
Reviewed by ROSEMARIE MULCAHY

Francisco Pacheco (1564–1644) is not renowned for his paintings, which are rather stiff and dry and often evidently based on printed sources. His claim to fame, apart from his being the father-in-law of Velázquez, is his treatise El Arte de la Pintura (1649), the book that has had most influence on the historiography of Spanish art and which captures the essence of the working methods and cultural environment of artists in late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain. Less well known is his Libro de Retratos, a unique work that brings together drawing, literature and poetry. Conceived as a homage to his native city of Seville and its most distinguished citizens (the full title is Libro de descripción de verdaderos Retratos, de ilustrés y memorables varones), it may also be seen as a memorial to himself as an artist and poet. It is a most impressive body of work containing fifteen black and red pencil drawings (Pacheco himself affirmed that he had made more than 170) of humanists, intellectuals, churchmen, men of arts and letters, professionals and artists, with biographies, eulogies and poems. In the Arts, Pacheco deals at length with portraiture and the importance of drawing from life. In the Libro we can see his talent for capturing a likeness without flattery – this is particularly evident in his portraits of churchmen. His technique of very finely drawn hatching, combined with rubbing the paper with pencil, creates subtle tonal effects. Outstanding portraits include those of the painter Pablo de Céspedes (Fig.20), the famous Mercedarian preacher Fernando de Santiago, and the founder of artillery Francisco de Ballesteros. The Libro, which is now in the Fundación Lázaro Galdiano in Madrid, had disappeared from sight soon after Pacheco’s death and was rediscovered in 1864 and purchased by Asensio y Toledo, who published the first monograph on it in 1876. There have been subsequent studies of the Libro, notably by Angulo, Piñero y Reyes, Basegoda and Carrete, but none as comprehensive as Marta Cacho’s thorough and lucidly written text, which brings Pacheco and his intellectual milieu vividly alive. His fortuna, biography and career as a writer is reappraised. The legend of Pacheco’s Academy, as Basegoda has shown, was born in the eighteenth century. Cacho argues that the position that he held among Andalusian scholars of his time was not that of a head of an academy but rather of an amateur of letters and scholarship. The eulogies in the Libro are examined with the intent of demonstrating that the text (also including poems and inscriptions) is as valuable as the portraits. In the process we are made aware of Pacheco’s skills as an editor and compiler; he had no inhibitions in drawing upon the work of others. His intelligent use of plagiarism is demonstrated by Cacho with comparative tables. He is shown at his most original in the eulogies of artists: Céspedes, Vargas and Campaña. Pacheco also collaborated with writers and poets: at least twenty-eight poems were commissioned for the Libro. An examination of the literary forms of the day shows the various conventions used; it is striking to what extent the Horatian concept of an poëtica permeates the poems.

The author tackles the problems inherent in the Libro with admirable clarity: the purpose for which it was made, the lack of rational order in the way in which it is currently bound, its lack of completeness, doubts as to the identity of some of the sitters, the relationship to the Libro of the portrait drawings in the Palacio Real, the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, and the Hispanic Society of America, New York. She concludes that the Libro was not destined for publication and that, in its present form, it is incomplete and not assembled as Pacheco intended. She discusses precedents for the work, in particular Paolo Giovio’s Elogia virorum illustrium (Basel 1575–77), whose publications were well known in Spain. An influence closer to home existed in the form of Gonzalo Argote de Molino’s museum, or camerín, in Seville, which was considered of such importance that Philip II went to see it on his visit to the city in 1570. As well as the library and the Wunderkammer, of particular interest was the portrait gallery of celebrated men carried out by Philip’s royal painter Alonso Sánchez Coello, a project Pacheco records in the Libro. It would seem that Pacheco was creating his own portrait gallery, one that celebrated the illustrious men of his own city of Seville as well as those of the reign of Philip II.

This volume makes a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Pacheco and the intellectual circles within which he moved. It also enriches our understanding of the complexities of cultural life in Seville during the Golden Age.


