charlotte probably dating from the years 1857 to 1859, based on her hairstyle and black lace shawl she carries, was engraved by Franck ‘after’ a painting by E. Devaux (n.d.). Charlotte is portrayed smiling slightly and glancing toward the viewer/artist with her pearls having slipped to one side as though she were turning the moment before (Figure 3.8). Its caption states this engraving was dedicated to the engraver F. Daems. No explanation is known and it is unclear whether this refers to an earlier edition or the edition illustrated here which was produced after 1867 as the caption identifies Charlotte as “Imperatrice.” The popularity of this edition is evidenced by numerous prints dispersed through widespread collections. According to an entry in a 1965 catalogue the original remains in a private collection.

35 Interestingly a print of this image was once in the collection of the Brussels Museum of Fine Arts although current records indicate no portraits of Charlotte were historically part of the collection. This discrepancy may perhaps be due to confusion in categories of print and painting. Records of the Royal Military Museum in Brussels.

36 Probably it was also very popular in its original edition but research to confirm this remains to be completed. An example of the later print edition was included in Leopold 1er et son Rène (Bruxelles: Archives Generales du Royaume, 1965). The image also circulated in the form of a collector’s card, “Postkarte ed. V.G – Brussel. Frz. Leg.” Vienna Bildarchiv. Pf 111:C (3E).
In and of itself, the Manchester Exhibition seems an insufficient reason for Charlotte to have left Milan so soon after her marriage. Whatever the cause of her return, she may have been still in Britain or Belgium 11 November when her aunt, Victoire, Countess of Nemours died “just four days after the anniversary of the day of Princess Charlotte’s death [first wife of Leopold I], just 40 years ago ….”37 Closely linked as they were this

---

37 Prince Albert at Windsor Castle to his brother, Ernest, 11 November 1857. Bolitho, 1934, 178. As mentioned above, Queen Victoria commissioned a portrait from Winterhalter of herself and Victoire in 1852. The Countess was married to the eldest
was a deeply affecting event for the Belgian, British, and French royal families and, for Leopold I, all the more so as he was superstitious and always experienced anxiety at the anniversary of the death of his first wife and son. The presence of Charlotte at this time would lend support to a possible interpretation of another print, in this case ‘after’ a portrait by Bouillot (n.d.) engraved by Wuileman (n.d.) (possibly Williaume) and known only through a c.1867 edition. As with the previous print, these were produced by Imperial Lithographer Ph. Ham, Brussels (Figure 3.9). Examples exist in several formats: as broadsheet prints in black and white, in tinted versions in which Charlotte’s dress, eyes, and brooch are touched with blue and the flowers with pastel colours, and as cards in collections in England, Belgium, Italy, and Austria. If it were the church of St. Charles Borromeo in Weybridge, Surrey, which is seen in the background, this would suggest Charlotte had not yet returned to Lombardy but the structure appears to differ from photograph images of the site. Significantly, this was the place of worship for the exiled French royal family, final resting place of Louis-Philippe, and, initially, of Victoire. If this image relates to the death of Victoire it would have restated Charlotte’s connections to the British and French royal families, but Charlotte does not wear mourning and there are other possible interpretations.

______________

surviving son of the Louis-Philippe and Marie-Amélie. Victoria later commissioned a memorial sculpture for Victoire’s tomb.

38 <http://www.liverpoolmuseums.org.uk/walker/collections/foreign/charles_borromeo_w eybridge.asp>

39 Her remains were later transferred to France.

123
The importance Charlotte attached to her name saint, Saint Charles Borromeo, lends an element of personal identification to the Wuileman image. And it was a connection that acquired additional significance during her position as Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia as Charles Borromeo was canonized for his selfless aid to victims of
the plague in sixteenth-century Lombardy. Maximilian was fully engaged with his role of Viceroy through autumn of 1857 and into spring 1858. His frustration at increasingly repressive policies imposed from imperial Vienna and dismissive official responses to his efforts to generate goodwill among the population of Lombardy-Venetia, prompted him to retreat with Charlotte to Trieste. Maximilian occupied himself in overseeing the construction of Miramare Castle until July when, together with Charlotte, he embarked on an Adriatic cruise. During this voyage, Haslip states, they visited the Shrine of the Madonna of Loreto. The title of one example of this image makes reference to the Church of San Loreto (Figure 3.9). Several similarly named sites exist, but one major shrine is near Ancona on the Adriatic coast (across from, and south of Trieste) in the small town of Loreto. In an 1860 letter from Charlotte to Léopold Brabant she refers to having been in Ancona one spring; the year implied is 1858. Charlotte's faith was important for her role as Vicereine in Catholic Lombardy-Venetia. The blue of her gown, pearls, ivory handle of her fan, and roses all have symbolic associations with the Virgin Mary and may have been intended to convey Charlotte’s piety. Her fashionable crinoline or hooped dress is conspicuously trimmed with lace and adorned with flowers and at her

---

40 According to Rossella Fabiani, Saint Charles Borromeo is one of five patron saints of the Habsburgs. Saint Charles’s image appears with those of the other four saints and a Madonna and Child on the ceiling of the Miramare Chapel. Fabiani, 2001, 39.

41 Legends relate that the house in which the Virgin Mary was born is located in Loreto having been transported there by angels. According to Haslip when Charlotte visited San Loreto she prayed she would conceive a child. Haslip, 1971, 118. Memoirs of court attendants imply the relationship between Maximilian and Charlotte was platonic, for instance, José Luis Blasio, Maximilian, Emperor of Mexico. Memoirs of his Private Secretary, (trans.) Robert Hammond Murray [1905] (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934).

42 “Fernblick auf die Kirche von Loreto …” 123.116 B (C) Vienna Bildarchives.

bodice is pinned a brooch with a miniature portrait of Queen Louise-Marie.\textsuperscript{44} Centred as it is the miniature would seem to carry particular significance especially as the image was printed in Brussels. Should the theory it commemorates Victoire prove valid, the miniature portrait would function as a proxy for Louise-Marie thereby including her in commemorating Victoire; conversely, the church depicted might be a similarly named site in Sicily, birthplace of Louise-Marie.

Among those known to have venerated the House of the Virgin Mary in Loreto is the historical personage St. Charles Borromeo.\textsuperscript{45} His history intersects with actions undertaken by Maximilian and Charlotte on several occasions during their Viceregal tenure and may inflect a painting probably commissioned by Charlotte. It is one of four by Belgian artist J. F. Portaels (1818-1895) analyzed in the next section of this chapter. Two of these paintings are known to be portraits of Charlotte and two, I speculate, may be portraits of Charlotte. Portaels painted those known to be portraits while he was in Milan and Trieste in autumn 1857 but his visit seems not to have been of sufficient duration for him to complete all four works. Charlotte’s presence in England, and likely in Belgium, in autumn 1857 and from autumn 1858 until early in 1859, could have provided opportunities for Portaels to paint two additional images. Each of the four paintings appears to invoke a heroic female archetype associated variously with Lombardy, Venetia, Friuli, and Sicily. Charlotte was Vicereine of Lombardy and Venetia, Maximilian was having Miramare built in the Friuli region, and Charlotte was


linked through her maternal relatives. A case can be made that these four paintings employ strategic, intertextual imagery expressing sympathy for nationalist desires and addressing both aristocratic and peasant classes.\textsuperscript{46} (While the inherent intertextuality of any texts has long been acknowledged, it is implications of a sustained and strategic programme of intertextuality to which I refer here.\textsuperscript{47} As such they would have favourably, and usefully, reflected Charlotte’s political philosophy and displayed her familiarity with Italian culture had opportunities for more prestigious roles arisen in these regions.

**The Portaels Puzzles**

Belgian artist Jean François Portaels arrived at Monza in early autumn to paint a portrait of Charlotte she had commissioned prior to her departure from Belgium.\textsuperscript{48} Charlotte had specified she wished Portaels to depict her wearing traditional dress of Brianza, the region situated between the two arms of Lake Como where Leopold I owned a villa and known as the garden of Lombardy.\textsuperscript{49} A portrait of Charlotte by Portaels now in the Miramare collection is described in inventory records as having been painted


\textsuperscript{48} Marie-Jeanne Chartrain-Hebbelinck, *Jean Portaels et ses élèves* (Bruxelles: Musée Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, 1979), 2 and 89.

\textsuperscript{49} Inherited by Leopold I on the death of his first wife, the English Princess Charlotte.
during the artist’s 1857 sojourn at the Viceregal court (see Figure 3.14).\footnote{Rossella Fabiani, *Itinerario nel museo storico*, Trieste, 1989, 115.} It is described as depicting Charlotte in Brianza peasant dress.\footnote{In some instances this painting is described as depicting Charlotte wearing Milanese dress or the national dress of Lombardy, both terms inferring Brianza dress, or as ‘the *Fiancée*’ for reasons that still relate to Brianza dress as will become clear later in this chapter.} I contend this is not the portrait of Charlotte in Brianza dress and that the *Brianza* portrait is untraced. Illustrations and studies of ethnic dress permit a detailed understanding of this type of costume and the gown Charlotte wears in the Miramare painting bears no resemblance to such a costume except for an ornamental comb she wears in her hair.\footnote{I am grateful to dress historian Grazietta Butazzi whose guidance regarding colour, fabrics, and construction of regional dress were indispensable to this investigation. Grazietta Butazzi’s erudite discussions via email with regard to regional dress depicted in this chapter were always immensely helpful.} This information together with a partial, perhaps inadvertent, description of the painting by a twentieth-century author, is sufficient to establish many features of the missing portrait and distinguish it from the existing portrait.\footnote{Joan Haslip, 1972, 123-124. Circumstances were not conducive to studying the *Miramare* painting at close range. It is displayed on the far wall of a tower room described as Charlotte’s salon and the entrance sealed with plexiglass.} The disappearance of the *Brianza*, the motif of elaborate hair pins common to both paintings, and the assumption both paintings were completed during Portaels’s autumn 1857 sojourn has, I suggest, resulted in their conflation and obscured the unique significance of each portrait.

In the course of attempts to disentangle these two portraits by Portaels, two further paintings by this artist were viewed in the Belgian Royal Collections. These paintings, *The Fiancée* and *La Bouquet de Violettes* are installed beside one another in the British Suite of Brussels’s Royal Palace (see 3.20 and 3.26). From at least 1868, and possibly much earlier, they were displayed together in the *chamber à coucher* of
Charlotte’s brother Leopold II until his death in 1909.\textsuperscript{54} Considered to be genre works, neither is dated and their provenance is unknown.\textsuperscript{55}

All four paintings (I include the missing \textit{Brianza}) depict a dark-haired young woman and all \textit{may} be portraits of Charlotte. As stated, two are known to be portraits of Charlotte; the other two may depict another sitter, be genre paintings with a fictional sitter, or also be portraits of Charlotte. Photographs of Charlotte are included beside these paintings for comparison with the painted features although these are not necessarily contemporary. Whether or not all four paintings are portraits of Charlotte is a less engaging point than the numerous shared aspects of intertextuality between these four paintings. Within the context of the Risorgimento and, in that regard, the veiled ambitions of England and Belgium, this pattern of intertextuality argues for the possibility the paintings pertain to Charlotte in her role as Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia regardless of whether or not they are portraits. Inclusion of the \textit{Fiancée} and \textit{Violettes} facilitates an exploration of meanings encoded in Portaels’s known portraits of Charlotte, the \textit{Miramare} and \textit{Brianza}, and opens to debate reasons for the apparent links between all four paintings.

Each of these paintings is freighted with references to a geographic region and can be construed as serving a similar purpose to childhood portraits in which Charlotte wore Flemish and Brabant dress demonstrating the monarchy’s commitment to Belgium’s two national cultures. The (untraced) \textit{Brianza} portrait links Charlotte to Lombardy and the \textit{Miramare} portrait, I suggest, references Venetia; the \textit{Fiancée} relates to

\textsuperscript{54} The Duke of Brabant succeeded Leopold I at the end of 1865 to become Léopold II.

\textsuperscript{55} With regard to these two paintings especially, I owe a great deal to conversations, and much lengthy correspondence, with Martine Vermeire and her extensive experience with the Belgian Royal Collections.
Sicily and *Violettes* to the Friuli region. Portaels’s four paintings contain elements that could lead to their being interpreted as romanticized or dramatized biographical references. The ‘popular celebrity’ that has accrued to Charlotte through historical novels and theatrical productions since the late nineteenth century might incline viewers to such a conclusion. However, studies such as those by Janice Helland and by Marguerite Lindauer cited earlier, demonstrate that images of or by women are often assumed to have personal or biographical meaning when political relevance was intended.\(^56\) Helland and Lindauer were each addressing established assessments of the work of a female artist whereas I am concerned with a female sitter; nonetheless, Charlotte was already exercising a degree of agency by the age of sixteen and active in the production of her *Brianza* portrait as both commissioner and director so that this distinction is of minor consequence here.\(^57\) When considered together and within their historical circumstances, these four paintings by Portaels convincingly reveal themselves to be components in a strategy employing visual art and intertextuality to situate the Vicereine within Italian culture and associate her with inspirational female archetypes - and simultaneously disassociate her from Austrian imperialism.

In arguing for this interpretation, I begin with the *Miramare* and *Brianza* portraits and identify discrepancies between descriptions of the *Miramare* and its actual

---


\(^57\) For discussions of Charlotte’s acquisition of a degree of agency over her visual representations, I thank Francesca de Bei of Trieste.
appearance. Working from this premise it is possible to recoup the general appearance of the untraced *Brianza* and attempt to determine its original significance, and that of the *Miramare*, through intertextual references. This process is facilitated by the existence of the *Financée* and *Violettes* paintings as they demonstrate an extended pattern of intertextuality. Analysis of the latter two paintings follows those of the *Brianza* and *Miramare*.

**Decoding Dress**

Any discussion of these four Portaels paintings is quickly complicated by their overlapping aspects and the physical absence of one work: the *Brianza* is untraced, the *Miramare* is commonly known as ‘*Charlotte in Brianza dress*’ or as ‘*the Fiancée*’ - but these are informal designations and it is neither one of the two Brussels paintings entitled *The Fiancée* nor an image of Charlotte in Brianza dress - while the second Brussels painting, *Violettes*, is one of three featuring regional peasant costume; all four paintings reference the theme of marriage. The key signifier in each painting is dress and in three of these denotes a particular Italian region through impeccable and authentic detail.58 Dress as an expression of resistance to Austrian control has already been mentioned in relation to the spring 1857 tour of Emperor Franz Josef and Empress Elisabeth. In so far as these paintings pertain to Charlotte as Vicereine representing, with Maximilian, Imperial Austria, such an explanation for wearing these costumes for portraits could imply subversive intent, however, other explanations for wearing costume are possible and must also be taken into account.

---

58 It is curious how closely Charlotte’s cosmopolitan gown in the *Miramare* portrait resembles that worn by Countess de Grunne in the portrait for which she sat to Portaels. This may mean these portraits were intended for display in close proximity to one another.
“Unraveling the meanings of clothes in paintings” Lou Taylor advises, “is complicated by the various aesthetic sartorial conventions used by artists from period to period.” Posing for a portrait in “fashions of the day was seen as too ephemeral and lacking the required gravitas and refined aesthetic qualities needed for heirloom portraits ….” Robin Simon agrees with Taylor that sitters often chose to be portrayed in costume as they thereby “escaped the evanescence of everyday fashion” but he also comments on a desire to recognize ancestral ties. Simon is addressing concern for social status but ancestral ties in terms of geographic region and culture are of interest in these Portaels paintings. There was also a ready market in the nineteenth century for genre paintings of attractive peasant people in picturesque regional costumes. At their most banal, such works reified one class as image/product for the delectation of another more privileged class. Gustave Courbet was prominent among artists disrupting this comfortable consumption in mid-century and one of his non-idealized, unusually large paintings of labouring peasant people was exhibited in Brussels in 1855. Among other artists taking a similar stance was Jean-François Millet whose quiet images achieve still more ominous implications. In his 1857 picture The Gleaners, peasant figures take on monumentality disproportionate to the size of the painting and display bitter economic disparity between classes. Portaels was based in Brussels but well connected to artists in Paris and would have been aware of social and political meanings read in such images.

61 Gustave Courbet (1819-1877), The Stone Breakers, 1849, 165 cm. x 238.8 cm. Destroyed in WW II.
62 Jean François Millet (1842-1875), The Gleaners, 1857, 83.5 cm. x 110 cm., Musee d’Orsay, Paris.
Whether or not Charlotte would have been cognizant of this aspect and taken it into account in choosing to wear peasant costume for her portrait is unknown; however, the political associations of Brianza dress were specific to the Italian states.⁶³

The mobility of fashion - inspiration can come from any source and be taken up first by any class - leaves the wearing of costume in portraits open to other competing interpretations. Sitters for such portraits were most often women of privilege and the cachet of the Risorgimento beyond the Italian states drew attention to extravagant feast-day or wedding dresses typical of these regions. Ethnographic prints made such costumes familiar elsewhere and these costumes were often appropriated by privileged women as statements of style without, necessarily, with any political intent. There was a long history of attempts, especially in Venetia, to restrict what Italian peasants could wear in terms of fabrics, colours, and accessories in order to maintain visible class distinctions.⁶⁴ Traditional regional dress for special occasions was felt to threaten the hegemonic order when this was richer and more lavish than that of the dominant class. Such rich adornment was possible despite extreme poverty among most Italian peasants because of their historical trade and cultural links with the Near East (particularly in Sicily) and the production of luxurious silks (in Lombardy especially). Another possibility is raised by instances of fashion-across-class investigated by Janice Helland and demonstrating women of British aristocracy sometimes wore fabrics and adaptations

⁶³ Deborah Cherry has observed that ‘[b]y later mid-1850s viewers and critics were speaking of ‘reading’ pictures, prompted by the accretion of incident which suggested the mid-century novel, and the written explanations which sometimes accompanied them.’ Deborah Cherry, Beyond the Frame: Feminism and Visual Culture, Britain 1850-1900 (London; N.Y.: Routledge, 2000), 39.

of regional dress with the philanthropic motive of promoting local producers. As Charlotte took a practical interest in the then-flagging silk industry of Lombardy, this should also be considered as possibly contributing to her decision to display these materials on her person. On the other hand, appropriating traditional regional dress, as Charlotte did in the Brianza, could potentially be interpreted by people of these regions as undermining their identity.

Two additional considerations relative to costume in portraits are the documenting of fancy dress that was made for private entertainments such as costume balls or tableau vivant, and the prominence of costume as a means of identifying characters depicted in the genre of ‘keepsake’ portraits. These ‘portraits,’ popular from early in the nineteenth century, depicted characters from novels, plays (especially those by William Shakespeare), and operas. As the appearance of the fictional sitters was imaginative and varied, specific fabricated costumes were critical for their recognition.

The overall point I wish to emphasize is the centrality of dress and accompanying accessories in these four Portaels paintings and their several possible interpretations. These interpretations are not necessarily exclusive from one another. Given the cultural and political sensitivity of her role as Vicereine within the context of the Risorgimento, questions as to where Charlotte’s various images were seen and by whom need to be explored in the process of reading for meaning.

Individuals wishing to curry favour with Austria were not encouraged to attend the Viceregal court at Monza and Austrian soldiers were not invited as their presence made Italian guests uncomfortable. Unfortunately for Maximilian and Charlotte, few

---

65 Janice Helland, Orion Visitor in the Arts Lecture, University of Victoria, 2003.
66 Such as the tinted photograph of Charlotte discussed earlier (see Figure 2.27).
Italians chose to attend as they faced intimidation from Italian nationalists if they did so.\textsuperscript{67} This exclusive nature of the Monza court makes it conceivable the \textit{Brianza} and \textit{Miramare} portraits could have been displayed there despite their potentially subversive implications. Additionally, Maximilian’s predilection for ‘exotic’ décor should be acknowledged as a possible influence when speculating on the use of costume in portraits of Charlotte; more broadly, nineteenth-century imagining (and control over, as Edward Said demonstrated) of the ‘Near and Middle East’ in the form of ‘Orientalism’ must be noted. Occidental fascination with these regions and cultures gained new impetus in the mid-nineteenth century from the Suez Canal project and Trieste society reflected this development.\textsuperscript{68} Illustrations of the interior of Villa Lazzarovich, Maximilian’s rented accommodation in Trieste, display themes such as a harem (Figures 3.10 and 3.11). Fabiani notes that travel in Greece, Turkey, and Dalmatia in 1850 “powerfully affected” Maximilian and evidence of this is found in paintings in the collection at Miramare dating from this journey.\textsuperscript{69} In 1851 and 1852 Maximilian visited Italy, Spain, and Portugal stopping in Sicily at the court of Ferdinand II.\textsuperscript{70} The King had vacated the palace of Caserta (birthplace of Marie-Amélie) for the fortified site of Gaeta but Maximilian visited the former and wrote admiringly in his journal of the palace and grounds designed to ensure that “even nature may not come in the way of … the measured step of a Court

\textsuperscript{67} Venosta, 1914, 282-285.

\textsuperscript{68} Said, [1978], 1979, 89-91. A concise definition of Orientalism in the sense that Said employed it is “the historical and ideological process whereby false images of and myths about the Eastern or Oriental world have been constructed in various western discourses.” www.laits.utexas.edu/doherty/glossary.html

\textsuperscript{69} Fabiani, 2001, 8.

\textsuperscript{70} Consort of Ferdinand II, an Austrian archduchess and aunt of Maximilian. For a description of this visit see Haslip, 1971, 43.
surrounded by the nimbus of royalty.”71 These experiences were brought to bear, in 1857, on the Viceregal court at Monza. Haslip describes Dalmatian attendants wearing national costume with jeweled ceremonial weapons and stationed at entrances, and young black pages looking like sculptures from “Venetian palaces.”72

---

71 Maximilian, Journals, quoted in Haslip, Ibid. Ferdinand II had been forced to flee Naples when his subjects rebelled against his punishing reign.

The Brianza, untraced

“The painter Portaels used his richest colors (sic) to immortalize the radiance that was about [Charlotte].”\footnote{Harding is referring here to a portrait of Charlotte. This author, whose imaginative book was later adapted for film, unfortunately does not provide details of the several portraits of Charlotte she mentions. Harding did have access to individuals with first hand knowledge of events she tells of and who may have possessed otherwise unknown portraits of Charlotte such as one in which she wears a yellow gown and another in which she wears a turquoise gown. Bertida Harding, \textit{Phantom Crown} (New York: Halcyon House, 1934), 212.}

The \textit{Miramare} portrait of Charlotte, which I believe to have become conflated with her \textit{Brianza} portrait, has been thought to allude to Alessandro Manzoni’s early nineteenth-century novel \textit{I promessi sposi} (translated as \textit{The Betrothed} or \textit{The Fiancée}) since the early decades of the twentieth century if not before. I maintain both these portraits reference external texts but that the \textit{Miramare} associates Charlotte with a Shakespearian character whereas the (absent) \textit{Brianza} portrait does, in fact, associate her with Lucia Mondella, the female protagonist of Manzoni’s novel, but in a manner that has not been fully comprehended. The confusion has been perpetuated by a motif common to both paintings. It seems not to have been observed, or perhaps not articulated, that Charlotte’s gown in the \textit{Miramare} portrait is distinctly different to Brianza traditional dress.

Guidebooks to Miramare castle reiterate assumptions that the \textit{Miramare} portrait is a depiction of the Vicereine in Brianza costume. For example, in the 1984 version, the authors write “[t]he large painting is a portrait of Charlotte in Brianza costume similar to
that of Lucia Mondella, the protagonist of Manzoni’s *The Betrothed* …”74 In the
guidebook of 2001 the painting is described as follows:

[Charlotte’s Room] is dominated by a full-length portrait of Charlotte herself that occupies a niche in the center of the room; this shows her dressed as a peasant woman of the Brianza area, with typical silver *sperada* - hairpins adorning her hair.75

*I promessi sposi (The Betrothed)*, was written by Alessandro Manzoni (1785-1873) in 1827/8 and is venerated as Italy’s first modern novel.76 Manzoni’s use of Tuscan vernacular speech in the 1840 edition emphatically declared his nationalist intent as in Tuscany this Italian dialect was spoken freely. Elsewhere, foreign powers occupying Italian states imposed their own languages with the result that these states were linguistically, as well as politically, divided. As Charlotte was Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia and Brianza was within Lombardy, it might seem reasonable for her to choose to wear a costume traditional to that region for a portrait. What is not addressed anywhere in the literature is that such an association between the Vicereine and the female protagonist of a novel considered a catalyst for the Risorgimento would be surprising, not

76 Alessandro Manzoni (1785-1873), poet and novelist. A few statistics convey the importance of this novel: six hundred copies sold in twenty days when it was first published; Manzoni spent fifteen years refining his work with the final edition being released in 1840/2; by mid-twentieth century, over five hundred editions had appeared. Archibald Colquhoun in Alessandro Manzoni, *The Betrothed*, trans. Archibald Colquhoun (London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd), Preface. Grazietta Butazzi points out that Manzoni was living near Lecco, a town in Lombardy where some of the action is set, and would seen the costume worn by his character Lucia. Although the author writes of the costume as though it originated long before the time of his novel, recent research indicates that it was worn only from the beginning of the nineteenth century. (Personal correspondence, spring 2004)
to say provocative. The text of this novel had quickly become so ingrained in Italian culture that quotations from the story became part of vernacular speech and the characters and motifs (including dress) became symbolic of traits and circumstances.  

A connection between Maximilian and author Alessandro Manzoni is mentioned by H. Montgomery Hyde. Manzoni was unwell in 1857 and Maximilian called at his residence to ask after his health. Subsequently the Viceroy had newspapers carry daily reports of Manzoni’s condition and when the author had recovered invited him to the court and attempted to bestow upon him a medal. Manzoni would not visit the court and refused to accept the medal; however, the evident appreciation of Maximilian and Charlotte for Italian culture and their charitable acts and liberal views gained them a degree of favour among the populace. While the majority of residents of Milan were emphatically supportive of both goals of the Risorgimento - Italian states free of foreign oppression and these states unified into one country - for land-starved, rural Italians experiencing harsh poverty, a means of livelihood was paramount and initially there was

---

77 In an article published in 1938 Leandro Pita Romero rhetorically asks “y Carlota?” meaning ‘and what of Charlotte?’ In doing so he is replacing Lucia’s name in the Manzoni phrase “y Lucia?” - a cryptic question freighted with moral significance - but of interest here because it suggests that allusions to Lucia, when referring to Charlotte, were and remained commonplace in Italy at that time. This cannot be taken to mean Portaels’s portrait of Charlotte in Brianza dress was a familiar image or was necessarily interpreted as I suggest above, but it is a point of interest. Leandro Pita Romero “Hamlet en Trieste y en Querétraro: Nuevos papeles, nuevas luces” in Nuovo Antología Rome 1er y 16 de septiembre de 1938.
78 Hyde, 1946, 80.
79 Suzanne Desternes and Chandet remark in passing that the village of Lecco especially benefited from Viceregal attention. Coincidentally, Lecco was birthplace of Manzoni’s father and the home of Lucia Mondella’s fiancé in Manzoni’s novel. Desternes and Chandet, 1964, 91.
hope that Maximilian might be able to institute land reforms.\textsuperscript{80} Had he been able to do so, many would have been willing to settle for regional autonomy under his rule despite ongoing demands for self-rule had this been an option.

The Culture of the Risorgimento

Todd Porterfield has argued that art made in the service of empire better represents national identity than does art inspired by revolutionary intent. Porterfield is commenting in the context of his study on art produced “in the service of French imperialism” earlier in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{81} The “art of empire” during Maximilian and Charlotte’s tenure as Viceroy and Vicereine in Lombardy-Venetia, was promulgated by Austria and unlike the circumstances in France that Porterfield addresses, art produced in the service of the Austrian Empire had little currency where national identity was concerned. The nineteenth-century Austrian Empire seethed with competing nationalisms amongst the many cultures it comprised and many of these wished not only to throw off Austrian control but to establish primacy over a neighbouring culture. Franz Josef was steeped in a military mentality and took up arms more readily than he conceived of the arts as

\textsuperscript{80} Wolfe makes clear the connections between class privilege, land ownership, and political influence in Italian states through this period. Stuart Woolf, \textit{A History of Italy, 1700-1860: Social Constraints of Political Change} (New York: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1986). The possibility of popular support for Maximilian and Charlotte detracting from the goals of those supporting the Risorgimento troubled Cavour. A vintage satirical drawing by Richard Boyle showing an Italian audience watching marionettes in a Milan theatre almost certainly refers to Charlotte and Maximilian. The response of audience members ranges from mild interest to annoyance as they watch a slender male marionet and a dark-haired female marionette manipulated by an unseen power. The major figure in the front foreground (grimacing) resembles Italian Prime Minister Camille Cavour. The female marionette wears a dress much like that worn by Charlotte in the Marbonn/Bertarelli image and quite different from clothes worn by female members of the audience. Richard Doyle, \textit{A visit to the marionette theatre in Milan}, c. 1857, Vintage Cartoon, Online. \(<http://www.cartoonstock.com/vintage/blowup.asp?imageref=csl1627&artist=Doyle,+Richard&topic=M...> (27 May 2007).

hegemonic ammunition although his state portraits were ubiquitous enough to become a perennial motif in popular literature and the Austrian double-headed eagle motif was as prevalent as police spies. In contrast, the nineteenth century was a time of momentous productivity for Italian culture, especially for Italian opera with its multi-sensory appeal, accessibility, and possibilities for disguised meanings.\(^\text{82}\) While some recent studies have taken issue with claims of opera as a primary force in the Risorgimento, none question that it was a vibrant factor.\(^\text{83}\) Like _La Muette de Portici_ by Auber, which popular history holds to be the ultimate inspiration of Belgian independence, the drama and emotion of opera constituted a public manifestation of encoded Risorgimento ideals - particularly as opera originated within Italian culture/s.\(^\text{84}\) Italian operas performed outside the Italian states captured the imagination, and much passionate sympathy for Italian people as the Greek struggle had done in earlier decades.

Previous unsuccessful manifestations of Italian nationalism scattered exiles throughout Europe, with many finding sanctuary in England. Study in Rome continued to be a highly desirable part of an artist’s education and foreigners working there frequently embraced the cause of unification and independence.\(^\text{85}\) English poets

\(^\text{82}\) The concerts arranged at the Belgian court by Duchess Marie Henriette, most often of Italian opera, have been mentioned previously. Charlotte’s upbringing was restrictive after the death of Queen Louise-Marie and training in classical music had not prepared her to appreciate other music - an ironic circumstance given the centrality I attribute to operatic themes in certain paintings from the later 1850s. Reinach-Foussmagne, 1825.


\(^\text{84}\) The name of Guiseppe Verdi, for example, proliferated in graffiti as V.E.R.D.I., an acronym for Victor Emmanuel (1820–1878), King of Italy (_Re d'Italia_). The fact that Auber’s opera and Manzoni’s novel date from the same year is indicative of mounting nationalism in the Italian states and elsewhere in these early decades of the nineteenth century.

\(^\text{85}\) A contemporary satirical drawing by Sir John Tenniel indicates that English official concern for the Italian peoples was not entirely philanthropic. Published in relation to
Elizabeth Barrett Browning and Robert Browning embraced the cause of Italian independence well before they took up residence in the Casa Guidi in Florence. There they had the salon painted green and hung with red and white striped curtains (colours of the illegal flag of Italy) and were at the centre of a politically engaged cultural community. Both wrote passionate and influential works on the subject and, regardless of Queen Victoria’s initial disapproval of Elizabeth Barrett Browning (or because of this), Charlotte would probably have been aware of this poet and may have read her work. Charlotte would also have seen, at the vast 1851 International Exhibition in England, an 1843 sculpture titled *The Greek Slave* by Hiram Powers (1805-1873). A celebrated work condemning slavery, it was also understood to criticize foreign rule in the Italian states. Powers was an American living in Florence. By the time of Charlotte and Maximilian’s arrival in Lombardy in 1857 another American sculptor, Harriet Hosmer, was also in Florence researching her sculpture *Zenobia*. This sculpture more specifically addressed the cause of Italian reunification and independence and caused a

---

86 Elizabeth Barret Browning (1806-1861) wrote a sonnet, *Aurora Leigh*, in response to viewing Power’s *Greek Slave*. On reading Browning’s sonnet in 1865 Queen Victoria wrote to Victoria the Princess Royal, Crown Princess of Prussia, asking if she had “read an extraordinary poem by a lady now dead a Mrs. Browning (Augusta Stanley knows her) … It is very strange, very original full of talent and of some beautiful things - but at times dreadfully coarse - though very moral in its tendency - but an incredible book for a lady to have written.” Dated 1 March 1865, in Christopher Hibbert, ed., *Queen Victoria in her Letters and Journals* (London: John Murray Ltd., 1984), 188. See also: <http://www.intute.ac.uk/artsandhumanities/cgi-bin/fullrecord.pl?handle-humbul 10107> (May 2006).
sensation when it was displayed.\textsuperscript{87} In the manner of the time, Power’s \textit{Greek Slave} drew
stylistic inspiration from the classical world even as revolutions or attempts at revolution
in the late 1840s provided conceptual inspiration. By the late 1850s when Homer
sculpted \textit{Zenobia}, realist tendencies better served a spirit of rebellion. Whereas Power’s
female sculpture was clothed only in ‘Christian virtue,’ Homer sculpted \textit{Zenobia} in robes
that she determined to be authentic. This difference speaks, in part, to the gender of the
artist, as Hosmer wished to imbue her female figure with the utmost dignity, but also to
Hosmer’s recognition of the symbolic potential of costume in relation to the
Risorgimento.

A particular approach to Realism was taken up by a small group of Italian painters
in response to the Risorgimento. Initially these artists painted images that were
provocative in their allusions to rebellion. Following initial successes in unifying the
Italian states these artists came to the opinion that the guiding ideals of the Risorgimento
were being discarded and they turned to painting the spare beauty of rural life and colours
of the land as statements of an essentially Italian way of life. Albert Boime has explored
this shift away from neoclassical ideals in Italian painting as exemplified by these
Macchia artists.\textsuperscript{88}

The literature and art that evolved out of this [nationalist and revolutionary] mind-set had to become free of the
constraints of classical form and content. To reach the
broad audience reawakened to a sense of history, the writer
or artist had to enter into the experiences and feelings that

\textsuperscript{87} Harriet Hosmer (1830-1908). Not all of Hosmer’s oeuvre was informed by political
issues. One of her minor works was purchased by Albert Edward, Prince of Wales.
Charlotte is not known to have visited Florence but would have been kept informed by
royal family members and periodical accounts.

\textsuperscript{88} Boime, 1993.
were inaccessible to the rigid, abstract principles of classical doctrine.\textsuperscript{89}

[Macchia artists] based their art on the humble world of figures, attitudes, profiles, compositional movements, color combinations and touches, or “patches,” which they preserved in their sketchbooks and, partly, in their memories.\textsuperscript{90}

Boime cites Alessandro Manzoni’s “I promessi sposi” as a literary example of this shift towards anti-classical and nationalist values. Further, Manzoni’s use of the Tuscan dialect “provid[ed] a textual model for the Macchiaioli, whose display of the macchia patch was meant to be an equivalent pictorial Tuscan vernacular.”\textsuperscript{91} (These “patches,” Boime states, roughly correlate to French \textit{plein air} and impressionist experiments and Macchia artists kept apprised of developments in France through contacts such as Florentine etcher, essayist, and art critic Diego Martelli).\textsuperscript{92}

The first illustrated edition of \textit{I promessi sposi} was published in 1840 with illustrations by Francesco Gonin.\textsuperscript{93} Lucia Mondella’s textual depiction is echoed in an illustration of Brianza ethnic costume by Hippolyte Lecomte (Figures 3.13 and 3.14).

\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., 1993, 42.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 10-12.
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 43.
\textsuperscript{92} French artist Edgar Degas (1834-1917) traveled to Naples in 1856 and was studying in Rome during the Viceregal tenure of Maximilian and Charlotte. Martelli (1838-1896) later became a close friend of Degas and in 1879 was the subject of one of the artist’s best-known portraits. This picture is now in the National Gallery of Scotland.
\textsuperscript{93} Francesco Gonin (1737-1818). Gonin was “the foremost nineteenth-century Piedmontese painter” and worked in many media including fresco; his engraving and printmaking techniques were precedent setting among Italian artists of the time. \textit{Grove Dictionary of Art} (Macmillan Publishers, 2000).
I promessi sposi begins in Brianza as Lucia is preparing for her wedding but the unwanted attentions of a nobleman and complicity of a priest force her to flee, together with her mother, before the ceremony can take place. \(^94\) They are given refuge in a monastery in Monza. \(^95\) Andrew Colquohn remarks this was a dangerous book as “peasants cut such a better figure” than the clergy and aristocrats. \(^96\) The story takes place

---

\(^94\) Colquhoun notes, “North Italian clergy were notoriously subservient to Austria.” Colquhoun in Manzoni, trans. Colquhoun [1840], 1959, xv.


\(^96\) Andrew Colquohn in the prologue to his translation of I promessi sposi.
in a time of plagues and Charles Borromeo features prominently. Manzoni’s description of Lucia Mondella dressed for her marriage ceremony includes mention of decorative hairpins, the motif common to both the *Miramare* and *Brianza* portraits and, as remarked, a major cause of their conflation.

Lucia had just come forth adorned from head to foot by the hands of her mother. Her friends were stealing glances at the bride, and forcing her to show herself; while she, with the somewhat warlike modesty of a rustic, was endeavouring to escape, using her arms as a shield for her face, and holding her head downwards, her black penciled eyebrows seeming to frown, while her lips were smiling. Her dark and luxuriant hair, divided on her forehead with a white and narrow parting, was united behind in many-circled plaits, pierced with long silver pins, disposed around, so as to look like an aureola, or saintly glory, a fashion still in use among the Milanese peasant-girls. Round her neck she had a necklace of garnets, alternated with beads of filigree gold. She wore a pretty bodice of flowered brocade, laced with coloured ribbons, a short gown of embroidered silk, plaited in close and minute folds, scarlet stockings, and a pair of shoes of embroidered silk.

There exists a brief, curious, description of the missing Brianza portrait. In her 1971 publication, Haslip writes of a painting “… depict[ing Charlotte] in the regional costume of the Brianza, the red dress with the laced-up bodice and gold ornaments, which sets off her dark, Italian type of beauty.” As the illustration accompanying this description is separated from the text, and as the illustration is in black-and-white, a discrepancy is not

---

99 Haslip, 1971, 125.
readily apparent - but the painting illustrated in Haslip’s book with the caption “Charlotte in Lombard national costume” is the *Miramare* portrait (see Figure 3.14).

Haslip’s description of the Brianza dress worn by Charlotte in a painting by Portaels correctly corresponds to details of this type of costume as described by Manzoni and is confirmed by dress historian Grazietta Butazzi and ethnic dress images, but it does not correspond to the gown in the *Miramare* portrait. Butazzi cites identifying characteristics of Brianza dress as “a bodice of floral damask cloth laced in front and back with coloured ribbons, sleeves attached with ribbons and worn over a white blouse and a skirt minutely-pleated and of a solid colour, red being especially popular . . .”100

It will also be obvious from Manzoni’s writing that the character Lucia is modest and somewhat shy so that Charlotte’s boldly *en face* *Miramare* portrait seems mismatched in conception as well as dress. In palette and pose the *Miramare* is more reminiscent of court paintings from Elizabethan England than contemporary Belgian or Italian portraits. In a letter written by Charlotte to Léopold Brabant in December 1857, she praises Portaels saying she finds her portrait admirable. She does not describe the portrait to which she refers and makes no reference to a second painting.

Milan, December 7, 1857

My dear Leopold,

Portaels leaves for Belgium tomorrow and I could not let him go without giving him some words for you . . . You are indeed right to promote his painting for it is strong and his knowledge of art transcends, unfortunately, that of most artists of our day. His talent is infinite and my portrait seems to me to be highly successful, it is painted with care

100 Personal correspondence, 2004.
and is, at the same time superb, giving a splendid effect even from a distance …

Portaels’s completion of the *Brianza* portrait is confirmed in a letter written to his uncle on December 23, 1857, in which the artist remarks he hopes “to profit from painting for the new Vicereine the portrait she desired … wearing the costume of women of Brianza,” Portaels’s optimism was well-founded as the following year he was commissioned to paint portraits of Charlotte’s brothers, Léopold Brabant and Philippe of Flanders. If Portaels did not paint the *Miramare* portrait during this sojourn he may have painted it earlier in 1857 and carried it with him along with others requested, or commissioned, by the Vicereine, or during her return in autumn 1857. It is not known how many paintings Portaels took with him to the viceregal court but one was a portrait of Countess Caroline de Grunne. A portrait of her painted by Portaels, perhaps a copy of that painted for Charlotte, appears in Reinach Foussmagne.

According to Albert Duchesne three paintings by Portaels hung in Charlotte’s private sitting room at Miramare. These are not identified but it is doubtful that they would be two earlier works by Portaels acquired by Maximilian that remain in the collection Duchesne was shown during a visit to Miramare. On what Duchesne bases the former presence of three paintings is unclear, however, the interior of Miramare was documented with photographs in the nineteenth century and it is possible an image of

---

102 Chartrain-Hebbelinck, 1979, 89.
103 Duchesne, 1985, 63.
104 Reinach Foussmagne, 1925, 81.
105 Duchesne, 1985, 65.
107 *Jewess of Cairo* and *Young Arab Woman*, both dating from the 1840s.
Charlotte’s salon exists with the paintings in situ. Lacking such an image, it could be speculated the three paintings by Portaels comprised the two portraits of Charlotte (the untraced Brianza and the Miramare) and that of Countess de Grunne. In 1867 Charlotte returned to Belgium from Miramare reputedly without any belongings. Beyond the unusual circumstances of her return, this would be in accord with Austrian marriage laws that required a wife’s chattels and wealth to revert to the Austrian royal family. Paintings possessed by Charlotte at the Viceregal court or at the Miramare residence would presumably have remained there. The Miramare painting is the only Portaels portrait of Charlotte accounted for in the castle inventory; it may be the Brianza also remained behind with its insinuation of revolt leading to its disappearance.107 Portaels’s two other paintings considered here as potentially portraits of Charlotte - and, if not, then certainly related to Charlotte’s Viceregal role - are, as described, among works displayed in the Brussels royal palace and may have been painted in Belgium during her months at the Belgian court. Duchesne remarks there is not a portrait of Charlotte with Portaels’s 1858 portraits of the Belgian princes but this may have been rectified in 1859 as discussed below.108

**The Miramare Portrait**

"Fair Portia's counterfeit!"109

The frontal pose and background of green drapery characterizing the Miramare portrait (Figure 3.14) is reminiscent of certain examples of sixteenth-century English

---

107 The painting probably differs in shape from the Fiancée and Violettes (and perhaps from that of the Brianza) as it has an arched frame and would likely have been painted as an image with an arch rather than rectangular as are the other two.
portraiture, in particular, copies of the *en face* image of Henry VIII by Flemish artist Hans Holbein (1497-1543) and certain portraits of Elizabeth I and Charlotte would almost certainly have been familiar with copies of these as would Portaels. I am not implying Charlotte thought to associate herself with Elizabeth I - or Henry VIII - but rather that a element of similarity between the *Miramare* image and portraits of English royalty might imply a link between England and Venetia. (As Charlotte is known to have specified how she was to be portrayed in the *Brianza*, it can plausibly be assumed she determined her *Miramare* image and she was thoroughly familiar with English history.)

A linking of England and Italy is found in a sixteenth-century play set in Venice and written by William Shakespeare: *The Merchant of Venice*. If, as I suggest, this portrait alludes to a character from this work, a visual connection would reinforce this intertextuality.\(^{110}\)

---

\(^{110}\) Admiration for Shakespeare’s plays extended to members of the British royal family, with caveats, as a letter of 9 April 1859 from Queen Victoria to her daughter Victoria the Princess Royal, Princess Frederich William, illustrates. “By the by you went to see the ‘Merry Wives;’ you must have found it very coarse; even I have never had the courage to go to see it … for your adored Shakespeare is dreadful in that respect and many things have to be left out in many of his plays.” Queen Victoria was not, however, always averse to Shakespeare as is evident in a 20 April 1859 continuation of this discussion. “With regard to what you say about Shakespeare, I quite agree. You need not be afraid of seeing Faust; … it is so beautiful that really one does not feel put out by it. I advise you to see it dear.” Hibbert, 1984, 110-111 and 211, respectively.
Figure 3.14. Jean François Portaels, Vicereina Carlotta d’Asburgo (painting known variously as The Archduchess Charlotte in Milanese Dress, Charlotte in Brianza Dress or The fiancée), 1857.

Figure 3.15. Photographer unknown (Disdéri?), untitled (Charlotte) c.1857-1864.111

111 The Miramare Castle collection inventory indicates the Miramare was painted during Portaels’s visit to the Viceregal court in autumn 1857. It is not known if the date is inscribed on the painting or otherwise recorded and, if not, it may have been thought to be 1857 because of confusion between the two portraits, or they may have both been painted in that year. This photograph of Charlotte resembles her appearance in the Miramare portrait and raises the possibility Portaels worked from this image. As with many nineteenth-century photographs, the date and photographer cannot presently be determined with certainty as the same photographs were re-photographed by others in many locations and dates of production of these latter images further confuse the date of origin.
The popularity of female characters from plays of Shakespeare was enhanced by nineteenth-century literary explorations of female characters from Shakespeare’s plays that enlarged upon their (imagined) lives. One such publication was Mary Cowden Clarke’s *The Girlhood of Shakespeare’s Heroines* published in 1851. In the twentieth century Nina Auerbach challenged negativity of Victorian myths relating to women and posits that these were a response to recognized but unspoken female potential. She describes Clarke’s publication as a reworking of negative scripts into stories that were ultimately and unexpectedly empowering for women. In Auerbach’s estimation, Clarke “frees the heroines from the boundaries of their plays, endowing them with rich lives of their own whose autonomy is impinged upon neither by Shakespeare nor the man his play will make them love.” Cowden Clarke’s publication was extremely popular and probably Charlotte would have been familiar with it.

The *Merchant of Venice* is set in this capital city of Venetia with much of the action taking place in Venice and the remainder at Belmont, the mainland villa of female protagonist, Portia. She is dutiful, clever, wealthy, and, beautiful. Her father has died and she is to marry a suitor according to a scheme devised by her father requiring her suitors to guess in which of three caskets is a ‘golden’ portrait of Portia. If her desired suitor, Bassanio of Venice, is to win her, he must choose the correct casket - as he does

---

113 Books from Charlotte’s library reputedly remain at Miramare Castle and access to these might allow verification of such details.
114 Shakespeare is thought to have based this play on an actual incident in which a Christian sought recompense from a Jew but to have transposed the roles of these individuals. There are many interpretations of this play but in the nineteenth century it was overwhelmingly celebrated as “life-affirming” as Linda Rozmovits demonstrates in her tightly focused study. Rozmovits, 1998, 2.
after other suitors have been unsuccessful. Bassanio and Portia marry and exchange wedding rings promising each other they will keep these rings forever. It had been necessary for Bassanio to borrow money from his friend Antonio who is subsequently threatened as a consequence of this generous act. The Merchant of the title claims his right to cut a pound of flesh from Antonio and, in the following courtroom scene, it is Portia, disguised in magistrate’s robes, who outwits the Merchant. Bassanio is unaware the magistrate who secured the release of Antonio is Portia. Still dressed as a magistrate, she tricks Bassanio into surrendering his marriage ring in gratitude for the verdict despite his having promised to always wear it. Portia resumes her own identity and is reunited with Bassanio. Pretending to just then notice it missing, she asks where his ring is. The play’s resolution sees Portia triumphantly revealing the ring she had insisted on being given as the magistrate and also, thereby, the secret of her court role.115

In the play, Portia’s ‘golden’ portrait hidden in the casket and the episode concerning the rings feature prominently. Charlotte’s bold en face pose in the Miramare fits that of brilliant Portia of Belmont far better than shy Lucia Mondella. As Butazzi points out, the gown worn by Charlotte in the Portia/Miramare portrait is an elegant and fashionable type probably influenced by French designs and would be worn in an urban environment (see Figure 3.14). Of heavy yellow-gold silk or satin, its off-shoulder neckline is set off with a band of flounced material that partially covers a fitted and

115 Charlotte’s religious education emphasized examining motives for one’s actions; as a young child she notoriously extended this to the behaviour of others, in particular to actions of her brother, Léopold Brabant. This earned her the sobriquet of ‘little magistrate’ within the royal family and perhaps inclined her to humourously associate herself with Portia. See Jo Gerard, “Comment Leopold I eduqua sa Fille” in IV.6 Eventail (1970).
peaked bodice.\textsuperscript{116} Tulips and chrysanthemums create a bold pattern over the voluminous skirt and a smaller version of the same pattern plays over the shoulder flounce. A mantilla of black Chantilly lace, perhaps attached to the dress itself, is looped over Charlotte’s right arm; in her left she holds a black fan. She wears a pearl bracelet, necklace, and earrings, a corsage at her breast and holds flowers in her left hand. Her right arm is relaxed and slightly forward at her side; her right hand is adorned with several rings (Figure 3.16).\textsuperscript{117}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3_16.jpg}
\caption{Detail of Figure 3.14.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{116} Charlotte wears gowns with peaked, fitted bodice and full skirt in the Bouillot and Pina prints, among others, indicating that it was a fashionable style in the late 1850s. \\
\textsuperscript{117} This feature not duplicated in other known portraits of Charlotte although several paintings and photographs do show her wearing rings but not multiple rings on one hand.
Adorning her smooth chignon is an array of decorative hairpins, *a spadine or sperada*, anchored on each side by a large, gleaming *spilloni* and it is this hair ornament that has most likely led to the painting becoming confused with the missing *Brianza* portrait. With the exception of an illustration in Corti’s 1924 book and another of 1935 in which the face appears as a drawn facsimile, no copies or reproductions of the Miramare portrait are known prior to the second-half of the twentieth century when these appear in relation to the Miramare collection.\(^{118}\)

The English origin of the text posited as reference for the *Miramare* portrait - *The Merchant of Venice* - and Charlotte’s cosmopolitan dress in this portrait distinguish it from Portaels’s other three paintings that I suggest comprise a series. In each of the other three (the missing Brianza and Figures 3.20 and 3.26) the external texts are Italian and Charlotte wears peasant costume. The *Brianza* portrait links Charlotte to Manzoni’s novel and the province of Lombardy; the *Miramare* to Shakespeare’s Portia and Venetia. This would have been in accord with conceptions of geographic entities denoting them as female, especially those under foreign imperial control such as the Italian states.\(^{119}\) An example of Venice in the guise of a maiden imprisoned by Austria - represented as a double-headed eagle - can be seen in a contemporary satirical image (Figure 3.17).\(^{120}\)

\(^{118}\) Corti, [1924], (1968), n.p.; Eugene Bagger, *Francis Joseph*, (New York; London: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1927), 336. Unlike the version illustrated, current reproductions often depict Charlotte’s right hand with the multiple rings in shadow.


Figure 3.17. Delfico, *Garibaldi Serenading Imprisioned Venice* (pertaining to a scene in G. Rossini’s opera *The Barber of Seville*), 1853.

Even if it is accepted that the *Miramare* portrait references Shakespeare’s play, it is possible the painting was conceived as a portrait of Charlotte in costume.\footnote{The enigmatic quality of this portrait prompts Duchesne to refer to it as “*le curieux portrait.*” Duchesne, 1985, 65.} Within the library at Miramare were busts of several favourite authors with one of Shakespeare among these and among copies of royal portraits were commissioned for the entrance hall was one of Elizabeth I. Charlotte would have been familiar with others in private collections in England and would have seen portraits of the fictional Portia. Most images of Portia portray her in magistrate’s robes rather than a gown as did Richard Bonnington who included Bassanio and the golden casket in the background of his painting (Figure 3.18). Portia was a favourite Shakespearean subject of ‘keepsake’ portraits such as this example in which her magistrate’s gown appears to be draped over one shoulder (Figure 3.19). Yet I am inclined to seek a larger, more political explanation for this theme than a portrait of Charlotte in fashionable dress or a costume portrait as this painting shares
multiple elements with the three other Portaels paintings addressed here. In the cultural context of nineteenth-century Britain, especially, Portia may have been “[f]or conservatives and antifeminist campaigners alike … an icon of Victorian femininity, but for advocates of gender political reform she became the New Woman incarnate. Wealthy and uncontrolled by either husband or father, learned, independent, dressed as a man and making her petition in a court of law, Portia held a magnetic attraction for those who aspired to the freedom she possessed.”

122 Wealthy, exceptionally well educated, and trained to govern, Charlotte might be defined as already possessing, in the late 1850s, much of the freedom of Portia.

---

Figure 3.18. Richard Parkes Bonington, *Basanio and Portia*, c. 1826.
Figure 3.19. Artist unknown, *Portia*, c. 1860.

---

The Fiancée

The ultimate victory of the rebels of the Sicilian Vespers resulted in the proclamation of the Commonwealth of Sicily … Not surprisingly, the episode took on rich symbolic significance for the period of the Risorgimento.¹²³

The medal of Saint Hélène was ordered struck by Napoleon III in 1857 with the stated intention of honouring the memory of those who fought for France between 1792 and 1815. It additionally gave hope to Italian nationalists who perceived this as an intimation of action on the part of Napoleon III against Austria.

