

Palomino, Mazo, and Velázquez:

Or, How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Look at *Las Meninas*

In the succinct and direct phrasing of Daniel Arasse: “There exists, without a doubt, few paintings that are, at the same time, historically so learnedly studied and so theoretically over-determined [as *Las Meninas*]”ⁱ (fig. 1). For decades, competing readings of the painting have emerged from the whole spectrum of visual studies, from the most empirical of art histories to art philosophy. Virtually none of them has been accepted entirely without question except one: the interpretation of the work as “a defense of the nobility of the art of painting,” originally suggested by Charles de Tolnay but more vehemently argued by Jonathan Brown.ⁱⁱ In essays and books on Diego Velázquez, Brown situates this reading of the painting within the larger context of “social conditions and personal ambitions”ⁱⁱⁱ at play in the Spain of king Philip IV – not only were painters at the time campaigning for recognition as practitioners of a liberal art, but Velázquez himself was about to formally petition his own knighthood to the king. The painting, according to Brown, is Velázquez’s argument in favor of his own promotion. It imagines a visit to Velázquez’s atelier on the part of the king whom it was Velázquez’s exclusive privilege to paint. That such visits took place is supposedly proven by Francisco Pacheco’s account of them in his treatise on painting, *El Arte de la Pintura*. In this treatise, Pacheco proposes the comparative examples of Apelles and Titian, predecessors of Velázquez’s who also enjoyed privileged relationships with the monarchs Alexander and Charles V and whose art was ennobled by their favor. With this evidence in hand, Brown clearly and decisively states that “*Las Meninas* would appear

fundamentally to be the record of a unique relationship between Velázquez and Philip IV, a relationship that guaranteed the noble status of the painter's art."^{iv} If we are to believe the account of Velázquez's life presented in Brown's monograph, it is this privileged relationship, between king and his painter, that structures Velázquez's entire career at the court of Philip IV.

It is little wonder that this reading of the painting has been so universally accepted. When the circumstances of the painting's display in the Alcazar palace are considered, Brown's reading of the painting is only confirmed. According to Fernando Marías, whose efforts to locate the painting in the palace are especially thorough, the painting was immediately hung in the *Despacho de Verano*, an extremely restricted site intended for the private use of the king and queen.^v If this is correct, *Las Meninas* is as much a work of installation as it is a work of painting. Not only is it aware of the rigid hierarchy of spaces in the Alcazar palace and the restricted networks of access to those spaces by members of the court, it *depends* on them for the completion of the conceit of the painting. Because of the mirror reflection at its center, the painting accommodates no viewers but the royal couple, and the site of the painting's display should have guaranteed no others.^{vi} From the standpoint of the king, the "audience of one"^{vii} for which the work was intended, a reading of *Las Meninas* as a personal argument for knighthood is perhaps the most logical. But what of the standpoint of the writers and artists whose attention the painting drew almost from the moment of its invention?^{viii} Brown's reading of the painting has proven virtually incontestable – but is it the only reading the painting would have generated before the audience not of one, but of many that it inevitably attracted? For all the argumentative logic of Brown's interpretation of *Las Meninas*,

readings of the work on the part of artists and scholars dating from Velázquez's own historical moment to modernity all describe the painting in slightly different terms. They tend to think less about the king than to look, rather, at the 'menina.'

If the Infanta at the very center of the canvas continues to exert an uncanny attraction on the modern viewer, he is in good – and long-standing – company. Picasso and Dalí both responded to *Las Meninas* by producing their own paintings of 'meninas' (figs. 2-3). Carl Justi, one of the earliest art historians to take an interest in Velázquez, said in his monograph on the painter that *Las Meninas* is "in reality, the portrait of the Infanta Margarita as centre of a recurrent scene of her life in the palace."^{ix} Most interesting, however, is the attention the writers of royal inventories paid to the Infanta in their descriptions of *Las Meninas* while it hung in the Alcazar palace, descriptions that paint a significantly different picture of what *Las Meninas* might have looked liked to those who happened not to be the king. In 1666, when the royal collection was inventoried on the occasion of the death of king Philip IV, it was described as a painting "portraying [*retratando*] the Lady Empress with her ladies-in-waiting and a dwarf by the hand of Diego Velázquez."^x In 1686 and again in 1701, it was described as "a painting...[in which one finds] portrayed [*retratada*] the Lady Empress, Infanta of Spain, with her ladies-in-waiting and servants and a dwarf, an original by Diego Velazquez."^{xi} It was not until the inventory of 1734 that the painting would be described as an image of "the family of king Philip IV, an original by Velazquez."^{xii} Scholars are reticent to interpret *Las Meninas* as a mere portrait of the Infanta Margarita^{xiii}, but the fact remains that for at least fifty years after its production, these are the terms according to which the painting was understood.

