

Velázquez's *Bodegones* and the Art of Emulation*

Tanya J. Tiffany

University of Wisconsin. Milwaukee

Anuario del Departamento de Historia y Teoría del Arte
(U.A.M.). Vol. XVIII, 2006

ABSTRACT

This essay explores Golden-Age Spanish approaches to artistic emulation through an analysis of Velázquez's youthful bodegones (genre scenes). Historians of Italian and French art have long recognized that seventeenth-century invention was based largely on emulation, in which artists competed with masters old and new by selectively appropriating aspects of their works. Building on writings by Velázquez's early biographers, I argue that emulation provides a historical framework for considering the young artist's innovation and engagement with the pictorial traditions of his time. An examination of the bodegones furthermore elucidates Velázquez's challenge to Caravaggio, whose exemplar the Spaniard transformed by painting scenes of daily life with strong chiaroscuro and witty conceits rooted in literary conventions.

RESUMEN

Este ensayo explora el concepto de la imitación artística en el Siglo de Oro español a través de un análisis de los bodegones de Velázquez. Los historiadores del arte italiano y francés han reconocido desde hace mucho tiempo que la invención artística en el siglo XVII se basaba en gran parte en la emulación, por la cual los artistas competían con los maestros antiguos y modernos a través de la apropiación selectiva de aspectos de sus obras. Utilizando los escritos de los biógrafos tempranos de Velázquez, este ensayo propone a la emulación como marco histórico para considerar la innovación en el joven Velázquez a la vez que su implicación en las tradiciones artísticas de su tiempo. El examen de los bodegones también aclara el reto de Velázquez a Caravaggio, al adoptar y adaptar el estilo del italiano en sus escenas de la vida cotidiana, vertidas en un potente claroscuro y con agudas alusiones a fuentes literarias.

To see Spanish art steadily and to see it as a whole is admittedly difficult... For the art that has been proclaimed by a given generation as the last word, and discarded by the next as obsolescent, has often been tardily granted an asylum and a renewal of life in Spain. Spain appears to-day as the Tower of Babel within which resound the many languages of art, the echoes of culture after culture, alive, moribund and dead; tongues as dissimilar as the Arab, the Gothic, the Italian and the Flemish, co-mingle and contend within the four corners of the square Peninsula¹.

Spanish art history has made great strides since Robert Rattray Tatlock, writing in 1927, described Spanish art as a provincial and indiscriminate amalgam of foreign pictorial tongues. Scholars have long rejected the nationalistic tenor of such characterizations and have challenged stereotypes of Spanish painting as the second-rate product of an artistic backwater. Since the early 1970s, historical investigations have shed particular light on painting from Spain's Golden Age by locating it within its cultural, political, and religious contexts². In recent years, scholars have published groundbreaking monographs on El Greco and Velázquez, and have produced major exhi-

bition catalogues on Ribera, Zurbarán, and Murillo³. These studies are the result of extensive archival research on the lives and careers of Spanish artists, and they elucidate larger themes including painters' struggles for acceptance as practitioners of a liberal art. In light of these achievements, scholars now have an understanding of Spanish patronage, collecting, and artists' social status almost unthinkable a few decades ago.

Despite these advances, historians of Spanish art have yet fully to locate Golden-Age painters on the European stage. In order to do so, scholars must consider Spanish artists' dynamic engagement with pictorial traditions from the Iberian Peninsula and abroad. Historians of Italian and French art have long recognized that seventeenth-century invention was based largely on creative emulation, in which artists competed with masters old and new by selectively imitating and appropriating aspects of their works. Indeed, seventeenth-century painters often called attention to their emulative approach to art. They frequently quoted pictorial sources and adopted elements of other artists' styles while embellishing these models through innovations in composition and handling of paint⁴. A consideration of this practice of selective appropriation provides a historical model for studying Spanish painters, who continually enhanced and transformed artistic examples from Italy, Flanders, and other parts of Europe. Pointing the way toward understanding emulation in Spain, Fernando Marías has recently suggested that Velázquez aimed to encompass and improve upon Titian's art by modifying the Italian master's painterly manner and representation of mythology⁵. Golden-Age theorists argued that Spanish painters fused aspects of foreign styles and subjects with their own inventions in order to rival and even surpass artists from abroad⁶. By emphasizing Spanish artists' creative synthesis, contemporary theorists suggested that Spaniards did not fall under the sway of foreign masters, but instead considered themselves participants in broader European artistic trends.

The *bodegones* (genre scenes) painted by Diego Velázquez in his native Seville present a vital opportunity to explore Spanish approaches to artistic emulation, because these paintings reveal the artist's remarkable innovation as well as his keen attention to the pictorial conventions of his time. In his *bodegones*, the young Velázquez painted scenes of daily life with bold realism and strong *chiaroscuro*, creating paintings unlike any produced before in Seville. Emphasizing the exceptionality of Velázquez's achievement, scholars have sought to liberate these works from the supposed influence exerted upon the youthful painter by Caravaggio and other foreign artists⁷. In the process, however, they have treated Velázquez in isolation from the seventeenth-century artistic milieu in which he worked. Equally important, they

have overlooked the evidence of Sevillian artists' serious attention to contemporary paintings from abroad.

Velázquez's master and father-in-law, Francisco Pacheco, and first biographer, Antonio Palomino, stress the young painter's close engagement with the works of other artists. Pacheco's *Arte de la Pintura* (completed in 1638, published in 1649) and Palomino's *Museo Pictórico* (1715-24) represent the two principal sources on Velázquez's life and oeuvre, and provide crucial insight into the cultural framework of early seventeenth-century Seville⁸. Both writers analyze Velázquez's *bodegones* in terms of emulation. Shedding light on the paintings' critical context and early reception, they argue that the *bodegones* manifest Velázquez's desire to depart from Sevillian pictorial traditions and to compete with the best masters from abroad. While their texts are clearly not literal replications of Velázquez's thoughts and intentions, they offer salient illustrations of the young artist's innovation with regard to local and foreign artistic precedents⁹.

My reading of Pacheco's and Palomino's texts departs from previous scholarship. I argue that Pacheco's discussion of the realism practiced by Velázquez and Caravaggio suggests that the theorist was more open to contemporary artistic developments than historians have generally believed. In this essay, Palomino's treatise also provides a crucial interpretive model for analyzing Velázquez's *bodegones*. Although Palomino never knew Velázquez personally, he was closely associated with many artists who did, and he based his biography largely on an account (now lost) by one of Velázquez's pupils¹⁰. Palomino thus offers invaluable evidence of how Velázquez's near contemporaries perceived his engagement with the works of other artists. By examining Pacheco's and Palomino's texts in concert with a close analysis of the *bodegones*, I offer a historical framework for assessing both Velázquez's challenge to Sevillian conventions and the controversial problem of his engagement with Caravaggio's art. This study of emulation also sheds light on the broader cultural context of Velázquez's *bodegones*, in which the young artist vied with painters as well as poets by representing scenes of daily life with strong *chiaroscuro* and witty conceits rooted in literary invention.

VELÁZQUEZ, BODEGONES, AND ARTISTIC THEORY

A glance at the *Old Woman Cooking* (1618) (Fig. 1), painted the year after Velázquez left Pacheco's studio, demonstrates the novelty of the young artist's *bodegones*¹¹. In the painting, Velázquez depicted two figures and a spare arrangement of still-life objects against a plain, dark background. An old woman in profile appears to the right of the composition, her sunken cheeks and



Fig. 1. Diego Velázquez, "Old Woman Cooking" (1618, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland).

weathered skin accentuated by the strong light source emerging from the right-hand side. On the left, a young boy gazes out of the picture plane, seemingly absorbed in thought. He holds a decaying pumpkin, convincingly rendered with tiny, heavily-impasted brushstrokes. The painting's still-life elements exemplify the artist's observation of nature. Velázquez's polished, almost imperceptible brushstrokes skillfully evoke the shiny glaze of the jugs on the wooden table and the bowl on the glowing stovetop. Providing a contrast to these smooth surfaces, long, loose brushstrokes laden with pigment create the illusion of eggs just cracked, and the copper pot in the lower-left foreground shines with uneven strokes of paint.

In execution and treatment of subject, Velázquez's *Old Woman Cooking* stands in marked distinction to *bodegones* painted by other Andalusian artists beginning in the late sixteenth century. Juan Esteban's *Market Stall* (1606) (Fig. 2) is similar to the *Old Woman Cooking* in scale, color scheme, and lowly subject matter, but Esteban has filled his scene with a copious display of still-life objects¹². Whereas Velázquez's austere figures appear against a sparse background, Esteban's motley, rot-toothed characters stand in a stall packed with flayed meat, birds, fruit, vegetables and bread, and their grinning faces give the painting a comic tone. Similarly, the anonymous *Kitchen Scene* (ca. 1604) from the Archbishop's Palace in Seville represents a young woman and a man

surrounded by an abundance of fruits, vegetables, and game, while the painting's background depicts three figures preparing a meal¹³. Unlike the technical virtuosity of the *Old Woman Cooking*, the anonymous artist's modest talents and limited study of nature are betrayed by his stiff brushstrokes and awkward rendering of anatomy, in which the young woman's arm twists uncomfortably at the elbow and wrist.

The difference between Velázquez's convincing rendering of nature and the pedestrian skills of other painters of *bodegones* is considered at length in Pacheco's *Arte de la Pintura*. Drawing upon Pliny's *Natural History*, Pacheco relates contemporary representations of lowly subjects to their antique precedents. He explains that the ancient Piraeicus painted

humble things (but very renowned in that genre), he painted barber's shops, craftsmen's shops, animals, plants, and similar things... he was like those in our time who paint fish stalls, *bodegones*, animals, fruits and landscapes: even if they are excellent painters in that field, with the pleasure and facility they find in that comfortable imitation, they do not aspire to greater things, and thus, republics and kings do not make use of them in more distinguished matters of greater majesty and erudition [*estudios*]¹⁴.



Fig. 2. Juan Esteban, "Market Stall" (1606, Granada, Museo de Bellas Artes) (photo: Institut Amatller d'Art Hispànic).

In this passage, Pacheco links the plebeian subject matter of *bodegones* to the humbleness of artists who create them. Piraeicus's shop scenes earned fame only "in that genre," and painters of *bodegones* do not aspire to the preeminence that results from works combining technical skill and learning. By contrasting *bodegones* with paintings involving greater effort and study, Pacheco suggests that the faithful imitation of mundane objects requires little artistic invention.

Yet Pacheco also articulates the distinction between commonplace *bodegones* and the masterpieces of his son-in-law and former pupil:

Well then? Should *bodegones* not be esteemed? Of course they should, if painted as they are by my son-in-law – who dominates the field and leaves room for no one else – then they deserve great esteem; for with these beginnings and the portraits, which we shall speak of later, he found the true imitation of nature [*la verdadera imitación del natural*], inspiring the minds of many with his powerful example. I ventured with [this example] once in order to please a friend while in Madrid in 1625, and I painted him a little canvas with two figures from life, flowers and fruits and other trifles, which my learned friend Francisco de Rioja now has; and I succeeded enough so that by comparison the other things from my hand appeared painted¹⁵.

