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INTRODUCTION

Connect with the Arts

The Washington Post art critic Sebastian Smee states that his purpose in writing his Great Works, In Focus column is not to educate his readers. He writes them for pleasure. To share artwork for which he derives pleasure and for which he has a passion — all found in American museums.

But we know that our students and we do learn when we read his essays. The connections he makes between the featured artwork and the work of other artists, poets and playwrights opens our eyes. Representative columns are in this resource guide. Use them for models of writing about art, for connections to other works — and to awaken students’ appreciation for different genre, time periods (contemporary, modern, 19th century) and artists (Old Masters, women, Black, Asian). There are more than 100 additional essays. A.P. Art History and Art 3 and Art 4 students could use as a great overview. Send students on an exploration to find one or more that call to them.

Students are asked to get acquainted with Post coverage of the arts and entertainment in two activities, It’s Friday. Read WEEKEND. and It’s Sunday. Relax with ARTS&STYLE. The questions are general enough to apply to any Friday and any Sunday section.

Suggestions for students to make their own connections to the arts and entertainment are found throughout the guide. Take them beyond the classroom into resources to last a lifetime and to enrich today.
Great Works, In Focus

One of the great things about pictures is that they make no demands on you. You can look as long as you like and walk away at any time. There’s a freedom in this arrangement that I love. I know people who go to museums to look at a single painting. That might seem a bit perverse, given all that’s on offer. But, in a sense, I try to enact a version of this same, focused impulse in my Great Works, In Focus column. I’m saying, “Hey, let’s look at this one thing.”

I don’t write these pieces to educate Post readers. I wouldn’t presume. I write them for pleasure. It’s that simple. “Pleasure,” wrote W.H. Auden, “is by no means an infallible critical guide, but it is the least fallible.”

I’m lucky on two counts: that enough people seem to get pleasure from reading them to make continuing worthwhile and that my subject — great works of art in America’s public museums — is pretty much inexhaustible.

If you learn something from them, great; we’re learning together. But what interests me more is finding ways to express (without, I hope, gushing, without patronizing, without intruding too much on your time) my passion for this stuff. My hope is that doing so might occasionally ignite similar excitement in you.

— Sebastian Smee
February 24, 2022

YOUR TURN

You can view and read more than 100 of Sebastian Smee’s essays on great works at https://www.washingtonpost.com/great-works-in-focus/. Skim through the listed pieces — the headlines, brief descriptions and miniature images — from most recently published to earliest essay. Select one piece to get to know better.

• Use the enlarge feature to focus on details before reading the essay. What do you see?
• What detail(s) do you find most interesting?
• Look at the artist’s name. What do you know about this artist?
• Look at the date of the work. What do you know about that time period?

Read Smee’s essay. You know he thinks this is a great work. What does he include about the following in a way to share his passion for the work?
• What is the historic context of the artwork?
• What was happening in the artist’s life?
• In what way does the artwork relate to other pieces of art, poetry or literature?
• What elements of nature are important to the composition?
• What techniques and medium are used — and to what effect?
* Re-read the lede and closing paragraphs. What reflection does he share? Do they unify the personal sharing of his exploration of a work he considers great?
There’s a poem by William Carlos Williams that I love because it is so selfish, honest, casually remorseful and loving. It comes in the form of a nonchalant apology (my favorite kind). Its title, “This Is Just to Say,” sets the tone. The rest of the poem is a masterpiece of guilelessness, comedy and concision. “I have eaten/ the plums/ that were in/ the icebox/ and which/ you were probably/ saving/ for breakfast/ Forgive me/ they were delicious/ so sweet/ and so cold.”

But even more than poems about plums, I love paintings of plums. The plums in this painting, by Anne Vallayer-Coster (1744-1818), have not come out of an icebox. But they do emerge from deep shadow, and they’re connected to the same sense of appetite and pleasure that radiates from Williams’s poem.

Vallayer-Coster was the daughter of a goldsmith who worked for the Gobelins tapestry factory in Paris. In 1770, the year after she painted this, she was unanimously accepted as a member of France’s Royal Academy. Ten years later, she was given the title of “Painter to the Queen” by Marie Antoinette (who also personally signed, as witness, the contract of Vallayer-Coster’s marriage to Jean-Pierre Coster, a wealthy lawyer and member of parliament).

Denis Diderot, the philosopher and art critic, also was a big admirer. “No one of the French school can rival the strength of [Vallayer-Coster’s] colors,” he wrote in 1771, “nor her uncomplicated surface finish.”