Still more compelling is the description of the painting provided in the biography of Velázquez in Antonio Palomino's treatise on painting, entitled *El museo pictórico y escala óptica* and written between the years of 1715 and 1724. In the very first sentence of his prose, Palomino describes *Las Meninas* as a "large painting with the portrait of the lady Empress (henceforth the Infanta of Spain) Miss Margarita Maria of Austria,"^{xiv} identifying the work twice more as a painting of the Infanta in marginal annotations to his prose.^{xv} In characterizing the painting thus, Palomino echoes the reading of the painting encouraged by the royal inventories. He has seen in the painting precisely what the makers of the royal inventories saw in it as well. But Palomino's writing also begins to expose the conceptual frameworks and real-world exempla that would have justified this reading. He makes an immediate comparison between *Las Meninas* and a self-portrait of Titian "holding in his hands another [portrait] with the effigy of king Philip II."^{xvi} Scholars, perhaps understanding this comparison as a fantastic rhetorical flourish, have never analyzed this aspect of Palomino's text. And yet, there is perhaps one especially good reason to do so – the painting in question, the self-portrait of Titian holding a portrait of Philip II, existed. It hung in the Pardo palace alongside series of portraits of Hapsburg royals, where it remained until 1604, when a fire destroyed the portrait gallery and with it, "fifty great portraits."^{xvii} Nonetheless, a clear record of the painting remains in the 1564 inventory of the Pardo palace, where it is described as "another [portrait] by the painter Titian = Titian whose Portrait one sees holding in his hands another of king Philip II."^{xviii}

This comparison, of course, reorganizes our vision of *Las Meninas* in a clear and simple way. Palomino states, with little subtlety, that just as the name of Titian would

persist as long as that of Philip II, so too would the name of Velázquez persist as long as that of the Infanta Margarita. It is a brief and succinct address to Velázquez's predecessor: It simply positions Titian and the portrait of Philip II as analogous to Velázquez and the figure of the Infanta Margarita. Although Titian's double portrait has been lost to history, it is survived by a portrait medal and a bronze medallion, both of which "were probably modeled on the lost self-portrait" (figs. 4-5).^{xix} Insofar as this is the case, they provide a sense of what that double portrait might have looked like. It might have looked just as Palomino leads us to believe it might – like an image of one figure embedded inside the image of another. When either medal or medallion is positioned next to *Las Meninas*, the textual analogy yields an immediate visual impact. There is no sense in denying that *Las Meninas* might be accurately characterized as a "group portrait,"^{xx} that it is an image of a small collective interacting in an intimate, even informal way – but Palomino's comparison invites the viewer to reduce the painting to two figures: Velázquez and the seemingly autonomous little figure in the center, who, for all her immersion in the scene coalescing around her, still emerges as its clear protagonist. We are invited to reconsider the possibility that, for some of the respondents to this painting, the relationship that animates this work is not that between Velázquez and the king, but that between Velázquez and the Infanta.

