In the course of his long career, Picasso gave numerous indications of his interest in meninas and infantas. As an adolescent in Madrid in 1897-1898, one of the notes he made in the Museo del Prado shows the Infanta Margarita with one of her maids of honor (see p. 146). His Woman in Blue (fig. 1) of three years later is a paraphrase of Velázquez’s Mariana of Austria (see p. 55), and in 1957, on the threshold of old age, he shut himself up for four and a half months with a photograph of Las Meninas, dissecting and reinterpreting it by way of 44 canvases. Though several of these are descriptions of the picture in its entirety, most are isolated figures and small groups, and there is a striking lack of attention to the figure of Velázquez and attraction to the Infanta Margarita, her maids of honor or Nicolásito Pertusato. The series marks the culmination of a long story of fascination with the picture and with the peculiar female personages that populate this and other works by Velázquez. It is also an extraordinary instance of the way artists themselves have constructed a discourse parallel to that of the art historians, and in engaging with the works of their predecessors have formulated questions and suggested responses that help us to understand those works better, and at the same time demonstrate that the history of a masterwork extends indefinitely in time thanks to its capacity to engender new works of art, in a process of which Las Meninas constitutes one of the paradigm examples.

In concentrating his attention on the infanta and her ladies, Picasso was resorting to the figures that had been most directly associated with Velázquez for more than a century, no doubt on account of their central role in the masterwork, the peculiarities of their apparel, and their capacity to evoke a particular court and a particular historical moment. We find significant testimony to that status in a cartoon by J. H. Thorpe in an early-20th-century number of the British humorous publication Punch. A connoisseur and a lady are standing in front of a picture, of which the former says: ‘The minute I saw it there as a Velázquez griten all over it.’ The lady replies: ‘How tiresome! But I see you managed to get it off.’ In order to represent an unequivocally Velázquez-like figure, the cartoonist resorted to an infanta or queen with a farthingale and a handkerchief.

In search of a tradition

Las Meninas and the female personages at the court of Philip IV in general had been important as the loom on which were woven two of the artistic traditions that nourished Picasso’s art: the Spanish, and the international painting of the second half of the 19th century. With regard to Spain, these are works that serve to relate Velázquez with Mazo, Goya, Rosales, Sorolla, Picasso, Dalí, Oteiza, etc. It is possible to trace a direct link between several of these artists, by way of the aforementioned portrait of Mariana of Austria, for example. Some years after Velázquez painted his portrait, Juan Carreño de Miranda used it as the model for a picture (see p. 59) that is a translation in grey of the original, and though in this case the figure is wearing a nun’s habit, the formal structure is similar: a narrow waist and ample skirts. What is more, the figure is standing with her right arm extended toward the back of a chair. To her left is a great curtain, too, and at back right there is a table on which we see the same clock as in the Velázquez picture. Those elements rendered in red in the Velázquez are repeated here, but transformed to grey: the upholstery of the chair, the curtain and the cloth on the table. As for the background, this also plays with the contrast between two colour fields: the greenish grey of the wall and the grey of the tablecloth. Though the spatial construction is different and the chromatic range has changed, it is undeniable that Carreño took Velázquez as his starting point. A century after, in 1789, Francisco de Goya made a portrait of Queen María Luisa (Museo del Prado, Madrid) in which she is wearing panniers under her skirts, an old-fashioned style of dress that is very much like the wide farthingales of the 17th century, notably the one worn by Mariana of Austria. The numerous relationships with the earlier portrait go beyond the general lines of the costume. For instance, both figures are standing, turned slightly to the side, with right arm extended. In addition, a dominant feature of both pictures is the elaborate headdress, which in the case of Queen María Luisa is of considerable height. The next link of this chain is the Woman in Blue, which has a similar formal structure: a woman with a very narrow waist and full skirts, with her arm held out almost horizontally. The length of fabric that flows down the front of her dress is similar to the flow of Mariana of Austria’s handkerchief. What is more, the background is organized in much the same way: in the Velázquez two prodigious colour fields that are superposed (greenish grey in the upper part and reddish in the lower), and the Picasso picture retains the idea...
of the overlapping of the two fields, but in this case the tones are green and blue, respectively.