Reviewed by OWEN HOPKINS

This book, a collection of ten essays mostly derived from a conference held at the University of York in 2006, aims to recover the term Baroque from the ‘margins of art history’, that is, art history as it is currently practised. The Baroque is still broadly understood as the mode of art and architecture that emerged in Rome in the work of Bernini and Borromini before spreading throughout Europe, and is characterised perhaps above all by the qualities of illusion and drama. Yet, historians working on the period traditionally termed Baroque (roughly spanning from the end of the Council of Trent in 1563 to the emergence of the Rococo in France and Lord Burlington’s rule of taste in 1720 Britain) have shied away from using the term. In these circles the Baroque is commonly perceived as an anachronism (there was no ‘Baroque’ art and architecture in the seventeenth century) and moreover, reflective of an outdated Hegelian mode of history at odds with an empirical, materialist approach. At the same time, the work of Walter Benjamin and Gilles Deleuze – notably the latter’s Le pli: Leibniz et le baroque (1988) – has brought the Baroque into the lexicon of a generation of scholars working in a wide
critique of Cartesian notions of subjectivity which presuppose an interiority–exteriority distinction, thereby disrupting linearity or narrative and allowing the past to be understood in terms of multiplicity – provides a model by which scholars can both address Baroque art and architecture while also reflecting on the ways in which that can emerge and has subsequently been modified, reinforced and transmitted.

Farago’s invitation to historians to ‘fold’ Baroque art history in on itself, in other words, to examine a body of artistic production in relation to the ideas and circumstances which saw it come into existence historiographically, is taken up in successive essays by Anthony Geraghty and Glenn Adamson. A recurring and important theme is Wölfflin’s distinction between the ontological and the epistemological. This was key to his famous classificatory system, and acts as the inspiration for Geraghty’s reassessment of several drawings by Nicholas Hawksmoor produced in the 1690s when he was still assisting Christopher Wren with the completion of St Paul’s Cathedral. By mixing orthographic and perspective views in the same drawing, Hawksmoor, Geraghty argues, sought to collapse the fundamental distinction Wölfflin later identified. By embedding an imagined view of the building as it might be seen by the viewer (perspective) with the building drawn as it was actually intended to be (orthographic), ‘Hawksmoor allows his buildings to both be and seem’. Geraghty draws out an important relationship between Hawksmoor’s drawing style and John Locke’s investigations into how we perceive the world around us in his Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690), recognising that Hawksmoor’s idea of ‘factoring human subjectivity’ into the design process elevates Baroque art to a new conceptual plane. The basis of reality itself thus becomes contestable – a place where Adamson’s essay on Rococo skill picks up. Such was the mastery of technique it displayed, that, Adamson asserts, ‘by combining mimetic form with its apparent antithesis (abstraction), rococo art and design implied that reality itself was manipulable through the techniques of artifice’.

The book concludes with three essays by Andrew Benjamin, Mieke Bal and Tom Conley which in various ways address the collapse of historical distinction and time specificity created by Benjamin’s and Deleuze’s approaches to the Baroque as concept or vision. Despite such inherent difficulties, it is this very uncertainty which avoids the inevitable Hegelian teleology of the traditional understanding of the Baroque. Indeed, possibly this book’s greatest contribution is that it prompts historians of Baroque art and architecture to look again at the term and its implications, and with the aid of Deleuze’s ‘fold’ reassess the period through the prism of its very construction and history as an archive worthy of study.

