

MAJOR AND MINOR MASTERS OF THE SEVILLIAN SCHOOL IN THE “GOLDEN AGE”

Traditionally, art history has organized members of an artistic “school” around major and minor artists. For writers of the nineteenth century, the relationship between them was constructed in terms of the “influence” exercised by the strong, dominant personalities of the former on the latter. Major artists, therefore, are considered leaders and minor artists are designated their followers, and relegated to a second league of the history of art. Leaders are distinguished by a creativity which is measured in terms of originality, invention, innovation.¹ Their unique gifts mean that they quickly outgrow their own masters and are constructed as self-taught individuals.² Followers, on the other hand, are thought to enjoy a dependent relationship on major artists; they might want to be like them, but do not possess sufficient talent.³ This canon rests on a series of value judgements around the perceived aesthetic quality of the works of major artists, which are articulated by means of the analysis of style – formalism – and the practice of connoisseurship.⁴

This methodology has been fruitfully applied to the production of the catalogues raisonné of canonical artists in the history of art.⁵ Given that artistic style is regarded as the key indicator of the quality and qualities which distinguish masters from their followers, connoisseurship is the main tool employed. It is assumed that the works of major masters are “better” than those of their pupils and followers, and aesthetic judgements of quality are considered crucial evidence in this discriminatory exercise. This approach underpins the most recent catalogue raisonné of Francisco de Zurbarán.⁶ Its positivistic tone is expressed in the prologue, which claims that its value lies in “delimitando de una vez por todas, en numerosa cantidad de obras, el área artística de la actividad del propio maestro y separándolo de discípulos y seguidores que nada tienen que ver con el gran pintor extremeño”.⁷ The first

¹ See E. Barker, N. Webb, and K. Woods, “Historical introduction: the idea of the artist”, in *The Changing Status of the Artist*, New Haven and London, 1999, pp. 7-25.

² See F. Pacheco, *Arte de la pintura*, ed. Madrid, 1990, pp. 202-03 on the “natural y grande ingenio” of Velázquez and other pupils (*discípulos*) who outstripped their teachers.

³ Pilar Silva (in Museo Nacional del Prado, *La Belleza encerrada. De Fra Angelico a Fortuny*, exh. cat., 2013, p. 50), for instance, speaks of the followers of Bosch as “autores [que] no tengan la fuerza y la capacidad creativa del Bosco”.

⁴ See, for instance, Bernard Berenson’s *Rudiments of Connoisseurship* (1902), which argued for the supremacy of the eye over documentation. In his *Florentine Painters* (1896), he developed the theory of the “tactile imagination” as the aesthetic value which characterized the best of the Florentine school.

⁵ See C. Scallen, *Rembrandt, Reputation and the Practice of Connoisseurship* (Chicago, 2004) for the case of the Rembrandt canon.

⁶ O. Delenda, *Francisco de Zurbarán, 1598-1664. Catálogo razonado y crítico*, vol. I, Madrid, 2009; *Zurbarán. Los conjuntos y el obrador*, vol. II, Madrid, 2010.

⁷ Delenda 2010, p. 14, preface by E. Valdivieso. This is reminiscent of the objectives of the early years of the Rembrandt Research Project, whose mission was to arrive at the “truth” by paring away all accretions to the master’s catalogue, including the works of followers, imitators, and even fakes. See the account of E. van de Wetering, “Connoisseurship and Rembrandt’s Paintings: New Directions in the Rembrandt Research Project, part II”, *The Burlington Magazine*, 1259, 2008, pp. 83-90.

volume identifies the corpus of “authentic” works by Zurbarán himself and the second volume is dedicated to the “obrador” or workshop of the master, and “sus mejores colaboradores”, although not to the wider “school”. The artists identified in the second volume are Juan Luis Zambrano (1598-c.1639), Ignacio de Ries (c.1616-after 1665), El Maestro de San Hermegildo (active c.1630-40), El Maestro de Besançon (active c.1630-40), the brothers Francisco Polanco (c.1600-1651) and Miguel Polanco (active c.1610-c.1650), Bernabé de Ayala (c.1625-1689), and Juan de Zurbarán (1620-49), all of whom are considered in one way or another to work in a style affiliated to Zurbarán. Throughout the text they are variously denominated his “aprendices”, “alumnos”, “discípulos”, “oficiales”, “ayudantes”, “colaboradores”, “imitadores”, and “seguidores”. These categories are applied interchangeably and with little rigor, even though the position of apprentice or assistant involved specific contractual obligations in the seventeenth century.⁸ Moreover, any artistic independence they may have enjoyed is overshadowed by the personality of Zurbarán, even though, to take one example, the so-called Maestro de San Hermenegildo painted at least one altarpiece, from which his art-historical name derives.⁹

In the case of Seville, the model of the artistic school established by Ceán Bermúdez has been very influential. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, he organized Sevillian painters around the pivotal figure of Bartolomé Esteban Murillo; he was “jefe de la escuela sevillana” and the progenitor of an artistic style which was continued by his “discípulos”.¹⁰ According to him, Murillo was an autodidact – basing his art on an eclectic assimilation of admired masters.¹¹ Later, he himself became an inspiring teacher and established a line of succession in the school.¹² Ceán Bermúdez listed his

⁸ The cataloguing terms used by the major auction houses provide a standard terminology to describe the relationship of a work of art to a given master: attributed to; studio of; circle of; style of; follower of; manner of; and, after. A disclaimer also generally stipulates that any statement relating to the authorship, attribution, origin, date, age, provenance, and condition of a work is a statement of opinion, not fact.

⁹ Delenda 2010, pp. 293-97.

¹⁰ Ceán Bermúdez, *Carta ... a un amigo suyo, sobre el estilo y gusto en la pintura de la escuela sevillana; y sobre el grado de perfeccion a que la elevó Bartolomé Esteban Murillo: cuya vida se inserta, y se describen sus obras en Sevilla*, 1806, p. 7. This author (*Ibid.*, p. 54) says that Murillo was acclaimed “príncipe de la escuela sevillana” after his first public commission for the small cloister of the Casa Grande de San Francisco. See J. Portús, *El concepto de pintura Española. Historia de un problema*, Madrid: Verbum, 2012, pp. 112-114 for the importance of Ceán’s *Carta* of 1806 as the first critical evaluation of the characteristics of this local school of painting; and *Ibid.*, pp. 162-64 on successive studies in the nineteenth century which cemented the idea of Murillo as head of the Sevillian school. See also M. S. García Felguera, *La fortuna de Murillo (1682-1900)*, Seville: Diputación Provincial, 1989.