Though Velázquez’s art took shape to a considerable extent as a response to international stimuli, it was to serve as the basis on which, from the from 18th century on, many Spanish painters and intellectuals were to ‘construct’ a Spanish pictorial tradition, and local artists thus quoted from his works as a kind of sign of identity. When Francisco Bayeu came to represent Painting in his Apotheosis of Hercules ceiling fresco in the Palacio Real he depicted her painting Velázquez’s Aesop, though it was more usual for his female figures to be alluded to. Thus, Alenza’s Portrait of a Girl in 17th-century Costume (Museo del Prado) derives directly from a portrait of a child in the Prado that was believed at the time to be by Philip IV’s painter; the debt to Velázquez in The Countess of Santovenia by Rosales is frequently remarked on, and Sorolla evoked the world of meninas and infantas on several occasions. In 1897 he began a portrait of the actress María Guerrero in character for her role in Lope de Vega’s The Stupid Lady (Museo del Prado). The silver and pink dress that the actress had had made for her is reminiscent of the dress in the Infanta Margarita in the Museo del Prado, and Sorolla represented her in that way in the foreground, while incorporating into the background a figure dressed in black that recalls the chamberlain we see, generating other masterpieces. One of the first to feel its influence was Juan Bautista Martínez del Mazo, Velázquez’s son-in-law; a copy is attributed to him, and he also used his father-in-law’s picture as the basis for The Artist’s Family (fig. 2), his most complex composition.

Though they are combined in a different way, we find here many of the elements that figure in Las Meninas: in the foreground is a group of elegantly dressed personages, including several children, and a mesh of relationships is established among them; a picture of the king on the rear wall; a spacious interior, decorated with paintings and modelled by the use of aerial perspective, and so on. In the background is an artist at his easel, but in contrast to Las Meninas he has his back to us, letting us see what he is painting: a portrait of the Infanta Margarita, who had sat for Mazo on several occasions. The picture also features a bureau with a sculptural bust, some drawings and flowers, and, in the upper right corner a shield with the family emblem of an arm with a mallet [mazo, in Spanish]. As in Las Meninas, in this work there is a manifest identificatory content, which is also infused with references to the artist himself, his art and his social situation. The image of Mazo painting the portrait of an infanta is complemented by the picture in the background with the likeness of Philip IV, which continues a typology very closely linked with Mazo’s father-in-law; all of which combines to reflect the social, family and professional life of the artist.

The history of the early fame of Las Meninas is closely bound up with Luca Giordano, one of the most famous painters of his time. Giordano coined the expression ‘the theology of painting’ that has accompanied the picture up to our own time; he also painted the canvas generally known as A Homage to Velázquez (1692–1700; National Gallery, London), which in fact represents various members of the family of the Count of Santiesteban. Though the spatial construction is radically different from Las Meninas, there is a series of shared narrative elements which suggest that Giordano took the Velázquez picture as his point of departure. This is a ‘family’ narrative: its protagonist is a girl in a splendid dress, and it also includes servants, dogs, a Knight of the order of Santiago and even the painter himself, who appears in the lower right corner gesturing toward the principal scene. The approximation to Velázquez is not confined to these borrowings, but is also apparent in the own pictorial writing handling, which makes considerable play of its fluency and facility.

A few years later there took place a phenomenon of fundamental significance for the enhancement of the picture’s reputation. Between 1715 and 1724 the painter Antonio Palomino published his famous three-volume El museo pictórico y escala.
óptica, the culmination of a tradition of more than a century of reflection on the art of painting and the defence of its nobility. The final section is devoted to the lives of more than two hundred artists, most of them Spanish — the first history of the art of this country. By way of these biographies, Palomino seeks not only to give an account of the lives and works of painters and sculptors, but also to demonstrate their social standing, listing the honours that they and their art have received, and to convince the reader of the nobility and the difficulty of the practice of art. Velázquez occupies a central place in Palomino’s discourse, as the figure who marks the highest point in the history of Spanish painting. In effect, Palomino’s book was to play a fundamental part in the subsequent affirmation of the existence of a ‘Spanish School’ and the definition of this in relation to Velázquez’s life and work. One of the headings of the biography of Velázquez is entitled ‘In which is described the most illustrious work of Don Diego Velázquez’, and this is the first detailed description of the picture and the basic source for the identification of most of the personages depicted in it. Las Meninas is the only one painting to receive such special treatment in Palomino’s treatise, a circumstance that elevates it to the status of a masterpiece of Spanish painting. The effect is heightened by the fact that Palomino not only describes the picture, but goes on to give a series of comparisons and anecdotes that create a novelesque or dramatic context for it. He thus uses references to noble deeds associated with Titian and Phidias, affirms that the members of the royal family attended several of the portrait sittings, recounts the origin of the Order of Santiago cross on Velázquez’s breast and refers to the astonishment of Luca Giordano, all of which served to create an aura of legend around Las Meninas. Palomino also made another very important contribution to the exalting of the picture’s status. He could not conceal the fact that it was a portrait — in other words, that it belonged to a secondary genre — but he asserted that ‘the caprice [is] new’, and that in the ‘storiated’ it is superior. In his description of the picture he seeks to make it clear how complex and how wise its composition is, and elsewhere in his treatise he defends the difficulty and the merit of certain portraits, which in terms of ‘invention’ could be placed on a par with history painting: ‘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 for 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.’