Count Venosta, who actively participated in the Risorgimento, describes the distribution and reception of the medal in Lombardy:

It was planned to place a medal in the hands of every veteran in Lombardo-Venetia (sic), as, with the distribution, it was hoped to revive the glorious memories of the [1848] battles fought against the Austrians by the Italian rank and file …. The giving of them was made with great precaution, be it understood, so as not to attract the attention of the police …. The medals were received with the greatest enthusiasm …. Only a Napoleon, it was said, could drive the Austrians out of Italy.¹²⁴

Italian nationalist artists such as the Macchia frequently found their source material in historical incidents such as the 1282 a.d. rebellion in Palermo, Sicily, provoked by a French soldier’s insult to a village woman on her way to church services.¹²⁵ This successful uprising against a foreign power was, correspondingly, the inspiration of Verdi’s 1854 opera The Sicilian Vespers. Verdi’s leading female protagonist in this work is Hélène, a virtuous noblewoman involved in Italian efforts to gain independence. Upon

¹²³ Boime, 1993, 57.
¹²⁴ Venosta, 1914, 270-73. Count Venosta was Minister of Foreign Affairs.
¹²⁵ For instance, three paintings by Francesco Hayez (1791-1882) on this theme dating from the 1830s and 1840s.
learning of a plan to massacre French guests at her wedding in an effort to gain independence from French rule, Hélène refuses to marry. Eventually she is forced to proceed with the ceremony and the carnage takes place.\footnote{Hélène of the Sicilian Vespers was not St. Hélène but as the medal shared this name it added a further layer of significance to this cultural text for supporters of the Risorgimento.} This combination of virtue and powerlessness in female characters is prevalent throughout cultural production in the nineteenth-century Italian states. Jonathon Morris has commented on this lack of any ‘Marianne-type figure’\footnote{A metaphorical woman who led French proletariat against the monarchy.} noting “when Verdi tried to create one in the warrior soprano Odabella in the 1846 opera Attila, the work was poorly received by the public. Significantly, the female lead in the later La Battaglia di Legnano was the more conventional figure of Lida, a blank and passive figure who serves as wife and mother for the nation.”\footnote{Jonathan Morris, Department of History, University College London, August, 2002: 2. \texttt{<http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.cgi?path=86851058896310>} (June 2004).} The young woman in Portaels’s Fiancée strongly suggests an allusion to Hélène and Verdi’s opera (see Figure 3.20).\footnote{Verdi’s promotion of Risorgimento values led to ‘Viva Verdi’ becoming a frequent battle cry. This not only celebrated Verdi’s work but, as mentioned previously, was a coded reference to the Victor Emanuele, Rei di Italia because the letters of the name ‘Verdi’ replicate the first letters of this name and title. A comprehensive site on Italian composer Giuseppe Verdi (1813-1901) is found at: \texttt{<opera.stanford.edu/Verdi/main.html>} (2005).} Her pose with averted gaze and inclined head is otherwise discordant with expectations given the title, whereas, if she is meant to reference Hélène, her pensive demeanour is appropriate. Portraels’s sensual rendering of the dress in Fiancée evokes paintings by Jean-Dominique Ingres, the French painter celebrated - and disparaged - for his obsessive detailing of women’s apparel in his
portraits. It represents traditional wedding attire worn in Piana dei Greci renowned for being especially sumptuous due to the region’s Albanian-Orthodox influences (Figure 3.20). A profile photograph of Charlotte seems not dissimilar to features of the face in this painting (Figure 3.21).

The heavy segmented, silver belt was of symbolic importance and a highly valued, and valuable, item of such costumes. Historically these segmented silver belts carried on the fermatura, or closure, the image of a saint; in the painted motif this feature may represent St. Charles Borromeo. It is a detail that could document the painting’s relationship to Charlotte. A rope looped about the saint’s neck, signifying humility and self-sacrifice as demonstrated in his efforts to secure relief for victims during a plague, is the identifying visual element in depictions of Saint Charles. The figure depicted on the buckle wears a cowl and a twisted cord (or perhaps a rope) that extends down from either side of the neck and across the chest (Figures 3.22, 3.23). It is suggestive of the Saint but not definitive. Conversely, the painting quite certainly refers to the Vespers and the purchase, or commissioning, of such an image would seem to demonstrate empathy with the Risorgimento in Sicily.

130 Aileen Ribeiro, Ingres in Fashion (Yale University Press, 1999).
Figure 3.20. Jean-François Portaels, *The Fiancée*, before 1868.

Figure 3.21. Photographer unknown, ‘*Charlotte,*’ detail, 1860s.
Attached to the woman’s headdress of golden and red materials is a long train. Graziela Butazzi observes that Portaels paints this train looped up through the belt as though for rapid walking - a gesture that would be appropriate to scenes in the *Vespers*. Flowers feature in this painting as in the *Miramare* but here they are *mughetti* (Lily-of-the-Valley) and a single stem of white roses in a vase in the background. On the wall is an Eastern Orthodox icon of a Madonna and Child.\(^{131}\) A jewel box or *cofanetto* echoes the plot of *The Merchant of Venice*; it is open and among the items is a necklace of pearls and another of coral, examples of which are known to have been among Charlotte’s

---

\(^{131}\) On the wall in the room described as the bedroom of Charlotte at Miramare is a copy of Raphael’s *Madonna and Child*, but this is not that painting.
dowry. The young woman wears a single string of pearls and hoop earrings. The material of the gown is a complex textile of gold and ivory brocade panels with floral motifs disposed upon it, gold ribbons running through it, and gold lacing at the bodice. A white undergarment has a delicate lace ruff edging each wrist and the round neckline and the silken material is puffed out between blue ribbons tying together the sleeves.132

Figure 3.24 Enruli Enrulo, The Sicilian Vespers, 20th century.

So pivotal are the scenes in the opera in which Hélène appears in her wedding gown that it is the subject of numerous paintings and continues to feature on promotion materials for productions of The Sicilian Vespers (Figures 3.24 and 3.25).

Figure 3.25. Designer unknown, The Sicilian Vespers (Montserrat Caballe as ‘Elena’), 20th century.

132 I thank Grazietta Buttazi for pointing out to me these important details.
The historical Sicilian uprising took place in Palermo and a close investigation of Portaels’s *Fiancée* painting led to the finding that it bears an inscription: *Piano (sic) dei Greci/Sicilia*,\(^{133}\) the name of a village near Naples, close to Caserta, Sicily. This proximity is significant as Caserta was the birthplace of Marie-Amélie and Palermo that of Louise-Marie. It will be remembered that Maximilian and Charlotte attended a performance of Verdi’s *Sicilian Vespers* in the days after their engagement and that the venue was the Monnaie Theatre where Belgium’s struggle for independence is said to have begun in reaction to Auber’s opera *Muette de Portici*.\(^{134}\) I have asserted this action can be interpreted as a symbolic ‘witnessing’ of foreign oppression in the Italian states by Charlotte and Maximilian and, although they were themselves foreigners in Lombardy-Venetia, a declaration of their alignment with the Italian peoples. King Leopold’s decade-long desire to intervene in the political situation of the Two Sicilies, and concern in England for deplorable conditions endured by Sicilians (and a desire for improved access to the Mediterranean), are well documented as discussed above. If Charlotte’s *Brianza* portrait and Miramare portraits are understood to represent geographical links corresponding to her Viceregal position, a painting relating to this Sicilian location might recognize family ties to Sicily or signal expanded political aspirations.

*Le Bouquet de violettes*

Like the *Fiancée* painting, *Le Bouquet de Violettes* could be a genre image of a young peasant woman in picturesque local costume (Figures 3.20 and 3.26 respectively). It is equally enigmatic yet, as with the *Fiancée*, its substantial dimensions and precise yet

---

\(^{133}\) Martine Vermeire: personal correspondence, 2004

\(^{134}\) Hyde, 1946, 68.
cryptic motifs makes its assignment to this category seem inadequate.135 Both paintings are outstanding examples of Portaels’s oeuvre and transcend examples of his works that Théophile Gautier once criticized as “sometimes laps[ing] into facile grace.”136 Rather than being a genre painting, *Violettes* can be seen to continue the pattern of allegory and regional intertextuality proposed for Portaels’s three other paintings.

Portaels portrays the young woman in *Violettes* from a low angle with the result that she seems transfixed and remote despite figuratively sharing physical space with viewers because of the compressed composition (see Figure 3.26).

---

135 *The Fiancée* measures 104 cm. X 82 cm.; *Violettes* measures 103 cm. X 80 cm.
136 Théophile Gautier (1811-1872) once commented that Portaels’s paintings were “in general full of a facile grace, of which he is perhaps too lavish ...." 


Dr. Judith Ogonovsky-Steﬀens, a leading authority on Portaels, wrote several articles about the artist including one exploring his role as art advisor to the Count of Flanders. There is also a small catalogue which, as the title suggest, focuses more on Portaels as a teacher than an artist. Marie-Jeanne Chartrain-Hebbelinck, *Jean Portaels et ses élèves* (Bruxelles: Musée d’Art Ancien, 1979).
Figure 3.26. Jean François Portaels, *Le Bouquet de Violette*, before 1868.

Figure 3.27. Photographer unknown, (*Charlotte as Empress of Mexico*), (detail), c. 1865.
Shallow pictorial space was characteristic of the *Miramare* and *Fiancée* paintings as well but neither of their subjects gazed so far into the distance as this woman appears to do. The viewpoint emphasizes her upraised face and moist eyes and these details are the more compelling for a scarcity of detail compared to *Fiancée* (see Figure 3.20). The simple space surrounding the figure in *Violettes* is animated with light and shadow emphasizing the squared and weathered stone background. In the upper right is a faint, partial, bas-relief of a thin rectangular frame around an oval one which contains a complex cross-like shape. Below this, in dark paint and in shadow, there appears to be written a single word, possibly ‘*Friuli*.’ Closer scrutiny of the painting is necessary to confirm this but the motif with religious connotations and this inscription, both on the right of the painting agree with the placement of similar elements in *Fiancée*. Coral beads with two small, gold, bell-like attachments are seen in both paintings. In the *Fiancée* these spill from the jewel box; in *Violettes* the subject is wearing these. In both paintings the young woman pictured holds a rosary though these appear to differ from one another as that shown in *Fiancée* has garnets among the beads; the hoop earrings are similar in both images. Portaels habitually repeated motifs in his more commercial pictures but in this instance it is possible repeated items such as the rosary might be explained by having belonged to Charlotte. Lists confirm Charlotte possessed a rosary with garnets and she is known to have had necklaces of coral but while the quality of

137 Among various connotations of weathered stone is the inevitability of death but it has also symbolic meaning integral to Freemasonry.

138 Portaels’s tendency to re-use motifs and titles make it difficult to identify specific paintings. There is, for instance, another painting by Portaels entitled *Violettes* (though not *Le Bouquet de Violettes* as is the actual title of this work) that was sold in 1990. [<http://web.artprice.com/ps/artitems.aspx/?/refGenre+A>] (January 2005).
these might have been rare, neither were uncommon items.\textsuperscript{139} Another possibility is that Portaels chose to harmonize \textit{Violettes} with \textit{Fiancée} through these articles as he does with his choice of palette.

The young woman wears an \textit{abito da festa} or peasant feast day attire which identifies it as originating in an area with Slovenian influence and this is confirmed by a penciled note on the back, “Young Girl near Trieste.” This would be a further shared element with \textit{The Fiancée} if the lettering in deep shadow is, in fact, the word ‘\textit{Fruili}.’ The costume dates to the fifteenth century with a long history of appropriation by local well-to-do bourgeois for portraits and weddings.\textsuperscript{140} A large white, linen kerchief edged with lace is placed on the head and its corners crossed at the nape of the neck then brought together and knotted above the forehead. Another lace-edged square serves as a shawl over the long-sleeved, cuffed, garment and dark vest with its embroidery and blue tassels. The belt consists of a narrow length of richly embroidered silver silk tied at the waist of a full, striped, skirt.\textsuperscript{141} Portaels captures the meticulous detailing of polychrome embroidery and plays up flashes of red against dark blue and black.\textsuperscript{142} As in the \textit{Miramare} and \textit{Fiancée} paintings, this is a three-quarter portrait but in \textit{Violettes} the subject is seated. Her support appears to be a section of the cut stones comprise the background. As has been remarked on by Martine Vermeire, the sitter’s pose could be construed as undignified for a woman of royal family and would seem to argue against

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Vachaudez, 2004, 25-35.
\item Butazzi, personal correspondence, 2004.
\item Doretta Davanzo Poles (ed.), \textit{Lace in Italian Folklore} (Burano: Lace Consortium of Burano, 1990), 101-102.
\item In fact, the artist’s apparent concern with harmonizing \textit{Violettes} and \textit{Fiancée} leads him to echo the embroidery on the latter in the elaborate frame in the background of the former.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the possibility of this image involving Charlotte. There are instances of aristocratic women assuming unusually casual poses for portraits but, as pose was liable to interpretation as an indicator of morality, it was a matter of careful consideration. Exceptions could be made, however, if an image were conceived of as a type of tableau vivant or impersonation of a ‘keepsake figure.’

The intertextual reference I propose for this painting is an ancient, mythic tale that Gioacchini Rossini transformed into an opera, his early nineteenth-century work entitled *La Cenerentola: La bonta en trionfo*. It was conceived of as an opera buffa or comic opera and was performed first in Rome in 1817. Three years later a production was mounted in London and by the 1840s it was a popular work in the Americas. In countries where English is spoken it is better known as *Cinderella* and the story of a motherless girl whose father and two older sisters treat her unkindly is too familiar to require much description. One motif, however, should be pointed out for its potential relevance to the *Violettes* painting: the flowers carried by Angiolina, or Angelina, the female protagonist, to her mother’s grave in one scene are violets - a flower which grows prolifically in the Fruili region and has connotations of love or death.

Rossini cloaked what is a stinging critique of hypocrisy, misuse of power, and degenerate aristocracy in humour but its political message was fully comprehended by

---


144 *La Cenerentola* quickly became a staple of opera performance; American artist Scully attended a performance when he was in London to paint a portrait of Queen Victoria. Rebora Barratt, 2003, 168.

145 The violets could infer a memorial painting commemorating the death of Louise-Marie but this would, by extension, cast other family members in a negative light so that an autobiographical explanation seems improbable especially as the Duke of Brabant kept this painting and the *Fiancée* in his personal quarters for many decades.
mid-nineteenth-century audiences. The neglectful father was Austria, or the Emperor himself, and the jealous sisters represented other regions of the Empire that benefited from the excellent deep-sea port at Trieste. As with Portia, the female protagonist Angiolina or Angelina, was sufficiently assimilated into English culture for Cinderella to be the subject of ‘keepsake’ portraits and a ceramic tile design (Figures 3.28, 3.29, 3.30). Most frequently she is depicted seated in an attitude of melancholy.

Figure 3.28. Henry Lejeune, *Cinderella*, 19th century.
Figure 3.29. Edward Burne-Jones (designer), Morris, Marshall, Faulkner & Company, *Cinderella*, 1862-65.
Figure 3.30. Millicent Sowerby, *Cenerentola*, early 20th century.

Emptied of its political content the *Cinderella* tale has become a bland romance - except perhaps in Friuli where complaints against administrative practices still include references to the region as a *Cenerentola*. An aspect potentially appearing to contradict this reading of *Violette* is the elaborate feast day dress depicted in this painting. It would seem too fine a costume for the character Angiolina, however, it accurately represents garments traditional in Fruili. Staged representations of the Cinderella story continue

---

147 The female protagonist’s standard costume differs somewhat from culture to culture.
to generally feature the female protagonist in white headdress, apron, and black bodice over a white blousson similar to those of the figure in *Violettes* (Figures 3.31, 3.32).

![Image of characters](image1.jpg)

**Figure 3.31.** Scene from 2002 *Cenerentola* production, Brandon University; John Blyth as Alidoro, Erin Pogue as Cenerentola.\(^{148}\)

**Figure 3.32.** Photographer unidentified, (*Cenerentola*), 1997 Israeli Opera production photograph, 20th century.

From this analysis Portaels’s four paintings emerge as a set of images relating to four different texts. Each story begins with the impending marriage of a virtuous young woman and each text is imbued with regional significance. This can be summarized as follows:

\(^{148}\) I thank Kelly Stifora for assistance in obtaining this image and Sylvia Richardson of Brandon University for making it available.
There is, additionally, a political or moral sub-text in each text. Manzoni critiques the treatment of peasants by a dissolute aristocracy and unconscionable priests in *I promessi sposi*. Shakespeare may or may not have had a political critique in mind when he wrote the *The Merchant of Venice* but his nationality and its setting together suggest a connection between England and Venice/Venetia and by extension Austria is cast as the Merchant. The Sicilian people were oppressed by the French when the historical events of the title occurred, but the timing of Verdi‘s *Sicilian Vespers* made it obvious this opera was an indictment of Ferdinand II. Finally, Rossini’s *Cenerentola* was a condemnation of neglect and exploitation of the Friuli region by the Austrian Empire.

Taking as fact, for the moment, my premise that these Portaels’s paintings relate to the characters Lucia, Portia, Hélène, and Angelina, their large size and superior quality remove them from the ‘keepsake’ category. They are extracted from their customary role giving them substance as heroic - if fictional - women, much like Clarke did with her writing. Lucia, Hélène, and Angelina, respectively featured in the paintings *Brianza*, *Fiancée* and *Violettes*, are unassailably spiritual; Portia, of the *Miramare* painting, boldly...

---

149 Flowers and jewelry are also important elements common to all four paintings and the significance of dress in each can hardly be overstated.
averts a wrongful act. Each of the four paintings could be thought to project onto Charlotte (were she the sitter or commissioner or both) exemplary qualities associated with these fictional, archetypal women. I would propose however, that this series of paintings is better defined as a pro-active strategy whereby Charlotte visually merges with these characters. By doing so she incorporates herself within Italian culture/s, aligns herself with those opposing foreign domination in the Italian states, and re-fashions these (non) heroines as women of substance.150

None of the parties desiring to free Italian states of foreign control were without self-interest regardless of their sincerity. Maximilian and Charlotte were encouraged by maneuvers of England and Belgium directed towards putting Lombardy and Venetia under the control of a benign ruler. Maximilian’s name was repeatedly put forward to fill such a position. Count Cavour was convinced the Italian states should be united as well as independent and his view was imposed upon those who differed. Napoleon III specified which territories he wanted ceded to France in return for sending troops to help the nationalists, while Austria was determined to retain the status quo. Portaels’s paintings should not be considered endorsements for goals identical to those of Italian nationalists but, instead, conducive to gathering support for independence under the empathetic, potential, rule of Maximilian and Charlotte.

The Miramare portrait could conceivably have hung at Monza but the Brianza would have been inflammatory unless it was presented as an image associating Charlotte with Lombardy and any connection to Lucia Mondella could be avoided. More probably these were privately displayed and quite probably copies would have been made for a few

150 I am meaning both physical substance and substance as being of respected stature.
select individuals, close friends, and relatives. The same would likely be true of the
Fiancée and Violettes paintings, if these were portraits, and they were probably produced
in Belgium about eighteen months after the former two paintings. Together these four
paintings offer a unique and sophisticated meditation meant to be read within the cultural
context of the Risorgimento; as such, they may document the agency of Charlotte more
than her appearance and demonstrate the use of art to negotiate gender by visual
representations more like ‘Lida’ than ‘Marianne.’

The issue of ‘likeness’ is central to these paintings as two (the missing Brianza
and the Miramare) are known to be portraits of Charlotte; Fiancée and Violettes might
also have been portraits. All would then be ‘costume’ images much in the manner of a
tableau vivant that replicates scenes of an historical or fictional event through pose and
costume. Such replicated scenes were often recorded in paintings or photographs, as in
the case of elaborate attire designed for costume balls, but Portaels’s series differs in its
strategic political implications. I have chosen details from photographs of Charlotte that
seem to me to support all four paintings being portraits but other photographs of
Charlotte could be juxtaposed to these which would tend to support a conclusion that they

---

151 There is, however, no evidence that they were copied but neither is it widely known
that a portrait of Charlotte as a small child exists together with at least one copy.
152 There was a vogue for photographic costume portraits in the mid-nineteenth century.
Two instances investigated by Heather McPherson are those of the Countess de
Castiglione and actress Sarah Bernhardt. These images functioned as explorations of their
own identity but did not convey any political message. The mediums of photography and
oil painting, of course, carried different connotations, advantages and disadvantages, and
153 That is to say, as virtuous and passive rather than virtuous and active - a distinction
especially important and Charlotte was childless and so without a maternal representation
to secure her reputation as being of a ‘womanly nature.’

174
were not portraits.\textsuperscript{154} The issue of likeness was a matter of curiosity and unease in the
mid-nineteenth century as Steven Levine convincingly argues in a 1978 article. Some
artists were better able to represent perceived verisimilitude, Levine contends, than were
photographers.\textsuperscript{155} The painted portrait, as has been described, is a collaborative process
or social contract between sitter and artist; the photographic portrait differs in that a
mechanical device mediates the process/contract. Prior to the invention of photography,
portrait painters were most esteemed for their ability to capture a (flattering) likeness and,
in state portraits, to convey confidence and deftly incorporate symbolic elements meant
to legitimize authority.\textsuperscript{156} Photographs were regarded as more ‘real’ and they were soon
used to document crime scenes, criminals, and states of madness for example, yet at the
same time photographers freely intervened in the production of images by means of
montaged elements or lines added to ‘improve’ subjects or aid in distinguishing subject
from background.\textsuperscript{157} Likeness became even more tenuous as modern artists began to
explore the expressive potential of portraits - and media - in tandem with developments in

\textsuperscript{154} The \textit{Brianza} of course is untraced so comparison with a photograph is impossible;
however, it is substantiated as a portrait commissioned by Charlotte as described above.
In the case of \textit{Violettes}, the photograph probably represents Charlotte’s appearance about
a decade after the picture was painted whereas those with the \textit{Miramare} and \textit{Fiancée}
paintings date from approximately the same time.
\textsuperscript{155} Steven Levine, “The Crisis of Resemblance: Portraits and Paintings during the Second
Empire,” \textit{Arts Magazine} 53 (December 1978): 90-93.
\textsuperscript{156} While such items as lush swags of fabric could be present in photographs, from the
sixteenth century in northern Europe pictorial traditions denoting royal images also often
incorporated distant vistas as reference to royal domains, and such objects as crowns and
scepters that did not necessarily exist.
\textsuperscript{157} Nonetheless, painted portraits continued to often be regarded as more ‘like’ the subject
than a photograph and generally more flattering.
the nascent science of psychiatry.\textsuperscript{158} The question of whether or not all four of Portaels’s paintings are portraits remains unresolved, but I would add that despite there being photographs of Charlotte displaying fewer similarities to the painted images, there are other photographs with an equally compelling resemblance. Those numerous features shared by the paintings and suggestive of an overall thematic strategy most convincingly support the possibility of Charlotte’s involvement.\textsuperscript{159} Further, as there is documentation for Charlotte having commissioned a portrait of herself in, specifically, Brianza dress, and as her study of Italian history would have made her aware of Manzoni’s novel and its political significance, it can be surmised that it was she who developed this thematic strategy. Portaels seems not to have been an artist given to making political statements and would have had little to gain from such a series of paintings were they not commissioned. (In Chapter Five I propose a later depiction of Charlotte wearing Zouave uniform similarly relates to an opera. This possibility reinforces the premise that the four Portaels paintings constitute a politically strategic series of intertextual images. As Charlotte is known to have commissioned the Zouave painting as well as the ‘Brianza’ portrait, these images demonstrate her interest in costume and its potential connotations while documenting two instances of agency in relation to her visual representations.)

Two important elements relating to these four paintings by Portaels have not yet been taken into account. One is the artist’s extensive travels in North Africa and the Near


\textsuperscript{159} A decade later another painting known to have been commissioned by Charlotte when she was Empress of Mexico portrayed her in costume with inferences of political resonance. This painting is discussed with other portraits of her as Empress.
East and subsequent reputation as an ‘Orientalist’ painter. Portaels relished depicting rich materials and intricate details of dress and would have been a ready collaborator in the program of intertextuality outlined above. The second factor is his history of association with the Belgian royal family. Duchesne states Portaels was at an 1856 ball held in honour of the engagement of Charlotte and Maximilian in 1856 and that the artist probably attended the reception after their wedding. More recently, Greet Donckers includes Portaels in a list of instructors employed by the royal family in the 1850s where the artist is described as Charlotte’s teacher of “drawing and painting” so that a relationship of confidence can plausibly be assumed between Charlotte and Portaels facilitating so discreet a project as I propose these paintings constitute.

Reprising Winterhalter

“She was a living Winterhalter portrait …”

Portaels is not thought to have painted any portrait of Charlotte prior to 1857; similarly, the 1857 Marbonn, Bertarelli, and Dell’Acqua images of Charlotte and Maximilian appear to have been the first by those artists, although Dell’Acqua would

---

160 From the age of eighteen to twenty-two Portaels was a student of François-Joseph Navez in Brussels and then studied at the Paris atelier of Paul Delaroche. In 1842 he won the Prix de Rome and traveled extensively, visiting Italy and Northern Africa as well as Egypt, Judea, Spain, Hungary, and Norway. From 1847 to 1850 Portaels was Director of the Ghent Academy of Fine Arts and in 1858 established an important atelier in Brussels. He resided in Morocco from 1870 until 1874 and in 1878 was appointed Director of the Brussels Academy of Fine Arts. The Dictionary of Art, vol. 25 (Grove, 1996), 261.

161 Duchesne, 1985, 65. Duchesne refers to correspondence from Mia Kerckvoorde regarding evidence of interest in Portaels’s work by Leopold I and Queen Louise-Marie as early as 1847. Portaels became a lifelong friend of both the Duke of Brabant and the Count of Flanders and Charlotte is known to have corresponded with him as late as 1864. Duchesne, 1985, 67-70.


later paint several more of Charlotte. The present study reveals that, on at least one occasion, Franz Winterhalter produced an important portrait of Charlotte either during her role as Vicereine or in the months immediately following the termination of this position. Further, knowledge of this painting supports the possibility that Charlotte sat to Winterhalter on two other occasions, firstly to commemorate the beginning of her Viceregal role and, secondly, her participation in Easter ceremonies soon afterwards. In this section I begin by exploring the relationship between portraits of Charlotte by Winterhalter known to have been painted in the 1860s and descriptions of her appearance in 1857 and 1858; the portrait of Charlotte previously attributed to various other artists but now known to have been painted by Winterhalter is considered at the end of this section.

Four very similar portraits of Charlotte depict her wearing a diamond coronet, diamond necklace, ‘waterfall’ brooch, and four golden bracelets of which at least two have miniature portraits attached. She stands turned towards the left, her face in three-quarter view, and hands crossed over her skirt front. In one painting her gown is bright pink, in another pale pink and, in the third, it is white; the fourth is known only from a black and white reproduction (Figures 3.33, 3.34, 3.35, and 3.36). The bright pink version is attributed to Franz Xaver Winterhalter and the date 1864 can be faintly discerned on the lower left while the pale pink version is signed and dated in the lower left as painted in Paris by F. Winterhalter in 1864 (Figures 3.33 and 3.34). The white gown image is by Albert Graefle (1807-1889) ‘after’ Winterhalter and was commissioned by Queen Victoria in 1868 (Figure 3.35). Graefle and Winterhalter were students together and the former was later an assistant in Winterhalter’s Paris studio before
moving to Munich where he established his career as an independent artist. The fourth is reproduced in Corti’s 1924 publication. Described as painted by Austrian artist Eugen S. Stieler (1845-1929), its similarity to the other images suggests it is another painting ‘after’ Winterhalter, especially as Stieler would not have been quite nineteen when Charlotte left Europe in early 1864 (Figure 3.36). There are reasons to conjecture these paintings relate to unknown portraits for which she sat to Winterhalter in 1857 and 1858 while Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia.

---

164 While still a student Winterhalter was associated with the Munich studio of portraitist Josef Stieler (1781-1858) who was extensively patronized by Ludwig I, King of Bavaria. Among Stieler’s best known works are his series of 36 portraits of Bavarian ‘court beauties’ and the oval portrait of Charlotte might be thought to have been painted by Stieler and copied by his son Eugen, were it not that the elder Stieler died in the spring of 1858. Ormond and Blackett-Ord consider Josef Stieler to have influenced Winterhalter’s style. No connection between Winterhalter and Eugen Steiler is mentioned. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 22.
Figure 3.33. (Left) F. X. Winterhalter (attributed to), *Charlotte de Belgique impératrice du Mexique*, 1864.
Figure 3.34 (Right) F. X. Winterhalter, *Empress Carlota*, 1864.
Charlotte’s depiction in the brighter pink gown bears a striking resemblance to descriptions of her wearing a cherry (*cerise*) pink gown with pink roses in her hair and diamond coronet for her official entry into Milan raising the possibility she sat for a portrait to commemorate this occasion (Figure 3.33).\(^{165}\) (Instead of the mantel of red velvet she is described as wearing on that occasion, Charlotte is depicted here with a tulle

\(^{165}\) Winterhalter’s painting style in relation to mid-nineteenth-century dress trends is discussed in detail by Aileen Ribeiro, “Fashion in the Work of Winterhalter” in Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 66-71. In a few instances Charlotte’s gown on this occasion is described as having been purple but this is likely an issue of translation, for instance, Ghika’s translation of Bibesco, [1937], 1956.
It is suggested by Jacques Foucart that this portrait is a study for the painting in which Charlotte’s gown is of a paler pink (Figure 3.34). The shoulder decoration, sash, and cross she wears represents the Order of Saint Charles (Orden de San Carlos), an imperial decoration awarded by Charlotte exclusively to recognize the achievements of women when she was Empress of Mexico. Plans for this Order and others originating with the Mexican monarchy were discussed during a meeting of Maximilian and Emperor Franz Josef at the end of 1861 according to Corti, however, it is thought not to have been awarded prior to 10th April 1865, the first anniversary of the Mexican Empire. One explanation for the discrepancy between the painting’s date of 1864 and the inception of the Order in 1865 may be that the decoration was added to an existing portrait already bearing the 1864 date.

This ‘bright pink’ version of Charlotte’s portrait and a pendant portrait of Maximilian (also by Winterhalter) are in the Museum of Arts collection in Fécamp.

---

166 Tulle, named for the French town prominent in its manufacture, is a sheer gauze-like material originally of silk or cotton and hand made until the late 1760s after which it was machine-made. In the mid-nineteenth century tulle became extremely popular for formal occasions and Winterhalter excelled in evoking its delicacy. <http://www.ravistailor.com/glossary.php> (2005).

167 The fullness of the lower face and somewhat fleshy neck in the unsigned Fécamp portrait attributed to Franz Xaver Winterhalter is consistent with his other portraits of Charlotte but its vividness is not.

168 There is a similar description of Charlotte wearing a gown of pink silk but with the black ribbon of the Order of Malta and “a sparkling diadème in her hair.” The occasion was a public ceremony in 1864 a few days before her departure from Europe. M. Paul Gaulot, “Expédition du Mexique” in La Metropole, journaux d’Anvers, 10 April 1914.

169 Corti, [1924], 1968, 140. This is confirmed in a letter to Marie-Hélène Desjardins, Chief Curator and Director, Fécamp, from Anne de Chefdebien, Curator at the National Museum of the Legion of Honour, 6 June 2002. (On 24 April 1865 Charlotte wrote to Léopold Brabant enquiring if Marie Henriette had received “le cordon de San Carlos” she had sent her. Capron, 1986, 149. The honours were awarded twice yearly: on the day commemorating Saint Charles Borromeo and on Charlotte’s birthday).

170 Another portrait of Charlotte by Albert Graeffe was amended in this manner. Acevedo, 1995, 63.
France.\textsuperscript{171} Purchased by the museum at a public sale held in Fécamp in July 1932, a note glued to the frame of the portrait of Charlotte states this painting and one of Maximilian formerly belonged to Count O’Mahony who lived part of the time in Fécamp and whose residence was sold together with its contents. The note also indicates Count O’Mahony was a nephew of Marquis d’Héricourt de Valincourt, husband of Louise Haenel de Gronenthall, an Austrian “compositrice de musique.”\textsuperscript{172} Historical references indicate that Louise was also known professionally as Julia and that Gronenthall was sometimes spelled Cronenthal and sometimes translated as Grunewald or De Grunne while Héricourt can appear as Hemricourt.\textsuperscript{173} The surnames De Grunne, O’Mahony, Valincourt, and Hemricourt (or the variations noted) are repeatedly linked in genealogical records.\textsuperscript{174} Duchesne writes of “la profonde affection” between Charlotte and her former dame du

\textsuperscript{171} Louvre curator Foucart considers an associated portrait of Maximilian to also be a study; if these are studies by Winterhalter they are rare examples of such. Only a study for a multiple figure painting (\textit{The Empress Eugénie surrounded by her Ladies-in-Waiting}) and a sketch for a full-length state portrait of Leopold I are mentioned by Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, Plates 34 and No. 14.

\textsuperscript{172} Museum file notes, \textit{Portrait de Charlotte impératrice du Mexique} FEC. 117.


\textsuperscript{174} The name O’Mahony is often connected with Munster, especially Co. Cork, in Ireland. <http://www.irelandseye.com/irish/traditional/names/family/omahony.shtml> (Accessed 25 November 2003). In addition to marriages between the families, they seem to share a history of service at various European courts. For instance, King Louis Philippe offered the post of Minister of War and the rank of general to a Count d’Héricourt de Valincourt in the 1830s and the Grunne name was associated with the Austrian court before and during Franz Josef’s reign as well as with the Belgian court.
palais, Countess Caroline de Grunne, and this portrait may have been a gift to the Countess, especially as Charlotte is known to have requested Portaels carry with him to Monza a portrait of her “bien chère amie,” Madame de Grunne.\textsuperscript{175} De Grunne is known to have been a recipient of the Order of Saint Charles and its presence in the Fécamp portrait would testify to this connection.\textsuperscript{176}

The ‘pale pink’ portrait signed and dated as painted by Winterhalter in 1864 may relate to a visit by Charlotte and Maximilian to Paris in the spring of that year as described in the following chapter (Figure 3.34).\textsuperscript{177} She was then Empress Elect of Mexico and the portrait is often described as a state portrait although white was de riguer for court gowns in France and England and Winterhalter seemingly did paint a portrait of Charlotte in a white gown in that year.\textsuperscript{178} The ‘pale pink’ portrait and its pendant portrait of Maximilian were purchased by American newspaper magnate Randolph Hearst (1829-1963) in 1937 and were included when the Hearst estate was donated to the State of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item [{175}] Duchesne, 1985, 67-70.
\item [{176}] Weckmann and Vandewoude, 1989, 1-4.
\item [{177}] Her hair styling in this and the ‘bright pink’ version suggests a date not much before 1858 and up to about the mid-1860s. Alex Marsden with Caroline Cox, \textit{Fashions in Hair} [1965] (London: Peter Owen, 1978). On the other hand, there are two examples of portraits by Winterhalter from 1861 and 1864 in which pink roses occur. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, Plates 44 and 48.
\item [{178}] Aileen Ribeiro, “Fashion in the Work of Winterhalter” in Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 70. Bertida Harding wrote that Empress Eugénie commissioned a portrait of Charlotte but the author’s associated brief remarks excludes it being this 1864 painting. This reference is considered in Chapter Four in the context of Charlotte’s portraits as Empress. Harding, 1934, 212. For references to some Winterhalter portraits owned by the French Empress, see Madame Carette, \textit{Recollections of the Court of the Tuileries}, (trans.) Elizabeth Phipps Train (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1889), 131-134. Eugénie sat to Winterhalter many times. She retained paintings by the artist when the Second Empire fell and she was exiled in England; it is not known if these included a portrait of Charlotte. A painting entitled \textit{The Empress’s Study at the Tuileries} shows Eugénie seated among some of her collection. Reproduced in Harold Kurtz, \textit{The Empress Eugénie 1826-1920} (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1964), 72. The collection was sold in 1927. See Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 51.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
California. Charlotte has neither flowers nor the Order of Saint Charles in this version (a small Austrian decoration is worn at her shoulder) and her features appear more mature in this portrait than in the ‘bright pink’ image.

Another portrait much like the ‘pink gown’ paintings but depicting Charlotte in a white gown was commissioned in 1868 by Queen Victoria from Albert Graefle ‘after’ an untraced portrait by Winterhalter in which she wears a white gown (Figure 3.35). As in the pale pink version, Charlotte wears neither roses nor the Order of Saint Charles.

The Milan reception was the first of two prominent occasions in the Viceregal career of Charlotte and Maximilian; the second was their participation in Easter ceremonies in Venice in spring 1858. There they walked in a solemn procession through the city from the Doge’s Palace to the Church of St. Mark, Maximilian in uniform and Charlotte, interestingly, with a coronet of diamonds and wearing a white gown beneath her red mantel. Given this description of her appearance the probability of an 1858 portrait of

---

179 Illustrated in Acevedo, 1995, 58-59. They were installed in ‘A’ House, Casa del Mar, at Hearst’s estate in San Simeon, California, where they remain. In December 1957 the San Simeon estate was donated “to the People of the State of California … by the Hearst Corporation.” The number of available public tours increased over time with ‘Tour 4’ (which includes the Casa del Mar) being initiated in 1974. “Guided Tour History,” the Hearst Castle website. <http://www.hearstcastle.com/history/tour_history.asp> (February 2008). The name by which ‘A’ House is known, Casa del Mar (or ‘house of the sea’) coincidentally echoes Maximilian’s Miramare (‘view of the sea’). Jana Seely notes that Hearst owned a 1928 English translation of Graf von Egon Corti, Maximilian und Charlotte von Mexiko Corti, nach dem bisher unveröffentlichten geheimarchive des kaisers Maximilian und sonstigen unbekannten quellen (Zürich: Amaltheaverlag 1924), 2 v. (The English translation is more common: Corti, [1924], 1968). Maximilian and Charlotte embarked for Mexico a year before Hearst was born and the audacity of the attempt to found a monarchy may have appealed to Hearst especially as his San Simeon estate was developed on land that was once Mexican territory known as La Cuesta Encantada (The Enchanted Hill).

180 Acevedo, 1995, 63.

181 La plus mémorable fut, en 1858, la procession solennelle du jour de Pâques, rétablie à Venise après une interruption de plus de cinquante ans. L’Archiduchesse et
Charlotte in white gains credibility - especially as the two portraits would commemorate respectively an occasion in Milan, capital of Lombardy, and in Venice, capital of Venetia and replicate the program of geographic links established in relation to Portaels’s paintings.

The related oval painting attributed to Steiler was in the collection of Charlotte’s niece, Princess Stéphanie (1864-1945), (Figure 3.36). Stéphanie could have acquired this work or commissioned a copy of such a painting in Austria as she resided there after her 1881 marriage to Crown Prince Rudolph, son of Emperor Franz Josef and Empress Elizabeth. Following her husband’s death, Stéphanie lived at Miramare for a decade with their daughter. The painting’s oval format may have been specified or Steiler may have worked from an existing oval replica.182

If the 1864 and 1868 portraits depicting Charlotte as Empress of Mexico derive from paintings commissioned while she was Vicereine it might be because such paintings could have been construed in Austria as demonstrating political ambition. Portraits by Winterhalter denoted exclusive social - and often political - stature. Such portraits of Charlotte as Vicereine could have been regarded as evidence of collaboration in Maximilian’s jockeying for power and caused their commissioning to be discreet. Conversely, were Winterhalter portraits of Charlotte as Vicereine displayed in Brussels with the artist’s portraits of the King and Queen of the Belgians, Queen Victoria and Prince Albert - and numerous other royal relations - they would have been seen to

---

Maximilien traversèrent la ville, du palais des Doges à l’église Saint-Marc, lui en grand uniforme d’admiral avec la Toison d’Or, elle en robe blanche de moiré antique, aven sur les épaules un manteau de velours écarlate brodé d’or, don’t la queue était portée par deux pages, et sur la tête un diadème de diamants avec une coiffure écarlate. “Voir & Lire” 1927, 272.

182 Emerson, 1979, 267.
appropriately document this extension of Coburg prestige and advertise Charlotte’s powerful connections.\textsuperscript{183} The determination of Leopold I to see Charlotte established in an influential position and his seasoned appreciation of the importance of royal portraits makes it probable portraits of Charlotte were commissioned to hang in Brussels after her departure from Belgium.\textsuperscript{184}

Assuming for the moment that these earlier paintings existed, reasons for Winterhalter later revisiting these rather than producing entirely new images could include his episodes of poor health in the early 1860s and the fact that demand for portraits by him exceeded his capacity even with the extensive support of an efficient studio workshop. Winterhalter’s last portrait of Charlotte, the 1864 Paris painting, was little known before a 1992 exhibition featuring the related white gown version commissioned from Graefle by Queen Victoria.\textsuperscript{185} Prior to this Winterhalter was not thought to have painted any portrait of Charlotte after about 1848 until 1864 when she was Empress Elect of Mexico.\textsuperscript{186} Lists of Winterhalter’s commissions include his 1842 portrait of Charlotte but no mention of the 1864 portrait or other possible portraits. The Fécamp version of the latter is not permanently displayed, the Hearst version not well known when Joanna Richardson was writing, and Winterhalter portraits of Charlotte are in royal or private collections that are not always accessible. It is surprising, then, that

\textsuperscript{183} The 1833 portrait of Victoria by Hayter and the full-length watercolour by Alfred Challon are mentioned in the previous chapter. No records of the Belgian Royal Collection in this period are known to have survived.

\textsuperscript{184} Portraits of Léopold Brabant and Philippe of Flanders were commissioned for the palace from Portaels in 1858 but, Duchesne remarks, there was not one of Charlotte; a portrait of her as Vicereine would have addressed this absence. Duchesne, 1985, 63.


\textsuperscript{186} Some of Charlotte’s early portraits were revised or reproduced with dates later than 1849 but no later Winterhalter portraits from her childhood or adolescence are confirmed.
the author could describe Charlotte as “a living Winterhalter portrait” in 1961 and be assured readers would understand this to imply someone poised, elegant, and immaculately groomed as Winterhalter’s sitters are inevitably depicted. Richardson could do so, not because her audience knew specific portraits of Charlotte painted by Winterhalter, but because his style was engrained throughout European cultures by images commissioned by European courts and his depictions of Queen Victoria, Prince Albert, and their children remained especially familiar and popular. If Richardson’s readers had read Corti’s popular 1924 book about Maximilian and Charlotte, they would have seen illustrated two portraits of Charlotte ‘after’ Winterhalter without being aware of this as these were attributed to Eugen Steiler and to Franz Schrotzberg as discussed above. It is only with the recent discovery of a note in files at Artstetten Museum in Lower Austria that the Schrotzberg painting, and other copies of this portrait by different artists, can be definitively described to as being ‘after’ a Winterhalter original.

A letter written to Léopold Brabant by Charlotte in spring 1861 refers to a portrait of her and one of Maximilian sent as gifts two years earlier. Charlotte does not describe the portraits nor mention the artist’s name but the date of the letter suggests these might have been sent for Leopold’s twenty-sixth birthday on 9 April 1859. As there is only a single portrait of Maximilian and only one of Charlotte as an adult listed in the Belgian Royal Collection inventory, it is highly probable these are those sent to

---

187 Richardson’s book appeared in the centenary year of the beginning of the French Intervention in Europe. In years immediately after its publication, numerous exhibitions and publications addressed the Intervention and associated attempt to found a Mexican Empire.

188 This was Manet and the Execution of Maximilian; see Wilson-Bareau, 1992, 19. The San Simeon/Fécamp portrait is not mentioned in the 1987 catalogue of Winterhalter’s works. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987.

189 Capron, 1988, 93.
Léopold Brabant. Maximilian’s portrait is ‘after’ that painted by Winterhalter in 1857 just before his marriage to Charlotte. The portrait of Charlotte is almost identical to the painting attributed, in Corti’s book to Schrotzberg (Figure 3.38). It depicts her in a gown of black and white with a black lace mantilla partly covering her head and shoulders and adorned with red flowers like those in Portaels’s 1857 Miramare portrait (see Figure 3.14). The Belgian Royal Collection contains several versions of this ‘black mantilla’ image, perhaps indicating one was copied for Philippe and another commissioned for Charlotte’s residence when she returned to Belgium in 1866. If this is the portrait of Charlotte sent to Léopold Brabant, it attests to her sitting to Winterhalter on at least one occasion in the late 1850s and increases the possibility he may have painted portraits of her as Vicereine as remarked above.

Apart from the Schrotzberg version in Artstetten, other copies of this ‘black mantilla’ portrait include one, reputedly painted by a Leopold Sanchez but more probably

---

190 This portrait circulated in the twentieth century on a royal greeting card, its reproduction authorized by the Comtesse de Flandre. No artist’s name is given. An example in the Brussels Royal Military Museum (FR-CP XVa-3) was sent 1967 inferring the card was produced to commemorate the anniversary of the fall of the Mexican Empire and Charlotte’s return to Belgium.
191 Schrotzberg was patronized by the Austrian royal family and eastern European aristocracy. He trained in Vienna and became a member of the Viennese Academy in 1861 having also traveled and studied in Germany, Italy, Belgium, France and England. See, for instance, Ulrich Thieme and Felix Becker, Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart (Liepzig: Seemann Verlag, 1907-1947; reprint 1950), 301. Brigitte Leidwein notes that Artstetten Castle was briefly owned by Maximilian. No other provenance information exists regarding the Schrotzberg painting.
192 The original is thought to exist but its location is undetermined.
193 The prestigious status of portraits by Winterhalter is emphasized by Ormond and Blackett-Ord’s observation that European courts competed for the artist’s attendance. Winterhalter was “[l]ike a court jeweler, who [supplied] rarefied artifacts to a specialized market which he knew intimately … an expert operating in a world of amateurs.” Richard Ormond in Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 52.
by Mexican artist Tiburcio Sanchez, in the Miramare Castle collection (Figure 3.39).\textsuperscript{194} A copy of the ‘black mantilla’ portrait may have been at Miramare before Charlotte and Maximilian departed for Mexico in 1864 but the Sanchez version is dated 1866 and so was not in their collection during their residence there.\textsuperscript{195} A further copy or replica is in a private Mexican collection and it is probable there are others in Mexico and elsewhere (Figure 3.40).\textsuperscript{196}

Figure 3.37. Artist unknown, ‘after’ Winterhalter, Princess Charlotte, 1859 (?). Figure 3.38. Franz Schrotzberg ‘after’ Winterhalter, Archduchess Charlotte, c. 1859.

\textsuperscript{194} Having concluded this might be so after searching for references to Leopold Sanchez and looking at paintings by Tiburcio Sanchez, I learned that Esther Acevedo remarked on this probability in 1995. Acevedo, 1995, 76-77.

\textsuperscript{195} Maximilian continued to be involved with Miramare through correspondence after his departure. Although this included his commissioning art, it is likely the ‘Sanchez’ painting reached Europe with the royal possessions sent from Mexico when Maximilian considered abdication at the end of 1866.

\textsuperscript{196} Reproduced in Acevedo, 1995, 77.
The black mantilla Charlotte wears in this portrait could cause the image to be interpreted as representing her in the role of Empress of Mexico for she is described in several instances as wearing such a wrap.\(^{197}\) Two factors argue against such an interpretation: first, the probability that it is the portrait painted in 1859 for Léopold Brabant, and, second, because this date would correspond with a vogue for Spanish-influenced fashion - such as black lace mantillas - inspired by the marriage of Eugénie de Montijo to Napoleon III in 1853.\(^{198}\) This fashion was revitalized by the popularity of Spanish-born opera singer Angelina Patti (1843-1919) whose operatic debut in 1859 at sixteen years of age won her critical acclaim.\(^{199}\)

---

\(^{197}\) Winterhalter was in England earlier in 1858 then in Paris until May 1859. See Winterhalter’s “itinerary” in Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 15.

\(^{198}\) Eugénie de Montijo, christened María Eugenia Ignatia Augustina Palafox de Guzmán Portocarrero y Kirkpatrick, Countess of Teba.

\(^{199}\) Of Italian-Sicilian descent, Adela Juana Maria Patti was born in Spain and grew up in America. She was admired for her dramatic abilities as well as the range and clarity of her voice. <http://www.opera-singer.co.uk/> (March 2007). Among many artists who
The number of known copies suggests still more were commissioned; if copies of this ‘black mantilla’ portrait were destined for locations in which the French Empress might view them, a more tenuous possibility is that Charlotte’s apparel flatteringly acknowledged Eugénie’s influence. Identification of this portrait as having been painted by Winterhalter affirms patronage of this artist in relation to portraits of Charlotte through the 1850s. Although the commissioner remains unknown, this is an important point as Winterhalter remained intimately connected to major European courts and his paintings were avidly sought after, not least by heads of state. Charlotte’s documented patronage of Portaels in relation to the missing Brianza portrait, and the programmatic intertextuality I suggest this painting shares with the three other Portaels paintings discussed above, infers she also commissioned at least one of these. Charlotte’s patronage of Portaels appears not to have extended into the 1860s although she is thought to have wished him to travel to Mexico as discussed in Chapter Five.

Maximilian had returned to active engagement in his role as Viceroy following his three-month absence in mid-1858. He found the situation rapidly worsening as oppressive policies formulated in Vienna caused further aggravation and hardship in Lombardy and, on 12 September, requested he be allowed to resign. Emperor Franz painted her portrait was Franz Xaver Winterhalter in 1863. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 115. As this debut took place late in the year it would not have influenced this portrait of Charlotte if, as seems likely, this portrait and that of Maximilian were for Léopold Brabant’s birthday in April. Charlotte’s portrait would have been commissioned previously and time allowed for it to have been sent although where it was sent from is not clear. As Corti asserts she was away from Lombardy-Veneta and Fruili from autumn 1858 until spring 1859 and Winterhalter was in Paris during this period, Charlotte could have sat to him there; circumstances at the time of her return make improbable that is was produced after this. According to Bibesco, in spring 1864 Charlotte was given a mantilla of black lace by Empress Eugénie during her visit to Paris with Maximilian. Bibesco, 1956, 127.
Josef denied this request on the grounds that such action would demoralize the population of Lombardy-Venetia.\textsuperscript{201} Grievances between Maximilian and Franz Josef were exacerbated when, in spring 1859, Maximilian sent “a special envoy to Paris to present the French Emperor with a small bronze model of Canova’s statue of Napoleon [I]” ostensibly to improve relations between France and Austria.\textsuperscript{202} More probably Maximilian meant to rekindle the slight relationship he had begun with the French Emperor in 1856 and favourably position himself at a time when the threat of France joining with Italian nationalists against Austria was immanent.\textsuperscript{203} In Chapter Four other works of art, and portraits in particular, afford glimpses of political machinations engaged in by Maximilian and Charlotte during years between the termination of their Viceregal positions and their installation as Emperor and Empress of Mexico under the auspices of France.

\textsuperscript{201} Haslip, 1971, 115.
\textsuperscript{202} Haslip does not cite a specific source for this information but refers to corroborating letters between the French Emperor and Maximilian. Haslip, 1971, 107-114. (Italian sculptor Antonio Canova (1757-1822). Napoleon III was a nephew of Napoleon I.) In contrast to deteriorating relations between France and Austria, increasingly close relations between France and Piedmont-Sardinia were personified in early 1859 by the engagement of Prince Napoleon, cousin to Napoleon III, to Princess Clothier, daughter of Victor Emmanuel II (1849-1861), King of Piedmont-Sardinia and later first King of Italy. Maximilian was clearly aware of a secret meeting in Plombieres between Cavour and Napoleon III at which the French Emperor agreed to protect Piedmont against Austria.\textsuperscript{203} Hyde offers a detailed account of Maximilian’s time in Paris in 1856 emphasizing how favourably Maximilian was received by the French Emperor and Empress. Hyde, 1846, 56.
Chapter Four

The Interim Images

The Loss of Lombardy

On 19 April 1859, on the eve of an Austrian attack on Piedmont, Emperor Franz Josef dismissed Maximilian as Viceroy accusing him of treacherous intrigues and of favouring Prime Minister Cavour. Maximilian was ordered to Venice where he suffered the insult of being placed under the authority of an officer of lower rank.\(^1\) Austria’s move against Piedmont played into the hands of Cavour for he had obliged France to mobilize in support of the Italians.\(^2\) On 4 June 1859 “[t]he 2\(^{nd}\) French Corps d’Armée and the Piedmontese marched east across the Ticino River into Austrian-held Lombardy. The 49,500 strong French and Piedmontese were outnumbered by the Austrian force of 53,000 but were victorious [at the battle of Magenta] in part because of confusion among commanding officers and insufficient supplies … French losses were 4,000 killed and wounded and 600 missing. Austrian losses were 5,700 killed and wounded and 4,500

\(^{1}\) Haslip, 1971, 117
\(^{2}\) Leopold I had warned Maximilian this was probable when the latter first visited Belgium in 1856. Maximilian himself thought it possible and passed these comments on to Franz Josef. On 10 December 1858 Cavour had “secured a promise of French military intervention if Piedmont came under attack. He then sought to provoke Austria by mobilizing Piedmontese armed forces on March 9, 1859. In response, Austria began mobilizing on April 9 and Emperor Franz Josef issued an ultimatum for Piedmont to demobilize on the 23rd. Cavour rejected the ultimatum and when Austria invaded Piedmont less than a week later “rail cars were already rushing French troops to help defend the little kingdom.”

<http://www.historynet.com/magazines/military_history/3822461.html>

Count Cavour did not, of course, act alone in fomenting nationalist desires but he is generally considered the prime strategist of the Italian Risorgimento. Victor Emmanuel II conducted himself honourably in the 1848 uprising, sought support for the Risorgimento internationally and placed himself on the Italian frontline when the campaign was renewed. See Whyte, A. J., [1930], 1962.
Twenty days later 120,000 Austrian troops battled 118,600 French and Piedmontese at Solferino resulting in 22,000 killed or wounded among the former and 18,000 among the allied forces. Lombardy was “ceded to France who in turn allowed it to be annexed to Piedmont. France received Nice and Savoy.” Napoleon III unexpectedly declared a truce before Venetia was freed from Austrian control.