Scholars have argued that this passage demonstrates Pacheco's pride regarding his son-in-law's achievement, but it also reveals his effort to grapple with the merit and success of Velázquez's *bodegones*¹⁶. Pacheco contends that *bodegones* painted as Velázquez does are praisewor-

thy in their "true imitation of nature." By "true imitation," Pacheco means that nature is counterfeited so convincingly that such masterly *bodegones* appear real, causing other works to seem merely "painted." The realistic representation of nature achieved in the *bodegones* has motivated others to follow Velázquez's example, inciting even his teacher to try his hand at the genre. In a circular argument, Pacheco also explains that Velázquez's *bodegones* are praiseworthy simply because they are the best of their kind. For Pacheco, preeminence even in a lowly genre merits "great esteem." He thus contends that Velázquez elevates himself as well as the genre's potential by "dominat[ing] the field and leav[ing] room for no one else."

In his *Museo Pictórico*, Antonio Palomino builds on Pacheco's characterization of Velázquez's ability to surpass other artists through the realism of his *bodegones*. He praises the "rare diligence" of Velázquez's observation of nature in the *Two Men at Table* (ca. 1620-21) (Fig. 3), and emphasizes the "liveliness" of "the fire, the flames, and the sparks" on the stove in the *Old Woman Cooking*¹⁷. Significantly, Palomino represents the young Velázquez as a painter solely of *bodegones* and portraits. By excluding the young artist's religious works (even those that combined *bodegones* and sacred themes), Palomino isolates Velázquez from the overwhelmingly sacred traditions of Sevillian painting. Indeed, Palomino explains that Velázquez painted *bodegones* in order to set himself apart from other artists:

Everything our Velázquez did at that time was in this manner, in order to distinguish himself from everyone, and follow a new path. Knowing that Titian, Dürer, Raphael, and others had already pulled ahead of him on a good wind, and that their fame was more alive after they had died, he made use of his novel, fanciful [*caprichosa*] invention, taking to painting rustic things in a bold manner [*a lo valentón*], with strange color and light. Some rebuked him for not painting more serious subjects with softness, and beauty, in which he could emulate Raphael of Urbino, and he gallantly replied, saying: That he would rather be first in that coarseness, than second in delicacy¹⁸.

According to Palomino, the young Velázquez placed his works within the trajectory of sixteenth – and early seventeenth-century art and realized that he could not compete with the great painters of the Renaissance in the masterly execution of history paintings. He therefore chose not to follow in their footsteps and fall short of their examples, and instead sought preeminence in "coarseness": the creation of novel, lowly subjects in a realist style. Palomino's characterization of the young Velázquez's bold rejection of the lyrical sweetness of Raphael is especially significant in that it also signals the

Fig. 3. Diego Velázquez, "Two Men at Table" (ca. 1620-21, London, Wellington Museum) (photo: Victoria & Albert Museum, London / Art Resource, NY).



young artist's repudiation of Pacheco's teachings. In the *Arte de la Pintura*, Pacheco establishes Raphael as his supreme exemplar, "whom I have tried to imitate since my youth (due to some hidden force of nature), moved by his extremely beautiful inventions [*invenciones*]"¹⁹.

In an insightful analysis of Velázquez's works, Palomino argues that the young artist realized the limitations of the models provided by Sevillian painters. Although Velázquez admired Pacheco's learning, he abandoned his master's artistic example, "having known, from the very beginning, that such a tepid manner of painting – although full of erudition, and drawing [*dibujo*] – did not suit him, for it was contrary to his natural pride and love of greatness"²⁰. He therefore sought out new models and chose painters whose works best accorded with his own artistic goals. In particular, recent paintings imported from Italy "greatly inspired Velázquez to attempt no smaller feats with his ingenuity [*ingenio*]"²¹. Palomino explains that Velázquez's convincing re-creation of nature led contemporaries to call him "a second Caravaggio, because he counterfeited nature so felicitously in his works, with such propriety, having [nature] before him for everything, and all the time"²². In keeping with his emphasis on Velázquez's desire for supremacy, Palomino casts this relationship in terms of rivalry, writing:

Velázquez competed with Caravaggio in the boldness of painting [*la valentía del pintar*], and equaled Pacheco in theoretical speculation [*lo especulativo*]. He esteemed the former for his excellence, and for the sharpness of his ingenuity [*la agudeza de su ingenio*]; and knowing Pacheco's erudition, which he considered worthy of his choice, he selected the latter as his teacher²³.

In this passage, Palomino's description of Velázquez's "theoretical speculation" – *lo especulativo* – highlights the young artist's intellectual approach to painting. For Golden-Age writers, the term *especulativo* characterized painters who studied artistic theory and deliberated on subject matter and style throughout the creative process²⁴. By arguing that Velázquez appreciated "the sharpness of [Caravaggio's] ingenuity," Palomino links Velázquez's realism to his *ingenio*: the painter's intellect and the source of artistic invention²⁵. This statement challenges early seventeenth-century Spanish characterizations of Caravaggesque realism as "superficial imitation" of nature that lacked "precepts, doctrine, and study"²⁶. For Palomino, Velázquez thus surpassed Caravaggio by combining realism, boldness, and ingenuity with an erudition equal to Pacheco's.

VELÁZQUEZ'S EMULATION

Despite Palomino's perceptive description of Velázquez's novel style and subject matter, scholars have not taken seriously the author's statement that the young artist "would rather be first in that coarseness, than second in delicacy" because it forms part of a *topos* with a long tradition in the history of Spanish art. Sixteenth – and seventeenth-century Spanish theorists attributed similar declarations to Titian, Bosch, and Juan Fernández de Navarrete, claiming that these artists worked in their distinct styles in order to set themselves apart from their forebears²⁷. Palomino evidently built on these texts, and his assertion finds its direct source in *El Héroe* (1639), by the Jesuit writer, Baltasar Gracián (1601-1658)²⁸. In the manner of Castiglione's *Il libro del cortegiano* (1528) and

other Renaissance treatises on comportment, *El Héroe* fashions an ideal model for achieving preeminence in fields such as politics, literature, and painting. Using the words later adopted by Palomino, Gracián describes the importance of competitive imitation for the hero:

Another gallant painter saw that Titian, Raphael and others had advanced ahead of him. Their fame was more alive after they had died. He [therefore] made use of his invincible invention: he took to painting in a bold manner [*lo valentón*]. Some rebuked him for not painting in a soft and polished style, in which he could emulate Titian; and he gallantly replied that he would rather be first in that coarseness, than second in delicacy²⁹.

As scholars have argued, this passage may well refer to Velázquez, whose works Gracián knew and admired³⁰. Indeed, Gracián's *El Criticón* (1651-57) hails Velázquez as a modern Timanthes, the ancient Greek painter famed both for his representation of human emotions and for his practice of competing with other artists³¹. Whether the text quoted above alludes directly to Velázquez, what is significant is Palomino's use of this *topos* to characterize the young painter's attitude toward his art. Like Gracián's "gallant painter," Palomino's Velázquez chose to paint in a novel, bold style in order to achieve primacy in his "coarseness," rather than accepting mediocrity in the "delicacy" advocated by Pacheco. Careful readers of Palomino's treatise no doubt recognized his source in Gracián's well-known text, and his implicit comparison of Velázquez and the hero would therefore have reinforced his description of the young artist as a competitive painter.

As a paradigm of sixteenth – and seventeenth-century literature on emulation, Gracián's treatise also provides a historical context for understanding the relationship between the novel style and subject matter of Velázquez's *bodegones* and the traditions of Sevillian painting³². Just as Palomino describes Velázquez's awareness of his inability to compete with the masters of the High Renaissance, Gracián warns his hero that those who are born after great men are often considered mere imitators, suffering from the "presumption of imitation"³³. Nevertheless, Gracián argues that the hero may overcome this handicap by departing from his predecessors and inventing "a new path to excellence"³⁴. By way of illustration, he explains that "Horace yielded epic poetry to Virgil, and Martial the lyric to Horace. Terence opted for comedy, Persius for satire, each hoping to be first in his genre. Bold fancy [*capricho*] never succumbed to facile imitation"³⁵. Refusing to be simple imitators, these ancients sought primacy in their own genres of writing and used novelty to overcome what Harold Bloom has termed the "anxiety of influence" produced by the examples of illustrious forebears³⁶.

Like Gracián's hero, Velázquez forged a new path with his *bodegones*, which represented a bold departure from the history paintings favored by Pacheco and most established artists in Seville. Although Velázquez was not Seville's earliest painter of *bodegones*, he was, as Pacheco suggests, the first to use these lowly subjects as means of finding the "true imitation of nature"³⁷. As both Pacheco and Palomino tell us, the young artist won fame through the novelty of these works and inspired imitators of his own. Significantly, the *bodegones* signal the beginning of Velázquez's lifelong pursuit of novelty in painting. In a recent analysis of *Las Hilanderas* (*The Fable of Arachne*) (ca. 1657-58), Svetlana Alpers has argued that Velázquez's innovative synthesis of genre painting and mythology epitomized Gracián's emphasis on achieving "singularity"³⁸. She suggests that Velázquez thwarted pictorial convention by encompassing the mythological tale within a scene of women spinning yarn – even as he proclaimed his artistic lineage by including Titian's *Rape of Europa* as the tapestry woven by the ill-fated Arachne.

An examination of competitive imitation as characterized by Gracián also elucidates Palomino's description of Velázquez's rivalry with Caravaggio's mastery of realism. After entreating the hero to forge new paths, Gracián argues that he may also achieve greatness by surpassing his predecessors in their own areas of expertise. In this context, Gracián distinguishes between facile *imitación* (simply following the example of others) and praiseworthy *emulación* (competing with a desire to surpass). He admonishes the hero to "think of the first in each category, not so much to imitate them as to emulate them, not to follow them, but rather to surpass them"³⁹. Gracián emphasizes the importance of choosing the proper models to emulate, for "in every occupation there is a first and a worst: miracles of excellence and their antipodes. Only the wise know how to appraise them, having studied every category of the heroic in the catalogue of fame"⁴⁰. These statements reveal the importance of Velázquez's rejection of the "tepid" style of Pacheco in favor of the "boldness" of Caravaggio, as described in Palomino's text⁴¹. Judiciously choosing his models, the ambitious young artist painted with bold realism in order to emulate Caravaggio and thereby rival the Italian in his own area of eminence.