**Las Meninas in the Age of Enlightenment**

The next important moment in the history of the critical reception of Las Meninas comes some fifty years later, at a time when Spanish painters and intellectuals were directing their attention to the art of previous centuries in the attempt to identify a tradition within which to inscribe themselves. Two of the most active figures in this endeavour were Francisco de Goya and Jovellanos. Goya’s interest in Velázquez is well known: he regarded him as a principal referent, an artist with whom he conducted a dialogue that made itself apparent in many of his works. One of the pictures that impressed him most deeply was Las Meninas, to judge by the number of references he made it. He reproduced it in a drawing and a print (see p. 182), and several of his state portraits of groups contain elements probably borrowed from it: see, for example, *The Count of Floridablanca* (1783; Banco de España, Madrid) or *The Family of Charles IV* (1800; Museo del Prado), which among other things includes a self-portrait strongly reminiscent of Velázquez’s. In my view, however, the closest of Goya’s works in terms of content is *The Family of the Infante Don Luis de Borbón* (fig. 3), in which a question of identity is raised in a manner similar to Velázquez’s. In order to show the royal rank of the Infanta Margarita, Velázquez represented her in the exercise of her daily routine, with her attendants and servants gathered around her, one of these being Velázquez, as chief chamberlain and court painter to the king. Goya used a similar device: the Infante Don Luis and his wife, Teresa Vallabriga, are seated at a table and in banal everyday activities. He is playing cards, she is having her hair dressed, and the two are surrounded by their children and their servants. Also shown is the artist, who is painting a portrait of Don Luis. The picture, like Las Meninas, embodies a discourse on the rank and the identity of the subjects, in this case with a vindicative intention. It was public knowledge that the Infante had incurred the disfavour of his brother Charles III by rejecting the ecclesiastical career marked out for him and choosing instead to marry Teresa Vallabriga, a lady from the minor Aragonese nobility.
Don Luis was effectively banished from the Court and stripped of certain of his privileges, such as his children's right to bear the Borbón name. Goya's vindication of the rank of the family proceeds along lines similar to those of Las Meninas: personages captured in a moment of absolute quotidian normality in the midst of their servants. The implications of this combination of regal rank, everyday activities and pictorial or public representation would have been immediately intelligible to the courtly spectator of the time, and are found in other Spanish pictures, such as Charles III Dining before the Court (Museo del Prado), by Luis Paret. But what is perhaps most significant in the case of Goya's vindication of his subject is that it paraphrases Velázquez's picture, exploiting its exceptional historical prestige and constructing a collective portrait that in its dimensions, its narrative and compositional complexity and its historical implications it belongs to the tradition of the great courtly portrait.

From what we have seen thus far in the pictures by Mazo, Giordano and Goya we can deduce that during the century and a half after Las Meninas was painted, the artists who addressed it were fully conscious of the play of social relationships it reflected, and learned from it a way of articulating a discourse in which recovered the lineage of the artist's own family (Mazo) or that of his clients. In addition to this social content, each of these works makes reference to the artist himself: a reference that also has a vindicative dimension, in the degree in which the painter, in addition to expressing a creative debt to Velázquez, demonstrated his access to the nobility or royalty. During the 19th and 20th centuries, as we shall see, these contents disappeared from reinterpretations of Las Meninas, as artists chose instead to focus on formal and art-historical considerations.

Goya's engagement with the picture coincided with a significant moment of critical reflection on the art of Velázquez, to which such major figures as Mengs or the aforementioned Jovellanos contributed. The German painter, one of the most influential artists and writers on art of his day, is the author of several writings on painting, and in particular on those in the collections of the Spanish royal family, and is frequently cited as an admirer of Velázquez who was instrumental in establishing his reputation. But while it is true that Mengs was capable of appreciating Velázquez's great talent for the depiction of nature, his praises become less effusive if we bear in mind the lowly regard in which, as a good classicist, he held that capacity. This is clearly apparent in, among many other places, his commentary on Las Meninas: 'In the king's conversation room there is an excellent work by Velázquez, which represents the Infanta Doña María Margarita of Austria, with Velázquez himself portraying her; but this work being already so well known for its excellence, I need only say that it may serve to demonstrate, that the effect produced by the imitation of nature is that which tends to please all classes of person, particularly where the principal appreciation of beauty is not made.'20 Mengs speaks of Velázquez's 'excellence' and his fame, but the last clauses clearly reveal his pronounced classicist prejudices. For Mengs, then, fame or universal appreciation, far from being a guarantee of the quality of the work, constitutes a proof that this is an 'easy' and far from select painting, whose enjoyment depends not on the viewer's experience or intellectual preparation but on the painter's ability to imitate nature.21 In contrast to Mengs's misgivings, Jovellanos's response to Velázquez was highly receptive, influenced by both aesthetic and nationalistic considerations. In works such as Elogio de las bellas artes (1782) he encouraged other painters to follow the star of Velázquez, and to walk in the path of truth and nature — the same path Jovellanos himself followed in the literary field. His relationship to Las Meninas was very direct, since he was the owner of a smaller version of the picture, once believed to be from Velázquez's own hand, but more recently attributed to Martínez del Mazo. In his ‘ Reflexiones y conjeturas sobre el boceto original del cuadro llamado La familia', in which he subtly counters Mengs's complaints and asserts that Velázquez achieved “that gift of expression which belongs to the sublime and philosophical part of art”.22