Contingency Images

There exists a portrait of Charlotte dated 1859 the same year that Maximilian sent Napoleon III the statue of Napoleon I and that Lombardy was lost to Austria. It is not known who commissioned this portrait of Charlotte or whether it was painted before or after Maximilian’s gift or the outbreak of hostilities, but his action raises the possibility that the intended recipient may have been the French Emperor. One reason for such speculation is that the artist was Isadore Pils (1815-1875), a French artist who excelled at patriotic battle scenes and who was for this reason a favourite of Napoleon III. Pils only

---

3 Young, 1977, 27-28, 46. Young does not comment on the enormous number of “missing” Austrian troops but it is evident inadequate support in the field and incompetent leadership caused what was, more accurately, their unauthorized departure.  
4 So extreme was the suffering at Magenta and Solferino that it was in part responsible for the International Red Cross being founded five years afterwards. Young, 1977, 46. I introduce casualty figures into this discussion because literature addressing Charlotte and Maximilian omits visceral realities of war and revolution informing their decisions in art and in politics.  
5 Isadore (in some instances spelled Isodore or Isidore) Pils was born in Paris and studied with Francois-Edouard Picot who later recommended him for a commission restoring paintings at Fontainebleau that brought Pils to the attention of French officials. An 1838 Prix de Rome enabled Pils to travel. Like Portaels many of his early works were religious or historical subjects and he was attracted to the ‘exoticism’ of the East. <http://www.groveart.com.Pils,Isodore-Alexandre-Augustin.1> (June 2006). Pils came to be considered a Realist for sympathetic images of working class individuals and of soldiers in the Crimean War. Critics were divided over Pils’s style, in particular his broken facture which was condemned as “coarse,” “vulgar” and “glaring daubs” in the entry for this artist in Hamerton, Contemporary French Painters (London: Seeley, Jackson, & Co. 1867) quoted in Laurence Clement and Clara Erskine Hutton, Artists of
rarely painted portraits and his early realist style, controversial for its lack of academic finish, is a departure from other portraits of Charlotte (Figure 4.1).\textsuperscript{6}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{isadore-pils-charlotte-von-sachsen-coburg-gotha-1859}
\caption{Isadore Pils, \textit{Charlotte von Sachsen-Coburg-Gotha}, 1859.}
\end{figure}

\begin{flushright}
\textit{the Nineteenth Century}, (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1880), 183. He taught at the Paris l’école des Beaux-Arts and was awarded the Legion of Honour. \textsuperscript{6} The painting was catalogued as \textit{Charlotte von Sachsen-Coburg-Gotha} when it entered the Kunsthistorisches Museum collection in the 1940s and is referred to as probably having been commissioned by the Imperial court in Vienna. The Pils portrait of Charlotte was in Habsburg possession at the end of WWI and in 1918 ownership was transferred to the Kunsthistorisches Museum. “[T]he painting came directly from the former imperial Hofärar into the possession of the Kunsthistorisches Museum. This was a formal act, the painting itself remained [after 1918] in the (formerly imperial) Hofburg-apartments.” I thank Dr. Alexander Wied, Director of the Gemäldegalerie, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Wien, and Birgit Hammerschmid, Curator, for providing this information. Personal correspondence, 24 October 2003.
\end{flushright}
Pils’s style was well suited to conveying the texture of the silk taffeta gown’s abundant ruffles and soft ecru wrap circling Charlotte’s waist. Charlotte may not have applied cosmetics as overtly as Pils’s picture depicts but her clearly defined features call attention to the directness of her gaze. The intimacy of this portraits casts doubt on it being a gift for Franz Josef whose relationship with Maximilian and Charlotte was strained at best. Nor does it seem a probable gift for Archduchess Sophie, Maximilian and Franz Josef’s mother, and Maximilian and Charlotte did not indulge in the romantic habit of exchanging intimate portraits with one another. No provenance information is known for this painting earlier than the twentieth-century when it hung in the Rauchsaloon (Smoking Room) of Emperor Franz Josef together with a portrait of Maximilian by

---

7 Tamar Garb remarks on the capacity of oil paint to, “adumbrate a rich terrain of sensory stimuli, in which the surface of the painting provides an extended corporeal surrogate for the figure it represents.” Tamar Garb, The Painted Face: Portraits of Women in France 1814-1914 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 2, 3.

8 Cosmetics could be treacherous to a woman’s reputation in the nineteenth century as “the resulting brilliant eyes and flushed cheeks,” V. Steele asserts, were condemned by some as mimicking sexual arousal. Tamar Garb ably describes, however, that a subtle application of make-up to enhance - or give the impression of - a smooth and healthful complexion was expected of women. The task of an artist was to maneuver between artifice and nature; the woman’s ‘task’ in applying her make-up was a matter of articulating the appropriate degree of artifice in relation to her social class. “Although the virtues of artifice … were extolled in the mid-nineteenth century … they were tied to the pervasive perception of women as bewitching seductresses, and associated with the performative sexuality of courtesans, actresses and powerful salonnières rather than the restrained respectability of wives and mothers, from whom a more demure femininity was required.” Ibid.

9 The strained relations between the Emperor and his brother extended to Charlotte and would seem likely to have inhibited the exchange of portraits. This image of Charlotte in particular might not have been considered agreeable to Franz Josef who was known to disapprove of the “exaggerated décolleté style so fashionable among young ladies belonging to the great world.” North Peat includes an anecdote about Emperor Franz Josef having ordered court attendants to cloak the naked shoulders of “a certain Princess X - the star of Vienna during two successive seasons.” North Peat, 1903, 267-268.
If it _were_ conceived as another diplomatic gift to Napoleon III, unfolding events may have precluded sending it or perhaps a copy may have been sent and the original retained. This is conjectural yet the French Emperor was sufficiently well disposed towards Maximilian that proposals put forward at the Peace of Villafranca (and favoured by Leopold I and the British government) included Venetia being placed under the governorship of Maximilian.11

Franz Josef predictably refused to entertain this proposal and, divested of his responsibilities, Maximilian appeared to concentrate on the construction of Miramare Castle. He and Charlotte indulged in frequent pleasure cruises off the Balkans along the Istrian coast.12 Pilastro and Isoni, however, refer to visits and voyages “to Vienna and to other principal European capitals” that were “of an intense diplomatic nature for the

---

10 Details kindly provided by Georg Kugler. Electronic mail. 15 February 2006.
11 Theories as to why the French Emperor halted his advance range from his horror at the slaughter he witnessed, to anxiety further action might provoke Prussian retaliation, to a secret agenda regarding Venetia’s position as potentially beneficial to France in the future; to varying degrees all are probable. On July 6 1859 Napoleon III “attempted to negotiate through the British Government with Austria … proposing as a basis of negotiation the cession of Lombardy to Piedmont, the independence of Venetia, and the erection of an Italian Confederation” as John Raymond details in a footnote to 10 July correspondence on this subject from Lord John Russell to Queen Victoria. Russell and Prime Minister Palmerston recommended that the Queen “should give to the Emperor of the French the moral support which is asked. It is clearly understood that if the Emperor of Austria declines to accept the propositions, Great Britain will still maintain her neutral position.” Presumably it was then that Maximilian’s name was put forward in relation to the independence of Venice although his name is not mentioned in these documents. Victoria responded she was not convinced “moral support” would not jeopardize Britain’s officially neutral position but matters were concluded between France and Austria before further discussion took place. Lord John Russell to Queen Victoria, 10 July 1859; Queen Victoria to Lord John Russell 10 July 1859. John Raymond, [1907], 1963, 251. See also Haslip: 1971, 121, and Ashdown, 1981, 119.
12 Regions then within the Austrian Empire. Among small paintings by Charlotte displayed at Miramare Castle is one of the _Fantasia_, a paddle-wheel vessel used for some of these voyages.
purpose of securing an office which would have restored his prestige.”

In autumn 1859 Charlotte purchased the island of Lacroma off the Istrian coast in Dalmatia. Details are scarce as to her motivation but it is notable the island is located close to the heavily fortified site of Ragusa. As ethnic tensions were causing the region to agitate against Austrian control Charlotte’s description of this site as a summer retreat seems ingenuous. Indeed, it was Octave Aubry’s assessment that Charlotte was “intriguing to find a throne in the Balkans.”

Maximilian and Charlotte’s journeys seeking potential future positions must have been conducted surreptitiously. “Hardly a month went by” Haslip states, “without the secret police in Trieste reporting [to Franz Josef] some injudicious remark or criticism” made by Maximilian. Photographs taken of the Austrian royal family in autumn late 1859 are interesting for the contrasting poses struck by Franz Josef and Maximilian. While portraits cannot be read as demonstrating character or emotion, the subject’s expression and assumption of physical postures can be

---

14 Haslip, 1971, 135.
15 Octave Aubry, *Empress of the French*, trans. F. M. Atkinson (Philadelphia; J.B. Lippincott, 1931), 161. Most biographies of Eugénie characterize actions and attitudes of Charlotte as ambitious and obstinate while presenting those of the French Empress in a sympathetic light although Nichols Barker offers a more balanced and valuable exception. Nancy Nichols Barker *Distaff Diplomacy: the Empress Eugénie and the Foreign Policy of the Second Empire* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967). The opposite is true to an extent except that Charlotte was later diagnosed as ‘mad,’ a development presenting a convenient metaphor for the dangers of excessive female ambition at times when gender anxieties were high and undercut more positive interpretations. This phenomenon, in so far as it relates to images of Charlotte, is discussed in Chapters Five and Six.
16 See also Corti, [1921], 1926, 84-87. Reinach-Foussmagne includes Emile Ollivier’s assertions that Maximilian was competitive and deceptive, especially regarding Lombardy and Hungary, and provoked the hostility of Franz Josef. Emile Ollivier, *L’Empire liberal* (Paris: Garnier, 1897) quoted in Reinach-Foussmagne, 1925, 147. However, as already remarked, many in Austria were highly approving of Maximilian as were many statesmen in Britain.
indicative of the impression they mean their image to convey. In the examples below, one interpretation of poses struck by Franz Josef and Maximilian is that these exhibit mutual disaffection given the political context in which the photographs were produced (Figure 4.2 and 4.3).\(^\text{17}\)

Figure 4.2. Ludwig Angerer, *The Austrian Imperial Family*, (detail) 1859. Back row, left to right, Emperor Franz Josef, Archduke Maximilian, Archduchess Charlotte, Archduke Ludwig Victor, Archduke Karl Ludwig; front row, Empress Elisabeth holding Crown Prince Rudolph, Princess Giselle, Archduchess Sophie, former Emperor Ferdinand II.

Figure 4.3. Photographer unknown. *Untitled (Archduke Karl Ludwig, Archduke Ludwig Viktor, Emperor Franz Josef, Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian)*. c. 1859 or early 1860s.

\(^\text{17}\) In 1859 Archduchess Sophie gathered together the Austrian royal family at the spa town of Ischl hoping to encourage reconciliation. An anecdote being repeated by December and locating Maximilian in the mountainous region around Ischl suggests that he was not motivated to make peace with Franz Josef. Instead it reinforces his reputation as chivalrous, sympathetic, and possessing a keen talent for attracting attention. Alone on a walking tour and incognito he is said to have become lost and stopped at a cottage to ask directions. Learning the family was penniless “because the [older] brother was in the army” - a reference to Franz Josef’s harsh military policies - Maximilian was moved to improve their situation through a gift of money thereby demonstrating his far more magnanimous nature. North Peat, 1903, 217-218.
Corti comments that “the turmoil of the war of 1859 and its consequences kept Europe in breathless suspense.”18 This was not only because unification of the Italian states had been temporarily thwarted by the unexpected Peace of Villafranca leaving Venetia within the Austrian Empire, but also because the partial success of the Italian states revived demands elsewhere for nationalist or ethnic autonomy. Additionally, the innate opportunism of Napoleon III aroused concerns he would intervene in such situations to the advantage of France. The French Emperor had declared support for the principle of nationalities (the right of ethnic groups to self-government) upon his assumption of the title of Emperor in 1852. His duplicity in this regard was revealed by France’s territorial gains following the cessation of French-Piedmont and Austrian hostilities and he was further compromised by his guarantee of French protection for the Papal States against Italian nationals who wished to incorporate these within a unified Italy. Pope Pius IX angered the Italian peoples by announcing his neutrality after initially taking a stance supportive of the Risorgimento. Subsequently forced to flee Rome in 1848, the Pope was given sanctuary by Ferdinand II at Gaeta in Sicily until Napoleon III provided security by stationing some of his Imperial Guard at the Vatican. Price concisely describes the lack of coordination characterizing French foreign policy in Second Empire France and reasons for international anxiety regarding this circumstance.

The main result of Napoleon’s foreign policy and his determination to re-make the map of Europe was to ensure growing international distrust of French intentions and effective diplomatic isolation. The Crimean War and subsequent expressions of sympathy for Polish independence alienated Russia; the Italians resented French annexation of Nice and Savoy as the price for support in 1859 and especially the obstacle to further progress to unity.

18 Corti, [1924], 1968, 93.
represented by the garrison in Rome; the Austrians, defeated in 1859 and then even more humiliatingly by Prussia in 1866, added the absence of French support against their northern enemy to their growing list of grievances; British suspicion was aroused by the Italian campaign and the Emperor’s evident determination to turn the Mediterranean into a French lake.19

The inconclusive end to the French-Piedmont and Austrian war and growing Hungarian agitation for independence caused Maximilian to fear that both Miramar and the island of Lacroma were at risk of attack by Italian forces. He wrote Leopold I of his anxiety with respect to certain financial holdings in Hungary and requesting the King fictitiously purchase Miramar and Lacroma so as to render them neutral in case of such an event. Leopold I did so for Lacroma but assured Maximilian that Miramar was safe and concern over Hungarian investments unnecessary - a reassurance somewhat surprising given the threat of civil strife throughout the Austrian Empire. The debacle resulting in the loss of Lombardy reflected directly on Emperor Franz Josef, his policies, and appointees; there were muted calls for his abdication even as Maximilian’s liberal views gained him still greater popularity especially in Hungary.20 British Prime Minister Palmerston and Foreign Minister Lord Russell were convinced Britain needed to be involved to prevent the situation from escalating but Queen Victoria was adamant Britain should not support nationalists in their struggle for independence from Austrian control.21

---

20 Haslip, 1972, 122 and 159.
21 The persistence of her Foreign Minister and Prime Minister often exasperated the Queen partly because she felt it exhausted Prince Albert as she wrote to Victoria, the Princess Royal (Crown Princess of Prussia). “[Your father] is so fagged and worked and our 2 Italian Masters [Russell and Palmerston] almost drive us crazy. Really I never saw two such obdurate … I won’t use any expression because I can’t trust what it would be.”
In November 1859, a month after the purchase of Lacroma, Charlotte and Maximilian set out on a curious sea voyage that was first characterized as a round-the-world trip and then as a state visit to Habsburg relatives ruling Brazil. For reasons that remain obscure Charlotte was disembarked on the Spanish island of Madeira and remained there, apparently with few of their retinue, throughout the winter until Maximilian returned in spring 1860. An 1863 letter from Queen Victoria contains mention of an earlier occasion when Prince Albert was “sitting down at Osborne with Max and Fritz [Prussian Prince Frederick William, husband of Victoria, the Princess Royal] and listening to the former’s accounts of the Italian War.” This may have occurred during the 1859 voyage; Madeira is not too distant (relative to Trieste) from Osborne House on the Isle of Wight. The timing would have been opportune for Maximilian as Lord John Russell was then urging that Britain both support revolution in the Two Sicilies and attend to the evolving situation in Hungary.

Maximilian and Charlotte returned to Trieste in early spring 1860 and visited the court at Vienna. Bibesco asserts “Franz Josef received them with coldness and mistrust. The Emperor had recently learned from his Ambassador in London that Queen Victoria, in connivance, no doubt, with [Leopold I], was intriguing for Max to be crowned King of

---

22 As noted previously, there were also Coburg links to the royal family of Brazil as a result of marriages arranged by Leopold I.

23 The Queen is recalling this incident while writing of a more recent visit of Prince Alexander of Hesse and his discussions of the Peace of Villa Franca (July 11, 1859). Queen Victoria at Windsor to Victoria, Princess Frederick, 29 April, 1863. Quoted in Fulford, 1968, 205.

24 “Lord John Russell presents his humble duty to your Majesty. He is sorry he cannot agree that there would be any moral wrong in assisting to overthrow the Government of the King of the Two Sicilies.” 30 April 1860, Lord John Russell to Queen Victoria. Raymond, [1907], 196, 265.
Hungary. But of all this Max knew nothing.”\textsuperscript{25} Maximilian (and Charlotte) undoubtedly knew much of these discussions although Bibesco may be mistaken regarding Queen Victoria’s involvement. Austrian author Corti is reticent so far as Maximilian and possible aspirations relating to Hungary but Haslip refers to Franz Josef’s anger at “the impertinent suggestion put forward by the British Foreign Minister that Hungary should be given her independence with Ferdinand Maximilian as King.”\textsuperscript{26} She is describing events that took place in 1860 and returns to this subject at a later point. “On more than one occasion,” Haslip asserts, John Russell and Lord Palmerston attempted unsuccessfully to intervene with the Austrian Emperor to have [Maximilian] “appointed either as King of Hungary or Governor-General of Venetia.”\textsuperscript{27} Maximilian’s liberal views, goodwill towards Britain, and royal family connections were valued by Russell and Palmerston. Less advantageously Maximilian was also inexperienced in governing, lacking in tenacity, and impractical; nonetheless, it was not these factors but his resentment and jealousy of Franz Josef that ensured any access to political influence would be curtailed by the latter.

In September 1860 shortly after her twentieth birthday, Charlotte replied to a letter from Léopold Brabant in which he assessed “the state of the world.” “The wind that is blowing may topple the old dynasties,” she wrote, “but not a young dynasty such as Belgium’s that strongly supports suffrage.” “Universal suffrage” Charlotte considered “a farce” while “true suffrage resulting from affection and accomplishment” provided the “most solid base a government can have … for the people will reciprocate.” She goes on

\textsuperscript{25} Some accounts indicate that only Maximilian visited Vienna at this time. Bibesco, [1937], 1956, 116.
\textsuperscript{26} Haslip, 1971, 159.
\textsuperscript{27} Haslip, 1971, 189.
to recall springtime in the Italian countryside around Ancona with its beauty and “rich vegetation in splendid sunshine” on an occasion “less than two years earlier … now there is nothing but blood spilled on all sides, all for a nameless infamy without historical precedent. It is frightful!”

Widespread and vociferous dissatisfaction with the rule of Franz Josef forced him to replace many of his ministers and, in October 1860, to announce a Charter meant to suppress unrest (most urgently in Hungary) without making meaningful changes. This proved to be inadequate as did a February 1861 attempt at resolving issues through an Imperial Patent. According to Eugene Bagger “Hungarian leaders coquetted with Napoleon [III], corresponded with [Italian General] Garibaldi, and conferred with Kossuth [exiled Hungarian leader], agitators sneaked in, emissaries sneaked out; there were rumours of large shipments of arms being smuggled into the country from Italy.”

Recognizing that the failure of these imperial initiatives increased potential for revolution in the Austrian Empire, and concerned Garibaldi might attack the Istrian coast and provoke Austrian retaliation, Lord Russell requested permission of Queen Victoria to contact the General to urge caution. Russell was, moreover, alarmed Napoleon III was “again exciting the Hungarian party” and thought Garibaldi would act if French support were forthcoming.

There is little chance of Garibaldi’s refusing to take part in this expedition” Russell wrote to the Queen, “and if he does proceed to the Damatian or Istrian coast, his name will have an immense effect …. It does not seem reasonable to throw away any chance of saving the Austrian Empire and the peace of Europe ….

---

In the month of March Hungary will be in a blaze; But if Italy, German, and France keep away, the fire may burn itself out.30

Palmerston and Russell presented proposals to Emperor Franz Josef designed to resolve this crisis and it might have been then that Maximilian’s name was put forward as King of Hungary. This highly-charged political environment and its shifting implications for their future might be expected to have influenced art commissions made by Charlotte and Maximilian after the end of their Viceregal tenure and there is reason to think this was the case. In early summer 1860 they installed themselves in a small two-story structure known as the ‘castelleto’ on the grounds of Miramar castle until they were able to move into a completed section of the castle itself at the end of the year. Charlotte assumed partial responsibilities for developing the still nearly barren grounds of Miramar, devoted time to her own art, and made plans for future displays of portraits within the castle.31

30 Lord John Russell to Queen Victoria, 11 February 1861. In John Raymond ed., Queen Victoria’s Early Letters, [1907], 276, 277.
31 She “spent the morning painting,” Charlotte tells Léopold Brabant, and was including with her letter “a small package of lithographs she had made.” 22 September 1860 (an addition to a letter of 21 September), Capron, 1986, xerox copy page illegible. Both Charlotte and Victoria, the Princess Royal (Princess Frederich William of Prussia), pursued personal studies in art and explored several media. Queen Victoria and Prince Albert encouraged this interest and correspondence between the Queen and Princess Royal from the 1860s is rich in references to portraits – almost to the point of replicating the centrality of portraiture in letters between Queen Victoria and Queen Louise Marie in the 1840s and 1850s but generally without political ramifications characterizing the former. The British monarchs did not unconditionally endorse the study and practice of art as Queen Victoria reminded her daughter. “I hear you model and even paint in oils, this last I am sorry for; you remember what Papa always told [you] on the subject. Amateurs never can paint in oils like artists and what can one do with all one’s productions? Whereas water colours always are nice andpleasant to keep in books or portfolios. I hope, dear, you will not take to the one and neglect the other!” Queen Victoria to Victoria, the Princess Royal, 9 April 1859. Christopher Hibbert, ed., Queen Victoria in her Letters and Journals (London: John Murray Ltd., 1984), 110, 111.
“Perhaps there will be war, perhaps there will be revolution, perhaps nothing. Those are the three possibilities and I don’t know which is more probable” Charlotte confided to Léopold Brabant on 20 December 1860, but throughout this period she and Maximilian continued to commission art for Miramar. Charlotte engaged Belgian sculptor Guillaume Geefs, who had produced two sculptures of her as a small child, to produce a bust of Leopold I and one of the Louise Marie. In addition, Mia Kerckvoorde relates, Charlotte commissioned a “Flemish scene” from another Belgian artist, Jean-Baptiste Madou (1796-1873), but declined it as not sufficiently characteristic of Flanders. It was also at this time that Charlotte began to collect what would become an “immense” number of photographs. These were predominantly portrait photographs and two received by Charlotte at this time from Léopold Brabant of Sultan Abul Medjid were undoubtedly added to her collection. Her brother had made the first of his travels to distant locations in 1854, the year after his marriage, with a visit to Egypt during which he stopped in Trieste as Barbara Emerson describes. Ostensibly necessary because of sciatica or rheumatism, his near-constant journeys irritated both Leopold I and the Belgian public.

Frequent letters between Léopold Brabant and Charlotte convey the impression they were closer and more affectionate than was the reality. Charlotte wrote prolifically and her regular correspondents were numerous. Excerpts from letters to Léopold Brabant sketched and painted throughout her life. With respect to the Queen admonitions to Princess Frederich it is amusing that Ormond mentions Winterhalter “provided the Queen with her first lessons in oil painting ….” Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 41.

---

32 Capron, 1988, n.p. on copy.
33 These were a ‘head’ of Charlotte as an infant and a full-length sculpture based on a portrait by Ross (see Figure 2.8).
34 Kerckvoorde, [1980], 1981, 74-75.
35 Emerson, 1979, 19.
dominate in the present discussion as Charlotte’s letters to her brother contain key references to portraits bearing on the social and political significance of these works. The relationship between Charlotte and Léopold Brabant was characterized by “mutual dislike” from 1853, if not earlier, in the estimation of Neal Ascherson. Charlotte was at a disadvantage in desiring cooperation from Léopold Brabant who, assured of succession to the Belgian throne, had little need of his sister’s support. Neither were relations between Leopold I and his heir enviable; instead, they “deteriorated in the 1860s from coolness to estrangement” Emerson notes, attributing this primarily to the King’s failing health.

Charlotte and Maximilian established themselves in the completed section of the castle at the end of 1860 and by 23 February 1861 she was able to inform Léopold Brabant the apartments were “charming.” She reminded him, however, her “salon” still lacked portraits of “the Brabants.”

Everyone asks where these are and I am embarrassed to answer. The other day, I showed my rooms to some strangers and explained the situation of family portraits. Here are my parents, here is my brother the Count of Flanders. ‘And the Duke and Duchess of Brabant?’ I could not reply. I did not know what to say and responded that my brother has promised these but I believe he has forgotten as he has been suffering [ill health] this past while which makes this oversight forgivable ….

That some of these “strangers” were individuals whose good opinion might be useful to him would not have been lost on Léopold Brabant. Among guests at Miramar in the early 1860s were members of the Orléans, Austrian, and English royal families but also

---

rulers of Italian states, wealthy local financiers, and others.³⁷ Charlotte and Maximilian entertained their guests sumptuously, opened the nascent Miramare gardens to the public for concerts, and hosted special events in defiance of their uncertain situation.³⁸ This uncertainty made the display of family portraits all the more crucial as a means of demonstrating social position and political connections. “When you are better,” she chides Léopold Brabant, “I do not know what reason to allege that will not compromise your reputation,” and requests he send copies of paintings by Belgian artist Tuerlinx “to admirably and finally complete my collection so that your [visual] absence does not expose us to unfavourable interpretations on the part of visitors.”³⁹ It is in this letter that there is mention of portraits sent previously to her brother.

Without speaking here of a disregarded promise and one’s conscience, I assure you it is not a good idea for you not to have your portrait anywhere in the salon collection of your sister, and it is particularly not a good idea if one knows this same sister and your brother-in-law sent you portraits of themselves two years ago … it must be considered that one would expect reciprocity.

As discussed earlier these were almost certainly her ‘black mantilla’ portrait and a copy of the 1857 portrait of Maximilian by Winterhalter. Léopold Brabant must have written back excusing himself for not sending portraits of himself and Marie-Henriette as he

³⁷ In her letters Charlotte frequently mentions visitors, including her Orléans aunt Clémentine, her mother-in-law, Austrian Archduchess Sophie, Maximilian’s brothers and Philippe of Flanders, and Victoria, the Princess Royal (Crown Princess of Prussia). Lloyd’s Insurance founder P. Revoltella continued to be a guest at Miramar even in 1866. Haslip also remarks “there was always some discontented Venetian nationalist, some liberal politician or a representative of the foreign press” visiting Miramar. Haslip, 1971, 159.
³⁹ Charlotte from Miramare 23 February 1861 to Léopold, Duke of Brabant, in Brussels. Capron, 1986, 91-92. Note: Tuerlinx is spelled Tuerlinck in a later letter. No information on this artist has been discovered in regard to his commission.
could not find a suitable artist as, on 3 April 1861, Charlotte writes she has had “an excellent idea” in this regard and hopes “to discuss it with him in person.” Charlotte’s frustration over Léopold Brabant’s failure to reciprocate with portraits of himself and Marie-Henriette did not derive from sentiment or aesthetics; this refusal to demonstrate family connections by extension represented refusal to endorse political aspiration she and Maximilian might hold. It is clear Charlotte monitored matters in Belgium, reading speeches Léopold Brabant delivered to the Belgian Senate for instance, and was attentive to political issues elsewhere. “It was at this time the previous year troubles in Sicily began” she observes and “it remains to be seen what this spring will bring.” Concerning Austria, and apparently referring to the Imperial Patent issued by Franz Josef in February 1861, Charlotte remarks “there is new uncertainty regarding the overture of the Reichsrath.” A final, glancing mention of portraits closes her letter. “The other day I showed your [portrait] photographs to the elderly Countess of Molina, widow of Don Carlos, and she thought you looked very well and Marie extremely beautiful.”

Miramare

Winterhalter’s 1857 painting of Maximilian portrays him as youthful and confident in his newly acquired Vice Admiral uniform (Figure 4.4). Dismissed from his Viceregal post, stateless, and heavily in debt for the still-unfinished Miramare, Maximilian’s future in 1860 would seem compromised but the art he commissioned at

---

40 (Perhaps also a photograph of Philippe, Count of Flanders). The visit of Léopold Brabant did not take place since Charlotte, in another letter written soon after this, expresses her regret they would not see him because he was detained by illness in Gastein. “Are there good doctors there? Those of Turin should not be famous since they have just killed Cavour, Garibaldi is sick as is also Ricasoli, it is an epidemic.” Count Cavour died 7 June 1861 and was succeeded by Baron Bettino Ricasoli. Charlotte to Léopold Brabant, c. mid- June, 1861. Capron, 1986, n.p. (illegible).
this time contradicts such an assessment. Among these commissions was a very large, resplendent genealogy of his Habsburg and Lorraine ancestry painted by Hungarian artist Ede Heinrich (1819-1885) that hangs in the double-height throne room at Miramare Castle (Figure 4.5).

Figure 4.4. F. X. Winterhalter, Archduke Maximilian, 1857.
Figure 4.5. Ede Heinrich, Albero Genealogico degli Asburgo Lorena, 1860-1861.

The genealogy painting is explained by Rossella Fabiani by there being a Habsburg “family tradition that all royal residences should have a room that recalled the greatness of the dynasty.”\(^{41}\) Nevertheless, Maximilian’s personal circumstances and the

\(^{41}\) The Miramare Throne Room is a spacious hall of double height, a choir stall above the thrones, and gothic-style ceiling with eleven candelabras.\(^{41}\) Heinrich represented ancestral figures from the House of Habsburgs in gold rondels and those of House of Lorraine in silver rondels connected by looping ribbons rising from a base featuring crowns and castles pertaining to these royal families. At the top are portraits of Maximilian and Charlotte connected by a ring. Fabiani, 2001, 59-61. Opposite the genealogical painting hangs an even larger canvas by Geiger entitled the “Triumph of Charles V” which “allegorically represents lands of the Emperor who gave history the famous quote: “The sun never sets on my kingdom.” Numerous other portraits of the Habsburg dynasty are also displayed in this room. Pilastro and Isoni, 1987, n.p. See also
Austrian Empire’s instability in 1860 make the timing of this Heinrich commission unusual. Maximilian’s facial features in Heinrich’s genealogical painting closely resemble the 1857 Winterhalter portrait but his naval uniform is here replaced by a burgundy tunic with a white silk stock at the neck. These details are difficult to discern in the small genealogical rondel but are boldly apparent in an individual portrait. Individual portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian were additionally commissioned from Heinrich that replicate and expand upon the rondels (Figures 4.6 and 4.7).

![Figure 4.6. Ede Heinrich, ‘Charlotte,’ c.1861.](image)
![Figure 4.7. Ede Heinrich, ‘Maximilian,’ c.1861.](image)

---

Fabiani, 2001, 44-59. (Charlotte refers obliquely to the maxim of Charles V in a letter of 27 January 1962 saying she hopes the sun will not set a second time on the Habsburg Empire.) Capron, 1988, page illegible. As Emperor of Mexico, Maximilian envisioned territorial expansions as apparent from a map included in Corti, [1924], 1968, n.p. The notable similarity of Heinrich’s portraits of Maximilian and Charlotte to earlier portraits by Franz Xaver Winterhalter would be a useful point to investigate further in order to determine whether they are ‘after’ unknown works or if templates from Winterhalter were involved in their production.
In that of Maximilian he is seen with a waxed mustache and thicker beard and wears a blouse of brilliant red under a burgundy tunic richly embellished with gilt embroidery. Over his right shoulder is a similarly decorated band and across his chest are displayed jeweled, golden chains and insignia. Bibesco describes Maximilian as wearing “Magyar costume” in this painting. Heinrich’s individual portraits of Maximilian and Charlotte are discussed in the 2001 Miramar guidebook as depicting them in their official robes as rulers of Mexico. The assumption these are state portraits of Maximilian and Charlotte as Emperor and Empress is understandable as the date given for these paintings in the 2001 guidebook is 1863 by which time negotiations for them to assume these roles were well underway. An 1863 date is contradicted, however, by the fact that Charlotte’s individual portrait is virtually identical to that in Heinrich’s 1860 genealogical painting and Maximilian’s appearance in both the individual and genealogical images is very similar, though more hirsute in one, and what can be seen of his attire in the earlier painting matches that in his individual image. Dates can be seen faintly in the 1997 guidebook reproductions of Heinrich’s individual portraits; it cannot be determined conclusively that these negate the 1863 date but neither do they support it. The last number on Charlotte’s portrait cannot be read with certainty from this image; the last number on Maximilian’s portrait appears to have been altered but resembles a ‘1’ more

---

43 In a later painting, Dell’Acqua depicts Maximilian as Emperor of Mexico similarly attired but the tunic is deep pink. This allegorical painting (installed on the ceiling of the History Room at Miramar) was an homage commissioned posthumously. A description is included in Fabiani, 1989, 186.
44 Marthe Bibesco, Princess, Carlota, John Ghika (trans.) (Melbourne: William Heinemann Ltd., 1956), 103. Bibesco had access to material not necessarily available to other authors. Many details in her book are accurate although this is a romantic novel loosely based on historical events and should not be considered a reliable source. Her observation in relation to this particular portrait, nonetheless, is usefull.
45 Fabiani, 2001, 54.
than a ‘3.’ If these were painted prior to 1863 (when Maximilian’s role as Emperor of Mexico remained probable but unconfirmed) it could be speculated these were commissioned as contingency images should Maximilian and Charlotte become rulers of Hungary. (The fact that Pilastro and Isoni refer to the portraits in this guidebook as “regal medallions” without mention of Mexico is interesting in this regard.) ‘Magyar,’ as Anna Cienciala describes the term, is the “Hungarian name for ethnic Hungarians as distinct from the non-Hungarian peoples of old Hungary: Croats, Germans, Jews, Romanian, Saxons, Serbs, Slovaks”. Heinrich portrays Maximilian not simply in ‘Magyar’ costume but in robes like those worn by his uncle, Ferdinand I, in portraits as Emperor of Austria and Hungary and by Franz Josef upon his coronation as King of Hungary in 1866 (Figures 4.8 and 4.9).

---

The possibility that Maximilian and Charlotte were preparing themselves should Hungary attain independence and they find themselves candidates for the throne gains credence from Britain’s support for such an outcome.\textsuperscript{47} This premise would be strengthened if a connection could be made between Charlotte’s appearance and images of Hungarian queens. Details of her attire cannot be determined in the genealogical painting beyond the presence of a coronet, ermine, and miniscule portion of the neck of her gown. Her individual portrait repeats the ermine cape and coronet; the visible portion

\textsuperscript{47} Corti refers to the anxieties of Franz Josef and Austrian authorities regarding possible decisions that might be made by the Hungarian Diet that might favour placing Maximilian in a position of authority. Corti, [1924] 1968, 344.
of her gown is dark blue and horizontally patterned with still darker blue or black marks or weaving. There does not appear to be anything in this latter image explicitly inferring a connection with Hungary. A brief enquiry into images of Hungarian queens from the nineteenth century or earlier indicates, however, they were sometimes portrayed wearing red (or orange-red) robes not unlike those worn by Ferdinand I and Maximilian (Figure 4.10).48

Figure 4.10. Artist unknown, Mária, Queen Regnant, n.d.
Figure 4.11. Francisco Morales Van Den Eyden after Heinrich, Carlota, Maximiliano de Habsburgo, n. d.
Figure 4.12. ‘After’ Heinrich, empressa Carlota, early 1860s.

In this respect it is interesting that there exist other versions of Heinrich’s individual portrait of Charlotte in which her gown is red (Figure 4.11 and 4.12). In the right hand

image above, a hand-coloured photograph of a Charles Jacotin lithograph, multi-coloured jewels adorn her coronet, she wears a segmented brooch, a ringlet of hair extends on either side of her neck, and her ermine cloak can be seen at both shoulders - all aspects that differ from the Heinrich portrait of Charlotte displayed at Miramar. Upon the red gown can be seen traces of gold patterning, a detail that might imply a portrait existed in which Charlotte wore similar robes to those of Maximilian with the picture of her in a dark blue gown being a later version.\textsuperscript{49} It is likely, however, that this was coloured in Mexico where a tradition exists of depicting certain female saints in red robes decorated with gold. A connection between Charlotte in her later role as Empress of Mexico and traditional depictions of female saints would seem unlikely yet some such instances occurred as discussed in Chapter Five (see Figure 5.10)\textsuperscript{50}

The History Room at Miramare presents a selectively constructed historical narrative that is as much about Maximilian as it is about historical events taking place at that residence. Among the large oil paintings by Cesare Dell’Acqua is one documenting a visit to Miramare by Franz Josef and his consort Elisabeth that occurred in May 1861 (Figure 4.13).

\textsuperscript{49} Lithographs of Heinrich’s depiction of Charlotte were produced in Paris, Belgium, Italy, the United States and possibly elsewhere. A Decaen lithograph is reproduced in Acevedo, 1995, 38. Examples are also held in USA collections. The Jacotin lithograph was distributed in Italy under “Charler & Jacotin, Parigi.” In some version Charlotte is shown wearing elaborate earrings. Aurelia Cimino Folliero de Luna, Massimiliano d’Austria e il Castello di Miramare (Firenze: Tipografia Cooperativa, 1875; Trieste: Mgs Press Editrice, 1994), n.p.

\textsuperscript{50} See also illustrations of retablos honouring Our Lady of Refuge (Nuestra Señore de la Refugio) and Sorrowful Mother (Mater Dolorosa or Nuestra Señore de los Dolores) in Netto Calil Zarur and Charles Muir Lovell, 2001, 165-166, 182.
Empress Elisabeth’s life was a protracted journey that removed her from Vienna, her strained marriage, and difficult relationship with Archduchess Sophie whenever possible. Elisabeth embarked on a voyage to Madeira in November 1860 officially explained as necessary to restore her health and Haslip asserts Franz Josef held Maximilian partially to blame for this awkward departure. Adding to Franz Josef’s embarrassment was the loan of a yacht by Queen Victoria as “none of the available Austrian ships [were] suitable.” This expedition became, on a minor level, an international affair as Elisabeth traveled first to Belgium on her way to boarding the Victoria and Albert. Elisabeth was met by Léopold Brabant and Marie-Henriette before being escorted to Ostend by Leopold I; on Elisabeth’s stopover in England she exchanged

---

51 Haslip, 1971, 137.
visits with Queen Victoria.\textsuperscript{52} The voyage culminated in Elisabeth’s arrival at Lacroma seven months later where Franz Josef and Maximilian met her and then continued with her to Miramar. This provided a unique opportunity for a painting prestigiously including not only the Austrian Emperor and Empress with Maximilian and Charlotte but also the British flag.\textsuperscript{53}

Emperor Franz Josef tenaciously and inflexibly retained control of Hungary. If the individual Heinrich portraits were commissioned in readiness should Maximilian have been called upon to rule a separate state they became superfluous.\textsuperscript{54} In 1862 King Otho and his consort, Queen Amalie, abandoned the Greek throne following an assassination attempt on her life. Britain was eager for its own reasons to see a more compatible ruler installed.\textsuperscript{55} Lord John Russell put forward Maximilian’s name as a replacement for Otho and the possibility Charlotte might become Queen of Greece must

\textsuperscript{52} Raymond, [1907], 1963, 270-273.

\textsuperscript{53} Corti says only that Charlotte “did not get on very well with the Empress Elisabeth.” Corti, [1924], 1968, 92. He does not refer to an incident (a large dog belonging to Elisabeth killed a smaller dog given to Charlotte by Queen Victoria) escalating ill-will during this visit although Haslip does so. Haslip, 1971, 138. See also Von Margutti, Lieutenant-General Baron, C.V.O., \textit{Emperor Francis Joseph and His Times} (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1921), 89.

\textsuperscript{54} The fact that Heinrich’s image of Maximilian in red robes is apparently unknown beyond Miramar increases the likelihood this premise is correct. A discreet aside in a letter from Leopold I to Alphonse de Mensdorf-Pouilly, 25 July 1863, \textit{may} relate to the possibility of Maximilian becoming ruler of an independent Hungary. “Regarding that of which you spoke, the situation in Hungary seems to me to be a little less favourable, but I do not have precise details.” Letter No. 113, reproduced in Jean Puraye et Hans-Otto Lang, 1973. 427.

have heartened Leopold I.\textsuperscript{56} Franz Josef refused to allow Maximilian’s candidacy for the throne of Greece on grounds that Otho was a cousin and it would be unseemly to benefit from his misfortune.\textsuperscript{57} On 10 October 1861, however, another proposal had been put forward that Maximilian and Charlotte become Emperor and Empress of Mexico - a proposal virtually dormant at the time of Russell’s suggestion. Maximilian had declared his interest and in this instance Franz Josef “advanced no fundamental objections ….”\textsuperscript{58} Corti asserts the Emperor willingly entertained this proposal as it had the potential to remove “his restless, critical, ‘free-thinking’ brother, who was always causing him

\textsuperscript{56} Letter from Leopold I, Laeken, 25 December, 1862, to Duke Ernest of Saxe Coburg Gotha. “The reason of my to-day’s letter is the Greek affair. [I]f I could shake off twenty years of my age, I would undertake the management of things there since there is after all the prospect of a great future, even without Constantinople …. The great wish in England, and apparently in Greece, is that the future Chief should belong to our family.” The Duke was invited to become King of Greece but declined. Ernest of Saxe Coburg Gotha, 1890, 81.

\textsuperscript{57} Corti, [1924], 1968, 203-204. In spring 1863 there was a rebellion in Poland and “a considerable body of European statesmen were in favour of restoring it as an independent monarchy.” Maximilian’s name was mentioned in relation to this but the prospect did not arise as Russia suppressed the revolutionaries with “sanguinary ferocity.” Haslip, 1971, 190.

\textsuperscript{58} The absence of children was perceived as an advantage in some quarters as Nichols Barker remarks. “Perhaps the Empress’ satisfaction over the conditional acceptance of the Austrian Archduke was increased by her hope that room remained for the Spanish Carlists in the project [of founding an empire in Mexico]. Ferdinand Maximilian and his wife, Archduchess Charlotte, were childless after four years of marriage (sic), and - if rumours about Maximilian were true [there was speculation Maximilian was homosexual or had contracted a disease rendering him sterile] - likely to remain so.” Maximilian and Charlotte had been married six years in 1863. Eugénie, whose father was Spanish and who had been raised in Spain, “saw an opportunity for the children of [the Spaniard] Don Juan de Borbón, who had succeeded to the role of Carlist pretender, and she suggested them as heirs to the Mexican throne.” Nichols Barker quotes the response of Austrian Ambassador Metternich to this proposal: “I am completely flabbergasted.” Metternich’s letter to Oldenburg, 6 October 1861, quoted in Nancy Nichols Barker, 1967, 91.
embarrassment and anxiety, but was at the same time extraordinarily beloved in the whole country ....”

The Mexican Proposal

The Mexican proposal was officially presented in October 1861 and was propelled by the ambitions of certain expatriate Mexicans in Europe who had been, since the late 1850s, seeking foreign intervention and a European prince to rule in their homeland where Liberal President Benito Juárez had won power. By replacing Juárez they hoped to return Mexico to a status quo more favourable to their interests and they found an attentive audience in Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie. Maximilian and Charlotte may have been aware of plans evolving at the French court in relation to Mexico. In an early 1861 letter to Léopold Brabant Charlotte replies to advice he offered with regard to “ecclesiastics.” “The actions you advise regarding property rights and the Constitution,” she writes, “would be difficult to undertake with honesty.” Property rights and the Constitution were key issues in Mexico’s Reform Wars that began when Benito Juárez, then President of the Supreme Court, declared a Constitution which Conservative Mexican President Comonfort refused to enact. Juárez became President

---

59 Corti, [1924], 1968, 107
60 In the nineteenth century it was not uncommon for less developed countries to seek to establish ties with wealthier European countries in this manner.
61 France had intervened in Mexico during the reign of King Louis Philippe and members of the French royal family had seen military service in Mexico.
63 The terms Liberal and Conservative are generally used in accounts of this period but these imply more defined political parties than was the case. A nuanced and insightful description of the political climate of mid-nineteenth century Mexico can be found in Erika Pani, “Dreaming of a Mexican Empire: the Political Projects of the Imperialistas” Hispanic American Historical Review (2002): 821, 1-31. An earlier, sometimes useful but racially biased work is Wilfrid Hardy Callcott, Liberalism in Mexico 1857-1929 (Hamden: Archon Books, 1965).
in 1859 and proceeded with reforms including redistribution of land, appropriation of some Catholic Church property, removal of education from Church control, and a temporary suspension of interest payments on foreign debt as the already impoverished country had been made nearly bankrupt by civil strife.\textsuperscript{64} The former actions outraged the Church, many Catholics, and those of a wealthy elite who were adversely affected, while the latter prompted Britain, Spain and France to send a joint force to Mexico in 1861 meant to force Juárez to rescind the moratorium as previously described. A satirical cartoon from this time comments on this action (Figure 4.14).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure4_14.png}
\caption{Frank Bellew, \textit{The sick woman of Mexico}, ‘Say, Missus! Me and these other Gents ‘ave come to Nurse you a bit.’ 1862.}
\end{figure}

Mexico is represented as female, ailing, and in need of rescue; male figures gathered at her bedside personify Spain, Britain, and France but convey more menace than concern.\textsuperscript{65}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{64} Regarding Church property see Haslip, 1971, 264-5, 268, 285, 289.
\item \textsuperscript{65} A similar but much later image depicts Columbia as an ‘unprotected female’ surrounded by male figures representing, among others, Austria, France, England, and Mexico. Mexicans, and others of non-European race, are portrayed half the size of European figures. Johnson points out “[a]s was the practice of the time … the people of the various Latin American republics,” as they are depicted in this example are
\end{itemize}
(Britain and Spain withdrew their military contingents when it became apparent Napoleon III had an agenda other than financial compensation.) As Anne McClintock demonstrates, such positivist and paternalistic interpretations of cultural difference were used to justify imperialism. While female personifications often reiterated assumed linkages of woman and nature in a manner supporting purported European superiority, John Johnson points out other motivations for this female personification. “Prior to 1920,” he notes, “cartoonists commonly portrayed Latin American states as female when seeking to invoke compassion for them ….” The cartoon illustrated here was intended to solicit public sympathy in the United States towards Mexico in ‘her’ struggle against foreign invaders. Fear of the ‘Other’ also derived from cultural difference and was frequently countered by imagery portraying ‘Others,’ especially men, as child-like. A satirical montage employs this tactic to diminish the authority of indigenous President Benito Juárez (see Figure 6.13).

Additional French troops had been deployed in Mexico to pacify the country prior to details of the new empire’s organization being finalized. “ … I do not believe there

“indistinguishable one from another ….” John J. Johnson, Latin America in Caricature (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980), 33. The characterization of Latin America as ‘female’ should not be regarded as unanimous. Empress Eugénie refers to Mexico as “your new fatherland” in a letter to Charlotte. Undated (1864). Quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 833. The implication Europe was always regarded as ‘male,’ and therefore rational, was also not unanimous. Gutierrez described Austrian reserve towards the Mexican proposal as resembling “that of a young girl waiting modestly for someone to come and ask for her hand.” Ibid. 109.

68 Johnson, 1980, 76.
69 Johnson discusses the “staying power of stereotypes, such as the childishness of Latin Americans generally and the powerlessness of Latin American males” in his concluding chapter. Johnson, 1980, Chapter 8.
will be any serious resistance there” Napoleon III assured Maximilian in January 1862.\textsuperscript{70}

Initially the French military achieved substantial success but on 5 May 1862, although outnumbering Mexican forces, they suffered a disastrous defeat near Puebla. This outcome was unsettling not only in terms of casualties but because it inverted the child-like characterization of indigenous President Benito Juárez and challenged a pervasive nineteenth-century rationale that Europeans were morally and physically superior to Latin Americans (Figure 4.15). These prejudices entered into questions of Mexico’s viability as a nation state and influenced decisions in Europe regarding support for the French Intervention and proposal to install Maximilian and Charlotte as Emperor and Empress.\textsuperscript{71}

Figure 4.15. Photographer unknown, President Benito Juárez, n.d.

\textsuperscript{70} 14 January, 1862. Quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 144; see also 169-170.

\textsuperscript{71} These prejudices later fuelled certain speculations as to the cause of Charlotte’s alleged madness. Fear and suspicion of ‘the Other’ was not exclusive to Europe but existed also in Mexico where French aggression in 1861 was simply the most recent foreign invasion. Perceptions held by the Mexican population are touched on in later chapters but to a lesser extent than European responses to portrayals of Charlotte before and after her time in Mexico.
Leopold I required urgent surgery early in 1862 and Charlotte was as a result in Belgium when word of the defeat at Puebla reached Europe.\textsuperscript{72} Maximilian appears to have joined Charlotte in Brussels later in May as Corti states the King counseled them to use “great circumspection” and “aim at ascertaining the truth” in regard to Mexico.\textsuperscript{73} Britain, in the King’s opinion, would support the project and guarantees of assistance from Britain and France would be essential. Leopold I was mistaken with regard to Britain; Prince Albert had vigourously opposed their involvement as did Queen Victoria.\textsuperscript{74} Palmerston was willing to entertain the prospect but Russell was highly critical.\textsuperscript{75} These views were made known to Maximilian as was the skepticism of Austrian diplomats.\textsuperscript{76} In contrast he and Charlotte received cautious but encouraging advice from Leopold I and optimistic and enthusiastic information from the French court and prominent Mexican ex-patriots. Dominant among these individuals were José Manuel Hidalgo y Esnurrizar (1826-1896), with family ties to Spanish nobility, the monarchist José Maria Gutierrez de Estrada (1800-1867), long a resident of Rome, and of

\textsuperscript{72} Letters of Leopold I reveal him to have been capable of deep affection but relations with his children were formal and detached at best. He refused to allow himself to be seen by anyone, sometimes including his doctors, when he was suffering. Emerson, 1979, 32. “Dear Uncle Leopold is much better; it is most distressing that he will not see any of his children for a moment even, and they feel it so much; poor Charlotte traveled night and day to Brussels and he is furious to hear it (though he knew he was very ill) and forbid [sic] her coming to Laeken!” Queen Victoria at Balmoral to Victoria the Princess Royal, Crown Princess of Prussia, May 15, 1862, in \textit{Dearest Mama: Letters between Queen Victoria and the Crown Princess of Prussia 1861-1864} (ed.) Roger Fulford, London: Evans Brothers, 1968: 62.

\textsuperscript{73} Corti, [1924], 1986, 170

\textsuperscript{74} The Prince Consort died of typhoid at the age of forty-two 14 December 1861. For Queen Victoria’s opinion of the Mexican imperial project see, for instance, her letter of 9 April, 1864 to Victoria the Princess Royal, Crown Princess of Prussia, in Fulford, [1907], 1968, 318.

\textsuperscript{75} For Palmerston’s position see Corti, [1924], 1968, 243.

\textsuperscript{76} Corti, [1924], 1968, 112-133, 156, 167,
lesser influence, Juan Nepomuceno Almonte (c.1803-1867).\textsuperscript{77} Communications from Napoleon III had lapsed for some time following the Puebla battle, a circumstance adding to Maximilian’s uncertainty as to whether or not to fully commit to the Mexican proposal. When Napoleon III resumed contact it was with assurances that reinforcements were to be sent to Mexico.\textsuperscript{78}

**Lacking Visual Credibility**

The declining health of Leopold I made it clear Léopold Brabant would soon succeed to the Belgian throne and Charlotte renewed her request for portraits from her brother. The ironic tone of her 1861 letter in which she reminded him of his unfulfilled promise to send portraits is replaced by one of conciliation in a letter dated 12 August 1862. “It is necessary that I again make a request close to my heart and that I hope you will not refuse …. It concerns your portraits that I have mentioned before ….” Charlotte offers to purchase these if doing so would expedite their arrival. “You will understand” she writes, “I appeal to your kindness that has never failed me.” At this point she draws on the paper a rectangle with square protrusions to indicate windows and to which she adds numbers and names (Figure 4.16).

\textsuperscript{77} Corti, ibid., 18, 29-33, 207.
\textsuperscript{78} Estimates of troops sent vary between 20,000 and 29,000. Ibsen puts the number at just under 24,000. Ibsen. 2006: 218
Figure 4.16. Archduchess Charlotte, “Voici mon salon,” 1862.

Here is my plan for my salon and the panels where I would put you. You see it will be charming. In two other spaces (6 and 7) is a wall with windows that leaves space for two small rondel portraits of your children but, out of discretion, I do not ask for these now, and only hope you will permit us to have copies when some are made.

With all the portraits together it will be very attractive, and if Philippe marries one day I also have a panel on which to place his wife’s portrait.79

Léopold Brabant responded that the Tuerlinck portraits were not sufficiently accomplished to warrant copies but Charlotte assures him he need not concern himself with this; those she has are not “des chef-d’oeuvres” but still create a good effect. Her response conforms to nineteenth-century attitudes which did not distinguish between originals and copies to the extent that later became the norm.

That of Philippe is an original by Portaels, that of dear Papa is, I believe, a copy of the Schuster that you have there, and that of dear Maman is a copy of an amateur’s painting. Therefore, copies of the Tuerlincks would not be scorned but would provide me recognition and fill me with satisfaction.80

79 Capron, 1986, 115.
80 Ibid., 116.
Charlotte’s efforts to assemble a display of family portraits during the early 1860s make it more puzzling that she and Maximilian did not commission state portraits of themselves in anticipation of becoming Empress and Emperor of Mexico.

It is evident from comments by Gutierrez in letters of June and September 1863 that copies of earlier portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian were sent to Mexico. In the June letter he describes a portrait of Maximilian being received with enthusiasm. The September reference is to portraits of both Charlotte and Maximilian. Corti quotes the unctuous Gutierrez who wrote “Mexicans, in their awe would approach the portraits of the Emperor and Empress which had been distributed throughout Mexico only hat in hand!”

Prints of Schubert’s 1857 engravings of Charlotte and of Maximilian and numerous copies of Heinrich’s c. 1860 portrait of Charlotte found in Mexican collections suggest these were among portraits sent prior to mid-1863.

Aspects of the Heinrich portrait in its ‘blue-black’ version echo an important portrait of Empress Eugénie that Winterhalter was painting in 1861 and completed in 1862. A black and white postcard version of the Heinrich portrait of Charlotte facilitates comparison with Eugénie’s portrait (Figures 4.17 and 4.18).