Turning from theory to practice, the discussions of artistic emulation by Gracián and Palomino also elucidate Velázquez's appropriation and rejection of aspects of paintings by Caravaggio and his followers, who were often conflated with the master himself in seventeenth-century Spain. As many scholars have noted, the strong sculptural presence of the illuminated figures against the dark backgrounds in paintings such as the *Old Woman Cooking* (Fig. 1) attests to Velázquez's admiration of Caravaggio's *chiaroscuro*⁴². As in Caravaggio's *Supper at Emmaus* (ca. 1600-1) (Fig. 4), Velázquez's stark lighting

Fig. 4. Michelangelo da Caravaggio, "Supper at Emmaus" (ca. 1600-1, London, National Gallery).



emphasizes the figures' volume and accentuates the elderly woman's sallow skin and the rough texture of her veil and doublet⁴³. Echoing Caravaggio's representation of the smooth, decaying fruits in the foreground, Velázquez has captured the waxy texture of the rotting pumpkin carried by the boy. Yet in contrast to the cheating lowlifes represented in genre scenes such as Caravaggio's *Fortuneteller* (ca. 1594-95) and *Cardsharps* (ca. 1594-95), Velázquez provides few clues to the character of his humble figures⁴⁴. By painting his *bodegón* with strong *chiaroscuro*, Velázquez has followed the example of the Caravaggists, rather than the master himself, who painted genre scenes early in his career, before adopting what would become his characteristic tenebrous manner⁴⁵. In the *Old Woman Cooking*, Velázquez also modified Caravaggio's dramatic deployment of formal elements. His composition is self-contained, whereas the figures and objects in works such as Caravaggio's *Supper at Emmaus* challenge the limits of the picture plane. Velázquez muted Caravaggio's brilliant color scheme and harsh, raking illumination and instead used ochre tones and painted his figures in a strong yet golden light⁴⁶.

Competitive imitation thus provides a historical model for approaching the controversial question of the young Velázquez's relationship with paintings by Caravaggio and his followers. Until recently, most historians agreed that the strong *chiaroscuro* and striking realism of Velázquez's *bodegones* reflected his interest in Caravaggio's art, but generally characterized that interest in terms of the Italian painter's purported influence over the young

Spaniard⁴⁷. Reacting against this paradigm, Jonathan Brown and others have affirmed the originality of Velázquez's painting⁴⁸. Brown has stressed the differences between the two painters' works and has even asserted that Velázquez would have known too little of Caravaggio to have engaged with his art. Yet as emphasized in the recent exhibition catalogue, *De Herrera a Velázquez: El primer naturalismo en Sevilla*, paintings by Caravaggio and copies after them were available in Spain and discussed in Seville, where they were documented by the early 1620s⁴⁹. For example, Spaniards such as the Count of Benavente (who was Spain's Neapolitan viceroy from 1603 until 1610) and the Count of Villamediana (who lived in Naples from 1611 until 1617) brought works by Caravaggio home to Castile⁵⁰. In addition, an unidentified painting by Caravaggio as well as a copy of his *Madonna of Loreto* were recorded in the 1632-36 inventory of Seville's Duke of Alcalá, Velázquez's patron and the owner of his *Two Men at Table* (Fig. 3). Pacheco praised the striking realism of copies of Caravaggio's *Crucifixion of Saint Peter* in Seville, and his statements suggest that even copies served as powerful models for local painters⁵¹.

Although the number of original paintings by Caravaggio in Spain was limited, his many followers played crucial roles in disseminating significant aspects of his style for Velázquez and other artists. Palomino tells us that Velázquez admired works by Jusepe de Ribera, whose paintings were collected by Andalusian patrons including the Dukes of Alcalá and Osuna. Ribera expanded

on Caravaggio's polished style in his *Crucifixion* (1618) for a ducal chapel in Osuna by painting the figures with thick, impasted brushstrokes that stand out from the smooth, black background⁵². In the *Sense of Taste* (ca. 1613-16), apparently also painted for a Spaniard, Ribera applied Caravaggio's *chiaroscuro* and intense study of nature to the representation of a dirty, gluttonous figure drinking wine and eating eels at a rustic table⁵³. Ribera's use of these elements in a genre scene thus established a Spanish model for creating *bodegones* based in part on Caravaggio's style.

Equally important for the young Velázquez, Caravaggio and Caravaggism occupied key places in Spanish discussions of painting. An examination of early seventeenth-century Spanish treatises indicates that writers were keenly interested in Caravaggio and surprisingly well-informed about his art⁵⁴. For instance, the *Plaza universal de todas ciencias y artes* (1615), by Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa, contains one of the earliest mentions of Caravaggio in print⁵⁵. Vicente Carducho's *Diálogos de la Pintura* (1633) includes the first extensive, explicit invective published against the artist and his followers, and contains the first printed condemnation of his alleged role as the destroyer of painting⁵⁶. Carducho evidently considered Caravaggism a major presence in Spain; in his text, he laments that "the greatest abundance of painters" are "gluttonously following" Caravaggio's manner, and he bemoans the "large number of people of all kinds" who guilelessly believe that Caravaggio's works exemplify "good painting"⁵⁷. Pacheco discusses Caravaggio in a more sympathetic vein in the *Arte de la Pintura* and singles him out for praise in a consideration of "painters in Italy who are nobles or gentlemen of the habit"⁵⁸. Although the list includes accomplished artists such as Il Passignano, Giovanni Baglione, and the Cavaliere d'Arpino, Pacheco describes only Caravaggio's art and distinguishes him as a "bold imitator of nature [*valiente imitador del natural*]"⁵⁹. These comments are especially important for considering the role of discourse in generating an awareness of Caravaggio and Caravaggism in Pacheco's Sevillian circle, in which knowledge of foreign painting was continually fostered by discussions and writings on art⁶⁰. Regardless of the number of authentic paintings by Caravaggio in Spain, his central role in Spanish artistic discourse indicates that Velázquez would have been well aware of his reputation as a preeminent realist painter.

LIGHT, SHADE, AND PAINTING FROM LIFE

In the *Arte de la Pintura*, Pacheco links Caravaggesque *chiaroscuro*, the convincing representation of nature, and the lowly subject matter of *bodegones*. Pacheco particularly acclaims Caravaggio's *chiaroscuro*

for creating "relief": the illusion of three-dimensionality⁶¹. Establishing the critical context of Velázquez's dark *bodegones*, Pacheco argues that the illusion of relief is most powerful when an illuminated figure appears against a "black ground"⁶². For Pacheco, relief is a function of color and is the most important of its three elements (the others are "beauty" and "softness") because the play of light and shade makes paintings "seem round like sculpture and like nature"⁶³. Although Pacheco argues that "beauty" and "softness" are crucial to "the most serious and honorable part of painting, which consists of ... sacred images and divine histories," he contends that painters of *bodegones* need only relief because their principal aim is to represent nature convincingly⁶⁴. These comments suggest that the ocher tones and strong *chiaroscuro* in Velázquez's *Kitchen Servant* (ca. 1617-23) and other *bodegones* were deemed appropriate only for humble subjects⁶⁵. Significantly, Velázquez tested these guidelines of decorum in two *bodegones* that include religious scenes in the backgrounds: the *Supper at Emmaus* (ca. 1617-18) (a variant of the *Kitchen Servant*) and *Christ in the House of Martha and Mary* (1618). In these works, he rendered the biblical episodes with bright hues and painted the foreground kitchen scenes with dark tones and bold *chiaroscuro*⁶⁶.

Pacheco explicitly links Velázquez and Caravaggio by arguing that the former adopted the latter's revolutionary practice of painting from life. In so doing, Pacheco suggests that Velázquez's emulation of Caravaggio included not only employing powerful contrasts of light and dark but also embracing the Italian master's working method. Building on the writings of Carel van Mander and others, Pacheco explains that painting from life is central to representing nature realistically⁶⁷:

But I keep to nature for everything; and if I could have it before me always and at all times – not only for heads, nudes, hands and feet, but also for drapery and silks and all the rest – that would be best. Michelangelo Caravaggio worked in this way; in the *Crucifixion of St. Peter* (being copies), one sees with how much felicitousness. Jusepe de Ribera works in this way, for among all the great paintings the Duke of Alcalá has, [Ribera's] figures and heads seem alive, and all the rest, painted – even if next to [a work by] Guido Bolognese [Reni]. And my son-in-law follows this path, [and] one also sees the difference between him and the rest, because he always has nature before him⁶⁸.

In this passage, Pacheco explains that Caravaggio worked directly from nature in representing both still-life elements and figures. He argues that Ribera has embraced this method and achieved a realism so convincing that

compared to his works, which “seem alive,” even masterpieces by Guido Reni appear “painted.” Pacheco also contends that this novel process of painting from life is the foundation of Velázquez’s distinctive realism: the “true imitation of nature” of his *bodegones*. By this account, Velázquez needed to master Caravaggio’s method in order to contend with the Italian painter’s expertise in re-creating nature.

The objects and figures that recur throughout Velázquez’s early paintings indicate that he did work from life, and his adoption of Caravaggio’s practice not only underlies his realism but also explains some of the awkward passages in his *bodegones*. For example, Velázquez included the same glazed jug, mortar and pestle, and elderly model in the *Old Woman Cooking* and *Christ in the House of Martha and Mary*, both dated 1618⁶⁹. The *Old Woman Cooking* reveals the conflicting viewpoints and shadow projections characteristic of Velázquez’s youthful works. Although Velázquez depicted the painting’s figures, metal utensils, and blue jug at eye level, he observed the white bowl and brass mortar from above and cast their shadows in different directions. These problems of perspective, light, and shade suggest that Velázquez avoided creating detailed compositional drawings and instead studied and painted the objects individually⁷⁰.

The very inconsistencies of the *bodegones* also gauge Velázquez’s progress in studying nature and support Palomino’s suggestion that the young artist’s realism was linked to his theoretical interests and pursuit of preeminence in art. In *Two Men at Table* (ca. 1620-21) (Fig. 3), Velázquez cast the black shadows consistently to the left, representing their contours as sharp when close to the objects casting them, and then blurring them at a distance – a phenomenon treated at length by Leonardo and later writers on light and shade⁷¹. He expanded on these changes in the *Waterseller of Seville* (1623) (Fig. 5) by representing the shadows on the table not as black, but as darker shades of the table’s brown wood, and by using subtle gradations of shadow to suggest the ceramic pots’ three-dimensional forms⁷². Like other artists of his day, Velázquez probably integrated this continual study of nature with his readings on the properties of shadows, which were considered difficult to render solely from observation because of their continually changing behavior⁷³. Palomino tells us that the young artist assiduously studied treatises by theorists including Giovanni Battisti Armenini, who recommended blurring shadows’ edges for naturalistic effect, and Daniele Barbaro, who built on Dürer’s method of accurate shadow projection in painting⁷⁴. Barbaro’s *La pratica della prospettiva* (1568) is listed in Velázquez’s death inventory, along with treatises such as François de Aguilon’s *Opticorum libri sex* (1613), in which prints designed by Rubens illustrate the analysis of



Fig. 5. Diego Velázquez, “Waterseller of Seville” (1623, London, Wellington Museum).

light and shade⁷⁵. As Palomino argues, this combination of theory and practice was central to Velázquez’s training, and Pacheco himself recommends representing light and shade by consulting the works of “great mathematicians and experts in optics” while examining nature directly, “applying the laws and precepts of optics to the observation of nature”⁷⁶.