To see what Diderot meant by “uncomplicated surface finish,” home in on the plums in this painting, which is on view at the Cleveland Museum of Art. They could not look more plummy. Setting them against the deep but muted greens of the leaves and moss that protect them, Vallayer-Coster painted the late-summer stone fruits with rich reds before laying down patches of dark purple and cloudy mauve.

The brushstrokes are clearly visible. They move in apparently random directions, often leaving visible traces of the brush’s hairs. There is only one bold white highlight. Vallayer-Coster also uses a touch of yellow in the center of the uppermost plum to accentuate the intensity of that fruit’s red.

Vallayer-Coster is often compared to Jean Baptiste Siméon Chardin, the greatest still-life painter of the 18th century. There is a similar mellowness and sobriety in both artists’ work. But Vallayer-Coster’s paint handling is so relaxed and fresh, so open to accidental effects, that it anticipates the loose handling of Manet’s still lifes a century later.

The painting is just under two square feet. Its other features are telling. Vallayer-Coster could have added expensive crystal, pewter or porcelain. Instead she gives us a simple glass of water. I have several just like it in my cupboard. She creates an illusion of volume with just a couple of nonchalant highlights. Smears of color suggest the reflections of the plums and the cakes.

Those cakes, cradled in paper crisped by the oven, are crumbly, buttery, blond. I can almost smell them. It’s all just so.

Life is good when there is plenty, yes. (No one wants to go to the icebox and find all the plums gone.) But for some reason, it is even better when it is simple, when it is fresh. Vallayer-Coster’s painting shows us what that might look like.

Sebastian Smee is a Pulitzer Prize-winning art critic at The Washington Post and the author of The Art of Rivalry: Four Friendships, Betrayals and Breakthroughs in Modern Art. “They are things that move me. Part of the fun is trying to figure out why,” says Smee about this series.
With a Nonchalant Apology, This Is Just to Say

Let’s take a closer look at Sebastian Smee’s essay, “The Pure Perfection of Plums.” Before reading the piece look closely at the artwork that inspires his work and passion for the still life by Anne Vallayer-Coster.

1. What items are found in the still life? Describe them.

2. If you did not know the name of the fruit, from the title of Smee’s piece and the title of the artwork you know they are plums.
   a. If you have eaten a plum, describe what it tastes like.
   b. If you have not eaten a plum, does the artist make the fruit look appealing? Explain your response.

3. Before reading Smee’s essay, review the meaning of these words. If there are several definitions which is the best in the context of the artwork?
   Accentuate  Mellowness
   Brushstrokes  Muted
   Concision  Nonchalant
   Guilelessness  Remorseful
   Icebox  Sobriety

Read Smee’s piece before responding to the following questions.

4. Smee references several people and organizations. From the essay and some research, what do you know about them?
   a. Jean Baptiste Siméon Chardin (1699-1779)
   b. Denis Diderot (1713-1784)
   c. Gobelins tapestry (est. 1662)
   d. Édouard Manet (1832-1883)
   e. Marie Antoinette (1755-1793)
   f. Royal Academy of France (founded 1648)

5. What do we learn about the artist Anne Vallayer-Coster who was born in 1744?
   a. Select three milestones in her life and indicate her age at the time.
   b. What details give an indication of her social status?

6. Smee begins his essay indicating his love for “This Is Just to Say,” a poem by William Carlos Williams. He then explains why and quotes the whole poem. Read the poem aloud to hear the line breaks and play with tone.
   a. What confession does the speaker make?
   b. Did the speaker like the plums? Give details to support your response.
   c. Was the speaker sorry the plums were eaten?

7. Smee, in paragraphs 5 and 6, tells the reader about his observations of the still life’s details. Compare and contrast his observations to yours in #1.
   a. What do you both indicate about the plums?
   b. Did you include the cakes? Did you wonder why cakes were included?

8. What does the comparison to the works of Jean Baptiste Siméon Chardin and Édouard Manet add to Smee’s piece?
9. How are the first and last paragraphs unified?
   a. Begin with the first two sentences. Note the switch to the owner of the plums.
   b. Smee concludes with these two sentences: “But for some reason, it is even better when it is simple,
      when it is fresh. Vallayer-Coster’s painting shows us what that might look like.” What do the poet and
      the painter bring to life?