Our understanding of the painting reoriented around these two figures, how then to account for the rest of the painting? What justifies the inclusion of the ladies-in-waiting, dwarf, and dog in this work? The answer is provided, again, by Palomino. Like the royal inventories before him, Palomino designates this painting a portrait. But he introduces an important qualifier that permits the genre of portraiture to include the many

figures in excess of the central pair, and to accommodate the many ways in which *Las Meninas* seems to exceed the practical limits of the genre. His description of the painting begins, as mentioned above, with the figure of the Infanta, and it ends with Velázquez, brush and palette in hand. In between, however, Palomino describes what he refers to as “the ‘historiado’ of this painting,”^{xxi} and it is here that he identifies and critiques the little collective attending the Infanta. Palomino not only addresses each figure by name, but he considers their relative positioning within the painting, considering their placement in the foreground, background, and middle ground, and commenting on the little interactions between them that “make for the composition much harmony” and “make for the ‘historiado’ a marvelous effect.”^{xxii} As Javier Pórtus points out, Palomino elaborates his meaning of the term ‘historiado’ elsewhere in his writing, specifically using it to qualify portraiture of a certain complexity and compositional ambition:

And if the picture or surface, where there are one or two independent single figures, were organized of other adhesions, such as some portion of architecture, country, curtain, bureau, etc, though it be a portrait, in pictorial terms we also call it storiated; for though there be no more than one figure, that congress, organized of several parts, of whose harmonious composition it proves a perfect whole, is imagined as storiated since from its constitution the same graduation and temperance must be observed as in a history; and because the said adhesions stand in for the place and positioning of the figures.^{xxiii}

It is the inclusion of the ancillary figures in Velázquez’s portrait and their harmonious disposition within a larger composition that make up the ‘historiado’ of this portrait, and that make this a ‘historiated’ portrait.

This qualifying term and its definition seem simple enough to justify the scene containing the Infanta and Velázquez in the painting. But there is still another aspect of the painting that is perhaps accounted for by Palomino’s introduction of this term.

Although in his index of terms he defines ‘historiado’ as an adjective^{xxiv}, in his prose

Palomino uses the word as though it were a noun. But simply to characterize the term

‘historiado’ as a noun is to overlook what may be one of the more telling nuances of this particular choice of words. ‘Historiado’ is a word that takes the form of a past participle – a verb, in other words, that has been done to some unnamed, pre-existing noun. There is one question that logically follows: what, exactly, has been ‘historiated’? If we reexamine the painting itself, the elements of the ‘historiado’ all seem to converge upon the menina at its center – her ladies-in-waiting are clearly attending her; the dwarf, boy, and dog in the lower right-hand corner of the painting are all oriented towards her; even Velázquez leans slightly backwards in her direction. If we accept the notion that *Las Meninas* is in fact best understood as a ‘historiated’ portrait, perhaps the portrait that has been ‘historiated’ is hers.

Consider the following: in the decade during which Velázquez painted *Las Meninas*, he was not only occupied with the painting of Philip IV, the task for which he was originally contracted to work at the court of the king. He and his workshop were equally busy producing portraits of the queen Mariana and her daughters María Teresa and Margarita to satisfy a substantial demand for images of the royal family.^{xxv} Among their number was the little portrait of the Infanta Margarita currently hanging in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, thought to have been executed just before Velázquez painted *Las Meninas*, perhaps even in the very same year (fig.6).^{xxvi} The similarities in appearance of the Infanta between the two images is clear – her dress and expression are identical, as are the orientation of her body and the general disposition of her arms. In light of the extent to which *Las Meninas* appears to have taken this portrait as its starting point, Palomino’s comparison with Titian’s double-portrait takes on a new

urgency. Unlike Titian, Velázquez has not only presented himself, the painter, in the same image with a portrait of his own authoring – he has made himself illusionistically concurrent with his portrait, collapsing representational registers so that product and producer appear simultaneous, in a scene in which production itself has been thematized (Velázquez appears here, as mentioned above, with brush and palette in hand). It is perhaps true that Velázquez enjoyed a privileged relationship to the king throughout his career and that in *Las Meninas*, he meant to characterize himself as painter to the king. However, for those that were able to recognize his self-citation, Velázquez has perhaps unwittingly also characterized himself as a painter of ‘meninas.’