THE WATERSPELLER OF SEVILLE: RE-INVENTING THE BODEGÓN

This union of theory and practice is beautifully illustrated in Velázquez’s final *bodegón*, the *Waterseller of Seville* (1623) (Fig. 5), in which the artist elevated the genre to a level of invention that challenged Pacheco’s artistic precepts. In the *Waterseller*’s foreground appears an enormous earthenware water jug. On a rustic wooden table on the right side of the composition sits another, smaller clay pitcher. Behind the still-life elements stand three men of different ages. The oldest, dressed in a torn ochre cloak, rests one hand on the large jug and with the other proffers an exquisite glass to the boy at his side. A

young man appears behind them, taking a drink and gazing out at the viewer. Velázquez has represented the old man's illuminated face in profile; the boy appears in a three-quarter pose, his face partially obscured in shadow; and the young man is shown frontally, his figure nearly lost in darkness⁷⁷. The artist has rendered the composition's details with stunning virtuosity. The deep wrinkles on the elderly man's face are wrought with linear precision, while the uneven striations of the large jug create the illusion of an imperfect manufacture, and tiny drops of water spill out onto the jug's surface, producing white highlights. In this work, Velázquez has resolved the awkward spatial relationships and lack of compositional unity evident in earlier *bodegones* such as the *Old Woman Cooking*, establishing a harmonious relationship among figures and objects.

As suggested by the painting's provenance and imagery, Velázquez surely gave the *Waterseller* to his first protector in Madrid: Pacheco's friend, the native Sevillian cleric, Juan de Fonseca y Figueroa (1585-1627). Fonseca had left Seville to become Philip IV's *sumiller de cortina*, and the painting would have been an appropriate gift because he played a crucial role in Velázquez's early success at court⁷⁸. Pacheco tells us that Fonseca was a great "lover of [Velázquez's] painting," and he emphasizes the cleric's hospitality during the young artist's brief trip to Madrid in 1622⁷⁹. When the position of painter to the king was vacated the following year, it was Fonseca whom the king's chief minister commanded to summon the artist back to court⁸⁰. Upon returning to Madrid, Velázquez lived in Fonseca's home and painted the cleric's portrait (now lost), which was brought to the royal palace as an example of the young artist's talent. According to Pacheco, palace officials so admired the portrait that Velázquez was asked to paint the king himself. Evidence suggests that Velázquez and Fonseca maintained a close relationship until the latter's death in 1627, and the *Waterseller* is first recorded by the artist himself in the posthumous inventory he compiled of the cleric's art collection. In the inventory, Velázquez made clear his high estimation of the work and assigned it a greater monetary value than any other in the collection, proudly writing, "A painting of a waterseller, by the hand of Diego Velázquez, four hundred *reales*"⁸¹.

The *Waterseller's* balanced, solemn composition together with the artist's own valuation of the work suggest that Velázquez considered his invention to surpass the commonplace *bodegones* discussed by Pacheco. Scholars have therefore long searched for the image's possible hidden significance. Basing their interpretations on Velázquez's careful differentiation of the figures' ages, both Leo Steinberg and Julián Gállego have suggested that the *Waterseller* represents an allegory of the three ages of man⁸². Although Velázquez's painting lacks the

skull, compasses, and other attributes of the theme, it is possible that Fonseca – a cleric – interpreted the three figures' varying ages in relation to the passage of time and the brevity of life. In Fonseca's inventory, the *Waterseller* is listed alongside landscape paintings, portraits, and religious images. This juxtaposition suggests that, whether or not Fonseca considered Velázquez's *bodegón* in religious terms, he saw little conflict between sacred subjects and the "lowly" representation of nature in ostensibly secular paintings.

In addition, a key to the *Waterseller's* invention lies in its wit. As Manuel Pérez Lozano has argued, the artist used the *Waterseller's* still-life elements to make ingenious references to his protector's name⁸³. Velázquez alluded to the surname Fonseca ("dry fountain") through the water glass given to the boy, the mug drunk by the young man, and the waterseller's attribute of the earthenware jug. The elegant glass given by the waterseller is out of place in a humble genre scene, and its exquisiteness seems to thematize Velázquez's gesture of giving the prized painting to Fonseca. The fig inside the glass is both a naturalistic illustration of the contemporary custom of flavoring water and a punning reference to the cleric's maternal surname: Figueroa⁸⁴. Velázquez's invention is particularly apt because the fig (*higo* in Spanish and *ficus* in Latin) features prominently in the Figueroas's history and heraldry. The Figueroas claimed to have gained their coat of arms after winning a victory against the Moors near a fig tree, and the family's arms therefore consisted of five fig leaves against a gold shield⁸⁵.

With these visual puns on the name Fonseca y Figueroa, Velázquez brought his painting into competition with the art of poetry and made his *bodegón* the pictorial equivalent of witty word plays that were central to poetic invention in the Sevillian circle to which he and Fonseca belonged⁸⁶. For instance, in the whimsical epithalamium written in honor of Velázquez's marriage to Pacheco's daughter, the Sevillian poet Baltasar de Cepeda used puns to allude to the participants in the lively "contest of wits" (*concurso de ingenios*) held at the wedding reception⁸⁷. Cepeda plays on the resemblance between the name of the poet, Francisco de Rioja (a friend of Fonseca's and Pacheco's), and *río*, the Spanish noun for river. He relates Rioja's rivers of ingenuity to the floods of poetic inspiration produced by the ancient Hippocrene fountain:

Rioja, perennial source, produced rivers springing forth from him: a greater torrent than that given to the world by the hoof of Pegasus...

*Rioja, fuente perene,
dió Ríos de sí manando
mayor raudal que el que dió
al mundo el pie de Pegaso....* ⁸⁸

Cepeda similarly plays on the name of Rioja's friend, the cleric, Doctor Sebastián de Acosta. He compares the erudite Acosta to a boat traveling from coast to coast in a sea of knowledge:

There was seen a doctor in name, who went from coast to coast plying without danger, engulfed in a sea of knowledge; and he triumphed from the storm...

*Vióse en el nombre un Dotor
ir Costa a Costa surcando
i en el hecho sin peligro
en mar de Ciencia engolfado,
i triunfó de la tormenta...*⁸⁹

In the *Waterseller*, Velázquez's puns on the name Fonseca y Figueroa offer visual counterparts to these word plays. By alluding to his protector's name through the still-life elements in a lowly genre scene, Velázquez captured the jocular spirit of these poetic conventions as used in works like Cepeda's. Yet whereas Cepeda's art permits only linguistic allusions to the guests' names, Velázquez's references make use of both verbal and visual elements. His depiction of the jugs, glass, and fig encourages the viewer to recall the name Fonseca y Figueroa, while his representation of these still-life elements also brings his punning allusions vividly before the spectator's eyes. Both an accomplished poet and an amateur painter, Fonseca would have delighted in Velázquez's pictorial interpretation of witty poetic conceits and his implicit challenge to the art of poetry⁹⁰.

Even as the *Waterseller* reflects Velázquez's engagement with the poetry produced by Pacheco's Sevillian circle, the young artist's emphasis on the still-life elements declares his independence from his master's teachings. Although Pacheco praises the imitation of nature associated with *bodegones*, he also admonishes artists to remember the importance of representing human figures, who should be given "the same emphasis [*valentía*] as the other things"⁹¹. He thus cites the Plinian *topos* of Zeuxis's painting of a boy carrying a bunch of grapes, which were rendered so convincingly that birds came to peck at the painted fruit. In telling the tale, Pacheco emphasizes Zeuxis's lament: "I have painted the grapes better than I have painted the boy, because if he were perfect, the birds would be afraid to approach the grapes"⁹². Pacheco explains that this *topos* exemplifies the danger of emphasizing "the less important things" at the expense of "the main elements" in secular or religious scenes⁹³. He then provides a contemporary example of this problem. In 1595, his friend Pablo de Céspedes painted a *Last Supper* for the cathedral of Cordoba (Fig. 6), and the spectators marveled at his exemplary rendering of a vase, ignoring the



Fig. 6. Pablo de Céspedes, "Last Supper" (1595, Cordoba, Cathedral) (photo: Institut Amatller d'Art Hispànic).

rest of the image. Infuriated, Céspedes threatened to have the painted vase removed, exclaiming, "Is it possible that no one notices so many heads and hands, in which I have placed all my study and care, and that everyone is drawn to this impertinence?"⁹⁴

In the *Waterseller*, Velázquez has placed his enormous clay jug in the central foreground of the painting. The light strikes the side of the jug, making it brighter than any other element in the image and vaunting the artist's technique. As Zahira Véliz has argued, Velázquez's emphasis on the jug represents an explicit renunciation of the precepts upheld by Pacheco and Céspedes⁹⁵. Véliz's comment merits elaboration because it sheds light on the aptness of Velázquez's invention for Fonseca. As the author of a treatise on ancient painting, *De veteri Pictura* (now lost), Fonseca would have been well acquainted with the *topos* of Zeuxis's dismay at painting the grapes more skillfully than the figure, and he may have heard the contemporary parallel told by his friend Pacheco⁹⁶. Equally important, Fonseca's art collection consisted largely of still lifes and landscapes, indicating his taste for scenes that privileged "the less important things" over figures⁹⁷. He would therefore have appreciated Velázquez's ingenious renunciation of Pacheco's notion of the importance of relegating still-life elements to lesser roles in painting.

The *Waterseller*'s witty imagery thus sheds light on the young Velázquez's emulation. In the painting, Velázquez's explicit rejection of Pacheco's precepts exemplifies his departure from the traditions of Sevillian art. Velázquez further emphasized the novelty of his work by challenging the elevated status of history painting and offering an interpretation of playful poetic conventions within the context of a *bodegón* – a genre judged by his contemporaries to require little capacity for invention. By

joining these clever conceits with humble subject matter, Velázquez highlighted his ingenuity and demonstrated his ability to take Spanish *bodegones* to a new level of sophistication. Just as Gracián's "gallant painter" distinguished himself through his "invincible invention" and "bold manner," Velázquez established his own singularity by combining witty imagery with striking realism and a keen observation of nature⁹⁸.

CONCLUSION

With their distinctive subject matter and Caravaggesque realism, Velázquez's *bodegones* thus provide a touchstone for considering invention and imitation in seventeenth-century Spanish art. As Palomino argued, Velázquez did not simply adopt Caravaggio's "boldness," but rather used the Italian artist's *chiaroscuro* and practice of painting from life as means of enhancing the illusion of reality in his innovative representations of lowly themes. Palomino also maintained that Velázquez's talent for synthesizing and transforming lessons learned from other artists, together with his remarkable naturalism, constituted the foundation of his extraordinary achievements throughout his career. According to Palomino, Velázquez brought these lessons learned in Seville to the court in

Madrid, where he vied with the Spanish monarchs' preferred painter: Titian⁹⁹. In late works including the *Rokeby Venus* (ca. 1648) and *Las Hilanderas* (ca. 1657-58), Velázquez emulated well-known compositions by Titian while forging a magnificent painterly style that surpassed the Venetian's¹⁰⁰.

Palomino further contended that Spanish artists' fusion of local and foreign exemplars was vital to the development of seventeenth-century painting in Spain. He explained that the illustrious Golden-Age painters – including Velázquez as well as Zurbarán, Murillo, Juan de Carreño y Miranda, and others – ingeniously combined their sources in artists such as Caravaggio, Titian, and van Dyck with Spanish pictorial traditions and the careful observation of nature, thereby cultivating the Spanish taste for vivid color and convincing naturalism¹⁰¹. Belying Tatlock's vision of Spanish art as an eclectic mixture of "every form of culture," Palomino understood that Spanish painters did not passively assimilate each foreign development presented to them, but rather learned from and rivaled artists whose works reflected their own pictorial concerns¹⁰². For Palomino and other artists and theorists of his day, Velázquez's brilliance lay in his original inventions, which combined his ingenious conceptions and dazzling technique with his close study of the works of both art and nature.