10. What will your experiment in inspiration be? Select one of these.
   a. Write a poem to accompany a painting or work of art that you like.
   b. Paint, sculpt, create a work of art that is inspired by a poem. Does the subject, details, atmosphere or
      mood of the poem inspire you?
   c. Do some more reading. Have other writers been inspired by artwork? Write an essay about both
      artwork and literary work in which you include details to compare and contrast the styles, techniques
      and themes.
   d. Read about local, national or international events. Select one to write about in an essay or poem, to
      illustrate through a collage (perhaps from pages from the newspaper), to draw or sculpt.

With a Nonchalant Apology, This Is Just to Say | continued
Every 7-year-old looks beautiful to eyes past a certain age. So it’s hard to say whether this 18th-century portrait by Jean-Étienne Liotard is of a particularly lovely 7-year-old or whether it’s just a particularly lovely picture. I’m going with the latter. Anyone can see it: The level of artistry is astonishing.

The medium is not paint but pastel, which Liotard (1702-1789) came as close as anyone to perfecting. Pastel is powdery and sensitive to light, so for its own good, this portrait spends a lot of time in storage. But I’ve noticed that when I visit the Getty and it’s on display, it’s always surrounded by sighing admirers.

Liotard died the year the French Revolution broke out. He stayed there for four years, perfecting his pastel technique with pictures of local domestic scenes. When he came back, he kept an eccentrically full beard and continued wearing Turkish clothing, earning him the nickname “the Turkish painter.” He made portraits of subjects including his Dutch wife and Rousseau in “exotic” Eastern costumes at a time when fashion was regarded as an integral aspect of good portraiture.

At some point, Liotard also developed an intense love of the color blue. All of his best pictures hinge, chromatically, on pure shades that hover somewhere between sky and royal blue. Here, Maria Frederike wears a rich blue cape with a white fur trim. Slightly lighter hues of the same color can be found in her hair ribbons, her dress, the collar of the little dog she cradles like a doll and her eyes.

Up close, you can see how Liotard used both the texture of the vellum surface and the opaque, subtly layered and slightly granular pastel to imitate the look of skin, with its pores and shadows and highlights. The delicate striations of diagonal highlights on the girl’s rosy right cheek give it a palpable luster. And the set of the child’s lips against her skin is realized so sensitively that you cannot conceive that so much soft, dimpled vitality depends for its underlying structure on something as ghastly as a skull.

Notice, above all, her eyes. They seem to have noticed something, and to react with a kind of tender calm, verging on disinterested amusement. Few things are as moving as youthful self-possession. Meanwhile, the little dog — possibly a Japanese Chin? (I defer to the dog experts) — stares out of the picture with doggy bemusement.

Sebastian Smee is a Pulitzer Prize-winning art critic at The Washington Post and the author of The Art of Rivalry: Four Friendships, Betrayals and Breakthroughs in Modern Art. “They are things that move me. Part of the fun is trying to figure out why,” says Smee about this series.
It’s exciting, when you get up close to this 1939 painting by Edward Hopper, to see the weave of the canvas showing through the smooth paint. You can see it especially at the edge of the red curtain and where the shadow meets the tan-colored wall.

It’s fun to think that Hopper was using paint to represent a wall that was itself painted. The appearance of the woven canvas is like a tiny break in these layers of fact and illusion, a flicker of uncanniness, as when a child watches her mother removing makeup at the mirror.

What are we looking at here? A female usher in a movie theater. What else?

Well, it’s dark. And somehow the darkness feels just as important as what is illuminated. Shadows animate our speculative capacities, our yearning for stories. Isn’t that what makes going to the movies so exciting?

Hopper also shows us various light sources, including a fragment of the movie screen, where the action is no doubt rushing inexorably toward a Hollywood climax.

The freedom that comes with living our own stories

Edward Hopper (b. 1882)
New York Movie, 1939

On view at the Museum of Modern Art, New York

A series featuring art critic Sebastian Smee’s favorite works in permanent collections across the United States
But Hopper’s attention is elsewhere. It’s on the usher. The wall lamp illuminates her blond hair. Her uniform — a blue jumpsuit with a snazzy red stripe — is accessorized by pumps and a flashlight. She’s glamorous.

But her demeanor is pensive and, like so many of Hopper’s figures, rather stiff. It reinforces the sense we have of her … stuckness.

She could be in the movies herself. But she’s not a leading lady. She’s an usher, waiting. The loose, purposeless pocket of time she inhabits is at odds with the contrived and efficient time of the movies.

How disappointing, you could say.