As we have seen, in the period to 1800 Las Meninas had given rise to major works of art and generated a high level of critical debate, resulting in its elevation to the status of masterwork of Spanish art, but the painters and intellectuals principally involved were either Spanish or in the service of the Court in Madrid, and it attracted very little attention elsewhere in Europe.23 This state of affairs was to change radically in the course of the 19th century, to the extent that by 1900 it was acclaimed as one of the masterworks of western painting, and had been a source of inspiration for French, British, German and American artists. In recognition of the picture's extraordinary prestige, in 1899 the board of the Prado decided to hang it in a room of its own.

The increasing fame of Las Meninas during the 19th century is directly related to the growing interest in Velázquez in the same
period: he went from being all but unknown artist outside of Spain to occupying a prime place in the pantheon of the great, and one of the old masters most highly regarded by the most important and advanced painters, for a number of whom he was a fruitful source of inspiration. This has a bearing not only on the history of Velázquez's critical fortunes but also on the whole evolution of painting in that century, with the result that it has been much studied. The phenomenon is clearly related to the far greater ease of access to Velázquez's works after the opening of the Museo del Prado in 1819, the improvement in travelling conditions in Spain and to the fact that a number of works were taken out of the country. Velázquez's standing rose steadily, and had reached a very considerable level by the end of the century; two crucial elements in this process were his classification as a 'naturalistic' painter, and the profoundly realist slant of the most advanced movements in the art and literature of the era. It was also influenced by his thematic and stylistic variety and by his achievement in development the portrait, a genre of great interest to many 19th-century painters. Velázquez's variety meant that the roster of artists who recognized their own practice in the work of their predecessor was also very varied, and covered a wide range of aesthetic principles. Velázquez was championed not only by the most innovative—such as Courbet, Manet, the Impressionists, Sargent and so on—but also by many of the more conservative artists, still essentially academic in stance, who enjoyed the favour of the market. Though it has been said, and with good reason, that of the great painters only Manet and Sargent internalized Velázquez's art and took it as a guide for real innovation, the fact is that the list of painters for whom his name was a watchword, who expressed their indebtedness and gratitude to him or even travelled to Madrid in order to study his work is long and varied, includes Wilkie, Phillip, Zorn, Renoir, Degas, Courbet, Millet, Toulouse-Lautrec, Monet, Bonnat, Carolus-Duran, Chase, Whistler, Eakins and more... Each of them found what they had sought to find; and in fact, different periods throughout the century showed a preference for different works, in a succession similar to that of the stylistic development of Velázquez's work itself. While Wilkie and other artists and writers in the early part of the century expressed a great appreciation for the rigorous naturalism of The Feast of Bacchus, a decade or two later there were many, like Richard Ford, who considered The Surrender of Breda—a serene and 'noble' composition—the Spanish painter's masterwork, while in the last third of the century, coinciding with the pre-Impressionism and Impressionism, the balance had clearly shifted in favour of the more openly colourist and freely handled works, believed to date from his last years. At the start of the 20th century the panorama changed again, and by the time Picasso painted his Woman in Blue he and others were already turning their gaze toward El Greco, who was in a sense to take Velázquez's place as the Spanish painter who captured the attention of the avant-garde artists.

It is important to note that this appreciation by practising artists was accompanied by intense critical and historiographic activity, as manifested by the publication in the second half of the century of a great number of monographs on the painter, among them studies by Stirling-Maxwell, Cruzada Villaamil, Justi, Lefort, Beruete, Justo Octavio Picón, Armstrong, Curtis and Stevenson, together constituting a major advance in the understanding of Velázquez's artistic development and in the drawing up of the critical catalogue of his works.