NOTAS

* Research for this essay was made possible by grants from the Fulbright Commission and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Parts of this essay were presented in the Art History Lecture Series at the Meadows Museum in Dallas (2004), at the Sixteenth Century Society and Conference Annual Meeting in Toronto (2004), and at the Renaissance Society of America Conference in San Francisco (2006). I am grateful to the participants of these conferences and to my colleagues in the Early Modern Studies Group at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for their feedback. I especially thank Christina Maranci for offering insightful critiques of various drafts of this article. I am also grateful to the faculty at Johns Hopkins University – in particular Charles Dempsey, Richard L. Kagan, and Elizabeth Cropper – for their advice as I first developed this material in a dissertation chapter. Laura Bass and Ari Zigelboim kindly assisted with translating the abstract. Unless otherwise noted, all translations from Spanish are my own. In citing Spanish sources, I have remained faithful to the spelling and punctuation used in the sources named.

¹ R. R. TATLOCK, intro. to *Spanish Art: An Introductory Review of Architecture, Painting, Sculpture, Textiles, Ceramics, Woodwork, Metalwork*, by idem et al., Burlington Magazine Monograph, vol. 2, B. T. Batsford, London, 1927, 1.

² Seminal works that helped to forge this reassessment include: Julián GÁLLEGO, *Vision et symboles dans la peinture espagnole du siècle d'or*, Klincksieck, Paris, 1968; Jonathan BROWN, *Images and Ideas in Seventeenth-Century Spanish Painting*, Princeton Essays on the Arts, vol. 6, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1978; Vicente LEÓ CAÑAL, *Nueva Roma: Mitología y humanismo en el Renacimiento sevillano*, Diputación Provincial, Seville, 1979.

³ See especially: Fernando MARIAS and Agustín BUSTAMANTE, *Las ideas artísticas de El Greco (Comentarios a un texto inédito)*, Ensayos arte Cátedra, Cátedra, Madrid, 1981; Fernando MARIAS, *El Greco: Biografía de un pintor extravagante*, Nerea, Madrid, 1997; Jonathan BROWN, *Velázquez: Painter and Courtier*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1986; Fernando MARIAS, *Velázquez: Pintor y criado del rey*, Nerea, Madrid, 1999; Alfonso E. PÉREZ SÁNCHEZ and Nicola SPINOSA, eds., *Ribera, 1591-1652*, exh. cat., Museo del Prado, Madrid, 1992; Jeannine BATICLE, ed., *Zurbarán*, exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1987; Enrique VALDIVIESO, ed., *Zurbarán: IV centenario*, exh. cat., Museo de Bellas Artes, Seville, 1998; Xanthe BROOKE and Peter CHERRY, *Murillo: Scenes of Childhood*, exh. cat., Dulwich Picture Gallery, London, 2001; Suzanne L. STRATTON-PRUITT, ed., *Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617-1682): Paintings from American Collections*, exh. cat., Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth, 2002.

⁴ See especially Elizabeth CROPPER and Charles DEMPSEY, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996, 11-12; María H. LOH, "New and Improved: Repetition as Originality in Italian Baroque Practice and Theory," *Art Bulletin*, LXXXVI/3, 2004, 477-504; Elizabeth CROPPER, *The Domenichino Affair: Novelty, Imitation, and Theft in Seventeenth-Century Rome*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2005, esp. 99-155, 193-207. For broader discussions of emulation in Western art, see Thomas E. CROW,

- Emulation: Making Artists for Revolutionary France*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1995; Marc GOTTLIEB, *The Plight of Emulation: Ernest Meissonier and French Salon Painting*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996.
- 5 Fernando MARIAS, "Tiziano y Velázquez, tópicos literarios y milagros del arte," in Tiziano, ed. Miguel Falomir, exh. cat., Museo del Prado, Madrid, 2003, 111-32. See also Svetlana ALPERS, "Singularity at Court" and "The Painter's Museum," chaps. 6-7 in *The Vexations of Art: Velázquez and Others*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2005, 133-218.
- 6 See the section entitled "Velázquez's Emulation" below.
- 7 See BROWN, 1986, 12-15; Steven N. ORSO, *Velázquez, "Los borrachos," and Painting at the Court of Philip IV*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993, 28.
- 8 Francisco PACHECO, *Arte de la Pintura* (1649), ed. Bonaventura Bassegoda i Hugas, Cátedra, Madrid, 1990 (see also the 2d ed., Cátedra, 2001); Antonio PALOMINO, *Museo Pictórico y escala óptica* (1715-24), with a prologue by Juan A. Ceán y Bermúdez, 3 vols., Aguilar, Madrid, 1988. The third volume of Palomino's *Museo Pictórico* – the artists' biographies – has been published separately in Antonio PALOMINO, *Vidas* (1724), ed. Nina Ayala Mallory, Alianza, Madrid, 1986.
- 9 The interpretation of Spanish Golden-Age theory is still in its infancy, as discussed in Karin HELLOWIG, intro. to *Die spanische Kunstliteratur im 17. Jahrhundert*, Vervuert, Frankfurt am Main, 1996, 15-20; Fernando MARIAS, "Los saberes de Velázquez: El lenguaje artístico del pintor y el problema de la 'Memorial de las pinturas del Escorial,'" in *Symposium Internacional Velázquez: Actas*, ed. Alfredo J. Morales, Junta de Andalucía, Consejería de Cultura, Seville, 2004, 167-77.
- 10 In PALOMINO, 1986, 20, the author explains that he made significant use of a manuscript by Velázquez's pupil, Juan de Alfaro. See also HELLOWIG, 97.
- 11 This article focuses on *bodegones* that are unanimously considered originals by Velázquez. The attribution to Velázquez of the problematic *Three Musicians* (Berlin, Gemäldegalerie) and *Three Men at Table* (St. Petersburg, Hermitage) has recently been discussed in Tanya J. TIFFANY, *Interpreting Velázquez: Artistic Innovation and Painted Devotion in Seventeenth-Century Seville*, Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 2003, 235-43. On the attribution of the *Kitchen Servant* (ca. 1617-23, Chicago, Art Institute) to Velázquez, see Brown, 1986, 21. The study of the *Old Woman Cooking* in Bodo VISCHER, "'Cibus et potus' – Velázquez' 'Alte Köchin,'" *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, LXIX/3, 2006, 305-341, appeared after this article was submitted for publication.
- 12 Esteban's *Market Stall* measures 129 x 167.5cm, and Velázquez's *Old Woman Cooking* measures 100.5 x 119.5cm. On Esteban's *Market Stall*, see Peter CHERRY, *Arte y naturaleza: El Bodegón Español en el Siglo de Oro*, trans. Ivars Barzdevics, Doce Calles, Madrid, 1999, 35, 110-11.
- 13 The relevance of the *Kitchen Scene* to Velázquez's *bodegones* has recently been considered by Benito NAVARRETE PRIETO and Alfonso E. PÉREZ SÁNCHEZ, "De Herrera a Velázquez: El primer naturalismo en Sevilla," in *De Herrera a Velázquez: El primer naturalismo en Sevilla*, ed. Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez and Benito Navarrete Prieto, exh. cat., Hospital de los Venerables, Seville, and Museo de Bellas Artes de Bilbao, Bilbao, 2005, 38. Pérez Sánchez's catalogue entry (in *ibid.*, 166-67), discusses the *Kitchen Scene* and includes a photograph of the painting after its recent restoration, during which the figure of the man was revealed.
- 14 PACHECO, 1990, 407: "cosas humildes (pero en aquel género de mucha fama), pintaba barberías, tiendas de oficiales, animales, yerbas y cosas semejantes ... que era como lo que en este tiempo pintan pescaderías, bodegones, animales, frutas y países: que aunque sean grandes pintores en aquella parte, no aspiran a cosas mayores, con el gusto y facilidad que hallan en aquella acomodada imitación y así, las repúblicas y reyes no se valen dellos en las cosas más honrosas y de mayor majestad y estudios."
- 15 PACHECO, 1990, 519: "¿Pues qué? Los bodegones no se deben estimar? Claro está que sí, si son pintados como mi yerno los pinta alzándose en esta parte sin dexar lugar a otro, y merecen estimación grandísima; pues con estos principios y los retratos, de que hablaremos luego, halló la verdadera imitación del natural alentando los ánimos de muchos con su poderoso ejemplo; con el cual me aventuré una vez, a agradar a un amigo estando en Madrid, año 1625, y le pinté un lencecillo con dos figuras del natural, flores y frutas y otros juguetes, que hoy tiene mi docto amigo Francisco de Rioja; y conseguí lo que bastó para que las demás cosas de mi mano pareciesen delante dél pintadas." Pacheco's *bodegón* has not been identified by scholars.
- 16 Discussions of this statement as evidence of Pacheco's loyalty to Velázquez include Lauriane FALLAY D'ESTE, intro. to *L'art de la peinture*, by Francisco Pacheco, Klincksieck, Paris, 1986, 38; José María QUESADA VALERA, "La pintura de género en los tratados españoles del Siglo de Oro," *Boletín del Museo e Instituto Camón Aznar*, XLVII, 1992, 72.
- 17 PALOMINO, 1986, 156, describes the *Two Men at Table*: "Otra pintura hizo de dos pobres comiendo en una humilde mesilla, en que hay diferentes vasos de barro, naranjas, pan, y otras cosas, todo observado con diligencia extraña." In *ibid.*, he describes the *Old Woman Cooking*, in which "se ve la lumbre, las llamas, y centellas vivamente..."
- 18 PALOMINO, 1986, 156: "A este tono era todas las cosas que hacía en aquel tiempo nuestro Velázquez, por diferenciarse de todos, y seguir nuevo rumbo; conociendo, que le habían cogido el barlovento Ticiano, Alberto, Rafael, y otros, y que estaba más viva la fama, cuando muertos ellos: valióse de su caprichosa inventiva, dando en pintar cosas rústicas a lo valentón, con luces y colores extraños. Objetáronle algunos el no pintar con suavidad, y hermosura asuntos de más seriedad, en que podía emular a Rafael de Urbino, y satisfizo galantemente, diciendo: *Que más quería ser primero en aquella grosería, que segundo en la delicadeza.*" In translating this passage, I have consulted Antonio PALOMINO, *Lives of the Eminent Spanish Painters and Sculptors*, trans. Nina Ayala Mallory, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987, 141. On the term *capricho* in Spanish artistic discourse, see Fernando MARIAS, "El género de *Las meninas*: Los servicios de la familia," in *Otras meninas*, ed. idem, Siruela, Madrid, 1995, 247-78, esp. 253-54.
- 19 PACHECO, 1990, 349: "A quien (por oculta fuerza de naturaleza) desde mis tiernos años he procurado siempre imitar movido de las bellísimas invenciones suyas."
- 20 PALOMINO, 1986, 157: "habiendo conocido, muy desde el principio, no convenirle modo de pintar tan tibio, aunque lleno de erudición, y dibujo, por ser contrario a su natural altivo, y aficionado a grandeza."
- 21 PALOMINO, 1986, 156-57: "Trafan de Italia a Sevilla algunas pinturas, las cuales daban gran aliento a Velázquez a intentar no menores empresas con su ingenio." In *ibid.*, 157, Palomino also emphasizes the breadth of Velázquez's artistic engagement by stating that he admired works imported from Italy by artists including Il Pomarancio, Giovanni Baglione, Giovanni Lanfranco, Jusepe de Ribera, and Guido Reni.
- 22 PALOMINO, 1986, 157: "Diéronle el nombre de segundo Caravaggio, por contrahacer en sus obras al natural felizmente, y con tanta propiedad, teniéndole delante para todo, y en todo tiempo."
- 23 PALOMINO, 1986, 156: "Comptió Velázquez con Caravaggio en la valentía del pintar; y fue igual con Pacheco en lo especulativo. A aquél estimó por lo exquisito, y por la agudeza de su ingenio; y a éste eligió por maestro, por el conocimiento de sus estudios, que le constituían digno de su elección."