¹¹ Palomino tells us that Murillo learned the rudiments of painting from Juan del Castillo, but that his education really began when he went to Madrid to study the works of the royal collection and “copió mucho de Ticiano, Rubens, y Van-Dick, en que mejoró mucho la casta del colorido, no descuidándose en el dibujo por las estatuas, y en las academias ...” Palomino ed. 1988, p. 410; Ceán Bermúdez 1800, II, p. 48. Ceán Bermúdez (1800, II, p. 50) interpreted his paintings for the small cloister of the convent of San Francisco as the product of his eclectic absorption of the masters he studied in Madrid – Ribera, Van Dyck, and Velázquez. Ceán Bermúdez.

¹² See E. Kris and O. Kurz, *Legend, Myth, and Magic in the Image of the Artist. A Historical Experiment*, New Haven and London, 1979, pp. 18-22 on this motif of teacher-pupil genealogies found in classical historiography.

“discípulos” as: Francisco Meneses Osorio (1640-1721), Juan Simón Gutiérrez (1643-1718), Juan Garzón, Alonso de Escobar, Fernando Márquez Joya, Francisco Pérez de Pineda, José López, D. Francisco Antolínez de Sarabia (c.1645-c.1700), Esteban Márquez (1652-1696), the knight don Pedro Núñez de Villavicencio (1640-95), and Murillo’s slave Sebastián Gómez (active 1690s).¹³ The date range covered by the careers of these painters suggests greater heterogeneity in the school than is implied in this source. Moreover, according to their biographies in Ceán Bermúdez’s *Diccionario histórico*, not all of them were formally taught by Murillo. Alonso de Escobar was not a pupil (*discípulo*), but an imitator of Murillo.¹⁴ Esteban Márquez was taught by his uncle, Fernando Márquez Joya, who attended the Seville drawing academy and “siguó la manera de Murillo”, and the nephew appears to have independently studied the style of Murillo.¹⁵ Sebastian Gómez was said to have taught himself to paint in his free time.¹⁶ Núñez de Villavicencio was an amateur painter who learned to paint “por afición y entretenimiento” with Murillo.¹⁷ Antolínez de Sarabia, a lawyer by profession, was another amateur who was a self-taught follower of Murillo.¹⁸ Indeed, their styles betray a wider range of motivations in their response to Murillo than is accommodated by this model of the “school”.¹⁹ Despite being an expedient which simplifies and distorts the realities of possible artistic relationships with a major master, the idea of the school has proved to be a resistant motif in the history of art.²⁰

¹³ Ceán Bermúdez 1806, pp. 109-10. Antonio Palomino only included in his *Lives* the Sevillian followers of Murillo who came to Madrid. These were Francisco Antolínez, one of whose paintings - a copper of the *Flight into Egypt* - was praised for looking as if it were by Murillo (ed. 1988, p. 485) and Núñez de Villavicencio (ed. 1988, pp. 483-4).

¹⁴ J. A. Ceán Bermúdez, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las bellas artes en España*, Madrid, 1800, II, p. 30, “Quando no haya sido discípulo de Murillo, procuró imitar su estilo.”

¹⁵ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, III, pp. 67-69. It is said of Márquez that “volvió a Sevilla, donde con su aplicación superó en poco tiempo á los que se habían mofado de él, pues consiguió mas corrección en el dibuxo, mas frescura en el colorido, mas desembarazo con los pinceles y mucha imitación del estilo de Murillo.”

¹⁶ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, II, p. 204. Subsequently, Ceán Bermúdez (1806, p. 110) claimed that Murillo taught Gómez painting.

¹⁷ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, III, p. 242. For Palomino (ed. 1988, pp. 483-4), although Núñez de Villavicencio painted genre subjects with children “cuadros de su invención, siguiendo el estilo de Murillo”, he was not a disciple of Murillo but of the Maltese works of Preti.

¹⁸ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, I, pp. 37-38.

¹⁹ The author’s thinking has benefited from the ideas in the lecture of E. J. Sluifster, “Neat Concepts and Messy Realities: On Local Schools, Tastes, and Identities”, Dublin, 24 April, 2009.

²⁰ For accounts of Murillo’s “school”, see D. Angulo Iñíguez, *Murillo y su escuela en colecciones particulares*, Seville, 1975; E. Valdivieso and J. M. Serrera, “La época de Murillo”. *Antecedentes y Consecuentes de su Pintura*, Seville, 1982; E. Valdivieso, *Historia de la pintura sevillana*, Seville, 1992. For a later generation of artists, see A. Pleguezuelo and E. Valdivieso, *Domingo Martínez en la estela de Murillo*, Seville, 2004; F. Quiles García and I. Cano Rivero, *Bernardo Lorente Germán y la pintura sevillana de su tiempo, 1680-1759*, Seville, 2006; F. Quiles García and I. Cano Rivero, *Alonso Miguel de Tovar (1678-1752)*, Seville, 2006.

For Ceán Bermúdez, Murillo is a *pater familias* and his school a model of familial harmony and filial loyalty.²¹ In his *Carta* and, earlier, in his biography of the artist, he argued that Murillo's pictures revealed "su genio y sus pasiones". He insisted on the virtue and sweetness of Murillo's nature, and his charitable predisposition: "Se distinguía de todos los demás de su profesión por la suavidad con que enseñaba á sus discípulos: por la prudencia con que trataba á sus émulos y por la caridad con que repartía quantiosas limosnas á los pobres, que después lloraron su muerte. ... Pero los que mas la sintieron fueron sus amados discípulos, que traspasados de dolor y sentimiento no hallaban consuelo en la pérdida de un padre que los amaba tiernamente, de un maestro que los dirigía con cariño, y de un protector que los fomentaba, proporcionadoles obras para su sustento."²² This is to be contrasted with the "genio dominante" and "cáncer orgulloso" of Murillo's contemporary and rival Juan de Valdés Leal.²³

We are told that Murillo was particularly close to Don Pedro Núñez de Villavicencio and "que le amaba tiernamente".²⁴ In both the biography of Murillo and Núñez de Villavicencio, Ceán Bermúdez tells the story of the master dying in the arms of the younger artist.²⁵ Whether this actually happened or not is irrelevant; it is a device which memorably exemplifies the relationship between them. It functions in other ways too. The anecdote is a retelling of others in the history of art, such as Vasari's of Leonardo da Vinci dying in the arms of the king of France, which is a proof of the noble status of painters and of painting. Given that Villavicencio was from a noble family and himself knight of the order of Malta, and an amateur painter, it is likely that Ceán's is to be read in analogous terms.