Born after the little portrait was sent to Vienna to join the Austrian imperial collections, Palomino perhaps did not know of this particular painting when writing his text. That said, at least one of his other early respondents would almost certainly have been intimately familiar with it: Juan Bautista Martinez del Mazo, Velázquez’s son-in-law and principal assistant in the last decades of his career at the court.^{xxvii} Scholars have readily acknowledged that the painting now known as *La Familia del Pintor* owes its overall appearance to *Las Meninas*, albeit it with a bit of skepticism regarding its relative sophistication (fig. 7).^{xxviii} But the similarities are readily visible. Those that have worked on the painting have recognized that the little collective of figures that make up the ‘historiado’ in *Las Meninas* recurs in the foreground of *La Familia del Pintor*,^{xxix} translated into the idiom of Mazo’s own personal and professional life. In lieu of Velázquez, the Infanta, and her courtly entourage, one finds Mazo’s children and wife,^{xxx} appearing in familiar tones of black, brown, red, and silvery white and sharing the same little interactions and intimacy so privileged by Palomino’s critical terminology. In the

center, one sees not a mirror reflecting Velázquez's royal patrons, but the last portrait of king Philip executed by Velázquez and his workshop, a portrait on which Velázquez and Mazo may have even collaborated (fig. 8).^{xxxii} Although seemingly derivative of a compositional strategy already effectively put to use in *Las Meninas*, Mazo's organization of the foreground of his painting is made all the more noteworthy by the scarcity of group portraits in the Spanish Golden Age.^{xxxiii} It leaves little doubt, moreover, that *La Familia del Pintor* is the product of an artist who has looked at the painting and means to engage what he has seen.

For all the apparent similarities between Mazo's work and that of Velázquez, there is one aspect of the painting that seems an irreconcilable departure from *Las Meninas*: the contents of the upper right-hand corner of the painting, in which one sees a painter at work on a painting, likely Mazo himself in his studio (fig. 9).^{xxxiv} Thematically, the image of a painter at work is entirely in keeping with Velázquez's self-portrait in front of his canvas. Like so many other aspects of the painting, it directly translates one of the elements of *Las Meninas* into the idiom of Mazo's life – Velázquez's self-portrait at work is transformed into Mazo's self-portrait at work. Mazo was not only Velázquez's son-in-law and disciple – upon Velázquez's death in 1660, Mazo officially replaced him as *pintor de cámara*^{xxxv} and continued his production of members of the royal family, starting with paintings of the Infanta Margarita modeled after paintings executed by Velázquez in the year before his death^{xxxvi} (figs. 10-13). In his inclusion of one of these in *La Familia del Pintor*, Mazo effectively models himself after not the Velázquez that was painter to the king, but Velázquez, painter of 'meninas.' Mazo identifies, in other words, with the characterization of Velázquez in *Las Meninas* afforded

only to those who might have recognized the painting as a variation of the very portraits of infantas coming out of Velázquez's studio at the end of his life. Thematically, the contents of the upper right-hand corner of *La Familia del Pintor* pick up, in a way, where *Las Meninas* left off.^{xxxvi}

And yet, from a spatial standpoint, there is a seeming disjunction between this part and the rest of Mazo's work. Perhaps it is meant to correspond compositionally to the opening through which one sees Jose Nieto Velázquez in the back of the room that is the setting of *Las Meninas*. But the hard edges that delimit this apparent studio space on its left-hand side and across the ostensible ground give this aspect of the image a spatial autonomy not afforded the stairway barely visible beyond the frame of the doorway in *Las Meninas*, an autonomy that makes this space appear oddly discontinuous with the space of the foreground. The confusion arising from efforts to reconcile the two is easily dispelled, however, when one realizes that it only arises if the viewer assumes spatial continuity between the foreground of the painting and its upper right-hand corner. Perhaps another framework entirely is in order here – one might consider, rather, the suggestion of Daniel Arasse that edges might be “edges, nothing more,” that “they don't represent a thing.”^{xxxvii} The edges that delineate this secondary image-within-the-image are not meant to operate at the level of illusion – they are operative at the level of the very “surface of the painting,”^{xxxviii} where they piece together two thematically related but representationally discreet zones. The foreground of *La Familia del Pintor* and the image-within-the-image in its upper right-hand corner are perhaps two such zones that were never meant to relate to one another in strictly spatial terms.