- ²⁴ This notion of *lo especulativo* is encompassed in the admonishment to “dibujar, especular, y mas dibujar,” repeated throughout the text in Vicente CARDUCHO, *Diálogos de la Pintura: Su defensa, origen, esencia, definición, modos, y diferencias* (1633), ed. Francisco Calvo Serraller, Turner, Madrid, 1979, 25 and passim. The term *especulativo* is discussed in MARIAS and BUSTAMANTE, 1981, esp. 165.
- ²⁵ *Ingenio* is discussed in these terms in PACHECO, 1990, 281.
- ²⁶ CARDUCHO, 271. Carducho describes Caravaggio’s “afectada y exterior imitacion” and claims that the artist worked “sin preceptos, sin doctrina, sin estudio.”
- ²⁷ On this *topos*, see Ángel VEGUE Y GOLDONI, “Un lugar común en la Historia del Arte Español: El cambio de estilo en Ticiano, Navarrete, el Greco y Velázquez,” *Archivo Español de Arte y Arqueología*, X, 1928, 57-59. I thank Charles Dempsey for pointing out that José de SIGÜENZA, *Historia de la Orden de San Jerónimo* (1600-1605), ed. Ángel Weruaga Prieto, 2 vols., Junta de Castilla y León, Valladolid, 2000, 677, applies this *topos* to Bosch. Gridley McKIM-SMITH, review of *Velázquez*, by Enriqueta Harris, *Art Bulletin*, LXVI/4, 1984, 699, states that Palomino’s “seeming quotation is a reworking of a conventional story,” and therefore praises Harris for ignoring it. Emily UMBERGER, “Velázquez and Naturalism I: Interpreting *Los borrachos*,” *Res*, XXIV, 1993, 25 and note 18, however, has used Palomino’s assertion as evidence of Velázquez’s engagement with Caravaggio.
- ²⁸ Although *El Héroe* was published in 1637, the first surviving edition dates to 1639. A critical edition and discussion of the text are provided in Baltasar GRACIÁN, *El Héroe* (1639), in *Obras completas*, ed. Miguel Batllori and Ceferino Peralta, 2 vols., Biblioteca de autores españoles, Atlas, Madrid, 1969, vol. I, 235-70. I discuss Gracián’s text as well as issues of artistic imitation and emulation at greater length in TIFFANY, 2003, 53-112. ALPERS, esp. 155-61, has recently used this passage from *El Héroe* along with other works by Gracián in characterizing the mature Velázquez as an emulative artist. The works of Velázquez and Gracián have also been compared in Thomas S. ACKER, *The Baroque Vortex: Velázquez, Calderón, and Gracián under Philip IV*, Currents in Comparative Romance Languages and Literatures, Peter Lang, New York, 2000.
- ²⁹ GRACIÁN, 1969, vol. I, 254: “Vio el otro galante pintor que le habían cogido la delantera el Ticiano, Rafael y otros. Estaba más viva la fama cuando muertos ellos. Valióse de su invencible inventiva: dio en pintar a lo valentón. Objetáronle algunos el no pintar a lo suave y pulido, en que podía emular al Ticiano; y satisfizo galantemente que quería más ser primero en aquella grosería, que segundo en la delicadeza.” My translations of Gracián’s text are based in part on Christopher MAURER, trans. and ed., *The Hero*, in *A Pocket Mirror for Heroes*, by Baltasar Gracián, Doubleday, New York, 1995, 1-55. In addition to Gracián’s text, Palomino’s description of Velázquez’s rejection of Raphael probably depends on Marco BOSCHINI, *La carta del navegante pitoresco* (1660), ed. Anna Pallucchini, Cività veneziana, Fonti e testi, Istituto per la collaborazione culturale, Venice and Rome, 1966, 79. Boschini tells us that when Velázquez was asked his opinion of Raphael, the Spaniard replied: “no! me piase niente.” On Boschini’s discussion of Velázquez, see Philip SOHM, *Pittoresco: Marco Boschini, His Critics, and Their Critiques of Painterly Brushwork in Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century Italy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991, esp. 163-65. Regarding the problem of succeeding great men and being “born too late,” see Harold BLOOM, *The Anxiety of Influence*, 2d ed., Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1997, esp. 99.
- ³⁰ See A. MOREL-FATIO, “Cours du Collège de France, 1909-1910, sur les moralistes espagnols du XVII^e siècle et en particulier sur Balthasar Gracián,” *Bulletin Hispanique*, XII, 1910, 204. Although the older Velázquez emulated Titian, Gracián’s “galante pintor” may refer to the young Velázquez and his Caravaggesque realism. It is also possible that Gracián’s “galante pintor” is Caravaggio himself. Gracián’s principal patron, Vincencio Juan de Lastanosa, owned works attributed to Caravaggio. See GRACIÁN, 1969, vol. I, 101. On Velázquez’s competitive relationship with Titian, see Jan Baptist BEDAUX, “Velázquez’s Fable of Arachne (*Las hilanderas*): A Continuing Story,” *Simiolus*, XXI/4, 1992, 296-305; MARIAS, 2003, esp. 119-32. ALPERS, esp. 181-216, discusses Velázquez’s competition with Titian and Rubens.
- ³¹ See Baltasar GRACIÁN, “Crisi duodécima. La isla de la inmortalidad,” in *El Crítico* (1651-57), ed. Santos Alonso, 2d ed., Letras hispánicas, Cátedra, Madrid, 1984, 791.
- ³² On early modern theories of imitation and emulation, see especially G. W. PIGMAN, “Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, XXXIII, 1980, 1-32; Thomas M. GREENE, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1982. For a discussion of Spanish theories of imitation, see in particular Ignacio NAVARRETE, *Orphans of Petrarch: Poetry and Theory in the Spanish Renaissance*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1994. Emulation is discussed by an artist in Pacheco’s circle: Pablo de CÉSPEDES, *Poema de la Pintura*, in *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las bellas artes en España* (1800), by Juan Agustín Ceán Bermúdez, reprint of 5 vols. in 1, with a new prologue by Miguel Morán Turina, Fuentes de Arte, istmo, Madrid, 2001, vol. V, 324-43. See also the works cited in note 4 above.
- ³³ GRACIÁN, 1969, vol. I, 253: “presunción de imitación.” This passage is also discussed in ALPERS, 158-59.
- ³⁴ GRACIÁN, 1969, vol. I, 253: “Es, pues, destreza no común inventar nueva senda para la excelencia.”
- ³⁵ Translated in MAURER, 25; GRACIÁN, 1969, vol. I, 254: “Cedióle Horacio lo heroico a Virgilio, y Marcial lo lírico a Horacio. Dio por lo cómico Terencio, por lo satírico Persio, aspirando todos a la ufanía de primeros en su género: que el alentado capricho nunca se rindió a la fácil imitación.”
- ³⁶ BLOOM, 5-16, defines the concept.
- ³⁷ PACHECO, 1990, 519.
- ³⁸ ALPERS, 133-218. Regarding Gracián and “singularity,” see *ibid.*, esp. 155-63. On the date of *Las Hilanderas*, see BROWN, 1986, 252 and note 32.
- ³⁹ GRACIÁN, 1969, vol. I, 267: “Propóngase en cada predicamento los primeros, no tanto a la imitación cuanto a la emulación, no para seguirles, si para adelantárseles.”
- ⁴⁰ Translated in MAURER, 52; GRACIÁN, 1969, vol. I, 267: “En todo empleo hay quien ocupa la primera clase, y la infama también. Son unos, milagros de la excelencia; son otros, antípodas de milagros. Sepa el discreto graduarlos; y para esto tenga bien repasada la categoría de los Héroes, el catálogo de la fama.”
- ⁴¹ PALOMINO, 1986, 157.
- ⁴² See, for example, Enriqueta HARRIS, *Velázquez*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1982, 53-54; José LÓPEZ-REY, *Velázquez’ Work and World*, New York Graphic Society, Greenwich, 1968, 24-25. See also the works cited in note 46 below.
- ⁴³ See Howard HIBBARD, *Caravaggio*, Harper and Row, New York, 1983, 78, for a discussion of the dating of the *Supper at Emmaus*.
- ⁴⁴ For a reproductions of Caravaggio’s *Fortuneteller* (ca. 1594-95, Paris, Musée du Louvre) and *Cardsharps* (ca. 1594-95, Fort Worth, Kimbell Art Museum), see HIBBARD, 26, 24, respectively.
- ⁴⁵ On Caravaggio’s adoption of *chiaroscuro* after painting the works for the Contarelli Chapel (1599-1600), see Charles DEMPSEY, “Idealism and Naturalism in Rome around 1600,” in *Il Classicismo: Medioevo Rinascimento Barocco* (Atti del Colloquio Cesare Gnudi, 1986), ed. Elena de Luca, Nuova Alfa, Bologna, 1993, 233-43, esp. 236.
- ⁴⁶ Differences between Velázquez’s and Caravaggio’s art are noted in LÓPEZ-REY, esp. 25. As discussed below, BROWN, 1986, 12-15, argues that these differences make any pictorial connections between the two artists untenable. On critiques of Caravaggio’s strong colors and supposedly excessive