Ceán Bermúdez asserts that Murillo was "el fundador del estilo sevillano" and he described with some precision the characteristics of this style.²⁶ He says that on Murillo's death he left a legacy of work – of models and examples - which sustained the future of his followers.²⁷ From this

²¹ Ceán Bermúdez's model here is that of Raphael and his disciples, as described by Vasari, who said that his virtuous character instilled harmony in his workshop and among other artists. Doubtless Murillo too would have known the passage well. See. P. C. Rubin, *Giorgio Vasari, Art and History*, New Haven and London, 1995, p. 396.

²² Ceán Bermúdez 1806, pp. 107-10. Ceán Bermúdez 1800, II, pp. 55-56, speaks of the "amabilidad" with which Murillo taught his "discípulos", "dirigiéndolos con blandura por el buen camino que va á la imitación de la naturaleza".

²³ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, V, p. 108.

²⁴ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, III, p. 243, "En fin vivió con tanta veneración y afecto á su maestro, que siempre estaba á su lado mereciendo su confianza y predilección, y así fue testigo de su testamento y le ayudó en su enfermedad hasta el último instante de su vida, pues falleció en sus brazos ...".

²⁵ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, II, p. 55; III, p. 243. See note 12 above.

²⁶ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, II, p. 56. The Sevillian style is "estilo de suavidad, que le caracteriza entre los primeros naturalistas, y que se distingue entre todos por un acorde general de tintas y colores; por una indecisión de perfiles sabia y dulcemente perdidos; por los cielos opacos que dan el tono á la escena; por las actitudes sencillas y decorosamente expresivas; por los semblantes de amabilidad y virtud; por los pliegues de paños francos y bien trazados; por la fuerza de luz en los objetos principales; y sobre todo por el verdadero color de las carnes.". This is played out further in his *Carta ... a un amigo suyo, sobre el estilo y gusto en la pintura de la escuela sevillana* of 1806.

²⁷ Ceán Bermúdez 1806, pp. 109-10, "... proporcionadoles obras para su sustento.".

comment, it would appear that Murillo was conscious of his leadership role in the Sevillian school. The story of the artist's rejection of an offer of the King of Spain to work at the court of Madrid may be one indication of this.²⁸ Another is most certainly his role as a founder member and first director of the drawing academy. The latter can be seen as a "nationalistic" project in terms of Murillo's desire to enhance the prestige of the artistic school and the social status of artists in Seville.²⁹ Indeed, Ceán Bermúdez calls this "El deseo patriótico que tenia [Murillo] del adelantamiento de las bellas artes ...", which led him to overcome personal interests and jealousies among his fellow artists, and to unite them in a collective enterprise.³⁰ This author, moreover, has Murillo teaching in the drawing academy, posing the model and explaining proportion and anatomy, and suggests that the academy was important for the formation of his school. It is significant in this respect that a number of Murillo's disciples are described as actively committed to the academy; Ceán Bermúdez documents Meneses Osorio as one of its leading members.³¹ Again, the contrast with Valdés Leal is intentional, the latter being cast by this author as an artist whose individualism, pride, and *envidia* made him unsuitable as a teacher, and resulted in a unique style which could only be followed by his own children.³²

Of course, some artists were actually related biologically and it is to be supposed that sons and daughters had intimate knowledge of the ideas and techniques of their fathers. Moreover, they could enjoy and exploit the prestige of this link if their fathers were famous. A relevant case is that of Juan de Zurbarán, who was listed among the students of José Rodríguez Tirado, a dancing master, as "hijo de Francisco çurbaran el gran pintor".³³ However, this relationship has also fuelled an art-historical tendency to regard such artists as dependent entities. The negative treatment of Artemisia Gentileschi in modern historiography is perhaps the most obvious case and is one compounded by issues of gender.³⁴ In the Spanish world, the ambiguous place that Jorge Manuel, son of El Greco, has occupied in relation to the art of

²⁸ Palomino ed. 1988, p. 416. The idea here is that he did not abandon Seville, as Zurbarán had done, and did not suffer from the *wanderlust* of artists like Velázquez and Alonso Cano.

²⁹ See J. Portús, "Los discursos sobre el arte de la pintura en la Sevilla de Justino de Neve", in Madrid, Museo del Prado, *Murillo y Justino de Neve. El arte de la amistad*, exhibition catalogue, ed. G. Finaldi, 2012, pp. 47-59; and Portús 2012, pp. 47-51, on the collective pride in Sevillian art in local artistic circles by second half of seventeenth century.

³⁰ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, II, p. 56.

³¹ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, III, p. 119; 1806, p. 68, where Meneses is called "el discípulo mas aprovechado de Murillo". Ceán Bermúdez (1800, I, pp. 37-38) tells how Francisco Antolínez "se dedicó á la pintura en la escuela de Murillo, asistiendo á la academia pública que los profesores habían establecido en la casa lonja de aquella ciudad, con lo que hizo notables progresos sobre el gusto y colorido de su maestro.". The practice of drawing is also noted as a distinguishing feature of a number of the disciples. In the case of Sebastián Gómez, for instance, Ceán Bermúdez (1800, II, p. 204) gives a relatively precise definition of his imitation of Murillo, consisting of "buen gusto de color, mucho empaste en los lienzos y bastante exactitude de dibujo".

³² Ceán Bermúdez 1800, V, pp. 107-112.

³³ M. L. Caturla and O. Delenda, *Francisco de Zurbarán*, Paris, 1994, p. 310, doc. 115.

³⁴ M. Bal ed., *The Artemisia Files*, Chicago and London, 2005.

his father has been recently reassessed.³⁵ The assumption that he was a weak, derivative artist has been questioned, especially in light of the facts that he headed his father's workshop in the last years of his life and finished a number of his commissions.³⁶ Jorge Manuel, moreover, satisfied a demand for paintings after the death of his father and produced works which conformed to a brand. Juan de Zurbarán would appear to offer a counter example. He may have been driven by a perverse desire to make a name for himself in the "minor" genre of still-life painting, in which paternal models are rejected in favour of modish Neapolitan ones. On the other hand, this reading of his career may well be a consequence of the limited state of our knowledge; only one signed still life is known by the father and no figure paintings have so far been identified by the short-lived son.