---

81 Gutierrez to Schertzenlechner, 20 June, 1863, quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 219.
82 Gutierrez had been in Europe two decades by this time with no intention of returning to Mexico. European artists working for the Mexican court perpetuated visually the flattering assessment that Mexican people were in awe of their European rulers but these images more accurately document European expectations and rationalizations than Mexican attitudes. Gutierrez to Baron Du Pont, 22 September, 1863. Ibid., 261.
83 The copy of the ‘black mantilla’ Winterhalter portrait of Charlotte probably arrived with her as there is no indication that it circulated widely as did her other images. See Acevedo regarding the need for painted portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian and of Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie. Acevedo, 1995, 41.
Eugénie’s royal arms and an inscription incorporating the date appear high in the background in this very large painting and she is depicted wearing mourning for her sister Paca. While of far less imposing dimensions and not a portrait commemorating so personal an event, the superficial similarly between the Heinrich and the Winterhalter portraits is intriguing as Heinrich placed his own joined initials under a stylized ‘W’.\textsuperscript{84} Instead of a coat-of-arms, the word ‘Miramar’ is inscribed below Heinrich’s initials and the date below that. These appear level with Charlotte’s shoulder in the background as though on a wall behind her.\textsuperscript{85} Ormond notes many of Winterhalter’s portraits can be grouped as belonging to one of a few types dominating his output at different times, for

\textsuperscript{84} Dimensions of the portrait of Empress Eugénie are 337 cm. X 450 cm. Those of the Heinrich painting are unavailable but the version displayed at Miramare is estimated as slightly less than life size.

\textsuperscript{85} Winterhalter signed his work in the lower left. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 50. Heinrich signed the ‘Magyar’ portrait of Maximilian as he did the ‘blue-black’ of Charlotte except that he did not include the word ‘Miramar’ on that of Maximilian. Acevedo mentions this portrait of Eugénie but not in relation to Heinrich’s portrait of Charlotte.
instance certain poses or colour combinations. The similarities raise the possibility that Heinrich’s portrait of Charlotte was influenced by Winterhalter’s style or be ‘after’ an unknown Winterhalter portrait of Charlotte - a possibility strengthened by the fact that the face of Maximilian as painted by Heinrich bears so close a resemblance to Winterhalter’s portrait of the Archduke. Copies of Heinrich’s individual portrait of Charlotte are paired, in Mexico, with images of Maximilian in uniform or civil dress ‘after’ the Archduke’s portrait by Winterhalter whereas, at Miramare, the pendant portrait of Maximilian is Heinrich’s ‘Magyar’ painting.86

Acevedo’s investigations of imperial visual representations of Maximilian and Charlotte in Mexico are pertinent to the question of why they failed to commission official images as Empress and Emperor until shortly before their departure from Europe.87 The result, Acevedo concludes, was an inconsistency of imperial representation in Mexico. This absence of state portraits also had implications for efforts to establish their imperial credentials at European courts as the success of the proposed Mexican empire depended on recognition extended by other European sovereigns and as

86 An example featuring the 1857 Winterhalter portrait of Maximilian is in the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco and was lithographed by Mexican artist Decaen. There is also a lithograph of King Louis Philippe by Decaen in the same collection; both were published by Masse y Decaen in Mexico City.

87 Alison McQueen has observed that state portraits of Napoleon III or Empress Eugénie did not exist for more than two years after the Second Empire had begun. It would be useful to ascertain with what frequency such a delay in the production of state portraits occurred in the nineteenth century in order to accurately evaluate the situation with the Mexican Empire. Significant differences should, however, be considered with regard to the initial lack of state portraits of Maximilian and Charlotte. Among these is the fact that requests were ongoing from Mexican representatives for suitably imperial images of Maximilian and Charlotte from late in 1863; additionally, Napoleon was already well known in France, and the state portrait of the French Emperor and Empress were immensely successful whereas this was not so for those Alfred Greafle ultimately supplied to the Mexican regents.
support would consist, in part, of volunteers from Belgium and Austria. State portraits, as has already been demonstrated with Charlotte’s early portraits, were exchanged between, and displayed at, European courts and often reproduced for public circulation. Franz Winterhalter was the most admired court painter through the second half of the nineteenth century and Charlotte and Maximilian did ultimately sit to Winterhalter for half-length state portraits but only weeks before they were to leave for Mexico; they additionally commissioned full-length state images from Winterhalter, however Acevedo is of the opinion that these were never completed.

Ormond quotes from an 1863 salon review by critic Arthur Stevens regarding Winterhalter: “He specializes in painting the queens and princesses of the whole world; every august head appears to require consecration by Winterhalter’s brush.”

Disparaging though this was meant to be, it reflects the fact that portraits by Winterhalter set the royal standard and by the time of Stevens’s comment this had been the case for over two decades. Winterhalter’s 1838 portrait of Queen Louise Marie and the infant Léopold Brabant had led to his painting full-length state portraits of her and of Leopold I that were engraved for public consumption and copied for distribution to other courts.

His state portraits of King Louis-Philippe and Queen Marie-Amélie, painted in 1840 and

---

88 Robert Duncan states that Mexican envoys were accredited in Austria, Belgium, and Rome in addition to France. “Several other European nations, such as Holland, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, Spain, and Switzerland, soon followed suit. Though Britain hesitated initially, Queen Victoria … eventually named a minister to the Mexican court.” Robert H. Duncan, “Political Legitimation and Maximilian’s Second Empire in Mexico, 1864-1867,” Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos 12 (1) Winter (1996), 36.
89 Acevedo, 1995.
92 Léon Nöel engraved these in 1844. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 190.
1842 respectively, were also “copied many times for prefectures, mairies and embassies, reproduced on Sèvres porcelain and popularized as prints. They became the accepted images of the Royal couple, and Winterhalter the established painter at court.”

He became similarly indispensable to the British court through the same years producing life-size images of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert with their children, empathetic informal portraits of the royal children, and large canvases documenting official occasions in addition to four pairs of state portraits. He was commissioned to produce replicas of the 1842 state portraits of Victoria and Albert for the French and Belgian courts and these were lithographed, reproduced on porcelain, and copied on enamel “for insertion into bracelets to be given to friends.” In 1847 Winterhalter’s commissions for the royal family were exhibited at St. James’s Palace where they attracted 100,000 visitors in the two month duration,” indisputable evidence of Winterhalter’s public popularity.

Winterhalter’s association with the Second Empire began with an invitation issued in spring 1853 to paint a portrait of Empress Eugénie; by the end of the year he had completed full-length state portraits of both the Empress and Napoleon III. These became, like those of Louis Philippe and Amélie before them, iconic images that were “engraved, transferred to Sèvres porcelain, woven into tapestry, made into miniatures, interpreted in sculpture, to become universal talismans of the Second Empire …. So huge was the reproduction business that special request forms were printed to cope with the

---

95 Ormond notes that the only review was negative and expressed “anti-German sentiment which Winterhalter’s work invariably provoked in the English press.” Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 41.
demand from Préfectures, consulates and embassies. His painting of Empress Eugénie and her Ladies in Waiting met with “immense popular success” but mixed critical reviews as was usual with his portraits. “[W]hen it exhibited in Vienna during the spring of 1856 [the room] became so crowed that tickets had to be issued” and Empress Elisabeth and Emperor Franz Josef were among those attending the showing.

As has been remarked previously, Winterhalter was sometimes unwell through the early 1860s and this circumstance might have interfered with plans for portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian. In November 1862 Queen Victoria advised Victoria, Crown Princess of Prussia, “Winterhalter is ill and won’t come now; but he thinks he can in March.” Queen Victoria was writing in relation to a portrait she wished to have of Alexandra, then fiancée of Edward, Prince of Wales but was also waiting for other paintings. In another letter five months later the Queen declares, “Winterhalter is most provoking, saying he won’t come to England, that he has Russians and Poles to paint, that he is very ill and that he will paint me in Germany.” Winterhalter attended the British court in May 1864 but “refuse[d] to paint full lengths of Bertie and Alix [by then Prince and Princess of Wales].” By June he had finished half-length portraits of the Prince and Princess and these the Queen thought “very fine, but he is so poorly himself that he

96 Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 47.
97 Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 49.
99 “This he cannot,” the Queen adds, “for I go to Germany to be out and to see old friends and be quiet and not to be painted. He may give way, but I doubt it.” Queen Victoria at Osborne to Crown Princess of Prussia, 6 May, 1863. Quoted in Fulford, 1968, 209.
100 Queen Victoria to Crown Princess, 19 May 1864. Quoted in Fulford, 1968, 335.

Lauchert had been a pupil of Winterhalter.
can do nothing else.”

Nonetheless, Winterhalter kept up a strenuous schedule through these years. His commissions in 1862 included a large group portrait of Victoria, Crown Princess of Prussia, her husband Crown Prince Frederich, and their children. In 1863 his commissions included a major portrait of Marie-Henriette, Duchess of Brabant.

Winterhalter probably arrived in Brussels in August to paint this portrait; he may have still been at the Belgian court when Charlotte arrived in early September for a week of consultations with Leopold I regarding Mexico. If the opportunity for a state portrait of Charlotte occurred at that time it is not known to have been taken.

Three months earlier a French offensive reversed the defeat suffered near Puebla by capturing the fort and the following month French forces entered Mexico City forcing Juárez to evacuate to the north of Mexico. The insistent persuasion of Mexican expatriates and increasing pressure from Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie, together with these developments, led Maximilian in October 1863 to tentatively agree to become Emperor of Mexico. A Mexican delegation visited Miramare to present the formal proposal to Maximilian and he accepted with conditions. The ceremony, like the 1861 arrival of Empress Elisabeth, was documented by a painting by Dell’Acqua for the Miramare History Room; like the former, it was carefully stage-managed. Maximilian is seen standing alone in front of the assembled Mexican delegation. All the figures are

---

102 Corti, [1924], 1968, 245-251.
103 Wilson-Bareau, 1992: 41
104 Corti, ibid., 315.
105 For a highly informative article examining the rationale and motivation of Mexicans who participated in the Imperial government see Pani, 2002.
106 Acevedo points out that Dell’Acqua was requested to travel from Brussels to Miramar so as to be present and observe the ceremony. Acevedo, 1995, 35-36.
male and all are somberly elegant; on the wall behind them are displayed several royal portraits (Figure 4.19).

Figure 4.19. Dell’Acqua, *Mexican Delegation*, c. 1864.

Figure 4.20. Artist unknown, *Untitled. (Maximilian and Charlotte with members of the Mexican Delegation).* 1864.
Corti notes “it was desired at Vienna that the Archduke should give the reception of the deputation at Miramar a private rather than a ceremonial character. It was also expressly ordered by the Emperor Franz Josef that the Ministers of the Imperial House and for Foreign Affairs should not be represented at the reception of the delegation” in order to avoid the appearance of Austrian complicity in the Mexican project.\textsuperscript{107} By focusing closely on Maximilian and the delegation, Dell’Acqua avoids the awkward absence of representatives from Imperial Austria. At the same time he circumvents the Emperor’s specific demand no association be made to Austria or to himself as head of the House of Habsburg by incorporating a large portrait of Franz Josef.\textsuperscript{108} Charlotte is not included in this scene presumably as it was Maximilian who was offered the throne; nonetheless, she participated fully in the process leading up to this moment and her royal family connections to Belgium and Britain were perceived as highly advantageous.\textsuperscript{109} Maximilian’s decision to have himself depicted alone with the delegation suggests concern to fashion his personal history. This emphasis on Maximilian continues in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Corti, [1924], 1968, 261. (Italics original.)
\item One reason for depicting the entire delegation was to demonstrate that Maximilian was responding to the offer of the Mexican throne from group officially representing Mexico and not seeking the throne of his own accord. Gutierrez quoted in Acevedo, 1995, 37.
\item One member of the Mexican delegation wrote of Charlotte as follows: “The arch-duchess is one of those persons that cannot be described. Her grace and charm cannot be captured on a canvas or on photographic paper. She is tall, slim, healthy and full of life, and she breathes contentment and well-being. She is extremely elegant but always simply dressed; she has a full forehead, happy, alive eyes like those of the Mexicans, fresh, flesh-colored lips, white teeth, a firm breast and she is full of confidence and majesty; she is intelligent and spiritual, calm, kind and cheerful, but there is something serious about her that commands respect; imagine this, and much more and you will have an idea of the personality of princess Carlota.” Ignacio Aguilar y Marocho, 1864. (Specific source not cited.) Quoted in Amparo Gómez Tepexicuapan. \textit{México en el Tiempo} (May-June 1997) 18. Online. <www.mexicodesconocido.com.mx/english/cultura> (8 July 2006).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
current displays at Miramare Castle where a full-length portrait of Maximilian is positioned near the throne whereas the collection does not contain a full-length state portrait of Charlotte.\footnote{Jules Bertaut describes Maximilian as a someone who “surrounded himself with artists and writers, and preferred a calm life, so that he would seem to be the least sort of man interested in an adventure of this sort.” Bertaut continues “[m]ais il y a Charlotte ....” who was energetic, strong-willed, self-sufficient and to whom the role of Empress would seem appropriate.” Jules Bertaut. \textit{L’Impératrice Eugénie et son temps} (Paris: Amiot Dumont, 1956), 230.}

Charlotte figures in at least one other depiction of the visit of the Mexican delegation (Figure 4.20). Her presence is further confirmed by an oil sketch by Dell’Acqua “from life after the reception of the Mexican delegation ....” (Figure 4.21).\footnote{This oil sketch is known only from a reproduction in a newspaper article published at Charlotte’s death in 1927. The caption describes it as being in the collection of “Monsieur le Baron Francis Houtart, Bruxelles.” Efforts to trace this image elicited no response.}

Figure 4.21. Cesare Dell’Acqua, \textit{La Princesse Charlotte de Belgique Arcduchesse d’Austriche}, 1863.
This is the earliest known image of Charlotte as Empress Elect and may be related to large, full-length state portraits of her and Maximilian in full regalia commissioned from Dell’Acqua by Almonte, head of the temporary regency in Mexico during these years. These portraits, discovered in Dell’Acqua’s studio after the artist’s death, were completed but never shipped.

By 1863 two years had elapsed since the Mexican imperial project was first discussed with Maximilian and Charlotte and the necessity of developing an imperial persona in Mexico was apparent to others and surely to them. Several weeks after the visit by the Delegation a request was made by Luis Arroyo, Secretary to the Mexican Regency, for photographs of Maximilian and Charlotte that could be reproduced in large numbers and distributed in Mexico. In response Maximilian and Charlotte sat to Trieste photographer Malovich in the first months of 1864. The resulting images were immediately extremely popular and copied by other photographers in various formats and lithographed. The best-known photograph of Charlotte from this sitting, that which became so iconic a representation of her as Empress, is firstly an emblem of imperial mystique and only secondarily a portrait of an individual (Figure 4.22). It derives its authority from her regal pose, remote gaze, and dark, and asymmetrical background of curtain and wall. The composition is strengthened by having been cropped on the left offsetting her spectacularly detailed gown. Some credit for the striking effect of this

113 This was, presumably his Brussels studio rather than that in Trieste as Dell’Acqua died in Belgium.
114 Ibid. An example of a photograph from this sitting is in the Royal Belgian Archives. In some of the many commemorative publications of 1927 it is identified as an image of her as Vicereine and attributed to Ghemer Frères but details appear to match those from the session in Trieste.
image is due Charlotte as she was accomplished in the art of posing and her appearance was probably of her own devising.\textsuperscript{115}

\textbf{Figure 4.22.} G. Malovich, \textit{Charlotte, (Empress Elect of Mexico)}, 1864.

\textsuperscript{115} Haslip states that Maximilian stipulated Charlotte dress simply for a state visit to the Yucatan in 1865 but there is no other reference to his influencing her appearance and Malovich, not having the stature of Winterhalter, would not have determined her gown and ornamentation. Haslip, 1971, 339.
The popular fascination with this photograph was due in part to public perception of the Mexican undertaking as dangerous and exotic. It was also because photography was still a novel medium and for a photograph to function as a principle state portrait - as it did by default since no painted portrait of Charlotte as Empress then existed - was unprecedented. In Mexico, especially, photographs from the Malovich session continued to represent her even when painted portraits finally appeared as it was, by then, widely disseminated as cartes-des-visite and reproduced in other media.

Maximilian and Charlotte were received in Paris by Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie in early March 1864 when conditions set out in his response to the Mexican delegation regarding financial and military matters remained unsettled and the political preference of Mexican people still had not been convincingly demonstrated. Ernest II, Duke of Saxe Coburg Gotha, brother of Prince Albert and cousin to Charlotte, was in Paris during this time.

---

116 In a letter written the day after Charlotte and Maximilian departed for Mexico, Empress Eugénie expresses her hope Charlotte will receive it as they pass through Rome and encloses “the little photograph for which [Charlotte] asked.” Eugénie continues “I should like to remind you in turn that I have not one of the Emperor [Maximilian]” and requests that she be sent one. “I should like it to be signed.” This implies she already possessed a photograph of Charlotte as Empress and most likely this would have been a print of the Malovich image. Empress Eugénie to Empress Charlotte, 15 April, 1864. Corti, [1924], 1968, Appendix.

117 A referendum in favour of Maximilian’s rule had not been truly representative and a plebiscite held afterwards to rectify this was in fact heavily influenced in Maximilian’s favour by the presence of the French military. For excerpts from Richard Metternich to Maximilian 14 February, 1864 and Maximilian to Metternich 17 February, 1864, and other pertinent observations see Corti [1924], 1968, 322-233.
“Everybody” the Duke recounts, “was … concerned in these illustrious personages, who were about to complete a work commenced by France in the other hemisphere of the Globe ….

The very public and ostentatious staging of this visit made it appear there was no doubt Maximilian and Charlotte would become Emperor and Empress of Mexico, a presumption calculated by the French sovereigns and making it more difficult for them to withdraw from the proposition. This situation was exacerbated by a stipulation demanded by Emperor Franz Josef, and made known to them only just prior to their departure for Paris, that Maximilian, on accepting the crown of Mexico, renounce all claims to Austrian succession.\footnote{Ernest of Saxe Coburg Gotha, 1890.}

During their state visit in March 1864 Charlotte and Maximilian are thought to have sat to Winterhalter for half-length state portraits although this is not certain. (Their daily official obligations were extensive, a circumstance that could have required Winterhalter to work from his previous portraits of them as discussed above.)\footnote{André Castelot describes this visit including items of their itinerary. André Castelot, \textit{Maximilien et Charlotte du Mexique} (Paris: Perrin, 1977).}

Acevedo agrees Winterhalter was the most esteemed court portrait painter in Europe but considers it would have been impertinent on the part of Maximilian and Charlotte to commission portraits by this artist. While I consider portraits of Charlotte as Vicereine painted by Winterhalter could then have been viewed by Franz Josef as impertinent or subversive, the situation was very different in 1864 as the Austrian Emperor had given his consent to them becoming Emperor and Empress of Mexico. As Acevedo herself states, only portraits by Winterhalter would have carried authority at European courts. When Winterhalter’s frequent attendance at the Belgian court during Charlotte’s

\begin{footnotesize}
118 Ernest of Saxe Coburg Gotha, 1890.
\end{footnotesize}
childhood is taken into account, it would seem more expected than impertinent to have had Winterhalter produce their state portraits. There are the half-length portraits in San Simeon inscribed “Paris 1864” in which Maximilian wears civil attire and Charlotte a pale pink gown but there are also hints another portrait of Charlotte may have been painted in which she wears a white gown after which the 1868 copy commissioned for Queen Victoria was painted (see Figures 3.33, 3.34, 3.35). Winterhalter was to have produced full-length state portraits from the half-length images, Acevedo relates. In the full-length portrait, Charlotte would have been depicted wearing a white gown and a reference exists claiming Winterhalter requested Charlotte acquire a “white gown with pearls” to wear for a portrait. As Acevedo notes, instructions included with this request that she purchase the gown from a “Mm Boyer” makes the reference suspect as couturier Frederick Worth dominated fashion in Paris and Charlotte’s wardrobe is known to have included costumes by Worth.120 A symbiotic relationship between Worth and Winterhalter has been commented on by Aileen Ribeiro as seeming sometimes as though the two men “…were working as a team, with the same ideas of the beautiful and the sublime; this is not surprising when we realize that many of Worth’s clients were painted by Winterhalter and they wished to be depicted in their very expensive finery ….”121 Winterhalter worked quickly but the half-lengths remained unfinished at the time of

120 Letter from Hidalgo to Charlotte, 15 March, 1865. Acevedo, 1995, 62. Diana de Marly describes Charlotte as “a French creation, part of Napoleon III’s disastrous attempt to establish a French sphere of influence in the America. With French troops and French money supporting this enterprise, it was only natural that the French imperial couturier should do the wardrobe for the new empress, and Carlotta was sent on her tragic mission with her husband, Maximilian of Austria, suitably equipped with quantities of Worth evening gowns and day dresses.” Diana de Marly, The History of Haute Couture 1850 – 1950 (New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, Inc., 1980), 131-132.
Maximilian and Charlotte’s departure for Mexico 14 April 1864. These were retained in Europe to serve as a basis for the commissioned full-length images; however, supposedly because Winterhalter was unable to proceed because of poor health, the commission was passed to Albert Graefle after Maximilian and Charlotte had embarked. ¹²² Acevedo is of the opinion it is probable Winterhalter received more commissions in 1864 than he could paint; and it is significant that his most pressing commissions in mid-1864 were for the Austrian court.

In his 1863 comments on Winterhalter’s popularity Arthur Stevens was, of course, overstating the situation when he claimed “every august head in Europe” sought to be “consecrated” by a Winterhalter portrait but every major European court had patronized the artist by 1863 with the exception of the Austrian court. Ormond and Blackett-Ord note “Winterhalter’s chief mission” in Vienna was to “portray the Empress [Elisabeth] and [was] referred to as such in a letter of June 1864.”¹²³ The authors were of the impression Maximilian and Charlotte were then still in Austria but Acevedo points out Winterhalter did not arrive in Vienna until September by which time they were in Mexico. The confusion arose because, in addition to full-length state portraits of Franz Josef and Elisabeth (and two more of the Empress), and a portrait of Archduchess Sophie, Winterhalter also painted portraits of Maximilian and Charlotte during his stay in Vienna.

“Payments disbursed in the summer of 1865 for the dispatch of portraits of the Emperor

¹²² This observation is based on remarks by Hidalgo. No specifics are given. Acevedo, 1995, 60.
¹²³ Elisabeth’s portrait is considered one of Winterhalter’s most successful but its concentration on the gown of the Empress and her smiling gaze directed at the viewer makes it more fashionable than regal. Such an image would not have contributed to the legitimacy and authority of Charlotte in Mexico but the position of Elisabeth was secure and she took no part in political affairs other than championing the cause of greater autonomy for Hungary.
and Empress [of Mexico],” state Ormond and Blackett-Ord. “presumably refer to these portraits.” Winterhalter was probably still completing the half-length portraits he had begun of Charlotte and Maximilian in Paris and those dispatched were quite certainly the full-lengths painted by Graefle. In Acevedo’s opinion, the half-length Paris portrait of Maximilian was probably kept by the Austrian court while the Paris portrait of Charlotte was sent to Mexico. Acevedo appears to refer to the ‘pale pink’ portrait but both it and the pendant half-length of Maximilian remained in Europe, if these are those in the San Simeon collection, as they were in Austria when purchased by Randolph Hearst. It seems most probable that he did so but that it did not go to Mexico. This complicates the situation as the question then arises as to what happened to such a painting, but it also could explain the half-length copy commissioned by Queen Victoria from Graefle in 1868 in which Charlotte wears a white gown but not the Order of Saint Charles. It is known that Graefle worked partly from Winterhalter’s existing half-lengths when painting the full-length state portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian. In the latter Charlotte wears a white gown with pearls like that mentioned in the letter of Hidalgo. Graefle added the Order of Saint Charles to the full-length image just before it was shipped as the Order had by then been instituted, whereas this was not the case when Charlotte and Maximilian were in Paris in 1864. As Graefle was almost certainly working in his Munich studio and, as Queen Victoria patronized Graefle and occasionally visited Germany, it is possible she saw there a portrait of Charlotte in a white gown. Otherwise, the Queen’s commission for a copy of this half-length in 1868 is puzzling as there is no evidence of such a painting elsewhere in Europe. Another possibility is that a copy had

125 Acevedo, 1995, 57-64.
been made for the Belgian court and Queen Victoria saw it on a visit to Leopold I. It would be expected copies of such a portrait would be made but, at present, no documentation is known supporting this possibility.\(^{126}\) The position of the hands in the painting Graefle produced for Queen Victoria is the same as in the ‘pink gown’ portrait and differs in this respect, as well as in the absence of the Order, from the full-length portrait he painted (see Figure 5.4).

Why Charlotte and Maximilian neglected to commission state portraits until they were about to leave Europe remains to be explained but the result was that they arrived in Mexico without official state portraits and remained without these crucial elements of imperial apparatus for over a year. The insistence that Maximilian renounce his Habsburg rights led him to attempt to withdraw his candidacy but he was by then too compromised. Regarding his declaration he would reject the Mexican throne and leave Austria rather than renounce his rights, Austrian Ambassador Metternich summed up the indignation of all concerned. “I feel bound to affirm … that it is most important in the interest of our own peace that the matter should be settled. Really, the scandal of his leaving the country and the ‘brouille mortelle’ between the two brothers would be too great.”\(^{127}\) The issue of renunciation was not broached until January 1864, however, so

\(^{126}\) Maximilian and Charlotte are not known to have commissioned copies. Gutierrez ordered for his Rome villa copies of half-lengths by Winterhalter. Acevedo, 1995, 37.

\(^{127}\) Prince Richard Metternich to Rechberg, 28 March, 1864 (?), quoted in Corti [1924], 1968, 339. In the opinion of Corti, there was substantial justification for the demand he “renounce … all rights of succession and regency as well as his apanage” in so far as protecting the Austrian Empire and the prospect of Maximilian succeeding to the throne of Austria when he was Emperor of Mexico was impractical at best. The author generally gives the impression of being protective of the reputation of the ruling family. Charlotte met with Franz Josef in an effort to amend the terms of the renunciation. She was largely unsuccessful in this but, according to Corti, found him to be “frank and honorable. He quotes her as saying, nonetheless, the Austrian Emperor “grasps things
cannot have influenced the matter of state portraits. As remarked above, requests for portraits of them for circulation in Mexico before and during early 1864 would have made it difficult to overlook the necessity of state portraits. There is also the matter of full-length state portraits painted by Dell’Acqua for Almonte that remained in the artist’s studio, the “Paris 1864” half-lengths by Winterhalter that remained in Austria, and the commission of full-length state portraits from Winterhalter being transferred to Graefle. Finally, there is the commissioning of Winterhalter to paint state portraits of the Austrian Emperor and Empress shortly after the departure of Charlotte and Maximilian for Mexico and it may be that their lack of state portraits was the result of political interference.

Four days after the official proclamation of Maximilian and Charlotte as Emperor and Empress of Mexico on 10 April 1864 they left Miramar for Mexico by way of Rome (Figure 4.23). They were to have left on 11 April but it had been necessary to delay as Corti explains.

> It was not until now that the Archduke became fully conscious of the appalling burden which he had irrevocably taken upon himself … On the following day, April 11, the departure was to have taken place; but in the Emperor’s moral and physical condition this was quite impossible.128

---

128 Corti, [1924], 334, 344-349. Napoleon III also wavered in his conviction that an empire could be established in Mexico. “The Emperor, who was greatly in favour of the scheme, was much put out and, wrote Lord Cowley, ‘there is a question, but pray do not mention it further, of having Bazaine made President of the Republic, and of abandoning the Imperial scheme!!” n.d. (probably March 1864.) Colonel the Hon. F. A. Wellesley (ed.), *The Paris Embassy during the Second Empire: Selections from the Papers of Henry Richard Charles Wellesley, 1st Earl Cowley, Ambassador at Paris 1852-1867* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1928), 266. The confidence in which Bazaine was held at the French court and his complete control of military matters later became a serious cause of friction between the General and Maximilian and contributed to the collapse of the Empire.

128 Corti, [1924], 1968, 357. Charlotte “in radiant spirits” had overseen the final preparations and presided over ceremonies, dinners, and events. Haslip writes that “[t]here were those who disapproved of these radiant spirits and regarded her as hard and
The next-to-last painting by Dell’Acqua for the Miramar History Room depicts the scene of their departure (Figures 4.24). Charlotte and Maximilian are seen standing in the prow of a tender and facing crowds gathered on the harbour.

unfeeling. One of them was her young brother-in-law, Ludwig Viktor … [who later] assured his mother [Maximilian] would never have gone on with the Mexican business, had it not been for Charlotte’s nagging”. Haslip, 1971, 230-32.
Figure 4.24. Cesare Dell’Acqua, *La partenza di Massimiliano e Carlotta per il Messico*, 1866.

Figure 4.25. José Salomé Pina, *Visit of Pope Pius IX to Emperor Maximilian and Empress Charlotte of Mexico in 1864*, 1866.
In Rome an audience with Pope Pius IX had been arranged despite Maximilian having been advised against doing so. They stayed at Villa Marescoli, the sumptuous residence of Gutierrez where Pope Pius IX paid them a return visit after their Vatican audience. Paintings of both these events were later commissioned from Mexican artist José Pina (Figure 4.25). Vatican knowledge of the situation in Mexico was based on information from clergy exiled after the election of Juárez, and, like the expatriate Mexicans who agitated for a foreign prince, these members of the clergy were strongly biased. It was clear to most there was no room for compromise with the Church regarding confiscated properties - but also no way in which these redistributed properties could be returned and by requesting a papal audience Maximilian risked finding himself committed to changes with which he would be unable, or unwilling to proceed.

129 The Convention of Miramare, detailing French obligations towards the Mexican Empire, was signed the same day.
Chapter Five

Empress Carlota

During their voyage from Europe to Mexico Maximilian and Charlotte prepared a formal protest to his forced renunciation of Habsburg rights. The document did not enhance their international position; its distribution to the courts of Austria, Belgium, Britain, France, and the Vatican instead provoked discomfort and annoyance as the matter was considered to be a Habsburg problem. It did cause the Hungarian Diet to question the renunciation’s legality with the sole result that hostility was perpetuated between the Emperor and Empress of Mexico and the Austrian Emperor and parliament.¹ Maximilian and Charlotte also applied themselves to drafting a large manual of court ceremony and protocol. Corti ascribes much of the blame for this protest to Charlotte and attributes the book of court ceremonial to Maximilian but it is improbable either project was undertaken without close collaboration.² Rigorous attention was given to compiling this Court Ceremonial and a Master of Court Ceremonies and Lord Chamberlain were appointed during the voyage. “… Maximilian was firmly convinced,” Corti states, “that the etiquette and court ceremonial … were absolutely necessary to preserve his imperial prestige.”³ This emphasis on ceremony is not reflected in Corti’s account of the new Emperor and Empress entering Mexico City 12 July wearing traveling attire and “driving in a coach like anybody else” and his account is, in fact, at variance with other

¹ The document protesting the demand Maximilian renounce his claims was dated 25 May 1865. Corti, [1924], 1968, 483.
² Corti, [1924], 1968, 414. This author also considers Leopold I to bear much responsibility for Maximilian and Charlotte’s decision to travel to Mexico.
³ Ibid., 417.
descriptions and with illustrations of the event.⁴ According to Haslip, they “drove in a state coach ordered in Trieste” and “Maximilian wore the full dress uniform of a Mexican general.” Charlotte wore “a diamond crown and a mantilla of the finest Brussels lace ....”⁵ Acevedo’s research confirms Maximilian’s attire but revises Haslip’s description of Charlotte. The Empress wore a blue and white costume, Acevedo states, and a hat made in Paris.⁶ With the exception of Vera Cruz where they disembarked before an official representation could arrive and whose citizens, Sara York Stevenson states, “evinc[ed] little curiosity and less interest …. ” The rest of the journey was “a well-prepared ovation” in part because “[t]he priests, now anxious to come to the fore, had ordered out the Indian population. The action of Maximilian in going to Rome … had been received by the ultra-clerical party as a hopeful sympto[m] of returning papal ascendancy under the coming reign.” Support for the empire was strongest in urban centers, especially the capital, but the presence of French troops also motivated conspicuous celebration. Their Mexico City reception was recalled by York Stevenson in her reminiscences (Figure 5.1).

![Figure 5.1](image.png)

Figure 5.1. Artist unknown, *Mexico City Reception of Maximilian and Charlotte*, 1864.

⁴ Corti, ibid., 423.  
⁵ Haslip, 1971, 251.  
⁶ Acevedo, 1995, 52.
“The lavish ingenuity of the French - anxious, for obvious reasons, to make the occasion a telling one - vied with the interested patriotism of the clerical party to excite the enthusiasm of the people, and to produce an impression upon the Austrian (sic) travelers.”7 Large numbers of portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian were produced in Mexico for display upon their arrival although little is known about these images. Some accounts describe these being installed in decorated windows and Harry Graham asserts one carriage in the royal procession carried “life-size portraits of the august pair … which the astonished spectators were thus enabled to compare with their originals.”8 Among these portraits was one deriving from Malovich’s photographs which was reproduced larger than life-size on a triumphal arch (the Arco de la Flores) erected in honour of the Empress; the same image was printed on diverse other objects including souvenir handkerchiefs presumably meant to be waved by those watching the procession (Figure 5.2).9 Mexican photographer Julio Valleto later used the same portrait in a composite photograph of Charlotte surrounded by individual portraits of her dames d’honneur (Figure 5.3).10 The distribution of these official Malovich photographs of Charlotte and regal mystique exerted by them had already entrenched them as primary imperial representations.

7 Sara York Stevenson, “Maximilian’s Empire” Vol. LV. November 1897-April 1898 The Century Magazine, 420-432. York Stevenson was fifteen and residing with her family in Mexico City during the French Intervention and Mexican Empire.
10 The Valleto brothers, Julio, Guillermo, and Ricardo, established a photographic studio in Mexico City in 1865 that endured for fifty years. <www.universia.pr/frida/Juan-Coronel-Rivera-ing.pdf> (18 April 2008).
Brian Hamnett has written of the “extraordinary quantity of photos and paintings of the Imperial couple, a desperate attempt to propagate their image as widely as possible in an increasingly adverse environment.”11 This assumes Maximilian and Charlotte were in solely responsible for the dissemination of their visual representations but the reality was more complex. As described in Chapter Four, it is known that members of the temporary Mexican regency were already attempting to cultivate an imperial presence by circulating portraits of the Emperor and Empress in late 1863. It may also be that some of the portraits seen by Hamnett dated from the 1960s when there was a vogue for copies

of portraits of Maximilian and Charlotte.\textsuperscript{12} There are also several instances recorded in which Maximilian or Charlotte declined the installation of her visual representation in public sites. Prince Michael of Greece mentions Charlotte deterred Marshall François Achille Bazaine (1811-1888), commander of French troops in Mexico, from erecting “a bust of her in a public square” and Acevedo explains municipal plans for a statue of Charlotte in San Juan del Río did not proceed because Maximilian felt such an honor “was not due someone still living.”\textsuperscript{13} Robert Duncan relates a further example of planned public recognition of the Empress being aborted. Soon after their arrival, he writes, the Emperor became aware that in Mexico City

\begin{quote}
[i]mperial supporters … intended to build a marble arch dedicated to the empress at the entrance to the Avenida de la Piedad (hereafter renamed the “Avenida de la Emperatriz Carlota”). Wishing to be Mexican “more than ever,” the royal couple requested that a monument, consecrated to the ‘independencia de la patria,’ be raised instead in the Plaza Mayor. Using marble allocated for the arch, the base of the monument would contain statues of principal figures [of the Mexican War of Independence] along with the inscribed names of the other leaders of the ‘glorious epoch.’ Maximilian himself resolved to put the first stone for the memorial in place on September 16.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

It is not known if similar interventions took place in relation to representations of Maximilian but these examples suggest official decisions were made to control Charlotte’s public image. Maximilian’s intention to lay the first stone on September 16 reveals an understanding of “the value of linking the Second Empire to national rituals

\textsuperscript{12} Reasons for these are discussed in the concluding chapter.
and the importance of involving more than just the elite” as it is on this date that Mexican
Independence from Spain is commemorated.\textsuperscript{15} Duncan challenges the widely held
opinion that the attempt to found a Mexican Empire in 1867 was untenable. His study
explores the struggle to secure legitimacy for the Empire through the use of images,
symbols, rituals and efforts to construct governmental continuity and links with Mexico’s
past.\textsuperscript{16} Duncan addresses these initiatives primarily in relation to Maximilian so that the
extent of Charlotte’s participation in these decisions cannot be assessed. As there are
contemporary accounts of her political and administrative capabilities, and she was
criticized for involving herself in political decisions, it is clear she exerted substantial
influence.\textsuperscript{17} Charlotte acted as Regent for much of the first year of their reign with her
initial regency beginning in early August 1864, when Maximilian left on a tour of the

\textsuperscript{15} Duncan, 1996, 56. (Mexican War of Independence (1810-1821)).

\textsuperscript{16} Duncan argues that “[a]fter years of domestic turmoil, financial ruin, and foreign
threats, conservatives and monarchists alike longed for the perceived stability of the
colonial era… a foreign prince seemed feasible and desirable, both in Europe and

\textsuperscript{17} In September 1865 William Marshall Anderson was visiting Mexico City and wrote of
his observations. “Everybody says Maximilian is a good man & [sic] an honest ruler.
Some think he has not the genius of Shakespeare, or the cunning of Talleyrand. Some
say he has not the practical, governing, good-sense of the Empress (if that smile which
she launched towards a couple of Americans was intended for me, I’ll say ‘God bless
her’).” William Marshall to his family as quoted in Ramón Eduardo Ruiz (ed.) \textit{An
American in Maximilian’s Mexico 1865-1866. The Diaries of William Marshall
Anderson.} (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1959), 29. Corti notes that in
confidential - and otherwise highly critical - reports of October 15 and November 19
1865 “[t]he Empress was the only person who came off well, for Maury considered that
her beneficence and her conduct were universally praised.” Corti remarks “[t]his was,
however, contradicted by others, who disliked the empress’s pride and haughty bearing.”
Included in Maury’s recommendations was his advice to Maximilian to not appear in
civil dress but to wear a uniform. Maury’s reports of 15 October and 19 November are
discussed in Corti, [1924], 509, 539-540.
provinces, and continuing into October. On 16 September Maximilian was, therefore, not in Mexico City to lay the foundation stone as he planned, but in the town of Dolores. It would not have been coincidental that in this town and on that day in 1810, Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla (1753-1811) called for Mexican independence with his *Grito de Dolores*. Re-enactments of this remain a tradition on Independence Day and Maximilian wrote afterwards of his trepidation in calling out from a window the *grito*. To his pleasure and relief the crowd expressed their approval. It was Charlotte who presided over the ceremonies held in Mexico City.

The determination to integrate the Empire with Mexican history translated into art commissions when portraits of several heroes of the Mexican War of Independence were brought to the attention of Maximilian. He commissioned portraits of other prominent figures for the ‘*Galerie de Iturbide*’ in the Mexico City Imperial Palace. Designated the centre of government administration, the Palace included a “salon” for Charlotte where there were installed “portraits of her parents, her brothers, and her grandparents” writes

---

18 Writing on 10 September 1864, Charlotte describes her activities as Regent to Empress Eugénie in terms that flatter her mentor and demonstrate respect, rather more than warranted, for Maximilian’s primacy in matters of state. She had “given a few little dinners,” she begins, then continues “[i]t is also [Maximilian’s] desire that I should preside over the Ministerial Council, like Your Majesty, and following your good example.” Moreover, on Sundays I hold public audiences in the Emperor’s name … Besides this, I visit as many schools and institutions as possible. Today I am just back from Tlalpan, where we have seen another two factories, one a paper-factory, the other a cotton-mill.” Empress Charlotte to Empress Eugénie, 10 September 1864. Quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 848.

19 Maximilian to his brother, Archduke Karl Ludwig, 21 September 1864, quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 434. Father Hidalgo’s exact words in Dolores in 1810 are debated. Two of the most accepted versions are “¡Mexicanos, Viva México!” and “Long Live Our Lady of Guadalupe, Long Live Independence;” “Death to bad government” is a frequent additional phrase.
Prince Michael of Greece. This is more than plausible but unconfirmed, and whether or not Charlotte had acquired portraits of both Philippe Flanders and Léopold Brabant is questionable as the latter may never have complied with her request for a portrait of him and of Marie-Henriette. In a letter to Philippe from Mexico on 20 November 1864, Charlotte requested he arrange for her to have a large portrait of himself, as well as one of Leopold I and of Queen Louise Marie. Albert Duchesne remarks that “curiously,” it is obvious from the letter Charlotte was “content with photographic portraits of Léopold Brabant and Marie-Henriette although she “avidly wished to have painted portraits of their parents and her younger brother.” The reason could be that Charlotte preferred not to be rebuffed again in this regard.

If a painting by Beaucé renders accurately an interior scene, copies of Winterhalter’s portraits of Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie were also prominently displayed as would have been the case with Maximilian’s family portraits. Those of the French Emperor and Empress were copies of the paintings upon which Graefle partially modeled his full-length portraits of Maximilian and Charlotte. Installing in the Imperial Palace portraits of European royalty and Mexican heroes of independence visually created a continuum meant to demonstrate the legitimacy of the Empire. There was equally concern to recognize Mexico’s ancient indigenous history and this factored into the decision to establish the imperial residence at Castillo Chapultepec. ‘Chapultepec’ is

---

21 As Charlotte already had portraits of her parents and Philippe at Miramare it may be that these were left there as she asks for others in the letter. When in Europe, she possessed only a copy of a small portrait of the Duke of Brabant painted when he was a child and a copy of this that she herself had painted. These remain in the Miramare collection.
22 Duchesne, 1985, 67.
generally translated as ‘hill of the grasshoppers’ and refers to a steep bluff near Mexico City that is surrounded by woodlands. In a letter to Empress Eugénie begun 18 June 1864 and completed 22 June, Charlotte describes the view from Chapultepec “where we are already living” as “perhaps one of the finest in the world.” (As Charlotte was writing this letter the American Civil War was brought uncomfortably close to France when the Kearsarge sank the Alabama off the coast near Cherbourg). Chapultepec has been a place of ritual and royal significance from as early as the fourth century and in the time of the Aztecs was linked to the island city of Tenochtitlan by a causeway along which ran an aqueduct. Maximilian had this route developed into a broad boulevard that connected Chapultepec to the Imperial Palace. Pre-Columbian structures had been

---

23 Thirteenth century Tenochtitlan rulers had their palaces on Chapultepec, as did Aztecs in the early sixteenth century, and among the woods and lakes below the hill were shrines to the gods of rain and running water. In 1537 Charles V declared Chapultepec an officially protected area. A number of important museums have been located there since early in the twentieth century with twelve rooms of the History Museum housing artifacts relating to Charlotte and Maximilian. The current Presidential Residence, Los Pinos, is also within this precinct. “National Museum of History Castillo de Chapultepec.” Online. <http://dti.inah.gob.mx/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599> (April 2007).


25 The degree to which Maximilian and Charlotte recognized indigenous Mayan and Aztec cultures and promoted and adopted aspects of these is striking, predating as it did by half a century the ‘Mexicanidad’ championed following the Mexican Revolution. To some extent, the enlightened opinions of Leopold I and his concern for the well being of Mexico’s indigenous peoples should be credited as his views were a strong influence on the administration of the Empire. Maximilian and Charlotte separately submitted diplomatic requests for the return of Aztec artifacts held in Belgian and in Austrian collections. In response, the shield of Moctezuma and a report from Fernando Cortés to Charles V were returned from Vienna and the Aztec Emperor’s feathered cloak, bow, and quiver from Brussels. Corti, 591; Duncan, 54. In what anthropologist Miguel Angel Andame explains as the Mexican response to “the process of globalisation and denationalization,” public attention is again turning to Aztec culture. Jo Tuckman, “The new lords of the dance” in The Guardian, guardian.co.uk (23 May 2008).

26 This has been known as Avenue de la Reforma since 1867.
destroyed by the nineteenth century and the neglected remains of a large, two-story Spanish viceroy’s palace dominated the hilltop. Extravagant measures were undertaken to transform one section of this plain structure into a symbol of imperial majesty. Artists from the San Carlos Academy in Mexico City were commissioned to paint pictures with religious subjects such as the Virgin of Guadalupe and images of the name saints of Maximilian and Charlotte, as well as murals, and statues in marble and bronze. Duncan remarks that at one point four hundred artisans were simultaneously at work in Chapultepec Palace.

Graefle’s full-length state portraits arrived in Mexico in early summer 1865 but, as Acevedo describes, Maximilian was dissatisfied with his image. It was neither displayed in an exhibition held in Mexico City that year nor copied in oils. Other state portraits of the Emperor were commissioned from Mexican artist Joaquín Ramírez (1839-

---

27 This structure served various purposes over time, most famously as a fortress during the Mexican-American War when it was stormed by troops led by General Winfield Scott. When the Americans triumphed several young cadets who were among the hill’s defenders committed suicide rather than be captured. Remembered as the Niños Héroes, their memorial is located in the Chapultepec woods. <http://dti.inah.gob.mx/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599> (April 2007). Also see Duncan, 1996, 53.


29 Duncan, ibid. Duncan provides a great many statistics useful for illuminating aspects of policies and ceremonial and charitable undertakings in the time of the Empire. For instance, the scale of court balls becomes apparent when it is realized seven hundred to two thousand guests might be in attendance, and that of charitable efforts when it is learned Charlotte is estimated to have “personally donated $69,097 between July 1864 and May 1866 … to hospitals, poorhouses, orphanages, and to help those in emergency need.” In citing this figure I do discount monetary and human devastation wrought by the French Intervention, and French financial demands attaching to the founding of the Empire, upon an already destitute Mexico but rather to better define the actions of the Empress. Duncan notes that the Empress also organized charity auctions “once donating a picture she had painted.” The author points out that secular charity institutions would have usefully undermined leverage exercised through charitable functions of the Church. Duncan, 1996, 64.
1866), (completed by Santiago Rebull (1829-1902) after the death of Ramírez), and from Beaucé.\footnote{30} The Rebull painting resembles an 1864 photograph by Malovich, as Acevedo has observed, in which the Emperor stands beside a small table but the larger painting by Beaucé is a gallant depiction of the Emperor on horseback. Graefle’s portrait of Charlotte is thought to have been displayed but not reproduced  (Figure 5.4).

Figure 5.4. Albert Graefle, Empress Charlotte, 1865.

Rebull was additionally commissioned to paint another state portrait of Charlotte but only a half-length oil study is known to have been completed (Figure 5.5). A double portrait of Maximilian, after the state portrait by Ramirez/Rebull, and Charlotte, after the Graefle state portrait, is also attributed to Rebull but may have been painted after the fall of the Empire (Figure 5.6).  

Winterhalter’s 1853 full-length state portraits of Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie did not provide a complete solution for Graefle, Acevedo recounts, in his task of creating full-length state portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian. Graefle additionally had consulted the half-length portraits Winterhalter painted presumably at the time of Charlotte and Maximilian’s visit to Paris as has been discussed. The Winterhalter

31 Figure 5.5 is in the Národní Museum in Prague. For context see Lubomír Srseň and Dana Stehlífova. Mexické, Dobrodružství I Maximiliana Habsburského (Praha: Národní Muzeum. 1999).
32 Copies of the 1853 are illustrated in Ormond; the originals are untraced. Ormond and Blackett-Ord, 1987, 34.
portraits of the French Emperor and Empress that are quoted in the court scene painted by Beaucé, document their proxy presence, and responsibility, in imperial Mexico. This action recalls Dell’Acqua’s incorporation of a portrait of Franz Josef into the scene depicting Maximilian and the Mexican delegation (Figure 5.7). While this earlier example served to reference imperial Austria and, thereby imply official sanction of the Mexican venture, the visual inclusion of the French sovereigns should also be understood as demonstrating the high esteem in which they were held by Charlotte and Maximilian. Initially this was a valid assessment of the relationship and although the relationship deteriorated and difficulties increased in the Mexican Empire, Charlotte and Maximilian continued until late 1866 to flatter their mentors whenever possible.33

Figure 5.7. Winterhalter, Empress Eugénie, 1853.
Figure 5.8. Jean-Adolphe Beaucé, Reception of the Indians at the Mexican Court, (detail) Empress Charlotte is at the far left behind the partially seen Emperor.

33 This effort to use the Second Empire as model for the Mexican court is stressed in letters from Charlotte to Eugénie in the Appendix in Corti, [1924], 1968.
In the detail of Beauce’s painting illustrated, Charlotte is situated in line with the left side of the frame of Winterhalter’s 1853 portrait of Eugénie seen on the back wall (Figure 5.8). This same painting may offer an example of Eugénie’s fashion influence as a photograph depicts her wearing a dress with white shirt-style collar like that worn by Charlotte and other female members of the Mexican court (Figure 5.9).

![Figure 5.9. Photographer unknown, Untitled (Empress Eugénie), 1869.](image_url)

Charlotte wore a similar dress when she sat, probably to Disderí in Paris, in the early 1860s and this photograph may have been among the first images sent to Mexico as

---

34 Illustrated in Ein Herzogtum und viele Kronen - Coburg in Bayern und Europa’ Bayerische Staatskanzlei (Augsburg, Lower. Austria: Castles Artstetten & Luberegg Collections 1997). This style of day dress was not unique to Empress Eugénie; numerous photographs exist of Queen Victoria, for instance, in which she is similarly attired.

numerous painted versions of this image exist, at least two being in collections in the United States (see Figure 7.12).  

Charlotte was also portrayed on horseback but by Pina not Beaucé. It was not possible to view this painting but based on Acevedo’s text it is a smaller work and does not include additional figures. While the large size and presence of onlookers contribute to Maximilian’s heroic representation by Beaucé, gender conventions inhibit an equivalent representation of Charlotte regardless of its apparently smaller dimensions and the absence of onlookers. Maximilian is portrayed in a black, gold-trimmed, general’s uniform crossed with the green and red Order of Guadalupe. He has removed his hat and holds it with his right arm extended to acknowledge onlookers and sits astride a white horse. Behind him on the left are mounted soldiers; on the right is a Mexican peasant family and others are seen to have gathered in the distance. Maximilian faces out and his gaze is directed to the left beyond the painting’s frame where it is implied more people have gathered. Viewers of the painting and the intimated onlookers theoretically share the same low vantage point and gaze up at the resplendent Emperor. The only woman in the painting (in which some two dozen figures can be counted) is positioned in front of a man carrying a child on his shoulder and the spatial relationship of these three figures suggests the woman is the child’s mother. Only the head and torso of this

---

36 For instance, at the University of Berkeley, California. (The photograph was one that was later altered and recycled in quite different contexts as discussed in the following chapter).

37 If the date is correct Pina may have painted this portrait in Paris as he was there in late 1865 and into 1866. Acevedo thinks this may have been painted at a still later date but does not state reasons for this opinion. The painting is in a private Mexican collection. Esther Acevedo, 1995, 92-96.

38 (In shadows behind the woman’s face can be seen part of a face that may be also be female.) Acevedo similarly points out that a single female member of Charlotte’s retinue
modestly dressed woman is visible as she and the others stand on the far side of an elevated path occupied by the Emperor astride his horse. She holds a tray of fruits and flowers that in combination with the colours of her clothing repeat those of the Mexican flag as Acevedo points out. The implications of nurturing and domesticity are perceived to be as naturally female gender specific as the gesture of saluting with one’s hat in images of (usually uniformed) rulers mounted on spirited horses is masculine.

The 1857 portrait that Charlotte commissioned of herself in Brianza dress on becoming Vicereine of Lombardy-Venetia in 1857 associated her with the province of Lombardy of which Brianza is a part as was explored in Chapter 3. I posited this image simultaneously declared her political position by referencing the female protagonist in I promesi sposi (The Betrothed or The Fiancée), the early nineteenth-century inflammatory novel by Alessandro Manzoni, and that three other paintings functioned in the same manner. Such a strategy of situating herself would seem difficult to pursue in Mexico, a non-European culture and vastly larger, more ethnically diverse country. Despite Corti asserting Charlotte and Maximilian’s attempts to familiarize themselves with Mexico were fatally skewed by members of the clerical party, policies implemented soon after

appears in a lithograph depicting their arrival in Veracruz and questions whether this reflects Mexican social attitudes. Acevedo, 1995, 48.

39 An ‘exotic’ woman holding fruits and flowers came to be a cliché in the twentieth century, with sexual connotations employed consciously or not, and pervaded advertising and tourism promotion images as well as art. In Mexicanidad art that gained primacy in Mexico following the Revolution in the first decades of the twentieth century, this motif was, to a large extent, revised and became an expression of indigenous values.

40 The persuasiveness of the expansive gesture, uniform, highly visible onlookers, and low vantage point in creating an image of authority is evident when Beaucé’s painting is compared with a very similar portrait of Maximilian on horseback that lacks these features. This painting is, nonetheless, of interest as it depicts Maximilian in charro (riding) costume and it may be the one Blasio mentions as commissioned from Rebull. Blasio, [1905], 1934, 56. It is reproduced in Corti, [1924], 1968, n.p. (op. 464).
their arrival confirm they gained a reasonable knowledge of Mexican culture and political history.\textsuperscript{41} Their understanding of the importance of the Virgin of Guadalupe, for instance, was sufficient that they interrupted their journey to pray at the Virgin’s shrine in Cholula before continuing on to Mexico City, thereby displaying their respect for this central figure in Mexican spiritual life immediately upon their arrival. The legend of the Virgin of Guadalupe (also called the Madonna of Guadalupe or Our Lady of Guadalupe) tells of her first appearing about 1531 to an indigenous peasant named Juan Diego on Tepeyac Hill and requesting he build a church on the site of her apparition.\textsuperscript{42} Most accounts refer to a Pre-Columbian shrine having been on Tepeyac Hill and consider the legend to relate to merging indigenous and Christian beliefs.\textsuperscript{43} A church was erected on the site when, after a further visitation, the Virgin’s image was discovered on Juan Diego’s \textit{tilma} or cape after he had gathered up in it roses she caused to bloom in the dry soil. This celestial figure is paramount among female archetypes transcending Mexican cultural and ethnic diversity. Designs on Charlotte’s part to identify herself with the Virgin of Guadalupe, so deeply revered and pivotal to Mexican national identity would seem prohibitively presumptuous and culturally insensitive yet a connection was made and, surprisingly, was precipitated by the people of San Juan del Rio. Acevedo notes a reference to “the sovereign” as being “like a tender mother.” This phrase is found in an 18 June 1864 announcement of plans for a statue of Charlotte portraying her in this guise.