- contrasts of light and dark, see especially Janis C. BELL, "Some Seventeenth-Century Appraisals of Caravaggio's Coloring," *Artibus et Historiae*, XIV/27, 1993, 103-29; idem, "Light and Color in Caravaggio's *Supper at Emmaus*," *Artibus et Historiae*, XVI/31, 1995, 139-70.
- ⁴⁷ See, for example, Roberto LONGHI, "Un San Tomasso di Velázquez e le congiunture italo-spagnole tra il '5 e '600," *Vita artistica*, II, 1927, 4-11; Juan AINAUD DE LASARTE, "Ribalta y Caravaggio," *Anales y Boletín de los Museos de Arte de Barcelona*, V, 1947, 345-413; HARRIS, 53-54.
- ⁴⁸ BROWN, 1986, 12-15; ORSO, 28.
- ⁴⁹ In the catalogue (as in n. 13), see especially: NAVARRETE PRIETO and PÉREZ SÁNCHEZ, 19-52; Salvador SALORT PONS, "Las relaciones artísticas entre Italia y Sevilla durante el primer tercio del siglo XVII," 53-68, which addresses the question of Sevillian artists' awareness of Caravaggio and provides new documentary evidence of connections between artistic patrons in Italy and Seville in the early seventeenth century. MARIAS, 1999, 35, provides an especially provocative discussion of Velázquez's engagement with Caravaggio. See also David DAVIES, "Velázquez's *Bodegones*," in *Velázquez in Seville*, ed. Michael Clarke, exh. cat., National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1996, 51-65, esp. 56; Peter CHERRY, "Los bodegones de Velázquez y la verdadera imitación del natural," in *Velázquez y Sevilla. Estudios*, ed. Alfredo J. Morales, exh. cat., Santa María de las Cuevas, Salas del Centro Andaluz de Arte Contemporáneo, Seville, 1999, 80-81; Jeremy M. N. ROE, chaps. 2-3 in *Velázquez's "Imitation" of Nature seen through "ojos doctos": a study of painting, Classicism and Tridentine reform in Seville*, Ph.D. diss., The University of Leeds, 2002, 80-185. In the course of writing dissertations on Velázquez, Dr. Roe and I independently developed our interpretations of the artist's Sevillian career. I am grateful to him for sharing his dissertation with me.
- ⁵⁰ See Giovanni Pietro BELLORI, *Le vite de' pittori, scultori e architetti moderni* (1672), ed. Evelina Borea, G. Einaudi, Turin, 1976, 214 (original pagination, as listed in the margins of Borea's text). Bellori states that the Count of Benavente brought a Crucifixion of Saint Andrew, and he writes that the Count of Villamediana brought a "mezza figura di Davide e' l ritratto di un giovine con un fiore di melarancio in mano." Caravaggio's *Crucifixion of Saint Andrew*, along with another "original of Caravaggio," was listed in the 1653 inventory of Benavente's son, Juan Francisco Pimentel. On the inventory, see AINAUD DE LASARTE, esp. 380. *Ibid.*, 380-95, provides an extensive list of paintings by Caravaggio and copies after his works in early seventeenth-century Spain. Ann TZEUTSCHLER LURIE and Denis MAHON, "Caravaggio's Crucifixion of St. Andrew from Valladolid," *Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art*, LXIV, 1977, 3-24, have identified Benavente's painting as the *Crucifixion of Saint Andrew* now in Cleveland. According to documents published and discussed in Elena FUMAGALLI, "Precoci citazioni di opere del Caravaggio in alcuni documenti inediti," *Paragone*, XLV/535-37, 1994, 105-7, 114-16, the second count of Villamediana owned two paintings by Caravaggio – one of the Madonna and another of *putti* playing music – as well as a copy of his *Seven Works of Mercy*. For copies of paintings by Caravaggio imported to Seville in 1623, see Jean DENUCE, ed., *Lettres et documents concernant Jan Breugel I et II*, Sources pour l'histoire de l'art Flamand, vol. 3, "De Sikkel," Antwerp, 1934, document 12.
- ⁵¹ On the Duke of Alcalá's collection, see Jonathan BROWN and Richard L. KAGAN, "The Duke of Alcalá: His Collection and Its Evolution," *Art Bulletin*, LXIX/2, 1987, 231-55. The copies of Caravaggio's *Crucifixion of Saint Peter* are discussed in PACHECO, 1990, 443. See also NAVARRETE PRIETO and PÉREZ SÁNCHEZ, esp. 27-28.
- ⁵² Regarding Velázquez's engagement with Ribera, see PALOMINO, 1986, 157. Ribera's *Crucifixion* (1618, Osuna, Colegiata) is reproduced and discussed in Gabriele FINALDI, "The Patron and Date of Ribera's *Crucifixion* at Osuna," *Burlington Magazine*, CXXXIII/1060, 1991, 445-46. Marias, 1999, 35, emphasizes the importance of the Osuna paintings for the young Velázquez.
- ⁵³ NAVARRETE PRIETO and PÉREZ SÁNCHEZ, 42-43, have recently discussed the potential significance of the Five Senses series for the young Velázquez. Giulio MANCINI, *Considerazioni sulla pittura* (ca. 1617-21), ed. Adriana Marucchi, commentary by Luigi Salerno, 2 vols., Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome, 1956-57, vol. I, 251, states that this series was painted for a Spaniard, whom he does not name. Regarding the possible identity of this Spaniard, see Gianni PAPI, "Jusepe de Ribera a Roma e il Maestro del Giudizio di Salomone," *Paragone*, LIII/629, 2002, 34. On Ribera's *Sense of Taste* (ca. 1613-16, Hartford, Wadsworth Atheneum) and the entire series of the Five Senses, see Craig FELTON, "Ribera's Early Years in Italy: The Martyrdom of St. Lawrence and the Five Senses," *Burlington Magazine*, CXXXIII/1055, 1991, 71-81. The *Sense of Taste* is reproduced in *ibid.*, 78.
- ⁵⁴ On Caravaggio's role in Spanish artistic discourse, see Chiara GAUNA, "Giudizi e polemiche intorno a Caravaggio e Tiziano nei trattati d'arte spagnoli del XVII secolo: Carducho, Pacheco e la tradizione artistica italiana," *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, LXIV, 1998, 57-78, esp. 60-68. The importance of discourse in disseminating Caravaggism for the young Velázquez and other Spanish artists is also considered in Charles DEMPSEY, "Caravaggio e i due stili naturalistici: speculare contro maculare," in *Caravaggio nel IV centenario della Capella Contarelli (Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi: Roma 24-26 maggio 2001)*, ed. Caterina Volpi, Petrucci: Città di Castello, 2002, 185-196, esp. 191-95. Dempsey further argues that the young Velázquez's polished style relates to early seventeenth-century discourse on the realism of Caravaggio's highly-finished paintings.
- ⁵⁵ I have used a slightly later edition: Cristóbal SUÁREZ DE FIGUEROA, *Plaza universal de todas ciencias, y artes, parte traduzida de Toscano, y parte compuesta por el Doctor Christoval Suarez de Figueroa*, Luys Rovre, Perpignan, 1630. See *ibid.*, 316v. Suárez de Figueroa's treatise is in part a translation of Tomaso GARZONI DI BAGNACAVALLO, *La piazza universale di tutte le professioni del mondo*, Giovanni Battista Somascho, Venice, 1586. However, Suárez de Figueroa added Caravaggio and others to Garzoni's list of illustrious painters.
- ⁵⁶ See CARDUCHO, 270-72. Because Carducho was born in Florence and maintained contacts with Italian artists and theorists, he may well have heard contemporary Italian criticisms of Caravaggio before publishing his *Diálogos*. Giovanni BAGLIONE, *Le vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti: Dal Pontificato di Gregorio XIII del 1572 in fino a' tempi di Papa Urbano Ottavo nel 1642* (1642), ed. Jacob Hess and Herwarth Röttgen, 3 vols., Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City, 1995, vol. I, 138, explains that Caravaggio is accused of having "rovinata la pittura." Most famously, André FÉLIBIEN, *Entretiens sur les vies et sur les ouvrages des plus excellens peintres anciens et modernes* (1666-88), 6 vols., S.A.S., Trevoix, 1725, vol. III, 194, tells us that Poussin "ne pouvoit rien souffrir du Caravage, & disoit qu'il étoit venu au monde pour détruire la Peinture." On this statement, see Louis MARIN, *Détruire la peinture*, 2d ed., Flammarion, Paris, 1997.
- ⁵⁷ CARDUCHO, 270-71. Carducho writes that "le siguen glotonicamente el mayor golpe de los Pintores." He further explains that "[Caravaggio] ha podido persuadir a tan grande numero de todo genero de gente, que aquella es la buena pintura."
- ⁵⁸ PACHECO, 1990, 183: "pintores en la Italia nobles y caballeros de hábito."
- ⁵⁹ PACHECO, 1990, 183.
- ⁶⁰ On Pacheco's circle, see BROWN, 1978, 21-83; BASSEGODA, intro. to Pacheco, 1990, esp. 20-32; TIFFANY, 2003, 19-52.
- ⁶¹ See PACHECO, 1990, 404-11.
- ⁶² PACHECO, 1990, 406: "campo negro."
- ⁶³ PACHECO, 1990, 404, explains that relief is important "porque tal vez se hallará alguna buena pintura que carezca de hermosura y de suavidad, que por tener esta parte de la fuerza y relieve, y parecer rendonda como el bulto y como el natural, y engañar a la vista saliéndose del cuadro, se le pondon las otras dos partes." Gauna, 65-66, discusses the relationship among *hermosura*, *suavidad*, and *relieve* in Pacheco's text.