Geraghty and Glenn Adamson. A recurring and important theme is Wölfflin’s distinction between the ontological and the epistemological. This was key to his famous classificatory system, and acts as the inspiration for Geraghty’s reassessment of several drawings by Nicholas Hawksmoor produced in the 1690s when he was still assisting Christopher Wren with the completion of St Paul’s Cathedral. By mixing orthographic and perspective views in the same drawing, Hawksmoor, Geraghty argues, sought to collapse the fundamental distinction Wölfflin later identified. By embedding an imagined view of the building as it might be seen by the viewer (perspective) with the building drawn as it was actually intended to be (orthographic), ‘Hawksmoor allows his buildings to both be and seem’. Geraghty draws out an important relationship between Hawksmoor’s drawing style and John Locke’s investigations into how we perceive the world around us in his Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690), recognising that Hawksmoor’s idea of ‘factoring human subjectivity’ into the design process elevates Baroque art to a new conceptual plane. The basis of reality itself thus becomes contestable – a place where Adamson’s essay on Rococo skill picks up. Such was the mastery of technique it displayed, that, Adamson asserts, ‘by combining mimetic form with its apparent antithesis (abstraction), rococo art and design implied that reality itself was manipulable through the techniques of artifice’.

The book concludes with three essays by Andrew Benjamin, Mieke Bal and Tom Conley which in various ways address the collapse of historical distinction and time specificity created by Benjamin’s and Deleuze’s approaches to the Baroque as concept or vision. Despite such inherent difficulties, it is this very uncertainty which avoids the inevitable Hegelian teleology of the traditional understanding of the Baroque. Indeed, possibly this book’s greatest contribution is that it prompts historians of Baroque art and architecture to look again at the term and its implications, and with the aid of Deleuze’s ‘fold’ reassess the period through the prism of its very construction and history as an archive worthy of study.


Reviewed by MARK MCDONALD

WITH THE EXCEPTION of a handful of prints made in the fifteenth century, the story of printmaking in Spain begins in 1561 when Philip II decided to settle his court permanently in Madrid. This established the town as a centre of political power and the base from which the Spanish monarchy governed its empire. Philip II’s interest in prints and his awareness of their efficacy for disseminating images and information had a major impact on the development of printmaking in Spain. His travels throughout Europe exposed him to the highly organised printmaking industry there. He had a particular interest in maps, reflecting his enthusiasm for new printing technologies while also fulfilling a practical need for information about his empire. It is against this background that the development of printmaking in Madrid during the early modern period, or the ‘Baroque’, as it is termed in this book, must be set.

The arrival of foreign printmakers to the new capital from the late sixteenth century onwards was a response to the development of Madrid as a centre of publishing where they could reasonably expect to find work. Between 1566 and 1600 as many as sixteen publishing houses were established in Madrid. What sets Madrid apart from other European capitals is that until the mid-seventeenth century printmaking was completely dominated by foreigners, whose work comprised mainly book illustration. Another important feature was the absence of an organised reproductive print industry, although this publication brings to light a small number of hitherto unrecognized prints of this type. The reasons for this arc complex, but largely due to the disabling effect of the influx of foreign prints from Italy and especially Northern Europe. There is considerable evidence for the shipment – along with books – of large numbers of prints to Spain, corroborated by the fact that there is hardly a single artist’s inventory made during the seventeenth century that does not record prints, where the name of the printmaker is sometimes recorded.

The ambitious aim of this monumental study is to catalogue all known prints by foreign printmakers working in Madrid from the late sixteenth century until the mid-seventeenth century, including those they made before arriving in Spain, which in the case of an artist such as Martin Droesvoorde comprised the bulk of his work. The majority of these printmaking are examined in a number of introductory essays. The first looks at printmaking in wider Europe (mainly the north) by way of explaining the background of those who trained there and later moved to Madrid. They include Juan de Noort from Antwerp and Juan de Courses from Paris, names that today are little known. The forms of printmaking and the commercial ingenuity of the publishing houses such as the Plantin press in Antwerp had a direct effect on what was produced in Madrid, which was also shaped by specific local needs. The distinctive Muderríen style of printmaking blended earlier sources with new inventions regulated by the Office of the Inquisition, which monitored the iconography of print images. A biographical discussion of the northern printmakers in Madrid follows. The earliest and most important was the Flemish Pedro (Pieter) Perret, who arrived in 1585 and is best known for thirteen prints depicting the