\textsuperscript{41} Corti, Ibid., see remarks in his Preface, also 259-264, 275, 277-278, 282-283.

\textsuperscript{42} Harding is condescending regarding Mexican culture as are most twentieth century publications about the Empire if not written from a Mexican perspective. Her version of the legend of the Virgin of Guadalupe, nonetheless, contains interesting details. Harding, 1934, 144-147.

to be placed in the main plaza of the town. Mexico had already a historical ‘Father of the Nation’ in the priest Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla but no historical woman was considered ‘Mother of the Nation.’\textsuperscript{44} This form of address was instead reserved for the Virgin of Guadalupe and Acevedo finds it to have also been used frequently in reference to Charlotte during the short-lived Empire.\textsuperscript{45} In her traditional depictions, the Virgin of Guadalupe is a woman with brown skin, a blue mantle, and a dress usually colored red reminiscent of the roses gathered by Juan Diego (Figure 5.10).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{our_lady_of_guadalupe.png}
\caption{Our Lady of Guadalupe/Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, 19th Century.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{45} Acevedo, 1995, 48. See also website “Our Lady of Guadalupe” <http://www.sancta.org/> (January 2008).
Harding claims Charlotte “had a preference for marine colors, ranging from faint lime through lilac to deepest purple. But most of all she loved clear azure…” and there are descriptions of the Empress wearing blue on several occasions. It cannot be concluded Charlotte’s supposed choice of colours referred to the mantle of the Virgin of Guadalupe and she certainly did not wear ‘marine colours’ exclusively. José Luis Blasio, Maximilian’s personal secretary, writes of Charlotte wearing a yellow silk gown for a state ball and elsewhere states “[s]he usually affected dark colors; her gowns were high in the neck and adorned only by a belt or fine white lace at the wrists and collar.” On 3 February 1865, the Empress describes herself wearing a pink gown for a recent court ball, and on Good Friday of that year a “black silk dress and mantilla.” For ceremonies of particular importance, she wore the costume of white dress, velvet mantle, and crown as in Graefle’s painting ‘after’ Winterhalter. There are indications imperial associations

46 Harding, 1934, 178. It is difficult to extricate fact from fantasy in Harding’s account. She describes refers an untraced portrait of Charlotte painted “[during] the early Mexico days” in which “an unknown Spanish artist portrayed [the Empress] at her best, proud, confident, serene, in a turquoise blue crinoline, with the Cross of Malta on her left shoulder and a diadem of blossoms above her high brow.” Ibid., 212.
47 Blasio, [1905], 1934, 37 and 24.
48 In a letter to Empress Eugénie, 3 February 1865, Charlotte caters to Eugénie’s appetite for details when writing “… (my dress that evening happened to be pink).” In Corti, [1924], 1968, 881; “Yesterday, Good Friday, we took an outing in the city to visit two hospitals. In a moment the plaza was thronged with people, greeting us with the friendliest faces … The Emperor wore a frock-coat and I was in a black silk dress and mantilla.” Ibid., 900.
49 Blasio, [1905], 1934, 59 and 82; Haslip, 1971, 374; Prince Michael of Greece, [2001], 2001, 210. No allusions to Our Lady of Guadalupe are discernable in any portraits of Charlotte currently known. In Mexico retablos refers to religious icons usually painted in oil on tin; also called santos, laminas, or imagines pintadas, they represent a folk art primarily practiced in central Mexico and especially vibrant from 1820 to the 1880s. An earliest scholarly consideration of this art form is Gloria Kay Giffords, Mexican Folk Retablos (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1974). Also valuable is the recent, more broadly based text addressing this subject is Elizabeth Netto Calil Zarur and Charles Muir
with the Virgin of Guadalupe were officially cultivated, for example, by the celestial image being incorporated into the Order of Guadalupe (an honour awarded exclusively to men and dispensed by Maximilian) and on the reverse of medallions struck for Maximilian’s saint’s day. That both these instances involve Maximilian rather than Charlotte is a small point but, cumulatively - Maximilian chose to exclude her image from the ceremony with the Mexican delegation, two large state portraits were painted to replace Graefle’s of Maximilian while no other large state portrait of Charlotte is known, and at least three public representations planned of Charlotte were cancelled - raise the possibility there was a desire to limit her portraits, however counter-productive that may seem. In the instance of the statue that was to depict Charlotte as a ‘tender mother,’ the argument can be made this would draw attention to the awkward fact she and Maximilian had no children after seven years of marriage but this is unconvincing when it is considered the Emperor himself used the same phrase in speaking of the Empress.50

Tall, blond, and impressively bearded, the presence of Maximilian in Mexico prompted some contemporaries to speak of the light-skinned god of Mexican mythology, Quetzalcoatl, whose return was predicted in legends.51 “The analogy [to Quetzalcohuatl] spontaneously occurred to every thoughtful onlooker, and spread like lightning throughout the city” recalled Sara Yorke Stevenson. Maximilian’s European origin, and

---

50 The phrase is used in an early (date unspecified) speech by Maximilian: “To the empress is confided the sacred trust of devoting to the country all the noble sentiments of Christian virtue and all the teachings of a tender mother.” Quoted in Taylor, 1894, 90.
51 Considered by some to have been an early Toltec king.
fondness for mentioning Charles V as his ancestor, prompted others to speak of Cortez.\footnote{Harding, 1934, 154; York Stevenson, 1897/8, 431. Or “Montezuma” - now more frequently referred to as Moctezuma II (c.1466-1520) - as his youngest brother was apt to refer to him, perhaps because Maximilian, in several letters to Archduke Ludwig Viktor mentions this Aztec ruler in relation to Chapultepec. See Maximilian’s letter of 24 February 1864 for instance, quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 465.}

The Quetzalcohuatl legend has no female protagonist and, therefore, no associated figure to whom Charlotte might have been compared. Instead, as has been discussed, a connection was made to Our Lady of Guadalupe, ‘mother of Mexico.’ But there is an archetypal historical woman associated with Cortez who is also spoken of as a mother figure - not, however, as “Mother of Mexico” but as mother of Mexico’s mixed races. A twentieth-century painting by Ruiz vividly conveys this concept (Figure 5.11).

![Figure 5.11. Antonio Ruiz, The Dream of Malinche, 1939.](image)

\footnote{Harding, 1934, 154; York Stevenson, 1897/8, 431. Or “Montezuma” - now more frequently referred to as Moctezuma II (c.1466-1520) - as his youngest brother was apt to refer to him, perhaps because Maximilian, in several letters to Archduke Ludwig Viktor mentions this Aztec ruler in relation to Chapultepec. See Maximilian’s letter of 24 February 1864 for instance, quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 465.}
Her name may have been Malinalli Tenepatl or Malitzín but she is most often known as Doña Marina or Malinche. She is thought to have been Aztec and was one of twenty young women given to Cortez soon after he reached Mexico. Fluent in both Nahuatl and Mayan, she became Cortez’s translator and later gave birth to a son fathered by him. Her role as translator was regarded as facilitating the conquest of Mexico and gained her infamy as a traitor; the son Doña Marina bore Cortez is considered the first mestizo, but for this she has historically been reviled as lascivious. In the past several decades others who consider her actions to have mitigated the devastation brought about by the Spanish Conquest have challenged this assessment. The role of Doña Marina has been intensely debated in reference to national identity and gender relations in Mexico and negative interpretations of her involuntary involvement with Cortez have been confounded to some extent, but in mid-nineteenth-century Mexico virtually all associations with her name were pejorative. The title of a derisive song, Adios, Mama Carlota, immensely popular among Republican troops and supporters of Juárez in early 1866, refers to Charlotte who used the Spanish spelling of her name in Mexico. No

---

53 Doña Marina is mentioned in the chronicles of Bernal Díaz del Castillo (c. 1495-1584), Historia verdadera de la Conquista de la Nueva España first published in 1632. Díaz was a soldier with Cortez during the conquest of Mexico. A popular interpretation of these chronicles is Albert Idell, ed., The Bernal Diaz Chronicles: The True Story of the Conquest of Mexico (N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1956). Several excellent twentieth century studies have focused on Doña Marina. See Octavio Paz for a profound exploration of archetypal figures as influences on the Mexican psyche. Octavio Paz, 1994. For an insightful study from a feminist perspective see Sandra Messinger Cypress, La Malinche in Mexican Literature: From History to Myth (Austin: University of Texas, 1991).

54 In this regard, she is often called La Chingada, ‘the fucked one’ in street vernacular.

55 The ‘adiós’ of the title relates to lines in the song that predict Charlotte would have to leave Mexico once French troops returned to France. Attributed to Vincente Riva Palacio (1832-1896), General, lawyer, diplomat, and author, the original lyrics were mocking but not lewd as were, it is claimed, other versions. Joan Haslip, for instance, remarks on “obscene verses” that “exploit[ed] her vulnerability.” Haslip, 1971, 329. In the Yucatan
mention of Doña Marina appears in the lyrics but the ironic title probably plays on
slippage between honorific references made to Charlotte in connection with the Virgin of
Guadalupe and the fact that both the historical and celestial figures are regarded as
‘mothers’ respectively of Mexico and of Mexico’s mixed races.56 Charlotte’s lack of any
maternal role not only meant the Empire had no heir but was a serious personal handicap
in a society valorizing childbirth. The clerical party launched personal attacks against
Charlotte and Maximilian relating to the absence of children at about the same time the
song appeared.57

Charges that Charlotte was ambitious were frequent from the time of her role as
Vicereine and gathered force as Maximilian vacillated as to whether or not he would
accept the crown of Mexico. In a letter to Marie-Amélie, Charlotte protests her ambition
is only to be useful and defends her political activities as being a means of assisting

________________________

one version includes the description of Charlotte as having “a nose like a bull.” I thank
Carolina Ramirez Aznar for these lyrics.

56 For an excellent exploration of Mexican concepts of redemption related to childbirth as
well as the complicated mythology of Doña Marina as lascivious mother figure see
Messinger Cypress, 1991, 43-55; Rosario Pérez-Lagunes, “The Myth of La Malinche:
From the Chronicles to Modern Mexican Theatre” (Master’s Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic
Institute and State University, Blackburg, Virginia, 2001). Also very useful is Steve
Stern, The Secret History of Gender in Late Colonial Mexico (Chapel Hill: University of
North Carolina, 1995).

57 No satirical images of Charlotte have been encountered during research although Corti
includes a letter in which Charlotte writes she enclosed a copy of L’Orquesta, a liberal,
satirical newspaper, containing a drawing relating to Maximilian. Charlotte to Eugénie, 8
December 1864. Corti, [1924], 1968, 857. No sources interviewed were aware of such
images of Charlotte and a publication on the history of graphics in Mexico includes only
two generally sympathetic depictions of her as Empress. Esther Acevedo, et al, Los
Pinceles de la Historia: La Fabricacion del Estado, 1864-1910 (México City: Museo
Nacional de Arte, 2003). A selection of graphic political satire related to the attempt to
found a Mexican Empire can be found in Alfred Jackson Hanna and Kathryn Abbey
Hanna. Napoleon III and Mexico: American Triumph over Monarchy (Chapel Hill:
University of North Carolina, 1971).
Maximilian and not unreasonable as she had no maternal responsibilities.\textsuperscript{58} When Maximilian, early in 1865, confirmed plans to uphold reforms initiated by Juárez in regard to the Church, the clerical party was incensed and a similar explanation of Charlotte’s involvement in political issues was mobilized to undermine Maximilian’s reputation. A representative of the Vatican had been sent, at Maximilian’s request, to Mexico to discuss changes adversely affecting the Church. Maximilian and Charlotte anticipated it would be possible to reach a compromise. When in late 1864 the papal representative, Monsignore Meglia, arrived it became apparent only complete reinstatement of Church rights and properties and disallowing freedom of religion would conciliate the nuncio.\textsuperscript{59} It was equally evident such a course was untenable, and on 27 December an Imperial decree was promulgated in Mexico “confirming the nationalization of Church property, establishing the free exercise of all creeds, and commanding that only those purchases of Church property should be subject to revision in which the procedure had some flaw in it.” This effectively set the clerical party,

\textsuperscript{58} No date is given for an extract from this letter is quoted in Haslip, 1971, 329. Corti appears to quote from the same letter. His reference to Rainich-Foussmagne (sic) as his source is puzzling as the biography by de Reinach-Foussmagne was published the following year. Neither spelling is included in his index or bibliography. Corti, [1924], 1968, 526.

\textsuperscript{59} Corti notes the Empress Eugénie “had misgiving about the Pope’s choice ….” A letter from Charlotte to Eugénie makes it obvious she shared this sentiment as she suggested the only solution was to “throw the nuncio out of the window.” Charlotte to Eugénie 27 December 1864. Letter Reproduced in Corti, [1924], 1968, 863. “The Holy Father,” wrote Charlotte in January 1865, “who said himself in his jesting way that he was a \textit{jettatore} [had the ‘evil eye’], was indeed right, ‘for, she wrote, ‘it is a fact that since his envoy set foot in our land we have had nothing but trouble and we expect to have more in the immediate future.’” Charlotte to Eugénie, 26 January 1865. Quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 468. And a few weeks later, “[t]he poor Holy Father is doing us a pretty service in Europe with the encyclical. If I might allow myself a slight irreverence, I should say that if it comes from any spirit at all, I do not think it is the Holy Spirit.” and same Feb 3 1865. Reproduced in Corti, [1924], 1968, 880.
clergy, and Church dignitaries against the Emperor and his administration at a time when the Empire was beginning to unravel on other fronts, military and financial in particular.60 It was publicly claimed “from the pulpit” that Maximilian was unable to father children as a result of venereal disease. A letter by Gutierrez was discovered in which he made this claim and alleged the Empress’s unhappiness at being childless “drove her to exhaust herself in ceaseless activity.”61 Initially these reports undermined the Emperor’s position but, as Harding observes, a shift occurred which saw the central topic become the Empress and her “apparent sterility.”62 In reaction to these tactics Maximilian arranged in early September 1865 to adopt two grandsons of Augustín Iturbide (1783-1824) who had briefly ruled as Constitutional Emperor of Mexico at the beginning of the 1820s.63 Salvador de Iturbide y de Marzán (1849-1895), the older of the two cousins was sent to study in Europe; the younger, Augustín Iturbide y Green (1863-1925) was to live with his Aunt Josepha in the Imperial residence to become official heir

60 Corti gives a good account of the demands being made and reasons for rejecting these. Corti, [1924], 1968, 450-455. See also Corti regarding financial demands on Mexico. Ibid. 543.
61 Rumors had circulated in Europe for many years regarding Maximilian’s sexuality but had little effect as he was not in so prominent a role. In 1865 an Abbé Alleau was arrested and accused of being a provocateur and spy: the letter, dated 13 December 1864, was found on his person. Gutierrez to Abbé Alleau, 13 December 1864. Cited in Corti, [1924], 1968, 456-457. Victor Alba similarly recounts “[t]he church began to favor attacks against Maximilian, and it was declared from the pulpit that the emperor was syphilitic, which was why [Charlotte] had borne him no children.” Victor Alba, The Mexicans: The Making of a Nation (NY: Praeger, 1967), 83.
62 Haslip’s interpretation of these attacks insinuates they were motivated by gender conventions. According to this author, the Empress was subsequently “sometimes forced to leave the room on a sign from her husband, who no longer seemed to wish her to participate in his confidential discussions with his ministers.” Haslip does not provide a source for this information. Haslip, 1971, 331
63 Maximilian earlier urged that his youngest brother, Ludwig Victor, become his heir but neither Ludwig Victor nor the Austrian royal family was interested in this proposal. (He had also attempted to interest Ludwig Victor in marrying a daughter of the Brazilian royal family to no avail). Corti, [1924], 1968, 280.
to the Empire at a later date. But if the Empire now had an heir, this did not permit a
double portrait of the Empress and Augustin in the tradition of a ‘presentation of the heir’
image.64 Alice Iturbide Green, mother of Augustin, had reluctantly agreed to the
adoption and immediately afterwards sought, without avail, to retrieve her youngest
child.65 As she was an American citizen this provided an avenue of official protest just as
the Civil War had ended and increasing demands were being mounted against foreign
intervention in Mexico. Adding to the gathering crisis, Maximilian ill-advisedly issued
what became known as the Black Decree on 3 October in response to pressure from
France that he gain greater control. The Decree made armed opposition to the Empire
punishable by death and caused the unforeseen execution of many “known to be
honourable and valiant men, though of republican opinions” with the result that “[t]he
struggle now became so bloody and savage that the European troops engaged in it
themselves expressed their horror.”66 By November 1865 the situation was too volatile
for the Emperor to leave the capital for a state visit planned to the Yucatan peninsula and

---

64 Ibid., 527-529. Word of the adoption spread quickly. “Anything was welcome to
[American Secretary of State] Seward that might cause embarrassment to Maximilian’s
government was welcome. He instructed Bigelow, the American Ambassador in Paris, to
use his influence with Drouyn de Lhuys [Minister at the French Court] to induce him to
intervene in the mother’s favour.”, Corti, [1924], 1968, 726-727. According to
Montgomery Hyde, Seward passed news of the adoption to the newspapers where it
received extensive coverage. H. Montgomery Hyde, 1946, 178. As Charlotte had
apparently not been consulted about the adoption, she might have chosen not to be
portrayed together with little Augustín in an official portrait. John Taylor is alone in
suggesting that the adoption was Charlotte’s idea. He quotes from a letter written by
Charlotte “to the Austrian Empress, Augusta (sic), ‘[n]ow I consider my being childless
as a blessing from heaven, for I already foresee an orphan in this prince.’” No source
Putnam’s Sons, 1894), 118.
65 Mother and child were reunited in 1867.
66 Corti, [1924], 1968, 539.
instead the Empress was delegated to represent the Empire.\(^{67}\) Charlotte remained in Mexico City on 4 November to honor the day of her name saint and immediately afterwards departed with a small entourage and traveled overland to Vera Cruz then by ship to the Yucatan peninsula. They were received coldly when passing through the towns of Orizaba and Puebla before Vera Cruz but the latter was a port city enriched by traffic resulting from the Intervention. Approaching Vera Cruz, in the small centre of Paso del Macho, they were met by welcoming dignitaries and a reception of citizens including women wearing elegant Parisian hats for, despite armed resistance to the Intervention, there was a ready market for French fashion.\(^{68}\) Conversely European interest in Mexican cultures had been generated by travel accounts published in Europe two decades earlier and subsequent photographic images.\(^{69}\)

---

\(^{67}\) From the beginning Maximilian had seen Central America as potentially the most important territory in his intention to expand the Empire. With animosity increasing from the United States he expected there would be a loss of territory along the shared Mexican and United States border with the result that the Yucatan and adjoining territories took on increasing importance in this regard. Haslip, 1971, 338.

\(^{68}\) See Haslip, 1971, 339-343 and 391. Mexican women from wealthy families patronized Frederick Worth and it was not unusual for them to wear gowns from this couturier to court balls in Mexico. Elizabeth-Ann Coleman tells of one Mexican client who had taken a vow “never to wear silk again, only brown wool. But she was to have ball and dinner dresses, day outfits, everything in her prescribed cloth of penance …” Elizabeth Ann Coleman, *The Opulent Era: Fashions of Worth, Doucet, and Pingat* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1989), 104.

\(^{69}\) Fascination with pre-historic Mexico had been aroused in the west by the 1841 publication of *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan*. Illustrated by Frederick Catherwood, English architect and illustrator, this account of explorations by Catherwood and John Lloyd Stephens stimulated efforts to document these monuments and sites. Frederick Catherwood and John Lloyd Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan*, 2 vols. (London: Murray, 1841). Lithographs from daguerrotypes of contemporary Mexican people in traditional costume and of ancient ruins were popular and circulated widely. Examples are included in Robert Levine, *Images of History: Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Latin American Photographs as Documents* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1989); and
accelerated this interest through personal accounts of participants and exhibitions held in Europe of Mexican scenes by artists who had traveled to Mexico.\textsuperscript{70} Accordingly the imperial expedition was accompanied by at least one photographer and contributed to documentation of the ancient site of Uxmal when the Empress, members of her party, city officials, and an informal phalanx of young men, rode from Mérida some fifty miles distant.\textsuperscript{71} If Charlotte sat to photographers on this journey the images remain undiscovered; however, some visual evidence of her passage through the Yucatan remains and is discussed in the final chapter.\textsuperscript{72}

The tour lasted almost six weeks and Charlotte was still in the Yucatan when Leopold I died on 10 December 1865.\textsuperscript{73} His death deprived the Empire of an important

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{70} On 24 February 1865 Charlotte enclosed “an album of photographs of Mexican ruins” with a letter to Eugénie. Corti, [1921], 1968, 885. The complex of Uxmal is thought to date from A.D. 700 or 850 and was named a World Heritage Site in 1996. Site didactic information; see also: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/791> (9 June 2006). Located just inside the current entrance to this site are displays of collected pallic-shaped stones of religious significance. They may be those removed from their places within the complex prior to Charlotte’s arrival out of concern they might offend her feminine sensibilities.

\textsuperscript{71} Haslip quotes from a letter by Charlotte to Maximilian telling of a festive reception in Mérida with “thousands of people filling the roofs, the doorways and the balconies.” No date is given. Haslip, 1971, 342.

\textsuperscript{72} See Aubert and Widdy Donation, Royal Military Museum, Brussels, Belgium. Désiré Charnay was funded by the Commission Française des Monuments Historiques and had traveled to Mexico to begin documenting monuments and ruins in 1857. For historical and biographical information on early photographers in Mexico see Levine, 1989; Ochoa, 2001; also \textit{Mexico: From Empire to Revolution}, an exhibition mounted by the Getty Research Institute 2000-2002.

\textsuperscript{73} A message of condolence sent from the Grand Orient of Mexican Freemasons demonstrates the extensive influence and close connections of this organization. Quoted without citation in Prince Michael of Greece, [1998], 2001, 235.
advocate and put an end to Belgium’s participation through volunteer forces.\(^{74}\) Within weeks of this news a letter was received from Napoleon III announcing French troops were to be recalled over the next eighteen months. Blasio remarks Charlotte and Maximilian “discussed very seriously affairs of state, which unfortunately became more complicated daily.” Charlotte is described by Haslip as strained and unwell in the early months of 1866.\(^{75}\) Blasio does not mention this but states Maximilian was suffering from “liver trouble and intermittent fever” at this time. By May the Emperor was holding councils of state daily; apparently the Empress did not attend as Blasio writes he would go to her apartments each night from eight to ten or eleven to brief her on events of the day. “She would listen attentively, as she paced the floor. Concerning some of them [the reports] she would dictate her opinion; in connection with others she would give positive orders and place her initial or signature at the bottom …. So it went on for twenty days. Then the Emperor took charge of everything.”\(^{76}\) During this period and probably earlier Charlotte was preparing lists of objects and artworks to be displayed at the International

---

\(^{74}\) In mid-1864 the arrival of some twelve hundred Belgian volunteers and six hundred Austrian veterans allowed Marshall Bazaine to send home a French brigade. It was hoped that further volunteers from Belgium and Austria would follow. Corti, [1924], 1968, 487. Maximilian was touring Tlascal, Apam, and Orizaba, and Charlotte again Regent in April 1865 when a contingent of two hundred and fifty inexperienced Belgian volunteers was ambushed by Republican forces far outnumbering them. There are few publications relating to the Mexican Empire conveying how severe a setback this was details are provided in an article on the leader of the Belgian troops, “Major Tigdal, Captain Chazal (the son of the Belgian minister of war), Captain Delaunay, three Lieutenants and about 110 men were soon killed. Eight of the Belgians were killed and more than two hundred taken prisoner. “Alfred Baron Van der Smissen” <http://www.austro-hungarian-army.co.uk/mexican/vdsmisson.htm> (23 May 2007). When a Belgian deputation sent by Leopold II to formally announce his succession was attacked in early 1866 and Baron de Huart (a friend of both Léopold Brabant and adjutant of the Count of Flanders) was killed and others wounded, the King closed recruiting centres. Corti, [1924], 1968, 589. See also Blasio, [1905], 1934, 71; Haslip, 1971, 314.\(^{75}\) Haslip, 1971, 359.\(^{76}\) Blasio, [1905], 1934, 67-78.
Exposition to be held in Paris in spring 1867. This major exhibition presented an unparalleled opportunity to display to an international audience Mexico’s cultural diversity, natural resources, and artistic richness and to attract investment and immigration.\textsuperscript{77} Planning had been underway for some time and it had been decided that the Mexican pavilion would be built to resemble an early Mayan pyramid. Charlotte’s lists included a painting of \textit{Our Lady of Guadalupe} by Joaquín Ramírez (1839-1866) and busts cast in bronze of her and of Maximilian by Felipe Sojo (c. 1833-1869) (Figure 5.12).\textsuperscript{78}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.3\textwidth]{figure5_12}
\caption{Felipe Sojo, \textit{Carlota, emperitriz de Mexico}, 1866.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{77} From lists of art compiled by Charlotte it appears that the selection of works was, to a considerable extent, her responsibility and is an aspect of her activities as Empress that would reward further research. Lists and related letters are published in Luis Weckmann and Emile Vandewoude, \textit{Carlota de Belgica: correspondencia y escritos sobre Mexico en los archivos Europeos (1861-1868)} (Mexico: Editorial Pourra, 1989).

\textsuperscript{78} These are reminiscent of Roman busts of emperors as Acevedo has commented and, as such, expanded the eclectic mix of imperial images. A bust of Charlotte by Josef Gasser de Valhorn is also illustrated in Acevedo, 1995, 69-70. There is a fine miniature bust of the Empress in the Soumaya Museum, in Churubusco. No provenance is known for this work and it is unsigned. Maximilian also commissioned, Blasio states, imperial bronze busts of himself and of Charlotte from an artist called Noreña. Blasio, [1905], 1934, 56.
Charlotte had funded a restoration of Alameda Park in Mexico City from her private means and it is possible a painting by José María Velasco was another considered for the Exposition (Figure 5.13). The Alameda project was taken up within the context of urban renewal launched by Maximilian and it was proposed to not only beautify these neglected gardens but to also provide a place where Mexicans of all classes could take their leisure. Velasco’s painting documents Charlotte’s association with the garden and

---

79 An unspecified painting representing the ‘national school’ appears on the list.
80 From Robert Duncan’s study it is clear that the mayor of Mexico City exercised considerable influence in plans for renovating the Alameda and that “concern went beyond health and social benefits to embrace the image Mexico would project, both as a people and a nation.” Duncan, 1996, 49. In winter 2008, an attempt to address the need for leisure space in Mexico City led to the temporary transformation of the zócalo,
he may have conceived it as a work suitable for the Exposition as he more often concentrated on landscape; alternatively, it may have commissioned by Charlotte. The Empress and a female companion are situated at the centre of the scene in an area of bright sunlight. Charlotte is riding sidesaddle and wears a flowing print dress, wide-brimmed hat with attached veil, items of conventionally feminine presentation. A male rider follows them and another with a reddish beard - perhaps Maximilian - rides behind him and their somber-coloured charro costumes serve as foil for the softer, more colourful attire of the women. Behind these figures is a cortege that has yet to enter the sunlit area and in the distance beyond these can be seen Chapultepec Palace. In the half-shadowed right foreground a group of indigenous boys and young men wearing simple white shirts and trousers are working as laborers; some glance at the passing riders while others pay them no attention. In the left foreground and, touched by sunlight, is a Mexican peasant woman holding her child. Others individuals are gathered near the woman and child and across the sunlit space can be seen many more figures most of whom are massed in shadows beneath the trees. Most figures in the park appear to be indigenous Mexicans. In reality, crushingly long hours demanded of most indigenous workers by their upper class, usually Creole employers effectively ruled out leisure

(public square), into a gigantic ice rink and more successfully included less privileged citizens than did the Alameda Gardens project. The success was due, in part, to the more egalitarian nature of the space. Duncan Kennedy, “Mexicans take to giant ice rink” <BBC News, Mexico City http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/americas/7169057.stm> (3 January 2008).

81 The view of Chapultepec was less an accurate view than it was an oblique reference to the identity of the nearest lead rider, Charlotte. <http://www.virtualmuseum.ca/Exhibitions/Landscapes/popup.php3?language=1&image=img12ebm> (25 May 2006).
time. Velasco was the same age as Charlotte and was then just beginning a distinguished career that would focus on national identity largely through realist portrayals of Mexican landscape. Considering this inclination, and mindful of John Barrell’s analysis of nineteenth-century scenes in which light and shadow demarcates social and economic disparity, I suggest Velasco constructed the scene as a political critique.

As Velasco’s figures in this painting are very small and the title by which it is known makes no mention of the Empress, the identity of the central figure was forgotten until recent decades when it was revealed by the discovery of preliminary studies. The painting is displayed in Mexico’s National Museum of Art rather than at Chapultepec and contextualized within many other examples of this artist’s work. Whether or not it was ever displayed at Chapultepec or the Imperial Palace or was rejected and so remained with the artist is unknown. A didactic panel placed beside this work by Velasco in the National Museum refers to nineteenth-century fashions making it difficult to decode a woman’s social status and points out this would have contributed to the painting becoming detached from its subject. Aileen Ribeiro has remarked “… it was sometimes difficult to tell the virtuous from her impure sister” once machine-produced clothes made fashion and opulence available to all. “Compared to the eighteenth century, when even

---

82 In the spirit of King Leopold’s concern for Mexico’s indigenous population, a law put forward by Maximilian and passed during Charlotte’s regency in the summer of 1865 formulated to improve working conditions for the poor. It addressed the control that rich landowners enforced through credit, was to have ensured fair wages, and abolished corporal punishment. Without alternative employment available and without land to enable them to gain independence, workers were unable to demand such rights with the result that the law failed to improve their conditions. Haslip, 1971, 323-324.
84 Museo Nacional de Arte. INBA. CONACULTA.
the upper-classes had relatively few clothes, in the nineteenth century with huge technical
devances in fabrics and clothes, women were able to possess huge wardrobes.”
Velasco’s elegant female riders attended by male companions could have been mistaken
for women of unsavory reputation - a possibility perhaps intended by the artist as a
metaphor of imperialism. Reading Velasco’s scene as a critique shows it to contest the
focus on Charlotte’s philanthropic acts by ‘overshadowing’ these with broader ethnic and
economic issues; further, through the depiction of lavish dress the artist subverts a
decorative feminine image of the Empress that might have countered attacks of her as a
ruthless “virago” with ‘unnatural’ political ambitions.

A Costume Change

Another 1866 multiple-figure painting featuring an image of Charlotte was
commissioned about the same time as the Alameda. As in Velasco’s painting the figures
are small, Charlotte is one among many, and nothing overtly indicates her identity. She
wears a hat similar to that in Velasco’s image and which appears to be the same hat as
seen in two photographs (see Figures 5.14 and 7.3). In Velasco’s painting the Empress
turns away from the viewer whereas her facial features can be seen in the other painting
(Figure 5.15).

86 José Iturriaga de la Fuente writes of a French woman dressed in European fashions
being aggressively expelled from a church as her attire was considered lewd. José N.
Iturriaga de la Fuente, “Marshal Bazaine.”
sub=0&idpag=1905> (7 March 2007)
Charlotte commissioned the painting and a companion piece in which she does not figure; the scene in which she is included was exhibited at the 1866 Salon in Paris. These were painted by Beaucé and while similar in the features noted, the exhibited scene differs strikingly from Velasco’s image. Charlotte’s apparel in the Alameda image can be described as “affirm[ing nineteenth century] ideas about the feminine” regardless of whether or not the Velasco subverted the meaning. In Beaucé’s painting she flouts conventions of femininity as well as expectations of appropriate pose and place (see Figure 5.15).

89 Wilson-Bareau, 1992, 82, ft.18. Note: I am unaware of any reproduction showing the entire painting.
The scene is an active Zouave camp with the arrival of a rider dominating the left-hand side. On the right-hand side the Empress is seen in conversation with a semi-reclining officer. She is seated on the ground and is, surprisingly, wearing Zouave uniform.90

“Appearances testified to the maintenance of a social order based on visible distinctions,” Tamar Garb has stated. Undermining these distinctions disrupted “culture’s highly organized categories” and could potentially “generate doubt, confusion and the possibility of dissent.”91 Tamar Garb is referring to the production or subversion of gender in nineteenth-century imagery in general and not to this painting in particular yet

90 In the companion painting the reclining figure closest to the picture plane may represent Maximilian. As with the image of Charlotte, the figure I think to be Maximilian appears to be conversing with a Zouave officer but because both figures recline the impression is one of relaxation. As Beaucé painted the large portrait of Maximilian mounted on a white horse the presence of a white horse tethered in the background above the two figures may indicate the identity of the Emperor. On the other hand, the rider entering the scene to the left of the Empress in the other painting is mounted on a white horse and that rider bears no resemblance to Maximilian. Two figures are seen to be preparing a meal below the Empress and her companion. A knife held upright by left lower figure is puzzling as this could be interpreted as symbolically threatening relative to the position of the Empress but no other elements in the scene corroborate so chauvinistic a gesture on the part of Beaucé. The painting possibly depicting Maximilian is illustrated in Acevedo, 1995, 74. See also Wilson-Bareau, 1992: 26.

91 Tamar Garb, Bodies of Modernity: Figure and Flesh in Fin-de-Siècle France (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988), 1-2.
her point is relevant to Charlotte’s self-representation. Class distinctions are maintained in the painting by depicting Charlotte in a slightly elevated (and thereby hierarchical) position in the composition. This would have been deliberate to avoid a casual viewer, on seeing a uniformed female in a military camp, mistaking the Empress for a vivandiere and cantinier.92

The choice to be portrayed in uniform and seated on the ground in the context of a military encampment may be partially explained by the painting being intended for a European rather than Mexican audience. Beaucé was primarily a history artist and painter of battle and military scenes who sometimes painted portraits; he was also an accomplished illustrator. Among texts for which he provided images was Daughter of the Regiment by Gaetano Donizetti (1797-1848).93 The multiple social interactions incorporated into the Zouave scene featuring Charlotte can be interpreted as similar in the spirit to Donizetti’s comic opera.94 Marie, the female protagonist in Daughter of the Regiment (La Fille du Régiment), was an orphan rescued by French Sargeant Sulpice and raised by Sulpice and his French regiment. The opera pivots on the theme of frustrated

92 These were women who oversaw a canteen and sometimes nursed injured soldiers. The terms tended to be used interchangeably although duties of a cantiniere were more often restricted to supervising provisions.
94 That is to say, the gravity of contemporary circumstances in Mexico is not evident in Beaucé’s camp pictures. Proposing that the image of Charlotte alludes to a comic opera does not contradict her awareness of the critical reality of her situation. In an 1865 letter written to Caroline de Grunne, Charlotte expresses a willingness to take risks if circumstances warranted. “If necessary,” she writes, “I can lead an army. Do not laugh at me. I have gained some experience of warfare, just from being in continual contact with guerrilla skirmishes, which are a part of our life here.” Charlotte to Countess Caroline de Grunne, April 1865.
love as Marie wishes to wed Tonio, a peasant who joined the regiment in order that he could marry her, and culminates in their wedding that was initially forbidden. Depictions of Marie often portray her in uniform, or adapted uniform, but she is a conventionally feminine and virtuous character (Figures 5.16 and 5.17).

In Beaucé’s picture Charlotte is shown in uniform. At the time she commissioned the painting, she was protected by French troops and would not have known of the impending troop withdrawal. The pose of the soldier who reclines beside her, his chin supported by his hand and gazing up at her, is more evocative of romance than, for instance, discussions of rations or maneuvers. In the opera he would have played the part of Tonio.\(^{95}\) An intertextual reference to an opera would correlate with my interpretation.

\(^{95}\) The painted figure bears no resemblance to Maximilian although Tonio was Tyroleon and therefore Austrian. Neither does it resemble General Van der Smissen who, in years following World War II, was rumoured to be the father of General Weygand. Maxime
of Portaels’s earlier portraits of Charlotte as alluding to female protagonists in various well-known texts. A further point, perhaps supporting such a reading, is the popularity of Zouave-inspired jackets among fashionable women in the 1860s. This fashion and the familiarity of nineteenth-century viewers with Daughter of the Regiment might have led viewers to recognize an ironic ‘role-play’ in Charlotte’s attire and camp surroundings. A Mexican audience would have been unlikely to find such a theme entertaining; however, Beaucé returned to France in mid-1865, the painting was produced and exhibited in France and it remained in Europe. A note by Wilson-Bareau states “[o]ne of two military genre scenes … was shown at the Salon of 1866, no. 98, Campement du 3rd Zouaves à San-Jacinto, près de la lagune de Chapala, versant du Pacifique …” The painting including Charlotte is dated 1866; as the other painting, that I suggest includes Maximilian, is dated 1867, it must have been the scene with the figure of the Empress that was shown. The title of no. 98 makes no mention of Charlotte and its relatively small scale (75 cm. x 120 cm.) amid the density of the exhibition would have caused many viewers to miss her inclusion, especially if the work were hung high on the wall. Nonetheless, Beaucé was a prominent artist and his paintings would have attracted much

Weygand was born in early 1867 and there is little is known of his early life other than that his upbringing was linked to the Belgian court. There was speculation Charlotte was Weygand’s mother. Jacques Weygand, Weygand Mon Père (Paris: Flammarion, 1970).

This style was also popular in the United States. <http://www.uvm.edu/~hag/godey/images/zouave.html> (14 July 2005). The red flannel shirts of Garibaldi and his volunteers were similarly adopted as fashionable for women and Empress Eugénie was among those who wore this. Coleman, 1989, 45.

This painting is the same size as the other Zouave scene commissioned from Beaucé inferring they were meant to hang as a pair. Wilson-Bareau does not refer to the figure of Charlotte and, as her focus was paintings by Manet, this feature may not have been noted. Wilson-Bareau, 1992, 82, n.18,
attention so that some viewers might have registered his depiction of Charlotte. This is a point that awaits further research.

By late spring 1866 the Mexican Empire was bankrupt and virtually under siege. The announcement that French troops were to be withdrawn broke with the 10 April 1864 Convention of Miramare guaranteeing long term military support to the Mexican monarchy and in mid-April 1866 the withdrawal was begun. Pressure exerted by the United States resulted in the cancellation of scheduled reinforcements from Austria.98 France was threatening Belgium with annexation and Léopold II refused to receive the Mexican envoy sent to request further aid.99 With little alternative to abdication - Maximilian was initially willing but Charlotte rejected this option - it was determined Charlotte would travel to Europe.100 There she would confront Napoleon III, seek further troops and funding, and present a Concordat to Pope Pius IX with a view to reconciling with the Church and thereby regaining support from the clerical party in Mexico.101

---

98 Maximilian and Charlotte were not well informed regarding circumstances in Europe. Corti refers to “over-sanguine” reports sent from Europe by envoys and others. Corti, [1924], 1968, 569.
100 The vacillation of Maximilian and resistance of Charlotte are abundantly documented in literature relating to the Mexican Empire.
101 “[W]ith her sure tact” Maximilian wrote to his brother, Karl Ludwig, the Empress would “ascertain how far we can still reckon upon the help of sluggish old Europe.” Emperor Maximilian to Archduke Karl Ludwig, Chapultepec, 30 July 1866. Draft in Vienna National Archives. On 15 August 1866 Maximilian sent a letter to Emily, Baroness Binzer, commenting “[w]ho can better obtain this security for us than the coolly calculating Empress, who alone, besides myself, knows all the secret ins and outs of our policy?” Both letters quoted in Corti 1968: 643. Charlotte carried reports and records with her and prepared extensive notes in preparation of her meetings with Napoleon III and his Ministers. She had written to the Belgian representative in Rome, Henri de Carolus, before leaving Mexico requesting him to seek an audience with the Pope to initiate further discussions that might lead to a satisfactory compromise. Corti dates this letter to 29 July 1866 but would seem to be in error as she was then en route to Europe. Corti, [1924], 1968, 682-684 and 697.
many later accounts of the Mexican Empire, Charlotte is assessed as responsible for the
death of Maximilian because she deflected his inclination to abdicate. Bagger, for
instance, writes “Charlotte stopped him. Called him a coward. This highstrung, beautiful
and barren woman, in whom the tender warmth of motherhood was converted into a
devastating fire of ambition.”102 With his tendency to hyperbole Bagger illuminates
usually muted frictions between gender and authority. The problem was not that
Charlotte was allegedly “highstrung” as this quality was often thought characteristic of
women; it was not that she was allegedly “beautiful” as this corresponded to gender
ideals. But she was said to be “barren” - and here the shift mentioned by Harding is
perpetuated - with the natural “tender warmth of motherhood” transformed into unnatural
“ambition ….”103

Efforts were made by the Mexican court to counter any impression the Empress
was fleeing. On Feast of Corpus Christi shortly before her departure Charlotte wore a
gown decorated with diamonds to negate rumors her jewels had already been sent out of
Mexico. This was undermined by actions of the United States administration that
capitalized on such speculation with a special editorial published in the New York Herald
of 01 August 1866 and repeated in European newspapers. This asserted ‘[t]he events

102 Bagger, 1946, 349. Although Bagger was writing much later, his perspective
represents prevailing contemporary assessments demonstrating gender expectations. His
version is used here to demonstrate the continuing entrenchment of these views into the
twentieth century.
103 Regarding the significance of these circumstances and criticism of Charlotte as
ambitious, Diane Hartunian states “her entry into the public sphere [of politics], her
development of “masculine traits” such as ambition and outspokenness, and possible
“womb-related” problems, namely that of frustrated maternity, are the very same
symptoms of hysteria as defined by early twentieth-century doctors.” Diane Hartunian,
“Maximilian’s History/Carlota’s Hysteria. Herstory: on Misreading Carlota,” Romance
Languages Annual, 6, 1994, 492-8, 493.
now transpiring in Mexico … leave no doubt that the empire of Maximilian is doomed.’

The empress left Mexico City 9 July 1866 for Europe via the port of Vera Cruz.104

The woman in question

“Yesterday … the woman in question arrived in Paris and alighted at the Grand-Hôtel ….” John Hay, Paris chargé d’affaires ad interim for the United States. 105

Charlotte and her party reached Saint-Nazaire 8 August 1866, continuing on to Paris 9 August 1866. The sensation created by her arrival and circumstances motivating her return aroused consternation among European heads of state and American diplomats. Despite her departure and mission having been announced in Mexico and the news having been relayed by American newspapers to Europe the French court reputedly did not anticipate her arrival as did John Hay the American chargé d’affaires ad interim in Paris.106 The Empress was unwell during the voyage and her trembling, flushed and feverish appearance on disembarking was remarked on at the time.107 This later came to be regarded not as symptoms of physical illness but symptomatic of an unstable state of mind exacerbated by the ominous absence of imperial representation among officials

104 While Charlotte was on her voyage to Europe, Prussia was engaged in the Seven Week War with Austria and achieved dominance of the German Confederation with the battle of Sadowa 03 July 1866. Austria’s military resources were devastated and Emperor Franz Josef forced to sign a peace treaty with Prussia 26 July 1866. Peter Young includes a concise account. Young, 1979: 40
105 John Hay (1838-1905), 10 August 1866 letter to Frederick Seward. Frederick Seward was son of William Seward (1801-1872), Secretary of State, phrase stressed in original. Quoted in De Kératry, 1867, 171-174.
107 See especially Kerátry, 1867.
welcoming her at the port. No invitation to stay in a royal suite was forthcoming and Charlotte took rooms in a hotel where the Empress Eugénie paid her a courtesy call the following day. Charlotte’s presence, and that of members of her court wearing wide-brimmed sombreros and vests adorned with silver ornaments, riveted public attention in France and beyond. Seeing her pass by, Prosper Mérimée, royal librarian and confidant of Empress Eugénie, described Charlotte as “a masterful looking woman, the spit of Louis-Philippe ....” Charlotte’s multiple connections to France as daughter of Princess Louise and granddaughter of former king and queen Louis-Philippe and Marie-Amélie, were advantageous to gaining public goodwill and the 1864 state visit to Paris gained her and Maximilian recognition and admirers. They had remained personally popular

108 Neither Charlotte’s physical ailments nor effects of medications commonly prescribed for certain symptoms she increasingly exhibited appear to have been investigated in relation to her condition in late 1866. References to her taking daily doses of bromide indicate physical illness and the prevalence with which opium was prescribed in the nineteenth century might be considered with regard to her intermittent state of delusion. <www.msstate.edu/archives/history/mexico2000/carlota.html> (server since disabled) (5 August 2006). See also Prince Michael of Greece, [1998], 2001, 34; Suzanne Desternes and Henriette Chanted. Maximilien et Charlotte (Paris: Librairie Academique Perrin, 1964), Appendix. “Opium, not its alkaloids, was the essential ingredient in the innumerable remedies dispensed in Europe and America for the treatment of diarrhea, dysentery, asthma, rheumatism, diabetes, malaria, cholera, fevers, bronchitis, insomnia, and pains of any sort.” Peter Ward Fay, The Opium War 1840-1842 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975). Online. <http://www.victorianweb.org/history/empire/opiumwars/opiumwars3.html> (7 August 2008).

The was also the fact that the danger of contracting Yellow Fever was high in the rainy season and the imperial party passed through an area en route to board the ship to Europe where this viral disease was active. This risk was said to exemplify Charlotte’s patriotism in undertaking her mission to Europe even as Yellow Fever was “claiming victims on the coast of Vera Cruz.” Extract from the announcement of the departure of the Empress as it appeared in Diario Oficial, 7 July 1866. Quoted in Blasio, [1905], 1934, 82.

109 Corti, [1924], 1968, 943.

although public opinion became overwhelmingly against French involvement in Mexico. There was additionally some sympathy for Charlotte because of the death of Leopold I and that of her grandmother Marie-Amélie who died 24 March 1866. Ramifications of the death of Leopold I had attracted attention in many quarters. F. A. Wellesley, British Ambassador in Paris, notes Charlotte’s potential inheritance was especially of interest as “[a]t the beginning of 1866 very bad news was received from Mexico. The French financial agent was told that unless he was prepared to make an advance of twenty million francs, the Emperor Maximilian could not go on ….” Lord Clarendon [the British Prime Minister], relates Wellesley, received a letter from the French Ambassador asking “whether it was true that King Leopold had left a fortune of seventy million francs and that his daughter, the Empress Charlotte, was to receive a third of that sum. ‘If so,’ the Ambassador continued, ‘she will be able to carry on in Mexico longer than was expected ….’”

A photograph for which Charlotte sat to André-Adolphe Disdéri during this time was as consciously staged as those of Queen Victoria in mourning for Prince Albert but creates an effect quite different from the pathos of these earlier (but continuing) images as it makes no allusion to the past. Charlotte dressed in mourning for the session and chose to wear gloves and a fur-trimmed “cloak of black velvet, and a small bonnet with black silk ribbons tied under her chin” as though to reference the temporary nature of her presence in Paris (Figure 5.18).

112 Blasio, [1905], 1934, 101.
How much the photograph owes to Disdéri is difficult to assess but his inclusion of fur-trim along her cape’s lower edge softens the composition’s geometry, a point apparent when the photograph is compared to painted versions that delete this element (see Figures 6.42 and 6.43). Disdéri could not, however, have elicited the composure expressed by his sitter’s pose.\footnote{Several photographs of Charlotte, including this one, appear to show an asymmetry of mouth and left eyelid drooping lower than the right (ptosis). She “almost always, when addressing a person, narrowed her eyes as though to see better” Blasio recounts, as a result of myopia. Blasio, [1905], 1934, 24. These indiosyncracies may have been responsible for a comment Haslip includes as indicating latent mental instability. A guest at the wedding of Charlotte and Maximilian is said to have remarked on “a queer look in her eye ….” No source is cited. Attempts to corroborate state of mind with appearance have been mentioned already; these often correspond to plot development as in Haslip’s} In the absence of elements in the background, Charlotte’s upright stance

Figure 5.18. A.E. Disdéri, *Portrait de l’Impératrice Charlotte, en deuil ….*, 1866.
and direct gaze engage the viewer in the moment of the image. Recipients of this photograph, knowing any aid for the Mexican Empire was improbable and that Charlotte believed this to be a betrayal, might have read her comportment and expression as accusatory or defiant.\textsuperscript{114} The portrait was designed to circulate and was produced in large format and as a visiting card, and was copied as a painting at least twice (see Figures 6.42 and 6.43).\textsuperscript{115} The painted versions, discussed in the following section, display a starkness characteristic of some early modernist works influenced by the sharp contrasts of early photographs (though more emphatic than is seen in the photograph).\textsuperscript{116} Disderí’s portrait became part of an extensive visual discourse of popular images, salon art, and photographs relating to the French Intervention and Mexican Empire as did reproductions of Graefle’s full-length state portrait.\textsuperscript{117}

In contrast to the broad distribution of Charlotte’s photographic portrait, an oil study for which she sat to Pina is intimate and did not circulate (Figure 5.19).\textsuperscript{118}

description of Portaels’s painting of Charlotte in the Miramare collection. There is “the look of melancholy” she writes, “… the small head rises proud and arrogant from a long slender neck, the supercilious mouth has a downward turn. It is a face at once passionate and cold ….” Haslip, 1971, 362 and 124. For analysis of this approach to viewing portraiture, see Berger Jr., 1994.

\textsuperscript{114} “I have the satisfaction of having upset all their arguments, brought all their false pretexts to naught, and thereby given you a moral triumph, but He [Napoleon III] curtly refuses, and no power can aid us, for he has hell on his side and I have not.” Extract from letter of Charlotte to Maximilian, 22 August 1866. Quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 685.

\textsuperscript{115} It was printed as visiting card and also in large format; an example of the latter is in the National Library, Mexico City.

\textsuperscript{116} It is not known who commissioned the painted copies, who the artist was, or to whom these were given. Haslip includes a reproduction of one painting and identifies the collection as that of Ignazio Condé, Norma Hueffer de Redo, and Pedro Aspé. Haslip, 1971, n.p. In a Museum of the Dynasty photograph of such a painting, a Royal Belgian coat-of-arms can be seen above the image.

\textsuperscript{117} Wilson-Bareau, 1992.

\textsuperscript{118} Pina was in Europe working on the paintings for the Mexican court of Charlotte and Maximilian’s 1864 Papal audience. Acevedo, 1995, 91-94.
Figure 5.19. José Salomé Pina, *Carlota, emperatriz de Mexico*, 1866.

No finished portrait is known and Pina may have retained this study as it is in a private collection rather than at Miramare as might be expected had Charlotte taken it with her when she left Paris. Although russet tones used by Pina in this portrait study closely resemble those in his paintings depicting Charlotte and Maximilian with Pope Pius IX in 1864, Acevedo remarks the 1866 sketch of Charlotte differs in pose and attire so it is unlikely it was a preparatory sketch related to these paintings.\(^{119}\) Charlotte visited Pina’s

\(^{119}\) Acevedo, 1995, 95. Charlotte is shown standing, facing front, and wearing a tasseled over-blouse or jacket over a low-necked day dress. Charlotte’s disappearance from public view soon after this and the mysterious nature of her illness led to rumours she was expecting a child when she returned from Mexico. Much has been written with credible arguments for and against such a possibility but none are conclusive. The
studio twice, probably during the week she waited for Napoleon III to return to Paris.\textsuperscript{120}

(Charlotte would likely also have visited Beaucé to collect the Zouave camp painting at that time).\textsuperscript{121}

As Corti recounts Charlotte had initially been encouraged by a meeting with Minister for Foreign Affairs, Drouyn de Lhuys, and another with Achille Fould, the Minister of Finance.

[Drouyn de Lhuys] showed himself very accommodating during the interview, and listened most attentively to Charlotte’s explanations, so that in her report to Maximilian she was able to announce that she had convinced him on every point. The unhappy princess did not know that Drouyn de Lhuys had already his resignation in his pocket …

Fould “was so enthusiastic he made a cursory allusion to the possibility of a new loan” following Charlotte’s description of Mexico’s silver resources; however, he immediately afterwards advised Napoleon III no further support should be given the Mexican Empire.\textsuperscript{122} Between these meetings Charlotte discussed Mexican affairs with Prince Metternich who sought to convey a more accurate assessment of the determination of the French government. “I should be very glad for their sake,” Metternich later wrote to Count von Mensdorff-Pouilly, “if they were to obtain a single man, a single penny, and a

\begin{flushleft}
fullness of Charlotte’s contour repeated in the vase behind her and position of her left hand holding her jacket corner could be construed as supporting such a possibility; however, this would presume Blasio knew her condition and that she wished to document it - both implausible premises - and more probably has to do with the artist’s stylistic vocabulary. This explanation might be verified by comparing the sketch with other portraits by Pina.
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{120} Fausto Ramírez, \textit{La plástica en el siglo de la Independencia} (México: Fondo Editorial de la Plástica Mexicana, 1985), 67.

\textsuperscript{121} Both are in the Miramare collection. Rossella Fabiani, \textit{Il Castello di Miramare: Itinerario nel Museo Storico} (Trieste: Fachim, 1989), 203-204.