**Flowers for an infanta**

In this story, both Las Meninas and the portraits of queens and infantas play a precise and important part. In the case of the former, because it continued to have the aura of a masterwork, and was paraphrased by so many great painters, above all in the last decades of the 19th century. The case of the infantas was a very special one. Important portraits of Mariana of Austria and of the Infanta Margarita were exhibited in the Prado, and in Vienna there is a magnificent collection of portraits from the painter’s last years but the pictures in the Austrian museum were not well known and a number of them were shown in unsatisfactory conditions, and those in Madrid, though the one of the infanta attracted the attention of many Spanish and some foreign artists, were eclipsed by Las Meninas. However, the best known and most influential infanta portrait during the 19th century was in neither Madrid nor Vienna, but in Paris. This is the Infanta Margarita María in the Louvre (fig. 4), whose fame did not only rest on its intrinsic qualities but was greatly enhanced by it's being one of the few works attributed to Velázquez on show to the public in Paris, or anywhere else in France, and the image through which local painters and critics could best appreciate the characteristics of the painter's developed style. The picture was very much admired, above all during the last third of the 19th century,
and was hung in the Salon Carré containing the masterworks of the museum’s collections. The evidence of its appreciation is abundant, and is expressed both in written commentaries and in artistic interpretations. Renoir’s astonished observation to Volland is well known: ‘The Infanta Margarita’s little pink ribbon — the whole painting is in it!’ Indeed, a glance at some of his pictures, such as La loge (Courtauld Gallery, London), Girl Braiding her Hair (Lehman Coll.) or Romaine Laceaux (1864; Cleveland Museum of Art) is sufficient to reveal echoes of the Velázquez. The Louvre’s records of copyists bear witness to the picture’s popularity, with as many as 42 requests to copy it submitted between 1851 and 1857. Among the artists that visited the museum with the idea of copying it are Díaz de la Peña, Cabanel, Fantin-Latour, Degas (fig. 5) and Manet. The last two actually met for the first time in precisely such circumstances, and both have left etchings representing it that are notably different in their interpretation. Others, like Renoir, preferred to take it as the starting point for compositions of their own, such as Millet in his Autour de la Peau (before a mirror), Alfred Dehodencq in Marie Dehodencq (c. 1872; Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyons), Jean-Jacques Henner in his Henriette Germain (1874; Musée Jean-Jacques Henner, Paris) or Manet in his A Bar at the Folies Bergère (1881-1882; Courtauld Gallery, London).

The children depicted in one of the masterworks of 19th-century French painting, Courbet’s A Burial at Ornans, reminded at least one contemporary observer of Velázquez in style, while another painter, Léon Bonnat, wrote one of the most enthusiastic paragraphs in its praise ever to be devoted to it. The fame of Las Meninas and of the Infanta Margarita in the Louvre, and the existence of other similar portraits meant that in the second half of the 19th century Velázquez was regarded as the painter of childhood par excellence, and this is especially significant if we bear in mind the great appeal of childhood among the artists of the time. On March 13th, 1868, Flaubert, who was then at work on Sentimental Education, wrote to his friends the brothers Goncourt to ask them what were the most beautiful portraits of children. We may infer their response from the novel itself: one of the last chapters narrates the death of the son of Rosanette and Frédéric, the novel’s hero. Frédéric wanted to have a portrait of the boy, and sent for his friend Pellerin, the painter, who set to the task without much sensitivity, ‘as if he were working from a plaster model’. As he was painting he praised Correggio’s little St John’s, the pink Infanta by Velázquez, the creamy flesh of Reynolds, the distinction of Lawrence [...]. But the literary work in which the picture in the Louvre is of greatest importance is Victor Hugo’s poem ‘La rose de l’Infanta’ (1859), in which Velázquez’s girl serves as the inspiration for a beautiful reflection on the Court of Philip II, with Hugo playing on the contrast between all that we associate with childhood and the dark connotations of that period in history.

Outside of France, a number of other artists were drawn to that world of meninas and infantas. The English painter Millais evoked it in his Souvenir of Velázquez (1868), painted for the Royal Academy in London; Sargent used it as the point of departure for Lady with the Rose (1882; Metropolitan Museum, New York); Chase alluded to it in a painting with a sufficiently significant title: An Infanta. A Souvenir of Velázquez (1894; private coll.), for which the model was his daughter Helen Velázquez, and in Harmony in Grey and Green: Miss Cicely Alexander (fig. 6) Whistler mixed references to Velázquez and Japanese influences. He had a great admiration for Velázquez in general and for the infantas in particular, as the following excerpt from his famous lecture entitled ‘Ten O’Clock’ clearly reveals: he claims that art is a goddess who is ‘[...] occupied with her own perfection only —having no desire to teach— seeking and finding the beautiful in all conditions, and in all times [...]’ As did, at the Court of Philip, Velázquez, whose Infantas, clad in inaesthetic hoops, are, as works of Art, of the same quality as the Elgin marbles. Whistler’s appreciation was seconded by the painter Jean-Jacques Henner, who in July 1883 declared to Émile Durand-Gréville: ‘The little Infanta in the Louvre is as beautiful as one might dream, believe me. She seems sculpted by Phidias.’