Imagining her disappointment put me in mind of a passage from a wonderful essay by literary critic James Wood. Wood noticed that an army officer in the Anton Chekhov story “The Kiss” is disappointed by the account he has just given to his fellow officers of an extraordinary event in his life. He thought it would take a long time, but “it takes only a minute to tell.”

Wood notices, moreover, that “many of Chekhov’s characters are disappointed by the stories they tell, and somewhat jealous of other people’s stories.”

You could say something similar, I think, about Hopper’s characters. In this painting, which combines the suspenseful, lamplit drama of Degas’s “Interior” with the boredom of Manet’s “A Bar at the Folies-Bergère,” the disappointment, tinged by jealousy, is palpable.

The usher (my projection, but Hopper invites us to speculate) is struggling to reconcile her youth and beauty with her prosaic, low-paying job. She’s seen enough movies: She knows there must be more to life.

Something about her evident disillusion makes us believe in her more. Chekhov’s characters, too, can seem uncannily lifelike, and Wood attributes this to a kind of literary special effect. It’s produced by Chekhov letting his characters be disappointed by their own stories.

By allowing his fictional creation in “The Kiss” to be disappointed by the story he has just told, Chekhov allows him, by implication, to be disappointed by the story Chekhov has given him. “Thus,” writes Wood, the character “wriggles out of Chekhov’s story into the bottomless freedom of disappointment.”

I love this idea. It’s subtle, but it gets at something big: the freedom promised by art. And it helps explain why we get such a feeling of reality from Hopper’s paintings, even though they are highly artificial, radically stripped-down.

We are all in the usher’s position. We are waiting. Our stories feel fatally unformed. They don’t cohere. We did not become movie stars. We are not going viral on TikTok. We don’t have as many followers as the next person. It’s all decidedly disappointing.

But we are — “like a bird on the wire, like a drunk in a midnight choir,” as Leonard Cohen sang — free. Not only can we wriggle out of the fictions society tries to impose on us; we can do it on our own terms, in our own time.

We can step through the velvet curtains, up the carpeted stairs and out into the sunlight of disillusion. Or we can stay exactly where we are, in this state of gorgeous make-believe, this penumbral present, with its rich colors, heavy drapes and musty air of perfume, popcorn and potential.

Sebastian Smee is a Pulitzer Prize-winning art critic at The Washington Post and the author of The Art of Rivalry: Four Friendships, Betrayals and Breakthroughs in Modern Art. “They are things that move me. Part of the fun is trying to figure out why,” says Smee about this series.
If you see one piece of art, we have 100 suggestions

BY SEBASTIAN SMEE

• Originally Published February 27, 2022

One of the great things about pictures is that they make no demands on you. You can look as long as you like and walk away at any time. There’s a freedom in the arrangement that’s different from going to the movies, concerts or the theater. I know people who go to museums to look at a single painting. That might seem a bit perverse, given all that’s on offer. But, in a sense, I try to enact a version of this same, focused impulse in my Great Works, In Focus column. I’m saying, “Hey, let’s look at this one thing.” My only aim is to start a conversation about it. I don’t write these pieces to educate Post readers. I wouldn’t presume. I write them for pleasure. It’s that simple. “Pleasure,” wrote W.H. Auden, “is by no means an infallible critical guide, but it is the least fallible.”

I’m lucky on two counts: that enough people seem to get pleasure from reading them to make continuing worthwhile, and that my subject — great works of art in America’s public museums — is pretty much inexhaustible.

If you learn something from them, great; we’re learning together. But what interests me more is finding ways to express (without, I hope, gushing, without patronizing, without intruding too much on your time) my passion for this stuff. My hope is that doing so might occasionally ignite similar excitement in you.

Occasionally, people let me know that they feel intimidated by art. On the one hand, I get it. Some in the art world, wanting to establish their authority, fall back on jargon or giddy abstractions to create a zone of exclusion. It can be insufferable.

But what field doesn’t see a version of this phenomenon? Baseball writing makes zero sense if you haven’t grown up with the sport. Have you tried understanding cellular biology? Blockchain technology? Contract law? In my experience, there is less of this rarefied talk around art than around most other fields.

The bigger hazard of my profession is condescension. People don’t like to be patronized. They know who Rembrandt is. They have strong opinions about Frida Kahlo and Jeff Koons. They saw a Ragnar Kjartansson exhibition last week.