As can be seen from the sources cited above, the idea of the artistic school formed in the nineteenth century regarded proximity to the major master in a positive light. For Ceán Bermúdez, the stylistic dependence of the followers on Murillo was such that they were confused with one another.³⁷ He also speaks of the Polanco brothers as "discípulos" of Zurbarán and "vecinos de Sevilla, donde estudiaron la pintura con Francisco de Zurbarán. Hicieron tales progresos que llegaron a equivocarse sus obras con las de su maestro".³⁸ In their case, the example of the master evidently permitted them to raise their game. In the case of Bernabé de Ayala, the opposite occurs: "Estudio con Zurbarán con aprovechamiento; pero el viaje que éste hizo a Madrid, donde quedó establecido, cortó las esperanzas de igualarle." Here, Zurbarán's move to Madrid in 1658 leaves Ayala without his guiding example.³⁹

The modern catalogue raisonné has obvious value in establishing a corpus of accepted works by a given major artist. One of the by-products of ring-fencing off their work from those of followers is to draw attention to the latter and, in some cases, to rescue them from the margins of art history. However, at the same time, the dominant idea of the passive dependence of minor masters on major ones over-simplifies the evidence of the very artistic

³⁵ F. Marías, "El Greco, viejos y nuevos problemas: El Greco y Jorge Manuel Theotocópuli", in *II Metodo del Conoscitore. Aprocci, Limiti, Prospettivi*, eds. S. Albi and A. Aggujaro, Rome, 2016, pp. 85-110.

³⁶ The model of the Venetian family workshop is relevant here; El Greco, for instance, would have been familiar with the role of Orazio Vecellio as the son and successor of Titian. See also the operations of the workshop of Bonifacio de' Pitati in P. Cottrell, "Unfinished Business: Palma Vecchio, Lorenzo Lotto, and the Early Career of Bonifacio de' Pitati", *Venezia Cinquecento*, XIV, 27, 2004, pp. 5-34.

³⁷ See Ceán Bermúdez 1800, II, pp. 176, for the life of Juan Garzón, where he says that his works and those of Meneses Osorio "andan confundidas con las de otros imitadores de su maestro, pues todos iban por un camino y estilo."; *Ibid.*, IV, p. 80, for the life of Francisco Pérez de Pineda, whose "obras están confundidas en su patria con las de otros pintores que siguieron como él el gusto y colorido de Murillo.". His son, of the same name, however, "pasó a la escuela de D. Lucás de Valdés" (*Ibidem*).

³⁸ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, IV, p. 104

³⁹ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, I, p. 85. Ceán concedes that he did achieve a respectable imitation, particularly by adopting Zurbarán's approach of working from draped mannequins: "No obstante le imitó muy bien en el colorido y tintas, y en paños y brocado, que trabajaba por el maniquí como su maestro".

individuality of the former gained from looking at their works. This results in contradictions. In the catalogue raisonné recently dedicated to Zurbarán, the Polanco brothers are described as “excelentes alumnos o seguidores de Zurbarán” and, along with Bernabé de Ayala, are seen as artists who “tanto quisieron copiar a su maestro”.⁴⁰ A first glance at the corpus of works of the Polanco, however, shows that these artists are far from being superficial stylistic imitators of Zurbarán and that they had independent artistic interests. Their nocturnes, for instance, can be explained by their emulation of sources other than the models of Zurbarán, such as paintings by the Caravaggisti (**fig. 1**).⁴¹ Francisco de Polanco’s *St. John the Baptist* can be seen to sweeten the harsh naturalism of Zurbarán.⁴² This is also the case with the so-called Maestro de Besançon, whose *Flight into Egypt* offers an improvement on the uncompromising naturalism of Zurbarán’s precedent (**fig. 3**).⁴³

In the case of the Cordoban painter Juan Luis Zambrano, who was around the same age as Zurbarán, any description of him as a mere “imitator” or follower of Zurbarán would seem to ignore the facts of their artistic and professional relationship. If Zambrano did indeed paint at least four of the scenes of the life of San Pedro Nolasco for the cloister of the convent of the Merced Calzada, then this can be best regarded as a collaboration between equals. A parallel case would be the collaboration between Zurbarán and Francisco de Herrera on the cycle of the Life of San Buenaventura for the Franciscan college in Seville, which has been more easily accepted as such by historians of art because of the status assigned to the latter as a “major” master. In terms of dividing up the work, it would have been natural for each artist to paint to their strengths. Zambrano was evidently able to paint in ways that Zurbarán could not, or did not wish to work, as can be seen, for instance, in his intensely dramatic gestures.⁴⁴ Despite the visual facts of Zambrano’s contribution to the cycle, the power of the canon and the master narrative of major and minor masters is such that, in a recent exhibition dedicated to Zurbarán, he is characterized as a follower who was unable to achieve the level of mastery of the latter, and his stylistic individuality is construed as weakness. As the catalogue entry for the painting of *The Death of St. Peter Nolasco* has it:

⁴⁰ Delenda 2010, pp. 264, 265; p. 21.

⁴¹ Delenda 2010, p. 327, PO-11.

⁴² Delenda 2010, p. 322, PO-1.

⁴³ Delenda (2010, p. 264), comparing the *Flight into Egypt* by Zurbarán (Seattle Art Museum) with the one by the Maestro de Besançon, finds that the latter “muestra unas calidades propias – un estilo personal atribuibles a un buen colaborador”. However, in her catalogue entries to the recent Zurbarán exhibition in Madrid (Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, *Zurbarán. Una nueva mirada*, eds. O. Delenda and M. Borobia, 2015, cats. 20, 53), Delenda praises Zurbarán’s painting as an “obra maestra autógrafa”, while perceived formal weaknesses in the work of the follower condemn it to a secondary status, adducing “unas cuantas torpezas, el canon de las figuras más reducido y la ausencia de volumen en estas últimas, así como el hecho de que la escena está tratada de manera más anecdótica ...”.

⁴⁴ Ceán Bermúdez, 1800, VI, p. 22, calls Zambrano a follower of Pablo de Céspedes and praises his style: “Pintó con valentía y brillantez de colorido ...” and with figures whose “actitudes tienen fuego y expresión.”. Palomino, ed. 1988, mentioned his “manera gallarda, y espirituosa”.