In parallel with the extensive reflections on Velázquez on the part of 19th-century critics and artists, Las Meninas was also a constant object of their attention, and this, too, was a progressive process. It was in this period (1843) that the picture received the title by which it is now known, and continued to inspire declarations of appreciation, so that it always retained the status of masterwork it had had from the first. But there were also those who expressed their revulsion at they considered to be the decidedly distasteful figures that composed the picture, though responses of this kind were more common among travellers (such as Elliot, Clarete or Gasparin) than among painters or art historians. From our present perspective, in which the picture is one of the most open and enigmatic compositions of the art of the Modern Age, it is perhaps surprising to note how little variety there was
among the different readings of it in the 19th century, and the general consensus that its theme is exactly what we see. Though there is some variation in the focus or in the order in which its contents are narrated, there is never any discrepancy as to the interpretation of its underlying meaning. Indeed, those different approaches were simultaneous with one another. Some, like Stirling-Maxwell, Ford, Madrazo or Passavant, read the picture from left to right and emphasized the presence of the painter at his easel. Many others, like Justi or Stevenson, regarded it as first and foremost a portrait of the Infanta Margarita, which is how it is described in the old royal inventories. And almost all alluded to a topic that crops up time and time again in 19th-century approaches were simultaneous with one another. Some, like Stirling-Maxwell or Justi—warmly praised the infanta, there were plenty of others who disliked her. Roberts, in 1860, spoke of the ‘malevolent displeasure’ of her face, and Hay, in 1871, wrote that the painter ‘was beginning the portrait of a stupid little infanta...’

The triumph of the everyday
During the 19th century, Las Meninas was ‘deactivated’ in terms of its deeper contents as a Court image, in which a complex network of social relations and rank is brought into play, the reflection of a rigid and elaborate hierarchical system. On the other hand, this enabled it to be seen as expressing the most personal and intimate family contents, and it went from being one of the most formalized of portraits and one of the supreme expressions of Velázquez’s female portraits: the odd and uncomfortable cut of their costumes, taken to be a kind of symbol of the inflexibility of the Spanish Court. To 19th-century eyes, the dwarves and buffoons are generally unpleasant and in poor taste, and the female apparel is ridiculous; and though the majority—like Stirling-Maxwell or Justi—warmly praised the infanta, there were plenty of others who disliked her. Roberts, in 1860, spoke of the ‘malevolent displeasure’ of her face, and Hay, in 1871, wrote that the painter ‘was beginning the portrait of a stupid little infanta...’

so many artists were championing ‘insignificant’ or historyless themes and seeking a way to translate instant visual experience onto the canvas, approached the picture in similar terms. This is precisely what the authors of the principal monographs on Velázquez do. Justi, in 1888, wrote that the picture is ‘in reality, the portrait of the Infanta Margarita as centre of a recurrent scene of her life in the palace’, and insists on its apparent spontaneity, even though he is the historian of that period most conscious of many of the problems of composition and content it presents; Lefort considered it ‘the last word in realist painting’, and asserted that its theme ‘is no more most complex than that of The Fable of Arachne’, since the artist confined himself to painting what he would have seen around him every day, and Beruete insisted on its primarily formal values, claiming that: ‘Las Meninas moves us in a manner absolutely independent of the subject it represents [...] The different elements of this painting [...] have not other aim than art in itself.’ The thematic values of ‘insignificance’, the quotidian and instantaneous were accompanied by a series of stylistic qualities extremely appreciated by the critics and artists of the time. The picture was one of the supreme exponents of Velázquez’s most mature painting, which Justi had grouped under the denomination ‘the third style’, characterized by a very liberal use of the brushstroke and a radical affirmation of chromatic and atmospheric values; in other words, an approach that connected with the concerns of many contemporary painters. Lefort, in 1888, was the first to apply the term ‘impressionism’ to describe this part of the painter’s catalogue, and one of the most interesting phenomena of the Velázquez bibliography of the late-19th and early-20th century is the frequency with which the authors of monographs allude to his relationship to contemporary art. In doing so they introduced into the debate on the artist a category it has never abandoned: that of Velázquez as a ‘modern painter’, thus paradoxically making him a point of reference to be combated by some of the critics most closely associated with the innovative movements of the early 20th century, such as Julius Meier-Graefe.

Those same years that mark a climax in the study of Velázquez and the appreciation of Las Meninas were also the years in which the picture attracted the greatest number of approaches from the pictorial field. The most elemental form of address was the copy of the entire composition or of some part of it. Phillip, Lewis, Federico de Madrazo, Sargent, Chase and Picasso himself were
among those who approached the picture in this spirit. But there were also many who, like Goya, used Velázquez’s composition as the starting point for original works, among them a number of important French, American, German or Spanish artists.

There is an abundance of works that make explicit or implicit reference to Las Meninas, and the variety of treatments is no less striking, as each artist sought to adapt the picture to his own particular preoccupations. This variety was favoured by the great wealth and complexity of Velázquez’s work, both in its formal aspects and its narrative contents, making it an inexhaustible source of inspiration. But as we shall see, within that variety there are certain common elements that are of considerable interest when it comes to defining the limits within which late-19th-century readings of the picture were enclosed.