Art is a wide field. It’s deep, it’s diverse. You can come at the subject from countless angles. People seem to have been making art since the beginning, so the subject is interwoven with the whole history of humanity. So yes, things can get complicated.

But, in the end, we’re talking about pictures and sculptures. How hard is it to look at a painting? How onerous is it to walk around a sculpture? (It’s easier than understanding NFTs, that’s for sure.) Children get it immediately. They know there’s no right or wrong when it comes to looking at art. There are just things to notice, to test against our imperfect sense of the truth, to
fold into our various conceptions of beauty. Things we notice may provoke feelings. They may lead to ideas. They might equally provide a release from ideas — a release into wonder, into new kinds of awareness connected to your body, your senses, your general state of existential bafflement.

What I notice will be different from what you notice. In fact, the most rewarding part of writing these pieces is the feedback I get from you, in online comments and emails. Some people write to take issue with things I’ve written; others offer fascinating speculations of their own. It’s humbling.

I learn things every week. Probably the most remarkable moment came after a piece I wrote about a David Hockney painting at the Art Institute of Chicago.

The painting is famous: It depicts two Los Angeles collectors, Fred and Marcia Weisman. Hockney painted it in 1968 — a dramatic year in American history. So, in my short piece, I tried to put Hockney’s stiff and immaculate painting in the messy context of that period’s widespread social upheaval (assassinations, wars, protests). I focused on Fred Weisman’s clenched fist as a possible clue to that wider context.

What I completely missed, as one reader pointed out, was the possibility that the clenched fist is an indicator of something far more specific.

Two years before Hockney’s painting, I was told, Fred Weisman had been in a fight at the Polo Lounge in the Beverly Hills Hotel. Frank Sinatra was there celebrating Dean Martin’s birthday. Their party was noisy, and Weisman asked them to quiet down.

What happened next is disputed. What is not disputed is that Weisman ended up in hospital with a fractured skull. His injuries required hours of brain surgery. His clenched fist, I was informed, was a lingering side effect.

According to one account, Sinatra had disparaged Weisman with an anti-Semitic slur. After a further exchange, Sinatra allegedly grabbed a telephone and smashed Weisman over the head with it. Weisman never pressed charges — allegedly (again) because he received threatening, late-night telephone calls.

That is just one account, and as I said, it’s disputed. But now the painting looks different, no?

That’s how it goes with art. I might be looking at an abstract painting by Lee Krasner in Cleveland, a sculpted head from the Ife kingdom in Nigeria at the Kimbell Art Museum in Texas or a 15th-century wooden panel depicting the Annunciation at the Met Cloisters in New York. There are always stories to tell, things to notice, feelings to try to express.

Extending knowledge is one way to trigger excitement — and I’m all for it. But passion can also be aroused by an unfamiliar emotion or new flavors of confusion. I try to be open to all of it. I don’t mind not knowing. I’m suspicious of the idea of “closure.” I like staying in that place where thinking and feeling remain intertwined and evolving, not tied up and snipped off.

I’ve been doing these pieces since late 2019. (I wrote a similar column for the Boston Globe for six years.) Some of them work better than others. When they fail, or fail to inspire, it’s on me. But the fact that a storied media company like The Post sees it as part of its mission to publish this kind of writing is why I love working here.

The artworks I write about are all in American museums that are open to the public. These museums are the pride of the cities that support them: St. Louis, Fort Worth, Chicago, San Francisco, Richmond, Washington. Millions flock to them every year. The artworks they display are part of our communal inheritance.

A central part. More than the political or economic conditions of any given era, it is art that later generations most want to remember. We remember the name Rembrandt ahead of all the tulip speculators and ship captains who powered the Dutch economy. We remember Leonardo over the popes and kings he worked for. We remember Picasso and Matisse with more love than Gen. Franco or Marshall Petain. And we remember the Beatles and Francis Bacon over the prime ministers who governed Britain in the 1960s (for the record, Harold Wilson and Harold Macmillan).

That’s because the arts — and I define the term as broadly as possible — reveal the best of us. It’s because they combine the most intelligent and the most feeling of us. They testify, most fundamentally, to the fact that we’re alive, that people lived before us, that as a species we’re capable of making the most extraordinary things, and that human consciousness and the world beyond it are nothing short of astonishing.

Again and again, art expresses that astonishment — that alloy of wonder and dismay, knowing and unknowing, pleasure and pain, joy and fear.