- 64 PACHECO, 1990, 407. Pacheco writes that *hermosura*, *suavidad*, and *relievo* are necessary to “la parte más grave y más honrosa de la pintura, que pertenece a la expresión de las sagradas imágenes y divinas historias.” However, when artists paint *bodegones*, “no les hace mucha falta la hermosura y suavidad, aunque el relieve sí.”
- 65 On the attribution of the *Kitchen Servant* (ca. 1617-23, Chicago, Art Institute), see BROWN, 1986, 21. The painting is reproduced in *ibid.*, 20.
- 66 On these stylistic issues, see Tanya J. TIFFANY, “Visualizing Devotion in Early Modern Seville: Velázquez’s *Christ in the House of Martha and Mary*,” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, XXXII/2, 2005, 433-53. *Supper at Emmaus* (ca. 1617-18, Dublin, National Gallery of Ireland) and *Christ in the House of Martha and Mary* (1618, London, National Gallery) are reproduced in BROWN, 16, 20, respectively.
- 67 Carel VAN MANDER, *Het Schilder-Boeck*, Paschier van Wesbvach, Haarlem, 1604, 191, is the first published account of Caravaggio’s practice of painting from live models. On Pacheco’s engagement with van Mander’s treatise, see Simon A. VOSTERS, “Lampsonio, Vasari, Van Mander y Pacheco,” *Goya*, CLXXXIX, 1985, 130-139; BASSEGODA, intro. to Pacheco, 1990, 33. Although Pacheco discusses Caravaggio’s practice in a chapter dealing with preparatory drawings, his use of van Mander suggests that he is referring to the artist’s practice of painting – rather than simply drawing – from life. *Ibid.*, 529, furthermore explicitly discusses the importance of painting portraits from life.
- 68 PACHECO, 1990, 443: “Pero yo me atengo al natural para todo; y si pudiese tenerlo delante siempre y en todo tiempo, no sólo para las cabezas, desnudos, manos y pies, sino también para los paños y sedas y todo lo demás, sería lo mejor. Así lo hacía Micael Angelo Caravacho; ya se ve en el Crucifiamiento de S. Pedro (con ser copias), con cuánta felicidad; así lo hace Jusepe de Ribera, pues sus figuras y cabezas entre todas las grandes pinturas que tiene el Duque de Alcalá parecen vivas y lo demás, pintado, aunque sea junto a Guido Bolonés; y mi yerno, que sigue este camino, también se ve la diferencia que hace a los demás, por tener siempre delante el natural.” On Ribera’s practice of painting from life, see James CLIFTON, “‘Ad vivum mire depinxit’: Toward a Reconstruction of Ribera’s Art Theory,” *Storia dell’arte*, LXXXIII, 1995, 111-32.
- 69 On Velázquez’s use of the same model for the *Old Woman Cooking* and the *Christ in the House of Martha and Mary*, see BROWN, 1986, 17.
- 70 Radiographs of Velázquez’s early paintings indicate that he sketched only the main contours onto canvas, and then worked in detail on individual sections, perhaps modifying the compositions as he progressed. See Zahira VÉLIZ, “Velázquez’s Early Technique,” in CLARKE (as in n. 49), 79-84, esp. 83; Jonathan BROWN and Carmen GARRIDO, *Velázquez: The Technique of Genius*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1998, 18, 26.
- 71 See Thomas DA COSTA KAUFMANN, “The Perspective of Shadows: The History of the Theory of Shadow Projection,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXXVIII, 1975, 258-287, esp. 272. On Velázquez’s interest in optics and perspective, see in particular: Martin KEMP, *The Science of Art*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1990, 99-108; MARIAS, 1995, esp. 265-67; Agustín BUSTAMANTE and Fernando MARIAS, “Entre práctica y teoría: la formación de Velázquez en Sevilla,” in MORALES, 1999 (as in n. 49), 141-57; Eileen REEVES, “1614-1621: The *Buen Pintor* of Seville,” chap. 5 in *Painting the Heavens: Art and Science in the Age of Galileo*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1997, 184-225. Fernando MARIAS, “Skiagraphía: De las sombras de Robert Campin a Velázquez,” in *El Museo del Prado. Fragmentos y detalles*, ed. Fernando Checa, Fundación de Amigos del Museo del Prado, Madrid, 1997, 211-25, discusses the representation of shadows in Velázquez’s *bodegones*. On shadow projection in Western art, see also Victor I. STOICHITA, *A Short History of the Shadow*, trans. Anne-Marie Glasheen, Reaktion, London, 1997.
- 72 On seventeenth-century Italian artists’ avoidance of purely black shadows, see in particular Elizabeth CROPPER, “Poussin and Leonardo: Evidence from the Zaccolini MSS,” *Art Bulletin*, LXII/4, 1980, esp. 577-78.
- 73 See DA COSTA KAUFMANN, 258-60.
- 74 See Giovanni Battista ARMENINI, *De’ veri precetti della pittura* (1587), ed. Marina Gorreri, intro. Enrico Castelnuovo, I Milleni, G. Einaudi, Turin, 1988, esp. 104-5; Daniele BARBARO, *La pratica della prospettiva*, Borgominieri, Venice, 1568, 175-178; Albrecht DÜRER, *The Painter’s Manual: 1525 (Unterweisung der Messung)*, trans. and commentary by Walter L. Strauss, Abaris Books, New York, 1977, 365-95.
- 75 Velázquez’s inventory is published in *Corpus velazqueño: documentos y textos*, 2 vols., Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, Dirección General de Bellas Artes y Bienes Culturales, Madrid, 2000, vol. I, 469-83. REEVES, 211 and note 68, identifies the “Matemática de Aguilon” as François de AGUILON, *Opticorum libri sex philosophis juxta ac mathematicis utiles*, Plantin, Antwerp, 1613, noting that this was the only treatise published by Aguilon.
- 76 PACHECO, 1990, 388, praises “los grandes matemáticos y perspetivos, como Alhacen, Vitellión, Euclides, Tolomeo y el Comandino, y otros muchos.” This list makes it clear that Pacheco is using the Latin meaning of *perspectiva*. *Ibid.*, 389, advocates “aplicando a las leyes y preceptos de la perspectiva la observancia del natural.”
- 77 The painting has probably darkened over time. On the darkening of Velázquez’s canvases, see Gridley McKIM-SMITH, Greta ANDERSEN-BERGDOLL, and Richard NEWMAN, *Examining Velázquez*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1988, 108-111; BROWN and GARRIDO, 18, 26.
- 78 BROWN, 1986, 12, plausibly suggests that Velázquez “presented” the *Waterseller* to Fonseca as a “showpiece.” Fonseca seems to have kept a house in Madrid from at least 1615, but was again living in Seville from 1617-21, when he was a canon of the city’s cathedral. On his friendships and travels throughout the 1610s, see José LÓPEZ NAVÍO, “Don Juan Fonseca, canónigo maestreescuela de Sevilla,” *Archivo hispalense*, XLI/126-27, 1964, esp. 99-101; Francisca MOYA DEL BAÑO, “Los comentarios de J. de Fonseca a Garcilaso,” in *Garcilaso*, ed. Víctor García de la Concha, Academia literaria renacentista, vol. 4, Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, 1986, 204-5. The relationship between Velázquez and Fonseca has recently been considered in ROE, 203-25 and *passim*.
- 79 PACHECO, 1990, 203. Pacheco explains that when Velázquez first traveled to Madrid, “Fue muy agasajado de los dos hermanos don Luis y don Melchior del Alcázar, y en particular de don Juan de Fonseca, sumiller de cortina de Su Majestad (aficionado a su pintura).”
- 80 PACHECO, 1990, 204, tells us that Philip IV’s chief minister, the Count-Duke of Olivares, called upon Fonseca to summon Velázquez to court. On the friendship between Fonseca and Olivares, see John Huxtable ELLIOTT, *The Count-Duke of Olivares: The Statesman in an Age of Decline*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1986, 22, 25, 141.
- 81 The inventory is published and discussed in José LÓPEZ NAVÍO, “Velázquez tasa los cuadros de su protector D. Juan de Fonseca,” *Archivo Español de Arte*, XXXIV, 1961, 53-84. See *ibid.*, 64: “Un quadro de un aguador, de mano de Diego Velazquez, quatrocientos rls.” López Navío also discusses Velázquez’s stay in Fonseca’s home.
- 82 Leo STEINBERG, “The *Water Carrier* of Velázquez,” *Art News*, LXX, 1971, 55; Julián GÁLLEGO, *Velázquez en Sevilla*, 2d ed., Arte hispalense, vol. 6, Excma. Diputación Provincial, Seville, 1994, 132. For an alternative reading of the painting, see Manuela MENA MARQUÉS, “‘El aguador’ de Velázquez o una meditación sobre la cultura clásica: ‘Diógenes y los hijos de Xenófades,’” *Archivo Español de Arte*, LXXII, 1999, 391-413.
- 83 Manuel PÉREZ LOZANO, “Velázquez y los gustos conceptistas: *El aguador* y su destinatario,” *Boletín del Museo e Instituto Camón Aznar*, LIV, 1993, 36-37.
- 84 Elena RAMÍREZ-MONTESINOS, “Objetos de vidrio en los bodegones de Velázquez,” in *Velázquez y el arte de su tiempo: V Jornadas de Arte*, Alpuerto, Madrid, 1991, 403, has challenged the traditional identification of the fig, suggesting that it is instead a blue glass bubble.

- ⁸⁵ PÉREZ LOZANO, 1993, 37. On the Figueroas's history and heraldry, see also Gonzalo ARGOTE DE MOLINA, *Nobleza del Andalucía*, Fernando Díaz, Seville, 1588, vol. II, 345v.
- ⁸⁶ PÉREZ LOZANO, 1993, 34, also relates the *Waterseller* to seventeenth-century Sevillian poetry.
- ⁸⁷ The poem is published and discussed in William L. FICHTER, "Una poesía contemporánea inédita sobre las bodas de Velázquez," in *Varia velazqueña; homenaje a Velázquez en el III centenario de su muerte, 1660-1960*, ed. Antonio Gallego y Burín, 2 vols., Madrid, 1960, vol. I, 636-39. The poem has recently been published without commentary in *Corpus velazqueño*, vol. I, 32-36.
- ⁸⁸ FICHTER, 637. On Fonseca's friendship with Rioja, see Francisco de RIOJA, *Poesías*, ed. Cayetano Alberto de la Barrera y Leirado, Rivadeneyra, Madrid, 1867, 292-318, 347, 352-54; ROE, 203-25 and *passim*.
- ⁸⁹ FICHTER, 637. The friendship between Rioja and Acosta is mentioned in Manuel PÉREZ LOZANO, "Velázquez, en el entorno de Pacheco: Las primeras obras," *Ars Longa*, III, 1991, 90. For a letter from Rioja to Acosta see BCC (Biblioteca Capitular y Colombina, Seville) 59-3-23 (sig. antigua: 4^o-85-4-2), fols. 48r-60v; Francisco PACHECO, ed., *Tratados de erudición de varios autores* (1631), BN (Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid) MS 1713, 39r-49v. Both manuscripts also provide evidence of the friendship between Acosta and Pacheco.
- ⁹⁰ For a list of Fonseca's writings (all unpublished), see MOYA DEL BAÑO, 208-11. On his *Arte Poetica*, see ROE, 203-9. Fonseca's activities as an amateur artist are discussed in PACHECO, 1990, 216. Upon Fonseca's death, Velázquez purchased some of his painting materials. See LÓPEZ NAVÍO, 1961, 68.
- ⁹¹ PACHECO, 1990, 512: "igual valentía que a las demás cosas."
- ⁹² PACHECO, 1990, 520: "Mejor he pintado las uvas que el muchacho, porque, si estuviera perfeto, las aves tuvieran miedo de llegar a ellas."
- ⁹³ PACHECO, 1990, 521: "las cosas menos importantes"; "lo principal."
- ⁹⁴ PACHECO, 1990, 521: "¿Es posible que no se repare en tantas cabezas y manos en que he puesto todo mi estudio y cuidado y se vayan todos a esta impertinencia?"
- ⁹⁵ This point was first made in VÉLIZ, 84.
- ⁹⁶ The existence of the manuscript *De veteri Pictura* is recorded in Nicolás ANTONIO, *Biblioteca hispana nueva* (1788 ed.), trans. Miguel Matilla Martínez, 2 vols., Fundación Universitaria Española, Madrid, 1999, vol. I, 736. PÉREZ LOZANO, 1993, 32-33, suggests that Fonseca's discussion of ancient and modern concepts of the *linea* [BCC MS 57-3-24 (sig. antigua 83-3-19), fols. 231r-233r] may be a fragment of *De veteri Pictura* or notes for the text.
- ⁹⁷ See LÓPEZ NAVÍO, 1961, 53-84.
- ⁹⁸ GRACIÁN, 1969, vol. I, 254.
- ⁹⁹ PALOMINO, 1986, 154-97.
- ¹⁰⁰ On the date of the *Rokeby Venus* see BROWN, 1986, 183. On Velázquez's emulation of Titian's style and subject matter in these two works, see especially MARIAS, 2003, 111-32.
- ¹⁰¹ For Palomino's biographies of Zurbarán, Murillo, and Carreño, see PALOMINO, 1986, 197-99, 290-96, and 285-90, respectively.
- ¹⁰² TATLOCK, 1.