\textsuperscript{122} Corti, [1924], 1927, 676-677.
postponement of the evacuation, if only for a month.” Ultimately, Charlotte was unable to persuade Napoleon III to reverse his decision to suspend aid to Mexico and withdraw troops, as John Hay advised Frederick Seward, American Under-Secretary of State, on 17 August 1866. The French Emperor was troubled by gall bladder ailments and temporarily left the city to recuperate but Charlotte, unwilling to accept the refusals as final, remained in Paris. On his return Napoleon III paid her a further visit but reiterated no assistance would be forthcoming and urged that Maximilian abdicate. To emphasize this decision, formal notification was delivered to Charlotte 21 August when she was about to leave Paris for Miramare.

The French Emperor placed his imperial train at Charlotte’s disposal for the journey, a courtesy that might have also been advantageous in monitoring her actions. She had sent telegrams to the Belgian and Austrian courts stating it was impossible for her to visit because of political considerations but nothing else was known of her plans. The uncertainty variously aroused anger or apprehension within the American administration and at the French, Belgian, and Austrian courts. Haslip quotes from a letter written by Philippe probably in late August 1866 to an Orléans uncle, Prince Joinville. In response to Joinville’s enquiries regarding Charlotte, the Count of Flanders declared: “I am afraid I am unable to give you any information as to Charlotte’s plans.

123 Richard Metternich, Austrian Ambassador, to Count Alexander von Mensdorff-Pouilly, 12 July 1866, quoted in Corti, [1924], 1927, 676.
124 Hyde, 1946, 14. Handwritten drafts of the Empress’s notes are held in the Royal Belgian Archives.
125 Corti notes that the Empress achieved “two points in Paris: namely that the two loans should not be converted, and that the legations in Europe should receive their arrears to pay.” Corti. [1921] 1968: 698 France still demanded agreement with an ‘oppressive customs convention’ and Maximilian complied in September 1866.
Her movements seem to be very erratic and are dictated by a touchiness which verges on the ridiculous ….”

Charlotte’s passage through Italy was triumphant. She was welcomed royally by city officials and King Victor Emmanuel traveled from Rovigo to greet her in Padua. From Milan Charlotte traveled to the Villa d’Este Lake Como estate of Leopold I where she rested a few days and attended mass at the nearby tomb of Saint Charles Borromeo. Resuming her journey she encountered further expressions of public support in Bari, where women had created in embroidery a Mexican flag, and at Desenzano, where red-shirted Garibaldi volunteers played for her the Garibaldian hymn. These experiences revived the spirits of the Empress but fever and episodes of trembling continued to recur and at times prevented her from attending official ceremonies. From about this time letters written by Charlotte sometimes contain passages which, by their irrationality or intensity, imply she was distraught or possibly delusional due to illness or medication. Accounts assert she became suspicious and fearful of Napoleon III and distrustful of members of her retinue. This apprehension increased in severity but continued to alternate with periods of calm rationality and even pleasure at the opportunity to visit sites in Europe.

126 Haslip, 1971, 386.
127 Charlotte to Maximilian 26 August 1866. Quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 690-691. Corti draws from a report Charlotte wrote describing her reception in Italy and conditions in the country. Corti, ibid., 693-695.
129 In a letter written as she was about to leave Paris, Charlotte begins to refer to Napoleon III as the devil. The use of this term was not uncommon in relation to either Napoleon III or Napoleon I. For instance, Holden, writing about Leopold I, tells that “[w]ith increasing years, the King’s spleen against the Emperor became more pronounced until, in his ageing and embittered eyes, Napoleon III became vested with all the
Charlotte’s health appeared to stabilize with rest upon the party reaching Miramare. Her concern when José Blasio arrived on 15 September having passed through Paris carrying dispatches from Mexico has been cited as evidence of further mental deterioration. Yet it was Blasio’s youth and inexperience with political intrigue that caused her anxiety, as he describes in his memoirs, and the prevalence of police spies in Second Empire France is well documented.\textsuperscript{130} The evening of 16 September, Mexican Independence Day, she presided over celebrations during which “the words ‘\textit{Independencia}’ and ‘\textit{Enviva Messico}’ glittered in fireworks over the Adriatic.”\textsuperscript{131} Haslip quotes from a letter written the next day by Felix Eloin, Belgian envoy of the Mexican court, to Maximilian: “I left the Empress Carlota radiant with youth and health ….”\textsuperscript{132} Two days later Charlotte left for Rome where an audience was arranged with Pope Pius IX. An outbreak of cholera made it necessary to travel by land and, on reaching Botzen, the Empress advised her suite she was ill and was abandoning the journey. “But shortly afterwards,” continues Corti, “came counter-instructions to the effect that she intended to go on.” When Charlotte arrived at Miramare she had been greeted with cheers and salvos from Austrian naval ships anchored in the castle harbour.\textsuperscript{133} Passing through Mantua on spectacular powers of a pantomime devil.” Holden, 1946, 227). Charlotte’s overwrought references are, nonetheless, puzzling although not incontrovertibly evidence of insanity. Charlotte to Maximilian, 22 August 1866; quoted in Corti, [1924], 1968, 685. For caricatures depicting Napoleon I as devil or antichrist, or ‘beast of the apocalypse, see: <http://www.napoleon.org/en/special_dossier/caricatures/caricatures3.htm> (November 2005).
\textsuperscript{130} Blasio, [1905], 1934, 96. Hyde, 1946, 54.
\textsuperscript{131} Haslip, 1971, 413. See also H. de Reinach-Foussemane, \textit{Confesiones, memorias y biografía de Carlota de Belgica, emperatriz de México} (Brussels: 1925: 314).
\textsuperscript{132} From Felix Eloin at Miramare to Maximilian in Mexico City, 17 September 1866. Haslip, 1971, 413.
\textsuperscript{133} The ships were at Miramare as a visit by Emperor Franz Josef was immanent; Haslip states that this visit was postponed in response to Charlotte being in residence. Archduke
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her journey to Rome she was given a state reception and an Austria military contingent stationed there “greeted her with a salute of a hundred and one guns” writes Corti.\textsuperscript{134} The battle of Sadowa, in which Austrian troops were badly defeated by Prussia forces, had occurred as Charlotte was en route to Europe. Emperor Franz Josef was afterwards taunted in Venice with cries of “Long live Maximilian!” writes Corti.\textsuperscript{135} It is Corti who provides the most comprehensive account of the journey from Miramare to Rome but, uncharacteristically, he does not identify his source material; a portion is included below for its relevance to Charlotte’s continued topicality after leaving Paris:

The Empress met with the warmest greetings the whole way from the Po to Rome. Wherever she arrived, there were parades, music, salvoes of artillery, and receptions by the notabilities. The whole population turned out, even at the smallest railway stations, where it was known beforehand that the train [carrying the Empress] would not stop. At Reggio the authorities went out to meet the Empress in full-dress uniform, and escorted her to the palace of the Cavaliere Ferrari-Corbelli, before which the \textit{banda} and the regular soldiers were drawn up, and a ceremonial luncheon was prepared.\textsuperscript{136}

At Folgia near Rome Charlotte “was seized with an attack of violent trembling and palpitations” Corti states. Blasio, who was traveling with the party, gives a less dramatic account: “Excusing herself on the plea that she was slightly indisposed, the Empress did not attend a dinner which had been arranged for her at Foglio that afternoon by the authorities, and dined in her carriage with Señora del Barrio.” He continues, “It

\textsuperscript{134} Corti, [1924], 1968, 705.
\textsuperscript{135} Corti, ibid., 654 and 732-3.
\textsuperscript{136} The excerpt included above refers mainly to public events that could be corroborated through municipal archives and periodicals. I have not pursued this for the present study as it only indirectly relates to portraits of Charlotte. Corti, [1924], 1968, ibid.
was dark and raining when we reached Rome at eleven o’clock that night, but
nevertheless the railway station was elaborately illuminated and decorated and an
immense crowd was waiting to see the Empress leave her train.”137 Charlotte’s itinerary
was reported in articles in European and American newspapers often illustrated by
lithographs ‘after’ drawings of related events, or sometimes by the Graefle state
portrait.138

The following morning the Empress rose early and with her lady-in-waiting,
Señora del Barrio, toured the city until mid-day.139 That afternoon she received Cardinal
Antonelli who welcomed her on behalf of the Pope. “Official announcement was made
to us that Pope Pius IX would receive the “Princess Carlota” and her suite at eleven
o’clock on the morning of September 27,” relates Blasio. This slight was not lost even on
the guileless Blasio, but Charlotte’s expectations of success were tempered by previous
experiences of negotiations with the papal nuncio in Mexico. Charlotte returned from the
Vatican “gloomy and taciturn” and ate alone that evening. She is thought to have
requested Pius IX intervene with Napoleon III on behalf of the Mexican Empire and sign
the Concordat. Although Corti allows “[t]here is no record of what they said,” he asserts
“[i]t is certain … that Charlotte handed the Pope the draft of a concordat and that she left

137 Blasio, [1905], 1934, 97. Stress original.
138 For instance, “L’imp. C.: Le Saint-Père rend visite a l’Impératrice,” Desternes and
Chandet, 1964), n.p.; Acevedo states the Graefle painting was photographed in Paris
139 After meeting with Antonelli, Charlotte, accompanied by del Barrio, “drove in the
Pincio, the beautiful park on the summit of the hill of that name,” writes Blasio. He had
hired a horse and eager to “know all the drives of Rome” went riding each afternoon. On
one occasion he passed the carriage of the Empress, saluted, and “noticed her smile and
say something to Señora del Barrio. On their return, he continues, Señora del Barrio “
told [Blasio] smilingly that the Empress had said: ‘These Mexicans can’t keep away
from a horse. See how quickly Blasio has obtained one, so that he can show himself off.
How happy is youth, to be able to enjoy everything!’” Blasio, [1905], 1934, 98.
his study out of her mind.” Having concluded the Empress was “out of her mind” Corti then remarks, “the Pope’s return visit [two days later] passed off comparatively calmly.”

From the time of Charlotte’s arrival in Rome soldiers of the French Imperial Guard or those of the Vatican cuirassiers were stationed outside her hotel, concerts by military bands were performed in her honour several times a day and there were frequent receptions. Among those who called on Charlotte or signed the guest register were “Roman nobility, the diplomatic world, the higher clergy, and the authorities ….”

Disconcertingly, Corti writes “nothing in the Empress’s appearance betrayed the cares that weighed upon her.” After her initial papal audience Charlotte cancelled the honour guard and bands and, following the lengthy return visit by Pius IX on 29 September, again secluded herself in her apartments. In the early evening of 30 September Charlotte, dressed in mourning, ordered her carriage and “directed Señora del Barrio to accompany her …. As she descended the staircase, we could see that her face was haggard, her eyes sunken, and her cheeks blazing - symptoms of the intense fever that had consumed her in recent days” recounts Blasio. Returning unannounced to the Vatican, Charlotte “dismissed the coachman and told him to return to the hotel and not to come back for her. She ascended the staircase and asked to see the Pope. He received her immediately.” She and her lady-in-waiting were given sanctuary in the Vatican that the night perhaps in the unoccupied chamber of Mgr. Borromeo, a descendant of the

---

140 As explained previously, Napoleon III had sent some of his Imperial Guard to Rome at the request of Pope Pius IX as defense against what were perceived to be dangers presented by Italian nationalists. It is uncertain whether or not Charlotte was aware of this reason for the guards presence.

family of Saint Charles Borromeo. A telegram from the Vatican to the Belgian royal family advised them the Empress needed rest and care, and, in response Philippe of Flanders was sent to Rome. Charlotte’s attendants were notified he would arrive on 7 October and accompany her to Miramare. Apocryphal descriptions of her being carried screaming through the streets or, starving, plunging her hand into a cauldron of boiling soup following the night spent at the Vatican are contradicted by Blasio’s account.

“That day [1 October] a messenger came from the Pope, saying that Carlota was calmer and had been convinced that she ought to return to the hotel. She had been told that all of the persons whom she suspected had left Rome; for this reason it was advisable that none of her suite allow themselves to be seen by her … We all hid ourselves, but in places from which we could see the Empress alight from the closed carriage in which she had ridden. Accompanied by Señora del Barrio and the faithful Mathilde, she walked up the stairs and, dismissing the lady of honor (sic), she locked herself in her apartments with the maid [Mathilde].”

According to Blasio, word was already circulating “that the unfortunate Empress had become insane.” Shortly afterwards, he continues, an elderly member of the royal suite, Madame Kuhachevich, was called to the apartments of the Empress later emerging

---


143 Her mental instability was deemed sufficiently serious that the Count of Flanders, presumably on directions from Leopold II, “sent three telegrams, to Rothschild’s in Vienna and Paris and to Cuza in London, who had portions of the Empress Charlotte’s property in their keeping, with instructions not to carry out any further orders from her unless they were countersigned by Radonetz.” (Eduard Radonetz was Prefect of Miramare). Corti, [1924], 1968, 714.

144 Haslip, 1971, 425; Corti, [1924], 1968, 712. Similarly, there are stories that the Empress was poisoned while in the Yucatan, and stories of bizarre behaviour on her part during the journey to Vera Cruz when she was leaving that are not credible. See Malortie 1882; also Michael of Greece, [1998], 2001, 315.
visibly distressed. Blasio writes that Kuhachevich was accused by Charlotte of being complicit in attempts by Napoleon III to poison her but he appears to base this explanation on hearsay. Weckmann and Vandewoude reproduce instructions given to Madame Kuhachevich by Charlotte on the same date. These relate to preparations Charlotte wished to be carried out after her death and offer an alternate possibility for the distress of this long-serving member of the suite. They also reveal the extent to which Charlotte felt herself to be imperiled. To ensure she was not poisoned, Charlotte had her carriage driver take her to fountains on the following days to collect drinking water. On 6 October she met with Count Bombelles and rationally discussed with him her inheritance from Leopold I. Blasio attended the Empress the morning of 7 October and describes her “standing, erect as always, dressed in mourning, in a high-necked gown, with her hair carefully dressed, for her insanity had not caused her to be careless of her appearance.” Haslip includes an unsourced reference to the Empress at times appearing “haggard and unkempt, because she imagined a comb to be a poisoned weapon.” The Empress accompanied Bombelles to the train station the evening of the

145 Blasio, [1907], 1934, 101-103.
147 Charles Bombelles, Chief of the Palace Guard at the Mexican court and one of the party traveling with her to Europe. Bombelles was the son of the Maximilian and Franz Josef’s childhood tutor and had been a friend of both since that time. See the following chapter, also Michael of Greece, [1998], 2001, 315.
148 For an analysis of the significance of such aspects of appearance and female insanity see Anne McClintock, Double crossings: madness, sexuality and imperialism (Vancouver: Ronsdale Press, 2001).
149 Haslip, 1971, 428. Blasio confirms Charlotte compelled her maid, Mathilde Doblinger, to assemble and prepare all food in the apartments to insure it was not poisoned. “Mathilde … had procured a small iron stove, charcoal, two live chickens and a basket of eggs. The food was to be cooked in Her Majesty’s presence….“ Blasio, [1905], 1934, 104.
7 October to meet her brother Philippe. Her distress and preoccupation with poison were evident but she guided Philippe on a tour of churches the next day. They left Rome together 9 October and it is Buffin’s opinion the Empress believed they were going to Venice where she was to board a steamer leaving for Mexico 15 October; instead their destination was Miramare. Immediately upon their arrival she wished to leave for Venice and when prevented from doing so, twice attempted to flee. The Director of the Vienna Insane Asylum, Dr. Reidel, had been summoned to Miramare and advised “that the sick woman should see as few people as possible and should in fact be isolated from the outside world.” Accordingly, on 13 October 1866, two days before her scheduled departure for Mexico, the Empress was forcibly confined in the upper rooms of a garden house with barred windows on the grounds of Miramare in order that she could

---

150 Buffin, 1925, 238.
151 It is unclear who was responsible for this decision. Didactic panels at Miramare state it was the Belgian royal family and Fabiani writes “… the empress began to show signs of mental breakdown, which led her family to first shut her away in the small castle in the Miramare grounds ….” Fabiani, 2001, 10. Public curiosity regarding Charlotte and associated political circumstances may be inferred from articles such as “The Austrian Empire” and “Foreign and Colonial Intelligence with reference to France” in the 3 November 1866 Illustrated London News. An illustration entitled Miramare near Triest, The Residence of the Empress of Mexico was included in this issue. No. 1397, Vol. XLIX. <http://www.iln.org.uk/iln_years/year/1866.htm> (26 June 2008).

Regarding extreme measures taken to secure the grounds surrounding Miramare during this time, see Cimino Folliero de Luna, [1875], 1994. As this episode remains uninvestigated, readings of images of Charlotte in 1867 and later decades of the nineteenth century are tenuous. Responses indicating research requests at Miramare could not be accommodated cited the absence of historical materials on site. The cartons of files Hyde consulted at Miramare in the mid-twentieth century may have been part of a State Museum it then housed. Several dozen cartons of files were traced to the Department of Architecture, Archeology and Culture. These are in poor condition and perhaps could not be recuperated but constitute a valuable research resource of administrative records relating to the castle including through WWI and the appropriation of the Castle in WWII as first a training facility for Nazi officers, and secondly as administrative offices for Allied forces in Trieste. As there is no public access to this material it was not possible to establish if any relates specifically to portraits of Charlotte but a brief visit determined the presence of documents relating to works of art.
be treated and observed.\textsuperscript{152} Caroline, Countess de Grunne, was one of several women who, concerned Charlotte had no female companion, attempted to go to her aid in the ensuing months but none were permitted.\textsuperscript{153} Diane Hartunian, an author who has explored the gender and political implications of Charlotte’s sudden affliction within the context of female hysteria and from a feminist perspective, concludes “[t]he dilemma of the Second Empire,” in so far as it had instigated the disastrous Mexican Empire, “is resolved through Carlota’s [imposed] attitude of guilt. Because she is deviant, she receives the punishment of the retreat from the public sphere to the private . . . .”\textsuperscript{154} While this oversimplifies the circumstances, Charlotte’s illness was a fortuitous development for several heads of state then responding to the shifting centres of power. It is probable political expediency played a part in the subsequent erasure - from 1866 until the early decades of the twentieth century - of imperial representations of Charlotte but social factors contributed to this displacement as discussed in the second half of Chapter Six.

\textsuperscript{152} See correspondence reproduced in Reinach-Foussmagne, 1825, 314, 323; also the reports of Queen Marie-Henriette in Janssens and Stengers, 1997. Less authoritative material is included by Prince Michael of Greece, [1998], 2001, 324, 347.

\textsuperscript{153} “Alas!” wrote de Grunne, “… politics are a villainous thing.”\textsuperscript{153} The Count of Flanders was about to be married and left the following day. Charlotte’s retinue dispersed except for her maid, Martha Doblinger, and Doblinger’s assistant, Amalia Stöger; the former is reputed to have disappeared and the latter was found hanged during the months Charlotte was kept at Miramare. Prince Michael of Greece, ibid., 335-346; see also an excerpt from a letter of Queen Victoria quoted in second part of Chapter Six.

\textsuperscript{154} Diane Hartunian, 1994, 495.
Chapter Six

Afterimages

About Manet’s *amazone* ….

In this first section of Chapter Six I propose that an enigmatic picture painted by French artist Edouard Manet (1832-1883), *View of the International Exposition 1867*, can be read as an allegory pertaining to Charlotte, Maximilian, and Napoleon III (Figure 6.1). International public attention was generated by the imperialist agenda of Napoleon III in Mexico; in France public opinion was intensely divided on the advisability of this venture and increasingly negative. Manet’s opposition to the Intervention and sympathy for the circumstances of Maximilian and Charlotte in Mexico is known from archival sources and, especially, from his series of paintings and a lithograph depicting the execution of Maximilian.1 Certain earlier images by Manet prompted Juliet Wilson-Bareau to speculate these also encode criticism of the regime of Napoleon III from the beginning of the Intervention and it is this possibility I pursue here. Wilson-Bareau’s speculation seems affirmed when expanded to further images produced by Manet contemporary with the Intervention years and when these are read against related events. A pattern emerges demonstrating his attention to this subject and inferring he developed motifs functioning as a code when traced sequentially. For this latter observation, I owe much to Theodore Reff’s analysis of Manet’s “repertory of attributes” although my interpretation of the meanings of *View of the International Exposition* differs substantially from his.2 In addition my analysis is indebted to earlier scholarly attention to this painting, most

---

1 See especially Wilson-Bareau, 1992.
particularly with regard to potentially symbolic motifs and to Manet’s depiction of the
Exposition buildings, and to readings of Manet’s later images of the death of Maximilian.

At the centre of Manet’s View of the International Exposition in 1867 is a
signifier of nineteenth-century women’s growing independence: the figure of an
amazone, a woman on horseback without an escort (Figure 6.2). The amazone has
ridden up to a viewpoint recommended in official publications relating to the
International Exposition and shares the space with diverse other Parisian ‘types’ who

---

3 Robert Herbert’s concise and evocative definition is used here but the term was broadly applied to active women who flaunted conventions. Robert Herbert, Impressionism: Art, Leisure and Parisian Society. (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1988 5.
gaze, for the most part, across the Seine at the panorama on the other bank. She has ridden at a brisk pace as a blue ribbon attached to her hat flies out to the right, her tulle veil billows behind, and the mane of her horse swings away from its neck, its hooves blurring as it is simultaneously reined in and turned towards the viewer. Her precipitous arrival goes unnoticed by all other figures; the scene remains tranquil, suspended, luminous, and as orderly as a design by Haussman. Indeed, amazone and horse cast dense shadows suggestive of a base like that of a chess piece or statue and which counter an impression of movement. The amazone and horse occupy the horizontal and vertical centre of the canvas and are alone in the painting’s shallow middle ground. Between the hill (on which the viewpoint is located) and the distant city (with its exposition pavilions) flows the river Seine and it is frequently remarked that, the Seine being only glimpsed, viewpoint and city abruptly collide. This elimination of intervening space combines with discrepancies in the scale of various figures to imply an ingenuous naïveté on the part of the artist.


5 Baron Georges Eugène Haussmann (1809-1891) was appointed Prefect of the Seine in 1853 and was responsible for the modernization of Paris under Napoleon III. For a concise summary of social and visual ramifications of Haussmann’s transformation of Paris as Clark sees these to be illustrated by View, see Timothy J. Clark, The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Life of Manet and his Followers (New York: Knopf, 1984) 60-69.

6 James Rubin’s remarks on a “still-life-like essence” characteristic of Manet’s paintings are especially relevant to a study of View. James Rubin, Manet’s Silence and the Poetics of Bouquets (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994), 182.

7 Rubin proposes the concept of a “centred foreground” in his eloquent meditation on the artist. Rubin, 1994: 84.

8 See Michael Fried for his comments on Manet’s “deliberate, extreme naïveté” in some early works. Michael Fried, “Manet’s Sources: Aspects of His Art, 1859-1865,” Artforum, 7 (March 1969) 28-82: 70, n. 69.
Figure 6.2. “Amazone” (detail of Figure 6.1).
Figure 6.3. “Leon Leonoff” (detail of Figure 6.1).
Figure 6.4. “Gardener” (detail of Figure 6.1).
Figure 6.5. “Spectral Figure” (detail of Figure 6.1).
In the foreground are figures situated at, or close to, the lower edge of the painting - a gardener in the left hand corner and Manet’s son Léon-Edouard Leenhoff and Léon’s dog on the right (Figures 6.3 and 6.4). The gardener is seen from the front but looks down attending to the garden in which he stands separated from the larger scene by a knee-height perimeter fence. Léon, painted more crisply and casting a strong shadow like the amazone, is caught in mid-stride as he turns his head to observe the painting’s audience. The image of his dog is loosely brushed in, its head almost indecipherable. Figures beyond the amazone are seen from behind or in profile with one exception, a woman who points into the distance with her parasol and whose pale visage is accentuated by her greenish-black attire (Figure 6.5). There are differing opinions on what ‘types’ are represented by particular figures but no debate that the three on the left are soldiers of the French Emperor’s Imperial Guard. Acknowledged by Robert Herbert as “non-threatening” in their poses, he nonetheless regards their inclusion as alluding to the ubiquitous military presence when they are considered with Manet’s selective inclusion of structures with military significance. Many Parisians and visitors noticed the irony of staging on military parade grounds an exposition officially dedicated to harmony and progress and the guard’s casual postures might have registered as equally

---

9 Léon Köella Leenhoff was the son of Manet’s wife Suzanne Leenhoff and may have been the artist’s son but this is uncertain. The gardener, or workman, Mainardi notes, “provides a traditional entry into the painting - a repoussoir figure whose function is to establish the first plane.” Patricia Mainardi, 1987, 147.

10 Carol Armstrong notes fashion illustrations of the time often gave back views of figures and would have provided a source for Manet. Armstrong, 2002, 363, n.13. Michael Fried argues figures viewed from behind in Manet’s paintings relate to puppetry and, by extension, to the performative role of an artist. See Michael Fried, “Manet’s Sources,” Artforum, 7 (March 1969): 70, n. 46, 71 n. 69.

11 Instituted in 1852 by Napoleon III shortly after his coup d’état. Ibid. Mainardi, Art and Politics. 1987: 219 Ft. #72

12 Herbert, 1988, 5.
ironic. A comparison of architectural features identifiable in *View* to those in popular depictions of the same scene demonstrates Manet’s selectivity in buildings excluded or included. Among those excluded were some sites of official exhibitions of art, but included prominently is the National Panorama building (on the left in *View*) where changing images of French military prowess were shown. Manet’s diminishing of the landmark dome of *St-Louis-des-Invalides* by means of a plume of smoke rising from chimneys on the exposition grounds is significant. Herbert identifies this seemingly innocuous detail as “a piece of visual naturalism in which Manet confounds a well-known symbol of military authority.”

Dating to 1670-1 in the reign of Louis XIV when it functioned as a home for wounded or aged military veterans, the *Invalides* was symbolic of political power from 1840 as the resting place for the ashes of Napoleon I.

Manet was not participating in the official 1867 exhibitions - the Salon and the art component of the Exposition. Like Gustave Courbet, Manet chose to have a private pavilion erected across the Seine from the exposition where he mounted a retrospective comprising over fifty of his works. His optimism that this would gain him public understanding and appreciation to offset lack of official enthusiasm quickly dissipated as neither his nor Courbet’s exhibition could compete with the appeal of the exposition.

---

14 Herbert, 1988, 5.
15 Carol Armstrong, *Manet Manette* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 10-30. These pages include a list of paintings Manet exhibited in his pavilion. See also Mayo Roos *Early Impressionism.* Roos, 1996, 92.
which diminished even the number of visitors to the official Salon.\textsuperscript{16} The bridge at the far left in View led to the private pavilions of Manet and Courbet and this geographical proximity raises the possibility the painting’s preoccupied figures are a synecdoche for public indifference encountered by the artists. It is unlikely View was a genre piece. The “types in the park are drawn for easy reading and do not seem to especially engage one another’s attention. They are spiky, dapper, and articulate … floating past one another slightly out of scale” and offer no discernable thematic narrative.\textsuperscript{17} The questions of whether or not it is finished and whether Manet meant it as an allegory or genre work have provoked considerable discussion.\textsuperscript{18} Clark asserts it is a finished painting that “pretends all the same to be not quite a picture, not quite finished;” despite it size, “it is quite insistently sketchy.”\textsuperscript{19} This ambiguity, lack of finish, and undeclared moral stance regarding the extravagant Exposition contradicted traditional expectations and confounded potential suspicion of subversion.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{16} Patricia Mainardi is of the opinion that Manet would not yet have been able to assess the response, or lack of response but it did not attract many visitors in its first five days as Emile Zola wrote Valabrègue 29 May 1866. Quoted in Cachin et al, Manet 1832-1883, 520. By August, as Mainardi notes, Manet was deeply discouraged. The intervening two months between Zola’s letter and August saw little change other than a reduction in ticket price because of low attendance. Mainardi, 1987, 150.

\textsuperscript{17} Clark, 1984, 62.

\textsuperscript{18} In her discussion of a “combative metaphor” employed by Emile Zola in reference to Manet’s work, Mainardi points out that his essay might almost apply to the various figures in View, with two “fashionably dressed gentlemen” perhaps representing art critics. Mainardi, 1987: 150.

\textsuperscript{19} T. J. Clark, 1984, 62.

James Rubin, Michael Fried, and Carol Armstrong have each advanced theories of intertextuality with literature or with street theatre of the period. Armstrong considers View’s disparate figures as equating (through the painting’s “optical decentredness”) a literary “decentredness” then being explored by Edmond and Jules Goncourt who visited Manet during the writing of their novel Manette Solomon. Nonetheless, it is difficult to deny the centrality of the amazone figure in View. Reff demonstrates the “seemingly random” array of figures is actually organized along two diagonal lines intersecting at the amazone. The artifice with which figures occupy their places has been described by Mayo Roos as a “tableau vivant.” “[T]he figures never become fully assimilated into the situation of which they are supposedly a part” with the result that there exists “an underlying ambiguity in the work, a fissure in its pictorial coherence.” Read as a self-contained work, View is disconcerting; its initial appearance of transparency becomes increasingly problematic as inexplicable details accumulate. The ‘fissure’ sensed within this painting derives, I suggest, from a fault line running between its unfulfilled semblance of genre and a purposeful allegory.

Manet began to develop an autographic “repertory of attributes” in the 1860s repeating these motifs or tropes to carry forward, into later works, their previous connotations. When View is scrutinized for such repeated attributes, the “naturalistic”

---

21 Rubin, (Ibid., 1994); Michael Fried, 1992; Carol Armstrong, 2002, 50-51, 58.
22 In reference to the novel Manette Solomon by the Goncourt brothers, published at the end of 1867, see Armstrong, 2001.
24 Mayo Roos, 1996, 92.
rendering is seen to be a modification of an effect achieved in Manet’s 1862 lithograph *Le Ballon* (Figure 6.6). In both instances a centrally situated motif displaces the dome of the *Invalides*. There are other correspondences: both were produced during years in which an international exposition was held in Paris, and both were produced during the French Intervention in Mexico (1861-1867). *Le Ballon* depicts the launch of a hydrogen balloon during celebrations of French emperor Napoleon III’s official birthday but its juxtaposition of motifs simultaneously articulate a politically charged allegory. It is now widely regarded as Manet’s response to the bloody defeat of French troops 5 May 1862 by a smaller contingent of Mexican soldiers near Puebla.

Reading *View* within broader symbolic and temporal frames of reference that allow for inclusion of other works by Manet and of incidents occurring outside the year in which it was painted (1867) elicits evidence of allegorical intent. Its relationship to *Le Ballon*, for instance, offers compelling reasons to consider *View* as similarly condemning the human costs attendant to the French Intervention. An examination of elements constituting this relationship, considered within their historical specificities, points to the likelihood of *View* being an allegorical rendering of events subsequent to the withdrawal of French troops from Mexico.²⁷

The results of this decision by Napoleon III, in contravention of signed agreements guaranteeing the security of the monarchy in Mexico, were unfolding during the months preceding the International Exposition. As has already been described, in April 1866 French forces were ordered to begin withdrawing and in July 1866 the

---

²⁷ The term ‘historical specificities’ is useful but I employ it here not to imply a fixed, single view of specific historical events is possible but rather to mean prevailing accepted interpretations of these.
Empress of Mexico left on her mission to Europe. Maximilian had been kept apprised of Charlotte’s progress and on learning illness had prevented her return to Mexico he again contemplated abdication. He decided upon this course and had archives and belongings shipped ahead with the expectation that he would arrive in Europe in December 1866. To the anger and regret of Napoleon III, Maximilian then reversed his decision and courageously led his few troops until his capture 15 May 1867. This was the situation as Manet began painting View. Maximilian and two of his generals, Miquel Miramón (1832-1867) and Thomas Mejía (1815-1867), were charged with treason and executed 19 June 1867. News of the execution (subsequently the subject of a lithograph, oil sketch, and three paintings by Manet) was not officially confirmed in France until 3 June 1867.

On about that date Manet ceased painting View of the International Exposition; it was left unsigned and never displayed in his lifetime. The purported subject of this painting is the Exposition but I propose Manet contrived it as a visual allegory of the collapsing imperialist intention in Mexico, the three main protagonists, Napoleon III, Maximilian, and Charlotte, and of the cynical role - in Manet’s opinion - served by the spectacular Exposition in deflecting public attention and criticism.

Manet’s interest in the ongoing French Intervention is known from Le Ballon of 1862 and his later Execution series; while this adds plausibility to a premise that View can be similarly understood, it does not explain why Manet might have felt impelled to prominently feature an allegorical reference to the Empress as is suggested here. Circumstantial evidence supports this premise in so far as the Emperor Maximilian and Empress Charlotte remained highly topical and Manet had reason and opportunity to follow the unfolding drama. Wilson-Bareau has pointed out the French Intervention “like
the Russian oppression of Poland or Prussian expansion within the German states, formed a permanent background to life in France in the 1860s.” She observes “[i]t would be very remarkable if such a politically alert and independent artist did not take account of these events.”

Further, she speculates that bullfights, a theme Manet repeated throughout the 1860s, might refer to the French Intervention and Mexican monarchy. I argue for this interpretation and assert actions and episodes illustrated in his bullfight-related paintings and others from 1861 through 1867 narrate the evolving situation in Mexico.

Sara Yorke Stevenson distinguished between the “bull-fights once in a while [which] gathered in the vast enceinte of the Plaza de Toros the society of the capital” and the less fashionable ordinary bullfights. The former were “brilliant affair[s]” where “[a]ll who took part were amateurs.” In contrast, contests staged for the general population “turn[ed] the arena into a slaughter-house, the sight of which it is impossible for an Anglo-Saxon to endure.”

The theme of bullfighting, with spectators at a safe remove and with its foregone conclusion of death, served as preface to Manet’s visual narrative of the French Intervention, and View of the International Exposition was the penultimate plot summation.

Besides his several paintings relating to bullfighting there are others that contribute to an argument for View being a politically critical allegory. Manet’s production of these during the 1860s is reviewed below in association with excerpts from

28 Wilson-Bareau, 1992, 44.

29 Wilson-Bareau’s speculation that Manet’s bullfight images potentially contain political critiques is based, in part, on the attendance at such spectacles of the French and Mexican regents. “Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie attended bullfights at Bayonne-Saint-Esprit from 1856-62. In Mexico bullfighting was encouraged by the Conservative (and by Maximilian) and suppressed again when Juárez and the Liberals returned to power in 1867.” Wilson-Bareau, 1992, 83 n. 31.

contemporary sources that are introduced to disrupt or enlarge upon dominant perceptions of the unfolding Intervention and Mexican monarchy. I am concerned with specificities of Charlotte’s involvement in this imperialist project, particularly her

Figure 6.6. Edouard Manet, *Le Ballon*, 1862.

Figure 6.7. Edouard Manet, *Boy With a Sword*, 1861.
absence/presence in Europe from 1866, in so far as these may have had a bearing on *View of the International Exposition*. At the time of her return, confusion and concern about the Emperor of Mexico was mitigated by Maximilian’s distance from Europe and by expectations he would abdicate and return. The extracts record public opinion and official surveillance in France, including opinions and surveillance of the Empress and the impact of her mission.\textsuperscript{31} Investigation of Manet’s circumstances of production reveals several artists with direct connections to the Empress through portrait commissions were in Paris or nearby in 1867. It is probable Manet saw some of their portraits of Charlotte and while the *amazone* is not a portrait *per se*, her confrontation with Napoleon III could have seemed concisely characterized by this motif. A detailed reading of *View* as allegory is presented next and followed by possible explanations for Manet’s abandoning this painting.

1861

Late in 1861 Manet painted *Boy with a Sword*, an image he continue to rework as a print into 1862 (Figure 6.7). Léon Köella Leenhoff posed for this and Manet is known to have borrowed the sword and sheath from the artist Charles Monginot. The seventeenth-century sword may be an homage to Spanish artist Diego Rodriguez de Silva Velasquez (1559 -1660) whom Manet particularly admired, but his repeated use of the image in four prints (and the sword but not Léon in another instance) implies something

---

\textsuperscript{31} The extracts were sought out in response to historiographic omissions. Other examples could be found and different conclusions reached but continuing discoveries of confidential files lend credence to damage control on the part of the authorities due to the perceived inflammatory nature of the Empress’s return to Europe. For example files of Léopold II, some pertaining to the Charlotte, were discovered sealed within a Brussels house during its demolition. Gustaaf Janssens, “*Les Goffinet, Archivistes de la famille royal et gestionnaires de la fortune du Roi eopold II*” in Janssens and Stengers, 1997, 15.
beyond artistic influence.\textsuperscript{32} It was more cumbersome in its sheath than contemporary swords and more difficult for Léon to carry. Given that the Intervention had just begun it may be that Albert Boime is correct in his assessment “[t]he urchins of [Thomas Couture, Manet’s teacher] and Manet … are typically placed in adult roles and are forced to behave self-consciously and handle their accessories in an awkward fashion …. The child innocently plays his part and is seemingly unaware of the destructive potential of the circumstances for the grown-up.”\textsuperscript{33} Swords feature prominently in several of Manet’s other paintings of this decade and may function to inscribe the presence of the artist within the image.\textsuperscript{34}

This same year, 1861, saw the ashes of Napoleon I transferred to a space immediately beneath the dome of the Invalides. It was an action serving to remind the public of the first Emperor Napoleon and reinforcing the authority, through the Bonaparte family name, of his nephew Napoleon III.\textsuperscript{35} But it was casualties resulting from the French Intervention in Mexico that is thought to have prompted Manet to depict a crowd

\textsuperscript{32} Julius Meier-Graefe. \textit{Edouard Manet} (Munich: 1912) 202, ft. 1. Quoted in Cachin et al., 1983, 76
\textsuperscript{33} Albert Boime, \textit{Thomas Couture and the Eclectic Vision} (New Haven, 1980), 460. Quoted in Cachin et al., 1983, 74-82. This the first time that Manet includes Léon in his art but he later becomes the family member most frequently portrayed.
\textsuperscript{34} I am unsure whether Manet holds a sword or a walking stick in his self-portrait in \textit{La Pêche}, also dating from 1861, but several swords are visible in the \textit{Little Cavaliers, after Velasquez} dating from 1861 or 1862, a sword motif is present in most of his paintings based on a theme of bullfights through to 1867, and the central soldier in his 1867 - 8 \textit{Execution of Maximilian} prominently wears a sword. There is one other interesting use of a sword image. It appears to the right of Manet’s signature and on the same angle in his lithograph \textit{Civil War}. In this instance the title refers to civil war in France. It was probably drawn in 1871. All the images mentioned here are illustrated in Cachin et al, 1983, or in Wilson-Bareau et al., 1992.
\textsuperscript{35} Philip Nord usefully refers to “the ritual organization of public memory” on the part of Republicans - rituals which would contest actions such as the one noted above. Philip Nord, \textit{The Republican Moment: struggles for Democracy in Nineteenth-Century France}. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), 195.
near the Invalides complex that, along with the remains of Napoleon I, continued to function as the national home for wounded soldiers.

1862

Repressive laws controlled the press and visual images were closely monitored during the Second Empire in contrast to art sympathetic to the regime and cultural or public occasions advantageous to the state. Public opinion was assessed and secretly reported by procureurs généraux who were “legal agents of the ministry of justice.” In his examination of these reports Lynn Case has noted that “[t]ime and again the government turned to the procureurs généraux when it wanted special information on such subjects as the election of the general councils of the départements, the celebration of the Emperor’s birthday, insults against the Emperor ….”

In light of the importance given by the state to these reports, an episode recounted by Anthony North Peat, (an Englishman living in France who provided daily letters for publication in English newspapers) seems to veil political dissent with humour. North Peat describes an excursion by French writer M. Prévost-Paradol from Paris to Etretat in Normandy to avoid “[t]he fêtes of the 15th of August ... and to escape from their demonstrative loyalty [and ] mercenary cheers and paid Imperialism.”

Arriving at his destination he heard cries of ‘Vivre l’empr’eur!’ (sic) and discovered these to emanate from his pet parrot with which he traveled. ‘The horrible fact became apparent; his own parrot had turned Imperialist - a

36 Procureurs généraux were attached to courts of appeals and acted as chief prosecuting attorneys; among their duties was the compiling of confidential reports for the minister of justice, on a quarterly or sometimes weekly, regarding public opinion and the local economy. Lynn M. Case, French Opinion on the United States and Mexico 1860-1867 [1936] (Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1969), xiv.
37 Case, [1936], 1969.
38 Lucien Anatole Prévost-Paradol (1829-1870).
phenomenon subsequently explained by the confession of an intimate friend whom he had kept waiting an unconscionable time the previous day … and who had maliciously relieved his tedium by teaching M. Paradol’s parrot loyalty to his Sovereign.39

Elsewhere, North Peat takes mock umbrage at the fact that the government is not regulating increasingly popular spiritualist séances which “endanger the human intellect” but the target of his anger is political repression.

If we were floating on a sea of liberty we should make no remark. But when we have witnessed the fruitless efforts of eminent men … to obtain permission to give lectures on subjects utterly disconnected with politics, when we know by bitter experience what our liberty of the press amounts to … .40

The model Victorine Meurent is depicted in a large painting entitled Mlle V … in the Costume of an Espada, an espada being the one who delivers the death blow to a bull (Figure 6.8).41 Like the Boy with a Sword, Victorine holds a sword, and images by Spanish artist Francisco Goya are often cited as precedents.42 Critics of the time found Manet’s Espada image to be provocative, bold, crude and inexplicable in his apparent disregard for ‘proper’ perspective. In the background are the oddly diminutive figures which irritated the critics and, behind them, a wall with spectators not unlike that which Manet would later paint in his Execution of Maximilian. As with the image Boy with a

40 Waller, 1903, 113.
42 Francisco Goya y Lucientes (1746-1828). For instance, a painting by Goya of a small boy José Costa y Bonells called Pepito, ca. 1813, and Tauromaquia by the same artist, 1815-1816. Cachin et al., 1983, 76, 112.
Sword, Manet repeated the \textit{Espada} image as an etching.\footnote{Cachin et al, 1983, 110-117.} If these were disguised dissenting comments on the French Intervention, there was reason to be discreet but it is also in keeping with his portrayals of women as confident and unconventional.\footnote{Lipton, Eunice. ‘Manet: A Radicalized Female Imagery’. Artforum, 13 (March 1975), pp. 48-53}

Public sentiment in relation to events in North America is not always recorded in reports of the \textit{procureurs généaux} but Case cautions this does not mean it was not intensely studied. Rather, there was a “common practice of the \textit{procureurs} reserving distinct parts of their reports for discussions of the Civil War and the Mexican expedition.”\footnote{Lynn M. Case, \textit{French Opinion on the United States and Mexico 1860-1867} [1936] (Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1969), v.} This likely explains the lack of reports pertaining to the battle of 5 May 1862 near Puebla when French troops were defeated by a much smaller Mexican force loyal to Juárez. Despite state efforts to minimize the Puebla defeat, Wilson-Bareau demonstrates accurate reports were available. Manet, for instance, had access to military information through friends and family members as well as to more objective accounts in newspaper such as \textit{L’Independence belge}.\footnote{The fact that this newspaper sometimes contained references to his art would seem to ensure that he would be familiar with it. Wilson-Bareau, 1992, 41.} The lithograph entitled \textit{Le Ballon} (noted above) dates from just after the Puebla incident and is now understood to convey Manet’s indignation at the human cost of Second Empire policies.\footnote{Le \textit{Ballon} was long regarded as a realist work of modern life and its political subtext only retrieved in 1983 by researchers D. Druick and P. Zegers. ‘“Manet’s ‘Balloon’: French Diversion, \textit{The Fête de l’Empereur 1862},” Print Collector’s Newsletter XIV (May-June 1983): 37-46, noted in Cachin et al, 1983, 136, n. 10. The relationship of \textit{Le Ballon} and \textit{View} was frequently discussed in general terms; Juliet Wilson-Bareau, for instance, emphasized the presence of subversive themes in Manet’s work. Wilson-Bareau, 1992, 35 - 86. Ibsen more specifically identifies connections between these two works in her analysis of \textit{Execution of Maximilian}. Ibsen, 2006, 217.} This lithograph, unpublished
during his lifetime, depicts a dense gathering of people around a hydrogen balloon about to be launched. The launch was part of festivities to celebrate the official birthday of Napoleon III, 15 August 1862 (also the day of the Feast of the Assumption). Reff’s identification of this particular balloon as *Le Gloire* confirms Manet’s ironic and subversive meaning. Owned by Eugène Godard, the French Emperor’s former balloonist, it was used during France’s participation in Italy’s risings against Austria. Retired from its military service and transformed into an object of entertainment, *Le Gloire* has drawn a dense throng of onlookers. These onlookers are oblivious to a crippled child in the foreground and their view of the *Invalides* military hospital, had they been inclined to notice, is hidden behind the balloon. To the right is a puppet theatre, whose manipulated figures amplify this critique of disingenuous Second Empire policies in general and the French Intervention in particular.

1863

The unanticipated tenacity of Mexican forces at Puebla in 1862 was a setback contradicting official predictions Mexico would be easily conquered and for several months the prospect of a Mexican Empire was in jeopardy. French reinforcements took the fort at Puebla in 1863 and French troops occupied Mexico City but developments in the American Civil War were less promising for the interests of Napoleon III. Manet

49 Reff, 1983, 260-263.
50 The puppet theatre in *Le Ballon* is thought to be that of Edouard Durancy, writer, critic, and friend (or soon to be friend) of Manet. Michael Fried, 1969, 38-39.
Figure 6.8. Edouard Manet, *Mlle VS in the Costume of an Espada*, 1862.

Figure 6.9. Edouard Manet, *Battle of the Kearsarge and the Alabama*, 1864.

Figure 6.10. Edouard Manet, *The Dead man*, 1864-1865.

Figure 6.11. Edouard Manet, *The Tragic Actor*, 1865-1866.
returned to the theme of bullfights late in 1863 or early in 1864 with *Incident in a Bullfight*.

**1864**

In mid-1864 American vessels Kearsage and Alabama engaged in a sea battle off the French town of Calais. This flagrant proximity to France made the victory of the North’s Kearsage all the more uncomfortable for Napoleon III who had presumed the American South, with policies more favourable to establishing a Mexican Empire, would win the Civil War.\(^{51}\) As Reff remarks a painting by Manet of this sea battle marks his entry into history painting albeit with a contemporary event and it continued Manet’s criticism of the French Intervention (Figure 6.9).\(^{52}\) In his report of 27 April 1864, Colmar Procureur, P. G. De Bigorie de Laschamps, summarized his assessment of public opinion regarding the departure, two weeks earlier, of Maximilian and Charlotte from Miramar:

> It is desired that the fortune of the new sovereigns will match their courage; the establishment of a monarchy is now becoming visible, and presages a true civilization which will be to the advantage of France and Europe which the Latin race will spread in this part of America. One sees there, for the future, a monarchy which will find its point of support, when it arrives, at the side of a confederated South and will contribute to ending the purely materialist development of the Anglo-Saxon element and Protestant ...

Manet cut the dead toreador out of his earlier *Incident in a Bullfight*, exhibiting it as an independent painting entitled *The Dead Toreador* (or *The Dead Man*). At first glance it appears the prostrate figure holds only a cloak used to bait the bull; closer

---

[^51]: Nord, 2000, 32-33.
inspection reveals a small portion of sword hilt can be seen with the blade understood to be wrapped within the cloak (Figure 6.10). An even smaller piece of metal, a ring or portion of the sword handle, can be detected on the figure’s finger. Viewers whose impulse was to urge Maximilian and Charlotte not to participate in the imperial venture might have seen the image as a presentiment of what awaited the regents in Mexico.

1865

President Abraham Lincoln was assassinated 14 April 1865, five days after the end of the American Civil War. The more aggressive foreign policy of his successor, Andrew Johnson, was quickly brought to bear upon the French-supported Mexican monarchy. The United States applied political pressure in Austria and France and, increasingly threatened by an increasingly aggressive Prussia, they complied. It became increasingly clear the Mexican monarchy was faltering even as preparations were underway for Mexico’s pavilion at the projected 1867 Paris exposition.

In summer 1865 shortly before or, more probably, soon after a trip to Spain, Manet painted a portrait of actor and artist Philibert Rouvière. Entitled The Tragic Actor it portrays Rouvière in the role of Hamlet with a sword on the ground beside him (Figure 6.11). Cachin comments Manet may have “hoped the image would succeed as a painting with a broader significance than a portrait of a specific individual.” Cachin does not suggest what this broader significance might have been but remarks “the choice of title seems to have been influenced by motives similar to those that led him the following year to exhibit his painting of a dead bullfighter (cut from Incident in a Bullfight) as The Dead

54 It would be interesting to study this detail for any indication it is a Masonic ring.
56 “Nota de Carlota sobre preparativos para la Exposición Universal de París de 1867,” Item W-190 reproduced in Weckman and Vandewoude, 1989, 338.
A related painting, *Bullfight*, from the late 1865 or early 1866 shows the toreador, or torero, walking away from the carnage at the centre of the canvas (Figure 6.12). Manet’s use of irony and semblance of detachment have been the focus of academic attention to this image. It is often considered a visual souvenir of his time in Spain but this conclusion may need to be revisited, especially as Manet expressed his intention to demonstrate the visceral drama of bullfights he witnessed while in Spain. A satirical depiction combining a portrait of Mexican President Juarez with additional drawing costuming him as a (childlike) bullfighter, (a paternalistic and imperialist conceit), adds credence to the potential for the concept of bullfighting to function as signifier for the French Intervention. Bullfight references in memoirs by Baron Malortie and by Sara Yorke Stevenson infer this spectacle occupied a prominent place in the public imagination in these years (see Figure 6.13).

57 Cachin et al., 1983, 232. Fried traces Manet’s changing subject sources in a perceptive and extensively researched article. Fried, 1969, 38. The shadow in this painting is much like that in Velasquez’s painting, but it also resembles calipers. Research as to whether or not Rouvière was a Freemason might be rewarding in relation to Freemasonry’s connections to republicanism and arts.

58 Manet also painted another image with the same title but depicting a scene occurring later in the sequence of a bullfight than the scene discussed here. Wilson-Bareau, 1992, 45.


Manet submitted two paintings to the 1866 Salon and both were refused.\textsuperscript{61} One of these was \textit{The Tragic Actor} discussed above; the subject of the other, \textit{The Fifer}, is ‘a boy trooper in the Imperial Guard’ that was provocative in its flatness and dispassionate treatment (Figure 6.14).\textsuperscript{62} Although the young boy carries a fife not a weapon (as is the case in \textit{Boy with a Sword}) his military uniform similarly contrasts youthful vulnerability with the possibility of danger. The availability of military models and uniforms (such as the boy posing for the \textit{Fifer} in ‘undress uniform’ was facilitated by Manet’s military connections like Commandant Hippolyte Lejosne (1814-1884).\textsuperscript{63} Lejosne and his wife Valentine Thérèse hosted salons to which “[t]he guest list”, Nord observes, “bore witness to the host’s diverse passions. Bazille, Fantin-Latour, and Manet represented the arts, Léon Gambetta politics.”\textsuperscript{64} The cultured Lejosne was also a fervent Republican and a long-time friend of the Manet family, as was historian Jules Michelet.\textsuperscript{65} Michael Fried has explored the influence of Michelet’s philosophy in Manet’s art of the first half of the 1860s and contends “it was Manet who made Michelet’s vision of Frenchness a medium of painting.” France, to Michelet, represented “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, above all

\textsuperscript{61} There has sometimes been confusion, probably stemming from different titles for the same paintings as to whether or not these works were rejected. Jane Mayo Roos’s valuable analysis includes a pertinent chapter regarding political exclusions. Roos, 1996, 39-48, also n. 32 and n. 237.
\textsuperscript{62} Cachin et al., 1983, 243.
\textsuperscript{63} Cachin, 1983, 243-234.
\textsuperscript{64} Frédérick Bazille, a cousin of Lejosne, and Henri Fantin-Latour were painters who, like Manet, challenged the conservative art of the Academy. Gambetta was a lawyer and a Republican politician. Manet’s painting \textit{Music in the Tuileries} includes a portrait of Commandant Lejosne.
\textsuperscript{65} Michelet was earlier linked to the Orléans as history tutor to Queen Louise-Marie.
Figure 6.12. Edouard Manet, *Bullfight*, 1866-1866.

Figure 6.13. François Aubert, photograph ‘after’ Merrill (?) *Untitled (Benito Juarez as Bullfighter).*

Figure 6.14. Edouard Manet, *The Fifer*, 1866.

Figure 6.15. Edouard Manet, *A Matador*, 1866-1867.
The last of these. The Second Empire’s failure to honour these values could be considered to be echoed by restrictive juries controlling admission to the Salon. The 1866 Salon had opened the first of May and was administered by a particularly conservative committee; many artists whose work had been rejected by the Salon committee called for a Salon Des Refusés. The Prefect of Police denied this request but allowed artists whose work had been refused to hold small exhibitions in their studios, as described above, and Manet was among those who did so.

Manet continued his theme of bullfights with the A Matador (Figure 6.15). The significance of the pose of the matador has been described by Moreau-Nélaton and Durant as, respectively, “accepting the applause of the crowd following the death of the bull” or asking for “permission to kill the bull.” Like the Dead Man, the matador’s cape is wrapped about his sword held in his left hand. He stands holding his hat in his right hand, its gold lining bright as a mirror, and looking upwards perhaps reverently. It has also been suggested this gesture may indicate the matador stands before an altar.

At the beginning of 1866 public opinion of the French Intervention worsened and concern over national security, with troops still in Mexico and Prussian threats increasing, grew more acute. British Ambassador in Paris, Lord Cowley, remarked perceptively:

… when the Mexican question comes to be discussed, and it is shown that France has obtained nothing but humiliation, this discontent will probably increase and there is no saying to what shifts the Emperor may resort to try

---

68 For a useful discussion of this painting see Cachin et al, 1983, 240-241.
and occupy the public mind. Some think that he will endeavour to do so by taking part in a German-Austrian War at a favourable moment, but I am inclined to think that the Emperor pins his faith on the Great Exhibition of next year, when he hopes to see Sovereigns and Princes coming to do homage to him in Paris and thus to rehabilitate himself in public opinion.  