There was no need for artists to make the journey to Madrid to receive the influence of Las Meninas and reflect it in their own work. Copies, photographs or other kinds of reproduction would suffice to give a sense of its extraordinary complexity and novelty of composition. One of those who reflected on the picture without ever having seen it at first hand was Degas. In 1857-1858 he painted a Variation on Velázquez’s Las Meninas (fig. 7) that is conceived in part as a game: it retains the setting, several of the protagonists and some of their gestures, but orders them in a very different way, thus upsetting the perfect balance of the Velázquez original and creating a kind of divertimento that is in some degree akin to Manet’s Shinnecock (1892; Terra Foundation for American Art, Chicago), a pastel by William M. Chase. Here we recognize Las Meninas in the careful perspective of the room, in the presence of the two girls (daughters of the artist) in the foreground, in the pictures on the walls and in the atmosphere of domestic seclusion; however, these characteristics would be insufficient to relate the picture to the Velázquez if it were not for the mirror in the background, whose mirrors reflect the painter at work. As in the Whistler, the references to the Spanish painting are combined with Oriental resonances: the vase in the foreground, the chair near the wall at the back or the prints with which the girls play. Another American, the sculptor Frederick MacMonnies, reworked Velázquez’s picture in one of his more most important paintings, The French Chevalier (1921; Palmer Museum of Art, Penn State University). The centre of the composition is occupied by Georges Thesmar, dressed as a cuirassier. Thesmar was a family friend and the godfather of the artist’s daughter, Berthe Hélène, who is shown holding his hand; the girl’s long blonde hair, the fact that she is looking out of the picture, and the flared skirts of her dress recall the Infanta Margarita in Las Meninas. But the references to the Velázquez do not end here: they are made explicit in the mirror on the rear wall, which reflects the image of the artist in front of his easel. The German painter Max Liebermann (another who never visited Spain) also used a mirror as a key resource in his self-portrait in his studio (1902; Kunstmuseum, St Gallen), though in this case the setting is not an ordinary domestic interior but a genuine space for pictorial creation, with the tools of the painter’s trade spread across the table, a large window to provide sufficient light and several pictures on the walls, one of which appears to be a copy of Velázquez’s Innocent X. Other references to Las Meninas include the large canvas of which we see only the back,
the meticulous perspective of the whole and the dog sleeping on a chair.64

One of the most interesting things about the images referred to previously is the distinctive use of the mirror. Chase, MacMonnies and Liebermann all introduce it, but instead of using it, as Velázquez did, to complicate the narrative, it provides them with a simple solution to the irresolvable dilemma posed by Velázquez, in that what it reflects is the artist painting. In this way it facilitates the reading of their pictures and establishes in a single motif two of the most characteristic elements of Las Meninas. Looking at these works, one has the impression that these 19th-century artists found the presence of Velázquez in the same pictorial space as his models somewhat disconcerting, and that they did not appreciate the structural importance and the symbolic implications of the reflection of the king and queen in the mirror. The solution they adopted constituted a further—and very significant—step in the double process of deactivating the highly formalized contents of Las Meninas and translating it in terms of everyday domesticity and virtuoso technical display.

Both of these concepts are prominent in several paintings that take their inspiration from Velázquez’s masterwork. The splendid Daughters of Edward Darley Boit (1882; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) is one of the most important offshoots of Las Meninas to be found in the art of the 19th century. The artist, John Singer Sargent, had recently copied the original in Madrid,65 and in this large-format work (221.93 x 222.57 cm) he attempted to recreate the prodigious atmospheric effect of the Velázquez by means of a space modelled by lights and shades. Of the four girls in the picture, the one on the left, with her long fair hair and her frontal position, is clearly reminiscent of the Infanta Margarita.66 The paradoxical (to 19th-century eyes) effect produced by the presence of such anomalous beings as the dwarves and the dog is recreated here by the enormous jars, which are taller than the girls and once again provide an Oriental note. In Spain, this interest in using the Velázquez picture for scenes with a manifestly informal and everyday atmosphere is found in Sorolla, for example, in paintings such as My Children (1904; Museo Sorolla, Madrid) and The Family of Rafael Errázuriz Urmeneta (1925; Masaveu Collection).

But traces of Las Meninas can be discovered in many other works. They are there, for instance, in the self-portraits of artists like Manet, Chase, Pinazo or MacMonnies, and in some notably complex compositions, where the references are subtler. In The Gross Clinic, by Thomas Eakins (1875; Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia), the attitude of the figure standing in the door in the background is similar to that of José Nieto,66 and in A Bar at the Folies Bergère (1881-1882; Courtauld Gallery, London), Manet plays with several of the motifs most closely associated with the image of Velázquez in his day: a mirror that complicates the spatial play; a blonde waitress in an eye-catching dress adorned with a flower, who evokes Velázquez’s infantas; and an extraordinarily free and fluid pictorial handling similar to that developed by the Seville painter in what was referred to in Manet’s day as his ‘third style’.69