How, then, to understand their relation? Both parts of the painting have been shown to relate directly to elements of *Las Meninas*, but how do they relate to each other? In *Las Meninas*, the painter and his portrait, on the one hand, and the group of ancillary figures that make up the painting's 'historiado,' on the other hand, are seamlessly merged together into a single scene. If we read the foreground of *La Familia del Pintor* as corresponding to the latter and the image-within-the-image in the upper right-hand corner as corresponding to the former, we are left wondering why Mazo has dismantled Velázquez's careful 'historiation,' why he has broken it up into two contiguous, and by no means seamless, images. Once again, we might consider the proposal of Daniel Arasse, borrowed from the writings of André Chastel. Arasse, offering a creative paraphrase of Chastel's essay "*Le tableau dans le tableau*,"^{xxxix} claims that "according to [Chastel], when a painter paints a 'painting within a painting,' the latter often presents the 'production scenario' of the painting in which it is."^{xl} Taking the upper right-hand corner of Mazo's *Familia del Pintor* as a painting-within-a-painting^{xli}, so demarcated by the edges that divide this part of the painting from the rest, one might expect it to reflect on the conditions of production of *La Familia del Pintor*, as a whole. This operation would be simple enough, were it not the case that insofar as nearly every part of it recalls some aspect of *Las Meninas*, the very meaning of *La Familia del Pintor* depends on Velázquez's example. *Las Meninas* is, at some level, the real subject of *La Familia del Pintor*. Whatever else it might be, *Las Meninas* is famously a painting about painting. *La Familia del Pintor*, by contrast, is not a painting about painting – it is a painting about *another* painting. As Velázquez's assistant in the decade during which Velázquez executed both *Las Meninas* and the Vienna portrait of the Infanta Margarita,

Mazo would have been in the best possible position to see *Las Meninas* as Palomino does

– that is, as a portrait of the Infanta around which a group portrait has been expanded.

Otherwise phrased: Mazo would have been in the best position to understand that one of the conditions of production of *Las Meninas* is the production, first, of the Vienna portrait. It is this condition that *La Familia del Pintor* renders visible.

In the succinct and direct phrasing of Daniel Arasse: “There exists, without a doubt, few paintings that are, at the same time, historically so learnedly studied and so theoretically over-determined [as *Las Meninas*].”^{xlii} For decades, competing readings of the painting have emerged from the whole spectrum of visual studies. But then again, perhaps there has always been more than one way of reading *Las Meninas*.

Bibliography:

- Arasse, Daniel. "L'art Dans Ses Œuvres. Théorie De L'art, Histoire Des Œuvres." In *Y Voir Mieux, Y Regarder De Plus Près*, edited by Danièle Cohn. Paris: Rue d'Ulm, 2003.
- . "The Woman in the Chest." In *Take a Closer Look*, edited by Alyson Waters and Daniel Arasse. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Brown, Jonathan. *Images and Ideas in Seventeenth-Century Spanish Painting*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- . "In Detail: Velázquez's *Las Meninas*." In *Olvidando a Velázquez : Las Meninas*, edited by Gertje Uteley and Malén Gual. Barcelona: Ajuntament de Barcelona, Institut de Cultura, 2008.
- . *Velázquez, Painter and Courtier*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Chastel, André. "Le Tableau Dans Le Tableau." In *Fables, Formes, Figures*. Paris: Flammarion, 1978.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things; an Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York, Vintage Books c1970.
- Gallego, Julián. *Visión Y Símbolos En La Pintura Española Del Siglo De Oro*. Madrid: Aguilar, 1972.
- Humfrey, Peter, and Aidan Weston-Lewis, eds. *The Age of Titian : Venetian Renaissance Art from Scottish Collections*. Edinburgh: National Galleries of Scotland, 2004.
- Inventarios Reales En 12 Volumen Y Un Indice (Fotocopias)*. Vol. I. 1555 - 1623. [s.l.]: [s.n.].

Inventarios Reales En 12 Volumen Y Un Indice (Fotocopias). Vol. II. 1636 - 1674.

[s.l.]: [s.n.].

Inventarios Reales En 12 Volumen Y Un Indice (Fotocopias). Vol. III. 1686 - 1695.

[s.l.]: [s.n.].

Inventarios Reales En 12 Volumen Y Un Indice (Fotocopias). Vol. VI. 1734 - 1747.