That both Manet and Maximilian were born in 1832 and suffered from policies of the Second Empire (although in quite different respects) has been mentioned as reason for Manet to feel empathy with the emperor of Mexico.  

This may have been so but there were other coincidental aspects of their lives possibly prompting Manet to take an interest in Maximilian - though less as an individual than for his significance in regard to Second Empire foreign policy. Both had experience in the navy of their respective country and had sailed across the Pacific.  

Manet was traveling through Belgium in 1856, the Silver Jubilee of Leopold I during which Maximilian and Charlotte’s engagement was announced. Perhaps Manet knew of the large portrait of Princess Charlotte that Antwerp’s city officials had commissioned from Nicaise de Kaiser and which the artist was then painting. As Antwerp was the home of Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) and a city rich in the Flemish tradition of Realist depictions of interiors Manet would have found much of interest.  

Louis Gallait was among prominent artists of that city and extensively patronized by Leopold I, (including a portrait the king

---

71 As was Emile de Kératry. A slight physical resemblance between Manet and Maximilian has also been remarked upon. See Ibsen, 2006, 220.
72 Manet traveled to Rio de Janeiro on a naval training ship leaving Europe in July 1848 reaching South America February 1849. In September 1854 Maximilian became a Rear Admiral of the Austrian navy and sailed to Brazil late 1859, early 1860.
commissioned of Charlotte at about six years of age, as noted above), and by King Louis Philippe for whom Gallait produced works for Versailles. The royal engagement was not made public until the end of December but there were numerous festivities throughout the Jubilee year. And Manet may have heard firsthand of the 6 January 1857 court ball as nearly 1500 invitations were sent and artists, certainly those patronized by the crown, were often included on such occasions. Among the guests at the reception following Charlotte and Maximilian’s 27 July 1857 marriage were Gallait, Jean-Francois Portaels, François-Joseph Navez (Director of the Royal Academy of the Art of Brussels of 1835-1862 and Portaels’s father-in-law), and Cesare Dell’ Acqua. Portaels had studied with Paul Delaroche as had Manet’s teacher Thomas Couture and Portaels had been introduced to Couture when visiting Delaroche in Paris.

Paris 1866

Cesare Dell’ Acqua’s painting *Departure of Maximilian and Charlotte from Miramare to Mexico* is dated 1866, a time when that artist resided in Brussels (see Figure 4.26 and Figure 6.16). He also participated in French exhibitions and it is possible Manet saw Dell’ Acqua’s *Departure* in which Charlotte wears travel attire resembling the riding habit worn by the *amazone* in *View*. As Patricia Mainardi has pointed out “[t]he Belgians of all the foreign artists … were the best known in France; many, such as Alfred Stevens, [a close friend of Manet] … exhibited regularly in the Paris Salon. [T]he Belgian School

---

74 An important connection between Portaels, Dell’ Acqua, Maximilian, and Leopold I, to name only a few in this circle, was their allegiance to Freemasonry. See Reinach-Foussmagne, 1925, 200. The convergence between Freemasonry and Republicanism was extensive and, ultimately, was critical to the establishment of a lasting republic. For a lucid synopsis of French art and artists in relation to Freemasonry, gender and, more especially, politics, see Nord, *The Republican Moment*, 1995, 28-29.

75 After studying with François Navez, with whom Alfred Stevens also studied, Portaels went to Paris about 1841 to study with Paul Delaroche (1797-1856).
was widely seen as a subdivision of the French.”

Manet would have made the acquaintance of many Belgian artists through the Salon and as a result of his friendship with Stevens.

Among established French artists Manet was known to be friends with Disdéri to whom Charlotte sat in August 1866 for a photograph depicting her in mourning and Manet would have known of Isadore Pils to whom Charlotte sat in 1859 (see Figures 4.26 and 4.1). Like Manet, Pils sketched and studied his military subjects and uniforms from life and also painted in an early Realist style. Manet would hardly have admired Pils’s patriotic battle scenes, however, in 1867 Pils was painting murals in the new Paris Opera House. Another painter of battle scenes then in Paris was Jean-Adolphe Beaucé. Among works he was exhibiting that year was his _Capture of the Fort of San Xavier, near Puebla, 29 March 1863_ - the battle won by the French following their unsuccessful attempt to take the fort in 1862. Wilson-Bareau considers it likely that Manet and Beaucé were acquainted as in 1875 Manet contributed a painting to a fund raising effort for Beaucé’s widow. Beaucé would probably have known José Salomé Pina who also was in Paris with a commission from the Mexican court. The Beaucé painting featuring the Empress seated in a Zouave camp must have been completed by spring 1866 as it was displayed in the Salon that year (see Figure 5.15 and Figure 6.17). Although Charlotte apparently took this picture with her when she left Paris in summer 1866, Manet might have already seen it displayed in the Salon or possibly in Beaucé’s studio. The Paris art community would likely have been aware of Charlotte’s two visits to the studio of José Salomé Pina during that August (Figures 5.19 and 6.18). It is likely the portrait study for

---

which she sat to Pina remained with him and possible Manet sought this out because of his interest in events in Mexico.

Figure 6.16. Cesare Dell’Acqua, *Emperor Maximilian and Empress Charlotte departing for Mexico*, (detail of Figure 4.24) 1866.

Figure 6.17. Jean-Adolphe Beaucé, *Empress Charlotte in Zouave Encampment*, (detail of black and white image, possibly a study for Figure 5.15), 1866.

Figure 6.18. José Salomé Pina *Empress Charlotte of Mexico*, (detail of Figure 5.19) 1866.
Manet and Disdéri are known to have been friends and while direct connections between Manet and the other artists mentioned are yet to be investigated, there existed multiple connections between several of them. For instance, as a young man Alfred Stevens drew in the studio of François-Joseph Navez the teacher of Jean Francois Portaels. Portaels, Dell’Acqua, Gallait and Navez knew one another as they attended the wedding reception of Charlotte and Maximilian. Dell’Acqua was a Realist and would surely have known Manet’s close friend Alfred Stevens, also a Realist painter as both regularly exhibited in Brussels. Portaels moved to Paris to study with Paul Delaroche, an artist acquainted with Thomas Couture who was Manet’s teacher. Gallait, who painted many commissions for French patrons, including the Emperor of the French, was a Romantic artist who generally painted battle scenes and would probably have known Beaucé and Pils who also painted battle scenes for Napoleon III. Wilson-Bareau has noted the probability that Manet knew Beaucé; it is plausible Beaucé would have been in contact with Pina in Paris given their mutual connection to the Mexican court. There is additionally the Freemason connection, its links with Republicanism, and Manet’s trenchant Republican ideals. While these personal connections remain conjectural, they are sufficiently numerous that it is likely Manet would have had contact with some of the seven artists to whom Charlotte had sat and who were resident or frequent visitors in Paris in 1866 and 1867. There were several other sources of information available to Manet regarding the Empress and events in Mexico. The most important of these was a serialized history of the Mexican empire by Count Emile De Kératry. His was the first account to be published and appeared in the Revue contemporaine beginning in July 1867, a month
after Manet began View.\textsuperscript{77} De Kératry had served in the military in Mexico and retired in 1866. As Wilson-Bareau notes, \textit{L’Empereur Maximilien, son élévation et sa chute} “was first published in book form outside France; it appeared in book form in France late in 1867 with a new preface by Prévost-Paradol (mentioned above in relation to North Peat’s story of the parrot) dated November 1867.”\textsuperscript{78} This publication includes a statement by De Keratry making his opinion of the then former Emperor and Empress of Mexico abundantly clear: “Born to rule by divine right, [Maximilian] had pretended to reign by the will of the people. Easy to dominate, he lacked tenacity. All his strength resided in the ardent soul of the empress [sic] Charlotte.”\textsuperscript{79}

Manet’s military acquaintances may have led him to meet De Kératry. Like Maximilian and Manet, De Kératry was born in 1832 and Prévost-Paradol only three years older. In its attribution of blame to Napoleon III, the Preface to which Wilson-Bareau refers makes it clear that all three shared vigorous anti-imperialist views.\textsuperscript{80} Additionally, when not in Paris Prévost-Paradol resided in the seaside town of Etretat popular with artists, and was himself the youngest member of the literary Académie française.

Baron Camille Malortie, too, could have provided Manet with information had they encountered one another.\textsuperscript{81} Six years younger than Manet, Malortie had been one of

\textsuperscript{77} The Second Empire continued to be repressive in later years in terms of visual art but allowed more leeway in written material. See the valuable essay by John House, ‘History Painting, Censorship and Ambiguity in the Second Empire’ in Wilson-Bareau, 1992, 87-111.
\textsuperscript{79} De Kératry, 1867, 356.
\textsuperscript{80} Wilson-Bareau, 1992, Preface v-xx.
\textsuperscript{81} Baron Karl von de Malortie, \textit{Here, there and everywhere, being the second part of ‘Twixt old times and new} (London: Ward & Downey, 1895).
the military party accompanying the Empress on her July 1866 journey from Mexico City to Vera Cruz where she embarked for Europe. In his memoirs, published in 1895, Malortie’s recollection of Charlotte on the journey to Vera Cruz is romanticized but has some basis in fact. According to this account the coach in which she rode became mired in mud repeatedly and Charlotte, anxious the French mail steamer might leave before their arrival, rode through the night on horseback wearing “white dust mantle, grey riding habit, [and] large sombrero with a long, floating veil attached.”82

Charlotte remained in Paris almost two weeks and, with her colourful entourage, was highly visible. Accounts of her itinerary after leaving France were published, often with illustrations, and her visit to Rome was of particular interest due to mounting suspense as to the outcome of her mission. News of her sudden insanity was received with “sadness across Europe” but the magnitude of this response is difficult to judge.83 Rumours as to what might have been the cause proliferated and inflamed accounts of imagined scenes quickly filled the vacuum left by scarcity of official or reliable information.84 Two weeks later, however, the procureur for Mourier could report that

82 Malortie quoted in Hyde, 1946, 204; Blasio, [1905], 1934. Prince Michel of Greece thinks this highly unlikely and he is probably correct on this point; however, Malortie’s admiration for the Empress would have influenced an audience. Prince Michel of Greece, [1989], 2001.
83 Dulcie Ashdown, *Victoria and the Coburgs* (London: R. Hale, 1981), 127. See also Reinach-Foussemagne, 1925, 314. Also see De Kératry: “A l’heure où le désespoir et la folie de l’impératrice Charlotte attristaient l’Europe entière, émue d’avance du coup qui allait atteindre Maximilien, les événement se précipitaient au Mexique.” De Kératry restricts himself to this observation regarding Charlotte’s condition and her detainment at this point in his text; however, he ends it with a rebuttal of information previously published and attributed to him that implied the Empress was irrational while in Paris. He includes this open letter, “Réponse au Moniteur Officiel” in the book. De Kératry, 1867, 174, 371-372, and Appendix.
84 Rumours proliferated but virtually no official information was released to the public or to family members, so far as is known. The sensitivity of this development leaves gaps in
public attention to the question of Mexico seemed to be subsiding. With the decision to withdraw French troops, Mexico ceased to be a charge of France. There were expressions of dismay for the Empress but, generally, indifference to the expected abdication of Maximilian. On 22 December 1866 P.G. Gaulot, precursor for Lyons, reported

[t]his Mexican question, by a deplorable calamity, seems to have brought us only bitter deceptions. The strange malady of the empress, her voyage and her misfortunes, the hesitations of Emperor Maximilian, are a sad finish to a campaign that ennobled our soldiers but betrayed our policies.

Six days later, with Maximilian’s arrival thought to be imminent, North Peat wrote:

An hour ago I met an officer returned but last week from Mexico. I rushed up to him, and, after hurriedly congratulating him on his return, plunged into the question of the day by the inquiry, ‘Where is Maximilian?’

Public and official concern intensified when the Emperor failed to appear. 1867

French anxiety over Prussia lessened with the news troops were returning from Mexico although this was tainted with a sense of humiliation that France had bowed to American pressure. There was anger among French citizens who had invested in Mexican bonds anticipating great profit and there continued to be muted public interest and apprehension with regard to Maximilian and Charlotte. Together with his earlier publications where information could have been compromising although this may well be coincidental. See for instance Waller, 1903; Case, [1936], 1969; also Noel Blakiston, The Roman Question: Extracts from the Despatches of Odo Russell from Rome, 1858-1870 (London: The University of Chicago Press London, 1962).


87 North Peat’s entry December 28, 1866. Waller, 1903, 221.
paintings on the theme of bullfighting (Espada, Dead Man, and Bullfight), Manet
displayed The Matador in his private pavilion during the International Exposition. He
also included Boy with a Sword, The Fifer, and The Battle of the Kearsarge and the
Alabama and opened his private pavilion 24 May 1867.\textsuperscript{88} As remarked above,
Maximilian and Generals Mejía and Miramón were captured by Juárez’s troops 15 May
and their court martial, 12 to 15 June, corresponds with Manet’s beginning View of the
International Exposition. By that time the Empress had been in Europe ten months and
held at Miramar eight and a half months. Two months later and coincident with news of
the execution of Maximilian reaching Paris, Manet appears to have ceased work on View
of the International Exposition. On 9 July 1867 Imgarde de Leffemberg, Precursor of
Dijon, reported:

The unpopularity of the [Mexican] enterprise which was
present at its inception and persisted throughout its five
years, and the subsequent misfortunes of the monarchs of
Mexico are now principally a matter of internal politics.\textsuperscript{89}

An Allegorical Reading of View of the International Exposition

A balloon hides the dome of the Invalides in Manet’s 1862 lithograph Le Ballon
produced shortly after the Puebla debacle with its many casualties. Smoke ‘screens’ the
same dome in View; however, both tropes imply the state’s deliberate obfuscation of
unpleasant realities. The amazone in View occupies a position analogous to that of the
crippled youth in Le Ballon and halts directly beneath the exposition chimneys and the

\textsuperscript{88} Carol Armstrong’s book contains images of paintings (including these) hung in
\textsuperscript{89} Case, [1936], 1969, 430.
barely seen dome of the *Invalides*. Clark notes “the distant flags and foliage blend in with Antoine-Auguste Préault’s [1809-1879] *Gallic Horseman*, perched there at the picture’s centre as a noble (and illegible) reminder of the republic.” Amazone and horse are isolated within the middle ground and might be invisible in so far as they are not remarked by any of the other figures (see Figure 6.2). (Or they might almost be a statue, yet another of numerous stone or bronze heroic figures on horseback found throughout Paris.) The rider faces out but her features are indistinct. Recalling Reff’s observation of this figure being a pivot of axes structuring the painting, she is oriented towards the gardener who turns his back to her. The figure of the gardener intercepts viewers by his placement and scale - theoretically he stands outside the picture - but averts his gaze occupying himself with his work (see Figure 6.4). He appears to hold a hose yet Manet’s depiction of the water spraying from it is odd in its sharply linear definition. A low perimeter fence around the garden separates the gardener from other figures. It is spiked in the section between the *amazone* and gardener and, more faintly,

---

90 Based on Rouart and Wildenstein *catalogues raisonné*, this is the only use of an *amazone* motif in Manet’s *oeuvre* in that depicts a rider and her horse from a distance. A close view showing only a portion of both dates from and two drawings illustrate a young woman standing attired in riding habit. Denis Rouart and Daniel Wildenstein, *Edouard Manet: Catalogue raisonné* Vol. 1, 2 (Lausanne: Bibliothèque des arts, 1975-1985).

91 Clark, 1984, 63. Préault, a Romantic artist, was best known for his earlier bas relief of Ophelia. If there were already allusions to Charlotte as an Ophelia figure this would raise the possibility of another reference to her but I am not aware of this allusion being made before the death of Maximilian. Préault completed a plaster cast of this relief in 1841 and it was cast in bronze 1843. Six years after his death the French state purchased a bronze cast of this work and it was displayed in the Salon of that year, 1876.

92 Collectively, the background figures infer the power of distraction exerted upon the public by Exposition and, in the opinion of Ibsen, complacency on the part of the middle class. Clark points to class consciousness and a display of dress and behaviour characterizing these figures which was performance in itself. Clark, 1984, 61.

93 The lean lines of water prompted Clark to imagine the hose as “the handle of a giant paintbrush.” Clark, 1984, 62.
through the area between Léon, his dog, and the garden. (Perhaps it is not spiked but a series of conjoined crosses, as the frank-blood red of the ‘flowers’ suggests; perhaps the red and green and white infer the Mexican tricolour). The pose and facial features of the gardener resemble those of the officer who prepares to administer the *coup de grâce* in Manet’s later *Execution* series. The similarity of uniforms worn by the Mexican firing squad in Manet’s paintings of this scene to those of French soldiers and, more particularly, the resemblance of the officer to the French Emperor are thought to have been the reasons for official objections to these images (Figures 6.19 and 6.20). I suggest the gardener in *View* ‘could be’ said to also resemble Napoleon III (Figure 6.21).

---

94 Ibsen uses the phrase “could be” when discussing the imprecise but insistent qualities which seem, almost inadvertently, to bring to mind alternate interpretations of Manet’s motifs. Ibsen, 2006, 220.
Figure 6.19. Edouard Manet, *The Execution of Maximilian* (detail, final version), 1867.

Figure 6.20. F.X. Winterhalter (unsigned), *Emperor Napoleon III* (detail), c. 1859.

Figure 6.21. “Gardener” (detail of Figure 6.1).
The garden’s sparseness reinforces this premise by adroitly referencing the managed, artificial, and temporary nature of the Exposition - and, by extrapolation - the management of spectacle to facilitate Second Empire intentions. The viewpoint depicted, the Trocadéro, was recommended by publications relating to the event and was atop a hill labouriously lowered just prior to the opening by twenty feet so as to present a more spectacular view. To further enhance the view, the site was groomed and gardens planted to present an ideal space from which to look across at the Exposition.  

Although viewing the exposition is the *raison d’être* for the location and, ostensibly for Manet’s painting, he depicts the main figures facing forward, their backs turned to the spectacle across the river. The various figures loosely aligned along the edge of the viewpoint behind the *amazone*, Léon, and the gardener, do not function as Kristine Ibsen has argued for figures arrayed along the wall in Manet’s *Execution of Maximilian*. Ibsen convincingly contends emotions registered by the expressions of those figures (as opposed to the dispassionate main figures) model a moral response. Figures aligned in the background of *View*, however, do not register emotions any more than do the major characters in this painting; their indifference instead heightens tension created by forward-facing figures positioned at points of an implied triangle. Among these is a pair of figures on the grass appearing to wrestle with one another, a pair of overly-large,  

---

95 The immense labour required to construct this showcase viewpoint is described in Clark, 1984, 60-61.  
96 As Ibsen points out, Manet revisited the motif of figures, often only portions of figures, aligned in the background of his works. The two *Bullfight* paintings include this feature in the form of figures climbing an arena fence as in Goya’s *Tauromaquia* images but his later *Masked Ball* offers a humourous version with legs seen along a mezzanine, the top of which extends beyond the composition. Ibsen, 2006, 222.
flâneurs, and the pointing figure rather like a Greek chorus of one (see Figure 6.5). This spectral figure whose greenish-black clothing contrasts with a white face turns towards the audience but is seemingly engaged in pointing out to her companions the smoke and the Invalides. In the present reading she could be said to be a death’s head apparition anticipating the fate of Maximilian. Only one figure, Léon, gazes directly at the painting’s viewers (see Figure 6.3). His pose is reminiscent of that of him holding a heavy sword rather than the leash he holds in this scene (see Figure 6.7). Two observations, one by James Rubin and the other by Michael Fried, are of special interest here. Rubin writes of power of the gaze in Manet’s images, for instance in Olympia in which “The artist’s presence as ‘spectacle master’… [is] subsumed into the expressive handling of form. The model [Victorine Meurent] … by returning our gaze becomes another kind of artist’s alter ego, draws us into her world, which is a world of visuality - of being seen - … as well as a world of seeing.” In relation to the idea a figure can function as ‘witness,’ Fried’s assertion that only one figure gazes out in Manet’s large group images give weight to the role of Léon in View. If View is Manet’s response to the debacle of French intervention in Mexico, then Léon’s gaze transfers a moral obligation to those viewing the painting.100

97 The parasol of the ‘spectral’ figure, cane of one of the overly-large men, hose of the gardener and leash of Léon together jostle the eye, directing one’s vision back and forth.
98 Armstrong also writes of death’s-head and spectral figures in Manet’s work.
100 Michael Fried, James Rubin, and Carol Armstrong are among authors who explore the concept of Manet inscribing himself in his art. Regarding Manet’s frequent incorporation of portraits of his son Léon to perform such a function, see Cachin et al, 1983, 75; also n. 79.
Charlotte as candidate for the amazone

King Louis Philippe’s abdication had distanced Charlotte from the people and history of France but her images multiplied and continued to circulate. She was confident, capable, and energetic - not unlike the women Eunice Lipton describes as featuring in Manet’s paintings.101 Manet saw women, Lipton asserts, “as strong, autonomous beings, firmly saying no to centuries of conventional behavior. They are not available, seductive, good-tempered, pleasant, helpful or patient.” “Manet’s view of women,” Lipton argues, “was consistent with the overall development of the realistic program of his art.” She points to the shift evident between Manet’s early paintings in which “his realism played itself off between specific art-historical sources” and later works which “grew out of his day-to-day experience.” Lipton considers the break to have occurred between the 1860s and the 1870s and 1880s, whereas images such as Le Ballon of 1862 make it clear that Manet was already attending to events of the day even as he continued to re-work and integrate earlier subjects and styles.102 More recently Carol Armstrong’s explorations of identity, inscription, and gender lead her to contend that “Manet’s painting … defies and undermines … a phallic Western aesthetics.”103 Intelligent, politically informed and assured, and disconcertingly childless at the age of twenty-six, Charlotte embodied challenges to gender conventions as much as to foreign policy.104 The potential of Charlotte’s actions to successfully challenge patriarchal

101 Eunice Lipton, 1975, 53.
102 Lipton, 1975, 53
103 Armstrong, 2002, 322, n. 27.
104 In so far as socially prescribed, appropriately female behaviour of the nineteenth century western society.
authority was undermined by gender prescriptions and ultimately thwarted by her indisposition and imposed seclusion.\textsuperscript{105}

Manet’s implacable loathing for Napoleon III was rooted in his experience, when a nineteen year old art student, of viewing bodies of those killed as a result of Napoleon’s \textit{coup d’état}.\textsuperscript{106} Charlotte’s act of confronting Napoleon III on his withdrawal of French military protection and French imposition of unscrupulous financial terms was no less symbolic of justified resistance for being unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{107} It is this moment I suggest is implied through the motif of an \textit{amazone} in \textit{View of the International Exposition}. Slippage between signifier-of-resistance and allegorical reference to the person of the Empress of Mexico evokes her absence/presence in Europe and in the public imagination in 1867 and geographic compression referencing Maximilian and French authority simultaneously. Napoleon III, who cultivated the French Intervention and planted the Mexican monarchy is seen to turn his back on the figure of the \textit{amazone}. Léon compositionally forms the third point of a triangle.\textsuperscript{108} Clustered above the triangle’s peak

\textsuperscript{105} Her return and the reasons for it provoked consternation among other heads of state – Léopold II, King of the Belgians, Emperor Franz Josef of Austria, Pope Pius IX, and American President Andrew Johnson. Benito Juárez was confident in his growing consolidation of control over Mexico; Victor Emmanuel II welcomed the Empress as a sovereign empathetic to Italian independence.

\textsuperscript{106} \textit{Coup d’état} of Louis Napoleon (Napoleon III) 2 December 1851.

\textsuperscript{107} Napoleon III was held to be largely responsible for the human and financial costs of the French Intervention and Mexican monarchy. Pressure from the United States together with the personal agenda’s of Leopold I, Léopold II, Prussian Prime Minister von Bismarck, Bazaine, and Franz Josef also contributed to the outcome, as did the compliance of Maximilian and Charlotte at the outset. Regarding Bazaine, see for instance, Corti, [1924], 1968, 584-5.

\textsuperscript{108} A triangle occurs in Freemasonry symbolism often surrounding an eye motif (the ‘Eye of Providence’). The eye is sometimes shown in the sky apart from the triangle. It is notable that the balloon in Manet’s painting invokes a similar sensibility. T. J. Clark speaks of a “gaze” from the balloon like a giant camera returning the gaze of the background figure with binoculars. Clark, 1984, 66.
are the Invalides (screened by smoke) symbol of military authority and military casualties, the (invisible) Gallic Horseman (symbol of the Republic), and (by ominous inference) the Emperor of Mexico.

Kristine Ibsen cites Manet’s bitter disdain for the International Exposition.\textsuperscript{109} She concludes that “the artist’s visual diminution of the Academy and deletion of 1867 Salon site, the Palais de l’industrie, exposes the true aims of state-sponsored culture in Second Empire France.” The French Intervention began in 1861 before Manet produced his lithograph Le Ballon and entered its final months as he painted View as Ibsen notes.\textsuperscript{110} Ibsen’s assertion that View alludes to the Second Empire’s cynical employment of spectacle to deflect criticism, Clark’s observations regarding Manet’s depictions of various classes, and Armstrong’s intertextual link to the Goncourt’s novel Manette, are valuable interpretations of View of the International Exposition of 1867. Many of Manet’s paintings are more kaleidoscopic than enigmatic; turn them one way (Marxist for instance) and a particular pattern appears, turn them another (such as Feminist) and the pieces rearrange themselves into a different pattern. The allegorical reading I propose does not invalidate others but privileges particular historical specificities. These specificities are: the continued topicality of the Empress of Mexico; the probability her removal from public life and Maximilian’s capture would have had particular interest for the artistic milieu in Paris 1867; and - building on Wilson-Bareau’s observation of the potential relationship of Manet’s bullfight scenes to the French Intervention - that Manet was a Republican consistently critical of the Second Empire and its imperialist ventures.

\textsuperscript{109} Based on Antonin Proust, Edouard Manet, Souvenirs (Paris: Laurens, 1913), 56. (Antonin Proust (1832-1900) was a friend of Manet, an art critic, journalist, and served under Gambetta as Minister for Fine Arts).

\textsuperscript{110} Ibsen, 2006, 218.
View flickers between allegory and depiction. Allegorically, it is a painting thematically linked to the earlier lithograph Le Ballon and to later Execution of Maximilian; as such, it constitutes a more extensive engagement, on Manet’s part, with the French Intervention than is currently recognized.\textsuperscript{111} It depicts a spectacular moment of the Second Empire and constitutes, in that sense, an historical record and it is a dazzling work of modern art.

The figure of the amazone is central to the composition and key to accessing its allegorical meaning. Charlotte’s topicality in June 1867 is difficult to detect in publications following her seclusion but appears “between the lines” and “at the edges,” to borrow Pierre Macherey’s terms for the process of seeking meaning where it might be inadvertently revealed.\textsuperscript{112} News of Maximilian’s execution was magnified in France since word reached Napoleon III and Empress Eugenie as they were about to award exposition prizes before a grand gathering including many heads of state.\textsuperscript{113} Many of those heads of state had appealed to Juárez for clemency on behalf of Maximilian and the shock reverberating through Europe and England and America was partly because Juárez was indigenous President of a former colony and Maximilian an Archduke of the House of Habsburg.\textsuperscript{114} But Charlotte and her circumstances constituted an incendiary issue: she remained alive and within Europe, her “strange malady” unexplained. The intersection of gender and politics assumes visual form in the amazone at the centre of Manet’s canvas.

\textsuperscript{111} Wilson-Barreau, Douglas Johnson, John House, and John Leighton make a compelling case for this in their exploration of Manet’s Execution of Maximilian, however, View of the International Exposition was peripheral to their investigation. Wilson-Bareau, 1992.

\textsuperscript{112} Macherey, 1938. Included here is a small sample of excerpts from correspondence, reports, and articles touching on widespread, public fascination in regard to the Empress’s return and sudden seclusion.

\textsuperscript{113} The execution took place 19 June 1867. On Prize Day, 1 July 1867, the seats of the Count and Countess of Flanders were empty as news of the execution reached Belgium before it was known in France. Corti, [1924], 1968, 825-826.

\textsuperscript{114} There were numerous petitions signed by prominent figures from many fields.
Manet makes visible the Second Empire’s cultural apparatus, its often cynical purpose, pervasive policing, and disavowal by Napoleon III of considerable responsibility for the consequences of his Intervention into Mexico. The then-impending fate of Maximilian in Mexico is inferred through a gesture made by an image of death; the confrontation of Charlotte with Napoleon III is reprised in the *amazone* who wheels her horse about to face Napoleon III who - in the dis/guise of a gardener - turns his back on her. To discount contemporary public awareness of Charlotte skews sensibilities and attitudes prevailing in Paris at the time Manet began his painting.

There were several artists then living in Paris, or moving between Paris and Brussels, who had at various times painted portraits of Charlotte. There were, additionally, several writers whose work included first hand descriptions of Charlotte as well as accounts by individuals recently returned from Mexico. Manet closely followed developments in Mexico and political subtexts relating to the Intervention and monarchy in Mexico have already been acknowledged in Manet’s 1862 lithograph *Le Ballon* and 1867/1868 images of *The Execution of Maximilian*. Wilson-Bareau conjectured that some of Manet’s bullfight images might be allegorical references to the French Intervention. I contend several images on this theme and three works with different subjects (in addition to *View*) could be interpreted as ongoing commentary on the French

---

115 Franz Winterhalter, to whom Charlotte had sat most often, is known to have been in Germany and Italy during part of 1867. Even had he been in Paris when Manet was painting *View*, their interests and temperaments were decidedly different it is less likely they would have encountered one another.

116 Wilson-Bareau mentions specifically *Incident in a Bullfight, Dead Man* (originally part of the former), and two paintings both entitled *Bullfight*. Wilson-Bareau, 1992: 41-45.
Intervention and Mexican monarchy. View of the International Exposition is the last but one of these images. The amazone figure is the pivot piece and key to the allegory through its relationship to other motifs - the Invalides, the pointing figure, the military presence on either side, and the gardener. The amazone does not function as an image of the Empress but of her action in confronting Napoleon III regarding his responsibility for the Intervention and associated human and financial losses.

Ernest II, Duke of Saxe Coburg Gotha and cousin of Charlotte, visited the exhibition in Paris coincident with Manet painting View. In his memoirs he recalls “everybody’s attention was anxiously directed to the tragedy now drawing to a close in Mexico, it will easily be conceived what interest it afforded me to inform myself personally as to the position of affairs ....” Meeting with Napoleon III, he and the emperor were both “involuntarily reminded” [Ernest, Duke of Saxe Coburg Gotha] had also been present in March 1864 at “the parting visit of the Emperor Maximilian and … cousin Charlotte in the Tuileries ....”

In these hours of anxious suspense, all other political affairs became of secondary importance … It was not until the 3rd of July, that the telegraph spread the official news of the death of the unhappy Emperor Max through the world. Outside the closer family circle, there was scarcely any mention as yet of the fate of the Empress Charlotte. But her life, almost more than the death of her husband, cast an impenetrable shadow upon the French Imperial couple.

---


Manet responded to the news of Maximilian’s death with the iconic series of images of the execution that evolved as additional information became available and he selected this information and adjusted elements of his composition for emphasis as Wilson-Bareau has shown.\textsuperscript{120} An official letter sent to Manet advised him that should he submit a painting on this subject, it would not be accepted into the Salon and he was given notice that printing of his lithograph was forbidden. Manet made these unprecedented measures of censorship known to Emile Zola who mounted a literary attack.\textsuperscript{121}

This is the sort of measure that can save a government. Is its authority in such a bad way then that those who serve it feel bound to spare it the slightest annoyance.

The censors no doubt thought, ‘if we allow Maximilian to be shot in public, his shade will go wandering, with ominous cries, in the corridors of the Tuileries. There’s a ghost that it is our duty to put behind bars.’

Further Zola declared he knew exactly what kind of lithograph these gentlemen would be delighted to authorize, and if M. Manet wants to have a real success in their eyes, I advise him to depict Maximilian alive and well, with his happy, smiling wife at his side. Moreover, the artist would have to make it clear that Mexico has never suffered a bloodbath and that it is living and will long continue to live under the blessed rule of Napoleon III’s protégé.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{120} Manet is thought to have begun these upon learning of Maximilian’s death in 1867. He continued work on these images through the winter of 1868 and 1869. Wilson-Bareau, 1992.

\textsuperscript{121} Emile Zola (1840-1902), French author and political journalist.

\textsuperscript{122} 4 February 1869 “\textit{Coups d’epingle}” in \textit{La Tribune} Thursday no. 35 quoted in Cachin et al, 1983, 533.
The oblique reference to Charlotte and her circumstances is at least as damning of Second Empire foreign policy as Zola’s comments regarding Maximilian. For Manet, the execution of Emperor Maximilian would have rendered View irrelevant. It referenced a situation no longer existing; it was old news. Manet briefly stopped painting before beginning the series of images of Maximilian’s execution that remain iconic within western art history. View of the International Exposition of 1867, as Mainardi remarks, is the single major image documenting that event.123 Read as allegory it exposes the role of the Exposition in distracting public attention from consequences of the French Intervention in Mexico; more specifically it documents an act of resistance largely obscured in history: the confrontation of Napoleon III by Charlotte, Empress of Mexico.

As Ophelia

Three weeks after the execution of Maximilian, Mejía, and Miramón, Léopold II received a letter from Queen Victoria conveying her concern over Charlotte’s continuing isolation at Miramare. “My dear Leopold,” the Queen began,

… [t]he terrible affair in Mexico, the death of poor Max whom my dear Albert liked so well, the state of our dearly loved Charlotte, all is a history more terrible and more tragic than the poems and tragedies of ancient times. I cannot stop thinking about it ….”

I pray you not to leave Charlotte there alone! It seems to us, now that Max is dead and Charlotte without children, the Austrian [royal] family who were never good to her - nor for us - must return her to her family and her homeland, where she has always been loved tenderly.

My God! When I think of the happy times in the past when that dear and beautiful child played with our children - my

123 Mainardi, 1987, 42.
heart is wrung when I think of her terrible fate. I desire everything be done that can be done for her … [Vicky] speaks so well and so tenderly of Charlotte.\textsuperscript{124}

At the end of her letter Victoria enquires “[h]ave you a portrait of poor Max?

Winterhalter painted one before he departed and I would very much like you to have a copy.”\textsuperscript{125}

Plans were already then in place for Queen Marie-Henriette, consort of Léopold II, to travel to Vienna and Miramare accompanied by Baron Adrien Goffinet. In Vienna Marie-Henriette was received by Emperor Franz Josef and succeeded in obtaining his permission for her to retrieve Charlotte; on 16 July the Queen and Goffinet arrived at

\textsuperscript{124} Belgium was in need of British support in the face of Prussian and French ambitions, a circumstance that would have given added impetus to ensuring the return of Charlotte. The Queen’s casual reference to “Vicky,” Crown Princess of Prussia would have emphasized this point. Emerson notes that “[i]n June 1866, before the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian war, Lord Clarendon [British Foreign Minister] told the Belgian minister in London that Bismarck [(1815-1898), then Prussian Minister-President of Prussia, later Chancellor of Prussia] had offered France the [Belgian] coal-mining region of Wallonia bordering France, and after the Austro-Prussian war the Belgians were even more aware of the kind of deal France and Prussia were planning at their expense.” The next month Leopold II visited Queen Victoria and “it was during his stay in London … that news was received of the Prussian victory over Austria at Sadowa. Leopold [II] realizing that the position of Napoleon III would be severely weakened by a much strengthened Prussia and fearing that Belgium might be annexed to France in an attempt to redress the shift in the balance of power, took the opportunity to press the British government personally to guarantee Belgian neutrality …” Emerson, 1979, 36-38.

\textsuperscript{125} (Underlining is original.) The portrait of Maximilian painted by Winterhalter in 1857 was extensively reproduced and is well known. Both he and Winterhalter were last at the British court in 1864 and no portrait of Maximilian from that year is known. The Queen may have been referring to the earlier painting. Janssens and Stenger, 1997, 70-79.

Note: Queen Victoria had already written from Windsor to the Crown Princess of Prussia on 6 July indicating she was aware of developments at the Belgian court prior to her letter to Léopold II. “Oh that horrible murder of poor Max … Marie of Belgium is to start tonight for Vienna and Miramar and hopes to bring poor, dear, and most unhappy Charlotte back to Belgium.” Reproduced in Roger Fulford, ed., Your Dear Letter: Private correspondence of Queen Victoria and the Crown Princess of Prussia 1865-1871 (London: Evans Brothers Limited, 1971), Fulford,1968, 141.
Despite having official papers from the Austrian Emperor verifying the release, it demanded “all the Queen’s willpower and Goffinet’s energy to overcome the hostile situation with which they were confronted at Miramare.” That receptions for Charlotte and gatherings at train stations along the route back to Belgium were forbidden demonstrates news of this change was already circulating. On returning to Brussels Queen Marie-Henriette detailed her experiences and impressions in a report for Leopold II which was forwarded to Queen Victoria. Marie-Henriette dedicated herself to the care of her sister-in-law who resided at the royal family residence of Laeken until September 1867 when she was moved to Chateau Tervueren. Two companions, Madame Moreau and Mlle de Bassompierre, were employed as companions (dames de compagnie) to Charlotte. Clotilde de Bassompierre (1820-1881) left a unique record of her service in the form of letters written to her sisters from the time of her hiring until

---

126 Adrian Goffinet was aide de camp to the King of the Belgians and secrétaire des commandements of the King and Queen Marie-Henriette.

127 Their difficulties were caused by Charles Bombelles who was in charge at Miramar and who, only under duress, provided a key allowing access to Charlotte. “Relation du Voyage de la Reine Marie-Henriette à Trieste et de son retour à Bruxelles en compagnie de l’Imperatrice Charlotte, en 1867.” APR, Fond Goffinet. Archives de la Reine Marie-Henriette. Reproduced in Janssens and Stenger, 1997, 73-79.

128 While this was done to avoid alarming Charlotte it also prevented her emaciated and traumatized condition from becoming public knowledge. Information was passed to Queen Victoria and on 16 July 1867 the Queen wrote to the Crown Princess of Prussia: “I reopen my letter to add the copy of one from Marie of B. [Marie-Henriette] to Leopold [sic], relative to Charlotte which he has sent to me. It is after all true that one of her dressers hung herself.” Extract reproduced in Roger Fulford, ed., Your Dear Letter: Private correspondence of Queen Victoria and the Crown Princess of Prussia 1865-1871 (London: Evans Brothers Limited, 1971), 144.

129 Bassompierre’s letters indicate she was frequently at Laeken with Charlotte after this time.
termination of employment in October 1868. Extracts from this correspondence were
organized and published by Albert Duchesne in 1973.130

Marie-Henriettte continued to be closely involved with Charlotte after the move
to Tervueren and Charlotte’s medical prognosis was cautiously optimistic.131 During this
time Bassompierre recounts, Charlotte had frequent visitors including the King and
Countess de Grunne but was not always willing to receive them. Charlotte’s fear of
poison, the primary basis for her diagnosis of mental collapse, left her soon after her
being secluded at Miramare. Bassompierre found her rational and lucid much of the
time; Queen Marie-Henriette describes other fears that had developed while Charlotte
was held at Miramare and subsequently worsened.132 Charlotte read voraciously and
though newspapers and periodicals were monitored for articles that might cause her
distress, had access to a wide range of literature. In early September she was reading the
fourteenth-century historical text Chroniques de Froissart and Oliver Goldsmith’s 1766
Vicar of Wakefield.133 It is probable she also read Victor Hugo’s 1866 Les Travailleurs
de la Mer (The Toilers of the Sea) and possible an illustration by Hugo influenced her
when she commissioned a painting that was then reproduced and distributed as memorial

130 Bassompierre’s original letters remain in the Museum of the Dynasty Archives.
Duchesne remarks discretion could be expected from Bassompierre as she, like others
hired as companions for Charlotte, were daughters of military officers.
131 On 14 August 1867 Queen Victoria wrote from Osborne to the Crown Princess of
Prussia: “Leopold B. [Léopold II] was here for one night, having come the whole way
across from Ostend to see me. He told me much about Charlotte who is improving since
she came to Tervueren. She has more liberty, goes out driving in the morning, and the
great object is to let her be reassured that she will not be shut up - or force used - which I
fear has been the case at Miramar [sic] …. ” Fulford, 1971, 148.
133 Bassompierre, Tervueren, 2 September, 1867 in Duchesne, 1973, 8.
cards in carte-des-visite format (Figure 6.22).\footnote{This novel was originally published in Brussels and attracted a great deal of attention. The image I am referring to is Hugo’s Le Bateau-Vison and I suggest he may have been the artist for the Maximilian image also. (For a discussion of Hugo’s illustrations see Richard Cardinal, “Victor Hugo, somnabulist of the sea” in Artistic Relations: Literature and the Visual Arts in Nineteenth-Century France (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 209-221.) Hugo was among prominent cultural and political figures who petitioned Juárez for clemency towards Maximilian; they may have been encouraged in thinking their petitions would influence the Mexican President as he, like Maximilian and doubtless many signing these petitions, belonged to the Freemasonry movement.}

From extracts of Bassompierre’s letters it is clear that portraits continued to occupy a place of central importance in Charlotte’s life even as her mental condition deteriorated. Those referred to by Bassompierre are photographic portraits some of which may have been ‘after’ painted portraits. With two known exceptions Charlotte’s art patronage and the agency she exercised over her visual representations was extinguished with her removal from public life. These exceptions are the memorial picture of Maximilian and a portrait of her probably from the late 1860s and perhaps unfinished.\footnote{Bassompierre makes numerous references to collecting and arranging photographic portraits in albums on Charlotte’s instructions, but in accordance with Queen Marie-Henriette’s oversight. It is not known what paintings may have hung in Tervueren. Surviving inventories of the Belgian Royal Collection indicate a number of paintings were installed in her later residence of Bouchout. The late portrait of Charlotte by an unidentified artist remains in storage at the Museum of the Dynasty. No provenance information is known.} “The Empress (sic) is always occupied with lists and changes of portraits” Bassompierre wrote on 8 December. The directions Charlotte gave regarding these one day, Bassompierre lamented, were often reversed the next day. On 27 December, Bassompierre writes “[t]he Empress [sic] talks to me constantly of her albums and books” and two weeks later, “[t]he commissions [for portraits] are constant.”

By mid-May 1868 Bassompierre had finished her lists for the Viennese photographer Augeré’s catalogue. As she was carrying these to Charlotte she met Léopold II who stopped her “with some pleasant words and added that he was going to send some
photographs to me to be given to the Empress [sic].” Bassompierre, overwhelmed with
her growing involvement with portrait photographs, was dismayed to learn more would
be added to the collection. Charlotte was “enchanted” with the portraits and gave
Bassompierre further album responsibilities, “a new torment for a person gauche and
inexperienced.” Bassompierre’s handwriting was “charming” but Charlotte worried if
the ink used for captions was good. And later Bassompierre blundered, as Charlotte
observed, for King Victor Emmanuel was listed but his portrait missing. By the end of
August 1868 Bassompierre writes “I have, for my distraction, twelve albums to review
before mending them and returning them to the Empress [sic]. I see that, from time
inmemorial, the Empress [sic] had a passion for photographs.”

136 The importance to Charlotte of photographs during her detention at Miramare is
evident from references in letters she wrote during this time, for instance to Countess de
Grunne 11 May 1867 in which Charlotte requests photographs. “These would give me
much pleasure. You know without me saying again, that you are always in my heart.”
Extracts quoted in Reinach Foussmagne, 1925, 349. Bassompierre, reproduced in
José Luis Blasio was among those receiving a copy of the picture of Maximilian as he described in his memoirs:

Some days after [Maximilian’s] funeral I received a letter, asking me to call at the Belgian legation [in Vienna].\footnote{Maximilian’s body was embalmed in Mexico and retained there for some time. His remains were returned to Trieste 16 January 1868; he was buried in Vienna.} There I was given a photograph of Maximilian, showing him in sailor’s uniform, standing at the prow of a vessel with a flag in his arms, in the midst of a stormy sea. On the wrapper of the photograph was written in Carlota’s hand: ‘To Don José Luis Blasio,’… I judged that the photograph had been taken from a painting, symbolical [sic] of the shipwreck of the Mexican Empire, which had been done by order of Carlota herself in one of her lucid intervals. It was evident that the Empress was not ignorant of Maximilian’s...
tragic end, for on the back of the photograph was inscribed: ‘Pray for the repose of the soul of His Majesty, Ferdinand Maximilian Joseph, Emperor of Mexico, Born at Schoenbrunn, July 6, 1832. Died at Querétaro, June 19, 1867.’ This was followed by two verses for the Bible, in Latin and Spanish.¹³⁸

Prince Léopold, the only son of Léopold II and Marie-Henriette, became gravely ill in summer 1868 and died, at ten years of age, on 22 January 1869.¹³⁹ It was a catastrophic event for the royal family and gave relentless momentum to the King’s determination to found a colony. The death of the Prince took an emotional toll on Queen Marie-Henriette affecting her ability to maintain, to the same degree, her attention to Charlotte.¹⁴⁰ Following the birth of Princess Clementine in 1872, Marie-Henriette and Léopold II lived apart much of the time.

This second section of Chapter Six explores the displacement of Charlotte’s regal images by memorial souvenirs and allegories incorporating religious motifs, allusions to Shakespeare’s character Ophelia, and didactic illustrations from the emerging science of psychiatry. Many of these c. 1867 depictions of Charlotte are adaptations of earlier photographs. One form of memorial portrait was the *craif* in which a portrait of the deceased, printed on a black background, is set within an elaborate ‘frame’ often

¹³⁸ Blasio, [1904], 1934, 187.
¹⁴⁰ The severity of Charlotte’s illness was also increasing and required constant medical supervision. Writing to Queen Victoria on 31 December from Berlin following a visit to the Belgian royal family, the Crown Princess of Prussia describes Charlotte as ‘look[ing] as she always did - but she only talked on indifferent subjects and never mentioned Mexico or her husband. I perceived nothing strange in her manner - but I thought her *baisée* - no longer making the impression of the very clever intellectual person she was!’ Fulford, 1971, 214. Laurence Van Ypersele notes suicidal tendencies and delusional states in letters written by Charlotte from 1868 to 1869. Van Yperseles, 1995.
comprised of flowers with symbolic associations. Immediately following the fall of the Mexican Empire there appeared a vast number of these images featuring an image of Maximilian, sometimes with two or more of his Generals Míramon, Meíja, Mendez, and Marquez, and often including a portrait of Charlotte. One such craif composed by French artist François Aubert, features portraits of Maximilian, Míramon, Meíja, and Mendez grouped around a central image of Charlotte; another combines separate photographs of Maximilian and Charlotte (Figures 6.23 and 6.24).

141 There were also numerous depictions of the execution, (all apparently drawn after the fact), details of which changed as more information became available. (Manet is known to have referred to these for his series on this subject.) No photographs of the actual execution are known but Belgian photographer François Aubert, who was present, drew a sketch and took photographs of the emperor’s bullet-torn shirt and of his mummified corpse. An illustration in Hyde appears to show an effigy figures and not Maximilian’s corpse as the image is identified. Hyde, 1946. Harding states these were set into half-size ‘coffins’ and that three versions were made. Harding, 1934, 360.

142 It was common to refer to these five men as the “magic M’s.” In Corti’s opinion it “was difficult to subordinate any of them to the others” in terms of their roles during the weeks leading up to the fall of the Empire; they differed considerably in personal character as he describes. Corti, [1924], 1968, 783.
In the first image Maximilian’s portrait is at the top, and Generals Mejía on the left, Miramón on the right, Mendez at the bottom. All are in uniform and bear orders and medals with Maximilian additionally distinguished by a drape of ermine. In the centre, slightly smaller rondel with a partial inner frame of flowers, is a head-and-shoulders image of Charlotte taken from her photograph as an amazone (see Figure 5.14). She has neither Orders nor medals and is devoid of jewellery. This lack of jewellery and her plain costume contrasts with the uniforms, connoting courage and control, that are worn by the male figures. (The importance of jewellery as signifier of economic power and authority for women has already been mentioned.) This contrast is probably unintentional; portraits for such images were sometimes chosen from whatever was readily at hand as the market for these mementos was large but fleeting and the portrait’s primary function was to secure identity. This inclusion of her image with those of Maximilian, Mejía, Miramón, and Marquez, all of whom were dead, invites the interpretation Charlotte, too, was dead. The title refers to these individuals collectively as “martyrs of Queretaro [sic].” It was known Charlotte remained alive but she was almost invisible to the public and so seemed no longer to inhabit the world in a normal sense.

Such images both reflected this perception and served to reinforce it.

The second image, also by Aubert who lived in Mexico during the Empire, features a dense border of pansies and lilies around portraits of Maximilian and Charlotte. The head from Beaucé’s large painting of Maximilian on horseback provides his image in this craif while that of Charlotte is from a full-length photograph taken in Mexico depicting her wearing the Order of St. Charles. This photograph is discussed in relation to its adaptations at greater length below.
Lithographed memorial images were also produced in many variations and frequently involved montages of separate portraits. A lithograph by Kreslit K. Maixner in which Maximilian and Charlotte are separately framed but joined by thorn branches is a biblical reference to the ‘crown of thorns’ from the crucifixion of Christ (Figure 6.25). It recalls Charlotte’s assessment of her role as Vicereine - that it was an undertaking not without thorns - and was echoed by actions of Dr. Jilek, Court physician at Miramare, who placed a crown of thorns above Maximilian’s portrait when Charlotte returned in September 1866.143

Figure 6.25. Kreslit K. Maixner, Emperor Maximilian and Empress Charlotte, c. 1867 or 1868.
Figure 6.26. A. Péraire, Untitled (Eagle lifting veil to reveal the faces of Emperor Maximilian and Empress Charlotte), c. 1867.

---

143 Haslip, 1971, 411. It is highly doubtful the artist was aware of Charlotte’s remark and more likely represents the pervasiveness of this motif. The near-canonization of Maximilian is a subject deserving investigation but is beyond the scope of the present study.
The Maixner double image is from the collection of Národní museum in the Czech Republic (then within the Austrian Empire), and demonstrates the widespread production of these commemorative items.\textsuperscript{144} As with the \textit{craif} discussed above, this image carries the connotation Charlotte and Maximilian were martyrs, an especially predominant sentiment in Austria regarding Maximilian. Maixner depicts Maximilian in civil dress and Charlotte in court gown with sash and jewellery and both images appear to be ‘after’ Malovich’s photographs. The circle formed by the crown of thorns (recalling Heinrich’s use of a ring or wedding band in the genealogy painting joining rondels of Charlotte and Maximilian) implies they were joined together in life and in death.

An overtly imperial eagle dominates another double portrait of Maximilian and Charlotte (Figure 6.26). This image, a montage of two photographs embedded in a drawing by A. Péraire, is described in records of the United States Library of Congress as portraying an eagle “lifting a veil to reveal the images.” There was some public sympathy in the United States for Maximilian after his capture, and public dismay at his execution as this ethereal, romantic image is meant to convey. The montaged double image it incorporates is frequently reproduced and is sometimes described as an illustration of Charlotte and Maximilian during their Viceregal tenure; however, details of these images dispute so early a date and they are almost certainly also from the 1864 Malovich sessions (Figure 6.27).

\textsuperscript{144} I am grateful to Ph. Dr. Lubomír Srsen for providing this and other little known images and information.
Other images based on this same photo-montage were produced by A. Péraire and by François Aubert and are of interest for two reasons (Figures 6.28 and 6.29). One is that both are reminiscent of traditional depictions of the apparition of the Virgin of Guadalupe to Juan Diego in the sixteenth century and so integrate the image within Mexican visual traditions.¹⁴⁵ In both versions, Maximilian and Charlotte are seen kneeling in clouds before the Virgin of Guadalupe who holds a palm frond as do they. The compositional relationship infers the Virgin of Guadalupe is bestowing her blessing upon the imperial couple.

A second point of interest is that compared to one another the Aubert and Péraire images differ in details perhaps calculated to appeal, in the former, to European viewers, and, in the latter, to Mexican viewers. Below the clouds in Aubert’s version is Querétero, or more precisely the Hill of Bells (Cerro de las Campanas), where the execution took place. When compared to the Péraire image it can be seen that, although the relationship between the Virgin of Guadalupe, Maximilian and Charlotte is identical, the clouds are darker and torn by jagged lines. If these lines indicate lightning the intended meaning might be Divine wrath over the disastrous end of the Mexican Empire, but Jesse Lerner reads these as bayonets piercing the clouds and threatening the figures of Maximilian and...
Charlotte. This latter interpretation would be better received in Mexico whereas Aubert’s version would better represent European opinion.

A memorial souvenir card, printed in Vienna and produced from an engraving by Jägern ‘after’ a painting by Karl von Stur, presents a more dramatic view of the fall of the Mexican Empire (Figure 6.30). The depiction of Maximilian is adapted from a popular Pinot print; that of Charlotte is again based on the Malovich photograph; however, in this instance, modifications to Charlotte’s image reveal both folkloric and psychiatric influences. In the painting Charlotte and Maximilian occupy different realms, neither of which appear to be part of the earthly world. Maximilian is shown standing on a bluff beyond the clouds. His gaze is fixed, looking neither at the priest to the right nor at the menacing, indistinct figures behind him to the left. (Their large brimmed hats identify these figures as Mexican while their faceless, shadowy depictions signify they are the enemy/Other.)