One of the factors that influenced the artistic fortunes of Velázquez’s work in the second half of the 19th century was the metapictorial nature of many of the pictures being made at that time. In the Portrait of Santiago Rusiñol by Rusiñol’s friend Ramón Casas (1889; private coll., Barcelona) we find a metapictorial discourse to which Velázquez is one of the keys.70 The Catalan painter is shown standing by the far wall with his right hand resting on the back of a chair. On the floor we see his baggage, a box of matches and a cigar, seeming to suggest a reference to Manet. On the wall there is a landscape signed by Rusiñol which partly overlaps another painting, of which only the top of a head and some panels of a door are visible. These details do not offer much information with which to identify the work, but they are sufficient: what we are shown is the head of the Infanta Margarita and the open door in the background of Las Meninas. Such parsimony is very significant, suggesting as it does that the picture was so well known that a fragment chosen apparently random should be enough to identify it.

The cases we have considered in these pages give an idea of the extent to which the infantas and meninas interested the artists of the last decades of the 19th century; and suggest that when we come to evaluate works by Picasso such as Woman in Blue or the variations on Las Meninas we need to take into account not only the Velázquez original on which they are based, but also the already long tradition of its appreciation and reinterpretation by other artists. The comparison with the works of the painter from Málaga also helps us to understand more clearly the respective significance of the former and the latter. The 19th century, when it was not copying Velázquez’s masterwork, was inspired by it to create new works, taking contemporary spaces and personages, playing down many of its social connotations, and interpreting the work in terms of the everyday and the spontaneous, qualities...
that were of paramount concern to an era in which painting was, as a rule, conceived in naturalistic terms. Picasso, who brought to his work a very pronounced historical consciousness, recovered Velázquez's composition and personas and adapted them to his own formal system, taking an interest in all of the figures, and overlooked none of the complex play of artistic, formal and historical contents associated with Las Meninas; in doing so he took a giant step in the history of the work's artistic interpretation.

1 Museo Picasso, Barcelona, MPB 110-398.
6 See, for example, J. Barón, ‘El retroceso español entre Zuluyoa y Picasso’, op. cit., no. 72.
8 J. Barón, ‘El retroceso español…’, op. cit., no. 68.
10 The most complete appraisal of the history of the reception of Las Meninas, up to a very recent date, is Caroline Kesser, Los Meninas von Velázquez. Eine Wirkungs- und Rezeptionsgeschichte. Berlin, Reimer, 1994.
17 F. Marías, ‘El género…’, op. cit.
To understand Velázquez's influence, it is essential to recognize the extent to which his work was admired and copied by a wide range of artists. His portraits, particularly of the Infanta Margarita and the Infanta Margarita and the Infanta Margarita and the Infanta Margarita, were not only reproduced in Spain but also in France, where they were studied and admired by artists such as Manet, Whistler, and Tinterow. The influence of Velázquez's work was not limited to his contemporaries; it also extended to the next generation of artists, including those who were influenced by his work in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Velázquez's Las Meninas, for example, was one of the most influential works of art in the 19th century. It was admired by artists such as Manet and Whistler, who used it as inspiration for their own works. The painting was also studied by art historians, who analyzed its composition and techniques. The influence of Velázquez's work was not limited to France, but also extended to other countries, such as Britain, where it was studied and admired by artists such as Tinterow.

The influence of Velázquez's work was also evident in the art of the next generation of artists, such as the Impressionists. They were influenced by the way Velázquez used light and shadow to create a sense of depth and realism. The influence of Velázquez's work was also evident in the art of the next generation of artists, such as the Impressionists. They were influenced by the way Velázquez used light and shadow to create a sense of depth and realism.

The influence of Velázquez's work was also evident in the art of the next generation of artists, such as the Impressionists. They were influenced by the way Velázquez used light and shadow to create a sense of depth and realism. The influence of Velázquez's work was also evident in the art of the next generation of artists, such as the Impressionists. They were influenced by the way Velázquez used light and shadow to create a sense of depth and realism. The influence of Velázquez's work was also evident in the art of the next generation of artists, such as the Impressionists. They were influenced by the way Velázquez used light and shadow to create a sense of depth and realism.

The influence of Velázquez's work was also evident in the art of the next generation of artists, such as the Impressionists. They were influenced by the way Velázquez used light and shadow to create a sense of depth and realism. The influence of Velázquez's work was also evident in the art of the next generation of artists, such as the Impressionists. They were influenced by the way Velázquez used light and shadow to create a sense of depth and realism. The influence of Velázquez's work was also evident in the art of the next generation of artists, such as the Impressionists. They were influenced by the way Velázquez used light and shadow to create a sense of depth and realism. The influence of Velázquez's work was also evident in the art of the next generation of artists, such as the Impressionists. They were influenced by the way Velázquez used light and shadow to create a sense of depth and realism.