[s.l.]: [s.n.].

Lubar, Robert S. "Picasso, *Las Meninas*, and the Advent of Cubism." In *Olvidando a Velázquez : Las Meninas*, edited by Gertje Utley and Malén Gual. Barcelona: Ajuntament de Barcelona, Institut de Cultura, 2008.

Mallory, Nina Ayala. "Juan Bautista Martinez Del Mazo: Retratos Y Paisajes." *Goya*, no. 221 (1991): 265-76.

Marías, Fernando. "El Género De *Las Meninas*: Los Servicios De La Familia." In *Otras Meninas*, edited by Fernando Marías. Madrid: Ediciones Siruela, 1995.

Morán Turina, Miguel. "It Was an Astonishing Ending. Still, It Was an Ending." In *Velázquez: Las Meninas and the Late Royal Portraits*, edited by Javier Portús Pérez. New York: Thames and Hudson, 2014.

Nichols, Tom. *Titian and the End of the Venetian Renaissance*. London: Reaktion Books, [2013].

Novero Plaza, Raquel. "La Familia De Juan Bautista Martínez Del Mazo, Yerno De Velázquez. Consideraciones Sobre Los Personajes Del Cuadro *La Familia Del Pintor*." *Boletín del Seminario de Arte y Arqueología* LXXII-LXXIII (2006-2007): 177-91.

Palomino de Castro y Velasco, Antonio *El Museo Pictórico Y Escala Óptica*. 3 vols. Vol.

3. Madrid: Aguilar, D.L., 1988.

———. *El Museo Pictórico Y Escala Óptica*. 3 vols. Vol. 1. Madrid: Aguilar, D.L.,
1988.

Portús Pérez, Javier. "Meninas and Infantas: History of a Seduction, 1656-1901." In

Olvidando a Velázquez : Las Meninas, edited by Gertje Utley and Malén Gual.

Barcelona: Ajuntament de Barcelona, Institut de Cultura, 2008.

———, ed. *Velázquez : Las Meninas and the Late Royal Portraits*. London: Thames &
Hudson Ltd, 2014.

Solano Oropesa, Carlos. *Juan Bautista. Martínez Del Maço*. Edited by Juan Carlos Solano

Herranz. Cuenca: Diputación Provincial de Cuenca, 2004.

Stratton-Pruitt, Suzanne L. "Velázquez's *Las Meninas*: An Interpretive Primer." In

Velázquez's Las Meninas, edited by Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt. Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Vahlne, Bo. "Velázquez' *Las Meninas*: Remarks on the Staging of a Royal Portrait."

Konsthistorisk Tidskrift 51 (1982): 20-8.

Woodall, Joanna. "'His Majesty's Most Majestic Room': The Division of Sovereign

Identity in Philip II of Spain's Lost Portrait Gallery at El Pardo." *Nederlands*

Junsthistorisch Jaarboek, no. 46 (1995): 53-103.

ⁱ “Il existe sans doute peu de tableaux qui soient, à la fois, historiquement aussi savamment étudiés et aussi surdéterminés théoriquement [que *Les Ménines*].” Daniel Arasse: “L’art dans ses œuvres. Théorie de l’art, histoire des œuvres,” in *Y Voir Mieux, Y Regarder de Plus Près*, ed. Danièle Cohn, Paris 2003, p.16.

ⁱⁱ This and other helpful observations concerning the historiography of *Las Meninas* can be found in Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt: “Velázquez’s *Las Meninas*: An Interpretive Primer,” in *Velázquez’s Las Meninas*, ed. Suzanne L. Stratton-Pruitt, Cambridge, UK 2003, pp.128-9.

ⁱⁱⁱ Jonathan Brown: *Images and Ideas in Seventeenth-Century Spanish Painting*, Princeton, N.J. 1978, p.109; and again in Jonathan Brown: “In Detail: Velázquez’s *Las Meninas*,” in *Olvidando a Velázquez : Las Meninas*, ed. Gertje Utley and Malén Gual, Barcelona 2008, p.240.

^{iv} Brown 1978, p.94. Similar claims are more briefly presented in Brown 2008, “In Detail;” an expanded version of this argument can be found in Brown 1986, pp.253-64.