On close inspection Charlotte’s pose is seen to be a coded portrayal of madness (Figures 6.31 and 6.32). Unlike her standing pose in the Malovich photographs, Charlotte is shown seated - a cavalier adaptation of the original image that demonstrates how malleable the photographic medium was considered to be, and how intermingled photography and graphic images were, in the mid-nineteenth century. Although allusions to the Shakespearean characters Ophelia and Hamlet are present in this picture, there are more sinister implications in its details. Von Stur’s picture displays the

---

146 Lerner, 2000/1, 1-8.
148 In the twentieth century the terms ‘appropriation’ and ‘mixed media’ attached to such uses of imagery when these acts were often political or philosophical statements whereas similar nineteenth-century actions were more often practical solutions.
influence of cultural preoccupations, then characteristic of Western Europe, with supernatural/unnatural women, as discussed below.\textsuperscript{149} Charlotte’s seated pose is significant for its correspondence with established representations of melancholia. Her head is turned as in the most familiar Malovich photograph, but more sharply, and her arms in a similar position but stiffly extended. It is a pose closely resembling that of ‘Crazy Kate’ in a painting of that title by English artist George Shepheard (Figure 6.33).

\textsuperscript{149} Queen Olga of Würtenberg (1822-1892), born Grand Duchess Olga Nikolaevna of Russia, commissioned this painting. The Württemberg royal family was connected by marriage to the Coburgs and Orleans and Olga well-liked and respected for supporting education for girls and health care for children, veterans, and the disabled so that the vehemence of Von Stur’s painting is unlikely to have been specified in the commission. Princess Antoinette of Saxe Coburg Saalfeld (1779-1824), eldest sister of Leopold I married Duke Alexander of Württemberg (1771-1833). The younger sister of Queen Louise Marie, Princess Marie, married the son of Antoinette and Alexander, also called Duke Alexander (1804-1881). The younger Alexander, then a widower, is seen at the back, far left, in Winterhalter’s multiple-figure painting (see Figure 2.13).
Figure 6.30. Jägern ‘after’ Karl von Stur, *Miramare - Querétaro*, c.1867.
Figure 6.31. Detail of Figure 6.30.

Figure 6.32. Detail of Figure 6.30.
Figure 6.33. George Shepheard, *Crazy Kate*, 1815.
Shepheard’s painting is one of many illustrations of this folklore character driven to madness by the loss of her lover at sea. Like Kate, Charlotte’s madness is signalled by emphasis on the white of her eyes, a facial expression registering distraction, and a contorted left arm. Charlotte’s right hand clutches thorn-stemmed roses arranged in a crown-like array with one stem having fallen to the hem of her skirt. It would seem an image vilifying the Empress, or representing fear of contagion, or both. Her other arm appears normal except for one finger crooked as though in spasm. She wears the earrings and double string of pearls inherited from Queen Louise Marie but not the gold bracelets with their miniatures displaying her lineage. Instead it may be a timepiece on her forearm, perhaps to imply the passing of time as an angel drapes her in a veil of oblivion reminiscent of Péraire’s image.

Through the last weeks of the Mexican Empire perceptions of Maximilian evolved from him being considered a ruler often inept if liberal and conciliatory, to one of him as a heroic martyr. Suspense had mounted after his capture and the refusal of Juárez to yield to international requests that he commute Maximilian’s death sentence; regardless, news of the execution had the effect of a “thunderbolt” in Europe that was magnified because of the courage displayed by Maximilian.150 In contrast, Charlotte’s voyage to Europe and her vigorous attempts to obtain support for the Mexican

150 “Maximilian had borne the anguish of the last day with composure” writes Corti, “in spite of the disease which was sapping his strength.” I am not meaning to minimize the courage and loyalty of Miramón and Mejía. According to Corti, they stood beside Maximilian when he was shot and Mejía then witnessed the death of Miramón before he himself was killed. Both Mejía and Miramón called out “Long live Mexico, long live the Emperor!” in the moment before their death. “Thunderbolt” was the term Prince Metternich used to describe the effect this outcome had in Europe. Corti, [1924], 1968, 816-817, 822-823, and 826-828.
monarchy too easily fell outside gender expectations.\textsuperscript{151} After the execution of Maximilian, Charlotte constituted for some a culpable figure in the death of her husband; for others she represented a vestige of failed imperialist ambitions and, in Belgium particularly, a living reminder of volunteers whose lives were lost for this foreign cause.\textsuperscript{152} Her role as first princess of the Belgian people and her dependent state resulting from mental affliction were elided in other memorial images combining her title as Empress with a portrait of her as a child, or a similar portrait with the title Princess but beside a brief text including reference to her role as Empress (Figures 6.34 and 6.35). Still other images rehearsed allusions to Ophelia so frequent in print once news of Maximilian’s execution became known in Europe. ‘Ophelia’ imagery characterizes a more usual and piteous representation of Charlotte that presents Queen Marie-Henriette as her guardian angel.\textsuperscript{153} As the drama of the executions receded, so too did Maximilian’s presence in memorial visualizations of Charlotte. A lithograph produced by J. Varenne of Brussels probably dates from 1867 or 1868 immediately after Charlotte’s return to Belgium (Figure 6.36).

\textsuperscript{151} Corti states Prince Metternich, having met with Charlotte during her sojourn in Paris in August 1866, “admired the virile tenacity of her character.” As Metternich was well disposed towards Charlotte, his statement can be taken as positive although reflective of prevailing gender perceptions.

\textsuperscript{152} In early 1866 Count Bombelles was sounding opinion in Europe and reported London was “good” but described attitudes towards the Mexican Empire in Brussels as “infamous.” Corti, [1924], 1968, 756.

\textsuperscript{153} A market for depictions of morbidly romantic, usually dying, women was not unrelated to the use of opiates which caused a pale complexion (and much else) if taken habitually. Its influence in fashion was evident, for instance, in powders to whiten the face - ‘Poudre Ophelia’ - suggestive of decorous addiction. See photographs of Countess Castiglione and of Sarah Bernhard in McPherson, 2001. An example of medical reliance on opium is related in Bassompierre’s letters in reference to a dose of opium given to the young Prince Léopold, Count of Hainault. Bassompierre quoted in Duchesne, 1985, 59-70.
Figure 6.34. Ch. Brillion ‘after’ Winterhalter, *S. M. l’Impératrice Charlotte*
Figure 6.35. Ch. Brillion ‘after’ Winterhalter *La Princesse Charlotte*

Figure 6.36. (Verso) ‘J. Varenne, Photographe Bruxelles’ (etc.), *Tervueren, 1879*, Reissue 1879.
Figure 6.37. Artist unknown. *The Princess Charlotte, Ex Queen of Mexico* (sic), 1879.
The example reproduced here is seen to be a reissue as the word ‘Tervueren’ is added as a caption. Charlotte kneels before a *prie-dieu* against a background of sky in which is suspended an image of Christ on the Cross; above this can be seen the head and shoulders of Maximilian. A shaft of light emanates from Maximilian and illuminates the figure of Charlotte whose palms are pressed together as though in prayer but whose gaze is elsewhere and unfocussed. The angle of the *prie-dieu* support visually accentuates Charlotte’s arched back. Her hair and ornamentation are as they were in Malovich’s photographs of her as Empress Elect and her white-collared day dress like that in several other photographic portraits. Her features, however, owe more to Winterhalter’s paintings of her as a child. Queen Marie-Henriette is seen in the guise of an angel gently supporting her sister-in-law. In contrast to Von Stur’s depiction of Charlotte, this image is in harmony with commonly languorous portrayals of Ophelia. A portrait of Charlotte ‘after’ a photograph appearing in the British press in relation to this incident was altered in its lithographic reproduction to convey she was then approaching her fortieth year (Figure 6.37). This more dignified representation probably owes something to the continuing concern of her cousin Queen Victoria.

In the nineteenth century the character Ophelia was a popular subject of keepsake portraits, and pictures of drowning or swooning Ophelias or Ophelia-like women were ubiquitous (Figures 6.38 and 6.39).

---

154 As remarked in Chapter Two, several popular early portraits of Charlotte were also re-issued such as those by Franck and by Wuileman (see Figures 2.38 and 2.39).

155 *Whitehall Review*, 8 February 1879.

156 Artists from Eugéne Delacroix to John Everett Millais took up this theme in paintings. Préault’s sculpted version remains popular and is available printed on boxer shorts and notepaper among other formats. “Préault Ophelia” <www.cafepress.com/buy/insanity/-/pg_5> 23 (19 October 2007).
The treatment of mental illness and efforts to define types of derangement gathered momentum in the second half of the nineteenth century. J. M. Charcot was a prominent neurologist and sketches and photographs he employed to illustrate stages of disease progression, notably of female hysteria, became well known, not least because these were sometimes staged and often sensational (Figure 6.40).\textsuperscript{157} A remarkable study of the “cultural history of madness and art in the western world” undertaken by Sander L. Gilman in the early 1980s analyses “how the portrayal of stereotypes has both reflected

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{157} Jean-Martin Charcot (1825-1893). “Art and illustration became a pivotal tool in stressing [Charcot’s] anatomoclinical method - the artist in Charcot rapidly communicated a patient's changing neurologic state with sketches and drawings. The art of photography, introduced to him by Duchenne, was also extensively used by Charcot to capture changes in a patient's neurologic status.” Jay Venita, “The legacy of Jean-Martin Charcot” Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine (January 2000) online: <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3725/is_200001/ai_n8895032/print?tag=artBody; col1> (20 June 2008).}
and shaped the perception and treatment of the mentally disturbed.” Gilman includes in his investigation images associated with Charcot.\footnote{Gilman, 1982, jacket statement. Regarding Charcot, see especially Chapter 16 “Seeing the Insane at the Salpêtrière.”}

Figure 6.40. Anonymous lithograph, ‘after’ a painting. Charcot lecturing in his clinic, c.1875.

Figure 6.41. Photograph from Salpêtrière, “amorous supplication”, n.d.

An Ophelia figure painted by Marcus Stone is shown at a \textit{prie-dieu}, as was Charlotte in the earlier image, and exhibits a similarly rapturous state not dissimilar to illustrations of the state clinically described as ‘amorous supplication’ (Figure 6.41). Nineteenth-century
familiarity with didactic representations of hysteria would have set up a subtle sexual tension, combined as it is in both pictures with spiritual allusions. Neither Stone’s nor Rossetti’s figure, however, display the over-arched back seen in the picture of Charlotte. In compendiums of didactic imagery, this ‘arc de cerle’ was considered to be a further sign of female hysteria. The subject of Rossetti’s painting, “that hypnotic Victorian icon” as Nina Auerbach calls this image, is Beatrice who “has miraculously taken into herself life and death simultaneously.” It is a statement equally applicable to public perceptions of the absent/present former Empress Charlotte during the late nineteenth century.

Privileging the sensational

In 1879, the year in which Tervueren burned, a bottle of ink was thrown at De Keyser’s 1857 full-length portrait of Charlotte located in Antwerp’s town hall. As Charlotte had then been secluded for a decade it is probable this act derived from Flemish dissatisfaction with economic disparity in Belgium or with the monarchy rather than directed at her specifically; nonetheless, it is apparent Charlotte’s unseen presence provoked scorn and resentment among some portion of the Belgian population. Accounts of a dishevelled Charlotte running along the roof of the burning building shouting “It is forbidden! It is forbidden!” and enraptured with the fire became a staple in twentieth-century references to her mental state. Published in the centennial year of the

---

159 Gilman, 1982, 198.
161 The resulting damage was repaired. I am grateful to Tuur Van Hove for his extensive assistance regarding the De Keyser portrait. (Electronic correspondence, 5 March 2004.)
162 The International Congo Society was formed in 1878 and Léopold II acquired control in order to pursue his economic goals in Africa. There was little interest in Belgium in acquiring a colony; by 1879 the King was proceeding to gain personal ownership of the Congo Basin.
inception of the Mexican Empire, Ghislain de Diesbach incorporates this version while framing his comments with an intimation of respect.

“Should we not also admire even the strange folie des grandeurs of the Empress Charlotte who, imprisoned in the Château de Bouchoute, consoled herself for the loss of the Mexican throne by wearing a gold paper crown …?”

Regarding Charlotte’s meetings with Napoleon III and Pope Pius IX in 1866, Ghislain states “[t]he Empress Charlotte in the meantime had lost her reason, insulted Napoleon III in despicable fashion, and caused a scandal at the Vatican ….” Subsequently, she was “haunted by the monomania of power.” When Tervueren burned, “… it was incredibly difficult to make her come down from a tower where, fleeing the flames, she had taken refuge. Clad in a nightdress, her hair flying loose in the wind, she refused to leave her post: ‘We cannot abdicate,’ she screamed, ‘we shall never abdicate!’”

In his book denouncing the merciless control Léopold II exercised over the Congo, Adam Hochschild reiterates without question the prevailing views of Charlotte following her seclusion.

“Besides his disobedient daughters to fret over, the king had his mad sister, Carlota, confined to her château on the outskirts of Brussels, apparently believing she was still Empress of Mexico. Her bridal dress, faded flowers, and a feathered Mexican idol hung on her wall. She was reported to spend her days talking to a life-size doll dressed in imperial robes. Rumors [sic] of her delusions provided endless reams of copy to tabloid editors all over Europe.

—

164 Ibid., 51. Léopold II had his eldest daughter confined to an asylum for several years when she fled an arranged marriage. Attempts on the part of the King to prevent his daughters inheriting any substantial portion of his wealth were rejected by the Belgian government.
Once when her château caught fire, Carlota was said to have leaned over a parapet and shouted at the flames, ‘That is forbidden! That is forbidden!’

These descriptions derive from but distort an account written by Charlotte’s niece Princess Stéphanie. Stéphanie writes that Charlotte’s apartments “occupied the first stage of the south-western wing of the castle; the windows were protected by fine mesh wires.” A laundry was located below these apartments and an overheated furnace there is thought to have caused the fire in the early hours of the morning. Charlotte’s dame de compagnie, Madame Moreau, was awakened by the smoke and rushed to Charlotte’s bedroom that was filling with smoke. Charlotte, disoriented and alarmed, did not wish to leave her room. “This should not be,” she repeated several times. Fire had already consumed the clothing Charlotte had worn the day before when the courageous Madame Moreau was finally able to lead Charlotte, dressed in clothes provided by a chambermaid, into the château grounds. From the house of Dr. Hart, located in the grounds, Charlotte gazed at the flames. "Ah yes, it is very serious, it is very serious, but it is beautiful!"

Stéphanie recounts her Aunt saying, and then, “suddenly, [Charlotte] understood the extent of the disaster and began to weep.” The buildings were completely destroyed and almost nothing remained of furniture, objets d’art, textiles or clothing. “Happily, the jewels of the Empress were in safety in Brussels.”

---

165 Hochschild, 136.
166 Stéphanie’s reference to Charlotte’s jewels unwittingly relates to the King’s use of his sister’s wealth to underwrite his colonizing ambitions. Stéphanie of Belgium, Comtesse de Lonyay, *Je devrais être Impératrice - Mémoires de la dernière Princesse héritière d'Autriche-Hongrie* (Bruxelles : Jean Dewit, 1937), 33-39. Warped by the heat of the fire, it is displayed in the Museum of the Dynasty. It should be noted that Stéphanie’s description is not a first hand account but is much closer to the source that more sensational renditions.
fire at Tevueren and alleged words and actions of Charlotte has an indirect bearing on certain visual representations of her in that preconceptions of insanity and its visual signs appear to influence these; more directly, such accounts intersect with portrait selection and display site as discussed in the final chapter. ¹⁶⁷

Up to this point visual representations of Charlotte following the fall of the Mexican Empire reproduced here have been examples drawn from popular art. There were also images produced outside these parameters that are more appropriately considered portraits but which also derive from earlier images. There are, for instance, the two known painted portraits ‘after’ the photograph of Charlotte in mourning taken by Disdéri in Paris 1866. Clothilde Bassompierre recounts discussing portraits with Charlotte during a walk at Tervueren 25 September 1867. Referring to the Disdéri photograph, Charlotte described it as the last portrait for which she sat and offered a copy to her companion saying it would give her pleasure if Bassompierre would like to have this. ¹⁶⁸ As Charlotte described it as her last portrait and did not mention the versions painted ‘after’ this image, it is probable these were produced at a later date. Photographs of the two known paintings show the geometry of Disdéri’s photography sharpened by the deletion or addition of details. Wainscoting added in the background creates a horizontal line, a bauble dangling from the feather on Charlotte’s hat seems not to have

¹⁶⁷ See Hochschild, 276; also “Seeing Africa” Tate Britain exhibition 22 July-29 October 2006, online: <www.tate.org.uk/britain/ exhibitions/seeingafrica/essay.shtm> (29 March 2007). Corti’s departure from his usual meticulous sources and citations in descriptions of the Empress following her return to Europe has already been mentioned. His choice of sensational accounts - over, for instance, the memoirs of Blasio which he cites on one occasion - is significant as his text dominated all others throughout the twentieth century. ¹⁶⁸ It was “ugly” Bassompierre writes, showing Charlotte wearing and “old-fashioned” hat and a very long velvet cape trimmed with fur …. ” Bassompierre letter extract in Duchesne, 1973, 14.
been included (the images of the paintings are fairly illegible), the decorative bag or fan she holds is cropped as is, in one, the fur trim seen in the lower portion of the original photograph. Minor though these details are, they softened the impression of Charlotte’s presentation in the photograph. If the paintings are not distorted by the reproduction process, Charlotte’s facial features are schematized in these and the proportions of her torso altered as is the line of her cape. The resulting contour resembles that of a bird of prey and the emphatic tonal contrast creates a mask-like result (Figures 6.42 and 6.43). 169 As with other altered images of Charlotte, changes should not be assumed to have been perpetrated purposefully or for negative, or positive, effect.

Figure 6.42. Artist unknown, ‘after’ Disdéri, Empress Charlotte in Mourning, n.d. Figure 6.43. Artist unknown, ‘after’ Disdéri, Empress Charlotte in Mourning, n.d. Figure 6.44. Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Pandora, 1878.

169 This discussion is based on the illustration in Haslip and a photograph in the Museum of the Dynasty not, unfortunately, a study of the actual paintings that might lead to rather different conclusions.
The painted versions are reminiscent of popular nineteenth-century depictions of more dangerous female archetypes than Ophelia, those powerful, mythical women Auerbach refers to as “demons.” Auerbach defines three categories of outcast women (the supernatural angel/demon, the old maid, and the fallen woman) each of which was in opposition to prevailing ideals of woman inhabiting the domestic sphere and gave cause for anxiety. The author does not argue for the discredited concept of women inhabiting primarily a domestic sphere but addresses demonizing perceptions of women mobile in society. In a review of Auerbach’s publication, Helen Moglen agrees a demonizing tendency was exhibited in literature and art but considers it a psychological reality more than a social reality experienced by nineteenth-century women. Even, or especially, in this form it is relative to certain images of Charlotte produced after 1867.

One such mythic female was Pandora and a painting of this title by Rossetti presents notable parallels in terms of contrast, expression and hands-as-prominent-motif (Figure 6.44). Rossetti’s Pandora dates from 1878 but Auerbach notes earlier works by this artist of similarly “anomalous divinities.” She links the prominence of hands in these and related images to “[Sigmund] Freud’s iconography of female hysteria” whereby “portions of his patient’s bodies acquire a preternatural life of their own … an eerie potency in dissociation.” I think Auerbach overstates her case in asserting “[f]antastic

---

172 Whereas Auerbach traced myths of inherent demonic traits in women primarily through literary texts, Bram Dijkstra has explored this as a persistent theme in nineteenth-century academic art depicting women. Bram Dijkstra, Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of the Feminine Evil in Fin-de-Siécle Culture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986). Elaine Marks points out Dijkstra’s efforts to correlate such imagery with prevailing
as it seems, this iconography of womanhood tells us more about the Victorian experience than does the flattering literal-mindedness of much conventional portraiture,” but I suggest there was a confluence between changing perceptions of gender and mental illness influencing visual vocabularies in the second half of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{173}

Charcot’s prominence and his use of drawn or photographic images of his patients was one reason for this confluence; social concern with the policing of gendered behaviour was another. Based at the institution of Salpêtrière that primarily housed women patients, and focusing much of his attention on female hysteria, Charcot directed the production of abundant visual representations of women judged to be insane.\textsuperscript{174}

For those not in contact with Charlotte she became an abstract concept following her removal from public life, a two-dimensional space upon which pathos or antipathy could be projected. In Rossetti’s painting “Pandora’s strong curled hand has the power to effect a dark transformation that injects an innocent world with evil.” In the paintings ‘after’ Disdéri’s photograph the contours of Charlotte’s body are more completely hidden beneath the cloak resulting in her pale, unmodulated face and leather-gloved hands appearing disembodied. Her hands are put to prosaic use - the left gripping the back of a chair, the right (only partially seen) apparently clasping a purse - but their isolation within the simplified composition imbues them with disproportionate importance. Based

\footnotesize

social, scientific, or cultural discourses, in some instances overlooks temporal discrepancies; nonetheless, his assertions are compelling and instructive in relation to certain images of Charlotte. Elaine Marks, review of \textit{Idols of Perversity} by Bram Dijkstra, \textit{Journal of Modern History} (Sept. 1989) 61, 3, 582-584.

\textsuperscript{173} In the first decades of the nineteenth century, the work of Georges-Francis-Marie Gabriel (n.d.) and Théodore Géricault (1791-1824) contributed to an individualization of images of the insane in the opinion of Gilman. Gilman, 1982, 74-89.

\textsuperscript{174} Gilman notes the problems with these increasingly impressionistic images and points out Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) discarded this approach. Gilman, 1982, 204.
on Disdéri’s photograph in which Charlotte collaborated, the paintings nonetheless
participate in a discourse that owes more to anxieties regarding women, power, and
madness than to an individual likeness.

A full-length photograph of Charlotte, in some instances displayed as pendant to
photographs of Maximilian, may have been taken in a different location from his as the
carpet differs. There are others of Charlotte from the same session. The photographs are
all attributed to Aubert who had returned to Belgium following the fall of the Empire
(Figures 6.45 and 6.46). Charlotte’s full-length photograph depicts her apparently
wearing the same gown and hair ornamentation as in an earlier head-and-shoulders image
thought to have been taken in Mexico (Figure 6.47).\footnote{175} As she wears the Order of Saint
Charles in the head-and-shoulders picture but not in the full-length photographs they are
unlikely to date from the same session. There are other details unexpected in a state
portrait - a less carefully groomed hairstyle with the ornament a little askew, the folds of
her skirt falling unadjusted so that the hemline is somewhat crumpled.

\footnote{175} Usually accompanied by the publisher’s name Hacette.
Figure 6.45. F. Aubert, *untitled*, c. 1860s.
Figure 6.46. F. Aubert, *untitled*, c. 1866.

Figure 6.47. Photographer unknown, *Empress Charlotte*, c. 1866.
Another photograph from this session has the table on the left rather than the right (Figure 6.48). Perplexingly, Charlotte’s right hand rests on a loosely folded cloth in this image not on a customary tasselled, velvet cushion (Figure 6.49). (See Maximilian’s hand in Figure 6.45). A hand-coloured photograph of Charlotte in the same gown but with her hands crossed portrays her with flushed face and tear-filled eyes perhaps from a desire to convey an impression of tragedy or, possibly, to suggest mental instability (Figures 6.50 and 6.51). (Viewed closely a tear is seen artfully suspended from the corner of Charlotte’s right eye.) It is a relatively small image but prominently displayed in the Royal Military Museum among a few others of Charlotte and of disproportionate
significance because so few publicly accessible images of Charlotte exist in Brussels or elsewhere in Belgium.

The suddenness of Charlotte’s mental affliction and disappearance from public view, her return ten months later still shielded from observation, and little official information on her condition promoted public curiosity and concern; the memorial images provided a means of resolution. Her condition remained open to speculation, or sometimes became a tabloid subject of spectacle, and she had become an abstract caricature by the end of the nineteenth century. By the time of her death in 1927, many were surprised to learn she
was not already dead. Public interest in Belgium was greater than officially anticipated and a restriction allowing only local residents to pay their respects had to be rescinded. As *Time Magazine* reported “[o]ver a thousand Belgians braved a raging blizzard in Brussels last week, trudged on foot four miles behind a coffin draped with the flags of Mexico and Belgium.”¹⁷⁶ Her coffin was carried by elderly survivors of the Belgian volunteer force in Mexico and among those attending were members of the Belgian royal family including King Albert I (Figure 6.52).

Figure 6.52. Van Parys-Sygma, *Untitled (funeral procession of Princess Charlotte)*, 1927.

¹⁷⁶ “Thus they paid homage to a lady great in sadness ….” “Empress’s Funeral.” 31 January 1927 <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,729896,00.html>
Chapter Seven

Assimilating the Empress

Summary

A cursory survey of the geographical distribution of portraits of Charlotte speaks to the impact of international conflicts and regime change as much as to historical associations between subject and place. Currently known works exist in Italy, Austria, the Czech Republic, France, England, Belgium, the United States, and Mexico. The portraits retain a political charge within these widely separated locations that is articulated through their contextualization and sites of display or, in some instances, by their absence.

Other than a print collection in Milan, no portraits of Charlotte have been traced in Lombardy, independent from Austria since 1859, or within the boundaries of Venetia as these were drawn when Charlotte was Vicereine and Maximilian Viceroy as the history of the Risorgimento has overwhelmed their passing presence. Borders revised as a result of World War II caused the region of Friuli to become part of Italy and with it Miramar Castle and its collection. Twice emptied of its contents, initially when Emperor Franz Joseph ordered these be removed to Vienna prior to World War I, and again when civic officials learned the Castle was about to be appropriated by Nazi forces near the end of World War II. The assistance of Allied troops in facilitating the collection’s re-installation subsequently contributed to the Castle becoming a pre-eminent tourist attraction for the region in the second half of the nineteenth century.¹ It remains dedicated primarily to Maximilian whose project it was but contains some of the most

¹ Miramare Files, Ministry of Architecture, Archeology, Art, and History, Trieste.
interesting portraits of Charlotte. One is a Portaels painting displayed with conspicuously more protection than other works (see Figure 3.14). There is also a copy of Winterhalter’s painting of Charlotte at two years of age and one of his ‘black mantilla’ portrait placed above the camp cot in Maximilian’s bedroom - a curatorial decision as it was painted after Maximilian and Charlotte resided at Miramare (see Figures 2.10 and 3.39). There are additionally the two Zouave camp scenes by Beaucé, and Dell’Acqua’s series of paintings for the History Room, two of which feature Charlotte although only one is displayed (see Figures 5.15 and 4.13).² Finally, there are the Heinrich portraits that replicate small rondel pictures of Charlotte and Maximilian seen in the large genealogical painting by the same artist (see Figures 4.6 and 4.7). There is no state portrait of Charlotte as Empress although the full-length Ramírez/Rebull painting of Maximilian (more probably a replica) is positioned, free standing to emphasize its proxy function, to one side of a bench-like throne.³ Portraits of Charlotte play a secondary role in the narration of Maximilian’s story at Miramare. The Portaels painting is described as a portrait of Charlotte in Brianza dress during their Viceregal tenure and her depiction in Zouave uniform is miniscule and difficult to decipher because of the painting’s location and, therefore, unlikely to pique viewers’s curiosity. A large statue of Maximilian located on the grounds reinforces his primacy as does a grotto dedicated to him and

² Dell’Acqua’s painting documenting the marriage of Maximilian and Charlotte is not displayed.
³ This painting is thought to have been among belongings sent back to Europe by Maximilian in late 1866. Two joined bench-like thrones appear in architectural plans included in the Miramare inventory. Fabiani, 1989, 187.
dominated by a cross made from the mast of the ship Novara.\(^4\) A bas relief of Austrian Empress Elisabeth is at Miramare and a statue of her is in Trieste at the beginning of the road which passes by the Castle.\(^5\) Charlotte is discussed at greater length in the most recent guidebook to Miramare Castle than she was in previous publications but her detention there during 1866 and 1867 continues to be a sensitive issue.\(^6\)

Like the representations of Charlotte at Miramare, Pils’s 1859 portrait of her was formerly a Habsburg possession. It remains in Vienna where it is exhibited in the former palace of Schönbrunn as a portrait of Charlotte von Sachsen Coburg Gotha, the title by which it was catalogued when it became part of the State collection after World War II (see Figure 4.1). A few minor images of Charlotte can be found in Vienna’s military museum and Artstetten Castle in Lower Austria displays a Schrotzberg copy ‘after’ Winterhalter’s ‘black mantilla’ portrait as well as the Mexican court scene by Beaucé in which Charlotte figures (see Figures 3.39 and 5.8). Franz Kasky, an Austrian who lived many years in Mexico but returned to what is now the Czech Republic, carried with him the Rebull oil study of Charlotte as Empress now in Prague (see Figure 5.5). Kasky also donated a large collection of other artifacts relating to the Mexican Empire and informing the context within which this portrait study appears. The 1848 revolution, unpopularity of the French Intervention, Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871), and two world wars are

\(^4\) Maximilian served on this ship during his naval career and Charlotte and he traveled to Mexico aboard it; the Novara was later dispatched to Mexico to return the body of Maximilian to Europe.

\(^5\) Empress Elisabeth frequently visited Miramare in the late 1800s; she was assassinated in 1898.

\(^6\) In the 2001 guidebook Fabiani emphasizes Charlotte’s contributions while Empress of Mexico. Fabiani, 2001, 10. The Castle housed the State Museum until 1984 and, as a result, the focus of earlier guidebooks to the Castle is broader than in later versions. See for instance Pilastro and Isoni, 1984, n.p.
probably responsible for the scarcity of portraits of Charlotte in France. Despite her family and political connections with this country, records consulted show only one replica portrait of her at Versailles apart from the unique portrait study in Fécamp. The Versailles image is the replica of Winterhalter’s portrait of Charlotte at two years of age that was commissioned by King Louis-Philippe. The Orléans were forced to flee the Revolution of 1848 leaving behind their possessions many of which were destroyed; Empress Eugénie was permitted to retain some of her art collection including works by Winterhalter following the collapse of the Second Empire. It is highly probable Eugénie and Napoleon III possessed a portrait of Charlotte but this has not been established. I have speculated the portrait study in Fécamp may have been a gift from Charlotte to Caroline de Grunne although its provenance currently extends only to a former Fécamp private collection. The connection to its locale is therefore tenuous and its large size and limited museum space generally consign it and a pendant portrait of Maximilian to offsite storage. In contrast, Buckingham Palace has ample space and the copy of Winterhalter’s portrait of Charlotte as Empress of Mexico, commissioned from Graefle by Queen Victoria in 1868, is prominently displayed as are the numerous immediate and extended royal family portraits painted by Winterhalter and others (see Figure 3.36). This prestigious setting allows it to be seen by official visitors to the Palace but it is seldom accessible to the general public. Other early paintings of Charlotte are in St. James Palace, Osborne House, or Windsor Castle and still less accessible; their presence, however, testifies to the close rapport between British and Belgian courts through the 1830s and 1840s.
Belgium, as might be expected, has the greatest number of portraits of Charlotte. Aside from the De Keyser portrait in Antwerp these are concentrated in Brussels and most date from Charlotte’s childhood although several versions of Winterhalter’s ‘black mantilla’ portrait are in the Royal Collections (see Figure 3.38). The two Portaels paintings I suggest relate to Charlotte’s tenure as Vicereine are in the same collection (see Figures 320 and 3.26); public access to the Royal Palace and royal residence of Laeken is usually on an annual basis. Records indicate a bust of Charlotte was formerly part of the Brussels Museum of Fine Arts but no image of her is currently part of this Collection. Those in the Royal Military Museum have been discussed above as publicly displayed images of Charlotte contextualized within Belgium’s contribution of volunteers to the French Intervention (see Figures 6.45 through 6.51).\(^7\) The Royal Albert Library Archives and Print Section together with private collections comprise a substantial resource for images of Charlotte (Figures 7.1 and 7.2) but these are rarely, if ever, displayed. Neither are those within diverse archives and collections managed by the Museum of the Dynasty since, as its name indicates, this institution is dedicated to the line of succession. These are, nonetheless, a valuable resource for research relating to portraits of Charlotte and include several remarkable personal artifacts as well as a half-length version of her 1844 Winterhalter portrait, numerous images in various media in addition to periodicals, correspondence and cards (for instance, Figures 7.3, 7.4, 7.5).\(^8\) A bust of Charlotte as a

\(^7\) This institution also houses the extensive Aubert and Widy photographic collections with numerous photographs of Charlotte and has in its collection a number of print portraits.

\(^8\) Almost no personal belongings of Charlotte have survived. Among eclectic items in the Museum of the Dynasty collection are monogrammed black silk stockings and a miniature, articulated amulet presented to her during the 1865 Yucatan state visit.
small child can be seen in the museum and her paint box, warped by the Tervueren fire, is also displayed.

Figure 7.1. Photographer unknown, *Untitled (Empress Charlotte)* c.1868
Figure 7.2. Photographer unknown, *Untitled (Empress Charlotte)* c.1868
Figure 7.3. Reinach (?) *L’Archduchess Charlotte in Mexican riding habit.* c. 1868.

Figure 7.4. Ghemer Frères, *Untitled (Princess Charlotte)* c. 1905
Figure 7.5. J. da Cunha-Plon (?) *L’imperatrice Charlotte sortant du château, ayant auprès d’elle le colonel Van Echout.* (Figure on the left unidentified.) c.1921-1925.
Illustrations of Charlotte in contemporary Belgian publications are significant for their selection and official nature. One of these is a lithograph ‘after’ the ‘black mantilla’ portrait (Figure 7.6). It has the effect of depicting her older than the painted image and emphasizes her eyes with black lines, perhaps with the intention of referencing her ‘mad’ mental condition. Another lithograph reproduced in the official Belgian Monitor (Moniteur Belge/Belgisch Staatsblad) is ‘after’ a double photograph of Charlotte and Maximilian likely taken in Vienna in the early 1860s (Figure 7.7). While the pose is reproduced (in reverse), the photographic image of Maximilian has been replaced with a lithograph of Winterhalter’s more flattering 1857 portrait of him; Charlotte fares less well. This image, possibly produced in nineteenth-century Mexico, was chosen to illustrate an article concerning the Mexican Empire. De Keyser’s important 1857 portrait of Charlotte commissioned for the Silver Jubilee of Leopold I remains on display in
Antwerp’s town hall, an ironic emblem of the monarchy amid current challenges to national unity relating to power and resource sharing between Flanders and Wallonia. In this context it recently appeared in the background of a photograph published in the Flemish newspaper *De Morgen* (Figure 7.9).\(^9\)


The 1879 fire which destroyed Chateau Tervueren and its contents and an 1890 fire at the royal residence of Laeken in which further paintings were lost may explain the

\(^9\) I thank Dorine Cardyn-Oomen for providing this image.
absence in Belgium of painted portraits of Charlotte as Empress. It is possible there were never such paintings in Belgium but this is difficult to ascertain as few records of early Royal Collections survive. No trace remains of the six decades Charlotte lived secluded at first at Tervueren and then at Bouchout. Following the fire at Château Tervueren its grounds became the site of the Royal Museum for Central Africa. Château Bouchout was acquired in 1939 from the Belgian royal family and is now the National Botanic Garden of Belgium. On the Garden’s official website is a mention of Bouchout as long being a residence of Charlotte and a photograph of her as Empress Elect is included (Figure 7.10). The origin of this photograph was discussed already as appearing to be from the 1864 Malovich session although it is frequently attributed to Ghemar Frères of Belgium and is sometimes described as depicting Charlotte as Vicereine (Figure 7.11). In the website version of this image she is described as

10 The fire occurred on New Year’s Day and resulted in the loss of one life.
11 “To give the development and ‘civilization’ of Congo a higher profile, and also to give the Belgian public a better idea of the economic possibilities of the area, Léopold II decided to establish a kind of museum to ‘showcase’ his Congo. The original idea was to add colonial wings to the Natural History and Jubelpark Museums, both in Brussels. But when these plans failed to take shape quickly enough the king determined to have a separate exhibition on his royal estate at Tervueren, which he’d known well as a young prince and duke of Brabant. Léopold II had the Museum of Africa built in the grounds of Tervueren.” Impetus for opening the first purpose-built structures for this museum project was given by the World Fair held in Belgium in 1897. Quotes from didactic material, Royal Museum for Central Africa, “AFRICA/TERVUEREN,” http://www.africamuseum.be/research/about/histobuildings (21 August 2008).
12 The website notes “[t]he Empress Charlotte, the sister of King Leopold II [sic], and widow of the executed Emperor of Mexico, lived here almost her entire life.” The grounds, then comprising 73 hectares, consist of “the adjacent grounds of Meise castle and Bouchout castle that Léopold II had merged for his sister Charlotte, Empress of Mexico.” These properties, perhaps purchased with his sister’s funds then managed by the King, were largely undeveloped. “Introduction and History: National Botanic Garden of Belgium” <http://www.jardinbotanique.be/PUBLIC/GENERALVISITORINFOVISITORMAP/bouchoutcastle.html> (14 August 2008).
Empress, a point of interest because of the scarcity of her imperial images in Belgium. It is possible to purchase official pictures of members of the Belgian royal family, such as reproductions of a painted version of the 1866 Disdéri photograph of Charlotte and photographs of her on her death bed (see Figure 5.18).

Figure 7.10. Website image from Ghemar Frères photograph ‘after’ Malovich (?), *Untitled*, 1864.
Figure 7.11. Ghemar Frères ‘after’ Malovich (?), *Empress Charlotte*, 1864.
Images of Charlotte are found in several collections in the United States, most frequently ‘after’ a photograph probably taken by Disdéri in Paris in the early 1860s and much like her representation in the Beaucé multiple figure painting in Artstetten (see Figure 5.8). Maximilian is known to have sent a photograph of himself to Juárez in the course of attempts to win the Mexican President’s goodwill, and it may be that this image of Charlotte was distributed in the United States for similar reasons. It is diplomatically devoid of imperial signifiers and was produced as lithographs, paintings, and cards (Figures 7.12 and 7.13). A copy ‘after’ this photograph was incorporated into a popular and widely circulated multiple figure portrait of the principle participants in the Mexican Empire (Figure 7.14).

13 I thank Dean Smith of Berkeley University for his assistance in relation to these images.
An important exception to this simple representation of Charlotte found in the United States (and elsewhere) is Winterhalter’s half-length state portrait of her painted in Paris in 1864 now in the Hearst collection in California (see Figure 3.35). Housed within an extraordinarily eclectic collection, it is evidence of Hearst’s voracious appetite for collecting rather than Charlotte’s role in historical events. The specific placement of this painting and pendant portrait of Maximilian, separate from the main structure in a house often used by Hearst as private residence, would reminiscent of ancestral displays in manor houses were they grouped with other portraits.

Hearst, who was infamously supportive of Hitler in the early years of World War II and whose newspapers carried propaganda reflecting this view, would not have appreciated the 1939 film *Juarez* (sic). The question of whether or not the United States
should join the Allies in WW II prompted this production conceived as a vehicle for
“valourizing Juarez [sic]” and demonizing Maximilian in relation to the French
Intervention and Mexican Empire. This theme was intended to declare, by extension,
“scorn for fascism and Nazism.”
So important was this to its producers that they
bought the rights to another film, *The Mad Empress*, and held back that film’s release to
prevent it competing with *Juarez* (sic). Regardless, their message of liberal principles
triumphing over “fascism and Nazism” was undermined by Brian Aherne’s sympathetic
portrayal of Maximilian and a less stellar representation of Juárez by Paul Muni. “Less a
biography than a historical drama, less either than a stirring restatement of faith in the
democratic principle, [sic] the Warners's *Juarez* [sic] which had its premiere last night …,
has read another dramatic lesson from the dead pages of history” wrote Frank Nugent
Fryer in his review of the film’s premiere. “Juarez [sic] clearly is the hero of history, but
Maximilian is the hero of the picture.” Bette Davis played Charlotte “whose insanity
[she] counterfeits so well” and was especially acclaimed for the “mad scene.” This early
film adaptation contributed to mythologizing the Mexican Empire and Bette Davis’s
impersonation later informed certain visual and performance representations of Charlotte.
One of the most interesting examples of such an image appeared in Mexico where there

---

14 *Juarez* (sic) premiered April 25, 1939. Nugent Fryer relates it was “adapted by John
Huston, Wolfgang Reinhardt and Aeneas MacKenzie from Mrs. Bertita Harding’s novel,
*The Phantom Crown*, and a play by Franz Werfel ….” William Dieterle directed and Hal
B. Wallis produced the film for Warner Brothers; the musical score was by Erich
Wolfgang Korngold. Frank S. Nugent Fryer, review: “The Warners Look Through the
Past to the Present in ’Juarez,’ [sic] Screened Last Night at the Hollywood,” online.
<http://movies.nytimes.com/movie/review?res=9907E2DC113CE73ABC4E51DFB2668
382629EDE> (22 August 2008).
is a history of contradictory interpretations regarding Charlotte’s imperial role as discussed below.

Figure 7.15. Designer unknown, ‘Juarez’ (sic) 1939/40 movie poster
Figure 7.16. Designer unknown, ‘Juarez’ (sic) 1939/40 movie poster

Mexico has a legacy of royal representations of Charlotte resulting from her imperial/ist participation in the Empire generated by the French Intervention. In Puebla, site of fierce battles between Mexican and French troops in 1862 and 1863, there remains defiance towards foreign interference and Charlotte is more frequently referred to as Princess rather than Empress.\(^{15}\) Puebla’s Museum of No Intervention contains some visual representations of Charlotte but the majority of these are in Mexico City and its surrounding area. Of particular interest are paintings at Chapultepec, now the National History Museum, including the full-length Graefle state portraits not included in possessions Maximilian sent back to Europe when he again considered abdicating in late 1866 (see Figure 5.4). Reproductions of early portraits of Charlotte in the Museum of the Interventions are encountered after displays of lithographed satirical depictions of King Louis-Philippe in reference to an earlier French intervention in Mexico. These early

\(^{15}\) This is common in others parts of Mexico but less so than in Puebla.
portraits of Charlotte were likely among examples distributed in Mexico as a means of introduction prior to the 1864 photographs by Malovich that most successfully established her imperial image. (It was the most popular version of these Malovich photographs that, on the centennial of the French Intervention, served as model for intriguing painted versions produced in Mexico and perhaps commissioned by patrons whose nineteenth-century relatives were monarchists.)

Three portraits of Charlotte are, uniquely, displayed within art galleries as distinct from museums of history. These are a delicate miniature bust of unknown origin and a coloured photograph/card in the private Museo Soumaya, and the 1866 scene painted by Velasco in the Museum of Fine Arts in Mexico City (see Figures 4.2 and 5.13). Eight decades after Velasco painted this picture of Charlotte riding with her entourage through Alameda Park, Mexican artist Diego Rivera (1886-1957) began a mural entitled *Dream of a Sunday Afternoon in the Alameda Park* which incorporates portraits of Charlotte and Maximilian (Figure 7.17).

In Rivera’s kaleidoscopic inventory of Mexican history Charlotte’s appearance is more Mexican than European. Her hair ornament is one seen in certain photographs of her as Empress and similar to that worn by an earlier Mexican consort for a painted portrait.

Rivera, a major figure in the movement to develop a national Mexican art (*Mexicanidad*), was living in Europe at the beginning of the twentieth century and was attracted to the

---

16 I thank Axayácatl Gutiérrez and Victor M. Ruiz Naufal for explaining to me the probable motivation for these pictures. One such image is in the collection of the Museum of the Revolutions.

17 The ‘Pastry War’ of 1838-1839.

18 In 1896 Rivera began his studies at Academy San Carlos in 1896 and in the studio of José Guadalupe Posada. Rivera’s early works demonstrated an admiration for the landscapes of Velasco but he avidly explored Cubism while in Europe from 1907 to 1921 when he returned to Mexico. He is best known for monumental murals that helped define a sense of national identity through their representations of indigenous Mexicans.
drama associated with the end of the Empire, as Patrick Marnham recounts. The artist claimed an implausible but colourful family connection to Charlotte through his great uncle that is of interest for her Mexican appearance in this mural painted after his return to Mexico.\textsuperscript{19}

Charlotte’s visual assimilation into Mexican history is further exemplified in a Memorial to the Motherland in the Yucatan capital of Mérida. Designed in 1944 by Manuel Amabilis Dominguez, its extensive bas reliefs were carved by Romulo Rozo (1899-1964) and completed in 1956 (Figure 7.18).\textsuperscript{20} Rozo chose to work in the Puuc style found in many Pre-Columbian sites of the region with the result that his figures are densely grouped and flattened. The image of Charlotte is modelled on her appearance in the Malovich photograph of her as Empress Elect in the white dress with flounced bodice and string of pearls. Rozo translates the pearls into shapes representing Pre-Columbian necklaces of large and precious gemstones symbolic of power and prestige. The result is striking in its portrayal of Charlotte as a figure of fierce authority but in an indigenous visual vocabulary and on Mexico’s terms. A lithographed portrait of Charlotte is displayed in Merida’s municipal museum together with those of Porfirio Diaz and Pope John Paul under the caption ‘notables who have visited the Yucatan capital.’

\textsuperscript{19} Patrick Marnham, Dreaming with his eyes open: a life of Diego Rivera (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California, 1998), 25.
\textsuperscript{20} Columbian-born sculptor Rozo studied at the National School of Fine Arts of with Rodriguez Villar and Central Technical Institute in Bogota. He lived in Europe from 1923 to 1931 and in Mexico thereafter becoming one of the nation’s most important sculptors. Rómulo Rozo Krauss, Rómulo Rozo, indoamericano escultor. (Mexico DF: Editions Universities of Latinoameric-Mexican, 1974), 42.
Figure 7.17. Diego Rivera, *Sueño de una Tarde Dominical en la Alameda Central*, (detail) 1947 completed 1948, revised and shown publicly 1956.

Figure 7.18. Author’s photograph. Manuel Amabilis Dominguez, designer, 1944, and Rómulo Rozo, sculptor, *Monumento to La Patria*, 1956.
Figure 7.19. Rafael Gallur/Orlando Ortiz, ¿No “chupa” Vuestra Majestad?
A more recent visual assimilation of the Empress is seen in a dynamic comic-book-style history text (Figures 7.19 and 7.21). It revives Charlotte’s appearance with bow-like hair ornamentation as seen in photographs in Brussels’s Royal Military Museum and in Rivera’s mural image (see Figures 6.51 and 7.17). It is these illustrations I mention above as an example of representations of Charlotte that have been influenced by the appearance of Bette Davis in her role in the movie Juarez (sic).21 Author and illustrator of this text, Adios, Mama Carlota, broaden the context of the Mexican struggle, for instance through their attention to soldaderas (women who actively fought against the French Intervention), thereby expanding upon circumstances potentially influencing Mexican portraits of Charlotte.

---

21 A discussion of Charlotte’s involvement with the Alameda Park in this publication from a Mexican point of view but this pre-dates research revealing the influence of the municipal authorities as described, for instance, by Duncan, 1992.

Figure 7.22 *The Empress of Farewells* book jacket illustration/montage of cropped Graefle portrait of Charlotte superimposed upon map. Designer unknown.

Figure 7.23 Image of Charlotte ‘after’ Malovich photograph on *The Grand Opera* webpage.

Figure 7.24. Artist Unknown, ‘*Empress Charlotte/Emperor Maximilian*’ Straw effigies, Publicity image, Cinco de Mayo Museum, 2007.

From the 1930s to the present a growing number of film and stage portrayals of Charlotte, together with reproductions of portraits in popular or exhibition publications and in displays or merchandise related to cultural tourism, have revived her imperial
image (Figures 7.21, 7.22, 7.23 and 7.24).\textsuperscript{22} Their contextualization has invariably reinforced the seductive drama of the Mexican Empire while more particular circumstances in which these and other portraits of Charlotte were produced have until now remained unexplored. While the range of available reproductions of portraits of Charlotte is expanding, there is a tendency to incorporate these, too, into prevailing romantic myths thereby perpetuating embedded social conventions and the simplification of political complexities. For instance, a cropped version of the ‘black mantilla’ portrait of Charlotte illustrates an entry on the website \textit{Mad Monarchs}.\textsuperscript{23} The complete portrait is reproduced together with others of Charlotte, such as a pink-gowned version or adaptation of Portaels’s \textit{Miramare} painting, on a website dedicated to the \textit{Grand Opera of Charlotte and Maximilian} (Figure 7.25).\textsuperscript{24} As a result this portrait of Charlotte, almost certainly produced during her role as Vicereine, is viewed within accounts of ‘madness’ or, alternatively, as tangential to her role as Empress.

Figure 7.25. Web image; a version of the 1857 \textit{Miramare} portrait by Jean François Portaels, \textit{The Archduchess Charlotte in Milanese Dress}, n.d., or modified image of this painting.

Figure 7.26. Edwin Landseer (Detail or replica of Figure 2.26) \textit{Princess Charlotte}, c.1851.

\textsuperscript{22} The popularity of the phrase ‘Adios Mama Carlota,’ first coined as title of an 1865 derisive song as discussed earlier, as a title for various productions can make it difficult to distinguish one from another in references as per Figure 7.21.

\textsuperscript{23} www.madmonarchs.nl (9 July 2007)

\textsuperscript{24} www.grandopera.com/storyc3.html (24 September 2005)
Conclusion

It might be intuited portraits of Charlotte depicting her as powerful in her imperial role would be discovered in Europe where she was related to many royal families and where the concept of a Mexican Empire originated; equally, it might be intuited portraits of Charlotte depicting her as pitiable or alarmingly ‘mad’ would be characteristic of her presentation in Mexico. The foregoing partial synopsis of current geographic distribution, sites of display, and contextualization of portraits of Charlotte demonstrates the situation is, in fact, inverted. I am unaware of replicas or images deriving from 1864 photographs of Charlotte by Malovich being publicly accessible in Europe and examples of these photographs, or copies of these, seem to have largely disappeared from state collections. Neither do I recall seeing a replica or copy in Europe of the Graefle/Winterhalter full-length state portrait of Charlotte despite it having been familiar in the nineteenth century through published reproductions since a photographic record was made prior to its being shipped to Mexico. The half-length state portrait by Winterhalter in the Hearst Collection seems to have been unknown in Europe until late in the twentieth century by which time it was in the United States.25 In Mexico Charlotte’s imperial portraits, or paintings ‘after’ these, dominate her visual representation in both popular and state displays. While I attempt to disrupt the dominant themes of imperialism and madness framing representations of Charlotte and interpretations of her portraits, some of the most remarkable images of her would be excluded if these frames were completely discarded, for instance, the distorted European lithograph by Von Stur

25 Some of this applies with respect to the distribution of portraits of Maximilian in Europe and Mexico but this is a distinct subject as his execution and Charlotte’s affliction and seclusion complicates public and official reception of their images.
and those *Mexicanidad* public artworks by Rivera and by Manuel Amabilis Dominguez and Romulo Rozo (Figures 6.30, 7.17, and 7.18). Rather I argue such images signify beyond imperialism or madness and are most valuably read as, respectively, a graphic illustration of the early practice and influence of psychiatry on politics and gender construction, and post-colonial assimilation of symbols of the French Intervention.

I have sought also to retrieve earlier images of Charlotte and to read these within their historical specificities. In doing so it is apparent that these images contributed to the cultivation or maintenance of international alignments, initially between Belgium, France, and Britain and, later, between Belgium and Austria. The invention of photography and new means of printing and distribution developed just prior to Charlotte’s birth imbued portraiture with the potential for exerting more far reaching influence socially and geographically.

The extent to which Charlotte exercised agency over her visual representations once she reached adulthood is a critical issue and one that could not be investigated in depth in this initial study of her portraits. Two specific instances of Charlotte commissioning works are documented in related literature although both discoveries were tangential to the authors’s focus.26 These relate to portraits in which Charlotte is depicted in one case in regional costume and, in the other, in Zouave uniform. This evidence regarding posing in costume supports a premise that, on first gaining a agency, Charlotte embarked on politically provocative commissions presenting herself as Lucia, Portia, Hélène, and Cenerentola - the female protagonists in, respectively, Manzoni’s nationalist novel *I promessi sposi*, Shakespeare’s ambiguous *Merchant of Venice*, Verdi’s

---

26 Wilson-Bareau and Ogonovszky-Steffens as discussed in Chapters Three, Five, and Six.
provocative *Sicilian Vespers*, and Rossini’s comedic *Cenerentola*. I propose that such a history of commissions (these paintings are linked by multiple motifs as explained in Chapter Three and so imply a programmatic series probably commissioned by the same individual) makes viable a premise that the image of Charlotte in uniform alludes to the female protagonist Marie in another comedic opera, *Daughter of the Regiment* by Donizetti. These protagonists variously contradicted gender conventions or personified virtue and strength of character unlike the role of Ophelia allotted Charlotte upon the termination of her public life in October 1866. This late characterization is an extreme example of Charlotte’s visual representation being beyond her control and there are implications this may have often been situation during her role as Empress of Mexico as noted in Chapter Five. Conversely, it is likely that Charlotte commissioned the two portraits, illustrated in Chapter Six, for which she sat upon her return to Europe before the collapse of the Mexican Empire. This is an area for further research with potential significance for the autonomy of nineteenth-century women in managing their visual representations and exemplifies the value of re-situating iconic portraits of Charlotte as Empress of Mexico among her earlier portraits and the late adaptations of her portraits as Empress.27

The trajectory of portraits of Charlotte is ongoing as previously unknown or privately held images continue to appear and widen the scope for examination of this

27 The painting of Charlotte in uniform and the *Miramare*, one of the series referred to above, are displayed at Miramare Castle where, detached from their original meanings and circumstances of production, they propel the narration of Maximilian’s heroism. Early images of Charlotte in Flemish and *brabançonne* costume painted by Franz Xaver Winterhalter and that of Charlotte in Greek costume by Louis Gallait might also be investigated as demonstrating the prevalence of meaningful role-play in nineteenth-century portraiture.
body of work (Figure 7.26). Disrupting entrenched ‘Ophelia’ interpretations of iconic images of Charlotte facilitates investigations of her portraits as a means of negotiating, or enforcing, gender conventions, and as, potentially, a vehicle for intervention in political circumstances. I contend such motivations and strategies signify beyond the biography of a single historical figure to resonate with present-day intersections of portraits, gender, and political power.
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