Llama la atención la unidad estilística que presentan dichos cuadros de ambos pintores; las semejanzas se deben probablemente a las exigencias expresadas por el padre comendador en el contrato. Es por tanto comprensible que Ponz dijera que estos cuatro lienzos “apenas pueden distinguirse de los otros”. Sin embargo, los tipos físicos, los ropajes, resueltos a base de pliegues más menudos, la animación de las personas, la presencia de elementos todavía manieristas y el discurso más teatral eran inusuales en la pintura de Zurbarán, si bien pueden corresponder al estilo de Zambrano. La factura es buena, con excelentes detalles, pero los gestos de las figuras que rodean el santo no reflejan el espíritu sosegado del maestro extremeño. ... el tono narrativo de la escena resulta muy diferente: este importante cuadro de Zambrano revela otro espíritu al que le falta fuerza plástica y escultórica.⁴⁵

While these examples show how we might begin to consider relationships between artists in a more objective light, there is still a reluctance to abandon the received model which considers minor masters pejoratively, as supposedly lacking in artistic initiative and artistic agency in relation to their major counterparts. A recent article on the works of Juan Simón Gutiérrez is entitled “A la sombra de Murillo” and begins thus: “A la sombra de una gran encina no pueden crecer los jóvenes arbustos. Esta frase pronunciada en 1907 en París por el escultor Constantin Brancusi cuando Rodin le propuso que fuera su discípulo, serviría para describir lo que aconteció entre Bartolomé Esteban Murillo y su discípulo Juan Simón Gutiérrez, dado que este último aceptó siempre el espíritu creativo de su maestro de tal forma que quedó totalmente eclipsado por el gran artista sevillano. De esa manera su personalidad quedó casi anulada y su escasa fama no le configuró más que como un artista secundario a la sombra de su mentor.”⁴⁶ Is this a characterization of Simón Gutiérrez that he himself would have recognized, or is it an orthodox construction of the history of art? While we cannot know the former, we are now more keenly aware of the sway of the latter. Given this, we might attempt to reevaluate the relationship of Simón Gutiérrez with Murillo differently. We might reconnect him with Murillo in more complex ways, which would include the possibility that the artist was a “rival” of the now dead famous master. Simón Gutiérrez’s *Ecstasy of St. Dominic* (**fig. 8**), for instance, invokes Murillo’s early *Death of St. Clare* (Dresden, Gemäldegalerie) painted for the Casa Grande de San Francisco – the site of Murillo’s public debut -, and can be seen to improve on the prototype - in terms the grace of the assembled female martyrs and the painting’s colour and lighting – via an emulation of the master’s later style.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ O. Delenda in Madrid 2015, p. 150. The first part of the entry repeats Delenda 2010, p. 272.

⁴⁶ E. Valdivieso, “Juan Simón Gutiérrez, a la sombra de Murillo”, *Ars*, 8, 25, 2015, pp. 110-20. *Ibid.*, p. 113, for the belief of J. Amador de los Ríos, *Sevilla pintoresca* (1844) that the artista “no tenía bastante genio para producir grandes concepciones y por esta causa no tenía estilo alguno”.

⁴⁷ Perhaps Murillo’s painting had already begun to suffer from exposure to the elements. For the painting by Simón Gutiérrez, see Valdivieso 1992, p. 243, fig. 199. Murillo’s prototype is also invoked by Esteban Márquez’s painting of the *Ecstasy of St. Dominic*. *Ibid.*, p. 245, fig. 200.

The relative importance of the “major” masters is evident from the extent of their coverage in Ceán Bermúdez’s biographies; Murillo is given eighteen pages, with a comprehensive list of his public works, while Francisco Meneses Osorio is dispatched in one page.⁴⁸ This is despite the fact that Meneses is first in the author’s list of the “discípulos” of Murillo and that he claims that in Seville “son estimadas sus obras sobre todas las de los discípulos de Murillo”. Moreover, he acted as the artistic heir of Murillo; he finished the master’s last public commission, in the Capuchin church in Cádiz, and put to the test his understanding of the art of Murillo in successfully creating a “seamless” and unified work.⁴⁹ In reality, however, what was his relationship with Murillo? Was he an apprentice (*aprendiz*), or was he an assistant (*oficial*), or both? Was he, perhaps, the most trusted assistant of Murillo, who enjoyed a special status in the workshop?⁵⁰ Either way, one cannot begin to understand Meneses without taking into account in one form or another his close artistic relationship with Murillo.⁵¹ Meneses Osorio himself may even have mythologized a proximity to the master in order to give authority to his art and this, in turn, was something that was valued by his contemporaries and beyond.

One of the ways to circumvent the inherited master narrative which considers Meneses Osorio a derivative painter, or another “shadow” of Murillo, might be to jettison the conventional notion of the “influence” of “major” artists on “minor” ones.⁵² This would result in a more disencumbered assessment of his work and, perhaps, a more precise definition of the character of the artistic relationship between the two artists. Ceán Bermúdez claimed that Meneses Osorio was “el discípulo de Murillo, que imitó mejor su blandura y agraciado colorido, hasta el punto de equivocarse sus obras con las de su maestro.”⁵³ This degree of “intimate imitation” may well have been based on an understanding of the master’s style and technique which came from direct access to his working methods. It should be remembered that workshops were not only dedicated to the production of paintings, but were places of teaching and learning, and where assistants could study the master’s paintings and drawings. Murillo himself made replicas of some of his own works and probably had a large number of pictures in stock which could be made available to apprentices and assistants. He may well have taken

⁴⁸ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, III, p. 119. J. Brown (*Painting in Spain, 1500-1700*, New Haven and London, 1991, p. 232) mentions Murillo’s “assistants and followers” in one short paragraph, while some fifteen pages are dedicated to Murillo himself.

⁴⁹ Alonso Miguel de Tovar’s extension to the upper part of Murillo’s *St. Augustine* (Museo del Prado, inv. 980), with the addition of many angels, is a remarkably successful emulation by an artist who had never known the master. See Angulo 1981, II, pp. 229-30, no. 272; Quiles García and Cano Rivero 2006, cat. 23.

⁵⁰ Compare, for instance, the case of Van Dyck in Rubens’ workshop, Adam Eaker, “Van Dyck between Master and Model”, *Art Bulletin*, XCVII, 2, 2015, pp. 173-191.

⁵¹ The sources tell us that Meneses enjoyed a close friendship with Juan Garzón, another “condiscípulo” of Murillo, and that they worked together. Ceán Bermúdez 1800, II, p. 176; III, p. 119. This collaboration adds a further dimension to his practice, if Garzón was able to imitate Meneses’ imitative style.