^v Fernando Marías: “El Género de *Las Meninas*: Los Servicios de la Familia,” in *Otras Meninas*, ed. Fernando Marías, Madrid 1995, pp.249-52.

^{vi} It goes without saying, of course, that who is standing in front of the painting and under what circumstances has been the driving obsession of at least one strain of the secondary literature on this painting since Michel Foucault’s provocative ekphrasis of the painting (Foucault c1970, pp.1-13).

^{vii} Phrased thus in Robert S. Lubar: “Picasso, *Las Meninas*, and the Advent of Cubism,” in *Olvidando a Velázquez : Las Meninas*, ed. Gertje Utley and Malén Gual, Barcelona 2008, p.263, note 25.

^{viii} Javier Portús Pérez: “Meninas and Infantas: History of a Seduction, 1656-1901,” in *Olvidando a Velázquez : Las Meninas*, ed. Gertje Utley and Malén Gual, Barcelona: 2008, p.247.

^{ix} Cited in Portús, *op. cit.* (note viii), p.252.

^x “Retratando a la Señora Emperatriz con sus damas y una enana de mano de Diego Belazquez.” *Inventarios Reales en 12 Volumen y Un Indice (Fotocopias)*, II. 1636 - 1674, [s.l.]: [s.n.].

^{xi} “Una pintura...[en la cual se ve] retratada la Señora Emperatriz, Infanta de España, con sus damas y criados y una enana, original de Diego Belazquez.” *Inventarios Reales en 12 Volumen y Un Indice (Fotocopias)*, III. 1686 - 1695, [s.l.]: [s.n.].

^{xii} “La familia del señorrey Phe. Quarto[,] original de Velazquez.” *Inventarios Reales en 12 Volumen y Un Indice (Fotocopias)*, VI. 1734 - 1747, [s.l.]: [s.n.].

^{xiii} The one most notable exception to this is Bo Vahlne, who uses this observation to ultimately assert that *Las Meninas* was commissioned by the queen of Spain (Vahlne 1982). The article is otherwise uneventful.

^{xiv} “Cuadro grande con el retrato de la señora Emperatriz (entonces Infanta de España) Doña Margarita María de Austria.” Antonio Palomino de Castro y Velasco: *El museo pictórico y escala óptica*, III, Madrid 1988, p.248.

^{xv} Palomino, *op. cit.* (note xiv), pp. 248 and 251.

xvi "Teniendo en sus manos otro [retrato] con la efigie del señor Rey Don Felipe Segundo." Palomino, *op. cit.* (note xiv), pp.249.

xvii Joanna Woodall: "'His Majesty's Most Majestic Room': The Division of Sovereign Identity in Philip II of Spain's Lost Portrait Gallery at El Pardo," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 46 (1995), pp.54-5.

xviii "Otro [retrato] de Ticiano pintor = Ticiano cuyo Retrato se ve teniendo en sus manos otro del Rey Don Felipe." *Inventarios Reales en 12 Volumen y Un Indice (Fotocopias)*, I. 1555 - 1623, [s.l.]: [s.n.].

xix Tom Nichols: *Titian and the end of the Venetian Renaissance*, London [2013], p.168. That this might have been the case is also implicitly suggested in Woodall 1995, p.57 and more explicitly in Humfrey 2004, p.368.

xx Brown, "In Detail: Velázquez's *Las Meninas*," p.238.

xxi "[El] historiado de esta pintura." Palomino, *op. cit.* (note xiv), p.249.

xxii "Hace[n] a la composición gran armonía;" "hacen a lo historiado maravilloso efecto." Palomino, *op. cit.* (note xiv), p.249.

xxiii "Y si el cuadro, o superficie, donde hay una, o dos figuras solas independientes, estuviere organizado de otros adherentes, como algún trozo de arquitectura, país, cortina, bufete, &c. aunque sea un retrato, en términos pictóricos, llamamos también historiado; porque aunque no haya más que una figura, aquel congreso, organizado de varias partes, de cuya armoniosa composición resulta un todo perfecto, se imagina historiado; pues para su constitución se ha de observar la misma graduación, y templanza, que en una historia; y porque los dichos adherentes sustituyen el lugar y colocación de las figuras." Antonio Palomino de Castro y Velasco: *El museo pictórico y escala óptica*, I, Madrid 1988, pp.151-2. Translation: Portús 2008, p.248. For Javier Portús' references to this passage, cf. Portús 2008, p.248 and Portús 2014, p.47.