To view all 100 of Sebastian Smee’s Great Works, In Focus columns, visit wapo.st/gwif

Sebastian Smee is a Pulitzer Prize-winning art critic at The Washington Post and the author of The Art of Rivalry: Four Friendships, Betrayals and Breakthroughs in Modern Art. He teaches non-fiction writing at Wellesley College.
It’s Friday. Read WEEKEND.

Each Friday Post readers find WEEKEND inserted into their daily Washington Post. Its pages are packed with articles and a mix of advertising. Let’s explore its content.

Begin by finding each of the following components that makeup the content. Indicate the page(s) on which you located it.

COVER
BEST BETS | Noteworthy events this week
INSIDE
STANDING COLUMNS
  Ask Tom
  Casual Dining
  Dream Day
  the GUIDE to the Lively Arts
  Movie Directory

FEATURED PAGES/Arts and Entertainment
  Movies
  Featured film
  Also opening
  Also playing
  Streaming
  Common Sense Media
  Music
  On Exhibit
  On Stage

ADVERTISING
Instead of page numbers, count how many advertisements are in this WEEKEND.

1. All of the content you reviewed may not be found in the Friday WEEKEND you are reading. What factors do you think influence what is included?

2. The content, after the first three pages, may vary in order from one Friday to the next. Why do you think the editors of WEEKEND do not keep a consistent order of content?

3. Which of the above content appealed to you most? Why?
4. If you want to go to an art exhibit, where are three exhibits being held that interest you? Where did you locate this information in WEEKEND?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

5. You want to watch a movie. Name the movie. In what movie category do you find the following?
   a. Movie to watch with a younger sibling
   b. Movie at a nearby theater
   c. Latest release

6. Read the Cover Story. Summarize the topic and highlight one part of it.

7. Select a piece from Music or On Stage.
   a. What aspects of the performer, performance, music or script are highlighted?
   b. Are any negative aspects included?
   c. For what audience do you think this piece is targeted?

8. Advertisements provide readers with additional choices to spend their time and money.
   a. Which ad was most visually interesting to capture your attention?
   b. Which ad sparked your interest in possibly attending or visiting?
   c. If an advertising supplement is included, what is the featured activity? Explain how the layout, photographs and illustrations give it a different appeal than other ads.

9. Read the dining-related pieces — Ask Tom, Casual Dining and Dining.
   a. Which restaurant would you like to go to with a date or your family?
   b. What made it sound so good? Food, ambience, culture, location, prices?
   c. Write a restaurant review that might appear in your student media or shared to persuade someone to go there with you.

10. Read the Dream Day essay. What kind of information is found in the introduction? What other information is provided for readers? Write your own Dream Day essay.
It’s Sunday. Relax with ARTS&STYLE.

On Sunday, the STYLE section becomes ARTS&STYLE. You will find feature articles about theater, dance, movies, art, architecture, exhibits and the people behind them; going out opportunities; diversions and advice.

1. Select one of the stories that cover the arts and popular culture. Write three to five paragraphs about something new you learn in this article.

2. Summarize the Cover Story. Be sure to include title, author and date of publication.

3. Hunt for information. Where would you look if you want to find the following?
   a. For personal advice, to which columns do you turn?
   b. Where a certain movie is showing
   c. A quick overview of theater options in the Metro area
   d. The Strathmore production of “Defiant Requiem”
   e. Sebastian Smee’s byline

4. Read a review in Book World. Respond to the following questions.
   a. Title and author of the book that is reviewed, its genre and other basic information
   b. Who is reviewing the book? Why do you think this person was selected to review this work?
   c. What type of information is included in the review?
   d. Does the reviewer recommend this book? Why or why not?

5. What diversions appear in the last page of this section of the Sunday newspaper?

6. Choose one of the following. For #1, use content in what you read in ARTS&STYLE.
   a. Prepare a personalized viewing grid for one week. Be sure that day and time are clear. How many categories will your grid need (For example, broadcast, streaming, cable; specials, movies, awards, sports)? Vary the programs to reflect different interests (news, sports, comedy, drama, children) and activities. You may include programs beyond the week in a DO NOT MISS section.
   b. Review the photographs and art reprints found in the section. Comment on the subject and quality, choice of image(s) and dominant one. In what way do they add another dimension to the article?
   c. Advertisements help to cover the expenses of producing print and online publication. Review the ads in this section. To whom are they appealing? Consider use of typeface, white space, illustration/photograph(s), and color. Select two of the best ads to highlight, explaining what makes them exemplary for advertising for these readers.