⁵² M. Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention. On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*, New Haven and London, 1986, esp. pp. 58-62, “Excursus against influence”.

⁵³ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, III, p. 119.

pleasure in his style being emulated. Comparative technical analysis of Meneses Osorio's paintings would be crucial in identifying the extent to which his is a "deep" response to Murillo, in which the master's technical procedures are emulated.⁵⁴ His access to Murillo's drawings is also a relevant factor here. It may be possible, therefore, to see his works in a more positive light as actively interpreting the models of Murillo and amplifying his style. Like many of the followers, Meneses Osorio adopts a deliberately atmospheric and tonal style, which is a variation on the so-called "second" manner of Murillo, characterized by Ceán Bermúdez as "de ambiente tan desvanecido y suave, y de tono tan acordado y agradable ...".⁵⁵ The flatter facture of his works may not be so much a stylistic weakness as a respectful recognition of the impossibility of following something so personal and distinctive in his master as his handling. His style, then, could be seen in terms of a self-fashioning strategy which deliberately celebrates his relationship with Murillo. He might even be seen as another Murillo.⁵⁶ In this way, his *St. Joseph with the Christ Child* (fig. 7) is an emulation of a typology invented by Murillo, but it is, above all, a new work.⁵⁷ The painting is signed and dated 1685, after Murillo's death. A study of the frequency and type of Meneses Osorio's signatures on his paintings would be revealing in terms of his strategies vis a vis Murillo. Obviously, the taste for Murillo paintings did not end with the master's death and may even have increased. The loyalty of Meneses Osorio to the models of Murillo can be seen as a means of producing more Murillo paintings for the market after the demise of the master. His responses also included easel paintings of details from Murillo's major public works, which were evidently painted for a market of private collectors, such as a bust-length version of the head of Christ from *Christ at the Pool of Bethesda* in the church of the Hospital de la Caridad.⁵⁸

What is the best way to deal with the so-called minor masters in the case of Seville? We could decide not to measure these artists against major names such as Zurbarán and Murillo. Would this relativism result in a misrepresentation of phenomena? A greater appreciation of the artistic achievements of minor masters could even allow them to ascend the artistic

⁵⁴ See, for instance, the following comparative technical studies of the "leonardismo" of Leonardo's followers: L. Keith and A. Roy, "Giampietrino, Boltraffio, and the Influence of Leonardo", *National Gallery Technical Bulletin*, 17, 1996, pp. 4-19; M. Spring et al, "Painting Practice in Milan in the 1490s: The Influence of Leonardo." *National Gallery Technical Bulletin*, 32, 2011, pp. 78-112.

⁵⁵ Ceán Bermúdez 1806, pp. 56-57.

⁵⁶ The idea is borrowed from the reading of Padovanino's imitation of Titian in M. H. Loh, *Titian Remade: Repetition and the Transformation of Early Modern Italian Art*, Los Angeles, 2007.

⁵⁷ See, for instance, Murillo's painting of the Christ Child asleep in St. Joseph's lap (E. Valdivieso, *Murillo. Catálogo razonado de pinturas*, Madrid, 2010, no. 276). The image of St. Joseph with the Christ Child was one of the subjects Meneses completed for Murillo's last public work, the altarpiece of Santa Catalina, Cádiz.

⁵⁸ The author saw this work recently in a private collection in Spain, accompanied by a report of Bernardino de Pantorba. Ceán Bermúdez (1800, II, p. 53; 1806, p. 81) admired the expressiveness of the head of Christ in the original.

hierarchy. However, maintaining any semblance of the inherited model of the canon means that other, even more “minor”, artists could take their place.⁵⁹ Or, we might think of alternative ways to accommodate them in a history of art.

One of these might be a history of art which takes account of the realities of workshop practices and artistic production of the time. We should not forget that teachers in the past did not always try to bring out the individuality of pupils and that it was normal to train apprentices in the style of the master. In this way, the use of assistants (*oficiales*) who painted in the “house style” was a practical expedient for the execution of altarpiece paintings, or paintings in series, where a team was necessary and where a high degree of stylistic coherence was crucial. Of the assistants of Zurbarán named in a document of 1636 - José Durán, Diego Muñoz Naranjo, Alonso de Flores, Ignacio de Ries – only the last has a defined corpus of works; the production of the others remains subsumed within the “Zurbarán” brand.⁶⁰ Unfortunately, this list of names does not tell us anything about their respective roles in Zurbarán’s workshop and how this was organized. Indeed, there is a chronic lack of written documentation about workshop practices in Spain. This, in turn, throws us back on the analysis of the works themselves in order to ascertain the types of collaboration which might have existed in practice. The liberal and non-specific use of terminology in the history of art such as “Zurbarán y obrador” and “Obrador y Zurbarán” for single pictures is clearly unsatisfactory.⁶¹ Close looking and technical examination are crucial here. What evidence is there, for instance, for the activities of specialists in backgrounds and in costume painting? It might be the case that painters of the drapery of female saints which came out of Zurbarán’s workshop also worked on the draperies of polychrome sculpture. Can the intervention of the master and more competent assistants be distinguished in the faces and hands of figures? What visual proof is there for paintings being retouched by the master? Could Murillo have begun pictures for assistants to work up, intervening again only to add “finishing” touches? Instead of a history of art of names, we might create a more inclusive one which concerns practices and materials. In this respect, even the *pintura ordinaria* of the period has something to tell us. Any serious consideration of such a range of issues would also involve a paradigm shift in terms of research, given that, as regards painting anyway, campaigns of technical analysis usually accompany monographic museum exhibitions which are reserved for major masters.

Is connoisseurship the best recourse for the cataloguer for an historical period in which the hand (“la mano”) of the artist was not always interpreted in a literal, autograph sense?⁶² Of course, the authorship of paintings did matter

⁵⁹ For the problem of the art-historical canon, see M. Camille, Z. Çelik, J. Onians, A. Rifkin, and C. B. Steiner, “Rethinking the Canon”, *Art Bulletin*, 78, 2, 1996, pp. 198-217.

⁶⁰ B. Navarrete Prieto, *Zurbarán y su obrador. Pinturas para el Nuevo Mundo*, Valencia, 1998, pp. 23-32.

⁶¹ Recent attempts have been made to ascertain the kinds and degrees of intervention of the workshop in the case of El Greco. See *El Greco’s Studio*, ed. N. Hadjinicolau, Iraklion, 2007; *El Greco, arte y oficio*, ed. L. Ruiz Gómez, Madrid, 2014; J. Redondo Cuesta, “Una propuesta sobre los ‘originales’ del taller del Greco”, *Ars*, 7, 22, 2014, pp. 92-104.