xxiv Palomino, *op. cit.* (note xxiii), p.666.

xxv Javier Portús Pérez: exh. cat., *Velázquez : Las Meninas and the Late Royal Portraits* Madrid (Museo del Prado) 2014, pp.29-36.

xxvi This date is proposed for the painting on the basis of the difference in apparent age between the Infanta as she appears in the Vienna portrait and in *Las Meninas*, respectively. Portús, *op. cit.* (note xxv), p.124.

xxvii General information about this painter is provided in Nina Ayala Mallory: "Juan Bautista Martínez del Mazo: Retratos y Paisajes," *Goya* 221 (1991).

xxviii It is worth remarking that the study of Juan Bautista Mazo and his paintings has most likely faltered in the face of prejudices dating to Giorgio Vasari against copyists and in favor of singular geniuses, of which Velázquez has been traditionally perceived to be a prime example. A preliminary discussion of some of these problems can be found in Miguel Morán Turina: "It was an astonishing ending. Still, it was an ending," in *Velázquez: Las Meninas and the Late Royal Portraits*, ed. Javier Portús Pérez, New York 2014.

xxix Mallory, *op. cit.* (note xxvii), p.269.

xxx The most complete recent investigation of the identities of the figures in the foreground of this painting can be found in Raquel Novero Plaza: "La familia de Juan Bautista Martínez del Mazo, yerno de Velázquez. Consideraciones sobre los personajes del cuadro *La familia del pintor*," *Boletín del Seminario de Arte y Arqueología* LXXII-LXXIII (2006-2007).

^{xxx} Portús, *op. cit.* (note xxv), pp.102-6.

^{xxxii} Mallory, *op. cit.* (note xxvii), p.270.

^{xxxiii} Although historically perhaps controversial, the identification of this figure as Mazo is confirmed in Novero Plaza 2006-2007, pp.186-7; Mallory 1991, p.269; Solana Oropesa 2004, p.81; and Pórtus 2014, p.140.

^{xxxiv} Carlos Solano Oropesa: *Juan Bauppta. Martínez del Maço*, ed. Juan Carlos Solano Herranz, Cuenca 2004, p.75.

^{xxxv} It is also worth noting here that according to Fernando Marías, Mazo and fellow artist and architect Sebastián de Herrera Barnuevo were involved in the production of the royal inventory of 1666 (Marías 1995, p.247).

^{xxxvi} It is worth mentioning as well that this part of the painting might be convincingly read as the reverse of *Las Meninas*, if the left-hand wall, punctuated by windows, is taken as the reverse of the right-hand wall of the room in which *Las Meninas* is set, and if the painter to the left of his canvas, seen from the front, is taken as the reverse of Velázquez, shown to the right of his canvas, seen from the back. It is unclear, however, what this might do for either painting, except to say that Mazo might be proposing that the canvas whose recto is invisible in *Las Meninas* is a portrait of the Infanta.

^{xxxvii} Daniel Arasse: "The Woman in the Chest," in *Take a Closer Look*, ed. Alyson Waters and Daniel Arasse, Princeton 2013, p.108.

^{xxxviii} Arasse, *op. cit.* (note xxxvii), p.108.

^{xxxix} André Chastel: "Le Tableau dans le Tableau," in *Fables, Formes, Figures*, Paris 1978, pp.75-98.

^{xl} Arasse, *op. cit.* (note xxxvii), p.112.

^{xli} That it might be read as such is in fact perhaps first suggested by Julián Gallego: *Visión y Símbolos en la Pintura Española del Siglo de Oro*, Madrid 1972, p.312.

^{xlii} Il existe sans doute peu de tableaux qui soient, à la fois, historiquement aussi savamment étudiés et aussi surdéterminés théoriquement [que *Les Ménines*]. Daniel Arasse, *op. cit.* (note i), p.16.