⁶² See J. van der Veen, “By his own hand. The valuation of autograph paintings in the 17th century”, in E. van de Wetering ed., *A Corpus of Rembrandt Paintings IV: Self-Portraits*,

at the time – to artists, patrons, connoisseurs and to dealers, as it still does – but this was a wider concept than we think of today. It not only referred to the painting's facture, but also to the artist's ideas, his drawings, and his models. Moreover, what of the concept of authority? This is not our notion of authenticity, but the acknowledged importance, prestige, and fame of artists, their imagery, and their styles, and is something that would extend to the dominant typologies created by Zurbarán and Murillo which generated responses from other artists, either under the direction of these masters, or not, as was perhaps more often the case. In this regard, does the practice of connoisseurship even ask the relevant questions of the works it sets out to classify? In the realm of religious paintings, for instance, why are there so many variations on Zurbarán's models, such as his Saint Francis (**fig. 4**), his female martyr saints, or his Veronica? How can we account for the success of Murillo's Immaculate Conceptions, his images of the Holy Family and Saint Joseph, and infant devotions? Instead of a history of art of exceptional artists and exceptional images – of individuals and aesthetic quality - we might think more in terms of imagery, as well as conventions, currents, traditions, tastes, fashions, and market forces, and, as we have noted above, of brands.

Perhaps a deliberate alignment of artists with certain masters had implications for the contemporary market. Zurbarán was, after all, the most prestigious painter in the Sevillian ambit and his authoritative name would have been a lure for many painters. Looked at from this perspective, Bernabé de Ayala may not so much have lamented the absence of Zurbarán from Seville after 1658 as have seen it as a business opportunity; this allowed him to continue Zurbarán's career in Seville by proxy (**fig. 2**). In this respect, it is worth noting the absence of signatures in the majority of cases of Zurbarán's imitators. Is it appropriate here to talk of strategic confusion by painters, and even of falsification, under the rubric of "imitation"? The complex history of attributions of Zurbarán's works would suggest that this is a distinct possibility.⁶³

Ceán Bermúdez praised Murillo, and in broader terms the "naturalistic" Sevillian school, for his handling of atmospheric perspective and the flesh tints of his figures, especially in the charming infants of his religious paintings.⁶⁴ He admired Murillo's composition of religious narratives to draw out their moral meaning and his ability to excite devotion in the viewer in the single figure of a saint, mentioning in particular the *St. Anthony and the Christ Child* from the altarpiece of the Capuchin church in Seville (Seville, Museo de Bellas Artes).⁶⁵ Murillo's signature imagery of infants had a demonstrable effect on other artists. Artists multiplied the presence of cherubs in religious pictures

Dordrecht, 2005, pp. 3-31 for a useful discussion of autography, albeit in the case of Rembrandt and his circle. See also R. Spear, *The "Divine" Guido: Religion, Sex, Money, and Art in the World of Guido Reni*, New Haven and London, 1997, chapter 14.

⁶³ Jilleen Nadolny, "Recipes for deceit: documentary sources for the production of paintings forgeries from 1300 to 1900, in *Sources on Art Technology: Back to Basics*, eds. S. Eyb-Green, J. H. Townsend, K. Pilz, S. Kroustallis and I. van Leeuwen, London, 2016, pp. 51-64.

⁶⁴ Ceán Bermúdez 1806, pp. 115-17, 122.

⁶⁵ Ceán Bermúdez 1806, pp. 126-28.

and amplified, even exaggerated, their charm.⁶⁶ It is praise indeed from Ceán Bermúdez of Meneses Osorio that he owned a picture of “unos niños de su mano, que muchos inteligentes creen ser de lo bueno del maestro.”⁶⁷ Murillo’s paintings of infant devotions were widely copied and varied by painters of more modest talents for a market about which we currently know little (**fig. 6**).⁶⁸ However, Zurbarán had earlier invented images of the child Virgin and child Christ which had also generated a considerable number of responses (**fig. 5**). What was the strength of demand for such subject matter from female clients? Murillo’s paintings of the Virgin and Child appear to have been reproduced by his studio assistants in his lifetime and stimulated a wide range of variations from artists after his death, and the phenomenon deserves to be investigated further. Ceán Bermúdez, for instance, speaks of the “infinite” number of copies which had been made of Murillo’s *Virgen de Belén* for the Capuchin church in Seville.⁶⁹ However, he does not tell us why this image was so successful.

How can we arrive at a more meaningful account of the relationships between major and minor artists? As noted above, in the case of Meneses Osorio, the inherited idea of “influence” implies an unrealistic passivity on the part of so-called minor artists in relation to the works of the major artists.⁷⁰ A more useful model might consider the agency of minor masters and the ways in which they act on their sources and interpret them. In this way, the works of followers can be seen to offer a contemporary pictorial commentary on the examples of the major masters. A case in point is the work of Pedro Núñez de Villavicencio. Ceán Bermúdez’s insistence on the mutual affection of Núñez de Villavicencio and Murillo is offered as an “explanation” of his claim that the former’s genre paintings of children are “copiado del natural, con tal gracia y verdad, que parecen de Murillo”.⁷¹ However, is this really the case? A comparison of their paintings shows that the urchins in Núñez de Villavicencio are rougher types, represented perhaps with more “verdad” than “gracia”, and his subject matter demonstrates a more overt morality. Núñez de Villavicencio was not a professional painter and did not depend on the market, and this may have given him greater latitude to follow his own artistic inclinations. On the other hand, his genre paintings, however different they are from those of

⁶⁶ See, for instance, the *Flight into Egypt* attributed to Juan Simón Gutiérrez by Valdivieso (2015, p. 112). See also the painting by Esteban Márquez of *Christ and the Virgin as Protectors of Infancy* (Valdivieso, 1992, p. 246, fig. 201) and Domingo Martínez’ *Entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem* for the church of the seminary of San Telmo, which interprets Murillo’s precedents via the images of Núñez de Villavicencio (Ibid., p. 313, fig. 261).

⁶⁷ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, III, p. 119.

⁶⁸ This painting is a reduced variant of Murillo’s *St. John the Baptist and the Lamb* in the Museo Nacional del Prado (P0963). For drawings by Sevillian artists other than Murillo which vary this theme, but without his graphic virtuosity, see J. Brown, *Murillo and His Drawings*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976, pp. 41, 43; J. Brown, *Murillo. Virtuosos Draftsman*, New Haven and London, 2012, pp. 25-26, 27.

⁶⁹ Ceán Bermúdez 1806, p. 89. The reproductive print by Blas Ametller is also mentioned here. See Subastas Alcalá, Madrid, 5 October 2016, lot 217 for a painted translation which emphasizes the smile of the Virgin and the wide-eyed innocence of the Christ Child.

⁷⁰ This account of the agency and intentionality of artistic response is indebted to Baxandall 1986, pp. 58-62. Ibid., p. 59 for the possibility of an expanded vocabulary used to describe the range of responses of one artist to another.

⁷¹ Ceán Bermúdez 1800, III, p. 243.

Murillo, are unthinkable without the acknowledged precedent of the latter. The example shows not only that the works of followers maintained the fame of this master, but that they reconfigured it over time and for new audiences.

Acknowledging the agency of so-called minor masters in response to the works of major artist allows us to reevaluate their work. From this standpoint, the “imitative” paintings by artists of divergent talents can be regarded as creative adaptations, variations, and reelaborations of the works of a given master for the needs of the market. A majority of imitative paintings probably traded on an unspecific “air” of the works of a given master. However, the example of the genre paintings of Núñez de Villavicencio demonstrates that imitation had particular creative value when the authoritative models remain discernible, but are transformed into something new.⁷² This was particularly true, of course, for prototypes which were on public view in sites such as churches, but which were inalienable possessions of such institutions. Murillo’s *Birth of the Virgin* in the chapel of the Immaculate Conception of Seville cathedral was so well known as to be intentionally recognizable in the adaptation of the subject by Cristobal López (1671-1730), the son of José López who was mentioned by Ceán Bermúdez as a disciple of Murillo.⁷³ López signed the work as his own creation and, while it draws on the invention of Murillo, its style is utterly alien to that of the source image. The *Vision of St. Anthony* by Alonso Miguel de Tovar (1678-1752), for example, invokes and paraphrases Murillo’s monumental altarpiece for Seville cathedral in an easel painting for a market of court collectors during the *lustro real* who avidly sought out the earlier master’s paintings.⁷⁴ It is also complicated by its anachronistic character, since it harks back to Francisco de Zurbarán’s treatment of analogous subjects in terms of reductive compositions with large-scale figures in the foreground.⁷⁵

The established idea of progress in the arts based on the originality of major masters who improved on those who went before does not appear to be in step with the realities of painting in Seville. Artistic tradition was valued here and was negotiated in a dynamic way by artists in response to each other’s works. Palomino notes that Murillo was guided by the early naturalistic style of Velázquez before he went to the court of Madrid, an affiliation which can be read as a form of “sevillismo” in itself. Murillo’s artistic career and the public commissions he left behind meant that his own authority in Sevillian artistic circles was paramount. Artists appear to have been happy to acknowledge this and to work within established local conventions set by his precedents. If we were to consider many of these artists in Seville less as “maestros

⁷² Fundamental studies of this idea include T. M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*, New Haven, 1982; J. A. Ackerman, *Origins, Imitation, Conventions. Representation in the Visual Arts*, Cambridge (MA), 2002, pp. 126-41; E. Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair: Novelty, Imitation, and Theft in Seventeenth-Century Rome*, London and New Haven, 2005, esp. chapter 5.

⁷³ Valdivieso, 1992, p. 237, fig. 192.

⁷⁴ For the attribution to Tovar, see Quiles and Cano 2006, p. 21. Angulo, 1981, II, p. 239, noted the attribution to Meneses Osorio, but suggested that it was by a collaborator of Simón Gutiérrez.

⁷⁵ See, for instance, Delenda 2010, cat. no. 42. See also Zurbarán’s visionary subjects with St. Francis; Delenda 2010, cat nos. 47, 283.

menores”, or passive “victims” of the “influence” of Murillo - as if so-called “Murillismo” were a contagion - and more as ambitious artists who chose to interpret a range of perceived and valued qualities of Murillo’s painting, then we might be closer to explaining the existence of this phenomenon.

APPENDIX. ILLUSTRATIONS



Fig. 1 - Francisco and Miguel Polanco, *St. Theresa Guided by the Angels*, 161 x 211 cm., Iglesia del Santo Ángel, Seville. Source: Madrid, Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Zurbarán: *Una nueva mirada*, 2015, p. 155.



Fig. 2 - Bernabé de Ayala, *St. Roch*, 220 x 110 cm., Museo de Bellas Artes, Seville (Inv. DJ1443P). Source: Domus, Portal de Museos de Andalucía, Museo de Bellas Artes de Sevilla.



Fig. 3 - Master of Besançon, *Flight into Egypt*, 125 x 105 cm., Musée des Beaux-Arts et d'Archéologie, Besançon (Inv. 896.1.123). Source: webpage Musée des Beaux-Arts et d'Archéologie de Besançon, as "Francisco de Zurbarán"



Fig. 4 - Unknown artist, *St. Francis in Meditation*, Oil on canvas, 161 x 104 cm, Private Collection. Source: Valencia, Museo de Bellas Artes, *Zurbarán y su obrador. Pinturas para el Nuevo Mundo*, 1998, p. 137.



Fig. 5 - Unknown artist, *The Virgin as a Child Sewing*, Oil on canvas, 68 x 55 cm., Private Collection. Source: Valencia, Museo de Bellas Artes, *Zurbarán y su obrador. Pinturas para el Nuevo Mundo*, 1998, p. 169.



Fig. 6 - Unknown artist, *St. John the Baptist and the Lamb*, Oil on canvas, 96 x 78 cm., Pushkin Museum, Moscow (inv 1501). Source: L. Kagané, *Bartolomé Esteban Murillo. El maestro español del siglo XVII*, St. Petersburg: Aurora, 1995, p. 181.



Fig. 7 - Francisco de Meneses Osorio, *San José y el Niño Jesús*, Signed, 1684, 167 x 110 cm., Museo de Bellas Artes, Sevilla (Inv. CE0918P). Source: Domus, Portal de Museos de Andalucía, Museo de Bellas Artes de Sevilla.



Fig. 8 - Juan Simón Gutiérrez, *The Ecstasy of St. Dominic*, 1711, (dimensions unknown), Museo de Bellas Artes, Sevilla. Source: E. Valdivieso, *Historia de la pintura sevillana*, Sevilla: Guadalquivir, 1992, fig. 199.